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Marvell and the Cause of Wit

NICHOLAS MCDOWELL
To Sally and Rowan
The more important affinity with Marvell and his contemporaries is the gifted group of recent Ulster poets...they write out of an imagination of civil war...when Marvell and his contemporaries, like the Ulster poets of the last ten years, were so wittily serious and resourceful with the self-infolded simile, they were at once recognizing and resisting the perverse infoldings and divisions, surmounting them with resilient paradox.

(Christopher Ricks, 1978)
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Introduction: Marvell and Friends

*A wise man only is a friend*: Friendship is only amongst the wise, for in them only is an unanimity as to things that concern life and community, so as our friends may make use of them as freely, as we our selves. Unanimity is the science of common good... But, in the wicked, there is infidelity, and inconstancy, and hostility, and therefore not friendship, but some external connexions, whereby necessity or opinion ties them together.¹

One might declare that Marvell, unlike Milton, and like so many poets of the earlier seventeenth century, was a brilliant amateur, one of the many for whom the writing of poetry was almost as much a social as a purely literary activity, and that the kind of poetry which had been, and to some extent still was being, written and circulated around him largely determined the kind of poetry which he himself wrote.²

Andrew Marvell (1621–78) was back in England from some four years of travel in continental Europe by November 1647 at the latest. The consensus is that ‘by 1648 or 1649 he was moving in London literary circles’ and keeping royalist company.³ In 1958 Christopher Hill wrote that ‘[m]ost of Marvell’s friends at this time seem to have been aristocratic young cavaliers of the type he was likely to meet in continental salons; and when he returned to England his sympathies were apparently royalist’. In 2005 Nicholas Von Maltzahn described Marvell as ‘immersed in the counter-revolutionary ferment of London and a resurgent Cavalier literary culture’.⁴ The intervening half-century has not added much detail to such generalizations about Marvell’s literary life between his return to England and the regicide.⁵ Nigel Smith’s recent edition of the poems confirms the conventional dating of a number of the lyrics to 1647–9. Yet there has been little concerted effort to reconstruct the possible social contexts for the composition of Marvell’s lyric verse in the late 1640s. Indeed there is something

of a contradiction between the widely accepted claim that when he was writing many of his lyrics Marvell was associating with a circle of cultivated poets and wits, who would certainly have exchanged and shared their poetic efforts, and the enduring belief that Marvell preferred ‘to keep his poetry to himself’.6 The considerable work that has been done in the last twenty years to contextualize the ‘public’ poetry of Marvell has tended to focus on the post-regicide verse, on the ‘Horatian Ode’, ‘Tom May’s Death’, and the poems of the later 1650s, rather than the published occasional verse of 1648–9; moreover this work has been grounded for the most part in the separation of the public verse from the lyrics. This is understandable and in some ways sensible, as attempts to read the lyrics as political allegories tend to result in strained interpretations that deform the aesthetic unity of the verse. The wager of this book, however, is that the imaginative reconstruction of the social context in which Marvell wrote many of the lyrics can also open up new perspectives on the early public poetry and the early political identity.

The associations between three men during the English Civil Wars are at the heart of this book: Marvell, Richard Lovelace (1618–57), and John Hall of Durham (1627–56). The assumption that Marvell was involved with royalist literary coteries on his return to England rests on the three poems published in 1648–9: the elegy for Francis Villiers, Marvell’s authorship of which is still sometimes disputed; the commendatory poem for Richard Lovelace’s Lucasta, published in May 1649, and the contribution to Lachrymæs Musarum, a collection of elegies for Henry, Lord Hastings, published soon after Hastings’s death from smallpox in June 1649. We know that Marvell and Lovelace were friends in the late 1640s and that Marvell was familiar with Lovelace’s poetry; we know that Lovelace and Hall were also friends in the late 1640s. Marvell and Hall appear beside each other both in the commendatory poems for Lovelace’s Lucasta and in the second edition, and some copies of the first edition, of Lachrymæs Musarum. Although no transparent textual record of friendship between Marvell and Hall survives, recent scholarship has linked the careers of the two men and it will become clear in the chapters that follow that Marvell knew Hall’s lyric verse and likely read his controversial prose.7 The relationships with Lovelace and Hall connect Marvell to an impressive literary circle that formed in London in 1646–7 under the patronage of the wealthy young gentleman and aspiring poet Thomas Stanley (1625–78). This circle included several of the figures who have become known to posterity as the ‘Cavalier poets’—Lovelace, James Shirley, Edward Sherburne, and Alexander Brome. Robert Herrick also seems to have had some association with the circle. They were brought together by bonds of family and friendship and by a shared devotion to scholarly and poetic

---

7 See David Norbrook, Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric, and Politics, 1627–1660 (Cambridge, 1999), 169–82.
pursuits, in particular the translation and imitation of classical, neo-Latin, and continental verse. Stanley regarded the literary activity that he fostered in his rooms in the Middle Temple as a means of preserving classical virtues in a world without a court, which had been the centre of cultural patronage in England for several generations. Despite its strong Cavalier membership Stanley’s circle was not, however, homogeneous in its royalist allegiance. Hall, who had been under Stanley’s patronage since they had met in Hall’s home town of Durham in 1642, wrote Parliamentarian polemic during the second civil war of 1648 and by May 1649 had become one of the Commonwealth’s chief salaried propagandists alongside John Milton (1608–74), for whom Hall had a long-standing admiration. In his classic work *The Cavalier Mode* Earl Miner admitted that ‘Marvell baffles most of us. Whether he followed some consistent line through most inconsistent times, or whether he too was buffeted off the straight line by the storms of the day—these matters invite very different interpretation… Perhaps once we have explained the middle decades of the century more wholly, we shall understand the Marvells… better.’

This book sets out to understand the early Marvell better by linking and comparing his poetic and political journey in 1642–50 not only to that of Milton, with whom he became friends in the 1650s, but also to that of Hall, Lovelace, and several other poets associated with Stanley’s circle.

In my opening chapter I argue that recovery of the culture of poetic experimentation and competitiveness in the Stanley circle can help us define a new social context for Marvell’s exceptional lyric productivity in the late 1640s, and offer his most famous lyric, ‘To His Coy Mistress’, as a test case. Thirty years ago Hilton Kelliher wondered why more attention had not been paid to Stanley and Marvell as possible acquaintances. The point has not been subsequently developed beyond Nigel Smith’s intriguing but unsubstantiated suggestion that Marvell was part of a poetic ‘club’ in the Commonwealth years, ‘producing verse alongside acquaintances and collaborators’ including Stanley, Hall, Marchamont Nedham, and ‘possibly even Lovelace’. While we know Marvell was friends with Lovelace in 1648–9 because of Marvell’s published verse epistle ‘To His Noble Friend Mr Richard Lovelace’, much of my argument for Marvell’s association with the Stanley circle relies on poetic resemblance and echo. It might be objected that argument from poetic resemblance is always fraught with the dangers of over-reading and that my mode is too frequently conditional (‘might’, ‘may’, ‘perhaps’). Blair Worden has recently argued for the relations in the 1650s of both Milton and Marvell with Marchamont Nedham, the propagandist for Commonwealth and Protectorate who also features in the latter stages of this book and who was apparently a close associate of Hall in the composition of polemical print from as early as 1648, when they were writing for opposite

---
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Worden accepts that much of his evidence lies ‘where the animating force of political writing in and after the Renaissance is so largely to be detected: between the lines, or below the surface’; consequently ‘the examiner of allusions and parallels must sometimes crave the reader’s patience, while the evidence is mapped. The necessary instrument of analysis is quotation, which, being the separation of words from their contexts, can be a diminishing device.’

I would similarly crave the reader’s patience: it will become clear that I do not rely on any specific piece of circumstantial evidence or particular poetic resemblance but on the wider context that develops from an accumulation of personal association and poetic relationship. The links made with Lovelace, Hall, and other friends and clients of Stanley in the chapters on Marvell’s occasional verse of 1648–50 will add, I hope, some retrospective plausibility to the arguments of the first chapter for the relationship of Marvell’s lyric verse with the practices of the Stanley’s circle.

The lack of evidence of manuscript circulation of Marvell’s verse is often cited as proof that he was his own audience. According to this scenario, Marvell sat in a room in London reading the latest books of poetry on the market, such as Herrick’s *Hesperides* (1648), experimenting with lyrics in various genres for his own amusement and then locking his efforts in a drawer until after his death, when his housekeeper and perhaps wife Mary Palmer discovered them and had them published in 1681. This notion has proved tenacious partly because Marvell rose to prominence in the 1920s and 1930s ‘as the creator of an acutely private art’, valued by intellectuals who ‘felt a severance from the civilization that both created and threatened them’; but it goes against everything we have learnt in recent years about the social context and function of earlier seventeenth-century verse.

It also leaves us wondering why this solitary figure who kept his verse jealously to himself was invited to contribute to Lovelace’s *Lucasta* and to join an array of well-known London literary figures in *Lachrymae Musarum*. The literary circle was ‘one of the essential material conditions for the production of literature in an era in which patronage relations were crucial and in which manuscripts were frequently circulated among coteries of sympathetic readers’. Derek Hirst and Steven Zwicker tell us that ‘the acquisition of a patron was crucial to Marvell’s literary production’.

---

Annabel Patterson and Martin Dzelzainis has shed light on the assistance given to Marvell by the Earls of Anglesey and Shaftesbury when composing *The Rehearsal Transposed* (1672–3). But what of the period prior to Marvell’s employment as tutor to Mary Fairfax from late 1650? If the acquisition of a patron was indeed crucial to Marvell’s literary production, then it remains unclear who supported Marvell during one of the most productive periods in his poetic career.

The outbreak of civil war disrupted traditional structures of literary and cultural patronage, and one of the dominant themes of this book is the efforts of writers and intellectuals of various political allegiances, including Milton, to re-establish lines of cultural activity and patronage in the aftermath of war and the dissolution of the court. The formation of Stanley’s circle between 1646 and the regicide was a self-conscious and significant attempt, which has gone virtually unremarked by scholars, to revive the link between literary culture, sociability, and liberty of thought that was fostered by Ben Jonson and the ‘tribe’ which he gathered around his considerable person in the taverns of early Stuart London. Several poets and dramatists who associated with the Stanley circle—Herrick, Sherburne, Shirley, Richard Brome—had been part of these Jonsonian circles. At the same time Stanley evidently sought to preserve an element of aristocratic cultural patronage by gathering around his personal wealth these poets, most of whom had lost their living in the court or source of income from the public theatre; although, as we shall see, Stanley himself preferred to think of his group in terms of a circle of like-minded friends and equals rather than as a pyramid with himself at the top. There are no known records of Marvell having any patronage relationship with Stanley in the late 1640s. Yet it needs to be emphasized that a poetic plea for patronage in this period did not have to be direct . . . a piece which simply agreed with views the patron was known to hold would produce the same effect, and, when presented in a reasonably dignified way, was an accepted part of the vocation of letters. Neither did the response have to be in cash: houseroom, wine, clothing, or assistance in some suit for preferment would be just as welcome.

Indeed ‘patronage’ might be defined simply as the grant of access to an exclusive social circle. I will suggest that the assistance Marvell received from Stanley and his circle may not have been material so much as social and literary—Marvell’s involvement with the group allowed him to meet and read the work of other poets, some established and some, like himself, at the beginning of their careers.

The argument for Marvell’s association with Stanley and his literary friends, despite the lack of evidence from manuscript circulation of his poetry, is not incompatible with Peter Beal’s conclusion that Marvell showed his verse only

---
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to his ‘immediate circle’ of acquaintances. Beal similarly finds that Lovelace has ‘left few manuscript remains’ and that his verse did not find ‘much circulation in contemporary manuscripts’, while I have found no evidence of the scribal circulation of Hall’s verse: his friend John Davies tells us in 1657 that Hall wrote many poems that were never published though ‘there are not ten copies to be retrieved’. Yet Stanley names both Lovelace and Hall as core members of his 1640s London literary circle in his unpublished, post-Restoration work ‘A Register of Friends’. As Beal’s Index of English Literary Manuscripts illustrates, the 1620s and 1630s were the peak decades of the culture of manuscript circulation. The outbreak of war unsurprisingly seems to have had a profound impact on a culture that depended on social networks and enclosed, exclusive social spaces such as the court, the universities, the Inns of Court. By the end of the first civil war in 1646 attitudes towards the relationship of lyric poetry to the print medium had changed. Instead of being ‘a potential embarrassment to royalist writers’ because of its association with the professional who wrote for a living, the printed book became ‘a safe haven for their work and a sign of political resistance to the authority of those who had defeated the king’s forces’. Stanley, Lovelace, Hall, Shirley, Sherburne, and Herrick all published volumes of their lyric poetry between 1646 and 1651. The proper question to ask about Marvell, then, is not why we have so little evidence of manuscript circulation but why he chose not to publish his lyric verse in the late 1640s. There may have been personal reasons for this decision. He may have been particularly anxious about hostile criticism in an age of printed ridicule and abuse: an age in which, as he writes in the verse epistle to Lovelace (ll. 13–14), ‘He highest builds who with most art destroys, | And against others’ fame his own employs.’ As Lois Potter observes, ‘like the opening of the “Horatian Ode”, the poem [to Lovelace] suggests a parallel between the danger of the soldier going to the war and that of the writer about to “appear” in print’. Or there may be reasons we can classify as ‘political’ in either a broad or a more narrowly partisan sense, such as the reluctance to have his lyric verse identified as ‘a sign of political resistance to the authority of those who had defeated the king’s forces’.

Leishman’s notion that the poetry ‘written and circulated around Marvell largely determined the kind of poetry which he himself wrote’ is brought to life when we situate Marvell in the context of the Stanley circle. Marvell is recognized as a poet who, in both the lyrics and occasional poetry, ‘worked at all times by reflection and response’; as someone who wrote ‘a poetry of criticism’ in which he scrutinized traditions and conventions, both cultural and political, by echoing

---

the work of other poets. The chapters that follow relate this process of reflection and response, both in several of the lyrics and devotional poems and in all of the occasional verse of 1648–50, to a detailed social context. As a result we will have a much clearer idea about the nature of the ‘London literary circles’ and ‘resurgent Cavalier literary culture’ in which scholars have assured us Marvell was ‘immersed’ after his return from the continent. It seems surprising that such vague generalizations have hitherto been applied to the social circumstances of Marvell’s alleged ‘royalism’ of the late 1640s when so much ink has been spilt and so many fine hairs have been split over the issue of Marvell’s political, and indeed psychological, consistency in the early political poems. John M. Wallace, in what ‘remains the most unchallenged of the historical studies’ of the ‘Horatian Ode’, declares baldly: ‘it is impossible to believe that Marvell could have changed his allegiance from the royal to the Puritan cause for reasons that were unrelated to the Engagement arguments’ for the de facto legitimacy of the ruling power, advanced in 1649–50 by supporters of the Commonwealth. But this statement begs several questions. It presumes that Marvell’s allegiance before he wrote the ‘Ode’ was to the cause of the king, although Wallace barely refers to the three poems of 1648–9 that are taken to be evidence of this allegiance and gives us little sense of how Marvell’s verse reflects his royalism, or of how Marvell’s experiences in London in the late 1640s might have shaped or altered that royalism. It also presumes that the ‘Ode’ is written on behalf of the ‘Puritan’ cause when after 1646 there was no such thing as the Puritan cause but a widening fissure between Independents, who had control of the New Model Army and were in favour of a wide degree of liberty of conscience, and Presbyterians, who had the majority in both the Westminster Assembly and Parliament and whose most vocal spokesmen sought a compulsory Presbyterian church discipline and state persecution of those whose beliefs they deemed heterodox. Another complicating factor is anti-Presbyterian republicanism, which we are beginning to recognize as ‘an underestimated force of the Puritan Revolution’. There have been several fine literary historical studies devoted to either royalism or republicanism in the last ten to fifteen years, as well as wider surveys of the effect of civil war and regicide on the literary culture of all parties. Poetry and
Allegiance in the English Civil Wars is concerned with the things that could unite, rather than divide, writers of various political allegiances: friendship, literary admiration, patronage relations, anticlericalism. By recovering the cultural values that were shared by Marvell and the like-minded men with whom he moved in the literary circles post-war of London, we may be more likely to find the reasons for their decisions about political allegiance. This book is concerned with the political and cultural development of men such as Lovelace, Hall, and Alexander Brome (who is more than the coarse and unthinking Cavalier he has been taken for) as well as Marvell because by placing their changing attitudes in parallel we can get a sense of the values they retained and shared during the rapid and unprecedented historical change of the civil war period. By focusing on a circle of friends and associates we can also get a sense of how they communicated with and influenced one another through their verse. Barbara Everett argues that Marvell should be cleared of the charge of ‘political opportunism’ in his early poetry because ‘the political situation of the 1640s and 1650s was so complicated as to make such terms as “opportunism” unsuitable. It is not simple to change sides when there are no simple sides.’ But we could just as easily reverse the first half of this statement and conclude that it is easier to change sides when there are no simple sides, especially if friends and fellow poets whose character and verse one has long respected have already made that change.

My subtitle ‘Marvell and the Cause of Wit’ alludes to a key cultural value that Lovelace, Hall, Marvell, Stanley, and Milton all sought to advance, although they may have disagreed about some of the forms in which it was properly manifest and about the political and social circumstances which would best further it. ‘Wit’ was a term which in the early seventeenth century could denote both ‘high, inventive talent’ and ‘displays of verbal ingenuity’. ‘Wit’ became politicized during the civil wars as royalists sought to claim a monopoly of literary and linguistic talent over a Parliamentary opposition and government that they represented as stereotypically Puritan and thus as grim, philistine, and deeply hostile to the arts. By 1650 Thomas Hobbes and William Davenant, in their exchange of letters on the topic of poetics, defined the concept of ‘wit’ against any notion of inspiration as the source of poetic creativity, as inspiration had become

---

23 In his study of the discourse of Stoicism in Marvell, Milton, and Katherine Phillips, Andrew Shifflett hopes ‘to show that these poets and friends within the republic of letters have more in common than the usual philosophical, political, and aesthetic categories have allowed’ (Literature, Politics, and Stoicism in the Age of Milton: War and Peace Reconciled (Cambridge, 1998), 3).

24 Everett, ‘Shooting of the Bears’, 42.

tainted for royalists by association with Puritan and sectarian religion. Their exchange paved the way for wit to become the informing aesthetic concept of ‘Augustan’ satiric verse and Restoration comedy. The royalist appropriation of wit during the 1640s and the efforts of John Hall to undo it are part of my story, but so also is the effect on cultural politics of the splitting of the Independents and the Presbyterians in the mid-1640s. I spend some time on these effects in Chapter 2 because while scholars have emphasized the traumatic effect on Milton of having his divorce tracts condemned by the ‘high’ Presbyterian clergy as heretical and libertine, Milton’s subsequent efforts in 1645–6 to seek a rapprochement with a royalism on the verge of defeat have been given less notice. My extended analysis of Milton’s sonnet to Henry Lawes, the ‘Cavalier songwriter’ with whom Milton had worked in the 1630s for the masque at Ludlow Castle, is set alongside the virulent anti-Presbyterianism of the satirical sonnets written around the same time. The perceived threat to learning and liberty of thought from a repressive Presbyterian church government and from the Scottish influence over English affairs that was associated with Presbyterianism is a theme which unites Milton’s prose and verse of the 1640s with the royalist polemic of the likes of John Cleveland and Alexander Brome. Anti-Presbyterian and anti-Scottish rhetoric invoked a common enemy against which men of letters could rally, whatever their political allegiance. The prospect of an Independent–royalist alliance against the Presbyterians that is implicit in Milton’s sonnets informs the 1647–8 political prose of John Hall, who expressed his enthusiasm for Milton’s prose as early as 1646 and whose writing shows him to have been perhaps the most attentive reader of the prose in the whole period. Hall was at once a key member of Stanley’s nostalgic Cavalier society and a vigorous proponent of the reform of educational and cultural structures envisaged by Samuel Hartlib and his network of associates. What makes Hall a particularly interesting character is the apparent respect and friendship which he retained with Stanley and his circle even after he began to appear in print on behalf of Parliament in 1648 and after he was employed as a propagandist by the successive Commonwealth and Protectorate regimes.

While Hall envisaged the dissolution of the court and the collapse of the church as an opportunity for Baconian reform of the structures of intellectual communication and cultural patronage, the post-1646 verse of his friend Lovelace, who like Marvell and Stanley returned from the continent with the end of the first civil war, shows him contemplating and trying to come to terms with the defeat of the king. In my discussion in Chapter 3 of several of his best-known poems, pre-eminently ‘To My Worthy Friend Mr Peter Lilly’ and ‘The Grasshopper. To My Noble Friend, Mr Charles Cotton’, Lovelace emerges less as the committed royalist projected in recent scholarship than as a poet

---

dwellings on the loss of the cultural centre of the court and its patronage. As the titles of his poems suggest, Lovelace looks less to any potential restoration of the court than to the celebration of friendship, poetry, and conviviality in withdrawn circles such as the one that gathered around Stanley in post-war London—to the private preservation in a hostile public world of Jonsonian notions of ‘worth’ and ‘nobility’. In Chapter 4 I turn to Marvell’s occasional verse. Marvell’s elegy for Francis Villiers is read as a meditation on the destruction of a noble Caroline court culture, as personified by Villiers’s messy death, by charting its several allusions to poems by Thomas Carew. The verse epistle to Lovelace, which I date to late 1648, shows Marvell’s attentive reading of Lovelace’s verse in its emphasis on the decline during the civil wars of Horatian and Jonsonian values of civility and on the further threat posed to the survival of these values by Presbyterian repression. But I also find in both of these occasional poems discordant elements of satire on the anachronistic persona of the Cavalier which are illuminated by linking them with John Hall’s political writing of 1648. The poem to Lovelace shows Marvell thinking hard about the relationship between poetry and allegiance: the opening of the verse epistle echoes language used in attacks in the royalist newsbooks on Hall as a traitor not only to his king but to his literary friends and indeed to poetry itself.

Chapter 5 initially considers the third of Marvell’s published occasional poems of 1648–9, the elegy for Hastings, in relation to the contributions to *Lachrymae Musarum* by several of the writers that I have linked to Marvell in the earlier chapters—including Hall, who was by now in the employment of the Commonwealth government but nonetheless appears with Marvell, as well as Herrick and Alexander Brome, in a volume in which many of the poems are indirect (but not covert) elegies for the king. The ‘Horatian Ode’ may contain the most powerful poetic representation of the execution of Charles I but Marvell did not follow members of the Stanley circle in writing an elegy for the king in the aftermath of the regicide. Yet the enigmatic imagery of ‘The Unfortunate Lover’, which scholars have long suspected has some connection with royalist languages of regicidal lament, is very close at times to the verse rendering of the *Eikon Basilike* (1649) that Stanley was working on in the months following the execution. The lyric may have been written to maintain Marvell’s links with Stanley, who had left London and returned to his family estate in Hertfordshire. Written a year after the elegy for Hastings, the ‘Horatian Ode’ raises in its very title the relationship between literary patronage and political allegiance, for Horace had supported the losing (republican) side in the Roman civil wars before addressing the victor Augustus as his new patron. The ‘Ode’ finally lays to rest Stuart court culture, the demise of which Marvell had contemplated in both the Villiers elegy and the verse epistle to Lovelace. Cromwell’s martial valour is celebrated as the means of subordinating clerical and foreign threats to English civil government, whether from the Irish Catholics or the Scottish Presbyterians, as the poet emerges as a figure who in some respects anticipates the Restoration Marvell, famed for his
consistent stand against clerical power. There are several echoes in the ‘Ode’ of Hall’s vision in his post-regicide writings of an English Commonwealth freed from clerical tyranny and courtly monopoly as heralding, at least in potentia, a new golden age of learning and letters, capable of eclipsing the glories of the Stuart court. But Marvell qualifies this vision by ascribing Hall’s images of sublime achievement not to Parliament but to Cromwell, a man whom Hall had barely mentioned in his writing and who embodies the arts only of war and Machiavellian cunning from the beginning to the end of the ‘Ode’. The potential for the warrior Cromwell to preside, Augustus-like, over a new era of cultural patronage and the revival of Horatian civility remains very much in doubt at the end of the poem. These doubts were apparently resolved by late 1654, when Marvell composed and then published his unqualified panegyric of Cromwellian rule, The First Anniversary.

One approach to the apparent inconsistency or ambiguity of Marvell’s ‘public’ verse is to consider how it was read by contemporaries. The assumption that there is no evidence of contemporary reception during Marvell’s lifetime is often cited as one of the problems that so vex any attempt to ascertain why or for whom Marvell wrote two poems that supposedly take opposed political positions. In 1969 John Carey declared there to be ‘not the least evidence’ that the ‘Horatian Ode’ and ‘Tom May’s Death’ were ‘made public in manuscript’. Since then there has been some progress in measuring the reception of the 1650 poems and I hope here to add to our knowledge. The final section of Chapter 5 considers allusions to the ‘Ode’ in the early Restoration writing of John Dryden and Abraham Cowley, who seem to associate Marvell’s poem with the pursuit of Cromwellian patronage—a charge from which Dryden and Cowley were anxious to disassociate themselves in 1660. In my substantial conclusion I show how Lovelace and Alexander Brome, once members of the Stanley circle, both remember ‘Tom May’s Death’ later in the 1650s and they both apparently remember it for the rousing defence by Ben Jonson’s ghost of the ‘ancient rights’ of the poet. The familiarity with the satire displayed by Lovelace and Brome suggests Marvell wrote it for an audience of the poets with whom he had socialized since his return to England and who had dedicated themselves to the cause of wit. But Lovelace’s use of the poem in a satire against mercenary poets also raises the question of how these friends regarded Marvell’s later service to the Protectorate.

In recent years scholars have preferred not to see in Marvell’s early public verse any narrative of consistent political development. Thomas N. Corns warns against ‘reading backwards from the reassuringly liberal voice’ of the Restoration prose and imposing ‘internal coherence’ upon works that ‘defy any certain or straightforward resolution’. If the civil war poems are ‘disconcertingly unstable’ in their allegiance it is because they reflect disconcertingly unstable times. As

Corns pithily puts it: ‘Marvell does not hold together.’ Similarly David Norbrook has argued that we ‘need to be wary about constructing an unproblematic grand narrative of Marvell’s career: in a period of massive political upheaval, major discontinuities may have marked personal and poetic histories’.28 The lyrics, meanwhile, have been vacuum-packed off from the political poems and treated as if they are the work of a different poet. I do not seek here to construct ‘an unproblematic grand narrative of Marvell’s career’ but I do uncover persistent concerns and anxieties, both personal and political: the relationship between literary patronage and political allegiance; the threat of clerical power to liberty of conscience and expression, and the survival of Jonsonian wit and discrimination in times of war and religious zeal. One of the novelties of my approach here is that rather than putting the lyric verse to one side or twisting the lyrics out of aesthetic shape under the weight of political allusion and allegory, I relate Marvell’s early political identity to his emergence from a social context which could also have fostered his lyric activity. Of course no poet, especially a poet as various and as complex as Marvell, is reducible simply to their contexts. ‘Study of the social and external alone’, as Barbara Everett observes in relation to Shakespeare, will not ‘tell us anything worth knowing about the creative mind’.29 The crucial word here is ‘alone’. It is equally reductive, potentially absurdly so, to claim to have discovered a magic key that will unlock everything significant about Marvell’s poetry, as has been tried with alchemy and apocalypse.30 But no poet is an island, especially in seventeenth-century England. In what follows I try to illuminate aspects of Marvell’s early poetry and political identity by relating them to the conjectured social side of his existence, and to offer a portrait of a man recognizable as the future MP and political activist who immersed himself in ‘diversion, business, and activity’.31


29 ‘Reade him, therefore: Why Biography can Never Tell us as Much about Shakespeare as the Plays and Poems can’, *Times Literary Supplement* (17 Aug. 2007), 13.
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Social Contexts of Marvell’s Lyric Verse, 1646–1648

THOMAS STANLEY, CAVALIER POETICS, AND THE ORDER OF THE BLACK RIBAND

Sometime in 1641 Thomas Stanley made a trip north to see his grandmother’s second husband, Walter Balcanquall, Dean of Durham. Stanley, the eldest son of a substantial Hertfordshire landowner, Sir Thomas Stanley of Cumberlow Green, had matriculated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, in December 1639, at the age of 14. He had also spent some time at Oxford in 1640. His uncle William Hammond (c.1614–54), an outstanding Greek scholar and Fellow of Pembroke, accompanied Stanley to Durham. They were introduced there to one of Durham School’s finest recent pupils, John Hall. Stanley immediately recognized the intellectual abilities of the younger boy, as he recalled in his (unpublished) 1670s poem ‘A Register of Friends’: ‘Thou early blossom of the wandering North! | Where first I saw and singled out thy worth.’ Stanley nostalgically remembered his trip north and his conversations in Durham with Hammond and Hall in terms of an idyllic, harmonious prewar world of friendship and learning: ‘Happy those hours! How sweet! How innocent! | But oh! The halcion-dayes we there convers’d | Presaged a storm’ (PTTS 356, 359).

Stanley returned to Cambridge, where he stayed at least until March 1642, when he was admitted to the degree of Master of Arts. With the outbreak of civil war, he left England and travelled on the continent for four years. Hall’s matriculation at Cambridge, meanwhile, was delayed with ‘the Nationall commotions encreasing, and the Universities transformed into Garrisons’. He ended up studying on his own in the library of Durham Cathedral until the end of the first civil war in 1646. According to his friend John Davies of Kidwelly (1627–93), Hall made himself ‘Master’ of ‘many languages’ during these years, which were spent in ‘such constancy of study, and sequestration

1 See the account in PTTS, p. xxiv. See also Warren Chernaik, entry for Thomas Stanley in the ODNB.
2 ‘A Register of Friends’ was completed sometime between 1675 and Stanley’s death in 1678 (PTTS, p. lviii).
from the pleasures and enjoyments of this life, that Antiquity even amongst the severest Philosophers hardly afford a greater example of ardor and assiduity, age considered’.3 A manuscript completed in 1645 on the best method of reading history testifies to Hall’s youthful engagement with the classics, making a series of parallels between British and Roman history, although Hall has little to say about the conflicts that had confined him to Durham. The work belongs to the genre of the familiar letter of advice on studies, and the ‘friend’ to whom Hall addresses his ‘Method of History’ is probably Stanley.4

Despite Stanley’s absence from England, it seems that he acted as patron of Hall’s studies in Durham: in dedicating his 1647 Poems to ‘his truly noble, and worthily honoured friend, Thomas Stanley’, Hall declares that ‘what I was first indebted to you at Durham, I endeavour to acquit here at Cambridge’.5 Hall had finally arrived at St John’s College, Cambridge, in February 1646, although war was not to end formally until June, with the surrender of Oxford. By November he had published a lengthy collection of essays that owe their digressive style to Montaigne and their didactic purpose to Bacon. Horae Vacivae was dedicated to John Arrowsmith, Master of St John’s, and included a portrait of the 19-year-old Hall in Roman pose by William Marshall, who had recently provided the engraved frontispiece to Milton’s 1645 Poems. The preface, by Hall’s tutor John Pawson, emphasized Hall’s precocity and mastery of French, Italian, and Spanish as well as the classical languages (sig. A5v). Encouraged by the reception of his essays, Hall set about compiling a volume of poetry, which was printed by the University printer Roger Daniel for a London publisher and appeared in January 1647, with the same portrait of Hall that had been used in Horae Vacivae.6 It was still unusual for the frontispiece portrait of a living poet to appear in small-format (as opposed to folio) volumes. The only example prior to Milton’s 1645 Poems is the Poetical Blossomes (1633) of Abraham Cowley (1618–87)—an even more impressive example of youthful precocity than Hall’s collection.7 In a peculiar, exclamatory poem at the head of the commendatory verses, the Cambridge Neoplatonist Henry More greeted Hall as a satirical rather than a

---


4 The manuscript is Bodleian Library, MS Rawl. d. 152. It is not in Hall’s hand, and may be copied from a lost printed version. For discussion and transcription of the manuscript, see Joad Raymond, ‘John Hall’s A Method of History: A Book Lost and Found’, English Literary Renaissance, 28 (1998), 267–98. Raymond believes the ‘friend’ is Stanley (286 n. 1).

5 The text is reprinted in MPCP ii. 180.

6 The London publisher, J. Rothwell, was apparently dissatisfied with the brevity of the collection and demanded more poems, which Hall immediately provided in the form of a ‘Second Booke of Divine Poems’ attached to the orginal, Cambridge-printed collection of verses on secular themes; Davies, ‘An Account of the Author’, sigs. B1r–v. Although the title-page of Hall’s Poems is dated 1646, the dedication is dated 6 January 1646, i.e. 1647.

7 Leah Marcus, Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton (1996), 204.
lyrical talent: ‘Young monster! born with teeth, that thus canst bite | So deep, canst wound all sorts at ten and eight’.  

