



Kent Academic Repository

Frew-Costa, Hope Ynes (2020) *Printing Polemic: An Examination Of The Prose Polemic Of Andrew Marvell And His Relationship With His Readership*. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) thesis, University of Kent.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/81771/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

This document version

UNSPECIFIED

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in **Title of Journal**, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

Printing Polemic: An Examination Of The Prose Polemic Of Andrew Marvell And His Relationship With His Readership

Abstract

Printing Polemic aims to deepen critical understanding of Andrew Marvell's printed prose by fully re-politicising these works. These texts are polemic, the aim of publishing to incense and incite the reader, convincing them of the urgent need for reform. Critical attention has largely focused on *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and *An Account of the Growth of Popery*; this thesis will correct this imbalance by interrogating his prose as an oeuvre, in order to reveal the anti-establishment themes prevalent across these works, which run the gamut from satire to secret history. Across these works, Marvell insists on the need for adequate political representation, freedom of conscience, and an end to institutional corruption – appealing to the public sphere his primary means of effecting change. This thesis centres the reader, reconstructing the cultural and political apparatus shaping the lives and attitudes of Marvell's Restoration audience. These texts are rich in allusion, and considering Marvell's prose in relation to contemporary literature and ephemera – from rhetorical manuals, polemical tracts, theatre, newspapers and even his own poetry – reveals the subtext available to an active reader. This thesis will also contribute to the field by analysing Marvell's relationship to means of political expression, namely petitions and political parties, to retrace the implicit means by which Marvell encourages political participation (whilst skirting accusations of sedition in an increasingly hostile political climate). Contextualising these pamphlets with the reader in mind reveals both the effectiveness of Marvell's rhetorical strategy and the depth of his subversion. The intricacy of his subtext is crucial to his polemical agenda – in Marvell's rhetoric, shaping active readers is a means of creating active citizens.

Word count: 99,989 *excluding bibliography and footnotes*

Hope Y. Frew-Costa
2020
University of Kent
Centre for Medieval and Early Modern Studies

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Rosanna Cox, for her support – her encouragement and advice has been ceaselessly valuable throughout this process. I would also like to thank Dr. Ryan Perry and Professor Catherine Richardson for their suggestions, alongside the rest of my colleagues at MEMS. Dr. David Colclough introduced me to Marvell's prose works – his insight and guidance was critical in the creation of this project. I would also like to thank my examiners, Dr. Anne Hughes and Dr. Sarah Dustagheer. My family have stood behind me throughout this process and I hope that I have made them proud. And a special thanks to Mark Chappel for offering his service as a proofreader and a sounding board.

List of Abbreviations

RT – The Rehearsal Transpros'd

RT2 – The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part

Smirke – Mr Smirke; Or, The Divine in Mode

SHE – A Short Historical Essay

Account – An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government

Contents

<i>Introduction</i> –	1
 <i>Section 1: Levity and Brevity: Establishing a Tone</i>	
I. Levity –	54
II. Brevity –	93
 <i>Section 2: The Political Voice Writing for the Public Sphere</i>	
I. The Politician –	132
II. The Chameleon –	169
 <i>Section 3: Textual Scaffolding: Writing for the Literary Marketplace</i>	
I. Popular Culture –	211
II. Unpopular Theologies –	260
 <i>Conclusion</i> –	 299
 <i>Bibliography</i> –	 301

Printing Polemic

For he did, with his utmost skill,
Ambition weed, but conscience till,
Conscience, that heaven-nursèd plant,
Which most our earthly gardens want,
A prickling leaf it bears, and such
As that which shrinks at every touch;
But flowers eternal, and divine,
That in the crowns of saints do shine.¹

Penned late in the summer of 1651, when Andrew Marvell (1621-1678) served as tutor to the daughter of Lord Thomas Fairfax (1612-1671), *Upon Appleton House, To My Lord Fairfax* (from which these lines are taken) seemingly exalts the merits of retirement from public life. Fairfax, formerly Chief Commander of the Parliamentary forces, had resigned his command after refusing to invade Scotland or participate in the trial of Charles I (1600-1649). His private 'Conscience' is figured in this verse as both 'earthly' and 'divine', natural and sublime – an internal force that by necessity checks 'ambition.' His principles forbid political involvement, and disengagement offers a means of redemption. Though Marvell would admire his patron in these terms, they would not provide a model for his own behaviour. By the 1670s the matter of private conscience became a cause of political concern in light of mounting fears of authoritarianism and increased sanctions against religious nonconformity; Christian and civil liberty needed to be defended, and Marvell chose prose as his means of entering the political arena. Marvell – who in his youth had exiled himself to the continent from late 1642 to 1647, intentionally avoiding the most turbulent years

¹ Andrew Marvell, 'Upon Appleton House, To My Lord Fairfax', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.216-241 (p.226, ll.353-360).

of the Civil War – would spend the last years of his short life actively engaged in political debates. This engagement stands in stark contrast to the indifference to public life seen in his verse; his prose texts, and the means by which he sought to provoke his readership, functioned as his primary means of active, political involvement.

The 1670s, relative to the extraordinary political developments of its surrounding decades, might appear as a lacuna in English political history. The monumental political upheaval that occurred in the middle of the century – which had seen political developments ranging from an entirely unprecedented form of government (Republicanism) and the introduction of a new political medium (the newspaper) – was brought to an apparent halt by the Restoration in 1660. In order to create an imagined sense of continuity, Charles II (1630-1685) and his inner circle entered into a programme of selective mercy (“forgiving” the majority of Parliamentarians and punishing only those directly involved in his father’s regicide) and extensive repression and censorship (of which the newspaper was a primary casualty). The spectre of the Civil War and Interregnum became an expedient tool for political suppression, as Marvell would lament in his *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* (1677) those who sought to defend the ‘Liberties of the Nation’ would be thwarted by those who seeking ‘to inculcate *Forty and One* in Court and Country.’² And yet, despite this hinderance, as enthusiasm for the King and his methods waned attempts to voice dissent grew in intensity.³ Marvell – publicly serving as a member of parliament and representing the Hull Corporation, whilst privately honing his craft as a poet – helped stoke this maelstrom by publishing a series of political pamphlets and adding his voice into a vociferous polemic body that questioned the status quo. *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* (1672), *The Rehearsal Transpros’d: the Second Part* (1673), *Mr Smirke* (1676), *A Short Historical Essay* (1676), and *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* ⁴

² Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), II, pp.225-377 (p.287).

³ Though Charles II managed to retain his title, his brother and heir would not enjoy the same success: those who took to print to criticise the King in the 1670s contributed to the public dissatisfaction that initiated the first Exclusion Crisis of 1679.

⁴ Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University

Marvell's first foray into printed controversy, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, appeared in November 1672. Marvell was prompted to enter into the toleration debate by Anglican reactionary Samuel Parker (1640-1688), chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Gilbert Sheldon (1598-1677). His *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie: wherein The Authority of the Civil Magistrate Over the Consciences of Subjects in Matters of Religion Asserted* (1670) proved one of the most controversial texts of the period, with Parker emerging as the most vocal and vociferous advocate of a unified Church in Restoration England, and a staunch supporter of both royal absolutism and disciplinary punishments for those who deviated from Anglican orthodoxy.⁵ Throughout this text and his other polemical tracts Parker insisted upon the necessity of anti-nonconformist legislation for social order, argued in favour of public control over the private consciences of men, and promulgated a decidedly absolutist stance. Parker's addition of a preface to a publication of *Bishop Bramhall's Vindication of Himself and the Episcopal Clergy From the Presbyterian Charge of Popery, As it is managed by Mr. Baxter in his Treatise of the Grotian Religion. Together with a Preface Shewing What Grounds there are Fears and Jealousies of Popery*, emerging in June of 1672, provided Marvell an opportunity to offer a rejoinder.⁶ It was in direct response to this text that Marvell penned *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, using Parker's fierce *ad hominum* attacks – a perceived breach of civility – as an opportunity to respond in kind. Marvell used the genre of animadversion, in which a satirist directly quotes from and dissects the writing of another text, to undermine his opponent's logical inconsistencies and highlight the danger of his ideology, whilst simultaneously using an comedy and literary allusion to mock Parker and his style of prose. The publication of Marvell's pamphlet may have been timed to follow the next

Press, 2003), I, pp.41-203; Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), I, pp.221-438; Andrew Marvell, *Mr Smirke: Or, the Divine in Mode*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), II, pp.35-113; Andrew Marvell, *A Short Historical Essay, Concerning General Councils, Creeds and Imposition in Matters of Religion*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), II, pp.115-176.

⁵ Samuel Parker, *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie: wherein The Authority of the Civil Magistrate Over the Consciences of Subjects in Matters of Religion Asserted* (London: Printed by John Maryn, 1670).

⁶ Samuel Parker, 'A Preface to the Reader', in *Bishop Bramhall's Vindication of Himself and the Episcopal Clergy From the Presbyterian Charge of Popery, As it is managed by Mr. Baxter in his Treatise of the Grotian Religion. Together with a Preface Shewing What Grounds there are Fears and Jealousies of Popery* (London: Printed by A. C. for James Collins, 1672), sig.A2r-[e8]v.

session of Parliament, due to begin on October 30th (though it was eventually prorogued), leveraging the public reaction to the text to influence the course of debate. The popularity of the text precipitated pirated editions and two separate duodecimo editions were illicitly produced in 1673.⁷ A second, censored, octavo edition purporting to be 'The second Impression, with Additions and Amendments' (featuring a brief publisher's preface that specifically rebuked the '*Counterfeit Impression in 12^o*' in circulation) was published early in 1673.⁸

The Rehearsal Transpros'd had been met with vociferous criticism and numerous rebuttals, including by Samuel Parker, who attempted to respond to Marvell in kind by producing his own animadversion, *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd* (1673).⁹ Marvell's first polemical outing had been 'a smash hit, avidly (and also vituperatively) read by the good and the great' – in critiquing him his adversaries attempted to emulate both his rhetorical and commercial success by mimicking his polemical strategy, using absurdist humour, literary allusion, and vitriolic *ad hominem* attack in their own replies.¹⁰ By publishing *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* Marvell provided an answer to his critics and further cemented his ideological position, which Dzelzainis and Patterson define as 'a theoretically coherent attack on the doctrines of monarchical absolutism, Erastianism, and enforced conformity that Parker had been advocating.'¹¹ *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* deviates from the other entries in the Marvell prose oeuvre, being both a sequel and a text published sans the cloak of anonymity. Both of these choices considerably affect the content and approach of Marvell's text. Marvell is anticipating a reader aware of both his and Parker's reputation, and of the controversy generated by their polemical sparring; many of the jokes rely on the

⁷ Martin Dzelzainis and Annabel Patterson, 'Introduction', in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), I, pp.3-40 (p.33).

⁸ Nicholas von Maltzahn, *An Andrew Marvell Chronology* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), pp.134-5.

⁹ Samuel Parker, *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transposed*, in *Discourse to its Authour* (London: Printed for James Collins, 1673).

¹⁰ Matthew C. Augustine, 'Marvell and Print Culture', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.14> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-21 (p.2).

¹¹ Martin Dzelzainis and Annabel Patterson, 'The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part', in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), I, pp.207-220 (p.208).

reader having encountered some of the “Reproofs” inspired by the original *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*. In this way the text functions as performative literary engagement, anticipating a reader interested and engaged in this print controversy. Two editions of the text were published in tandem in November 1673 – the first a 410 page octavo, the second a 376 page duodecimo.¹² The second edition appears to have been a deliberate attempt by Marvell’s bookseller, Nathaniel Ponder (1640-1699), to pre-empt piracy by producing a copy for the cheaper end of the market – an acknowledgement of public demand.

Marvell’s next printed venture would be the joint publication *Mr Smirke and A Short Historical Essay* in May, 1676; it would mark a significant increase in the outrage and contention precipitated by his prose. *Mr Smirke* followed the model of his previous commercial successes – a satirical animadversion targeting an ambitious Anglican reactionary. The controversialist locked in Marvell’s cross-hairs was Francis Turner, royal chaplain to the Duke of York, who in February 1676 published *Animadversions upon a Late Pamphlet* – the *Late Pamphlet* in question being Bishop Herbert Croft’s (1603-1691) *The Naked Truth: or, the True State of the Primitive Church*, in which Croft advocated for comprehension of Protestant dissenters into the Anglican church.¹³ Turner’s pamphlet had been scabrous and caustic in its response to Croft’s measured call for toleration – a show of disrespect that allowed Marvell to reply in an equally contemptuous tone.¹⁴ By contrast, *A Short Historical Essay* eschews literary allusion and satire in favour of biblical citation, as Marvell presents the reader with a history of the church that is highly sceptical of the church’s motives. Nigel Smith notes that ‘Andrew Marvell learned much from Milton when constructing his own history of church councils,’ echoing his vision of the church:

¹² von Maltzahn, *Chronology*, p.148.

¹³ [Francis Turner], *Animadversions Upon a Late Pamphlet Entitled The Naked Truth; Or, the True State of the Primitive Church* (London: Printed by T. R., 1676).

¹⁴ In 1675 Bishop Herbert Croft penned *The Naked Truth: or, the True State of the Primitive Church*, intending to deliver it to Members of Parliament in time for the parliamentary session opening on April the 13th – a session in which one of the topics of discussion would have been further measures to curb religious dissent. Croft had been part of a group of Anglican religious leaders arguing for comprehension and the relaxation of penal punishments for nonconformists – and Croft was charged with producing a pamphlet to promote their cause. As Marvell explains in *Mr Smirke*, Croft had intended four hundred copies to be printed and distributed only among MPs and peers. Unfortunately for Croft, on the 9th of June Charles II prorogued Parliament, before the pamphlet could reach its very specific intended audience. Despite Croft’s efforts to suppress the pamphlet, the text was pirated without his permission.

as progressively corrupted through time by power-hungry bishops and post-scriptural impositions; testimony in support of episcopacy in church historical writing is either unreliable or in error. The history of the councils in the early church is therefore a sad history of one power abuse after another until the rise of the Popes in the Middle Ages, which is even worse.¹⁵

It was this initiative to direct his readers to question the actions of the episcopacy that would spark a furore and scandalise ‘the upper echelons of the Church of England’: Marvell acknowledged the controversy in a letter, when recounting that ‘Henry Compton, bishop of London, [who had provided an imprimatur to Turner’s pamphlet] had carried his marked-up version to Privy Council meetings buttonholing members about its contents.’¹⁶ Three quarto editions of the tract were produced in quick succession in 1676.

Published in January of 1678, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* would provoke even greater controversy. In this text Marvell (in defiance of the law and parliamentary protocol) provided his readers with an account of political corruption, framing recent political disasters for the government as the result of Catholic conspirators working to undermine parliament’s ability to act as a representative body for the people. Whilst ostensibly “conspirators” are scapegoated, Marvell’s implicit criticism of the King and his inner circle is scathing. The government’s reaction was swift and severe. In a proclamation printed in *The London Gazette* in March 1678, the pamphlet was condemned for containing ‘*Seditious, and Scandalous Libels against the Proceedings of Both Houses of Parliament, and other His Majesties Courts of Justice, to the Dishonour of His Majesties Government, and the Hazard of the Publick Peace*’; a reward of ‘Fifty pounds’ for the printer and ‘One hundred Pounds’ for the author was promised, a considerable sum reflecting the seriousness of the government’s response.¹⁷ Though efforts were made to suppress the text, they were

¹⁵ Nigel Smith, ‘The Anti-Episcopal Tracts: Republican Puritanism and the Truth in Poetry’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Milton*, ed. by Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199697885.013.0008> [accessed April 15th, 2020] pp.1-20 (p.4, n.9).

¹⁶ Martin Dzelzainis and Steph Coster, ‘The Commissioning, Writing, and Printing of *Mr. Smirke: A New Account*’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.32> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-23 (p.1).

¹⁷ *The London Gazette*, 25 March 1678 <<https://www.thegazette.co.uk/London/issue/1289/page/2>> [accessed 1st May, 2020].

ultimately ineffectual. In his *Honesty's best Policy* (1678), Marchamont Nedham (1620-1678) would decry Marvell as 'the Author of the New Directory for Petty States-men' and his work as a 'Treasonous Libellius Pamphlet, industriously now spread and dispersed into all hands about the Kingdom' – though his condemnation testifies to the 'spread' and impact of the work.¹⁸ The first edition (a quarto of 156 pages) would be printed by John Darby in January of 1679, shortly followed by a second quarto edition of 144 pages (by a different, anonymous printer): Marvell's untimely death on August 16th, 1678 allowed for him to be named as author on the third edition published in 1679, 'a more imposing folio' intended to 'help explain the Popish Plot'; as Nicholas von Maltzahn suggests, 'that the author of such a tract should be named was unusual and helped raise Andrew Marvell, Esquire, to his posthumous prominence.'¹⁹

Together these texts represent a marked generic and ideological shift in Marvell's textual production. As a poet Marvell sought obscurity; as a polemicist he sought the widest possible audience.²⁰ Whilst his poems were strictly kept in manuscripts with a select readership, these texts were printed and published. Even more audaciously, given the subversive subtext (and occasionally simply *text*) of Marvell's writing, these pamphlets were written intentionally to provoke and delight his readership. This thesis will examine these works as propaganda. These were not passive documents – a mere opportunity for Marvell to air his political commentary – these were texts written with a clear eye, fixated on the figure of the reader. As shall be explored, one of the more striking features of Marvell's prose is the frequency with which he consciously addresses his reader. In his animadversions the reader is a comrade, mocking Parker alongside the speaker of the pamphlet as Marvell directs their attention to particularly egregious passages written by his opponent; the very

¹⁸ Marchmont Needham, *Honesty's Best Policy, or Penitence the sum of Prudence* (London: s.n., [1678]) pp.9-10.

¹⁹ Nicholas von Maltzahn, 'Introduction', in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), II, pp.179-221 (p.203).

²⁰ Marvell's poetry circulated in manuscript form, and the scant number of extant MS copies of his verse (especially pre-Restoration) attests to a close control of his poetry - in fact many of his early works *only* appear in the posthumously published *Miscellaneous Poems* (1681). By contrast his prose works all appear in multiple print editions - *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, for instance, was an instant hit, necessitating two editions within a year and inspiring a pirated "2d Edition Corrected." Nigel Smith, 'Introduction', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.xii-xvii (p.xii).

genre of animadversion plays with these conventions. By design the writer is consciously framing themselves *as* a critical reader scrutinising an objectionable text and directly presenting their response as commentary, thus the parallels between their critical voice and that of their putative reader exist on a metatextual level. Both writer and reader are figured in opposition to an offending text, and Marvell uses sly asides – ‘how properly, let the Reader Judge’ – to add to the satiric impact of his work.²¹ In *An Account* these arch references to an individual reader are replaced by a call to a collective, establishing a sense of national identity. In both, references to the reader are utilised to create a sense of immediacy that adds to the polemic urgency of the text. Examining this metatextuality will be one approach of this thesis. The task at hand is to deconstruct Marvell’s method; to understand how the rhetorical strategy evidenced in these works intended to function.

The aim of this thesis is to *fully* re-politicise Marvell’s prose texts. Marvell’s legacy as a poet has far over-shadowed that of his political prose – even though these works came to dominate the last years of his life and were all published (whilst his poems were tightly withheld) and issued at great risk to the author. Marvell not only engaged in some of the most rancorous debates of the Restoration – religious toleration and the spectre of arbitrary government – he did so in spectacular fashion. Both the number of print runs and number of scabrous printed replies to all of the texts discussed in this thesis reveal the extent of the outrage caused by his prose output among his political enemies. These texts were not ignored by his contemporaries; they did not fly under the radar. The work he produced was both incendiary and highly influential – in fact, it is probably this influence that secured their obscurity for modern scholars. Recently the tide has turned, with critics once again looking to Marvell’s pamphlets. Whilst this work has been begun by Marvellian critics such as Martin Dzelzainis, Annabel Patterson, Nigel Smith and Nicholas von Maltzahn among others, their focus has most frequently been focused on unpicking the rhetorical structure, political ideology or historical moment of individual texts. This thesis will build on their work, but will take the next logical step and view these texts as an oeuvre – it is by comparing and contrasting these texts against each other that a broader analysis of Marvell’s rhetorical strategy can be accomplished. This

²¹ Marvell, *RT*, p.122.

thesis will actively ask *why* certain literary and rhetorical choices are made in one pamphlet and eschewed in another – why is humour so potent a weapon in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, yet actively contrasted with an earnest work of church history with the joint publication of *Mr Smirke* and *A Short Historical Essay*? How does Marvell's rhetorical strategy alter when he reveals his authorship, as happens with *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part*? As will be revealed, the answer to these and other questions this thesis will interrogate is the reader.

The reader is crucial to a full understanding of these texts as propaganda – which they undoubtedly were. The texts were specifically designed to provoke anger (whether against or on behalf of the establishment was of course dependent on the political leanings of the reader). In this endeavour Marvell was incredibly successful: as Matthew C. Augustine contends, 'while Marvell may have published his work only narrowly and discreetly, what he did choose to print, or let slip into print, had a remarkable influence on literary discourse and public opinion alike and deserves study on the basis of that achievement.'²² Marvell was adept at recognising the cultural trends and market factors that would affect the reception of his work – in analysing his prose, this thesis will foreground these considerations of his writing. These texts were active sites of political activity – without proposing a method of political engagement (a fraught activity that will be investigated in Section Two), Marvell is still utilising and appealing to the idea of a popular, political consciousness, or what Habermas would label the "Public Sphere." Stirring public discontent through print, this thesis will argue, was clearly seen as a means of effecting political change (even if, in actuality, this change was slow to manifest). As such the reader is integral to the endeavour – *their* response is the purpose of publishing, and so an understanding of Restoration culture and its political climate is intrinsic to an understanding *not* of Marvell's political leanings (a formidable task already admirably undertaken by Marvellian scholars), but of the readers he was attempting to incense and persuade. The variance in these potential reactions attests to the active role the reader's response figures in the creation of meaning. Roger Chartier, whose highly influential work centres on the history of the book, posited that inherent to the act of reading is the process of "appropriation" – in this model of reader engagement,

²² Augustine, 'Marvell and Print Culture', p.3.

reading is an inherently active exercise: ‘apparently passive and submissive, reading is, in fact, in its own way, inventive and creative.’²³ Different readers will interpret or use the same text in their own way, to their own ends. In this configuration reading is a personal, individualised experience: ‘to concentrate on the concrete conditions and processes that construct meaning is to recognize, unlike traditional intellectual history, that minds are not disincarnated, and, unlike hermeneutics, that the categories which engender experiences and interpretations are historical, discontinuous, and differentiated.’²⁴

Though this may seem to suggest that a text can be interpreted a ‘limitless number of ways by the reader’, Chartier makes clear in his model that ‘historical’ context and evidence of how various ‘interpretive communities’ encountered the text, can provide insight into the text was engaged with: ‘what is called for is a social history of the uses and understandings of texts by communities of readers who, successively, take possession of them.’²⁵ What the reader *takes* from the text is dependent on the social conditions that have shaped their lived experience; reaction to the text is mutable dependent on these factors. A nonconformist and a devout Anglican will belong to independent “interpretive communities” – they will potentially read and appropriate texts in significantly different ways. In this theory of reader response there is the potential for conflict between the author’s intentions and the reader’s reaction: ‘we must recognize, therefore, a major tension between the explicit or implicit intentions a text proposes to a wide audience and the variety of possible reading responses.’²⁶ While Chartier theorises this as a tension, Marvell’s prose – in particular his animadversion – plays with the possibility of variant meaning. As will be explored by this thesis, the dense use of literary allusion creates layers of potential interpretation – the text facilitates alternative readings depending on the texts already encountered by a contemporary reader. At points in his prose Marvell echoes the imagery found in his verse; a reader aware of his verse satires will potentially interpret a greater degree of subversion in the text than a reader without

²³ Roger Chartier, *Forms and Meaning: Text, Performances, and Audiences from Codex to Computer* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1995) p.90.

²⁴ Chartier, *Forms and Meaning*, p.89.

²⁵ Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011) p.31; Chartier, *Forms and Meaning*, p.92.

²⁶ Chartier, *Forms and Meaning*, pp.92-93.

this foreknowledge. These texts were built to engender a multiplicity of meaning, and anticipate an active reader. Reflecting on his earlier work, Chartier clarifies that:

interpretative community and appropriation, were at the core of my analysis, but with the proviso that both had to be historicized and located within the set conventions, norms, interests, and practices that characterized different ways of reading, different relations with the written culture, and the different perceptions and representations of the social experiences.²⁷

The 'codes and conventions that are imposed by social identity' – from political persuasion, religious affiliation, and socio-economic status – implicitly affect how a reader is likely to respond to a text.²⁸ Understanding the social conditions shaping Marvell's readership can provide insight into the varied ways the text was received by its contemporary audience, but also inform our understanding of how Marvell shaped his polemical strategy in recognition of a reader's power to interpret the text for themselves.

Chartier's conception of reading as a process of appropriation is especially relevant to a consideration of early modern readers. Victoria Kahn, in fact, argues that active reading and the acknowledgment of a reader's ability to construct meaning was so intrinsic to an early modern understanding of reading itself that, 'reader response criticism could only be seen as new and fashionable when the assumptions of a humanist rhetorical tradition had been forgotten.'²⁹ In his *Godly Reading* (a wide-ranging spatial history of reading in puritan communities), Andrew Cambers provides a critical survey into the history of reading, and concludes that:

Amongst this array of "object" studies (where the focus is on numerous readers of one book), "impact" studies (where the focus is on a single reader) and more general studies of readership, one particular interpretation of reading has been given prominence: that early modern readers were "active" readers who "appropriated" texts.³⁰

²⁷ Roger Chartier, 'The Order of Books Revisited', in *Modern Intellectual History*, 4 (2007), 509-519 (p.518).

²⁸ Chartier, 'Revisited', p.518.

²⁹ Victoria Kahn, *Rhetoric, Prudence, and Skepticism in the Renaissance* (London: Cornell University Press, 1985), p.19.

³⁰ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.30.

This culture of active reading was in part a result of a humanist education. As William H. Sherman observes, 'Renaissance readers were not only *allowed* to write notes in and on their books, they were *taught* to do so in school.'³¹ This method of engagement with the text was encouraged as an aid to memory, but it also functioned as a means of appropriation, with the reader choosing the parts of the text to highlight (whether in condemnation or praise) for their own use. Sherman's work on marginal annotation reveals the prevalence of this practice: having examined 7,500 volumes printed between 1475 and 1640 in Huntington Library's *Short Title Catalogue*, Sherman found that more than 1 in 5 of the early printed books held in this archive contain some form of marginalia.³² The presence of manicules, underlining, marginal symbols, comments, glosses, and translations attest to the various and diverse strategies employed by readers to respond to the text, and customise their copy to fit their purpose.³³

This data is complicated by the fact that "clean" copies of early printed books have traditionally been valued by antiquarians (annotations were often actively removed by a process of bleaching) and that the books which have been most handled are less likely to survive, extant copies of early modern texts representing 'only a fraction of those that were produced.'³⁴ Even so, Sherman's work reveals that annotation was a common practice used by early modern readers, and that 'readers continued to add to texts [...] and that printed books did not contain everything that every reader needed to make sense of (and with) their texts.'³⁵ This was even acknowledged by printers themselves. There were in fact mass market books produced that purposefully left space for the owner to add their own annotations, such as printed commonplace notebooks that provided subheadings to prompt a reader to organise their responses to texts: these notebooks are just one of many 'examples of printed items that were destined to engender and preserve writing by

³¹ William H. Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008) p.3.

³² Sherman, *Used Books*, xii.

³³ Sherman, *Used Books*, p.5, pp.15-18.

³⁴ Sherman, *Used Books*, pp.5-6

³⁵ Sherman, *Used Books*, p.9.

hand.³⁶ This process of appropriation is epitomised by the commonplace book; here the reader acted as an editor, curating excerpts from various texts.

These practices exemplify that ‘early modern readers approached books for the use they could get out of them.’³⁷ The cultural emphasis on rhetoric in the early modern period also contributed to this phenomenon. Kevin Sharpe contends:

The rhetorical tradition was throughout as concerned with readers and auditors as with orators and writers: rhetoric presumes readers who may be persuaded or not persuaded, able to ‘read’ as they decided. And as Erasmus clearly discerned, ‘right reading’ was as much an ethical practice, an inculcation and practice of virtue and prudence, as learning to write, speak and act. Reading was an action, an activity, through which people learned to be good citizens in a Christian commonweal.³⁸

Both author and reader are positioned as capable of constructing meaning and, for the reader in particular, this process of analysing the text was envisioned as a civic duty. The classical rhetoricians venerated in the early modern period placed particular emphasis on the art of persuading an audience: Kahn asserts that, ‘Renaissance rhetoric is by definition concerned with the effect of the text on the reader, and in particular with educating or influencing the reader’s judgement.’³⁹ The aesthetics of rhetoric were thus inexorably bound to the ideas of morality. This idealised vision of “right reading” as a civic duty also accounts for the cultural anxieties surrounding reading. As books became more accessible to a greater proportion of society denunciations of the printing press, and its power to breed ‘corruption’ and sedition, grew in intensity.⁴⁰ Persuading a reader was acknowledged as a politically charged action. This thesis will posit that polemic, and persuading a reader, is Marvell’s praxis; protest is his aim. Though he does not condone any form of political action explicitly, he continually seeks to promote controversy – asking his readers to question the actions and narratives promulgated by figures in authority, to

³⁶ Chartier, ‘Revisited’, p.512.

³⁷ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.30.

³⁸ Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (London: Yale University Press, 2000) p.40.

³⁹ Kahn, *Rhetoric*, p.19.

⁴⁰ Chartier, ‘Revisited’, p.516.

appropriate a message of dissent. Whether in the guise of comedy, or by adopting a more serious persona, Marvell seeks to turn his audience from active readers into active citizens. A key focus of this thesis will be reconstructing the contextual scaffolding – whether political, literary or cultural – that these texts are built upon.

It is by this act of reconstruction that we can begin to interpret how Marvell envisioned his putative readers – the interpretative communities that would be responding to his prose – in order to discern exactly how his texts were calibrated to elicit their engagement. Appreciating the ‘humanist recognition of the independence and power of readers, as well as authors, to construct meaning’ – to foreground the figure of the reader – is essential in a discussion of Marvell’s political aims in taking to print.⁴¹ In considering the relationship between author and reader in the period, Sharpe observes:

Writers themselves were the first to credit the reader’s independence and authority. They knew that certain genres virtually demanded readers to make their own meanings and that the habit and freedom so called up were redeployed as common practice.⁴²

This is certainly true of Marvell’s prose; in his animadversions in particular he frequently addresses his reader directly. He promises that in handling Parker that; ‘I shall without Art write down his own Words and his own *quod Scripsi Scripsi*, as they ly naked to the view of every Reader.’⁴³ The ‘Reader’ is figured as capable of engaging in their own analysis, and their judgement is deferred too. In this way Marvell is performatively creating ‘space for the interpretation of the reader.’⁴⁴ As this thesis will prove, it is through the process of relocating attention to the reader that Marvell’s prose texts can fully be appreciated and appraised as polemic, rather than as passive documents – testaments only to his personal beliefs. By considering the reader, we can restore the polemic force of his prose work.

Central to a discussion of the history of reading in the period is a consideration of the spatial context in which reading took place. Cambers research into the reading

⁴¹ Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.40.

⁴² Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.41.

⁴³ Marvell, *RT*, p.91.

⁴⁴ Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.41.

practices of religious nonconformists reveals that 'early modern reading was a creative and active process, subject to transformation and fluctuating in different social and cultural contexts.'⁴⁵ Reading happened in private and in public, independently and communally. How a reader encountered the text – whether in the closet, the bedchamber, the household hall, or in a town library, a coffeehouse, a bookshop, whether alone or surrounded by their household or a crowd, whether they physically read the text or heard the text read aloud – invariably shaped their experience; reading was 'conditioned by context.'⁴⁶ These different social and spatial scenarios necessitated 'a range of styles of reading.'⁴⁷ For instance, the study – a space that had professional associations, a room in which books were often stored, and which was furnished with a desk and writing materials – might encourage a style of reading that involved annotation.⁴⁸ Conversely, the coffeehouse was a space that promoted sociability and debate, and where books and newspapers were provided for patrons: 'whether graphically or textually, coffeehouses were rarely depicted without books and readers.' The sociability connected with the coffeehouse was also closely associated with dissent: as Adrian Johns observes, 'the coffeehouse was easily the Restoration's most notorious centre for conspiracy and communal reading.'⁴⁹ Illiteracy was no bar to access, as texts were read aloud – controversial texts were especially prized for their ability to excite debate. In these spaces texts would be read and analysed communally. In the Restoration period bookshops also served as a venue for reading, both as an individual and communal activity. Booksellers frequently lived in rooms above their stores, and were known to use their private dwellings as showrooms for illicit texts, and occasionally let customers use this space to read.⁵⁰ These spaces were invaluable to the nonconformist community for whom gathering in more public spaces could qualify as an illegal conventicle, as 'the physical spaces of bookshops offered potential for reading and religious sociability.'⁵¹

⁴⁵ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.31.

⁴⁶ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.34.

⁴⁷ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.34.

⁴⁸ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, pp.72-74.

⁴⁹ Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998) p.112.

⁵⁰ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.198.

⁵¹ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.190.

As bookshops grew in size the opportunity to browse became available to potential readers – diarist Samuel Pepys being one of the many who regularly ‘read books whilst stood in bookshops, often for several hours at a time.’⁵² There is even evidence of individuals borrowing books from a bookseller for a limited time – whilst town and parish libraries were unlikely to hold subversive material, booksellers were less likely to have these qualms.⁵³ Bookshops were not just a retail outlet, as James Raven observes: ‘the bookshop became a focus for news and information exchange, and in many cases, as much a node of polite sociability as the coffeehouse or more formal meeting places.’⁵⁴ Evidence from his correspondence suggests that Marvell himself utilised this reading space. In a letter to Sir Edward Harley (1624-1700), a supporter of the nonconformist cause, Marvell laid out his reasons for publishing *The Second Part*:

I find here at my returne a new booke against the Rehearsall intituled: St, to him Bayes: writ by one Hodges. But it is like the rest onely some-thing more triviall. Gregory Gray-beard is not yet out. Dr Parker will be out next weeke. I have seen 330 pages and it will be much more. I perceive by what I have read that it is the rudest book, one or other, that was ever publisht.⁵⁵ (P&L, 2:328)

This correspondence provides insight into Marvell’s motivation, which he teasingly ascribes a desire ‘to intermeddle in a high and noble argument’; in fact since the publication of *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* the political climate was growing increasingly hostile towards religious nonconformists.⁵⁶ The letter also provides insight into his movements, as the timing of this letter (written May 3rd, before Parker’s text would go on sale in June) suggests that Marvell was reading his critics in bookshops or their adjoining printing houses before they were issued. Clearly Marvell was a familiar enough face in the publishing community to be granted advance access to texts. This chimes with recent scholarship which indicates that Marvell was highly

⁵² Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.199.

⁵³ Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.45; Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.200.

⁵⁴ James Raven, *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade 1450-1850* (London: Yale University Press, 2007) p.113.

⁵⁵ He was correct in his estimation of Parker’s loquaciousness – his *Reproof* would in fact balloon to 528 pages.

⁵⁶ Anglesey had attempted to bring in a bill to protect Protestant nonconformists from penalties in March, 1673 – an attempt that was decidedly quashed, and instead followed by a strengthening of anti-nonconformist legislation.

involved in the process of publication: as Augustine contends, ‘we should take seriously the idea that Marvell’s prose works constitute significant collaborations between writer and printer.’⁵⁷ This involved making active decisions as to the ‘protocols of *presentation*’; Marvell is highly attentive to the semiotic potential of his graphic choices, utilising ‘typefaces, italics, points, dingles, marginalia, etc.’ strategically in order to engage the reader and play with Restoration literary conventions, as will be explored in later chapters. Both the coffeehouse and the bookshop represent centres of social reading, places where readers could interact with texts communally – their responses contributing to a public discourse: ‘ideas were printed, discussed, debated, negotiated and shaped in the spaces of the public sphere.’⁵⁸ Readers did not necessarily need to own, or physically hold a copy of the text in order to be engaging with its contents as these spaces allowed for oral and aural interaction with the text, highlighting the ‘importance of thinking about reading beyond the book and of employing a more capacious definition of what constituted reading.’⁵⁹ Considering the ‘mental, material, and spatial parameters within which specific acts of reading can be placed’ offers a tantalising glimpse into how Marvell’s Restoration readers would have interacted with and engaged with his prose.⁶⁰

In acknowledgment of its provocative and subversive content the publication of this pamphlet – and the majority of Marvell’s prose output – was clandestine. In discussing Marvell’s relationship to Restoration print culture, Augustine asserts that ‘the first thing that we need to understand about Marvell’s [...] polemical prose of the 1670s is that their publication—almost without exception—took place underground and illegally.’⁶¹ For instance *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* was neither licensed or entered into the Stationer’s Register, and the first edition (an octavo running to 326 pages) was issued under a false imprint.⁶² In consequence the process of its dissemination was fraught; Marvell’s bookseller was raided on December 2nd, 1672 and one of his printers, John Darby (d.1704), was interrogated by the Stationer’s

⁵⁷ Augustine, ‘Marvell and Print Culture’, p.15.

⁵⁸ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.210.

⁵⁹ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.211.

⁶⁰ Sherman, *Used Books*, xvi.

⁶¹ Augustine, ‘Marvell and Print Culture’, p.11.

⁶² Attempts were made to censor, including changing the imprint; von Maltzahn, *Chronology*, pp.136-137.

Company and 'was forced to shut down one of his presses.'⁶³ To ensure its continued circulation Arthur Annesley, Earl of Anglesey (1614-1686), a privy counsellor invested in the nonconformist cause interceded on the printer's behalf; support for the pamphlet went to very high places, and the King himself was purported to have helped mediate its release, with Annesley reporting in his diary that 'he will not have it suppress.'⁶⁴ *Mr Smirke's* route to publication was particularly circuitous. In their analysis of the genesis text, Martin Dzelzainis and Steph Coster document its underground publication – numerous printers were involved to conceal its production, resulting in three quarto versions (a first edition, a variant issue of the first edition, and a second edition) produced in quick succession and containing 'bewildering bibliographic complexities' as a result of the collaboration necessitated by its covert manufacture.⁶⁵

Ponder was in fact imprisoned as a result of his involvement, his warrant citing his crime as the production of an 'unlicenced Pamphlett tending to Sediton and Defamation of the Christian Religion' and the Stationers Company went to great lengths to suppress the pamphlet.⁶⁶ For these reasons Marvell's works were not advertised via *The London Gazette* or *Term Catalogues* (a published list of newly released and reprinted volumes issued by booksellers), so pricing the texts is a speculative exercise. The 1630s saw an inflationary rise in the relative price of books as a result of the Stationer's Company inflating the price of paper; however, as Raven notes, incomes had increased enough to combat this inflation:

Increased consumption from the mid-seventeenth century followed from an economic regime largely recovered from earlier price inflation, trade depression, and harvest failures. The continuing move towards a money economy and price stability from about the 1650s was further related to a critical fall in the price of foodstuffs as compared to the price of industrial goods.⁶⁷

⁶³ Augustine, 'Marvell and Print Culture', p.12.

⁶⁴ Arthur Annesley, Earl of Anglesey, quoted in Dzelzainis and Patterson, 'Introduction', p.28.

⁶⁵ Dzelzainis and Coster, 'Commissioning *Mr. Smirke*', p.10.

⁶⁶ Dzelzainis and Coster, 'Commissioning *Mr. Smirke*', p.3.

⁶⁷ '[It has been] estimated that the "average" book retailed, unbound, at about 0.33d per sheet before 1560, and rose with inflation, to about 0.45d from 1560 to the 1630s. These estimates, which probably err on the low side, are at best averages subject to wide variance from case to case'; D. R. Woolf,

As such books were more affordable in the 1670's than they had been in the mid-seventeenth century. Using the prices listed in the *Term Catalogues*, Richard D. Altick established average ranges for the retail prices of books in the Restoration: 'in 1668 folios, meant for the wealthy trade, were priced from 5s. to 16s., the majority from 7s. to 10s. Most newly published books in octavo, the commonest size, ranged from 1s. to 4s. bound [...] The smallest books (12mo) usually were 1s. 6d.'⁶⁸ Between 1671 and 1672 Nathaniel Ponder, bookseller for *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and *The Second Part*, appears in the *Term Catalogue* advertising: '*The sole and sovereign way of England's being saved* [...] In Octavo. Price, bound, 2s. 6d.'; '*Domus Mosaicae clavis, sive Legis sepimentum* [...] In Octavo. Price, bound, 2s. 6d.'; and '*Exercitations concerning the Name, Original, Nature, Use, and Continuance, of a Day of sacred Rest* [...] In Octavo. Price, bound, 3s. 6d.'⁶⁹ These prices are consistent with Altick's averages, and suggest that the octavo editions of Marvell's works would have retailed within this range.

Marvell would in fact take particular relish in berating Samuel Parker for publishing his reproof to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* in 'so thick an *Octavo*', barring 'a poor Fanatick' from purchasing his work 'under the prodigal expence of Five Shillings.'⁷⁰ This quip assumes the reader's knowledge of the book trade; his publishing an octavo at the price of a folio is proof of his avarice, and his exclusionary politics. It has to be presumed, for this joke to work, that Marvell's texts sold for less. As for the duodecimo edition of *The Second Part*, in 1669 Ponder advertised '*A Brief Declaration and vindication of the doctrine of the Trinity* [...] In Twelves. Price, bound, 1s.', which suggest Ponder's prices were in line with averages for the period and that this edition would have retailed for less than the first octavo impression to meet public demand.⁷¹ Though his texts were never officially advertised, there is some record of the price of *Mr Smirke*. On June 6, 1676, antiquarian Thomas Blount recorded in his diary that *Mr Smirke* 'sold for half crowns a peece and 15 non

Reading History in Early Modern England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) p.44: Raven, *Business of Books*, pp.100-101.

⁶⁸ Richard D. Altick, *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900*, Second Edition (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998) p.22.

⁶⁹ These pamphlets ran to 351, 288, and 354 pages, respectively: Edward Arber, *The Term Catalogues, 1668-1709 A.D.; with a Number for Easter Term, 1711 A.D.: A Contemporary Bibliography of English Literature in the reigns of Charles II, James II, William and Mary, and Anne*, 3 vols. (New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1965), I, p.78, p.65, p.121.

⁷⁰ Marvell, *RT2*, pp.225-226.

⁷¹ Arber, *Term Catalogues*, p.8.

conformists took off the whole Impression to disperse.⁷² Annabel Patterson suggests that if accurate ‘this entry is remarkable [...] for its evidence of an organization created to protect and disseminate’ the pamphlet; a community of readers actively engaging with its messaging and working to promulgate it.⁷³ Public demand for his prose continued, and in 1680 ‘*An Historical Essay* [...] Written by Andrew Marvell, Esquire, lately a member of the House of Commons. Quarto. Price 6d.’ was produced.⁷⁴ As for the pirate editions of Marvell’s texts produced during this period, these could have sold for as much as half their retail price.⁷⁵ A reader also had the option to purchase books second hand from travelling chapmen, small shops and auction houses – a practice that became prevalent during the Restoration.⁷⁶ Analysing an auction catalogue held in the Folger Library (which details auctions between 1676 and 1682), Leah Orr conducted a ‘quantitative analysis of the prices of English books listed in this catalogue in comparison with prices for new books from the *Term Catalogues*’: her research reveals that ‘a majority of relatively new books vended second-hand at auction sold for discounted prices, in many cases over fifty per cent off the advertised retail price from the *Term Catalogues*.’⁷⁷ Orr contends that this ‘submarket of previously owned copies of recent books available for far less than the new copies of the same books’ has far-reaching implications for our understanding of the Restoration literary marketplace, allowing these texts to be accessible to a much ‘wider group of potential readers’⁷⁸

Figuring Marvell’s putative reader is largely a speculative task – as the chapter ‘The Politician’ will argue, the broad access to political texts facilitated by the rise of the coffeehouse ensured that Marvell’s texts had the potential to reach a broad audience. Marvell sought mass appeal, adapting the methodology used by pamphleteers during the civil war: ‘the writers who published their ideas in pamphlet

⁷² Dzelzainis and Coster suggest that this would be the second impression; Thomas Blount quoted in Dzelzainis and Coster, ‘Commissioning *Mr. Smirke*’, p.13.

⁷³ Annabel Patterson, ‘Introduction’, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), II, pp.3-29 (p.11).

⁷⁴ Arber, *Term Catalogues*, p.382.

⁷⁵ Raven, *Business of Books*, p.93.

⁷⁶ Raven, *Business of Books*, p.193.

⁷⁷ Leah Orr, ‘Prices of English Books at Auction c.1680’, in *The Library*, 20 (2019) 501-526 (pp.501-502).

⁷⁸ Orr, ‘Prices of English Books’, p.502.

format drew upon existing forms of communication to reach an audience long accustomed to buying sermons, jestbooks, and other forms of popular literature.⁷⁹ The “low genres” of the literary marketplace – cony-catching pamphlets, almanacs, ballads – were co-opted by revolutionary writers as a means of broadening their readership and broadcasting their polemic to even to those formally excluded from political debate (those of a lower social class; the dreaded “Multitude”); Marvell’s animadversions, which meld references to high and low genres in pursuit of a laugh, seek as wide a reception as possible. There is no “specific” reader in mind, even though pointed referrals to the reader are made throughout. In this regard, Marvell stands in contrast to his former employer and friend, John Milton (1608-1674).

Milton frequently identified and imagined his reader, a tactic seen in full force in his *Aeropagitica* (1644), in which he idealised those men engaged in ‘fast reading, trying all things, assenting to the force of reason and convincement.’⁸⁰ Milton goes further than this in his own animadversion, *Eikonoklastes* (1649), identifying those best suited to fully comprehend and value his work, those ‘readers [...] few perhaps, but those few, such of value and substantial worth, as truth and wisdom [...] have bin ever wont in all ages to be contented with.’⁸¹ Whilst the majority of his actual audience might be hostile, those receptive to his writing and possessing ‘wisdom’ will be able to further the message and ‘truth’ present in the text. Marvell’s mission is akin to Milton’s, both men used prose as a polemic vehicle and Marvell would even openly borrow the imagery and ideas of *Aeropagitica* in *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, and this thesis will reveal that Marvell was deeply invested in continuing the mission of the “active reader” – and yet in their relationship to their readers Milton is specific where Marvell is deliberately obscure. One way to interpret this disparity is to account for the difference in political situation when they took to the press. As Sharon Achinstein outlines in her account of the revolutionary reader, the ‘shift toward recognizing both the power of individuals in political process and the power of public opinion as a

⁷⁹ Sharon Achinstein, *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p.10.

⁸⁰ John Milton, *Areopagitica: A Speech of Mr. John Milton, in John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education*, ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2013), pp.181-213 (p.207).

⁸¹ John Milton, *Eikonoklastes*, in *John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education*, ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2013), pp.277-317 (p.218).

force in politics' can be traced to the civil war.⁸² Writers used print as a means of effecting political change by appealing to public opinion: 'they did this by demanding that their audiences make political choices and that they participate in the political process.'⁸³ Marvell never specifies a means of direct political engagement – due to the increase in censorship mandated by the Restoration, a call to even metaphorical arms was out of the question. His stance in relation to the reader is reflective of this political moment; political action could not be advocated, the power of the individual in politics could not be openly stated. Instead the reader needed to infer their political significance; to appropriate a message of dissent.

The stance taken by Marvell in these texts is at odds with the establishment narrative. The Declaration of Breda – issued in anticipation of Charles' restoration in 1660 – announced to English subjects an end to the 'the general distraction and confusion which is spread over the whole Kingdom', redress to 'wounds which have so many years together been kept bleeding', and an immediate, peaceful return to a peaceful status quo:

So we do make it our daily suit [...] put us into a quiet and peaceable Possession of that Our Right, with as little blood and damage to Our people, as is possible; Nor do we desire more to enjoy what is Ours, than that all our Subjects may enjoy what by Law is theirs, by a full and entire Administration of Justice throughout the Land, and by extending our mercy where it is wanting and deserved.⁸⁴

The individuals for whom mercy was *not* 'wanting and deserved' proved to be nonconformists. Though Charles promised to 'declare a Liberty to Tender Consciences' and respect the 'several opinions in Religion' born of 'the passion and uncharitableness of the times have produced', the Cavalier Parliament elected to support his ascension had a differing agenda. They sought both to scapegoat nonconformists as agents of disunity and re-establish the Anglican Church as a united and implacable organisation by bringing in legislation that restricted the ability of the

⁸² Achinstein, *Revolutionary Reader*, p.3.

⁸³ Achinstein, *Revolutionary Reader*, p.3.

⁸⁴ Charles II, *King CHARLES II. his DECLARATION To all His Loving SUBJECTS of the KINGDOM of ENGLAND. Dated from His Court at Breda in Holland, the 4/14 of April 1660* (London: Printed by W. Godbid for John Playford in the Temple, 1660), p.1.

nonconformist groups to gather in worship; a means of undoing Puritan reforms. These aims were variously achieved through the implementation of punitive punishments for proponents of heterodox beliefs (collectively known as the Clarendon Code) and a public relations offensive.⁸⁵ Marvell questions monarchical authority, investigates parliamentary incompetence, and growing episcopal influence in both secular policy decisions and in the domain of individual conscience – ideas so incendiary that his prose frequently ran afoul of a freshly strengthened censor. Each pamphlet differs in topic and in the target of their censure (from specific, officious clergymen, to the broader mechanics of government), and each alters rhetoric and polemical strategy accordingly.

Though there is no clear, consistent ideological through line (a reflection of Marvell's reflexive and adaptive methodology) – throughout there is an emphasis placed on the relationship between author and reader. For instance, in *An Account* – whilst constructing an account of recent history – Marvell directly configures his role as author:

Yet, that I may not be too abrupt, and leave the Reader wholly destitute of a thread to guide himself by thorow so intreaguing a Labyrinth, I shall summarily as short, as so copious and redundant a matter will admit, deduce the order of affairs both at home and abroad, as it led into this Session.⁸⁶

Here, the writer is a guide – the task at hand is public service. The 'Labyrinth' he leads his 'Reader' through is the result of political intrigue; a deliberate attempt by the Crown (euphemistically referred to throughout as 'Conspirators') to obfuscate their attempts to control Parliament by continual prorogations and push through a foreign policy plan that flew in the face of the national will. Though the fact that Charles II had signed the Secret Treaty of Dover in 1670 was not yet widely known to be cause of England's withdrawal from the Triple Alliance, the result of this action – the Third Anglo-Dutch War (1672-1674) – made clear the pro-France and anti-Dutch bent of Charles' administration. As will be further discussed in Section Two, *An Account* went as far as to break the *arcanii imperia* (i.e. "secrets of the empire") by tallying the votes

⁸⁵ As will be explored in Section Three, this in large part involved the promotion of drama with overt Royalist messaging.

⁸⁶ Marvell, *Account*, p.241.

cast in this 'Session'; in doing so Marvell broke the law in order to inform his 'Reader.' Yet in this image, Marvell also acknowledges the readers ability to appropriate his text for themselves. The 'Reader' is active – they are not passively lead by the figure of the author, they hold the 'thread' and make their own way through.

Above all, the individual reader's capacity to make an informed judgement – whether in matters of religious identity or issues of state – is principally valued. Attempts to curtail these liberties (whether by the imposition of repressive ecclesiastical legislation, or by making a mockery of the right of franchise by repeated prorogations of Parliament) are presented to readers as pernicious to both individual freedoms and the health of the body politic. This through line can only be examined when his prose works are viewed in a continuum; the individual strategy of each will be considered, but the effect of the texts together as a whole and what they might suggest about Marvell's broader agenda will also be scrutinised. This is an exploration that has rarely been undertaken, and an oversight this thesis will seek to correct. This omission in Marvell studies is due in large part to the appropriation of his prose by the Whig movement.⁸⁷ Marvell became a figurehead for the movement, as attested to by Nicholas von Maltzahn, who argued that 'as a witness to Stuart misrule after the Restoration and as a model of disinterested public service, Marvell's reputation was rivalled only by that of the estimable Sir William Temple.'⁸⁸ The weight given to his prose is proven by the first collected edition of Marvell's work. Printed in 1776 in three volumes, his constituency letters and *An Account* were given precedence as proof of the 'ethos of that virtuous parliamentarian.'⁸⁹ This vision of Marvell even took hold in the iconography of the period: 'in 1776 too it is this Marvell of the *Account* who joins with Milton, Locke, and Algernon Sidney in James Barry's engraving, *The Resurrection of Freedom*. Beclouded, they stand lamenting at the bier of English liberties, while in the bright distance lies the brave new world of

⁸⁷ The Whig version of history – that glowingly envisioned the Glorious Revolution (1688) and the "bloodless" coup that saw James II (1633-1701) deposed as a triumph and the epoch of British democracy – found support for its version of history in Marvell's prose. As van Maltzahn suggests: 'that eighteenth-century Whig historians looked to Marvell's *Account* as an explanation of some of the most controversial events in the 1670s appears from the succession of narratives in which he is present, if not always cited.' Nicholas von Maltzahn, 'Andrew Marvell and the Prehistory of Whiggism', in *"Cultures of Whiggism": New Essays on English Literature and Culture in the Long Eighteenth Century*, ed. by David Womersley (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005), pp.31-61 (p.37).

⁸⁸ von Maltzahn, 'Prehistory', p.41.

⁸⁹ von Maltzahn, 'Prehistory', p.31.

America.⁹⁰ As the Whig version of history began to be unpicked by revisionists, his prose and verse satires fell from grace; T. S. Eliot notoriously declared that of all of Marvell's verse 'the really valuable part consists of a very few poems.'⁹¹ These 'very few poems' were the only works to achieve the aesthetic sublime, in large part due to the absence of "worldly", political concerns.

The task of disentangling Marvell's legacy from his reputation as an archetypal Whig has ably been achieved by Nicholas von Maltzahn, whose essay 'Andrew Marvell and the Prehistory of Whiggism' fully charts the cultural changes that presaged these paradigmatic shifts in Marvellian criticism:

In particular the disinterestedness that the political and aesthetic traditions alike imposed on Marvell will be set against his "interestedness" in politics and poetry alike. In his politics, a series of strongly personal engagements characterize his involvement in matters of church and state.⁹²

Recent criticism has been far more invested in retracing this political "interestedness", finding interest and value in Marvell's participation in civic life, and this work will continue and this further tradition, contributing to the field by introducing new means of gauging this "interestedness."⁹³ This thesis will evaluate the relationship between Marvell's prose and print mediums such as the newspaper and the petition, which have not yet been discussed in depth, in order to build a fuller picture of Marvell's interaction with wider Restoration political culture; it will also deepen the discussion of Marvell's treatment of topics such as anti-popery, by revealing the extent to which his stance on these topics shifts depending on the direction and force of his polemic. By understanding how Marvell is targeting the reader, a fuller sense of his 'involvement' in political issues will be revealed. Until recently, critical attention centred on Marvell's prose (a body of work vastly

⁹⁰ von Maltzahn, 'Prehistory', p.31.

⁹¹ T. S. Eliot, *Selected Essays*, ed. by William A. Armstrong (London: Faber and Faber, 1951), p.292.

⁹² von Maltzahn, 'Prehistory', p.32.

⁹³ Notable examples of this investigation into Marvell's political activity include: D. Smith, 'The Political Beliefs of Andrew Marvell', *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 36 (1966), 55-67; Annabel Patterson, *Marvell and the Civic Crown* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978); Warren Chernaik, *The Poet's Time: Politics and Religion in the Work of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); (eds.) C. Condren and A. D. Cousins, *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1990); (eds.) Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis, *Marvell and Liberty* (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999).

overshadowed by analysis of his verse) has been focused on two of his pamphlets: *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and *An Account*.

The critical attention lavished on these texts in particular is understandable.⁹⁴ *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* in essence established a new mode of satirical discourse; though the genre of animadversion had existed prior to Marvell's deployment of it, his combination of literary reference, biting political satire and strain of absurdist comedy reinvigorated the form and established a model whose influence would extend well into the next century. Indeed, both the sheer number of and the diversity of his references set his work apart:

The classical satirists Horace and Juvenal, Donne's *Metempsychosis*, Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bacon's *Wise and Moderate Discourse*, Davenant's *Gondibert*, Hobbe's *Leviathan*, Montaigne's *Essays*, the *Cassandra* of Costes de la Calprenède, Sidney's *Arcadia*, Denham, Killigrew, Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Ogilby's *Fables*, Guarini's *Pastor Fido*, the Father's of the Church, not to mention a vast array of historians, inhabit the pages of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*.⁹⁵

⁹⁴ For a no means exhaustive list, see: Jennifer Chibnall, 'Something to the Purpose: Marvell's Rhetorical Strategy in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*', in *Literature of Controversy: Polemical Strategy from Milton to Junius*, ed. by Thomas N. Corns (London: Frank Cass, 1987), pp.80-104; Raymond A. Anselment, 'Satiric Strategy in Marvell's *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*', in *Modern Philology*, 68 (1970), 137-50; Raymond A. Anselment, *'Betwixt Earnest and Jest': Martin Marprelate, Milton, Marvell and Swift and the Decorum of Religious Ridicule* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979); Sharon Achinstein, 'Milton's Spectre in the Restoration: Marvell, Dryden and Literary Enthusiasm', in *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 59 (1996), 1-29; N. H. Keeble, 'Why Transpose *The Rehearsal*?', in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999), pp.249-268; Jon Parkin, 'Liberty Transpros'd: Andrew Marvell and Samuel Parker', in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999), pp.269-289; Derek Hirst, 'Parker, Marvell, and political culture, 1667-73', in *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth Century England*, ed. by Derek Hirst and Richard Strier (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp.145-164; Stephen Bardle, *The Literary Underground in the 1660s: Andrew Marvell, George Wither, Ralph Wallis, and the World of Restoration Satire and Pamphleteering* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Conal Condren, 'Andrew Marvell as Polemicist: His *Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*', in *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Conal Condren and A. D. Cousins (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1990), pp.157-187; Clement Fatovic, 'The Anti-Catholic Roots of Liberal and Republican Conceptions of Freedom in English Political Thought', in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 66 (2005), 37-58; Annabel Patterson, 'Marvell and Secret History', in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999), pp.23-49; M. L. Donnelly, 'Interest, Honour, and Horatian Raillery in the Service of Liberty: *An Account of the Growth of Popery*', in *Marvell and Liberty* ed. by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999), pp.313-333.

⁹⁵ Annabel Patterson, *Andrew Marvell* (Plymouth: Northcote House Publishers Ltd., 1994), p.60.

Patterson's survey here, though extensive is not exhaustive – *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* is littered with allusions. The act of reading this text is to consciously negotiate this textual scaffolding. Examining Marvell's prose, unpicking this interconnected web of literary allusion, has thus often served as a means of investigating the literary forebears to these esteemed eighteenth century wits, its most prominent progeny being Jonathan Swift's *A Tale of a Tub* (1704).⁹⁶ *An Account of the Growth of Popery* has earned itself a different critical legacy. As a tract condemning Catholic influence at court written on the eve of the first Exclusion Crisis (1678) the text has been of considerable importance to historians; those looking to chart the evolution of nascent Whig identity, and those interested in attitudes towards English Catholics in light of the mounting hostility that would eventually result in the expulsion of King James II in favour of a Protestant sovereign. The opening lines of the text – 'there has now for divers Years, a design been carried on, to change the Lawful Government of England into an Absolute Tyranny, and to convert the established Protestant Religion into downright Popery' – are near ubiquitous in accounts of Restoration domestic and foreign policy, a convenient coda for the public's mounting paranoia and frustration.⁹⁷

In this way Marvell's text has been used as a barometer for both public dissatisfaction, and as a measure of his own personal beliefs (an issue that this thesis will itself address). To take John Dixon Hunt's biography (published in 1978) as an example, Hunt devotes only a small space to discussion of Marvell's prose, the vigorous intellectual efforts of his later life confined to a single chapter ('So peculiar and entertaining a conduct'), with *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* garnering the most attention. Hunt's interest in Marvell's prose is both to chart the major events of his life, and in many ways to glorify and valorise his subject. In *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, Hunt sees Marvell's ultimate agenda as reflective of his egalitarianism: 'for Marvell toleration of alternative ideas and beliefs to his own was a great matter, which Parker's understanding could not be allowed to diminish.'⁹⁸ This analysis eschews a consideration of the scurrilous and borderline libellous *ad hominem*

⁹⁶ Jonathan Swift, *A Tale of a Tub* in Jonathan Swift, *A Tale of a Tub and Other Works*, ed. by Angus Ross and David Woolley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) pp.1-103.

⁹⁷ Marvell, *Account*, p.225.

⁹⁸ John Dixon Hunt, *Andrew Marvell: His Life in Writing* (London: Elek Books Limited, 1978), p.171.

attacks that also form the basis of Marvell's rhetorical strategy, nor does it consider how Marvell's call for toleration was deliberately calibrated in order to convince his audience; rather it is emblematic of 'Marvell's essential humanity that emerges and triumphs.'⁹⁹ Hunt's summary of *An Account* traces similar lines: 'the whole work speaks a convinced parliamentary man – not only in his detailed and inside knowledge of its workings or non-workings between 1675 and December 1677, but also in his implicit confidence in Parliament's necessary role in proper government.'¹⁰⁰ To Hunt *An Account* represents an 'earnest, intense plea.'¹⁰¹ The tone and polemic strategy of *An Account* will be subject to inquiry over the course of this thesis – though the emphasis will not be on Marvell's interiority. His prose texts will not be analysed as individualised expressions of his political and personal beliefs, but as active sites of polemic. His goal is to persuade and convince his readership – as a result every opinion conveyed and every reference employed has been carefully calibrated in order to best serve the strategic aims of the individual text. Whilst the 1672 Declaration of Indulgence is lauded in both parts of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, it is roundly condemned in *An Account* – his earlier enthusiasm for Charles II's employment of the royal prerogative was never a reflection of his personal opinion, rather a choice made in order best lambast the hypocrisy of his satirical adversary. Though both *Mr Smirke* and *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* series are animadversions that borrow their central conceits from Restoration stage dramas, the tone of these texts evolves as the target of these satires shift from criticism of ambitious clerics to the wider church hierarchy; subtext becomes text.

Viewed in isolation these texts reflect and respond to specific, pivotal events in the 1670s, but this has the effect of narrowing the scope, and obscuring Marvell's broader polemical agenda.¹⁰² In *Marvell and Liberty* (1999), a seminal collection of Marvellian criticism, *An Account* has thirty one entries in the index, *The Rehearsal* has twenty two, whilst *Mr Smirke* has five and *A Short Historical Essay* has three – an accurate display of the weight given to discussing these pamphlets, indicating the

⁹⁹ Hunt, *Andrew Marvell*, p.169.

¹⁰⁰ Hunt, *Andrew Marvell*, p.182.

¹⁰¹ Hunt, *Andrew Marvell*, p.182.

¹⁰² The events in question being the controversy surrounding the 1672 Declaration of Indulgence and the campaign for an election in 1677, respectively.

direction of modern criticism of his prose.¹⁰³ In *Marvell and Liberty* (1999), a seminal collection of Marvellian criticism, *An Account* has thirty one entries in the index, *The Rehearsal* has twenty two, whilst *Mr Smirke* has five and *A Short Historical Essay* has three – an accurate display of the weight given to discussing these pamphlets. The newly published *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell* (2019) is a wide-ranging, interdisciplinary collection of essays which provide an over-view of Marvell’s life and work, synthesising analysis of his poetry, prose, and personal correspondence (including engagement with recently discovered manuscripts and letters written by Marvell) to ‘throw new light on connections between Marvell’s writing and the religious, political, and sexual identities of his time, as well as its relationships with the period’s literary and intellectual currents.’¹⁰⁴

The Oxford Handbook has gone further than any volume in providing insight into multiple aspects of Marvell’s life and work, and though discussions of *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* and *An Account* are most prominent (Alex Garganigo’s chapter, ‘*The Rehearsal Transpros’d* and *The Rehearsal Transpros’d: The Second Part*’ devotes fourteen pages to the former work, and three to the latter), discussion of Marvell’s prose texts is more evenly balanced here.¹⁰⁵ In particular the production and anti-episcopal politics of *Mr. Smirke* and *A Short Historical Essay* is explored in great depth – with Dzelzainis and Coster providing a detailed account of its fraught production and insight into the difficulties of underground production in the period, and Philip Connell’s chapter on Marvell’s relationship to the Anglican Church placing his disdain for neo-Laudian episcopal policies in the context of religious tensions from his early life until the Restoration.¹⁰⁶ This volume is an invaluable resource, placing Marvell’s varied literary output in the context of his activities as a politician and his developing

¹⁰³ Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis, ‘Index’, in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. By Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1999), pp.354-365 (pp.360-1).

¹⁰⁴ Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton, ‘Preface’ in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <<https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780198736400-miscMatter-4>> [accessed May 7th, 2020] pp.1-3 (p.2).

¹⁰⁵ Alex Garganigo, ‘*The Rehearsal Transpros’d* and *The Rehearsal Transpros’d: The Second Part*’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <[10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.31](https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.31)> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-25.

¹⁰⁶ Philip Connell, ‘Marvell and the Church’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <[10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.9](https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.9)> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-19.

political ideology. Throughout, his poetry and prose is discussed in tandem to reveal the nuances and developments in Marvell's personal and political output. This thesis will continue this recent trend of Marvellian criticism by paying particular attention to the 'intellectual currents' influencing and shaping the context of these texts; however the focus will be a consideration of the role of the reader in the development of Marvell's rhetorical strategy and in discussing his prose as an oeuvre. Annabel Patterson, a highly influential Marvellian scholar, identifies the necessity to view his prose in a continuum – in a reference to the lack of attention paid to Marvell's prose in comparison to his verse, she declared: 'to concentrate only on the satirical skills or political doctrines of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, or indeed to concentrate upon it to the exclusion of the later pamphlets, is to lose sight of the enormous shift of energy and focus that Marvell directed to his polemical prose.'¹⁰⁷ The texts are best understood when compared and considered together to reveal their specific rhetorical agenda – meaning is fluid, depending on a reader's engagement with Restoration literary culture.

Elsewhere, recent criticism has paid particular attention to Marvell's career as a tutor and his political offices in Europe. Nicholas von Maltzahn has illuminated how Marvell's time in 'Sweden and Denmark as secretary to the English embassy led by the Earl of Carlisle' shaped his identity as a writer – his position in the embassy informing his knowledge of Baltic politics and his role in the production of official correspondence contributing to the development of 'a literary register of gentlemanly poise' that he would employ in his later satires.¹⁰⁸ In considering how Marvell's role as a diplomat, his experience of international politics, and the necessity of modulating his style to suit the discursive model necessitated by this role, Edward Holberton argues, 'the Carlisle embassy offers valuable insights into the way that rhetorical and poetic thinking could shape emerging ideas and protocols in international relations.'¹⁰⁹ Nicholas McDowell's work on Marvell's inaccurate translations of

¹⁰⁷ Annabel Patterson, *Marvell: The Writer in Public Life* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2000), p.108.

¹⁰⁸ Nicholas von Maltzahn, 'Andrew Marvell's Paper Work: The Earl of Carlisle's Baltic Embassy (1664)' in *Marvell Studies*, 3 (2018), 1-30 <<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.15/>> [accessed April 3rd, 2020].

¹⁰⁹ Edward Holberton, 'Marvell and Diplomacy', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.6> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-21 (p.3).

François Rabelais (1494-1553) in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* draws attention to the way the French satirist was viewed by Restoration readers, and how Marvell utilised the 'ridicule of clerical absolutism' associated with his work, arguing that: 'Rabelais was among the favoured authors of the sceptical, cosmopolitan, urban audience that Marvell sought to address in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and to convince that religious toleration is moral and useful.'¹¹⁰ In considering the implications of this act of readerly appropriation, McDowell contends that:

the misattributed and misremembered references to Rabelais in Marvell's controversial prose offer insights into the movement of people, texts, and ideas between France and England in the mid- and later seventeenth century, and are a reminder that literary transmission was a process accomplished not simply through material encounter with texts but also by passing through various "conversable worlds."¹¹¹

McDowell's work serves as a reminder that writers, as well as readers, 'approached texts for what they could get out of them' and that the reputation and cultural memory of a text could prove as powerful a means of creating meaning in a reader's mind as the text itself. These essays are representative of a trend which aims to place Marvell's work in a geo-political contextual framework, interrogating his interactions with European literature and re-engaging with the role his diplomatic career had on his actions as a parliamentarian and a satirist.¹¹²

¹¹⁰ Nicholas McDowell, 'Wit, Conversation, and Literary Transmission in Mid-Seventeenth-Century France and England: How Andrew Marvell Heard His Rabelais' in *Renaissance Quarterly* 69 (2016), 940-961 (p.942).

¹¹¹ McDowell, 'Wit, Conversation, and Literary Transmission', p.961.

¹¹² Jean-Paul Pittion, 'If things of sight such heavens be/ What heavens are those we cannot see': Marvell and Protestant Saumur in the 1650s', in *Marvell Studies*, 2 (2018), 1-16 <<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.18/>> [accessed April 3rd, 2020]; Steven N. Zwicker, 'What's the Problem with the Dutch? Andrew Marvell, the Trade Wars, Toleration, and the Dutch Republic', in *Marvell Studies*, 3 (2018), 1-12 <<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.20/>> [accessed April 3rd, 2020]; Ineke Huysman, 'Andrew Marvell and Constantijn Huygens: Common Grounds and Mutual Contacts', in *Marvell Studies*, 3 (2018), 1-18 <<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.16/>> [accessed April 2nd, 2020]; Ryan Netzley, 'Literalizing Value: Poetry, Evaluation, and the Market in Marvell's "The Last Instructions"', in *Marvell Studies*, 3 (2018), 1-28 <<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.17/>> [accessed April 2nd, 2020]; Nigel Smith, 'Transvernacular Poetry and Government: Andrew Marvell in Early Modern Europe', in *Marvell Studies* 2 (2017), 1-26 <<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.14/>> [accessed April 2nd, 2020]; Steph Coster, 'Sending them beyond the Sea': Andrew Marvell, the Earl of Clare, and Tutoring in the Restoration', in *Marvell Studies*, 2 (2017), 1-20 <<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.9/>> [accessed April 3rd, 2020]; Sean H.

Recent biographies have given equal weight to a discussion of poetry and prose when detailing the defining events of Marvell's life. Nigel Smith's excellent *Andrew Marvell: The Chameleon* (2010) is fastidious in chronicling the events immediately prior to the inception and publication of each work, placing each in its immediate historical context and illuminating the parliamentary proceedings that prompted Marvell's pen.¹¹³ The events that prompt Marvell to write in turn precipitate the urgency of their reception by the reader. By this point in the 1670s, Marvell's audience would have grown accustomed to a cycle in which new Parliamentary sessions were preceded by a flurry of politically motivated pamphlets (akin to Marvell's own *An Account*).¹¹⁴ This is a normality that he himself references: 'Nothing is more usual than to Print and present to them Proposals of Revenue, Matters of Trade, or any thing of publick Convenience; and sometimes Cases and Petitions.'¹¹⁵ These texts sought to cause a stir directly before a Parliamentary session in order to cause enough public agitation as to effect political change; his audience would be under no illusion that they were being appealed to in response to a critical vote or bill. On the whole this thesis will engage with Marvell's putative readers, considering the ways his texts were constructed in order to appeal to an imagined audience – though evidence from his *actual* readers will be used to assess the effectiveness of his strategy using contemporary annotations and excerpts from commonplace books, as well as printed responses from his critiques. This is done with the intent of gauging the effectiveness of Marvell's strategy – each pamphlet is a negotiation between an approach to his ideal reader (one already partisan to his cause), a persuasive foray toward the agnostic, and a narrative voice that will be capable of infuriating his critics whilst avoiding the most extreme expressions of their censure. Whilst Marvell succumbed to a premature death via natural causes in 1678, the execution of Algernon Sidney following the confiscation of his manuscript *Discourses Concerning Government* (which would be printed posthumously in 1698) – a text equally as critical of absolute monarchy as *An Account*, though even more overt

McDowell, 'Justus Lipsius, Andrew Marvell, and Epistolary Style', in *Marvell Studies*, 2 (2017), 1-20 <<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.6/>> [accessed April 2nd, 2020].

¹¹³ Nigel Smith, *Andrew Marvell: The Chameleon*, Paperback Edition (London: Yale University Press, 2012).

¹¹⁴ Sheila Lambert, *Printing for Parliament, 1641-1700*, Special Series vol. 20 (London: List and Index Society, 1984).

¹¹⁵ Marvell, *Mr Smirke*, pp.50-51.

in its assertions of individual liberty and the rights of citizens – serves as a potent reminder of the risk undertaken by Marvell in his propaganda campaign.¹¹⁶ In his attempt to stir internecine conflicts, Marvell questioned the status quo; analysing the evidence left behind by his contemporary audience is one potent way of assessing how his ideas resonated or incensed his readers.

The methodology adopted by this thesis is highly influenced by the work of Quentin Skinner, in particular the method outlined in the first volume of his *Visions of Politics* (2002) series. Skinner asserts that ‘if we are to write the history of ideas in a properly historical style, we need to situate the texts we study within such intellectual contexts and frameworks of discourse as enable us to recognise what their authors were *doing* in writing them.’¹¹⁷ For Skinner texts *are* acts – they are inherently performative, with the performance directed by the cultural conditions that precipitated by their inception. Skinner is clear in his intent to put a focus on the effect of perceived or expected audience reaction in the design of political propaganda – a stance this thesis will actively adopt:

The question we accordingly need to confront in studying such texts is what their authors - writing at the time when they wrote for the specific audience they had in mind – could practice have intended to communicate by issuing their given utterances [...] the social context figures as the ultimate framework for helping to decide what conventionally recognisable meanings it might in principle have been possible for someone to have intended to communicate.¹¹⁸

In order to fully understand the mechanics of the rhetoric at play it is vital to situate political texts within an intertextual framework; Skinner posits this as a method of reconstructing authorial intent, contending that it is only by considering the influences an author is subject to that their methodology can be deciphered: ‘to understand any serious utterance we need to grasp not merely the meaning of what is said, but at the same time the intended force with which the utterance is issued. We need, that is, to grasp not merely what people are saying but also what they are *doing*

¹¹⁶ Algernon Sidney, *Discourses concerning Government* (London: To be printed and sold by the Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1698).

¹¹⁷ Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics: Volume I, Regarding Method*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), I, p.vii.

¹¹⁸ Skinner, *Visions of Politics: I*, p.87.

in saying it.¹¹⁹ This methodology intrinsically grasps the performativity of texts – this approach is especially relevant to Marvell given his propensity for sarcasm. For instance, Marvell makes frequent mocking mention of Parker’s “*Push-pin Divinity*”, using Parker’s own terms when describing the necessity of enforcing religious uniformity: ‘for he would perswade the Princes that *there cannot a Pin be pull’d out of the Church but the State immediately totters*. That is strange.’¹²⁰ It is clear that the phrase ‘that is strange’ is sarcastic, but the underlying threat of Parker and his absolutist stance on religious doctrine only becomes clear when placed in the wider context of the toleration debate, and when considering the reality of religious persecution placed on nonconformists; placing his satire in context allows us to appreciate the full extent of the irony that a contemporary reader would comprehend.

Restoring full polemical weight to his writing is only possible when we reconstruct how a reader would have understood the performative force of the text. With this in mind, an analysis of Marvell’s tone will be central to the first section of this thesis, and will inform discussion throughout, as will consistent close reading: Marvell’s literary strategy is inextricably tied to his political messaging. In order to understand how Marvell interacted with this readership, it is necessary to uncover the shared language of Restoration culture – this allows us to retrace the polemic undercurrents employed by Marvell even when he is joking or being ironic. By reconstructing these cultural conditions it will be possible to see where Marvell ‘followed or challenged or subverted the conventional terms’ of the political debates with which he engaged and place each text in its exact context.¹²¹ Where my methodology will depart from Skinner is in relation to the figure of the author; in plotting his methodology, Skinner acknowledges that the inclusion of biographical detail will not figure in his evaluation of authored texts.¹²² As this thesis will show at various points, despite his attempts at anonymity, Marvell’s critics were aware of his identity and used it in their diatribes – in pre-empting and responding to these attacks Marvell gauges the reaction of the reader based on their knowledge of him. Furthermore, Marvell also plants references to his verse within his prose – whether

¹¹⁹ Skinner, *Visions of Politics: I*, p.82.

¹²⁰ Marvell, *RT*, p.109.

¹²¹ Skinner, *Visions of Politics: I*, p.125.

¹²² Skinner, *Visions of Politics: I*, pp.118-9.

consciously or unconsciously – and these references create two differing strata of reader: those encountering only his prose and those also *au fait* with his verse. An awareness of Marvell's verse immediately renders an ironic edge to the loyalist line toed in some of his prose. As Patterson remarks when noting the presence of pro-establishment reasoning in *An Account*, 'only someone who had never read Marvell's Cromwell poems [...] could take this passage at face value.'¹²³ As such, Marvell as the *author* of these texts will figure in this evaluation of his engagement with Restoration literary culture as a key measure of reader response.

Restoration literary culture was intrinsically shaped by the politics of the period; the aftermath of the Civil War proving a wound slow to heal. In *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* (1994) Sharon Achinstein chronicles the explosion of printed material from 1640 to 1661, recording that over twenty-two thousand pamphlets were published over this time frame – representative of an increased awareness and public involvement in politics.¹²⁴ These texts served a diverse audience: loyalists and parliamentarians, Anglicans and Puritans, moderates and radicals could hear their voice reflected and amplified in this multifaceted discourse. The Restoration of the monarchy and resultant censorship brought in by the reinstated Stuart regime curtailed this burst of political expression – yet the style of reading that Achinstein identifies proved difficult to quell. Part of the appeal of the coffeehouse was the immediate access to (and subsequent conversation about) texts that directly addressed the current events; the presence of "Treasonous Tables" (which hosted the most incendiary material) at these establishments attests to a public appetite to consume political material and engage in debate.¹²⁵ Furthermore, these discussions did not happen in a vacuum – having these conversations in the coffeehouse could influence debate in the House. Von Maltzahn contends that tracts such as *Englands Appeal* (1673) and *Relation of the Most Material Matters Handled in Parliament* (1673), which both had a clear pro-Dutch bent and were published in response to the

¹²³ Patterson, *Marvell: The Writer in Public Life*, p.108.

¹²⁴ Achinstein, *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader*, pp.1-5.

¹²⁵ Johns, *The Nature of the Book*, pp.112-3.

Third-Anglo Dutch War (1672-1674), sought to have a direct political impact; ‘in these oppositional pamphlets publicising high politics for a wider readership, authors sought to sway public opinion and help it shape parliamentary debate.’¹²⁶ As this thesis will discuss in future chapters, the dominance of the coffeehouse in Restoration culture, the rise of the newspaper, petitions and other innovations that could broadly be localised as evidence of a public sphere, attests to the continued interest and engagement of the public in political discourse – however, the need to cloak subversive or libellous content in the construction of these works became paramount.¹²⁷

Religious tensions continued to ferment over the course of the decade, one consequence of an uncomfortable restoration settlement which made the ascendancy of pre-war Anglicanism a core component of its policy; an attempt to return to a former status quo and undermine the episcopal revisions of the Interregnum. In the ensuing propaganda, Charles I’s regicide became the work of a minority of religious fanatics – and they became the focus of punitive retribution. Nonconformist sects proved a helpful scapegoat in this climate of condemnation. N. H. Keeble’s study of nonconformist procedure and practice reveals that this persecution enabled these disparate sects to ‘forge the corporate identity of dissent as all the parties in nonconformity shared together in the experience of exclusion and persecution they had hitherto in their history endured separately.’¹²⁸ Roughly speaking, there existed two traditions of heterodox thought – sectarianism and “parish puritanism.” Sectarians fundamentally disavowed church hierarchy in favour of ‘self-governing, choosing its own members and pastor, and paying more heed to the action of the Holy Spirit on members and pastors than to external qualifications.’¹²⁹ “Parish puritans”

¹²⁶ Nicholas von Maltzahn, ‘Introduction’, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), II, pp.179-221 (p.182).

¹²⁷ Steven Pincus’ work on the relevance of the term “public sphere” in studies of the Restoration, and the cultural conditions that provide proof of the political engagement needed to meet the requirements set out by Habermas will be discussed below, and shape Section II of this thesis: Steven Pincus, ‘The state and civil society in early modern England: capitalism, causation and Habermas’s bourgeois public sphere’, in *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England*, ed. by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp.213-231.

¹²⁸ N. H. Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-century England* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1987), p.47.

¹²⁹ John Spurr, ‘From Puritanism to Dissent, 1660-1700’, in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* ed. by Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (Basingstoke: Macmillan Publishers Ltd, 1996), pp.234-265 (p.235).

disagreed with Anglican doctrine on 'indifferent ceremonial matters', but ideologically believed in the potential of being accommodated by the National Church if they could be excused from certain ceremonies on the grounds of conscience.¹³⁰ Both radical and moderate nonconformists – who in other matters vigorously disagreed with each other – found themselves targeted by aggressive anti-toleration legislation, and thus became uneasy allies.

The Act of Uniformity (1662) officially inscribed the process of worship, as outlined by the Book of Common Prayer (1662). John Spurr outlines the main protests nonconformists had with the Prayer Book:

Its repetitions, obsolete words, implicit theological errors (especially in the baptism and burial services [...]), and offensive rubrics requiring the wearing of the surplice, the sign of the cross at baptism and kneeling to receive the sacrament, fell far short of perfection. Ministers objected to a set form of worship which totally excluded the use of their own spiritual "gifts" in extempore prayer and they were horrified by the authorities' insistence on such trivial matters despite the warning of the scriptures against offending the tender consciences of the "weaker" or more scrupulous brethren.¹³¹

Even conforming Anglicans took issue with the government's high handedness: 'Pepys thought the degree of ceremony approached that of the Roman Church and Sir Edward Harley thought the surplice "a proper massing garment".'¹³² The consequences of the government's actions on the nonconformist community were far reaching and, in some cases, devastating; 'persecution ranged from minor harassment, through disruption and rough handling by constables, soldiers or mob, personal injury and wanton destruction, to mass imprisonment; on several occasions whole congregations were carted off to gaol.'¹³³ The immediate suffering faced by nonconformists added immediate urgency to the polemic written in their defence. This appeal to *pathos*, found in the literature of his contemporaries, certainly emerges

¹³⁰ Spurr, 'From Puritanism to Dissent', p.235.

¹³¹ Spurr, 'From Puritanism to Dissent', p.237.

¹³² Spurr, 'From Puritanism to Dissent', p.236.

¹³³ Spurr, 'From Puritanism to Dissent', p.248.

in Marvell – his defence of nonconformity is based not on a justification of their beliefs, but a horror at the thought of persecution.

Even in the midst of his farce, the fact of oppression sounds a discordant note. In defending the right of the conscience, Marvell is implicitly critiquing the ideology of the establishment. Marvell was valorised by the Whig tradition as a champion of religious conscience – but what was the specific implication of this term in the seventeenth century? Ceri Sullivan’s work on the rhetoric and poetic construction of the “conscience” elucidates the intensely personal and private nature of the concept: ‘the early modern Protestant conscience is an intriguing construction: a conglomerate, part divine, part human. Founded on the relationship with God, it is the only important and enduring element in the self.’¹³⁴ The conscience was envisioned as a spiritual intermediary – Catholic confession replaced by a process of private study and introspection: ‘by the early 1660’s [... it was recognised that] the laity had to judge their own actions.’¹³⁵ To nonconformists communion with their conscience formed the basis of their dissent; for the Anglican establishment, this line of reasoning was both corrosive to episcopal order and a gateway to zealotry. Milton’s poem ‘On the New Forcers of Conscience under the Long Parliament’ (c.1646-47) – a sonnet written in defence of nonconformists – reflects the former position and frames the conscience in direct opposition to secular invasion: ‘From them whose sin ye envied, not abhorr’d,/ Dare ye for this adjure the civil sword/ To force our consciences that Christ set free/ And ride us with a classic hierarchy.’¹³⁶ Here Milton conceptualises the conscience as a key tenet of Christianity (an actual God-given gift); imposition of spiritual oversight is likened to temporal slavery. Here can be no tangible separation of the conscience and the self.

The most vociferous advocate of this latter camp was Samuel Parker (Marvell’s first polemical adversary) – a reader of his *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie* need go no further than his list of contents to discover his vehement condemnation of ‘Liberty of Conscience’: ‘the remiss Government of Conscience has ever been the most fatal

¹³⁴ Ceri Sullivan, *The Rhetoric of the Conscience in Donne, Herbert and Vaughan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p.1.

¹³⁵ Sullivan, *The Rhetoric of the Conscience*, p.14.

¹³⁶ John Milton, ‘On the new forcers of Conscience under the Long Parliament’, in *The Poetical Works of John Milton*, ed. by William Aldis Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p.82, ll.4-7.

miscarriage in all Common-wealths [...] The Mischiefs that ensue upon the permitting men the Liberty of their Consciences are endless. Fanaticism a boundless Folly.’¹³⁷ To Parker the conscience envisioned by Milton is a fallacy and invention – conformity is essential to preserve both the Church and the state. Though one advocates for and the other negates the conscience, both writers conflate the spiritual and secular – religious toleration, and the extent to which it was practiced, would have immediate political consequences. Both those in favour of religious toleration and those against argue that their method would both promote order and protect the spiritual well-being of the subject. Achinstein contends that in entering the toleration debate Marvell went deliberately against the establishment agenda, and followed Milton in his configuration of a reader’s ability to have a personal relationship with scripture:

An Anglican Tory understanding of the relation between “inner” and “outer” allowed that the Church could impose conformity on the external forms of worship on the grounds that a reliance on inner conscience was a primary threat to order. Those arguing in favor of toleration condemned the imposition of such forms as an affront to the promptings of conscience. Like Marvell, some believed that individuals were equipped to interpret texts apart from external authority.¹³⁸

The political implications of his intervention in spiritual issues would not have been lost on his contemporary readers; in defending liberty of conscience, Marvell also defended the impetus to dissent.