Pawson’s preface to *Horae Vacivae* is dated 3 June 1646, but the volume was not collected until 9 November by the London bookseller George Thomason. Stanley contributed a commendatory poem and seems to have returned to England in the months after Charles I’s surrender to the Scots in May 1646. He moved into rooms in the Middle Temple adjacent, apparently by coincidence, to his kinsman Edward Sherburne (c.1616–1702), a Catholic who had been clerk of His Majesty’s Ordnance before the civil war and had then served as commissioner general of the artillery in the royalist army, first at Edgehill and then in Oxford. His estates having been confiscated by Parliament, Sherburne sought refuge after the fall of Oxford in the Middle Temple chambers of his cousin William Povey. In ‘A Register of Friends’ Stanley emphasized the good fortune of meeting with his ‘til then, unknowne’ relative: ‘Kind was the storm, which for shelter drave | Like Dido and Aeneas, to one Cave.’ Stanley immediately ‘entered into a near Com[m]unication of Friendship and Studies’ with Sherburne. They were, as Stanley put it, united by the ‘double ty of Sympathy and Blood’—the tie of sympathy was the love of poetry and their studies centred on the imitation and translation of classical, neo-Latin, and continental texts (*PTTS* 363).  

Over the next five years Sherburne (who had not been to university but been privately tutored by the famous classicist Thomas Farnaby) issued two translations of Seneca: *Medea* (1648), with a commendatory poem from Stanley, and *Answer to Lucilius his quaere; why good men suffer misfortunes seeing there is a divine providence?* (1648), addressed to Charles I. Sherburne’s 1651 *Poems and Translations*, dedicated to Stanley, is almost completely comprised of imitations and translations of classical, French, and Italian poets. In 1647 Stanley published translations from the Spanish, of Montalvàn’s prose romance *Aurora* and, from the Italian, of Preti’s long poem *Oronta*. In the same year he also published privately his *Poems and Translations*; in the revised and expanded edition of 1651, this volume includes the first complete English translation of the ancient Greek poems attributed to Anacreon, the first English translation of Pico della Mirandola’s *A Platonick Discourse Upon Love*, a translation of a sequence of neo-Latin love lyrics by the Dutch poet Secundus, and renderings of Italian and French poets such as Marino, Guarini, Saint-Amant, and Théophile De Viau. Stanley’s versions of Anacreon and the Greek pastoral poets Bion and Moschus are followed by textual notes or ‘excitations’. As Stella Revard has suggested, Stanley and Sherburne seem to have undertaken together in the late

---

8 ‘To the young Author upon his incomparable Vein in Satire and Love Sonnets’, in *MPCP* 181, ll. 1–2.
9 Letter from Edward Sherburne to Anthony Wood, Bodleian Library, MS Wood F. 44, fo. 244v. See also Hugh De Quehen, entry for Edward Sherburne in the *ODNB*. 
1640s a systematic ‘programme of study and translation’. They were assisted in this programme by Hammond, whose poems were collected and published posthumously by Stanley in 1655, and William Fairfax, about whom little is known other than that he was the eldest son of Edward Fairfax, the first English translator of Tasso’s *Gerusalemme liberata*. William, who is given the first entry in ‘A Register of Friends’ and hailed as ‘pensive Fairfax, Learning’s Hermitage’, had been employed as Stanley’s tutor both in ‘Childhood’ and ‘Youth’ and then became his partner in classical scholarship:

Then what before Instruction us’d to be  
Grew by degrees into Society.  
With scrutiny the Greeks we often vext,  
And disentangled oft the Romane Text[.]

*(PTTS 335, 355)*

Hammond, Sherburne, and Fairfax were not Stanley’s only companions in literary discussion and exercise in the Middle Temple. The Virgilian analogy with which Stanley describes his meeting with Sherburne hints at Stanley’s project of turning his Middle Temple rooms into a refuge for writers impoverished by civil war and the dissolution of the court patronage system. Sherburne was acquainted with court writers of the 1630s such as Thomas Carew, Robert Herrick, Thomas May, and James Shirley. It was presumably through Sherburne that Stanley became friends with Shirley (1596–1666), who had been in receipt of the patronage of Henrietta Maria in the 1630s but had lost his career as both a playwright and a court writer with the outbreak of war and the closure of the theatres. He had served another patron, William Cavendish, Earl of Newcastle, in the royalist army until 1644, and had subsequently paid a sequestration fine. He then moved to London, but without financial support he was forced back into his old career of school teaching. Stanley seems to have immediately taken Shirley into his patronage on returning to London in the summer of 1646: Stanley stood at the head of the commendatory verses for Shirley’s 1646 *Poems* and Shirley also contributed a commendatory poem to Hall’s *Horae Vacivae*, although the comparatively curt, distant nature of the praise suggests Shirley may as yet have been unacquainted with Hall. Shirley also composed, as did Fairfax, Sherburne, and Hammond, an epithalamium for Stanley’s wedding in May 1648; these were added to some copies of Stanley’s 1647 *Poems*, for which Shirley also wrote a commendatory poem praising Stanley as the successor to Carew as England’s pre-eminent love poet. In the preface to the published text of his play *The Brothers* ...

10 “Thomas Stanley and “A Register of Friends”’, in Summers and Pebworth (eds.), *Literary Circles*, 159. Revard’s is the fullest discussion hitherto of Stanley’s literary circle.

11 For a narrative of Shirley’s various patronage relationships and efforts to secure patronage throughout his career, see Sandra A. Burner, *James Shirley: A Study of Literary Coteries and Patronage in Seventeenth-Century England* (Lanham, MD, 1988).

12 Gerald Eades Bentley, ‘James Shirley and a Group of Unnoted Poems on the Wedding of Thomas Stanley’, *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 2 (1938–9), 219–32. Lovelace also wrote an
(1652), Shirley acknowledges that he will never be able to fulfil his ‘obligation’ to Stanley’s ‘favours’, which have been characterized by their ‘greatness and number’. But he has learnt that the ‘way to relieve my self, is no more to look at what you have confer’d, but on the bestower, for I have now learn’d to separate you from your benefits. Thus in place of cancelling my former debts, I put your vertue to a new disbursement’ (sigs. A3r–v). In other words Stanley places value not upon the extent of his ‘favours’ but upon the part they play in the advancement of literary enterprises; or at least that is how Shirley hopes to persuade Stanley to regard himself.

The Inns of Court milieu in which Stanley and his friends moved is emphasized by the involvement in the circle, attested to in several commendatory poems, of Alexander Brome (1620–66), who had pursued a career in the law in London since 1640 and entered Gray’s Inn in 1648. His often explicitly anti-Puritan songs and bawdy love lyrics were not published until after the Restoration but circulated in manuscript in royalist circles during the 1640s and 1650s.13 Alexander Brome was probably introduced to the group by his friend Richard Lovelace, the courtier, soldier, and poet who was twice imprisoned during the 1640s. After brief imprisonment in 1642 for presenting the Kentish petition against Parliament, Lovelace had fought, according to Stanley in ‘A Register of Friends’, in ‘Forrein Wars’ in Holland and France; on his return in late 1646 from fighting for the French armies, Lovelace joined his cousin Stanley’s literary community in London, presumably preparing his first collection of poems Lucasta for publication under Stanley’s protection. Lovelace may have been in need of Stanley’s patronage by this stage, if we accept Wood’s report that during the 1640s Lovelace had lived beyond his means, ‘furnishing men with horse and arms’ for the royalist war effort and ‘relieving ingenious men in want, whether scholars, musicians, soldiers’.14 Lovelace’s interest in the culture of poetic imitation practised by Stanley’s circle is suggested by the translations appended to his Lucasta. Postume Poems (1659/60): the Greek Anthology, Seneca, Catullus, Ausonius, and Théophile de Viau, all favourites of Stanley and Sherburne.

Another grateful recipient of Stanley’s patronage was Richard Brome (c.1590–1652), whose career as a professional dramatist had ended abruptly on 2 September 1642 when the London theatres were closed by Parliament; his final
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13 Roman R. Dubinski, entry for Alexander Brome in the ODNB. For Brome’s links with Stanley, see e.g. ‘To his Friend Thomas Stanley Esq., On his Odes Set and Published by Mr John Gamble’, in John Gamble, Ayres and Dialogues (1657), B1; and his numerous appearances in commendatory poems beside Stanley, Shirley, Sherburne, and Lovelace (see e.g. the commendatory poems to Richard Brome, A Jovial Crew (1652) and Shirley’s Via ad Latinem Linguan Complanata (1649)). Stanley also wrote a commendatory poem for Brome’s edn. of Richard Brome’s Five New Playes (1659).

play, *A Jovial Crew*, was showing at the Cockpit Theatre on the day that the order was made. Brome dedicated the 1652 published text of *A Jovial Crew* to Stanley, identifying both himself and his play with the beggars he represents on stage, ‘limp[ing] thither to beg an alms at your hands’. Brome refers to his ‘old Engagements’ to Stanley and fears the text of his play is not a sufficient ‘Testimonial of my Gratitude or Recompense for your Favours’ (sigs. A2v–v).

According to Sherburne, Robert Herrick (1591–1674) also associated with the literary circle under Stanley’s patronage after Herrick was ejected from his living in Dean Prior in Devon and returned to London in 1647, where he lived off the charity of a number of patrons until the Restoration. The two pounds that we know Herrick received every quarter from Mildmay Fane from 1647 to the Restoration was hardly enough to sustain his life in London. It was during 1647 that Herrick finally prepared his large collection of miscellaneous lyrics, translations, and imitations, *Hesperides* (1648), for publication, with its dedication to Prince Charles and implicitly anti-Puritan invocations of rural festivity and ritual. Other prominent writers seem to have been on the fringes of the circle. Thomas Jordan (c.1614–85), former playwright and friend of Shirley and Richard Brome, published in 1650 an epithalamium for Stanley’s wedding and an ‘Answer’ to one of Stanley’s translations of Secundus. John Berkenhead (1617–79), formerly editor of the king’s Oxford newsbook *Mercurius Aulicus* and the most prolific royalist propagandist of the 1640s, had presented Stanley for a degree at Oxford in 1640 and the two seem to have maintained links, probably through their mutual friend Shirley. John Denham (1615–89), whose topographical poem *Cooper’s Hill* had been published to acclaim in 1642 and who acted as a royalist intellencer in 1646–8 before he was discovered by Parliament and fled to the exiled court in Paris, was close to Herrick and discussed the art of translation with Sherburne.

So on his return to London in 1646–7 Stanley quickly gathered around him some of the most talented writers of the day: some were established poets and playwrights in need of support; others were, like Stanley himself, younger men embarking on a literary career in difficult times. Two of the central members of the coterie, Sherburne and Lovelace, were connected to Stanley by blood; the political background of several of the members was strongly royalist. It was probably Shirley who introduced Stanley to the London publisher Humphrey

---


17 *PTTS* 360; Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead*, 24, 139–42.

Moseley (c.1603–61). Shirley worked closely with Moseley at this time: Moseley published Shirley’s 1646 Poems and Shirley wrote the preface for Moseley’s folio of the Comedies and Tragedies of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher (1647). Between 1645 and 1651 Moseley published from manuscript many collections of poetry and drama by writers associated with the dispersed Stuart court. In the prefaces to these volumes Moseley often presents himself as preserving the fragments of a shattered culture. The choice of title for his 1646 collection of the works of Sir John Suckling (1609–41?), Fragmenta Aurea, signifies, as Thomas N. Corns has observed, ‘a writer and a culture both now perceived to have been destroyed by the political turmoil occasioned by the Puritan and Parliamentary opposition to the king’. The title-page tells us that Suckling’s poems were ‘published by a Friend’, so rehearsing ‘a recurrent motif of royalist writing in the 1640s, the friendship and generosity which were perceived as keeping the old ideologies alive’. Moseley addresses Suckling’s writings to an audience of ‘only knowing Gentlemen’ who scorn the ‘Paper prostitutions’ of the pamphlet wars and possess the learning and refinement to appreciate true poetry. Stanley composed the (anonymous) epigram beneath Suckling’s portrait, indicating the links that he developed with Moseley on his return to England and his sympathy with Moseley’s sentiments and project. Significantly Stanley had his 1647 Poems and Translations privately published ‘for the Author and his Friends’.

In his preface to the Beaumont and Fletcher folio, Shirley invokes nostalgia for prewar literary culture by lamenting ‘this Tragicall Age where the Theater hath been so much out-acted’, although he then urges the reader to ‘congratulate thy own happinesse, that in this silence of the Stage, thou hast a liberty to reade these inimitable Playes, to dwell and converse in these immortall Groves which were only shewd our Fathers as in a conjuring glass, as suddenly removed as represented’ (sig. A3r). The plays were preceded by thirty-four commendatory poems by writers associated with royalism and the court, turning the publication into a mass act of writerly resistance to the supposed cultural barbarity of the recently victorious Parliamentary party. The contributors included most of the extended Stanley circle: Berkenhead, Alexander Brome, Richard Brome, Denham, Herrick, Lovelace, Shirley, and Stanley himself. The poems invoked the glory of English culture under the Stuarts and gathered together in print the sort of literary community that had previously gathered in person in the court. However neither Moseley nor Stanley were simply concerned to contrast the flourishing literary culture of the Stuart era with its decline after the dispersal of the court, the death of figures such as Suckling, and the triumph of Parliamentary
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21 The preface is repr. in Reed, ‘Humphrey Moseley, Publisher’, 76.
22 Thomas, Sir John Berkenhead, 134; Potter, Secret Rites and Secret Writing, 21.
Puritanism. With the end of the war Stanley sought to write and encourage, and Moseley to commission and publish, new work that demonstrated the potential for literary studies in England to revive and even develop, primarily through the incorporation of classical and continental models. In 1647–8 Moseley published, for example, Stanley’s translations of Montalván and Preti and Sherburne’s renderings of Seneca.

Indeed many of the poems in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio are optimistic about the future as well as nostalgic for the past and angry at the present. The king was handed over by the Scots to Parliament’s commissioners on 30 January 1647 and comfortably installed at Holdenby House in Northamptonshire; his ‘subsequent travels via the royal houses at Newmarket, Windsor, and Oatlands to Hampton Court had something of the flavour of a royal progress about it’. The king’s return promised to some royalists the restoration of court culture. Richard Brome sees the publication of the Beaumont and Fletcher plays, which appeared sometime after 14 February, as a sign of this revival:

They dyed Since the Kings absence or were layd aside As is their Poet. Now at the Report Of the Kings second coming to his Court, The Bookes Creepe from the Presse to Life not Action; Crying unto the World, that no protaction May hinder Sacred Majesty to give Fletcher, in them, leave on the Stage to live.

Appropriately Shirley concludes the series of commendatory poems by explicitly connecting the printing of the plays with the prospect of a restored court: ‘A balme unto the wounded Age I sing | And nothing now is wanting but the King’ (sig. g1v). Stanley celebrates in his verses the irony that Fletcher’s plays have been saved for posterity by the necessity of printing them in an England where performance is prohibited: ‘They that silenc’d Wit | Are now the Authors to eternize it’ (sig. b4v).

The royalist optimism of early 1647 about the imminent return of court culture and royal patronage was short-lived. Indeed after the Restoration Stanley looked back on the immediate period after he returned to England as a ‘slavish peace’ when royalists were ‘To servitude so miserable led | That who remain’d alive envy’d the dead.’ Yet he proudly regarded the circle under his patronage as having helped to preserve the English lyric tradition in anti-poetic times: his ‘friends’ provided a private, cultured audience for each other’s work at a
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24 Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, 149; see also Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism*, 249.
time when dramatic performance was banned and published poetry was under threat of censorship by a philistine Parliament. As he puts it in his eulogy on Shirley:

Then oft, withdrawne from the dull ears of those,  
   Who licens'd nothing but rebellious Prose.  
Me with those pleasures thy kind Muse supply'd  
Which to it selfe the sullen Age deny'd.  

(PTTS 357)

Stanley only explicitly politicized the activities of his coterie in retrospect (and even then he kept his views in manuscript). However the background of his friends and the sentiments they express in their own poetry and in commendatory poems, whether for each others’ work or in venues such as the Beaumont and Fletcher folio, indicate that the coterie conceived of itself from its inception in political as well as poetic terms. In dedicating his translation of Seneca’s *Answer to Lucilius his quaere* to Charles I, Sherburne declared it had been written in contemplation of ‘Your Majesties sufferings’ and to show that Sherburne still had ‘a will to serve You’ (sigs. A2’, A3’). In his commendatory poem for Sherburne’s rendering of *Medea*, Stanley suggests that Medea’s violence is an appropriate reflection of the terrible ‘crimes’ of the English civil war:

This Cruelty thou didst once more expresse,  
   Though in a strange, no lesse becoming dress,  
And her Revenge did’st rob of half its pride  
   To see it selfe thus by it selfe out-vy’d;  
Whilst boldest Ages past might say, our Times  
   Could speak, as well as act their highest Crimes.

As Revard observes, these ‘kinds of intimate asides remind us that we are dealing with poets who shared political opinions and understood the subtleties of one another’s work’.  

Not all of the poets whom Stanley assisted in 1646–7 were based in London and the Inns of Court. In a letter written around March 1647 from St John’s College, John Hall discloses that ‘the sudden sickness of a Gentleman (under whose shade I enjoy my studious leisure) called me abruptly out the University’. Stanley seems to have suffered from ill-health regularly throughout his life. Hall alludes to the opening of Virgil’s first eclogue, in which Tityrus extols a life of leisured contemplation or *umbra* in the country, retired from the confusions and conflicts of public life. Stanley evidently continued to assist Hall after the latter went up to St John’s, and the dedication of the 1647 *Poems* must recognize Stanley’s patronage both at Durham and Cambridge: four of
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26 Hall to Samuel Hartlib, 29 [Mar.?] 1647, in *HP* 9/10/ 5A. On Stanley’s bad health, see *PTTS*, p. xxix; Warren Chernaik, entry for Thomas Stanley in the *ODNB*.
the poems in the first book of the volume, which is comprised of verses on secular themes, are addressed to Stanley. Indeed Hall even seems to have been in a position at Cambridge, through Stanley’s help, to become a patron himself. John Davies states that Hall took him ‘into patronage and acquaintance’ when they matriculated at St John’s at the same time.  

Davies then also become part of the Stanley circle, to which he was presumably introduced by Hall. Davies shared the circle’s interest in the translation of continental, and especially French, writings: his renderings of French romances, De Scudéry’s *Clelia* and Urfé’s *Astrea*, were published by Moseley in 1656 and 1658. Davies dedicated his 1657 translation of Scarron’s *Novels* to Stanley. In the dedication to the second edition of 1665, Davies writes of his ‘extraordinary obligations’ to Stanley and discloses that the translation of Scarron ‘had its birth under [Stanley’s] roof’ at Cumberlow Green. Stanley, accompanied by Sherburne, retired to his family estate in Hertfordshire after the regicide, although he continued to keep his rooms at the Middle Temple and make periodic visits to London.  

Davies writes of his ‘extraordinary obligations’ to Stanley and discloses that the translation of Scarron ‘had its birth under [Stanley’s] roof’ at Cumberlow Green. Stanley, accompanied by Sherburne, retired to his family estate in Hertfordshire after the regicide, although he continued to keep his rooms at the Middle Temple and make periodic visits to London.  

It is unclear when Davies came under Stanley’s patronage. It may not have been until late 1651 after Davies returned from France, where he had gone after the regicide. Hall, however, left Cambridge after less than eighteen months to join Stanley’s circle at the Inns of Court. In June 1647 Hall was admitted to Gray’s Inn. Hall’s presence in Stanley’s coterie in 1647 is indicated by the commendatory poems that Hall contributed, alongside Sherburne, Fairfax, and Hammond, to Stanley’s two publications of that year, the *Poems and Translations* and the translations of Montalván and Preti. Hall’s growing reputation as a poet in London 1647 (as well as Herrick’s membership of the Stanley circle) is indicated by Herrick’s ‘To his worthy friend M. John Hall, Student of Grayes-Inne’, included in *Hesperides*, in which Herrick emphasizes Hall’s poetic precocity:

Tell me young man, or did the Muses bring  
Thee lesse to taste, than to drink up their spring;  
That none hereafter sho’d be thought, or be

---


A Poet, or a Poet-like but Thee.
What was thy Birth, thy starre that makes thee knowne,
At twice ten yeares, a prime and publike one?

(RHP 292, ll. 1–6)

The poem suggests that Hall has now left his life of ‘studious leisure’ in Cambridge to become a ‘publike’ literary figure in London, although Herrick’s friendship with Hall presumably also developed under the ‘shade’ provided by Stanley’s patronage at the Inns of Court. The reference to Hall drinking up the Muses’ spring hints at the bibulous nature of some of the meetings of Stanley’s friends.

It is not clear whether Hall, when he moved to Gray’s Inn and became part of Stanley’s poetic coterie, also subscribed to the order of the ‘Black Riband’, a subcircle of the literary group whose members apparently wore a black armband as a display of sympathy with the king’s plight and of mourning for his defeat in the first civil war. However, what little we know of this order comes from poems by Hall and Shirley published in 1646–7.30 In ‘On a black Riband’ Shirley makes no mention of Stanley; but he does disclose that the riband has been given to him by a ‘noble’ writer:

All Orders have their growth, and this, when sent,
To me, had something that was glorious meant,
From one, whose blood writes noble, but his mind
And souls extraction leave that stream behind:
And this who knowes in calmer time may thrive,
And grow into a Name, if Arts survive?
Til when, to this black Arme-let, it shall be
My Honour, to be call’d a Votary.31

Shirley associates the black riband with the survival of the arts in barbarous times, hinting at the relationship with the literary circle under Stanley’s patronage. In his 1647 Poems Hall includes a Latin poem, ‘Armilla Nigra’, in which, like Shirley, he compares the order of the Black Riband with the Order of the Garter and praises the armband as a symbol of potentially glorious future enterprises. The opacity of Shirley’s poem and Hall’s use of Latin suggests that Stanley wished to keep the order secret—as with Shirley’s poem, Hall’s ‘Armilla Nigra’ does not mention Stanley but is addressed to ‘the youthful Sun’. However Hall’s commendatory poem for Stanley’s 1647 Poems andTranslations, which was also included in Hall’s Poems, does link Stanley directly to the Black Riband. In praising the innocence of Stanley’s love lyrics, Hall reworks lines from ‘Armilla Nigra’: ‘Nay, vestals might as well such sonnets hear, | As keep their vows and thy Black Riband wear’.32 In a

31 Shirley, Poems (1646), 53.
32 ‘To his Honoured Noble Friend, Thomas Stanley, Esq., on his Poems’, in MPCP ii. 198, ll. 21–2; compare 206, ll. 12–14.
Social Contexts of Marvell’s Lyric Verse

Stanley also reprinted the poems by Hall and Shirley on the Black Riband in the 1647 volume of his own poems, indirectly acknowledging his leadership of the order. It is unclear if the order was restricted to Stanley’s literary friends and clients, but in his copy of the 1635 edition of Donne’s Poems, Giles Oldisworth (1619/20–78) wrote ‘1646. Oct. 6’ by the words ‘black...ribband’ in the verse epistle ‘To Sir Thomas Roe. 1603’ (in fact not by Donne but Sir John Roe). Oldisworth, who was at Cambridge at the same time as Stanley and at Trinity at the same time as Marvell, was deprived of his scholarship in 1644 on account of his royalism; he was ‘in close touch with well-informed views upon literary and other topics of the day’. ‘1646. Oct. 6’ might, as Margaret Flower suggested some time ago, ‘mark either Oldisworth’s entry into the Order or Stanley’s foundation of it’.34 If so, the annotation emphasizes the intimate connection of political allegiance with the reading and writing of poetry in the Stanley circle in the later 1640s.

By the time Stanley came up to Cambridge in late 1639, Marvell had been at Trinity College for six years. Marvell did not leave Cambridge for another two years: given Stanley’s interest in poetry and the classics, it would be unsurprising if he met or even sought out Marvell, who had contributed verses in both Greek and Latin to a 1637 collection of poems by Cambridge academics and students congratulating Charles I and Henrietta Maria on the birth of their fifth child; other contributors included Abraham Cowley and Richard Crashaw (1612–49). Stanley would surely have attended literary events in Cambridge such as the performance of Cowley’s play The Guardian in Trinity on 12 March 1642 before the visiting Prince of Wales. Among those attending this royal première were Cowley’s friend George Villiers, second Duke of Buckingham (1628–87), and his younger brother Francis (1629–48), who had both come up to Trinity in 1641. A week earlier Stanley had been admitted MA with the Prince and the Villiers brothers.35

Marvell was living in London by the time of Prince Charles’s visit to Cambridge. He had probably left not long after his father drowned in the Humber in January 1641. By February 1642 Marvell was living in Cowcross in London, close to the Inns of Court, where he witnessed in that month (in Gray’s Inn) the transfer of land in Yorkshire between Sir William Savile and Thomas, Viscount Savile. It seems likely, as Hilton Kelliher has argued, that Marvell was a student

---

33 John Hall to Samuel Hartlib, 20 Apr. 1647, HP 60/14/32A–33B.
34 Stephen Wright, entry for Giles Oldisworth in OBNB; J. Sampson, ‘Contemporary Light upon John Donne’, Essays and Studies, 7 (1921), 82–107; Flower, ‘Thomas Stanley (1625–78)’, 141.
at one of the Inns at this time. Some time between the summer of 1642 and the autumn of 1643, Marvell left England for the continent and spent, according to Milton, ‘foure years abroad in Holland, France, Italy, and Spaine to very good purpose, as I believe, and the gaineing of those 4 languages’. A 1655 report confirms that Marvell was ‘skilled in several languages’ and indicates that he had travelled abroad as a tutor to ‘Noblemens Sones’. He was back in England by November 1647 and apparently in need of money, as he sold property in Meldreth, Cambridgeshire. We may surmise that Marvell, like Stanley, left England with the outbreak of the first civil war and did not return until after the fighting had ended. In the apostrophe to Hammond in ‘A Register of Friends’, Stanley recalls his dismay on returning to England after the war:

Under different climes
We wail’d the fury of unruly Times;
Which weathered out, at last I liv’d to see
My native soil once more, and dearer Thee.
Thee dearer? Vain comparison! Alas!
Thou wert the same, she far from what she was;
Her face, disfigur’d so by Civill Wars,
Cou’d scarce be known, through those dishonour’d scars.

Although we know from Sherburne’s letter to Anthony Wood that Stanley travelled mostly in France, Stanley’s mastery of Spanish and Italian—evident in translations of Boscan, Montalván, Lope de Vega, de Góngora, Petrarch, Preti, Casone, Guarini, and Marino—indicates that he also spent time in those countries. Might the paths of Stanley and Marvell have crossed in Europe? Given Stanley’s connection with George and Francis Villiers at Cambridge, such a meeting would most likely have occurred over dinners held by Buckingham at the English College in Rome in 1645–6.

The Villiers brothers had left Cambridge to join the king at Oxford with the outbreak of war and served under Prince Rupert at the royalist defeat at Lichfield Close in 1643; their estates were subsequently sequestered by Parliament and they were placed under the care of the Earl of Northumberland, who sent them on a tour of Europe. Buckingham and his brother were in Rome by December 1645, living in ‘as great a state as some of those sovereign princes’ and apparently presiding over a ‘Poetical Academy’ of exiles. The Catholic priest Richard Flecknoe,

36 Andrew Marvell: Poet and Politician, 29.
recalling after the Restoration his ‘accession’ to this ‘Poetical Academy’, described it as ‘a free Mart, or Fair; | I now perceive of all Poetick ware’. The commercial metaphor suggests that the ‘Academy’ offered Flecknoe and other exiles the opportunity to sue for Buckingham’s favour through the circulation and performance of their poetry. We might compare John Harrington on poetry as currency in the Elizabethan court: ‘Verses are grown such merchantable ware, | That now for sonnets, sellers are and buyers.’

Buckingham was a writer and liked the company of poets, as is evident from the friendship that he cultivated with Cowley when they were both at Trinity. Marvell arrived in Rome towards the end of 1645 and the dinners held by Buckingham in the English College would seem to be the social occasion of Marvell’s satirical poem on Flecknoe and his verse, ‘Flecknoe, an English Priest at Rome’ (probably written around March 1646, first published in 1681). As Kelliher suggests, Marvell’s ‘virtuoso performance’, with its knowing mockery of Flecknoe’s manner and witty play with the language of Catholic theology and ritual, ‘presupposes a sympathetic audience’ and was probably written to divert his companions in Rome or ‘as a pièce de salon to amuse the members of a London literary circle on his return’. The Flecknoe poem may have been a display of Marvell’s literary talents designed to attract Buckingham’s patronage, or it may have been composed to fulfil the obligations imposed by that patronage: Marvell’s opening insistence that he called to see Flecknoe only because he felt ‘Obliged by frequent visits of this man’ suggests that the impoverished ‘poet, priest, musician’ had sought to cultivate Marvell, presumably as means of getting to Buckingham (ll. 1–2). If Stanley did visit the Villiers brothers in Rome, the model which he would found there of a ‘Poetical Academy’, in which poets came together to compare and exchange their efforts under the patronage and presidency of a wealthy nobleman, could have inspired his activities in the Middle Temple on his return to England in the latter half of 1646 (although, judging by Flecknoe’s involvement, Buckingham’s coterie was engaged in rather less high-brow literary work than Stanley’s). But then Buckingham’s ‘academy’ sounds like it was itself derived from the ‘privat Academies of Italy’ that Milton encountered in 1638–9, in which ‘every one must give some proof of his wit and reading’ and which Milton proposed in The Reason of Church Government (1642) should be the basis of a reformed English

---


40 Kelliher, Andrew Marvell, 32. See also Pauline Burdon, ‘Andrew Marvell and Richard Flecknoe in Rome’, Notes and Queries, NS, 19/1 (1972), 16–18.

41 For the argument that Marvell was in receipt of the patronage of the Villiers brothers, see Edward Chaney, The Grand Tour and the Great Rebellion: Richard Lassels and the ‘Voyage of Italy’ in the Seventeenth Century (Geneva, 1985), 347–50. See also Norbrook, Writing the English Republic, 167–8; MP 166; Von Maltzahn, An Andrew Marvell Chronology, 30–1.
literary culture that would be cleansed of ‘ignorant Poetasters’ (like the Flecknoe mocked by Marvell).  

The Villiers brothers returned to England in 1647, and it is possible that Marvell, as a member of their circle, returned with them. The sequestration order on their lands was lifted in October 1647, but the brothers immediately became involved in royalist conspiracy and took up arms with the outbreak of the second civil war. On 7 July 1648 Francis Villiers was killed in unheroic circumstances by Parliamentarian troopers in Kingston, Surrey; on the same day the brothers were declared traitors by the Commons and their estates were again taken into sequestration. Three days later the royalist army led by Buckingham and the Earl of Holland was intercepted at St Neots; Buckingham managed to escape to the continent and joined the exiled court after the regicide, having refused to accept Parliament’s terms for his return. An Elegy upon the Death of my Lord Francis Villiers—published unsigned and undated in a single-page quarto, presumably soon after Villiers was killed—was attributed to Marvell by the antiquarian George Clarke (1661–1736). Scholars who argue for a consistently radical Marvell have solved the problem posed by the apparently ardent royalism of the poem, with its fantasy about the violent deaths of Marvell’s two future patrons, ‘heavy Cromwell’ and ‘long-deceivèd Fairfax’, and bloodthirsty desire to transform elegy into execution (‘And we hereafter to his honour will | Not write so many, but so many kill’), by using doubts about attribution to excise it from the canon (ll. 14–16, 125–7).43 However Nigel Smith confidently ascribes the elegy to Marvell on the grounds of Clarke’s reliability, Marvell’s connections with the Villiers family, and similarities with other Marvell poems; while Harold Love believes those who argue that the poet who wrote the pro-Commonwealth and pro-Cromwellian poems of the 1650s could not also have written the Villiers elegy ‘display a naïve attitude towards the politics of patronage as they affected the scribal medium’.44

The poem will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4; it will suffice to observe here that the attribution makes good sense when the elegy is read in the context of Marvell’s personal association and possible patronage relationship with the Villiers brothers. The poet emphasizes his acquaintance with Villiers, recalling how he watched the young nobleman training for battle (ll. 56–7): ‘I know how

well he did, with what delight | Those serious imitations of fight.’

45 He is also aware of Villiers’s romance with the married Mary Kirke, the innocence of which he defends, while the references to Villiers’s ‘unimitable handsomeness’ and the ‘use of terms that suggest visual representation’ imply that the poet has seen Van Dyck’s portraits of the brothers (and may also allude to the famous collection of pictures bequeathed to Buckingham by his murdered father, which Buckingham had sold off to raise funds for the royalist war effort). 46 Indeed it has been argued that the turn to Villiers’s intimate relationships, after the initial reference to the public world of Cromwell and Fairfax, puts in doubt claims for the committed royalism of a poem which is concerned rather ‘to satisfy the demands of an immediate and purely personal grief’. 47 In one of the other three printed elegies for Villiers, the poet advertises his personal ties to the Villiers family: An Elegie and Epitaph, upon the Right Honourable the Lord Francis Villars: written by an affectionate servant to his family, kinsman to his person, and prisoner for the same caus this noble lord so bravely dyed in was collected by Thomason 4 August 1648. Here though the sense of personal loss is immediately and fully integrated with suffering on behalf of the royalist cause and this poem, with its attacks on the Presbyterians and the Levellers, is more consistently concerned to relate Villiers’s death to public matters.