Much as the status of the ‘conscience’ was contested, absolutism hung at the forefront of the national conversation as faith in the Stuart regime eroded, and dissatisfaction at its repressive policy gained momentum. The Restoration, though ambitiously advertised as a return to the former status quo (a complete dismantling of the aims and policy decisions of the Interregnum government), could not escape the legacy of England’s brush with Republicanism. In the aftermath of the Civil War; ‘it was now established that the English constitution required *both* king and Parliament. Unfortunately, this still left open the question of which was to

¹³⁷ Parker, *Ecclesiastical Politie*, p.2.

¹³⁸ Sharon Achinstein, ‘Milton’s Spectre in the Restoration: Marvell, Dryden, and Literary Enthusiasm’, in *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 59 (1996), 1-29 (p.29).

predominate.¹³⁹ Bucholz and Key unpick the uneasy distribution of power in their account of the Restoration settlement. The Militia Acts of 1661 and 1662 ensured that Charles II had complete executive control over the militia and oversight of foreign policy decisions (though control of the army remained outside of his remit). In terms of domestic policy, Charles had the freedom to appoint ministers and judges, and could theoretically suspend the law during national emergencies: 'he could summon, prorogue, or dismiss Parliament with much the same freedom as his predecessors had exercised, within the limitations of the Triennial Act.'¹⁴⁰ Furthermore, Charles' financial settlement was generous given England's precarious financial situation at the moment of his ascension.¹⁴¹ The fact that Charles perennially outran his salary by £200,000-£300,000 proved a public relations nightmare, as did his exercise of his prerogative and frequent prorogation of Parliament. Accusations of corruption also dogged his court.

Charles acknowledged fourteen illegitimate children – these children were provided with estates, titles and offices. This generosity earned both raised eyebrows and considerable financial expense.¹⁴² Charles' distribution of pensions led to accusations of waste and cronyism, with public funds perceived to be funnelled towards his mistresses and favourites (a fair assessment).¹⁴³ By 1670 the royal debt would amount to £2.5 million.¹⁴⁴ Coupled with a growing disgust at the licentious behaviour of the King and his courtiers, the initial euphoria of the Restoration had well and truly waned, and accusations of arbitrary rule grew louder. The issue lay in the tension between the "absolute" power traditionally envisioned as a monarchical right under the divine right of kings, and the exercise of "arbitrary" power, unlimited

¹³⁹ Robert Bucholz and Newton Key, *Early Modern England 1485-1714: A Narrative History* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2004), p.265.

¹⁴⁰ Bucholz and Key, *Early Modern England*, p.266 - the Triennial Act merely required Charles to hold a Parliament, briefly, once every three years.

¹⁴¹ They restored Crown lands confiscated during the war and granted the Customs for Charles' life, a courtesy denied his father. In order to make up for the abolition of fees of wardship and feudal dues, Parliament also granted the king a continuation of the liquor Excise. The whole package was designed to yield the truly princely annual sum of £1,200,000 – far more than any previous Parliament had granted any previous sovereign. Bucholz and Key, *Early Modern England*, p.267.

¹⁴² James Scott (1649-85), Duke of Monmouth and Charles' eldest illegitimate son, was even briefly considered as a viable Protestant alternative to James II during the Exclusion Crisis. Bucholz and Key, *Early Modern England*, p.269.

¹⁴³ Charles awarded £180,000 in pensions to his friends and courtiers, approximately a seventh of his annual revenue. Bucholz and Key, *Early Modern England*, p.273.

¹⁴⁴ Bucholz and Key, *Early Modern England*, p.275.

and unrestricted by law (the reserve of despots). Throughout Europe the ubiquity of the former necessitated the threat of the later – though England by and large avoided the association *because* of the presence of Parliament. John Miller asserts:

England had developed a system of government by consent which made the ideas and methods of absolutism not only less acceptable but also less necessary. The local self-government that was so widespread in late medieval western Europe had here developed on a national level. Its ultimate expression was Parliament: England's kings, unlike those of France, had managed to create a national means of securing consent to taxation and legislation.¹⁴⁵

Whilst this regal concession to civilian consent provided useful optics, allowing for the consideration of a general public consensus (in theory if not in practice), it also proved a major point of contention for those arguing the legitimacy of absolute monarchy.

Both James I and Charles I encouraged the view and surrounded themselves with advisers who purported 'a view of the prerogative which can only be described as absolutist, in that overriding normal laws would cease to be highly exceptional and become something close to a regular practice.'¹⁴⁶ This insistence on the royal prerogative and exercise therein sealed the fate of Charles I, who would stand trial for tyranny. This set an undeniable precedent. The "ancient constitution" (set down by the Magna Carta in the popular imagination) gave political legitimacy to representative politics and enshrined certain rights and liberties: law protected property and person, criminals had the right to be judged by a jury, and Parliament would stand as a delegates for citizens. Common law would continue to be held by theorists as a check to royal prerogative, though as the century progressed the validity of absolute monarchy itself began to be questioned.¹⁴⁷ It was into this

¹⁴⁵ John Miller, 'Britain', in *Absolutism in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, ed. by John Miller (London: Macmillan Education Ltd., 1990), pp.195-224 (p.195).

¹⁴⁶ Miller, 'Britain', p.197.

¹⁴⁷ J. H. Burns, in his analysis of John Locke's treatment of the topic, contends that: 'the term "absolute, arbitrary power" is virtually a compound which cannot be broken down into separate elements. Power that is absolute *is* by its very nature arbitrary; and such power, Locke believes, degenerates almost inevitably into actual tyranny. For a ruler to wield power of this kind is any case at odds with the essential liberty of those who are his subjects.' J. H. Burns, 'The Idea of Absolutism', in *Absolutism in*

maelstrom that Marvell would launch his *Account* – though he would go further than his peers in his defence of Parliament. Miller asserts that, ‘inhibited by memories of the 1640s, MPs rarely underpinned [their demands] with a claim that the reason the king should follow the Common’s wishes was that the Commons represented the people.’¹⁴⁸ Marvell would, in writing, declare to the reader that if Parliament did not represent the interest of even the ‘meanest Commoner’ then it was failing in its purpose. Central to *his* attack on the royal prerogative was the figure of the reader, and what was due to them as a citizen. Even in a period defined by censorship and repression, print still served as a means of exploring political identities and as a means of establishing, defining and redefining the position of the subject.

This thesis will be divided into three sections, with each further divided by two chapters. Section One will be titled ‘Levity and Brevity: Establishing a Tone’, and will serve as an exploration of Marvell’s rhetoric strategy and his method of creating inflection; there is a stark difference between Marvell’s animadversion’s (which are ribald and satiric) and his sober accounts of recent history. This section will evaluate how these differing modes of discourse were intended to achieve their political agenda.

‘Levity’ is a chapter devoted to exploring Marvell’s use of animadversion and dissecting his comedy, focusing attention on *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* – his first pamphlet, and the beginning of his career as a polemicist. The text was composed in direct response to an incendiary pamphlet – though more broadly it addressed concerns surrounding increasing religious repression. As a genre of political discourse, animadversion allowed Marvell to challenge a conflicting ideology by criticising the tenets of his adversary’s rhetoric by directly quoting his opponent (often citing the page to allow a reader to verify their opinion). His addition to the genre was the injection of comedy – a jocular and irreverent tone to counter the

Seventeenth-Century Europe, ed. by John Miller (Macmillan Education Ltd: London, 1990), pp.21-42 (p.22).

¹⁴⁸ Miller, ‘Britain’, p.201.

earnest bigotry of Samuel Parker. 'Levity' will consider why this approach was used; why use humour to tackle such a serious issue? Raymond A. Anselment, in his evaluation of the pamphlet, argues that; 'the serious amusement may lapse into a more heavy-handed wit closer to polemic, but under the circumstances the achievement is significant.'¹⁴⁹ This thesis takes a differing stance, contending instead that polemic was always the intention; humour is the mechanism that delivers the satiric messaging of the piece. Quentin Skinner's work will be used to contextualise early modern attitudes towards mirth. Laughter was considered a moral judgement levelled at the individual who had made themselves the object of scorn – inducing laughter in a reader was to prove the moral degradation of the person being laughed at, in this case Samuel Parker. Humour in this polemic is used by Marvell as a specific literary strategy to convince his readership of the necessity of clemency for nonconformists. Whilst he mocks the bombastic excess of his adversary, his approach is not entirely irreverent; Marvell repeatedly draws attention to the actual harm made possible by this level of prejudice:

he is contented that they should only be exposed (they are his own expressions) to the *Pillories, Whipping-posts, Galleys, Rods, and Axes*; and moreover and above, to all other Punishments whatsoever, provided they be of a severer nature than those that are inflicted on men for their immoralities. O more then humane Clemency!¹⁵⁰

The image of 'Whipping-posts' recurs four times throughout the pamphlet, and even appears in *the Second Part* – the reader is encouraged to feel a sense of revulsion at the imagined cruelty of the state's treatment of nonconformists, even if couched in a heavy layer of sarcasm. As Marvell is keen to show 'they are his own expressions' – though Marvell frequently stretches Parker's writing to *ad absurdum* lengths it is not necessary here. His absolutism speaks for itself. Though Parker is undoubtedly a straw man – a figure who easily accrued scorn – by drawing readers into mocking him, they are by extension asked to question the institutions he represents, and the values underpinning his adversaries arguments. Active reading is a method of

¹⁴⁹ Raymond A. Anselment, "Betwixt Jest and Earnest": Ironic Reversal in Andrew Marvell's "The Rehearsal Transpros'd", in *The Modern Language Review*, 66 (1971), 282-293 (p.293).

¹⁵⁰ Marvell, *RT*, p.105.

promoting critical reflection on contemporary attitudes; by publishing the text, Marvell is protesting the government's actions.

The chapter 'Brevity' will follow and consider how Marvell sought to persuade his readers when not writing in a comedic tone, using the joint publication of *Mr Smirke* and *A Short Historical Essay* to explore the dichotomy between these opposing modes of discourse. Whilst *Mr Smirke* is an animadversion, following a formula established by Marvell's previous commercial successes, the transparently titled *A Short Historical Essay* is devoid of the rhetoric and satiric flourishes that had defined his earlier work. In joining these two very different pamphlets, Marvell is catering to two distinct markets – the coffeehouse set, who would recognise and respond to the allusion to the play, and those who would want to consider Marvell's history of the Church. 'Brevity' will consider the various ways Marvell establishes a didactic tone when eschewing comedy and dealing with the subject in earnest; from a polemical stand point, the chapter will consider how Marvell's tone affected the performative positioning assumed in his text. Whilst the 'Whipping-posts' imagined by Parker are to be sneered at, the tradition of persecution Marvell attributes to the Church reveals a trend towards absolutism and episcopal influence in secular politics that Marvell encourages the reader to be wary of: 'Imposition and Cruelty became Inherent in them, & the power of Persecution was grown so good & desirable a thing, that they thought the Magistrate scarce worthy to be trusted with it longer.'¹⁵¹ Replacing *ad hominem* attacks levelled at a cipher for an institution with an open attack on a political body meant that the reader would be approached in a radically different way; the polemical aim became to openly convince rather exercise covert influence. This chapter will explore how Marvell aimed to convince and "teach" his reader, by considering how his texts situate themselves within the wider toleration controversy in order to retrace the nuances a contemporary reader – alert to the wider parameters of the debate – would be able to discern. Steven Zwicker contends that when analysing the political discourse of the period, critics must embark on the process of:

¹⁵¹ Marvell, *SHE*, p.162.

Centering the aesthetic within the political, a geometry that was second nature to those who wrote the politics and the imaginative literature of the later seventeenth century, allows us to appreciate the contestative force of its literature and the complex ways in which the aesthetic performed and transformed the political.¹⁵²

Section One will realise this approach by dissecting why Marvell's aesthetic choices – from the tone he creates to choices in layout and decisions that would affect the material reality of the text handled by his readers – were chosen, and why they were effective as polemic delivery systems. In choosing to write he is performing for an audience, and his critique of the episcopacy and the punitive restrictions faced by nonconformists recurs in both his satiric and serious modes even when the nature of the performance shifts. This section and these chapters will interrogate how these literary choices were employed and consider the various means by which Marvell attempted to persuade his reader of the urgency and righteousness of his cause.

Section Two, 'The Political Voice: Writing for the Public Sphere', will consider the specific ways Marvell engaged with the political culture influencing his contemporary readers, and consider more broadly how these texts (which do not candidly advocate direct political action) could make an impact on the public. The first chapter – 'The Politician' – will scrutinise how Marvell interacted with new and overtly political mediums (namely the coffeehouse and newspaper), and consider how this interaction might be interpreted as engagement with the public sphere. In his monograph *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1962), Jürgen Habermas coined the term 'public sphere' and argued that the idea of public opinion having political cachet as a phenomenon did not exist before the eighteenth century. This thesis will take the view espoused by Steven Pincus that; 'the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 did not put an end to the public discussion of civic issues. Indeed, the state did much to facilitate the expansion of the discussion of political economy.'¹⁵³ Pincus identifies coffeehouses as important and influential sites of

¹⁵² Steven Zwicker, *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649-1689* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), p.201.

¹⁵³ Steven Pincus, 'The state and civil society in early modern England: capitalism, causation and Habermas's bourgeois public sphere', in *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England*, ed. by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2007), pp.213-231 (p.217).

political engagement – a means by which the masses could debate and discuss the latest (and incendiary) political tracts. As will be discussed in this chapter, there is proof that the coffeehouse was frequented by a wide cross section of society (which included women). The convergence of these conditions enabled a national political dialogue, that included a broad section of the social strata – conditions associated with a public sphere.¹⁵⁴ A pamphlet that proved a success in the coffeehouse could wield significant influence. Of course, this was Marvell's intention. To signal on the first page that there had been a plot to 'change the Lawful Government of England into an Absolute Tyranny' was a line written to inspire immediate agitation in the reader.

Marvell's radical insistence on the necessity of political representation – that people have full and effective representation in Parliament – clearly anticipates and appeals to a public sphere. Patterson summarises Marvell's core agenda in writing *An Account* as such:

A key aspect of English secret history as pioneered by Marvell was a combination of two liberal premises: that the government of any country ought to be practised, and seen to be practised, as the constitution requires; and that the concept of "libel" tends to be deployed as a weapon by those whose administrative conduct will not survive public scrutiny.¹⁵⁵

As this chapter will show, these premises are indeed clear through the ways in which Marvell constructs his *Account* and presents it to the reader – but the second premise is most clearly illustrated by the way Marvell engages with the Restoration newspaper. The newspaper, once a thriving arena of political discourse, had been significantly diminished – *The London Gazette*, under the watchful eye of state censor Roger L'Estrange (1616-1704), was the only public newspaper left standing. Marvell's distaste for this publication is blatant – when Charles' ministers went as far as to have the King's reprimand to Parliament published after a particularly fraught session, he notes that Parliament had the misfortune as to be subject 'to that height of contempt,

¹⁵⁴ The fact that the government tried to ban the coffeehouse in 1675 attests to their potential as sites of dissent.

¹⁵⁵ Annabel Patterson, 'Marvell and Secret History', in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999), pp.23-49 (p.31).

as to be *Gazetted*.¹⁵⁶ Assessing Marvell's prose work in relation to the newspaper is a task that has not yet been rigorously attempted: this section will redress this omission, revealing the various ways in which Marvell uses a critique of this government mouthpiece to more broadly protest state censorship. This chapter will examine how Marvell deliberately contrasts his own account of the recent history with that given in the *Gazette* by directly comparing their coverage of the same events, to reveal how he asks his reader to interrogate the way in which this mouthpiece of the state is conveying the news to its own advantage and by extension criticising this form of censorship. Susan J. Owen, in reference to Marvell's political partisanship, writes:

When I say Marvell's partisanship is real, I do not necessarily mean real in the sense of what he felt in his heart but real in the sense of its devastating effectiveness, its sharp resonance for contemporaries [...] L'Estrange's view of Marvell as oppurtunistic but also fanatical and dangerous shows an ability which some critics have lacked, to grasp the serious political thrust – and threat – behind a rhetorically skilful and diverse text.¹⁵⁷

This chapter will retrace and restore the 'devasting effectiveness' of his writing, by considering it through the prism of Restoration political culture, and through mediums – such as the newspaper – by which this text has rarely been considered, in order to reveal the full extent of Marvell's radical and subversive agenda.

The second chapter of this section, 'The Chameleon', will contend with the difficulty of envisioning how Marvell could encourage political action whilst maintaining the distance necessary to avoid the accusation (and penal consequences) of open sedition. This balancing act – inciting public ire whilst skirting the accusation of sedition – ensured that the public persona established by Marvell in his prose is a plastic construction.¹⁵⁸ The stance he takes in his printed texts often contradict with

¹⁵⁶ Marvell, *Account*, p.369.

¹⁵⁷ Susan J. Owen, 'The Lost Rhetoric of Liberty: Marvell and Restoration Drama', in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999), pp.334-353 (p.338).

¹⁵⁸ From his personal correspondence we have a remarkable insight into both how Marvell conducted himself as an MP serving his constituents, and how he related political events in both a professional capacity (to the Hull Corporation) and in a personal one to his relations (particularly his beloved nephew, William Pople) – allowing insight into the distinctions between his public and private

the way he voted in Parliament. M. L. Donnelly defines this seeming instability as in fact a feature used to appeal to a reader:

The Marvellian mask-*persona*, with its indefinable authorial slipperiness, serves a purpose beyond making possible a rational ethical appeal to a wide range of audiences. The shifts of tone and stance, the refusal to project a simplistic, crudely defined partisan role, keep the reader off-balance and force him or her to read more actively, alert to nuance and unexpected meanings, weighing and judging the argument in an exercise of those qualities of rationality, lucidity, and high-minded honour that the pamphlet itself continually appeals to and invokes.¹⁵⁹

This chapter will engage with this interpretation, considering where in the text a reader might be called on to actively read, identifying moments where Marvell avoids the appearance of partisanship whilst simultaneously crafting polemic, using his personal correspondence to contemplate the difference between his private and public personae. This chapter will also engage with placing Marvell in the context of popular displays of discontent; a consideration of his work that has not yet been embarked upon. This thesis takes the view proposed by Mark Knights that '[in] the later Stuart period England witnessed a significant shift towards a representative society.'¹⁶⁰ By examining the nascent rise of the political party and the fraught history of petitioning, this chapter will consider how Marvell's prose chimed with a climate of increasing political activism. As a whole, this section will consider how Marvell engaged with Restoration political culture – insisting on the necessity of viewing these texts as polemic, and considering new ways by which to examine their impact on the public sphere. Placing the reader at the forefront of analysis reveals the depth of Marvell's radicalism.

Section Three of this thesis, 'Plays, Poetry, Prayer: Marvell's Prose and Literary Culture', will consider how Marvell engaged with Restoration literary culture,

personas. Andrew Marvell, *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell: Volume II Letters*, ed. by H. M. Margoliouth, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), II.

¹⁵⁹ M. L. Donnelly, 'Interest, Honour, and Horatian Raillery in the Service of Liberty: *An Account of the Growth of Popery*', in *Marvell and Liberty* ed. by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999), pp.313-333 (p.316).

¹⁶⁰ Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p.3.

appealing to a reader by drawing meaning from intertextual interplay. The first chapter, 'Popular Culture', will study the relationship between Marvell's animadversions and the Restoration stage. The Restoration of the monarchy also precipitated the restoration of the theatre – famously shut during the Interregnum as a concession to Puritan morality, re-opening the theatre served as a public relations coup for the Stuart regime, signalling a return to the former status quo. Charles II – both an avid attendee and patron of drama – even going so far as to “suggest” what playwrights should portray in their work. This ensured that re-enactments and allusions to recent history thoroughly towed the Royalist party line. Plays such as *Cromwell's Conspiracy* (1660) and *The Rump; or The Mirrour of the Late Times* (1661) wore their bias with pride.¹⁶¹ The close cultural association between the sovereign and the stage makes Marvell's use of stage characters as figures in his burlesque immediately pointed. *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* borrows the character of 'Mr Bayes' from George Villier's (the Duke of Buckingham, 1628-1687) smash hit play *The Rehearsal* (1670) – conflating Samuel Parker with the pompous and pedantic figure.¹⁶² In particular Marvell's seeks to associate Parker's work with theatricality – referring to the publication of his 'very first Book' as an effort to corral a raucous crowd; rather than readers, Parker has an 'Auditory.'¹⁶³ In figuring Parker's reader as a theatrical audience Marvell suggests that his arguments are intended only as spectacle – and as the tract progresses the grandiose and bombastic scenes that Marvell imagines his adversary participating in increase in ridiculousness. Parker's audience – through Marvell's lens – are present to witness the absurd, and treated as idle spectators. This is in deliberate contrast to Marvell's continual, gracious references to his own 'Reader.'

As will be discussed, this character was understood by the play's contemporary audience as a lampoon of two public figures: the Earl of Arlington (1618-1685), Villier's personal political enemy, and John Dryden (1631-1700), the court's most vociferous and active literary supporter. By rendering ridiculous a

¹⁶¹ Anon., *Cromwell's Conspiracy; a Tragy-Comedy, Relating to our latter Times* (London: s. n., 1660); John Tatham, *The Rump; Or, The Mirrour of The late Times* (London: Printed by W. Godbid for R. Bloome, 1660).

¹⁶² George Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, in *Restoration Drama: An Anthology*, ed. by David Womersley (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2000) pp.141-170.

¹⁶³ Marvell, *RT2*, p.271.

prominent statesman and a mouthpiece for the court, Villier's play implicitly critiques Stuart government. In both *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* and its predecessor, drawing on a reader's association with Villier's work adds performative force to Marvell's satire – adding a subversive undercurrent and covert critique of the court to his text, discernible to the active reader. This chapter will also consider how the dynamic between Marvell and his reader changed after the veil of anonymity was lifted – he had been exposed as the author of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* in numerous “reproofs”, including Parker's. In taking to this public stage once again in *The Second Part*, Marvell actively sought to explain his motivation to his reader: ‘and though I cannot arrogate so much as even the similitude of those good qualities to my Writing, yet I dare say that never was there more a pregnant ripeness in the causes.’¹⁶⁴ This chapter will consider how Marvell negotiated this shift, and adapted his writing in anticipation of a reader aware of his identity – consciously crafting a public persona rather than an anonymous, flexible mask-persona. By analysing these references to Restoration literary culture, this chapter will examine how Marvell uses literary reference to add a subversive edge to his writing, creating a textual scaffold that allowed a reader the opportunity to navigate these intertextual connections and create further meaning.

‘Unpopular Theology’ will further examine Marvell's presentation and treatment of nonconformists, and in particular Catholics. Marvell's position on the issue of “popery” is both a reflection of contemporary prejudice but also a reaction to the secular, political threat posed by Catholic nation states. *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* is (even by its very title) deliberately incendiary, openly courting accusation of libel by exposing deep-seated political corruption, and equating its emergence to a growing “Catholic” influence at court. The anti-popery on display in *An Account* however is at odds with the dissatisfaction towards Anglican hegemony expressed in *Mr Smirke*, for instance. Both his position on the issue of non-conformity and the tone of his narrative voice shifts depending on the polemical agenda of the pamphlets. This plasticity is not a reflection of the author's personal beliefs – rather, the stance taken in these individual works has been engineered to elicit a different response in the reader. As this section will explore, “Popery” was a

¹⁶⁴ Marvell, *RT2*, p.242.

ubiquitous concept with no fixed meaning – it could apply to both a private practitioner and more broadly to papal institutions or international Catholic governments. In his “anti-popery”, Marvell presents Catholicism less as a faith than as a political system. To this end, this chapter will use the work of Scott Sowerby to consider how Marvell’s engaged with both “anti-popery” and “anti-anti-popery”; whilst those in the former camp identified practising Catholics living in England and Catholic nation states as the cause of domestic crises, the latter camp attributed this paranoia as the true threat, a potential weapon utilised by those aiming to stir sedition and popular unrest.¹⁶⁵ Marvell plays with both anti-popery and anti-anti-popery as means to an end in his endeavour to convince his readership to support a new election.

In *An Account* it is Catholic conspirators that are a threat to English liberties; in *Mr Smirke*, however, Marvell utilises anti-anti-popery to criticise his adversary’s high-handedness, and more broadly condemn the idea of religious uniformity. Turner had both widely criticised “papists”, yet praised the Roman Catholic Church, recounting how ‘p. 12. *The Jews in Rome are constrained once a week to hear a Christian Sermon*’ and lamenting that ‘p. 14. *I can onely wish for the present, that by forcing them into our Churches, they may hear our defences*’ – by pointing out this ecclesiastic and secular interference with individual conscience to his reader, Marvell to asks them to recoil at the ‘force, violence, [and] punishment’ that Turner envisions.¹⁶⁶ Marvell’s approach to “popery” differs between his tracts, as he chooses the mode that will best serve his polemic. By examining his oeuvre rather than discrete texts, this chapter will further critical understanding of how Marvell interacts with these unpopular theologies. As this chapter will show, Marvell both subverts and utilises the pre-existing prejudice of his audience. Achinstein argues that when approaching toleration tracts it is necessary to challenge outward meaning (the risk of libel by necessity ensured an element of self-censorship, a “conspiracy of silence”) in order to appreciate the full

¹⁶⁵ ‘Many people in later Restoration England saw anti-popery as a leading threat to political stability. The solution to this problem, in their view, was something that we might call anti-anti-popery, a critique of anti-popery that was designed to lay the troubles of the Restoration to rest by countering their perceived root cause.’ Scott Sowerby, ‘Opposition to Anti-Popery in Restoration England’, in *Journal of British Studies*, 51 (2012) 26-49 (p.27).

¹⁶⁶ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.101.

range of subtext a contemporary reader – well aware of these political pressures – were likely to try and unearth:

What does it mean to challenge that conspiracy, to dig into “censored” texts to unearth political meaning therein? [...] The toleration debate made a crucial issue out of the relation between outward action and inner belief, and the relation corresponds to the problem of esoteric, or coded, meaning.¹⁶⁷

This section will untangle text and subtext, using a broad examination of Restoration cultural conditions to reveal the ‘coded meaning’ Marvell plants within his prose for a reader to uncover.

By its conclusion this thesis will have explored the manifold ways that Marvell interacts with his audience and will have considered the question posed by Steven Zwicker in his consideration of nonconformist writing; ‘what constituted the relations between its political and imaginative modes, and where might those relations best be studied?’¹⁶⁸ To this end a broad cross section of Restoration literary culture – from verse satire, the theatre, political pamphlets and the newspaper – will be examined. It is by recovering ‘the social imaginary’ – ‘the complete range of inherited symbols and representations that constitute the subjectivity of an age’ – that we can form a fuller image of Marvell’s putative reader; it is by reconstructing his audience that we can best understand his rhetoric and to dissect the ways in which his polemic functions.¹⁶⁹ Marvell’s aesthetic choices in his construction of his texts are designed to have the greatest persuasive impact. They are actively trying to engage a reader in order to meet a propagandistic end – a reader that the text is highly conscious of. It is no accident that self-conscious references to the reader recur. In seeking to protest establishment corruption, encroachment on liberty of conscience and state censorship Marvell prioritises inciting the reader. The reader is a participant in the formation of these texts; it is their imagined response that guides Marvell’s prose. In *Lines of Authority*, Zwicker identifies this dialectic between the literary and the political in the Restoration:

¹⁶⁷ Achinstein, ‘Milton’s Spectre’, p.7.

¹⁶⁸ Zwicker, *Lines of Authority*, p.200.

¹⁶⁹ Skinner, *Visions of Politics: I*, p.102.

The years between the two revolutions form a distinct phase of English literary culture; the shared experience of the politics and polemics of imagination, on literary languages, modes, and forms, that is, on all aspects of literary culture. The civil wars displayed the full implications of contest and confrontation, what it meant to stir public opinion, to deploy oratory and eloquence, to indulge verbal savagery and violence.¹⁷⁰

Marvell deliberately sought to 'stir public opinion' – our task will be to dismantle his strategy, his reader will be the key.

¹⁷⁰ Zwicker, *Lines of Authority*, p.9.

Levity and Brevity: Establishing a Tone

I. Levity

The Restoration of Charles II and of a Cavalier parliament had brought in a reactionary regime in religious matters, with the government attempting to quash nonconformist religious sects, and strengthen the Anglican Church. Tim Harris argues that 'the first Act of the Cavalier Parliament declared null and void all laws' brought in to effect during the Interregnum – this meant that in effect all ecclesiastical legislation implemented during this period was retracted, and that Acts of Uniformity and recusancy laws which had been relaxed (such as 1593's Act Against Puritans, under which those who refused to conform to orthodox religious practice could be imprisoned or even executed, their property seized by the Crown) were brought back into full effect.¹ The repeal of Cromwell's Puritan ecclesiastic reforms was followed by the implementation of a series of repressive penal measures to curb dissenters and strengthen the Anglican Church. Collectively dubbed the Clarendon Code, it consisted of: the Corporation Act of 1661, which asked those who wished to take up municipal positions to renounce the 1643 Solemn League and Covenant; the Act of Uniformity in 1662, which made the observance of the Book of Common Prayer (banned during the Interregnum) compulsory; the Conventicle Act of 1664, that banned the meeting of more than five people for unauthorised sessions of worship; and the Five Mile Act of 1665, which banned nonconformist ministers from entering large towns or areas in which they had formerly preached.² These measures were accompanied by stringent fines and the threat of imprisonment.³ When offered the chance to renounce the Solemn League and Covenant and to prescribe to every particular within the Book of Common Prayer in exchange for their professional posts, two thousand and twenty

¹ Tim Harris, "'Lives, Liberties and Estates": Rhetorics of Liberty in the Reign of Charles II', in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, ed. by Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1990), pp.217-242 (p.225).

² Named the Clarendon Code after the Lord Chancellor who presided initially presided over the Cavalier Parliament, Edward Hyde, the Earl of Clarendon (1609-1674).

³ Under the first Conventicle Act, for example, a first offence could be punishable by a £5 fine or a three month gaol term, a second punishable by a £10 fine or a six month stint in detention, and for a third a £100 fine or the possibility of transportation was possible under this new legislation. Michael R. Watts, *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), p.225.

nine clergymen, lecturers and fellows refused between 1660 and 1662.⁴ These strict harsh penal measures caused dismay amongst the many and varied recusant Protestant groups which existed throughout the country, who refused on grounds of conscience to participate in religious services which they perceived to involve ceremonies without a scriptural basis. However, a window of opportunity to revoke these laws emerged in 1667. Though the Cavalier Parliament that had brought in this legislation was still seated, the influence of the Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Clarendon (1609-1674) was waning following dissatisfaction with his handling of the Second Anglo-Dutch War (1664-1667).⁵ In the vacuum created by Clarendon's descent, a group of leading ministers colloquially known as the Cabal (led by the Duke of Buckingham) rose to ascendance – these ministers possessed either Catholic or dissenting sympathies, and so religious toleration sat at the forefront of their agenda.

Lobbying the public for endorsement of toleration also became a political priority for both nonconformists and those sympathetic to their plight. One of the first men to call for the relaxation of anti-dissenter legislation was the Presbyterian clergyman John Humfrey (1621-1719). *A Proposition for the Safety & Happiness of the King and Kingdom both in Church and State* was published anonymously in 1667 and appealed directly to those 'Great Sirs!' with the power to repeal the Clarendon Code.⁶ Throughout Humfrey argues that retracting these punitive laws will inspire loyalty in dissenters, who (aside from the potentially misguided few) are presented as otherwise peaceful subjects. Gary S. De Krey contends that Humfrey saw the 'conscience' as 'the God given faculty that enables human beings to determine the conformity of their belief and behaviour to divine will.'⁷ Humfrey argues that for a nonconformist to prescribe to practices which they do not believe in would be hypocritical and thus a sin. To enforce such harsh penalties would entail 'dragging innocent folks thus to prison, for doing nothing in earnest but endeavouring to save

⁴ Watts, *Dissenters*, p.219.

⁵ Paul Seaward, 'Hyde, Edward, first earl of Clarendon', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <<https://www-oxforddnb-com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-14328?rskey=33i1GX&result=4>> [accessed 17th July, 2019].

⁶ John Humfrey, *A Proposition or The Safety & Happiness of the King and Kingdom both in Church and State* (London: s.n., 1667), p.94.

⁷ Gary S. De Krey, 'Rethinking the Restoration: Dissenting Cases for Conscience, 1667-1672', in *The Historical Journal*, 38 (1995), pp.53-83 (p.58).

their souls.⁸ Humfrey's ardent plea to end the oppression of recusants quickly met an answer in Thomas Tomkins' (1637/8-1675) anonymously published *The Inconveniences of Toleration* (1667).⁹ Whilst Humfrey attempted primarily to appeal to the sentiments of his readers, Tomkins presented his text as a recourse to reason. The main thrust of Tomkins' criticism is that his adversary intends to pander to public opinion: 'Only one notion he hath ... [that] Penalties and Rigour doth but alienate their minds farther from us; whereas Indulgence would work upon their Affections.'¹⁰ Tomkins takes particular exception to the idea of nonconformists as benign citizens, that '*the most of them are certainly Inoffensive persons.*'¹¹ Tomkins is quick to remind his readers of the role played by opponents of episcopacy in the recent Civil War, lambasting dissenters as 'the Abettors and Applauders of the Murder of the *King*.'¹² The dichotomy these pamphlets present – with one side presenting nonconformists as Protestants too earnest in their faith to ignore their conscience, willing to suffer as a result of their piety, and the other presenting these religious minority groups as seditious zealots, a danger to civil order and the Anglican Church – would continue to be litigated in the pamphlets that followed, as more writers joined the controversy and continued to criticise or laud the government's treatment of nonconformists, trying to convince the reader to take their side.

By 1672, the year Marvell took to press and released his first published prose text, the toleration controversy had been ferociously debated in print for over five years, since the publication of Humfrey's impassioned plea on the behalf of persecuted dissenters. Entries into the argument included weighty theological and political treatises (such as John Owen's (1616-1683) *Indulgence and Toleration Considered*, published in 1667 and immediately met with vociferous criticism), animadversions (such as Owen's answer to Samuel Parker, *Truth and Innocence Vindicated: in a Survey of a Discourse Concerning Ecclesiastical Polity*, published anonymously in 1669), and scabrous, cheap, widely available anti-dissenter propaganda (the *A Friendly Debate betwixt two Neighbours* series, begun in 1668).¹³

⁸ Humfrey, *A Proposition*, p.10.

⁹ Thomas Tomkins, *The Inconveniences of Toleration* (London: Printed by W. Garret, 1667).

¹⁰ Tomkins, *Inconveniences*, p.25.

¹¹ Tomkins, *Inconveniences*, p.3.

¹² Tomkins, *Inconveniences*, p.3.

¹³ John Owen, *Indulgence and Toleration Considered: in a Letter unto A Person of Honour* (London: s.n., 1667); John Owen, *Truth and Innocence Vindicated: In a Survey of a Discourse Concerning Ecclesiastical*

This year also marked a victory for the Cabal (though it would be short lived). Charles II issued the Declaration of Indulgence in March, immediately suspending the penal restrictions which limited the religious liberty of nonconformists and Catholics. By opposing the authoritarian rhetoric of Samuel Parker, Marvell was by default aligning himself with the King's political agenda. Though he objected to the royal prerogative in other works, here Marvell can use the King's overt support for religious toleration to his advantage. Parker would rhetorically frame toleration as a fringe position (held by 'bold and giddy People'), and Protestant nonconformists as 'a Wild Fanatique Rabble' whilst vociferously express his admiration for 'Supreme Civil Power'; a nation in which 'Kingly Power and Priestly Function' work in tandem to monitor the spiritual lives of citizens is proposed as the ultimate means of curbing dissent.¹⁴ It is this tension between Parker's rigid Anglicanism and his staunch support of royal prerogative that Marvell exploits. The support of royal authority ensures that Marvell's satiric persona *isn't* launching his attack as an outsider, but as a moderate – Parker and the attitude he represents can be presented as fringe, as extreme, as dangerous. In other words, Parker is presented by Marvell in the same terms he himself used to vilify nonconformists. Marvell capitalises on the political moment in order to challenge and subvert his audiences' expectations, and change attitudes towards a beleaguered and stigmatised section of society. His pamphlet attempts to situate an acceptance of nonconformity within the mainstream; comedy is a vital part of that strategy, a way of ensuring mass appeal and thus a greater opportunity to effect the popular consciousness. This is why his prose texts merit literary criticism; their intertextuality and marked use of rhetorical tropes reveal an extreme awareness of the reader. The full extent of his political intent can only be discerned by deconstructing his rhetorical and literary strategy – engaging a reader is intrinsic to his polemical programme, the key to persuading his audience.

Of all of Marvell's prose, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* has been the text that has garnered the most critical attention – critics have charted how Marvell responded to his contemporary political moment, debated his political ideology, and continued the work of unpicking his dense web of contemporary cultural references. This chapter

Polity (London: s.n., 1669); Simon Patrick, *A Friendly Debate Betwixt two Neighbours, The one a Conformist, the other Non-Conformist* (London: s.n., 1668?).

¹⁴ Parker, *A Discourse*, p.xl, p.ii, p.2.

will contribute to the field by building on this discussion of Marvell's intentions, but will further it by forensically considering *why* his particular brand of at times absurdist, at times blunt satire was such a potent polemical weapon; bringing fresh light to the discussion by focusing specifically on how a reader would *read* such a text by considering how humour and laughter were perceived and understood as psychological processes in the early modern period. As Chartier contends, in order to understand how reader appropriation functions, it is necessary to investigate:

[the] social history of the various uses (which are not necessarily interpretations) of discourses and models, brought back to their fundamental social and institutional determinants and lodged in the specific practices that produce them.¹⁵

Recognising how Marvell's contemporary reader perceived laughter (and the rhetorical devices used to produce it) informs our understanding of how satire as a model was understood, and how a reader might appropriate its contents. To inspire laughter was not a benign act; in fact, it was perceived as a means of revealing moral weakness: though Parker is the main target, an attentive reader can discern a clear attack on the institutions and attitudes he represents – by turning him into a figure of ridicule, his arguments in turn become ridiculous and lose their validity. Placing the focus on the reader of the text and the rhetorical strategies Marvell uses to persuade them will further our understanding of how Marvell sought to change public perceptions and influence political change, asserting that encouraging his audience to question authority serves as a means of political protest. Marvell does not advocate action, but that does not mean that this text were not built to accomplish political means – *The Rehearsal Transpros'd's* aim is to engender dissent. The incredibly stylised nature of the text – oscillating between rambunctious imagery, dry sarcasm and burlesque set pieces – cloaked deep cynicism and anti-establishment sentiment under a veneer of mirth, whilst drawing a reader's attention to the text's inherent performativity.

¹⁵ Roger Chartier, *Forms and Meaning*, p.89.

His ostentatious use of rhetorical tropes and flourishes reflects one of the key lines of argument in the text. Marvell deliberately highlights the elitism of his opponent's rhetoric, in particular the reactionary impulse to prohibit citizens from access to political and theological texts; his ostentatious style reflects the emphasis placed on rhetoric in the early modern curriculum. In his overt use of mocking tropes Marvell both presents a blistering critique of his adversary, and offers his reader a methodology for dismantling the narratives promulgated by establishment mouthpieces, such as Parker, whose work clearly aimed to bolster the episcopacy. By exploring the significance of rhetoric in the early modern curriculum and applying this understanding of rhetorical figures to Marvell's prose, this thesis will apply a new model of literary analysis to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* that reconstructs a contemporary reader's perception of his methodology. The focus will be on how political speech was constructed in the period, and how Marvell utilises these conventions in his polemic. The form of protest this text inculcates is close reading. Marvell's contribution to the debate, and to the genre of animadversion, was the injection of humour into a political and theological matter of (in some cases, grave) seriousness – this chapter will discuss the full implications of this choice. Marvell uses levity to both appeal to and persuade his readers, comedy proving the bedrock of his rhetorical strategy. In his biography of Marvell Warren Chernaik contends that; 'Marvell's later writings are almost entirely satire and panegyric, genres which can never be neutral, since they aim to persuade, to direct their reader's judgement, often to recommend a particular course of behaviour.'¹⁶ Every stylistic choice, literary flourish and rhetorical structure has been deliberately chosen not simply to amuse a reader, but to raise awareness of the controversy, and – should they not share Marvell's political outlook – sway them.

A Laughing Matter

In writing a humorous rebuttal to Samuel Parker's *A Preface Shewing What Grounds there are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery* (1672), Marvell was employing a carefully

¹⁶ Warren Chernaik, *The Poet's Time: Politics and Religion in the Work of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p.14.

calibrated rhetorical strategy, a strategy designed both to engage his intended reader and to dismantle his adversary's arguments – his wit proving to be his most devastating weapon. The appropriateness of including humour in religious discourse was already a point of contention in the period. The argument against its inclusion found an anchor in the Gospels – in his epistle to the Ephesians, Paul offered a guide for behaviour, including the instruction, 'Let there be no filthiness nor foolish talk nor crude joking, which are out of place, but instead let there be thanksgiving' (Ephesians 5:4). Interpretations of this passage varied from strict adherence to others, as described by Raymond Anselment, 'choosing to read Paul's statement as a "sober caution" rather than a rigid prohibition.'¹⁷ An argument against mocking in religious discourse can be found in Joseph Hall's tract, *Christian Moderation* (1640); written in the prelude to Civil War, a time of increasing rancour in religious debate, Hall exhorted his contemporaries to moderate their satire: 'wee refraine from all rayling termes, and spightful provocations of each other in the differences of Religion [...] it is rare to find any writer, whose inke is not tempered with gall, and veneger, any speaker whose mouth is not a quiver of sharpe, and bitter words.'¹⁸ The rhetorical effectiveness of satire however made it a tool writers were loath to abandon, causing many to justify its admittance.¹⁹ As Anselment argues, 'the complex era embracing both Marleprate and Swift believed some form of religious ridicule was acceptable.'²⁰

Despite this acceptance of some mockery, writers remained cautious: 'aware that religious ridicule may be easily abused, they too strive to show by their behaviour the "fitting decency" and the "stately *gravity*" befitting the Christian satirist.'²¹ In his attack on Parker – an established clergyman – Marvell deliberately pushed the boundaries of acceptable mocking, by refusing to take his adversary seriously in the first place: 'for, as I am obliged to ask pardon if I speak of serious

¹⁷ Raymond A. Anselment, *"Betwixt Jest and Earnest": Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift & the Decorum of Religious Ridicule* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), p.10.

¹⁸ [Joseph Hall], *Christian Moderation: In two Books* (London: Miles Flesher, 1640), pp.151-2.

¹⁹ For instance, in *Gangræna* (1646), Thomas Edwards (1599-1648) argued that it was his religious zeal that led him to 'scoffe and jeer' at those he perceived as a danger to the Church: 'I conceive I may make most for the glory of God, [and] the peace of this Church. Thomas Edwards, *The First and Second Part of Gangræna: or a Catalogue and Discover of many of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of the time* (London: Printed by T. R. and E.M. for Ralph Smith, 1646), sig.[B4]r.

²⁰ Anselment, *"Betwixt Jest and Earnest"*, p.32.

²¹ Anselment, *"Betwixt Jest and Earnest"*, p.32.

things ridiculously; so I must now beg excuse if I should hap to discourse of ridiculous things seriously. But I shall as possible observe *decorum*, and whatever I talk of, not commit such an Absurdity, as to be grave with a Buffoon.’²² It was the success of his jovial tone that those who replied to *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* found most galling. In the anonymously published *A Common-place-Book out of the Rehearsal Transpros’d* (1673), Marvell is labelled an ‘ill-bred Clown’, and his comedic tone disgraceful: ‘he used him untowardly, and so that it is a shame to tell.’²³ In his reply to Marvell, *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros’d* (1673), Parker accuses Marvell of ‘accosting me in such a clownish and licentious way of writing, as you know to be unsuitable to bothe Civility of my Education, and the Gravity of my Profession’, declaring him to be a ‘Clown’, ‘Buffoon’ and a ‘Cunning Gamester.’²⁴ However, whilst all Marvell’s critics lambasted his comedic tone, it did not stop them sublimating this technique when they came to write their own replies. Martin Dzelzainis asserts that, ‘by successfully introducing wit and fantasy into an arena in which brute intellectual force was hitherto dominant, [Marvell] had transformed the rules of the discursive game’ – a legacy that would influence eighteenth century satirists, including Jonathan Swift.²⁵ In order to understand the rationale behind Marvell’s use of a comedic register – by turns jocose and mordant – it is necessary to consider contemporary attitudes to laughter, as well contemporary perceptions of rhetoric.

Quentin Skinner explores how laughter was perceived in the century, exorcising modern preconceptions to reveal the early modern reality – one at odds with current sensibilities. In the sixteenth century ‘a specialised literature began to appear on the physiological as well as the psychological aspects of the phenomenon’ – indicative of the intense interest in isolating and understanding amusement.²⁶ This literature was influenced by classical writers, including Cicero and Aristotle, who both conclude that ‘jesting is always an expression of contempt’: ‘comedy deals in the

²² Marvell, *RT*, p.96.

²³ Anon., *A Common-place-Book Out of the Rehearsal Transpros’d* (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1673), p.18.

²⁴ Samuel Parker, *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transposed, in Discourse to its Authour* (London: Printed for James Collins, 1673), p.1, sig.A2v, sig.A2r.

²⁵ Martin Dzelzainis and Annabel Patterson, ‘Introduction’, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), I, pp.3-40 (p.21).

²⁶ Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics: Volume III, Hobbes and Civil Science*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), III, p.142.

risible, and the risible is an aspect of the shameful, ugly or the base.²⁷ Maria Plaza contends that this is a model for conceptualizing laughter that originated in the classical period, expounded by writers such as Plato, and which is now understood as “Superiority Theory” or *schadenfreude*.²⁸ This understanding of laughter was adopted and embellished by early modern writers. Writers such as the French physician Laurent Joubert asserted that we laugh at what we find ridiculous; ‘something that strikes us as ugly, deformed, dishonest, indecent, malicious and scarcely decorous [...] We can never avoid some measure of scorn or dislike for baseness and ugliness, so that “the common style of our laughter is contempt or derision”.’²⁹ Joubert went on to explain the process by which we are moved to laughter; ‘that we experience feelings of contempt whenever we perceive “the fondness, the filthiness, the deformitee” of someone else’s behaviour, with the result that we are prompted to “laigh him to skorne out right”.’³⁰ As such, in the early modern period laughter was not considered to be the by-product of joy or happiness, it was perceived and categorised as a moral judgement upon those who had made themselves ridiculous; that they induced laughter was symptomatic of the object of ridicule’s vice, moral turpitude or foolish behaviour. To move an audience to laughter could thus be as powerful a persuasive technique as moving them to tears or anger. To elicit laughter was to prove your enemy contemptuous. In this theory of laughter, laughter is a sign of contempt. To be laughed at constituted a ‘pure loss of face.’³¹ Thus when Marvell took it upon himself to counter the absolutist stance of Parker, his primary means of attacking his adversary was to stimulate his reader through the rhetorical device of *Pathopeia*. In *The Garden of Eloquence* (first published in 1577), Henry Peacham (1546-1634) defines *Pathopeia* as ‘a forme of speech by which the Orator moueth the minds of his hearers to some vehemency of affection, as of indignation, feare, envy, hatred, hope, gladness, mirth, laughter, sadnesse or sorrow.’³² In describing the use of such a ‘forme

²⁷ Skinner, *Visions of Politics: III*, p.152.

²⁸ Under this model laughter is a response to the faults of others, a way of asserting our own, comparative, superiority: ‘the laughable is a kind of vice, more specifically a lack of self knowledge, and amusement a kind of malice, as we take pleasure in others’ faults.’ Maria Plaza, *The Function of Humour in Roman Verse and Satire: Laughing and Lying* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p.7.

²⁹ Skinner, *Visions of Politics: III*, pp.145-146.

³⁰ Skinner, *Visions of Politics: III*, p.145.

³¹ Skinner, *Visions of Politics: III*, p.164.

³² Henry Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence, Containing the Most Excellent Ornaments, Exornations, Lightes, flowers, and forms of speech, commonly called the Figures of Rhetoricke* (London: H. Jackson, 1593), p.143.

of speech', Peacham asserts, 'this figure pertaineth properly to moue affections, which is a principal and singular vertue of eloqution.'³³ To achieve *Pathopeia*, Marvell makes pointed use of the mocking tropes – the figures of rhetoric designed to ridicule an adversary and invoke laughter.

The humanist movement, begun in the fourteenth century, was born in response to, and helped promulgate, the “re-discovery” of classical texts; by transcribing, translating and printing these works, these writers became newly available to readers in Europe. This included the canon of the great Roman rhetorician, Cicero. As a result, the early modern syllabus began to focus heavily on the study and practise of rhetoric. Paul Oskar Kristeller argues that ‘rhetoric [...] consisted primarily in the theory and practise of prose composition, but also in the theory of plausible or probable arguments and in theory of persuasion.’³⁴ Rhetoric was not just presented as a stylistic choice, presenting your arguments in the most rhetorically effective way was reflective of the writer or speaker’s intellect: ‘[it was a] claim advanced by humanists that the pursuit of eloquence (*eloquentia*) was a major task for the educated scholar and writer and that it was inseparable from the pursuit of wisdom (*sapientia*).’³⁵ Peter Mack’s research into the formation of a humanist curriculum in England reveals that rhetoric (in theory and practice) was at the core of early modern pedagogy, forming the basis of a student’s instruction at the grammar school:

[...] In his instructions for reading, which were included in Lily’s *Brevissima institutio*, Erasmus suggested that pupils should re-read texts four times: at first straight through to record the general meaning more thoroughly; then word by word noticing vocabulary and constructions; thirdly for rhetoric, picking out figures, elegant expressions, sententiae, proverbs, histories, fables and comparisons; and finally ethically, noting exemplary stories and moral teaching.³⁶

³³ Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence*, p.144.

³⁴ Paul Oskar Kristeller, ‘Humanism’, in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. by Charles B. Schmitt et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp.113-137 (p.122).

³⁵ Kristeller, ‘Humanism’, p.123.

³⁶ Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.15.

These steps for reading a text reveal the emphasis placed on both establishing meaning in a text and on discerning the mechanics of rhetoric, with students actively trained to identify and classify rhetorical tropes. Analysing the form and structure used by an orator or writer sat at the heart of a humanist lesson plan.³⁷ 'Knowing the tropes and figures' was regarded as the best means for students to be able to recognise an author's agenda, and be able to imitate their rhetorical effectiveness.³⁸

In this model aesthetics and ethics are inextricably linked – the style of delivery, the form taken by a text, and the literary devices used within have direct impact on how the text will be received and read. Grammar school attendees learnt how to appeal to an audience and recognise the mechanics of the appeal, with close reading forming the basis of their educational instruction; this in turn shaped them as readers. For the privileged minority of students who continued their education at university, rhetoric also formed a major part of their course. The study of rhetorical manuals was mandated by university statutes (and at Cambridge the first year of a Bachelor of Art student's course was devoted to rhetoric), with 'Cicero's *Orations* and his rhetorical works, especially the pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium* [...] Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, Cicero's *De oratore* and Aristotle's *Rhetoric*' repeatedly recurring in extant university book lists.³⁹ The structure of assessment also privileged a firm command of rhetoric. Candidates for degrees at Oxford and Cambridge were obliged to attend and participate in disputations – taking positions as respondent and opponent, students were required to debate each other, presenting a persuasive argument and dismantling the logic of their adversary. For many early modern theorists, there was a moral as well as practical impetus to implement a humanist curriculum. John Milton would frame learning in *Of Education* (1644) as the ultimate public good: 'it be one of the greatest and noblest designes, that can be thought on, and for want whereof this nation perishes.'⁴⁰ Milton recommends the writing of

³⁷ 'In his manual for teachers first published in 1612 John Brinsley argued that pupils would be helped to construe more accurately if they understood the shape and purpose of the text they were reading [...] an approach to the text as embedded in the relation between speaker, audience, purpose and occasion.' Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, pp.18-19.

³⁸ Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, p.46.

³⁹ Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, pp.51-52.

⁴⁰ John Milton, 'Of Education. To Master Samuel Hartlib.', in *John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education* ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2013), pp.170-180 (p.171).

'*Quintilian*', the famous Roman rhetorician and author of *Institutio Oratoria* (a foundational textbook of the discipline) alongside other authors to help mould students into great orators: 'into a gracefull and ornate Rhetorick taught out of the rule of *Plato, Aristotle, Phalereus, Cicero, Hermogenes, Longinus*.'⁴¹

The ability to close read texts is essential in both the public and private lives of citizens: as well as being 'excellent writers', those afforded an exemplary education will be able to glean 'universal insight into things' by actively studying texts, aiding them in their public offices and also shaping their relationship with the Bible.⁴² For Milton, a healthy Protestant nation is built on active reading. In response to these broad humanist shifts in education, rhetoric manuals emerged in the literary marketplace in the latter half of the seventeenth century – serving as reference guides and even introductions to *eloquentia*.⁴³ These manuals, inspired and informed by great classical rhetoricians, were incredibly popular – necessary tools to help students and readers attain *sapientia*, and fashion themselves in the form of a humanist scholar; Thomas Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique* (first printed in 1553), one of the genre's forebears, went through eight editions over the next fifty years, and continued to be reissued into the seventeenth.⁴⁴ These texts 'concentrated on analysing the figures and tropes of speech' – teaching the reader to approach both oration and prose in a highly structured and systematic way; as a result of their abundance, and the growing emphasis placed on rhetoric as a liberal art, 'by the end of the sixteenth century, these and other writers had made available to English readers a complete understanding of the classical *Ars Rhetorica*.'⁴⁵ They also served to democratise rhetoric, allowing the literate the opportunity to refine their ability to close read and hone their persuasive prowess. Readers of Marvell's prose would have been acutely aware of the cultural significance of rhetoric in the period, training in rhetoric and debate likely playing a role in their formative education; many would

⁴¹ Milton, 'Of Education', p.174, p.177.

⁴² Milton, 'Of Education', p.178.

⁴³ Quentin Skinner, 'Political Rhetoric and the Role of Ridicule', in *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Politics of Democratization in Europe: Concepts and Histories*, ed by Kari Palonen, Tuija Pulkkinen and José María Rosales (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008), pp.137-149 (p.138).

⁴⁴ Thomas Wilson, *The Arte of Rhetorique, for the use of all such as are studious of Eloquence* (London: George Robinson, 1585).

⁴⁵ Skinner, 'The Role of Ridicule', p.138.

have been able to identify the figures of speech Marvell employed, and be aware of their significance within his persuasive strategy.

The grammar school shaped Marvell's readership, and his readers would be alert to his rhetorical tactics, fully aware of the moral implications rhetorical theorists ascribed to the devices he employs. He can use their innate understanding of political speech to his advantage. For instance, throughout the text, the speaker of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* makes heavy use of the figure of *Ironia*, or irony. First published in 1657 by 'JOHN SMITH, Gent.', *The Mysterie of Rhetorick Unveil'd* went through 10 editions, and continued to be published into the eighteenth century – published to cater for a mass market audience, it promised to be 'eminently delightful and profitable for all sorts, enabling them to discern and imitate the Elegancy in any Author they read' by citing '130 [...] TROPES and FIGURES', offering an example of each from a Latin, an English, and a scriptural source.⁴⁶ In his treatise, Smith explains *Ironia* to his readers: 'it is called the mocking Trope, whereby in derision we speak contrary to what we think or mean, or when contrary is signified by another.'⁴⁷ *Ironia* is evident when Marvell's satirical persona admires Parker's 'courage': 'yet in the mean time I cannot but admire at Mr. Bayes his courage; who knowing how dangerous a Villain a well-meaning Zelot is, and having calculated to a man how many of them there are in the whole Nation, yet dares thus openly stimulate the Magistrate.'⁴⁸ Prior to this, Marvell's speaker had gleefully exposed Parker's radical inconsistency when figuring the nonconformist "threat". Summing up Parker's policy advice as '*Persecution recommended*', Marvell quotes Parker to reveal his opponents flawed logic: 'You have seen how he in-veighs against Trade: *That whilst mens Consciences are acted by such peevish and ungovernable Principles, to erect Trading-Combinations is but to build so many Nests of Faction and Sedition.*'⁴⁹ He goes on to cite Parker's calculations: 'he hath in one place taken a List of the Fanatick Ministers, whom he reckons to be about an hundred *Systematical Divines.*'⁵⁰ In his *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*, Parker had cited these 'hundred men' as the cause of nearly all of

⁴⁶ John Smith, *The Mysterie of Rhetorick Unveil'd, Wherein above 130 The TROPES and FIGURES are severally derived from the Greek into English* (London: Printed by E. Cotes, 1665), title page.

⁴⁷ Smith, *The Mysterie of Rhetorick*, p.38.

⁴⁸ Marvell, *RT*, p.107.

⁴⁹ Marvell, *RT*, p.104.

⁵⁰ Marvell, *RT*, p.104.

the nation's issues – 'the only Cause of all Our Troubles' – and punishing and otherwise removing these men from the public sphere, it would be possible for the government to:

take away the very Grounds and Foundations of Scandal, remove all our Differences, prevent much Trouble and more Sin, cure all our Schisms, Quarrels, and Divisions, banish our mutual Jealousies, Censures, and Animosities, and establish a Firm and lasting Peace.⁵¹

Yet whilst Parker had credited nonconformity with 'all Our Troubles', he was also keen to stress their impotency as a movement, as Marvell is quick to elucidate: 'and then for their People [...] *their noise is greater than their number ... in Country Towns and Villages, where they arise not above the proportion of one to twenty.*'⁵² Parker's logical fallacies are exposed by Marvell's irony – they cannot be so few, and yet so great a risk to the state. Parker's estimation of the threat is pure fear mongering, his figuring of them as a rebellious minority mass threatening the peaceable, moderate vast majority is purely imagined: 'I do not think Mr. Bayes ever breaks his shins, but it is by stumbling upon a Fanatick.'⁵³

Given Parker's repeated calls to have nonconformists treated punitively, it is only because of the 'peaceableness of their Principles' that 'nevertheless he may walk night and day in safety.'⁵⁴ Regardless, Parker's insistence on defining nonconformists as a mob ignores their genuine and individual beliefs: 'I suppose the Nonconformists value themselves tho upon their Conscience and not their Numbers.'⁵⁵ By laughing at Parker's overt scare-tactics, Marvell implicitly prompts the reader to question the fear behind the hyperbole. Alexandra Walsham's research into the persecution faced by dissenters and practicing Catholics in the early modern period reveals 'a fresh surge of prejudice against dissenters' during the Restoration; attacks on meeting houses became common place, with a particularly violent assault on a Baptist church in Dunstan's Hill occurring on May 4th 1660, the very same month Charles II made his

⁵¹ Parker, *Ecclesiastical Politie*, p.253.

⁵² Marvell, *RT*, p.105.

⁵³ Marvell, *RT*, p.177.

⁵⁴ Marvell, *RT*, p.105.

⁵⁵ Marvell, *RT*, p.105.

return, a harbinger of times to come.⁵⁶ The same year saw the townspeople of a village in Dorset gather outside a Quaker meeting hall and, in order to disrupt the service within, they beat drums and fired guns, proceeding to attack the congregation as it attempted to flee.⁵⁷ This violence could even lead to fatalities; in 1662 a mob attack on a Quaker meeting held at the Bull and Mouth Inn in London was so brutal that two worshippers died as a result.⁵⁸ It was just not at the hands of a bigoted mob that nonconformists needed to fear for their safety.

In 1664 twelve Baptists from Aylesbury were sentenced to death under 1593's Act Against Puritans, having refused to attend Anglican church services – they were granted clemency by Charles II, but the severity of their initial sentence reveals the entrenched prejudice of Buckinghamshire's magistracy, though this county was by no means an exception. Many counties made use of the terms of the Conventicle Act to heavily fine their nonconforming citizens.⁵⁹ Ellis Hookes (1635-1681), a Quaker administrator, catalogued the number of convicted nonconformists, the fines imposed on them and which goods were seized in his pamphlet *For the King and Both Houses of Parliament* (1676), explicitly criticising mercenary local authorities: '*they make prey upon said Peoples Estates and Livelihoods; ruining and destroying these Peaceable Protestant Subjects, under pretence of doing the King Service.*'⁶⁰ In Kent '40 l. 18 s. 9 d.' is the recorded toll, in Norfolk the fines amount to '1244 l. 7 s. 5. d.', and in Yorkshire the total collected in fines is a staggering '2381 l.'; Hookes also makes sure to itemise the property taken from these '*Subjects*' – 'Heifers, Horses, Sheep, Household Goods and Mault' – further emphasising the financial burden imposed by the state.⁶¹ Even if the accused avoided prison sentences, by confiscating their equipment, livestock and personal possessions these fines could leave spiritual offenders financially destitute and without a means of work, making poverty a devastating consequence of government imposition in matters of faith. Parker's assertion that nonconformists are

⁵⁶ Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England 1500-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), p.117.

⁵⁷ Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, p.117.

⁵⁸ Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms 1660-1685* (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2006), p.77.

⁵⁹ Harris, *Restoration*, pp.76-77.

⁶⁰ Ellis Hookes, *For the King and Both Houses of Parliament. Being a Brief and General Account of the Late and Present Sufferings of Many of the Peacable Subjects called Quakers* (London: s. n., 1676), p.4.

⁶¹ Hookes, *For the King*, p.9, p.7, p.17.

the source of 'much Trouble' and 'Animosities' is particularly disingenuous considering that those he vilifies in his rhetoric were openly the target of both mob violence and oppressive local authorities. His vision of a vast, threatening network of religious minorities is a virulent distortion of reality. Marvell directs the reader to laugh at Parker's inflated bigotry, and in doing so to turn their scorn on the prejudice underpinning his polemic.

Alongside *Ironia*, *Sarcasmus* is a rhetorical figure heavily employed by Marvell's satirical persona. Peacham defines '*Sarcasmus*' as 'a bitter kind of derision, most commonly used of an enemie'; yet though 'bitter', the trope has undoubted utility: 'the most lawfull use of this Trope is to repress proud folly and wicked insolence and sometime leud miserie.'⁶² Similarly, Smith explains, 'a *Sarcasme* is a bitter kind of derision; most frequently used of a enemy; it is near an Irony, but some what bitter [...] a biting scoff or taunt.'⁶³ Once again, Marvell uses irony to expose a logical fallacy – but sarcasm is used to express his mocking disdain:

But till that happy juncture, when Mr. Bayes *shall be fully avenged of his new Enemies the wealthy Fanaticks* (which is soon done too, for he saith there are but few of them men of *Estates or Interest*) he is contented that they should only be exposed (they are his own expressions) to the *Pillories, Whipping-posts, Galleys, Rods, and Axes*; and moreover and above, to all other Punishments whatsoever, provided they be of a severer nature than those that are inflicted on men for their immoralities. O more then humane Clemency!⁶⁴

Here Marvell is keen to stress that his seemingly hyperbolic list of punishments is not his fantastical invention, they are Parker's 'own expressions' and his deliberate intentions. Marvell exaggerates his sarcastic tone here through the use of *Mycterismus*, the 'trope of sneering speech' – which Peacham describes as: 'the use hereof differeth not much from the use of *Sarcasmus*, but in this, that *Sarcasmus* is more manifest [...] the chief use of this figure serueth to repress pride, rebuke folly, and taunt vice; and may be likened to a black frost, which is wont to nip a man by the

⁶² Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence*, p.37.

⁶³ Smith, *The Mysterie of Rhetorick*, p.68.

⁶⁴ Marvell, *RT*, p.105.

nose, before he can discern it with his eye.⁶⁵ It is *Mycterismus*, in the form of the exclamation 'O more than humane Clemency!', that hammers home Marvell's persona's contempt for Parker's rhetoric, a very clear 'rebuke' to his 'vice.'

This contemptuous tone is used throughout the text and used in tandem with other mocking tropes such as *Synchoresis*, explained by Smith to be, 'A figure when an argument is Ironically or mockingly yielded onto, and then marred by a flinging retort onto the objector.'⁶⁶ This is evident when Marvell's persona interrogates Parker's chosen title, namely, *A Preface Shewing Grounds there are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery*, and the opening salvo to his polemic: 'To consider what likelihood or how much danger there is of the return of Popery into this Nation. The very first word is; For my part I know none. Very well considered.'⁶⁷ Marvell, in a show of sarcastic agreement, assents to Parker's (abridged) assertion, adding further that, 'He is an Enemy to the State, whoever shall foment such discourses without any likelihood or danger.'⁶⁸ After this serious aside to the reader, he then continues his mock acquiesce, further supplicating to Parker's "sensible" argument: 'This I confess hath some weight in it. For truly before I knew none too, I was of your Opinion Mr. Bayes, and believed that Popery could never return to England again, but by some very sinister accident.'⁶⁹ By employing such an elongated and exaggerated use of *Synchoresis*, Marvell is deliberately subverting one of the basic tenets of oratory. In the classical tracts that detail the style of ideal rhetorical oration, six (or even seven) stages of argument are identified – in the third, the *Divisio* (or Division) a speaker was expected to identify the areas of their adversary's argument that they agreed with, and the areas they disagreed with; a demonstration of their ability to remain objective. Through *Synchoresis* Marvell appears to be complying to this rhetorical structure, and considering the strengths of Parker's arguments – however, Parker can only be taken seriously after heavy editorial intervention, there is nothing within his writings that can be agreed with when read in full. Parker appears to the reader to be fixated on an incredibly unlikely hypothetical – the return of 'Popery'. With this basic premise undermined, the rest of his work appears as little more than needless fear

⁶⁵ Skinner, 'The Role of Ridicule', p.146; Peacham, *Garden of Eloquence*, p.38.

⁶⁶ Smith, *The Mysterie of Rhetorick*, p.192.

⁶⁷ Marvell, *RT*, p.174.

⁶⁸ Marvell, *RT*, p.175.

⁶⁹ Marvell, *RT*, p.176.

mongering; 'Mr. Bayes I must tell you, that 'If I had printed a Book or Preface upon that Agreement, I should have thought my self, at least a Fool for my labour.'⁷⁰ Marvell draws on the reader's innate understanding of the rules of rhetorical engagement to render his opponent's ideology contemptible.

Diasyrmus, the trope of flippant comparison, is also used by Marvell to mock his adversary. Peacham figures '*Diasyrmus*' as:

a Trope by which the arguments of an adversary are either depraved or rejected [...] this figure is for the most part made by some base similitude, or by some ridiculous example, to which the adversaries abieation or argument is compared, whereby it is either made ridiculous or at least disgraced [...] The most lawfull and commendable use of this Trope is either to make an evasion out of the subtle snare of a captious argument.⁷¹

One such argument of Parker's which Marvell targets is his insistence that all Anglican religious ceremonies must be observed in the interest of national, even secular, security: 'for he would perswade the Princes that *there cannot a Pin be pull'd out of the Church but the State immediately totters*. That is strange.'⁷² It is 'strange' given what Parker himself concedes, and which Marvell duly notes: 'Why 'tis some ceremony or other, that is *indifferent in its own nature, that hath no antecedent necessity* [...] it, is *declared to have nothing of Religion in it*.'⁷³ In Marvell's comparison, Parker's insistence on the symbiotic relationship between Church and State is reminiscent of 'Ivy', as 'there is nothing more natural than for the Ivy to be of the opinion that the Oak cannot stand without it', even though it in fact 'sucks the Tree dry, and moulders the building where it catches.'⁷⁴ To underpin his incredulity, Marvell's persona makes another, even more ridiculous, 'base similitude': 'But what, pray Mr. Bayes, is this Pinne in Pallas's buckler?'⁷⁵ In Villier's play *The Rehearsal*, from which Marvell procured his pamphlet's title and Parker's epithet of 'Bayes', 'Pallas's Buckler' is part of a ridiculous farce, a prop in an impromptu banquet: 'Lo, from this

⁷⁰ Marvell, *RT*, p.174.

⁷¹ Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence*, p.39.

⁷² Marvell, *RT*, p.109.

⁷³ Marvell, *RT*, pp.109-110.

⁷⁴ Marvell, *RT*, p.109.

⁷⁵ Marvell, *RT*, p.109.

conquering Lance/ Does flow the purest Wine of *France*/ And to appease your hunger, I/ Have, in my Helmet, brought a Pye:/ Lastly, to bear a part with these,/ Behold a Buckler made of Cheese.'⁷⁶ Any reader who had seen a performance would have immediately understood the reference – the allusion alone might have been enough procure a laugh. Intertextuality has been weaponised.

Marvell's persona paints Parker's arguments as ludicrous props concealing harm, a hidden 'Pinne'. To rebuff his absolutist Anglican doctrine, Marvell employs another rhetorical strategy; namely, *Paralepsis*. Peacham explains that by using *Paralepsis* 'the Orator fainteth and maketh as though he would say nothing in some matter, when in not withstanding he speaketh most of all.'⁷⁷ By refusing to engage with Parker's thesis that an '*indifferent*' matter of ecclesiastic affairs be defended with the utmost severity that the '*State*' can muster, Marvell renders it as contemptuous and as farcical as 'Pallas's Buckler': 'this I will keep cold: anon perhaps I may have a stomach. But I must take care lest I swallow your Pin.'⁷⁸ Whilst in the play these objects are benign, in Marvell's reckoning, Parker's arguments, should they be contended with, can cause physical harm. Parker's solution to the problem of nonconformity would be physical reprisals: 'he is contented that they should only be exposed (they are his own expressions) to the *Pillories, Whipping-posts, Galleys, Rods and Axes*.'⁷⁹ The Clarendon Code already ensured that nonconformists faced financial penalties and had their freedom of movement restricted – in Parker's rhetoric, the intensity of sanctions would be increased, and a matter of private conscience made a matter of public inquisition and punitive torture. By 'maketh as though he would say nothing in some matter', Marvell reveals how much he utterly disdains Parker's opinion. Whilst Parker's other arguments are animadverted – answered, mocked and dismissed – the violence he intends to invoke in the name of religious hegemony does not bear thinking (or writing) about. The charge that Parker's work would 'fill the world with Blood, Execution, and Massacre' is the most serious Marvell levels against him.⁸⁰ In 1662 a Quaker was beaten to death in retaliation for an act of vandalism committed in St Paul's Cathedral by two members of the sect; violence predicated on

⁷⁶ Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, IV.1.225-230 (p.162).

⁷⁷ Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence*, p.130.

⁷⁸ Marvell, *RT*, p.110.

⁷⁹ Marvell, *RT*, p.105.

⁸⁰ Marvell, *RT*, p.134.

religious difference was not hypothetical.⁸¹ The graveness of the accusation is still undercut by the imagery; however sharp the 'Pinne', it is still hidden in a 'buckler.' Whilst Marvell stresses the disturbing punitive imagery present in Parker's work by listing his suggested punishments to the reader, such disturbed thinking is still shown to come from a ridiculous, derisory source. However the real world implications of his rhetoric linger.

The humanist tradition placed particular emphasis on the importance of the reader – as Sharpe observes, early modern culture, starting from the 'pedagogic instruction of the grammar school' and extending into the wider popular conscious, 'foregrounded the reader as a forceful presence in the culture of letters.'⁸² Their ability to construct meaning and use the text for their own ends was an established convention. In considering how the mechanics of rhetoric were understood in the period, Victoria Kahn contends that:

the central assumption of the humanist rhetorical tradition is that reading is a form of prudence or of deliberative rhetoric and that a text is valuable insofar as it engages the reader in an activity of discrimination and thereby educates the faculty of practical reason or prudential judgement which is essential to the active life.⁸³

This 'central assumption' is key to Marvell's satire – he is engaging their ability to exercise their 'prudential judgement' by exposing Parker's ideology. In turn, a reader is expected to disassemble Parker's arguments for themselves – the reader's response to the text is key to the function of his polemic, encouraging them to engage in acts of textual deconstruction. Marvell's readers, living in a culture heavily shaped by humanism and trained to identify rhetorical tropes, would have been well aware of the moral implications of the mocking tropes Marvell employs; sarcasm is not just an affect used by his persona to meet satiric ends, their use is a deliberate inditement of Parker's absolutism; Marvell keeps the victims of Parker's world view in his reader's vision. Marvell's use of these mocking tropes establishes a deep running vein of

⁸¹ Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, p.117.

⁸² Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.41.

⁸³ Kahn, *Rhetoric*, p.9.

disdain, a contempt for his adversary which he intends to be shared with his reader. In the struggle to combat Parker's ideas, laughter would prove his keenest weapon, and thus a comedic tone absolutely necessary to accomplish his rhetorical aims.

Reading Satire

In both *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and its sequel, the very act of reading is explored for satiric effect. Restricting access to information and discussion deemed heretical or unorthodox was a touchstone of Parker's absolutist strategy – a method of controlling and silencing the masses. In challenging Parker's elitist world view, Marvell uses the act of reading – whether through encouraging the reader to close read and interrogate the text of his adversary (as the genre of animadversion demands), or using it to reveal the anti-humanist agenda of his opponent – to encourage the reader to be an engaged participant, rather than a bystander, in the debate.

One of the main critiques Marvell levels at Parker, and directs the reader to notice, is Parker's style of prose. Marvell repeatedly accuses Parker's style of being ornamental, an insult of particular weight in the period. N. H. Keeble, in his evaluation of Parker's work, notes that in considerations of public discourse in this period; 'ornamentation is associated with falsehood, fiction, and deceit, with Rome and with tyranny; plainness with integrity, right-dealing and truth, with Protestantism and liberty.'⁸⁴ By this standard, Parker falls short: 'Parker's is a style of grand gestures, of impassioned prejudices, of bombastic assertions and absurdly inflated fears', not to mention 'grandiose conceptions and grandiloquent expressions.'⁸⁵ As Marvell repeatedly expounds to the reader, Parker 'is a lover of Elegancy of Stile, and can endure no mans Tautologies but his own', and his treatises constitute the epitome of disingenuity: 'the Deformity of Falsehood disguised in all its Ornaments.'⁸⁶ Marvell

⁸⁴ N. H. Keeble, 'Why Transpose *The Rehearsal*?', in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999), pp.249-268 (p.259).

⁸⁵ Keeble, 'Why Transpose *The Rehearsal*?', pp.257-258.

⁸⁶ Cicero, *On the Orator: Book 3. On Fate. Stoic Paradoxes. Divisions of Oratory*, trans. by H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library 349 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942), p.43, in *Loeb Classical Library* <https://www-loebclassics-com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/marcus_tullius_cicero-de_oratore/1942/pb_LCL349.43.xml> [accessed 6th September, 2019]; Marvell, *RT*, p.51, p.134.

injects levity into his defamatory literary analysis by playing on the definition of the term ornament to deride Parker, playing on the sense of its Latin root, *ornatus*. Skinner contends that ‘in classical Latin, *ornatus* is the word ordinarily used to describe the weapons and accoutrements of war’, as opposed to decorative ornaments which the translation could potentially imply – *ornatus* was the key to unlocking the rhetorical arsenal, ‘the weapons an orator must learn to wield if he is to have any prospect of winning the war of words.’⁸⁷ Cicero defined these men as; ‘those whose speeches are clear, explicit and full, perspicuous in matter and in language, and who in the actual delivery achieve a sort of rhythm and cadence – that is, those whose style is what I call artistic’ – an ideal in stark contrast to Marvell’s depiction of Parker’s ‘luscious and effeminate Stile.’⁸⁸

Instead, Marvell imagines Parker’s rhetorical arsenal (and his adherents) to be comically wanting. In announcing ‘*the return of Popery*’, Marvell figures Parker as sounding ‘the Pulpit drums’, trying to muster allegiance; ‘there was care taken too for arming *the poor Readers, though they came short of Preachers in point of efficacy*.’⁸⁹ Yet the equipment these ‘*poor Readers*’ have available is sub-par: ‘*Polemical and Controversial Divinity* had for so long been hung up in the Halls, like the rusty obsolete Armour of our Ancestors, for monuments of Antiquity; and for derision rather than service.’⁹⁰ In arming themselves, Parker’s followers desperately scramble to assemble a rhetorical ensemble, fashioning themselves into Christian soldiers, but in their fervour they mistakenly brandish the arguments of their intended targets – nonconformists: ‘Here you might see one put on his Helmet the wrong way: there one buckle on a back in place of a Breast. Some by mistake caught up a Socian or Arminian Argument, and some a Popish to fight a Papist.’⁹¹ To add further insult to injury, Marvell employs *Aestismus*, the trope by which a word’s dual meaning can be exploited for ironic effect. According to Peacham’s definition, ‘this figure pertaineth chiefly to reprove by derision, and also to jest and and moue mirth by opposing contraries.’⁹² Thus Marvell plays on the word ‘Nonconformity’, with its dual

⁸⁷ Skinner, ‘The Role of Ridicule’, p.141.

⁸⁸ Marvell, *RT*, p.53.

⁸⁹ Marvell, *RT*, p.175.

⁹⁰ Marvell, *RT*, p.175.

⁹¹ Marvell, *RT*, p.175.

⁹² Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence*, p.33

significations of both heterodox religious beliefs and more general disorder: 'never was there such Incongruity and Nonconformity in their furniture.'⁹³

Within this scene, Marvell also employs *Mimesis*, the trope of mimicry, by deliberately echoing Parker's own phrasing in his *Preface*. Parker had derided 'the fierce and fiery Calvinists', figuring them as fanatical zealots, who, in attempting to sway 'men [who] care not to be convinced' with their theology, have wasted 'so much Oyl and Sweat to no purpose.'⁹⁴ In Marvell's version this image has been subverted – it is Parker's faction who are labouring to convince and who have fallen to 'oyling.' However it is not just Parker that Marvell mimics; Marvell is also deliberately referring back to a poem written earlier in his career, namely, 'An Horatian Ode Upon Cromwell's Return From Ireland' (1650).⁹⁵ In the poem, Cromwell, figured as 'the forward Youth', leaves the comfort of his study, bidding farewell to 'his Muses dear' and leaving 'his numbers languishing', in order to pursue military glory: 'Tis time to leave the books in dust,/ And oyl th' unused armour's rust:/ Removing from the wall/ The corselt of the hall.'⁹⁶ Both the poem and Marvell's burlesque of it describe the removal of rusted 'armour' from a 'hall', and the act of 'oyling' it in anticipation of combat. Yet, where the subject of attention in the poem abandons the study of words in favour of action, in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* it is in fact 'numbers' – namely, poetry and stylised language – which are being utilised (ineffectively) as a means of attack. Marvell repeatedly styles his opponent as a 'Duellist', at one point mockingly referring to one of Parker's arguments as 'the terriblest Weapon in all his Armory.'⁹⁷ He furthermore figures the title of Parker's work as a deliberate call to arms, after all; 'A new War must have, like a Book that would sell, a new title.'⁹⁸ By invoking the term *Popery*, Marvell suggests that Parker is performing an intentionally incendiary act, given the long-standing animosity between Protestant and Catholic powers. Under the guise of 'arming *the poor Readers*' with knowledge, Marvell sees Parker's strategy

⁹³ Marvell, *RT*, p.175.

⁹⁴ Parker, *Preface*, sig.[A6]v, sig.[A7]r.

⁹⁵ Patterson, *Marvell: The Writer in Public Life*, p.6; Section III of this thesis will explore which readers would likely have seen this poem, given that it was circulated in manuscript and not printed until 1680.

⁹⁶ Andrew Marvell, 'An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Routledge: London, 2007), pp.273-279 (p.173 ll.1-9).

⁹⁷ Marvell, *RT*, p.157.

⁹⁸ Marvell, *RT*, p.167.

as the re-inciting of old, now irrelevant fears – he would be ‘arming’ them with arguments that had ‘so long had been hung up in the Halls’ as to now be ‘rusty and obsolete.’⁹⁹ Marvell greatly expands his original scene, rendering it completely fantastical. His language in the passage is deliberately stylised, notable for the repeated use of alliteration, sibilance, consonance and anaphora, as seen in the above example, and instanced elsewhere, as in the phrase: ‘some piss’d in their Barrels, other spit in their pans, to scowr them.’¹⁰⁰ Combined together they have the effect of rendering the passage deliberately repetitive, a sign of the excess of “zeal” these soldiers display. The gratuitous use of these rhetorical devices is intended to seem as obvious affectation – self-consciously literary – a reflection of the grandiose ambitions of ‘Bayes’ and his ilk. Throughout this scene Marvell is appealing to the reader’s education and their reading, drawing on their understanding of rhetoric to paint Parker as a failed orator – for all his ‘Elegancy of Stile’, Parker has failed to grasp the essentials, the clarity that Cicero identified as the core of *ornatus*. He has clad himself with cloth instead of armour; ‘bedawb’d with Rhetorick, and embroyder’d.’¹⁰¹

In his polemical work Parker alludes to an argument throughout that was evoked by many writers during the period; namely that limiting access to education would prevent dissent. In attacking John Owen, Parker took pains to attack the intelligence and social standing of Owen’s readers:

And yet it is rare and admirable to the Wits of the Congregation; and the Doctor is a wonderfully precious and convincing Man. But the truth is, he has an Advantage above most of his Neighbours for Writing Non-Sense in that his common Readers despair beforehand to understand the Categoricalness of his Logick: Otherwise he abounds so plentifully with Absurdities and Incoherences in every Page, that there is nothing keeping him from being despicable even to the Apron-men of his own Dispensation [...] they cannot hope to carry along with them the Thread and Connexion of the Discourse, so neither dare they presume

⁹⁹ Marvell, *RT*, p.175.

¹⁰⁰ Marvell, *RT*, p.176.

¹⁰¹ Marvell, *RT*, p.55.

*to observe its Flaws and Weakness [...] Men of their Education are neither able to fathom, nor obliged to understand.*¹⁰²

Parker tirades against these 'common Readers', men of little 'Education' or rank ('Apron-men'); the reading public are 'the credulous Rabble' and the 'silly Multitude.'¹⁰³ Parker's elitism is reflective of a contemporary anxiety concerning the expansion of education. In his seminal survey of early modern literacy rates, David Cressy observes that an increase in local schools saw a national improvement in literacy throughout the seventeenth century (through progress was affected both by war and reactionary government initiatives), causing illiteracy to be far lower in urban areas and amongst the working classes: 'a renewed attack on illiteracy [...] began] a little before 1660 [...] Tradesmen and yeomen everywhere made solid progress in the Restoration era and even husbandmen began to emerge from illiteracy in the late 1660s.'¹⁰⁴ This coincided with a huge burst of book production: 'the figures point to a tenfold expansion of print, with two million or more volumes to be disposed of each year, including 400,000 two penny almanacs.'¹⁰⁵ This created a whole new demographic of readers.

Grammar schools were a vehicle for social mobility, they were, 'the engine of social transformation in the early modern period [...] they enabled the socially humble but talented to join the ranks of the educated elite'¹⁰⁶ It was the prospect of both social mobility and public engagement that caused the ruling elite concern. Sir Roger L'Estrange, Marvell's own censor, famously declared that books played 'upon the *Passions* and *Humours* of the *Common People*; and when they shall have put *Mischief* into their *Heart*, their *next Business* is to put *Swords* in their *Hands*, and to Engage them in a direct *Rebellion*.'¹⁰⁷ A literate populace was innately distrusted. Harold Weber illustrates that a recurring 'image of the book' throughout the period

¹⁰² Parker, *Preface*, sig.a3v.

¹⁰³ Parker, *Ecclesiastical Politie*, p.138, p.139.

¹⁰⁴ David Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), p.172.

¹⁰⁵ Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order*, p.47.

¹⁰⁶ Marvell himself was no stranger to the democratising power of education, being both of relatively humble ancestry (his grandfather was a yeoman farmer) and a product of a grammar school. Smith, *The Chameleon*, p.25.

¹⁰⁷ Roger L'Estrange, *Considerations and Proposals In Order to the Regulation of the Press: Together with Diverse Instances of Treasonous, and Seditious Pamphlets, Proving the Necessity thereof* (London: Printed by A. C., 1663) sig.A4r.

was 'as a sower and spreader of poisons.'¹⁰⁸ This anxiety surrounding the expansion of the literate populace is epitomised in Samuel Butler's (1613-1680) hugely influential satirical poem *Hubridas* (the first part of which was published in 1663) which bemoans that, 'Religion spawn'd a various Rout,/ Of Petulant Capricious Sects,/ The Maggots of Corrupted Texts,/ That first Run all Religion down,/ And after every swarm its own': nonconformity is even figured to be the catalyst for the English Civil War; 'So *Presbyter* begot the other other,/ Upon the *Good Old Cause* his Mother.'¹⁰⁹ Marvell's distaste for Butler, and his crude caricatures are made abundantly clear, as he declares, 'I will assure the Reader that I intend not *Hubridas*.'¹¹⁰ This profound distrust of both improved education, and by extension an increased readership, stood in direct conflict with the aims and ideals of humanism. The period also saw a rise in educational tracts, with writers envisioning an ideal curriculum, detailing how to inform and shape individual students (forming them into exemplary citizens), and imagining optimal schools. One such treatise, *The Reformed School and the Reformed Librarie Keeper* (1650), written by John Dury (1596-1680), postulates an ideal education system in which all men can profit from an education and access to books, an embodiment of humanist ideals: in seeking to critique Parker, Marvell shows him to be in opposition to this didactic mission.