In their discussion of Marvell’s patronage relationships with Fairfax and Cromwell, Hirst and Zwicker suggest that Fairfax helped Marvell become MP for Hull in 1659 and that, ‘when Fairfax removed himself from the stage, Marvell seems to have transferred his loyalties to Fairfax’s son-in-law, Buckingham’ (Buckingham married Mary Fairfax in 1657). 48 The title of The Rehearsal Transprosd (1672–3) pays tribute to Buckingham’s play The Rehearsal (1672) and during the 1670s Marvell was accused of being a member of the Green Ribbon Club, a group of future Whigs gathered around Buckingham that met in the King’s Head Tavern in London. Certainly Buckingham is one of the heroes of Marvell’s An Account of the Growth of Popery (1677) for his resistance to arbitrary government: Buckingham was committed to the Tower, along with Shaftesbury, Salisbury, and Wharton, for speaking out against the Long Prorogation of 1675–7. 49 Personal ties that were forged in the 1640s, and perhaps specifically in Rome in 1645–6,

45 Chernaik argues that this reference indicates the author was ‘one of Villiers’s fellow soldiers’, but if Marvell stayed with the Villiers brothers he could have seen Francis engaged in exercises, either in Rome or England, or indeed have trained with him; we know that Marvell had fencing lessons in Spain, probably in 1646 (‘Was Marvell a Republican?’, 81; Marvell, Poems and Letters, ii. 324).

46 MP 15, l. 45 n.; Kelliher, Andrew Marvell, 35–6; Norbrook, Writing the English Republic, 181.


48 ‘High Summer at Nun Appleton, 1651, 265.

49 The Litany of the D. of B. (1679), broadsheet; Patterson, Andrew Marvell, 151–3; The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell, ed. Annabel Patterson et al., 2 vols. (New Haven and London, 2003), i. 4–9, ii. 205, 275 n. 277. On the politics of the Green Ribbon club, see Melinda Zook, Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics in Late Stuart England (Philadelphia, 1999), 7–18.
seem to have been restored in the very different political circumstances of the 1660s and 1670s. But even if Marvell was in receipt of Buckingham's patronage when both he and Buckingham returned to England in 1647, then that source of support was surely cut after Buckingham's estates were again sequestered and he was forced to flee back to the continent in July 1648. As I observed in my introduction, if 'the acquisition of a patron was crucial to Marvell's literary production', as Hirst and Zwicker maintain, then it remains unclear from whom Marvell obtained support, at least after Buckingham was forced into exile, during one of the most productive periods in his poetic career. There may be some indication in the overlap between the company that Marvell keeps in the volumes in which he published two occasional poems in 1649, *Lucasta* and *Lachrymae Musarum*, and the coterie gathered under Stanley's patronage in the Middle Temple.

As with the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647, the Stanley circle provided a core of poets for *Lachrymae Musarum*. The volume was edited by Richard Brome and among the contributors were Herrick, Alexander Brome, Denham, and Charles Cotton the younger (1630–87), a close friend, through his father, of Lovelace, Herrick, and Alexander Brome. Cotton's interest in classical and continental translation—including Anacreon, Martial, Ausonius, Secundus, and Théophile de Viau—suggests that he was involved in the circle. The contributor 'J. B.' is very likely Berkenhead, who often signed published prefaces and poems with his initials. John Hall provided the longest of the thirty-five elegies. The hasty compilation of *Lachrymae Musarum* is indicated by the inclusion in the first edition of a 'postscript' containing a further eight elegies, submitted after the original volume was printed. Marvell's 'Upon the Death of Lord Hastings' appears in this postscript. However in at least one surviving copy of the first edition and two copies of the second edition, published in January 1650, Marvell's elegy is moved forward and placed after Herrick's and Denham's and before Hall's contributions. This change has been seen as giving 'Marvell his natural place among fellow poets' (an argument that would, incidentally, underline Hall's reputation as a poet). One possibility is that Richard Brome, with his knowledge of the Stanley circle, promoted Marvell's elegy so that Marvell took his place among current and former members of that circle—Herrick, Denham (who by June 1649 was in exile in Paris), and Hall. Or perhaps Brome placed Marvell's elegy before Hall's in the 1650 edition of *Lachrymae Musarum* to repeat the sequence of the commendatory poems in Lovelace's *Lucasta*, published around six months earlier, in which Hall's 'To Colonel Richard Lovelace, on the Publishing of his

---

50 Cotton wrote an elegy for Lovelace and a commendatory poem for Alexander Brome; see Cotton, *Poems on Severall Occasions* (1689), 481, 511. On Cotton's likely involvement in the circle, see Revard, “Thomas Stanley and ‘A Register of Friends’”, 161 n. 27.

51 For an account of the bibliographical complexities, see *MP* 23.

52 Kelliher, *Andrew Marvell*, 39. As Kelliher points out, in 'bibliographical terms the change was unnecessary, and could in any case have been made to either of two other positions in the volume'.

Ingenious Poems’ directly follows Marvell’s ‘To his Noble Friend Mr Richard Lovelace, upon his Poems’. In some copies of *Lucasta* Marvell’s poem is moved from the middle to the head of the volume, which again has been seen as an indication of Marvell’s growing reputation; Hall’s poem is also moved, retaining its position after Marvell’s verse epistle.53

Presumably Lovelace and Brome invited Marvell to contribute to, respectively, *Lucasta* and *Lachrymae Musarum*, while Marvell’s appearance beside Hall in both volumes points to a known association between the two in London literary circles. It has long been thought that Marvell met Lovelace when the latter was incorporated MA at Cambridge in 1637.54 Given Marvell’s need for support, especially after Buckingham had fled, and given Stanley’s keenness to draw into his company ‘young men (like himself) embarking on literary careers’, it seems likely that Lovelace brought Marvell to Stanley’s rooms in the Middle Temple in 1647–8, where he would have been introduced to Hall.55 But there are several alternative scenarios for Marvell’s introduction to the Stanley circle. Stanley and Marvell might have known each other from Cambridge or they might have met as guests of the Villiers brothers in Rome. Buckingham, who knew Stanley from Cambridge, could have introduced Marvell to Stanley after all three men returned to London from the continent after the end of the first civil war. (The name Buckingham and Marvell gave to their Green Ribbon club, if it existed, interestingly recalls Stanley’s Order of the Black Riband.) Finally, a significant number of the contributors to both *Lucasta* and *Lachrymae Musarum* had been or were still at Gray’s Inn, where Marvell had witnessed deeds in 1642. Kelliher suggests that ‘Marvell may have resumed his connection with the Inns of Court’ on arriving back in London.56 Alexander Brome, who was at Gray’s Inn from at least 1648, also wrote poems for both the Lovelace and Hastings collections, although for some reason his poem for *Lucasta* was not included in the published volume and was first printed in 1661.57 If Marvell was at Gray’s Inn at this time, he would surely have met Hall, who had arrived there in June 1647. Whatever the route by which Marvell was introduced to Stanley and his friends, the interconnections between Marvell, Lovelace, Hall, and Stanley make it likely that Marvell had some association with the circle in 1647–9, providing a fresh context not only for the early occasional poetry but lyrics written around

54 On Lovelace and Marvell at Cambridge, see Raymond A. Anselment’s entry for Lovelace in the *ODNB*. Despite the title, only a few pages are devoted to discussion of the relationship between Marvell and Lovelace (and no mention is made of the Stanley circle) in Patsy Griffin, *The Modest Ambition of Andrew Marvell: A Study of Marvell and his Relation to Lovelace, Fairfax, Cromwell, and Milton* (Newark, NJ, 1995), 23–5.
55 Revard, “Thomas Stanley and “A Register of Friends””, 149.
57 *LP*, pp. lxxxvi–lxxxvii. The only other person to contribute verses to both *Lucasta* and *Lachrymae Musarum* was John Hamar, under-master at Westminster School, who was intruded as Professor of Greek at Oxford in 1650 and edited a collection of panegyrics to Cromwell in 1654.
the same time—as exemplified by Marvell’s most celebrated lyric, ‘To His Coy Mistress’.

‘TO HIS COY MISTRESS’ AND THE ORDER OF THE BLACK RIBAND

Marvell, as Annabel Patterson puts it, ‘had a habit of borrowing other men’s words’ and numerous echoes of contemporary poets have been found in Marvell’s poetry. ‘To His Coy Mistress’ is the poem in which, as Nigel Smith has shown, ‘the presence of other poets is at its greatest’. The poem is convincingly dated by Smith to the 1647–52 period, mainly on the grounds of its echoes of poems published and circulating in this period. The most extended and direct of these echoes, however, is in the conclusion, which unmistakably reworks lines from stanzas two and five of Hall’s ‘To his Tutor. Master Pawson. An Ode’, published at the beginning of 1647:

Come, let us run
And give the world a girdle with the sun,
For so we shall
Take a full view of this enamelled ball
Both where it may be seen
Clad in a constant green,
And where it lies,
Crusted with ice;
Where’t swells with mountains, and shrinks down to vales;
Where it permits the usurping sea
To rove with liberty,
Where it pants with drought, and of all liquor fails.

But objects here
Cloy in the very taste; O, let us tear
A passage through
That fleeting vault above; there may we know
Some rosy brethren stray
To a set battalia,
And others scout
Still round about,
Fix’d in their courses, and uncertain too;
But clammy matter doth deny
A clear discovery,
Which those that are inhabitants, may solely know.

(MPCP ii. 208–9, ll. 13–16, 50–1)

58 Patterson, Andrew Marvell, 5; MP 75.
Compare the opening four lines of both these stanzas with the final six lines (41–6) of ‘To His Coy Mistress’, the most famous lines of Marvell’s most famous lyric:

Let us roll all our strength, and all  
Our sweetness, up into one ball:  
And tear our pleasures with rough strife,  
Thorough the iron gates of life.  
Thus, though we cannot make our sun  
Stand still, yet we will make him run.

Hall imagines Pawson, his tutor at St John’s, leading him on a fantastic pilgrimage in the pursuit of knowledge: the poem moves with dizzying speed from a total comprehension of the internal secrets of nature, to a panoramic contemplation of the globe, with its natural beauties and ruins of ancient kingdoms, to a rapturous Platonic ascent to the heavens and the mysteries of angelic existence. The ode is a platonized carpe diem, in which Hall beckons Pawson away from humdrum routine through breathless description of the beauty of creation and the excitement of knowledge: ‘Come, come away, | And snatch me from these shades to purer day’ (ll. 1–2); ‘Then let’s away, | And journey thither: what should cause our stay?’ (ll. 61–2) Hall is worried about wasting time or becoming distracted from the pursuit by the lower, sensual faculties: ‘We’ll not be hurl’d | Asleep by drowsy potions of the word. | Let not Wealth tutor out, | Our spirits with her gout’ (ll. 63–6). This sense of urgency and speed and the rapid telescoping of time and space are also of course features of Marvell’s poem—except in Marvell the references to global travel (‘the Indian Ganges’ side’), biblical and millenarian time (‘the flood’, ‘the conversion of the Jews’), and the history of human civilization (‘Vaster than empires’) are used negatively, as symbols of what the speaker and his mistress are unable to achieve: ‘Had we but world enough, and time’. Equally Hall’s vision of disembodied souls in contemplative, angelic union becomes in Marvell an emphatically earth-bound vision of animalistic sexual union (‘like am’rous birds of pray’) and the corruption of the body: ‘then worms shall try | That long preserved virginity’ (ll. 38, 28).

For Paul Hammond, Marvell’s reworking of Hall’s ode, a poem which ‘evokes ecstatic intellectual and social pleasure between men’, suggests that when Marvell ‘composed this poem about desire for a woman, [his] imagination was dwelling on other forms of desire’.59 But Hammond equally argues that ‘To His Coy Mistress’ should be regarded as a ‘homosocial poem, an exercise written to impress an audience who are connoisseurs of such poetry’.60

59 Figuring Sex between Men from Shakespeare to Rochester (Oxford, 2002), 221. The echo was first noted by Michael Craze, The Life and Lyrics of Andrew Marvell (London and Basingstoke, 1979), 327. See also Smith, ‘“Courtesie is fatal”’ 181–2.
60 Figuring Sex between Men, 221, 223. The variant MS version of ‘To His Coy Mistress’ in the hand of Sir William Haward and dated to 1672 (Bodleian Library, MS Don. b. 8) shows that there
Marvell’s adaptation of Hall’s ode in a poem indebted to the tradition of Latin love elegy also makes sense if the poem was written to impress a male audience of Stanley, Lovelace, Hall, and their poetic coterie. Marvell may not have sought simply or only to pander to the salacious taste of an elite masculine group, as Hammond suggests, but also to impress a group of better-known poets—including a wealthy literary patron—with his command of classical and contemporary poetic modes. As we have seen, the Stanley coterie was working on a range of imitations and translations of classical, neo-Latin, and continental amatory verse in this period: between 1646 and 1651 Stanley himself finished the first complete English translation of the anacreontics, ancient Greek poems extolling the virtues of love and wine, and translated the majority of the Basia sequence by the Dutch poet Johannes Secundus (1511–36). He published these in the expanded, 1651 edition of his Poems and Translations (1647), although there is a version of Basium 3 in the earlier 1647 volume that Stanley had printed ‘for the Author, and his Friends’. In his commendatory poem to the 1647 volume, Hall drew attention to Stanley’s reinvigoration of ancient traditions of love poetry:

Thee, noble soul! Whose early flights are far
Sublimer than old eagles’ soarings are,
Who light’st love’s dying torch with purer fire,
And breath’st new life into the Teian lyre.[62]

Stanley’s classical and neo-Latin interests are representative of, and probably helped shape, the poetic enterprises of his circle. Many of the poems in Herrick’s Hesperides were written long before Stanley began to gather his circle in 1646. Yet we know that Herrick ‘revised assiduously’ for publication and omitted a number of items; Corns has convincingly argued that Hesperides should be regarded as ‘a product of the late 1640s’ and specifically of the political situation in London in 1647–8.63 Anacreon and Horace are the presiding classical spirits in Hesperides, in which festivity, drinking, and sexual indulgence provide an escape from the harsh public world of war, but also a distraction from the certainty of mortality, as in ‘Anacreontike’

were versions of the poem in circulation during Marvell’s lifetime. The more bawdy tone of this version, which has two extra lines, suggests the poem was made ‘more salacious in order to suit the fashionable masculine taste of the 1670s’; Paul Hammond, ‘Marvell’s Coy Mistresses’, in Maureen Bell et al. (eds.), Re-Constructing the Book: Literary Texts in Transmission (Aldershot, 2001), 28.

Due to its private publication, the 1647 Poems is complex in bibliographical terms. No two surviving copies have the same make-up, and the addition in one copy of the epithalamia for Stanley’s wedding indicates that, while sections were printed in 1647, the volume was not finally made up until after Stanley’s wedding on 8 May 1648.

‘To my honoured Noble Friend, Thomas Stanley, Esq., on his Poems’, in MPCP ii. 198–9, ll. 15–18.

Or as Stanley starkly puts it in the final line of his version of *Anacreontea* 36: ‘There’s no drinking in the grave.’ *Hesperides* is full of *carpe diem* poems, most famously ‘To Virgins, to make much of Time’ and ‘Corinna’s going a Maying’, which may also be echoed in the final couplet of ‘To His Coy Mistress’: ‘Our life is short; and our dayes run | As fast away as do’s the Sunne’.64 Similarly the opening poem of Shirley’s 1646 Poems urges country swains to bring Cupid’s ‘wanton harvest home’ and use their ‘amorous sickles’ to reap maidenheads that ‘dangle on their stalks, | Full blown’. The invocations in Lovelace’s *Lucasta* of drinking, friendship, and unabashed sexuality are indebted to Anacreon, moderated by the more restrained Horace: Lovelace’s ‘The Grass-hopper. To My Noble Friend, Mr Charles Cotton. Ode’ (discussed in detail in Chapter 3) blends *Anacreontea* 43 with Horace, *Odes 1. 9*. In his (much more faithful) version of *Anacreontea* 43 Stanley retained Lovelace’s title of ‘The Grasse-hopper’, perhaps ‘paying tribute to his cousin’s earlier adaptation’.65 Sherburne, Alexander Brome (described by Edward Phillips as ‘the English Anacreon’), Berkenhead, and Charles Cotton the younger, son of the addressee of Lovelace’s ‘The Grass-hopper’, all composed anacreontics in the late 1640s and 1650s.66

Similarities between several of the poems in *Hesperides* and Stanley’s versions of Anacreon suggest one poet influenced the other or that they collaborated, while Sherburne included, unaccredited, Stanley’s version of *Anacreontea* 28 in his own *Poems and Translations*.67 Stanley translated a lyric by Marino, ‘On a Violet in her Breast’; Sherburne translated the same piece as ‘Violets in Thaumantia’s Bosome’, making notes in a copy of Marino presented to him by Stanley. But while in

67 Compare for instance Stanley’s anacreontic 40, ‘The Bee’, ll. 7–8 (‘A wing’d Snake hath bitten me, | Called by Countrymen a Bee’), with Herrick, ‘The wounded Cupid’, ll. 8–9 (‘A winged Snake has bitten me | Which Country people call a Bee’). *PTTS* 92, 391; *RHP* 50; Sherburne, *Poems andTranslations*, 70.
Stanley’s version the drooping violet ‘Doth smilingly erected grow, | Transplanted to those hills of snow’, in Sherburne’s the flowers suffer the same fate as the lover: ‘What boots it to have escap’d winter’s breath, | To find, like me, by flames a sudden death?’68 The two lyrics are companion pieces that respond to one another. Hall and Stanley began to translate the ‘Golden Verses’ of Pythagoras at the same time in the late 1640s: when in 1655 Hall prepared his translation for publication, along with the Hierocles’s commentary on the verses, he included Stanley’s rendering of the ‘Golden Verses’ after his own version, praising the poetic qualities of Stanley’s version but explaining that his own was ‘a little more implicite in the sense of Hierocles’.69 The likelihood of shared literary interest, collaboration, and even competition between these poets is heightened if we focus on a single neo-Latin love lyric: between 1646 and 1651 Stanley, Herrick, Sherburne, and Shirley all published imitations of Secundus’s Basium 6, in which the speaker begs his mistress Neaera for multiple kisses in exchange for his one (while Alexander Brome published a version after the Restoration). As Stella Revard has convincingly argued, the ‘existence of different versions of the same poem by Secundus suggests that the poets of the circle were serving as audience and respondents to one another. Perhaps some kind of poetic competition within the circle sparked the composition.’70

Was Marvell also involved in such ‘poetic competitions’ in the late 1640s? There is a resemblance in ‘To His Coy Mistress’ to an early Stanley love lyric, ‘Celia Singing’:

The winged Chariot of the Light,
Or the slow silent wheels of Night;
The shade, from which the swifter Sun,
Doth in a circular motion run.

Again we have the sun/run rhyme; but compare also ‘To His Coy Mistress’, lines 21–2: ‘But at my back I always hear | Time’s wingèd chariot hurrying near’. Although Smith gives Stanley’s poem a 1651 publication date, it was in fact one of the poems that had previously appeared (as ‘Celia Singing, or Sleeping’) in the 1647 Poems; the poem also survives in a manuscript dated 1646.71 Along with Hall’s ode, this is one of a cluster of resemblances in ‘To His Coy Mistress’ to poetry published in 1646–8 by writers who were part of the Stanley coterie. Lines

68 PTTS 243; Sherburne, Poems and Translations, 22.
70 ‘Thomas Stanley and “A Register of Friends” ’, 168. See also Stella Revard, ‘Translation and Imitation of Johannes Secundus’s Basia during the Era of the Civil War and Protectorate in England’, in Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Abulensis: proceedings of the tenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies (Temp, AZ, 2000), 553–61. Shirley’s version appeared first, in his Ovidian narrative Narcissus (1646), 18, followed by ‘Kissing Usurie’ in Hesperides (RHP 30); Stanley’s first appeared in 1651 (Poems and Translations, 124), and Sherburne’s ‘Love’s Arithmetic’ was included in his Poems and Translations, 100; Brome, Songs & Other Poems (1664), 36–7.
71 Stanley, PTTS 13, ll. 5–8; MP 82.
19–20—‘For Lady you deserve this state; | Nor would I love at lower rate’—resemble Herrick’s ‘Upon a Delaying Lady’, lines 7–12:

I scorne to be
A slave to state:
And since I’m free,
I will not wait,
Henceforth at such a rate,
For needy Fate.

(RHP 137)

Lines 23–4—‘And yonder before us lie | Deserts of vast eternity’—resemble Herrick’s ‘Eternitie’, lines 5–8:

And these mine eyes shall see
All times, how they
Are lost i’ th’ Sea
Of vast Eternitie.’

(RHP 344)

Lines 13–18 are customarily linked with Catullus, Carmina 5:

An hundred years should go to praise
Thine eyes, and on thy forehead gaze.
Two hundred to adore each breast:
But thirty thousand to the rest.
An age at least to every part,
And the last age should show your heart.72

Marvell may be thinking of Jonson’s famous adaptation of Catullus for the songs to Celia in Volpone (1606). But Stanley had included a blend of Carmina 5 and 7, under the title ‘Imitatio Catulliana’, in his 1647 volume; this is unsurprising given his interest in Secundus, as Basia 6 and 7 are in fact derived from the Catullus lyrics. The speaker of Stanley’s ‘Kiss’ 7 declares that

Kisses a hundred, hundred fold,
A hundred by a thousand told,
Thousands by thousands numbered o’re,
As many thousand thousand more
As are the Drops the Seas comprise,
As are the stars that paint the Skies,
To this soft Cheek, this speaking Ey
This swelling lip will I apply.

(PTTS 125, ll. 1–8)

72 See MP 81. Smith notes the similarities to Herrick’s ‘Eternitie’ and ‘Upon a Delaying Lady’.
The association between ever-multiplying numbers (of kisses in Stanley’s poem, of years of praising in Marvell’s) and blazon of the mistress’s face is not found in Jonson’s songs to Celia, nor in another contemporary poem cited as a possible source, Cowley’s ‘My Dyet’ (1647; MP 81). However it is possible that ‘To His Coy Mistress’ influenced Stanley in this instance, given that Stanley’s versions of the Basia (with the exception of Basium 3) were not published until 1651, although he had clearly been working on them throughout the mid- and late 1640s.

Of the various imitations of the Secundus lyric in the Stanley circle, another interesting comparison with ‘To His Coy Mistress’ is found in Shirley’s Ovidian narrative Narcissus or, The Selfe-lover (1646), in which the nymph Echo takes the role of Secundus’s (male) lover and Narcissus is the ‘coy Lad’ whom she begs for kisses (l. 13):

Thou canst not loose thy lip, but finde pleasure: 
Come let us now, though late, loves warre begin; 
And meet me boldly, for one kisse of thine 
Ile give a thousand: Lov’s Exchequers mine. 

... 

Be not too coy then to receive a Kisse, 
Thou might’st have kist me twenty times’ ere this. 
Come sit thee downe upon this banke a while, 
And let us sport, as other lovers doe. 

(ll. 405–8, 419–22)

Conversely in Marvell’s poem the male lover adopts the female voice of Echo in her fruitless efforts to seduce Narcissus: lines 33–6 adapt the description of Echo’s physical excitement as she sees and pursues Narcissus in the Metamorphoses, and Marvell punningly alludes to his use of the Ovidian story and identification with Echo in the phrase ‘My echoing song’ (l. 27). Indeed almost every line of the ‘echoing song’ of ‘To His Coy Mistress’ reverberates with poems produced by members of the Stanley circle between 1646 and 1651—all, with the exception of Hall’s ode, love lyrics derived from the classical or neo-Latin traditions. Even the strikingly bestial description of the envisaged love-making—‘like am’rous birds of pray’—has a parallel with Stanley’s rendering of Basium 8, lines 17–20 (although again this poem was not published until 1651, so it may exhibit Stanley’s reading of Marvell):


74 See MP 77, 83. Hammond argues that the identification of the speaker’s voice with Echo’s shows that Marvell ‘could only write about courting a woman if he imagined himself courting a boy’ (Figuring Sex between Men, 224).
I'll follow thee with eager haste
And having caught (as Hawks their Pray)
In my victorious Arm held fast
Panting for Breath, bear thee away.\(^{75}\)

(\textit{PTTS} 126, ll. 17–20)

Herrick’s \textit{Hesperides} was prepared for the press in late 1647 while all of the poems by Hall, Shirley, and Stanley cited above—apart, importantly, from those in Stanley’s ‘Kisses by Secundus’ sequence—had been published by the end of 1647. Given that Marvell is thought to have returned from the continent sometime in 1647 (we know he was back by November of that year), the series of echoes of these lyrics in ‘To His Coy Mistress’ give us reason to believe that it was written in 1647–8 as a contribution to the culture of poetic collaboration and competition developed in these years in Stanley’s rooms in the Middle Temple. Marvell, as Nigel Smith puts it, reflected ‘deeply on the nature of poetry, ancient and modern, classical, Renaissance and contemporary, European and English’. Such reflection, conjoined with practice, was the \textit{raison d’être} of the Stanley circle and Marvell would surely have found in the Middle Temple, where the circle of friends presumably ‘listened to and read each other’s poetry’, a congenial atmosphere in which to experiment with lyric modes and to develop his poetic ability.\(^{76}\) The Stanley circle looks very much like one of the ‘scribal communities’ of early Stuart England described by Harold Love—a network of kinsmen and friends sharing manuscript materials in the enclosed social environment of the Inns of Court. Indeed Stanley seems to have set out to preserve this form of prewar literary culture. The inns were places where ‘alliances between groups of the rising young could be formed which might persist throughout an entire lifetime or professional career’. Writing and ‘its controlled circulation’ performed a central role in creating such ‘new communities within the community’: ‘[o]ne widely attested practice was for members of a group to take turns in reading a text aloud with pauses for explication and discussion’.\(^{77}\) The echoes of Hall, Stanley, Herrick, and Shirley in ‘To His Coy Mistress’ indicate that Marvell was hoping to impress these more established poets by demonstrating how well he knew their work and understood its classical and European basis. In Rome Marvell had previously written poetry to amuse and impress a literary club, Buckingham’s ‘Poetical Academy’, if a less impressive one than that under Stanley’s patronage. ‘To His Coy Mistress’ may have been as much a display of poetic talent in an

\(^{75}\) Although both Stanley and Marvell may recall Shakespeare, \textit{Venus and Adonis} (1593), ll. 55–60: ‘Even as an empty eagle, sharp by fast, | Tires with her beak on feathers, flesh, and bone, | Shaking her wings, devouring all in haste, | Till either gorge be stuff’d prey be gone: | Even so she kiss’d his brow, his cheek, his chin, | And where she ends she doth anew begin.’ All references to Shakespeare are to \textit{The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works}, ed. Richard Proudfoot \textit{et al.} (rev. edn. 2001).

\(^{76}\) \textit{MP}, p. xv; Revard, ‘Thomas Stanley and “A Register of Friends”’, 162.

\(^{77}\) Love, \textit{Scribal Publication}, 218–19; see also 224–9.
effort to win patronage, tailored as precisely to its London audience of the Stanley circle as the satire on Flecknoe had been to its audience of the Villiers circle a year or two earlier. If less explicitly so than ‘Flecknoe, an English Priest at Rome’, ‘To His Coy Mistress’ is also a poem about poetry to the extent that it is a (dazzling) collage of the best bits of other people’s poems; this is one reason why readers have been unsettled by the impersonal nature of the mistress.

One contemporary poet echoed by Marvell on several occasions who was not, however, part of the Stanley circle is Abraham Cowley. Having been ejected from his Trinity fellowship with the outbreak of war, Cowley had joined the king in Oxford and written several anti-Puritan satirical poems, ‘The Puritan’s Lecture’, published as *A Satyr Against Separatists* in late 1642, and *The Puritan and the Papist* (1643). At some stage in 1644–5 he had followed his patron Henry Jermyn to Henrietta Maria’s court in Paris. Cowley’s first collection of poetry, *The Mistresse*, was published while he was absent from England. In the love lyrics of *The Mistresse* Cowley transmitted to England something of the Epicurean philosophy popular in the intellectual circle gathered in Paris around the patronage of William Cavendish, Earl of Newcastle (1593–1676), and which included figures such as Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679), Mersenne, Descartes, and Pierre Gassendi. The materialist, atomistic epistemology of Epicurus and Lucretius, with its emphasis on chance and the earthly pursuit of happiness, seems to have appealed to exiled royalists because it served as a philosophical antidote to the moralism, providentialism, and apocalyptic invocation of spirit that they associated with Puritanism. Charles Kay Smith has provocatively argued that the echoes of Cowley in ‘To His Coy Mistress’ are ironic, and that Marvell assumes the ‘satiric mask’ of an ‘Epicurean | Lucretian Cavalier’ whose hyperbolic materialist arguments—‘And while thy willing soul transpires | At every pore with instant fires’—are systematically undercut by comic exaggeration and juxtaposition with providentialist imagery (ll. 35–6).  

Smith’s argument is grounded in the assumption that Marvell is a Puritan satirizing a royalist attitude and writing for a Puritan audience—specifically Thomas Fairfax, his wife Anne, and their daughter Mary—and so he dates the poem to 1651–2 when Marvell was Mary’s tutor at Nun Appleton. However if we place ‘To His Coy Mistress’ in the context of the gathering of poets such as Herrick, Lovelace, Shirley, Cotton, and Alexander Brome in Stanley’s rooms in the 1640s, then the poem emphatically regains its traditional status as ‘a witty Cavalier lyric in the *carpe diem* tradition’. Indeed it becomes a poem which

Social Contexts of Marvell’s Lyric Verse

prides itself on its awareness of and facility with ‘Cavalier’ modes. The ‘pagan philosophy of lustful pleasure’ that Smith argues is satirized by Marvell is a common theme in the lyrics of several of these poets—usually derived, as we have seen, from classical sources such as Anacreon. Some of Brome’s and Cotton’s anacreontics from the 1650s are particularly coarse in their rejection of a higher spiritual realm, associating the subordination of body to spirit with a victorious Puritan enthusiasm and instead promoting ‘drunken excess and whoring as sordid survival tactics for defeated royalists’. Members of the Stanley circle would have had a particular interest in the Epicurean ideas being discussed in the Cavendish circle in Paris: during his service to Cavendish in the late 1630s and early 1640s, Shirley had helped Cavendish compose the comedies *The Countrey Captaine* and *The Varietie*, and may have arranged for Moseley to publish them in 1649.

Yet there may nonetheless be something in the argument that Marvell is playing in the poem with an Epicurean persona or exaggerating Epicurean atomistic philosophy to parodic effect. Stanley’s own philosophic tastes remained firmly Neoplatonic, despite his translations of Anacreon and Secundus and the sympathetic account of Epicurus (including a translation of Gassendi’s biographical essay) that Stanley would later provide in the third volume of his four-part *magnum opus*, the *History of Philosophy* (1655–62)—a comprehensive account of Greek philosophy that became a standard authority and cemented Stanley’s scholarly reputation in the Restoration. Stanley adjusted Secundus to ‘his own exacting Neoplatonic standards’, despite the earthier imitations and translations by the poets to whom he gave patronage, omitting from his translation of Secundus the five most explicitly erotic poems in the *Basia* sequence. These standards are established by his translation of Pico della Mirandola’s *A Platonick Discourse Upon Love*, attached to the 1651 *Poems and Translations* as if to comment on and qualify the pagan eroticism of Anacreon and Secundus. In his commendatory poem for Stanley’s 1647 *Poems*, Hall insists on the spiritual purity of the love poetry in which Stanley celebrates his mistress ‘Chariessa’, and declares Stanley’s versions of the ancients to be so morally pure:

\[
\text{That love’s best secretaries that are past,} \\
\text{Liv’d they, might learn to love, and yet be chaste.}
\]

80 See Lynn Hulse, entry for William Cavendish, first Duke of Newcastle, in the *ODNB*.
82 Revard, “Thomas Stanley and “A Register of Friends””, 164; Stanley, *Poems and Translations*, 197–229. Stanley dedicates both the 1647 and 1651 volumes ‘To Love’ and makes clear that his idea of love is derived from the account in Plato’s *Symposium*: ‘By thy mysterious Chains seeking r’unite | Once more, the long-since torn Hermaphrodite.’ (*PTTS* 1, ll. 7–8)
So chaste is all, that though in each line lie
More amarettoes than in Doris's eye,
Yet so they're charmed, that look'd upon they prove
Harmless as Chariessa's nightly love.

(MPCP ii. 198, ll. 18–19, 23–6)

In fact Hall's own poetry goes even further than Stanley's in rendering 'chaste' and 'harmless' the motifs of ancient and contemporary love lyric. As Joshua Scodel has observed, and as we have seen in the ode to Pawson, in his 1647 Poems Hall 'sanitizes Cavalier forms': his verses 'recall carpe diem seductions' only to demand "Platonic" rather than sensual fulfilment. This is most obvious in 'A Rapture', the title of which echoes Thomas Carew's influential, notoriously libertine poem (first published 1640) and which begins with a typical carpe diem address—'Come, Julia, come!'—only to confound expectation by imagining the poet and his mistress 'From all contagion of flesh remov'd'. Whereas Carew dreams of a pagan Elysium free from Christian morality, in Hall's poem the lovers ascend to a heavenly state and find 'Elysiun doth beneath us lie'. In his commendatory verses Shirley contrasts Stanley's love poetry with Carew's, declaring that if Carew might come 'But from his own to thy Elysium, | He would repent his immortality, | Given by loose idolaters, and die | A tenant to these shades'.

The Caroline court, and particularly Henrietta Maria, had fostered a Neoplatonic aesthetic and Stanley's interest in Neoplatonic ideas of love might be seen as an effort to keep alive one aspect of court culture, in the same way that he regarded his circle as providing a cultivated audience for poetry in the absence of the court. But it was a culture in which Stanley (unlike his friend Shirley) had been too young to participate and it is not a connection that Stanley ever makes himself. The interest for Stanley seems rather to derive from his deep engagement with Greek literature and philosophy. Hall however seems to be specifically reacting to and against poets such as Carew and Cowley. In 'An Epicurean Ode' Hall adopts a parodically Epicurean voice only to expose the inadequacies of a philosophy which conceives of nothing beyond the material:

Since that thing we call the world,
By chance on atoms is begot,
Which though in daily motions hurl'd
Yet weary not;
How doth it prove,
Thou art so fair, and I in love?


84 On the cult of Neoplatonic love in the Caroline court, see e.g. Erica Veevers, Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments (Cambridge, 1989).
Since man’s but pasted up of earth,
And ne’er was cradled in the skies,
What terra lemmia gave thee birth?
What diamond, eyes?
Or thou alone,
To tell what others were, came down?85

(MPCP ii. 201, ll. 1–6, 13–18)

Hall repeatedly gestures towards an Epicurean, carpe diem ethos in his 1647 Poems, only to seek instead a movement beyond or above the physical to a more fulfilling—and exciting—intellectual or spiritual plane. The forms of the love lyric are rejected as limiting and its erotic energies channelled instead into the dynamic quest for a higher knowledge. In ‘Anteros’, one of the devotional poems that Hall supposedly added to his volume at the request of the publisher, the poet again longs to be released matter and body in language that seem to be rewritten by Marvell in ‘To His Coy Mistress’ to celebrate an Epicurean fulfilment of sensual desire:

How should I become all one flame,
And melt in purest fires! O how
My warmed heart would sweetly glow,
And waste those dregs of earth that stay
Glued to it; then it might away
And still ascend, till that it stood
Within the centre of all good []

(MPCP ii. 221, ll. 24–30)

Now, therefore, while the youthful glew
Sits on thy skin like morning dew,
And while thy willing soul transpires
At every pore with instant fires,
Now let us sport us while we may . . .

(‘To His Coy Mistress’, ll. 33–7)

The connection with Hall’s ‘Anteros’ provides a new perspective on the textual problem of line 33 of ‘To His Coy Mistress’. The 1681 Miscellaneous Poems and most modern editions have ‘youthful hew’, which is amended to ‘glew’ in the Bodleian annotated copy of the 1681 volume. However the Haward manuscript of the poem, dating from 1672, has ‘glue’. ‘Glew’ is accepted by Smith, and he glosses it as meaning both ‘sweat’ and ‘glow’.86 Hall, however, uses both ‘glow’ and ‘glued’ within three lines, raising the possibility that Marvell punningly

85 Cf. Cowley, ‘All-over, Love’, in The Mistresse (1647), 25, ll. 16–17: ‘Let Nature if she please disperse | My Atoms all over the Universe;’ ‘Inconstancy’, in The Mistresse, 11, ll. 19–22: ‘The World’s a Scene of Changes, and to be | Constant, in Nature were Inconstancy; | For ’twere to break the Laws her self has made: | Our Substances themselves do fleet and fade.’

86 MP 83; see also the discussion in Hammond, ‘Marvell’s Coy Mistresses’, 28–31.
conflates Hall’s ‘glow’ and ‘glue’ as ‘glew’ to emphasize the connection between the ‘glow’ of sexual excitement and the ‘glue’ of the bodily from which Hall seeks to escape. Whoever transcribed the more bawdy version of Marvell’s poem in the Haward manuscript preferred to emphasize the materiality of the image by remembering ‘Sits on thy skin’ as ‘Sticks on your cheeke’.

If the Epicurean voice of ‘To His Coy Mistress’, with its apparent ignorance of grace or afterlife, is regarded as ironic or satiric, then the rewriting of Hall’s ‘To his Tutor, Master Pawson’ at the end of the lyric works intertextually to point to a world of (male) friendship, learning, and spirit beyond the world of animalistic sexuality and crude materialism to which the speaker is limited. It would then follow that Marvell’s poem is more specifically addressed to an audience of Hall and Stanley rather than the wider literary circle; although it would hardly be beyond the capacity of Marvell to compose a lyric that simultaneously appealed to Hall and Stanley as a parody of the libertine excesses of Epicurean philosophy, as distilled in the lyrics of Cowley’s *The Mistresse*, and to Herrick, Lovelace, Shirley, Cotton, and Alexander Brome as a consummate exercise in the imitation of classical *carpe diem* poetics. There is one final piece of evidence in this argument both for a 1647–8 date for ‘To His Coy Mistress’ and the particular influence on the lyric of Marvell’s association with Hall at this time. A date in the early or mid-1650s has often been proposed for ‘To His Coy Mistress’ on the grounds that such a date ‘helps the wit of proposing to wait “Till the conversion of the Jews” (l. 10)—1654 and 1656 being proposed by some as likely dates for the Second Coming of Christ, which, according to the book of Revelation, would be precipitated by the conversion to Christianity of the Jews. However on 21 December 1646 Hall wrote from Cambridge to Samuel Hartlib—their correspondence in 1646–8 is discussed in more detail in the next chapter—thanking Hartlib for sending him either a manuscript or printed tract on ‘the Conversion of the Jews’ that ‘is well relisht by those to whom I have in this short time communicated, but the Authors name is much desired’. Hartlib and his close friend John Dury maintained the Second Coming should be accelerated by greater efforts to reunite Christians and Jews, publishing several tracts on the issue, and their arguments helped to convince Cromwell to readmit Jews to England in 1655. The work in question may be a manuscript version of *Nova Solyma* (1648) by Samuel Gott (1613–71), an associate of Hartlib and Dury who sought to ‘reconcile the millenarian and utopian impulses’ of the Hartlib circle by ‘setting an ideal society of converted Jews in the Holy Land, itself a symbol


of the Last Days’. So in 1646–7 Hall was enthusiastically circulating a work about the conversion of the Jews to his acquaintances, raising the possibility that he discussed the work with or showed it to Marvell during evenings of discussion in Stanley’s rooms. Hall would certainly have appreciated the wit of Marvell’s reference as early as 1647, as would the rest of the circle if Hall had introduced it as a topic of conversation.

While ‘To His Coy Mistress’ is the lyric that most frequently resembles poetry produced by the Stanley circle, Marvell’s involvement in the coterie would illuminate aspects of other lyrics that have been dated to the late 1640s. For example ‘The Definition of Love’, which Nigel Smith argues belongs with ‘To His Coy Mistress’ in ‘its complicated forms of self-awareness and self-reflection’, contains a strong echo of the opening poem in Lovelace’s Lucasta, which is itself indebted to Donne’s ‘A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning’:

Though Seas and Lands betwixt us both,
   Our Faith and Troth,
   Like separated soules,
   All time and space controules:
   Above the highest sphere we meet
   Unsee, unkowne, and greet as Angels greet.90

As lines so loves oblique may well
   Themselves in every angle greet:
   But ours so truly parallel,
   Though infinite, can never meet.

(‘The Definition of Love’, ll. 25–8)

Marvell asserts the impossibility not only of the physical but also the spiritual union of the lovers by picking up on the angel/angle pun and the greet/meet rhyme, as though directly responding to Lovelace and expanding on the debt to Donne while reversing the imagery of connectedness in both the Donne and Lovelace lyrics. Given Marvell’s commendatory verse for Lucasta, it is unsurprising to find echoes of that volume in Marvell’s poetry. At the same time it was a habit of Stanley’s friends to respond both directly and implicitly to one another’s poems: in his 1647 Poems Stanley includes Hammond’s ‘The Union’, on the theme of one soul in two bodies, followed by his own reply, while Thomas Jordan published an ‘Answer’ to Stanley’s rendering of Basium.91 One of Stanley’s most anthologized lyrics, ‘When I lie burning in thine eye’, is a (depoliticized and

91 PTTS 66–7. Compare and contrast also Hall’s celebration of geographic distance in ‘Platonic Love’—‘Love’s like a landscape, which doth stand | Smooth at a distance, rough at hand’ (ll. 19–20)—with Marvell’s image of global separation: ‘And, us to join, the world should all | Be cramped into a planisphere’ (ll. 23–4).
more conventionally Petrarchan) rewriting of Lovelace’s ‘To Althea, From Prison’. (Stanley’s poem was included in his 1647 volume, although Lovelace’s poem was not published until 1649.) Donne was also ‘the group’s favourite English poet’, so Marvell’s witty rewriting of Lovelace rewriting Donne would have been particularly apposite for a circle in which, as the versions of Secundus indicate, ‘the spirit of playful competition reigns supreme’.92

This spirit of imitation and competition in the Stanley circle is likely the context for a Marvell lyric, ‘A Dialogue between Thyris and Dorinda’, that some have preferred to exclude from the canon. This exists in more manuscript copies than any other Marvell lyric, although all but three of these texts are post-Restoration, and takes two distinct forms: the shorter form is found only in manuscript. The earliest text, thirty-four lines in length, is ascribed to Henry Ramsey of Christ Church in an Oxford verse miscellany in which none of the datable poems were composed after 1635. There is also a musical setting in the autograph songbook of William Lawes, consisting of thirty-six lines, which must obviously have been composed before William’s death fighting for the royalists at the siege of Chester in 1645. Marvell is unlikely to have written the poem ascribed to Ramsey, given that he was 16 and at Cambridge in 1635.93 It has been persuasively argued, however, that Marvell rewrote and extended Ramsey’s poem, developing it into a more sophisticated and ‘metaphysical’ debate about death and suicide.94 Smith accepts this thesis and dates the Marvell version to 1646–54 (MP 243). Marvell’s rewritten version was first published in 1659 with a setting by John Gamble in Gamble’s second book of Ayres and Dialogues. Gamble (d. 1687), who had been a musician with the King’s Players before the war, published settings of no less than eighty-five Stanley lyrics in 1656; the volume contained commendatory poems (addressed to Stanley but also praising Gamble) from, among others, Lovelace and Alexander Brome. Gamble apologizes in his dedication to Stanley for taking so long to finish the settings, and several of the lyrics in Gamble’s collection retain readings that are struck out in the fair copy of his poems that Stanley had made in 1646–7 and that are altered in the versions of the poems published in 1647–8 and 1651. It seems that Gamble worked from a manuscript that may have been drafted as early as 1647.95 Gamble had been one of a group of musicians employed by the Middle Temple in 1641, and it was

---

93 See Kelliherr, Andrew Marvell, 48–9; Chernaik, The Poet’s Time, 13–14. The poem is also deleted from the annotated Bodleian copy of the 1681 Poems, where it is surprisingly placed between two 1650s political poems, ‘On the Victory Obtained by Blake over the Spaniards’ and ‘The Character of Holland’.
95 ‘To the worthy of all Honour, Thomas Stanley, Esq.’, in Gamble, Ayres and Dialogues (to be sung to the Therbo-lute or Bass-Viol) (2nd edn. 1657), sig. a4v’. This 2nd edn was published by Moseley. On the 1647 date for the MS from which Gamble worked, see PTTS, pp. lii–liv.
probably through this connection that Gamble came to Stanley’s notice when the latter returned to England in 1646.

Marvell and Gamble, seemingly one of Stanley’s ‘house’ musicians, may thus have rewritten the original lyric in the late 1640s for performance before the Stanley circle. Certainly the pastoral dialogue between lovers about the nature of death, heaven, and hell was a popular genre among members of the circle. Smith cites Herrick’s ‘Charon and Phylomel, a Dialogue sung’, which was also set by William Lawes, as a contemporary example of a pastoral dialogue concerning lovers who follow each other into death, but Herrick’s continued interest in the genre in the late 1640s is illustrated by his elegy for Hastings, written sometime after 24 June 1649. The elegy is a dialogue between ‘Charon and Eucosmia’, with the ‘Musical part being set by M. Henry Lawes’, William’s brother. Hall had also tried his hand at the form in ‘A Sea Dialogue’ in the 1647 Poems (a ‘very free version’, as Peter Davidson observes, of Horace Odes 3. 9), but perhaps the most significant example is Lovelace’s ‘Dialogue. Lucasta, Alexis’. This lyric was also ‘Set by Mr. John Gamble’, according to the printed text in Lucasta, indicating that it too may be a product of Stanley’s literary gatherings. Marvell’s knowledge of this lyric is shown by the clear echo of lines 15–16—‘Love neere his Standard when his Hoste he sets, | Creates alone fresh-bleeding Bannerets’—in lines 57–8 of ‘The Unfortunate Lover’, written, as I will argue in Chapter 5, in early 1649: ‘This is the only banneret | That ever love created yet’. Marvell’s rewriting of the ‘Dialogue Between Thyrsis and Dorinda’ seems to be another product of the competitive (because competing both for prestige within the group and for Stanley’s patronage) spirit fostered in the Stanley circle.

Among the numerous affinities between Marvell’s lyric verse and the poetry and poetic interests of the Stanley circle, there are several significant instances in the devotional poetry of the late 1640s. Stanley himself wrote only a couple of lyrics that can be called devotional, while Sherburne, Lovelace, and Shirley appear to have been completely uninterested in religious poetry. Although the clergyman Herrick appended a book of religious poetry, ‘Noble Numbers’, to Hesperides, the secular book is five times as long. Of the Stanley circle, only Hall appears to have been as interested in devotional as amatory and classical modes: apart from the book of ‘Divine Poems’ that he added, at the publisher’s request, to his 1647 Poems, Hall had prepared for the press by March 1647 a book of ‘Divine Emblems’. This was printed by Roger Daniel in 1648, but for some reason did not appear until 1658 as Emblems with Elegant Figures, dedicated by Daniel to Thomas Stanley’s wife, Dorothy. Hall’s religious poems, as with Marvell’s, ‘represent a very wide range of contemporary genres—meditation, emblem poem,

---

97 In late March 1647, Hall told Hartlib that he was now ‘putting in the press two books of Divine Emblems’ (HP 60/14/39A–40B).
debate, pastoral eclogue, hymn of praise’, indicating that both poets engaged in ‘generic and thematic experiments’. A recurring focus in Hall’s religious verse, as in Marvell’s, is ‘the dilemma created by the Christian’s simultaneous life in two spheres, the order of nature and the order of grace...and the art produced by or proper to each order’.98 As Smith has observed, Marvell’s ‘The Coronet’ might be seen as ‘an expansion of the second stanza’ of Hall’s ‘An Ode’, which closes the book of ‘Divine Poems’ in Hall’s collection:

I think I pass  
A meadow gilt with crimson showers  
Of the most rich and beauteous flowers;  
Yet thou, alas!  
Espi’st what under lowers;  
Taste them, they’re poison; lay  
Thyself to rest, there stray  
Whole knots of snakes that solely wait for pray.  

Thou who alone  
Canst give me assistance, send me aid,  
Else shall I in those depths be laid  
And quickly thrown,  
Whereof I am afraid[.]

(MPCP ii. 225, ll. 9–16, 32–7)

Through every garden, every mead,  
I gather flow’rs (my fruits are only flow’rs)  
Dismantling all the fragrent tow’rs  
That once adorned my shepherdess's head.  
And now when I have summed up all my store,  
Thinking (so I myself deceive)  
So rich a chaplet thence to weave  
As never yet the King of Glory wore:  
Alas I find the serpent old  
That, twining in his speckled breast,  
About the flow’rs disguised does fold,  
With wreaths of fame and interest...  
But Thou who only could’st the serpent tame,  
Either his slipp’ry knots at once untie,  
And disentangle all his winding snare  
Or shatter too with him my curious frame...  

(‘The Coronet’, ll. 5–16, 19–22)

The winding structure of both poems—‘An Ode’ is composed of five eight-line, one-sentence stanzas, ‘The Coronet’ of two sentences, of eighteen and

then eight lines—reflects both the poets’ meandering progress through a flowery meadow and, metaphysically, the entanglement of the soul in the ‘knots of snakes’ and ‘slippery knots’ of original sin. Both speakers realize with horror the inherent corruption of their own imaginative natures and switch from narrative to address in the final lines, throwing themselves violently on Christ’s mercy. In both poems the ‘beauteous flowers’ seem to signify the arts of secular poetry, although the metaphor is clearer in ‘The Coronet’ with its reference to ‘my curious frame’—simultaneously the sinful flesh of the poet and the poem constructed by his tainted wit. The guilt of both speakers derives from the sense that they have misdirected their poetic praise away from its proper focus in Christ and the Crucifixion and towards pride in their own creative imagination.

‘The Coronet’, like ‘Dialogue Between the Soul and Body’ and ‘On a Drop of Dew’, is indebted to emblem literature. In his book of ‘Divine Emblems’, Hall provides moralizing epigrams for fairly unsophisticated plates on Augustinian themes, many of them taken from Michael Hoyer’s *Flammulae Amoris* (1629). The epigrams are interspersed with devotional poems, including most of those that had appeared in the 1647 *Poems*. In one of the poems not included in the 1647 volume, the poet addresses and condemns his own ‘Vain curiosity’:

Vain Curiosity! Yee lead
The mind in mazes, make her tread
A-side, while that she toyles and is not fed.

O empty searchings! Do I care
If I can slice yon burning sphere
To the least atoms, and yet near come there.

Though I can number every flame
That fleets within that glorious frame;
Yet do not look on him that can them name.99

Hall and Marvell, then, shared an interest in emblem literature in the later 1640s. In ‘The Coronet’ Marvell seems to have combined elements of Hall’s ‘An Ode’ and ‘Vain Curiosity’ with Donne’s ‘La Corona’, where the crown is clearly a metaphor for the poem itself. But while the elaborate circular structure of Donne’s poem provides reassurance, ‘The Coronet’ ends ‘unresolved’ and ‘definitely in the mode of penitential prayer’.100 The final line of Hall’s ‘An Ode’ is even more acutely aware of the poet’s frailty: ‘Lest from myself my own self ruin be’ (l. 40)


100 Annabel Patterson, “‘Bermudas’ and “The Coronet”: Marvell’s Protestant Ethics’, *English Literary History*, 44 (1977), 495–6.
Despite Stanley’s disinterest in religious verse, Marvell’s fascination with the tension between nature and grace may have led him to explore the spiritual implications of Stanley’s erotic images. The two-part structure of ‘On a Drop of Dew’ bears comparison with Stanley’s ‘The Bud’. To a young Gentlewoman’, which first describes the rosebud and then explains that it represents the beauty of the ‘young Gentlewoman’ in the same way that Marvell’s poem first describes the drop of dew and then relates it to the nature of the soul. Certainly the opening lines of the poems are close:

See how this infant bud, so lately borne,
Swelled with the Spring warme breath and dew o’ th’ morne,
Contracted in its folded leaves doth beare
The richest treasures of the teeming yeare . . .

(PTTS 327)

See how the orient dew,
Shed from the bosom of the morn
Into the blowing roses,
Yet careless of its mansion new;
For the clear region where ’twas born
Round in itself incloses: . . .

(‘On a Drop of Dew’, ll. 1–6)

This resemblance is particularly striking given that there is no clear common source for both poems (although continental Catholic emblem literature is certainly an influence on both, particularly Marvell). Moreover Stanley never published ‘The Bud’: it only survives in a fair copy of his poems that Stanley had made in 1646, in preparation for the 1647 Poems.101 Of course Marvell’s poem explores, in the relation between dew drop and rose, ‘the soul’s proper stance towards the seductions of nature’, while Stanley more simply celebrates the ‘new Deity’ of the young woman’s ‘early beauty’.102 Stanley’s theme of budding beauty derives originally from epigrams in the Greek Anthology, several of which Stanley translated, and to that extent has more in common with Marvell’s ‘Young Love’, also dated by Smith to the late 1640s, although Stanley’s poem is much less direct and explicit than both its Greek sources and ‘Young Love’. Stanley merely contemplates the young woman’s beauty (as Marvell contemplates the drop of dew) while in ‘Young Love’ Marvell coarsely demands the love of the ‘little infant’ (l. 1). At the same Ros, Marvell’s Latin companion poem to ‘On a Drop of Dew’, does incorporate, as with ‘The Bud’, the erotic associations of the filling of roses with dew in Greek and neo-Latin poetry (see ll. 17–18).103 It has been suggested

101 Cambridge University Library MS Add. 7154; for discussion of this MS, see PTTS, pp. lv–lvi.
that Marvell wrote ‘On a Drop of Dew’ and *Ros* as a pedagogic exercise for Mary Fairfax in 1651–2. However Stanley rewrote his poems in various languages: in his 1647 *Poems* he includes versions of ‘Celia Singing, or Sleeping’ in Latin and French as well as English. We have seen that ‘To His Coy Mistress’ shares its image of the ‘wingèd chariot’ with ‘Celia Singing, or Sleeping’; Stanley’s poem is derived from a lyric by Marino, two of whose poems are the source for Marvell’s ‘The Fair Singer’, dated by Smith to 1647–8.

Was Marvell—along with both established and rising writers such as Shirley, Sherburne, Hall, Herrick, and Alexander and Richard Brome—in receipt of Stanley’s patronage at some time between his return to London in 1647 and his employment by Fairfax in 1651? There is no mention of Marvell in Stanley’s ‘Register of Friends’ or in any of the writings of the Stanley circle; there is no commendatory poem by Marvell for any of their publications. Obviously there can be no dedication of thanks from Marvell such as we find before the published texts of Hall’s *Poems*, Sherburne’s *Poems*, Shirley’s *The Brothers*, or Richard Brome’s *A Jovial Crew*, given that Marvell never published any of his lyric verse. If Marvell showed his poems to the Stanley circle in the late 1640s in the hope of receiving acclaim and reward for his mastery of classical, continental, and contemporary English poetic forms—and indeed he may have been motivated to write by the culture of friendly competition and commentary in the circle as much as by hopes of patronage—it would allow us to fill in the gap in our knowledge of Marvell’s activities between his return from the continent and his time at Nun Appleton House, and between his (possible) receipt of patronage from Buckingham and employment by Fairfax. Marvell had funds from the sale of the Meldreth property, so perhaps the support that he received from Stanley was as much intellectual as financial (the income from the sale has been calculated at £40). It may also be the case that Marvell’s membership of the Stanley circle helped him get the post of tutor to Mary Fairfax when the Meldreth money ran out, an opportunity which has usually but rather vaguely been ascribed to Fairfax’s connections with Marvell’s native Hull. William Fairfax was the eldest son of Edward Fairfax (?1558–?1632), translator of Tasso. Edward was the third of the four sons of Sir Thomas Fairfax (1521–1600)


105 *PTTS* 13–14, 244, 379–80; *MP* 96. In the 1647 volume, the English version is followed by the French and then the Latin.

106 Although Stanley curiously excised the commendatory poems for his 1647 *Poems* by Hall, Sherburne, William Hammond, and William Fairfax from the revised and expanded 1651 volume.

of Denton and Nun Appleton, Yorkshire; Edward's eldest brother was Thomas (1560–1640), first Lord Fairfax of Cameron, whose eldest son was Ferdinando (1584–1648)—father of Marvell's patron Thomas Fairfax (1612–71). William Fairfax, in other words, was the first cousin of Thomas Fairfax's father: as a tutor himself, William would have been an obvious person to recommend a tutor for Thomas's daughter.108

If Marvell was part of the Stanley coterie, we might reasonably expect to find the influence of his poetry on that of other members. As we shall see in the conclusion, Lovelace and Alexander Brome knew 'Tom May's Death'; we have seen above that imagery in Stanley's translations of Secundus's Basia 7 and 9, which were not published until 1651, may anticipate or recall 'To His Coy Mistress'. These resemblances suggest that more attention should be paid to Hilton Kelliher's observation that Stanley's version of Basium 16 employs the unusual metre of the 'Horatian Ode':

Thy Arms about me thou shalt ty,
Thy warm to my cold Breast apply,
And summon me from Death
With a Long Kisses Breath.
Thus let us Dear in mutual Joy
The florid part of Time employ;
For Age our lives will waste;
Sickness and Death make haste.

An earlier version of Basium 16 in a different metre survives in the fair copy of his poems that Stanley had copied in 1646, in preparation for the 1647 Poems; this original translation of Basium 16 was not included in the published volume. So Stanley rewrote his translation sometime between 1646 and 1651, raising the possibility that he saw the 'Horatian Ode' soon after it was written in the summer of 1650 and used it as the metrical model for the new version.109 If Stanley admired what Barbara Everett calls the 'remarkable thinking metre' of the 'Horatian Ode', what would he have made of its politics?110 No matter how poetically impresssive, a panegyric of Cromwell—if that is what the 'Horatian Ode' is—would seem obviously incompatible with the emphatic royalism of the

---

108 There are other possible connections between the Stanley circle and Nun Appleton. From 1647 to the Restoration Herrick was in receipt of patronage from his Cambridge contemporary Mildmay Fane, Thomas Fairfax's brother-in-law; so Herrick was also in a position to put in a good word for Marvell with Fairfax.

109 PTTS 129, ll. 37–44; Kelliher, Andrew Marvell, 34. It has long been thought that the metre of the 'Horatian Ode' might be derived from Sir Richard Fanshawe's version of the fourth ode of the fourth book in Selected Parts of Horace, published in 1652 but begun in 1648. It is of course possible that Stanley saw Fanshawe's translation in MS, although there is no evidence of contact between Stanley and Fanshawe.

110 'Shooting of the Bears', 44.
order of the Black Riband. Yet, as the following chapters reveal, the Stanley circle could subordinate politics to friendship and literary admiration. For John Hall, the ‘early blossom of the wandering North’ whose intellectual worth Stanley had first identified in Durham in 1641 and whose studies he had supported throughout the 1640s, had by 1648 lent his pen to the Parliamentarian cause—but not, apparently, at the cost of his friendship with Stanley and the royalist literati.
Milton, John Hall, and Cultural Communities in Post-War London, 1646–1647

JOHN HALL, THE STANLEY CIRCLE, AND THE HARTLIB NETWORK

The Stanley circle was not the only cultural community with which John Hall had become involved in post-war London. While at Cambridge Hall had begun a correspondence with the educational reformer and intelligencer Samuel Hartlib (c.1600–62) at a time when Hartlib had become ‘one of the key intellectual brokers in seventeenth-century Europe’.\(^1\) Born in Elbing to an English mother and German father, Hartlib had first arrived in England to study at Cambridge in the early 1620s. He finally settled in London in 1628. Through correspondence and discussion during the 1630s with, pre-eminently, the Scottish minister John Dury (1596–1680) and the Moravian educational theorist Johannes Amos Comenius (1592–1670), Hartlib had come to believe that pan-European Protestant unity could only be realized through a universal reformation of learning, termed *pansophia* by Comenius. Hartlib had the outlines of *pansophia* that Comenius sent him in manuscript, *Conatuum Comenianorum præludia* and *Pansophiae prodomus*, published in England in 1637 and 1639, and issued a translation of the latter tract in 1642 under the title *The Ref-*


\(^2\) *HP* 7/109/1A–2B; Mark Greengrass, entry for Comenius in the *OBNB*.
of one Truth may beget another’.3 Such language points toward the providential and millenarian contexts of the Hartlibian vision. ‘Certainly God had has some special aime in bringing this notion of a Pansophical learning into the world’, Hartlib wrote in his dairy in 1639; ‘[it is] a preparation for that happy promised state of God’s church and a forerunner to bring men that blessed and wished for unity and union by stating of all the universal principles aright’.4

The concept of universal reformation formulated by Hartlib and his correspondents is distinguished by its emphasis on spiritual regeneration through material change. Pansophia issued in practical proposals for reform in a wide variety of disciplines, from education at every level and all forms of natural philosophical speculation to linguistics, horticulture, and public health policy. Hartlib’s ideas were shaped by his reading of an eclectic range of continental intellectuals, logicians, and pedagogues; among British influences, the writings on experimental philosophy of Francis Bacon (1561–1626) were undoubtedly a major influence. Hartlib had sent Baconian works to Comenius in the early 1630s and Hartlib frequently insisted that his proposals were a means to ‘put in practice the Lord Verulams Designations, De Augmentis Scientarum’—a reference to the 1623 Latin translation and expansion of Bacon’s The Advancement of Learning (1605). Crucially the accumulation and advancement of knowledge depended upon improved forms of intellectual communication and exchange. ‘It is evident’, Hartlib wrote in 1647, ‘that the benefit of Mutuall Communication in good things is the chief fruit of all Society.’5 As his diaries and copious correspondence demonstrate, Hartlib tirelessly sought to put theory into practice, developing a network of correspondents throughout Europe who would exchange information about discoveries, inventions, translations, and any matter that might reform or further the dissemination of knowledge. During the mid-1640s Hartlib formulated a scheme for an ‘Office of Address’, which was outlined in Considerations Tending to the Happy Accomplishment of Englands Reformation in Church and State (1647). This ‘Office of Address’, or ‘College’ as Hartlib often calls it in his correspondence, was to be a publicly funded, state-patronized ‘clearing house of information’.6 One branch, the ‘Office of Address for Communications’, would be based in Oxford, with Hartlib as its head: it would maintain registers of information on ‘Matters of Religion, of Learning and Ingenuities’ and act as a ‘Center and Meeting-place of Advices, of Proposalls, of Treaties and of all Manner of Intellectual Rarities freely to be given and received, to and from, by and for all’. It would also disperse funding

---

3 Hartlib, Considerations Tending to the Happy Accomplishment of Englands Reformation in Church and State (1647), 49.
5 Considerations Tending to the Happy Accomplishment, 41, 47.
for schemes, inventions, and intelligence which promised to advance learning and serve the public good. For Hartlib, ‘all human knowledge was a public endowment from God to be used in the service of all humankind’.

Supported by Dury, the Kentish gentleman and lawyer Sir Cheney Culpeper (1611–63), and, by 1645, the physician and projector Benjamin Worlsey (1618–77), Hartlib was zealous in his pursuit during the early 1640s of like-minded contacts and correspondents who could not only provide him with information, ideas, and manuscripts, but also promote his vision of the reformation of learning to influential figures and potential patrons. For around six months in 1646–7 Hall seems to have acted on Hartlib’s behalf in Cambridge, attempting to convince fellows and members of the University hierarchy to enter into correspondence with Hartlib and lend their intellectual and financial support to the Hartlib circle’s efforts to establish an ‘Office of Address’. John Davies tells us that Hall’s ‘correspondence at Cambridge was very great for the small time he stay’d there’; the letters preserved in Hartlib’s papers give us an insight into Hall’s activities in 1646–7 and a sense of his intellectual development while at Cambridge. The first surviving letter from Hall to Hartlib is dated 20 November 1646, from St John’s College, but they had evidently already met. Hall may have been introduced to Hartlib through links with the Stanley circle. Sir Justinian Isham (1611–75) is, along with Hall, one of the nine close friends remembered by Stanley in his ‘Register’; he was also one of Hartlib’s correspondents in the 1630s and early 1640s, writing on 10 October 1639, for example, about the need to gather ‘Intelligences and other paper rarities tending to advance the Common good of Religion and Learning’. Hartlib may also have sought Hall out after reading Horae Vaciævae. According to John Davies, Hall’s essays created a stir among British intellectuals: ‘breaking forth [they] amazed not only the University, but the more serious part of men in the three Nations’. In his essay ‘Of Fables’ Hall specifically praises the ‘stupendous Fabric of a College for Nature’ devised by Bacon in his utopian narrative New Atlantis (1627). ‘Salomon’s House’, the college of experimental philosophy in the New Atlantis, was one of the models for Hartlib’s ‘Office of Address’ and had shaped the ‘technological utopia’ sketched by Gabriel Plattes under Hartlib’s supervision, A Description of the Famous Kingdom of Macaria (1641).