In order to create 'a well-Reformed Common wealth' and for men to live in 'Glorious libertie', Dury argues that 'all the subjects thereof should in their Youth bee trained up in som Schools fit for their capacities, and that over these Schools, som Overseers should bee appointed to look to the cours of their Education, to see that none should bee left destitute of som benefit of virtuous breeding, according to the several kinds of employments' – to Dury education both instils moral fibre and trains the student for their career, and rather than simply the 'employments' of the nobility, Dury envisions reformed schools teaching all manner of men: 'whether it bee to bear som civil Office in the Common-wealth, or to bee Mechanically employed, or to bee bred to teach others humane Sciences, or to bee imploied in Prophetical Exercises.'¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸ Harold Weber, *Paper Bullets: print and kingship under Charles II* (Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1996), p.135.

¹⁰⁹ Samuel Butler, *Hubridas. The Third and last Part* (London: Printed for Simon Miller, 1678), p.94.

¹¹⁰ Marvell, *RT*, p.66.

¹¹¹ John Dury, *The Reformed Librarie Keeper With a Supplement to the Reformed-School, As Subordinate to Colleges in Universities* (London: William Du-Gard, 1650), pp.5-6.

Education does not just enable students professionally, to Dury it also presents the opportunity for personal growth; 'The true and proper end of Schooling is to teach and Exercise Children and Youths in the Grounds of all Learning and Virtues, so far as either their capacitie in that age will suffer them to com, or is requisite to apprehend the principles of useful matters, by which they may bee made able to exercise themselvs in everie good Employment afterwards by themselves.' In Dury's view education is a public service of value to both the individual and the state, and libraries (specifically the copyright library at the Univesity of Oxford) have the potential to advance this agenda – Dury argues that rather than simply a storeroom for texts, available to only a select few academics, libraries should be disseminators of knowledge, open to the public. Dury suggests that the role of librarian should be a skilled position (rather than a low paid role, requiring little training), with the librarian curating the collection by keeping abreast of foreign works and selecting worthy material accordingly.

Dury also argued that such an institution, staffed by 'Agents for the advancement of universal Learning', should be open to the public – to deny the public would be to starve them of intellectual and spiritual sustenance:

the vvaies of humane and divine Learning might bee mainly advanced, by the industrie of one man in such a place, vvwhose Trade should bee such as I formerly described, to deal vvith the spirits of all men of parts.¹¹²

In Marvell's prose, Parker is just such an individual, attempting to 'obstruct' access to information. It this scholastic and elitist attitude towards reading and Readers – a 'silly Multitude' unworthy of instruction – that Marvell lambasts: 'O *Printing!* how hast thou disturb'd the Peace of Mankind! That Lead, when moulded into Bullets, is not so mortal as when founded into Letters!'¹¹³ Marvell figures this attitude, through heavy use of *Ironia* to establish a sarcastic and acerbic tone, as a return to medieval pedagogy, with education denied to most, and the Bible only accessible to those taught Latin: "Twas an

¹¹² Dury, *Reformed Librarie*, p.17, p.28.

¹¹³ Marvell, *RT*, p.46.

happy time when all Learning was in Manuscript, and some little Officer, like our Author, did keep the Keys of the Library. When the Clergy needed no more knowledge than to read the Liturgy, and the Laity no more Clerkship than to save them from Hanging.’¹¹⁴

The library as a space for reading had become increasingly available to seventeenth century readers. Rather than a place of quiet contemplation (as we imagine libraries today), Cambers’ research reveals that: ‘libraries were places of knowledge and cultural exchange. They were places to read and to talk and to discuss.’¹¹⁵ In particular, ‘among nonconformists after the Restoration, the library could function as a hub for godly sociability and a location for godly reading.’¹¹⁶ For those pupils barred from attending university on account of their religious beliefs ‘dissenting tutors often kept large collections which could be used by their students.’¹¹⁷ In fact Dzelzainis’ recent investigation into Charles Morton’s (1627-1698) dissenting academy at Newington Green reveals that in the early 1680s Marvell’s state poems were being read, internalised, and recited by ‘a dissenting clergyman like Charles Morton.’¹¹⁸ Parish libraries were becoming an increasingly common local institution – with thirty-six opened before 1640, ‘eleven more were established between 1645 and 1659 [... and] a further fifty-two libraries were established between 1661 and 1695.’¹¹⁹ Secularly run town and public libraries ‘were a development of the early seventeenth century’ and gradually increased in number over the period.¹²⁰ These libraries gave readers access to spiritual and secular texts, and a space in which to discuss and debate their reading – and for nonconformists they afforded the opportunity to gather without the accusation of forming a conventicle, and ‘their status as centres of religious and cultural exchange and

¹¹⁴ Marvell, *RT*, p.45.

¹¹⁵ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.119.

¹¹⁶ Wealthy collectors of books often made their collections available to their community – for instance in Rye, Samuel Jeake (1623-1690) built a library of over two thousand items containing ‘radical pamphlets of the Civil War era’ and works by canonical puritan writers, such as Richard Baxter. Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.127.

¹¹⁷ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.128.

¹¹⁸ His former students would recall his particular affinity for a line from *The Second Advice to a Painter* (1666) which he used in his sermons. Martin Dzelzainis, ‘Marvell, Nicolas Chorier, and the Earl of Rochester: State Satire and Pornography in the Dissenting Academies’, in *Marvell Studies*, 2 (2017), 1-20 (p.11) <<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.12/>> [accessed April 2nd, 2020].

¹¹⁹ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.137.

¹²⁰ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.147.

sociability enhanced their importance in the fashioning of godly identity.¹²¹ These spaces and the engagement with texts which they allowed, which Parker's elitist comments deride, are defended in Marvell's prose – there is no valid reason to deny 'the Laity' access to the text. Instead, the reader is assumed to be both capable and astute.

Parker's world view is figured as retrograde, a threat to social advancements and to Protestant principles. Geoffrey F. Nuttall argues that the focus of the Protestant movement had been 'combined to direct men's attention to [...] the nature of religion in the Bible [...] as something individually experienced, a living, personal relationship, open to Everyman, between God and his soul.'¹²² The move for a unified church was perceived, by nonconformists and their supporters, as an attempt to curb this 'personal relationship' and impinge on private conscience. It is at this juncture in the text Marvell also appears to be making an allusion to Milton's *Areopagitica*. Penned in opposition to the Licensing Order of June 1643, Milton argued that a free press, and the printed debates that it would enable and nurture, were necessary for the accrument of knowledge and the continuation of the Reformation – and a fruitful comparison can be made between Marvell's disparagement of Parker's arguments and Milton's vision of London as 'the mansion house of liberty.'¹²³ To Milton, 'a good Booke is the pretious life-blood of a master spirit, imbalm'd and treasur'd up on purpose to a life beyond life' and 'hee who destroyes a good Book kills reason it selfe.'¹²⁴ This sentiment would be shared by Dury who, in picturing his ideal library, had seen the enterprise as more than 'a bare keeping of the Books': 'a fair Librarie, is not onely an ornament and credit to the place vvhether it is; but an useful commoditie by it self to the publick; yet in effect it is no more then a dead Bodie as novv it is constituted, in comparison of vvhether it might bee, if it vvhere animated vvith a publick Spirit to keep and use it, and ordered as it might bee for publick service.'¹²⁵ To jealously hold 'the Keys of the Library' is detrimental to the public. Milton famously declared books to be: 'as lively, and as vigorously productive, as those fabulous

¹²¹ Cambers, *Godly Identity*, p.158.

¹²² Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992), p.2.

¹²³ Milton, *Areopagitica*, p.107.

¹²⁴ Milton, *Areopagitica*, p.185.

¹²⁵ Dury, *Reformed Librarie*, p.17.

Dragons teeth; and being sown up and down, may chance to spring up armed men.’¹²⁶ In *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* it is just this phenomenon that inspires Marvell to ironically declare: ‘That Lead, when moulded into Bullets, is not so mortal as when founded into Letters!’¹²⁷ Marvell conflates the subject and the object of comparison in Milton’s simile, morphing it, so that in fact it is blocks of type that are metaphorically planted: ‘the Serpents teeth which he sowed, were nothing else but the Letters which he invented.’¹²⁸ Printing – ‘invented much about the same time with the Reformation’ – is defended as a disseminator of knowledge.¹²⁹ The accusation that reading is a threat to national security, a source of sedition, is sarcastically derided: ‘meer Ink and Elbow-grease, do more harm than *an hundred Systematical Divines* with their *sweaty Preaching*.’¹³⁰

Instead, Marvell turns the subverts the accusation – it is not readers who have been warped by reading, it is the ‘Author’, Samuel Parker. Within the previously discussed ‘arming’ scene is a reference that Marvell repeatedly makes throughout the pamphlet – an allusion to the titular protagonist of *Don Quixote* (published in Spanish in 1605, first printed in English 1620): ‘here a Dwarf lost in the accoutrements of a Giant: there a Don Quixot in an equipage of differing pieces, and of several Parishes.’ Readers familiar with the novel would recall the disarray of the “mad knight’s” rusty armour – including an infamous episode in which he mistook a brass basin for an enchanted helmet, and sought to possess it. In Miguel de Cervantes’ (1547-1616) novel, *Don Quixote* is a man consumed by ‘reading books of chivalry with so much devotion and enthusiasm’, that he begins to inhabit a fantasy world in which he himself becomes a knight, embarking on quests, unable to wake from his delusion.¹³¹ It is the bombastic style of these romances that corrupts his understanding: ‘with these words and phrases the poor gentleman lost his mind, and he spent sleepless nights trying to understand them an extract their meaning, which Aristotle himself, if

¹²⁶ Milton, *Areopagitica*, p.185.

¹²⁷ Marvell, *RT*, p.46.

¹²⁸ Marvell, *RT*, p.46.

¹²⁹ Marvell, *RT*, p.45.

¹³⁰ Marvell, *RT*, p.45.

¹³¹ ‘In short, our gentleman became so caught up in reading that he spent his nights reading from dusk til dawn and his days reading from sunrise to sunset, and so with too little sleep and too much reading his brains dried up, causing him to lose his mind.’ Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quixote*, trans. by Edith Grossman (London: Vintage, 2005), p.20, p.21.

he came back to life for only that purpose, would not have been able to decipher or understand.¹³² In Marvell's satire, a similar fate has befallen Parker. Like the tragicomical "mad Knight", Parker's mind has been warped: 'this happens by his growing too early acquainted with *Don Quixot*, and reading the Bible too late: so that the first impressions being most strong, and mixing with the last, as more novel, have made such a medly in his brain-pan that he is become a mad Priest.'¹³³ Marvell makes sure to heap onto Parker academic accomplishments: he was 'sent early to the *University*'; he was 'no ill Disputant'; 'he had learnt how to erect a *Thesis*, and to defend it *Pro* or *Con*.'¹³⁴ However, even with possession of a superior rank and a superior birth, it was not enough to cure him of his 'weening Presumption and preposterous Ambition.'¹³⁵ It is this ambition that is truly a danger to social order.

Parker's absolutist ideology, as Marvell repeatedly assures his readers, would 'strive to put the World into Blood, and animate Princes to be the Executioners of their Subjects for well-doing.'¹³⁶ Though asked to mock his presumption, the 'mad Priest' still poses an existential threat. Exposure to chivalry has not just affected Parker's mind – it has also affected his prose: 'you have so ingrossed and bought up all the Ammunition of Railing, search'd every corner in the Bible, and *Don Quixot* for Powder, that you thought, not unreasonably that there was not one shot left for a Fanatick.'¹³⁷ Animadversion, and the process of reading and critically analysing Parker's texts, is a vehicle that allows a reader to see through his rhetorical excesses, revealing arguments '[so] brittle and incoherent, that the least touch would break them again in pieces, so transparent that every man might see thorow them.'¹³⁸ In contrast, Marvell appeals to his own readers as rational and intelligent individuals, capable of seeing through Parker's logical fallacies and stylistic failings – he assumes and appeals to 'the good intelligence of the Reader.'¹³⁹ By bringing attention to the very act of reading, Marvell both blatantly appeals to his own readers – showing Parker as threatening the very activity that they are engaging in a pointed form of

¹³² Cervantes, *Don Quixote*, p.21.

¹³³ Marvell, *RT*, p.74.

¹³⁴ Marvell, *RT*, p.74.

¹³⁵ Marvell, *RT*, p.74.

¹³⁶ Marvell, *RT*, p.67.

¹³⁷ Marvell, *RT*, p.172.

¹³⁸ Marvell, *RT2*, p.250.

¹³⁹ Marvell, *RT*, p.186.

critique that figures them as potential victims of Parker's absolutist *diktats*. Humour is used to both challenge Parker's ideology and illustrate the power of active reading.

Active Readers

Having mapped Marvell's rhetorical strategy – revealing the structural underpinnings supporting his polemical aims – the question remains, how do we measure the extent to which his reader was receptive to his polemic? The methods for gauging the public's reaction to Marvell's texts available to modern critics are highly speculative. The fact that it sold well could attest to either popularity or notoriety and the numerous "reproofs" published in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*'s wake that aped his style prove that even his political enemies recognised the efficacy of his style of satire and aimed to counter his message using Marvell's own methodology – but neither serves as a direct means of assessing how readers reacted to the text. Reading is an individualised experience; as Sharpe contends:

For, whatever the intentions of authors (or authorisers) of texts, readers bring their experiences (not least of other texts) to any reading. Reading indeed becomes a process in which we translate into our own words, symbols and mental contexts the marks and signs on the page.¹⁴⁰

Social factors – including religious identity, political affiliation, and class – all work in tandem to inform the 'mental contexts' that shape reader response, which is why reconstructing Restoration cultural conditions is a key factor in gauging how Marvell's contemporary public (made up of varied interpretive communities) received his polemic. Annotations, however, provide a direct record of how specific, individual reader's used their copy of the text. To retrace these responses the 'marks and signs' readers leave on the page themselves are intriguing and valuable resources. Jennifer Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer assert that 'evidence about reader responses is essential to demonstrate the part that reception plays in the creation of

¹⁴⁰ Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.34

textual meaning.¹⁴¹ Readers in the early modern period, as previously discussed, were trained to critically deconstruct texts, to appropriate meaning, and to use their physical copy of the text as they saw fit. Readers in the early modern period did not feel constrained by the material strictures of the printed book, and as Sherman argues: ‘radically customised copies – copies, that is, where the text is not just annotated but physically altered, sometimes even cut up and combined with other texts There is evidence of reading so active that it challenges the integrity of the entire printed book.’¹⁴²

The fact that books were frequently sold unbound allowed readers to insert blank leaves on which they could leave their own notes, bind several texts together in a single volume, or even to rearrange the text or add in sections from other works.¹⁴³ In these acts of alteration and by marking the text, readers contributed to the construction of meaning, actively using the text in whatever way they saw fit. To analyse reader response it is necessary to ‘combine the investigation of the “primary” evidence’ of annotation and marginalia, with ‘the “secondary” historicist implications of an analytical reading of these books in the particular social matrixes of early modern England where they occur.’¹⁴⁴ The exact purpose of readers marks are not always clear; as Sherman observes, many marginal notes seemingly bear no relation to the text or are otherwise inscrutable, and it is a challenge to extrapolate: ‘general taxonomies of readerly behaviour from the traces of interaction preserved in the margins of Renaissance books. Marginalia rarely speak to the questions we most want answered.’¹⁴⁵ Where the annotator remains anonymous the precise meanings of their marks need to be interpreted; however, as Sharpe notes, ‘even when the marginal hand remains anonymous, annotations offer invaluable evidence of how a text performed at moments of publication and circulation.’¹⁴⁶ The fact that the reader has marked the text is evidence of an active response, and in the case of Marvell’s prose is central to his purpose. Marvell is intensely invested in drawing his reader’s attention to the act of reading and prompting them to close read is intrinsic to the polemical

¹⁴¹ Jennifer Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer, ‘Current Trends in the History of Reading’ in *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies*, ed. by Jennifer Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), pp.1-22 (p.9).

¹⁴² Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.9.

¹⁴³ Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.9.

¹⁴⁴ Andersen and Sauer, ‘Current Trends’, p.2.

¹⁴⁵ Sherman, *Used Books*, p.15.

¹⁴⁶ Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.274.

aims of the piece. The material evidence left by readers in their copies of the text allow us an insight into how individual handled the text, marking it to suit their purposes.¹⁴⁷

CUP.406.J.5, held in the British Library, bears dozens of pencil annotations throughout.¹⁴⁸ The text is bound with two leaves of a poem; though certainly bound at a later date (the edges of the copy are marbled), there is a possibility that these pages were intentionally placed around Marvell's text by one of its initial owners. If purposeful, this would constitute a form of customisation of the text – a reader combining two texts in order to construct their own meaning. The leaves are an excerpt from the elegy **The muses threnodie, or, mirthfull mournings, on the death of Master Gall (posthumously published in 1638)** by Scottish poet Henry Adamson (1581-1637).¹⁴⁹ Four pages from Adamson's second canto are the ones included and used to bracket Marvell's text, and if the inclusion of these leaves was a deliberate choice on the part of the reader, it does not suggest a favourable review:

Let Poetaster-parasits, who fain,
And fawn, and crouch, and couth, and creep for gain,
And, where no hope of gain is, huffe, and hur,
And bark against the Moone as doth a Cur;
Let such base curs, who nought but gobbets smell,
Wish the disgrac'd, and deeply sunk in hell.¹⁵⁰

These lines are positioned opposite the last page – so if intentional, this would indicate strong condemnation. The inclusion of the leaves could be entirely random

¹⁴⁷ As part of my research for this thesis I travelled in person to consult the extant copies of Marvell's prose held in the Bodleian Library, Cambridge University Library, the British Library, Lambeth Palace Library, Durham University Library, the Dr William's Library, Senate House Library, and the Marvell Collection at Kingston upon Hull's Local Studies Library. In the case of Lady Sarah Cowper's miscellany, I visited the Hertfordshire Public Records Office. I also used *Early English Books Online* to examine digitised versions of the text. The majority of texts consulted were "clean" or contained little marginalia. For the purpose of this analysis I focused on copies published pre-1680 and which contained multiple annotations in order to discuss consistent reader interaction with the text.

¹⁴⁸ London, British Library, CUP.406.J.5. Annotated copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s. n., 1672). This copy of the text has been fully digitized by the British Library as part of its Digital Store, and is available for view here: http://access.bl.uk/item/viewer/ark:/81055/vdc_100026991440.0x000001#?c=0&m=0&s=0&cv=4&xywh=-387%2C-1%2C2989%2C1823 [accessed 3rd September, 2019].

¹⁴⁹ Henry Adamson, *The Muses Threnodie, or, Mirthfull mournings, on the death of Master Gall* (Edinburgh: Printed by George Anderson, 1638).

¹⁵⁰ Adamson, *The Muses Threnodie*, p.24.

(the whim of a contemporary owner or the work of a later hand) – as a poem in its entirety, Adamson’s poem shares very little crossover with Marvell’s work – however, if it is understood as a deliberate choice, then these lines seem to suggest a reader both aware of Marvell’s identity as a poet (which was, by all accounts, a fairly open secret), and very critical of his agenda. This may be evidence of an unconvinced reader, one reading against their natural political or theological sympathies. Conversely the poem also exalts King Charles I and wishes him a long reign, so the inclusion of these leaves could be ironic; and given the characterisation of Parker as incredibly ambitious within the text, this censure could be directed at Marvell’s adversary. Two distinct symbols are used throughout the text to annotate passages: † appears the most frequently (seemingly to mark notable lines), appearing thirty seven times; ^ is the second most frequent (to mark longer passages), occurring thirteen times; and other marks, which appear seven times. The use of different symbols suggests a reader organising the text for themselves, identifying passages that particularly resonated with or incensed them and highlighting them for future use.

The first lines which are highlighted by this reader occur soon after Marvell’s sketch of Parker jealously holding the ‘Keys to the Library’; ‘when the Clergy needed no more knowledge then to read the Liturgy, and the Laity no more Clerkship than to save them from Hanging.’¹⁵¹ The line ‘O *Printing!* how hast thou disturb’d the Peace of Mankind! that Lead, when moulded into Bullets, is not so mortal as when founded into Letters!’ is also singled out.¹⁵² As this chapter has shown, these lines are crucial in Marvell’s rhetorical strategy – in establishing his relationship with his reader and in exposing Parker’s absolutism, something this annotator has also noted. This reader is also paying attention to the presentation of Parker, for instance a mark is used to highlight the line; ‘and truly, if at any time we might now pardon this Extravagance and Rapture of our Author; when he was pearch’d upon the highest Pinnacle of Ecclesiastical Felicity, being ready at once to assuage his Concupiscence, and wreck his Malice.’¹⁵³ As well as lines which mock Parker’s ambition, this reader has also highlighted a section with condemns his written style: ‘the Author’s end was only

¹⁵¹ CUP.406.J.5, p.5.

¹⁵² CUP.406.J.5, p.6.

¹⁵³ CUP.406.J.5, p.11.

railing [...] He never oyls his Hone but that he may whet his Razor.'¹⁵⁴ In doing so, this reader has isolated one of Marvell's key lines of attack. Sections of the text which attack Parker's conformist ideology are also clearly on this reader's radar: they highlight a line where Marvell lambasts Parker for 'persecuting men for their Consciences', and another where he condemns the impulse to 'reconcile all the Churches to one Doctrine and Communion (though some that meddle in it do it chiefly in order to fetter men straiter under the formal bondage of fictitious Discipline).'¹⁵⁵ The annotator also marks out the area in the text where Marvell is most strident in his critique of the episcopacy: 'for, though I am sorry to speak it, yet it is a sad truth, that the Animosities and Obstinancy of some of the Clergy have in all Ages been the greatest Obstacle to the Clemency, Prudence and good Intentions of Princes.'¹⁵⁶ This reader is attuned to Marvell's comedy, noting where Parker is mocked, but this is an active reader, tracking Marvell's global argument concerning nonconformists and observing Marvell's depiction of the Anglican establishment. There are no annotations leaving commentary, but the marginalia still attest to a reader concerned with tracking Marvell's polemical intentions.

In contrast, the reader who marked G.19514 and G.19515 (a set of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and its sequel annotated in the same hand) is interested in unpicking Marvell's web of references.¹⁵⁷ This reader specifically marks out many of Marvell's literary references, in particular noticing the ways that Marvell uses Buckingham's play as part of his satire – at numerous points the reader uses asterisks to identify characters or scenes borrowing from the 'Rehersall Comedy', such as the line; 'But it is a brave thing to be the Ecclesiastical *Draw-Can-Sir*; He kills whole Nations, he Kills Friend and Foe.'¹⁵⁸ The reader also notes that the line 'I could not patiently see how irreverently he treated Kings and Princes, as if they had been no better then *King Phyz*, and *King Ush* of Brandford' is a reference to the comic, would-

¹⁵⁴ CUP.406.J.5, p.41.

¹⁵⁵ CUP.406.J.5, p.33, p.28.

¹⁵⁶ CUP.406.J.5, p.95.

¹⁵⁷ London, British Library, G.19514. Annotated copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s. n., 1672): London, British Library, G.19515. Annotated copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673). These copies were possessed by politician and bibliophile Thomas Grenville (1755-1846), at which point they were rebound and the margins of these editions were cut, fragmenting many of these annotations].

¹⁵⁸ G.19514, p.42.

be usurping 'Kings in y^e Rehearsall Comedy.'¹⁵⁹ By providing themselves these glosses to the text it is clear that the reader is actively considering Marvell's literary references – as will be discussed in section three, the character of '*Draw-Can-Sir*' and the use of the "two kings" plot motif are both deliberate mockery of common tropes in heroic dramas in *The Rehearsal*. In using these specific tropes to burlesque Parker, Marvell is drawing on his reader's familiarity with Restoration literary culture, using cultural associations to add weight to his accusations. This reader's annotations suggest an awareness of the subtext. It is not just fictional individuals that pique the interest of this reader – Marvell's oblique references to actual public figures (necessary in order to avoid the accusation of libel) are also a source of fascination. Alongside the vignette in which Marvell alludes to Milton's *Aeropagitica* in order to mock Parker's urge to censor the press, imagining the letters of the printing press to be teeth, the names '[B]erkenhead/ L'Strange' are left as an annotation in the margin next to the phrase, 'How oft heave they been pull'd out by B. and L. the Publick Tooth-drawers!'¹⁶⁰ Later in the text, when deriding Parker's desire to become the 'Prolocutor of the Church of England' Marvell remarks that 'not being content with his own folly, he has taken two others into Partnership, as fit for his design' – next to which this reader suggests that those accused are the 'Do[ctors] Patrick & Craddock.'¹⁶¹ By identifying Simon Patrick (the author of the vehemently anti-nonconformist *The Friendly Debate* series, 1626-1707) and Zachary Craddock (chaplain in ordinary to Charles II, 1632/3-1695) without any specific textual prompts such as initials or personals allusions within the text to support the accusation, this reader was either privy to Marvell's specific intentions or, in making an educated guess, supplying their own personal interpretation, privately condemning Patrick and Craddock as men who 'render all the carefull and serious part of the Religion odious and contemptible.'¹⁶²

There are fewer annotations in this reader's copy of *The Second Part*, perhaps in part because Marvell consciously provided glosses in the form of marginal notes in his sequel. Despite this, there are still gaps that the reader is filling for their own

¹⁵⁹ G.19514, p.312.

¹⁶⁰ G.19514, p.6.

¹⁶¹ G.19514, p.44.

¹⁶² Marvell, *RT*, p.66.

purposes. In *The Second Part* Marvell returns to a motif used in his first text and continues to subvert the association between religious nonconformity and disease, upbraiding Parker's hyperbolic fear of influential nonconformists by burlesquing the recipe of an apothecary: 'Whether a Dram of Wealth mix'd with a Pound of Conscience, or whether a Scruple of Conscience infused in a thousand Pounds a year do compound a Wealthy Fanatick.'¹⁶³ In Marvell's scene, it is instead Parker who needs to be cured; 'and you may even during your dull and lazy distemper, have had experience how Necessary it is to be exact in the preparation and quantity, though it were but *Callimelanos*.'¹⁶⁴ Next to this archaic reference to "calomel" the reader supplies their own gloss of '[Me]rcuris Dulcis', reinforcing their awareness of this chemical's use as a remedy for syphilis.¹⁶⁵ There is a clear strategy employed by this reader – they are seeking in their annotations to reveal Marvell's intentions by identifying literary references, exposing the identity of public figures Marvell coyly alludes to, and providing their own cross references and definitions of terms. Their interpretation of Marvell's animadversion, and the meaning they will appropriate from his prose, has been shaped by their engagement with other texts. As opposed to the reader of CUP.406.J.5 who paid attention specifically to Marvell's global argument, this reader treated the text as a cipher to decode – unravelling the subtext by process of investigation. Both of these readers employed organisational strategies in order to tailor the text to suit their personal ends, using their individual methods of engagement to construct meaning. Though they varied in strategy, both readers took it upon themselves to close read the text – in spite of their reactions to his prose, by engaging with the text actively they responded in the way Marvell intended.

Marvell is using humour to depict Parker as a fool – but throughout his text there is an edge to his wit. Parker and his rhetoric excesses are laughable, but the ideology underpinning his writing is still framed as an existential threat. By drawing on his readers' understanding of laughter and the classical rules of rhetoric, Marvell interrogates and deconstructs the arguments of his adversary even whilst engaging in ribaldry. His allusions to the serious political writings of the likes of Milton in his sarcastic vignettes reveal his intention to prompt the reader to read actively and

¹⁶³ Marvell, *RT2*, p.319.

¹⁶⁴ Marvell, *RT2*, p.319.

¹⁶⁵ G.19515, p.184.

think critically – Parker was a hyperbolic extremist (and thus an easy target), but as contemporary instances of violence directed at nonconformists illustrate, the consequences (and casualties) of his polemic were real. This chapter has sought to further an understanding of Marvell’s polemical persuasiveness by analysing the effect of using comedy to convince the reader. Marvell is prompting the reader to mock Parker, but also implicitly suggesting that they – alongside nonconformists – could have their freedoms restricted if Parker’s world view came to fruition. Parker’s ideology does not just threaten obscure religious sects (for whom many Anglicans would have felt ambivalence, if not outright contempt), but his readers’ right to read. Marvell’s polemic centres on the concept that the general public would not want the likes of Parker holding ‘the Keys to the Library.’

II. Brevity

The previous chapter of this thesis considered Marvell's use of comedy, asking why such a tone was employed and considering the expected impact on his readership – this chapter will consider why Marvell deviated from this tone. His first prose text – *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* – had been a roaring commercial success, and essentially created a new genre, breathing new life into animadversion by blending it with comedy. Why not continue this pattern? This chapter will ask what effect the difference between levity and brevity could inspire in a reader. Even in texts that deal in the ridiculous, Marvell often leaves space to make a serious point – eschewing his comedic pace in order to earnestly discuss an issue. This phenomenon is typified by the joint publication of *Mr Smirke* and *A Short Historical Essay*. Though they share an anti-episcopal theme, they share little else. Whilst *Mr Smirke* would appeal to fans of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, recognising both the similarity in their titles and their use of animadversion, *A Short Historical Essay* bore more similarity to sincere, sober calls for toleration, such as Milton's *Of True Religion, Heresy, Schism, Toleration; and what best means may be used against the Growth of Popery* (1673) and Hobbes' *An Historical Narration concerning Heresie and the Punishment thereof* (written and circulated in the 1660's and published in 1680). Both these texts gave an account of the founding of the Church – both were anticlerical in tone, yet neither of their critiques of the Church establishment were as far reaching as Marvell's. In employing a serious tone, and approaching his readers with a more thorough layer of scholarship, Marvell expected a deeper participation from his readers, whilst still making a deliberate play for popular appeal in this venture. Marvell employs humour through irony in *A Short Historical Essay*, but eschews metaphysics in his imagery – the focus is on relaying the topic, and informing his readership. The switch from levity to brevity allows Marvell a didactic opportunity. Subjects treated with jocularly or irony – the persecution of nonconformists, authoritarianism, institutional corruption – in one instance, are discussed ardently and sedulously in another. Even within the animadversions, some topics are by necessity treated seriously. This chapter will consider the various ways Marvell established a didactic tone, the way he engaged with the broader toleration controversy (in particular, his

subversion of stereotypes), and how Marvell uses brevity to inspire his readers to humanise and empathise with the suffering of nonconformists. Cicero – father of rhetoric – had espoused that the ultimate purpose of well executed oratory was to ‘docet, et delect, et permovet’ (teach, delight and move).¹ In Marvell’s prose, whilst his animadversion aimed to ‘delight’, his shift to a serious mode of discourse sought to ‘teach’; both modes intended to ‘move’ readers.

Figuring the Enemy

One of the defining differences that distinguish Marvell’s satiric pamphlets from his serious texts is his choice of opponent. Animadversion requires an *ad hominem* approach, as the writer picks apart and directly confronts the remarks and opinions of his opponent’s text. Whilst Parker and Turner could, through their writings, represent larger societal or political structures that Marvell could criticise, the brunt of the endeavour was a critique of the individual, asking the reader to mock the subject of his animadversion, and lose respect for their moral and political stance in the process. In his serious texts, it is the establishment that Marvell places in his cross hairs and asks his reader to interrogate. In *A Short Historical Essay* it is a searing critique of the episcopacy that Marvell presents his readers. Marvell’s rhetorical strategy is to present the oppression of nonconformists as a result of clerical ambition and corruption – nonconformity representing a threat to both the spiritual and secular power possessed by the Church that they have historically sought to crush. In figuring the Church as the ultimate obstacle to peace for his readers, Marvell’s strategy differs greatly to that of his contemporaries – as particularly evidenced by the calls for tolerance penned by John Milton and Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679).

Milton’s *Of True Religion, Hæresie, Schism, and Toleration*, published in 1673, was written in reaction to Charles II’s withdrawal of the Declaration of Indulgence, and amid growing concerns surrounding his potential Catholic sympathies, and

¹ Cicero, *On Invention. The Best Kind of Orator. Topics*, trans. by H. M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library 386 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949), p.356, in *Loeb Classical Library* <https://www-loebclassics-com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/marcus_tullius_cicero-de_optimo_genere_oratorum/1949/pb_LCL386.357.xml?result=1&rskey=2Yy5sX> [accessed 6th September, 2019].

especially the proclivities of his heir apparent, James II. In this paranoid and recriminatory climate, Milton's call for toleration, aimed at reaching and putting pressure on Parliament, reached the press. The crux of his argument is that nonconformists should be tolerated, as they are ultimately Protestants – the more urgent threat facing the nation is “Popery”. David Loewenstein contends that, ‘Milton's *Of True Religion* reminds us that tolerance and intolerance could be interconnected in the early modern period; discrimination was, paradoxically, inherent in tolerance. All Protestants, whatever their various theological positions had a “common adversary”.² Milton argues that as long as nonconformists can account for their views through scriptural exegesis, they should be given a voice, and freedom to air it, privately and publicly: ‘If it be askt how far they should be tolerated? I answer doubtless equally, as being all Protestants; that is on all occasions to give account of their Faith, either by Arguing, Preaching in their several Assemblies, Publick writing, and the freedom of Printing.’³ Milton's attitude towards “Popery” is, in contrast, seemingly inflexible:

as for tolerating the exercise of their Religion, supposing their State activities not to be dangerous, I answer, that Toleration is either public or private; and the exercise of their Religion, as far as it is Idolatrous, can be tolerated neither way: not publicly, without grievous and unsufferable scandal giv'n to all consciencious Beholders; not privately, without great offence to God, declar'd against all kind of Idolatry, though secret.⁴

The ‘Unpopular Theology’ section of this thesis will more fully explore the means by which Restoration writers engaged with the issue of ‘anti-popery’; the stance Milton takes here is reflective of the fraught political landscape in the wake of growing concerns surrounding French influence at court in tandem with increased sanctions against Protestant nonconformists. *Of True Religion* is the ‘one major polemical pamphlet he published during the Restoration’ before the publication of his second

² David Loewenstein, ‘Of True Religion, Hæresie, Schism, and Toleration: Prefatory Note’, in *John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education* ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2013), pp.448-449 (p.448).

³ John Milton, *Of True Religion, Hæresie, Schism, and Toleration*, in *John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education*, ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2013), pp.451-458 (p.453).

⁴ Milton, *Of True Religion*, p.455.

edition of *Paradise Lost* – the matter was of enough urgency to warrant leaving his political retirement.⁵ Milton argues to his readers that a strong Anglican Church, one that tolerates heterodox belief ('Sects may be in a true Church as well as in a false'), is the only way of guaranteeing 'happy deliverance from Popish Thraldom.'⁶ Constant vigilance is needed in the face of this threat: 'Since therefore some have already in Publick with many considerable Arguments exhorted the people to beware the growth of this Romish Weed.'⁷

Andrew Hadfield suggests that Milton's writing was prompted by specific pieces of legislation: 'Milton is advising Parliament not to spend its time chasing windmills by trying to suppress legitimate differences between Protestants and to concentrate on removing the intolerable threat of Catholicism so that Christian liberty can be upheld.'⁸ Milton explains to his readers his view on the accusations of heresy laid at the door of nonconformists: 'I will now briefly show what is false Religion or Heresie [...] Heresie therefore is a Religion taken up and believ'd from the traditions of men and additions to the word of God'; Milton contends there is only one 'false Religion', as 'Popery is the only or the greatest Heresie.'⁹ This view of "popery" – as an autocratic, political system as opposed to an organic expression of religious faith – can found elsewhere in Milton's oeuvre. In *Areopagitica* a free press is necessary to advance both human understanding and the Protestant faith – 'to make a knowing people' – and the knee jerk instinct to censor possibly erroneous interpretations of scripture in the name of quashing heresy incredibly misguided: 'under these fantastic terrors of sect and schism, we wrong the earnest and zealous thirst for knowledge.'¹⁰ Leniency is the ultimately advantageous option, though not one that can be extended to all Christians:

Yet if all cannot be of one mind [...] this doubtles is more wholesome, more prudent, and more Christian that they may be tolerated, rather than compell'd.

⁵ Loewenstein, 'Prefatory Note', p.448.

⁶ Milton, *Of True Religion*, p.452, p.451.

⁷ Milton, *Of True Religion*, p.451.

⁸ Andrew Hadfield, 'Milton and Catholicism', in *Milton and Toleration*, ed. by Sharon Achinstein and Elizabeth Sauer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp.186-199 (p.195).

⁹ Milton, *Of True Religion*, p.452.

¹⁰ Milton, *Areopagitica*, p.207.

I mean not tolerated Popery, and open superstition, which as it expires all religions and civill supremacies, so it self should be expirat.¹¹

The Reformation had been founded on the ideal of personal interaction with the Bible; the strictures the Catholic Church placed on differing interpretations of the Holy text proved parenthetical to these values. Roman Catholicism is, to Milton, a censorious institution that represses any deviation from the established way (as had been proven historically by the Inquisition) – to re-introduce censorship is to risk the ‘thirst for knowledge’ inspired by the Reformation: ‘troubl’d at the first entrance of Reformation, sought out new limbo’s, and new hells wherein they might include our Books also within the number of their damned.’¹² Hadfield contends that, ‘Catholicism cannot be tolerated because it forces its adherents to accept a dual – and hypocritical – system of obedience to sacred and secular powers.’ By the 1670s, Milton’s view had not changed:

Are we to punish them by corporeal punishment, or fines in the Estates, upon account of their Religion? I suppose it stands not with the Clemency of the Gospel more than what appertains to the security of the State [...] we have no warrant to regard Conscience which is not grounded on Scripture.¹³

Marvell echoes the majority of the Milton’s views, except in one particular – ‘corporeal punishment’: ‘otherwise all Creeds become meer instruments of Equivocation or Persecution.’¹⁴

One running vein featured throughout both Marvell’s comedic and sombre prose is the profound distaste for violence and physical punishments – and he urges the reader to consider the full ramifications of such punishments. As seen in the previous chapter, Marvell’s abject disdain for Samuel Parker is exhibited most keenly in his rejection and horror at his adversary’s violent and sadistic imagery. In invoking images of ‘*Chains, Galleys, Whipping-posts*’, Parker was not alone – there had been a rich precedent of Church luminaries calling for the violent end of nonconformity.¹⁵ In

¹¹ Milton, *Areopagitica*, p.211.

¹² Milton, *Areopagitica*, p.190.

¹³ Milton, *Of True Religion*, p.455.

¹⁴ Marvell, *SHE*, p.145.

¹⁵ It was not just in his prose that Marvell sought to end these violent sentences; in 1675 Marvell actively participated in a parliamentary committee, the Committee for Abolishing the Writ for Burning

this era of increasingly volatile language, the threat of intense rhetoric turning into physical reality loomed large. For instance, in his *Heresiography* (1645), Ephraim Pagitt argued ‘if such as poyson waters and fountaines, at which men and beasts drinke, deserve Capitall punishment, how much more they that as much in them lyeth goe about to poyson mens soules?’¹⁶ Aside from a difference in the appropriate way to curtail “Popery”, both Marvell and Milton agree that its presence at court presents an existential threat to English Protestantism, depicting Roman Catholicism as at once a political enemy and a prohibition on personal conscience. In describing Catholic ministers, Milton depicts a system that deliberately obfuscates the source text: ‘they will not go about to prove their Idolatries by the Word of God, but run to shifts and evasions, and frivolous distinctions: Idols they say are Laymens Books, and great means to stir up pious thoughts and Devotion in the Learnedst. I say they are no means of Gods appointing, but plainly the contrary.’¹⁷

Here a dependence on tradition serves as a means of distancing religious participants from active involvement in their faith, which is further compounded by the embargo on vernacular bibles: ‘the Papal Antichristian Church permits not her Laity to read the Bible in their own tongue.’¹⁸ This critique of the Roman Catholic episcopacy is mirrored in Marvell:

For having thus a book which is universally avowed to be of Divine Authority, but sequestering it only into such hands as were intrusted in the cheat, they had the opportunity to vitiate, suppress, or interpret to their own profit those *Records* by which the poor People hold their Salvation.¹⁹

In both Milton and Marvell the aim is not to denigrate Catholics – they are instead presented as victims of a restrictive, autocratic church governing body, intent to ‘suppress’ individual interpretation of the Bible in order to control the populace. In his ‘Keys to the Library’ vignette, Marvell mirrors these sentiments – placing on

Heretics, attempting to strike off the death penalty for the “crime” of heresy, nullifying the statute of *de haeretico comburendo*. The last man to be executed for heresy had been Edward Wightman (1580-1612), the radical Anabaptist – convicted of holding anti-Trinitarian views and rejecting the Nicene Creed. Smith, *The Chameleon*, p.292.

¹⁶ Ephraim Pagitt, *Heresiography: Or, a description of the Hereticks and Sectaries of these latter times* (London: Printed by W. Wilson, for John Marshall, 1645), sig.Cv.

¹⁷ Milton, *Of True Religion*, p.455.

¹⁸ Milton, *Of True Religion*, p.456.

¹⁹ Marvell, *Account*, p.228.

Parker an association with this 'Papal' implementation of censorship. This association is both a critique of Parker as an individual, and the broader political impetus for Anglican conformity that he represented. In both Milton and Marvell, impositions on personal freedoms are framed as absolutist; they directly ask their readers to question sources of religious authority. Though ostensibly it is "Popery" facing the brunt of their scrutiny, by castigating a rigid episcopacy they both criticise Anglican rigidity – in refusing to accommodate (or "Indulge") tender consciences the Anglican Church behaves in a manner similar to that of its supposed arch-nemesis. In both Milton and Marvell, it is not Catholics that are the enemy, but officious Church authority that the reader should be wary of.

The primary difference in their stances comes down to the secular application of Church authority. "Popery" – the term of opprobrium used by both Marvell and Milton – though used broadly to describe Roman Catholicism, did in fact have a more specific designation. Gary de Krey argues that:

For English nonconformists, the threat from popery and arbitrary government was broader than either the internal threat of a popish successor or the external danger of the "advancing" European Counter-Reformation. Dissenters in London and elsewhere had experienced popery and arbitrary government in the parliamentary and magisterial efforts at coercion that attended the second Conventicle Act.²⁰

Whether a nonconformist brought to bear by an 'arbitrary' regime, or an orthodox Anglican growing increasingly worried at the prospect of religious upheaval brought about by a new sovereign (whose Catholic leanings were of considerable concern) – the term "popery" held considerable weight. Nicholas von Maltzahn argues that: 'Marvell's is the more familiar liberal perspective that contending faiths might agree to disagree, or even turn a blind eye on each other, with religion increasingly construed as a private practice tolerable within a secular state [...] Milton, by contrast, sees toleration as committing us to some collective discovery of Christian saving

²⁰ Gary S. De Krey, 'The First Restoration Crisis: Conscience and Coercion in London, 1667-73', in *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 25 (1993), 565-580 (p.577).

truth.²¹ In Milton's rhetoric, nonconformity should be tolerated as it will ultimately lead all men closer to truth: 'There is no Learned man but will confess he hath much profited by reading Controversies, his Senses awakt, his Judgement sharpn'd, and the truth which he holds more firmly establish't [...] If then it be profitable for him to read; why should it not at least be tolerable and free for his Adversary to write.'²² Whilst nonconformity should be tolerated, it is also perfectly acceptable to take penal steps to discourage and stem the tide of "Popery." Marvell instead presents his readers with a different line of reasoning; nonconformity must be tolerated because of the human consequences of imposing conformity. The best method of preventing this form of oppression is to separate the secular and religious spheres. Whilst Milton approaches his readership as diligent Christians, Marvell approaches his reader as an active citizen.

Hobbes composed *An Historical Narrative concerning Heresie and the Punishment thereof* in the late 1660s, and it circulated in a scribal manuscript form in the mid-1670s before it was eventually printed posthumously in 1680.²³ J. A. I. Champion, in his evaluation of Hobbes' writing on heresy, argues that:

in this work, derived and reworked from his other contemporary writings on cognate themes, Hobbes engaged head-on with the nature, function, and origins of heresy in the distant Christian past, and with the implications of this historical account for the nature and status of dissident belief in his contemporary society.²⁴

After the publication of *Leviathan* in 1651, Hobbes had found himself under fire, facing the charge of heresy both in the court of public opinion, and actual court, after the House of Commons threatened to bring forth a bill against "atheism and profaneness" – as such, 'Hobbes's reputation as a heretic was a commonplace in the Restoration.'²⁵ In *Leviathan* Hobbes defined the term heresy as a term of denigration

²¹ Nicholas von Maltzhahn, 'Milton, Marvell and Toleration', in *Milton and Toleration*, ed. by Sharon Achinstein and Elizabeth Sauer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp.86-104 (p.86).

²² Milton, *Of True Religion*, p.457.

²³ J. A. I. Champion, 'Hobbes, Barlow, and the Restoration debate over "heresy"', in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. by David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp.221-253 (p.224).

²⁴ Champion, 'the Restoration debate over "heresy"', p.224.

²⁵ Champion, 'the Restoration debate over "heresy"', p.225.

that could only be decided by the sovereign: '*for heresy is nothing else, but a private opinion, obstinately maintained, contrary to the opinion which the public person (that is to say, the representant of the commonwealth) hath commanded to be taught.*'²⁶ It was arguments such as this – that heresy had nothing to do with holding or practicing beliefs antithetical to the established orthodoxy, and was but '*a private opinion, obstinately maintained*' – that earned Hobbes' the (nebulous) label of atheist.²⁷ In *An Historical Narrative* Hobbes sought to clarify his definition, and refine his ideas – concluding that the issue of heresy is actually a problem of semantics. Hobbes' begins his treatise with an etymological discussion, by tracing the history of the word "heresy" for his readers back to its Hellenic origin, concluding the term to have initially been an innocuous term for an ideological dispute: 'nor was the name of Heresie then a disgrace, nor the word Heretick at all in use.'²⁸ It was the intervention of episcopal authority that made heresy a penal offence. Hobbes also takes issue with the legality of charges of heresy – given that charge is not legally defined, and instead decided by the clergy on a case by case basis: 'but I never heard that any such Declaration was made either by Proclamation, or by Recording it in Churches, or by publick Printing, as in penal Laws is necessary.'²⁹ Until these terms are specified, no man is safe from the charge; 'at least Points condemned in them, ought to have been Printed or put into Parish Churches in English, because without it, no man could know how to beware of offending against them.'³⁰

Champion also suggests that: 'heresy for Hobbes was a historical construct rather than an identifiable theological error. More pertinently, heresy was a device originally employed to denote diversity that had been turned into a powerful weapon of priestcraft.'³¹ It was this disdain for 'the powerful weapon of priestcraft' that Hobbes and Marvell share, both exhibiting a distrust of ecclesiastic dominion over the secular political sphere – however Marvell's critiques are far stronger. Hobbes had intended to publish the pamphlet in 1668, but was turned down by the censor, even after offering to cut any offending sections – by publishing anonymously, Marvell

²⁶ Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. by J. C. A. Gaskin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p.387.

²⁷ Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.387.

²⁸ Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.4.

²⁹ Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.16.

³⁰ Hobbes, *Leviathan*, p.17.

³¹ Champion, 'the Restoration debate over "heresy"', p.232.

circumvented the censor, and thus his attacks on the episcopacy could be particularly hard edged.³² In fact the government went to great pains to stop the circulation of the pamphlet once it hit the press – including arresting John Darby and Nathaniel Ponder, the publishers responsible for printing *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. A Parliamentary inquiry was launched in order to both suppress the pamphlet and find proof of its author – such was the inflammatory nature of its contents. Like Hobbes, Marvell traces the history of the idea of heresy – however, whilst Hobbes took issue with concepts, and the words used to discuss them, Marvell directs his reader to take issue with the men responsible for the imposition of creeds, finding the process decidedly wanting:

But as to the whole matter of the Council of Nice, I must crave liberty to say, that from one end to the other, though the best of the kind, it seems to me to have been a pittiful humane business, attended with all the ill circumstances of other wordly affairs, conducted by a spirit of ambition and contention, the first and so the greatest Æcumenical blow that by Christians was given to Christianity.³³

Here Marvell makes use of the rhetorical figure *Parrhesia*, defined by John Smith in *The Myserie of Rhetorick Unveiled* as ‘license or liberty’ in speech, ‘a figure when we speak freely and boldly’ and ‘confidently upbraid and rebuke others for their faults’ in spite of potential retribution as a consequence.³⁴ By confessing ‘I must crave liberty to say’, Marvell is acknowledging the controversy that will follow, as he lambasts the Council of Nicea, one of the cornerstones of Christian orthodoxy. Marvell’s agenda was incredibly controversial – Patterson contends that Marvell sets out, through his history of the early church, ‘to undermine the authority of all formal creeds, insofar as belief in them was mandatory, and of the general councils that had formulated them.’³⁵

By craving “liberty” Marvell signifies to his readers his awareness of the importance, and the radical nature, of his text. Though the likes of Milton and Hobbes

³² Champion, ‘the Restoration debate over “heresy”’, p.224.

³³ Marvell, *SHE*, p.142.

³⁴ Smith, *The Myserie of Rhetorick*, p.212.

³⁵ Patterson, ‘Introduction’, p.17.

had expressed similarly anti-clerical sentiments in their calls for toleration, Marvell's terms are particularly strong:

Nor can I wonder that those ages were so fertile in what they called Heresies, when being given to meddling with the mysteries of Religion further then humane apprehension or divine revelation did or could lead them, some of the Bishops were so ignorant and gross, but others so speculative, acute and refining in their conceptions, that, there being moreover a good fat Bishoprick to boot in the case, it is rather admirable to me how all the Clergy from one end to 'tother, could escape from being accounted Hereticks.'³⁶

Here Marvell makes use of sarcasm to underscore his disdain – it is 'ambition' (a word that repeatedly recurs throughout the pamphlet, and all of Marvell's printed polemics) that Marvell sees as the cause of these theological and ideological disputes – the root of persecution. Marvell even suggests to the reader that the pursuit of heresy allowed the episcopacy a gateway into secular politics: 'Imposition and Cruelty became inherent in them, & the power of Persecution was grown so good & desirable a thing, that they thought the Magistrate scarce worthy to be trusted with it longer, and a meer Novice at it, and either wrested it out of his hands, or gently eased him of that and his other burdens of Government.'³⁷ Like Hobbes, Marvell concludes that many of these disputes are semantic, or the result of confusion – however Marvell does not conclude it to be an honest mistake, given the obscurity of the language, but 'a Gibberish of their Imposing.'³⁸ It is only when these creeds, and the competing personal and ideological agendas they originally represented, are repealed that there is a chance of discovering "truth": 'in those days when Creeds were most plenty and in fashion, and every one had them at their fingers-ends, 'twas the Bible that brought in the Reformation.'³⁹ In both his animadversion and his *Short Historical Essay* Marvell directs his reader to question Church authority – whilst the focus of the first is an individual representative (echoing his earlier works), the latter broadens the scope. The shift between comedy and seriousness indicates a rising urgency for

³⁶ Marvell, *SHE*, p.137.

³⁷ Marvell, *SHE*, p.162.

³⁸ Marvell, *SHE*, p.144.

³⁹ Marvell, *SHE*, p.144.

the reader. Whether it is humour or scholarship that engages a prospective reader, both aim to prompt the reader to question Church authority.

Mechanics of Reading

Aside from the absence of absurdism, the most glaring difference between Marvell's animadversions and his more earnest efforts is the absence of self-referentiality. In his comedy he specifically draws attention to the mechanics of the act of reading. From book production, to specific references to booksellers and the marketplace of books, to his many addresses to his 'Reader', to the use of page citations and other textual apparatus, Marvell continually draws the reader's attention to the very act of reading – it is worth considering the effect of this self-consciousness, and also the effect of its absence, an aspect of Marvell's work that has been critically neglected, and to which this chapter will draw particular attention.

The term 'Reader' recurs nineteen times throughout *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in *Mr Smirke* it recurs fifteen times: by contrast in *A Short Historical Essay* this number shrinks to six and in *An Account* there is only one use of it, in which he promises to provide to the reader 'a thread to guide himself by thorow so intreaguing a Labyrinth.'⁴⁰ By repeating the term so frequently, Marvell asks his reader to consciously engage in the task of absorbing the message of his writing, and also to analyse and dissect the subject of his animadversion alongside him. Wolfgang Iser, in his theory of the phenomenological reading process, discusses how an author might shape their text in order to illicit pleasure in a reader and enhance the reading experience. One factor Iser suggests will determine audience appreciation is the connection between 'the artistic and the aesthetic': 'the artistic refers to the text created by the author, and the aesthetic to the realization accomplished by the reader.'⁴¹ It is the process of discovering the 'aesthetic' meaning of the text that prompts reader cognizance – making this process active and interesting is the primary means of ensuring reader enjoyment, therefore texts must aim to 'engage the

⁴⁰ Marvell, *Account*, p.241.

⁴¹ Wolfgang Iser, 'The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach', in *New Literary History*, 3 (1972), 279-299 (p.279).

reader's imagination in the task of working things out for himself, for reading is only a pleasure when it is active and creative.⁴² Engagement is also stimulated through the process of "identification":

What is normally meant by "identification" is the establishment of affinities between oneself and someone outside oneself – a familiar ground on which we are able to experience the unfamiliar [...] Consequently, "identification" is not an end in itself, but a stratagem by means of which the author stimulates attitudes in the reader.⁴³

Marvell's frequent addresses to the reader is a means of creating this identification – creating the illusion of familiarity and pitting the *actual* reader against his ideal reader, namely a reader receptive to his ideas and willing to engage in the same process of deconstructing his adversaries arguments. By the same token, his adversaries deserve the treatment they receive at his hands because they fail their readers in this regard – their writing is presented as tedious sermonising, their motive in printing their works murky and avaricious. In contrast Marvell presents his motive as public spirited, his writing being 'my Service to the Readers.'⁴⁴ On top of that, the intolerant content of their discourses is poisoning public discourse: 'so your virulence has corrupted the age you live in.'⁴⁵ In *The Rehearsal Transpos'd: The Second Part*, Marvell pays particular attention to the means of book production and distribution, presenting Samuel Parker's printing methods as indicative of broader character flaws. For instance, the fact that Parker's book was advertised in *The London Gazette*, is indicative of Parker's play for attention. Marvell directs his readers to his source: 'Gazette #of the 15th. of May, 1673.# in which he cries his Book to make it vendible.'⁴⁶ As will be discussed in section two, Marvell's relationship with the newspaper was fraught, and here the fact that Parker would stoop to placing an advertisement within its pages is proof of his rapacity – his primary drive to reap a financial benefit from the publication. This is further evidenced by the price of his wares: 'a poor Fanatick that has been of his intimacy cannot be inform'd how he does

⁴² Iser, 'The Reading Process', p.280.

⁴³ Iser, 'The Reading Process', p.296.

⁴⁴ Marvell, *RT2*, p.387.

⁴⁵ Marvell, *RT2*, p.397.

⁴⁶ Marvell, *RT2*, p.225.

under the prodigal expence of Five Shillings.⁴⁷ The prohibitive expense of his works ensures that those he derides as '*Shop-divines*' will be unable to purchase his writing; if his writing had truly been intended to convince nonconformists of their "error" and bring them back into the Anglican fold, they should be more accessible. Instead, his writing has no civic purpose. His price is reflective of his intention: exclusion.

Though a prolific author himself, part of Parker's global argument included restricting both press freedom and access to books among the lower classes. This impulse to control the act of reading is presented to Marvell's readers as a cardinal sin:

You say you find none of the *Non-Conformists dirty Thumb-Nails* in <your> *Patrons Library*. But have not you, nor your poor *Leaf-turners* liberty to peruse the Volumes? Or is there a peculiar Reverence due to the Books in that place that no man does or may touch them?⁴⁸

As a reader themselves, Marvell expects his ideal reader to revolt at the idea of restrictions placed on the very activity that they are currently engaging in. The term '*Leaf-turners*' is given as a quote as evidence of Parker's disdain – the term '*Leaf-turners*' refers only to the motion turning a page, not the act of reading, the implication being that they are incapable of processing the information within. The sneering image of '*Non-Conformists dirty Thumb-nails*' that Parker had invoked in order to mock and denigrate nonconformists quoted to reveal his deep seated prejudice. In contrast Marvell validates the reader, addressing them as capable and intelligent; 'I must refer to the Reader's judgement.'⁴⁹ In fact, Marvell argues that deference to the reader should be a deciding factor in the content of texts. Marvell makes reference to a practice dating back to the 'ancient times of Christianity', in which ministers were vetted by their congregation, which he proposes as a means of 'preventing' the promotion of the likes of Parker: 'he that would be a Preacher was to be first himself commented upon by the People, and in the stile of those Ages was said *Praedicari* [fit to be published].'⁵⁰ Publication here is presented as too valuable to be

⁴⁷ Marvell, *RT2*, p.226.

⁴⁸ Marvell, *RT2*, p.426.

⁴⁹ Marvell, *RT2*, p.241.

⁵⁰ Marvell, *RT2*, p.239.

run without deference to the public will. This method of public vetting would ensure that those attempting to coarsen the public discourse would not be promoted to higher office, or find their works advanced by the Church, which was the case with Parker's writing.⁵¹ Marvell remarks, in all seriousness, that Parker's texts and his agenda are:

destructive to Humane Society and the Christian Religion [...] that he should illustrate so corrupt Doctrines with as ill a Conversation, and adorn the lasciviousness of his life with an equal petulancy of stile and language.⁵²

The importance of countering this 'stile' of discourse and providing a dissenting voice for the reader is an important feature of Marvell's polemic – the reader should be concerned with both the persecution of a religious minority, and of restrictions upon the press, as it will ultimately affect them as a reader. Material references to Restoration book production also abound within the text – for example, in deriding Parker's ample polemic output Marvell accuses his adversary of crowding out the market: 'for ever since you were to be sold at *Jo. Shirly's, Sam. Tompson's, Rich. Davis's, J. Martin's, James Collins's, Henry Hall's*, you have so perpetually pester'd the Press with your own Books, and obstructed better Authors.'⁵³ These names all refer to one of Parker's booksellers. The mention of 'Five Shillings' depends on a reader's knowledge of the book market, their experience of having bought texts in situ or having noticed these names on the title pages of other texts – the length of this list is proof of Parker's ambitions, but also his influence. Given the authoritarianism he propounds, this should be a fact to trouble the reader.

By drawing his readers' attention to the mechanics and materiality of reading in his comedy, Marvell asks the readers of his prose to actively read, the intention of his polemic to convince them of his argument, though more broadly it asks them to treat the texts they consume with scepticism – to analyse and interrogate their books, especially the narratives promulgated by the establishment. His serious writing instead presents the reader with material to process and appropriate without this self-consciousness. Rather than instil self-consciousness in the reader, the intention is

⁵¹ Parker's patron was Gilbert Sheldon, the Archbishop of Canterbury (1598-1677).

⁵² Marvell, *RT2*, p.239.

⁵³ Marvell, *RT2*, p.397.

explicitly didactic. This reflects the early modern cultural perception of reading as ‘an ethical practice [...] through which people learned to be good citizens.’⁵⁴ In this construction ‘reading is a cultural as a well as personal action’ – part of your civic duty as an active citizen involved deeply considering the content of texts, using them to construct your own interpretation and inform your opinion.⁵⁵ The difference in reader experience is particularly on display in the joint publication of *Mr Smirke* and *A Short Historical Essay* – whilst the former asks the reader to examine the process by which a reader is prejudiced or convinced, the latter aims purely to convince. As with his attack on Parker, the physicality of Turner’s book is shown to be indicative of his artifice: ‘for the Authors Book of the *Naked Truth*, chancing to be of sixty six pages, the Exposer has not bated him an Ace, but payed him exactly, though not in as good Billet, yet in as many Notches.’⁵⁶ Here, the fact that Turner’s text (whether intentionally or coincidentally) contained the exact same number of pages as Croft’s is presented as proof that this animadverter attempted to cloak himself in scholarly authority by matching the length of his source text – the act of writing is merely a game to him, as eluded to by the use of gambling terminology. The length of his text is irrelevant however, given the nature of its content: ‘it exceeds perhaps the number of his Pages. For it is scarce credible how voluminous and pithy he is in extravagance: and one of his sides in *Quarto*, for Falshood, Insolence, and Absurdity, contains a Book in *Folio*.’⁵⁷ Just as in *The Second Part*, in *Mr Smirke* Marvell presents his reader with a scene of the literary marketplace when describing the process by which ‘answers’ to theologically controversial texts are commissioned and circulated by the Anglican church:

Buf if the Dean forsee that ‘tis a very vendible Book, he you may imagine forestalls the Market, and sends up for a whole Dicker of ‘em to retail at his best advantage. All this while the little Emissaries here in Town are not idle, but hawk about from London to Westminster with their Britches stiff with the Copies, and will sell them to any one for Commendation.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.40.

⁵⁵ Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.36.

⁵⁶ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.86.

⁵⁷ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.58.

⁵⁸ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.87.

The term 'vendible' is used again, but whereas it was Parker's own ambition fuelling his commercial ambitions, Marvell goes further in his satire here, implicating the entire episcopacy, describing a veritable cottage industry mass producing and disseminating propaganda, from the universities to church congregations. In this formulation, the general public has no control in the process – interest in and exposure to these theologically conservative texts is entirely manufactured: 'before the laity get notice of it, they hear it Preach'd over.'⁵⁹ The audiences for these diatribes are simply passive observers. In the case of Turner, it is not simply the style of his writing that is a source of consternation, but the fact that Turner has abused his position as an 'Animadverter'; rather than addressing his adversaries arguments, Marvell contends that he has set out to deliberately mislead the reader: 'he having misrepresented the Author, and prejuicated the Reader against him by all disingenuous methods, and open'd the whole Pedlers pack of his malice.'⁶⁰ For instance, Marvell draws his reader's attention to sections in which Turner deliberately misquotes Croft, making his views appear more extreme by aligning him with highly controversial interpretations of the scripture: 'I note that the Exposer very disingenuously, and to make it look more ugly, takes not the least notice of his Pique against *Homoiousios* too and the Arrian Heresies.'⁶¹ Turner's ploy to make Croft appear to be an extreme sectarian, by failing to recognise sections of his writing which counter 'the Arrian Heresies', is exposed as part of a broader scheme to discredit Croft's ideas.

His failure to cite his sources is also presented as a form of reader misdirection, as illustrated by an allusion to early Judaism: 'I should be glad to know where the Exposer learnt that the Jewish Church acknowledged of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost, as of a Distinct Person; which if he cannot show, he is very far out in the Mattter.'⁶² In affirming the scriptural authority of the Holy Trinity, Turner makes this affirmation – an affirmation he fails to support with a biblical or theological citation; Marvell suggests that he is only 'pretending now to be [...] learned' to convince his readers, he does not provide the scholarly apparatus that would allow a reader to

⁵⁹ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.87.

⁶⁰ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.57.

⁶¹ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.70.

⁶² Marvell, *Smirke*, p.73.

confirm this for themselves or perform their own research.⁶³ These attempts to associate Croft with the Arrian controversy, are a deliberate misdirect, however *Marvell's* reader is capable of seeing through Turner's rhetoric strategy and attempts to "prejudicate" the reader: 'this is I trow what they call reducing a man *ad Absurdum*, and I doubt he has hamper'd the Author mischievously.'⁶⁴ In drawing attention to the mechanics of reading, Marvell provides his readers with the skills needed to interrogate these texts – "Animadverters" cannot be taken at their word, it is necessary to examine the source text. In considering the history of the book and the habits of early modern readers, Joad Raymond observes that material studies have shown:

the importance of *ratio* and *utilitas* in the conscious intentions of readers, and the sophistication of readers and their interpretive strategies. Reading, we are told, was "utilitarian or preparatory" and radically analytic. Texts were anatomized and fragmented, individual words were subjects to perspicacious scrutiny.⁶⁵

The methodology Marvell is advocating aligns with these habits of reading – by drawing specific attention to the act of reading, he emphasises the importance of subjecting texts to this level of 'perspicacious scrutiny.' This level of analysis and the reader's ability to construct meaning is critical when the author's intent is to deliberately mislead; being an active reader is key to being an active citizen. Where reputations are at stake, it is necessary to ensure that you are entirely informed, as 'the Reader may please to consider [...] that Calumny is like London-dirt, with which though a an may be spatter'd in an instant, yet it requires much time, pains, and Fullers-earth to scoure it out again.'⁶⁶

Ultimately however, an earnestly written, well intentioned book will be its own best defense:

⁶³ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.72.

⁶⁴ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.76.

⁶⁵ Raymond, 'Irrational, impractical and unprofitable: reading the news in seventeenth-century Britain', in *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, eds. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) pp.185-212 (p.185).

⁶⁶ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.58.

It is all delivered in so Grave and Inoffensive manner, that there was no temptation to alter the stile into Ridicule, and Satyre. But like some Cattle, the Animadverter may Browze upon the Leaves, or Peel the Barke, but he has no teeth for the Solid, nor can hurt the Tree but by accident.⁶⁷

Throughout his satiric prose, Marvell advocates for active reading – as he dissects the writing of his adversaries, he gives the reader credit for being capable of performing the same task, illustrating the ways and means by which they too can counter the narratives promulgated by the establishment, foregrounding the importance of their judgement and interpretation of the text. The final line of *Mr Smirke* reads, ‘but the Printer calls: the Press is in danger. I am weary of such stuff, both mine own and his. I will rather give him this following Essay of mine own to busie him’ – declaring his distaste for animadversion, and tacitly promising his readers a text written in a ‘Grave and Inoffensive manner.’⁶⁸ Having both texts together increases the efficacy of this strategy by creating a tonal dissonance that insinuates the veracity of the latter text – his intent to produce an account that will withstand critical scrutiny. For instance, Marvell signposts his use of ‘Testimonies which I have collected out of the History of the Act, as of greatest Authority’, and frequently makes clear his sources: ‘Sozomene, l.4.c.25’; ‘Socr. L6.c.30’; ‘*Socr. L.4.c.24.*’⁶⁹ In this way, Marvell consciously corrects the errors he detects in his adversaries; rather than obfuscating his sources, a reader can take him at his word and appropriate his message. In this way the combination of a stylistic critique affirms the content of an earnest essay – by purposefully avoiding the methodology that he specifically identifies as a method of misleading readers, he asserts the didactic value of his own writing and its central message. Whilst Turner aimed to ‘prejudicate’ the reader against both Croft and the nonconformist community he had aimed to shield, Marvell’s work calls for an end to persecution. The plight of the communities he vilified are likened to that of early Christian converts:

The High Priest was so zealous in the Prosecution that he took the journey on purpose, and had instructed an exquisite Orator, Tertullus, to harangue Paul

⁶⁷ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.67.

⁶⁸ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.113.

⁶⁹ Marvell, *SHE*, p.120, p.151, p.161.

out of his Life, as a *Pestilent fellow, a mover of Sedition, and Ring-leader of the Sect of the Nazarenes.*⁷⁰

The terms employed here – which invoke pestilence and ‘*Sedition*’ – relate directly to the terms of denigration used against nonconformists, as does the use of the term ‘zealous’, so frequently used to minimise the authenticity of homodox expressions of belief. By likening ‘the Prosecution’ of Paul the Apostle to ‘the Prosecution’ of contemporary nonconformists, Marvell validates the suffering of these persecuted groups, and attempts to inspire sympathy in ‘the Judicious and Serious Reader.’⁷¹

‘He must be publishing his diseases’

A key feature of Marvell’s humour in his early light-hearted pamphlets is his use of bodily imagery, his satire and his energetic conceits veering between the fleshy, the scatological and the sexual; rendering the disorder in his opponent’s body indicative of the disorder of his logic. Whilst by no means an original satirical strategy, Marvell’s polemic subverts the usual tropes, slurs and stereotypes levelled at nonconformists to instead deride his ideological adversaries – a play on expectations that would have been evident to his contemporary audience.

Owen had based his criticism on Parker’s unwillingness to account for the ‘Mysteries’ of faith, and the possibility of spiritual revelation – Parker’s rejoinder is to reduce ‘J. O.’ to the physical sphere. Where Owen had discussed agape in his writings, Parker morphs this form of Christian love into amorous love, and mocks his ‘*Love and Compassion*’ as ‘*Enamouring Description*’, and his method of argument as ‘*hugging and kissing*.’⁷² This sarcastic treatment of Owen is coupled with continued references to his body: Parker remarks upon his ‘*Complexion*’ and ‘*blushes*’; he and his kind are driven by ‘*Vice or Humour*’; he is possessed of a ‘*gangren’d Temper*’; Owen does not speak, but will ‘*belch*’ his sermons.⁷³ Parker reduces his opponent to the bodily, and it is a body which is inherently corrupt and diseased. This imagery is extended to other

⁷⁰ Marvell, *SHE*, p.120.

⁷¹ Marvell, *SHE*, p.175.

⁷² Parker, *Preface*, sig.[a7]v-[a8]r.

⁷³ Parker, *Preface*, sig.av, sig.e4r, sig.c2r, sig.a2r.

nonconformist thinkers: 'their Preachers fill the Peoples Heads with Wind and Phrases [...] and spend most of their Pulpit-Sweat in making a noise about Faith, Communion with God.'⁷⁴ The 'Mysteries' Owen discussed are reduced to 'noise' made by corporeal, sweating men; their claims of 'Communion with God' are belittled by this reference to their physicality. This line of attack had been taken even further in Parker's *A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie* (1671), in which he locates the source of a nonconformist's communion with God to 'the Anatomy of the Brain, the structure of the Spleen and Hypochondria': he argues that human physiology offers an explanation to the source of revelation, and can 'give as certain and mechanical an account of all its phanatick Freaks and Frenzies', deciding that 'the Philosophy of a Phanatick [... is] as intelligible by the Laws of Mechanism, as the Motion of the Heart.'⁷⁵ In Parker's reckoning spiritual revelation is little more than a humoural imbalance. Though references to the physical juxtaposed with an intangible concept (revelation), Parker attempts to deride the spiritual underpinnings of his adversary's arguments.

Anselment argues that, 'Parker does not consider the possibility that his form of zeal could be confused with the object of its attack': Marvell utilises the comic potential implicit in this slip to mercilessly mock his adversary, and present Parker as the very model of a nonconformist zealot he had himself lambasted.⁷⁶ Marvell subverts a commonly held stereotype promulgated throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth century – that of the sexually licentious heterodox preacher, and of the supposed overthrow of sexual norms to be found in religious sects – by sexualising his adversary. Kristen Poole asserts that, 'from the 1640s through the early years of the Restoration, sectarian discursive activities were frequently associated with nakedness.'⁷⁷ 'Going naked as a prophetic sign' was a form of protest occasionally employed by religious sects, such as the Quakers: in July of 1667, for example, a Quaker – his 'privy parts covered with a seaman's neck cloth' – walked naked through the halls of Parliament, and in 1669 Solomon Eccles was arrested for preaching in a

⁷⁴ Parker, *Preface*, sig.dv.

⁷⁵ Samuel Parker, *A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie* (London: Printed by A. Clark for J. Martyn, 1671), p.342.

⁷⁶ Anselment, 'Ironic Reversal', p.285.

⁷⁷ Kristen Poole, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p.148.

state of undress.⁷⁸ This form of protest became notorious, popularly perceived as theatrical and a scandalous rejection of social mores, and often resulted in an ‘elision of naked preaching and illicit sexual behaviour.’⁷⁹ For instance, the frontispiece of Daniel Featley’s scathing indictment of Baptists, *The Dippers dipt*, makes this ‘elision’ visible.⁸⁰ The text went through several editions; first published in 1645, it went on to be printed a further four times, in 1646, 1647, 1651 and 1660, indicative of its popularity. In the centre of the frontispiece, under a banner bearing the legend ‘The Description of the Severall Sorts of ANABAPTISTS With there manner of Rebaptizing’, four men and four women are depicted standing in a body of water about to undergo a baptism: all are naked, with the woman to the left, in the process of being *dipt*, being placed in a particularly sexually suggestive position, as a male preacher guides her head in to the water directly in front of his loins, whilst a female figure on the right is depicted with a man leeringly draping himself over her. Around the edge of this tableau various sects are insultingly caricatured; whilst the ‘HEMEROBAPTIST’ and the ‘ADAMITE’ are both depicted naked, the ‘BUCHELDIAN’ is depicted with his arms around two women, presumably suggestive of lascivious intent on his part. In Marvell’s prose however, it is not a nonconformist who is presented to readers sermonising in the nude, it is Parker.

Marvell depicts Parker’s quick production of his *Preface* (without having ‘cool’d his Thoughts, and corrected his Indecencies’), imagining the text to have been composed in a moment ‘when a man’s Phancy is up, and his Breeches are down.’⁸¹ Once Parker reaches ‘the Highest Pinnacle of Ecclesiastical Felicity [...] into Street he runs out naked with his Invention’ consumed by his desire to ‘wreck his Malice’; leading Marvell to sarcastically beg his reader to ‘pardon this Extravagance and Rapture of our Author.’⁸² Marvell renders Parker as the very figure of an ecstatic naked preacher that was popularly mocked by the likes of Featley. Later in his pamphlet Marvell criticises Parker’s insistence on legal and corporeal punishments as

⁷⁸ Richard L. Greaves, ‘Seditious Sectaries or “Sober and Useful Inhabitants”? Changing Conceptions of the Quakers in Early Modern Britain’ in *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 33 (2001), 24-50 (p.28).

⁷⁹ Poole, *Radical Religion*, p.148.

⁸⁰ Daniel Featley, *Katabaptisai kataptysesoi. The Dippers dipt* (London: Printed by E. C. for N. B. and Richard Royston, 1660), frontispiece.

⁸¹ Marvell, *RT*, p.48.

⁸² Marvell, *RT*, p.48.

attempts at ‘reviling men into *Conformity*’, arguing that ‘the Nonconformists deserve some Compassion’, as having suffered ‘legally to the utmost’, they are demonised in the press: Marvell depicts Parker as lording over nonconformists, mercilessly inflicting arbitrary punishments upon them (such as the ‘*Ganteloop*’) and forcing them to ‘down with their breeches as oft as he wants the prospect of a more pleasing *Nudity*.’⁸³ As opposed to the depictions of nonconformists wilfully abandoning their clothes in religious fervour, Marvell presents to the readers nonconformists who are forced to do so at the whim of the authorities – the interest invested in their ‘*Nudity*’ and in the process of punishing those fighting for the right to exercise their own private conscience is sadistic, voyeuristic, and contemptible. In doing so Marvell is attempting to cultivate sympathy in his readers towards dissenters whilst simultaneously using *Ironia* to further cement their contempt towards Parker.

Throughout *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* Marvell makes repeated, pointed references to Parker’s health and physical makeup. N. Gallagher, in considering the prevalence of the “satire as medicine” trope, argues that:

The medical model had maintained a particular prevalence and resilience over the centuries [...] because it tied in with a broader understanding of human experience an understanding that made strong connections between physical and mental states of being, and particularly between moral virtue and physical health.⁸⁴

The humoral model of physiology – the prevailing model expounded by doctors and medical theorists throughout the early modern period – specified that the body and human temperament was controlled by four separate humours – blood, black bile, yellow bile, and phlegm. An imbalance of one of these humours would disrupt the internal workings of the system and cause illnesses – both physical and psychological. An excess of yellow bile, for instance, would be understood to cause depression, as well as affecting liver function. Accordingly, in his satire Marvell locates the source of his target’s intellectual, logical and ideological failings as his ill-humoured body. In

⁸³ Marvell, *RT*, p.82.

⁸⁴ Noelle Gallagher, ‘Satire as medicine in the Restoration and early eighteenth century: the history of the metaphor’, in *Literature and Medicine*, 31 (2013), 17-39 (p.20).

one such vignette, Marvell depicts a scene in which Parker lectures his adoring congregation: 'they all listened to him all the *Divinity* [...] this thing around elevated him exceedingly in his own conceit, and raised his Hypochondria into the Region of the Brain; that his head swell'd like any Bladder with wind and vapour. But after he was stretch'd to such an height in his own fancy, that he could not look down from top to toe but his Eyes dazled at the Precipice of his Stature.'⁸⁵ In describing Parker's 'Hypochondria', Marvell is aping Parker's own method of satirical attack, in which he located 'the Anatomy of the Brain, the structure of the Spleen and Hypochondria' as an explanation of revelation, heterodox theology the 'Freaks and Frenzies' of 'Phanaticks.' Marvell reverses the accusation; Parker's bellicose and ostentatious writing style is the result of his own 'Hypochondria' – his hyperbolic denunciations of nonconformists a result of his own internal disorder.

In his use of the phrase 'swell'd', Marvell is also making an overt reference to Milton and Sir Francis Bacon (1561-1626). In his highly controversial text *The Doctrine & Discipline of Divorce* (published first in 1643, then expanded and revised in 1644) Milton railed against the idea of 'Custome', and those traditions and concepts which are only taught and never intellectually challenged – those who only read from 'the book of implicit knowledge' will be poisoned by it:

proving but of bad nourishment in the concoction, as it was heedlesse in the devouring, puffs up unhealthily, a certaine big face of pretended learning, mistaken among credulous men, for the wholsome habit of soundnesse and good constitution; but is indeed no other, then that swoln visage of counterfeit knowledge and literature.⁸⁶

These men then proceed to pollute the 'publick' discourse, as they attain positions of authority: 'the common climer into every chaire, where either Religion is preach't, or Law reported.'⁸⁷ To Milton, "swelling" is the emblematic antithesis of the kind of learning and scholar he outlines in *Areopagitica* – scriptural exegesis and active reading should be the bedrock of a Protestant nation in Milton's ideal republic,

⁸⁵ Marvell, *RT*, p.75.

⁸⁶ John Milton, *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, in *John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education*, ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2013), pp.105-169 (p.105).

⁸⁷ Milton, *Discipline of Divorce*, p.105.

instead institutions are led and debates are quashed by 'Custome' and the people led astray by the 'swoln visage' of conservative minds. In his influential treatise *The Advancement of Learning* (1605), Bacon extolled the virtues of knowledge – defending the principle of education against the accusations of its detractors. William A. Armstrong contends that Bacon wrote his treatise at a time when a significant number of writers were 'entirely hostile to the pursuit of learning' (in particular, scientific pursuits).⁸⁸ In his treatise, Bacon defends 'the excellency of learning and knowledge, and the excellency of the merit and true glory in the augmentation and propagation thereof.'⁸⁹ Though Bacon extolls the necessity of knowledge, and defends it against contemporary criticisms, Bacon does acknowledge the potential for its misuse.

Within his essay, Bacon identifies three potential scholars: as surmised by Armstrong, 'one kind is egotistic: he seeks power for himself. A second is nationalistic: he seeks to extend the dominion of his native land over other countries' – the third is different, and, in keeping with John Dury's vision, seeks to 'serve the entire human race', an impulse 'rooted in charity.'⁹⁰ In regards to theological reasoning or inquiry, Bacon argues for deep study and consideration of the Bible (as opposed to only receiving access to the text second hand, via a clergyman and through sermons), though includes a caution: 'to conclude therefore, let no man, upon a weak conceit of sobriety or an ill-applied moderation think or maintain that a man can search too far or be too well studied in the book of God's word or in the book of God's works; divinity or philosophy; but rather let men endeavour an endless progress or proficience in both; only let men beware that they apply both to charity, and not to swelling.'⁹¹ 'Swelling' is phrase repeated throughout Bacon's essay, used to refer to vainglorious scholars – using learning to puff out themselves or their

⁸⁸ One such theorist, Giovanni Francesco Pico (1470-1533), wrote a treatise in 1520 that threw 'doubt on the evidence provided by the five senses and on all forms of human learning, exalting the Christian religion as a way of life based on faith, not human reason' – to seek knowledge not provided by the Church 'vain and wasteful', and ultimately sinful: 'because the fall of Adam was due to his pursuit of knowledge [...] it is better to be ignorant than learned. William A. Armstrong, 'Introduction' in Francis Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning: Book I*, ed. by William A. Armstrong (London: the Athlone Press, 1975), pp.1-47 (p.4).

⁸⁹ Francis Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning: Book I*, ed. by William A. Armstrong (London: Athlone Press, 1975), p.51.

⁹⁰ William A. Armstrong, 'Introduction', p.11.

⁹¹ Bacon, *Advancement*, p.55.

arguments, without any genuine understanding. For instance, at the beginning of his *Instauratio magna* (1620) Bacon humbly beseeches his God, offering a prayer for scientists and scholars, that in their studies they will not cross any ethical boundaries – in an answer to the accusation that the Fall was the result of knowledge, Bacon foresees the “advancement of learning” as reversing this lapsarian state of being: ‘stripped of fantasies and vanity [...] discharged of the serpent’s poison which swells and puffs up the human soul, we do not aspire to know what is too exalted or beyond the bounds of discretion, but cultivate the truth in charity.’⁹²

Bacon repeatedly uses of the verb ‘swell’ to a faulty understanding, or the pursuit of knowledge to a vainglorious or egotistical end. In using the word, Marvell echoes both Milton and Bacon’s language, and depicts Parker as such a scholar. Marvell’s vignette also mirrors Milton’s image of a poisoned mind. With his ‘head swell’d’, Parker does indeed lose ‘sight’ of himself: ‘stretch’d to such an height in his own fancy, that he could not look down from top to toe but his Eyes dazled at the Precipice of his Stature.’ Descriptions of Parker’s ‘swelling’ are purposefully comedic – the reader, however, is consistently reminded that Parker’s text had a polemic and didactic purpose; to affirm royal absolutism, instil prejudice in his audience and encourage persecution of dissenters. Marvell echoes Milton in his discomfort that such men, who uphold orthodoxy purely to further their ambition, succeed in climbing into ‘every chaire’ of authority. It is of note that in this vignette Parker stands before a crowd – his polemic is being ‘elevated’ by two official channels, in his position as a cleric and his licensed publications. His ‘conceit’, while framed as an intensely personal, medical affliction, will be disseminated if not held in check.

Unlike Hobbes, Marvell does not offer his readers an account of the origin or cause of heresy as a concept.⁹³ Instead Marvell echoes the tradition of tracing

⁹² Francis Bacon, ‘*Great Instauration preliminaries*’, in *The Oxford Francis Bacon*, ed. by Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, 16 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), XI, pp.2-26 (p.23).

⁹³ In fact, as John Marshall argues, during the Restoration “heresy” was an incredibly nebulous concept: ‘Early modern Europeans inherited identifications of “heresy” and characterizations of “heretics” from a host of frequently republished patristic and medieval works. That these works commanded authority in defining and anathematizing “heresy” was due both to deep reverence for the Fathers, and to the belief that contemporary “heretical” challenges to “orthodoxy” were rehearsals of preceding “heresies”. According to Early Modern “Orthodox” Catholics and Protestants, contemporary “heretics” such as Anabaptists, anti-Trinitarians, Familists, Arminians, and Quakers were repeating medieval and patristic “heresies” such as Catharism, Manicheanism, Arianism, Gnosticism, and Pelagianism.’ John Marshall, ‘Defining and redefining heresy up to Locke’s *Letters Concerning Toleration*’, in *Heresy*,

“heresy”, hereisography – however, instead of cataloguing and denigrating the various sects, Marvell traces back the “error” to the behaviour of the clergy. One of the prevailing metaphors employed by heresiographers when castigating dissenters was that of disease. As previously discussed, when attacking nonconformists allusions to mad, erratic dissenting preachers were *de rigueur* – but in cataloguing “heresy”, it is the very beliefs of nonconformists that are a virulent scourge. As noted by John Marshall, this rhetoric was found frequently in the writings of the Church Father’s: ‘Tertullian spoke of heretical “words that spread like cancer”; Jerome of the need to cut away the “putrid flesh” of heresy in order to save the body; and Augustine of a physican amputating a diseased member.’⁹⁴ This rhetoric was echoed by writers in the seventeenth century, reacting to the recent political and religious tumult. Thomas Edwards’ *Gangræna*’s very title echoes this history, nonconformists figured as a flesh eating disease, ravishing the body politic: ‘*as in a cleare and true Glasse, every impartiall and ingenuous Reader may plainly behold the many Deformities and great Spots of the Sectaries of these times ... Plague spots, Feaver spots, Leprosie spots, Scurvey spots.*’⁹⁵ Edwards’ diatribe had a cultural impact, with Thomas Jenner (1607-1676) – in his *Quakerism Anatomiz’d and confuted* (1670) –recalling Edwards’ central metaphor to warn his readers of the ‘spreading gangrene of Quakerism in the Kingdom.’⁹⁶ Marvell however inverts this image, the ambition of the clergy (from which all theological disputes springs) is the cause of tumult: ‘the New Disease which was so generally propagated then, and ever since transmitted to some of their Successors, that it hath given reason to inquire whether it only happened to those men as it might to others’ has resulted in an ‘Plague-sore in open Persecution.’⁹⁷ It is not sectarians who are poisoning the discourse, but those who seek to extirpate systems of belief.

The imagery of disease was deeply rooted in invectives aimed at nonconformists, and a keystone in discussions that validated the idea of active

Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture, ed. by David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp.254-281 (p.254).

⁹⁴ Marshall, ‘Defining and redefining heresy’, p.260.

⁹⁵ Thomas Edwards, *The third part of Gangæna. Or, A new and higher discovery of the errors, heresies, blasphemies, and insolent proceedings of the sectaries of these times* (Lomdon: Printed for Ralph Smith, 1646), sig.*r.

⁹⁶ Thomas Jenner, *Quakerism Anatomiz’d and Confuted* (Dublin: s.n., 1670), sig.A2v.