7 Considerations Tending to the Happy Accomplishment, 46, 48. See also [Hartlib], A further Discoverie of the Office of Publick Adress for Accomodations (1648); [William Petty], The Advice of W. P. to Mr Samuel Hartlib for the advancement of some particular parts of learning (1647).
12 ‘An Account of the Author’, in Hierocles, sig. A8’; Horae Vaciævae, 196; Charles Webster, The Great Instauration: Medicine, Science, and Reform, 1626–1660 (1975), 250; Webster, ‘The
Baconian enthusiasms—already evident in 1645 in ‘A Method of History’, which echoes sections of Bacon’s *The Advancement of Learning*—may thus have alerted Hartlib to Hall’s potential as a correspondent.13

In the same section of his essay ‘Of Fables’ in which he praises the *New Atlantis*, Hall refers to the ‘rare Common-wealths’ that ‘have beene moulded by Sir Thomas Moore, Campanella, &C’ (196). Many of the twenty-three letters from Hall to Hartlib between November 1646 and April 1647 are concerned with the translation of continental utopian works by Thomaso Campanella (1568–1639) and Johann Valentin Andreae (1586–54).14 These may have influenced Bacon’s *New Atlantis*, and they were certainly admired by Comenius and Hartlib as blueprints for the reformation of learning and the revised role of the intellectual in society.15 On 23 November 1646 Hall received from Hartlib copies of Andreae’s *Christianae Societatis Imago* (1620) and *Christiani Amoris Dextera Porrecta* (1620), which Hall had agreed to translate from the Latin. In the former tract Andreae describes a fraternity of Lutheran intellectuals, not unlike a monastic order, who dedicate themselves to the discovery of divine truth through the study of nature and the advancement of all branches of knowledge. After some delay at the end of 1646 due to the preparation of his *Poems* for publication, Hall completed the translation and in February 1647 had one hundred duodecimo copies of *A Modell of a Christian Society and The Right Hand of Christian Love offered* printed by Roger Daniel, the University printer who also printed the *Poems*. In the dedication to ‘his honoured friend Mr S. Hartlib’, Hall, citing Comenius and Bacon, called for the international exchange of ideas ‘since one Countrey can neither engrose all greater spirits, nor one great spirit all knowledge’. In Hall’s translation, Andreae similarly calls for ‘free communication of all things among good men’, following the model of ‘a communion of gifts’ practised by Christ and the Apostles. Andreae also asks why ‘so many of the best and wisest do satisfie themselves with a bare desire of a Colledge or society of the best things’ rather than taking the steps to establish such an institution.16

By March 1647 Hartlib had been put in touch with Robert Boyle (1627–91), probably by Worsley, who had been in discussion with Boyle about the

---

13 For the influence of Bacon on ‘A Method of History’, see Raymond, ‘John Hall’s *A Method of History*’, 280–1. The Bodleian MS of ‘A Method of History’ is probably a copy of a 1657 printed text, prepared for the press by John Davies, that is no longer extant; we know about the 1657 text because Hartlib had a transcript made of the title-page (*HP* 14/1/11A).

14 There are twenty-five letters from Hall to Hartlib in total, and one from Hall to Worsley, in the *Hartlib Papers*. For a full, if disorganized, discussion, see G. H. Turnbull, ‘John Hall’s Letters to Samuel Hartlib’, *Review of English Studies*, NS, 4/15 (1953), 221–33.

15 Comenius praises Campanella and Andreae alongside Bacon in the *Pansophiae prodromus*; see Dagmar Čapková, ‘Comenius and his Ideals: Escape from the Labyrinth’, in Greengrass et al. (eds.), *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation*, 84.

foundation of an ‘Invisible College’. This seems to have been envisaged as a
network of correspondence between intellectuals who could only meet infre-
quently in London concerning their ideas for the advancement of natural phi-
losophy, mathematics, technology, and various practical projects. Hartlib sent
the translation of Andreae to Boyle, who was living on his family estate in
Dorset, initiating an exchange of letters between Hall and Boyle. The latter,
despite being the same age, judged Hall ‘a person that, treading antipodes, to
the strain of his contemporaries, has September in his judgement, whilst we can
scarce find April upon his chin’. Hartlib was sufficiently impressed by Hall’s
work on Andreae to ask him to translate Campanella’s *Civitas Solis* (written in
Italian in 1602, published in Latin in 1623), which describes an apparently post-
apocalyptic city directed by a group of Hermetic priests and constructed around
seven concentric walls, each of which displays the totality of knowledge in a
category of natural knowledge. Hall, however, felt that he could ‘serve to a better
advantage’ and engaged Jeremy Collier, a fellow of St John’s, on the translation
of Campanella. On 11 March 1647 Hall assured Hartlib that ‘Civitas Solis will
(I hope) be in good forwardness by the End of the Week’ and asked Hartlib to
write the preface and gather testimonies from the likes of Boyle. In the same
month Hall promised he would also arrange for the translation of Andreae’s
*Christianopolis* (1619), again a depiction of a scholarly community devoted to
spiritual regeneration through the interpretation of both scripture and nature.
Although Collier would later translate Comenius’s *Pansophiae Diatyposis* (1643)
and dedicate it to Hartlib as *A Patterne of Universal Knowledge* (1651), the
translations of Campanella and Andreae’s *Christianopolis* do not seem to have
been completed; there is no further reference to them in the Hartlib papers and
no evidence that they were ever published.

There are obvious connections between the notion of a ‘Christian society’ of
intellectuals in the utopian narratives that Hall and Hartlib discussed in 1646–7,
the ‘Fraternal pact in the sight of God’ sworn by Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius
in 1642, and Hartlib’s scheme for ‘An Office of Address’. Hall’s enthusiasm for
what he calls ‘our Utopian Academy’—by which he presumably means Worsley’s
and Boyle’s ‘Invisible College’ or Hartlib’s Office of Address, or a combination
of both—is evident throughout his correspondence with Hartlib. He repeatedly
praises Hartlib’s ‘indeavours of gleaning together great and honest spirits’, declar-
ing that ‘the best way’ to advance learning is ‘a Colledge and the Associating of
Minds’. Indeed Hall himself hoped to ‘express an idea of a Commonwealth or
Colledge in a Romance’ and wrote to Hartlib about an unfinished work called

---

Birch, 6 vols. (1772), i. xxxvii, xl.

18 Hall to Hartlib, 17 Dec. 1646, *HP* 60/14/3A–4B; 11 Mar. 1647, 60/14/7A–8B; late Mar.
1647, 60/14/39A–40B; Davis, ‘Utopianism’, in Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Political
Thought, 1450–1700*, 335–6; Allen G. Debus, *Man and Nature in the Renaissance* (Cambridge,
'Leucenia', the title of which recalls Plattee's _Macaria_. (According to John Davies, the manuscript of 'Leucenia' was lost after Hall moved to Gray's Inn and lent it to a friend.\textsuperscript{19}) But Hall also sought to turn the idea of a 'Colledge' into reality by canvassing support for Hartlib in Cambridge. On 31 January Hall reports to Hartlib that he has delivered copies of Andreae's works to the Vice-Chancellor: from early 1647 this was John Arrowsmith, the Master of St John's to whom Hall had dedicated _Horae Vaciave_. Hall focused his efforts, however, on the circle of clergymen who have become known as the Cambridge Platonists. Hall was, according to Davies, 'intimately acquainted' with Henry More (1614–87), a fellow of Christ's since 1641: More had both written a poem (in Greek) for _Horae Vaciave_ and appeared at the head of the commendatory verses for Hall's _Poems_. On 21 December Hall promised Hartlib he would talk to More about their plans, 'feel his puls, and gain as many as I can'. He had already spoken to Ralph Cudworth (1617–88) and Benjamin Whichcote (1609–83), then a fellow of Emmanuel and Provost of King's College respectively. On 25 January 1647, Hall told Hartlib he doubted 'the affections to this business' of both the Vice-Chancellor and Cudworth but had delivered a draft of a proposal, presumably for some variation on the Office of Address, to the latter; on 5 April he emphasized the need to 'gain Mr Moor to our O[ffice]' as he is 'a man of rare parts' and to convince Cudworth for 'in him you gain Emmanuel Colledge, the most flourishing (for tongues) in the Town'. Hall's belief that the advancement of learning would end the religious conflicts that had given rise to civil war is indicated by his observation that individuals of the intellectual stature of More and Cudworth had to be involved in the Office because 'the Taking notice of great men is the best basis of a solid Peace'.\textsuperscript{20}

It appears that the Platonists remained largely unconvinced by the schemes of the Hartlib circle for an Office of Address or 'utopian Academy', despite the apparent sympathy between Hartlibian ideas of universal knowledge and religious unity and the Platonists' notion of the 'universal truth' latent in all systems of thought, their toleration of theological difference, and hatred of enthusiasm and sectarianism. More's scepticism about _pansophia_ seems to have derived in part from a residual pessimism about man's sinful nature and tendency to abuse knowledge: such 'great projectes seem to me', he wrote to Hartlib, 'like the building of Babell against a second expected deluge'. However Hall's efforts to bring the Cambridge Platonists into the Hartlib circle were not wholly in vain.

\textsuperscript{19} Hall to Hartlib, 17 Dec. 1646, _HP_ 60/14/1A–2B; 2 Jan. 1647, 9/10/1A; 26 [April?] 1647, 60/14/35A–36B; late Mar. 1647, 60/14/39A–40B; Davies, 'An Account of the Author', in _Hierocles_, sig. b2'. See also 'Whilst by the reedy banks of aged Cam', in which Hall seems to regret leaving Cambridge for London and expresses his sorrow that 'that great Fabrick of Leucenia' must 'lie unperfitt' and 'be at most a monstrous Embryo' (_Emblems with Elegant Figures_, 78). This poem must have been written after the _Emblems_ was originally prepared for the press in Mar. 1647, as Hall did not arrive in London until May.

\textsuperscript{20} Hall to Hartlib, 7 Dec. 1646, _HP_ 60/14/1A–2B; 21 Dec. 1646, 60/14/5A–6B; 25 Jan. 1647, 60/14/14A–15B; 31 Jan. 1647, 60/14/16A–17B; 13 Apr. 1647, 60/14/30A–31B.
Hall seems to have put More and Hartlib in contact, and it was Hartlib who in 1648 convinced More to enter into correspondence with Descartes. Cudworth was also in touch with Hartlib by 1648 and, significantly, Whichcote sent Hartlib money ‘from your Cambridge friends’ in March 1648. One lesser member of the Cambridge establishment that Hall apparently recruited to the cause of pansophia was his tutor Pawson, who, Hall reported, was ‘in good disposition our way’ and ‘a most learned man in this service’.21

Hall’s enthusiasm for the Comenian and Hartlibian vision of spiritual renewal through a universal apprehension of knowledge is surely a context for the rapturous panorama of nature and history in ‘To his Tutor. Master Pawson. An Ode’. As Hammond observes, Hall’s ‘Ode’ to Pawson ‘reminds us how Marvell’s contemporaries were often ravished with excitement as they contemplated the expansion of their knowledge of the natural world’:22 Hall’s poem also exhibits the influence of the Cambridge Neoplatonists and their sometimes ecstatic celebrations of the power of human reason to free itself from the material and participate in mind of the divine. The ‘light’ of Pawson’s intellectual companionship enables Hall to take a ‘full view of this enamelled ball’ and of nature’s ‘hardly open’d book, | Which to aread is easy, to understand divine’ (ll. 10, 11–12, 16). Yet the Neoplatonic perfectionism of the ‘Ode’ to Pawson is countered by the ‘Ode’ to Christ that closes the devotional section of Hall’s Poems, in which the poet painfully acknowledges the original sin that drives man’s curiosity in terms reminiscent of More’s warning to Hartlib about the building of a second Babel—both odes, as we have seen in the previous chapter, attracted Marvell’s attention. A similar Neoplatonic dialectic of grace and nature structures Hall’s Emblems, a volume that Hall had finished by March 1647 and that he wanted to dedicate to Boyle. While the genre of the Augustinian emblem-book demands a chastened acknowledgement of innate sin, at times Hall sounds more like Marsilio Ficino than St Augustine in his excitement at man’s sublime capacity for self-transformation:

Still may I rise; still further clime
Till that I lie
(Having out-run-short-winded time)
Swath’d in Eternitie:
So may my youth spend time and renue, so night
Never alternate with my light.

What is Mans body? Clay, or lead his soul?
The nimblest swiftest substance that can roul
It self ere thought; and by its power bring down,
Or mount to heaven, and so mak’st its own.

22 Hammond, Figuring Sex between Men, 222.
The Cambridge Neoplatonists were accused by Calvinist critics of subordinating revelation to natural reason and of elevating human merit over Christ’s atonement. In his preface to the 1658 published text of Hall’s *Emblems*, John Quarles, eldest son of the celebrated emblem-book author Francis Quarles, recognized Hall’s occasionally unorthodox tone when he left it up to the reader to decide whether ‘the matter be more full of Divinity, or the stile of learning and Art’.  

The ecstatic exclamations of man’s perfectibility through learning in Hall’s poetry and the interest in utopian social innovation in his translation of Andreae are consistent with the ‘ultimate goal’ of *pansophia*, which was ‘a millennial recovery of the knowledge that mankind had lost when expelled from the Garden of Eden’. In addressing *Of Education* to his friend Hartlib in 1644, Milton begins his proposals for the ideal academy by speaking in Hartlib’s language, declaring that the ‘end then of Learning is to repair the ruines of our first Parents by regaining to know God aright’. The tract was, according to Milton, the result of Hartlib’s ‘earnest entreaties, and serious conjurments’ that he should publish his thoughts about educational reform. While Milton is provocatively dismissive, considering his addressee, of Comenian projects for ‘universal knowledge’—‘to search what many modern *Janua*’s and *Didactics* more than ever I shall read, have projected, my inclination leads me not’—he praises Hartlib for ‘the learned correspondence which you hold in forreign parts, and the extraordinary pains and diligence which you have us’d in this matter both here, and beyond the Seas’.  

Hartlib circulated *Of Education* among his circle, asking for their opinions. Culpeper and Dury were luke-warm in their reaction, finding Milton’s proposals lacking in specifics; Hall, however, was full of admiration for what he had read. In a letter to Hartlib dated 17 December 1646, Hall seems to indicate that Milton has been in contact with him: ‘I had a loving and Modest express from Mr Milton, I desire to be enformed from you whether you suppose him willing to entertain a constant correspondence or noe.’ On 21 December Hall urges Hartlib to convince Milton of Hall’s worthiness as a correspondent: ‘I am much ambitious of the acquaintance of Mr Milton (who is said here to be the Author of that excellent discourse of Education you were pleased to impart) I beseech you be a means to bringing us to a Correspondency if you can.’ On 4 January 1647 Hall refers to the ‘account of Mr Milton and Mr Worsley by

---


Mr Blunden’ that Hall had earlier sent to Hartlib and declares his intention to write ‘next week’ to Milton and Worsley. (‘Mr Blunden’ is presumably the London publisher Humphrey Blunden, cited on several occasions in Hartlib’s notebooks for 1647–8.) Only four days later, however, Hall again begs Hartlib to ‘be a means of my acquaintance with Mr Milton and Mr Worlsey’. By the beginning of February Hall was in correspondence with Worsley, but there is no evidence of any (further) communication between Hall and Milton. The final reference to Milton in Hall’s letters, in late March 1647, indicates that Milton had reacted negatively to a proposal that had been put to him, presumably by Hartlib but possibly by Hall: ‘I am sorry Mr Milto[n] dos abundare suo sensu I wish I could not complain the like of my dear Stanley (to whom expect a letter as you desire next week). But I hope I shall win of him when I come to London as I shall shortly.’ The Latin phrase is from of Romans 14: 5 in the Vulgate, rendered in the Authorized Version as ‘fully persuaded in his own mind’.

Hall’s pairing of Milton and ‘my dear Stanley’, the patron of Hall’s studies at Cambridge, suggests Milton was ‘fully persuaded in his own mind’ that he did not wish to become involved in the efforts of the Hartlib circle to found an Office of Address. Hartlib had clearly identified Stanley as a potential patron of the Office, and had been keen to involve Stanley in his plans through their mutual friendship with Hall. In his letter to Hartlib of 11 January 1647 Hall enclosed a letter of introduction to Stanley that Hall was sure would ‘procure you the respect which is due to you’. This may suggest that Hartlib’s earlier approaches to Stanley had been rebuffed. On 11 March Hall expressed his surprise that ‘you never mention the Address Office or Stanley’, linking Hartlib’s desire to be introduced to Stanley with efforts to secure support for the Office. Hartlib’s entreaty to Hall in late March to send another letter to Stanley suggests Hartlib’s continued failure to elicit a response. But then on 29 March Hall reported his brief trip away from Cambridge to visit his ill patron, presumably in the Middle Temple or, more likely, Stanley’s estate in Hertfordshire: on 20 April Hall notes that Stanley has recently been ‘in the Country’. During this trip to see Stanley, Hall discovered that ‘some gentlemen are gathering an Academy of Ingenuitys for Humane Learning’. In his next letter Hall enclosed the proposal for this ‘Academy of Ingenuitys’ for Hartlib’s consideration. It would consist of sixty gentlemen, the Essentials, elected on the grounds that they had achieved something ‘memorable or Serviceable to the Politique or Litterary Republickes’. The leadership structure would be headed by a President, elected for one year; next to him would be the Orator, followed by a secretary, a library-keeper, and a master of ceremonies. Each member would pay an annual sum of not less than £4 towards the running of the Academy, although there would also be a group named the Fautores, separate

26 Hall to Hartlib, 17 Dec. 1646, HP 60/14/3A–4B; 21 Dec. 1646, 60/14/5A–6B; 4 Jan. 1647, 60/14/9A–10B; 8 Jan. 1647, 60/14/11A–12B; Hall to Worsley, 5 Feb. 1647, 36/61A–2B; Hall to Hartlib, late Mar. 1647, 60/14/39A–40B; Ariel Hessayon, entry for Humphrey Blunden in the ODNB.
from the Essentials, whose sole function was to raise money. Each week two Essentials would deliver discourses on some aspect of ‘Humane Learning’ to the Academy; these would be registered and stored in the library. Every Essential would annually submit ‘verses and some choise discourse’ and the best poems would be published under the name of the Academy.27

There are resemblances between the proposal for an ‘Academy of Ingenuitys for Humane Learning’ and aspects of both Hartlib’s projected Office of Address for Communications and Stanley’s community of poets and classicists. Hall does not reveal the identity of the ‘gentlemen’ who devised the proposal, nor do we know Hartlib’s reaction to it; but we do know from Hall’s letter to Hartlib on 20 April that Stanley ‘was proffered the second place (I mean Orator)’ in the Academy but would ‘not accept it, by reason himself hath a design Armilla Nigra, and forsooth will not be a ρώσειαττης [renegade]’. Stanley perhaps viewed the Academy as a potential rival to his own Order of the Black Riband as the leading intellectual community of postwar London; it seems more likely, however, that the basis of Stanley’s objection was political rather than personal. The Black Riband was defined by its nostalgia for a courtly system of cultural patronage that had been wrecked by civil war, while the ‘Academy’ was a postwar reorganization of the structures of intellectual culture that would apparently be independent of the court. Stanley’s refusal to be a ‘renegade’ to the Armilla Nigra—‘renegade’ still carried its original meaning of a Christian convert to Islam—may also have been a refusal to quit his allegiance to the Stuart court and its aristocratic patronage culture, which he hoped to see restored and the shape of which he sought to preserve in his own coterie. This attachment to what Peter Thomas calls ‘the “old” patterns of behaviour and relationship’, an attachment that was inextricably bound with royalist allegiance, was surely one of the reasons behind Stanley’s refusal to become involved in the efforts of the Hartlib circle to establish an Office of Address, despite the enthusiastic involvement of his close friend Hall. In his letter of 26 April Hall expresses his disappointment that Stanley did not share Boyle’s commitment to the cause of universal reformation: ‘If my deare friend Stanley…had to his stupendous parts the fores[ai]d Gentlemans Inclinations I durst be bold to challeng[e] our domestick or the forreign world for such a Gemini of Nobility’.28

Stanley and Boyle would finally appear together in the same intellectual ‘club’: they were both original Fellows of the Royal Society when it was formally incorporated in 1662.29 But in 1647 there were clear tensions between the

27 Hall to Hartlib, 11 Jan. 1647, HP 60/14/13A–B; 11 Mar. 1647, 60/14/7A–8B; 29 [Mar.?] 1647, 9/10/5A–6B; 13 Apr. 1647, 60/14/30A–31B. Hartlib seems to have passed on the proposal to Boyle, who refers on 8 May 1647 in a letter to Hartlib to Hall’s ‘propositions concerning the college’; Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle, i. xl–xli.

28 Hall to Hartlib, 20 Apr. 1647, HP 60/14/; 26 [Apr.?] 1647, 60/14/35A–36B. Thomas, Sir John Berkenhead, 143.

cultural–political attitudes of the Hartlib and the Stanley circles. Stanley saw himself and his friends as ‘withdrawn’ from a public world of ignorance and barbarity. Through his encouragement of poetic collaboration in the Middle Temple and at Cumberlow, Stanley preserved the tradition of a ‘participatory poetics’ that had characterized the enclosed social environments of Tudor and Stuart England—the Inns of Court, the universities, aristocratic country-houses, and, above all, the court. Walter Ong identifies this ‘participatory poetics’ with manuscript culture, and evidently the members of the Stanley circle privately exchanged each others’ poems and translations. It is true that Stanley was keen to publish the fruits of these private literary activities in collaboration with Humphrey Moseley. Yet, as we have seen, the prefatory apparatus surrounding Moseley’s publications, whether previously unpublished poetry by the likes of Suckling or new work such as the translations of Stanley and Sherburne, was often designed to invoke nostalgia in readers for a refined court culture that had been lost in civil war and a flood of polemical prose. Paradoxically Moseley represents his publication of coterie verse as a sign of the decline of literature with the disintegration of private systems of patronage and the rise of a public market-place of print.

Hartlib and his friends, conversely, were inspired by the collapse of aristocratic and royal structures of patronage to devise new mechanisms of funding that would better serve their project of intellectual collaboration in the public interest. Hartlib and Dury conceived of the public good ‘in the face of, and in reaction to, the system of patents and monopolies that had largely outgrown its intended purpose of stimulating native industry and turned into a tool of the patronage system’. Their advocacy of the free communication of ideas did not derive from a notion of free market economics, but was rather formulated in opposition to a model of monopoly that served only private interests: the writings of the circle display an anxiety that ideas to advance the public good might be ‘incorporated’ for private profit. The ‘ideology of information’ formulated in, for example, the letters between Dury and Culpeper that were published by Hartlib in 1642, under the title *A Motion Tending to the Publick Good of this Age*, had clear political as well as economic implications, for it involved ‘the rewriting of older notions of the state in which information was hierarchically distributed and controlled’. Hence the Office of Address would be both publicly funded and—unlike the court—publicly accountable. It is clear that Hall had swiftly become an ardent supporter of the Hartlibian vision of knowledge as an endowment from God to be used for public benefit. The influence of anti-monopoly rhetoric is evident in


Hall’s insistence in the introduction to his Andreae translation that no country can ‘engrosse all great spirits, nor one great spirit all knowledge’, while in the letters to Hartlib he repeatedly asserts his desire to become involved in any enterprise ‘wherein I may do the Publique and your self service’. Hall is always anxious that the manuscripts he receives from Hartlib should not merely be circulated among their friends but ‘should be sent to the bookbinders [so] that they may be more Publique’. In the last dated letter in the Hartlib papers, written on 8 February 1648 from Gray’s Inn, Hall assures Hartlib that he will ‘not faile to be (where I am able) subservient to the Com[m]onwealth of [lette]rs’.32

In his translations of Andreae and correspondence with the Hartlib circle Hall envisages an international republic of letters in which people and ideas move freely between national boundaries, and an England in which scholars and scholarship are at the centre of public life, working for the common good and constantly seeking to improve society through the advancement of learning. It is his emphasis on the public utility of innovation that leads Hall to reject the proposal for the ‘Academy of Ingenuitys for Humane Learning’: ‘I was ever of the opinion that it was too slight, to advance any way the Publique being rather a Private Conglobation’. Although David Norbrook is mistaken in ascribing the proposal for the Academy to Stanley—as we have seen, Stanley rather regarded the mooted society as a rival to his Black Riband—Hall’s rejection of the Academy on these grounds does raise the question of how he reconciled intellectually his central role in Stanley’s coterie with his Hartlibian and Comenian enthusiasms for universal reformation.33 While it is misleadingly simplistic to portray Hartlib and Dury as pressing the claims of ‘science’ over humanism, they had little time for the high classicist poetics practised by the Stanley coterie: in his proposals for the reform of the school curriculum, Dury attacked ‘the curious studie of Criticismes, and observation of Styles, in Authors, and of straynes of witt, which speake of nothing of realitie in Sciences’. Hall, however, seems to have subscribed to the seventeenth-century ideal of ‘general learning’, which ‘prized a knowledge of the entire range—or encyclopedia —of intellectual disciplines, from grammar, rhetoric, poetry and history, to natural philosophy, medicine, and law’.34 If Hall regarded rhetoric, poetics, and history as aspects of learning that were as vital to its advancement as experimental philosophy, it would help to explain the range of his intellectual activities and his enthusiasm for the emphatically literary and philological activities of the Stanley circle. Having already composed ‘A Method of History’ and published essays on a variety of philosophical, ethical, and literary themes, at the end of 1646 Hall was

---

32 Hall to Hartlib, 17 Dec. 1646, HP 60/14/3A–4B; 15 Feb. 1647, 60/14/22A–23B; 8 Feb. 1648, 60/14/20A–21B.
33 Hall to Hartlib, 20 Apr. 1647, HP 60/14/32A–33B; Norbrook, Writing the English Republic, 168.
simultaneously working on his *Poems*, dedicated to Stanley, his translations of Andreae, dedicated to Hartlib, and his book of divine emblems, which he hoped to dedicate to Boyle. Hall would presumably have approved of the publication of the translations of the Stanley circle, and indeed of Moseley’s publication of poetry that had previously circulated only in the court and private circles, on the same grounds that he translated Andreae and urged Hartlib to have manuscripts ‘sent to the bookbinders [so] that they may be more Publique’. For Hall, the activities of both the Stanley and the Hartlib circles contributed, in different but necessarily interrelated spheres, to the advancement of the ‘general learning’ of the English people.

Yet the political distance between the ‘private’ and ‘public’ conceptions of English intellectual culture held by the Stanley and Hartlib circles was nonetheless real, and is measured by the considerable patronage that Hartlib received from Parliament during the 1640s. In the 1630s Hartlib had operated a manuscript newsletter service, communicating intelligence from around Europe to gentlemen who had become alienated from the Stuart court. He then acted as ‘an unofficial agent for the Parliamentary cause’ during the first civil war, and received grants of £50 and £100 from Parliament in January 1645 and June 1646 respectively. The proposal for the Office of Address was published to coincide with a parliamentary vote of 31 March 1647 of £300 to Hartlib ‘in Consideration of his good Deserts, and great services’ and the recommendation that he be given ‘some Place of Benefit in the University’ of Oxford. Hall wrote to Hartlib on 13 April to congratulate him:

> I bless God he hath lent our state eyes to see your merits, the Taking notice of great men is the best basis of a solid peace, money is the Nerve of a Commonwealth, learning and Religion the blood and spirits without which it is an useless trunk and soon putrifys. I were injurious to the alacrity I have ever found in you to the Publique sho[u]ld I tell you you ar[e] more than ever engaged to a prosecution of good designs, by reason I know you so well-fraught with such apprehensions.

While Hall was dedicating poems to Stanley’s ‘Armilla Nigra’, a secret society formed out of grief for the ruin of the Stuart court, he was simultaneously celebrating Parliament’s support for Hartlib’s plans to establish a new cultural economy that would rely on public funding and be independent of royal patronage. Hall’s image of the body politic in his letter of congratulations has no place for a monarchical head and the hierarchical distribution of resources, but focuses rather on the circulation of money, learning, and religious virtue in the ‘trunk’ of the state. Equally the allusion in an early letter to Horace’s second verse

---

35 Hall to Hartlib, 26 [Apr.?] 1647, *HP* 60/14/35A–36B.
36 Caroline Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1983), 119; Greengrass, entry in *ODNB*.
37 Hall to Hartlib, 13 Apr. 1647, *HP*, 60/14/30A–31B. See also Boyle, writing on 8 May 1647, on Hartlib’s ‘glad parliamentary news’; Boyle praises Parliament for ‘taking notice of... men of rare industry and publick spirit’ (*Works*, i. xl).
letter to Augustus—‘in publica commoda peccem, | Si longo sermone morer tua tempora’—emphasizes Hall’s loyalty to the ‘public weal’, or what he calls the ‘commonwealth of letters’, while making Hartlib and his circle, rather than any monarchical or imperial figure, the patrons of England’s new intellectual golden age.\(^{38}\)

Hall, however, makes no explicit political comment in the letters to Hartlib: the closest he comes is in one of his last letters from Cambridge, in which he praises the ‘wisdom of Parliament’ in selecting Dury as tutor to the king’s children while Charles was imprisoned at Holdenby House, Northamptonshire, between February and June 1647. Hall suggests that ‘had that discipline bin practised many years since it might have been hoped that the Royal Family had not been now so desolate’. It is characteristic of Milton in the early 1640s to blame the civil war on the ‘mis-instruction’ of England’s religious and political leaders. In his anti-prelatical tracts he attacked the universities as institutions that should be ‘fountains of learning and knowledge’ but had been ‘poison’d and choak’d’ by a system which revolved around episcopal and aristocratic patronage rather than the reward of merit and the advancement of knowledge. Of Education presents an essentially Ciceronian vision of a linguistic and rhetorical education that, properly and fully administered, would cultivate virtue and ensure that individuals serve effectively the commonwealth and the public good. This emphasis on the cultivation of virtue in the service of the commonwealth is echoed in Hall’s letters, in which he asks Hartlib to obtain a draft of Boyle’s ‘little dialogue’ about ‘vertue and the way of teaching it’ because Hall has been closely studying how best ‘to conveigh vertue to men’. Conversely Milton identifies the faulty education in England’s schools and universities with the pursuit of private interest and the consequent fostering of moral and political corruption. Currently those graduates who ‘betake them to State affairs’ do so ‘with souls so unprincipl’d in vertue, and true generous breeding, that flattery, and court shifts and tyrannous aphorisms appear to them the highest point of wisdom; instilling their barren hearts with a conscientious slavery’.\(^{39}\) The association of flattery and lack of virtue with the court, and of the court with tyranny and slavery, lends substance to the argument that the tract ‘represents something very close to a “republican moment” for Milton’ as he brings together, ‘for the first time in a political context, many of the themes which dominate his writings of the later 1640s and 1650s’.\(^{40}\) One feature of Milton’s tract, published in June 1644 and written at a time when Parliament had been forced to enter into an alliance with the Scots after some heavy defeats, is its preoccupation with

\(^{38}\) See Horace, ‘Epistles’, 2. 1. 3–4, in The Works of Horace, tr. James Lonsdale and Samuel Lee (1900), 189: ‘I were an offender against the public weal, were I by a long epistle to occupy your time, O Caesar’. Hall to Hartlib, 17 Dec. 1646, HP 60/14/3A–4B.

\(^{39}\) An Apology Against a Pamphlet (1642), in CPWM i. 718; Of Education (1644), in CPWM ii. 375; Hall to Hartlib, 26 [Apr.] 1647, HP 60/14/35A–36B.

breeding a more effective officer class: Milton outlines a ‘complete and generous education’ which ‘fits a man to perform justly, skilfully and magnanimously all the offices both private and publicke of peace and war’, and he emphasizes the importance of military exercises to make students ‘perfect Commanders in the service of their country’. Milton’s growing militancy is underscored by the evidence in Hartlib’s papers that Milton responded to Hartlib’s call in 1643–4 for subscriptions to Edmund Felton’s work on an engine of war, to be used against the royalist cavalry. Yet Hall’s letters indicate that Milton, like Stanley, preferred not to become involved in the efforts of the Hartlib circle to found the Office of Address. Presumably Milton’s reasons were personal rather than political: as the implicit criticism of Comenian utopianism in *Of Education* suggests, Milton probably preferred to retain his characteristic stance of intellectual independence.

The pressing issue when Hall was in regular correspondence with Hartlib was not the more efficient prosecution of war, but the nature of the settlement that would emerge from the protracted negotiations between the king, the Presbyterians, and the Independents. Yet Hall’s admiration for *Of Education*—indeed he is the most enthusiastic contemporary reader of whom we are aware—is revealing of the direction in which Hall’s cultural-political attitudes were moving in 1646–7. In his letters to Hartlib he refers to the ‘short time I will spend in the University (and it will be very short)’. John Davies suggests that Hall left Cambridge ‘not without some dis-satisfaction with the Governours there for denying those honorary advancements, which are as it were the indulgences of the University, where there is an excess of merit’. However Hall makes no criticism of Cambridge in the Hartlib correspondence—the letters indicate that Hall in fact had an impressive degree of access to the university hierarchy for an undergraduate who had only just arrived as ‘a Pensioner or Commoner’, a position ‘obliging him to certain lownesses and collegial duties’. The 1647 *Poems* are prefaced by what Saintsbury describes as ‘extravagant encomia’ from an array of Cambridge fellows and contemporaries (MPCP ii. 177). Although he seems to have been unable to persuade fully More, Cudworth, Whichcote, and Arrowsmith of the benefits of Hartlibian reform, he was clearly on good terms with these well-known figures in the university establishment. Given his admiration for Milton’s virulent criticism of patronage and corruption in the universities, however, there is the ring of truth about Davies’s claim that Hall was upset at having to defer ‘to persons whose merit consisted chiefly in their time spent there, and sometimes to those whom confidence, a certain enthusiasticall and Ideal Learning, and particularly an affection for a fortunate Interest, had thrust in to be members of that Colledge’. Davies’s suggestion of friction between Hall and aristocratic members of St John’s is confirmed by the commendatory

verses by Pawson (who was tutor to both Hall and Davies) for Hall’s *Poems*, in which Pawson attacks Hall’s ‘ignorant Detractors’ as

…those who are contented to be known
By their forefathers’ virtues, not their own:
Those who scarce other worth acknowledge will,
Than what each tailor puts into his bil,
Such plumèd Estrages, ’tis hard to say
Whether the feathers or the head outweigh.

Hall’s poetry, writes Pawson, will purchase him a name ‘mongst those who advance | Learning’ that will be worth more than the detractors ‘can swap their heritages for’. According to Davies, it was Hall’s discontent with a university system that rewarded family name and inherited wealth over academic merit that ‘raised in him…aversions to *Monarchy*’. If so, the experience of Cambridge helped to convince Hall, as it helped to convince Milton, that educational and political reform were interdependent.

Yet Hall was himself under the patronage of a wealthy gentleman at Cambridge, and when he left for Gray’s Inn in May 1647 he appears to have associated more closely with Stanley’s coterie than with Hartlib and his fellow reformers: there are no dated letters from Hall in the Hartlib papers between 27 April 1647 (when Hall wrote from St John’s) and 8 February 1648 (when he wrote from Gray’s Inn). This may of course be due to the fact that Hall was now in London and so able to speak to Hartlib in person; yet in the 1648 letter Hall apologizes for having not been able to write ‘these few months…by reason of my many employments and negociations’. I have argued in Chapter 1 that it was in 1647–8 that Hall and Marvell became friends and discussed and wrote poetry with prominent ‘Cavaliers’ under Stanley’s patronage in the Inns of Court. Despite Hall’s enthusiasm for publication, the poems that he wrote in 1647–8, like Marvell’s lyrics, seem only to have circulated privately, although according to Davies there were a good number of manuscript copies: ‘Since the Edition of his *Poems*, I dare affirm he writ almost twice as many, which yet are so lost, that I think there are not ten copies to be retrieved.’ Hall’s neglect of his unprinted poetry was probably a result of the other ‘employments and negociations’ that also prevented him from keeping up his correspondence with Hartlib. For while Stanley’s ‘withdrawn’ coterie conceived of itself as a private circle of poetic resistance to the flood of ‘rebellious prose’ washing over Parliamentarian London, by the end of the summer of 1647 Hall had taken his first steps into the public world of the polemical pamphlet. This decision should be seen as a continuation

---

42 Hall to Hartlib, 25 Jan. 1647, *HP* 60/14/14A–15B; Davies, ‘An Account of the Author’, sig. b1’; Pawson, ‘To the no less knowing than ingenious Mr Hall, on his Ignorant Detractors’, in *MPCP* ii. 184, ll. 3–11.
43 Although two brief undated letters may be written from London; see *HP* 60/14/41A–B; 60/14/42A–B.
44 Hall to Hartlib, 8 Feb. [1648], *HP*, Davies, ‘An Account of the Author’, sig. b6’.
of his efforts at Cambridge to encourage communication and association between wits and intellectuals in the service of the ‘Commonwealth of Letters’. For in his debut as a prose polemicist Hall addressed his royalist literary friends in the Stanley circle and sought to convince them that they shared a common cultural cause with figures such as Hartlib, Culpeper, and Milton against the threat of Presbyterian repression. As we shall in the last section of this chapter, Hall set out in 1647 to bring together the two cultural communities in which he moved, despite their apparently opposed political beliefs, in a fight against a common clerical enemy. Milton was a crucial influence on Hall’s decision to enter the world of the pamphlet, albeit anonymously. The next section considers Milton’s own efforts to develop cultural bonds between Independents and royalists against the Presbyterians in 1646–7. For although Milton, still enraged by the reaction to the divorce tracts and with the war won or all-but won, did not publish any prose in this period, his sonnets are densely packed with unresolved thoughts about poetry, allegiance, and the clerical threat.

MILTON AND THE CAVALIER MODE: ‘TO MY FRIEND MR HENRY LAWES’

F. W. Bateson thought the verses that Milton appended to his Latin love elegies in the Poemata to be ‘perhaps the most repellent product of that social vacuum to which Milton confined himself in the reaction against Cambridge’. Bateson’s verdict on ‘Haec ego mente olim laeva’ is as emphatic in its disgust as the recantation itself. Milton denounces the seven elegies, composed in 1626–9, as ‘trifling memorials of my levity, which, with a warped mind and base spirit, I once raised’. ‘Seduced’ by the superficial attractions of such verse at Cambridge, Milton assures his readers that now ‘my heart is frozen solid, packed around with thick ice’ (MSP, ll. 1–2, 8). What Bateson found so distasteful, surely, is not the renunciation of love poetry, which is the conventional subject of a palinode, but the celebration of self-willed death—a heart frozen solid no longer beats, after all. Puritan moralism, it seems, has iced up the life-blood of classical lyricism, and Milton’s self-directed iconoclastic fury resolves in a morbid, even masochistic, satisfaction in the stopping of his lyrical heart. In the shame at past submission to sensual temptation and the triumphant attainment of redemption through self-violence, we might even see an anticipation of Milton’s Samson. We do not know whether the recantation was written in the 1630s, when Milton retired to Hammersmith and Horton, or when he was preparing to publish the 1645 Poems, although olim (‘memorials’) may suggest the later date. Either way, its inclusion begs the question of why Milton chose to publish the Latin elegies at all, which in turn begs the larger question of why Milton chose to publish

his poetry of the 1620s and 1630s in late 1645. The sonnet that Milton sent to his old friend Henry Lawes (bap. 1596, d. 1662) just after the publication of the Poems—a reminder of Milton's sociability—has attracted little sustained attention, but it points us towards personal and political answers to the latter question. The complex allusion to Dante in the final tercet of the sonnet also conceals some of the Miltonic anxieties that we find in a more transparent form in 'Haec ego mente': the self-denying devotion demanded of the prophetic poet and the temptation to ease, which for Milton seems to have become signified by the enchanting distractions of lyric.

A persuasive answer to the question of why Milton chose to publish the elegies of which, seemingly, he was so ashamed is that he wanted to represent his poetic career in terms of a narrative of 'the rising poet', progressing through the genres in the manner of Virgil, heading towards the sublimity of epic.46 In Elegy VI, written for his St Paul's friend Charles Diodati soon after Christmas 1629, Milton himself makes the distinction between the sociable, festive life of the lyricist and the obscure, frugal existence required of the epic bard. 'Song loves Baachus, and Baachus loves songs', Milton knowingly informs Diodati, and he goes on to display his mastery of a poetic form that he has outgrown by describing a dance where 'girls' eyes and girls' fingers playing will make Thalia dart into your breast and take command of it'.47 (ll. 14, 47–8). But while lyric poets 'can get drunk on old wine as often as they like', the poet who writes about wars and heroes and 'a heaven ruled over by Jove'—the poet Milton is becoming—must 'drink soberly from a pure spring', 'his morals strict and his hand unstained' (ll. 53–4, 62–4).48

While the Elegy cultivates a worldly air of moral and literary superiority over Diodati, who is told to stick to love poetry, Milton had himself only recently been experimenting with Italian lyrical forms. In December 1629 he had bought a copy of Giovanni Della Casa’s Rime e Prose (1563); the inscribed and dated copy, with marginal notes and text corrections, survives, bound with similarly annotated copies of Dante’s Convivio and Varchi’s Sonnetti.49 His reading of

47 Thalia is the muse of lyric poetry in Horace's Hymn to Apollo (Odes 4. 6). In classical literature elegy is accompanied by flute rather than lyre, and in early modern poetic theory love elegy is differentiated from lyric on metrical grounds (couplets rather than stanza forms). It was not until the 19th cent. that love elegy became regarded as a subgenre of lyric; see Alastair Fowler, Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes (1982; Oxford, 2002), 137; David Lindley, Lyric (1985), 10–13. However in Elegy VI, as the invocation of Thalia indicates, Milton is concerned with love poetry, whether elegy or lyric. He refers to his own ‘elegiac couplets’ but also to the ‘Roman lute-player’ and the ‘Thracian lyre’ (and not to the flute) in his description of the festive context of love songs. Consequently in this chapter the terms elegy, lyric, and love poetry are used interchangeably.
48 As David Quint observes, 'the unstained hand of this priestly poet seems pointedly to rule out masturbation' (‘Expectation and Prematurity in Milton’s Nativity Ode’, Modern Philology, 97/2 (1999), 204).
Italian lyrics is reflected in his writing in the closing months of 1629. He tells Diodati in the concluding lines of Elegy VI that he has composed ‘some little poems… on your native country’s pipes’—presumably the five Italian sonnets and Canzone (ll. 88–9). Already though, the Italian lyrics about and to a dark ‘foreign beauty’ (Sonnets IV, ll. 7), with their landscapes populated by young shepherdesses and ‘girls and boys in love’ (Canzone, l. 1), are implicitly represented as the issue of a former, frivolous self. The preceding section of the Elegy presents the composition of ‘On the Morning of Christ’s Nativity’ on Christmas Day 1629 as the moment at which Milton found his higher poetic vocation, or rather had it revealed to him: ‘These are the gifts I have given for Christ’s birthday: the first light of the dawn brought them to me.’ (ll. 86–7). Generations of students may have debated whether there is a hierarchical relation written into L’Allegro and Il Penseroso, which were surely composed around this time, but in the light of Elegy VI there can be little doubt that Milton privileges the ‘prophetic strain’—there is a pun on ‘strain’, indicating the arduous moral effort required of the prophetic poet—over the ‘linked sweetness’ of ‘soft Lydian airs’ that ‘lap’ over the passive listener (Il Penseroso, l. 174; L’Allegro, ll. 136, 140). Plato’s suspicion of the seductively relaxing qualities of the Lydian mode was developed by some in early modern England into an attack on the effeminizing effects of love lyric:

Fie on those Lydian tunes which blunt our sprights
And turne our gallants into Hermaphrodites.

Hence with these fiddlers, whose oyl-buttered lines,
Are Panders unto lusts, and food to sinnes,
Their whimpering Sonnets, puling Elegies,
Slander the Muses; make the world despise,
Admired poesie, marre Resolutions ruffe,
And melt true valour with lewd ballad stuffe.50

Milton has no qualms though in Elegy VI about recommending that his closest friend give himself up to wine and love poetry. While lyric is associated with ‘Circe’s hall’ and ‘the sirens’ song’, resistance to sensual temptation is the burden only of the elect poet of sacred and epic song. Perhaps this is why Milton is so hard on himself in his renunciation of the elegies. Or was there a painful association in his mind between love poetry and Diodati, who died young in 1638 and is remembered in Epitaphium Damonis, that emerged in self-recrimination at ever having wasted time on trifling lyric?51

F. T. Prince argues in detail for the influence of Della Casa’s formal innovations on Milton’s sonnets in The Italian Element in Milton’s Verse (Oxford, 1954), 14–33; see also Anna K. Nardo, Milton’s Sonnets and the Ideal Community (Lincoln, NE, and London, 1979), 158–78.


John T. Shawcross would have us believe that the relationship between Milton and Diodati itself involved some form of erotic love, either repressed or overt (‘Milton and Diodati’, Milton Studies, 7 (1975), 127–63).
for his Cambridge self comes as a shock after the ‘stream of excited sensory responses’ that runs through Elegy VI: Milton immerses himself in elegiac verse in the moment of rejecting it. Presumably he placed the most sensual of his Latin poems after the verse letter to Diodati in the Poemata because it provides a greater justification for the virulence of ‘Haec ego mente’, even though Elegy VII was written earlier (it is headed ‘in his nineteenth year’).

If ‘Haec ego mente’ was written in the early 1640s, the aggressiveness of its rejection of love poetry in comparison with Elegy VI is likely a consequence of Milton’s politicization of literary culture in the intervening decade. The language of the poem is certainly closer to the polemical prose, specifically the complaint in The Reason of Church-Government (1642) about the ‘corruption and bane’ that ‘our youth and gentry . . . suck in dayly from the writings and interludes of libidinous and ignorant Poetasters, who having scars ever heard of that which is the main consistence of a true poem . . . doe for the most part lap up vitious principles in sweet pills to be swallow’d down, and make the taste of vertuous documents harsh and sowl’ (CPWM ii. 818–19). There is an echo here of the admission in the recantation that Milton was ‘seduced’ by elegiac poetry and that ‘my ignorant youth was a vicious teacher’ (l. 4). That Milton hits in the prose work at Caroline court poets—the ‘Cavalier’ lyricists—is clear from the immediately subsequent condemnation of the ‘publick sports, and festival pastimes’ which Charles and Laud had sought to enforce as an extension of the Anglican liturgy, which were celebrated by court poets and masque writers, and to which the Maske Presented at Ludlow Castle (1634; first published 1637) was in part a response. For Milton, the festivities that ‘were authorized a while since’ are ‘provocations of drunkennesse and lust’. Typically fusing political commentary and biographical narrative, he goes on to oppose the love poet and the prophetic poet in the manner of Elegy VI but in the revolted language of ‘Haec ego mente’:

Neither do I think it shame to covenant with any knowing reader, that for some few yeeres yet I may go on trust with him toward the payment of what I am now indebted, as being a work not to be rays’d from the heat of youth, or the vapours of wine, like that which flows at wast from the pen of some vulgar Amorist, or the trencher fury of a riming parasite, nor to be obtained by the Invocation of Dame Memory and her Siren daughters, but by devout prayer to that eternall Spirit who can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and sends out his Seraphim with the hallow’d fire of his Altar to touch and purify the lips of whome he pleases . . . (820–1)

The sense in Elegy VI of the generic and moral inferiority of the song of elegy has intensified into visceral hatred for the baseness and corruption of its practitioners; and if ‘Haec ego mente’ was written for the publication of the Poemata, then by the early 1640s Milton was not merely disgusted by the poets of elegy, by the

vulgar Amorist[s], but by the very form itself and his own experiments with it. The literary and moral judgement on love poetry has also become a political and religious one: Milton has seen the writers of Ovidian verse who seduced him into experimenting with the form at Cambridge turn into the ‘riming parasite[s]’ of Laudian and court society. In *Apology Against a Pamphlet* (1642) Milton recalls with similar abhorrence how at Cambridge he had witnessed his fellow students ‘so oft upon the Stage writhing and unbuttoning their Clergie limmes...prostituting the shame of that ministry which either they had, or were nigh having, to the eyes of Courtiers and Court-Ladies’ (i. 887). The depraved cultural life of Cambridge—which, Milton strongly implies, facilitated and encouraged sexual licence (‘writhing and unbuttoning...prostituting’)—is directly linked with the corruptions of church and court over which the war is being fought.

Despite the inclusion of ‘Haec ego mente’, the dominant impression conveyed by the 1645 *Poems* is not, though, of a poet who had confined himself to a ‘social vacuum’ after leaving Cambridge. If anything the volume insistently asserts Milton’s sociability. There are letters of commendation before the *Maske Presented at Ludlow Castle* from his learned and well-connected friends Sir Henry Wotton, Provost of Eton and former ambassador to Venice, and Henry Lawes, renowned musician and former courtier, while the *Poemata* are prefaced by commendatory poems from the Florentine literati with whom Milton had socialized during his Italian tour of 1638–9. From the first the volume emphasizes Milton’s collaborative activities and his social connections, with the title-page informing the reader that the ‘Songs were set in Musick by Mr Henry Lawes Gentleman of the Kings Chapel, and one of his Majesties Private Musick’. The same tag was used by the publisher Humphrey Moseley in his edition earlier in 1645 of Edmund Waller and in his edition of Suckling the following year. Moseley’s 1646 edition of Shirley’s *Poems* follows a similar format to Milton’s vernacular lyric book by closing with a masque, while Moseley’s prefaces to both Milton’s *Poems* and Suckling’s *Fragmenta Aurea* ‘employ a common strategy, as they seek to establish a community of “knowing Gentlemen” in which the readers can be enrolled’.

Moseley’s editions of Cavalier poets, with the exception of Waller, post-date Milton’s *Poems*, but we have seen how the publisher was closely involved with royalist literary circles in the mid-1640s. It is usually assumed that even if Milton was involved in the careful arrangement of the texts of the *Poems*, he must nonetheless have disapproved of Moseley’s packaging. Barbara Lewalski writes of Milton ‘explicitly refusing the “Cavalier” construction laid upon him by the title-page and some other features of Moseley’s apparatus’. But he was involved enough in the design of the prefatory material to compose the Greek

---

55 *Life of John Milton*, 227. Chernaik writes that Milton is ‘virtually kidnapped...and transformed against his will into a royalist’ (*Books as Monuments*, 210).
verses mocking the frontispiece portrait. These verses establish ‘the appearance of authorial control over the volume’ as the reader (or at least the ‘knowing’ reader who has decent Greek) is addressed directly by the ‘real’ Milton.56

The assumption that Milton must have been upset by the Cavalier wrapping of the *Poems* excludes the possibility that Milton actively sought the attention of royalist readers. In *The Reason of Church-Government* Milton had maintained that he would not be able to fulfil his covenant with the English people to produce the great national epic until ‘the Land had once infranchis’d herself from this impertinent yoke of prelaty, under whose inquisitorious and tyrannical duncery no free and splendid wit can flourish’ (819). The 1645 *Poems* has often been described as a down payment on this self-imposed debt as the progress of the war moved inexorably towards a Parliamentary victory.57 But the decision to publish his poetry of the 1620s and 1630s through Moseley also indicates Milton’s desire to reconnect with the cultivated circles in which he had moved before the outbreak of war and his reluctant (or so he assures us) assumption of the role of prose polemicist. As the title-page reference to Henry Lawes makes clear, Milton’s pre-war artistic associates included figures who had strong connections with the court culture of the 1630s and with the royalist cause. Milton become acquainted with Lawes immediately after leaving Cambridge in July 1632, if not before. It must have been through Lawes, music master to the Earl of Bridgewater’s children, that Milton was invited in the latter half of 1632 to write *Arcades* for the children’s grandmother, the Countess of Derby, which then led to the collaboration with Lawes on the *Maske* in honour of Bridgewater in 1634.58 Lawes had been made a member of the Chapel Royal in 1626 and of the king’s music, the inner circle of musicians who played in the monarch’s apartments, in 1631. He was involved during the 1630s in the composition of music for court entertainments and masques by, among others, Carew and Davenant, and was well known for his settings of lyrics by court poets including Waller, Davenant, Suckling, Carew, Cartwright, Herrick, and Lovelace. Lawes’s political sentiments at the outbreak of the first civil war are indicated by his transcription of anti-Parliamentarian satires in 1642–3, while his brother William, also a noted composer and court musician, was killed fighting for the king at the siege of Chester in 1645.59

By the end of 1645, however, with the inevitability of royalist defeat, the splitting of the Parliamentary party into Presbyterian and Independent factions and the passing of legislation by the Presbyterian majority in Parliament to impose a national church government, the face of the enemy was not as clear

as it had been in 1641–3. Milton’s own allegiance had been complicated by the controversy over his writings on divorce, which had convinced him that the Presbyterians, in support of whom he had written the anti-prelatical tracts, now posed the most serious and urgent threat to the flourishing of ‘free wit’. In the prose of late 1644–5—Areopagitica and the divorce tracts Colasterion and Tetrachordon—Milton’s central polemical target is the Presbyterians in the Westminster Assembly and Parliament who had condemned as heretical and libertine his erudite arguments about divorce. In Milton’s history of priestcraft in Areopagitica (November 1644) the ‘apishly Romanizing’ bishops have themselves been imitated by the Presbyterians, who have ‘mastered the Episcopal arts’ to ‘execute the most Dominican part of the Inquisition over us’ (ii. 504). It is the Presbyterian clergy who now threaten the advancement of learning in England with their ‘tyrannous and inquisitorial duncery’. In Colasterion (1645), the most vitriolic of the early prose tracts, a ‘junto of clergymen and licensers’ in the Westminster Assembly are accused of being behind an ‘illiterat’ response to The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, full of errors of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew (ii. 724–5). In the opening to the more restrained Tetrachordon, Milton warns that, if ‘sound argument and reason shall be thus put off’ by ‘a rayling word or two in the pulpit’, then ‘all good learning and knowledge will decay’ (ii. 583). Milton reacts incredulously to the Presbyterian accusations of libertinism, assuming the strain of his devotion to study during the 1630s to be sufficient demonstration of his moral probity: ‘if his diligence, his learning...shall be turn’d now to a disadvantage and suspicion against him...why are men bred up with such care and expence to a life of perpetual studies[?]’ (584) The (untranslated) epigraph from Euripides’s Medea on the title-page makes it clear that Milton is appealing to a classically trained audience who possess the culture to ignore the narrow, philistine reaction of his clerical critics:

For if thou bring strange wisdom unto dullards
Useless thou shalt be counted as not wise
And if thy fame outshine those heretofore
Held wise, thou shalt be odious in men’s eyes.61

Of course Milton continued to write poetry during the 1640s, despite his claims in The Reason of Church-Government, but the continued draw of the public world on his poetic resources after the fall of episcopacy is evident in his use of the sonnet not for lyrical themes, but to satirize the ignorance and incivility of his clerical critics. In ‘On the Detraction which followed upon My Writing Certain Treatises’, usually dated to early 1646 but not published until 1673, Milton reduces his Presbyterian opponents to a bestial level: they are ‘owls and cuckoos, asses, apes and dogs’ who swarm around him making ‘a barbarous noise’

---

60 On 19 Aug. 1645 an ordinance was passed to place parishes ‘under the Government of Congregational, Classical, Provincial and National Assemblies’ (Lewalski, Life, 201).

The critics of the divorce tracts are like the foul-mouthed peasants ‘that were transformed to frogs’ in Ovid’s Metamorphoses for muddying the clear pool at which Apollo and Diana sought to drink (l. 5). In Elegy VI Milton had insisted that the prophetic poet must ‘drink soberly from a pure spring’, refraining from the sensual indulgence associated with Ovidian elegy. In the satirical sonnet, the ignorant Presbyterians soil the pure spring of Milton’s chaste and learned arguments for divorce with their accusations of sexual impropriety— Ephraim Pagitt, for example, had referred in his Heresiography (1645) to Milton’s ‘Tractate of Divorce, in which the bonds of marriage are let loose to inordinate lust’—and are punished by Ovidian metamorphosis. The use of bestial imagery to portray the uneducated, with its roots in the Circe episode of The Odyssey, is a conventional topos of humanist letters, but Milton’s identification of the Presbyterians with the Lycian peasants also invokes the charge of social, as well as intellectual, inferiority that is ubiquitous in the anti-Puritan satire of royalist propagandists such as John Berkenhead, and John Cleveland (bap. 1613, d. 1658), Milton’s Cambridge contemporary.

In his recent prose writings Milton had confirmed the royalist literary stereotype of the unlettered, anti-intellectual Puritan; in the 1645 Poems, with its aristocratic entertainments, displays of lyric virtuosity, and letter of commendation from the court’s most celebrated musician, he showed that this image was in no way applicable to the Independents. The Poemata, with its commendations from Italian literati and verses in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Italian, should be seen as not only an assertion of Milton’s personal civility against Presbyterian charges of sectarian heresy, but also of the civility of the Independents against indiscriminate royalist stereotypes of the unlettered Roundhead. For David Norbrook, the ‘1645 volume counters royalist charges that London has lapsed into unlettered chaos by meeting the royalist culture of the 1630s on its own terms’; but the Poems may have been designed as much to reassure royalists as refute them. For those royalist poets and scholars aware of Milton’s split with the Presbyterians, the volume provided a demonstration of the cultural distinctions in the Parliamentarian party and an assurance that, as the prospect of

---

62 I have argued elsewhere that Milton’s target in this sonnet was less the Presbyterians than the sectarian lay preachers who were reported to have used the divorce tracts to excuse their promiscuous behaviour; see Nicholas McDowell, The English Radical Imagination: Culture, Religion, and Revolution, 1630–1660 (Oxford, 2003), 48–9. However I have since been persuaded that Milton’s subject is more likely, or also, the Presbyterians by John Leonard’s ‘Revolting as Back-Sliding in Milton’s Sonnet XII’, Notes and Queries NS 43/3 (1996), 269–73.

63 Ovid, Metamorphoses 6. 317–81; Pagitt quoted in Lewalski, Life, 202. On the clerical reaction to the divorce tracts, see also 178–9, 201–6.

64 On the stereotype of the Puritan as lower-class ignoramus, see e.g. Thomas, Sir John Berkenhead, 101–3, 120–1.


66 Writing the English Republic, 164.
military defeat loomed large at the beginning of 1646, they could find common cultural ground after a Parliamentary victory with Independents who valued poetry, learning, and the classical tradition. The reception of the divorce tracts seems to have impelled Milton not only to adopt the anti-Puritan themes of royalist polemic in his satirical sonnets, but to look to the royalist literary community in the hope of an anticlerical alliance that would protect literate values against Presbyterian repression. The desire for post-war cultural rapprochement is apparent in the sonnet that Milton addressed in early 1646, around the same time as he composed the first of his furious anti-Presbyterian sonnets, to the most prominent member of that community with whom he had a personal and creative connection—Henry Lawes.

In the Trinity manuscript a rough draft of ‘On the Detraction which followed upon my Writing Certain Treatises’ appears after and on the same page as a rough draft and fair copy of the sonnet to Lawes. Milton probably sent the sonnet to Lawes with a presentation copy of the Poems: the rough draft, in Milton’s hand, is dated 9 February 1645/6, just over a month after Thomason received the Poems.67 The title of the heavily corrected and crossed-through draft is ‘To my friend Mr Hen. Lawes’. This is followed by a fair copy in Milton’s hand with a title added by an amanuensis: ‘To Mr Hen. Laws on the publishing of his Aires’. A third copy, in a scribal hand, has the modified title ‘To Mr H. Lawes, on his Aires’. The sonnet was first printed, as ‘To my Friend Mr Henry Lawes’, in Choice Psalmes (1648), a collection of sacred music by Henry and William Lawes that advertises its allegiance to the imprisoned Charles I. Published by Moseley, Choice Psalmes includes eight elegies by other musicians for William (who, in the words of Henry’s preface, ‘fell a willing Sacrifice for [his] Majestie’). The collection is dedicated by Henry to ‘his Sacred Majesty’ (‘from whose Royall Bounty both of us receiv’d all we injoy’d’) and is prefaced by an impressively detailed portrait of the king.68 There is no evidence within the poem or elsewhere that Milton knew the sonnet would be used as a commendatory poem for Choice Psalmes, where it appears after verses by Aurelian Townshend, the former court poet and masque writer, and James Harrington, the future republican theorist who in 1647–8 was waiting upon the king in his captivity as gentleman groom of the royal bedchamber. The altered title in the Trinity manuscript suggests that the sonnet was intended at some stage for publication in Lawes’s Ayres and Dialogues, a collection of his settings of love lyrics by, among others, Thomas Randolph, William Strode, Carew, Davenant, Cartwright, Waller, Herrick, Lovelace, and John Berkenhead. Ayres and Dialogues (which Lawes dedicated to his former pupils, the daughters of the Earl of Bridgewater) did not appear until 1653, and Milton’s sonnet was not in fact reprinted in the commendatory poems for this volume, or those for the second book of Ayres and Dialogues that Lawes

issued in 1655. It may be the case, as several scholars have argued, that the publication of the *Ayres* was delayed by Henry’s preparation of the volume to commemorate his brother and then by the regicide, and that Milton and/or Lawes recognized the ‘political divide was then too great’ for the inclusion of the sonnet.69 However Milton’s young nephews and former pupils, Edward and John Phillips, both contributed poems in 1653 addressed to their ‘Honour’d Friend’ Lawes, indicating a continuing connection between Milton and Lawes. John Phillips had only left Milton’s household the previous year and was publicly associated with the Commonwealth government, having issued a Latin defence of both his uncle and the regicide in late 1651.70

The ostensible subject of Milton’s sonnet is Lawes’s ability to accommodate the melodic line to the pace of the verse, in contrast to previous English musicians whose polyphonic style allowed sound to obscure sense:

> Harry, whose tunefull and well-measur’d song  
> First taught our English Music how to span  
> Words with just note and accent, not to scan  
> With Midas eares, committing short and long;  
> Thy worth and skill exempts thee from the throng,  
> With praise enough for Envie to look wan;  
> To after age thou shalt be wrt the man,  
> That with smooth Aire couldst humour best our tongue.  
> Thou honour’st Verse, and Verse must lend her wing  
> To honour thee, the priest of Phoebus choir  
> That tun’st their happiest Lines in hymne, or story.  
> Dantè shall give Fame leave to set thee higher  
> Than his Casella, whom he wooo’d to sing  
> Met in the milder shades of Purgatory.71

Lawes respects the sound and structure of verse in his settings and so poets naturally praise Lawes’s music; the harmony of language and music is matched by the mutual respect of poet and musician. By dedicating the sonnet to his ‘friend’ and addressing Lawes as ‘Harry’, Lewalski believes that Milton ‘removed this commendatory poem from the realm of politics and established personal terms for its inclusion in Lawes’s 1648 volume’. However, as we saw in Chapter 1, the appeal to friendship was a motif of royalist writing and publishing in the 1640s, suggesting the survival of literary tradition in small, embattled groups.72 Moseley emphasizes that Suckling’s 1646 works are ‘published by a Friend’. Most


70 See Gordon Campbell’s entry for John Phillips in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Lewalski e.g. does not mention the presence of the Phillips brothers in the 1653 *Ayres and Dialogues*; Norbrook mistakenly puts them in the 1655 volume (*Writing the English Republic*, 362).

71 The text here is taken from *Choice Palmes*, sig. a1v.

pertinently, Herrick refers to Lawes as ‘my Harrie’ in ‘To M. Henry Lawes, the Excellent Composer of his Lyricks’, a poem that was first printed in Hesperides.

Milton explicitly displays his familiarity with royalist literary culture elsewhere in the sonnet. Lawes is equally adept with ‘hymne’ and with ‘story’—an asterisk beside ‘story’ in the printed text of 1648 directs the reader to a marginal note, ‘The Story of Ariadne set by him in Music’. The reference is to ‘Ariadne Deserted by Theseus’ by William Cartwright, Jonsonian dramatist, Laudian cleric, and leading light in the late 1630s of a ‘knot of the choicest Oxford wits’, as a contemporary put it. Lawes had composed the music for Cartwright’s The Royal Slave, which was first performed before the king and queen at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1636 and drew great acclaim from the court, elevating Cartwright to the status of royal favourite: he was appointed Reader in Metaphysics at Oxford, preached the sermon of thanksgiving after the king’s return from the battle of Edgehill and become a member of Charles’s ‘Council of War’ at Oxford. Cartwright died from camp fever in November 1643. ‘Ariadne Deserted by Theseus’ was first published in Moseley’s 1651 edition of Cartwright’s Comedies, Tragi-Comedies, With Other Poems. Although the title of the Cartwright volume refers to the songs having been ‘set by Mr Henry Lawes, servant to his late Majesty’ (echoing the description of the Milton volume), Lawes’s setting of the poem first appeared in 1653, at the head of Lawe’s Ayres and Dialogues. The reference to Cartwright’s poem is not in the versions of the Lawes sonnet in the Trinity manuscript and the 1673 Poems, and it is not clear whether the gloss was added by Milton or someone else; but if Milton does intend the allusion to ‘Ariadne Deserted by Theseus’ he must have seen Lawes’s setting in manuscript or heard it in performance.

Although Cartwright had not died in battle, the early death of a figure who combined the offices of poet, priest, and scholar was nonetheless seen by royalists as symptomatic of the devastation of learning, religion and poetry during the war. According to Aubrey, ‘King Charles Ist dropped a teare at the newes of his death’. When asked why he wore black on the day of Cartwright’s funeral, the king replied that ‘since the Muses had so much mourned for the loss of such a son, it would be a shame for him not to appear in mourning for the loss of such a subject’. The commendatory verses by more than fifty writers associated with royalism and the court (including Henry Lawes) prefixed to Moseley’s edition of Cartwright repeatedly represent his death as symbolic of the demise of Stuart literary culture. In the preface to his edition of Cartwright’s works, Moseley makes much of Cartwright’s relationship with the father of Stuart poetics, Ben

73 David Lloyd, Memoires of the Lives, Actions, Sufferings, and Deaths of those Noble, Reverend, and Excellent Personages that suffered by death, sequestration, decimation, or otherwise, for the Protestant religion and the great principle thereof; allegiance to their Soveraigne, in our late intestine wars (1668), 425. On The Royal Slave, see Kevin Sharpe, Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I (Cambridge, 1987), 47–51; Spink, Henry Lawes, 66–70.
75 Potter, Secret Rites and Secret Writing, 21.
Jonson. ‘What had Ben said’, wonders Moseley, ‘had he read his own eternity’ in Cartwright’s long contribution to *Jonsonus Virbius; or, the Memorie of Ben Jonson Revived by the Friends of the Muses* (1638), a collection of elegies by mostly Oxford figures that was edited by the arch-Laudian and former Oxford Vice-Chancellor Brian Duppa and contained several assertions of the anti-Puritan civility of Caroline Oxford.\(^76\) The Cartwright volume is evidently designed to recall the Jonson collection as well as the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647. Moseley dedicates the volume not to a noble patron but to ‘the (late most flourishing) University of Oxford’, drawing attention both to the decline of learning under Parliamentary rule and the absence of the system of court patronage that had nourished writers such as Jonson and Cartwright, who is remembered as one of the foremost ‘Sons of Ben’; according to Moseley, Jonson once declared that ‘My Son Cartwright writes all like a Man’ (‘To the Reader’, sig. A4r). The death of Cartwright stands in Moseley’s preface and the commendatory poems for the literary inheritance of the Jonsonian golden age that has been squandered through civil war (or which survives only in Moseley’s editions).