⁹⁷ Marvell, *SHE*, p.126.

persecution. Walsham contends that, 'in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England it was widely believed that persecution of a false religion and its adherents was not merely permissible but, moreover, a laudable and virtuous act of devotion and piety.'⁹⁸ Roger L'Estrange wrote in his tract *Toleration Discuss'd* (first published in 1663 and regularly reprinted in response to calls for toleration) that religious homogeneity was, 'the *Ciment* of both *Christian, and Civil Societies*: Take That away, and the *Parts* drop from the *Body*.'⁹⁹ Those who, like Marvell, opposed systematic oppression were solitary voices in the debate as 'the chorus of voices vehemently defending the necessity, if not the virtue, of persecution vastly outnumbered the small minority who cried passionately and on principle for toleration.'¹⁰⁰ Sectarians were not simply viewed as a threat to Anglican authority, but also to social order:

By the 1670s and 1680s, a more secular rhetoric of reason of state was beginning to take root more widely within English society. Roger L'Estrange and others would accept that matters of "meere religion" and personal faith were essentially outside the jurisdiction of the civil authorities but they justified persecution as a necessary remedy of the chaos and anarchy that typically resulted from untrammelled consciences.¹⁰¹

If not to endorse religious sovereignty, persecution of dissenting voices thus served as a means of repressing personal freedoms and individual conscience. Maintaining Church unity – and maintaining the illusion of a "whole" – superseded the need to account for individual conscience. Poole argues that 'sixteenth- and seventeenth-century orthodoxies stressed unity and universality: one nation was dependent upon one church. The body politic and the body of Christ were to be coterminous, integral, entire [...] this call to unity was taken up by writers of strikingly diverse ecclesiastical perspectives; while those arguing for episcopacy and those advocating Presbyterianism, for example, may have differed in their conception of church government, there was no question but that there could be only one church.'¹⁰² In this environ Paul's letter to the Ephesians – '*there is one body, and one Spirit [...]* One

⁹⁸ Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, p.39.

⁹⁹ Roger L'Estrange, *Toleration Discuss'd; In Two Dialogues: The Second Edition much enlarged* (London: Printed by A. C. for Henry Brome, 1673), p.234.

¹⁰⁰ Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, p.49.

¹⁰¹ Walsham, *Charitable Hatred*, p.49.

¹⁰² Poole, *Radical Religion*, p.2.

Lord, one faith, one baptism, One God, and Father of all' (4.4-6) – served as ample ammunition in order to justify the need to keep the Church as a complete entity, and to thus stamp out dissenting congregations.¹⁰³ For instance, in *The Fortresse of fathers, earnestlie defending the puritie of religion* (1566) the writer expounds that, 'there is one word, one Scripture, one Baptisme, and one death of Christ, one Father, one Religion, and one Charitie.'¹⁰⁴ This attitude ensured that those uncomfortable conforming to this 'one Religion' faced accusations of weakening the state, by dividing the faith into different factions and sects, as 'this multiplication and confusion of religious identities destabilized systems of order and confounded traditional social and ecclesiastical categories.'¹⁰⁵

The characteristics that separated the sects from the main body of the Church – whether divergence on the issue of baptism, a differing scriptural interpretation, or issue taken with the episcopacy – were thus often imagined as physical deformities. In George Spinola's *Rules to Get Children by with Handsome Faces* (1642), this deformity even extends to the participants of these sects; 'I have not found such strange exotick, forrain, ridiculous deformities, and non-conformities of parts in the Faces Limbs of any kinde of Men, as in those which at this day are familiarly called the Sectaries and Separatists.'¹⁰⁶ Multiple catalogues describing the physical deformities of nonconformists, replete with accompanying images, such as Spinola's found their way to the press – a propaganda tool used to inspire prejudice against those daring to threaten the "Whole" body of the church. In Marvell's prose, this scrutiny of the nonconformist body is transferred onto the likes of Parker, and other hard-line Anglicans participating in this persecution:

When a Man is once possess'd with this Fanatick kind of Spirit, he imagines, if a Shoulder do but itch, that the World has gall'd it with leaning on't so long, and therefore he wisely shrugs to remove the Globe to the other. If he chance

¹⁰³ *The Bible: Authorized King James Version with Apocrypha*, ed. by Robert Carroll and Stephen Prickett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), Ephesians 4.4-6 (p.241).

¹⁰⁴ Anon., *The Fortresse of Fathers, earnestlie defending the puritie of Religion, and Ceremonies* (Emden: Printed by Egidius van der Erve, 1566), sig.A4r.

¹⁰⁵ Poole, *Radical Religion*, p.3.

¹⁰⁶ George Spinola, *Rvles to Get Children by with Handsome Faces* (London: Printed by R. H., 1642), sigs.A1v-A2r.

but to sneeze, he salutes himself, and courteously prays that the *Foundations of the Earth* be not shaken.¹⁰⁷

Here the motif of the body politic is burlesqued, and conflated with a reference to the classical figure of Atlas. It is not “deformity” afflicting this body politic, but the desire to control ‘the Globe’ and be the focal site of power; it is coveting authoritarian hegemony that is the true ‘Fanatick kind of Spirit.’ Parker’s fascination with the nonconformist disposition provides Marvell the window to offer his own diagnosis of his adversary: ‘he cannot sure take it unkindly if I enter into a further consultation of the Nature of his indisposition, and the remedies; seeing he has so voluntarily interested me therin, and his Readers.’¹⁰⁸

In his comedy Marvell subverts the tropes used against nonconformists, weaponising them against the promoters of prejudice. The spectre of these human casualties lends a bitter edge to his irony. In his serious works he invests yet further in his investigation of nonconformist suffering – inviting his readers to actively sympathise with members of society broadly demonised and isolated. The issue of human suffering is one he must render ‘without jesting, for the matter is too serious.’¹⁰⁹

Suffering

A defining feature of the language of heresiography and anti-nonconformist tracts is the use of monstrous and grotesque imagery to characterise, degrade and bestialise nonconformists. This is strongly evidenced in the most notorious and influential catalogue of nonconformity, Edwards’ vitriolic *Gangræna*. The image of a ‘monster’ is a recurring motif throughout Edwards’ work. In Edwards’ rhetoric, tolerating nonconformists is unacceptable, the threat they pose constantly gestating and threatening to birth a revolution; ‘the monster of Toleration conceived in the wombe of the Sectaries long ago, they having grown big with it ever since.’¹¹⁰ Though

¹⁰⁷ Marvell, *RT2*, p.225.

¹⁰⁸ Marvell, *RT2*, p.226.

¹⁰⁹ Marvell, *SHE*, p.145.

¹¹⁰ Edwards, *First Part: Gangræna*, p.56.

Edwards' project is an encyclopaedic record of each nonconformist sect's "errors" and transgressions, various sects become indistinguishable from each other: 'strange monsters having their heads of Enthusiasme, their bodies of Antinomianisme, their thighs of Familisme, their legs and feet of Anabaptisme, their hands of Arminianisme.'¹¹¹ Here Edwards proffers a reimagining and perversion of the body politic, one led not by a logical head, but by impulsive "Enthusiasme." In his imagining the nation is being terrorised by a chaotic, sinister amalgam of various, confusing "ismes" – there is no sense of the human congregation, made of individuals, representing these "ismes", instead these religious communities are hotbeds of dangerous ideas: 'Tis sad, very sad to see our *Anglia* [...] turned into *Africa*, new monsters every day, such horrid blasphemies, intolerable wickednesses, &c. Shall Vipers still be suffered to eate up the very bowels of their mother?'¹¹²

Here Edwards' intolerance extends beyond nonconformity of religious expression and into exoticism – the '*Africa*' he asks his reader to imagine that of fantastical travellers' tales rather than that of reality. Edwards' choice of the Latin '*Anglia*' providing both a neat alliterative link to '*Africa*', and evoking the term Anglican – nation and national Church are neatly rolled into one. These 'new monsters' threaten both religious and national security: 'Here the whole Papacie is destroyed; Anabaptists, Antitrinitarians, Arrians, and such monsters raised again from Hell, partly in Germany, partly in Transylvania, never found a sharper enemy.'¹¹³ The language of *Gangræna* reveals the entrenched and rampant paranoia of its author, but it is also emblematic of his wider political strategy. David Loewenstein argues that, 'besides expressing deep religious anxieties, this language of monstrosity dehumanized heretics, making violent assault on heresy, schisms, and religious toleration appear more justified and natural.'¹¹⁴ Marvell's readers would have been well aware and inundated by this cultural climate of dehumanising language – whether they were witness to or subject to its denigration – and would have been acclimatised to the portrayal of nonconformity (repeatedly conflated with the much

¹¹¹ Edwards, *First Part: Gangræna*, p.14.

¹¹² Edwards, *Second Part: Gangraena*, p.19.

¹¹³ Edwards, *Second Part: Gangraena*, p.160.

¹¹⁴ David Loewenstein, 'Toleration and the Specter of Heresy in Milton's England', in *Milton and Toleration*, ed. by Sharon Achinstein and Elizabeth Sauer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp.45-71 (p.46).

more serious offence of “heresy”) as monstrous and grotesque. The aim of the imagery was ultimately to justify inhumane treatment and a curbing of liberty, and create a culture in which nonconformists were feared and violence against them seen as necessary to ensure national stability. In *A Short Historical Essay* Marvell seeks to dismantle this established rhetoric and restore sympathy for those being oppressed both by a stigmatising culture and political oppression.

To achieve this, Marvell repeatedly calls on his reader to consider the persecution faced by members of the early Christian church, and apply that precedent to the contemporary plight of nonconformists. Marvell opens his pamphlet by reminding the reader of the origins of their Church – a religious movement founded and developed under the oppressive regime of the Roman Empire. In Marvell’s figuring of the history, persecution looms large as a repeated refrain: ‘the Christians having in a severe Apprenticeship of so many Ages learned the Trade of suffering.’¹¹⁵ Marvell’s use of the phrases ‘Apprenticeship’ and ‘Trade’ are significant. Marvell’s focus is not eminent historic Christian figures – the famed martyrs renowned, canonised and idolised for their sacrifice and suffering – but on the pains of the nameless, faceless majority; ordinary working people (those *with* a ‘Trade’), not just intellectuals and luminaries. This willingness to suffer as an expression of faith is noted by Marvell as one of the ultimate virtues: ‘Christian Valour and Contumacy to Death, under the most Exquisite Torments, for their holy Profession.’¹¹⁶ Again, Marvell calls upon his readers to consider the actual, physical hardship – the ‘Exquisite Torments’ – faced and inflicted upon those who refuse to concede in a matter of conscience. This puts Marvell in contrast to the approach of his contemporaries; for instance, Milton’s approach to the treatment of heterodox thinkers in *Of True Religion*:

It cannot be deny’d that the Authors or late Revivers of all these Sects or Opinions, were Learned, Worthy Zealous, and Religious Men, as appears by their lives written, and the same as many of their Eminent and Learned followers, perfect and powerful in the Scriptures, holy and unblameable in their lives: it cannot be imagin’d that God would desert such painful and

¹¹⁵ Marvell, *SHE*, p.122.

¹¹⁶ Marvell, *SHE*, p.122.

zealous labourers in his Church, and oft times great sufferers for their Conscience, to damnable Errors & a Reprobate sense, who had so often implor'd the assistance of his Spirit.¹¹⁷

In this passage Milton asks his readers to focus on the founders of certain sects, 'Religious Men' with a genuine connection to God – his focus is on the 'Learned', 'Worthy' and 'Eminent' figures within these sects, not the rank and file. It is these figures Milton envisions will illicit the sympathy and compassion of his audience – presumably other 'Eminent and Learned' Men. These men may hold suspect 'Opinions', but they are not heretics: 'Heresie is in the Will and choice profestly against Scripture; error is against the Will, in misunderstanding the Scripture after all sincere endeavours to understand it rightly.'¹¹⁸

Milton takes the time to explain the differing 'Opinions' of these sects – sects Edwards so unceremoniously melded and stitched together to form his “monsters”:

the Lutheran holds Consubstantiation, an error indeed, but not mortal. The Calvinist is taxt with Predestination [...] The Anabaptist is accus'd of Denying Infants their right to Baptism; again they deny nothing but what the Scripture denies them. The Arian and Socian are charg'd to [...] reject [the Holy Trinity] as Scholastic Notions, not to be found in Scripture.¹¹⁹

Gordon Campbell contends that in Milton's 'tolerationist thesis' he maintains that nonconformists should not be punished over indifferent religious doctrines, and that these religious debates 'are inevitable, are pursued in good faith, may contain errors, and are not crucial to salvation.'¹²⁰ By listing the differences between these sects and the orthodoxy of the Anglican Church, Milton intends to demystify the sects his readers would have elsewhere encountered and seen described as 'grotesque' – the use of anaphora makes the passage read like a list, rendering these Scriptural debates a matter of fact tone. They are entirely intellectual, and pose no threat outside of the private sphere. This tone diffuses the anger and flamboyant imagery found in the

¹¹⁷ Milton, *Of True Religion*, p.453.

¹¹⁸ Milton, *Of True Religion*, p.452.

¹¹⁹ Milton, *Of True Religion*, p.452.

¹²⁰ Gordon Campbell and Thomas N. Corns, *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p.368.

likes of Edwards' work. The verbs Milton uses to discuss these different sects are measured and dispassionate: 'taxt', 'is accus'd' and 'are charg'd'. These terms are clinical and legalistic, the kind used in a court of law. Milton suggests that when these ideas are put on trial, while found wanting, they are not guilty. However egregious these nonconformist "errors" might be, they pale in comparison to the greatest and most threatening error – the spectre that Milton figures as threatening the nation: 'Popery is the only or greatest Heresie.'¹²¹ Milton asks his readers to sympathise with the logical processes and study that lead 'Eminent' nonconformists to separate from the Anglican Church, whilst also redirecting their attention to the "ultimate" enemy; the spiritual and political authoritarianism represented by "Popery." Milton argues that it is the duty of all Protestants to strengthen their faith through a 'constant reading of Scripture', interrogating every established reading and interpretation therein, every man 'ever learning and never taught'; nonconformists forming differing, possibly erroneous opinions or beliefs is a natural consequence of this process, and a risk every Protestant runs when they 'take the pains of understanding their Religion by their own diligent study.'¹²² The more 'damnable Errors & a Reprobate sense' belong to belligerent legislators who are hampering this 'learning' via discriminatory laws. Milton attempts to inspire the sympathy of his readers by focusing on the overall health of the Protestant faith – nonconformity figuring as a dialogue concerning the scripture (a dialogue "heretically" prohibited by the Catholic Church), a dialogue that must be tolerated in order to advance the Reformation and move closer to the truth.

In contrast, Marvell is concerned by both the spiritual *and* the visceral suffering – particularly the physical suffering – of the followers of these sects, the ordinary people making extraordinary sacrifices for their faith: 'it is an inhumane and unchristian thing of those Faith-stretchers, whosoever they may be, that either put mens persons or their consciences upon the torture, to rack them the length of their notions.'¹²³ 'Faith-stretchers' an ironic pun, a play on the image of the rack (an instrument of torture no longer used and already viewed as a barbaric anachronism), and its role in "stretching" unrepentant preachers in various demeaning ways, a joke

¹²¹ Milton, *Of True Religion*, p.452.

¹²² Milton, *Of True Religion*, p.456.

¹²³ Marvell, *SHE*, p.146.

that would not feel out of place in one of Marvell's animadversions – however the joke ends there, it is not continued and expanded into a comic vignette, distorted into burlesque fashion. The irony makes plain Marvell's derision and disdain for the legislation that persecuted nonconformists, but the comedic potential of the image is not mined by further exploration, or used as a showcase for Marvell's deft wit. His, and by extension the reader's, attention is firmly on the 'persons' placed in such a precarious position: 'For one that is a Christian in good earnest, when a Creed is imposed, will sooner eat fire than take it against his judgement. There have been Martyrs for Reason, & it was mainly in them. But how much more would men be so for reason, Religionated and Christianized!'¹²⁴ Marvell is asking the reader to consider the imposition put upon these Christians (stressing their Christianity, and therefore their similarity to the rest of the Anglican populace) being asked to deny a sincerely, deeply held belief – a belief they may possibly view as a tenant of their eventual salvation or damnation. In such matters of faith, the stakes are incredibly high – too high to be left to the vagaries and (as Marvell argues) the ineptitude of the established Church: 'No, a Good Christian will not, cannot attune and indenture his conscience over, to be represented by others.'¹²⁵

The history of the church that Marvell presents his readers places a focus on the persecution inflicted on Christians by the hands of other Christians – and the perseverance of the oppressed, and their patience, 'the case of all true Christians worshipping God under the power and violence of their Persecutors.'¹²⁶ Though Marvell does not satirise this ironic reversal (Roman persecution replaced by a Christian one), he highlights the ironic potential for his readers: 'resolved to give them their full of Persecution. And it seem'd a piece of wit rather than malice, to pay them in their own Coyn, and to Burlesque them in earnest, by the repetition and heightening of the same severities upon them, that they had practiced upon others.'¹²⁷ The image of a 'Coyn' has a particular resonance in the pamphlet, symbolic of the ambition and avarice Marvell accuses the episcopacy of possessing. In considering Marvell's relationship with the Anglican church in both his role as an MP and in his

¹²⁴ Marvell, *SHE*, p.146.

¹²⁵ Marvell, *SHE*, p.146.

¹²⁶ Marvell, *SHE*, p.123.

¹²⁷ Marvell, *SHE*, p.155.

prose, Philip Connell argues that ‘Marvell remained consistent in his commitment to a capacious and tolerant national Church.’¹²⁸ This activism reflects his lifelong association with the nonconformist community; as N. H. Keeble and Joanna Harris document, ‘the young Marvell would have encountered in Hull a pronounced Puritan and nonconformist culture’, the city both having a robust dissenting community and acting as ‘a major trading port with the Protestant Low Countries through which much of England’s trade in books and pamphlets with the Protestant exiles abroad was conducted.’¹²⁹ As an MP it was his duty to serve this community; ‘by the time he was elected in 1659 he represented a constituency that was allegedly “two-thirds” Presbyterian, according to Charles Whittington, Collector of Customs at Hull.’¹³⁰ In the Commons he supported legislation that would lessen the persecution of religious dissenters, and ‘in July 1660 Marvell appears to have taken a leading parliamentary role in promoting a scheme of “reduced” episcopacy’, going as far as to act as a teller for this legislation.¹³¹ Marvell also actively opposed moves in 1670 to strengthen legislation that restricted conventicles, writing to his nephew William Popple to complain about ‘the terrible Bill against Conventicles’, referring to these political machinations as ‘the Quintessence of arbitrary Malice.’¹³² Marvell, who rarely spoke in the House, gave a speech on November 21st, defending those who had been arrested in London protesting the 1670 Conventicle Act.¹³³ His letters to the Hull Corporation reveal the extent to which he worked to mediate on behalf of his nonconformist constituents, and in his personal life ‘the evidence of Marvell’s letters to friends points to a close affiliation with nonconformist circles in London, including a close-knit group of eminent patrons of Restoration nonconformity: Sir Edward Harley, Sir Philip Harcourt, and Philip Lord Wharton.’¹³⁴

¹²⁸ Philip Connell, ‘Marvell and the Church’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.9> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-19 (p.13).

¹²⁹N. H. Keeble and Johanna Harris, ‘Marvell and Nonconformity’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.10> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-24, (p.2).

¹³⁰ Keeble and Harris, ‘Marvell and Nonconformity’, p.3.

¹³¹ Philip Connell, ‘Marvell and the Church’, p.6.

¹³² Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, p.314.

¹³³ Keeble and Harris, ‘Marvell and Nonconformity’, p.4.

¹³⁴ Keeble and Harris, ‘Marvell and Nonconformity’, p.4, p.6.

As a politician Marvell openly campaigned for the interests of the nonconformist community, reflecting the interests of his constituents and members of his personal acquaintance. Connell contends that Marvell's 'activities both before and after the Restoration suggest that he was just as fully committed (if not more so) to a "comprehensive" national Church settlement to which moderate Puritans might conscientiously subscribe'; taking to print (and the anonymity he assumed in publishing *Mr. Smirke* and *A Short Historical Essay*) afforded Marvell the opportunity to go further in his critique of ecclesiastic corruption.¹³⁵ His protest against increasingly discriminatory legislation centres on appealing to the reader's ability to empathise with the suffering of nonconformists. Marvell's focus is not just on arraigning the church establishment, he directs the reader to consider the effect on the populace, past and present: 'the sufferings of the Laity were become the Royalties of the Clergy.'¹³⁶ The behaviour Marvell identifies is a far cry from Christian ideals: 'Would you Anathemize, Banish, Imprison, Execute us, and burn our Books? You shall taste of this Christian Fare, and you shall relish it.'¹³⁷ Ann Hughes suggests that the ancient persecution that Marvell catalogues was contemporaneous, and ironic: 'why was it hard to be a "persecutor" in the 1640s? In the first place, Presbyterians like Edwards only a short time before had been the victims of persecution by Laudian bishops. Being (precariously) in power and attacking fellow-Protestants was a novel and uneasy position for former Nonconformists.'¹³⁸ This volte-face by the formerly oppressed provided ample room for criticism.

Responding to the conformist policies brought in by Laud, the puritan Sir Simonds D'Ewes (1602-1650) asserted that; 'it is the undoubted mark or brand of the Church *Antichristian* and *Malignant*, to persecute; of the Church *Christian Orthodox* and truly *Catholike* to be persecuted.'¹³⁹ D'Ewes' *An Historical Account* (1645) precedes Marvell's *A Short Historical Essay* both in its framing of a contemporary

¹³⁵ Connell, 'Marvell and the Church', p.7.

¹³⁶ Marvell, *SHE*, p.162.

¹³⁷ Marvell, *SHE*, p.151.

¹³⁸ Ann Hughes, 'Thomas Edwards' *Gangraena* and heresiological traditions', in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. by David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp.137-159 (p.153).

¹³⁹ Simonds D'Ewes, *The Primitive Practise for Preserving Truth. Or An Historical Narration shewing what course the PRIMITIVE Church anciently, and the best Reformed Churches since have taken to suppress Heresie and Schisme* (London: Henry Overton, 1645), p.1.

theological debate using historical precedent and in its insistence that magisterial oversight of matters of conscience or “heresy” constitutes a pernicious imposition: ‘it is likewise contrary to the practice of the best Princes, and the wisest States of this latter age of the world, to make matter of heresie it selfe a capital crime.’¹⁴⁰ This persecution echoes that faced by early Christians, a history Marvell directs his reader to consider:

and so the Pious Historian Pathetically goes on and deplores the Calamities that insued, to the loss of all that stock of Reputation, Advantage, Liberty, and Safety, which Christian people had by true Piety and adhereing strictly to the Rules of their Profession formerly acquired and injoyed, but had now forfeited [...] under Dioclesian’s *persecution*. And it was a *severe* one.¹⁴¹

Marvell is asking his readers to reframe their interpretation of nonconformists, transfiguring them from the “monsters” found in Edwards’ word to akin to the early Christians. In doing so he questions the very basis of the prejudice directed towards dissenters, even without publicly endorsing or acknowledging their variant beliefs. Those are matters of private conscience and should be free of secular intrusion.

When publishing both *Mr Smirke* and *A Short Historical Essay*, Marvell assumed the pseudonym ‘ANDREAS RIVETUS, *Junior*. Anagr. *RES NUDA VERITAS*.’ André Rivet (1572-1651) was a venerated Protestant theologian, famed for his exegesis of the Old Testament. Patterson argues that, ‘Rivet had taken his evidence from the three early church historians Eusebius, Socrates Scholasticus, and Sozomen, along with Ruffinus, and had spent some time describing the Council of Nicaea, in order to make the point that it was convened and controlled by Constantine the Great.’¹⁴² In assuming Rivet’s name, Marvell makes plain the earnestness of his scholarship – he is acknowledging his debt to Rivet’s legacy, and making clear his intention to offer his own reading of the history. In fact Marvell, when discussing the Council of Nicae, made use of the same sources – though his reading of the event was manifestly different. Though both texts share ‘ANDREAS RIVETUS’ as an “author”, and some of the same subject matter, they vary greatly – one a satiric animadversion, the

¹⁴⁰ D’Ewes, *An Historical Narration*, p.7.

¹⁴¹ Marvell, *SHE*, p.124.

¹⁴² Patterson, ‘Introduction’, p.17.

other a scathing indictment of the Church establishment. The difference in tone between the pamphlets – the shift between brevity and levity – is made clear from the offset. In *Mr Smirke* Marvell ironically dedicates his text ‘TO THE CAPTIOUS READER’, an acknowledgment of the inflammatory nature of his animadversion; ‘and I will answer for mine own faults, I ask thee no pardon.’¹⁴³ In *A Short Historical Essay*, Marvell doesn’t open with a dedication or justification – instead he dives straight into the history making a version of the history of the Council of Nicea available to those without access or the ability to translate versions of early Church history, and offers an interpretation of these events which is highly sceptical of Church authority. In Marvell’s idealistic formulation of the Anglican Church, there is a distinct separation of Church and state:

It being demonstrable, that a Religion instituted upon Justice betwixt Man and Man, Love to one another, yea even their Enemies, Obedience to the Magistrate in all Humane and Moral matters, and in Divine Worship upon a constant exercise therof, and as constant Suffering in that Cause, without any pretence or latitude for resistance, cannot, so long as it is true to it self in these things, fall within the Magistrates Jurisdiction.¹⁴⁴

His rhetorical strategy shifts between his comedic and earnest modes, recurrent themes emerge – both the promotion of personal conscience, a sympathy for the persecuted and a deep suspicion of autocratic institutions. The latter theme would take centre stage in his most incendiary work, *An Account of the Growth of Popery*.

¹⁴³ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.37.

¹⁴⁴ Marvell, *SHE*, p.122.

The Political Voice: Writing for the Public Sphere

I. The Politician

The previous chapter of this thesis considered how Marvell tailored his texts to appeal to different contemporary sensibilities in order to improve their rhetorical effectiveness. This chapter seeks to interrogate how this engagement was a result of, and sought to impact upon, the political culture of Restoration England; how Marvell took to and endeavoured to petition the public sphere. Petitioning (which had by precedent, and its crucial role during the Civil War and Interregnum, become established as a political right) as a means of political expression was being systematically oppressed by Charles' regime. Though not framed as a petition, in its desire to illuminate a public grievance and seek redress, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (1677) follows in the petitionary mould; the only difference being, that whilst petitions were usually addressed to an authority (the superior-suppliant relationship, and the subsequent tone of deference, a necessary mode in order to accomplish the ends of the petition and escape the charge of sedition), Marvell is instead appealing directly to the public, and specifically, the reader. Using petitionary norms as a lens through which to analyse *An Account*, this chapter will develop a new framework for approaching this text, revealing the explicitly radical aims of the author. What would be the point of these concerted attempts to sway public opinion if such an enterprise would not yield political change? This is a work that has been specifically calibrated to stir the public sphere, maximising controversy in order to demand an election. In his monograph *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain* Mark Knights charts the evolution of the British political landscape – arguing that the developments that occurred during the later Stuart period (namely the emergence of political parties) were both necessitated by and encouraged the growing public desire to express political opinions:

Men and women engaged in an ideological struggle about the nature of the church, the state, authority, and obedience. And there was a financial revolution that created a publicly funded national debt for the first time. These factors combined to produce a partisan political culture that was truly national

and in which the public became a routine, participating, part of the political process.¹

The way in which Marvell's text operates suggests an awareness of the fact (much maligned by those in authority) that a public will existed and needed to be consulted or placated; and would be contravened at great risk.

Marvell's pamphlets are not passive thought pieces – these works clearly have an agenda. Changing public opinion had the potential to change political realities. Marvell clearly acknowledges a public sphere – a strata of society engaged in politics, exchanging ideas, and demanding that their political representatives represent them, as will be discussed later in the chapter. Though he does not advocate for direct action, the contents of his pamphlets clearly intend to fuel anti-establishment sentiment in the hopes that popular dissatisfaction would prove a catalyst for change. Marvell published *An Account* in 1677, almost two decades into the reign of Charles II and at a critical juncture of British politics. 1679 would witness the lapse of the licensing act, the entrance of the Popish Plot into the national conversation and the beginnings of the Exclusion Crisis, the prelude to the Glorious Revolution of 1688, the moment in which the public chose to depose a Catholic royal (the rightful heir) in favour of a Protestant monarch. Though the road to a constitutional monarchy was long and winding, the balance gradually began to shift after 1688: royal absolutism had reached its nadir, as parliament – the body of representatives for the '*Knights, Citizens and Burgesses*' of the nation, men bound by duty to serve their constituents – would eventually become the foremost political power in the realm.² Marvell's writing, if it did not anticipate, welcomed this change, as he argued for increased political transparency and the necessity of honest political representation; by engaging with the public sphere, publishing an account of parliamentary process, a record of its intrigue and inadequacies, Marvell takes steps to affect this transparency, and hold the government to account. The reader is crucial to this process; inciting a reaction in the reader is Marvell's form of political protest. This thesis will further our understanding of this text by placing the reader at the forefront

¹ Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p.3.

² Marvell, *Account*, p.325.

of its analysis of Marvell's rhetorical strategy. Dissecting how Marvell appealed to the reader is critical to understanding his methodology as a polemicist.

The Restoration Public Sphere

The concept of a public sphere, and the idea of public opinion having legislative currency in an era in which politics was dominated by the elite, has been a point of contention for historians. It was the political theorist Jürgen Habermas who first brought the idea and the term into parlance in his history of bourgeois development, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1962). Habermas posited the 'bürgerliche Öffentlichkeit' (or "bourgeois public sphere") as a force that developed out of the 'bürgerliche Gesellschaft' ("civil society") which he locates as having been established in the High Middle Ages.³ As a result of 'the emergence of early finance and trade capitalism, the elements of a new social order were taking shape' – one in which those responsible for the nation's economic success, the middle class, sought to make their voices heard and to have an input into political decision making; an arena into which all but the upper echelon had previously been denied access to.⁴ In terms of British history, Habermas posits a definitive timeline:

A public sphere that functioned in the political realm arose first in Great Britain at the turn of the eighteenth century. Forces endeavouring to influence the decisions of state authority appealed to the critical public in order to legitimate demands before this new forum.⁵

Though Habermas alleges that this system of intellectual traffic only came into being in the eighteenth century, he locates several seventeenth century developments as the cornerstones of what would eventually become the public sphere, such as the rise in merchant trading, the exchange of news made widespread and commercialised by newspapers, and coffeehouses as sites of political debate. However, the essence of the public sphere – mass participation – is missing in the seventeenth century, according

³ Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. by Thomas Burger (London: Polity Press, 1992), p.xviii.

⁴ Habermas, *Public Sphere*, p.14.

⁵ Habermas, *Public Sphere*, p.56.

to Habermas' account. What is missing from the political climate of Marvell and his contemporaries is, as Habermas argues:

a more inclusive public of all private people, persons who – insofar as they were propertied and educated – as readers, listeners, and spectators could avail themselves via the market of the objects that were subject to discussion. The issues discussed became “general” not merely in their significance, but also in their accessibility: everyone had to *be able* to participate. Wherever the public established itself institutionally as a stable group of discussants, it did not equate itself with *the* public but at most claimed to act as a mouthpiece, in its name, perhaps even as its educator – the new form of bourgeois representation.⁶

This account of Britain's political development has been repeatedly called into question and revised by historians.

While some question whether this phenomenon existed even in the eighteenth century, others argue that this state of affairs can be seen functioning in the seventeenth century. Fast access to information on recent events, news of political tumults and gossip from town and court meant the literate populace had the opportunity to form an opinion as events unfurled, and feel a part of the national conversation.⁷ The coffeehouse as a space for reading was incredibly popular, and ‘by the end of the century there were more than five hundred in London alone’; as

⁶ Habermas, *Public Sphere*, p.37.

⁷ Steven Pincus details how information and discussion became democratised during this period: ‘the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 did not put an end to the public discussion of civic issues. Indeed, the state did much to facilitate the expansion of the discussion of political economy. It licensed the new coffeehouses which increasingly became the place where business transactions and economic discussion took place. The postmaster general, Roger Whitley, transformed the post office from an institution carrying the correspondence of the court into the primary vehicle of commercial interaction. In the 1670's Whitley proudly proclaimed that “the commerce of the nation is maintained by the ministration of this office”. The vast expansion of the post office combined with the remarkably rapid penny post in Greater London transformed the English into a letter-writing people. “Through the number of letters missive in England were not all considerable in our ancestor days”, commented one pamphleteer, they were now “prodigiously great”. In 1663 parliament passed the first turnpike act, which greatly improved the economic infrastructure of the country. By the last decade of the seventeenth Guy Miede, who had travelled widely throughout Europe, could confirm that “the English nation is the best provided of any for land-travel”. Despite Charles II's ambivalent attitude to public discussion, the Exclusion Crisis revealed that many had the normative value of the public sphere.’ Steven Pincus, ‘The state and civil society in early modern England: capitalism, causation and Habermas's bourgeois public sphere’, in *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England*, ed. by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp.213-231 (p.217).

Cambers observes, 'coffeehouses were novel commercial venues, which operated independently of traditional centres of authority like the church and the court, where [...] news, newspapers, and other printed material.'⁸ This independence afforded readers the opportunity to discuss contentious issues, and even engage in dissent; coffeehouses cannot be underestimated as sites of political discussion, and even action:

for the coffeehouse was easily the Restoration's most notorious center for conspiracy and communal reading alike. High Churchmen and nonconformists, gentlemen, retailers and mechanics – and men and women, for the notion that coffeehouses excluded women is baseless – all flocked to this attraction. There, even if it were not actually bought, "Any new Book especially, or Pamphlet, may be easily borrowed" – even "by him, that hath not Money enough, perhaps, to keep Company." There arose distinct zones within the coffeehouse, devoted to different topics of debate and boasting different tracts to be read. The "Treasonable Table," where opposition pamphlets could be discussed, became a major attraction.⁹

There is no doubt that the seditious topics Marvell skirted would have ensured he had a fair chance of earning a spot at Treasonable Tables all over the capital (which is why the government response to his tract was so immediate and reactionary).

Stephen Pincus' work has completely revised established notions of seventeenth century coffeehouses. Prevailing critical opinion frequently presented coffeehouses as exclusive and exclusionary, sites of frivolous discussion – Pincus however has proven the egalitarian nature of coffeehouses (both in clientele and reading material). Pincus goes even further, positing that these sites of dissemination for news, gossip and debate served as a political sphere – an area for active political engagement. Women, workmen, nonconformists, Anglicans, dandies and statesmen all frequented these establishments.¹⁰ This non-discriminatory aspect of the coffeehouse was greatly resented by the establishment.¹¹ Elitism is rife in their

⁸ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.183.

⁹ Johns, *The Nature of the Book*, pp.112-3.

¹⁰ Johns, *The Nature of the Book*, p.301.

¹¹ This is deftly typified in the pamphlet *Arguments Relating to a Restraint upon the Press* (1712), whose author bemoans that 'any new Book especially, or Pamphlet, may be easily borrowed by him

criticism: 'the misspending so much Time as the poorer Tradesmen do, in going about from one Coffee-House to another, pouring upon Seditious, Heretical and Treasonable Papers.'¹² The danger of "undesirables" being able to hear/read politically volatile material is one seen frequently in criticisms of both a free press, and of the social freedom and exchange of ideas seen in coffeehouses. Coffeehouses were favoured by a broad cross section of society, with people of all creeds and predications mingling together to discuss the very latest news from home and abroad. A religious radical could read with and dispute with a conservative Anglican in the coffeehouse, and the prospect of debate was central to the coffeehouses appeal: 'these were spaces for social, communal reading and [...] the sociability of the space helped to define the types of reading that went on in them.'¹³ The arguments enabled by this sociability were integral to the formation of public opinion. Marvell was undoubtedly aiming to make an impact in the coffeehouses and doing so would thus have guaranteed a wide dispersal. As regards audience, this makes Marvell's egalitarian arguments potentially more subversive. *An Account* frequently and fervently insists upon the rights of all, even 'the very meanest Commoner of England': everyone, regardless of 'Birth, Estates, Parts, and Merit' deserves some level of representation. Overall, this thesis supports the stance of Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, that: 'Jurgen Habermas distinguishes four phases of the public sphere, the ancient, the medieval (what he terms representative publicness), the bourgeois, and the degraded or transformed. While we find Habermas's periodisation a useful heuristic device, a conceptual starting off point, neither his rigidly stadial account nor his categories fit the patterns of historical development of early modern England.'¹⁴

that hath not Money enough, perhaps, to keep Company; easily, I say, because some People are much freer to lend out a bad Book than a good one' – these books, in the authors mind, pose an existential threat to the establishment: 'Appeals to the People are of most dangerous Consequence to all Magistracy.' Anon., *Arguments Relating to a Restraint upon the Press* (London: Printed by R. and J. Bonwick, 1712), p.14.

¹² Anon., *Restraint upon the Press*, p.24.

¹³ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, p.188.

¹⁴ Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, 'Rethinking the public sphere in early modern England', in *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England*, ed. by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp.1-30 (p.3).

Marvell took to the press in order to make an impact on the political sphere, inspiring action and asking his readers to expect more of their political representatives. Knights contends that:

there was a public eager to consume debate that was intemperate, personalized, abusive, passionate, and which traded printed accusations of lying and manipulation. Language was implicated in the irrationality and duplicity of the public sphere, for its debasement reflected and facilitated degraded discourse. There was no single public opinion that arrived, by consensus, at a version of the truth. And yet, at the same time, the polemicists' attacks on each other invoked, implicitly or explicitly, the notion of a governing public opinion, of a rational nation capable of discerning truth amid the lies it was being told.¹⁵

Though Marvell could not hope to persuade all, if a majority could be persuaded there was a distinct possibility for change. Though democracy, as understood by a modern reader, was not considered a viable form of governance, absolutism – as had been in effect for most of British history (only disrupted by Civil War) and in full effect in neighbouring European countries – was something to be feared and fought.

Marvell has a clear aim in writing *An Account*: to inspire the dissolution of parliament, which had been sitting for sixteen years, and bring on an election and alert the reader to institutional corruption. This chapter will explore how Marvell engaged with his readers and the political sphere. It will consider the role of the news communication – the Restoration marked a lacuna in the development of the news industry, as both the newsletter and printed newspaper fell under the remit of government control. *An Account* attacks the government's use of the news as propaganda; whilst offering his readers an alternate narrative, he is implicitly arguing for a free press as part of his polemic. It will consider the ways in which he established a collective identity between himself and his readership – his previous pamphlets established a connection between audience and author through self-conscious references to the act of reading and interpreting a text; in *An Account*,

¹⁵ Mark Knights, 'How rational was the later Stuart public sphere?', in *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England*, ed. by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp.252-69 (p.262).

rather than approach his readers as individuals, Marvell evokes a broader, national audience – the ‘*People*.’¹⁶ The full polemical potential of this approach will be considered, as well the ways in which Marvell altered his presentation of events from previous pamphlets to create a sense of urgency; the Declaration of Indulgence, portrayed as a an act of royal clemency in *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, is in *An Account* further proof of arbitrary government, and part of a broader conspiracy. The purpose of Marvell’s alternate history will be analysed. This section will also consider the ways in which Marvell’s text engaged with coffee house culture. Nigel Smith has contended that ‘it is precisely the coffee house and its role in the operation of the public sphere and the formation of public opinion that Marvell’s pamphlet assumed, exploited and celebrated’ – by examining the history of these sites of political activity, this thesis will scrutinise this idea.¹⁷

‘That height of contempt as to be *Gazetted*’

An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government differs from Marvell’s other pamphlets in both its means and its rhetorical ends. *An Account* represents a departure in form from Marvell’s other works of prose, being neither an animadversion nor an ecclesiastic treatise but instead an account of very recent history and a record of parliamentary activity. Criticism of certain members of the political establishment had been a feature of his writing previously, but whereas the focus of his previous publications had been the issue of toleration for nonconformists, *An Account* eschews this issue almost entirely. It is not a persecuted minority that he is asking his reader to consider, but the Protestant majority. Those who would be affected by an increase in political authoritarianism brought on by a crippled House of Commons – in *An Account* Marvell asks this majority to consider their rights, how their interests are represented, how a potential religious conversion would affect them, and how the behaviour of their King, or their MP, will affect their lives. In this line of argument there is no room for empathy for a maligned minority – Marvell is

¹⁶ Marvell, *Account*, p.374.

¹⁷ Smith, *The Chameleon*, p.304.

aiming to produce an autogenous response from his readers, tailoring his rhetoric to appeal to their sense of self-preservation.

Marvell begins an *Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* with a bold assertion of the necessity for, and the urgency of, political representation:

here the Subjects retain their proportion in the Legislature; the very meanest Commoner of England is represented in *Parliament*, and is party to those Laws by which the Prince is sworn to Govern himself and his people. No money is to be levied but by common consent. No man is for life, limb, goods, or liberty at the Sovereigns discretion: but we have the same Right (modestly understood) in our Propriety that the Prince hath in his Regality: and in all Cases where the King is concerned, we have our remedy as against any private person of the neighbourhood, in the Courts of Westminster Hall, or in the High Court of *Parliament*.¹⁸

'*Parliament*' is here italicised twice, a clear indication of its vital importance.

'*Parliament*' is the ultimate measure by which '*Arbitrary Government*' can and should be kept at bay – they are there to curb the power of 'the Prince' by imposing 'Laws.' There is no absolute sovereignty – every individual, even 'the very meanest Commoner', has recourse to express his grievances in 'the High Court of *Parliament*', and every man should have his interests represented by his political representative. However the ideal he describes (as the proceeding content of his pamphlet will show) is being undermined; the instruments in place to serve and the nation – 'Laws', the 'King', '*Parliament*' – have been sabotaged or corrupted. Marvell gives a documentary history of recent parliamentary activity – from the 1672 Declaration of Indulgence to its last session – charting events and recording both royal proclamations, clandestine discussions and speeches delivered to the House, information that would largely be unavailable to the public. Marvell offers a commentary on recent political events, from the marriage of James II to the Third Anglo Dutch War, revealing how in encouraging these events certain individuals at court had attempted to further strain

¹⁸ Marvell, *Account*, p.225.

relations with Holland in order to further bolster relations with France and strengthen the Royal prerogative:

And by this means they made it impossible for the Dutch, however desirous, to comply with England, excluded us from more advantageous terms, than we could at any other time hope for, and deprived us of an honest, and honourable evasion out of so pernicious a War, and from a more dangerous Alliance. So that now it appeared by what was done that the Conspirators securing their own fears at the price of the Publick Interest, and Safety, had bound us up more strait then ever, by a new Treaty, to the French Project.¹⁹

Nicholas von Maltzahn records that these actions went completely against prevailing public opinion: 'the Stuart sympathy for the French, and secret acceptance of subsidies from them in return for pro-French and pro-Catholic policies, were increasingly at odds with public suspicions of the French and widespread English anti-Catholicism.'²⁰ Repeatedly Charles II, like his father, used his ability to 'Prorogue the Parliament' in order to further his own political agenda and cripple parliament's ability to check these actions.²¹ During times of increased political tumult (such as the Popish Plot or the Exclusion Crisis) sales of *The London Gazette* – the newssheet serving as the official public record of parliamentary activity – dipped considerably, state sanctioned news omitting details craved by the public, falling from an average of seven thousand copies sold to five thousand copies between the year 1678 and 1681.²²

In order to understand and consider the ways in which Marvell sought to inform his readers, making them aware of a political reality that they may have had

¹⁹ James II's proxy marriage to the devout Roman Catholic Princess of Modena in 1673 occurred in complete defiance of parliament, who petitioned the King to secure an annulment, for which they were refused. This marriage served as further proof of James' Catholic loyalties – this fuelled public anxiety and led to the Exclusion Crisis. Though less overt in his religious proclivities, Charles was no less involved with Catholic powers. In 1670 Charles – in a bid to secure French support and funds – signed, in secret, The Treaty of Dover, in a conspiracy against the Dutch Republic. This would involve breaking the Triple Alliance and committing to the Third Anglo Dutch War. Charles also vowed to publicly convert to Catholicism, on the proviso that the French would quash any ensuing civil uprising. Though the full details were not made public until a century later, Charles' foreign policy decisions were widely suspected to be overtures to the French and were popularly despised. Marvell, *Account*, p.267.

²⁰ von Maltzahn, 'Introduction', p.180.

²¹ Marvell, *Account*, p.274.

²² John Childs, 'The Sales of Government Gazettes during the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-81', in *The English Historical Review*, 102 (1987), 103-6 (p.104).

limited or only partial access to, we must first explore the potential ways in which his readership could receive, and interact with, the news. Throughout the sixteenth century, news of the affairs of court and international events had been transmitted via many means including ballads, proclamations and written correspondence, a form of dispersal that evolved into the then nebulous genre of the newsletter, which was sometimes sent within personal, private correspondence – it was political crisis that transformed the marketplace: ‘printed newsbooks were a product of the English Revolution. Beginning in November 1641, armies of titles stormed the presses.’²³ These newsbooks kept the public abreast of the unfurling drama – often brazenly partisan and often inaccurate (with some titles notorious for their outright lies).²⁴ they sought an audience with either a confirmed bias or one susceptible to their political agenda, such as the fervently royalist *Mercurius Aulicus*.²⁵ Compared to the period of furious news production during the Civil War, the Restoration saw a dramatic reduction in the number of news outlets. In the wake of the Restoration, state control over the news increased. The secretaries of state, whose main purview was intelligence gathering (their role included controlling and monitoring the Post Office), also took on the role of intelligence dissemination and effectively established a monopoly over both printed and written news – only official newsletters, produced by these secretaries, were tolerated.²⁶ Given their remit over the Post Office, stifling the competition was also an important part of their role.²⁷

²³ Ian Atherton, ‘The Itch Grown a Disease: Manuscript Transmission of News in the Seventeenth Century’, in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Joad Raymond (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1999), pp.36-65 (p.52).

²⁴ These texts had a far reach, as has been illustrated by the work of Joad Raymond: ‘people of all literate classes, from Nehemiah Wallington [a committed puritan of the artisan class] and John Rous [a diarist] to the Earl of Essex and Charles II, read newsbooks’, with the illiterate having this information read to them – oral transmission ensuring an even wider dispersal of the contents. Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English newsbooks, 1641-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p.44.

²⁵ Marcus Nevitt, ‘Women in the Business of Revolutionary News: Elizabeth Alkin, “Parliament Joan,” and the Commonwealth Newsbook’, in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Joad Raymond (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1999), pp.84-108 (p.84).

²⁶ Peter Fraser, *Intelligence of the Secretaries of State: and their monopoly of Licensed News 1660-1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), p.1.

²⁷ ‘It fell to the lot of the Secretaries of State to prosecute all who infringed their legal monopoly of news [...] All news, whether printed or in manuscript, that was not derived from the Secretary’s office or officially licensed, was considered “false news”, and declared illegal by proclamation and order in council.’ Fraser, *Intelligence of the Secretaries of State*, p.115.

From September 1666 and to June 1679 (when the pressure of the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis brought on a lapse in press regulation) *The London Gazette* – under the control of the state censor, Roger L’Estrange – was the only English newspaper.²⁸ Whereas, for instance, *The Parliamentary Intelligencer* announced to its readers that it was ‘For Information of the People’, *The London Gazette* guaranteed its readership that it was ‘By Authority.’²⁹ Little more than a mouthpiece for the Government, the *Gazette* was made up of almost entirely international news, with little attention paid to domestic affairs, unless by design of the Crown.³⁰ L’Estrange’s censorious stranglehold on the printed news market backfired significantly, as ‘his failure to satisfy the public was notorious.’³¹ The sphere of the newsletter also came to be dominated by two voices: Henry Muddiman and Joseph Williamson, both secretaries of state, attempted to set up competing empires, though Muddiman was the clear victor.³² At its height, Muddiman’s newsletter had a circulation of approximately 150, much higher than his competitors.³³ In his biography of Muddiman, J. G. Muddiman charts the career of the prolific “newsmonger”, who throughout his career shifted between the medium of printed and written news – until 1666 there were ‘no other news-books in existence at this time than those written by L’Estrange, and no other news-letters other than those sent out by Muddiman’, who had been granted “free postage” by the Post-Master General – though Williamson created his own competing service in 1666, the price of postage meant his work had limited reach: ‘owing to the heavy postage rates, the news found in London coffee-houses did not circulate in the country, and Williamson’s competition with Muddiman was of the feeblest kind.’³⁴ Muddiman’s newsletter was

²⁸ Atherton, ‘Itch grown a disease’, p.53.

²⁹ *The Parliamentary Intelligencer*, Issue I, 26 December 1659; *The London Gazette*, 1 February 1665 < <https://www.thegazette.co.uk/London/issue/24/page/1> > [accessed 2nd September, 2019].

³⁰ Fraser notes that; ‘the *London Gazette* usually began with an item of domestic news from one of the English ports, and concluded with an official announcement and advertisements. Occasionally it treated its readers to a narrative of some engagement at sea, and of course there were the proclamations and Tory addresses.’ Fraser, *Intelligence of the Secretaries of State*, p.53.

³¹ J. G. Muddiman, *The King’s Journalist, 1659-1689; Studies in the Reign of Charles II* (London: John Lane, 1923), p.172.

³² In comparison to the *Gazette*, Muddiman’s newsletter was a far superior source of domestic news: The chief constituents were as follows: shipping news [...]; the proceedings of Parliament; the movements of the King [...]; and finally the various accidents of the time, fires, duels, the arrest of seditious publishers, conventiclers, highwayman, and so on.’ Fraser, *Intelligence of the Secretaries of State*, p.55.

³³ Atherton, ‘Itch grown a disease’, p.53.

³⁴ Muddiman, *The King’s Journalist*, pp.172-173.

popular, and he was lauded for his accuracy, however his success and visibility brought its own limitations: 'Muddiman [...] was subject to no supervision. Prudence of course, prevented him from making comments in his news-letters which might be unacceptable to the Government, and he did not correspond with disloyal subscribers.'³⁵ In the 1640s readers had choice in terms of which newsletter or newspaper they wished to subscribe to; readers in the 1670s had far fewer options.

Though arguably more accurate (though no less likely to partisanship) than the newsbooks and newsletters of the 1640s, the threat of censorship and the need to tow the government line became more pressing, and the likelihood of the public receiving information openly critical of the government or its policies through their news source decreased.³⁶ There is also the issue of access – those with connections in Whitehall would have a direct line of contact, and would be privy to any information their associates felt willing to communicate. In his own correspondence to both his nephew, William Popple (1638-1708), and his constituents in Hull, Marvell was an avid reporter of current events. Not every citizen would have had such a contact. For those without either private connections or sufficient disposable income, printed newspapers were an important resource. In his survey of news distribution and circulation, Ian Atherton makes clear the social and economic differences between printed and manuscript news: 'printed news was for everyone, even those who could not afford to buy it [...] Newsletters by comparison were for the elite, their very cost putting them out of the reach of the masses.'³⁷ At a time in which there were only two main news outlets, the difference in price was substantial: 'the twice-weekly Restoration *London Gazette* cost one penny an issue, or about nine shillings a year, compared to £5 a year for Muddiman's newsletter.'³⁸ Newsletters were therefore, to some extent, the preserve of the upper and middle classes, though the financial barrier did not mean the news held within would be entirely exclusive.³⁹ Though the

³⁵ Muddiman, *The King's Journalist*, p.172.

³⁶ Peter Fraser contends in his study of the secretaries of state, and their monopoly on the news that, 'the fact that contemporaries were prepared to pay two shillings for a newsletter when the newsbooks had sold for a penny reflects rather the extent to which the times were starved of domestic news, than any great superiority in the newsletter.' Fraser, *Intelligence of the Secretaries of State*, p.56.

³⁷ Atherton, 'Itch Grown a Disease', p.48.

³⁸ Atherton, 'Itch Grown a Disease', n.109 p.63.

³⁹ Evidence gathered by Atherton illustrates both the popularity and the far reach of Henry Muddiman's output, and also proof of its circulation in a communal environment: 'his newsletters were also purchased by a socially diverse readership, from the elite to the more humble, including the

cost of a subscription would be beyond the means of many, the purchase of an individual issue or entrance to a coffeehouse would be much more manageable – as texts were often read aloud in coffeehouses, illiteracy would also no longer be an obstacle to keeping up to date on current events.

However, though available to buy, Muddiman's main objective was not capitalistic; 'although Muddiman and Williamson had a number of paying clients, the majority who received their newsletters were officials who did not pay, and the letters from Whitehall were essentially official and confidential circulars.'⁴⁰ Rather than an enterprise that relied on satisfying its readership for survival, Muddiman's newsletter was a service – one that needed to remain on the right side of the establishment. In general, printed news remained the resource easiest to access for the British populace, and for those without means, printed news would conceivably have been the primary means of access to information, and the most egalitarian form of news dispersal on the whole.⁴¹ The recipient of a newsletter often had the contents tailored to their vested interests – the writer of a newsletter could also choose to censor certain content depending on the recipient. In this sense a newsletter addressed an individual – printing addressed the nation at large. It is in this context that the failings of *The London Gazette* under L'Estrange's stewardship become even more egregious. Contemporary commentators in the sixteenth century frequently remarked upon the increasing appetite for and availability of political news: 'in 1632, Sir Henry Herbert described the London Exchange as a place "where they minte more news than siluer at the Tower"; [...] Thomas Bradford claimed in 1665 that to send news to Norwich was "to throw water into the sea."⁴² Readers, many who could remember a time when the press had enjoyed a moment of diversity and relative

postmasters, parsons, and a bookseller. His newsletters were also distributed like printed newsbooks. In Norwich they circulated on market day, leading the town clerk to comment that "the poor countrymen" went home with "sacks full of news." Perhaps most significant of all, by the 1670s they were available in coffeehouses across England.' Atherton, 'Itch Grown a Disease', p.53.

⁴⁰ Fraser, *Intelligence of the Secretaries of State*, p.4.

⁴¹ Atherton contends: 'newsbook circulation was broad and socially diverse, crossing barriers of social distinction where newsletters had not. Newsbooks were designed to appeal to a much wider audience than the more exclusive newsletter. They were cheap and often carried pictures on their front pages. Second, newsbooks were in the public sphere, whereas the newsletter belonged to the more private world of correspondence.' Atherton, 'Itch Grown a Disease', p.53.

⁴² Atherton, 'Itch Grown a Disease', p.39.

freedom, voiced their displeasure – both the official newsletters and *The London Gazette* received complaints.⁴³

The propagandistic slant of the *Gazette* did not escape its contemporaries. Raymond argues that the *Gazette*, though a useful source of foreign news, on the domestic front served as little more than ‘an instrument of state propaganda, intended to control rumour and occlude alternative news services.’⁴⁴ The domestic material that the editors published served ‘as a positive form of manipulation, the *Gazette* included petitions and addresses to curry support for the regime.’⁴⁵ Roger L’Estrange was well aware of the power controlling the news could have upon the public imagination: ‘Tis the Press that made ‘um Mad, and the Press must set ‘um Right again.’⁴⁶ In choosing to print his own account of recent events, in opposition to the position sanctioned by the state, Marvell is presenting his readers with a counter narrative, one likely to make ‘um Mad’. On the 28th of May, 1677, the *Gazette* published in full a speech by the King to the House of Commons, prefacing it with: ‘the House of Commons having received His Majesties Pleasure to attend Him this morning in the Banqueting House, His Majesty was pleased to speak to them as followeth.’⁴⁷ The speech itself, also quoted in full in Marvell’s *Account* followed an acrimonious session. The Commons was generally in consensus that ‘unless the power of France be lowred we cannot be safe.’⁴⁸ The alliance the Crown had sought with the French was deemed to be untenable, and a ‘*Triple League*’ between other European powers the best method of curbing French power: ‘it was moved, that there might be a League Offensive and Defensive with Spain and the Dutch [...] therefore they Voted their Address to be particular and expressly for such a League with the Dutch.’⁴⁹ Marvell details both the arguments given for and against this alliance in the House, though ultimately remarks that, ‘this was passed with very general consent.’⁵⁰

⁴³ Joad Raymond, ‘The Newspaper, Public Opinion and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century’, in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Joad Raymond (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1999), pp.109-140 (p.123).

⁴⁴ Joad Raymond, ‘The Newspaper’, p.126.

⁴⁵ Joad Raymond, ‘The Newspaper’, p.126.

⁴⁶ Roger L’Estrange, *The Observator*, 13 April 1681, in *University of Oxford Text Archive* <<http://ota.ox.ac.uk/text/3139.html>> [accessed 3rd September, 2019].

⁴⁷ *The London Gazette*, 31 May 1676 <<https://www.thegazette.co.uk/London/issue/1203/page/1>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019] (page 1).

⁴⁸ Marvell, *Account*, p.352.

⁴⁹ Marvell, *Account*, p.354.

⁵⁰ Marvell, *Account*, p.354.

Marvell presents to the reader a unilateral decision, a conclusion that their representatives had reached: 'the Members generally said, *No, They would proceed on nothing but the French and Popery.*'⁵¹

There is a great deal of irony in the *Gazette's* repeated choice of the word 'pleasure', as the response from the King was caustic and stern:

Gentleman,

*Could I have been silent, I would have rather have chosen to be so, then to call to mind things so unfit for you to meddle with [...] Should I suffer this fundamental Power of making Peace and War to be so far invaded (though but once) as to have the manner and circumstances of Leagues prescribed to Me by Parliament.*⁵²

Marvell's transcription is identical to that found in the *Gazette*, except in one particular – where in the *Gazette* the phrase '*Soveraignte of England rests in the Crown*' the particulars of the King's title are highlighted, Marvell chooses to emphasise 'Parliament' by leaving it un-italicised, emphasising the system of national representation rather than engaging in patriotic grandstanding. The *Gazette's* presentation of this speech gives no context as to why it was instigated, nor why the Crown felt it necessary to castigate parliament through this very public forum – nor is there any mention of a reaction in the House. The nation's newspaper simply reports: 'And His Majesty was so pleased to declare His pleasure to them, that the House should be Adjourned till the 16th of July ex, telling them He would give them notice b. His Proclamation when His Majesty was pleased to say should not be till the Winter, unless there was some extraordinary occasion of calling them sooner.'⁵³ There is no editorial gloss to explain to the reader '*what sort of Leagues*' parliament had asked the King to enter – were the *Gazette* your primary source of news, a reader would have no inkling as to the development of this discussion, only that their King, ostensibly the man guarding '*the Security and Satisfaction of my People*' and charged with '*the*

⁵¹ Marvell, *Account*, p.367.

⁵² Marvell, *Account*, p.368.

⁵³ *The London Gazette*, 31 May 1676, p.1.

Prerogative of making Peace and War, saw it as necessary to publicly reprimand his parliament.⁵⁴

In Marvell's rendering the scene, there is no sense of 'pleasure' – instead it is one of confusion and anger: 'Upon hearing of this Speech read, their House is said to have been greatly appalled, both in that they were so severely Checked in his *Majesties* name, from whom they had been used to receive so constant Testimonies of his Royal Bounty and Affection [...] yet they were led into this by all the steps of Necessity, in duty to his Majesty and the Nation.'⁵⁵ Though many MPs sought to answer this address, they were silenced by the Speaker: 'there was no further liberty of speaking.'⁵⁶ The fact that parliament was so severely checked is also a point of anger, as he exclaims: 'thus were they well rewarded for their *Itch of perpetual Sitting, and of Acting, the Parliament* being grown to that height of contempt, as to be *Gazetted* among Run-away Servants, Lost Doggs, Strayed Horses, and High-Way Robbers.'⁵⁷ Here, to be featured in the *Gazette* is equal to ignominy; his depiction of the newspaper is incredibly arch. The content of the paper is mocked for its inadequacies – its usual concerns revealed to be the mundane and the domestic. Rather than offering their reader's a full portrayal of their government's behaviour, they are advertising 'Lost Doggs.' Marvell is also keen to stress to the reader this inequity – whilst the Crown has a propaganda vehicle, there is no means for parliament to communicate broadly with their constituents:

And that which more amazed them afterwards was, that while none of their own transactions or addresses for the Publick Good are suffered to be Printed, but even all Written Copies of them with the same care Libels are suppressed.⁵⁸

Being unable to communicate 'for the Publick Good' is therefore a 'Publick' ill – an injustice that Marvell is righting by providing an alternative account, allowing the

⁵⁴ Marvell, *Account*, pp.367-8.

⁵⁵ Marvell, *Account*, p.368.

⁵⁶ Marvell, *Account*, p.368.

⁵⁷ Marvell, *Account*, p.369.

⁵⁸ Marvell, *Account*, p.369.

reader to see the ways in which government is controlling the narrative in order to achieve their aims, aims at variance with the national will.

The tide began to turn shortly after Marvell's work was published, as 'after 1676 an increasing volume of unlicensed newsletters appeared, purveyed by professional newswriters, which the Secretaries strove to suppress together with the unlicensed printed journals that appeared with the Popish Plot.'⁵⁹ These titles, which sought to fill the vacuum left by state sanctioned sources and provide a critique of the establishment, became such an issue for the authorities that in May 1680 unlicensed news was once again officially declared illegal, however the Crown would continue to have issues regulating the press, and never regain the tight control exercised over the news industry that it held in the 1660s and 70s.⁶⁰ Knowing his readership to be a public desperate for news, and one apt to scorn sources that would not address the issues they considered interesting or pertinent to their lives, Marvell's text is filling a gap and servicing a considerable market. By elucidating matters of state and addressing issues known only to members of parliament, Marvell supplies his readership with information previously denied them. Sharing this information is a radical act of subversion and defiance – which Marvell would have been well aware of, knowing the lengths the state would go to suppress his work and make a public example of its author. A bounty of fifty pounds for the printer and a hundred pounds for the author was issued by the government, and the House of Lords convened a committee in order to properly investigate the pamphlet. Nicholas von Maltzahn contends: 'another index of the influence of the *Account*, and official fears of its effectiveness in persuading the political population of its anti-French argument, is the effort to suppress its publication and republication and prosecute those involved in its dissemination.'⁶¹ The extent to which its contents provoked panic in the establishment serves as witness to its rhetorical effectiveness, and radical agenda.

⁵⁹ The lapse of the Licensing Act in 1679 further precipitated that flurry .Fraser, *Intelligence of the Secretaries of State*, p.2.

⁶⁰ In moments of political crisis, the Crown would repeatedly try to limit political expression, for instance: 'in the last months of his reign James II was troubled by the newsletters that circulated in every coffee-house, and made strenuous attempts to suppress them: finally he issued a proclamation forbidding printing, writing, and even speaking about public events.' However, this last ditch attempt at an exercise of arbitrary power failed, and James was replaced by a monarch willing to have constitutional limits placed on their authority. Fraser, *Intelligence of the Secretaries of State*, p.7.

⁶¹ Von Maltzahn, 'Introduction', p.199.

Stephen Bardle asserts that, ‘Marvell’s experiences as a parliamentarian sensitized him to the close link between political tyranny and the restricted sharing of information.’⁶²

There is also material evidence that suggests that Marvell’s rhetorical strategy – in particular, its anti-French bent and attack on institutional corruption – struck a chord with his readership. A copy of the text held by Lambeth Palace Library attests to a contemporary owner’s interest in “French impositions”; the owner left twenty six manicules in this copy, alongside other annotations.⁶³ Manicules, a term coined by William H. Sherman, refer to illustrations of hands left in the margins of medieval and early modern texts, with an ‘index finger that extends from the hand toward the text, calling our attention to a particular section on the page.’⁶⁴ As a form of marginalia, the manicule is very common, and ‘between at least the twelfth and eighteenth centuries, it may have been the most common symbol produced both for and by readers in the margins of manuscripts and printed books.’⁶⁵ Sherman identifies the most common use of this mark to be ‘to clarify the organisation of the text and [...] to help individual readers to find their way around that structure and put their hands on passages of particular interest.’⁶⁶ The reader of this copy of the text certainly appears to have used the manicule in this way. For instance the phrase, ‘for the most hainous Crimes of State, and the most Publick Misdemeanours; upon which confidence it is, that the Conspirators have so long presumed, and gone unpunished’ has been highlighted by the owner.⁶⁷ The line, ‘That it has been made to appear, and that in Parliament that upon the Ballance of the *French* Trade, this Nation was detrimented yearly, 900000 l’, has also been singled out.⁶⁸ Later in the text the phrase, ‘*The doore to France must be shut and Garded, for so long as it is open our Treasure and Trade vwill creep out and their Religion creep in at it*’, is also pointed to.⁶⁹ These manicules attest to the annotator’s interest in Marvell’s account of England’s foreign policy decisions, tracing

⁶² Stephen Bardle, *The Literary Underground in the 1660s: Andrew Marvell, George Wither, Ralph Wallis, and the World of Restoration Satire and Pamphleteering* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p.156.

⁶³ London, Lambeth Palace Library, H5133 27.01. Annotated copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s. n., 1677).

⁶⁴ Sherman, *Used Books*, p.30.

⁶⁵ Sherman, *Used Books*, p.29.

⁶⁶ Sherman, *Used Books*, p.41.

⁶⁷ H5133 27.01, p.81.

⁶⁸ H5133 27.01, p.106.

⁶⁹ H5133 27.01, p.129.

the government's increasing involvement with the French. The first manicule apparent in this text is pointing to the line, 'but it is rather to be imputed to our unlucky Conjunction with the *French*', and in four further instances mentions of the Triple Alliance (and its subsequent demise) are purposefully highlighted.⁷⁰ This suggests that the owner of this copy was paying close attention to Marvell's highly sceptical view of the government's actions.

Though it is impossible to confirm if this reader was incensed by these accusations or concurred with Marvell's assessment, these manicules indicate a reader closely following Marvell's accusations and displaying a particular interest in his interpretation of recent events. Lines which explicitly discuss the "threatened" Protestant faith and James' controversial marriage to the Princess of Modena are also marked out, for example this line is pointed to: 'that the minds of his Majesties Protestant subjects will be much disquieted, thereby filled with infinite discontents, and Jealousies. That his *Majesty* would thereby be linked into such a foraine Alliance, which will be of great disadvantage and possibly to the Ruine of the Protestant Religion.'⁷¹ Marvell snidely discusses an incident in 1677 in which the King, during a parliamentary recession (following an agreement to raise 20,000 l. on the condition that the King form alliances with Protestant nation states), assembled 'the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of *France*, with so many of their Commons, meeting the King at *New-market*, it looked like another Parliament' – one of the topics that his Majesty discussed whilst 'the *English* had been Adjourned' being '*An Act for the marrying the Children of the Royal Family to Protestant Princes*' (one of the legal measures to curb Catholic influence at court that was being hotly debated); in this copy the phrase '*Protestants Princes*' has been underlined (the only example of this type of annotation in the text).⁷² This section of the text is one heavily laden with irony, and bears implicit critique of the actions of the King – Marvell even employs imagery in describing the deception (a rhetorical flourish rare in the text): 'for all things betwixt France and England moved with that punctual Regularity, that it was like the Harmony of the Spheres, so Consonant with themselves, although we cannot hear the

⁷⁰ H5133 27.01, p.46, p.104, p.106, p.128, p.129.

⁷¹ H5133 27.01, p.48.

⁷² H5133 27.01, p.120.

musick.⁷³ Parliament had granted the money on the understanding that it would ‘enable your Majesty to Speak or Act those things which are desired by your People’ – rather than serving the National Interest (his subjects framed in this Parliamentary address as ‘a most Loyal People’), the King is shown colluding with ‘a Grand French Embassade.’⁷⁴ The King is shown to be completely in step with a foreign enemy, his interests synchronised with them so completely that it resembles the ‘Music of the Spheres’ (produced by the mathematically perfect movement of the planets). Both Parliament and the ‘People’ they represent have been duped (and figuratively deafened) – ‘kept aloofe from the business of War, Peace, and Alliance’, they have been excluded from politics to the detriment of the state.⁷⁵ There are no mentions of ‘Conspirators’ in this section – though scapegoated elsewhere, here the King’s actions are simply recounted; it is up to the reader to apply censure should they choose. The annotations present in this section attest to a reader intensely interested in statecraft – the underlining of the phrase ‘Protestant Princes’ potentially suggesting agreement (or the reverse) with these parliamentary measures. Sherman contends that when contextualised marginal annotations ‘afford an unexpected intimacy and vitality’, allowing insight into ‘the important ways in which annotated books mediated both personal lives and power politics in Renaissance Europe.’⁷⁶ The reader of this copy clearly appropriated the text in order to inform their opinion of international relations and domestic politics, using marks to organise the text on this basis – potentially in anticipation of re-readings. Though the explicit opinions and reactions of this reader remain enigmatic, these marks certainly attest to a reader tracing Marvell’s rhetoric – we cannot know if they were convinced, but they are certainly responding to the political issues that Marvell sought to draw public attention to.

By publishing this sensitive material, Marvell’s text works to expose the tyrannical actions of the establishment and oppose it. Marvell begins his tract by illustrating exactly what he perceives has been put in jeopardy through political machination – sovereign power has grown intractable (though Marvell “tactfully” frames this as a result of his “Papist” advisors), people will have no recourse to

⁷³ Marvell, *Account*, p.341.

⁷⁴ Marvell, *Account*, pp.340-341.

⁷⁵ Marvell, *Account*, p.342.

⁷⁶ Sherman, *Used Books*, p.126.

redress their grievances. The state will no longer serve the majority, but only the elite. By warning his readers, Marvell is offering them the opportunity to remedy the balance of power.

Our Nation

Another feature of Marvell's writing that shifts in *An Account* is linguistic – a shift from the personal to the collective. In the texts previously discussed Marvell establishes a connection with his audience by repeatedly referring to them as a 'Reader.' In *An Account* this strategy is jettisoned in favour of an appeal to a shared identity. Rhetorically, this serves the purpose of suggesting that action must also be a collective enterprise. The words 'Reader' and 'Readers' is used a total of seventeen times in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. Marvell again and again refers to the act of reading and its importance. As has been discussed, this is the result of the nature of animadversion in and of itself – the author performatively positions themselves as a reader. In Marvell's work this establishes a sense of camaraderie between authorial persona and reader.

Marvell also juxtaposes his treatment of the reader with that of Parker's. Parker's phrase '*respect for poor Readers*' is quoted by Marvell on three occasions, used to show highlight Parker's elitism and hypocrisy – he in fact has no '*respect*' for his audiences judgement, and is instead insisting they subscribe to his way of thinking (or else be branded 'Fanaticks').⁷⁷ Marvell, in contrast, does not envision '*poor Readers*', but capable citizens: the mistakes he sees in Parker's work 'ly naked to the view of every Reader.'⁷⁸ Marvell actively asserts that he believes in 'the good intelligence of the Reader.'⁷⁹ The frequent use of the term 'Reader' to directly address his audience has several consequences. Each person reading the text is individualised, and Marvell uses the form of animadversion to suggest that the reader's 'good intelligence' will lead them to close read the text and dismiss Parker's arguments. In *An Account* Marvell changes this strategy – there is only one mention of a reader throughout the entire text: 'Yet, that I may not be too abrupt, and leave the Reader

⁷⁷ Marvell, *RT*, p.63, p.149, p.175.

⁷⁸ Marvell, *RT*, p.91,

⁷⁹ Marvell, *RT*, p.186

wholly destitute of a thread to guide himself by thorow so intreaguig a Labyrinth, I shall summarily as short, as so copious and redundant a matter will admit, deduce the order of affairs both at home and abroad, as it led this Session.’⁸⁰ No longer a collaborative effort, Marvell consciously informs the reader that he shall be forming a narrative, explaining the complicated series of events leading to the current state of the nation. In place of the ‘Reader’ as an imagined audience and beneficiary of the text, Marvell instead establishes a recurring image of a wider community: a Protestant nation. Terms such as “Subject”, “Persons” and “ours” are the ones that resonant and recur throughout the text – words which indicate a collective. For instance:

Our Church standing upon all points in a direct to all the forementioned errors. Our Doctrine being true to the Principles of the first Christian Institution ... Nor therefore is there any, whether Prince or Nation, that can with less probablility be reduced back to the *Romish* perswasion, than ours of England.⁸¹

This passage is heavy with reference to a group identity. Every reader is assumed to be a part of this fellowship – a member of ‘our Church’, a follower of ‘our Doctrine’, someone who would take pride in belonging to ‘[our nation] of England.’

This appeal to broad audience takes on a particular resonance when we consider the number of the ways in which a reader might have encountered the text in a communal context. As Cambers research has shown this type of reading experience was incredibly common in the period; public spaces such as the coffeehouse and the library fostered this type of interaction, and even domestic spaces like the hall afforded the opportunity for communal reading.⁸² When read among a group this appeal to a connecting, group identity gains power as rhetorical positioning. The entire text is peppered with references to a collective, patriotic identity: ‘*ours* more than any other Nation’; ‘the Soul of *our* Nation’; ‘after this exploit upon *our own Countrymen*’; ‘according to the Interest of *our* Nation’; ‘put himself at the Head of his Parliament and *People* in this weighty and worthy Cause of England’;

⁸⁰ Marvell, *Account*, p.241.

⁸¹ Marvell, *Account*, p.253.

⁸² Cambers, *Godly Reading*, pp.87-93.

'so durable and general an enlightening or *our* minds.'⁸³ Marvell uses this language to establish a sense of urgency and risk. The imposition of arbitrary government would invariably alter the 'Nation', breaking down the systems of representation that Marvell early in the pamphlet establishes as a societal ideal. Though the actions of a small minority – a mere few 'Conspirators' – happen away from public view, the implications for the majority could be vast, and even potentially threatening. Any of his readers, or listeners, no matter what their social status or gender, would be subsumed into this wider fraternity if English and Protestant.

Marvell makes clear to differentiate and repeatedly establish a dichotomy between a self-interested few and the 'Publick Interest.'⁸⁴ These men are shown to have failed those they are ostensibly bound to serve. For instance, Marvell documents how in April 1677, after having been previously dissolved and reassembled in order to be cajoled into providing the King further means, Parliament was abruptly adjourned; '[they] had given a Million, they did take little care to redress Grievances, or pass Good Laws, for *the People*.'⁸⁵ When discussing the harm of an *Arbitrary Government* Marvell repeatedly draws his readers' attention back to '*the People*' (a phrase which is often used and frequently italicised for further emphasis): absolutism is not an abstract outrage, offensive mostly in principle, but a detriment to citizens. Rises in taxation in order to maintain the upkeep of armed forces (in particular the 'Land-Army') is excoriated as 'expensive, needless, and terrible to the People.'⁸⁶ Acts of political machination work not just towards the 'ruine and despaire of so many interested persons', but precipitate 'the terrour of the whole Nation.'⁸⁷ Decisions made to further serve the private interests of a select few have direct consequences. Going against the grain of popular opinion, acting in divergence to the national will and the 'Publick Interest', is a means by which to erode public confidence and subvert channels of representation 'till there should be no further use for the Consent of the *People in Parliament*.'⁸⁸ The phrase '*People in Parliament*' is particularly resonant. Marvell is not describing Lords or "members", the House to which they belong is of no

⁸³ Marvell, *Account*, p.237, p.238, p.254, p.278, p.336, p.235 [italics mine].

⁸⁴ Marvell, *Account*, p.305.

⁸⁵ Marvell, *Account*, p.331.

⁸⁶ Marvell, *Account*, p.274.

⁸⁷ Marvell, *Account*, p.254.

⁸⁸ Marvell, *Account*, p.259.

importance – both are there to serve *'the People'*. Their private identity or role is secondary to their public function; they are physical embodiments of public sentiment – they are there to literally be *'the People in Parliament'*. Their 'Consent' should reflect the attitudes and opinions of the majority. To ignore this 'Consent' is to ignore the majority and defy 'Publick Interest', risking either absolutism or political turmoil. In contrast to the image of *'the People'*, to be merely a person, acting for singular interests, is practically a pejorative in comparison: 'it is a shame to think what trivial, and to say the best of them, obscure persons have and do stand next in prospect, to come and sit by them.'⁸⁹ This is further emphasised by use of capitals – whilst all matters related to the 'Publick' or state are capitalised, the private sphere goes without emphasis. For instance, the idea of previously 'Publick Revenue' falling into 'private possession' is, to Marvell, a viable threat – the word 'possession' further implying individual self-interest inveighing against the national good.⁹⁰

Though Marvell does not encourage or suggest any affirmative action in his text, there is still the implication of protest. Though he frowns on sedition, the actions of the establishment are equally unacceptable: 'no privat Man may without the guilt of Sedition or Rebellion resist, so neither by the Nature of the English Foundation can any publick Person suspend them without.'⁹¹ If the 'English Foundation' is being undermined, if natural rights are being "suspended", then a reaction is expedient. Even 'the very meanest Commoner' has innate rights and is deserving of representation; for their opinion and their will to be ignored is as great a public evil and as dangerous as 'Sedition'. This language, replete with constant referrals to *'the People'*, the 'Publick', the 'Nation' and the 'State' builds up a sense of civic necessity – the scale of the danger posed to these institutions is a grave injustice that needs to be redressed. This a period in which collective action and agitation was beginning to be understood as a way of addressing grievances. There is no doubt that power lay firmly in the hands of the landed elite, universal (or even expanded) suffrage was not a part of the national conversation or being considered as an option. However, Tim Harris contends that as the public's interest in politics grew exponentially, so did the need to have their will expressed, and public opinion grew increasingly difficult to

⁸⁹ Marvell, *Account*, p.291.

⁹⁰ Marvell, *Account*, p.237.

⁹¹ Marvell, *Account*, p.24.

ignore as throughout the country (but especially in London) citizens found methods of contributing to the political sphere:

the seventeenth century saw the rise of mass political activity in London, the beginnings of what has been termed a 'popular political culture'. The emergence of an articulate and politically aware London populace was to large extent contingent upon the rise in literacy. Adult male literacy was probably as high as 70 percent taking the London area as a whole, and even higher in the City alone. There were, of course, marked divergences in the literary structures of different social groups.⁹²

The fact that Marvell does not make such frequent references to his 'Readers' could also possibly suggest a sensitivity to his listeners. Oral transmission and aural consumption were a vital means by which information and texts were disseminated in the period.⁹³ However they encountered the text, Marvell intended the reader to be incensed.

Arbitrary Government

As a result of Marvell's shift in focus to the political machinations of certain nobles at Court and away from the issue of toleration, the nuance with which Marvell had considered individual, personal conscience is eschewed in *An Account* in favour of a direct and sustained offensive against the "Popery" of Charles' advisers. Whilst all of Marvell's previous pamphlets had espoused tolerance for nonconformists, and tacitly supported a relaxation of penal restrictions, in this text Marvell assumes a different rhetorical position and adopts a sterner narrative voice. The stance on nonconformity Marvell takes in this text is far more rigid and reactionary than that displayed

⁹² Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and politics from the Restoration until the exclusion crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p.27.

⁹³ 'Those who could not read could always listen to someone reading aloud from such tracts, whilst political prints and ballads transmitted their message in a visual and aural form. Political debate was increasingly being conducted in the public arena. Political matters were discussed by societies meeting in ward-clubs and in taverns and coffee-houses, where gentry, shopkeepers and artisans mingled freely'. Harris, *London Crowds*, p.27.

elsewhere. The Declaration of Indulgence – which Marvell had applauded in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* – is in *An Account* broadly and resoundingly condemned. What could be the reason for this radical shift in perspective? The answer is that that it fully served his argument in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* – Marvell's main agenda in that text had been to mock and undermine the writings and opinions of Parker, to reveal to the reader 'his Hyperboles and Impossibilities.'⁹⁴ Parker, initially a staunch monarchist and an advocate of royal absolutism, wavered in his beliefs after 1672. As part of his animadversion, Marvell initially draws attention to comments made by Parker in his *Ecclesiastical Politie*, in which he had argued: 'pag. 10 *That it is absolutely necessary to the peace and government of the World, that the supream Magistrate of every Commonwealth should be vested with a Power to govern and conduct the Consciencs of Subjects.*'⁹⁵ Derek Hirst asserts that, 'Parker was driven by the changed conditions of 1672 to abandon his earlier almost Hobbesian espousal of royal power in causes ecclesiastical' in his later books and *Preface*, affording Marvell the opportunity to 'expose the inconsistency.'⁹⁶

When he composed his text in 1669, the law and (seemingly) the political establishment supported Parker's reactionary, heterodox standpoint – however after March 15th 1672, Parker stood on the wrong side of the King's will. As Marvell bitingly notes: '[the] Princes Power [had been ...] uncontrollable and unlimited [...] This was in 1670. But by 1671. you see the case is altered [...] he hath made Princes accountable' – causing him to beg the question, 'how had the King been served if he had followed Bayes's advice, and assumed the power of his first Book?'⁹⁷ Marvell successfully dismantles Parker's logic by simply highlighting how his positions have wavered: 'I see if we give him but Rope enough what he will come to.'⁹⁸ The Declaration of Indulgence thereby becomes a stick by which to beat Parker – proof of his discrepancies and deviations. Parker had insisted on the necessity of absolute monarchic power (as the '*supream Magistrate*' should be '*vested with a Power to govern and conduct the Consciencs of Subjects*'), however Charles had used that

⁹⁴ Marvell, *RT*, p.72.

⁹⁵ Marvell, *RT*, p.92.

⁹⁶ Derek Hirst, 'Parker, Marvell, and political culture, 1667-73', in *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth Century England*, ed. by Derek Hirst and Richard Strier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp.145-164 (p.157).

⁹⁷ Marvell, *RT*, p.115.

⁹⁸ Marvell, *RT*, p.118.

power to alleviate the burden placed on nonconformists – this was an embarrassment to all he had publicly professed: ‘Will your Clergy only be the men, who in an affair of Conscience, and where perhaps ‘tis you are in the wrong, be the only hard-hearted and inflexible Tyrants; and not only so, but instigate and provoke Princes to be the ministers of your cruelty?’⁹⁹ Presenting the Declaration of Indulgence in this way to his readers – as an act of clemency and proof of royal disapproval – served as fuel for his satire.

Though Marvell would support the royal prerogative here, elsewhere he opposed this arbitrary use of power. In his role as a member of parliament for Hull Marvell voted in favour when ‘a majority in the House of Commons demanded that the King withdraw the Declaration as an unwarranted invasion of the rights of Parliament, an illegitimate attempt to make law by royal fiat.’¹⁰⁰ Nicholas von Maltzahn contends that Marvell:

condemns popery especially owing to its association with arbitrary government, to which the work then turns at length. Popery gains a less confessional and more secular sense; in sum, the work is written not against Rome but against France. It synthesizes for public debate issues in national policy centred in the growth of French power.¹⁰¹

In order to understand the full weight of the accusation of “Arbitrary Government” in the Restoration period, it is necessary to consider the reign of Charles I and how that particular term brought him to bear. Charles II’s reign was invariably shaped by his father’s problematic legacy – and the charge of “Arbitrary Government” one he would strenuously deny, even when deliberately contravening public opinion.¹⁰²

Throughout his reign, Charles’ policy decisions, both at home and abroad, proved decidedly unpopular. Kevin Sharpe argues that opposition to the establishment was frequent, as people objected to the raising of levies, ‘an exact militia, the Book of Orders, and social policy.’¹⁰³ Critiques of the Crown were frequent and impassioned:

⁹⁹ Marvell, *RT*, p.108.

¹⁰⁰ Chernaik, *The Poet’s Time*, p.90.

¹⁰¹ von Maltzahn, ‘Introduction’, p.182

¹⁰² Between the dissolution of parliament in 1629 and the Short Parliament of 1640, Charles I established a personal rule – bypassing parliamentary process for eleven years.

¹⁰³ Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (London: Yale University Press, 1996), p.929.

'a paper found in Lincoln's Inn in 1638 alleged that two in three exclaimed against the government, and the "enormities" it had perpetrated since the last parliament and which would only be reformed by another.'¹⁰⁴ The term 'slavery' became resonant in critiques of the government, as the populace felt with an increasing certainty an encroachment upon their ancient liberties. In terms of religion, Charles upset the Protestant status quo and the nascent Puritan movement with his proclivities and appointments: '[his] preferences for ceremonial worship and patronage of William Laud aroused fears for the safety of the church. By 1628 the King had so eroded the trust of his people that parliament demanded the acceptance of a Petition of Right as the guarantee of their liberties.'¹⁰⁵ Charles' disastrous wars necessitated new avenues of funding, avenues heavily resented by the populace.

In order to finance his wars and broad sweeping social policies, the granting of monopolies became a means for the Crown to bring in revenue: 'nothing seemed too trivial for a royal monopoly. In 1637 the King granted one for the making of beaver hats, and a year later another to organise London's painters, and a third to purge the city of "lewd and dissolute" musicians.'¹⁰⁶ Other monopolies had a much larger impact, and generated widespread public condemnation and protest – in particular, the granting of the monopoly of soap to a company of soap makers headed by Catholic trustees, earning its product the moniker "Papist soap" and creating a black market in protest and frustration. The most reviled of Charles' policies was the extension of ship money in 1634. Historically, coastal communities willingly supplied a tax to support the Royal Navy, in return for protection in the eventuality of maritime attacks. The increased remit of this tax was met with scorn and antagonism, which is reflected in its arrears – the refusal to provide funds symptomatic of their distaste for Charles' politics.¹⁰⁷ Increased military presence also proved a point of contention, as 'several recorded protests against orders for the muster master and militia rates' were seen up and down the country.¹⁰⁸ These protests do not represent a universal consensus,

¹⁰⁴ Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p.713.

¹⁰⁵ Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p.xvii.

¹⁰⁶ Charles Carlton, *Charles I: The Personal Monarch* (London: Routledge, 1995), p.190.

¹⁰⁷ At first the tax was paid by the majority of the populace, with arrears of only 1.13 percent in 1635; by 1636 this grew to 2.23 percent and continued to climb. By 1637 arrears were in 3.3 percent, by 1638 they had reached 9.9 percent and in 1639 arrears soared to 16.7 percent as dissatisfaction with the Government deepened. Carlton, *Personal Monarch*, p.191.