The reference in Moseley’s title to Lawes’s settings of Cartwright, which did not begin to appear in print for another two years, points to a collective poetic and musical production that happens off-stage.\(^77\) The very title-page of the published text invokes an exclusive literary circle based on personal acquaintance and the circulation of manuscripts. The reference in Milton’s sonnet to Lawes’s setting of ‘Ariadne Deserted by Theseus’ appeared in print in a similarly overtly royalist volume three years before Cartwright’s poem was published and five before the publication of Lawes’s setting. If the gloss is Milton’s, it emphasizes his desire in the sonnet to communicate with a royalist literary community in which the exchange of manuscripts functioned ‘as a form of social and political bonding’.\(^78\) As Lewalski points out, Milton’s sonnet to Lawes ‘imports many features of the Jonsonian epigram: the judicious tone, the very precise terms of the compliment, the praises offered as from one worthy to another’. Several of Jonson’s finest epigrams, such as ‘To William Camden’, are in fourteen lines and offer a ‘discreet revision’ of the sonnet form.\(^79\) The Jonsonian tone of Milton’s poem is heightened by the reference to the (unpublished) poetry of one of Jonson’s favourite sons. Milton is hardly concerned to elicit nostalgia for a lost age of civility; rather he seeks to persuade Lawes and his royalist literary friends that Jonsonian values and the Jonsonian ideal of a literary community as projected in the *Epigrams* can be revived in the aftermath of a Parliamentary victory. Milton may have hoped that circulation of the sonnet among Lawes’s Cavalier friends

\(^76\) On Duppa’s partisan literary activities in Oxford in the 1630s, see Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars*, 22, 26–8, 30–1.

\(^77\) Catherine Gray, ‘Katherine Phillips and the Post-Courtly Coterie’, *English Literary Renaissance*, 32/3 (2002), 432.


would provide a further demonstration of Independent civility to those wary of the consequences for learning of the Parliamentary victory. Lawes had certainly copied and circulated Milton's work among his friends before: he tells us in the preface to the 1637 printed text of the *Maske* that ‘the often copying of it hath tir’d my pen to give my severall friends satisfaction’. 

Milton’s vision of post-war cultural regeneration is implicitly threatened by Presbyterian philistinism. Lawes is praised for teaching English musicians how to set ‘Words with just note and accent, not to scan | With Midas eares, committing short and long’. This is the first occasion that the verb ‘commit’, meaning ‘to engage (parties) as opponents’ and ‘involve in hostility’, is used figuratively. The hostile engagement of civil war can give way to cultural accord through the harmonious setting of Milton’s words to Lawes’s music—through the renewed collaboration of Independent poet and royalist musician. The phrase ‘Midas eares’ recalls the bestial descriptions of the Presbyterian clergy in ‘On the Detractions which followed upon my Writing Certain Treatises’, who suffer Ovidian metamorphosis for obscuring the pure, spiritual truth of Milton’s arguments on divorce with the ‘barbarous noise’ of their crude accusations of libertinism. In the Lawes sonnet a lack of artistic sensitivity is similarly identified with Ovidian transformation: the ‘Midas eares’ who find only ugliness and discord where there is harmony and beauty are Milton’s philistine Presbyterian critics. After all, Milton’s final prose response to the attacks on his ideas on divorce, *Tetrachordon*, was named after the four strings of a Greek lyre that can combine to make a harmonious chord. Lawes is made the ‘Priest of Phoebus choir’: the light of learning and letters represented by Apollo, celestial patron of poetry and music, is opposed, as in the satirical sonnet, to the earth-bound sensuality of the ignorant, who create hostility (‘committing short and long’) between parties who might otherwise harmoniously combine their talents.

‘Thy worth and skill exempts thee from the throng’, Milton tells Lawes, echoing Horace’s exaltation of the lyric poet in his first ode; in the rough draft in the Trinity manuscript Milton had initially written ‘wit’ rather than ‘worth’. If the ‘throng’ is, as Scott Nixon suggests, ‘as much the throng of royalists as of composers’, then Milton addresses only those in the royalist community who are prepared to place the cause of wit in post-war England before allegiance to a (defeated) political cause. However, the reference to Lawes’s exemption from the ‘throng’ not only recalls Horace but anticipates Milton’s complex allusion to Dante in the final tercet of the sonnet. In Canto 2 of *Purgaturio* Dante, having arrived at the lower slopes of Mount Purgatory, observes an angel-propelled boat

---

81 ‘Me the ivy-leaf, the meed of learned brows, makes the partner of the gods above; me the cool grove and the tripping companies of Nymphs blended with Satyrs sever from the people’ (*Works of Horace*, 27); Nixon, ‘Milton’s Royalist Friend’.
that disembarks a ‘throng’ of penitent souls. One of these souls moves forward to
greet Dante, who recognizes the ‘shade’ to be Casella, the Florentine musician
who had set some of his *canzoni*. Dante asks Casella to play a love song to
‘solace my spirit’ and Casella begins to play his setting of the second *canzone* from
Dante’s *Convivio*, ‘Amor che ne la mente ni ragiona’ (‘Love that speaks in mind to
me’). The identification with Casella is apt on an artistic level because Lawes’s
recitative style was indebted to ‘the Florentine humanists who experimented to
revive the close union of music and poetry enjoyed by the ancient Greeks’. But
it is also apt on a personal level, because not only had Lawes composed the music
for Milton’s *Maske*, as Casella had set Dante’s lyrics, but he had also used his
influence at court to bypass the usual bureaucracy and secure Milton a passport
to travel to Italy in 1638.

David Norbrook follows E. A. J. Honigmann in seeing the Dante allusion as
‘a sting in the tail’ of the sonnet because when Dante reaches out to embrace
Casella, his hands find only empty space: ‘the gesture of friendship is there, but
so too is the acknowledgement of a huge ideological gulf, compared to the gulf
between the living and the dead’. Certainly the comparison between Lawes
and Casella, whose soul, stripped of ‘mortal flesh’, is beginning the great journey
of purgation, suggests that in the aftermath of defeat royalists will have to go
through a painful process of self-scrutiny, leading to recognition of their sins in
supporting a corrupt episcopacy. Yet Casella is happy to be making his journey
and the comparison implicitly offers royalist writers and artists the opportunity
of absolution and salvation. The comparison emphasizes above all the shared
cultural sympathies of Independent poet and royalist musician, again conveying,
through a typically complex intertextual manoeuvre, Milton’s belief that the
common enemy of all ‘free wits’ is the tyrannous spirit of the clergy, now taken
Presbyterian form. Milton regarded Dante as one of the great literary enemies of
clerical corruption. In tracing the history of clerical abuses back to Constantine
in *Of Reformation* (1641), he translated into blank verse several lines from Canto
19 of *Inferno*:

Ah Constantine! of how much ill was cause,
Not thy conversion, but those rich domains
That the first wealthy pope receiv’d of thee!

(*CPWM* i. 558)

Dante is hugged by Virgil for this impassioned attack on clerics who have made
their ‘god of silver and gold’ and betrayed the message of St Peter (l. 112).
The first explicit, public expression of Milton’s anticlericalism, St Peter’s speech

---

52, 109, 112.
84 The letter from Lawes which enclosed the passport is printed in *CPWM* i. 339.
in *Lycidas* (1638), is evidently influenced by Beatrice’s denunciation of corrupt and equivocating priests in Canto 29 of *Paradiso*: ‘So the poor sheep that know nothing eat dross, | Return from pasture fed on wind’ (ll. 106–7). Around the time he was writing *Lycidas*, Milton noted in his commonplace book that papal efforts to censor Dante’s *De monarchia*, in which Dante had attacked the papal usurpation of imperial authority, had been futile (i. 438).86 In *Areopagitica*, as we have seen, Milton accused the Presbyterian clergy of adopting the ‘inquisitorious’ stance of their Catholic and episcopal predecessors in seeking to enforce licensing laws. Milton’s charge in the prose is encapsulated in the final line of his anti-Presbyterian sonnet caudato, ‘On the New Forcers of Conscience Under the Long Parliament’, usually dated to the summer of 1646: ‘New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large’ (l. 20). The etymological pun here is of course that ‘priest’ is a contracted form of the Latin *presbyter*, and so ‘priest’ writ large literally is ‘presbyter’.

There is a more elaborate linguistic pun contained in the allusion to the meeting between Dante and Casella, an understanding of which depends upon knowledge of the Italian text of *Purgaturio*. When Dante asks Casella to play one of his songs, he begins: ‘Se nuova legge non ti toglie | memoria o uso all’amoroso canto’ (‘If some new law take not from thee the memory or practice of the song of love’).87 Other commendatory verses for the Lawes brothers repeatedly exploit the opportunity for punning offered by their name. In *Choice Psalmes*, for example, Aurelian Townshend contrasts the steadfastness of the Lawes brothers with the turbulent times of civil war that have undermined the laws of the crown: ‘In a False Time true Servants to the Crowne, | Lawes of themselves, needing no more direction.’ In his elegy for William Lawes, the musician Simon Ive equates the loss of Lawes in battle with the collapse of law in the civil war: ‘Have we not cause to weep and mourne, when as the children yet unborn make us sad, to think that neither girle nor boy, shall ever live for to enjoy such Lawes, such Lawes as once they had.’88 In a poem first published in 1653 but composed in 1635 (and so possibly seen by Milton before he wrote his sonnet), Edmund Waller equates the authority of the musical settings of Henry Lawes with the command of the law displayed by the eminent barrister William Noy: ‘Noy pleading, no man doubts the cause; | Or questions verses set by Lawes.’ In these examples of wordplay, the music of the Lawes brothers is identified with the law, whether juridical or monarchical; in Milton’s Italian–English pun, ‘some new

88 Townshend, ‘To the Incomparable Brothers, Mr Henry, and Mr William Lawes (Servants to his Majestie) upon the setting of these Psalmes’, and Ive, ‘An Elegie on the death of his deare fraternall Friend and Fellow, Mr William Lawes, servant to his Majestie’ in *Choice Psalmes*, sigs. a1v, Dd1v; Waller, ‘To Mr Henry Lawes, Who Had Then Newly Set a Song of Mine, in the Year 1635’, in Lawes, *Ayres and Dialogues* (1653), sig. a4v.
law’ rather threatens to suppress Henry Lawes’s ‘practice of the song of love’. In the context of Milton’s anger in the recent prose and the contemporaneous satirical sonnets about Presbyterian efforts to interfere with the civil power and prosecute writers arbitrarily deemed immoral, the ‘new law’ that Milton fears may stop Lawes’s song is surely one promulgated by a repressive and censorious Presbyterian regime. As the reference in the Commonplace Book to the failed papal effort to censor De monarchia indicates, Milton regarded Dante as an exemplar of the artist threatened (though unsuccessfully) by clerical repression.

Ironically the anxiety, concealed though it may be in an elaborate allusion to Dante, that a Presbyterian government imperils English literary and artistic activity aligns Milton with his royalist contemporaries, who represented Parliament’s closure of the theatres as evidence of a typically Puritan philistinism. In commendatory poems for Moseley’s 1647 Beaumont and Fletcher folio, for example, Thomas Stanley refers to Parliament as ‘They that silenc’d wit’, while Richard Brome declares that the printed plays will survive ‘until some After-age | Shall put down Printing, as this doth the Stage’. This sense of the arts under threat was later extended to Lawes’s music by John Berkenhead in his poem for the 1653 Ayres and Dialogues. Berkenhead fears a time when ‘Musick’s driven | (Like Kings and Bishops) banish’t back to Heaven’. In his commendatory poem for Moseley’s 1646 edition of Shirley, who had lost his career as both courtier and playwright, Francis Tucker invokes the bond of artistic friendship, as Milton does in the Lawes sonnet, against an authoritarian and persecutory regime that seeks to impoverish writers and obliterate the tradition of wit:

Friend, in this death of art, when but to write
Or think in verse, is to be destroy’d quite;
When sergeants too implacable are set
To fill the compters with wit and debt;
Nor any hope of rescue from those
Who would distrust their creed if’t were not prose;
I wonder at the influence of thy pen,
That would engage such generous knowing men
(Warm’d with thy flame) so boldly to advance
‘Gaints the prevailing monster, Ignorance.’

Tucker explicitly makes a political division between poetry and prose, suggesting poetry is suspected of idolatry by iconoclastic Puritans, ‘Who would distrust their creed if’t were not prose’. As the Beaumont and Fletcher folio and Cartwright’s works most strikingly illustrate, royalist writers used such commendatory poems

89 Stanley, ‘On the edition’, and Brome, ‘To the memory of the deceased but ever-living Authour in these his Poems, Mr John Fletcher’, in Beaumont and Fletcher, Comedies and Tragedies (1647), sigs. b4v, g1r; Berkenhead, ‘To the great Master of his Art my honoured F. Mr Henry Lawes on his Book of Ayres’, in Ayres and Dialogues, sig. b4r.

to create a sense of solidarity and to preserve the cultural values that they regarded as endangered with the dissolution of the court. When Milton wanted to communicate with the royalist literary community as the war drew to a close in 1645–6, he published his poetry of the 1620s and 1630s through Moseley and addressed a sonnet, later used as a commendatory poem, to his friend who was in closest contact with, and held in greatest respect by, that community. The sonnet's reference to Dante, regarded by Milton as a predecessor in the tradition of great anticlerical poets, combined with the echoes of the satirical sonnets written around the same time indicate the anti-Presbyterian motive behind Milton's desire to remind Lawes and his Cavalier friends that Independent Parliamentarians, at least, shared their interest in and facility with the arts.

Lewalski, following Norbrook and others, believes that in the 1645 Poems Milton ‘presents himself as a new kind of reformist poet . . . with poems designed to reclaim and reform several genres dominated by [the Cavaliers]’. This is surely true of Lycidas and to some extent of the Maske. But what of other poems included in the volume, such as the funeral elegies for the Marchioness of Winchester and Lancelot Andrewes? Milton's desire to impress a royalist literary audience in 1645–6, as the Presbyterian threat grew more urgent, is underlined by his revision of line 8 of the sonnet to Lawes. In the first draft in the Trinity manuscript, Milton tells Lawes he will be remembered as the man ‘That didst reform thy art, the chief among’. Presumably it is Lawes's insistence that his music should not obscure the meaning of the verse that Milton regards as ‘reformist’. Yet in the subsequent drafts of the sonnet and in the published version of 1648, the bold claim for Lawes as iconoclastic cultural reformer is replaced by praise of a smoothness that is more in line with ‘Cavalier’ taste: ‘That with smooth air couldst humour best our tongue.’ That Milton should propose smoothness as the ideal lyrical mode for the English language is surprising given the formal unevenness that characterizes Lycidas, the major vernacular poem in the 1645 volume. Norbrook argues persuasively that Lycidas at once ‘marks a decisive and unambiguous commitment to the Spenserian tradition’ and a rejection of the Jonsonian urbanity (as embodied metrically in the closed couplet) practised by the ‘sons of Ben’ in Jonsonus Virbius.

It is true that smoothness is not usually a virtue in the Miltonic register. In Apology Against a Pamphlet Milton recalls his literary interests at university to refute the charge that he visits brothels and to demonstrate rather his ‘love and steadfast observation of that vertue which abhores the society of Bordello’s’. In language which again suggests that ‘Haec ego mente’ was written in the

---

91 Lewalski, Life, 227; Thomas N. Corns discusses the funeral elegies in arguing that, if we were to judge on the basis solely of the poetry before ‘Lycidas’ in the 1645 volume, Milton might have become ‘incorporated into the ideological framework of the establishment, perhaps as a sort of younger, chaster Herrick’ (‘Milton before Lycidas’, in Graham Parry and Joad Raymond (eds.), Milton and the Terms of Liberty (Cambridge, 2002), 36).

early 1640s, he recounts how he was ‘allured to read’ the ‘Smooth Elegiack Poets, whereof the Schooles are not scarce’ and ‘which imitation I found most easie’, before rejecting ‘those authors any where speaking unworthy things of themselves; or unchaste of those names which before they had extoll’d’. Milton was particularly attracted by the ‘pleasing sound’ of elegy (CPWM i. 889–90). Smooth, musical love poetry is here associated with licentiousness, and both are associated in the anti-prelatical prose with the corruptions of court culture. Yet in the sonnet to Lawes, written around the time of the publication of the 1645 Poems, Milton seems to cultivate the Jonsonian smoothness that he disdains in Lycidas, even (perhaps) to the extent of citing the author of the most famous of the elegies in Jonsonus Virbius. Milton’s sensitivity to the ideological significance of regular and irregular form in his 1646 sonnets is apparent in ‘On the New Forcers of Conscience’, in which, as John Kerrigan observes, he rebels against Presbyterian attempts to impose morality through religious conformity by ‘writing a sonnet which was most tautly disciplined where least regular, Italianately tailed’.93 If Milton was beginning to believe that he had more in common culturally with the defeated Cavaliers than with the Presbyterians in the Parliamentarian party, the decision to rewrite line 8 of the sonnet indicates a concern that his praise of Lawes as cultural reformer might be too aggressive for a royalist readership.

The concluding reference to Dante, however, does maintain a link with the tradition of prophetic anticlerical poetry in which Milton firmly places himself in the headnote to Lycidas in the 1645 Poems. Indeed the conclusion of Dante’s meeting with Casella on the shores of Purgatory hints at Milton’s continuing misgivings about the moral substance of Cavalier poetics, despite his apparent hopes in the sonnet to Lawes for cultural reconciliation in the aftermath of the war. Dante, Virgil, and the other souls who arrived with Casella stand ‘transfixed’ as they listen to the lyric that Casella plays for them; suddenly the voice of Cato the Younger cuts across the music, rebuking the assembled crowd as ‘sluggard spirits’ for lingering in the work of purgation: “Hurry towards the peak and strip this grime | That covers God from you within its cloud” (ll. 120–4). Cato is made guardian of the approach to Mount Purgatory, and thus of the path to spiritual liberty, because of the heroic virtue he displayed in opposing Caesar in the Roman civil wars: Cato committed suicide when Pompey’s forces were defeated by Caesar at the Battle of Thapsus. Dante was no republican; but he found a personification of moral virtue in Lucan’s representation in the Pharsalia of Cato’s death in the cause of his republican principles. Milton got his sense of Cato as republican hero from Lucan, the ‘central poet of the republican imagination’, and from Sallust, the severely moralistic historian of the rise and

fall of the Roman republic. In the opening of the ‘Digression’ to book 3 of the *History of Britain*, which was probably written soon after the end of the second civil war in August 1648, Milton takes phrases directly from Sallust’s account in *Bellum Catilinae* of a speech delivered by Cato to the Senate, in which Cato warns that ‘martial spirit counts for less than moral virtues such as industry and justice’ in securing the lasting glory of a republic. In book 3 Milton draws a parallel between the situation following the withdrawal of the Romans from Britain in the fifth century and the end of the ‘late civil broils’; in the ‘Digression’ he then laments the moral weakness of the British, who have spurned their opportunities to imitate ‘other nations both antient and modern [that] with extreme hazard & danger have strove for libertie as a thing invaluable’ (*CPWM* v. 441, 443). Milton blames the failure to seize the opportunity for liberty in the aftermath of civil war both on the corruption of the British character after so many generations of courtly and episcopal subjection and the attempts of the Presbyterian clergy to ‘set up a spiritual tyranny by a secular power’ (v. 447).

While the sonnet to Lawes reaches out to the all-but-defeated royalist community in the cause of wit and learning against the threat of Presbyterian tyranny, what might be called the subtextual significance of the allusion to Dante is the invocation of Cato’s stern rebuke. The conclusion of the Casella episode reveals Milton’s (perhaps unconscious) anxiety about the wisdom of his appeal to Lawes in the sonnet, and to the wider royalist literary community in the 1645 *Poems*. As we have seen, the notion of love poetry as a sensual temptation to which he had briefly succumbed in his youth and then rejected was central to Milton’s representation and sense of himself as prophetic poet, lips touched and purified by the Spirit since Christmas Day 1629. The theme recurs in Elegy VI, several of the anti-prelatical tracts, and most aggressively in ‘Haec ego mente’, seemingly written specifically for the 1645 volume. In the prose the theme assumes a political dimension as love poetry become associated with Cavalier poetics and the degenerate cultural products of a corrupt court. Since the collaboration with Milton on the *Maske*, Lawes had become best known for his settings of these Cavalier lyrics by the likes of Cartwright, Carew, Suckling, and Lovelace. The allusion to Dante that is supposed to cement Milton’s offer of continued or renewed friendship with Lawes in the aftermath of war also conveys a residual anxiety about the moral virtue of the literary culture with which Lawes was associated. Milton’s self-identification with Dante indicates his fear that he may...
again be distracted from the arduous path to spiritual and political liberty by the seductive but insubstantial attractions of amatory lyric and the courtly culture in which it thrived, as he had once before at Cambridge.

Milton knew from his reading of Sallust that the prosperity which the Romans had obtained from abolishing kingship, so enabling and encouraging virtue to flourish, had also led to the decline and fall of the republic, as the citizens succumbed to avarice and luxury.\textsuperscript{96} With Parliament’s victory in the civil war looking inevitable by early 1646, Cato’s rebuke in \textit{Purgaturio} is a reminder of his warning to the Romans, as recorded in Sallust, that they must continue to strive for liberty after triumphing in arms and not succumb to the effeminizing ease of peace and prosperity. The Jonsonian smoothness of the sonnet to Lawes does not completely conceal the prose polemicist who blamed the popularity of ‘libidinous and ignorant Poetasters’ on the moral degeneracy of a society dominated by courtiers and bishops—although the crack in the elegant structure is very fine. The ghostly presence of the republican hero Cato behind the appeal to the royalist friend Lawes hints at a growing, if not yet fully formed, conviction that the struggle for liberty must not end in post-war settlement with the king, even if that settlement can prevent Presbyterian tyranny, but will require the expulsion of the Stuarts as the Romans expelled the Tarquins.

Of course, as Milton knew from his reading of the \textit{Convivio}, the love song that Casella plays in Purgatory is hardly the work of a ‘vulgar Amorist’: in the \textit{Convivio} Dante set out to provide extensive commentaries on fourteen of his \textit{canzoni} as Platonic allegories of his love for Lady Philosophy, the \textit{donna gentile} who appears at the end of the \textit{Vita Nuova}. Dante looks to reconcile philosophy and theology, reason and grace: those who love philosophical wisdom perfect their natures as rational creatures and are drawn into union with their creator, of whose majesty the beauty of the \textit{donna gentile} is the expression. Indeed in \textit{Apology Against a Pamphlet}, after recalling how in his youth he was ‘allured’ by ‘the smooth elegiac poets’, Milton insists that he came to prefer ‘the two famous renowners of Beatrice and Laura, who never write but honour of them to whom they devote their verse, displaying sublime and pure thoughts, without transgression’. It was the study of Dante and Petrarch that confirmed Milton ‘in this opinion, that he who would not be frustrate of his hope to write well hereafter in laudable things, ought himself to be a true poem; that is, a composition of the best and most honourablest things’ (CPWM i. 889). The example of Dante, in other words, was partly responsible for his renunciation of the love poetry that had briefly fascinated him at Cambridge and for which, by the early 1640s, having seen what had become of his Cambridge contemporaries, he had only moral revulsion. Dante abandoned the \textit{Convivio} having completed the commentaries for only three \textit{canzoni}; Cato’s rebuke when Dante is distracted from his journey

\textsuperscript{96} Dzelzainis, ‘Milton’s Classical Republicanism’, 22–3.
by the beauty of his own love song in Purgatory suggests that Dante had by this time given up on reconciling the sensuality of the love lyric with a poetry of divine grace. In the Apology the rejection of the elegiac poets for Dante and Petrarch is followed by the relegation of lyric poetry as a kind, as Milton recounts how he eventually found in Platonic philosophy a truer guide to virtuous love:

Thus from the Laureat fraternity of Poets, riper yeares, and the ceaseless round of study and reading led me to the shady places of philosophy, but chiefly to the divine volumes of Plato, and his equal Xenophon. Where if I should tell ye what I learnt, of chastity and love, I meant that which is truly so, whose charming cup is only vertue which she bears in her hand to those who are worthy. The rest are cheated with a thick intoxicating potion which a certaine Sorceresse the abuser of loves name carries about; and how the first and chiefest office of love, begins and ends in the soule, producing those happy twins of her divine generation knowledge and vertue, with such abstracted sublimities as these, it might one day be worth your listning, Readers, as I may one day hope to have ye in a still time, when there shall be no chiding… (i. 890)

Milton's education in sexual morality was completed by reading the scriptures (‘last of all not time, but as perfection is last’), in particular Revelation, where he learned that ‘the high rewards of ever accompanying the Lambe’ were denied ‘those who were defil’d with women’ (890). Here, as in the Convivio, Platonic philosophy and Christian soteriology are held to be complementary: Milton echoes the high-flown mediations between love, knowledge, and grace in Dante’s commentary on ‘Amor che ne la mente me ragiona’. But lyric poetry is implicitly rejected as sensual temptation: the allusion to Circe’s cup recalls Elegy VI, in which love lyric is played in ‘Circe’s hall, where men were made monsters’ (ll. 72–3), and ‘Haec ego mente’, in which Milton tells of how he could not turn away from the flashy attractions of love elegy ‘until the shady Academy offered me its Socratic streams’ (l. 5). In the satirical sonnets of 1646 the Presbyterians are ridiculed as Circean beasts and their accusations of sexual disorder dismissed as manifestations of their own swinish ignorance and fleshly obsessions. The Presbyterian reaction to his ideas on divorce pushed Milton to seek reconciliation, through his display of wit and civility in the 1645 Poems, with a royalist literary community that he hoped could be morally reformed in a nation now freed from episcopal corruption. The sonnet to Lawes, with its reference to artistic reconciliation in the Commedia, sheds light on these complex motivations behind the publishing of the Poems. Yet when the episode in Dante is followed to its close, the allusion reveals Milton’s anxiety that his renewed attraction to Cavalier literary society will distract him, as Circe distracted Odysseus, from his epic journey towards spiritual and political liberty. In April 1638, just before he left for Italy, Milton jotted down two lines on the back of the letter from Lawes which enclosed his passport: ‘Fix here ye overdated spheres | That wing the restless foot of time.’ ‘Overdated’, a word not previously recorded, has
the sense less that the spheres are ‘antiquated, out of date’, as Carey suggests, than that they are later than they should have been. If the lines on the letter from Lawes ‘are precipitated by alarm that, as he begins another preparation, he might already have missed his time’, they also register the debt to Lawes, who has enabled him to embark on the journey ‘which Milton thought might end his apprenticeship and make him an artist of European stature’.97 In *The Reason of Church-Government*, just before promising that he will make good on his poetic debt to the nation when ‘the impertinent yoke of prelaty’ is lifted, ‘under whose inquisitorious and tyrannical duncery no free and splendid wit can flourish’, Milton craves ‘excuse that urgent reason hath plucked from [him] by an abortive and forerated discovery’ his conviction that he will become the national poet of epic song (i. 820). In seeking to renew his friendship with Lawes at the beginning of 1646, Milton looked forward to a post-war settlement, presumably within the terms of constitutional monarchy, that would free their land of clerical tyranny and enable their wit to flourish. Yet Milton also feared the Cavalier songwriter who had once helped him catch up with time might now distract him from his foreordained path to becoming the prophetic poet of a British republic.

**JOHN HALL AND THE MILTONIC EXAMPLE**

In the long verse satire, clearly inspired by Donne, that opens his 1647 *Poems*, John Hall begins by voicing the conventional disdain of the royalist for the rise of the polemical pamphlet and the marketplace of print—for the ‘paper prostitutions’ scorned by Moseley in his preface to Suckling’s *Fragmenta Aurea*. Cheap in price and worthless in wit, the pamphlet is good for any purpose but the improvement of the mind:

Pray let m’alone; what, do you think can I
Be still, while pamphlets thus like hailstones fly
About mine ears?

To see such paper tyrants reign, who press
Whole harmless reams to death, which, ne’ertheless,
Are dogg’d by worser fates; tobacco can
Calcine them soon to dust; the dripping-pan
Pack them to th’dunghill; if they groc’ry meet,
They do the office of a winding-sheet:
How better were it for you to remain
(Poor quires!) in ancient rags, than thus sustain
Such antic forms of tortures . . .

(‘A Satire’, *MPCP* ii. 185, ll. 1–3, 8–16)

Yet little more than six months after the Poems appeared, Hall published A true account and character of the times, Historically and Politically drawn by a Gentleman to give satisfaction to his friend in the Country. The pamphlet was received by Thomason on 9 August 1647. Surviving copies have no title-page, but are signed ‘N. LL.’ Although Davies makes no mention of A true account in his discussion of Hall’s writings, a 1653 pamphlet ascribed to Hall by Davies, which also takes the form of a familiar letter, is signed ‘[Joh]N. [Ha]LL.’ As Robert Wilcher observes, the wide use of the genre of the familiar letter in the polemical exchanges of the first civil war, particularly by royalists, shows how the ‘divisions of allegiances in a Civil War depended for many on individual choice rather than the accident of nationality or class…Propagandists realized that it might be more effective to enact the process of persuasion in the text than to aim their arguments directly at the reader.’ In the case of A true account, Hall was probably addressing a particular royalist friend in the country—Stanley seems to have alternated between his London and Hertfordshire addresses during the summer of 1647. Davies tells us that between May and August 1647 Hall ‘made diverse sallies into Hertfordshire’, presumably to see Stanley at Cumberlow. (On one of these trips Hall ‘met with the Gentlewoman whom he afterwards married’, although they were soon living separately due to the strain placed on the relationship by the disapproval of Hall’s family.) While it was a conventional motif of the printed familiar letter to begin by establishing a long-standing personal relationship between writer and addressee, Hall’s opening acknowledgement of the ‘manifold favours’ that he has received from his friend suggests that A true account is addressed specifically to Stanley. By putting the letter into print Hall addresses himself more generally to the royalist literati in whose circles he moved under Stanley’s patronage. A true account has been regarded as ‘rather detached’ and ‘idiosyncratic’ in its analysis of the tumultuous recent events in London. In fact Hall’s argument is idiosyncratic in the literal sense of the word: he seeks to bring together different, seemingly incompatible mentalities. For his immediate purpose was to persuade literary friends—Stanley, Sherburne, Lovelace, Shirley, Alexander Brome, and, if he was back in London by this time, Marvell—to support the settlement proposed to the king by the Army and the Independents in July 1647.

After the Scots had ransomed Charles to Parliament in January 1647, the king was taken from Newcastle to Holdenby House. Due to concerns that Charles was finally prepared to cement a military alliance between the Scots and the Presbyterian majority in the Commons that would establish a Presbyterian church

98 A letter written to a gentleman in the country (1653), discussed in Ch. 5 below. See Davies, ‘An Account of the Author’, sig. b5v.
99 The Writing of Royalism, 146.
100 Ann Hughes, Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution (Oxford, 2004), 319, 320 n. 4.
101 Norbrook, Writing the English Republic, 169, suggests that ‘Marvell and Lovelace may be regarded as the intended audience’ of Hall’s pamphlet.
government in England, he was removed from Holdenby by Coronet Joyce on 4 June 1647 and put into the custody of the Army. Cromwell, Ireton, and the Army Council, in conjunction with the Independent faction in Parliament, presented a proposal to Charles for a new constitutional settlement, published at the beginning of August as *The Heads of the Proposals*. The *Heads* combined constitutional concessions to the king with a demand for a loosely structured national church that would allow a considerable measure of liberty of conscience. ‘Of all the terms offered Charles during the 1640s’, writes David L. Smith, ‘the *Heads* sought the least Parliamentary constraint on royal powers.’ Episcopacy could even be restored, ‘provided it lacked coercive powers’. 102 The terms of the *Heads* reflected fears within the Army and among Independents of a new tyranny under the Presbyterian parliamentary majority and of the imposition of Presbyterian church discipline. Only a few days before *A true account* was published, the Army occupied the city for the first time to restore Independent members who had fled from a mob that had invaded both Houses and forced a series of votes, including one to bring Charles to London immediately. 103 It is to this uncertain and dangerous constitutional moment in the aftermath of civil war, when both Presbyterian and Independent factions sought to reach opposed settlements with the king, that *A true account* speaks: when ‘the government of the Kingdome removed from White-hall to Westminster’, writes Hall, ‘[n]ow began the whole frame of State to bee taken in peeces: but it is easie for a child to discompose a Watch, but tantum non impossible to set it right againe’ (2). The image implies the war has wrecked a sophisticated political mechanism, and the tract certainly begins by speaking in a language that Hall’s royalist literary friends would understand.