¹⁰⁸ Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p.712.

however the evidence compellingly suggests opposition to Charles from both high and low – his brand of “arbitrary” government repeatedly met resistance, culminating in his deposition and eventual execution. Sharpe contends, ‘if we would be wrong to read every act of co-operation as support for the government, it would be misguided to interpret each denunciation or gesture of resistance as one voice of a hidden chorus of opposition’ – however, ‘to almost every governmental measure we can find evidence of critical reaction and even principal objection.’¹⁰⁹

Though the nation was not united in opposition, a sense of disquiet was palpable. The necessity for a King to serve in the interests of his people, rather than act in opposition to their will and arbitrarily execute orders became an imperative issue. Though the years of the interregnum would prove a failed experiment in the establishment of a Commonwealth, the role of sovereign was irrevocably altered; it was now possible to hold a monarch to account. This sentiment is given radical voice in Milton’s *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (1650), written during Charles’ lifetime though published after his execution:

It follows lastly, that since the King or Magistrate holds his authoritie of the people, both originally and naturally for their good in the first place, and not his own, then may the people as oft as they shall judge it for the best, either choose him or reject him, retaine him or depose him though no Tyrant, merely by the liberty and right of free born Men, to be govern’d as seems to them best [...] These words confirme us that the right of choosing, yea of changing their own Government is by the grant of God himself in the People.¹¹⁰

Though Milton’s view was decidedly controversial and decried as radical by a portion of his contemporaries, the role of the sovereign in relation to his subjects was still being debated after Charles II was “restored” as King in 1660. In recognition of this new climate (and his father’s failings) Charles II sought to establish an image of himself as a reasonable monarch. In contrast to his aloof and austere father, Charles II ensured his subjects were aware of his presence, *and* his authority: ‘Charles regularly

¹⁰⁹ Sharpe, *Personal Rule*, p.712.

¹¹⁰ John Milton, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, in *John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education*, ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2013), pp.246-273 (p.252).

spoke to his parliaments and to his people, and his speeches, throughout his reign, many of them printed, were directed at the maintenance as well as representation of that authority.’¹¹¹ Charles made a point of appearing to cooperate with his parliaments, though this was often belied by his actions.¹¹²

Central to this propaganda campaign was a language of consideration, as Sharpe illustrates in *Rebranding Rule 1660-1714*:

we should not, however, underestimate the importance of the image of himself that Charles had been projecting with care in his speeches. Amid provocation and assault he had (he himself had referred to his ‘patience’) sustained a calm, eirenic conciliatory tone which made charges of autocracy harder to sell.¹¹³

Charles’ speeches and public addresses were so central to his maintenance of power, that in 1681 (in the wake of the chaos of the Popish Plot) the Crown took the unprecedented step of publishing *Memorabilia or The Most Remarkable Passages and Counsels Collected out of the Several Declarations and Speeches That have been made by the King*, a collection intended to show the King’s magisterial aptitude and perpetuate an image of his cooperation with parliament. The introduction of this work makes clear the anxiety the press presented to the establishment, and thus the necessity of using the printed word to counter the threat it posed:

*[the] licentious Sickness of the Press, the many abominable Pamphlets that have come abroad, no doubt with Malitious design enough to alienate the Affections of the good people of England, and to infuse strange Perplexing Fears and Jealousies into them of the King and the Government, as if presently the whole Nation was to be turn'd Topsy Turvy, our Laws Cancell'd, our Liberties and Properties to be quite taken away from us, our Parliaments to be cashiered, our Religion changed, and our Lives wholly at the Merciless Devotion of Thirsty men of bloud.*¹¹⁴

¹¹¹ Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (London: Yale University Press, 2013), p.11.

¹¹² Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, p.42.

¹¹³ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, p.27.

¹¹⁴ [Edward] Cooke, *Memorabilia, or, The Most Remarkable Passages and Counsels Collected out of Several Declarations and Speeches That have been made by the King, His L. Chancellors and Keepers, and the Speakers of the Honourable House of Commons in Parliament since His Majesty's Happy Restauration*,

The text also aims to stress – in the face of so many accusations of Catholic sympathy, the King’s Anglican loyalty: ‘and if any man should question or suspect His Majesties affection towards the *Protestant Religion*, and his firm resolution still to maintain it, together with all our *Civil Rights*, let him be pleased to hear him give his own Royal word for’t.’¹¹⁵

The King used his speeches not just to exert his power over the Houses of Parliament, but to show to the nation his active role in statecraft: ‘we have occasion to observe that Charles’s speeches to the Houses of Parliament often, especially at critical moments, read like addresses to the nation. They were.’¹¹⁶ These speeches were not confined to their original audience – the Crown found wider means of dispersal:

A very high proportion of the royal speeches, for the first time, were published by the king’s command, or *cum privilegio*, and widely distributed. Charles II, however, also took particular advantage of a mode of royal representation that had been used increasingly but still only occasionally before the civil war: a declaration issued to the people and often commanded to be read in the churches of the realm so as to create the impression of personal, oral, delivery.¹¹⁷

These speeches, also often published in the *Gazette*, gave the public a sense of the King’s decision making process – Charles I’s taxes, levies and monopolies had been inflicted upon the nation without discussion, and with no explanation or rationale. Without a parliament, there were no elected representatives to question or contest these decisions; rebellion was the only avenue to express discontent. In order to avoid the charge of autocracy, Charles II used his addresses to present his people with his version of events, and detail a carefully orchestrated rationale. In contrast, the information regarding events in parliament were heavily controlled. The day-to-day

Anno 1660 til the End of the Last Parliament, 1680 (London: Printed for Nevil Simmons, Tho. Simmons and Sam. Lee, 1681), p.1.

¹¹⁵ Cooke, *Memorabilia*, p.3.

¹¹⁶ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, p.26.

¹¹⁷ ‘Charles’ declarations were in the main rhetorical performances: explanations and even justifications; appeals, at difficult moments in his relations with his parliament, to a wider political nation and a burgeoning public sphere [...] Charles from the beginning to the end of his reign presented himself directly to his people in words: words that were quoted, copied, circulated, remembered – and contested.’ Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, p.26.

events of parliament would be recorded in the Calendar of State Papers (a journal with restricted access), however these records would not include the specifics of discussion, as ‘the *obiter dicta* of debates are hardly ever recoded.’¹¹⁸ This information, as well as a report of how votes were split was deemed *arcanii imperia* (i.e. secrets of the empire), and the state took measures to control this knowledge, and keep it from the wider populace.

Excluding the years 1641 to 1660, it was illegal to print parliamentary proceedings – reports of parliamentary proceedings could only be transmitted through manuscript forms.¹¹⁹ On the 25th of June 1660, in the wake of the Restoration, the transparency that had been a feature of the Commonwealth was retracted, as the Commons passed a resolution not to print votes – though the issue proved to be a *bête noire*.¹²⁰ It is the disparity between the information deemed *arcanii imperia* and the information circulated by the state that Marvell takes issue with:

And that which more amazed them afterwards was, that while none of their own transactions or addresses for the Publick Good are suffered to be Printed, but even all Written Copies of them with the same care Libels are suppressed: Yet they found this severe Speech published in the next days News Book, to mark them out to their own, and all other Nations, as refractory, disobedient Persons, that had lost all respect to his Majesty.¹²¹

It is for this reason especially that Marvell so bitterly objects to the dishonour of being ‘*Gazetted*’ – to be presented to the public only through the prism of royal dictates puts parliament at a distinct disadvantage. They cannot present their acts of ‘Publick Good’ to the ‘Publick’ they are employed to serve. Though Charles’ speeches might leave the populace with an impression of a rational and judicious king, directly addressing his subjects, Marvell writing presents to his readers an alternative interpretation – one in which contrary voices, like those in parliament, are made liminal. In his speech to Parliament on May 28th 1677, the King had bemoaned that in petitioning him to enter into a diplomatic league with the Dutch to curb French

¹¹⁸ Fraser, *Intelligence of the Secretaries of State*, p.55.

¹¹⁹ This endeavour carried risk as the Post Office was monitored by secretaries of state. Fraser, *Intelligence of the Secretaries of State*, p.3.

¹²⁰ Fraser, *Intelligence of the Secretaries of State*, p.40.

¹²¹ Marvell, *Account*, p.369.

supremacy, Parliament were entering into a matter '*unfit for you to meddle with*', and asks his subjects; '*Should I suffer this fundamental Power of making Peace and War to be so far invaded (though but once) as to have the manner and circumstances of Leagues prescribed to Me by Parliament.*'¹²² Marvell checks this account of the occasion by informing his readers of the reaction in Parliament:

Upon hearing of this Speech read, their House is said to have been greatly appaled, both in that they were so severely Checked in his *Majesties* name, from whom they had been used to receive so constant Testimonies of his Royal Bounty and Affection, which they thought they had deserved, as also, because there are so many Old and fresh Presidents.¹²³

This questioning of the royal will is missing from the *Gazette's* account and abridged in other written testimonies. Marvell challenges the establishment version of events – though the Crown attempted to obfuscate the public's perception of the role of parliament, suggesting they had no role in foreign policy, Marvell reveals this to be a ploy to manipulate public perception, and undermine trust in the 'Publick Good' done by Parliament.

To counter the narrative of the Crown and to challenge the prevailing custom that parliamentary proceedings should be *arcanii imperia*, Marvell gives a detailed account of Parliamentary discussions in 1677. In March a House committee had been convened to discuss tensions resulting from Charles II's league with the French Crown, an alliance reviled by the public, and Marvell presents his readers with an insight into the disputes within the Houses, and between the King and Parliament, as, 'that business having occasioned many weighty Debates in their House, and frequent Addresses to his Majesty, deserves a more particular account.'¹²⁴ In direct opposition to the stance that the *obiter dicta* of debates be withheld from the public, Marvell details the arguments put forth by both sides of the debate. In terms of the "neys", Marvell lists ten reasons against going against the King's Will, including the fact that it 'was a dangerous thing hastily to Incite the King to a War', and 'that he [the King of

¹²² Marvell, *Account*, p.368.

¹²³ Marvell, *Account*, p.368.

¹²⁴ Marvell, *Account*, p.324.

France] would fall upon our Plantations and take Plunder and annoy them.’¹²⁵ Marvell also details the response of the “yeas”, signposting to the reader where their counter-arguments begin: ‘*on the other side, it was said.*’¹²⁶ Marvell lists eighteen reasons to proceed to sever ties with France (a clear indication of Marvell’s partisan bent, the counter-arguments almost doubling those of the opposition), and potentially start a war, including both the national will and thus the necessity of their representatives to represent their desires – ‘that the bent and weight of the Nation, did lean this way, and that was a strong Inducement and Argument to incline their Representatives’ – as well as more practical, fiscal imperatives:

that it had been made to appear, and that in Parliament, that upon the Balance of the French Trade, this Nation was detrimented yearly 900000 l. Or a Million, the value of the Goods Imported from France, annually so much exceeding that of the Goods Exported hence thither [...] unnecessary Wines, Silks, Ribbons, Feathers, &c.¹²⁷

While the “neys”, in Marvell’s rendering of the scene, rely on the maintenance of the status quo, and royalist commonplaces, the “yeas” focus on ideals and economic specifics.

In these passages, Marvell uses language to imbue in his readers a sense of how debates would be conducted – a process that was obscured from their view.¹²⁸ On the one hand, this specificity lends the *Account* veracity – a sense that all the information could be corroborated. It is also a way of critiquing printed newsbooks – on the dates in question, no mention would be made of these discussions, despite their clear importance and the ‘*manifest Dangers*’ perceived by Parliament. Only far after the fact are the public being properly informed. The word ‘answer’ is oft repeated throughout this section, though more widely a semantic field of dialogue is deployed. For instance: ‘then they fell upon the main consideration of the Message, and to make a present Answer’; ‘To this it was answered’; ‘It was replied’; ‘It was

¹²⁵ Marvell, *Account*, p.326.

¹²⁶ Marvell, *Account*, p.327.

¹²⁷ Marvell, *Account*, p.329.

¹²⁸ For instance, Marvell is particular in his use of dates: ‘the second address was presented to his Majesty, March 30. and till the 11. Of April, they received no Answer’; ‘upon the 11 of April, this following answer was offered to their House.’ Marvell, *Account*, p.330.

answered'; 'But then it was objected.'¹²⁹ Both the semantic field and the use of anaphora create a sense of repartee, an impression of a consensus being reached through ripostes, questions and replies. The notion of allowing the public access to this process of debate was widely dismissed, and the public's desire to be informed was resented by the establishment. The Earl of Newcastle sarcastically bemoaned that as a result of newspapers 'every man now is become a state man.'¹³⁰

It is a great irony that the Restoration period, a time of increased state censorship and curtailing of the burgeoning free press, also saw a significant increase in the public sphere, and public desire to be informed about the actions of their representatives. Eventually this contradiction would broil over into a change in policy. Raymond illustrates this phenomenon:

that "every one's ears" were "itching to hear the proceedings in Parliament," as Samuel Key wrote, was repeatedly testified to in the Restoration period. In March 1681 the House of Commons ordered the printing of its votes, an abridged version of its journals which were then only available in manuscript. Sir Francis Winnington opined: "I think it neither natural, nor rational ... that the People who sent us hither, should not be informed of our actions."¹³¹

In bringing his readership the information they were "itching" to hear, Marvell would directly contravene the law set down in 1660, and print votes:

After this long debate the House came to the Question, Whether this particular of a League *Offensive and Defensive with the Dutch* should be left out of the Address, upon which Question, the House Divided,

Yeas 142, Noes 182.

So that it was carried by *Forty* that it should stand.

Politicians had limited recourse when it came to informing the public of their debates and the conclusions of their Parliamentary committees – breaking the law under the cloak of anonymity was one of few options, though one with significant ramifications.

¹²⁹ Marvell, *Account*, p.332, p.333, p.335, p.338, p.335, p.337.

¹³⁰ Atherton, 'Itch Grown a Disease', p.56.

¹³¹ Joad Raymond, 'The Newspaper', p.122.

State control of the press and the post office meant that this highly illegal count could well have landed Marvell in a libel suit had he lived long enough for his authorship to be confirmed. The reader would have been well aware of the audacity of printing this material.

II. The Chameleon

The first section of this chapter sought to prove that Marvell acknowledged and engaged with the Restoration public sphere – the idea of public opinion having legislative currency was a concept acknowledged by and countered with repressive actions by the state. A general public consensus was clearly sought by those in power, as evidenced by Charles' behaviour as a monarch and his reliance on propaganda as a tool of state.¹ His success as a King was a direct result of his willingness to inveigle his subjects through a concerted public relations campaign – a strategy both his father and brother scorned, ultimately to their detriment. Subjects needed to be appealed to and convinced to be successfully ruled. Once the precedent of putting the king on trial had been set the public would forever present a danger to their governors, which the Crown was well aware of. Means needed to be put in place to placate and control the public imagination, with further constraints put upon news media, the press, personal correspondence, nonconformity and upon those who wished to report on parliamentary affairs – an establishment reaction against freedoms that had burgeoned, however briefly, during the Civil War and Interregnum. It was these restraints that Marvell roundly rejects and renounces both in the content of his prose and through the very act of publishing. There is no doubt that Marvell's work was propaganda, made to inspire a cause, even though he does not directly advocate a specific course of action. However, in the space between his cause and his silence exists a tension – a prompt towards action palpable to a Restoration readership.

For King and Country

¹ This became particularly evident in the later years of his reign, as has been charted by Tim Harris: 'Far from trying to keep his subjects out of politics, in the wake of the Exclusion Crisis he chose to engage in the battle for public opinion, and actively sought the support of those out-of-doors. His licenser of the press, Roger L'Estrange, conducted a press campaign specifically designed to win support amongst the lower orders, and the king himself even went so far as to encourage royalist crowds and loyal addresses [...] In short, the king and his advisers quite deliberately chose to appeal to the masses.' Tim Harris, "Venerating the Honesty of a Tinker": The King's Friends and the Battle for the Allegiance of the Common People in *Restoration England*' in *The Politics of the Excluded, c.1500-1800*, ed. by Tim Harris (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp.195-224 (p.195).

Marvell's letters to his constituents and his behaviour in parliament provides valuable insight into the ways in which Marvell's prose reflects his broader political agenda. Sean H. McDowell's recent work on Marvell's correspondence illustrates that as a correspondent he was heavily influenced by the work of Belgian stoicist Justus Lipsius' (1547-1606) epistolary guides, and his letters present a carefully cultivated, plain-spoken persona – in this way, they 'evince a literary artistry in their own right.'² Despite writing to his patrons ('those responsible for his election to Parliament and hence his livelihood') 'Marvell more often than not eschews elaborate strategies of arrangement and adopts the plain style of the familiar letter.'³ In writing to the Hull Corporation of the events in Parliament, informing them of political machinations 'Marvell favours a brief, clear, simple eloquence when speaking to his constituents, as if such qualities were essential to his professional identity as MP.'⁴ In his role as an MP and a citizen we can see him railing at the same repressive policies and restrictions that are addressed by his polemical persona. Von Maltzahn contends: 'debates, individual speeches, parliamentary addresses, and royal proclamations were widely communicated in newsletters and scribal "separates." As an MP, Marvell himself was very much involved in the dissemination of parliamentary news.'⁵ The weaknesses in printed and state sanctioned newsletters were such that Marvell was in fact filling a much needed gap for his constituents by taking on the role of a parliamentary journalist – Paul Seaward notes that:

Marvell's letters to Hull, however, are unique both in their number and in the depth with which they discuss parliamentary business and affairs of interest to their recipients. During a session, Marvell seems to have written at least once a week to Hull: in 1677 he was writing roughly every other night.⁶

As a result, a large body of his correspondence is available as a record of his responses to contemporary events, and there is a distinct intellectual through-line through all of his writing, both personal and public. The spirit of civic duty that we

² Sean H. McDowell, 'Justus Lipsius, Andrew Marvell and Epistolary Style', Sean H. McDowell, 'Justus Lipsius, Andrew Marvell, and Epistolary Style', in *Marvell Studies*, 2 (2017), 1-20 (p.18) <<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.6/>> [accessed April 2nd, 2020].

³ McDowell, 'Marvell and Epistolary Style', p.9.

⁴ McDowell, 'Marvell and Epistolary Style', p.10.

⁵ Von Maltzahn, 'Introduction', p.183.

⁶ Paul Seaward, 'Marvell and Parliament', p.3.

detect in *An Account*, and the anti-establishment conviction in his other prose, is also redolent in Marvell's letters; in publishing his pamphlet the personal is made political.

In a letter written to 'the right worpfull [sic] William Foxley, major of Hull and 'the Aldermen his Brethren of Kingstone upon Hull' on January 18th 1676, we see an example of Marvell serving his constituency;

And therefore I desire that you will, now being the time, consider whether there be any thing that particularly relates to the state of your Town, or your neighbouring Country, or of yet more Publick concernment, as whereof you may thinke fit to advertise me and therein to giue me any your Instructions, to which I shall carefully conforme. It is true that by reason of so many Prorogations of late years repeated, the Publick businesse in Parliament hath not attain'd the hoped maturity; so that the weight and multiplicity of those affairs at present will probably much exclude, and retard at lest, any thing of more Private and particular consideration.⁷

Marvell wrote this letter after the King recalled Parliament following a months' prorogation (having conspicuously failed to call an election), asking how best to oblige the residents of Hull – 'your Town' – though acknowledging the difficulty of achieving their aims, given the fraught political climate. Despite this willingness to assist his community, there is an edge to Marvell's missive. The King and court's obstinance - 'by reason of so many Prorogations of late years repeated' – is a clear point of tension, an undercurrent of sarcasm evident in an otherwise purely cordial and professional dispatch. Though Marvell the politician was more than 'ready to take the Station in the House of Commons which I obtain by your favour', it is clear that he resents that his role 'hath so many years continued' without an intervening election.⁸ Here his dissatisfaction at the frequent prorogations is couched in terms of professionalism; it is an inconvenience, but not one that will distract from the task of representing the 'Country'. McDowell contends that Marvell's letters (like his prose) reveal him to be 'steadfast in opposing corrupt or intolerant government actions'; however, in addressing his patrons Marvell's ire is 'mitigated or properly channelled

⁷ Andrew Marvell, *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell: Volume II Letters*, ed. by H. M. Margoliouth, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), II, p.177.

⁸ Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, p.177.

in the service of constancy.⁹ The persona he could adopt in prose would be even more forthright. The anonymity of *An Account* allows for overt sarcasm and criticism of the status quo, and the way in which it will ‘retard’ progress. Thus the frequent prorogations are discussed in much more bitter terms:

then by Chastizing them with *Prorogations*, frightening them with *Dissolution*, comforting them with long, frequent, and seasonable *Adjournments*, now by suspending, or diminishing their pensions, then again by increasing them, sometimes by a scorn, and other-whiles by a favour, there hath a way been found to reduce them again under discipline.¹⁰

The use of italics here underscores Marvell’s sarcasm (reminiscent of the kind of bitter *Sarcasmus* displayed in his comedic fare) – the court’s consistent use of ‘*Prorogations*’ is not a benign tactic to calm governmental disputes, it is instead a method of systematically hectoring and badgering the Houses, preventing them from having full autonomy or being able to properly function as a body of representatives. As a result, ‘their House hath lost all the antient weight and authority.’¹¹ The refusal to grant an election is thus an imposition that violates the inherent, ‘antient’ rights of English citizens. In doing so ‘the Conspirators’ – and by extension, the monarch for which they are acting as a straw man – are guilty of ‘the most hainous Crimes of State, and the most publick misdemeanours.’¹² Taking to the press allowed Marvell to both reach a larger audience, and be further reaching in his critique of the establishment.

In a letter to his nephew William Popple, addressed June 1672, we see further evidence of Marvell straining at the restrictions imposed by the establishment. At the time of writing the Declaration of Indulgence had been issued on 15th March of that year, and was still in effect, whilst the Franco-Dutch War raged on overseas:

We cannot have peace with *France* and *Holland* both [...] The whole Province of *Utrecht* is yielded up. No Man can conceive the Condition of the State of *Holland*, in this Juncture, unless he can at the same Time conceive an Earthquake, an Hurricane, and the Deluge [...] There was the other Day, tho

⁹ McDowell, ‘Marvell and Epistolary Style’, p.2.

¹⁰ Marvell, *Account*, p.305.

¹¹ Marvell, *Account*, p.305.

¹² Marvell, *Account*, p.305.

not on this Occasion, a severe Proclamation issued out against all who shall vent false News, or discourse ill concerning Affairs of State. So that in writing to you I run the Risque of making a Breach in the Commandment.¹³

Here Marvell's sympathy for the casualties of this catastrophic attack is evident, despite the recent enmity between England and Holland. His consternation at the idea that to discuss 'Affairs of State' is to make 'a Breach' in the public consciousness is also palpable; the very notion that 'writing' to his kinsman, discussing current affairs or potentially questioning the motives or actions of the government, is akin to the crime of spreading 'false News' is treated with heavy sarcasm. The same event is discussed in very different terms in the June 6th issue of the state-sponsored (and only publicly available) newspaper, *The London Gazette*:

After all the great brags of the Dutch of their Naval Victory over the *English*, we have certain advice, that their Fleet is come home in a very shatered and torn condition, and that instead, of the many English Ships it was expected they had taken and sent home, many of their own Ships are lost or still missing, besides those comes in disabled, and that they have had a slaughter of Men on board their Fleet. In the mean time, we hear, that most of the considerable Merchants and others in *Holland*, Are removing their Persons and Estates to *Hambrough* and other places, by reason of the imminent danger and great oppression they meet with in *Holland*.¹⁴

The political agenda of this account of the battle is manifest. The smug references to 'the great brags of the Dutch' and their former success in naval conflicts over the English is an example of blatant petty nationalism, an attempt to reinforce animosity towards the Dutch in the minds of their readership, when reporting civilian casualties.

In their rendering of the scene, the order in which the Dutch misfortunes are listed; loss of life (the 'bad slaughter of Men') is reckoned second to property damage. Fiscal and economic interest is ranked more highly than a nuanced discussion of the

¹³ Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, p.327-8.

¹⁴ *The London Gazette*, 6 June 1672 <<https://www.thegazette.co.uk/London/issue/684/page/1>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019] (page 1).

implication of the battle. The French were gaining an even greater foothold over Europe – an occurrence that the Triple Alliance of 1668, of which England had been a part, had tried to prevent. This portrayal of the Franco-Dutch War both chimed with and served the establishment agenda – in despite of both Parliament and the public’s unease at the thought of pursuing closer ties with the French, Charles II pursued a policy of French appeasement, as evidenced by the Secret Treaty of Dover (1670), which ultimately led to the initiation of the Third Anglo Dutch War (1672 to 1674). In fanning resentment towards the Dutch, the *Gazette* is serving as a mouthpiece for state propaganda, diverting attention away from the growing bond between the English and French court. As the letter is undated, it is unclear whether Marvell wrote his missive prior to or after this article appeared in the *Gazette*; however, in either case, by sympathising with the Dutch rather than engaging in nationalist grandstanding, Marvell is countering the establishment record. It is this spirit of critical dialogue that fuels *An Account*. Marvell’s experience in international relations informs his attack on Charles’ foreign policy. In 1663 Marvell was appointed as secretary to the Earl of Carlisle in his embassy to Muscovy, Sweden and Denmark; their mission was to secure trading privileges with the Muscovy Company, and to ‘build anti-Dutch alliances’ in northern Europe in anticipation of war.¹⁵ To this end their mission was only partially successful, and Carlisle’s dealings with Tsar Aleksei (1629-1676) had been fraught.¹⁶ In both *The Second Part* and *An Account* Marvell makes sly allusion to an incident in 1654, Tsar Aleksei notoriously having declared that some satiric verse was his motive for the invasion of Poland.¹⁷ In *The Second Part* the reference serves to reveal the extent of Parker’s ‘peek against the Non-conformists’, his combative ideology akin to the Tsar’s aggressive foreign policy: ‘the Duke of Muscovy indeed declared War against Poland, because he and his Nation had been vilified by a Polish Poet.’¹⁸ In *An Account* the Tsar’s frivolous military intervention is compared to the ‘Conspirators’ evocation of ‘Dutch abusive Historical Pictures, and False

¹⁵ Holberton, ‘Marvell and Diplomacy’, p.5.

¹⁶ Marvell’s role in the embassy involved writing and translating documents, and overseeing ‘diplomatic ceremony’, a task made difficult by the Tsar’s frosty reception of the English diplomats. In one particularly tense incident the Tsar complained about being addressed by the title of *Illustrissimus* rather than *Serenissimus*: throughout their tour ‘Carlisle and Marvell repeatedly complained about their ceremonial treatment by the Tsar’s officers.’ Holberton, ‘Marvell and Diplomacy’, p.6.

¹⁷ Von Maltzahn, ‘Baltic Embassy’, p.25.

¹⁸ Marvell, *RT2*, p.267, p.260.

Medalls' as justification for the Third Anglo-Dutch War: 'to fill up the measure of Dutch iniquity, they are accused of Pillars, Medalls, and Pictures: a Poet indeed, by a dash of his Pen, having once been the cause of War against Poland.'¹⁹

The medals mentioned were commemorations of Dutch military victories and the picture in question was a 'painting of the Chatham disaster that was hung in the main hall of Dordrecht's City Hall', for which – as Charles-Eduard Levillain explains - 'Charles II consistently sought more moral reparation after 1667.'²⁰ Both texts use reference to the Tsar to mock an overreaction; however, whereas Parker's belligerence is a personal foible, Charles' intransigence is a detriment to the nation. In considering the influence of Marvell's diplomatic career on his satiric prose, Holberton contends:

Marvell's pamphlet was not the first to offer a polemical interpretation of Charles II's diplomacy, or even to allege that a pro-French faction at court had undermined a series of alliances and negotiations with northern states (in particular the United Provinces) which would have been more in the national interest. But it develops a compelling narrative of conspiracy based on a probing and ironic close analysis of diplomatic materials and transactions; a style of witty synthesis and commentary which Marvell earlier practised in writing Carlisle's speeches in Muscovy.²¹

Drawing a comparison between Charles' actions and the Tsar's behaviour is intentionally provocative – an unflattering 'Picture' of monarchical absolutism: 'this certainly was the first time that ever a *Painter* could by a stroke of his Pencil occasion a Breach of the Treaty.'²² War is only used as a vehicle to defend sovereign pride, in defiance of the national interest. By combining 'narrative frames of international and domestic politics' Marvell presents his reader with a damning critique of their monarch's behaviour, implicitly comparing their king to international authoritarian

¹⁹ Marvell, *Account*, p.260.

²⁰ The Chatham disaster being the humiliating naval defeat (in which the Dutch fleet sailed up the River Thames and Medway, destroying ten English ships and towing away the *Royal Charles*) that brought the Second Anglo-Dutch War to its conclusion. Charles-Éduard Levillain, 'England's "Natural Frontier": Andrew Marvell and the Low Countries', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.7> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-16 (p.4).

²¹ Holberton, 'Marvell and Diplomacy', pp.12-13.

²² Marvell, *Account*, p.260.

leaders.²³ In publishing his *Account*, Marvell took an even greater ‘Risque of making a Breach in the Commandment.’ In many ways, the text represents a reflection of both Marvell’s personal opinions and political philosophy, especially in relation to his views on public service; to inform the public is a crucial component of civic life.

In his desire to provide the Hull Corporation with an accurate and thorough record of the events in town, we can witness Marvell acting in a manner akin to the MP he describes in *An Account*; a politician attempting to act in the best interests of his district, fully preoccupied by ‘Publick businesse.’ In a letter to Mayor George Acklam, addressed 6th April 1671, discussing the passing of new legislation to clamp down on recusancy and clamp down on the Clarendon Code, we see Marvell deliberately flout the restrictions placed on information deemed *arcana imperii*:

The debate turned into that principall question whether there should not be Indemnity as well for those who haue bin punishd by the former law as for them who have overacted in the Execution of it. This being carry’d in the negative **by 77 against 53**, the question for ingrosment passd without dividing the House againe. So it was yesterday red the third time & sent up to the Lords. But our house divided upon it **74 against 53**.²⁴

Here we see Marvell, in his personal life, deliberately publishing votes a – a punishable offense. However, it is not enough for Marvell to give a generalised sense of the debate and which arguments won the day – he is actively giving a sense of the scene, providing specific information revealing the sentiments of both Houses. Overseeing personal correspondence was one of the roles allotted to the secretaries of state – Marvell would have been well aware of the potential for interception, though less of a danger than publishing outright, privately publishing this data could have led to a reprimand. By publishing votes *publicly* Marvell took an even greater risk; valuing informing the public over personal security. Political engagement is the cornerstone of Marvell’s polemical theory. His writing displays an attitude towards civic duty in line with the model of seventeenth century public service outlined by Phil Withington:

²³ Holberton, ‘Marvell and Diplomacy’, p.12.

²⁴ Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, p.138 (emphasis mine).

Corporate citizenship was infused and enthused by Renaissance notions of public service, participation, and activity: citizenship in a more general, civic-humanist sense of the term. This, in turn, was a product of the developing state – or what early modern people termed a commonwealth – and the way its influence worked down-ward upon and within communities. Viewed in these terms, the story of early modern state formation is as much about the creation of citizens defined by their capacity for public activity as it is about the centralization of functions conventionally associated with modern polities: war, taxation, and bureaucracy.²⁵

In publishing *An Account* Marvell is both performing his duty as a citizen and encouraging ‘public activity’ – drawing the reader’s attention to the inadequacies in the current system of representation. By reading the text and engaging with its content (the ‘action, an activity, through which people learned to be good citizens’), the reader is performing *their* civic duty; the text is affording them the opportunity to exercise their own judgement and prompting them to scrutinise the political system that purports to represent them.²⁶ Though the term commonwealth fell out of favour – failing to shake its association with Britain’s doomed dalliance with republicanism – the system of governance Marvell describes places particular importance on the idea of a “common” good, and thus naturally finds alignment with this term, even when it is not explicitly stated. It is clear that Marvell’s message resonated with both his audience and the wider public. Between the restoration of Charles II in 1660 and 1677 (the year *An Account* was published), nineteen titles including the term “arbitrary” are recorded in the *English Short Title Catalogue*.²⁷ Whilst not uncommon, the term was not part of the *zeitgeist*. Between 1678 and 1690, immediately after the publication of Marvell’s pamphlet, this number rocketed to a hundred and four titles.²⁸ From these numbers we can definitively see that Marvell’s pamphlet imbedded itself within the public consciousness, and channelled public interest towards texts that claimed to scrutinise authority. Marvell’s text created a by-word

²⁵ Phil Withington, ‘Public Discourse, Corporate Citizenship, and State Formation in Early Modern England’, in *The American Historical Review*, 112 (2007), 1016-1038 (p.1017).

²⁶ Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.40.

²⁷ ‘Arbitrary, 1660-1677’, in *The English Short Title Catalogue* <<https://bit.ly/2nC27QD>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019].

²⁸ ‘Arbitrary, 1678-1690’, in *The English Short Title Catalogue* <<https://bit.ly/2pgNL8x>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019].

for inquiry, his accusations of corruption and conspiracy became a rallying cry for other writers to express discontent and anti-establishment sentiment.

While engaging with Marvell's personal correspondence, in order to determine the extent to which the persona Marvell presents to his readership is a reflection of this own personal ethos, this chapter will instead focus on placing Marvell in the context of popular displays of discontent, considering what kind of action his writing might have incited. Nigel Smith famously dubbed Marvell (and his seemingly flexible and shifting allegiances and ability to don multiple and conflicting personas both publicly and privately in much the same way that he revitalised and reimagined literary genres) a 'Chameleon' in his biography of the same name: 'in both poetry and the theory of toleration Marvell was a mould-breaker, remaking categories on the eve of modernity in poetry, religion and poetry.'²⁹ I will argue that Marvell's political plasticity applies not just to his fealty but also to his advocacy. It is of course important to identify Marvell's political leaning in order to properly establish his rhetoric aims – but it is also crucial to identify how Marvell was asking the reader to engage in the debate to gain a fully rounded portrait of him as a polemicist and to understand how he intended his pamphlet to be received. In an age of increasing government sanctions limiting displays of opposition, concern or consternation, what means were available to the general public of expressing public opinion? Of manifesting their discontent? This thesis takes the view proposed by Mark Knights that, 'the later Stuart period England witnessed a significant shift towards a representative society.'³⁰ The role of political parties and petitions will be explored in order to consider how Marvell's writing responded and contributed to this shift.

Marvell and Party

The Restoration saw the ascendance of the political party as a system of representation, with the birth of the antecedents of the Tory and Whig factions, and their presence began to have an impact on the wider political landscape. Marvell was

²⁹ Smith, *The Chameleon*, p.11.

³⁰ Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, p.3.

a part of the Duke of Buckingham's circle – though not officially aligned to the Country party or the Green Ribbon Club, and though Marvell was known to go against the party line, this was the party that best reflected Marvell's personal politics. This is reflected in *An Account* – though the narrator treats the idea of party allegiance with scepticism, the narrative related within the text lionizes the actions of one particular faction. Nigel Smith contends that in *An Account*, 'the country MPs were thus not a faction but guardians of the central national interest', in contrast to the actions of conservative Court party members of Parliament in serving the interests of the Crown are in fact damaging the nation at large.³¹ Marvell intentionally creates a persona that whilst refusing to pledge a loyalty to a party, presents the reader with a stark reality. He campaigns for a new election by revealing the deficiency of the current parliament – and the choice his readers should make at the ballot box is evident.

At the forefront of this political development was the expansion of the electorate. The condition of suffrage – a 40 shilling freehold, introduced in 1429 – became increasingly attainable, and between 1621 and 1628 the Commons repeatedly voted to extend the franchise.³² As the electorate grew, so did the influence of Parliament. J. Plumb notes that: 'parliament, in the seventeenth century, was a representative institution, and representative of a large and constantly growing body of men – the freeholders of England: a body which contemporaries never ignored.'³³ It was not *just* that 'the electorate had grown considerably', the demographic of the electorate also evolved: 'by the Long Parliament it reached down not only to the minor gentry and rich merchants, but to yeomen, craftsmen, shopkeepers in the majority of towns and all the counties.'³⁴ Victoria Kahn theorises that the increase in Parliament's influence coupled with the expansion of the electorate led to:

[a] shift from a world of status to one of contract – from a world, that is, of hierarchical feudal relations to one made up of autonomous individuals who rationally consent to their self-imposed government. In contrast to the

³¹ Smith, *The Chameleon*, p.323.

³² J. Plumb, 'The Growth of the Electorate in England from 1600 to 1715', in *Past & Present*, 45 (1969), 90-116 (p.101).

³³ Plumb, 'The Growth of the Electorate', p.91.

³⁴ Plumb, 'The Growth of the Electorate', p.103.

medieval pact of subjection, in which a corporate body of the people subjects itself to the sovereign, the new discourse of obligation yielded a protoliberal subject who freely enters into a social and political contract.³⁵

In Kahn's formulation, a sense of vote holders having influence in politics grew despite (or possibly in reaction to) the increasingly arbitrary and absolutist rhetoric of the establishment. As parliament's influence increased political parties became a nascent force within the parliamentary system, responding to the need to represent an expanding and politically aware electorate. Tim Harris contends that this progression burgeoned from a growing sense of disenchantment following the initial exaltation following the Restoration: 'from the late 1660s contemporaries were beginning to talk in terms of a clash between the Court (the supporters of a strong, royal executive) and Country (the champions of Parliament), and by the early 1670's most people were prepared to acknowledge the existence of Court and Country "parties".'³⁶ These groups would develop into the Tory and Whig parties.

Belonging to these early groups offered members a greater chance of achieving their aims; co-ordinating action and votes allowed these groups to become more powerful lobbyists in attempt to increase their political effectiveness in a raucous House. While these "parties" were acknowledged, allegiance to these loose organisations was largely fluid, with politicians choosing a camp in order to best pursue their own personal objectives; they were not held to the party line. The presiding issues of the day were the extent of the Crown's executive powers (and whether its remit should be expanded or contracted) and the debate for toleration – those in favour of toleration might (as Marvell did in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*) welcome the King's use of the royal prerogative to lessen the penal burden of recusancy in 1672, even though this went against the implicit agenda of the Country Party. In turn, those concerned by the potential for absolutism represented by the King's Declaration, might support the imposition of further Test Acts in retaliation, and in order to undercut Catholic, Royalist influence at court (including that of the heir apparent). The Country Party's political platform had more or else cemented

³⁵ Victoria Kahn, *Wayward Contracts: The Crisis of Political Obligation in England, 1640-1674* (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004), p.1.

³⁶ Tim Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society 1660-1715* (Harlow: Longman Group UK Limited, 1993), p.52.

itself by the 1670s, its main aims being the establishment of a fixed constitutional monarchy in which power was balanced between the Crown and the two Houses of Parliament – a means of preventing royal absolutism. The Country Party also, in recognition of the public's wishes, argued against the imposition of a standing army. The most vocal proponents of the movement were the Earl of Shaftesbury (1621-1683) and the Duke of Buckingham. In contrast the Court Party aimed to strengthen the Crown and preserve royal prerogative.

Throughout *An Account* Marvell does not explicitly mention either party – though he begins his pamphlet by outlining a model of the British constitution (even if it is heavily idealised), political parties have no space within Marvell's rubric. Marvell's emphasis is placed instead upon the importance of individual members of parliament, and ensuring each member is acting entirely in the best interests of his constituents. Rather than supporting a party, the ethos Marvell presents his readers is a lionisation of public rather than party service. The only "party" that is recognised is that faction of 'Conspirators' that Marvell identifies to his reader's as the cause of *The Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*, as seen in his discussion of the controversy surrounding James' marriage in 1673. The issue of James' faith was by this point a major source of consternation for the public, his marriage to a Catholic princess exacerbated this anxiety (especially coming so close on the heels of a humiliating naval defeat at the hands of the Dutch). Parliament called on Charles II to void the marriage, but the King refused. Marvell frames these political machinations as the result of 'Conspirators Counsels' – a deliberately orchestrated political maelstrom in order to serve their agenda: 'and the Conspirators as to their own particular reckoned, that while the Nation was under the more distress and hurry they were themselves safer from Parliament, by the Publick Calamity.'³⁷ James' marriage and enmity with the Dutch only serves one group's interest: 'the Popish party already lift up their heads in hopes of his marriage.'³⁸

The 'Popish party', in serving the royal prerogative are willing to go completely against the national interest – though not named as such, the parallels to the Court Party would have been apparent to Marvell's readers. Nicholas von

³⁷ Marvell, *Account*, pp.273-274.

³⁸ Marvell, *Account*, p.273.

Maltzahn argues, '[Marvell] presents the conspirators almost as they might see them themselves – as if high-minded, and not just high-handed – only then to expose such deceit as scarcely veiling the most naked private interest.'³⁹ The ideal is instead those of the 'unbyassed Party':

some *Gentlemen* that are constant, invariable, indeed English men, such as are above *hopes*, or *fears*, or *dissimulation*, that can neither flatter, nor betray their King, or Country: But being conscious of their own Loyalty, and Integrity, proceed throw good and bad report, to acquit themselves in their Duty to God, their Prince and their Nation.⁴⁰

This distrust of the idea of 'Party' is also prevalent in Marvell's other prose works. In *A Short Historical Essay*, for example, Marvell begins his anti-episcopal tract with the assertion that 'the Christian Religion, as first instituted by our Blessed Saviour, was the greatest security to Magistrates by the Obedience which it taught' – it is the imposition of worldly ambition that subverts this Christian balance: 'that while they observed his Precepts, they could neither fall under any jealousy of State, as an ambitious and dangerous Party, nor as Malefactors upon any other account deserve to suffer under the Publick Severity.'⁴¹ Though not specifically related to the idea of a political organisation, given the context of the rest of the pamphlet, and the staunchly pro-established church platform of the Court Party, the 'dangerous Party' in question bears resemblance to the contemporary institution familiar to Marvell's readers, acting to serve the interests of the Bishops in parliament by pursuing an anti-recusancy programme. Any group or 'Party' serving their own interests, whether in matters of 'State' or faith, is treated with a measure of suspicion. Marvell's polemical aim is to inform the reader and (in doing so) inspire anger towards institutional corruption, in order to encourage an election. As part of this agenda, the idea of political parties is maligned. In a parliament that fails to adequately represent its people, loyalty to any entity other than their constituents is an inexcusable fault:

for these it is, that the long and frequent Adjournments are calculated, but all whether the Court, or the Monopolizers of the Country Party, or these that

³⁹ von Maltzahn, 'Introduction', p.194.

⁴⁰ Marvell, *Account*, p.303.

⁴¹ Marvell, *SHE*, p.116.

profane the title of Old Cavaliers, do equally, though upon differing reasons, like Death apprehend a Dissolution.⁴²

Even in this formulation, clearly one group is preferable – while the ‘Court’ faction is universally censured; it is ‘the Monopolizers’, rather than the whole, of the Country Party who represent an issue, and who are preventing a much needed election in order to further their agenda.

Though Marvell does not instruct his readers how to vote or *explicitly* promote a particular Party (though his tacit endorsement of the Country Party is discernible), he is asking his audience to hold their representatives to a higher standard – an election is the only way of ensuring that those who hold the national interest as a priority replace members with another agenda. Much as the Country party only receives implicit support, Marvell’s discussions of another form of political expression – the petition – also only receives circumspect acknowledgment; whilst he does not condone popular displays of discontent, the content of his text gives voice to public grievances and clearly seeks redress.

Petitions and ‘*the indisputable rights of the Subject*’

Prior to the Restoration of the monarchy, petitions had been the dominant form of political participation for both the franchised and disenfranchised public. Regardless of their gender or social strata, subjects had the ability to petition their monarch or governors with impunity. A key tenet of the Restoration regime’s system of discursive and political repression was the obstruction of this process. Though Marvell does not directly incite the reader to petition their governor, by drawing attention to how improperly they are represented, Marvell implicitly alludes to the need for the subject to have an avenue for self-representation. Similar to the noticeable lacuna in the development of the newspaper detectable in the 1670s, petitioning as a medium had also been severely curtailed by the state; as Marvell wrote *An Account* he would have been well aware of the public ire towards this seeming injustice. Petitioning was an

⁴² Marvell, *Account*, p.303.

issue about to come to a head; knowing full well the incendiary nature of his material, inspiring illegal petitions would be a natural consequence of taking to the press. As such it is necessary to consider the history of petitioning when considering *An Account*.

Petitions had been a fixture of the British political landscape from the medieval period; an amorphous but irrefutable right of the subject, though mostly used as a means of resolution for local, and usually economic, concerns and disputes. Typically anonymous, petitioners took care to retain a tone of deferentially. The status of the petitioner would also affect its reception – petitions presented by the rich or noble were received by secretaries of state, in contrast the poor or underprivileged had their petitions received by the court of requests. It was the onset of Civil War that launched petitions as a means of lobbying on a national scale. David Zaret famously argued that the act of petitioning was the true origin of democracy, the tool used to expand the public sphere:

The political use of printed petitions in the English Revolution violated petitioning traditions and secrecy norms. Petitions became a device that constituted and invoked the authority of public opinion, a means to lobby Parliament. This practical development led to new ideas in politics that attached importance to consent, reason, and representation as criteria of the validity of opinions invoked in public debate.⁴³

While Zaret's account of the origins of democracy is undoubtedly utopian and optimistic – charting a steady incline in the progression towards “democracy” and neglecting to account for periods of repression (such as the Restoration) or the failures of the system of representation (from considerable gaps in the franchise to major inequalities), it is undoubtedly true that the use of petitioning during the Civil War permanently changed the political landscape, and public perceptions of the rights held by the subject. This unprecedented period of strife presented the populace with a novel choice of allegiance – whether to support their King or to stand behind parliament, a choice between a traditional fealty or a belief in the rights of the subject

⁴³ David Zaret, 'Petitions and the Invention of Public Opinion in the English Revolution', in *American Journal of Sociology*, 101 (1996), 1497-1555 (p.1499).

(rights impinged upon by Charles). Royalists and parliamentarians alike used petitions as a means of signalling their alliance and as a means to affect change by influencing both the intended recipient and the wider populace, as petitions were frequently printed and circulated as a means of propaganda. Participation was wide reaching (neither gender nor class were necessarily a barrier to participation) and depending on the topic being broached, could inspire mass subscriptions: 'some petitions contain as many as 20,000 signature, but most have three to 10,000 signatures.'⁴⁴

Groups that traditionally had been politically marginalised felt empowered to present petitions – in fact, petitions had become the primary means for the disenfranchised to exert some form of political authority. One such group was London's apprentices – as they could not hold property as part of the terms of their employment, these young men were barred from the franchise. Despite this, during the Civil War and Interregnum, London's apprentices emerged as a co-ordinated and active pressure group: in 1641 they petitioned against the episcopacy; in 1647 they petitioned and then eventually physically blockaded parliament, leading it to be dubbed the "Apprentices' Parliament"; in 1649 they joined forces with the Levellers, another political pressure group, to censure and condemn the government; and then in 1659, after attempts by the army to stop their petitioning, they called for a "free parliament" as the ultimate display of their dissatisfaction with the establishment.⁴⁵ Mihoko Suzuki documents that, 'in all but one of these instances, the apprentices' political activity proved to be significant and influential' – their interventions affected both public opinion and government policy, which is reflected in the content of these publications:

The petitions from the different phases strikingly chart the apprentices' increasing confidence as political agents and their emergence, in the later petitions, as political theorists. The early petitions are marked by a rhetoric of deference [...] the rhetoric of deference in addition serves to counter the apprentices' transgressive act, as subalterns, of publishing their demands. The

⁴⁴ Zaret, 'the Invention of "Public Opinion"', p.1504.

⁴⁵ Mihoko Suzuki, *Subordinate Subjects* (Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2003), p.136.

later petitions, however, become forceful and even provocative in their rhetoric, as their titles such as *An Outcry* and *Remonstrance* indicate.⁴⁶

Whilst England's experiment with civil war and republicanism had engendered 'a heightened level of political awareness amongst broad cross-sections of the population', petitions served as the predominant (legal) vehicle for the public to voice their opinion and attempt to effect change.⁴⁷ In fact (in perhaps one the greatest ironies of the Charles II's tenure as king) petitions paved the way for a placid, irenic Restoration.

Whilst Charles' return had been organised by powerful Royalist supporters, the absence of conflict was a direct result of intervention from the lower orders: 'in 1660 county petitions for a reinstated Parliament rained down on General Monk as he marched his army to London and set in motion events leading toward the restoration of the Stuart monarchy.'⁴⁸ As tallied by Knights, from December 1659 to June 1660 twenty nine petitions and addresses were presented to parliament calling for a new election and the restoration of the monarchy.⁴⁹ These petitions established a general consensus, an assertion of public opinion which meant that the transition between a republic and monarchical state could occur bloodlessly. The public had grown disillusioned, reviling the onerous tax burdens necessary to maintain Cromwell's standing army – in effect, Charles was an elected King, in the sense that he was chosen by the public for his role and was transported to power on the back of their displays of support. Gradually the right to petition evolved in the rhetoric of both Royalist and radical theorists into a birth right, one of the "Ancient Liberties" traced back to the Magna Carta and assured to all subjects – and it became a sign of despotic or corrupt leadership to ignore or suppress petitions.⁵⁰ The act of petitioning had become a major fixture in the public's conception of their political identity and the rights they possessed; a right that needed to be defended. A bold illustration of

⁴⁶ Suzuki, *Subordinate Subjects*, p.136.

⁴⁷ Harris, 'Allegiance of the Common People', p.203.

⁴⁸ Zaret, 'the Invention of "Public Opinion"', p.1505.

⁴⁹ Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, p.119.

⁵⁰ 'Petitions afforded subjects limited immunity to norms that otherwise restricted public commentary on political matters [...] Royalists, army agitators, Puritans, and Levellers understood the right to petition in terms of extant tradition, as a medieval privilege and immunity'; David Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, petitions, and the public sphere in Early-Modern England* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2000), p.88.

this transformation is found in *A Glasse for Weak Ey'd Citizens* (1646), a tract written in defence of a Presbyterian pamphlet that had been met with hostility by another pamphleteer: '*behold them condemning the course of Petitioning, the way themselves take, the only way left to the Subject to have their grievances removed; and that which is the indisputable right of the meanest Subject.*'⁵¹ The very title of this tract is suggestive of this shift, as the image of *A Glasse* is in reference to the "mirror for Princes" genre; a branch of political prose written in seeming deference to a person in a position of authority, listing the ideal behaviours of such a leader (in critique of their apparent short comings).

Though *Weak Ey'd*, and in danger of overlooking what the author perceives to be a public grievance, it is the *Citizens* who are being approached as the possessors of authority. It is the *Citizens* who have power and the *Citizens* who must be advised and directed in how they use their political currency. They must be made aware of those '*condemning the course of Petitioning*', as they pose a risk to this power – as *Citizens* they must be prepared to defend pamphleteering and petitioning in order to protect their inherent rights as *Subjects*. It is not just the propertied classes who are included in this conception of the body politic, even '*the meanest Subject*' is included and has value as part of this system of representation. This growing sense of the need for representational inclusion is further evidenced by the critical role petitioning held in both the activism and rhetoric of the Leveller movement. The Levellers were a grass-roots partisan group, audacious in their desire to extend the franchise to all men and to ensure that every person was judged fairly in the eyes of the law (an idea viewed as so radical that it was virulently rebuked in reactionary pamphlets); sentiments expressed most ardently in *An Agreement of the People* (1647), a series of evolving manifestos that firmly asserted the right for all men to be properly represented in Parliament, regardless of their means or social position.⁵² There should be no

⁵¹ Anon., *A Glasse for Weak Ey'd Citizens: or a vindication of the pious, prudent and peacable petition (to the Honorable the Lord Mayor, aldermen and commons in Common-Council assembled) now in agitation* (London: Printed for Tho: Underhill, 1646), p.6.

⁵² In the Levellers conception of the political landscape, parliament, as the body of representatives sent to serve the nation, should be the ultimate seat of power, unadulterated by a monarch or nobility: 'that the power of this, and all future Representatives of this Nation, is inferior only to theirs who chuse them, and doth extend, without consent or concurrence of any other person or persons; to the enacting, and repealing of Lawes; to the erecting and abolishing of Offices and Courts.' Anon., *An Agreement of the People for A firme and present Peace, upon grounds of common-right and freedome* (London: s.n, 1647), p.3.

'Magistrates' but those that have been given the position through an election or appointment by the people's representatives as a means of bypassing institutional corruption.⁵³ Elections should be frequent so as to avoid corruption and ensure members are incentivised to pursue the interests of their constituents – it is imperative in the Levellers manifesto 'that the People do of course chuse themselves a Parliament once in two years.'⁵⁴

The Levellers do not build their demands upon new political theory, but on an assertion that the right to be properly represented is intrinsic: '*These things we declare to be our native Rights, and therefore are agreed to maintain them with our utmost possibilities, against all opposition whatsoever, being compelled thereunto, [...] by the examples of our Ancestors, whose bloud was often spent in vain for the recovery of their Freedomes.*'⁵⁵ This model is expanded in further Leveller pamphlets, and as part of their theory of statecraft, petitions served as a mechanic for proper representation: 'those in Authoritie can in nothing more resemble God, then in their readiness to heare and receive the complaints and Petitions of any that apply themselves unto them.'⁵⁶ To 'heare and receive' public petitions is not just a function of governance but a 'readiness' to fulfil this role is likened to a Christian virtue. Though the Levellers remained far from mainstream, and the fundamental tenets of their manifesto did not gain political traction, their insistence on the necessity for thorough and extensive representation of the populace – and to listen to public opinion, whether as expressed through petitions or other forms – changed the tenor of public debate. Receiving and responding to petitions properly and judiciously had increasingly become an important part of governance for both local authorities and Parliament – in the rhetoric established by supplicants over the period, petitions were beginning to be understood as a public prerogative. This is illustrated even through conservative, reactionary criticisms of petitions during the 1640s and 50s, which rather than castigating the act of petitioning, lambasted the manner of writing. Customarily petitions were composed in a manner that stressed the inferiority of the

⁵³ Anon., *An Agreement*, p.3.

⁵⁴ Anon., *An Agreement*, p.3.

⁵⁵ Anon., *An Agreement*, p.5.

⁵⁶ Anon., *A Declaration of the Parliament of England, in vindication of their proceedings, and discovering the dangerous practices of several Interests* (London: Printed by John Field for Edward Husband, 1649), p.1.

supplicant, calling on the grace and magnanimity of the intended recipient – this mode was used even when couching revolutionary demands: ‘this rhetoric depoliticizes petitions by concealing the intent to lobby to promote preferred solutions to grievances, for this would signal contempt to authority.’⁵⁷

To bypass this mode was to risk appearing unappreciative of the potential boon you had asked of your social superior – this challenged the status quo and left the petitioner open to the accusation of sedition. Zaret argues that partisan groups on both ends of the political spectrum used a critique of style as a primary means of reprimanding petitioners: ‘debates over the respective merits of opinions invoked in support of different political positions thus frequently turned on the issue of whether the expressed opinion, or its mode of expression, was compatible with traditional petitionary rhetoric and practices.’⁵⁸ Petitioning was thus understood as a right, though contemporaries argued over the parameters of its form. As has been asserted by Derek Hirst, ‘historians of political crisis, whether in the 1640s or a generation later, have seen in mass petitions crucial instruments of partisan mobilization’ – though the extent to which petitioning affected public policy, it is clear that as both instruments of propaganda and barometers of public opinion they played a role during the Civil War and Interregnum, and had begun to be constituted as a right of the subject.⁵⁹ Not only do they serve as markers of popular sentiment they have also been interpreted as precursors to other political institutions: ‘many petitions in the 1640s did not come from corporate entities – as tradition dictated for petitions dealing with public issues – but from associations of private persons for petitions dealing with public issues – but from associations of private persons’; in effect these ‘associations of private persons’, in Zaret’s chronology, would be the antecedents to political groups such as the Green Ribbon Club, and eventually to what would now be recognised as political parties.⁶⁰ The importance of petitions and their role they

⁵⁷ Zaret, ‘the Invention of “Public Opinion”’, p.1514.

⁵⁸ David Zaret, ‘Petitioning Places and the Credibility of Opinion in the Public Sphere in Seventeenth-Century England’ in *Political Space in Pre-Industrial Europe*, ed. by Beat Kumin (London: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2013), pp.175-195 (p.192).

⁵⁹ Derek Hirst, ‘Making Contact: Petitions and the English Republic’ in *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (2006), 26-50 (p.27).

⁶⁰ Zaret, ‘the Invention of “Public Opinion”’, p.1499.

played in the public sphere is clear. Thus the retraction of this right could not help but cause consternation.

Silencing the Rabble

The English Short Title Catalogue records that between 1640 and 1659 1,748 printed documents written in English bear the word 'petition' in their titles or on their frontispieces.⁶¹ Whilst a number of these documents are mock petitions, the majority are either genuine supplications or polemic in the guise of a humble entreaty. Between 1660 and 1674, this number had dwindled to 197.⁶² As part of a repressive ploy to stifle potential sedition, in 1661 the Crown issued a proclamation prohibiting 'Tumults, and Disorders, upon pretence of preparing or presenting publike Petitions, or other Addresses to the Majesty, or the Parliament.'⁶³ The Act specifically forbade any subject from attempting to 'solicite, labor, or procure the getting of hands, or other consent of any persons about the number of twenty or more' for 'any Petition, Complaint, Remonstrance, Declaration, or other Address' to be presented before the King or Parliament upon threat of a hundred pound fine.⁶⁴ Petitions are specifically cited as a cause of Charles I's downfall, '[having] been made use of to serve the ends of factious and seditious persons gotten into power, to the violation of the publicke peace, and haue been a great means of the late unhappy Wards, Confusions, and Calamities in this Nation' – suppressing this form of political expression a means of 'preventing the like mischief for the future.'⁶⁵ Knights contends that, 'legislation thus effectively forestalled any new mass petitioning campaign, though it did not entirely eradicate the possibility that corporate bodies might press petitions on the monarch

⁶¹ 'Petition, 1640-1659', in *The English Short Title Catalogue* <http://estc.bl.uk/F/5PM3JI72R8DY2LUVK4NR157PHRFE4NC2QYAV3KDH6TAE5H99RE-35215?func=short-0&set_number=014976> [accessed 2nd September, 2019].

⁶² 'Petition, 1660-1674', in *The English Short Title Catalogue* <http://estc.bl.uk/F/5PM3JI72R8DY2LUVK4NR157PHRFE4NC2QYAV3KDH6TAE5H99RE-35498?func=short-0&set_number=015145> [accessed 2nd September, 2019].

⁶³ Anon., *Anno Regni Caroli IJ. Regis Angliæ, Scotie, Franciæ, & Hiberniæ, Decimo Tertio* (London: Printed by John Bill and Christopher Barker, 1661), p.21.

⁶⁴ Anon., *Anno decimo tertio*, p.22.

⁶⁵ Anon., *Anno decimo tertio*, p.21.

on matters of national policy.’⁶⁶ In this way economic entities were valued more highly than the rights of the individual. The wording of the Act specifically reveals the underlying anxiety behind the prohibition. It is the act of mass subscription, the ‘excessive number of people’ who had been canvassed and who by giving their ‘consent’ had asserted their convictions, insisting upon their right to voice their opinion and expecting to be answered, which disquieted the establishment.⁶⁷ In seeking to suppress petitioning, the government tacitly acknowledged the importance of the practice to the public sphere, and exposed the extent of their fear of public engagement with politics. Still, the desire to publicly express grievances persisted, as evidenced by the fact that subjects risked the penalty in order to publish their petitions.

By the time Marvell came to write *An Account*, the issue had already become a point of contention, on the verge of broiling over in the wake of the Exclusion Crisis – a tension between an intractable establishment and a politically assiduous public, a conflict of interest that his readership would have been well aware of. London’s apprentices, who had used petitions as a method of carving out a political identity during the war and Interregnum, turned to active displays of outrage, using riots as a method of expressing political discontent. In response to a growing sense of disenchantment at the actions of Charles and his government, accusations of hedonism and debauchery became the flash point at which the public directed their ire. In his *History of My Own Time* (the first volume of which was published in 1724) Whig historian Gilbert Burnet (1643-1715) encapsulated contemporary reactions to Charles’ behaviour: ‘the ruin of his reign, and of all his affairs, was occasioned chiefly by his delivering himself up at his first coming over to a mad range of pleasure.’⁶⁸ Instances of violence around the Easter holiday had been a regular occurrence prior to 1642 – the ubiquity of these civil disturbances was such that when apprentices rioted at Lambeth Palace in protest at the appointment and political influence of William Laud (1543-1675), an expression of a wider anti-episcopal discontent, it was

⁶⁶ Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, p.128.

⁶⁷ Anon., *Anno decimo tertio*, p.22.

⁶⁸ Gilbert Burnet, *History of His Own Time: From the Restoration of King Charles the Second to the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht, in the Reign of Queen Anne* (London: William S. Orr & Co., 1850), p.61.

derided by royalists as ‘a Shrove Tuesday business.’⁶⁹ The vogue for Easter riots returned in 1668 after the optimism of the Restoration became replaced by disenchantment. The Bawdy House Riots of 1668 marked the first explicitly political instance of rioting that occurred during Charles’ reign. Beginning on Easter Monday, the 23rd of March, in response to the government’s increased constraints upon non-conformist gatherings, rioters attacked brothels in explicit condemnation of Charles’ perceived sexual licentiousness and immorality.⁷⁰

Though violent, these actions were not senseless. Harris asserts that, ‘the riots were an explicitly political protest, motivated by grievances both against the Court and against the policy of religious persecution.’⁷¹ Rioters marched under green banners, the colour of the Levellers – in attacking what they had dubbed to be buildings symbolic of the establishment, the rioters proclaimed their sympathy with the radically democratic aims of the Leveller movement. This is also evident in the chants used, which included ‘Down with the Red Coats’ and threats to ‘pull White-hall down.’⁷² Also heard was the increasingly bitter popular aphorism ‘the Bishops get all, the Courtiers spend all, the Citizens pay for all, the King neglects all, and the Divalls take all.’⁷³ In the aftermath of the Bawdy House riots the participants were both condemned and excused by the press, with printed satires both mocking the event and further strengthening the connection between the attack on a “bawdy house” and a political protest against the court. The reaction by the Government was swift and extreme. As reported in *The London Gazette*:

⁶⁹ Branding instances of public unrest as an apprentice riot was a common tactic used by royalists as a means of minimising and trivialising expressions of political dissatisfaction and popular anger at the establishment: the very moniker Roundhead was in reference to an apprentice haircut. James Grantham Turner, *Libertines and Radicals in Early Modern London: Sexuality, Politics and Literary Culture, 1630-1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.65.

⁷⁰ The incident consisted of a full three days of rioting, involving attacks on brothels in Poplar, Moorfields, East Smithfield and Holborn – participants also attacked Finsbury Goal and New Prison in an attempt to release rioters who had been seized by the authorities. Evidence suggests these attacks were well organised – participants travelled from different areas of London, organised themselves into units headed by captains and came equipped with the tools necessary to raze a building. Harris, *London Crowds*, p.82.

⁷¹ Harris, *London Crowds*, p.84.

⁷² Harris, *London Crowds*, p.83.

⁷³ This chant gained traction in London after the introduction of the wildly unpopular hearth tax in 1662 (a measure introduced to “supplement” the Royal household), which many denizens of the city refused to countenance paying. Jenny Uglow, *A Gambling Man: Charles II and the Restoration 1660-1670* (London: Faber & Faber, 2009), p.191.

London, May 9. This day *Thomas Limmerick, Edward Cotton, Peter Messenger* and *Richard Beasley*, four of the persons formerly apprehended in the Tumult during the *Easter-holidays* [... having] been found guilty, and since sentenced as Traytors, were accordingly Drawn, Hang'd and Quartered at *Tyburn*, where they shewed many signs of there Penitence.⁷⁴

The punishment meted to the rioters was excessive. Historically the young men who engaged in Easter rioting were either excused or given lenient penalties; the sentences given to these rioters marked a clear escalation in government reaction. To try the rioters with the charge of high treason (claiming that in gathering together as a mass group, their actions were akin to the raising of an insurgent army) was, altogether, 'a rather dubious interpretation of the law.'⁷⁵ The severity of the sentence was a clear indicator of the Crown's anxiety, and the threat posed by these events. By setting a legal precedent of trying rioters as traitors, future protestors could easily be met with the same penalty.

The rioters needed to be made an example of, their punishment serving as a deterrent for others who might wish to engage in political protesting; in death they were even granted the ignominy of having their heads displayed on London Bridge, a warning to fellow discontented citizens. Immediately after proclaiming the verdict, the *Gazette* went on to inform its readership that '*London, May 9.* This day His Majesty was pleased to be present in the Lords House [... during] Which, with severall Private Bills, His Majesty was Graciously pleased to pass.'⁷⁶ The propagandistic intent of this placement is implicit. Printed in the space usually reserved for advertisements, both of these notices have been printed with a larger type face than the preceding material, giving them immediate visual priority for a reader. The mouthpiece for the state, whilst giving a substantial account of both the sentence and execution of the rioters (and taking care to stress the 'penitence' of the convicted men), positioned news of a protest made in opposition to a "libertine" King's actions directly beside a summary detailing that King performing his duty 'Graciously.' 'Pleased' is repeated in order to further stress Charles' devotion to his role. In painting Charles in this light the

⁷⁴ *The London Gazette*, 7 May 1668 <<https://www.thegazette.co.uk/London/issue/259/page/2>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019] (page 2).

⁷⁵ Tim Harris, 'The Bawdy House Riots of 1668', in *The Historical Journal*, 29 (1986), 537-556 (p.537).

⁷⁶ *The London Gazette*, 7 May 1668, page 2.

producers of the *Gazette* are undermining the concerns of the rioters and those who might sympathise with their actions – presenting their readers a dichotomy between ‘Traytors’ and a diligent, attentive monarch. In this way the state attempted to control the narrative and reframe the riots, however this didn’t preclude alternative interpretations. Though an act of violence in and of itself, responses to ‘the Tumult’ specifically aligned the incident with petitioning and the methods of political expression suppressed after the fall of Cromwell. The satires which discussed the events of the 23rd of March took the form of mock petitions, in which ‘poor whores’ petitioned Lady Castlemaine (Charles II’s most politically influential mistress) to protect them – in this way petitioning, the once primary means of the populace to voice their political opinion, re-emerged as a means of protest (now as a form of satire) to challenge the establishment.

These protests took place in a climate of intense elitism, in which the value of any political opinion not proffered by any one of the right class or gender was apt to be scorned or dismissed, a period of ‘polarized views about contract, consent, the right to resist, freedom of conscience, and hence also the power and rights of the people.’⁷⁷ The presentation of the public was dependent on the political ethos of the speaker:

The people could be regarded in a number of diverse ways: as the sovereign and/or as the mob, as a collective and/or as individuals, as a civil community and/or as a select few, as citizens and/or subjects, as landowners and/or as taxpayers, as a unified public and/or the many-headed rabble, as the commons and/or the Commons.⁷⁸

In presenting his readers ‘as a unified public’, as a Marvell is not just appealing to as wide a readership as possible, he is countering the assumption that great swathes of the populace needed to be blindly obedient – to be governed rather than represented: ‘here the Subjects retain their proportion in the Legislature; the very meanest Commoner of England is represented in Parliament.’⁷⁹ In these lines we see an echo of the sentiments expressed in the Presbyterian tract, *A Glasse for Weak Ey’d Citizens*: ‘*behold them condemning the course of Petitioning, the way themselves take, the only*

⁷⁷ Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, p.20.

⁷⁸ Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, p.107.

⁷⁹ Marvell, *Account*, p.225.

way left to the Subject to have their grievances removed; and that which is the indisputable right of the meanest Subject.' Though discussing differing forms of political expression – one direct, and one through means of an advocate – both promote the ideal that everyone, regardless of class, should have recourse to address societal ills. Variants of the term 'representative' occur over twenty times throughout *An Account* – used in both a positive sense, as a means of empowering the voting populace and avoiding arbitrary government, and as a damning indictment of the current status quo, in which both the people and their parliamentary spokesmen are deliberately being 'misinterpreted and ill represented' by those looking to pervert the system.⁸⁰ Attention is rarely paid to how insistently Marvell uses the term – it is both the cornerstone of the political philosophy expressed in *An Account* and the driver behind its polemic. As documented by J. Plumb, 'between 1653 and 1660 there were more parliamentary elections than there had been for the previous thirty years.'⁸¹ Many people had grown used to elections, and having a say in public policy – this was a shift in public inclination that Marvell is attuned to and *An Account* was published at a specific moment to further direct public dissatisfaction towards a new election.

Vox Populi

Thus far, this chapter has considered the means of political protest available (and unavailable) to English subjects during the years following the Restoration of Charles. It shall now turn its attention to the specific ways Marvell's text chimed with the agitations of the 1670s and the implications for his readership. Though Marvell does not ask the reader to contravene the law and petition the state, his pamphlet fits into a growing protest – Marvell's contribution to the campaign was both a common enemy (the 'Conspirators' holding perverting the otherwise unerring judgement of 'His Majesty') and a definitive method of removing this obstacle to fair governance: an election. For the state to deny the populace the ability to petition was not just a trespass against a long and proudly held right; as Marvell composed *An Account* petitioning was an issue forefront in the public consciousness as it became

⁸⁰ Marvell, *Account*, p.275.

⁸¹ Plumb, 'The Growth of the Electorate', p.107.

increasingly clear that the establishment refused to acknowledge the public's growing disapproval of its policies.

There are clear instances of citizens specifically bridling at the restrictions placed on their former participatory rights. On 24 June 1676 Francis Jenks (1640-1686), a linen draper and member of the Green Ribbon Club, delivered a speech to the liverymen assembled to elect sheriffs for London and Middlesex protesting the government. He urged his audience to pressure the lord major call a common council in order to petition Charles II to dissolve the Cavalier Parliament and call a general election.⁸² Jenks had been active in the emerging Country party scene, coming into contact with Marvell's own associate the Duke of Buckingham; his speech was met with immediate condemnation from the authorities and Jenks was arrested. When he appeared before Charles to testify, Jenks refused to renege on his former protestations. He was subsequently imprisoned. Marvell was well aware of this debacle, remarking about the affair in letters to both Sir Edward Harley and William Pople, sarcastically noting that when Jenks suggested an election as the 'Right and Remedy of the Nation' he was arrested as a result of the 'Mutinous and Seditious Motion & for his Arrogant defending it before the Council.'⁸³ Marvell's admiration of 'Mr Jinks' is clear; he even went as far as to dub him 'a single brave fellow.'⁸⁴ Here we see Marvell specifically deriding the idea that to present a petition (or in this case, even *request* to do so), be considered 'Mutinous and Seditious.' Jenks went on to become an influential figure in London during the Exclusion Crisis – spearheading a petition for a new parliament in January 1679, and throwing his support behind a petition to ensure a protestant succession. The contents of the 'Seditious' speech became widely available to the public when printed as a hand out in 1679, in an effort to add further momentum to the movement.

Though Jenks conforms to the supplication norms of the petitioner, asking permission to 'humbly [...] Petition His Majesty', his appeals are urgent and exact: 'That for the quieting and satisfying the minds of his liege People, and for the remedy

⁸² Like Marvell, Jenks played on anti-Catholic sentiment – inciting fears of popery and (in reference to the fiscal interests of his extended audience) the anxieties surrounding French commercial competition.

⁸³ Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, p.344.

⁸⁴ Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, p.348.

of the many mischeifs and grievances we now groan under, He would be graciously be pleased (according to the Statues of 4th. and 36th of *Edvv.* 3) immediately to call a *New Parliament*.⁸⁵ Though calling upon the “grace” of Charles, an election is, by Jenks’ logic, in accordance with statutes already in place – the denial of one is thus a trespass upon the rights of the citizenry. Though framed as a request, it is undoubtedly a demand. Jenks also raises fiscal concerns in his critique of the government: ‘[the French] have ruined our Trade at home, and beggared many thousands of our honest and industrious Weavers, and other English Manufactors [...] so that upon an exact balance of the Trade between us and them taken, it has been demonstrated, that this City and Kingdom doth lose Eleven hundred thousand pounds every year.’⁸⁶ The dominance of the French naval force is also a concern (“their Privateers daily take our Merchants Ships, plunder others’), as is the broader public discernment of French influence at court: ‘*That is the apprehension that is upon the minds of good men of danger to his Majesties Person and the Protestant Religion.*’⁸⁷

The parallels between Jenks’ speech and Marvell’s pamphlet are clear as in his polemic Marvell is specifically addressing the grievances expressed by the likes of Jenks, placing their concerns within his wider narrative:

The Conspirators had therefore, the more to gratify him, made it their constant Maxime, to burden the English Merchant here with one hand, while the *French* should load them no less with the other, in his Territories; which was a parity of Trade indeed, though something an extravagant one, but the best that could be hoped from the prudence and integrity of our States-men; insomuch, that when the Merchants have at any time come down from *London* to represent their grievances from the French, to seek redress, or offer their humble advice, they were Hector'd, Brow-beaten, Ridiculed, and might have found fairer audience even from *Monsieur Colbert*.⁸⁸

Here ‘the prudence and integrity of our States-men’ is treated with dripping sarcasm – in asking those who claim to ‘represent’ them to actually do so, the ‘Merchants’ are

⁸⁵ Francis Jenks, *Mr Francis Jenk's speech: spoken in a common hall* (London: s.n., 1679), pp.1-2.

⁸⁶ Jenks, *Jenk's speech*, p.1.

⁸⁷ Jenks, *Jenk's speech*, p.2.

⁸⁸ Marvell, *Account*, p.265: Charles Colbert de Croissy (1625-1696) had served as a term as French ambassador to London from 1668 to 1674.

vigorously rebuffed and their valid concerns completely ignored. By approaching the authorities using the traditional petitionary norms – couching their experience as ‘Humble advice’, expressing their ‘grievances’ rather than demanding action – Marvell is presenting the ‘Merchants’ to the reader as the very model of the rightful petitioner. Derek Hirst argues that:

the encounter of supplicant and superior imparted a dynamic element to early modern visions of order, and although the rhetoric of rule changed markedly across the decades, the responsiveness and care expected of magistrates did not.⁸⁹

The people had grown accustomed to being answered; in reflexively rebuffing the ‘Merchants’, the authorities are risking public ire. The way ‘the Merchants’ are received, given the respectful mode in which they approached the authorities is indicative of the callous indifference of the establishment, and the breakdown of the liberties of the subject – even when properly performing the mechanism that should serve as a means to ‘redress’ (the mechanism that asserts the superiority of the recipient, and thus preserves status quo), the petitioners are ‘Ridiculed’ and met with disdain. The system is broken and failing to serve the majority.

Marvell also addresses the same fiscal concerns expressed by Jenks. The Triple League between Holland, England and Spain (as well the resulting subsidiary treaties with other European nations) served not just to limit French power, but to bolster trade and English interests at home and abroad: ‘*Establishing a Free Trade for his Majesties Subjects [... and] a very great advantage for the Vending of Cloth and other our home Commodities, bringing back Silk and other Materials for Manufactures here.*’⁹⁰ Furthermore, ‘*His Majesty therefore, of his Princely Care for the Good of his People*’ made naval reinforcements ‘*to be for Security of our Merchants in the Mediterranean.*’⁹¹ Marvell frequently refers to ‘the French Depradations and Cruelties exercised at Sea upon his Majesties *Subjects*, and to this day continued and tollerated

⁸⁹ ‘In extreme cases, rulers who stumbled over petitions might face consequences. Only with difficulty did Charles I recover from his first grudging answer to the Petition of Right in 1628, and a generation later the army justified its expulsion of the Rump in 1653 by citing the latter’s failure to respond to the Council of Officer’s petition the previous August.’ Derek Hirst, ‘Making Contact’, p.26.

⁹⁰ Marvell, *Account*, p.247.

⁹¹ Marvell, *Account*, p.246.

without reparation' in order to stress a widely believed injustice, the use of italics to place emphasis on the term '*Subjects*' rather than in reference to the Monarch an implicit acknowledgment of the group truly wronged and deserving 'reparation.'⁹² This 'Princely Care' had since lapsed in the pursuit of interests distinct from '*the Good of his People.*' By breaking the League in order to pursue a stronger connection to France, 'the Conspirators' (and by extension '*His Majesty*') have instigated the issues '*our Merchants*' and '*Manufactures here*' have faced; an impasse that could only be resolved by a '*New Parliament.*' Marvell asserts throughout the pamphlet the right for his readers, and every other citizen, to be properly represented by their representatives – but as the treatment of 'the Merchants' reveals, the system of representation facilitated by 'the encounter of supplicant and superior' is no longer serving those who urgently need 'redress.' The persistent institutional malaise and corruption present at parliament further distances the reader from their right to be represented. The implicit suggestion is that it is necessary to act (like Jenks and 'the Merchants') and put yet further pressure on the establishment in order to prevent the onset of *Arbitrary Government*.

The call for an election and new parliament came from many and varied corners. One persistent premise that recurred in these discourses, was the argument that the frequent prorogations meant that a large swathe of the populace – namely, the men aged between 21 and 37, who had been too young to vote at the last election, but were now eligible as freeholders – were not being represented. This became a popular refrain, and 1677 saw a particular swell in this kind of writing, as 'a number of tracts argued that parliament's longevity broke the link between the people and representation.'⁹³ In particular, the Young Men's Plea put forward this argument, asserting that representatives only bore that authority when authorised by their constituents; without their votes, the validity of the title as representatives is nullified, and thus by extension the legislation advanced by them can be disregarded: 'Freeborn Englishmen who were denied their representative rights were, it was asserted, neither obliged to obey the laws nor pay taxation.'⁹⁴ In *The Long Parliament Dissolved* (1676) Denzil Holles (1598-1680), a member of the House of Lords, also

⁹² Marvell, *Account*, p.374.

⁹³ Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, p.35.

⁹⁴ Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, p.36.

advances this argument (though he does not advocate tax avoidance as a method of protest).⁹⁵ In Holles tract, a yearly election is a right set down by legislation enacted during the reign of Edward III, and while ‘the People have silently waited, and born that Omission’ in the past, the length of the current parliament is a burden that tests this patience: ‘the prodigious length of 15 or 16 years, till they were not *Representatives* of the one half of the People of *England*: Yet, we say, we held our Peace.’⁹⁶ The terms Holles uses to describe the representational rights of the people are definite: ‘we know, that all the People of *England* have equal Right to be *Represented*, and could make it demonstratable, that a Parliament of that length can never be the *Representative* of half the People’, excluding as it does, ‘all from 21 years of age to 37, which as the Major part of the People of *England*, both in number and vigor.’⁹⁷

Just as in *The Young Man’s Plea*, as these men are not being properly represented, and as the government is acting in defiance of an existing law, the men who have been excluded from the political process are under no obligation to uphold the laws passed by a House which does not represent them: ‘*That either the Prorogation is Null, and the Parliament as an End, or, All our LAWS are of no Effect.* And therefore we Appeal to Mankind in general, and more particularly to every Member of the late Parliament, Whether we are not reduced to an unavoidable necessity of Breaking our Silence.’⁹⁸ Holles repeatedly evokes the idea ‘of Breaking our Silence’: ‘Wisdom saith, *There is a vvell a time to Speak, as a time to be Silent* [...] such a Necessity we are under at this time. For no less than the *Lavvs*, and with them the *Lives, Liberties* and *Properties* of every *English-Man* is at stake [...] Wherefore on our own behalf, and the behalves of all other the People of *England*, we crave leave to speak.’⁹⁹ In Holles’ rendering of the issue, the ‘People’ have collectively acted respectively and calmly – though by rights they should be angry, ‘they have silently waited’ for the ‘*Remedy of Grievances and Mischiefs that daily happen.*’¹⁰⁰ Far from the

⁹⁵ Denzil Holles, *The Long Parliament Dissolved* (London: s.n., 1676).

⁹⁶ Holles, *Dissolved*, p.4.

⁹⁷ Holles, *Dissolved*, p.4.

⁹⁸ Holles, *Dissolved*, p.6.

⁹⁹ Holles, *Dissolved*, p.3.

¹⁰⁰ Holles, *Dissolved*, p.4.

'rabble', they are the reasonable ones; it is the actions of the government which are entirely illogical.¹⁰¹

This concern over the divided loyalty of members is further addressed in Marvell's text: 'for it is too notorious to be concealed, that a near a third part of the House have beneficial Offices under his Majesty, in the Privy Councill, the Army, the Navy, the Law, the Household, the Revenue both in England and Ireland, or in attendance on his Majesties person.'¹⁰² While Marvell does not name names, a sister text, entitled *A Seasonable Argument to Perswade All the Grand Juries in England, to Petition for a New Parliament*, was released hot on the heels of *An Account* in 1677.¹⁰³ Both this and Marvell's text were printed by John Darby, and the suggestion has been made that the two authors collaborated in order to cause the biggest possible stir.¹⁰⁴ *A Seasonable Argument* goes even further than *An Account* – whilst Marvell alludes to corrupt behaviour, *A Seasonable Argument* went as far as to libel individuals, listing regions and then listing members either accused of misusing public funds, or of holding an office that would divide their loyalty. To take 'Kent' as an example, seven members of parliament are named and shamed, including: 'Sir Thomas Peyton, the Coal-Farm, worth 2000 l. per annum, has had many Boons, and yet has spent all, and his own Estate to boot. This is Peyton the Informer'; 'Rochester. Sir Francis Clerk, a Commissioner of the Prizes and a constant Receiver of all Publick money, and a constant diner at Court Tables'; and 'Quinborough. James Herbert Esquire, is but fifteen years old, but Son in Law to the Treasurer, and therefore of Age to dispose of the Peoples Money.'¹⁰⁵ In just these three individuals from one county nepotism, cronyism and the misspending of public funds are evident: the blatant nepotism and ascension of a man so young into a position of power, would especially rancour amongst those 'Young Men' unable to exercise their right to participate in the political process. Here a reader could learn of the behaviour of their own so-called

¹⁰¹ A similar view of the Long Parliament was shared by some of its members, and an attempt was made in 1675 to pass a bill that would remove any member currently holding any role at court or in the royal household from having a seat – had it passed, this bill would have ensured a general election (as well as addressing concerns over institutional corruption), however, the bill failed.

¹⁰² Marvell, *Account*, p.299.

¹⁰³ Anon., *A Seasonable Argument To Perswade All the Grand Juries in England, to Petition for A New Parliament* ("Amsterdam": John Darby, 1667).

¹⁰⁴ Chernaik, *The Poet's Time*, p.97.

¹⁰⁵ Anon., *A Seasonable Argument*, pp.10-11.

representative, and be able to judge their fitness for the role – further inciting the need for an election. In arguing throughout *An Account* that members who divide their loyalty between their House and the court are undermining the needs of their constituents, Marvell situates himself within this discourse – the system of governance, necessary for the political health of the nation, can only function if all within the franchise are adequately represented. Marvell does not need to ask his readership to ‘Break their Silence’ – his work is chiming with a body of political discourse insistent upon the rights of the subject, and both acting as and proffering a means of protest.

Marvell’s efforts to sway public opinion coincided with a concerted campaign by newly emerging political parties. Warren Chernaik contends that the ‘Country Party pamphlets of 1675-7 [were] closely coordinated’ – Marvell’s work complemented these ‘appeals to the country, making public the proceedings of Parliament in order to stir up support for the Parliamentary opposition in the nation at large and strengthen the position of the Country Party in Parliament.’¹⁰⁶ Though Marvell exalts the system of representation, his pamphlet decried the representatives. In Marvell’s *Account* they are hapless puppets, with no qualms about changing their loyalties or accepting bribes. These corrupt statesman would ‘extend the supposed Prerogative on all occasions, to the detriment of the Subjects certain and due Liberties!’¹⁰⁷ Their only aim is to secure the ‘Advantage of their own Profession.’¹⁰⁸ Worse still, they lie to ‘*the People*’:

They are generally men, who by speaking against the French, inveighing against the Debauches of Court, talking of the ill management of the Revenue, and such Popular flourishes, have cheated the Countreys into Electing them, and when they come up, if they can speak in the House, they make a faint attaque or two upon some great Minister of State, and perhaps relieve some other that is in danger of Parliament, to make themselves either way considerable.

¹⁰⁶ Chernaik, *The Poet’s Time*, p.96.

¹⁰⁷ Marvell, *Account*, p.300.

¹⁰⁸ Marvell, *Account*, p.300.

In matters of money they seem at first difficult, but having been discourst with in private, they are set right, and begin to understand it better themselves, and to convert their Brethren: For they are all of them bought and sold.¹⁰⁹

This corruption is exploited by 'the Conspirators', who use the political inefficiency of the House of Commons to their own advantage. Marvell argues that the only way to tackle this inefficacy, to ensure that his readers are actually represented by their representatives, is to have a national election, so that these 'bought and sold' men, who have completely reneged on their campaign promises, can be replaced by honest 'Publick' servants.

Where Marvell had warned the reader of corrupt politicians, *A Seasonable Argument* provides the reader with the information necessary to truly hold *their* representative to account. Elections are vital to the body politic: 'for were it so, that all the Laws of England require, and the very Constitution of our Government, as well as Experience, teaches the necessity of the frequent Meeting, and change of *Parliaments*, and suppose that the Question concerning this Prorogation, were by the Custom of *Parliaments* to be justified.'¹¹⁰ Marvell's *Account* takes its place beside other works seeking to stir public dissatisfaction in their representation. Regional delegates should embody the majority opinion of their constituency, and work to the benefit of the 'Publick Interest' – the system is in place to serve his readership, and they must ensure that it properly functions. Should the loyalty of an MP be called into question, especially if they have ties to the royal household, this is unacceptable:

that the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses there assembled, are the Representers of the People of England, and are more peculiarly impowred by them to transact concerning the Religion, Lives, Liberties, and the Propriety of the Nation. And therefore no Honourable person, related to his Majesties more particular service, but will in that place and opportunity suspect himself, least

¹⁰⁹ Marvell, *Account*, p.302.

¹¹⁰ Marvell, *Account*, p.298.

his Gratitude to his Master, with his self-interest should tempt him beyond his obligation there to the Publick.¹¹¹

Above all, their duty is to their constituents.

Whilst Marvell's text does not go so far as to suggest a method of protest, unlike the other texts calling for an election, *An Account* is further reaching in its attack on the court, and by extension the Court Party and the monarch whose prerogative they acted to support. Though similar to a petition in its use of a deferent tone when referring to 'His Majesty', this deference is purely surface; beneath the veneer is a heavy layer of irony. For instance, in discussing one of the Crown's many requests to parliament for further funds, Marvell retorts 'they were told that it was now *Pro Aris & Focis*, all was at stake.'¹¹² '*Pro Aris & Focis*' is an adaption of the Cicero's adage "for altars and hearths" (a variant of "for God and Country") – rather than a simple Latin axiom, the allusion is to the hearth tax. The hearth tax was a much resented imposition on the British public – a burden they felt had been placed on the citizenry to support Charles' debauched lifestyle. In making reference to it here, Marvell conflates the supplies demanded of parliament with the taxes levied on the public. Earlier in the pamphlet when describing the state of constitutional bliss the state would be functioning under (where it not for 'the Conspirators', of course), Marvell argues that ordinarily there would be absolutely no need for the King to make further monetary demands, as he already 'hath a vast Revenue': 'from the Hearth of the Householder, the Sweat of the Labourer, the Rent of the Farmer, the Industry of the Merchant, and consequently out of the estate of the Gentleman: a large competence to defray the ordinary expense of the Crown, and maintain in lustre.'¹¹³ To refer again to the hearth tax here (rather than a less contested levy) is to allude to popular dissatisfaction whilst supposedly describing a state of harmony.

Ultimately, the actions of the King mean that such peace will remain elusive. Whilst all members of society contribute financially to the state – whether through their taxes, labour, rent, property or through trade – the contribution of the monarch is more obtuse. Conversely, Marvell presents parliament repeatedly acting in the

¹¹¹ Marvell, *Account*, p.299.

¹¹² Marvell, *Account*, p.272.

¹¹³ Marvell, *Account*, p.226.

interests of the wider populace, describing instances in which parliament voted against excessive tax or 'any Surcharge against the Subject.'¹¹⁴ This faux-deference is also apparent in discussions of the Land-Army: 'there was yet another thing, the Land-Army, which appearing to them expensive, needless, and terrible to the People, they addressed to his Majesty also, that they might be disbanded. All of which things put together, his Majesty was induced to Prorogue the Parliament again.'¹¹⁵ A standing army – ever unpopular with the British populace – is here used to highlight royal indifference. When presented with an issue widely acknowledged to be 'terrible to the People', the reaction of 'his Majesty' is to once again 'Prorogue the Parliament', effectively shutting down debate in the House, and preventing the electorate from voicing their opinion through an election. Marvell also asks his readers to question the limits of royal power – though asserting that subjects should be 'all concurring in common Obedience to the Sovereign' (a declaration necessary to avoid accusations of sedition), this statement is rendered ironic by the lines that proceed it, as it is more important that 'we respect our Obedience to God.'¹¹⁶ Here, duty to personal faith (the liberty of conscience Marvell more voraciously defends in his other pamphlets), is ranked greater than monarchical obligation. In his rendering of the constitution, though royal power is not denied, it is intrinsically limited: 'His very Prerogative is no more then what the Law has determined.'¹¹⁷ The King's power is circumscribed, and in the behaviour that Marvell goes on to relate, he has overstepped the bounds. In this depiction of the King ignoring the will of his subjects and parliament, parallels between Charles II and his French counterpart are made apparent for the reader in this vignette, which juxtaposes the two styles of governance:

the 15th of February 1676 came, and that very same day, the *French* King appointed his March for *Flanders* [...] And he thought it a becoming *Galantrie*, to take the rest of *Flanders* our natural out work in the very face of the King of *England* and his *Petites Maisons* of Parliament [...]

¹¹⁴ Marvell, *Account*, p.274.

¹¹⁵ Marvell, *Account*, p.274.

¹¹⁶ Marvell, *Account*, p.235.

¹¹⁷ Marvell, *Account*, p.225.

meanwhile] His Majesty demanded of the Parliament [...] *the Additional Excise upon Beer and Ale*.¹¹⁸

Where the French King (fixed in the popular imagination as the model of a tyrannous governor) is imagined as belittling British institutions, dubbing parliament “little houses”, Charles, in his “demands”, is placing further tax burdens on his subjects in pursuit of foreign policy aims at variance with the will of the said subjects. Neither monarch is respectful of civic institutions.

It is not just the monarch the Marvell that hintingly derides, but also the metanarratives used to support the Restoration regime; instead asking the reader to question these prevailing assumptions. One such grand narrative is the fall of Charles I – painted as the result of ambitious parliamentarians and a populist uprising upon the eve of the Restoration. Marvell instead attributes the regicide to a Catholic plot; ‘in the time of his late Majesty, King Charles the first, (besides what they contributed to the Civil War in England) the Rebellion and horrid Massacre in Ireland, and which was even worse than that, their pretending it was done by the Kings Commission.’¹¹⁹ It is the interference of foreign factions and noblemen with allegiance to Rome rather than Whitehall that engineered the civil war by “encouraging” Charles to pursue disastrous policies, ‘all of which ended in the ruine of His Majesties Reputation, Government and Person.’¹²⁰ Marvell is here countering the narrative that civil war was the result of petitioning, or any form of grass roots activism – though led astray, Charles still bears responsibility for ‘the ruine of His Majesties Reputation.’ Thus the idea that petitions – the means by which the public had recourse to express their opinion – were, as expressed by the 1661 proclamation against ‘Tumults’, simply a means ‘to serve the ends of factious and seditious persons gotten into power, to the violation of the publicke peace, and haue been a great means of the late unhappy Wards, Confusions, and Calamities in this Nation’, is rendered absurd, and the infringement upon a fundamental right even more egregious. Ultimately, a greater public injustice will be served if the public allow the rise of arbitrary Government to go unchecked:

¹¹⁸ Marvell, *Account*, p.295.

¹¹⁹ Marvell, *Account*, p.235.

¹²⁰ Marvell, *Account*, p.236.

For, as to matter of Government, if to murder the King be, as certainly it is, a Fact so horrid, how much more heinous is it to assassinate the Kingdom? And as none will deny, that to alter our *Monarchy* into a *Common wealth* were *Treason*, so by the same Fundamental Rule, the Crime is no less to make that *Monarchy Absolute*.¹²¹

This statement borders on sedition, a clear indication of the seriousness of Marvell's intent.

In other moments, Marvell counters popular representations of former Cavaliers. As will be discussed in the next section of this thesis, direct portrayals of Cavaliers (or convenient stand-ins for their loyal virtue) were a mainstay of the newly restored Restoration theatre, which served as a barely disguised propaganda vehicle for the Stuart regime – in Marvell's portrayal of these figures, however, glory is entirely absent. In sarcastically theorising how 'honest old Cavaliers' could allow the interests of the nation at large to slip from the top of the agenda, Marvell paints this tableau:

Yet were these men honest old Cavaliers that had suffered in his late Majesties service, it were allowable in them, as oft as their wounds brake out at Spring or Fall, to think of a more Arbitrary Government, as a sovereign Balsom for their Aches, or to imagine that no Weapon-salve but of the Moss that grows on an Enemies Skul could cure them¹²²

The phrase 'sovereign Balsom' drips with irony, an explicit critique of the ultimate source of their consternation – the failure of the King to reward their loyalty, leaving them instead to 'Revel and Surfeit upon their Calamities.'¹²³ Though Presbyterians had popularly been blamed for this lapse in recognition for their service and sacrifice, here Marvell transfers the blame to the 'Conspirators' as part of their plain to 'subvert the Government.'¹²⁴ However, though the veil of the 'Conspirators' is again invoked,

¹²¹ Marvell, *Account*, p.238.

¹²² Marvell, *Account*, p.239.

¹²³ Marvell, *Account*, p.239.

¹²⁴ Marvell, *Account*, pp.238-9.

the sly inclusion of the term 'sovereign' is a clear indicator of the real source of recent political upheaval.

In the seventeenth century, a cottage industry sprang up involving the import of "skull moss" (literal moss growing from a human skull) from Ireland for its apparent medical efficacy, the gruesome lichen gained popularity as a curative as a result of its use by luminaries including Robert Boyle (1627-1691) and Charles II.¹²⁵ Such was their association with the King (who manufactured tinctures using this prize ingredient in a private laboratory) that they colloquially became known as "the king's drops", and commanded a high price.¹²⁶ By alluding to the fashionable medicine (a substance inherently associated with authoritarian cruelty and governmental mismanagement) Marvell makes another deliberate reference to the monarch within the same breath that he seemingly absolves him of blame in regard to Cavalier dissatisfaction, an implicit suggestion that the King is the cause rather than cure of their 'wounds'. Their unflinching loyalty to the Crown is part of the issue – by abetting his prorogations they ensure that progress and public discourse is stifled. In another similarly non-deferential vignette the Cavalier faction are depicted as not merely succumbing to age and 'Aches', but as close to the end: 'these that profane the title of Old Cavaliers [...] like Death apprehend a Dissolution.'¹²⁷ Parliament has become a 'gross Body', a corpse on the cusp of 'Putrefecation' – the only men ensuring that the body politic is 'preserved' are the few honest politicians (the 'handfull of *Salt*') who advance the public interest in the face of factions and opportunists.¹²⁸ Though these unflattering portraits are reserved for those who 'profane the title of Old Cavalier', a broader critique of the royalist agenda is a tacit dismissal of their loyalties.

In a letter to his nephew, Marvell recalled the same scene, and was far more dismissive of the 'Cavalier Party', describing their agenda and involvement with recent commotions within Parliament as nakedly self-serving: 'they discoursed of

¹²⁵ The history of oppression and massacre on the island, coupled with the habit of generals such as Sir Henry Gilbert (1539-1583) of decapitating men, women and children and arranging their skulls in rows as a warning, ensuring a steady supply of the substance.

¹²⁶ Richard Sugg, *Mummies, Cannibals and Vampires: The History of Corpse Medicine from the Renaissance to the Victorians*, Second Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), pp.59-77.

¹²⁷ Marvell, *Account*, p.301.

¹²⁸ Marvell, *Account*, p.301.

none having any beneficial Offices but Cavaliers, or Sons of Cavaliers.’¹²⁹ Their presence is symptomatic of a broken system; a nation falling into the a cycle of repeating its mistakes. Preceding this image of ‘gross Body’ Marvell describes the activities of that Parliamentary session, cynically suggesting that ‘his Majesty in that want, or rather opinion of want’ of money, made a request that could not but remind his readers of the late King’s misadventures: ‘The House of Commons had not in that Session been wanting to Vote 300000 *l.* towards the building of Ships.’¹³⁰ In making this request – which Marvell slyly suggests is as a result of the King’s financial mismanagement – Charles is retracing the steps of his father, whose introduction of Ship Money proved a grave misstep. Charles II was not foolish enough to rule without parliament, however in continuing with a programme of prorogations the King is shown to be precipitating issues identical to those that plagued his father’s reign. Marvell describes a conspiracy, and old forces are shown to be at play: ‘and in the meane time they formented all the Jealousies which they caused. They continued to inculcate *Forty and One* in Court, and Country.’¹³¹ Though the meta-narratives of the Restoration placed blame on Parliament and Protestant sects for the outset of Civil War, Marvell prompts his reader to challenge these assertions and instead question the decision-making of those in positions of authority, using their power in acts of self-interest rather than in deference to the public will.

After 1679, the issue of inadequate political representation became a maelstrom that the establishment could no longer control. From December 1679 to January 1680 seven petitions for Parliament to sit were presented to authorities, in defiance of the prohibition against ‘Tumults and Disorders.’¹³² These petitions drew mass subscriptions and national support: ‘one massive petition from London and six provincial petitions were presented; but these provoked, in the spring 1680, a set of “addresses of abhorrence”, castigating the petitions, and these were printed in the officially sponsored periodical, the *London Gazette*.’¹³³ Once again, the *Gazette* served as means of propagating state propaganda, denying the rights of its very readers. Even though petitioners were threatened ‘upon peril of the utmost rigour of the law’,

¹²⁹ Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, p.341.

¹³⁰ Marvell, *Account*, pp.286-7.

¹³¹ Marvell, *Account*, p.287.

¹³² Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, p.117.

¹³³ Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, p.122.

the penalty was risked in order to offer a display of protest and in recognition of this, on the 27th of October 1680 the House voted that to represent petitioning as seditious was to betray the liberties of the subject, subvert the constitution and introduce arbitrary government, and a Bill of Rights was proposed that would establish the right of citizens to petition the king.¹³⁴ In taking to print, Marvell contributed to the growing cultural shift by constructing a model of statecraft in which the right to be adequately represented was of paramount importance, remaining the only true means of keeping arbitrary government at bay. The reader is approached as an active citizen and Marvell makes clear where their 'Ancient Liberties' are being threatened. Whether through institutional corruption, state censorship or the suppression of popular protests, Marvell presents the reader with manifold complaints against the current government; under the guise of blaming 'the Conspirators' he launches a broader call for political engagement amongst his readership.

¹³⁴ The issue of petitions would remain contentious throughout James' reign – becoming a privilege that was frequently revoked as James scrambled to retain power in the face of mounting public hostility.

Textual Scaffolding: Writing for the Literary Marketplace

I. Popular Culture

Intertextuality is perhaps the most striking feature of Marvell's satire – the aspect of his prose most expounded by critics and emulated by those he influenced. As such it has proved the defining feature of his polemical legacy. By drawing on his readers knowledge of Restoration literary culture and making their engagement with popular culture a cornerstone of his rhetoric, Marvell further encourages the active reading of his texts. A foreknowledge of his poetry and of the Restoration stage, alongside a broader knowledge of the toleration debate (including the scabrous replies that Marvell's first prose offering elicited) allows for a deeper reading of his text. The reader's response will be defined by their experience *as a reader* – and Marvell is consciously cultivating the possibility of differing strands of interpretation.

Intertextuality lends his prose a plasticity that anticipates and invites a reader to create their own associations with his text; prompting them to appropriate his critique of societal institutions and to question absolutist rhetoric. This chapter will explore the ways in which Marvell proffers the reader a text they can decode, if only they can reassemble the textual scaffold around which his satire is built. Cloaking his invective in seemingly ephemeral references allows for covertly libellous sentiments to remain above accusation – a concern especially pressing when Marvell eschewed his anonymity, and published the sequel to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* under his own name. This chapter will forensically examine Marvell's allusions to popular culture, contributing to the field by deeply considering how Marvell engages with the popular consciousness (especially the way that he deploys self-referentiality). Establishing this relationship with the reader – prompting them to read his work closely in order to decipher his covert meanings – allows Marvell to further his aims as a polemicist. His censure of the government and the episcopacy grows in force when fully decoded by a reader.

**'Abruptly he began, disguising his art,
As of his satire this had been a part.'**

Marvell is known first and foremost to modern readers as a poet; to his contemporaries however, Marvell's authorship of some of the most popular verse satires of the Restoration was a fact known only definitively by those with access (whether first, second or third hand) to the coterie in which manuscript copies of his poems were circulated. An example of such refracted transmission is provided by Harold Love in his study of scribal publication and evidenced by the experience of Samuel Pepys (1633-1703), the prolific diarist:

Pepys is a witness to the role of user publication in the process. On 14 December 1666, he acquired a copy of what was evidently the 'Second advice', 'sealed up, from Sir H. Cholmly'. This suggests a folded separate rather than the surreptitiously printed broadside that was also in circulation. On 20 January 1667 John Brisbane, another naval official, showed him a copy of the 'Third advice', which he took home in order to copy it, 'having the former being mightily pleased with it' [...] The second, third and fourth advices are found together in a number of manuscripts in the company of other poems from the tradition.¹

The way Pepys encountered these poems is indicative of how they circulated – 'separates' passed between acquaintances, who would then produce their own copy, with the potential to circulate this themselves continuing the process of transmission *ad infinitum*. However the exact scope of this transmission is impossible to calculate. Marvell's early lyric poems appear to have been circulated within an incredibly small circle; the poems appear only very rarely and highly infrequently in contemporary manuscripts or miscellanies, and the poems do not appear as fragments, even in a garbled form, in other manuscripts.² His Restoration satire, however, had a much broader reach in comparison.

Though his work was only published as a collection posthumously, Marvell clearly intended these works to have a wider audience, using scribal publication as

¹ Harold Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998), p.239.

² Nigel Smith, 'Introduction', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.xii-xvii (p.xiii).

his method of conveyance, as has been acknowledged by editors of his verse: ‘the body of Restoration verse satire that has been attributed to, or associated with, Marvell, survives in very great numbers of MSS.’³ This method of transmission, though freeing the poet from the fear of censorship, left the poems open to alteration: ‘there are very many instances of corruption in the process of copying, as well as additional lines in the course of time.’⁴ However, though Marvell allowed his later work (poems with a frank, rather than tacit, political agenda) to be broadcast via manuscript, there is no way of quantifying what percentage of his prose readership would have directly encountered his poems in this manner, though there is room for speculation. What is clear is that Marvell valued and cultivated his anonymity even whilst seeking to enter into public discourse: ‘insofar as a continuing theme can be identified behind Marvell’s conduct of his career, it is one of exercising the maximum amount of influence with the minimum amount of visibility.’⁵ Marvell very rarely discussed his own literature in his letters, even with his most trusted correspondents – though oblique references do appear, clearly great effort was made to maintain a modicum anonymity, even amongst his intimate circle.⁶

The popularity of his work, however, continued at a pace; “Marvellian” satires (not all of which were in fact penned by Marvell, as many imitators utilised his central conceits to build their own satires) featured prominently in private collections: ‘together with such widely circulated satires as ‘The downfall of the Chancellor’ [...], and ‘On the prorogation’ [...], they constituted the core of a widely-read body of oppositional satire, which was soon consolidated into linked groups and sub-collections.’⁷ The mercurial appeal of the genre to his contemporary public is evidenced by the popularity of the series of printed anthologies *A Collection of Poems on Affairs of State*; first published in 1689, it inspired multiple sequels and continued to be published into the eighteenth century. Marvell’s power as a public draw is evidenced on the title page, which proclaimed the verse inside to have been written ‘By A- M-I Esq; and other Eminent Wits.’⁸ As Love’s research into ‘[the] particular

³ Smith, ‘Introduction’, p.xii.

⁴ Smith, ‘Introduction’, p.xiv.

⁵ Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts*, p.63.

⁶ Smith, ‘Introduction’, p.xvii.

⁷ Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts*, p.239.

⁸ *A Collection of Poems on Affairs of State* (London: s. n., 1689), Titlepage.

tradition of scribal publication' reveals, the manufacture of satiric verse became increasingly industrialised in the Restoration:

[Scribal publication] began in the mid-1660s with the circulation of separates by author and user publication. From the mid-1670s we have evidence of professional involvement in the copying of court-libertine verse, and can assume the same with some confidence for the even more widely circulated state poems.⁹

Perhaps necessitated by the curtailing of press freedoms, scribal publication ensured widespread dispersal.

An acknowledgement of Marvell's reputation as a poet (and thus familiarity with the content of these works) is alluded to by his critics in the multiple character assassinations released in the wake of the publication of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. For example, the anonymous writer of *The Transposer Rehears'd* (1673) uses the term 'poet' repeatedly as a form of opprobrium, mocking Marvell's '*Play-Book-Stile*' and exclaiming: 'We have been somewhat the larger in the examination of this Character, because our Farce-Poet (in imitation of the *French* no doubt) has made but one Person considerable in his Play.'¹⁰ The brunt of this invective took the form of basic *ad hominem* attacks; 'his own body became a subject of published speculation.'¹¹ His attacker, in a mockery of Marvell's *Instructions to a Painter* series, depicts Marvell as the subject of a sketch:

I should now in imitation of our Author proceed to his Personal Character, but I shall only advise his Painter if ever he draws him below the Wast, to follow the example of that Artist, who having completed the Picture of a Woman could [...] change her in an instant into Man: but after our Authors Female Figure is completed, the change of Sex is easier; for Nature, or Sinister

⁹ Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts*, p.279.

¹⁰ [Richard Leigh], *The Transposer Rehears'd: or, The fifth act of Mr. Bayes's play being a postscript to the animadversions* (Oxford: Printed for the assignes of Hugo Grotius and Jacob van Hamine, 1673), p. 5, p.14.

¹¹ Derek Hirst and Steven N. Zwicker, 'Andrew Marvell and the Toils of Patriarchy: Fatherhood, Longing, and the Body Politic', in *ELH*, 66 (1999), 629-654 (p.630).

Accident has rendered some of the Alteration-strokes useless and unnecessary.¹²

The satire here is mostly dependent on crude sexualised invective, though Zwicker and Hirst contend that this accusation of sexual impotency taps into wider cultural associations: 'Puns, allusions, and innuendo here compound Italianate aesthetics, practices, and politics. The lines boldly conflate castration with buggery, and personal indecency with republican art and politics.'¹³ The author of the *The Transposer Rehears'd* seeks to land as many blows as possible, conjuring the spectre of multiple forms of (what would have been perceived to be) sexual deviancy and deformity within the space of this short scene, and this line of attack is continued throughout the pamphlet alongside other, more specific forms of insult. For instance, the writer makes pointed reference to Marvell's poetry:

*O marvellous Fate. O Fate full of marvel;
That Nol's Latin Pay two Clerks should deserve ill!
Hiring a Gelding and Milton the Stallion;
His Latin was gelt, and turn'd pure Italian.*¹⁴

These lines of doggerel verse attempt to degrade Marvell in numerous ways – the most obvious of which are the puns centred around his surname, the awkward use of antimetabole supposedly reflective of the poet's artifice and contrivance. Again castration is evoked though the reference to a 'Gelding' – a castrated male horse – the insult also relying on the reader's foreknowledge of Marvell's relationship with Milton, and his time spent serving with him as a Latin secretary. Milton's name is mentioned seventeen times throughout the pamphlet – Milton was so incensed by the scurrilous nature of this particular screed that reports circulated that he intended to answer it with his own reply, those these plans never came to fruition.¹⁵ Instead, Marvell made a particular point of defending his friend ('J.M. was, and is, a man of great Learning and Sharpness of wit') in his own response.¹⁶

¹² [Leigh], *The Transposer Rehears'd*, p.134.

¹³ Hirst and Zwicker, 'Toils of Patriarchy', p.630.

¹⁴ [Leigh], *The Transposer Rehears'd*, p.135.

¹⁵ William Riley Parker, *Milton: A Biography*, ed. by Gordon Campbell, Second Edition, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), I, p.630.

¹⁶ Marvell, *RT2*, p.417.

The writer also makes use of a contemporary controversy surrounding Milton's use of blank verse in *Paradise Lost* (1667), which eschewed the contemporary vogue for the heroic couplet. Smith argues that: 'Milton's aversion to rhyme at this late stage of his career soon became a target for his enemies, in as much as he associated rhyme with bondage, tyranny and custom.'¹⁷ In Book III of his epic poem, Milton made reference to his blindness – 'thee I revisit safe,/ And feel thy sovereign vital lamp; but thou/ Revisit not these eyes' – it is these lines that the writer of *The Transposer* debauches in order to mock Milton's physical incapacity.¹⁸ He repeatedly mocks 'the *blind* Author', depicting him 'groping for a beam of light', a subversion of the ethereal quality of the inspiration Milton describes.¹⁹ The creation of the *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* (which the writer accuses Milton of having co-written, a common accusation among the responses to pamphlet) is thus imagined in a crude caricature of Milton's verse: 'No doubt but the thoughts of this *Vital Lamp* lighted a *Christmas* Candle in his brain.'²⁰ In particular, the writer takes aim at Marvell's use of literary invention within his work:

besides the absurdity of his inventive Divinity, in making *Light* contemporary with it's Creator, that jingling in the middle of his Verse, is more notoriously ridiculous, because the *blind Bard* [...] studiously declin'd Rhyme as a *jingling sound of like endings*.²¹

In both the metaphor that designates him a 'Gelding' and in this vignette, Marvell is a poor imitation of his master.

Marvell would counter accusations such as the libellous slander found in *The Transposer* in his commendatory poem 'On Mr Milton's Paradise Lost', published in the second edition of the epic in 1674.²² This poem is notable as one of the rare few published during Marvell's lifetime, and also marks one of the very rare instances in which Marvell refers to reader in his verse (though so common a fixture in his prose).

¹⁷ Nigel Smith, 'Introduction to *On Mr Milton's Paradise Lost*', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.181-182 (p.181).

¹⁸ John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. by Alastair Fowler, Revised Second Edition (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2007), Book III ll.21-3 p.167.

¹⁹ [Leigh], *The Transposer Rehears'd*, p.41.

²⁰ [Leigh], *The Transposer Rehears'd*, p.42.

²¹ [Leigh], *The Transposer Rehears'd*, p.42.

²² Andrew Marvell, 'On Mr Milton's Paradise Lost', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.182-4.

The speaker compliments Milton's complete command of his content: 'Well mightst thou scorn thy readers to allure/ With tinkling rhyme, of thine own sense secure.'²³ Rhyme here is a shallow and artificial means to elicit reader enjoyment – quality verse does not need such embellishments: 'Thy verse created like thy theme sublime,/ In number, weight, and measure, needs not rhyme.'²⁴ By using rhyme in his commendation, Marvell makes a show of deference to Milton, suggesting a deficit in his own performance as a poet in comparison to his friend – and in doing so he is appropriating the insults of his critics, acknowledging his inferiority instead as a means of extolling Milton's peerless excellence. The speaker also has some choice words for his literary contemporaries: 'While the town-Bayes writes all the while and spells,/ And like a pack-horse tires without his bells.'²⁵ Whilst a direct critique of Dryden (who intended to condense the text into heroic couplets in an operatic version of the text for the 1674 season) the use of the term 'town-Bayes' acts as a broader reference to those attacking Milton in the 1670s. It is also, of course, a reference to his own prose works – a fascinating moment of interconnectivity between his texts. His pamphlet had made 'Bayes' a popular term of derision, and its association with an advocate of both absolutism and a powerful episcopacy – values common among those who condemned Milton's *A Letter Concerning Toleration*. For a reader attuned to this controversy, and aware of his authorship of both this poem and of both parts of *The Rehearsal*, Marvell is seen to own the slurs hurled at him by his adversaries, acknowledging his position as a poet. Marvell makes no direct mention of this line of attack in the sequel to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, however by returning to the debate he presents himself to his readership as unphased by the vitriol he faced – and he continued to allude to his own verse.

Though Marvell's earlier, lyric poems were purposefully disseminated within a very small circle, their resonance can still be heard within the pamphlets – Marvell consciously or unconsciously referring to his earlier work to signal the evolution of his outlook. One such subliminal self-reference is evident in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* and its allusion to Marvell's great ode to retirement from public life *The Garden* (1668); in both the leitmotif of wine makes an important

²³ Marvell, 'On Mr Milton's Paradise Lost', p.184 ll.45-6.

²⁴ Marvell, 'On Mr Milton's Paradise Lost', p.184 ll.53-4.

²⁵ Marvell, 'On Mr Milton's Paradise Lost', p.184 ll.47-8.

statement about the attitude towards civic duty possessed by the speaker of the poem and the persona Marvell employs in his prose respectively. In *The Second Part*, wine is used to symbolise palatable prose; harsh words akin to an acerbic draft, and inevitably a reflection of the source: 'sharpness of Stile does indeed naturally flow from the humour of the Writer.'²⁶ As in the case of fermentation – both literary and alcoholic – age has the ability to mellow or sour the mind or the spirit, as 'those that write too young, (when it resembles the acidity of juices strain'd from the fruits before they be matured) or else those that write too old (and then 'tis like the sownness of Liquors, which being near corrupting turn eager).'²⁷ In contrast, a well-considered, well-written book is the unquestionable superior of an acrid polemic:

and both these are generally disrellish'd: or if Men do admit them for sawce, yet he must be very thirsty who will take a draught of 'm; whereas the generousest wine drops from the grape naturally, without pressing, and though piquant hath its sweetness.²⁸

This image, of 'wine drops' falling effortlessly and naturally from the fruit, 'without pressing' – of ideas, properly ripened in the mind, freely and pleasantly expressed – clearly harkens to *The Garden*, paralleling its imagery. In this retirement poem the speaker achieves a state of transcendence wandering a superb landscape. The image of wine in this work represents the bounty of nature and the splendid ease that the speaker enjoys: 'What wondrous life is this I lead!/ Ripe apples drop about my head;/ The luscious clusters of the vine/ Upon my mouth do crush their wine.'²⁹ The process of 'pressing' the grapes is not necessary – the fruit willingly and actively supplies him with 'wine.' The speaker rambles through a pre-lapsarian paradise, though living in a post-lapsarian world – an Eden, 'that happy garden-state', far from the strife of public life, a reprieve from the 'busy companies of men.'³⁰

To the speaker, worldly concerns – glory, love, civic duty – are trivial pursuits compared to the possibility of private, intellectual reflection and spiritual

²⁶ Marvell, *RT2*, p.242.

²⁷ Marvell, *RT2*, p.242.

²⁸ Marvell, *RT2*, p.242.

²⁹ Andrew Marvell, 'The Garden', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.155-159 (p.157 ll.33-36).

³⁰ Marvell, 'The Garden', p.158 l.57, p.155 l.12.

transcendence. Rapport with nature is a requisite when attempting to converse with the sublime, achieved only through a 'complex interchange between the outward world of sense experience and the inward world of imagination.'³¹ This interchange is noted by Warren Chernaik as a predominant feature of Marvell's pastoral poetry with the theme of transcendence through a communion with the natural world a preoccupation of his verse pre-1670, with a particular focus on the workings of the imagination: 'the conduit between man and nature is the imagination, which is intermediate between sense perception and rational understanding.'³² 'Inward' reflection, as opposed to outward action, is the favoured mode of the personae of these poems. In *The Garden*, specifically, the speaker mocks 'how vainly men themselves amaze/ To win the oalm, the oak, or bays.'³³ This search for enlightenment is intensely individualistic: 'my soul into the boughs does glide:/ There like a bird it sits, and sings,/ Then whets, and combs its silver wings.'³⁴ This metaphysical flight of imagination delights the speaker, but its benefits are intangible. His imagination in this state is capable of the ultimate act of creative conception: 'it creates, transcending these,/ Far other worlds, and other seas;/ Annihilating all that's made/ To a green thought in a green shade.'³⁵ Implicit in this act is obliteration; the only way to achieve a *tabula rasa* is to completely ignore reality, to "annihilate" a material reality in order to fully delve into the imaginative world – a process purely for the benefit of the self and of the 'soul.' Chernaik suggests that in these lines: 'the claims of conscience are uncompromising; faced with a choice between ordinary human values or feelings and "Flowrs eternal, and divine" (line 369), we must turn our allegiance entirely to the latter. To retreat within the garden is to abandon the world outside to eternal perdition.'³⁶

Though there is clearly a parallel between the images of the 'generousest wine drops' and the 'luscious clusters of the vine', the stance of the speakers is completely reversed. The poetic persona Marvell adopted in *The Garden* seeks seclusion and a retreat from the public sphere – the act of publishing *The Second Part*, and to do so

³¹ Chernaik, *The Poet's Time*, p.34.

³² Chernaik, *The Poet's Time*, p.32.

³³ Marvell, 'The Garden', p.155 ll.1-2.

³⁴ Marvell, 'The Garden', p.158 ll.52-54.

³⁵ Marvell, 'The Garden', pp.157-158 ll.45-48.

³⁶ Chernaik, *The Poet's Time*, p.40.

without the veil of anonymity was to actively take a stand and enter a fierce and controversial debate. In a moment of performative self-reflection, Marvell presents himself to the reader as a man truly incensed by the words of his adversaries, genuinely disturbed and alarmed by the tone of the debate thus far, and so willing to declare a side, standing against the tide of public opinion and government policy. The price of silence would be too great, Parker (and his ilk) having 'diffused his poyson so publickly': 'and though I cannot arrogate so much as even the similitude of those good qualities to my Writing, yet I dare say that never was there more a pregnant ripeness in the causes.'³⁷ Marvell assumes the persona of one resigned to entering into a public eye, questioning the quality of his product (a nod to the perennial trope of authorial modesty) but deciding the endeavour is worth the scrutiny of a potentially hostile audience, submitting completely 'to the Readers judgement.'³⁸ In this way, the authorial voice he presents in his prose mirrors that of the speaker of his retirement verse: 'Society is all but rude,/ To this delicious solitude.'³⁹

The shift from a reverence of a state of willingly naivety to active involvement could also be inferred from a reference to 'The Nymph Complaining for the Death of her Fawn' (believed to have been composed between 1647 and 1662).⁴⁰ Marvell's contribution to the genre of pastoral lyric, the speaker of the poem is a plaintive nymph, mourning the loss of her fawn, recently slain by hunters. Chernaik contends that the poem evokes a sense of lost innocence, a loss precipitated by a cruel, indifferent world: 'it is impossible for her to achieve her end in this world, since what she desires is a state of infinitely prolonged childhood, a total instinctual absorption into nature, free from the canker of thought.'⁴¹ This nymph's idyll has been spoiled by the intrusion of 'Ungentle men!', who unfeelingly take the life of her beloved fawn:

In this warm life-blood, which doth part
From thine, and wound me to the heart,
Yet could they not be clean: their stain

³⁷ Marvell, *RT2*, p.242.

³⁸ Marvell, *RT2*, p.242.

³⁹ Marvell, 'The Garden', p.156 ll.15-16.

⁴⁰ Andrew Marvell, 'The Nymph Complaining for the Death of her Fawn', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.69-71.

⁴¹ Chernaik, *The Poet's Time*, p.27.

Is dyed in such purple grain.⁴²

As part of her lament, the nymph wonders about the lack of punishment that will accompany this crime: 'E'n Beasts must be with justice slain;/ Else Men are made their Deodands.'⁴³ This conceit centres around the definition of a 'deodand', the term relating to both items forfeited to God and a specific legal technicality in which any object or animal involved with the death of a human being would be forfeit to the Crown. Here the nymph imagines that just as an animal would be forfeit if it harmed a human, the hunters should be forfeit for the harm they have caused.

In *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* this very specific and arcane term is used as well, in reference to a man's reputation, a virtue that Marvell describes as 'dearer than life itself.'⁴⁴ In discussing the act of animadversion with his readers, Marvell considers what should be the punishment for publishing an 'Invective' (a category he consciously places himself within), given the value attributed to 'a Mans Credit': 'if beside the Law of Murther, Men have thought fit, out of respect to humane Nature, That whatsoever else moves to the death of Man should be forfeit to pious uses, why should there not as well be Deodands for Reputation?'⁴⁵ Here, rather than an animal elevated to the legal status of 'deodand', it is 'Reputation.' Thus the call to publish 'Invective' is a thankless task:

Who, in a World all furnished with subjects of praise, instruction and learned inquiry, shall studiously chuse and set himself apart to comment upon the blemishes and imperfections of some particular person? Such men do seldom miss too of *their own reward*.⁴⁶

Here the decision to publish an animadversion is not taken lightly – Marvell presents the reader with an explanation, making it clear that he resents the task. He has not undertaken the task for 'Credit', as men who write farcically risk their own legacy: 'they that make it their business to set out others ill-favouredly do pass for Satyres, and themselves are sure to be personated with prick-ears, wrinkled horns, and cloven

⁴² Marvell, 'The Nymph', p.69 l.3 and ll.19-22.

⁴³ Marvell, 'The Nymph', p.69 ll.16-17.

⁴⁴ Marvell, *RT2*, p.237.

⁴⁵ Marvell, *RT2*, pp.236-7.

⁴⁶ Marvell, *RT2*, p.237.

feet.⁴⁷ This reference to a stock figure from the pastoral genre could evoke yet more associations with ‘The Nymph Complaining’ to a reader acquainted with the verse. Whilst in ‘The Nymph’ (as in ‘The Garden’) retirement from public life and a retreat into a private idyll is exalted (‘Thenceforth I set myself to play/ My solitary time away’), in his prose the cost of silence, of not becoming involved in public life, is too great – and Marvell assures his reader that he is even willing to risk his ‘Credit’ in order to engage with them, asking them to analyse and critique the establishment narrative expounded by Parker. By alluding to the imagery of his early career, Marvell signals a shift in attitude towards civic engagement. Whilst ‘The Garden’ presented retirement as the only noble pursuit (an escape from endemic societal corruption), in *The Second Part* active public engagement is the order of the day – contributing well-intentioned books the primary means of correcting the ‘sowness’ of the current public discourse. In *The Second Part* Marvell attached his own name to his text, consciously choosing to take a public stand – the paradigmatic shift that his imagery suggests thus emblematic of his own mission in consciously choosing to print his work. Both through these references to his former work and by eschewing anonymity, Marvell gestures to his purpose: ‘for every one that will treat of so nice and tender argument, ought to affix his name, thereby to make himself responsible to the publick for any damage that may arise by his undertaking.’⁴⁸ ‘The Garden’ does not exist in an MS version and ‘The Nymph’ exists in only one, suggesting that the poems circulated in a very limited capacity. Though the majority of the initial audience of the pamphlet were unlikely to have seen ‘The Garden’ or ‘The Nymph’, and thus have been unaware of these inferences, after 1681 and the publication of the collection keen readers would be able to spot the parallels between the passage and the poem.

Marvell’s prose works also feature references to his later political poems, works with a much wider remit of circulation. *An Account of the Growth of Popery* shares many thematic similarities to Marvell’s verse satire ‘The Last Instructions to a Painter’ (composed in 1667 as a response to Britain’s defeat at the hands of the Dutch during the Third Anglo-Dutch War) – both express dissatisfaction at the status quo

⁴⁷ Marvell, *RT2*, p.237.

⁴⁸ Marvell, *RT2*, p.242.

and depict corruption at court and in parliament, parallels even more frank to those who were aware of the joint ownership of both. Near the end of the pamphlet, Marvell evokes a scene that mirrors an episode in 'The Last Instructions to a Painter.' In the poem, Marvell compares the House of Commons to a gambling den – their political leanings of the members determining their seats at the table: 'Describe the court and country, both set right/ On opp'site points, the black against the white.' However, the players are not equally matched, 'the court' having stacked their hand:

Those having lost the nation at tric-trac,
These now advent'ring how to win it back.
The dice betwixt them must the fate divide
(As Chance doth still in multitudes decide),
But here the court does its advantage know,
For the cheat Turnour for them must throw.⁴⁹

The Speaker of the House Sir Edward Turnour's (1617-76) reputation was tarnished when it emerged he had received cash gifts from the Treasury and East India Company. The implication here is that these payments served as bribes, the tactics of 'the Court' party underhand and dishonourable. No matter how they 'strike the die [...] still with them goes the share.'⁵⁰ Government, here, fails as a representative body – only those who can buy their way to the table have a chance of effecting decisions: 'with what small arts the public game they play.'⁵¹

Policy is not reached through debate and there is no stake in the public interest displayed here – statesmanship is merely 'the public game.' Similarly, in *An Account* Marvell compares the current state of affairs to a game,

It is here as in Gaming, where though the Cheat may lose for a while, to the
Skill or good fortune of a fairer Player, and sometimes on purpose to draw him

⁴⁹ Andrew Marvell, 'The Last Instructions to a Painter', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.369-396 (p.372 ll.109-14).

⁵⁰ Marvell, 'Last Instructions', p.372 l.116.

⁵¹ Marvell, 'Last Instructions', p.372 l.118.

in deeper, yet the false Dice must at the long run Carry it, unless discovered, and when it comes once to a great Stake, will Infallibly Sweep the Table.⁵²

The image of a 'false Dice' recurs in both, yet in *An Account* there is a clear sense of the victim of these crimes: 'yet men sit by, like idle Spectators, and still give money towards their own *Tragedy*.'⁵³ The public figuratively and literally pays. Compared to his verse satire, the prose here is vague in its description of corruption – whilst 'Conspirators' are at play, they are not explicitly named. The 'Last Instructions' had a small audience (potentially as a means of skirting libel charges, given how many prominent nobles are named and lampooned within its lines) – it appears in only eight MS copies, suggesting a very tightly controlled circulation compared to the other 'Advise' poems, which were issued widely in order to embarrass Clarendon. *An Account*, in contrast, was designed to meet a very wide audience.⁵⁴ Though only a select few would likely have seen both (though after the 1681 publication of the poem, the two could easily be viewed in tandem) on the pamphlets initial publication, for those readers who had experience of both texts the similarities between these scenes would have been apparent and the open contempt for 'the Court' faction in Parliament displayed in the verse could transfer to their reading of these lines in the prose text.

A mockery of the instruments of state propaganda also recurs in both verse and prose. Sir Robert Viner (1631-1688) donated a statue depicting Charles I defeating Cromwell on the 29th of October, 1672; it was not an original composition however, but a conversion of a statue of a polish general in battle with an Ottoman soldier.⁵⁵ 'The Statue in Stocks-Markets' (believed to have been composed between 1672 and 1674) is a burlesque of the event.⁵⁶ In mocking the statue, the speaker of the poem is searing in his critique of the current regime:

⁵² Marvell, *Account*, p.375.

⁵³ Marvell, *Account*, p.375.

⁵⁴ Nigel Smith, 'Introduction to The Last Instructions to a Painter', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.362-368 (p.363).

⁵⁵ The conversion was poorly executed (Cromwell could clearly be seen to be sporting a turban), and thus a source of general mirth.

⁵⁶ The poem exists in twenty-two MS versions, making it one of the more popular verse satires attributed to Marvell, and likely to have a fairly wide readership. Nigel Smith, 'Introduction to The Statue in Stocks-Market', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), p.415 (p.415).

But a market, they say, does suit the king well,
Who the Parliament buys and revenues does sell,
And others to make the similitude hold
Say his Majesty himself is bought too and sold.⁵⁷

Sir Robert Viner had been Charles' banker; the fiscal mistakes of both father and son bear the brunt of the satire, though James II doesn't escape notice: 'For 'tis such a king as no chisel can mend [...] Yet we'd better by far have him than his brother.'⁵⁸ Soon after Viner's unsuccessful attempt to memorialise the late King, Danby (in a clear attempt to curry favour and drum up popular support) erected a statue of Charles I on horseback in 1675, the subject of another satire attributed to Marvell, 'The Statue at Charing Cross'.⁵⁹ The poem mocks Danby's attempt to revive Stuart popularity, especially the amongst its oldest allies. His move to appeal to loyalist sentiment – 'to comfort the hearts of the poor cavalier/ The late King on horseback is here to be shown' – is portrayed as utterly contrived, his timing also the subject of scepticism: 'But why is the work then so long at a stand? [...] As the Parliament twice was prorogued by your hand.'⁶⁰

Here, just as in *An Account*, the continual prorogations of parliament are a source of ire and proof of political machination. This poem is also searing in its condemnation of Charles II:

So the statue will up after all this delay,
But to turn the face to Whitehall you must shun;
Though of brass, yet with grief it would melt him away,
To behold every day such a court, such a son.⁶¹

⁵⁷ Andrew Marvell, 'The Statue in Stocks-Market', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.416-417 (p.415 ll.21-4).

⁵⁸ Marvell, 'The Statue in Stocks-Market', p.416 ll.56-60.

⁵⁹ Dated to July, 1675: eighteen manuscript versions of this poem exist, putting its popularity on par with that of 'Stocks-Market'.

⁶⁰ Andrew Marvell, 'The Statue at Charing Cross', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.418-419 (p.419 ll.33-5).

⁶¹ Marvell, 'The Statue at Charing Cross', p.419 ll.55-6.

Both poems, though satirising different statues, mock the blatant propagandistic intentions of these instillations – this scorn is also in evidence within Marvell’s personal correspondence. In a letter to his nephew, William Popple, Marvell recounts:

But, for more Pagentry, the old King’s Statue on Horseback, of Brass, was bought, and to be set up at *Charing-Cross*, which hath been doing longer than *Viner’s*, but does not yet see the Light. The old King’s Body was to be taken up, to make a perfect Resurrection of Loyalty, and to be reinterred with great Magnificence; but that sleeps.⁶²

Here the commemoration of the late King is construed as mere ‘Pagentry’ – both ‘*Viner’s*’ attempt and the newest effort conflated as equally indulgent, akin to attempts to create an event of national mourning to inspire ‘Loyalty.’ Ultimately, these efforts are all subsumed by the main business of the session: ‘but principally the Laws were to be severely executed, and reinforced against Fanaticks and Papists.’⁶³ In *An Account* this scene is also recounted, though in seemingly softer terms. Though still an attempt ‘to make a perfect Resurrection of Loyalty’ amongst ‘the Cavaliers’, a reason is supplied to explain why this faction had behaved in fashion detrimental to the national interest in parliament.

Marvell proposes to the reader that they had been led astray by conspirators, quick to exploit their vulnerabilities – ‘they were more credulous than others, and so more fit to be abused’ – promising ‘that this was the time to refresh their antient merit, and receive the Recompence double of all their Loyalty.’⁶⁴ These shallow promises were followed by another form of ‘Pagentry’:

But there could not have been a greater affront and indignity offered to those Gentlemen, (and the best did so resent it) then whether these hopes were real, to think them men might be hired to any base action, or whether as thitherto but imaginary, that by erecting the late Kings Statue that whole Party might be rewarded in Effigie.⁶⁵

⁶² Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, pp.341-2.

⁶³ Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, p.342.

⁶⁴ Marvell, *Account*, p.279.

⁶⁵ Marvell, *Account*, p.280.

Here Marvell directs his ire at those fuelling false ‘hopes’ and abusing their loyalty, rather than mocking the entire enterprise. Prior to this episode, Marvell makes pointedly complimentary remarks regarding Charles’ stewardship as monarch. In matters of international diplomacy, he is described in glowing terms: ‘they knew that his Majesty being now disengaged from War, would of his Royal Prudence interpose for Peace by his Mediation, it being the most glorious Character that any Prince can assume.’⁶⁶ This description serves the purpose of avoiding the accusation of sedition, though it flies in complete contradiction to Charles’ record of international relations. To a reader familiar with Marvell’s verse however, this veil is soon lifted – though the prose text exalts ‘his Royal Prudence’, by alluding to the statue poems the passage absorbs a blistering critique of the King, belying the idea of his passive ignorance of certain affairs of state. Similarities between the subject matter of his verse and his prose allow for extra layers of interpretive meaning to exist for those encountering both. In alluding to his verse, Marvell could go further in his criticism of the King than possible in a printed text.

‘He that publishes an Invective, does it at his utmost Peril’

The Rehearsal Transpros’d: The Second Part is an interesting aberration in the Marvell prose oeuvre, being both a sequel and a text that bore his name. Both these occurrences had a considerable impact on the content and approach of Marvell’s animadversion, as the process of actively reading the text is not just reliant on having foreknowledge of Parker and his reputation – to understand many of the jokes and appreciate the nuanced differences between *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* and its sequel, the reader is expected to have a general knowledge of at least some of the “Reproofs” aimed at Marvell, in order to appreciate certain references. Marvell assumes the reader to be informed – he is addressing an active observer to an ongoing dispute, and thus structures his piece as performative literary engagement.

Marvell’s satirical pamphlet had both inspired approval and condemnation. Whilst Charles II himself stepped in to ensure that *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*

⁶⁶ Marvell, *Account*, p.278.

remained in print, with minimal censorship, the tract also inspired six separate reproving replies in quick succession.⁶⁷ Marvell's adversaries were well aware of the popularity *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* had accrued. In Edmund Hickeringill's *Gregory, Father Greybeard*, the author notes how well Marvell's 'biting irony' was received in London's coffee-houses, relating how 'at another Table sat a whole *Cabal* of wits [...] all laugh heartily and gaping.'⁶⁸ Whilst Parker had mocked Owen's followers, dubbing them 'Apron-men', in Hickeringill's account Marvell's text is well received amongst the frivolous and fashionable, who laugh at his jests, not caring that he employs 'smutty language' to garner cheap laughs.⁶⁹ Hickeringill argues that through his use of humour and references to contemporary theatre Marvell has alienated 'the Common Herd of mankind, that ne're paid six pence yet as a *Club* ... would quietly pass by the *Title-Page*, (when starch'd up with the Play-house *Bills*,) as unconcern'd and hopeless.'⁷⁰ Marvell's '*marvellous Book*' is popular because the 'stupendous contradictions and double-*Tongue* of the man' are lost on these 'wits.'⁷¹ Nevertheless, in trying to combat his arguments, writers such as Parker attempted to sublimate Marvell's strategy by employing humour to dismantle their opponent. Whilst Parker had argued in his *Reproof* that Marvell's jocular tone was an inappropriate mode discourse (his 'distemper' being 'unsuitable to the Civility of his Education and the Gravity of his Profession') in his own animadversions, Parker attempted to introduce the same stylistic playfulness as Marvell had employed, and which had insured the popularity of his adversary's publication.⁷²

In a passage which parodies the wording of the Declaration of Indulgence, Parker assumes the voice of the King and imagines the state of the nation with all magisterial power over men's consciences removed, imagining it as 'the toleration of debauchery.'⁷³ Under this new lax regime it is 'our Royal Will and Pleasure' to 'release to all our Loving Subjects the Obligation of the Ten Commandments, and all the Laws

⁶⁷ *S'too him Bayes* (1673): *A Common Place-Book Out of the Rehearsal Transpros'd* (1673); *The Transproser Rehears'd* (1673); *Gregory Father-Greybeard, with his Vizard off* (1673); *Rosemary and Bayes* (1672); and *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd* (1673).

⁶⁸ [Edmund Hickeringill], *Gregory, Father-Greybeard, with his Vizard off* (London: s. n., 1673), p.5.

⁶⁹ [Hickeringill], *Greybeard*, p.29.

⁷⁰ [Hickeringill], *Greybeard*, p.28.

⁷¹ [Hickeringill], *Greybeard*, p.26, p.25.

⁷² Parker, *Reproof*, p.1.

⁷³ Parker, *Reproof*, p.65.

of God', freeing 'the insolence of Fanatick Spirits' from any 'check and allay.'⁷⁴ By offering 'a free and uncontrollable Licence to all manner of vice and debauchery', Parker sarcastically suggests that it will 'prevent those mischiefs that are likely to befall our Kingdom from the sobriety and demureness of the Non-conformists.'⁷⁵ Parker employs the royal 'we' to give this passage the tone of an official declaration, whilst deriding the idea that toleration will result in 'peace and good fellowship.'⁷⁶ In attempting to appropriate a comic tone, Parker aimed to trivialise his opponent and utilise Marvell's rhetorical arsenal. However, whilst he condescends to mimic Marvell's humour, ultimately he condemns his style as inappropriate, and indicative of his adversary's ignorance of the issue: 'if you must be scribbling, betake yourself to your own proper trade of Lampoons and Ballads, and be not so unadvised as to talk in publique of such matters as are above the reach of your understanding.'⁷⁷ Parker was confident enough in the rhetorical rigour of his *Reproof* to declare, 'if you, or he, or any Body else have ought to object against it, you know the Press is open, do your worst.'⁷⁸ Marvell was quick to respond to this provocation.

The Second Part continued in its predecessors vain, mercilessly mocking Parker and his style of prose; however, lifting the veil of anonymity raised the stakes for the author. Marvell self-consciously places himself and his prose under greater public scrutiny, but also in physical danger. The title page of *Transpros'd* had attempted to establish a humorous, jovial tone, and initiated a joke which would run through the rest of his pamphlet by using a fake imprint which claimed the text had been printed at 'the Assigns of *John Calvin* and *Theodore Beza*, at the sign of the *King's Indulgence*, on the South-side the Lake-Lemane.'⁷⁹ Parker had asserted that whilst the Anglican Church and its exponents conducted their arguments and their religious services in 'plain and intelligible terms', nonconformists resorted to 'childish Metaphors and Allegories' – a 'New Language' completely inappropriate in religion and in the debate surrounding recusancy.⁸⁰ Parker's expression of vehement disapproval over the use of 'gawdy Metaphor' had afforded Marvell the opportunity

⁷⁴ Parker, *Reproof*, p.65.

⁷⁵ Parker, *Reproof*, p.65.

⁷⁶ Parker, *Reproof*, p.66.

⁷⁷ Parker, *Reproof*, p.526.

⁷⁸ Parker, *Reproof*, p.67.

⁷⁹ Marvell, *RT*, p.41.

⁸⁰ Parker, *Discourse*, p.75.

to show his adversary up, highlighting Parker's own use of the rhetorical device.⁸¹ Parker had, in his *Discourse*, figured the Protestant theologian John Calvin, as a 'Bramble on the South side of the Lake Lemane' which had, through lack of pruning, 'quite over-ran the whole Reformation.'⁸² Marvell is keen to alert the reader to the fact Parker's 'Metaphor': 'but straight our Bramble is transformed into a Man.'⁸³ In his use of figurative language Parker has conducted his arguments in a way he had decried as indecent, and Marvell repeatedly (and from the very first page) draws the reader's attention to this hypocrisy: 'our Author having undertaken to make Calvin and Geneva ridicule, hath not pursued it to so high a point as the Subject would have afforded.'⁸⁴ The jovial tone of Marvell's first title page is eschewed however in the sequel. The title page to *The Second Part* both lacks such a joke and bears more than just the title of text, the author's name, and an imprint – it also includes an excerpt from a menacing note left at 'a Friend's House': 'if thou darest to Print or Publish any Lie or Libel against Doctor Parker, By the Eternal God I will cut thy Throat.'⁸⁵

In including this threatening note Marvell presents himself to the reader not simply as a satirist, but as a man willing to risk physical reprisals in fulfilling his civic duty. Marvell asserts to the reader that in taking to print to defend liberty of conscience, especially without the safeguard of anonymity, he is placing himself in a position of danger.⁸⁶ Whilst Parker had complained that Marvell had not treated him with the necessary gravity, Marvell countered that Parker had not conducted himself in a manner deserving of respect. Whilst 'the Clergy certainly of all other ought to be kept and preserv'd sacred in their Reputation,' Parker's continued vitriol had equated to a forfeit of this right, as 'he has diffused his poison so publickly' that he is 'past the reach of any private admonition.'⁸⁷ Marvell presents himself to the readers as a man performing a public service through his raillery, one that will not allow Parker to 'foul the Pulpit, and afterwards the Press, with Opinions destructive to Humane Society

⁸¹ Parker, *Discourse*, p.74.

⁸² Parker, *Defence*, p.663.

⁸³ Marvell, *RT*, p.68.

⁸⁴ Marvell, *RT*, p.70.

⁸⁵ Marvell, *RT2*, p.221.

⁸⁶ Marvell not only lifted the veil of anonymity, he criticised Parker for continuing to publish without telling readers his name: 'for every one that will treat of so nice and tender argument, ought to affix his name, thereby to make himself responsible to the publick for any damage that may arise by his undertaking.' Marvell, *RT2*, p.242.

⁸⁷ Marvell, *RT2*, p.238, p.240.

and the Christian Religion' without comment and without taking up 'a high and noble argument.'⁸⁸ Compared to this benevolent imperative, Marvell presents Parker's motives for publication as decidedly suspect. Marvell asserts that, 'those that take upon themselves to be Writers, are moved to it either by Ambition or Charity' – the pursuit of fame or the profit of 'mankind.'⁸⁹

Parker was popularly accused of ambition, and his reason for taking to print often conjectured to be professional advancement.⁹⁰ In Marvell's prose, Parker's motive for publishing his *Reproof* is not to defend his absolutist views, but for fiscal benefit. As Art Kavanagh suggests, 'Marvell's attitude to wealth can be inferred from his moralising at the expense of pluralistic clergymen in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part*.'⁹¹ Marvell makes repeated reference to the price of 'Five Shillings', finding it to be exorbitant, as 'even the Clergy of his own Province scruple at the Price.'⁹² This taunt draws on a reader's experience of the Restoration literary marketplace ('Five Shillings' being above the average retail price for an octavo, the format of the *Reproof*) and, potentially, their knowledge of Parker's publishing history. Parker's first octavo pamphlet, *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Policy*, had sold for a reasonable '3s. 6d.' – the cost of its sequel, *A Defence and Continuation*, rocketed to 'In large Octavo. Price, bound, 7s.'⁹³ As an MP, Marvell was paid 6s. 8d. for each day he attended a session, as a supplement to his income – it would take more than a day's wage for him to purchase a copy.⁹⁴ The price of Parker's text has debarred a segment of its intended audience, and has even deterred the readers that Parker *should* (given his ardent dislike of their beliefs) be trying to reach and convert: 'a poor

⁸⁸ Marvell, *RT2*, p.239.

⁸⁹ Marvell, *RT2*, p.236.

⁹⁰ John Locke, for instance, wrote in reference to Parker's rhetoric that: 'to examine those that be of the Church of England what spirit that which sets him so zealously to stir up the magistrate to persecute all those who dissent from him in those opinions and ways of worship the public support whereof is to give him preferment?' John Locke, *Locke: Political Essays*, ed. by Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp.214-215.

⁹¹ Art Kavanagh, 'Andrew Marvell "in want of money": The evidence in *John Farrington v. Mary Marvell*', in *The Seventeenth Century*, 17 (2002), 206-212 (p.211)

⁹² Marvell, *RT2*, p.226.

⁹³ The qualification 'large Octavo' evidences the booksellers need to justify this steep price to their prospective customers, '7s.' being around the average price of a folio. Arber, *Term Catalogues*, p.21, p.58.

⁹⁴ Seaward, 'Marvell and Parliament', p.3. In fact, Marvell went into debt with his printer – and Ponder would legally testify to his friend's financial insecurity. Given their close collaboration 'Ponder was well placed to be able to say whether Marvell was well off'; Kavanagh, 'Andrew Marvell "in want of money"', p.211.

Fanatick that has been of his intimacy cannot be informed how he does under the prodigal expense of Five Shillings.⁹⁵ To limit his audience is antithetical to his duty as a man of the cloth, 'Clergy being Men dedicate by their Vocation to teach what is Truth, what Falshood, to deter Men from vice, and lead them unto all virtue.'⁹⁶ Just as John Owen had argued that Parker had no interest in the spiritual wellbeing of men, Marvell argues that Parker's main interest is financial, abusing the 'Gravity of his Profession' to force his congregation to 'buy their Penance so dear, and take off his Books every year in Commutation.'⁹⁷ In response to criticism levelled at the kind of audience his ribaldry had attracted, Marvell responded by criticising a text which excluded, through its cost, a section of the literate populace.

The very layout of *The Second Part* is a further performative riposte to accusations made in the "reproofs." Faced with criticism of his style, Marvell ensured his work appeared sufficiently academic, to give credence to the seriousness of his arguments.⁹⁸ Parker had levelled the charge at Marvell that he had failed to address any of his passages properly: 'without referring so much as to one passage of mine to make it good, you prove nothing at all but that you have a bold face and a foul mouth.'⁹⁹ In response Marvell directly quotes sections of his animadversion in which he had directly quoted Parker: '*Reh. Tr.* p.100, & 101'; '*Reh. Tr.* p.102.:' '*Reh. Tr.* p.119.:' '*Reh. Tr.* p.125, & 126.'¹⁰⁰ Parker was presumably referring to the sense of his arguments rather than the literal act of citation, but by taking him literally, Marvell reverses the charge laid against him – suggesting to his 'Gentle Reader' that it is his opponent, and not this author, who has failed to be intellectually and scholarly fastidious: 'Is here again no Reference, so much as to one passage, no shadow of proof?'¹⁰¹ This show of mock-seriousness added further weight to his accusations against Parker. As previously discussed, Marvell grounded his arguments for liberty

⁹⁵ Marvell, *RT2*, p.226.

⁹⁶ Marvell, *RT2*, p.239.

⁹⁷ Marvell, *RT2*, p.226.

⁹⁸ Annabel Patterson argues that as Marvell's scholarship had been challenged, 'the *Second Part* also rose to the challenge (from Hiceringill) that the first part had been insufficiently scholarly in its citations'; in retort, Marvell conspicuously implemented marginal annotations giving the location of his sources and was fastidious in providing 'edition and page references.' Dzelzainis and Patterson, 'Introduction', p.211.

⁹⁹ Parker, *Reproof*, p.66.

¹⁰⁰ Marvell, *RT2*, pp.366-367.

¹⁰¹ Marvell, *RT2*, p.367.

of conscience in secular, rather than theological tenets. His refusal to declare his religious allegiance definitively lead one contemporary, commenting on Marvell, to describe 'his Religion' as indeterminate: 'betwixt Moses, the Messiah, and Mahomet, with his Motto in his Mouth, *quo me vertam nescio*.'¹⁰² Instead, Marvell's focus is on the secular underpinnings of Parker's absolutist vision of the state. Jon Parkin suggests that in his discourses 'Parker had increasingly stressed the necessity of clerical support for secular authority to secure and stress the divine ties of moral and political obligation.'¹⁰³ For instance, in his *Discourse*, Parker argues that 'as long as men think themselves obliged, upon pain of Damnation, to Disobedience and Sedition, not any Secular Threatenings and Inflictions are of force to bridle Exorbitance of conscience.'¹⁰⁴ Nonconformists are in their beliefs especially 'Criminally bold' and 'too Stubborn, Insolent, and Presumptuous' to be allowed to threaten the state, and thus must be brought under the control of the Church to ensure they do not 'discompose the Publick Peace.'¹⁰⁵ For Parker, 'to compromise the rites of the Anglican Church, established by law, in response to the demands of individuals, was to surrender effective political authority.'¹⁰⁶

Whilst Marvell asserts that subjects do owe loyalty to their magistrates, it is not the unlimited obedience envisioned by Parker: 'Subjects are bound both as Men and as Christians to obey the Magistrate Actively in all things where their Duty to God intercedes not.'¹⁰⁷ Laws should all be created with 'some prospect of utility to the Publick' – those that do not are arbitrary, and morally reprehensible.¹⁰⁸ When this occurs, especially in matters of conscience, the magistrate is culpable: 'where the Magistrate does clash with the rules and ends of Christianity, he does of consequence subvert his own power.'¹⁰⁹ Parkin argues that Marvell was 'particularly wary of clerical claims to be able to interpret the will of an inscrutable God, whether this be in terms of religious doctrine, or of political theory.'¹¹⁰ In *The Second Part* he argues that

¹⁰² Anon., *A Letter from Amsterdam, to a Friend in England* (London: Printed for G. H., 1678), p.5.

¹⁰³ Parkin, 'Liberty Transpros'd', p.282.

¹⁰⁴ Parker, *Discourse*, p.286.

¹⁰⁵ Parker, *Discourse*, p.286.

¹⁰⁶ Parkin, 'Liberty Transpros'd', p.275.

¹⁰⁷ Marvell, *RT2*, p.324.

¹⁰⁸ Marvell, *RT2*, p.343.

¹⁰⁹ Marvell, *RT2*, p.343.

¹¹⁰ Parkin, 'Liberty Transpros'd', p.282.

while God had ‘devolved to the Magistrate his Divine Jurisdiction’, this ‘Jurisdiction’ would always be limited, humans lacking God’s omniscience, and He would always reside as ultimate judge: ‘God that sees into the thoughts of mens hearts, and to whom both Prince and Subjects are accountable.’¹¹¹ Marvell asserts that a magistrate needs to be loved by his subjects, and be fair and judicious in his rule – to be arbitrary, in the way envisioned by Parker, is to descend into tyranny.¹¹² Marvell, whilst asserting the necessity for government, and the importance of religion for national stability, presents to the reader a safeguard against despotism in his rhetoric; though the limits he places upon the magistrate are moral rather than constitutional, this acts as a critique of the royal prerogative. Faced with a challenge to his ‘understanding’, Marvell ensured that his reply to Parker was far more intellectually rigorous, and offered the reader a more moderate vision of statecraft to combat his adversary’s absolutism. Yet, in conceptualising a state with clear parameters to check royal and episcopal power (a vision in stark contrast to his political reality), Marvell is actually offering the reader a radical reimagining of the status quo. If they are to be able to discern the concerning absolutist rhetoric of reactionary conservatives, they must be able to close read the rhetorical output of the opposition. Marvell provides a critical model that will enable the reader to question and dismantle establishment narratives.

‘Enter’d into my Book or Imagination’

An immediate example of a reader responding to Marvell’s prose can be seen in the case of Lady Sarah Cowper (1644-1720) and her miscellany. Her commonplace book offers a rare insight into a reader’s exact reaction and response to a text, whilst also offering exact biographical detail into the hand taking note. Furthermore, Marvell’s inclusion was not a singular occurrence: ‘Lady Sarah Cowper listed extracts from *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* in her manuscript sequence ‘The Medley’ and one other

¹¹¹ Marvell, *RT2*, p.342.

¹¹² It was therefore the ultimate duty of magistrates to ensure that their ‘Administration [be] Humane.’ Marvell, *RT2*, p.342.

miscellany, and included a further passage and two poems attributed to 'AM.', one of which might be Marvell's.¹¹³

Lady Sarah Cowper married William Cowper (1638-1706) – a lawyer and heir to a baronetcy, who served as a Whig MP for Hertford between 1679 and 1681 and again between 1688 and 1700. Cowper's social circle thus included emerging Whig politicians and members of the Shaftesbury circle, as well as eminent clergymen.¹¹⁴ As recorded by Cowper's biographer, Anne Kugler, Cowper, though a committed Anglican with a conventional orthodoxy, had many ties to influential dissenters:

[Cowper] exchanged ideas and material with her friend and neighbour Martin Clifford, who was a writer, secretary to the Duke of Buckingham, master of the Charterhouse, and friend of Abraham Cowley. It was probably through him that she obtained material including [...] verses by Buckingham that were only finally published in the twentieth century.¹¹⁵

Cowper was an incredibly active reader, her miscellany a legacy of intellectual participation with popular culture and the political sphere. This participation is documented by Kugler, who fully surveyed Cowper's surviving written output:

Sarah's extensive reading and her personal contact with the shapers of political and social discourse were important factors in the fashioning of her outlook. Although as a woman she was denied political participation in any formal sense, she had the advantage of being able to base her opinions on the "inside" knowledge available to someone in her privileged position [...] Her diary and commonplace books specifically refer to at least 150 separate works [...] In addition she was a regular reader of the broadsheets.¹¹⁶

Between 1670 and 1700, Lady Cowper compiled eleven commonplace books, their contents a reflection of both her personal taste and a turbulent era. As previously discussed, the very act of creating a commonplace book is evidence of the active

¹¹³ Smith, *The Chameleon*, p.279.

¹¹⁴ Anne Kugler, 'Cowper [*née* Holled], Sarah, Lady Cowper', in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/article/66718>> [accessed February 19th, 2017].

¹¹⁵ Anne Kugler, *Errant Plagiary: The Life and Writing of Lady Sarah Cowper* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), p.31.

¹¹⁶ Kugler, *Errant Plagiary*, p.104.

reading encouraged by early modern culture, and involves a reader creating their own apparatus in order to organise their reading for their specific use – display of appropriation. In this way the reader the reader creates meaning; as Sharpe contends, ‘the commonplace method places the reader in a more dominant position and forces the text into categories he has conceived.’¹¹⁷ Cowper belonged to a latitudinarian social circle – a branch of the Anglican church marked by its moderation towards dissention, often known colloquially as “the broad church” given its willingness to accommodate the sects – though two of her most eminent acquaintances differed on the issue of nonconformity, namely Gilbert Burnet and Simon Patrick. Burnet, a fervent moderate, had been an avid supporter of the Declaration of Indulgence, even going as far to petition for a Second Declaration after the failure of the first. In contrast Simon Patrick had authored the infamous (and incredibly popular) *Friendly Debate betwixt a Conformist and Nonconformist* (1669), establishing an entirely new genre of diatribe against dissenters: ‘in a change of tone which shocked dissenters and friends alike [...] accusing the dissenters of glorying in the theology and rhetoric of antinomianism and portraying both as the fuel of sedition and social disruption.’¹¹⁸ That Cowper shared this antipathy with Patrick is evidenced both in her correspondence and in entries within her commonplace book. For instance, in an entry on religion, Cowper notes that, ‘7. Heresy is like a ring-worm, it will spread all over the Body, if it be not cured at first with ink.’¹¹⁹ However, as posited by Kugler, this antipathy could have been born primarily out of marital strife; ‘this alliance with pillars of the established church may well have been a conscious strategy of opposition to her husband, who generally relied on the dissenting community in Hertford for political support.’¹²⁰

Her public connections at court were robust enough to secure a position as King’s Counsel for her son in 1689, yet the expressions used by Cowper privately betray sentiments as very far from monarchist. Under the section labelled ‘Kings’ in her Medley, Cowper includes the following quotations: ‘4. He’s our King, True, but

¹¹⁷ Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p.181.

¹¹⁸ Jon Parkin, ‘Patrick, Simon [Symon]’, in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/article/21568?docPos=2>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019].

¹¹⁹ Hertfordshire, Hertfordshire Public Record Office, Panshanger MSS D/EP F37 “The Medley”, p.135; Cowper helpfully numbered her commonplace book, even providing an index.

¹²⁰ Kugler, ‘Sarah, Lady Cowper’, *ODNB*.

he's not fortunes, we are equally her subjects' and '7. Kings as they love treachery and hate Traytors so they loue virtue, but hate, and fear the virtuous.'¹²¹ These quotes are highly suggestive of Cowper's suspicion of royal sovereignty and reveal a general distrust of "Princes". Under the heading 'Subjects', Cowper includes the quote '2. Not nature but the consent and Election of the people made the first princes from the beginning of the world' – a phrase so resonant with Lady Cowper's sensibilities that she marked this gobbet with a manicule.¹²² Such statements suggest that in many ways Lady Cowper would have been Marvell's ideal reader – a reader already sympathetic to his political scepticism, though their theological stances differed greatly. Estimated by Nicholas van Maltzahn to have been added in 1674, Cowper includes a lengthy extract from *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* in her miscellany. As part of her Medley, under the section 'Characters', Cowper included quotations relating to both contemporary and historical eminent figures – under the heading 'Character of S. P.', Samuel Parker is lambasted by Cowper through Marvell's criticism: '7. He was Brisk and sudden, forward and impatient, talkative and disputatious scorning the dullness of Consideration, and reckoning himself about the drudgery of thinking.'¹²³ Under the section 'Elogies' Marvell is again utilised by Cowper:

1. Improbable Elogies are the greatest differencie to their own design, and do in effect diminish the person, whom they pretend to magnifie any worthy man may pass through the world unquestion'd and safe with a moderate recommendation, but when they are sett off and bedaub'd with Rhetorick and embroider'd so thick that you cannot discern the ground.¹²⁴

Through these inclusions it can be seen that the parts of Marvell's *Rehearsal Transpros'd* that resonate most with Lady Cowper are those that deal directly with reputation and conduct – though Marvell's text is littered with insults for Parker, Cowper does not choose a metaphysical conceit to skewer Parker, but a grounded taunt of his mannerisms and manner of speaking, possibly hinting that the reason this

¹²¹ D/EP F37, p.145.

¹²² D/EP F37, p.233.

¹²³ D/EP F37, p.27.

¹²⁴ D/EP F37, p.57.

slight resonated with Cowper is personal experience (whether first or second hand) of Parker's behaviour.

Though not judged by critics to be a genuine Marvellian work, Cowper also includes a line of verse attributed to 'A. M.' under the entry 'Books': '12. He who can write well and yet is of dul conversation, it's a sign he is not rich himself, but has a good credit and knows where too take up.'¹²⁵ Even this erroneous quote shows an interest in reputation, and the difference between genuine commendation and admiration, and displays a scepticism typical of Marvell's other works. Though these two bon mots are the only direct quotes from a Marvellian prose work found in Cowper's commonplace books, Marvell's influence can be seen elsewhere in the manuscript. Her commonplace book includes an anonymous satiric invective against John Dryden's poem *Religio Laici, Or, A Layman's Faith* (published in 1682, though likely composed earlier), a satire against dissenters, both Catholic and Protestant, which exalted the Anglican Church – the anonymous writer of the invective found in Cowper's commonplace book takes issue with this hard line position. This author uses the satiric motif employed by both Marvell and Buckingham in his play, addressing the poem to 'Mr Bayes.'¹²⁶ The allusion to Dryden aligns the reference with Buckingham's *The Rehearsal*, but the subject matter – that of religious controversy – mirrors Marvell's use of the conceit. The speaker of the poem derides Dryden's critiques of dissenting sects – 'What sect what error wilt thou next disgrace?' – and takes aim at Dryden's hardline Anglican conservatism:

Not all the rancour and felonious spite
Which animates thy lumpish soul to write
Cou'd have contriv'd a satyr more severe
Or more disgrace the cause thou wrought prefer.¹²⁷

The inclusion of this work suggests Cowper felt sympathy with the subjects of Dryden's invective, and uncomfortable with hardline Anglicans, determined to enforce heterodoxy. In Lady Sarah Cowper's circle Marvell was not first and foremost a politician – as shown by Nigel Smith, 'to these people Marvell was a wit, a

¹²⁵ D/EP F37, p.13.

¹²⁶ D/EP F37, p.43.

¹²⁷ D/EP F37, p.43.

controversialist and a poet.¹²⁸ Her commonplace book records a response to him that reflects an interest in the personas he adopts in his work. His literary output shaped public perception of him; to those sympathetic to his message (as appears to be the case with Cowper), Marvell's position as a questioning voice emerges from his prose.

'Such was their Dramatick and Scenical way of Scribling'

Previously this thesis has discussed Marvell's choice to lampoon Parker by christening him "Bayes", making use of George Villiers' preposterous playwright character in order to lambast his adversary and drawing on the popularity of the play *The Rehearsal* (1670) to broaden his audience. Now we will further interrogate this artistic choice. Sean H. McDowell suggests that 'Marvell's dominant literary style during the 1660s and 1670s reflects an overall linguistic shift toward the raillery of courtiers and playwrights', in particular the kind of raillery 'exercised freely in the comedies of manners' that were a staple of the Restoration theatre.¹²⁹ Adopting this persona and this mode allowed Marvell to both draw on his readers' associations with the theatre and make his satire particularly topical – whilst also using these associations to criticise some of the dominant, conservative voices using the theatre to promote their royalist rhetoric. The choice to incorporate the theatre as part of his satire is proof of Marvell's desire to engage with a set of associations specific to a Restoration audience.

During the Interregnum public theatres fell prey to a Puritan fiat, deemed immoral by the prevailing ideology. The reestablishment of the monarchy in turn brought about the re-emergence of public theatre as a source of diversion and (in an expansion of its role in public life) as a means of disseminating the Royalist message; all in a bid to affirm the position of the freshly anointed king and maintain the new status quo. Charles II, in fact, took particular interest in theatre, being both an avid attendee and a budding cultural czar. Susan J. Owen contends that:

¹²⁸ Smith, *The Chameleon*, p.279.

¹²⁹ Sean H. McDowell, 'Urban Marvell', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.17> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-20 (p.13).

the Restoration of the theatres together with the king was to be a symbol of the rejection of the “puritan” regime of the Interregnum. Charles saw the drama as a political instrument: from the first he was actively engaged in discussing with dramatists what they should write.¹³⁰

This ensured that re-enactments and allusions to recent history thoroughly towed the Royalist party line. The bias of these works is made abundantly clear by their titles; ‘the likes of *Cromwell’s Conspiracy* (1660), Tatham’s *The Rump; or The Mirrour of the Late Times* (1661), Wilson’s *The Cheats* (1662), and Lacy’s *The Old Troop* (1663).’¹³¹ The notion that the Civil War was entirely the doing of a small band of fanatical usurpers (succeeding even when confronted by the extraordinarily daring Cavaliers), and that the proceeding two decades of parliamentary rule were both farcically inept and brutally repressive is espoused by these works; the narratives of these plays transparently crafted to serve the state. This system of royal patronage in exchange for propaganda is examined in detail by Nancy McGuire in *Regicide and Restoration*, in which she argues that ‘the new playwrights were politicians who became playwrights either to gain or enhance their political credibility’:

By looking more closely at the playwrights’ affiliations with Charles II and his father, we see that, even though the politician/playwrights arrived at their Royalist stance in various ways, they constituted, in effect, a political machine geared to reinstating the Stuarts.¹³²

While earlier playwrights were always subject to censorship, the theatre had never experienced this level of stage management – audiences attending a public performance were bearing witness to the product of careful statecraft, an attempt to create a new paradigm of monarchy using the cultural scaffolding of previous generations to encourage loyalty in those who, having been citizens, found

¹³⁰ Susan J. Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p.11.

¹³¹ Richard Braverman, *Plots and Counterplots: sexual politics and the body politic in English literature, 1660-1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p.33.

¹³² ‘They formed a political network closely connected through families, experiences, and financial enterprises. Many held appointments in Charles II’s government, and [...] wrote political documents for the King.’ Nancy Klein Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration: English tragicomedy, 1660-1671* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p.3, p.17.

themselves once again subjects: 'for the first time, those in power promoted a consciously contrived campaign to build a new monarchy and a new culture.'¹³³

By choosing to consciously use the theatre to add a layer of comedic meaning to his satire, Marvell wilfully subverts this conservative agenda. The royal investment in the theatre was substantial as (from the outset of its reintroduction) the Stuart regime took care to cultivate the medium: Charles awarded Thomas Killigrew (1612-1683) and William Davenant (1606-1668) theatrical patents – the King even went as far as to commission work that directly served his cause, asking Roger Boyle (1621-1679, the Earl of Orrery) to produce a tragedy in the French style commemorating the Restoration, *The Generall* (1664), and supplying Boyle's next production (the wildly popular *King Henry the Fifth*) with costumes which had been worn by members of the royal family at Charles' coronation, firmly cementing the association between an historically celebrated monarch and the current king.¹³⁴ Marvell uses Charles' pet project and preferred method of propaganda to launch a critique of the establishment, a burlesque of the royal intent. Though the play does not openly criticise the monarch, using the theatre as a source deliberately contravenes the will of the establishment – a method of quietly dissenting against the royal prerogative. This subversion adds a layer of intrinsic irony to his satire immediately apparent to any reader with a passing knowledge of London's theatrical scene. Marvell's choice of source material further adds to this sense of undermining dominant cultural and political forces. George Villiers' *The Rehearsal* is a comedy which takes aim at the prevailing literary culture and its aesthetic values. In particular the character of Bayes, a bombastic and witless playwright, is a transparent parody of Dryden – the play which is being rehearsed being an obvious burlesque of Dryden's most recent historic epic *The Conquest of Granada* (1670).¹³⁵

Dryden, poet Laureate and staunch royalist, was the *de facto* voice of the establishment – his verse and dramatic works reflective of the image the state wished

¹³³ Maguire, *Regicide and Restoration*, p.7.

¹³⁴ Richard Braverman, 'The Rake's Progress Revisited: Politics and Comedy in the Restoration', in *Cultural Readings of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century English Theater*, ed. by J. Douglas Canfield and Deborah C. Payne (London: The University of Georgia Press, 1995), pp.141-168 (p.142).

¹³⁵ John Dryden, *The Conquest of Granada by the Spaniards: In Two Parts* (London: Printed by T. N. for Henry Herringman, 1673).

to project of itself.¹³⁶ While the lampoon of Dryden (both his manner of writing and personal foibles) is blatant in the text and has been thoroughly catalogued, other critics, in particular Margarita Stocker, have made a convincing case for viewing *The Rehearsal* as political allegory – with Bayes serving as a cipher for *both* Dryden and Arlington. Stocker elucidates the underlying political context which would have been implicit in the play for any attentive, contemporary audience member. Stocker argues that in ‘*The Rehearsal* political and literary satire are analogous, mutually reinforcing, and effectively inseparable.’¹³⁷ Though the caricature of London’s literary and theatrical mores is the obvious reading, to a contemporary audience member aware of the Duke of Buckingham’s chequered past and his fraught relationship with Arlington (his main rival for Charles’ favour) the political subtext of Buckingham’s narrative would have been clearer to discern. Villiers had a tumultuous political career – though his father had remained loyal to Charles I and Villiers had been exiled along with Charles II he struggled to retain his favour. Though thoroughly involved in the political machinations of the time (participating as a key player in the plot to bring down the Earl of Clarendon), Buckingham repeatedly found himself bested by Arlington, who in 1667 framed him Villiers for treason. Though the charges were dropped, Villiers’ influence at court was perpetually in flux.

It is within this context that *The Rehearsal* first graced theatres, its initial audience well acquainted with the reputation of its author and thus potentially attentive to the underlying political ideology beneath the comedy. His libertine personal persona and his staunch advocating on behalf of nonconformists stood in direct contradiction of the conservative, homodox agenda of the establishment.¹³⁸ His reputation for controversy also proceeded him: ‘Buckingham was not only a prominent political figure but also an incessantly controversial one, who had already

¹³⁶ *The Conquest*, in fact, was dedicated to James (a royal whose open Catholicism was a cause of anxiety and ire for the wider populace), with many critics drawing parallels between the heir apparent and the play’s noble warrior Alamanzar.

¹³⁷ Margarita Stocker, ‘Political Allusion in *The Rehearsal*’, in *Philological Quarterly*, 67 (1988), 11-35 (p.11).

¹³⁸ Jeremy W. Webster has contended that Buckingham’s very reputation stood in opposition to the societal ideals that the government sought to implant; ‘in a time of political crisis following the Dutch Wars, the government began to propagate its ideology of moderation by appealing directly to the populace with a strategic message of national order meant to stifle dissent.’ Jeremy W. Webster, *Performing Libertinism in Charles II’s Court: Politics, Drama, Sexuality* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), p.49.

been implicated in a major scandal over a comedy with political content.¹³⁹ His contemporary audience would be well equipped to read into the political subtext of the play, having this cursory awareness of the Duke's notoriety as well as foreknowledge of his loyalties, political persuasions and involvement in court intrigues; but it is not just implicit meaning that Buckingham prevails upon, the play's visuals also make the connection explicit. Arlington famously wore black plaster to cover a scar on his nose (a feature so synonymous with syphilis sufferers that it became a popular point of ridicule in satires against Arlington); after a mishap during a rehearsal of a battle scene, the character of Bayes takes a fall that results in a broken nose, and for the duration of the play 'a wet piece of brown paper' is affixed to his face.¹⁴⁰ Though the actor performing the character of Bayes was directed to particularly mimic Dryden's mannerisms, the specific inclusion of the patch would have made the connection to Arlington immediately apparent to a contemporary audience member.¹⁴¹ The particular focus on Arlington, the political operative with the most influence at court, is both an *ad hominem* strike and a critique of the wider political landscape over which he presided.¹⁴² The loudest and most exultating voice writing in praise of the government was Dryden – his prologue to *The Conquest of Granada*, for instance, was heavy in its praise of the Duke of York (to the point of bordering on sycophancy), exclaiming 'and certainly, if ever Nation were oblig'd either by the Conduct, the personal Valour, or the good fortune of a Leader, the English are acknowledging, in all of them, to your Royal Highness.'¹⁴³ In mocking the genre of heroic epic, and the values it espouses, Buckingham is obliquely reprehending the objects of the genres acclaim: 'by critiquing the latter explicitly, he critiques the former implicitly.'¹⁴⁴

When the play was published in 1672, Dryden included the essay *Defence of the Epilogue*, in which he laid out a grand design for the "advancement" of poetry specifically, and language more generally. In the course of his prose (in which he

¹³⁹ Stocker, 'Allusion', p.14.

¹⁴⁰ Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, II.5.39-50 (p.154).

¹⁴¹ Webster, *Performing Libertinism*, p.60.

¹⁴² A satirical attack on the figurehead thus serves as a broader lampoon: 'if targeted on Arlington in particular, the play's satire could articulate opposition ideas in terms which maintained the debate at factional level, without overt criticism of the king himself.' Stocker, 'Allusion', p.13.

¹⁴³ Dryden, *The Conquest of Granada*, sig.*2.v.

¹⁴⁴ Webster, *Performing Libertinism*, p.51.

exults the work of Ben Jonson and begins 'to observe errors' in Shakespeare and Fletcher), Dryden is keen to ascribe the recent improvement of language (a not at all implicit endorsement of his own work) to royal condescension: 'now, if any ask me, whence it is that our conversation is so much refin'd? I must freely, and without flattery, ascribe it to the Court; and, in it, particular the King; whose example gives a law to it.'¹⁴⁵ This was written a decade after the Restoration and, as this thesis has shown, Charles was becoming increasingly unpopular – to ignore this popular attitude in favour of fawning praise, especially in the wake of so many political disasters for the King, is transparent propaganda: 'At his Return, he found a Nation lost as much in Barbarism as in Rebellion: and as the excellency of his Nature forgave the one, so the excellency of his manners reform'd the other [...] Thus, insensibly, our way of living became more free.'¹⁴⁶ As shall be discussed below, the action of *The Rehearsal* completely belies this idea of order, the chaos enacted onstage an indictment of the current state of affairs. By mocking Dryden, Villiers mocks his idealism, his values, and his seemingly indefatigable belief in the competency and excellence of the establishment; Villiers' satire proved so particularly effective and popular with his audience in part because the faith in the Restoration that Dryden's writing attempted to keep lingering had long since dissipated. Dryden's works sought to reflect Stuart conception of kingship and conservative ideology, proposing it as the greatest form of governance (the force keeping innate 'Barbarism' at bay) – in criticising both the literary mode and ideology of his writing, Villiers attempted to subvert this assumption. Stocker asserts that 'the literary burlesque is a very distracting cover for political ideas' – an approach Marvell clearly understood.¹⁴⁷ In choosing to incorporate references to *The Rehearsal* so intrinsically within his animadversion, Marvell is consciously absorbing these meanings and associations within his own satire asking an attentive reader to blend these twin associations.

Marvell is drawing on the reader's engagement with Restoration literary culture as a means of adding layers of subversion to his satire – as either potential readers or audience members of either Dryden or Villiers (and both writers were of such cultural significance that their influence was widespread), a reader of Marvell

¹⁴⁵ Dryden, *The Conquest of Granada*, p.168.

¹⁴⁶ Dryden, *The Conquest of Granada*, pp.168-169.

¹⁴⁷ Stocker, 'Allusion', p.13.

has many entry points with which to launch their own discursive analysis when engaging with his prose. Marvell is anticipating a reader already in the habit of actively reading and cross-referencing their texts, using their own systems of organisation to construct their opinion. His dense web of allusion puts the reader in a dominant position, able to decode the text in a number of ways dependent on their previous reading. Whether as a reader with knowledge of Parker's work, as a reader familiar with Villiers and *The Rehearsal*, as a reader with an acquaintance with Dryden and *The Conquest of Granada*, or a reader aware of Marvell (as either a politician, or for the select few, as a poet) having knowledge, whether partial or full, of any of these texts or authors adds multiple levels of meaning to Marvell's work: having all offers multiple layers of possible interpretation and associations. McDowell contends; 'Marvell seems most fully a Restoration writer when his outsider perspective blossoms within an insider raillery—when he speaks the language of court, stage, and coffeehouse even when his content runs counter to the dominant party line.'¹⁴⁸ Referencing literary culture allows Marvell to both explicitly and implicitly critique prominent advocates for government absolutism, burlesquing and mocking their reactionary ideology – how a reader chooses to appropriate this message of dissent is a matter of choice.

Though Marvell begins his running joke in his first prose offering, it is in *The Second Part* that deliberate parallels between Parker and the character of Bayes take centre stage. Perhaps this served as a means of further obfuscating the potential for sedition in the material given that Marvell abandoned his pseudonym, and thus risked outright public opprobrium if seen openly critiquing the political establishment; in this way his literary allusion acts as a shield with which to guard against the suggestion of dissent, allowing the reader to insinuate critique by drawing on his source material's connotations. In a particularly bitter pronouncement near the end of the play, Bayes exclaims, 'I'll be reveng'd on them too; for I'll Lampoon 'em all. And Since they will not admit of my Plays, they shall know what a Satyrist I am.'¹⁴⁹ In a somewhat ironic twist of fate, by responding to Marvell's initial tract with a *Reproof*, Parker fulfilled this prophecy, allowing Marvell clear grounds to respond and once

¹⁴⁸ McDowell, 'Urban Marvell', p.13.

¹⁴⁹ Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, V.1.432-435 (p.170).

again criticise his adversary: 'for indeed whosoever he be that comes in Print, whereas he might have sate at home in quiet, the first, it concerns him to have no scarcity of Provisions, and in the other to be completely Arm'd'¹⁵⁰ In a clear allusion to his own running imagery in which he fully explored the conceit of words as weapons, the reader is inclined to see that Parker has not learned from the experience of being animadverted. Through use of literary analogy Marvell provides the reader with textual scaffolding – if conscious of Restoration literary culture, this broadens his prose satire from a lampoon of one individual to a wider critique of court.

An example of this intertextual interplay can be found in Marvell's use of war imagery – a rhetorical refrain that recurs throughout both the original and sequel. As previously analysed, Marvell draws heavily on militaristic imagery in his mocking of 'Bayes' – this imagery, associated as it is with both his own poetry and Milton's *Aeropagitica*, has many layers of cross-text interpretive exchange. For a reader familiar with Milton's text and the even smaller subset of his audience *au fait* with Marvell's poetry, these meanings are available to interrogate – however there is yet another way in which a reader could bring their own cultural references into their analysis, allowing for an even broader opportunity of audience recognition and engagement. The repeated use of this war imagery deliberately recalls the action of *The Rehearsal* (which features both the preparation for a battle scene and the ensuing chaos in the rehearsal space) – this aspect of the comedy was one of the more overt means of parodying Dryden. The focus on military action on the stage is depicted as entirely shallow – in describing the supposed appeal of his hero, Bayes expounds that the audience will enjoy scenes that 'puts [Drawcansir] in a warlike posture, so that you have at once your ear entertained with Music and good Language; and your eye satisfied with the garb, and accoutrements of war.'¹⁵¹ The sensory pleasure that Bayes anticipates in his audience is undermined by the inherent silliness of his character. Second to Mr. Bayes, Drawcansir is the most ridiculous and bombastic character on stage in Villiers' play, and the most obvious and visually striking means by which Villiers openly heaps scorn on Dryden's *The Conquest of Granada*.

¹⁵⁰ Marvell, *RT2*, p.236.

¹⁵¹ Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, V.1.210-214 (p.167).

It was not just in his prologue that Dryden paid tribute to James; as noticed by many critics, the actions of the character of Almanzor invites comparison between the soldier and the Duke. In describing his creation, Bayes exclaims that he has written, ‘a fierce *Hero*, that frights his Mistress, snubs up Kings, baffles Armies, and does what he will without regard to numbers, good manners, or justice’ – this invites the sarcastic rejoinder an onlooker that he is ‘a very pretty Character.’¹⁵² Whilst Bayes imagines this to be a sign of his genius, the audience is invited to see his vision of a ‘fierce Hero’ as not just inherently ridiculous, but emblematic of a kind of elite indifference. As Drawcansir himself declares, ‘I drink, I huff, I strut, look big and stare;/ And all this I can do, because I dare.’¹⁵³ His choices on stage are entirely driven by his own urges, ‘without regard’ to the people (dehumanised into purely ‘numbers’) who will be affected by his disregard of ‘justice.’ It is not simply that his aggression is the cause of chaos, it is his complete dismissal of the common wealth – individualism over and above than any kind of utilitarian principle – that reveals the inherent danger of the kind of statesmen valorised by the like of Dryden as the pinnacle of nobility. Instead of exalting in this glorification personal autonomy above community interest, Villiers invites his audience to disdain these “pretty Characters.” If viewed in relation to the parallel between Almanzor and James, this can be read as a direct criticism of James’ conversion and his decision to promote personal conscience in conflict with the will of his Protestant subjects. In Marvell’s work, he accuses his adversary of using a particularly scurrilous and aggressive written style in order to disarm any potential respondents:

For your design and hope was from the beginning, that no man would have answered you in a publick and solemn way [...] when you have rang’d all your forces in Battel, when you have plac’d your Canon, when you have sounded a charge, and given Word to fall on upon the whole Party; if you could then perswade every particular person of ‘m, that you gave him no Provocation, I confess, Mr Bayes, this were an excellent and a new way of your inventing, (‘tis your Moral Vertue) whole Armies.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵² Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, IV.1.110-114 (p.161).

¹⁵³ Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, IV.1.268-269 (p.165).

¹⁵⁴ Marvell, *RT*, p.136.

Directly preceding this exchange, Marvell reminds his readers of the an allusion Parker made in his *Preface* to the libel case brought against Sir John Bramston (1611-1700), a prominent MP for Essex.¹⁵⁵

This scene, though clearly jocular, has a sombre undercurrent – there is no way for serious men to counter Parker’s excessive rhetoric in ‘a publick and solemn way’ without opening themselves up to the possibility of libellous accusations, whether of “papist” tendencies or (as Marvell acidly quotes from Parker himself) a sympathy for ‘*the Fanatick Cause*.’¹⁵⁶ Alex Garganigo argues that by amalgamating the identity of Parker with ‘Dryden and his ranting heroes’ in the mind of the reader, Marvell is deliberately creating an association that reflects his adversary’s absolutism by painting Parker as: ‘a stupid bully who wishes to dominate and humiliate subordinates – the essence of religious persecution. Like Almanzor and the other huffing heroes, he speaks bombast and tries to fight single-handedly against scores of people to impose his will on them.’¹⁵⁷ In this way, Marvell asks his reader to both mock Parker’s pomposity by twinning it with Bayes’ militaristic grand-standing, but also alerts them to the ultimate victims of his rhetoric. Though Parker’s arguments are, by the process of animadversion, presented to the reader as both shallow and artificial as Drawcansir’s ‘warlike posture’, they are not without real world impact. His ability to invent ‘Whole Armies’ to rail against silences the small minority of those who hold heterodox beliefs; his is a one-sided war. Drawcansir’s pride in his body count is also a point of satire: ‘Others may bost a single man to kill;/ But I, the blood of thousands daily spill./ Let petty Kings the names of Parties know:/ Where e’er I come, I slay both friend and foe.’¹⁵⁸ Here his bloodlust is rendered even more absurd by the static and rigid use of heroic couplets (expounded by Dryden as the perfect form of verse); the chaos and disorder revealed by the content of his verse is slyly subverted by its form. In disregarding both ‘petty Kings’ and ‘Parties’ (the bodies created to represent the people), this model of “hero” is entirely devoid of civic responsibility or

¹⁵⁵ Bramston found himself accused of being a secret “papist” by a political opponent and of receiving payment from the Pope in order to promulgate his agenda; however the chief witness to this offence was quickly revealed to have forged evidence and the accusation was swiftly dropped. Thomas M. Croakley, ‘Bramston, Sir John, the younger’, in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <<https://doi-org.chain.kent.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/3244>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019].

¹⁵⁶ Marvell, *RT*, pp.135-6.

¹⁵⁷ Garganigo, ‘*The Rehearsal Transpros’d*’, p.10.

¹⁵⁸ Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, V.1.343-346 (p.169).

public duty. Marvell makes a point of repeating the phrase '[that he will] fill the World with Blood, Execution, and Massacre.'¹⁵⁹ Though an inherently theatrical pronouncement (in line with Parker's own perceived bombast), in taking the logic of Parker's aggression to its *ad absurdum* conclusion, there is a serious note underpinning the jocularity.

Though the reader is invited to mock Parker's preferment of penal punishments, his continued advancement is cause for concern. In *The Second Part*, in apparent response to Parker's deliberate and abusive *ad hominem* attacks, Marvell responded by making references to Parker's personal history even *less* veiled than they had been in his previous venture. For instance, Marvell reminds his readers of a very recent source of public humiliation for Parker. Parker had been receiving steady preferment in the Church since 1667, and his role as chaplain had expanded to include licenser duties: in the years intervening the publication of the first and second *Rehearsal Transpros'd*, Parker had licensed a particularly pernicious and gruesome piece of anti-nonconformist propaganda, *Mr. Baxter Baptiz'd in Bloud, or, A Sad History of the unparallel'd cruelty of the Anabaptists in New England* (1673).¹⁶⁰ This became a point of public embarrassment as Parker was forced via a Privy Council investigation to renounce the work and reveal that the story was fabricated.¹⁶¹ Marvell acerbically refers to this 'piece of Ecclesiastical History', quoting from the sordid pamphlet which promised to '*faithfully [relate] the Cruel, Barbarous, and Bloody Murther of Mr. Baxter an Orthodox Minister, who was kill'd by the Anabaptists, and his Skin most cruelly flead off from his Body.*'¹⁶² Marvell is not shy in condemning its creators and promoters, asserting 'there was never a completer falsehood invented.'¹⁶³ Just like 'Bayes', who revels in the gore he describes, Parker is portrayed as a propagandist ghoulishly dwelling on salacious, savage details. This behaviour is indicative of a dereliction of duty, given Parker's role as a clergyman – however persecuting nonconformists is a convenient means to advance. In the world Marvell

¹⁵⁹ Marvell, *RT*, p.134.

¹⁶⁰ Anon., *Mr. BAXTER Baptiz'd in Bloud, or, A Sad History of the Unparallel'd Cruelty of the Anabaptists in New-England* (London: s. n., 1673).

¹⁶¹ Jon Parkin, 'Parker, Samuel' in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* < <https://www-oxforddnb-com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-21336?rkey=lgNieH&result=1> > [accessed 2nd September, 2019].

¹⁶² Marvell, *RT2*, p.278; Anon., *Mr. BAXTER*, title page.

¹⁶³ Marvell, *RT2*, p.278.

creates for the reader, those who would '[make] Christianity Lacquey to Ambition' are unfortunately abundant.¹⁶⁴ However, whilst the '*cruelly flea'd*' bodies he imagines are entirely fictitious, the ramifications for actual '*Anabaptists*' slandered by these accusations is real.

Though Parker is the focus of this scorn, this referral to a real life incident asks the reader to question why a man of such a character has been vested with such authority – his behaviour is effectively sanctioned by the wider organisation of which he is an apparatus. There is a narrative thread running through Marvell's imagery and satire available to those active readers with pre-knowledge of his literary allusions – an indirect line from the Duke of York (and the kind of regal selfishness for which he was associated), to Almanzor (and the pro-establishment, conservative values promoted by Dryden), to Drawcansir (and Villiers' deconstruction of those values), to Marvell's use of war imagery. His depiction of Parker in a 'warlike posture' creates deliberate connective tissue between his text and the inspiration for its title.

Obfuscating the issue

The most striking characteristic of the character of Mr. Bayes which Marvell utilises in his satiric take down of Parker, is his propensity to expound upon his writing method and the superiority of his own process (though his explanation reveals the superficiality of his approach.) The language Villiers uses to create this affectation is deliberately mirrored by Marvell. In both, reference to a common-place book is utilised to reveal the superficiality of the subject of their satire. Bayes explains to onlookers that his common-place book is the source of his theatrical inspiration: 'No, cry you mercy: this is my book of *Drama Common places*; the Mother of many other Plays.'¹⁶⁵ Marvell presents a similar scenario to his readers in reference to Parker's first foray into printed polemic: 'his first Proof-piece was in the year 1665. the *Tentamina Physico theologica*: a tedious transcript of his Common-place book.'¹⁶⁶ This essay was not published anonymously (unlike the works Marvell took to task in his

¹⁶⁴ Marvell, *RT*, p.134.

¹⁶⁵ Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, I.1.99-101 (p.144).

¹⁶⁶ Marvell, *RT2*, p.263.

original tract) – though he maintains the conceit of calling Parker “Bayes”, this reference allows any reader not fully aware of the particulars of their printed spat (though by and large the identity of both participants was widely acknowledged) to discover Parker’s authorship. By describing the piece in these terms, Marvell completely derides Parker’s scholarship.¹⁶⁷ It is not simply that this approach lacks originality, this mode of writing takes the meaning of the original completely out of context:

But so flippant he was, and forward in this Book, that, in despite of all Chronology, he could introduce Plato to inveigh against Calvin, and from the Platoniques he could miraculously hook in a Discourse against Non-conformists.¹⁶⁸

By specifically critiquing this technique, Marvell suggests to his readers that issues such as nonconformity need to be discussed in deliberate regard to ‘Chronology’ – a contemporary controversy shaped by specific contemporary societal factors cannot be debated by those refusing to engage with modern realities, instead merely relying on the authority of writers whose work has been taken out of context.

By accusing him of merely regurgitating the work of other writers in order to feign scholarliness Marvell is attempting to draw distinct parallels in his readers minds between the object of his scorn and the contemptuous character of Bayes, an oblivious plagiarist: ‘as thus. I come into a Coffee-house, or some other place where witty men resort, I make as if I minded nothing; (do you mark?) but as soon as any one speaks, pop I slap it down, and make that, too, my own.’¹⁶⁹ Later, Bayes brags that: ‘*Perseus, Montaigne, Seneca’s Tragedies, Horace, Juvenal, Claudian, Pliny, Plutarch’s lives*, and the rest, have ever thought upon this subject: and so, in a trice, by leaving out a few words, or putting in others of my own, the business is done.’¹⁷⁰ Likewise, Parker’s inspiration comes from an unlikely source:

¹⁶⁷ Given that this essay was Parker’s most important contribution to theology and earned him admission to the Royal Society, this insult was specifically calibrated to rankle.

¹⁶⁸ Marvell, *RT2*, p.264.

¹⁶⁹ Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, I.1.132-136 (p.145).

¹⁷⁰ Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, I.1.150-155 (p.145).

But you have a peculiar delight in Scripture-Drollery, nothing less will taste to your Palate: whereas otherwise you have travelled so far in Italy, that you could not escape the Titles of some Books which would have served your turn as well, *Cardinalism, Nepotism, Putanism*, if you were in a *Paroxism* of the *Ism's*.¹⁷¹

Here Marvell mirrors Bayes' use of auxesis to create an absurd list, though the sources he identifies are not classical but indications of Parker's worldly interests as he is envisioned seeking literature on the hierarchy of the Roman Church, nepotistic preferment and prostitution. It is not just the content that Parker is depicted as requiring, but the mere suggestion of scholastic legitimacy, as he strives to collect and curate '*Ism's*.' Both caricatures present their subjects as cribbing unearned intellectual authority, but the ramifications of Parker behaving in this way are far more grave. His linguistic excesses are also an issue. For instance, Parker's absolutist assertions regarding the role of the magistrate are magniloquent enough to border on championing tyranny. In one particularly vivid scene in *The Second Part*, Marvell turns his attention once again to Parker's repeated advocacy for corporeal methods of punishing nonconformity in his *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity*, challenging the fundamental idea that they deserve punishment: 'He proclaims them for meer dissenting upon tenderness of Conscience, *Villains, Hypocrites, Rebels, Schismaticks, and the greatest and most Hereticks*.'¹⁷²

Indeed, in his writing Parker does call for the 'the severest Penalties, and the strictest Execution': 'He must *scourge them into order*. He must *Chastise them out of their peevishness, and Lash them into Obedience*.'¹⁷³ In his analysis of Parker's writing, Marvell surmises that his opponents use of imperatives is the ultimate presumption, an 'Imposition' that 'he lays [...] now upon the Magistrate':

Is this at last all the business why he hath been building up all this while that
Necessary, Universal, Uncontroulable, Indispensable, Unlimited and Absolute,

¹⁷¹ Marvell, *RT*, p.134.

¹⁷² Marvell takes care to footnote these passages – '[p.241. p.273. p.319.]' – a means of assuring his reader that these are not exaggerations. Marvell, *RT2*, p.271.

¹⁷³ Marvell, *RT2*, pp.271-2.

Arch-Deacon? Still *must, must, must*: But what if the Supream Magistrate won't? Why, *must* again, eight times at least in little more then one page.¹⁷⁴

Parker's insistent use of these adjectives is framed here as forwardness and impudence – the way that Marvell quotes Parker is designed to appear to the reader as if his adversary is himself commanding the magistrate, his repetition of '*must*' both a critique of his written style and of his effrontery. Yet this scene, at once a critique of Parker's authored texts, is also framed as inherently theatrical, as to summon an audience for his 'very first Book' he begins to 'hem in his Auditory.'¹⁷⁵ The term auditory, relating as it does specifically to aural apprehension, suggests that Parker's method of communication is entirely performative – rather than writing a discourse, he has written a speech. In imagining Parker's readership as a theatrical audience Marvell suggests that his arguments are merely spectacle, crafted with dramatic effect valued above either reason or ethics. This is in contrast to Marvell's pointed and continued reference to the term 'Reader.'¹⁷⁶

In a similar vein of considering audience enjoyment, Marvell (in a moment of mock introspection) wonders if his comic conceit has run its course, if 'the humour of Bayes be so worn out that it may not give the Auditory a second days diversion.'¹⁷⁷ However, judging it to be 'too ceremonious and tirsom to repeat so often upon all occasions the *Author of the Ecclesiastical Politie*', Marvell declares his intention to continue the motif; 'though I bear him great respect, yet I had rather of the two offend him than my Readers.'¹⁷⁸ Here Marvell both mocks Parker's accusation that Marvell should have (in consideration of his standing) dealt with him more seriously in his pamphlet and also reinforces an 'Auditor/'/Reader' binary. While 'Bayes' (and thus Parker by association) cannot sustain his 'Auditors' with his 'humour', Marvell stresses his 'respect' for his readership. In referring to them as 'my Readers', Marvell further seeks to establish a sense of familiarity and conviviality with those engaging with his text. It is a fundamental part of his rhetorical strategy to assert to his 'Reader'

¹⁷⁴ Marvell, *RT2*, pp.271-2.

¹⁷⁵ Marvell, *RT2*, p.271.

¹⁷⁶ The character of Bayes also makes repeated references to his 'Auditors', proclaiming his dramatic style 'the new way of writing', all part of his 'grand design upon the Stage is to keep the Auditors in suspense.' Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, I.2.9-14 (p.145).

¹⁷⁷ Marvell, *RT2*, p.283.

¹⁷⁸ Marvell, *RT2*, p.283.

that they are active participants, capable of reaching their own conclusions by following Marvell's train of thought – his use of literary allusion ensuring that the reactions to his text will be individualised, dependent on the prior reading each reader brings to the task of analysing his satire, as their experience as a 'Reader' is shaped by their own engagement with both Marvell and the popular culture of the Restoration. The impression that Marvell aims to establish is that while Parker is delivering an instructional harangue, *he* seeks to engage their critical faculties. In mocking Parker, Marvell infers that 'meer dissenting' should be re-evaluated. Though not actively criticising the King or his government, the fact that their policies in any way reflect the attitude of a mind like Parker's is an implicit criticism of their actions. Ultimately it is the citizenry who suffer from arbitrary government: 'as for poor Subjects there is no help for them.'¹⁷⁹

The theme of political confusion had become a mainstay of the Restoration stage – Marvell borrows this sense of disorder to add further subversion to his animadversion.¹⁸⁰ Although the theatre was predominantly a site of royalist rhetoric (as epitomised by Dryden), by the 1670s the ties between the state and the stage had loosened. Jessica Munns asserts that:

The serious dramas from the 1660s onward had problematized the political trope of the family as a microcosm or emblem of the state and the state as an emblem of the family. In serious dramas from the 1670s onward, royal families are frequently portrayed as dysfunctional – the kings and queens adulterous, incestuous, and murderous, the sons rebellious. The political and social forces working against the unquestioning acceptance of authority are articulated in the many plays that depict rulers as weak, tyrannical, lustful, and, on occasion, entirely insane.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ Marvell, *RT2*, p.271.

¹⁸⁰ As previously stated the reinstatement of the theatre was a promotional coup for the Stuarts, with their early investment in the art form ensuring that dramatists were incentivised to tow the loyalist line: 'in the divided society of the 1660s, in which Stuart ideology had to be reconstructed and reinstated after the rupture of the interregnum, the royalist play represents an attempt to paper over ideological cracks.' Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p.19.

¹⁸¹ Jessica Munns, 'Change, Skepticism and Uncertainty', in *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*, ed. by Deborah Payne Fisk (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp.142-57 (p.143).

This complete reversal in the theatre's polemical orientation is perhaps epitomised by Nathaniel Lee's *The Princess of Cleve* (1681), which went further than Villiers' *The Rehearsal* in its disassembly of heroic dramas and their tropes.¹⁸² Political turmoil was often expressed through the trope of having multiple characters assuming the identity of the king (or other figure of authority), the ensuing misdirection and miscommunication becoming either a source of comedic strife or the source of political chaos in serious work.

This trope – which had become increasingly popular in heroic dramas, in which the reinstallation of the rightful king in the place of a usurper aimed to reflect positively on Charles' ascension – is rigorously mocked by Villiers in *The Rehearsal*. The very fact that it is used by Bayes – 'the chief hinge of this Play [...] is that I suppose two Kings to be of the same place' – is a critique of its use, the chaos he imagines himself to have created is artificial, the overthrow of the two kings is simple, bloodless and ultimately has no effect on the action.¹⁸³ The connotation, given the plays invective against Arlington, is that the nation is rudderless, with power divested to those whose motivations and political agendas are opaque. Marvell also utilises the trope. In discussing the flurry of scurrilous responses that his first tract evoked, he remarks that 'there were no less than six *Scaramuccios* together upon the Stage', making it difficult discern his original adversary: 'I believe he imitated the Wisdom of some other Princes, who have sometimes been perswaded by their Servants to disguise several others in the Regal garb, that the enemy might not know in the battel whom to single.'¹⁸⁴ This vignette is both an attack on Parker's continued anonymity and on the sheer number of his respondents – clearly his text hit a nerve to mandate that many responses. Perhaps this reference to 'the Regal garb' might have evoked an association with the production of *Henry V* in which the actors wore the costumes loaned to them by the royal family or to Shakespeare's *Henry IV, Part I* (1597), or even with the exploits of Bayes who sought to keep 'his Auditors in suspense' by filling the stage with as many pretenders to the throne as possible – either way, the

¹⁸² Susan J. Owen contends that in Lee's play: 'the lack of moral coherence and of clear standards from the political centre of the nation coupled with the lack of any alternative worthy of respect, is an indictment of the leaders of society whose ill-regulated desires reflect a society badly ruled.' Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, p.19.

¹⁸³ Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, I.2.96-101 (p.146).

¹⁸⁴ Marvell, *RT2*, p.252.

association with theatrical stage practice could evoke certain interpretations in a reader. Richard Braverman deconstructs this trope, suggesting that:

The *sine qua non* of sovereignty was its theoretical indivisibility. That it could not be divided or shared meant that the king defined politics, which took place at court or in his presence in parliament. Politics was so restricted because the king was the sole communicant of the *arcana imperii*.¹⁸⁵

Associating Parker with this trope is deliberately provocative, given his total conviction in the 'Unlimited' power of the magistrate. In this theatrical formulation authority is a costume that can be donned, a rejection of 'the *sine qua non* of sovereignty' and thus one of Parker's key values. It is also a value that Marvell publicly and directly contradicts: 'I do most certainly believe that the Supream Magistrate hath some Power, but not all Power in matters of Religion [...] I do not believe that Princes have Power to bind their Subjects to that Religion they apprehend most advantagious.'¹⁸⁶ The use of 'some' here is provocatively ambiguous. In Marvell's configuration faith is intrinsic and personal – nonconformists should not be bound to performing conformity, given that this would be a betrayal of their intimate, innate beliefs. The phrase 'that Religion they apprehend most advantagious' could also potentially be read as a tacit reminder of the divided religious and political loyalties of the Stuarts, and the concern that should the heir apparent – the Duke of York – decide Catholicism to be the 'most advantagious' religion Parker's rhetoric would 'bind' every subject in spite of their own beliefs. Conformity, as Parker outlines it, could theoretically entail wholesale conversion according to the whims of the 'Supream Magistrate.' The secular and spiritual spheres should thus operate separately.

Marvell also sarcastically takes aim at the dissemination of the *arcana imperii*. One of the sources of confusion in the play within a play in *The Rehearsal* is Bayes insistence on having characters whisper onstage, meaning the audience is completely denied knowledge of their plans – when questioned on this decision, Bayes responds, 'matters of State ought not to be divulg'd.'¹⁸⁷ This discretion is lacking in Marvell's

¹⁸⁵ Braverman, *Plots and Counterplots*, p.16.

¹⁸⁶ Marvell, *RT2*, p.275.

¹⁸⁷ Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, II.1.77-78 (p.149).

adversary, as he sardonically notes Parker's allegation that '*that the Fanaticks*' have caused '*Christian Princes begin to be of a perswasion, that Christianity is an enemy to Government*' would (if taken literally, which Marvell jokingly asks his reader to do) mean that Parker was 'conversant and intimate with all the Princes of Christendom':

But I suppose that they reveal'd this secret of State to him only in confidence, for I never before heard of it in publick: and it is not so ingeniously or prudently done of him to proclaim in Print the subject of a familiar discourse [...] this sure will make Princes more cautelous for the future, whom they chuse for their Ministers.¹⁸⁸

While clearly a sarcastic censure of Parker's presumption, Marvell leaves enough references to Parker's career (such as his unsuccessful sojourn as a licenser) that even a reader unaware of Parker's identity would by this point have been aware that Marvell's adversary held a position of some authority within the Church – his actions clearly directed by powerful political operatives, given the propagandistic character of his material. The call for 'Princes' to be 'more cautelous' thus holds some resonance. Just as the character of Bayes gleefully delights in the chaos he creates on stage – 'There's now an odd surprize; the whole State's turn'd quite topsie-turvy, without any puther or stir in the whole world, I gad' – Marvell presents Parker's agenda (and the broader agendas he serves) as equally destabilising.¹⁸⁹ Were his words to be taken at all seriously, they would inspire, 'the disturbance of all Government, the misrepresenting of the generous and prudent Counsels of His Majesty, and raising a mis-intelligence betwixt Him and His People.'¹⁹⁰ As such mockery is the primary means to neutralise his rhetoric, and active reading the means to expose the danger behind his performance.

In *Player's Sceptres: Fictions of Authority in the Restoration*, Susan Staves argues that 'plays are often intensely political and that much of their interest lies in their concern with the problems of political authority and obligation.'¹⁹¹ In this way, Restoration theatre served as the perfect frame around which Marvell could build and

¹⁸⁸ Marvell, *RT2*, p.275.

¹⁸⁹ Villiers, *The Rehearsal*, II.4.80-82 (p.153).

¹⁹⁰ Marvell, *RT2*, p.245.

¹⁹¹ Susan Staves, *Player's Sceptres: Fictions of Authority in the Restoration* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979) p.47.

shape his animadversion – both the textual and sub textual material alluded to by engaging with drama providing ample avenues of interpretation for the reader. Without directly questioning systems of authority, instead aligning himself with a medium that exposed issues of ‘political authority and obligation’, Marvell dodges directly raising seditious ideas whilst still tacitly questioning the status quo; including themes that would be more openly explored in the anti-episcopal *A Short Historical Essay* and *An Account*, both of which would unequivocally critique powerful institutions. In *Mr Smirke*, though the character and the play with which Marvell draws from to build his satire (George Etherege’s *The Man of Mode* (1676)) is not as central or as intrinsic to the argument he creates, there is a clear point of similarity between both pamphlets. In both political power is depicted funnelling into the hands of the ambitious – scurrilous writing as a means of advancing the agenda of the Anglican Church is also presented as a major societal issue, indicative of a degradation in public discourse. Opening the treatise by announcing ‘the Play begins’, Marvell announces to the reader his intention for them to enter into the discourse drawing on their associations with the theatre; Restoration drama, which increasingly became less fawningly royalist, had begun to deeply question the motives and actions of those in authority, a mindset Marvell is asking his readership to assume.¹⁹² Using the theatre as a stage upon which to enact his satire functions as a means of drawing on a collective vocabulary shared by his readership. It also makes the scenes Marvell creates more vividly rendered given the direct corollary a reader might have from their experience witnessing a performance of these plays; the affectation of the character of Bayes on stage making Marvell’s central the visceral and vibrant for his contemporaries. The distinction he draws between an ‘Auditor’ and ‘Reader’ is also crucial – though he borrows from the medium, Marvell presents his text not as a soliloquy, but as a discussion.

Engaging with the contemporary literary culture of the Restoration enhances the interpretative meaning of Marvell’s prose. Just as is explored more frankly in *An Account of the Growth of Popery* through use of documentary history, allusion to the Restoration theatre reveals the anti-establishment feeling lurking beneath *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*’s jocularities. The fact that Parker is free to both impugn

¹⁹² Marvell, *Smirke*, p.58.

innocent nonconformists and allowed to have 'rang'd all your forces in Battel', given 'Canon' and allowed to 'have sounded a charge' reveals a fundamental injustice. Whilst others are silenced, the vacuum created has the potential for genuine damage: 'the one to uphold his *Fiction*, must incite Princes to Persecution and Tyranny, degrade Grace to Morality [... and] fill the World with Blood, Execution, and Massacre'¹⁹³ The ambition and individualistic self-interest of those in power is a potent threat.

¹⁹³ Marvell, *RT*, p.134.

II. Unpopular Theology

The first half of this section considered how Marvell engaged with the reader's knowledge of popular literary culture; our attention will now turn to examine how Marvell negotiated contemporary attitudes towards "unpopular" religious persuasions. As has been previously discussed, religious dissenters faced both penal repercussions and dogged criticism in the press, as illustrated by the works of Parker. It is within the parameters of this prejudice towards minority religious communities that Marvell's prose works exist, his arguments both informed by and directed against this undercurrent of animosity. Whilst in some of his works Marvell actively undermines the negative perceptions of nonconformity present in Restoration popular culture, in other works Marvell utilises this animosity (in particular anti-Catholic sentiments) as fuel for his rhetoric, using the power of the idea of "anti-popery" to promote the idea of English exceptionalism (and thus the necessity of protecting this ideal).

Marvell's position on the issue of "popery" is both a reflection of contemporary prejudice, but also a reaction to the secular, political threat posed by Catholic nation states. The very title of *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* is indicative of the proselytistic intentions of the pamphlet; which equated the growing Catholic influence at court to deeply entrenched political corruption. The anti-popery on display in *An Account* however is at odds with the dissatisfaction at Anglican hegemony expressed in *Mr Smirke, The Rehearsal Transpros'd* or *A Short Historical Essay*. Both his position on the issue of nonconformity and the tone of his narrative voice shifts depending on the polemical agenda of the pamphlets. Taken as a whole "Marvell's" position on other Christian denominations and sects isn't consistent – that is because it was never *intended* to be. The stance taken in each of these separate works is tailored to evoke a specific response in his readership. Marvell doesn't engage with explicit theological debate in the majority of his prose, rather he explores and relies upon the reader's experience of other systems of faith in order to challenge their assumptions or direct their pre-existing prejudices to serve his polemical ends. As this chapter will explore, a century's long suspicion of those

who privately practised Catholicism, a virulent distrust of the Roman Catholic papal establishment, and a xenophobic animus directed at the powerful Catholic nation states who directly competed with Britain all contributed towards a prevailing climate of hostility towards the very idea of “Popery.”¹ Marvell is utilising the reader’s preconceptions in order to transfer their distrust of *Popery* towards the other problematic institution named in his title, *Arbitrary Government*. In both discussions of nonconformity and popery, a contemporary controversy surrounding a religious sect is used as a platform to discuss secular ideas; “Popery” represented a threat to English ideological ideas and values only by its association with conformity to a central, unlimited organisation. Institutions that seek to restrict personal freedoms and liberty – whether Protestant, Catholic or monarchic – are equally subject to scrutiny.

Marvell plays with both anti-popery and anti-anti-popery as means to an end in his endeavour to convince the reader; either mocking this paranoia when attacking an adversary or engaging with the phenomenon in order to add urgency to his polemic. In discussing Marvell’s engagement with anti-popery, this chapter will take the line proposed by Clement Fatovic in his survey of critical discussions regarding the history and development of the idea of “freedom” in the latter half of the seventeenth century:

In noting the crucial role of popery in popular panics, constitutional battles over royal prerogative and succession, and campaigns for toleration in early modern England, numerous scholars have drawn attention to the general importance of historical and political context in understanding the conceptual development of political ideas.²

The political ideas espoused by Marvell in his prose can likewise only be properly contextualised and understood when viewed through this prism – by understanding fully the political and ideological inference of the concept of popery for an early modern reader, and delving into the deeper anxieties fuelling the bursts of ‘popular

¹ Catholicism is represented as a threat to both domestic policy and international interests – in his anti-popery, Marvell presents Catholicism less as a faith than as a political system.

² Clement Fatovic, ‘The Anti-Catholic Roots of Liberal and Republican Conceptions of Freedom in English Political Thought’, in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 66 (2005), 37-58 (p.39).

panics' that shaped the national discourse concerning popery. In this climate of fear, historic incidents of violence held palpable cultural currency, as 'the St. Bartholomew's day massacre, the Marian persecution and the Irish massacres of 1641 all showed the bloody cruelty of Papists in power.'³

It is necessary to view what appears on the surface as a simply reactionary response as a nuanced reaction to cultural conditions. Alexandra Walsham contends that;

recent studies [...] have adopted a more sophisticated perspective and endeavoured to recover the rationality of the spasms of anti-Catholicism that periodically rocked sixteenth and seventeenth-century English society. Rejecting the impulse to dismiss them simply as instances of popular credulity fuelled by a sensationalist press or manipulated (if not invented) by cynical elites for their own ends, they have sought instead to reconstruct the structure, function and ideological significance of these outbreaks of prejudice [...] they have fruitfully approached fear not as a cloud or fog which prevents us from apprehending an underlying reality, but rather as the main event itself.⁴

To this end, this chapter will consider both the history surrounding the idea of 'popery' and provide a clear understanding of how Marvell's readers would likely have responded to his cultural cues and where exactly on the spectrum his particular brand of anti-popery fell. It will also consider how Marvell utilised the ideological counter-part to anti-popery, turning instead to focus on his calls for toleration; in which comparison to Roman Catholicism was invoked as specific criticism of the Anglican establishment, and as a means of calling for toleration of minority religious groups (which tacitly included Catholics). By considering multiple texts this chapter will contribute to the field by broadening our understanding of how Marvell both used and challenged the prejudices of his readership – the sustained anti-popery of *An Account* is a tactical strategy that is not employed elsewhere. Ultimately, the chapter will turn to consider how Marvell's consideration of this historic

³ John Miller, 'Catholic Officers in the Late Stuart Army', in *The English Historical Review*, 88 (1973), 35-53 (p.36).

⁴ Alexandra Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain* (London: Routledge, 2016), p.317.

phenomenon was used to discuss contemporary corruption, and how he subverted his audiences expectations.

Pride and Prejudice

It is important to bear in mind the full extent of anti-Catholic sentiment when placing the anxieties expressed within Marvell's prose in context. The prejudice conveyed in *An Account* did not emerge from a cultural vacuum – fear of both foreign Catholic states and of malevolent actors working to undermine the Anglican Church were widespread and pervasive. These fears, a common theme since England's fraught conversion to Protestantism, had gained traction post-Restoration, as the ambiguous loyalties of both the head of the Church and his successor came into sharp relief. As the work of David Cressy illuminates, this bigotry not only infiltrated public discourse, it became a fixture of the calendar.

National holidays, an essential tool used in the formation of a “national” identity, were utilised as part of a propaganda campaign by the Crown to shore up their position. Anglican celebrations, and in particular those which, like Christmas, had been expunged from the public itinerary during the Interregnum, coupled with new anniversaries that celebrated Stuart ascendancy were of vital importance in the re-establishment of the monarchy: ‘the bells that welcomed Charles II in 1660 not only announced the restoration of the Anglican ecclesiastical calendar but also foreshadowed the adoption of new politicised national anniversaries on 30 January and 29 May.’⁵ These events served as a means of declaring Stuart legitimacy and of canvassing support amongst their subjects. However, it was not merely these patriotic displays that emerged as new additions to the calendar; long-established dates of Protestant remembrance gave rise to vehemently xenophobic, anti-Catholic

⁵ The 30th of January marked the anniversary of Charles I's execution, a ritual of national mourning intended to cement his legacy as a martyr and reiterate the horror of regicide; May 29th became Royal Oak day, a day to give thanks for the “miraculous” restoration of the monarchy, the nascent tradition of wearing of oak leaves on this day a reference to Charles' escape during the Battle of Worcester. David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: national memory and the Protestant calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1989), p.171.

displays. Though many of these events occurred decades prior to the 1670s, their power to ignite emotion remained astonishingly powerful:

Historic deliverances of the Elizabethan and Jacobean period lay beyond the reach of most living memory, yet they continued to influence religious consciousness and political behaviour. Rather than fading with time, such 'mercies' as the triumphs of Queen Elizabeth and the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot remained in view as highly charged points of reference and commentary.⁶

These dates became flashpoints in both discussions of religious identity and in expressions of dissatisfaction at the status quo. For instance, the ejection of dissenting ministers from their seats after the enforcement of the Act of Uniformity came in to effect on the 24th of August, leading many non-conformists to liken the expulsion of these ministers to their own St Bartholomew's Day – equating their persecution at the hands of the Anglican Church to that of the Huguenots persecuted by Catholics, using anti-Catholic rhetoric to shame the establishment using terms they would consider incredibly pejorative.⁷ In this way an event that occurred nearly a century before the Restoration retained cultural currency. The emotive potential in recounting episodes of Protestant persecution is not to be underestimated: 'it is striking to find, as late as 1681, a member of the English parliament giving a tearful speech about the fate of Bohemia.'⁸

The 5th of November, another date significant as a reminder of "historic deliverance", became the focal point of popular displays of anti-Catholic sentiment. The anniversary of the failed Gunpowder Plot initially served as an opportunity for London's apprentices to engage in political protest and turn the event into a 'fire festival.'⁹ The event was completed with an act of symbolic violence against representations of Catholics: 'there the monster was strung up above the street, to dance in the air and to provide a target for pistols, before descending into the flames.

⁶ Cressy, *Bonfires*, p.172.

⁷ Cressy, *Bonfires*, p.172.

⁸ Jonathan Scott, 'Radicalism and Restoration: The Shape of the Stuart Experience', in *Historical Journal*, 31 (1988), 453-467 (p.460).

⁹ This festival contained its own specific visual semiotics: 'they constructed an effigy of the Whore of Babylon, decked out with "all the whorish ornaments" of papal crosses, keys, beads and triple crown, and carried it in torchlight procession to "a great bonfire" in the Poultry.' Cressy, *Bonfires*, p.174.

The crowd was noisy, rowdy, and inebriated, but the symbolism was specific and controlled.¹⁰ In one particularly gruesome incident, an effigy of the Pope was filled with cats before being paraded through the streets then set alight. These events took a firm hold over the urban imagination as, ‘what had been a novelty earlier in the 1670s rapidly became established as a metropolitan tradition.’¹¹ These lavish, dramatic and sensationalist displays which began in the Capital soon garnered beyond support outside of London, in towns such as Salisbury, Halifax and Oxford - though few could match the level of spectacle achieved by the organisers of London’s parades.¹² The propagandistic aims and political underpinnings of these events was made clear from the source of their funding, as ‘Members of the Green Ribbon Club paid up to ten apiece to subsidize the November processions.’¹³ As political tensions continued to intensify, the event garnered renewed interest and increased engagement among the wider populace, and a fresh series of pamphlets published in the 1670s, rehashing the events of 1605, added fuel to the fire. Titles such as *Popish Policies and Practices* (1674)¹⁴, *The histories of the Gunpowder-Treason and the Massacre at Paris* (1676)¹⁵, *England’s Remembrancer; A True and Full Narrative of those never to be forgotten Deliverances* (1677)¹⁶ and *The Romanists designs detected, and the Jesuits subtill practices discovered and laid open* (1674, and reprinted as *The Papists Designs Detected* in 1678)¹⁷ were just some of the titles using historical accounts to stoke animus towards Catholics, and implicitly imply parallels between historic and contemporary events.

The Romanists designs detected begins by including ‘A Copy of the Letter found in the Jesuits Colledge at Clerkenwell, in the year 1627’, a “Letter” which supposedly details the conspiracy to return England to the Church of Rome.¹⁸ The primary

¹⁰ Cressy, *Bonfires*, p.174.

¹¹ Cressy, *Bonfires*, p.180.

¹² Cressy, *Bonfires*, p.179.

¹³ Cressy, *Bonfires*, p.180.

¹⁴ Edward Stephens, *Popish Policies and Practices Represented in the Histories of the Parisian Massacre; Gun-powder Treason; Conspiracies against Queen Elizabeth, and Persecutions of the Protestants in France* (London: Printed by John Leigh, 1674).

¹⁵ Jacques-Auguste de Thoue, *The Histories of the Gunpowder-Treason and the Massacre at Paris* (London: Printed by J. Leigh, 1676).

¹⁶ Samuel Clarke, *England’s Remembrancer; A True and Full Narrative of those never to be forgotten Deliverances* (London: Printed by J. Hancock, 1677).

¹⁷ Anthony Egan, *The Romanists designs detected, and the Jesuits subtill practices discovered and laid open* (London: Printed by John Leigh, 1674).

¹⁸ Egan, *The Romanists*, p.1.

strategy is to encourage a divide between the King and his subjects by diminishing the effectiveness of their representative body: 'You must know the Council is engaged to assist the King by way of Prerogative, in case the Parliamentary way should fail. You shall see this Parliament will resemble the *Pelican*, which takes a pleasure with her beak to dig out her own Bowells.'¹⁹ Published in 1674, in the direct aftermath of Charles' controversial use of his prerogative (the 1672 Declaration of Indulgence), the wording of this letter would certainly resonate with certain readers fearing a renewed civil unrest and suspicious of James II's open Catholicism. Mother pelicans were colloquially believed to injure themselves in order to allow their starving young to feed on their blood – this symbol of sacrifice was a popular inclusion in royal iconography, used especially in reference to Charles I's ultimate sacrifice. The invocation of the '*Pelican*' used here is both particularly grotesque and a deliberate inversion of the idea of devotion towards royal subjects. Here the image is of destruction and ruin; all mention of benefit to vulnerable members of society absent. The "Jesuit mission" is purely destructive, intended to completely subvert existing hierarchy and render the symbolic power of the monarch irrelevant. This sentiment is repeated throughout the tract, which asserts that, 'all good men may see that they will not stick at Murther or any other villany to uphold their Religion.'²⁰

The rationale that loyalty to the Pope equates to a disregard for royal authority is also given purchase; 'fidelity to the Prince, is not only contrary to the desire and express command of the *Pope*, but to the opinion of the greatest part of the Roman Catholicks themselves.'²¹ Likewise, in *England's Remembrancer* Samuel Clarke (1599-1682) presents to his 'Christian Reader' several lurid renditions of the events of November 5th (alongside details of other plots), assuring them that he offers '*a true and faithful Narrative of that grand work of darkness, forged in Hell, and by Satan suggested to some Popish Instruments*.'²² As in anti-Catholic screeds throughout the seventeenth century, the equating of Catholicism with allusions to Hell and other incarnations of evil is a common refrain throughout these works, though the language in *Popish Policies Represented* is particularly hostile. Catholicism is

¹⁹ Egan, *The Romanists*, p.1.

²⁰ Egan, *The Romanists*, p.16.

²¹ Egan, *The Romanists*, p.26.

²² Clarke, *England's Remembrancer*, sig.F2v.

“represented” as fundamentally violent, instilling a savagery in its practitioners, even those of supposed nobility. In a florid and gruesome recounting of the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre, the author recounts that:

*the young King thus trained up in prejudice against them, and moreover from his youth inured to cruelty, and the slaughters of his Subjects even in cold blood [willingly engaged to] joyn in a holy League for the extirpation of Hereticks.*²³

Rather than a series of growing tensions and escalating incidents of unrest, the event is characterised as an organised and vindictive genocide: “Therefore all agreed upon the utter ruine of the Protestants by a total slaughter.”²⁴

These incredibly biased depictions of Catholic aggression – accounts which confirmed deeply held suspicions and reinforced harmful stereotypes – were very popular among the book-buying public. However the drive to produce them was led not just by their popularity, but also by governmental initiative: ‘several of the early-Stuart treatises on Gunpowder Plot were reprinted to serve a new readership.’²⁵ The fervour created by this flurry of anti-Catholic tracts (of which *An Account* certainly acted as an accelerant) was not without consequence. As these tensions mounted, reaching their peak in the wake of the Popish Plot, practicing recusants found themselves the targets of frenzied magistrates – many were accused and prosecuted, and in the midst of the ensuing crisis of Titus Oates’ (1649-1705) “revelations” some of those discovered to be Jesuit missionaries were summarily executed.²⁶ For instance George Busby was hanged in Derby entirely on the testimony of his neighbours, for being a “reputed” Jesuit – denying being a Jesuit serving as axiomatic proof of being a Jesuit in the popular imagination.²⁷ As part of this polemical campaign, the stock-figure of the Jesuit appeared as both a means of enabling personal corruption through religious conversion and as a politically destabilising force. Walsham, in her survey of early modern depictions of Jesuit ministers, contends that: ‘forged on the double anvil

²³ Stephen, *Popish Policies*, p.II.

²⁴ Stephen, *Popish Policies*, p.21.

²⁵ “Thomas Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln, sponsored the republication of “an authentic history” of the Gunpowder Treason because parliament in November 1678 “did diligently seek after this book” but “found it not.” Cressy, *Bonfires*, p.176.

²⁶ Cressy, *Bonfires*, p.178.

²⁷ Jonathan Scott, ‘England’s Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot’, in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, eds. Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), pp.107-132 (p.119).

as xenophobic anti-popery and Protestant patriotism, it really fits the mold of the classic folk devil and has been the subject of repeated episodes of moral panic.’²⁸ This reaction is typified by Lewis Owen’s (1571-1633) *Speculum Jesuiticum* (1629) – which described a Jesuit minister as the ‘servant of Lucifer’, a force ‘fatall and ominous to all well governed Common wealths’; the connections to the devil are continued with international Catholic super powers described as ‘his infernall dominion of Hell’ on Earth, and Jesuits agents sent abroad ‘to uphold his tottering Antichristian kingdome’ by corrupting (or converting) vulnerable citizens.²⁹ Conversion here not just a theological lapse, but an existential threat to the state. However, it was not merely historic events which loomed large in the public imagination. The Great Fire of 1666 was a prime example of anti-Catholic paranoia:

there were rumours of thousands of Frenchmen and Papists in arms; citizens rushed to arm themselves. Foreigners, especially Frenchmen, were attacked in the streets; many were arrested and their release by the guards was later regarded as highly suspicious.³⁰

In the wake of this disaster, rumours swirled that the fire, rather than an accident, was an act of arson and that the perpetrators were seditious Catholics.³¹ Marvell in fact served on the Great Fire committee, a parliamentary panel convened to discover the cause of the fire and discern if the popular belief that the fire had been begun by Catholic terrorists was indeed true. Belief in Catholic intervention in national catastrophes was not confined to the fire; Catholic forces were also believed to have been involved in what was perceived as a great military humiliation, the 1667 Battle of Medway during the Second Anglo-Dutch War.

Fears of Catholic insurrection could be stoked with scant evidence, as illustrated by the events of 1674: ‘Shaftesbury told the Lords that there were sixteen thousand Papists in London ready to try desperate measures and that nobody’s life

²⁸ Alexandra Walsham, *Catholic Reformation*, p.136.

²⁹ Lewis Owen, *Speculum Jesuiticum* (London: Printed by Thomas Cotes for Michael Sparke, 1629), p.1, p.20-1.

³⁰ John Miller, *Popery and politics in England, 1660-1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), p.103.

³¹ These anxieties were not just an urban issue effecting London (the site of the fire); riots were held in Warwick and Coventry in direct response to the fire, and anonymous pamphlets circulated throughout town warning of further acts of destruction.

was safe.’³² In response to this sensationalistic claim, Charles was compelled to issue a royal decree ordering all Catholics within ten miles of London to remove themselves.³³ As a percentage of the population, Catholics were an undeniable minority. In a 1676 census undertaken by the Bishops in order to establish the number of “papists” in England and Wales – the data collected suggested 102 Catholics recusants were living in Northampton, 588 in Derby, 1244 in Lincoln, 2069 in London, and 11,871 in Canterbury.³⁴ The veracity or accuracy of these numbers is undeniably in question (made up mostly of those possessing criminal convictions for recusancy, therefore missing those successfully managing to conceal their faith and counting the falsely accused), however these numbers do reflect the perceived size of these Catholic communities, and in the paranoid Restoration reaction to ‘historic deliverances’ and “news” of Catholic sedition, these small, peaceful religious communities would be perceived as malignant sites of insurgency. The lasting cultural memory of these instances of persecution and moments of “Deliverance” proved to be a potent and substantial phenomenon – even with the benefit of critical distance these events retained their cultural cache. Marvell’s readership would have been steeped in this rhetoric – their conception of Protestant history certainly affected by this propaganda.

“Popery” and the Establishment

Another aspect of the early modern experience of Catholicism that it is necessary to dissect is the association between *Popery and Arbitrary Government*. It is through this prism that Marvell structures his response to international Catholic superpowers as well as his critique of the Anglican establishment. Jonathan Scott summarises the difficulties faced by the later Stuart monarchs given the international tensions they inherited:

³² Miller, *Popery and politics*, p.134.

³³ An exception was granted for house holders and the servants of peers.

³⁴ Brian Magee, *The English Recusants: A Study of the Post-Reformation Catholic Survival and the Operation of Recusancy Laws* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne Ltd, 1938), p.222.

The Restoration then succeeded too well, for it restored not only the structures of Early Stuart government but subsequently its fears, divisions and crises as well. The most important of these fears - because the most politically destructive - was religious, and it is the problem of popery which gives the seventeenth-century English experience as a whole (1603-88) its essential unity. This is because far from being 'broken in the middle' the seventeenth century in Europe as a whole was the century of the victories of the Counter-Reformation. It was a century of disaster for European Protestantism which was reduced in its course to the fringes of the continent, and from 50 per cent to under 20 per cent of its total area.³⁵

The success of the Counter-Reformation meant that Britain was truly an island, its closest neighbours – France and Ireland – also its religious opponents, with fewer and fewer Protestant allies abroad. The paranoid response to Catholic dominance on the continent was not without reason, as ‘the Catholic Church of the seventeenth century was not gentle towards Protestants within its power, and across the Continent monarchs were aspiring towards absolutism.’³⁶ Scott Sowerby asserts that the actions of Louis XIV of France (1638-1715) and Charles II of Spain (1661-1700) ensured a prevailing perception of threat, as ‘repeated acts of aggression by Catholic or crypto-Catholic rulers led English Protestants to fear that their embattled faith was about to be overwhelmed by what they called “popery”.’³⁷ However, the response to growing Catholic influence abroad was vitriolic and regressive – a nationalistic and xenophobic panic that went far beyond cause for concern.³⁸ Catholic practitioners living in England were thus forced to bear both the burden of pre-existing hostility and contemporary political fears; the two were conflated in the popular imagination, and traditional stereotypes and conventional means of derision continued to be employed as a method of perpetuating anti-Catholic bias.

³⁵ Scott, ‘Radicalism and Restoration’, p.460.

³⁶ Raymond D. Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660-1745* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p.10.

³⁷ Scott Sowerby, ‘Opposition to Anti-Popery in Restoration England’, in *Journal of British Studies*, 51 (2012) pp.26-49, (p.26).

³⁸ As Tumbleson contends, ‘behind the calls for a united front [...] against the Popish menace operated a political and ideological dynamic less benign than its inheritors have portrayed it.’ Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination*, p.10.

It was not just external pressures however that fuelled the rise of anti-Catholic sentiment – the actions of the ruling elite also incensed popular paranoia. In many ways the issues that rocked the latter half of the 1670s were a direct result of problems with the Restoration settlement.³⁹ Charles II, despite an annual stipend greater than his father and grandfather, never managed to achieve financial stability; thus it was necessary for him to rely on parliament in order to supplement his income.⁴⁰ This reliance however created a strained relationship between the wants of his supporters and Charles' own agenda:

This meant that to some extent he had to respect the prejudices of his servants and supporters in parliament and the localities – the “church and king” men, the old Cavaliers, the Tories. The Civil War and Charles I's martyrdom had identified the Church of England more closely than ever with the monarchy. The Cavalier element, the potential basis of support for strong monarchy, was solidly Anglican, and expected the king to pursue a “Cavalier” policy: to find jobs for “church and king” men, to follow a Protestant but cheap foreign policy, to rule according to law and to repress religious nonconformity, whether Puritan or Popish.⁴¹

These expectations, however, were at odds with both Charles' foreign policy aims (and specifically his covert alliance with the French), and his own assertions in the Declaration of Breda, despised by many Cavaliers for both allowing the ascendance of those who pledged loyalty to Cromwell and for its broad plea for religious toleration. Fears of a Catholic uprising were further exacerbated by the presence of openly Catholic officers:

M.P.s' suspicions of the Court late in 1678 were increased by the discovery of some Catholic officers in the army: “I was always of opinion”, said Henry Powle, “that Popery could never come into England without force. These

³⁹ As has been revealed by the work of John Miller: ‘the Restoration settlement confirmed the abolition of some of the institutions abused by Charles I during the personal rule; but it left the crown's prerogatives little diminished, notably in its right to summon and dismiss parliaments and in the ill-defined areas where prerogative action could shade into illegality.’ Miller, *Popery and politics*, p.91.

⁴⁰ Though unlike his father he relied on prorogations, rather than personal rule, in order to control the Commons.

⁴¹ Miller, *Popery and politics*, pp.91-92.

Popish officers are used to French government and quartered here, and the new-raised men are sent into Flanders to corrupt them in religion.⁴²

This gave rise to the fear of a potential military coup, and this paranoia was exacerbated by the actions of parliament. In 1673 it was suggested in the House of Lords that fifteen senior officers be granted exemption from the Test Bill in order to serve, to which the Commons initially agreed.⁴³ As a result of this arrangement 'traditional fears of a standing army became linked with equally traditional fears of Popery' – yet another way in which *Popery* impacted popular perceptions of *Arbitrary Government*.⁴⁴

As the decade wore on this dissatisfaction with Charles and his court continued to fester, and his time spent in exile at the French court began to be viewed as a liability. William Sacheverell (1637-1691) summarised the feelings of many when he declared in 1678 that; 'all our misfortune arises from the late times. When the King came home, his ministers knew nothing of the Laws of England, but foreign Government.'⁴⁵ Critics such as Arthur Marotti have even gone as far as to account for the Popish Plot as an immediate reaction to Charles' French sympathies and attempts at absolute rule:

The foreign policy and domestic political stance of Charles II's government that so alarmed the opposition, especially the more politically radical Protestant non-conformists, could be perceived to have the kind of controlling intelligence and larger design implied by the word *plot*, but it was less "popish" than it was royal absolutist.⁴⁶

French influence at court, and suspicions regarding the loyalties of both Charles and his successor in fact threatened to overturn the return of the King.⁴⁷ Though writing

⁴² Miller, 'Catholic Officers', p.36.

⁴³ Though they later rescinded in the face of extreme public hostility. Miller, 'Catholic Officers', p.38.

⁴⁴ Miller, 'Catholic Officers', p.36.

⁴⁵ Anchitell Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons, from the Year 1667 to the Year 1694*, 10 vols. (London: D. Henry and R. Cave, 1763) VII, p.51.

⁴⁶ 'The elaborate fiction constructed by Titus Oates and others was exploited by the Crown's political opposition as a convenient imaginative form for the expression of a specific antimonarchical and anti-Catholic political agenda.' Arthur F. Marotti, *Religious Ideology & Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England* (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005), p.158.

⁴⁷ As Scott asserts: 'Restoration used to be taken as a given. Subsequent crises and the thought associated with them were considered to be superficial. In fact, initially at least, it was restoration that

before the outbreak of the Popish Plot, Marvell's discussions of *Popery* were invariably shaped by the conflation of international politics and the current Stuart regime. Scott contends that:

the crisis was "about" the policies of Charles II, in their European context, which left the nation feeling dangerously vulnerable. Once again England faced its European nightmare: a government on the wrong side of the Reformation/Counter-Reformation divide.⁴⁸

Titus Oates' wild narrative was thus the inevitable release of political tensions, 'a consequence rather than cause of fears which had been gathering momentum for a decade.'⁴⁹ If this interpretation of the build-up to the Popish Plot is to be believed then, as surmised by Marotti, 'the anti-Catholic furor of the Popish Plot was, then, a cover for anti-Stuart feeling.'⁵⁰ As the loyalties of Charles' government came increasingly into question fears of a repeat of events in which the established Church was violently overturned in Germany, France, Ireland and Piedmont became ever more pressing in the popular imagination, and in public discussions secular issues of state and the state of the Church merged, as 'for at least the preachers and zealously religious MPs, anti-Catholic language at that time had both religious and political valence.'⁵¹

Even though *Popery* was a term heavily associated with a political concern, used as a means of discussing both international and internal threats to the state, this did not lessen the pressure on minority religious groups, as both Catholics and other dissenters were conflated in discussions of toleration; the concept of tolerating either viewed in some quarters as a means of weakening state control. These ideas even found voice inside parliament, with George Saville, the Marquis of Halifax declaring 'it is impossible for a Dissenter not to be a REBEL' – in Halifax's rhetoric, homodox practitioners represented a visceral threat to civic order, and thus needed to be

was superficial.' Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) p.162.

⁴⁸ Scott, 'Exhuming the Popish Plot', pp.118-9.

⁴⁹ Scott, *England's Troubles*, p.172.

⁵⁰ Marotti, *Religious Ideology & Cultural Fantasy*, p.159.

⁵¹ Marotti, *Religious Ideology & Cultural Fantasy*, p.159.

extirpated in order to defend the body politic.⁵² Much of the legislation brought in to expel Catholics from public office most adversely affected nonconformist communities, in particular Quakers who rejected worldly oaths.⁵³ Crackdowns on the press were also designed to stymie dissenting voices, with influential figures such as the Bishop of Derry declaring the need to ‘cut off [of] one of the schismatic’s and rebels’ best prop[s] and engine[s], the press, by securing and fencing it from bold, impudent pens.’⁵⁴ This led to physical raids in order to stop the dissemination of nonconformist literature nationwide, and in 1662 ‘magistrates seized over one hundred books in French from a Quaker who had come to Jersey intent on spreading the Friend’s message.’⁵⁵

This conflation between popery, nonconformity and sedition was challenged by those seeking toleration for dissenters. Those in favour of Charles II’s Declaration of Breda and sympathetic to nonconformity thus often found themselves in step with the agenda of anti-French activists: ‘they were strong in London, including the city government, where the combination of religious dissent with anti-French protestant internationalism acquired an increasingly high profile during the 1670s. They included ex-ministers like Shaftesbury and Buckingham [...] all of these Peers, and their allies, like the Presbyterian Lord Holles, stood for a tolerant parliamentary Protestantism.’⁵⁶ Despite these efforts, the cultural climate remained intractably hostile towards both Catholics and nonconformists – the combination of ingrained stereotypes and contemporary fears meaning that full and complete toleration of Catholics (and to a varying degree, other forms of dissent) could not be brooked:

They also pointed out that tolerating Catholics meant tolerating citizens whose loyalty was suspect or flawed since it was divided politically between England and a foreign power, the papacy [...] Thus developing English nationalism, growing opposition to royal absolutism, and the desire for more

⁵² George Saville, *The Works of George Saville, Marquis of Halifax*, ed. Mark N. Brown (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), p.139.

⁵³ ‘One estimate suggests that fifteen thousand Quakers were incarcerated and 450 died in prison. Many rotted in small country goals, while others were packed into insanitary London prisons like Newgate.’ Uglow, *A Gambling Man*, p.187.

⁵⁴ Quoted in Richard L. Greaves, *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), p.216.

⁵⁵ Greaves, *Deliver Us from Evil*, p.217.

⁵⁶ Scott, *England’s Troubles*, p.432.

representative government made Catholicism [...] religiously and politically intolerable. England and English identity were now Protestant. Although some social and economic accommodations were made, there was still no ideological or legal space for English Catholics.⁵⁷

This is the climate under which *An Account of the Growth of Popery* and the rest of Marvell's prose works were crafted and received, this overarching attitude towards Catholics ensuring that the toleration of *Popery* could only be imagined as an existential threat to the both English Protestantism and by extension, the state.

Marvell's Anti-Popery

An Account of the Growth of Popery, as a result of its widespread influence and prominent place within the Whig canon, has traditionally been viewed as the archetypal anti-popery tract – its paranoia representative of the stance that would lead to the Exclusion Crisis and Glorious Revolution. The pervasiveness of the belief in French influence at court has led many historians, such as Sowerby, to argue that it was the *perception* rather than actual presence of this influence that led to political instability; 'the political crises of the 1670s and 1680s were caused not by "popery" but by its opposite, anti-popery. Prognostications of doom by anti-popish politicians fed the fears of English Protestants that their embattled faith was about to be overwhelmed.'⁵⁸ This rationale did not go unchallenged however, and a dissenting perspective emerged to combat its ideological aims – a school of thought Sowerby identifies as anti-anti-popery:

Many people in later Restoration England saw anti-popery as a leading threat to political stability. The solution to this problem, in their view, was something that we might call *anti-anti-popery*, a critique of anti-popery that was designed to lay the troubles of the Restoration to rest by chuntering their perceived root cause.'⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Marotti, *Religious Ideology & Cultural Fantasy*, p.201.

⁵⁸ Sowerby, 'Opposition to Anti-Popery', pp.26-27.

⁵⁹ Sowerby, 'Opposition to Anti-Popery', p.27.

In Sowerby's rubric Marvell's *An Account* is a 'classic anti-popish tract' whilst Sir Roger L'Estrange's *An Account of the Growth of Knavery under the pretended fear of popery and arbitrary government* (1677) 'was a key anti-anti-popish tract.'⁶⁰ Roger L'Estrange, a staunch supporter of the Stuarts, had attacked the pamphlet both for stoking popular fears and for its attack of the government – his anti-anti-popery in essence serving as political conservatism. As he would write in the wake of the Popish Plot in an attempt to calm fears and prevent uprising, 'tis but the Rubbing of a Libel with a little Anti-Popery, to give it the Popular smack.'⁶¹ In this way, far from calling for an end to Catholic persecution, anti-anti-popery instead reveals the deeply political roots of anti-popery: 'by warning his readers against a "sort of men" who used "Anti-Popery" as camouflage for libelling and plotting, L'Estrange was describing his opponents as a rebellious faction against which his loyalist readers ought to define themselves.'⁶² If anti-anti-popery is thus indicative of L'Estrange's conservatism, Marvell's anti-popery can be understood as evidence of his radicalism.

Importantly, Sowerby does not identify a strand of *pro*-popery in this restoration controversy – in L'Estrange's writing there is no suggestion of relaxing restrictions on Catholic worship or recalling the Test Act. Instead his issue is with those who might utilise popular anxieties in order to raise sedition, or hold the establishment to account. Sowerby also identifies the flexibility of these two seemingly binary identities, as writers and politicians (particularly L'Estrange) would bounce between the two in order to persuade their audience.⁶³ Aside from being an international threat, the spectre of popery also served as an existential threat to foundational ideas of personal freedom: 'Catholicism, or "popery" as it was disparagingly called, played a constitutive role in the development of ideas about personal and collective autonomy that featured significantly in both liberal and republican theories of liberty.'⁶⁴ In their discussions of ideas of liberty, seminal writers such as John Locke and John Milton 'frequently relied upon an overcharged

⁶⁰ Sowerby, 'Opposition to Anti-Popery', p.30.

⁶¹ Roger L'Estrange, *The case put concerning the succession of his Royal Highness the Duke of York* (London: Printed by M. Clark for Henry Brome, 1679), p.37.

⁶² Sowerby, 'Opposition to Anti-Popery', p.30.

⁶³ 'Anti-anti-popery was as much the companion of anti-popery as it was its opposite. It was just as variable as anti-popery, and in the hands of different thinkers it could be used in different ways.'

Sowerby, 'Opposition to Anti-Popery', p.31.

⁶⁴ Fatovic, 'Anti-Catholic Roots', p.38.

contrast with Catholicism not only to clarify the meaning of liberty in the abstract but also to dramatize at a visceral level what was at stake.’⁶⁵ In their writing Papal authority was depicted as the ultimate absolutist and repressive institution; in order to protect the nation from being ruled by an arbitrary government, a look to our Catholic neighbours was all that was needed in order to discern how not to behave.

This distinction became particularly acute in debates which discussed the King’s use of the royal prerogative, and the dangers it presented to the constitution:

Prerogative, like the papal deposing power, seemed to be a boundless power that violated a “legalistic consensus” in the early seventeenth century that distinguished unconditional, or irresistible, power (which could still be bound in some sense by the law) from unlimited power (which exceeded all legal boundaries).⁶⁶

As Catholicism represented the ultimate restrictive institution, by engaging with the idea of anti-popery writers such as Marvell had a means of discussing royal prerogative with their readers; likening it to absolutism abroad was akin to open condemnation and provocation enough to encourage action. In *An Account*, Marotti argues, ‘the phrase “popery and tyranny” signified not a simple anti-Catholic stance but a vilifying of Stuart absolutism by means of the religious-polemical code.’⁶⁷ As it became a fixture of the public discourse, anti-popery became a politically expedient tool – a weapon in Marvell’s arsenal guaranteed to resonate with an audience deeply concerned by events at home and abroad. Conal Condren argues that in blaming Catholic ‘Conspirators’ for the rise in institutional corruption Marvell presents his reader with ‘a conspiracy theory’, however this does not mean that his accusations had no grounds: ‘there is, in short, enough truth in the drift of Marvell’s argument and the yoking of Catholicism to arbitrary rule for Marvell to have scored a palpable hit and to have encouraged deeply-felt prejudices.’⁶⁸ The question that must then be asked in order to fully determine Marvell’s rhetorical strategy and the ways in which

⁶⁵ Fatovic, ‘Anti-Catholic Roots’, p.40.

⁶⁶ Fatovic, ‘Anti-Catholic Roots’, p.42.

⁶⁷ Marotti, *Religious Ideology & Cultural Fantasy*, p.160.

⁶⁸ Condren, ‘Andrew Marvell as Polemicist’, pp.170-1.

he approached the reader is to what extent was Marvell's anti-popery a reflection of internal prejudice or a useful rhetorical device in order to achieve secular goals?

As discussed in the second section of this thesis, Marvell's work had a clear polemical aim – to inspire enough public ire to agitate for an end to the prorogation and also to shame corrupt political operatives (including Charles II), by allowing the reader an insight into the political process. The conspiracy laid out within the text was not simply for conspiracies sake – the conspiracy acted as a veiled attack on the broader political establishment, an account of widespread authoritative corruption designed to encourage active citizenship. What many readings of Marvell miss in their analysis is a consideration of the reader in relation to his prose – the cultural and ideological baggage a Restoration audience brought to bear on their reading invariably shaped the production of the text. Anti-Catholic sentiment was, for the vast majority of the Protestant public, a deeply ingrained prejudice – searching for liberality or toleration in a discussion of “Popery” is thus a misguided expectation. Anti-popery cannot be analysed through a modern conceptual lens, it must be viewed as both an early modern reality and as a persuasive device. Taking *An Account* as purely a reflection of Marvell's beliefs without considering it as a text specifically designed to elicit a certain response in a reader, using an existing prejudice as a means of influence, will result in a half-formed picture of Marvell's response to an unpopular theology. When considered alongside the rest of Marvell's prose oeuvre, it is clear that Marvell used both anti-popery and anti-anti-popery where necessary in order to convince his reader.⁶⁹ This awareness of Restoration social mores is missing from many readings of Marvell that view the text and its anti-popery as nakedly bigoted. For the purpose of engaging with this criticism I will take Raymond D. Tumbleson's reading of Marvell's *An Account* as an example. Tumbleson uses *An Account* as a platform from which to launch a critique of Whig ideology, seeing in both *An Account* and his poem 'Upon Appleton House' evidence of Marvell's personal agenda: 'Marvell's ongoing goal is to promote the power of the propertied, such as the Fairfaxes or Parliamentary electors, and his consistent device to disguise that class aggression, whether against the lower orders of the crown, as the national interest is

⁶⁹ In the words of Peter Lake, anti-Catholicism served as the 'ideal polemical tool.' Peter Lake, 'Anti-Popery: The Structure of a Prejudice', in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642*, ed. Richard Crust and Ann Hughes (London: Routledge, 1989), pp.72-106 (p.91).

attacking Catholicism.⁷⁰ The legitimacy of this reading of 'Upon Appleton House' is a discussion to be had in another forum – whilst it is certainly evident that Marvell intended to stir discord between the monarch and his subjects, it is arguable whether the only beneficiary would have been the landed classes.

Tumbleson also sees evidence of Marvell's demagoguery on the title page of his pamphlet; 'on the title page, "Popery" is in letters twice the height of any other word; "Growth" and "England" are next in magnitude; and "Arbitrary Government," the remaining words of significance, are in letters again barely over half the size of those of "Growth" and "England."' ⁷¹ Tumbleson argues that this is proof of Marvell's intent to '[reduce] Popery to a device for arousing popular attention and alarm.'⁷² Certainly Marvell's title page is indicative of his commercial interests; as this chapter has shown, 'Popery' was an issue firmly at the forefront of the public consciousness, however the argument that the typography used in *An Account* is indicative of Marvell's personal agenda is belied by both the content and the title page of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. The title page of his animadversion quotes the title of his adversary's tract, declaring its intent to dismantle 'A PREFACE SHEWING *What Grounds there are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery*' - 'Popery' here is un-italicised in order to ridicule Parker's anti-popery, drawing the reader's emphasis to what will be a major point of contention within his prose.⁷³ Here Marvell engages in what Sowerby identifies as anti-anti-popery; by summoning the spectre of 'Popery', Parker is derided as a hysteric. Parker had invoked 'Popery' in order to justify the persecution of nonconformists, conflating both as dissenting voices and claiming any dissenting voice to be a threat to the state:

So that now, no man can look at the wall, no man can pass by a Book-sellers stall, but he must see *A Preface showing what GROUNDS there are for FEARS and JEALOUSIES of Popery*. It had been something a safer and more dutiful way

⁷⁰ Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination*, p.47.

⁷¹ Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination*, p.47.

⁷² Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination*, p.48.

⁷³ 'And accordingly he hath now blessed us with, as he calls it, *A Preface, shewing what Grounds there are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery* [...] A pretty task indeed.' Marvell, *RT*, p.44.

of writing, A Preface showing the CAUSELESSNESS of the Fears and Jealousies of POPERY.⁷⁴

Here Marvell mirrors and apes the look of a title page, reframing the experience of materially experiencing the book on 'a Book-sellers stall' in order to supplant Parker's intentions, and Christen the book with a new subtitle. By collaborating with his printers, Marvell maximises the comic potential and visual impact of his text.

The editors of the Yale edition of the text note that for the second edition run of *The Second Part*, the printers did more than amend errors, in fact: 'Marvell revised the text with considerable care [...] the majority of changes, and there are many, create new paragraphs intelligently, increase punctuation in the interest of clarity [...] or (and this *is* remarkable) introduce new patterns of ironic emphasis through italicization.'⁷⁵ Marvell's careful amendments to his text reveal the crucial role of reader's experience of the text – from its content to its visual construction – in shaping his polemic strategy. Marvell repeatedly utilised visual signifiers in order to add edge to his wit, playing with the semiotic potential of the 'protocols of *presentation*' and using the associations attached to typefaces and italics to draw on a readers experience of Restoration print culture – as Augustine contends: 'Marvell was especially alive to the complex signifying potentials these devices entailed.'⁷⁶ For instance, in his *Reproof* Parker had conflated the state religious toleration with the removal of all 'the Laws of God and Man', and produced a mock royal imprint 'For the Tolerating of Debauchery' announcing the end of all societal 'Obligation.'⁷⁷ Marvell responded by reproducing this imprint word for word, though adding his own flourish: 'Marvell transforms this moment in Parker's text by having his printer set it in black letter, the Gothic typeface typically used for the publication of royal or parliamentary acts.'⁷⁸ In doing so, Marvell is 'visually highlighting Parker's presumption in usurping the royal prerogative', whilst also revealing the logical fallacy of comparing freedom of conscious with civil unrest and lawlessness; behind Parker's mockery is blatant fear mongering and demagoguery.⁷⁹ Using the visual

⁷⁴ Marvell, *RT*, p.174.

⁷⁵ Dzelzainis and Patterson, 'The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part', p.216.

⁷⁶ Augustine, 'Marvell and Print Culture', p.15.

⁷⁷ Parker, *Reproof*, p.64.

⁷⁸ Augustine, 'Marvell and Print Culture', p.15.

⁷⁹ Augustine, 'Marvell and Print Culture', p.15.

language of Restoration print culture allows Marvell to expose his adversaries arguments: 'I have in return of your Civility prevailed with my Printer to do you a cast of his Office.'⁸⁰

To the reader of Marvell's satire, rather than earnestly engaging with contemporary anxieties surrounding *Popery* as he does in *An Account*, Marvell instead focuses on the danger of inciting these fears: 'but this is exactly our Authors method and way of contrivance; whereby, more effectually by far than by any flying question fills mens mouths, & beats out all mens eyes with the probability of the return of POPERY.'⁸¹ Here Parker's attempt at engaging in populism is visualised as a visceral experience, one in which the passive reader finds their person physically invaded by Parker's spite – his rhetoric an actual assault on their senses. Rather than convincing his reader, Parker attempts to puppet them. As a further aid to his anti-anti-popery, Marvell purposefully subverts a stereotype commonly used in anti-Catholic screeds – that of the perceived connection between Catholicism and witchcraft: 'For I do not think it will excuse a Witch to say, That she conjur'd up a Spirit onely that she might lay it.'⁸² Here Parker's "conjuring" of the spectre of popery is likened to a witches' enchantment – it is also a continuation of an image conjured earlier in the text. A passage rich in intertextual meanings occurs when Marvell evokes the biblical image of the Witch of Endor when likening Parker's invoking of Bishop Bramhall to a supernatural summoning. Parker's choice to attach his polemic to the work of an esteemed high churchman likened to '*Sorcery and Extortion*'; 'the old Bishop was at rest, and had under his last Pillow laid by all cares and contests of this lower World; you by your *Necromancy* have disturb'd him, and rais'd his Ghost to persecute and haunt Mr B. whom doubtless at his death he had pardoned.'⁸³ To add further emphasis Marvell quotes a popular ballad to his reader's: '*Art thou forlorn of God, and com'st to me?/ What can I tell thee then but miserie.*'⁸⁴ Marvell takes these lines from the popular English biblical dialogue song 'In guilty night' (or sometimes called 'The Witch of Endor') by Robert Ramsey (1595-1644) – as Mary Chan's research into the ballad shows, the song was 'popular throughout the seventeenth century because it

⁸⁰ Marvell, *RT*, p.373.

⁸¹ Marvell, *RT*, p.174.

⁸² Marvell, *RT*, p.174.

⁸³ Marvell, *RT*, p.80.

⁸⁴ Marvell, *RT*, p.80.

was used as political and religious propaganda.’⁸⁵ The association between witchcraft and Roman Catholicism had been cemented in the popular conscious from the sixteenth century onwards, ensuring that the interlude in the bible in which Saul asks a witch to summon the ghost of Samuel (1 Samuel 28:8-20) was often used in anti-Catholic propaganda. As contended by Chan, ‘Marvell’s quotation in 1672 of the lines from Ramsey’s dialogue makes sense only if the dialogue had already accreted anti-Catholic significance.’⁸⁶

In quoting the song and then repeating this ‘Witch’ motif in deliberate reference to Popery, Marvell dismantles the cultural apparatus of anti-Catholicism, using tropes commonly used to attack Catholic practitioners to instead impugn those who would use these ploys to abuse a silent minority. In Marvell’s anti-anti-popery (in complete contrast to L’Estrange’s) to try and utilise popular public fears in order to pursue a repressive policy of persecuting individual conscience betrays a fundamental authoritarianism in Parker and his ilk. Ultimately, just as Parker’s polemic had blended issues of church with that of affairs of state – ‘and yet who ever shall take the pains to read over his Preface, will find that it intermeddles with the King, the Succession, the Privy-Council, Popery, Atheism, Bishops, Ecclesiastical Government, and above all with Nonconformity’ – in Marvell’s text these issues are likewise symbiotic, with both popery itself and ‘FEARS *and* JEALOUSIES’ of it a cause for political concern.⁸⁷ This supernatural motif as a means of discussing anti-popery also appears in *Mr Smirke*, proving it to be a device Marvell expected to resonate with the reader, though in this iteration his adversary is imagined as a witch finder. The target of his vendetta stands accused of ‘being first a Heretick, and now Witch by consequence.’⁸⁸ The 1603 statute against witchcraft which made the invocation of spirits a capital offence was still in effect, and as recently as 1664 a death sentence had been passed under it – though the 1665 publication of Reginald Scot’s (d.1599) *The Discovery of Witchcraft* had increased scepticism regarding the veracity of witchcraft. Not only does Marvell specifically quote Scot in his animadversion, but he

⁸⁵ Marvell may have seen the dialogue performed, or even enacted, whilst a student at Trinity College. Mary Chan, ‘The Witch of Endor and Seventeenth-Century Propaganda’, in *Musica Disciplina*, 34 (1980), 205-214 (p.205, p.208 n.8).

⁸⁶ Chan, ‘The Witch of Endor’, p.208.

⁸⁷ Marvell, *RT*, pp.46-7.

⁸⁸ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.63.

likens the penal process of trying witches to that faced by non-conformists: 'many persons besides have for trial run needles up to the Eye in several remarkable places'; in order to find a witches mark, they 'prick' the 'moles or warts upon his body'; and 'have tyed him hand and foot and thrown him into the Thames.'⁸⁹ The persecution of accused witches is thus likened to the treatment of dissenters and those accused of 'Popery' – in both the process of trial is torturous, merely a means for those in power to utilise mass hysteria in order to justify needless persecution. Furthermore, the accusation of 'Popery' is a means of permanently damaging a man's reputation: 'so dangerous is it to have got an Ill Name once, either for speaking Truth of for Incantation, that it comes to the same thing almost to be Innocent or Guilty: for if a man swim he is Guilty, and to be Burnt; if he sink, he is Drowned, and Innocent.'⁹⁰ In this theological controversy, the scales of justice are invariably weighted to favour of the accuser and the punishment does not fit the crime.

In both *Mr Smirke* and *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* (texts that explicitly deal with the issue of persecution on the basis of religious expression) Marvell employs anti-anti-popery, subverting tropes such as witchcraft in order to expose the ways in which polemicists used 'popery [as] a device for arousing popular attention and alarm'; using *An Account* as a sole source when discussing Marvell's anti-popery (as is done by Tumbleson) would be to discount the attitude towards persecution he presents to his readership in his other works. The argument that '[Marvell] redirects Anglican hostility from Dissent to Popery with more success than Milton precisely because he prefers demagoguery to theology', similarly is complicated by the rhetoric employed in Marvell's other prose works.⁹¹ As discussed in the second section of this thesis, Marvell's focus in *An Account* is the ineffectual leadership of parliament, his polemical aim being to call for a new election – in this arena anti-popery, with its overt connections to the tenuous political situation of the Stuart regime, is thus employed primarily as a means of criticising the political establishment. 'The gesture of inclusion' that Tumbleson observes in *Of True Religion*, is present in Marvell's other prose.⁹² Tumbleson (in asserting the superiority of Milton's tract) also argues,

⁸⁹ Marvell, *Smirke*, pp.62-3.

⁹⁰ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.63.

⁹¹ Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination*, p.49.

⁹² Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination*, p.57.

Of True Religion is a work deeply and deceptively involved with the larger contemporary political context; under a pretence of simply supporting a general Protestant tolerance, it covertly continues the war against royalty, episcopacy, and orthodoxy which Milton had waged so long before.⁹³

Marvell's work in contrast is depicted as sheer 'demagogy.' As this thesis has shown, these themes are all highly prevalent in Marvell's prose; concerns deeply imbedded within even his comedic works. The primary difference between Milton and Marvell's stance on church authority is Marvell's leniency. Philip Connell contends that 'Marvell's Restoration prose clearly fails to endorse Milton's long-standing hostility to the "secular chains" of civil power as a corrupting imposition on Christian conscience' – instead, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* 'defends the possibility of a comprehensive, non-compulsory church establishment.'⁹⁴ Tumbleson is right to observe Marvell's support of English Protestant exceptionalism and in his assessment that 'anti-Catholicism acted as the mechanism of cultural reproduction necessary to mobilize autonomous subjects in the service of the centralized state; it supplied the other, the enemy.'⁹⁵

Marvell is undoubtedly using this apparatus in order to use anti-Catholic phobia to persuade his reader of the need to challenge the current status quo, summoning images of mass defection in order to inspire fears of a challenge to the established church: 'the defection of considerable persons both *Male* and *Female* to the *Popish Religion*, as if they entered by Couples clean and unclean into the *Ark*.'⁹⁶ However it is only possible to argue that 'Marvell's position remains consistent because in both periods he is championing not "English freedoms" but the upper-class dominance that is coded as such freedoms' if the rest of his prose oeuvre is ignored.⁹⁷ As shown by Marvell's didactic aims and his abhorrence of Samuel Parker's elitism, the aim of his prose is to make political information accessible – urging the necessity of even 'the Meanest commoner' having a stake in the system that should represent them. The mercurial nature of Marvell's writing is evidenced by the fact that Marvell's

⁹³ Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination*, p.42.

⁹⁴ Philip Connell, 'Marvell, Milton and the Protectoral Church Settlement' in *The Review of English Studies*, 62 (2011), 562-592 (p.563).

⁹⁵ Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination*, p.15.

⁹⁶ Marvell, *Account*, p.375.

⁹⁷ Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination*, p.46.

work was actually cited by Catholics. Marvell appears in the Commonplace book of William Blundell (1620-1698), a committed Catholic. Blundell's common-place book served as a means for him to refine his understanding of his own faith and recusancy – a site of active reading. As Geoff Baker's research into Blundell's work reveals;

The surviving papers of William Blundell provide a unique window into the activities and worldview of a seventeenth-century English Catholic. Through an examination of the material, this book has shown that the carefully choreographed pose of a politically quiescent yet unquestioningly committed Catholic, with which Blundell sought to delude his contemporaries, disguised the innovative ways in which he exerted agency.⁹⁸

The inclusion of Marvell's work within his commonplace book is illustrative both of the popularity of his texts, and their malleability. Seemingly in spite of the clear Protestant nonconformist sympathy adopted in his text, Marvell's work could be intellectually utilised by those seeking freedom for personal conscience as Catholics. Arguably, the inclusion of Marvell can be read as either a deliberate act of political obfuscation, or a sign of appreciation for his use of anti-anti-popery in his satire, a persuasive technique utilised in his animadversion as a means of displaying the obstinance and malice of his adversary.

In *Mr Smirke*, for example, mentions of the Catholic Church or Catholicism are mostly used to upbraid Turner's use of anti-popery; the term 'Catholic' itself is mostly used when quoting his adversary. In particular, Marvell employs both anti-popery and its counterpart in order to express horror at the idea of forced conversion, bridling at the 'greatest condescension of [...] Ecclesiastical Clemency' in his opponents.⁹⁹ Turner had recounted how 'p. 12. *The Jews in Rome are constrained once a week to hear a Christian Sermon*' lamenting that 'p. 14. *I can onely wish for the present, that by forcing them into our Churches, they may hear our defences*' – leading Marvell to ask his reader to recoil at the 'force, violence, [and] punishment' that Turner envisions, and using his mention of Rome to upbraid him:

⁹⁸ Geoff Baker, *Reading and Politics in early modern England: The mental world of a seventeenth-century Catholic gentleman* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), p.208.

⁹⁹ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.101.

What could there be more proportionable, then to resemble the proceeding with Christians among themselves here in *England*, not differing in any point of Faith, with the proceeding at *Rome* against the *Jews*? But that the Exposer should *implicitly* liken and compare our Bishops to the Pope, may perhaps not be taken well by either Party.¹⁰⁰

Here Marvell uses anti-popery to call upon the reader's negative associations with the Papal establishment – the view of it as a restrictive, repressive organisation – in order to transfer those associations on to the Anglican Church, a comparison Turner allows him to make by himself lauding the forced attendance of '*Jews*' to Christian church services. This intrusion upon individual, personal conscience is unacceptable: 'the Author [...] persists in his unchristian and unreasonable desire that *men may be compelled*.'¹⁰¹ This act of compulsion is to be reviled and resisted – whether it affects '*Jews*', nonconformists, or even Catholics. Marvell sarcastically asks if Turner intends to 'stir up our Prince to an *Holy War* abroad, to propagate the Protestant Religion', but concludes instead that these churchmen are willing to remain, 'in a fat Benefice here, and to domineer in their own Parishes above their Spiritual Vassals, and raise a kind of Civil War at home, but that none will oppose them.'¹⁰²

This is a one-sided 'Battel', the casualties are those who dare deviate from the established track: 'why may they not, as well as force men to Church, cram the Holy Supper too down their Throats (have they not done something not much unlike it) and drive them into the Rivers by thousands to be baptized or drowned?'¹⁰³ The visceral imagery here is used deliberately in order to invoke disgust at the idea of forced conversion – spiritual mistreatment made manifest on the body. Episcopal authority attempting to extend into the private realm of conscience is presented as threat to liberty; 'but I know not why the Mouth of the Church should pretend to be the Brain of the Church, and understand and will for the whole Laity.'¹⁰⁴ The body politic motif is here inverted to condemn the silencing of the people – 'the whole Laity' – who are being silenced. Though Marvell frames the Catholic Church as a

¹⁰⁰ Marvell, *Smirke*, pp.100-101.

¹⁰¹ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.106.

¹⁰² Marvell, *Smirke*, pp.104-105.

¹⁰³ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.105.

¹⁰⁴ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.108.

repressive institution, individual Catholics are not blamed or maligned. In contrast to the anti-popish tract *England's Remembrancer* which detailed 'many malignant and Devillish Papists, Jesuits, and Seminary Priests, much envying, and fearing conspired most horribly' – Marvell doesn't identify Catholics in such a way.¹⁰⁵ In fact, as Kendra Packham notes in considering Marvell's relationship to Catholicism, 'while Marvell drew upon and contributed to anti-Catholic print [...] other parts of the *Account* reveal a more complex engagement with Catholics and Catholicism, picturing Catholic virtue as well as vice.'¹⁰⁶ In particular, Marvell's framing of the Test Act depicts some 'Catholics as "sufferers" for conscience.'¹⁰⁷ Marvell favourably depicts those Catholic courtiers and politicians who, rather than fraudulently swear an oath in conflict with their conscience, 'took up the Cross, quitted their present Employments and all hopes of the future, rather than falsify their opinion: though otherwise men for Quality, Estate, and Abilities [...] as capable and well deserving.'¹⁰⁸ They too are victims if 'compelled' by the system to conform to a faith system in which they do not truly believe. This lack of condemnation for individual Catholics has led some critics, such as John Spurr, to conclude his outlook to be 'anti-popish in a rather restrained way'; his focus instead 'virulently anti-French.'¹⁰⁹ In this way, Marvell's use of anti-popery referred specifically to the political tactics of the Church, and the actions of its European government states rather than English Catholics – likening the Anglican Church to Rome a means of criticising its methodology more so than its theology.

This strain of criticism (and in particular the war imagery) in *Mr Smirke* is a continuation of ideas Marvell had begun to ferment in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in which he had sardonically regarded 'Ecclesiasticall Combates.'¹¹⁰ When elected as the Bishop of Derry in 1633, Bishop John Bramhall (the subject of Parker's laudatory *Preface*) had been in charge of imposing the thirty-nine articles and English canons within the Irish church; a task fraught with difficulty and met with intense public

¹⁰⁵ Clarke, *England's Remembrancer*, p.105.

¹⁰⁶ Kendra Packham, 'Marvell, Political Print, and Picturing the Catholic: *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.33> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-24 (p.15).

¹⁰⁷ Packham, 'Picturing the Catholic', p.15.

¹⁰⁸ Marvell, *Account*, p.59.

¹⁰⁹ John Spurr, *England in the 1670s: 'The Masquerading Age'* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000), p.253.

¹¹⁰ Marvell, *RT*, p.56.

discontent (he was inevitably exiled in 1642). Marvell makes pointed reference of this failure to his readers: 'what then was this that Bishop Bramhal did? Did he, like a Protestant Apostle, in one day convert thousands of the Irish Papists? The contrary is evident by the Irish Rebellion and Massacre [...] notwithstanding his *Publick Employment and great Abilities*.'¹¹¹ Marvell presents the devastation left in the wake of this attempt at forced conversion as a source of shame and condemnation – an unnecessary imposition on the 'Irish Papists' who could not be made to conform. The attempt to unify the church is lambasted as both impossible and morally unsound:

I would only have ask'd the Bishop, when he had carv'd and hammer'd the Romists and Protestants into one Colossian-Church, how we should have done as to matter of Bibles. For the Bishop, p.117. complains that *unqualified people should have a promiscuous Licence to read the Scriptures*: and you may guess thence, if he had moreover the Pope to friend, how the Laity should have been used.¹¹²

In this formulation Marvell suggests to the reader that the only means of preventing dissenting opinion is ultimately to restrict access to the bible – a political decision associated fully with the Rome. In seeking to limit '*unqualified people*' from being able to scrutinise the text that formed the basis of their faith, the Bishop behaves like 'the Pope', and thus deserves the reader's Anglican censure.

Anti-popery is used here in part to argue against the very idea of attempting to penalise Catholicism – "hammering" 'the Romists' is equally as abhorrent as "hammering" Protestants. Belief should not be manufactured through artificial means. Likewise, Marvell condemns Parker's attempts at 'disarming the Papists of their Arguments [...and reducing] the Church of Rome to Reason.'¹¹³ Though the tone here is ironic (the deduction being perhaps that the Church of Rome is too far beyond 'reason' to be reasoned with), it also suggests that an understanding between the two churches (though whether a *détente* or a conversion to Protestantism is Marvell's ultimate goal is debatable) can only be achieved by leading from *example*, not force.

¹¹¹ Marvell, *RT*, p.57.

¹¹² Marvell, *RT*, p.59.

¹¹³ Marvell, *RT*, p.59.

The English Church must prove its exceptionalism through discourse and development, rather than invasion or physical intervention:

the Church being arrayed it self against the peaceable Dissenters only in some points of Worship [...] How ridiculous must we be to the Church of Rome to interpose in her Affairs, and force our Mediation upon her; when, besides our ill correspondence with the Foreign Protestants, she must observe our weakness within our selves, that we could not, or would not step over a straw, though for our perpetual settlement and security of our Church and Nation?¹¹⁴

As part of this discussion, Marvell includes a continuation of his armour imagery: ‘and those Churches which are seated nearer upon the Frontire of Popery, did naturally and well if they took Alarm at the March [...] He kills whole Nations, he kills Friend and Foe; Hungary, Transylvania, Bohemia, Poland, Savoy, France, the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, and a great part of the Church of England.’¹¹⁵ Here Marvell extends Parker’s argument *ad absurdum*, depicting Parker’s impulse to extend and unify the Anglican Church by silencing dissenting voices as a total war – even ‘Foreign Protestants’ are not safe, as any difference in doctrine must be extirpated. The result will be ‘to put the World into Blood, and animate Princes to be the Executioners of their own Subjects for well-doing.’¹¹⁶

Though an exaggeration of Parker’s rhetoric, this pronouncement – which recurs throughout both parts of *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* – is given seriously, a prescient concern that Marvell keeps directing the reader to consider. If the Church of England retained this authoritarian streak the consequences would be dire for all citizens. By referring to the Anglican establishment as ‘Ecclesiastical Governours’ Marvell aims to reveal the extent of the Church’s overstep into secular politics and private consciousness.¹¹⁷ The attempts to unify the Church – a move intended to shore up the fragile Restoration settlement – is seen as purely for the benefit of the institution (and the members liable to receive a ‘fat benefice’ for doing its bidding), their concern for the spiritual benefit of their congregants subjugated by the Church’s

¹¹⁴ Marvell, *RT*, p.60.

¹¹⁵ Marvell, *RT*, pp.63-65.

¹¹⁶ Marvell, *RT*, p.67.

¹¹⁷ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.38.

need to perpetuate its power and influence. In this way the Anglican Church is behaving akin to its supposed enemy, the Catholic Church, as it was perceived in the Restoration popular conscience. Marvell is using anti-popery as a means of attacking the ambitions of the episcopacy. Yet even in this condemnation, Marvell still finds room to engage in anti-anti-popery, declaring: 'in summe it seems to me that he is upon his own single judgment too liberal of the Publick, and that he retrenches both on our part more than he hath Authority for, and grants more to the Popish than they can of right pretend to.'¹¹⁸ The paranoid fears of Catholic intervention in England's affairs – which Marvell incites in *An Account* – are completely denounced here. Whilst in *An Account* this fear was used as a means of rebuking the establishment, its denouncement here serves as a way of defending toleration: the threat dissenters pose is not nearly as great as it is imagined. It is the 'false and secular interest of some of the Clergy' that is central cause of division.¹¹⁹ Ultimately, Marvell declares that the only important tenet of Christianity is a belief in the father and the son:

so was the Christian Faith seminally straitned in that virtual sincerity, vital point, and central vigour of believing with all the heart, that Jesus Christ was come in the Flesh, and was the Son of the Living God. And would men even now believe that one thing thorowly, they would be better Christians, than under all their Creeds.¹²⁰

Rather than the sectarians themselves, it is the attempt to persecute these groups which is the cause of societal division. A reader is encouraged to examine what they share with their fellow Christians rather than being subsumed by differences.

Corruption

The secular intent of Marvell's polemic is illuminated by his usage of critical terminology; in particular, in his use of the term corruption. Mark Knights contends that: 'the language of corruption in early modern England was religiously inflected;

¹¹⁸ Marvell, *RT*, p.58.

¹¹⁹ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.52.

¹²⁰ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.77.

that anti-popery provided an important idiom for the articulation of ideas about corruption; and that this process was political, excluding some from exercising power.¹²¹ Knights make use of databases in order to survey the ways in which the term “corruption” was used by early modern writers, and the terms it was often paired with. Knights concludes from this evidence of textual usage that ‘corruption had a predominately theological meaning and Protestants used sin and corruption as almost interchangeable terms, believing that man was naturally sinful and therefore naturally corrupt.’¹²² Corruption only began to gain an entirely secular meaning in the 1700s. Phrases such as ‘political corruption’ and ‘corrupt system’ did not have the cultural currency for Marvell’s audience as they would for a modern reader, though these ideas are clearly his central concerns. Given these ‘religiously inflected’ meanings, corruption became the perfect argot with which to decry “popery.” The term also related directly to ideas of subjugation, as has been shown by Fatovic;

The frequent association of popery with “tyranny” and “arbitrary government” made Catholicism in religion and politics virtually synonymous with “servility,” “slavery,” and “subjection,” which were intimately intertwined [...] Arbitrary government, superstition, ignorance, corruption, exorbitance, foreign domination, and other ideas tied to Catholicism found their direct counterparts in the rule of law, knowledge, education, virtue, simplicity, free government, and other ideas that came to be associated with liberty.¹²³

In this way the term “popery” was multi-faceted and could be read in reference to numerous political concepts, in particular to the idea of corruption. However, Knights’ conclusions regarding the use of the term ‘corruption’ in the early modern lexicon does not wholly chime with Marvell’s usage in his prose.

The resounding theme of *all* Marvell’s texts is corruption as it would be understood by a modern reader– whether a scolding rebuke of individual

¹²¹ Mark Knights, ‘Religion, anti-popery and corruption’, in *Popular Culture and Political Agency in Early Modern England and Ireland*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick and Phil Withington (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2017), pp.181-202 (p.181).

¹²² The term also had secondary meanings in the fields of law, politics, sexual morality and medicine (in which “corruption” was equated to disease and bodily decay); though all of these meanings were theologically tinged, originating in reference to the concept of original sin and the fall of man. Knights, ‘Religion, anti-popery and corruption’, p.185.

¹²³ Fatovic, ‘Anti-Catholic Roots’, p.40.

misfeasance in *The Rehearsal*, a sustained critique of the Anglican establishment in *A Short Historical Essay*, or a broader accusation of widespread, systematic injustice in *An Account*. In *An Account* the word 'corruption' is used three times. The first instance occurs early on in a discussion of the Triple Alliance, in a scene that ostensibly praises Charles' involvement in the consecration of the treaty signed in 1668 that sought to 'quiet this publick disturbance which the French had raised', and his care 'where the safety of his people and the repose of Christendom were concerned': 'this was a work wholly of his Majesties designing and (according to that felicity which hath always attended him, when excluding the corrupt Politicks of others he hath followed the dictates of his own Royal wisdom) so well it succeeded.'¹²⁴ This diplomatic portrayal of Charles' diplomatic endeavours is belied by the content that follows it, which depicts multiple scenes of Charles' political missteps. Here the use of the term could be read in line with Knights' definition of the term, the 'corrupt Politicks' in question referring to the Catholic 'Conspirators' Marvell identifies throughout the course of the pamphlet, the 'religious inflection' of the term perfectly suiting the subjects of the accusation. Though it is 'the corrupt Politicks of others' ostensibly being blamed for political upheaval in this configuration, criticism of the monarch lurks beneath the surface; the pamphlet serves as a catalogue of Charles' failings as a governor, rendering the phrase 'his own Royal wisdom' highly ironic. The term 'corrupt' is used in its traditional sense, but it is also used to associate the King with the full weight of its connotations. Immediately after this seeming praise for the King's 'dictates', Marvell recounts to the reader the swift downfall of an alliance 'to his Majesties eternal honour'; in 1670, the King had met with his sister Henriette-Anne, Duchesse d'Orléans (1644-1670), who acted as an emissary on behalf of the French court and helped facilitate the terms of the Secret Treaty of Dover.¹²⁵ Shortly after her return to France, the Duchesse died suddenly, leading to much speculation as to whether she had been poisoned.

In Marvell's rendering of the scene, Charles' relationship to his sister is emblematic of his failings as a ruler – the meeting, which clearly had a political animus, is depicted as purely for personal gratification: 'it seldomer happens to

¹²⁴ Marvell, *Account*, p.242.

¹²⁵ Marvell, *Account*, p.243.

Princes then private persons to enjoy their Relations.’¹²⁶ Though the suspected terms of the Secret Treaty are not elucidated, the suspicion of such an alliance is brought before the reader: ‘before ever the inquiry and grumbling at her death could be abated, in a thrice there was an invisible League, in prejudice of the Triple one, struck up with France, to all the height of dearness and affection.’¹²⁷ Not only is Charles’ knowing involvement and active execution of the Triple Alliance explicitly stated here (an alliance pointedly described in glowing terms within the very same paragraph), his motivation for essentially betraying ‘the safety of his people’ is entirely sentimental. Whether or not precipitated by ‘dearness and affection’ it is presented as unequivocally a *personal* rather than national tragedy. Though not presented as an act of open malfeasance or machination, by painting Charles’ inducement to endanger his nation’s international interests in this way, Marvell openly flirts with sedition and propounds to the reader that their monarch acts in naked self-interest. Though couched in praise of Charles and defamation of the ‘Conspirators’, a reader is left in little doubt that it was under ‘his Majesties particular Instructions’ that the breakdown of the Triple Alliance occurred, nor that the its successor was anything other than a disaster for the national interest; ‘this Treaty was a work of Darkness.’¹²⁸ Once again the people are shown to bear the cost of executive power; as a direct result of Charles’ political intrigue ‘it was necessary that the Parliament should after the old wont be gulld to the giving of mony.’¹²⁹ In presenting the event in this way and tacitly blaming the monarchy, Marvell’s focus is in line with that of popular discontent: ‘in 1675, with the outbreak of inflammatory political issues, reports of popular hostility again began to increase, including allegedly treasonable words against the king and the duke of York.’¹³⁰

Though it is the ‘corrupt Politicks of others’ that Marvell directly accuses, it is the ‘corrupt’ dealings of the monarch that the reader is asked to question. The second usage of the term occurs when Marvell lambasts the composition of Parliament, and the divided loyalties of its members, as ‘it is too notorious to be concealed, that a near

¹²⁶ Marvell, *Account*, p.243.

¹²⁷ Marvell, *Account*, pp.243-4.

¹²⁸ Marvell, *Account*, p.243.

¹²⁹ Marvell, *Account*, p.244.

¹³⁰ Richard L. Greaves, *Enemies Under His Feet: Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1664-1677* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), p.228.

a third part of the House have beneficial Offices under his Majesty [...] or in attendance on his Majesties person.’¹³¹ The question presented to the reader is how these men can be expected to act in deference to the will of their constituents when indebted to ‘his Majesty’ – the concern shall always linger that ‘his Gratitude to his Master, with his self-interest should tempt him beyond his obligation there to the Publick.’¹³² The ‘self-interest’ here is two-fold – with both the Crown and the accused members acting contrary to their duty to ‘the Publick.’ In order to hammer his point home, Marvell lists to his reader examples from other professions, making clear the absurdity of such an arrangement;

What self denyall were it in the Learned Counsell at Law, did they not vindicate the Misdemeanours of the Judges, perplex all Remedies against the Corruptions and Incroachment of Courts of Judicature, Word all Acts towards the Advantage of their own Profession, palliate unlawfull Elections, extenuate and advocate Publick Crimes, where the Criminall may prove considerable [...] without any respect to *Veracity*, but all to his own further Promotion!¹³³

Here corruption is used in its legal sense to show that the degeneration of the House of Commons is akin to a breakdown in the judicial system, the simile meant to elucidate the full extent to which the failure to properly represent the people whilst acting as their representative is an injustice. Just as they deserve to be properly represented in court by operatives who act in their interest and uphold the law, to have the house staffed by members who act in hope of ‘further Promotion’ rather than in deference to the national will is ethically ‘Criminall’ – a state of affairs sure to lead ‘to the detriment of the Subjects.’¹³⁴ Though this discussion of ‘Corruptions and Incroachment’ refers specifically to member of parliament, a criticism of ‘his Majesty’ is tacitly made. These MPs act with ‘self-interest’ in mind and they are shown to have voted to forsake ‘the good old and certain way of Subsidies’ when deciding how best to finance the Royal court in favour of ‘this Foraine course of Revenue.’¹³⁵ Charles’ spending habits were notorious – he repeatedly exceeded his budget, needing to

¹³¹ Marvell, *Account*, p.299.

¹³² Marvell, *Account*, p.299.

¹³³ Marvell, *Account*, p.300.

¹³⁴ Marvell, *Account*, p.300.

¹³⁵ Marvell, *Account*, p.301.

frequently negotiate with parliament in order to supplement his 'Revenue.' This acts as a 'great Grievance and double charge of the People, that so many of the Members might be gratified in the Farmes or Commissions.'¹³⁶

Whilst Marvell does not go as far as to explicitly suggest that the King is bribing members of the House, the inference that the King is using 'Farmes or Commissions' is still a weighty smear; in either case, it is clear that his style of leadership encourages 'ambitious, factious, and disappointed Members' – the few seats that do become available during the Long Parliament falling into the hands of the those with purely fiscal motivations: 'scarce any man comes thither with respect to the publick service, but in design to make and raise his fortune.'¹³⁷ Their behaviour is reflective of wider societal corruption as they engage in 'Debauchery, and Lewdness' and descend into 'Drunkeness and Bribery of their Competitors'; in choosing to depict them as such, Marvell deliberately mirrors the behaviour of Charles' court, with members behaving as libertine courtiers.¹³⁸ The moral corruption associated with court is thus shown to have spread to the representative body of the people: 'if neverthelesse any worthy person chance to carry the Election, some mercenary or corrupt Sheriffe makes a double Return, and so the Cause is handed to the Committee of Elections, who aske no better, but are ready to adopt his Adversary into the House if he be not Legitimate.'¹³⁹ Again the term 'corrupt' is used to highlight the degeneration of the nation's political apparatus – a deterioration that can be traced back to the leadership style of the supreme magistrate. Charles prevents parliament from operating in the interests of the people by 'Chastizing them with *Prorogations*, frightening them with *Dissolutions*, comforting them with long, frequent and seasonable *Adjournments*.'¹⁴⁰ Even when evoking 'Conspirators', the King is repeatedly implicated in discussions of societal corruption.¹⁴¹ Though the term 'corruption' had clear theological origins for an early modern audience, Marvell's use of the term is linked specifically to secular issues – rather than in express reference to 'the Conspirators' or the spread of popery, the term is instead used to indirectly

¹³⁶ Marvell, *Account*, p.301.

¹³⁷ Marvell, *Account*, p.303.

¹³⁸ Marvell, *Account*, pp.303-4.

¹³⁹ Marvell, *Account*, p.304.

¹⁴⁰ Marvell, *Account*, p.305.

¹⁴¹ Marvell, *Account*, p.305.

criticise 'his Majesty', who is always mentioned in quick succession after the spectre of 'corruption' is raised.

Marvell's secular usage of the term is illustrated even in absentia; in *A Short Historical Essay*, a tract directly accusing the episcopacy of institutional corruption, the term is not used at all, even though its theological origins perfectly suited the content of this work. In *Mr Smirke*, the sister pamphlet to the *Essay*, it is avarice rather than theological misconduct which is the source of corruption – in his defence of Croft Marvell assures his reader that he: 'gives a clear proof of his real submission and Addiction to the Church of *England*: all his fault for ought I see being, that he is more Truly and Cordially concerned for our Church than some mens Ignorance is capable of, or their corrupt interest can comply with.¹⁴² Marvell argues that Turner attempts to twist Croft's arguments and 'use him in this dirty manner' purely as a means of advancing his career – Turner's 'corrupt interest' is emblematic of a broader, cynical agenda to profit through the disenfranchisement of a religious minority.¹⁴³ In *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, the term is only used when quoting from a serious theological work. Marvell, in a brief interlude of seriousness, includes a lengthy quote from John Hales' (1584-1656) *Tract Concerning Schisme and Schismatics* (1642), a work that argued against the Conventicle Act and other restrictions on dissenters, choosing to end his excerpt with this 'material' paragraph;

"In times of manifest Corruption and Persecution, wherein Religious Assembling is "dangerous, Private Meetings, howsoever besides Publick Order, are not onely lawful, but "they are of Necessity and Duty. All pious Assemblies, in times of Persecution and "Corruption, howsoever practised, are indeed, or rather alone, the Lawful Congregations: "and Publick Assemblies, though according to form of Law, are, indeed, nothing else but "RIOTS and COVENTICLES, if they be stained with Corruption and Superstition.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴² Marvell, *Smirke*, p.54.

¹⁴³ Marvell, *Smirke*, p.54.

¹⁴⁴ Marvell, *RT*, p.130, p.134.

Here Hales inverts the typical early modern usage of the term ‘corruption’ – rather than in reference to “popery” or other forms of heterodox beliefs weakening the body of the church, it is the insidious nature of ‘Persecution’ that threatens the social order.

By capitalising ‘RIOTS and CONVENTICLES’ Marvell chooses to highlight to his reader the inversion of the typical designations of these terms – it is not nonconformist communities who represent these disorderly congregations. The terms traditionally used to denigrate these groups are instead used to defend their ‘pious Assemblies.’ Though succinct, Marvell argues that Hales’ work – and his arguments concerning ‘manifest Corruption and Persecution’ – is the definitive stance on the issue: ‘this little Book, of not full eight leaves, hath shut that *Ecclesiastical Polity*, and Mr. Bayes’s too out of doors.’¹⁴⁵ As in its use in *Mr Smirke*, the spectre of corruption is raised in order to criticise the systematic persecution of nonconforming communities. In both the political sense of the term employed in *An Account* and the anti-episcopal leanings it assumes in *Mr Smirke* and *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, the typical usage of the term is subverted in order to instead question the establishment and its prevailing ideologies. Though anti-popery is embedded within the central thesis of *An Account*, Marvell’s usage of the term ‘corruption’ is emblematic of his treatment of this Restoration issue – though it may be Catholic ‘Conspirators’ who are blamed for societal ills, ultimately the force undermining the state is the institution that symbolically served as the head of the body politic. It is the duplicitous and ‘self-interest’ of ‘his Majesty’ which is allowing a corrupt system to flourish. In his dealings with unpopular theologies, it is always the horror of persecution that informs the arguments he presents to his readers – the urge to vilify and victimise vulnerable religious communities symptomatic of something rotten within the state of the Anglican Church.

Marvell’s texts and their use of anti-popery can only be fully understood when considered as persuasive texts. The contemporary interpretive communities that would have read and responded to his texts would have been immersed in a culture that criticised and condemned practicing Catholics – Marvell calibrates his rhetoric accordingly. His use of both anti-popery and anti-anti-popery are employed

¹⁴⁵ Marvell, *RT*, p.130.

strategically to inspire reader discontent at the state of society. In the case of *An Account*, anti-popery is employed to indict the government and expose growing authoritarianism. As contended by Spurr, 'the impact of Marvell's *Account* may have been in the implicit, but unescapable, accusation that Charles was the common link between all the steps towards absolutism and popery.'¹⁴⁶ Anti-popery serves as the main means of illuminating this link, utilising a reader's paranoia in order to inspire action. In religious controversy, anti-popery proved the ultimate means of dismissing an opponent: 'both Anglicans and Dissenters sought to delegitimize each other by asserting their rivals' similarity to Catholicism, with the result that "true religion," true Protestantism, tended to equal the faith of the person doing the defining.'¹⁴⁷ Rather than follow this model, Marvell employs both anti-popery and anti-anti-popery in order to dismiss the idea of a singular 'true Protestantism' – while it is impossible to know the 'truth', it is possible to cease persecuting dissenting groups. The horror of forced conversion is a resonant refrain throughout Marvell's work – if individual conscience is to be respected, then it is necessary to extend toleration (or at the very least, ambivalence) towards unpopular theologies. The alternative is to behave like the enemy; in order to retain moral superiority it is necessary to allow individual conscience. The subversive nature of Marvell's texts can only be identified by reconstructing contemporary prejudices and attitudes. Understanding the reader reveals his radicalism.

¹⁴⁶ Spurr, *England in the 1670s*, p.254.

¹⁴⁷ Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination*, p.10.

‘And now I have done.’

This thesis has strived to restore to Andrew Marvell’s political prose its polemical force. By considering how Marvell interacted with the reader (and how they responded in kind) and deconstructing the rhetorical apparatus he employs I have sought to deepen our understanding of these pamphlets. These were documents designed to convince – purposefully built to engage and incense, and prompt the reader to pay attention to the actions of those in positions of authority. In his biography of Marvell, Nigel Smith summarises Marvell’s political persona as one deeply engaged with the idea of liberty: ‘Marvell stands for liberty – liberty of the subject, liberty in the state, liberty of the self, liberty from political and personal tyrannies: the domination of the public self and the interior private consciousness.’¹ Though his tone alternates between levity and brevity, and his stance on issues such as “Popery” and the royal prerogative morphs depending on how he has chosen to assail the reader, a focus on freedom of conscience and a scathing indictment of arbitrary institutions permeates all of his prose works – alongside a rhetorical style that prompts and encourages a reader to deeply assess their current political moment. His adaptation of animadversion both created a puzzle that his reader could decode by simply engaging with Restoration literary culture, and provided a blueprint for dismantling political tracts. His *Account* broke parliamentary precedent in order to alert his readership to covert political machinations, challenging the narrative promulgated by the establishment (and its mouthpiece, *The London Gazette*), asking them to question authority and engage with politics on an immediate level by holding their political representatives to a higher standard. In seeking to persuade he drew on popular culture to make his texts populist; he engaged with a religious controversy and sought to garner sympathy for a persecuted minority by approaching his readers as citizens rather than as Christians. His texts succeeded in causing a public stir because Marvell allowed his persona to be elastic – adopting differing modes in order to better convince his readership of the need to remain critical of the world around them, and remain active rather than passive observers of

¹ Smith, *The Chameleon*, p.343.

the political climate. The years after his death would witness precisely the kind of political engagement that he both anticipated and implicitly endorsed, as political parties gained momentum and the royal prerogative reached its nadir in England. Though he would not live to see these political developments reach their fruition, his writing undoubtedly expressed the political discontent felt by many and cemented itself in the popular consciousness. His achievements as a polemicist should stand alongside his poetic legacy; in both realms, Marvell was an innovator.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

MS and printed copies examined for marginalia –

Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, Keynes.W.3.14(2). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, Sel.3.239. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1678)

Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, Keynes.W.3.12. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, Ely.e.55. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: Printed by J. D., 1672)

Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, Keynes.P.1.13. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, Keynes.T.3.31. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673)

Cambridge, Christ's College Library, I.6.6(3). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College Library, K.7.1. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

Cambridge, Kings College Library, Keynes.D.03.27. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

Cambridge, Kings College Library, Keynes.D.03.26. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

Cambridge, Kings College Library, Keynes.D.05.30. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673)

Cambridge, Trinity College Library, Grylls 23.92. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

Durham, Durham University Library, Routh. 51.E.10/1. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

Durham, Durham University Library, Bamburgh. H 2.26/12. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

Durham, Durham University Library, Bamburgh. F.5.12/6. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

Durham, Durham University Library, Routh 15.C.30/1. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

Durham, Durham University Library, Routh 15.C.29. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Durham, Durham University Library, SB 1232. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673)

Hertfordshire, Hertfordshire Public Record Office, Panshanger MSS D/EP F37 "The Medley." Lady Sarah Cowper's commonplace book

Hull, Kingston upon Hull Local Studies Library, Marvell Collection. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Hull, Kingston upon Hull Local Studies Library, Marvell Collection. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

London, British Library, 702.e.4.(2.). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

London, British Library, C.55.d.20. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

London, British Library, T.88*(11.). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1678)

London, British Library, 4707.h.12. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1678)

London, British Library, CUP.406.J.5. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

London, British Library, 1485.k.17. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

London, British Library, C.131.b.22. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

London, British Library, C.141.b.4. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1673)

London, British Library, 1019.e.12. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

London, British Library, 4103.a.28. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

London, British Library, G.19514. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

London, British Library, G.19515. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673)

London, British Library, 1019.e.13. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673)

London, British Library, C.115.n.27. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673)

London, British Library, 1607/3406. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1674)

London, British Library, G.19515. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673)

London, British Library, 108.d.55. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

London, British Library, 701.g.10.(14.). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

London, British Library, 855.e.3. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

London, Dr William's Library, 85.4.12(R). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

London, Dr William's Library, 85.4.9(L). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

London, Dr William's Library, 3.44.18 (8). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

London, Dr William's Library, 5614.G.9. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

London, Dr William's Library, 1024.E.5. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

London, Dr William's Library, 5614.G.10. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1674)

London, Dr William's Library, 1024.E.6. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1674)

London, Dr William's Library, 3024.13.29. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1674)

London, Lambeth Palace Library, H5133 27.01. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

London, Lambeth Palace Library, NN196 16.03. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

London, Lambeth Palace Library, NN203.(M2). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

London, Lambeth Palace Library, H5136.(M2). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672) and Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673) bound together

London, Lambeth Palace Library, A69.3/36.(4). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

London, Lambeth Palace Library, H5133 928.03. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

London, Lambeth Palace Library, H5133 27.01. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

London, Lambeth Palace Library, NN196 16.03. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

London, Lambeth Palace Library, NN203.(M2). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

London, Senate House Library, Special Collections [G.L.] 1677. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

London, Senate House Library, Special Collections [Q.M.L.] G8.94 [Marvell]. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

London, Senate House Library, Special Collections [S.L.] I [Marvell – 1672]. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

London, Senate House Library, Special Collections [S.L.] I [Marvell – A. 1672]. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, C.11.15(7)Th. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1678)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, G. Pamph. 1359 (1). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677) bound with other titles.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, G.Pamph 1120 (1). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677) bound with other titles

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pamph. C 138 (1). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677) bound with other titles

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ashm. 733 (3a). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, P.4.16(7) Gall. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, T:30/1. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1677)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Pamph. C 136. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, T:807A/5. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, T:26/15. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, G.Pamph. 1052 (1). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676) bound with other titles.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, D 12.1 (4) Linc. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, 905 h 2 (6). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Firth e.8 (1). Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ashm. 1231. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke: or, The divine on mode* (London: s.n., 1676)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Vet.A3 f531. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, UU.b.5258. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, WH.8.1. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, G.2.22. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, UU.b.5086. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Vet.A3 f.628. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ashm.1591. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Vet.A3 f.755. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Dunston B 115. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, 8°C118 Linc. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Dunston B 1314. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: Or Animadversions Upon a Late Book* (London: s.n., 1672)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, 8°.C.558 Linc. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ashm. 1585. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Dunston B 1316. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, WF.8.24. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1674)

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Vet. A3 f.339. Extant copy of Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Ponder, 1673)

Printed editions -

A Collection of Poems on Affairs of State (London: s.n., 1689), Titlepage

Adamson, Henry, *The Muses Threnodie, or, Mirthfull mounrings, on the death of Master Gall* (Edinburgh: Printed by George Anderson, 1638)

Anon., *A Common-place-Book Out of the Rehearsal Transpros'd* (London: Printed for Henry Brome, 1673)

Anon., *A Declaration of the Parliament of England, in vindication of their proceedings, and discovering the dangerous practices of several Interests* (London: Printed by John Field for Edward Husband, 1649)

Anon., *A Glasse for Weak Ey'd Citizens: or a vindication of the pious, prudent and peacable petition (to the Honorable the Lord Mayor, aldermen and commons in Common-Council assembled) now in agitation* (London: Printed for Tho: Underhil, 1646)

Anon., *A Letter from Amsterdam, to a Friend in England* (London: Printed for G. H., 1678)

Anon., *An Agreement of the People for A firme and present Peace, upon grounds of common-right and freedome* (London: s.n., 1647)

Anon., *Anno Regni Caroli IJ. Regis Angliæ, Scotie, Franciæ, & Hiberniæ, Decimo Tertio* (London: Printed by John Bill and Christopher Barker, 1661)

Anon., *Arguments Relating to a Restraint upon the Press* (London: Printed by R. and J. Bonwick, 1712)

Anon., *A Seasonable Argument To Perswade All the Grand Juries in England, to Petition for A New Parliament* (Amsterdam: s.n., 1667)

Anon., *Cromwell's Conspiracy; a Tragy-Comedy, Relating to our latter Times* (London: s.n., 1660)

Anon., *Mr. BAXTER Baptiz'd in Bloud, or, A Sad History of the Unparallel'd Cruelty of the Anabaptists in New-England* (London: s.n., 1673)

Anon., *The Fortresse of Fathers, earnestlie defending the puritie of Religion, and Ceremonies* (Emden: Printed by Egidius van der Erve, 1566)

Bacon, Francis, *The Advancement of Learning: Book I*, ed. by William A. Armstrong (London: Athlone Press, 1975)

Bacon, Francis, 'Great Instauration preliminaries', in *The Oxford Francis Bacon*, ed. by Graham Rees and Maria Wakely, 16 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), XI, pp.2-26

Burnet, Gilbert, *History of His Own Time: From the Restoration of King Charles the Second to the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht, in the Reign of Queen Anne* (London: William S. Orr & Co., 1850)

Butler, Samuel, *Hubridas. The Third and last Part* (London: Printed for Simon Miller, 1678)

de Cervantes, Miguel, *Don Quixote*, trans. by Edith Grossman (London: Vintage, 2005)

Charles II, King CHARLES II. his DECLARATION To all His Loving SUBJECTS of the KINGDOM of ENGLAND. Dated from His Court at Breda in Holland, the 4/14 of April 1660 (London: Printed by W. Godbid for John Playford in the Temple, 1660)

Cicero, *On Invention. The Best Kind of Orator. Topics*, trans. by H. M. Hubbell, Loeb Classical Library 386 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949), p.356, in *Loeb Classical Library* <https://www-loebclassics-com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/marcus_tullius_cicero-de_optimo_genere_oratorum/1949/pb_LCL386.357.xml?result=1&rskey=2Yy5sX> [accessed 6th September, 2019]

Cicero, *On the Orator: Book 3. On Fate. Stoic Paradoxes. Divisions of Oratory*, trans. by H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library 349 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942), p.43, in *Loeb Classical Library* <https://www-loebclassics-com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/marcus_tullius_cicero-de_oratore/1942/pb_LCL349.43.xml> [accessed 6th September, 2019]

Clarke, Samuel, *England's Remembrancer; A True and Full Narrative of those never to be forgotten Deliverances* (London: Printed for J. Hancock, 1677)

Cooke, [Edward], *Memorabilia, or, The Most Remarkable Passages and Counsels Collected out of Several Declarations and Speeches That have been made by the King, His L. Chancellors and Keepers, and the Speakers of the Honourable House of Commons in Parliament since His Majesty's Happy Restauration, Anno 1660 til the End of the Last Parliament, 1680* (London: Printed for Nevil Simmons, Tho. Simmons and Sam. Lee, 1681)

D'Ewes, Simonds, *The Primitive Practise for Preserving Truth. Or An Historical Narration shewing what course the PRIMITIVE Church anciently, and the best Reformed Churches since have taken to suppress Heresie and Schisme* (London: Printed by M. S. for Henry Overton, 1645)

Dryden, John, *The Conquest of Granada by the Spaniards: In Two Parts* (London: Printed by T. N. for Henry Herringman, 1673)

Dury, John, *The Reformed Librarie Keeper With a Supplement to the Reformed-School, As Subordinate to Colleges in Universities* (London: Printed by William Du-Gard, 1650)

Edwards, Thomas, *The First and Second Part of Gangræna: or a Catalogue and Discover of many of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of the time* (London: Printed by T. R. and E.M. for Ralph Smith, 1646)

Edwards, Thomas, *The third part of Gangæna. Or, A new and higher discovery of the errors, heresies, blasphemies, and insolent proceedings of the sectaries of these times* (London: Printed for Ralph Smith, 1646)

Egan, Anthony, *The Romanists designs detected, and the Jesuits subtile practices discovered and laid open* (London: Printed for John Leigh, 1674)

Featley, Daniel, *Katabaptisai kataptysesoi. The Dippers dipt* (London: Printed by E. C. for N. B. and Richard Royston, 1660)

Grey, Anchitell, *Debates of the House of Commons, from the Year 1667 to the Year 1694*, 10 vols. (London: D. Henry and R. Cave, 1763), VII

[Hall, Joseph], *Christian Moderation: In two Books* (London: Printed by Miles Flesher, 1640)

[Hickeringill, Edmund], *Gregory, Father-Greybeard, with his Vizard off* (London: s.n., 1673)

Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan*, ed. by J. C. A. Gaskin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Holles, Denzil, *The Long Parliament Dissolved* (London: s.n., 1676)

Hookes, Ellis, *For the King and Both Houses of Parliament. Being a Brief and General Account of the Late and Present Sufferings of Many of the Peaceable Subjects called Quakers* (London: s.n., 1676)

Humfrey, John, *A Proposition or The Safety & Happiness of the King and Kingdom both in Church and State* (London: s.n., 1667)

Jenks, Francis, *Mr Francis Jenk's speech: spoken in a common hall* (London: s.n., 1679)

Jenner, Thomas, *Quakerism Anatomiz'd and Confuted* (Dublin: s.n., 1670)

[Leigh, Richard], *The Transposer Rehears'd: or, The fifth act of Mr. Bayes's play being a postscript to the animadversions* (Oxford: Printed for the assigns of Hugo Grotius and Jacob van Hamine, 1673)

L'Estrange, Roger, *Considerations and Proposals In Order to the Regulation of the Press: Together with Diverse Instances of Treasonous, and Seditious Pamphlets, Proving the Necessity thereof* (London: Printed by A. C., 1663)

L'Estrange, Roger, *Toleration Discuss'd; In Two Dialogues: The Second Edition much enlarged* (London: Printed by A. C. for Henry Brome, 1673)

L'Estrange, Roger, *The case put concerning the succession of his Royal Highness the Duke of York* (London: Printed by M. Clark for Henry Brome, 1679)

L'Estrange, Roger, *The Observer*, 13 April 1681, in *University of Oxford Text Archive* <<http://ota.ox.ac.uk/text/3139.html>> [accessed 3rd September, 2019]

- Locke, John, *Locke: Political Essays*, ed. by Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Marvell, Andrew, *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), II, pp.225-377
- Marvell, Andrew, 'An Horation Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.273-279
- Marvell, Andrew, *A Short Historical Essay, Concerning General Councils, Creeds and Imposition in Matters of Religion*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), II, pp.115-176
- Marvell, Andrew, *Mr Smirke: Or, the Divine in Mode*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), II, pp.35-113
- Marvell, Andrew, 'On Mr Milton's Paradise Lost', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.182-4
- Marvell, Andrew, 'The Garden', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.155-159
- Marvell, Andrew, 'The Last Instructions to a Painter', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.369-396
- Marvell, Andrew, 'The Nymph Complaining for the Death of her Fawn', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.69-71
- Marvell, Andrew, *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell: Volume II Letters*, ed. by H. M. Margoliouth, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), II
- Marvell, Andrew, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), I, pp.41-203
- Marvell, Andrew, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), I, pp.221-438
- Marvell, Andrew, 'The Statue in Stocks-Market', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.416-417
- Marvell, Andrew, 'The Statue at Charing Cross', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.418-419

Marvell, Andrew, 'Upon Appleton House, To My Lord Fairfax', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.216-241

Pagitt, Ephaim, *Heresiography: Or, a description of the Hereticks and Sectaries of these latter times* (London: Printed by W. Wilson, for John Marshall, 1645)

Milton, John, *Areopagitica: A Speech of Mr. John Milton*, in *John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education*, ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2013), pp.181-213

Milton, John, *Eikonoklastes*, in *John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education*, ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2013), pp.277-317

Milton, John, 'Of Education. To Master *Samuel Hartlib*.', in *John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education* ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2013), pp.170-180

Milton, John, 'On the new forcers of Conscience under the Long Parliament', in *The Poetical Works of John Milton*, ed. by William Aldis Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p.82

Milton, John, *Of True Religion, Hæresie, Schism, and Toleration*, in *John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education*, ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2013), pp.451-458

Milton, John, *Paradise Lost*, ed. by Alastair Fowler, Revised Second Edition (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2007)

Milton, John, *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, in *John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education*, ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2013), pp.105-169

Milton, John, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, in *John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education*, ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2013), pp.246-273

Parker, Samuel, *A Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie* (London: Printed by A. Clark for J. Martyn, 1671)

Parker, Samuel, *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie: wherein The Authority of the Civil Magistrate Over the Consciences of Subjects in Matters of Religion Asserted* (London: Printed by John Martyn, 1670)

Parker, Samuel, *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transposed, in Discourse to its Authour* (London: Printed for James Collins, 1673)

Parker, Samuel, 'A Preface to the Reader', in *Bishop Bramhall's Vindication of Himself and the Episcopal Clergy From the Presbyterian Charge of Popery, As it is managed by Mr. Baxter in his Treatise of the Grotian Religion. Together with a Preface Shewing What*

Grounds there are Fears and Jealousies of Popery (London: Printed by A. C. for James Collins, 1672), sig.A2r-[e8]v

Patrick, Simon, *A Friendly Debate Betwixt two Neighbours, The one a Conformist, the other Non-Conformist* (London: s.n., 1668?)

Peacham, Henry, *The Garden of Eloquence, Containing the Most Excellent Ornaments, Exornations, Lightes, flowers, and forms of speech, commonly called the Figures of Rhetoricke* (London: Printed by R. F. for H. Jackson, 1593)

Owen, John, *Truth and Innocence Vindicated: In a Survey of a Discourse Concerning Ecclesiastical Polity* (London: s.n, 1669)

Owen, John, *Indulgence and Toleration Considered: in a Letter unto A Person of Honour* (London: s.n., 1667)

Owen, Lewis, *Speculum Jesuiticum* (London: Printed by Thomas Cotes for Michael Sparke, 1629)

Needham, Marchmont, *Honesty's Best Policy, or Penitence the sum of Prudence* (London: s.n., [1678])

Sidney, Algernon, *Discourses concerning Government* (London: To be printed and sold by the Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1698)

Smith, John, *The Myserie of Rhetorick Unveil'd, Wherein above 130 The TROPES and FIGURES are severally derived from the Greek into English* (London: Printed by E. Cotes, 1665)

Spinola, George, *Rvles to Get Children by with Handsome Faces* (London: Printed by R. H., 1642)

Stephens, Edward, *Popish Policies and Practices Represented in the Histories of the Parisian Massacre; Gun-powder Treason; Conspiracies against Queen Elizabeth, and Persecutions of the Protestants in France* (London: Printed for John Leigh, 1674)

Tatham, John, *The Rump; Or, The Mirrour of The late Times* (London: Printed by W. Godbid for R. Bloome, 1660)

de Thoue, Jacques-Auguste, *The Histories of the Gunpowder-Treason and the Massacre at Paris* (London: Printed for J. Leigh, 1676)

Tomkins, Thomas, *The Inconveniencies of Toleration* (London: Printed for W. Garret, 1667)

The Bible: Authorized King James Version with Apocrypha, ed. by Robert Carroll and Stephen Prickett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

The London Gazzette, 1 February 1665 <<https://www.thegazette.co.uk/London/issue/24/page/1>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019]

The London Gazette, 7 May 1668
<<https://www.thegazette.co.uk/London/issue/259/page/2>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019]

The London Gazette, 6 June 1672
<<https://www.thegazette.co.uk/London/issue/684/page/1>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019]

The London Gazette, 31 May 1676
<<https://www.thegazette.co.uk/London/issue/1203/page/1>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019]

The London Gazette, 25 March 1678
<<https://www.thegazette.co.uk/London/issue/1289/page/2>> [accessed 1st May, 2020]

The Parliamentary Intelligencer, Issue I, 26 December 1659
[Turner, Francis], *Animadversions Upon a Late Pamphlet Entituled The Naked Truth; Or, the True State of the Primitive Church* (London: Printed by T. R., 1676)

Wilson, Thomas, *The Arte of Rhetorique, for the use of all such as are studious of Eloquence* (London: Printed by George Robinson, 1585)

Villiers, Geroge, *The Rehearsal*, in *Restoration Drama: An Anthology*, ed. by David Womersley (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2000) pp.141-170

Secondary Sources

Achinstein, Sharon, *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994)

Achinstein, Sharon, 'Milton's Spectre in the Restoration: Marvell, Dryden and Literary Enthusiasm', in *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 59 (1996), 1-29

Altick, Richard D., *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900*, Second Edition (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998)

Andersen, Jennifer and Sauer, Elizabeth, 'Current Trends in the History of Reading' in *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies*, ed. by Jennifer Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), pp.1-22

Anselment, Raymond A., "Betwixt Jest and Earnest": Ironic Reversal in Andrew Marvell's "The Rehearsal Transpros'd", in *The Modern Language Review*, 66 (1971), 282-293

Anselment, Raymond A., *"Betwixt Jest and Earnest": Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift & the Decorum of Religious Ridicule* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979)

Anselment, Raymond A., 'Satiric Strategy in Marvell's *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*', in *Modern Philology*, 68 (1970), 137-50

Arber, Edward, *The Term Catalogues, 1668-1709 A.D.; with a Number for Easter Term, 1711 A.D.: A Contemporary Bibliography of English Literature in the reigns of Charles II, James II, William and Mary, and Anne*, 3 vols. (New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1965), I

'Arbitrary, 1660-1677', in *The English Short Title Catalogue* <<https://bit.ly/2nC27QD>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019]

'Arbitrary, 1678-1690', in *The English Short Title Catalogue* <<https://bit.ly/2pgNL8x>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019]

Archer, Ian W., 'Royal Entries, the City of London, and the Politics of Stuart Successions', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.257-282

Armstrong, William A., 'Introduction' in Francis Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning: Book I*, ed. by William A. Armstrong (London: the Athlone Press, 1975), pp.1-47

Atherton, Ian and Como, David, 'The Burning of Edward Wightman: Puritanism, Prelacy and the Politics of Heresy in Early Modern England', *English Historical Review*, 120 (2005), 1215-125

Atherton, Ian, 'The Itch Grown a Disease: Manuscript Transmission of News in the Seventeenth Century', in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Joad Raymond (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1999), pp.36-65

Augustine, Matthew C., "A Mastery in Fooling": Marvell, the Mock-Book, and the Surprising Life of "Mr. Bayes", in *Studies in Philology*, 112 (2015), 353-378

Augustine, Matthew C., 'Beyond Politics? Marvell and the Fortunes of Context', in *Literature Compass*, 11 (2014), 235-245

Augustine, Matthew C., 'Marvell and Print Culture', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <[10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.14](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.14)> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-21

Augustine, Matthew C., 'The Chameleon or the Sponge? Marvell, Milton, and the Politics of Literary History', in *Studies in Philology*, 114 (2014), 132-162

Baker, Geoff, *Reading and Politics in early modern England: The mental world of a seventeenth-century Catholic gentleman* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010)

Bardle, Stephen, *The Literary Underground in the 1660s: Andrew Marvell, George Wither, Ralph Wallis, and the World of Restoration Satire and Pamphleteering* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Barnes, Diana G., 'Remembering Civil War in Andrew Marvell's "Upon Appleton House" *Emotions and War: Medieval to Romantic Literature*, ed. by Stephanie Downes, Andrew Lynch and Katrina O'Loughlin (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), pp.185-202

Baron, Sabrina A., 'Licensing Readers, Licensing Authorities in Seventeenth-Century England', in *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies*, ed. by Jennifer Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), pp.217-242

Barry, Jonathan, 'The Press and the Politics of Culture in Bristol, 1660-1775', in *Culture Politics and Society in Britain 1660-1800*, ed. by Jeremy Black and James Gregory (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981), pp.49-81

Battigelli, Anna, 'John Dryden's Angry Readers', in *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies*, ed. by Jennifer Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), pp.261-281

Berry, Helen, *Gender, Society and Print Culture in Late Stuart England: the Cultural World of the Athenian Mercury* (Aldershot: Routledge, 2003)

Birrell, T. A., *Aspects of Book Culture in Early Modern England*, ed. by Jos Blom (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013)

Braverman, Richard, *Plots and Counterplots: sexual politics and the body politic in English literature, 1660-1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Braverman, Richard, 'The Rake's Progress Revisited: Politics and Comedy in the Restoration', in *Cultural Readings of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century English Theater*, ed. by J. Douglas Canfield and Deborah C. Payne (London: The University of Georgia Press, 1995), pp.141-168

Brayman Hackel, Heidi, *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender, Literacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Brayman Hackel, Heidi, 'The Countess of Bridgewater's London Library', in *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies*, ed. by Jennifer Andersen and

Elizabeth Sauer (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), pp.38-159

Brotton, Jerry, *The Sale of the Late King's Goods: Charles I and His Art Collection* (Basingstoke: Pan Books, 2007)

Bucholz, Robert and Key, Newton, *Early Modern England 1485-1714: A Narrative History* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2004)

ed. by Bullard, Rebecca and Carnell, Rachel, *The Secret History in Literature, 1660-1820* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017)

Burns, J. H., 'The Idea of Absolutism', in *Absolutism in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, ed. by John Miller (London: Macmillan Education Ltd., 1990), pp.21-42

Cable, Lana, 'Licensing Metaphor: Parker, Marvell, and the Debate over Conscience', in *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies*, ed. by Jennifer Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), pp.243-260

Calhoun, Joshua, 'Reading Habits and Reading Habitats', in *Early Modern English Marginalia*, ed. by Katherine Acheson (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019) pp.15-34

Cambers, Andrew and Wolfe, Michelle, 'Reading Family Religion, and Evangelical Identity in Late Stuart England', in *Historical Journal*, 47 (2004), 875-896

Cambers, Andrew, 'Reading the Godly, and Self-Writing in England, circa 1580-1720', *Journal of British Studies*, 46 (2007), 796-825

Cambers, Andrew, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

Campbell, Gordon and Corns, Thomas N., *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Carlton, Charles, *Charles I: The Personal Monarch* (London: Routledge, 1995)

Chalmers, Hero, *Royalist Women Writers, 1650-1689* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

Champion, J. A. I., 'Hobbes, Barlow, and the Restoration debate over "heresy"', in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. by David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp.221-253

Chan, Mary, 'The Witch of Endor and Seventeenth-Century Propaganda', in *Musica Disciplina*, 34 (1980), 205-214

Chartier, Roger, *Forms and Meaning: Text, Performances, and Audiences from Codex to Computer* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1995)

Chartier, Roger, *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe* (Palo Alto, CA.: Stanford University Press, 1994)

Chartier, Roger, 'The Order of Books Revisited', in *Modern Intellectual History*, 4 (2007), 509-519

Chernaik, Warren, 'Choosing a captain back for Egypt: Milton and the Restoration', in *From Republic to Restoration: Legacies and Departures*, ed. by Janet Clare (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), pp.245-266

Chernaik, Warren and Dzelzainis, Martin, 'Index', in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. By Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1999), pp.354-365

Chernaik, Warren, "'Such a king as no chisel can mend": Marvell, Charles II and Republicanism', in *New Perspectives on Andrew Marvell*, ed. by G. Sambras (Reims: Épure, 2008), 97-111

Chernaik, Warren, *The Poet's Time: Politics and Religion in the Work of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983)

Chibnall, Jennifer, 'Something to the Purpose: Marvell's Rhetorical Strategy in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*', in *Literature of Controversy: Polemical Strategy from Milton to Junius*, ed by Thomas N. Corns (London: Frank Cass, 1987), pp.80-104

Childs, John, 'The Sales of Government Gazettes during the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-81', in *The English Historical Review*, 102 (1987), 103-6

Clare, Janet, 'Acts of oblivion: Reframing drama, 1648-65', in *From Republic to Restoration: Legacies and Departures*, ed. by Janet Clare (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), pp.147-167

Clark, J. C. D., 'Church, Parties, and Politics', in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism*, ed. by Jeremy Gregory, 5 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), II, 289-313

ed. by Coffey, John and Lim, Paul C. H., *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Colclough, David, *Freedom of Speech in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

Condren, Conal, 'Andrew Marvell as Polemicist: His *Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*', in *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Conal Condren and A. D. Cousins (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1990), pp.157-187

Connell, Philip, 'Marvell, Milton and the Protectoral Church Settlement', in *The Review of English Studies*, 62 (2011), 562-592

Connell, Philip, 'Marvell and the Church', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <[10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.9](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.9)> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-19

Corns, Thomas N., *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)

Coster, Stephanie, 'Robert Boulter and the Publication of Andrew Marvell's *Miscellaneous Poems*', in *The Review of English Studies*, 69 (2018), 259-276

Coster, Steph, 'Sending them beyond the Sea': Andrew Marvell, the Earl of Clare, and Tutoring in the Restoration', in *Marvell Studies*, 2 (2017), 1-20
<<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.9/>> [accessed April 3rd, 2020]

Cowan, Brian, 'The Rise of the Coffeeshouse Reconsidered', in *Historical Journal*, 47 (2004), 21-46

Cressy, David, *Bonfires and Bells: national memory and the Protestant calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1989)

Cressy, David, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980)

ed. by Crick, Julia and Walsham, Alexandra, *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Croakley, Thomas M., 'Bramston, Sir John, the younger', in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <<https://doi-org.chain.kent.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/3244>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019]

D'Addario, Christopher, *Exile and Journey in Seventeenth-Century Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

De Krey, Gary S., *Restoration and Revolution in Britain: a Political History of the era of Charles II and the Glorious Revolution* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)

De Krey, Gary S., 'Rethinking the Restoration: Dissenting Cases for Conscience, 1667-1672', in *The Historical Journal*, 38 (1995), pp.53-83

De Krey, Gary S., 'The First Restoration Crisis: Conscience and Coercion in London, 1667-73', in *Albion: A Quaterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 25 (1993), 565-580

Dzelzainis, Martin, 'Managing the Later Stuart Press, 1662–1696', in *The Oxford Handbook of English Law and Literature, 1500–1700*, ed. Lorna Hutson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 529-47

Dzelzainis, Martin, 'Marvell and the Dutch in 1665', in *A Concise Companion to the Study of Manuscripts, Printed Books, and the Production of Early Modern Texts*, ed. Edward Jones (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015), pp. 249-65

Dzelzainis, Martin, 'Marvell, Nicolas Chorier, and the Earl of Rochester: State Satire and Pornography in the Dissenting Academies', in *Marvell Studies*, 2 (2017), 1-20 (p.11) <<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.12/>> [accessed April 2nd, 2020]

Dzelzainis, Martin and Patterson, Annabel, 'Introduction', in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), I, pp.3-40

Dzelzainis, Martin and Holberton, Edward, 'Preface' in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <<https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780198736400-miscMatter-4>> [accessed May 7th, 2020] pp.1-3

Dzelzainis, Martin and Coster, Steph, 'The Commissioning, Writing, and Printing of *Mr. Smirke: A New Account*', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <[10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.32](https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.32)> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-23

Dzelzainis, Martin and Patterson, Annabel, 'The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part', in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), I, pp.207-220

Dzelzainis, Martin, "'The Second Edition, Corrected": A Revised Printing History of Andrew Marvell's *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* (1672)', in *Notes and Queries*, 63 (2016), 62-66

Dzelzainis, Martin, "'The Sport of *Bishop-Hunting*": Marvell and the neo-Laudians', in *From Republic to Restoration: Legacies and Departures*, ed. by Janet Clare (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), pp.226-244

Donnelly, M. L., 'Interest, Honour, and Horatian Raillery in the Service of Liberty: *An Account of the Growth of Popery*', in *Marvell and Liberty* ed. by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999), pp.313-333

ed. by Durston, Christopher and Eales, Jacqueline, *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Publishers Ltd., 1996)

- Eliot, T. S., *Selected Essays*, ed. by William A. Armstrong (London: Faber and Faber, 1951)
- Ellis, Markman, 'Coffee-House Libraries in Mid Eighteenth-Century London', in *The Library*, 10 (2009), 3-40
- Fatovic, Clement, 'The Anti-Catholic Roots of Liberal and Republican Conceptions of Freedom in English Political Thought', in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 66 (2005), 37-58
- Feroli, Teresa, *Political Speaking Justified: Women Prophets and the English Revolution* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006)
- ed. by Ferrell, Lori Anne and McCullough, Peter, *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History, 1600-1750* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001)
- Fraser, Peter, *Intelligence of the Secretaries of State: and their monopoly of Licensed News 1660-1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956)
- Gallagher, Noelle, 'Satire as medicine in the Restoration and early eighteenth century: the history of the metaphor', in *Literature and Medicine*, 31 (2013), 17-39
- Garganigo, Alex, 'The Rehearsal Transpros'd and The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.31> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-25
- Grafton, Anthony, *Commerce with the Classics: Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997)
- Grantham Turner, James, *Libertines and Radicals in Early Modern London: Sexuality, Politics and Literary Culture, 1630-1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- Greaves, Richard L., *Deliver Us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986)
- Greaves, Richard L., *Enemies Under His Feet: Radicals and Nonconformists in Britain, 1664-1677* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990)
- Greaves, Richard L., 'Seditious Sectaries or "Sober and Useful Inhabitants"? Changing Conceptions of the Quakers in Early Modern Britain', in *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 33 (2001), 24-50
- Green, Ian, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)

Habermas, Jürgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans by Thomas Burger (London: Polity Press, 1992)

Hackenbracht, Ryan, 'Marvell, Dryden, and Commercial Fishing Propaganda during the Anglo-Dutch Wars' in *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 59 (2019), 485-506

ed. by Hadfield, Andrew, *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001)

Hadfield, Andrew, 'Milton and Catholicism', in *Milton and Toleration*, ed. by Sharon Achinstein and Elizabeth mc (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp.186-199

Hamilton, Gary D., 'Marvell, Sacrilege, and Protestant Historiography: Contextualising "Upon Appleton House"', in *Religion, Literature, and Politics in Post-Reformation England, 1540-1688*, ed. by Donna B. Hamilton and Richard Strier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 161-186

ed. by Hammond, Paul and Hopkins, David, *John Dryden: Tercentenary Essays* (Oxford University Press, 2000)

Hammond, Paul, *Milton and the People* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)

Harris, Tim, "'Lives, Liberties and Estates": Rhetorics of Liberty in the Reign of Charles II', in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, ed. by Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1990), pp.217-242

Harris, Tim, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and politics from the Restoration until the exclusion crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)

Harris, Tim, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society 1660-1715* (Harlow: Longman Group UK Limited, 1993)

Harris, Tim, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms 1660-1685* (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2006)

Harris, Tim, 'The Bawdy House Riots of 1668', in *The Historical Journal*, 29 (1986), 537-556

Harris, Tim, "'Venerating the Honesty of a Tinker": The King's Friends and the Battle for the Allegiance of the Common People in Restoration England', in *The Politics of the Excluded, c.1500-1800*, ed. by Tim Harris (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp.195-224

Healy, Margaret, *Fictions of Disease in Early Modern England: Bodies, Plagues and Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001)

ed. by Hessayon, Ariel and Keene, Nicholas, *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2006)

Highley, Christopher, 'Charles II and the Meaning of Exile', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.75-94

Hirst, Derek, 'Making Contact: Petitions and the English Republic', in *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (2006), 26-50

Hirst, Derek, 'Parker, Marvell, and political culture, 1667-73', in *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth Century England*, ed. by Derek Hirst and Richard Strier (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp.145-164

Hirst, Derek and Zwicker, Steven N., 'Andrew Marvell and the Toils of Patriarchy: Fatherhood, Longing, and the Body Politic', in *ELH*, 66 (1999), 629-654

Hirst, Derek and Zwicker, Steven N., *Andrew Marvell: Orphan of the Hurricane* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Holberton, Edward, 'Marvell and Diplomacy', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.6> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-21

Holberton, Edward, 'Representing the Sea in Andrew Marvell's "Advice to a Painter" Satires', in *Review of English Studies*, 66 (2015), 71-86

Hone, Joseph, 'Daniel Defoe and the Whig Tradition in Satire', in *ELH*, 84 (2017), 865-890

ed. by Houston, Alan and Pincus, Steve, *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

Hughes, Ann, 'Approaches to Presbyterian Print Culture: Thomas Edward's *Gangraena* as Source and Text', in *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies*, ed. by Jennifer Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), pp.97-117

Hughes, Ann, 'Thomas Edward's *Gangraena* and heresiological traditions', in *Heresy, Literature, and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. by David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp.137-159

Hunt, John Dixon, *Andrew Marvell: His Life in Writing* (London: Elek Books Limited, 1978), p.171

Huysman, Ineke, 'Andrew Marvell and Constantijn Huygens: Common Grounds and Mutual Contacts', in *Marvell Studies*, 3 (2018), 1-18
<<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.16/>> [accessed April 2nd, 2020]

Iser, Wolfgang, 'The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach' in *New Literary History*, 3 (1972), 279-299

Jardine, Lisa, *Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory* (London: Harper Collins, 2008)

Jardine, Lisa and Grafton, Anthony, "'Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy', in *Past & Present*, 129 (1990), 30-78

Johns, Adrian, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998)

Johnson, Odai, *Rehearsing the Revolution: Radical Performance, Radical Politics in the English Restoration* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2000)

Kahn, Victoria, *Rhetoric, Prudence, and Skepticism in the Renaissance* (London: Cornell University Press, 1985)

Kahn, Victoria, *Wayward Contracts: The Crisis of Political Obligation in England, 1640-1674* (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2004)

Kavanagh, Art, 'Andrew Marvell and the Duttons of Sherborne in 1657', in *Notes & Queries*, 248 (2003), 183-188

Kavanagh, Art, 'Andrew Marvell "in want of money": The evidence in *John Farrington v. Mary Marvell*', in *The Seventeenth Century*, 17 (2002), 206-212

Keeble, N. H. and Harris, Johanna, 'Marvell and Nonconformity', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.10> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-24

ed. by Keeble, N. H., *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

Keeble, N. H., *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-century England* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1987)

Keeble, N. H., 'Why Transpose *The Rehearsal*?', in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999), pp.249-268

Kewes, Paulina, 'Between the "Triumvirate of wit" and the Bard: The English Dramatic Canon, 1660-1720', in *Texts and Cultural Change in Early Modern England*, ed. by Cedric C. Brown and Arthur F. Marotti (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), pp.200-224

Knights, Mark, 'How rational was the later Stuart public sphere?', in *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England*, ed. by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp.252-69

Knights, Mark, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-1681* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Knights, Mark, 'Religion, anti-popery and corruption', in *Popular Culture and Political Agency in Early Modern England and Ireland*, ed. by Michael J. Braddick and Phil Withington (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2017), pp.181-202

Knights, Mark, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)

Knights, Mark, 'The Loyal Address: Prose Panegyric, 1658-1715', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. by Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.319-335

Kristeller, Paul Oskar, 'Humanism', in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. by Charles B. Schmitt et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp.113-137

Kugler, Anne, *Errant Plagiarist: The Life and Writing of Lady Sarah Cowper* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002)

Kugler, Anne, 'Cowper [*née* Holled], Sarah, Lady Cowper', in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/article/66718>> [accessed February 19th, 2017]

Lake, Peter, 'Anti-Popery: The Structure of a Prejudice', in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642*, ed. Richard Crust and Ann Hughes (London: Routledge, 1989), pp.72-106

Lake, Peter, 'Deeds Against Nature: Cheap Print, Protestantism and Murder in Early Seventeenth-Century England', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. by Peter Lake and Kevin Sharpe (London: Red Globe Press, 1994)

Lake, Peter and Como, David, "'Orthodoxy" and Its Discontents: Dispute Settlement and the Production of "Consensus" in the London (Puritan) "Underground", in *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (2000), 34-70

Lake, Peter and Questier, Michael, 'Puritans, Papists, and the "Public Sphere" in Early Modern England: The Edmund Campion Affair in Context', in *Journal of Modern History*, 72 (2000), 587-627

Lake, Peter and Pincus, Steven, 'Rethinking the public sphere in early modern England', in *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England*, ed. by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp.1-30

Lambert, Sheila, *Printing for Parliament, 1641-1700*, Special Series vol. 20 (London: List and Index Society, 1984)

Levillain, Charles-Éduoard, 'England's "Natural Frontier": Andrew Marvell and the Low Countries', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.7> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-16

Loewenstein, David, 'Of True Religion, Hæresie, Schism, and Toleration: Prefatory Note', in *John Milton Prose: Major Writings on Liberty, Politics, Religion, and Education* ed. by David Loewenstein (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2013), pp.448-449

Loewenstein, David, *Representing revolution in Milton and his contemporaries: religion, politics, and polemics in radical Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

Loewenstein, David, 'Toleration and the Specter of Heresy in Milton's England', in *Milton and Toleration*, ed. by Sharon Achinstein and Elizabeth Sauer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp.45-71

Love, Harold, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998)

Loveman, Kate, 'Books and Sociability: The Case of Samuel Pepys's Library', in *Review of English Studies*, 61 (2010), 214-233

Loveman, Kate, 'Imagining London: Thomas Otway's *The Soldiers' Fortune* and the Literature of the Popish Plot', in *Restoration*, 26 (2002), 85-96

Loveman, Kate, *Reading Fictions 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008)

Loveman, Kate, *Samuel Pepys and his Books: Reading, Newsgathering, and Sociability, 1660-1703* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015)

ed. by Lynch, Beth and Dunan-Page, Anne, *Roger L'Estrange and the Making of Restoration Culture* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016)

Mack, Peter, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

ed. by MacLean, Gerald, *Culture and Society in the Stuart Restoration: Literature, Drama, History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)

Magee, Brian, *The English Recusants: A Study of the Post-Reformation Catholic Survival and the Operation of Recusancy Laws* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne Ltd, 1938)

Maguire, Nancy Klein, *Regicide and Restoration: English tragicomedy, 1660-1671* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)

von Maltzahn, Nicholas, *An Andrew Marvell Chronology* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005)

von Maltzahn, Nicholas, 'Andrew Marvell and the Prehistory of Whiggism', in *"Cultures of Whiggism": New Essays on English Literature and Culture in the Long Eighteenth Century*, ed. by David Womersley (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005), pp.31-61

von Maltzahn, Nicholas, 'Andrew Marvell's Paper Work: The Earl of Carlisle's Baltic Embassy (1664)' in *Marvell Studies*, 3 (2018), 1-30
<<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.15/>> [accessed April 3rd, 2020]

von Maltzahn, Nicholas, 'Introduction', in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), II, pp.179-221

von Maltzahn, Nicholas, 'Liberalism or Apocalypse? Milton and Marvell', in *English Now; Selected Papers from the 20th IAUPE Conference in Lund 2007*, ed. Marianne Thormählen, Lund Studies in English Series, (Lund: Lund University, 2008), 44-58

von Maltzahn, Nicholas, 'Marvell's Aviary: The Cassowary', in *Marvell Studies*, 3 (2018), 1-3 <<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.13/>> [accessed April 2nd, 2020]

von Maltzahn, Nicholas, 'Marvell's Indian Posion-Pot', in *Notes and Queries*, 60 (2013), 535-537

von Maltzahn, Nicholas, 'Milton, Marvell and Toleration', in *Milton and Toleration*, ed. by Sharon Achinstein and Elizabeth Sauer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp.86-104

Marotti, Arthur F., *Religious Ideology & Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England* (Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005)

Marotti, Arthur F., 'Southwell's Remains: Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern England Texts and Cultural Change in Early Modern England', in *Texts and Cultural Change in Early Modern England*, ed. by Cedric C. Brown and Arthur F. Marotti (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), pp.37-65

Marsh, Christopher W., *The Family of Love in English Society, 1550-1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)

Marshall, John, 'Defining and redefining heresy up to Locke's *Letters Concerning Toleration*', in *Heresy, Literature and Politics in Early Modern English Culture*, ed. by David Loewenstein and John Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp.254-281

McDonald, Keith, "'Far off the public stage": Marvell's public and private writings, 1649-65', in *From Republic to Restoration: Legacies and Departures*, ed. by Janet Clare (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), pp.168-184

McDonald, Peter D., 'Implicit Structures and Explicit Interactions: Pierre Bourdieu and the History of the Book', in *The Library*, 19 (1997), 105-21

McDowell, Nicholas, 'Tales of Tub Preachers: Swift Heresiography', in *The Review of English Studies*, 61 (2010), 72-92

McDowell, Nicholas, 'Classical Liberty and Cavalier Poetics: The Politics of Literary Community in Caroline London from Jonson to Marvell', in *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 44 (2014), 120-136

McDowell, Nicholas, *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars: Marvell and the Cause of Wit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

McDowell, Nicholas, 'Wit, Conversation, and Literary Transmission in Mid-Seventeenth-Century France and England: How Andrew Marvell Heard His Rabelais' in *Renaissance Quarterly* 69 (2016), 940-961

McDowell, Sean H., 'Justus Lipsius, Andrew Marvell, and Epistolary Style', in *Marvell Studies*, 2 (2017), 1-20 <<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.6/>> [accessed April 2nd, 2020]

McDowell, Sean H., 'Urban Marvell', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <[10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.17](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.17)> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-20

McKenzie, D. F., *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

McKeon, Michael, 'Civil and Religious Liberty in 17th-Century England: A Case Study in Secularization', in *Representation, Heterodoxy, and Aesthetics: Essays in Honor of Ronald Paulson*, ed. by Ashley Marshall (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2015), pp.157-189

McKeon, Michael, *Politics and Poetry in Restoration England: The Case of Dryden's Annus Mirabilis* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975)

McKeon, Michael, 'Swift's Debt to Marvell: Parody, Figuration, Religion, and Print Culture', in *Reading Swift: Papers from the Sixth Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift*, ed. by Kirsten Juhas, Hermann J. Real, and Sandra Simon (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2013), pp.149-158

McRae, Andrew, *Literature, Satire, and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Mendle, Michael, 'Preserving the Ephemeral: Reading, Collecting, and the Pamphlet Culture of Seventeenth-Century England', in *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies*, ed. by Jennifer Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), pp.201-216

Miller, John, *After the Civil Wars: Government in the Reign of Charles II* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014)

Miller, John, 'Britain', in *Absolutism in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, ed. by John Miller (Macmillan Education Ltd: London, 1990), pp.195-224

Miller, John, 'Catholic Officers in the Late Stuart Army', in *The English Historical Review*, 88 (1973), 35-53

Miller, John, *Popery and politics in England, 1660-1688* (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1973)

Montaño, John Patrick, *Courting the Moderates: Ideology, Propaganda, and the Emergence of Party, 1660-1678* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2002)

Mottram, Stewart, 'The religious geography of Marvell's "An Horation Ode": popery, presbytery, and parti-coloured pict's', in *The Seventeenth Century*, 33 (2018), 441-461

Mowry, Melissa M., *The Bawdy Politic in Stuart England, 1660-1714: Political Pornography and Prostitution* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2004)

Muddiman, J. G., *The King's Journalist, 1659-1689; Studies in the Reign of Charles II* (London: John Lane, 1923)

Munns, Jessica, 'Change, Skepticism and Uncertainty', in *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*, ed. by Deborah Payne Fisk (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp.142-57

Munns, Jessica, *Restoration Politics and Drama: the Plays of Thomas Otway, 1675-1683* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1995)

ed. by Mulsow, Martin and Rohls, Jan, *Socianism and Arminism: Antitrinitarians, Calvinists, and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth Century Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2005)

Netzley, Ryan, 'Literalizing Value: Poetry, Evaluation, and the Market in Marvell's "The Last Instructions"', in *Marvell Studies*, 3 (2018), 1-28
<<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.17/>> [accessed April 2nd, 2020]

Nevitt, Marcus, 'Women in the Business of Revolutionary News: Elizabeth Alkin, "Parliament Joan," and the Commonwealth Newsbook', in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Joad Raymond (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1999), pp.84-108

Norbrook, David, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Nuttall, Geoffrey F., *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992)

Orr, Leah, 'Prices of English Books at Auction c.1680', in *The Library*, 20 (2019) 501-526 (pp.501-502)

Owen, Susan J., *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)

Owen, Susan J., 'The Lost Rhetoric of Liberty: Marvell and Restoration Drama', in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999), pp.334-353

Packham, Kendra, 'Marvell, Political Print, and Picturing the Catholic: *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*', in *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Martin Dzelzainis and Edward Holberton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198736400.013.33> [accessed May 6th, 2020] pp.1-24

Parkin, Jon, 'Liberty Transpros'd: Andrew Marvell and Samuel Parker', in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999), pp.269-289

Parkin, Jon, 'Parker, Samuel' in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <<https://www-oxforddnb-com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-21336?rskey=lGNieH&result=1>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019]

Parkin, Jon, 'Patrick, Simon [Symon]', in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/article/21568?docPos=2>> [accessed 2nd September, 2019]

Parker, William Riley, *Milton: A Biography*, ed. by Gordon Campbell, Second Edition, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), I

Patterson, Annabel, *Andrew Marvell* (Plymouth: Northcote House Publishers Ltd., 1994)

Patterson, Annabel, *Censorship and Interpretation: the Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984)

Patterson, Annabel, 'Introduction', in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, Nicholas von Maltzahn, 2 vols. (London: Yale University Press, 2003), II, pp.3-29

Patterson, Annabel, 'Marvell and Secret History' in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. by Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1999), pp.23-49

Patterson, Annabel, *Marvell and the Civic Crown* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978)

Patterson, Annabel, *Marvell: The Writer in Public Life* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2000)

Patterson, Annabel, *The Long Parliament of Charles II* (London: Yale University Press, 2008)

Peacey, Jason, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016)

Peacey, Jason, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

'Petition, 1640-1659', in *The English Short Title Catalogue*
<http://estc.bl.uk/F/5PM3JI72R8DY2LUVK4NR157PHRFE4NC2QYAV3KDH6TAE5H99RE-35215?func=short-0&set_number=014976> [accessed 2nd September, 2019]

'Petition, 1660-1674', in *The English Short Title Catalogue*
<http://estc.bl.uk/F/5PM3JI72R8DY2LUVK4NR157PHRFE4NC2QYAV3KDH6TAE5H99RE-35498?func=short-0&set_number=015145> [accessed 2nd September, 2019]

Pincus, Steven, 'The state and civil society in early modern England: capitalism, causation and Habermas's bourgeois public sphere', in *The politics of the public sphere in early modern England*, ed. by Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2007), pp.213-231

Pittion, Jean-Paul, 'If things of sight such heavens be/ What heavens are those we cannot see': Marvell and Protestant Saumur in the 1650s', in *Marvell Studies*, 2 (2018), 1-16
<<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.18/>> [accessed April 3rd, 2020]

Plaza, Maria, *The Function of Humour in Roman Verse and Satire: Laughing and Lying* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Plumb, J., 'The Growth of the Electorate in England from 1600 to 1715' in *Past & Present*, 45 (1969), 90-116

Poole, Kristen, *Radical Religion from Shakespeare to Milton: Figures of Nonconformity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Raven, James, *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade 1450-1850* (London: Yale University Press, 2007)

Raymond, Joad, 'Irrational, impractical and unprofitable: reading the news in seventeenth-century Britain', in *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, eds. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp.185-212

Raymond, Joad, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Raymond, Joad, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English newsbooks, 1641-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)

Raymond, Joad, 'The Newspaper, Public Opinion and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century', in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Joad Raymond (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1999), pp.109-140

Richards, Jennifer, *Rhetoric: A New Critical Idiom* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008)

Ritger, Matthew, 'Marvell's double negatives: Oliver Cromwell and "An Horation Ode"', in *ELH*, 85 (2018), 631-667

Sauer, Elizabeth, *Milton, Toleration, and Nationhood* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014)

Saville, George, *The Works of George Saville, Marquis of Halifax*, ed. by Mark N. Brown (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989)

Scott, Jonathan, *Commonwealth Principles: Republican Writing of the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Scott, Jonathan, 'England's Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot', in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, eds. Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), pp.107-132

Scott, Jonathan, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Scott, Jonathan, 'Radicalism and Restoration: The Shape of the Stuart Experience', in *Historical Journal*, 31 (1988), 453-467

Seaward, Paul, 'Hyde, Edward, first earl of Clarendon', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography Online* <<https://www-oxforddnb-com.chain.kent.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-14328?rskey=33i1GX&result=4>> [accessed 17th July, 2019]

Seaward, Paul, 'The view from the devil's mountain: Clarendon, Cressy, and Hobbes, and the past, present and future of the Church of England', in *From Republic to Restoration: Legacies and Departures*, ed. by Janet Clare (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018), pp.206-225

Sharpe, Kevin, *Criticism and Compliment: the Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)

Sharpe, Kevin, *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies* (London: Pinter Publishers Limited, 1989)

Sharpe, Kevin, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (London: Yale University Press, 1996)

Sharpe, Kevin, *Reading Authority and Representing Rule in Early Modern England* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013)

Sharpe, Kevin, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (London: Yale University Press, 2000)

Sharpe, Kevin, *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (London: Yale University Press, 2013)

Sherman, William H., *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in Renaissance England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995)

Sherman, William H. 'What Did Renaissance Readers Write in Their Books?', in *Books and Readers in Early Modern England: Material Studies*, ed. by Jennifer Andersen and Elizabeth Sauer (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), pp.119-137

Sherman, William H., *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008)

Skinner, Quentin, *Liberty before Liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Skinner, Quentin, 'Political Rhetoric and the Role of Ridicule', in *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Politics of Democratization in Europe: Concepts and Histories*, ed by Kari Palonen, Tuija Pulkkinen and José María Rosales (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2008), pp.137-149

Skinner, Quentin, *Visions of Politics: Volume I, Regarding Method*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), I

- Skinner, Quentin, *Visions of Politics: Volume III, Hobbes and Civil Science*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), III
- Slights, William W. E, *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2001)
- Smith, D., 'The Political Beliefs of Andrew Marvell', *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 36 (1966), 55-67
- Smith, Nigel, *Andrew Marvell: The Chameleon*, Paperback Edition (London: Yale University Press, 2012)
- Smith, Nigel, 'Introduction', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.xii-xvii
- Smith, Nigel, 'Introduction to *On Mr Milton's Paradise Lost*', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.181-182
- Smith, Nigel, 'Introduction to The Last Instructions to a Painter', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), pp.362-368
- Smith, Nigel, 'Introduction to The Statue in Stocks-Market', in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, Revised Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), p.415
- Smith, Nigel, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660* (London: Yale University Press, 1994)
- Smith, Nigel, 'The Anti-Episcopal Tracts: Republican Puritanism and the Truth in Poetry', in *The Oxford Handbook of Milton*, ed. by Nicholas McDowell and Nigel Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), in *Oxford Handbooks Online* <10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199697885.013.0008> [accessed April 15th, 2020] pp.1-20
- Smith, Nigel, 'The Boomerang Theology of Andrew Marvell', in *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme*, 25 (2003), 139-155
- Smith, Nigel, 'Transvernacular Poetry and Government: Andrew Marvell in Early Modern Europe', in *Marvell Studies* 2 (2017), 1-26
<<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.14/>> [accessed April 2nd, 2020]
- Smyth, Adam, *"Profit and Delight": Printed Miscellanies in England, 1640-1682* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2004)
- Southcombe, George and Tapsell, Grant, *Restoration politics, religion, and culture: Britain and Ireland 1660-1714* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010)

Sowerby, Scott, 'Opposition to Anti-Popery in Restoration England', in *Journal of British Studies*, 51 (2012), 26-49

Spurr, John, *England in the 1670s: 'The Masquerading Age'* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2000)

Spurr, John, 'From Puritanism to Dissent, 1660-1700', in *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* ed. by Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (Basingstoke: Macmillan Publishers Ltd, 1996), pp.234-265

Staves, Susan, *Player's Sceptres: Fictions of Authority in the Restoration* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979)

Stocker, Margarita, 'Political Allusion in *The Rehearsal*', in *Philological Quarterly*, 67 (1988), 11-35

Sugg, Richard, *Mummies, Cannibals and Vampires: The History of Corpse Medicine from the Renaissance to the Victorians*, Second Edition (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016)

Sullivan, Ceri, *The Rhetoric of the Conscience in Donne, Herbert and Vaughan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Suzuki, Mihoko, *Subordinate Subjects* (Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2003)

Swift, Jonathan, *A Tale of a Tub*, in Jonathan Swift, *A Tale of a Tub and Other Works*, ed. by Angus Ross and David Woolley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) pp.1-103

ed. by Tapsell, Grant, *The later Stuart Church, 1660-1714* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012)

Tapsell, Grant, *The Personal Rule of Charles II, 1681-85* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2007)

Tumbleson, Raymond D., *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660-1745* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Turner, James Grantham, *Libertines and Radicals in Early Modern London: Sexuality, Politics and Literary Culture, 1630-1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Uglow, Jenny, *A Gambling Man: Charles II and the Restoration 1660-1670* (London: Faber & Faber, 2009)

Walsham, Alexandra, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance and Intolerance in England 1500-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006)

Walsham, Alexandra, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain* (London: Routledge, 2016)

Watts, Michael R., *The Dissenters: From the Reformation to the French Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)

- Weber, Harold, *Paper Bullets: print and kingship under Charles II* (Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1996)
- Webster, Jeremy W., *Performing Libertinism in Charles II's Court: Politics, Drama, Sexuality* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005)
- Weiser, Brian, *Charles II and the Politics of Access* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003)
- Wilcher, Robert, *The Writing of Royalism, 1628-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)
- Withington, Phil, 'Andrew Marvell's Citizenship', in *The Cambridge to Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Derek Hirst and Steven Zwicker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp.102-122
- Withington, Phil, 'Public Discourse, Corporate Citizenship, and State Formation in Early Modern England', in *The American Historical Review*, 112 (2007), 1016-1038
- Withington, Phil, "'Tumbled into the Dirt": Wit and Incivility in Early Modern England', in *Journal of Early Modern History*, 15 (2011), 2-30
- Withington, Phil, 'Company and Sociability in Early Modern England', in *English Historical Review*, 52 (2008), 587-610
- Withington, Phil, *Society in Early Modern England: The Vernacular Origins of Some Powerful Ideas* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010)
- Withington, Phil, *The Politics of Commonwealth: Citizens and Freemen in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- Woolf, D. R., *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Worden, Blair, *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell and Marchamont Nedham* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)
- Worden, Blair, 'The Politics of Marvell's Horatian Ode', *The Historical Journal*, 27 (1984), 525-547
- Zaret, David, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, petitions, and the public sphere in Early-Modern England* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2000)
- Zaret, David, 'Petitions and the Invention of Public Opinion in the English Revolution', in *American Journal of Sociology*, 101 (1996), 1497-1555

Zaret, David, 'Petitioning Places and the Credibility of Opinion in the Public Sphere in Seventeenth-Century England', in *Political Space in Pre-Industrial Europe*, ed. by Beat Kumin (London: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2013), pp.175-195

Zook, Melinda S., *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics in Late Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999)

Zwicker, Steven N., *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649-1689* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993)

Zwicker, Steven N., 'What's the Problem with the Dutch? Andrew Marvell, the Trade Wars, Toleration, and the Dutch Republic', in *Marvell Studies*, 3 (2018), 1-12
<<https://marvell.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/ms.20/>> [accessed April 3rd, 2020]