Hall expresses sympathy for the ‘flower of the Gentry’ who have fought for the losing party and are now subject to the harsh penalties imposed by Parliament. Defeated royalists had to deal with ‘two kinds of material disaster’: sequestration and compounding. Sequestration involved the seizure by Parliament of the estates of those ‘malignants’ who had fought for or assisted the cause of the king; the procedure of compounding required an individual’s application for pardon and applied a system of graduated fines depending on the gravity of their ‘malignancy’. 104 While compounding was obviously the more lenient measure, it raised a case of conscience for royalists in that it required them to admit publicly their defeat and acknowledge the legitimacy of the Parliamentary committees. Hall furiously attacks these committees as ‘raised of men of contemptible condition’

and dismisses the sequestrators as ‘a vermine which might well make a seventh plague in Ægypt’. We have seen how vigorously Hall supported schemes that would benefit the public in his letters to Hartlib; here Parliament is accused of behaving ‘under the pretence of the publicke’ to pass ordinances that are ‘flat against the reason and letter of the Law’ and have caused the ‘ruine of many fine families’. Some men ‘out of bare suspicion, were outed of their livlihoods, and put to compound’ (2–3). Hall may here have Lovelace in mind, or Herrick, who took no part in the war but had been ejected from his living in Devon in 1646. Yet Hall’s attack on arbitrary Parliamentary power is in line not only with royalist but also Independent fears in the summer of 1647, and Hall establishes his royalist credentials before seeking to persuade his readers that they should focus their blame not on Parliament as an institution, but on the influence of the Presbyterian clergy in the Commons and in the country in general. The key moment in the rhetorical strategy of Hall’s tract is his acknowledgement that his correspondent’s ‘person and family have suffered so much by [the Parliamentarians], that I fear me ’twill be a work of difficulty to make you heare that which might be rationally said in their excuse’ (3).  

Those appointed to the sequestration committees have abused their power because they have been ‘for the most nuzzled up under some non-conformist Ministers, and by them a little enslaved in their consciences’. These ministers had gained the people’s esteem when they were persecuted under Laud and the bishops in the 1630s, but with the fall of episcopacy the Presbyterian clergy began ‘creeping into the fattest places that were left’ and ‘most unhappily began a new model of Ecclesiastial Policy’. The recent actions of the Presbyterians in Parliament demonstrate that a Presbyterian church government, which has only managed to gain ‘Publique Toleration’ in Scotland, is ‘incompatible’ with civil government and would in only ‘a few years render itself more odious than [episcopacy] had been in many Centuries’ (3–4).  

For Hall, the Presbyterian demand for enforced religious uniformity inevitably entails a tyrannous usurpation of civil power. The ‘congregational way’ of the Independents, ‘being free and leaving a scope to mens consciences’, is naturally abhorrent to the Presbyterians, who typically seek, out of material self-interest rather than a sense of spiritual responsibility, to suppress any idea, individual, or group that threatens their clerical power. Significantly Hall cites as evidence of the repressive zeal of the Presbyterian clergy their fury at the decision of Charles Herle, himself a Presbyterian clergyman. 

105 Stanley of course did not take part in the war, although it appears that he inherited the fines owed by the royalist Sir John Enyon when he married Enyon's daughter in 1648 (Chernaik, entry for Stanley in ODNB).

106 As historians have long pointed out, those who supported the Presbyterian interest in Parliament were not necessarily religious Presbyterians. It is part of Hall’s polemical point, however, to elide such distinctions. Ann Hughes has noted the lack of distinction between Presbyterian political and religious aims in polemical writing by all sides, including the Presbyterians, in 1646–7 (Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution, 404).
member of the Westminster Assembly, to license the major statement of Independent principles, the ‘modestly penned’ (as Hall puts it) Apologetical Narration (1644).\(^{107}\) While avoiding any direct statement of sympathy with Independency, Hall attacks the attempts of the Presbyterian clergy in books such as Thomas Edwards’s *Gangraena* (3 pts., 1646) to smear the Independents by associating their support for liberty of conscience with the rise of sectarian heresy. Indeed Hall blames the ‘waspish and violent rancour’ and ‘almost monkish forgeries’ of *Gangraena* for helping to create the confrontation between the Presbyterians and the Army in 1647—an analysis that is substantially confirmed by Ann Hughes’s recent study of the impact of Edwards’s heresiography (4–5).\(^{108}\) The adjective ‘monkish’ associates the Presbyterians’ drive for absolute power with Catholic tyranny over the conscience. As with Independents such as Milton and John Goodwin, Hall’s vitriol is aimed not at all Presbyterians but at those clerics Goodwin called the ‘high Presbyterie’ and ‘Gangraena’s Gang’.\(^{109}\) Hall even recommends that Edwards and ‘some of the hotter spirited’ Presbyterian clerics ‘deserve punishment as Incendiaries’ (7). (In fact Edwards had fled London for Amsterdam when the Army occupied the city.)

Hall does not conclude by declaring his own position or by making a direct, polemical argument for the settlement proposed by the Independents. Rather he unexpectedly distances himself from the dispute by concluding with a series of ‘general’ and ‘particular’ maxims that can be ‘historically and politically drawn’ from the events in London. In ‘A Method of History’, the letter of advice on studies that he wrote in Durham in 1645, Hall extols the ‘extract[ion] of Politick Observations’ from ‘the variety of events’. This collection of ‘experience & civill wisdome’ can then be applied to future problems. The generation of historical and political maxims was associated with Tacitus and his sharp, provocative style: Hall recommends Tacitus for his ‘excellent Theorems of Policy wch he breathes in almost every line’. Tacitus was the major classical influence on ‘new humanist’ arguments of political interest and reason of state in Europe between 1580 and 1620. Bacon, whose influence on ‘A Method of History’

\(^{107}\) On the split in the Westminster Assembly over the Apologetical Narration, composed by five members of the Assembly, see John Morrill, ‘The Impact of Puritanism’, in Morrill (ed.), The Impact of the English Civil War, 59–60.

\(^{108}\) On A true account, see Hughes, Gangraena and the Struggle for the English Revolution, 319–20; see also her comment that Gangraena helped ‘construct polemical communities in which divisions on some issues—liberty of conscience in particular—were maximized’ (403). Hughes suggests in passing that the John Hall who wrote A true account is the same John Hall who is named in the third part of Gangraena as ‘a great Sectary, who hath vented many erroneous Positions in some parts of Barkshire and thereabouts’ and was ‘sometime of Colebrooke [in Devon] . . . now resident in or about Henley upon Thames’ (311; Gangraena, 3 pts. (1646) iii. 171). The errors taught by this Hall are not named, but the locations cited by Edwards suggest that he is not John Hall of Durham. At the same time, Davies tells us that Hall was later accused of mortalism, cited in Gangraena as one of the most serious heresies abroad in Civil War England; see Davies, ‘An Account of the Author’, sig. b5v.

\(^{109}\) Goodwin, Hagiomastix, or The Scourge of the Saints (1647), sigs. b\(^{-2}\).
is strong, was ‘the most spectacular example of an Englishman thinking in
terms of the “new humanism”.’ ‘A Method of History’ reveals Hall’s reading of
Machiavelli, Guicciardini, Lipsius, and Montaigne—all recommended by Bacon
and central to the rise in Europe of theories of reason of state, according to
which constitutional laws and moral principles can be overridden to secure civil
peace. Hall’s Tacitist style acknowledges that his implicit appeal to his royalist
friends to accept the terms of the Heads as a means of preventing Presbyterian
tyranny involves such an abandonment of cherished legal and moral principle.
It probably also reflects one of the likely intellectual sources of his complaint
against clerical usurpation of civil power. The lawyer and great humanist scholar
John Selden (1588–1654) had argued in Tacitist terms in his controversial work
on the History of Tithes (1618), which Hall had certainly read by 1654, that
ecclesiastical rights were authorized by civil rather than sacred law, and that civil
law was not immutable but subject to historical change. The clear implication
was that the clergy, whether Catholic, Anglican, or Presbyterian, falsely claim
jure divino authority for tithes, and more generally for an authority over the
people that is autonomous from civil power, out of self-interest. In his Preface
to the History of Tithes Selden had surveyed the history of the clergy’s repression
of learning, comparing himself to ‘Reuchlin and Bude, [who] the one for his
Hebrew, the other for his Greek, were exceedingly hated, because they learned
and taught what the friars and monks were mere strangers to’. Selden had ‘helped
to block the triumph of Presbyterianism’ in the mid-1640s in his role as one
of the Commons’s representatives to the Westminster Assembly, where, accord-
ing to Aubrey, he continually mocked the Presbyterians’ claims to scriptural
authority by demonstrating their lack of knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek
original.111

In his ‘particular’ maxims Hall reiterates his sympathy with defeated royalists
who are stigmatized as ‘malignants’, arguing that ‘it is a brave and gallant way to
peace, to extinguish the names of parties, and not to discountenance Malignants’
(8). Moreover recent events demonstrate the general maxim that ‘the government
of one coming into the hands of many, who are unskilful Pilots, is to be wished
againe, though accompanied by some inconveniences’. However Hall does not
specify that the ‘government of one’ must be a monarchy; indeed he prefers to
focus on the personal character of Charles and his patient suffering rather than
the legal or religious authority of his office: ‘the King all the while carryed himself
with patience, and his party are resolved to suffer as well as they have acted with
their master... the King seemes to have this advantage by all his troubles, that
he hath shewed to the world the incomparable excellencies that are in him, and
extorted a confession even from his enemies’ (6–7). Rather the political focus
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Way of Settlement Settled and Confirmed (1654), 17; Selden, The Historie of Tithes, preface, p. xvi.
of the maxims is again on the will to power of the Presbyterians, from whose behaviour Hall derives the general anticlerical principle that ‘Clergy-men’ should not be allowed ‘to gaine upon the conscience too much in matters indifferent, for they are a race of people, who though they least ought, have ever the basest ends of their own’ (6). In particular Hall accuses the Presbyterian clergy of ‘offending against knowledge’, stating that ‘learning hath incomparably suffered by these times’ (8). From one perspective this looks like the standard royalist claim that Puritan iconoclasm has destroyed a golden age of cultural and intellectual achievement under the Stuarts. Hall’s complaint echoes the opening line of the Prologue to Cowley’s *The Guardian*, the play performed in Cambridge before the Prince of Wales and the Villiers brothers (and probably Stanley) in March 1642. Cowley’s address to the prince is typical in its ascription of wit and learning to the patronage of the royal family and depiction of Parliamentary London as a city dominated by a brutal philistinism:

> Who says the Times do Learning disallow?  
> ’Tis false, ’twas never honoured so as now.  
> When you appear, great Prince, our night is done:  
> You are our Morning Star, and shall b’our Sun.  
> But our scence’s London, now, and by the rout  
> We perish if the Roundheads be about:  
> For now no ornament the head must wear,  
> No Bays, no Mitre, not so much as Hair.  
> How can a Play pass safely, when we know  
> Cheapside-Cross falls for but making a show?112

Cowley connects the decline of learning with the suppression of the drama; in his next maxim in *A true account* Hall calls for the public theatres to be reopened. This policy would of course have appealed to the Stanley circle, which included the former professional playwrights Shirley and Richard Brome and several of the contributors, including Stanley himself, to the commendatory verses for the Beaumont and Fletcher folio earlier in 1647. However Hall’s argument for the reopening of the theatres is not based on cultural value or nostalgia but on political and educational utility: ‘it were a good way to mollifie peoples minds to suffer Play-houses againe, and...it would be a considerable addition to the education of the Gentry’ (8).

Milton had argued for the efficacy of public ‘recitations’ of poetry as a method of teaching virtue in *The Reason of Church-Government* (1642).113 As we have seen, Hall shared with Milton and the Hartlib circle the conviction that the civil war was in great part a consequence of miseducation. While Hall’s complaint


113 *CPWM* i. 819.
about the damage done to learning by the times echoes royalist polemic, there
is also a Miltonic ring to Hall’s attack on the Presbyterian clergy’s offence
‘against knowledge’, by which Hall appears to mean not only their cultural
narrowness and iconoclastic rejection of the theatre but their efforts to suppress
arguments and writings which they deem ungodly or a threat to their authority.
In Areopagitica Milton had attacked the Presbyterian clergy for supporting the re-
establishing of the licensing laws that had operated under episcopacy and which
were ‘the greatest discouragement and affront, that can be offer’d to learning and
to learned men’. The influence of Areopagitica may also be apparent in one of
the general maxims that Hall derives from the polarizing impact of Gangraena: it
is ‘no great policy to give heterodox opinions life by opposition, nor to draw on
the hate of a victorious Army’ (6–7). Such a pragmatic, rather than principled,
defence of the free circulation of ideas might be regarded as in line with the
form of the maxim and with the arguments for royalist settlement with the
Independents based on interest rather than ideology that are implicit in A true
account. But it also echoes Bacon as quoted in Areopagitica: ‘The punishing of wits
enhaunces their authority, saith the Viscount St. Albans, and a forbidd’n writing
is thought to be a certain spark of truth that flies up in the faces of them who seek
to tread it out.’

Given his admiration for Bacon, Hall’s eye would have been
drawn to this reference. Hall’s insistence that ‘regard to tender consciences is
as necessary, as a generall consideration would be inconvenient’, again signals
sympathy with the Independent platform. However the second part of the maxim
reflects the policy of Cromwell and the more conservative Independents to
support a toleration that encompassed only differences over ecclesiology among
Protestants rather than the toleration of heresy demanded by Milton and by
radical Independents such as Hartlib’s friend Henry Robinson, or the universal
dispensation advocated by Levellers such as Richard Overton and William
Walwyn. While Hall may have read Areopagitica and Robinson’s Liberty of
Conscience (1644), he promotes the less radical settlement outlined in the Heads
that was more likely to be accepted by his royalist audience. When he states that
‘most of the Kingdom seeme to breath after a moderate Episcopacy’, his qual-
ification echoes the proposal in the Heads for the restoration of a non-coercive
episcopacy (7).

During the summer of 1647 royalists of various hues could find common
cause with Independent, Army, and Leveller spokesmen in working against the
threat of a Presbyterian tyranny over English political and religious government.
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Two royal chaplains, Michael Hudson (who had fought in the first war and was to die in the second) and Jeremy Taylor (who had risen under Laud’s patronage in the 1630s and been briefly imprisoned in 1645), issued pleas for a wide-ranging toleration in the summer of 1647. Hudson, in *The Divine Right of Governments*, and Taylor, in *The Liberty of Prophesying*, emphasized the sinfulness of being forced to act against the conscience and opposed the uncertainty of religious knowledge to Presbyterian certitude and biblical fundamentalism.\(^{116}\) A host of satirical pamphlets and poems appeared in August, with titles such as *The Scottish politike Presbyter, Slaine by an English Independent* and *The Presbyterians Litany... For the more speedy suppressing of the growth of Independency*, in which the Presbyterians ask God to protect them not only ‘From having Bishops in our land, | According unto Christ’s command’ and ‘From honouring our native King’, but also ‘From Joyce, from Cromwell, and from Pride, | Or any loyall hart beside’ (4–5). The anonymous author of this satire, received by Thomason on 26 August, avoids the obvious tensions between royalist and Independent religious politics by ventriloquizing the Presbyterian voice and having the Presbyterians themselves unify royalist and Independent as a single enemy. Indeed John Davies, whose list of Hall’s writings is accurate if not complete, ascribes to Hall ‘the Satyre against Presbytery’, which in the context of Davies’s broadly chronological account must have been published sometime between early 1647 and May 1648. This tract has not previously been identified and has been presumed lost.\(^{117}\) *The Presbyterians Litany* may be Hall’s satire against Presbytery. In its clever ventriloquizing of the Presbyterians’ own voice to damn them as the enemy of both the royalists and the Army, both episcopacy and Independency, the poem certainly has the same goal as *A true account of evading differences between the former enemies and forging an anti-Presbyterian alliance*. As in Hall’s pamphlet of the previous week, the Presbyterians are usurpers of the political power of both Parliament and king as well as tyrants over the conscience of the people:

That it may please thee to restore
Us to that power we had before,
To force men to imbrace our lore.

*Quæsumus te.*


That it may please thee, we may gaine
The Scepter from our Soveraigne
To his, and all his Subjects paine.

Quæsumus te.

From those that willingly assent,
Or urge for a free Parliament,
And will not be with halfe content,

Libera nos.

(The Presbyterians Litany, 2–4)

The device of ventriloquism was used by Hall’s friend Alexander Brome to clever effect in anti-Parliamentarian poems such as ‘The Saint’s Encouragement’ (1643), so Hall may have chosen the form of the poem with a Cavalier audience in mind.118

Of course Hall must have recognized how difficult it would be for many royalists to accept the idea of an alliance with (non-Presbyterian) Parliamentarians against whom they had so recently fought. The ambivalence of attitudes among Hall’s audience in the Stanley circle towards an alliance with the Army and Independents is suggested by Alexander Brome’s Cromwells Panegyrick, a broadsheet published (anonymously) in September 1647. The politics of this poem are more complex than previous commentators have realized.119 It is in part an obviously ironic encomium on Cromwell—Brome makes the usual royalist jokes about Cromwell’s ‘dominicall’ nose, his supposed lowly background in brewing, and his envy of, rather than opposition to, kingship.120 Brome also associates the Army with iconoclasm and the neglect of literary culture, mocking the uncultured soldiers as ‘Poet Laureats’ who derive their inspiration from Cromwell’s beer. However the focus of Brome’s scorn is less on Cromwell and the Army than the Presbyterians: Brome celebrates the routing of the ‘Scotish zealots’ who have ‘torn the Church’ and refuse to free ‘any Conscience from [their] Covenant’. As in A true account, the Presbyterian influence in Parliament is blamed for the mistreatment of defeated royalists: the Presbyterians are ‘Sequestrating Knaves’ who have ‘made whole Countries beggarly, and slaves’. In this context Cromwell emerges, palpably against Brome’s will, as a heroic figure: ‘What honour does he merit, what renown | By whom all these oppressions are pul’d down’. This tension between admiration and aversion is encapsulated in Brome’s image of the visual memorialization of Cromwell’s triumph: ‘His name shall never dye, by

118 Wilcher, The Writing of Royalism, 152.
119 Wilcher regards it as a straightforward mock panegyric on Cromwell (ibid. 263). The poem was given the fuller title ‘Cromwell’s Panegyrick, upon his riding in triumph over the baffled City of London’, in Brome’s 1661 Songs; see Alexander Brome: Poems, ed. Roman R. Dubinski, 2 vols. (Toronto, 1982), i. 348–50.
fire nor floud | But in Church-windows stand, where pictures stood.’ Brome’s poem becomes a literary version of the pictureless church window: he finds himself forced to commemorate an iconoclastic enemy whose military power has at once rid London of Presbyterian domination and shattered the beauties of Stuart culture.

Cromwells Panegyrick shows how distinctions between Presbyterian and Independent in the Parliamentarian party began to assume new significance for royalists after the end of the first civil war. The so-called Louvre group of exiled royalists gathered around Henrietta Maria, which ‘consistently privileged the interests of temporal power over church allegiance’ and included writers such as Cowley and William Davenant, had generally regarded the Presbyterians as the faction most likely to support a powerful monarchy; but the queen sent agents to treat with Cromwell and the Independents in the summer of 1647 about the Heads and its accommodating terms. However the exiled royalists led by Edward Hyde, and clerics such as Henry Hammond who advised the king in his captivity, refused to countenance any alteration to the Anglican church. The reluctance of Hall’s royalist friends such as Brome to form an alliance with the Army and the Independents is doubtless acknowledged in the pragmatic tone of Hall’s pamphlet and the debt that it owes stylistically to the Tacitist tradition. This aspect of A true account may seem to link it with the Louvre faction and their willingness to commit to any religious policy that would restore the Stuarts to power. Yet there are hints in A true account that Hall’s sympathy with the Independent position goes beyond mere expediency. This is unsurprising given his close involvement with the Hartlib circle. For Hartlib, as we have seen, universal reformation was linked politically to the Parliamentary cause, both through his own intelligencing work and by Parliament’s (intermittent) patronage of his activities. As the Westminster Assembly and then Parliament began to fragment into Presbyterian and Independent factions in the mid-1640s, Hartlib and his circle came to regard the Presbyterians’ demands for a coercive church government and for the censorship of ideas and books deemed heretical as the major obstacle to the circle’s efforts to advance learning and bring about religious reconciliation. In 1644 Hartlib had aligned himself publicly with the Independents in the controversy that divided the Assembly by writing a brief preface for Hezekiah Woodward’s response to Thomas Edwards’s attack on the Apologetical Declaration—the ‘modestly penned’ manifesto for Independency that, as Hall observes disapprovingly in A true account, the hotter Presbyterian clergy such as Edwards would suppress. Later in 1644 Woodward wrote a defence of John Goodwin’s arguments for toleration that was cited by the

122 See Woodward, A Short Letter, Modestly intreating a Friends judgement on Mr Edwards his Booke Anti-apologie (1644), sig. A1v.
Stationers’ Company alongside Milton’s *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* in a complaint to Parliament about the unlicensed printing of ‘scandalous books’. The circle of sponsors of Hartlib’s efforts to establish an Office of Address outlined in Sir Cheney Culpeper’s letters includes figures such as Hugh Peter, Henry Robinson, and Sir Henry Vane the Younger who were associated with (the more radical end of) the Independent party, ensuring an increasingly ‘positive response to Hartlib’s schemes’ with ‘the growing consolidation of the power of the Independents’.

Culpeper’s letters to Hartlib, which show him to be ‘an emphatic Independent’ and ‘a committed Parliamentarian with a developed and radical political agenda’, are particularly striking in their new hostility in 1646–7 towards the Presbyterians and the Scots. Liberty of conscience was for Culpeper a condition of political freedom and ‘popery’ was defined as any attempt to force another against his conscience. On hearing in February 1646 that the Scottish Parliament had sent congratulations to the City authorities for their petition against religious toleration, he warns that if ‘our good Brethren shall impose their judgement on us either in what they think be best policy or what they conceive according to the word of God I shall make no difference between a [King] & a Scot; I have been a most hearty Scotsman, (none beyond me); but truly I now fear them’. For Culpeper, a military alliance between the Scots and the English Presbyterians to extend Presbyterian church government to England was a threat to the liberties of the people as grave as any that had been posed by episcopacy or the king. Culpeper’s growing enmity towards the Presbyterians issued in a virulent anticlericalism. He lumps together the ‘Papall, Episcopall, Presbyteriall’ clergy as ‘Locustes’ who feed off the people through suppression and exploitation. The clergy of all stripes maintain their tyranny by ‘bindinge and persecutinge the conscience’; the mechanisms of persecution are in turn established and maintained by ‘makininge the Civill magistrate their Honourable hangemen’. The restoration of ‘Christe to his Spirituall & the People to its Civill Supremacy’ will not be achieved until ‘the Supreme Magistrate in all states, doe againe free their consciences from ecclesiastical tiranny under what notion soever’. While the Presbyterian party stands ‘somewhate neerer the true intereste of the People’ than episcopacy or popery, it ‘hath yet that kinde of dominion in it which was at firste usurped over the People by those who are bid to be examples to, not lords over Gods heritage’. It is the Presbyterians who are to blame for perpetuating conflict and disorder after the royalist defeat. In his letter to Hartlib

125 See *A Letter of the Minister of the City of London, presented to the Assembly of Divines, against Toleration* (1647); Culpeper to Hartlib, 17 Feb. 1647, 264.  
126 Culpeper to Hartlib, 30 Apr. 1646, 274–5.
on 7 September 1647, soon after the Army’s occupation of London, he accuses the Presbyterians of having

layde the groundwoorke of our miseries, whyleste (without contentinge eyther the [King’s] party, the Independente, or easinge the Kingdome all which they had in their power to doe) they sowght a domineeryng power for themselves, & nowe (rather than fayle of a revenge) will call in the [King’s] party the Scotts, the Frenche, & and the Devill & all, Flectere si nequeo.127

Although neither Hall nor Culpeper mention each other in their letters to Hartlib, Culpeper was an integral member of the Hartlib circle and his letters give us a sense of the political and religious ideas that Hall might have encountered, especially if he continued his discussions with Hartlib after leaving Cambridge for London in May 1647. Aspects of the virulently anti-Presbyterian argument and language of Culpeper’s letters in 1646–7 are echoed in the more politically moderate but stridently anticlerical arguments of *A true account*. Hall repeatedly insists on the incompatibility of Presbyterianism with civil government, scornfully refers to the ‘Scotch copy’ that the English Presbyterians seek to imprint on England, and, like Culpeper, associates the Presbyterians with the plagues of insects that decimate Egypt in Exodus 10—although this was also an image that would appeal to Hall’s royalist audience, having been used by Alexander Brome in the anti-Roundhead songs that he circulated in manuscript among his friends.128 Edwards’s *Gangraena* is also cited by Culpeper as evidence of the persecutory Presbyterian ethos. Writing to Hartlib in February 1646, Culpeper expresses his contempt for and anxiety about the impact of the first part of *Gangraena*, which Hartlib had sent him. While Culpeper jokes about using the sheets of the bulky *Gangraena* as toilet paper, he fears its scare stories about the proliferation of heresy and heretical books will be used to justify the ‘presbyteriall lock upon the presse’.129

The most famous protest against clerical efforts to impose a ‘presbyteriall lock upon the presse’ in the mid-1640s is of course Milton’s *Areopagitica*. As I have argued above, Milton’s furious reaction to the efforts of Presbyterians in both the Westminster Assembly and Parliament to denounce and suppress *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* is the crucial context for much of his writing in 1644–7.130 Hall makes no mention of *Areopagitica* in his letters to Hartlib. However we have already noted some resemblances between *A true account* and Milton’s tract, which, like *Of Education*, appears to have circulated in the mid-1640s

127 Culpeper to Hartlib, 7 Sept. 1647, 301. The Latin is from Virgil, *Aeneid* 7. 312: ‘flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo’ (‘If heaven I cannot bend, then I’ll wake up hell’).
129 Culpeper to Hartlib, 24 Feb. 1646, 266.
among the Hartlib circle. Several scholars have suggested that the ‘entreaties and persuasions’ that Milton claims encouraged him to write *Areopagitica* came from the Hartlib circle. Milton indeed addresses himself to Parliament in Hartlibian language, as someone who seeks to ‘advance the Publick good’—the phrase recalls the letters between Culpeper and Dury about the free exchange of information that were published by Hartlib in 1642 as *A Motion Tending to the Publick Good* (*CPWM* ii. 486). At other points Milton seems to be careful, as he was in *Of Education*, to distance himself from the Hartlib circle and their utopianism: ‘To sequester out of the world into Atlantick and Eutopian polities, which never can be drawn into use, will not mend our condition.’ Yet at the same time Milton insists that utopias such as those of Plato, More, and Bacon should be valued for their insights into ‘those unwritt’n, or at least unconstraining laws of vertuous education, religious and civill nuture’ that should shape every ‘writt’n Statute’ (ii. 526). As Nigel Smith observes, here ‘education is seen to enable a discovery of natural law principles’ in a manner consistent with the Hartlibian vision of the revelation of the fundamental truths of nature through the accumulation of knowledge. The tract certainly seems to have played a part in the intellectual development of Culpeper, several of whose letters to Hartlib in late 1644 and early 1645 unmistakably echo the language and imagery in which Milton argues for the virtue of intellectual experiment and innovation. On 25 April 1647, when he was still in regular correspondence with Hall, Hartlib received a critique of Milton’s tract from a German correspondent, who suggested *Areopagitica* should be translated ‘to give it good circulation in other lands where such tyranny reigns’. Hall did not read *Of Education* until December 1646, when he was sent a copy by Hartlib: perhaps Hall then sought out Milton’s other prose works, or Hartlib sent him a copy of *Areopagitica* in response to his enthusiasm for *Of Education*. As we shall see in Chapter 5, Hall’s *The Advancement of Learning* (1649) is the most sustained example of the influence of *Areopagitica* on Milton’s contemporaries.

Hartlib’s German correspondent thought that *Areopagitica* was ‘rather too satirical’ and that its arguments needed to ‘be more moderately set forth’. Presumably he was referring to the startling aggressiveness of Milton’s anticlericalism which is integrated with the protest against prepublication licensing by Hartlibian arguments against monopolies. Milton had complained in *Tetranchordon* about clerics who ‘would ingrosse to themselves the whole trade of interpreting’ scripture, emphasizing that the clergy have a material interest in maintaining their false claims to exclusive spiritual knowledge. He warns that

---

clerical prevention of the exercise of ‘Sound Argument and Reason’ will lead to a decline in ‘good learning and knowledge’ (ii. 583). In *Areopagitica* he argues that the English people have been denied the freedom of thought and interpretation upon which virtuous action depends by clerical efforts to monopolize knowledge, of which the Presbyterian support for licensing is just the latest instance. Milton resembles Hartlib, Dury, Hall, and others in the circle such as Henry Robinson in his conception of truth as a commodity (‘our greatest merchandise’) but a commodity that should ‘not be monopolized by any group licensed to set terms under which exchanges may take place’. For Milton, as for Culpeper, clerical licensing entails a tyrannous usurpation of civil power. In *Areopagitica* he represents licensing as a mechanism of papist origin and seeks to damn the Presbyterians by associating them with the actions of the ‘Popes of Rome’ in ‘engrossing what they pleas’d of Politicall rule into their own hands’. The threat to the supremacy of the civil magistrate is the grounds for Milton’s notorious exclusion of Catholicism from toleration: ‘I mean not tolerated Popery and open superstition, which as it extirpats all religions and civill supremacies, so it self should be extirpat’. But the logic of Milton’s arguments would also require the suppression of Presbyterianism as it poses a similar threat to ‘all religions and civill supremacies’. We have seen how in Milton’s history of priestcraft, which probably shaped the account in Culpeper’s letters, the ‘apishly Romanizing’ bishops have themselves been imitated by the Presbyterians, who have ‘mastered the Episcopal arts’ to ‘execute the most Dominican part of the Inquisition over us’ (*CPWM* ii. 501, 541, 565, 568).

Hall evidently felt he had to employ the terms of reason of state to persuade his more sceptical royalist friends of the benefits of an Independent–royalist alliance and of a settlement according to the terms of the *Heads*. Yet his sympathetic representation of Independency and insistence that it is the Presbyterians who are the enemies of learning and literary culture, rather than the Parliamentarian party *in toto*, should be seen in the context of his personal association with the Hartlib circle and admiration for Milton rather than the political manoeuvring of the Louvre faction. Indeed Hall’s decision to switch his focus from poetry to political prose, and to appear specifically against the Presbyterians, was probably inspired by Milton’s example. The exhilarating vision in *Areopagitica* of civil war London as a new Athens inverts the recurrent image in royalist writing, from Cowley’s *The Guardian* to the contributions by the Stanley circle to the Beaumont and Fletcher folio, of a London in intellectual decline. Yet Stanley and

---

Milton might at least agree on this—wit could never flourish under the clerical rule of the Presbyterians. The turbulent events of the summer of 1647 and the Presbyterian threat to ‘knowledge’ in fact offered Hall an opportunity to try to unite ideologically the two cultural communities of which he was a member. Of course for all his insistence that his wit was held in bondage by the clerical yoke, Milton continued to write poetry during the 1640s. His own distinction between poetry and politics is collapsed in the sonnets that are explicitly concerned with contemporary issues (but mostly remained unpublished until 1673 or later). ‘On the New Forcers of Conscience Under the Long Parliament’ continues the themes of *Areopagitica* in its virulent attack on the Presbyterian clergy for their popish usurpation of civil power and ignorant stigmatizing of learned ideas—specifically Milton’s on divorce—as heresy:

> Because you have thrown off your prelate lord,  
> And with stiff vows renounced his liturgy  
> To seize the widowed whore plurality  
> From them whose sin ye envied, not abhorred,  
> Dare ye for this adjure the civil sword  
> To force our consciences that Christ set free,  
> And ride us with a classic hierarchy  
> Taught ye by mere A. S. and Rutherford?  
> Men, whose life, learning, faith and pure intent  
> Would have been held in high esteem with Paul  
> Must now be named and printed heretics  
> By shallow Edwards and Scotch What-d’ye-call:  
> But we do hope to find out all your tricks,  
> Your plots and packing worse than those of Trent,  
> That so the Parliament  
> May with their wholesome and preventive shears  
> Clip your phylacteries, though baulk your ears,  
> And succour our just fears  
> When they shall read this clearly in your charge  
> New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large.

This sonnet cauduto is usually ascribed to the summer of 1646 (although plausible arguments might be made for a date in the first half of 1647). As in Culpeper’s letters and Hall’s pamphlet, Thomas Edwards personifies the

---

136 In *MSP* Carey dates the sonnet to Aug. 1646 when Parliament had taken steps to settle Presbyterian government, although this hardly fits with Milton’s faith in the poem that Parliament will suppress the Presbyterians. Lewalski suggests that the reference to Edwards indicates summer or autumn 1646, when Edwards was especially active (Life, 605 n. 36). But as Hall’s *A true account* shows, the issues of Presbyterian repressiveness, Scottish ambition, and Edwards’s false charges were equally to the fore, and indeed more urgent in a national context, in summer 1647. In the Trinity MS a corrected draft of the sonnet has a note stating that it should be inserted between Sonnet XI, ‘A book was writ of late called *Tetrachordon*,’ dated 1647 by Carey and 1646 by Lewalski, and the sonnet to Fairfax, written in Aug. 1648.
philistine and persecutory ethos of the clergy, which has been transmitted from priest to prelate to Presbyter. This ethos is shown to be not only anti-Christian but un-English through association with both continental Catholicism and the Scots (A[dam] S[tewart] and Samuel Rutherford were leading Scottish Presbyterian divines). As Howard Erskine-Hill observes, ‘mental despotism here has a pronounced Scottish accent and Presbyterian form’. Milton had good personal reason for attacking Edwards, who had cited ‘Milton’s doctrine of divorce’ in his ‘Catalogue of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies’ that ‘have been preached and printed in these last four years in England’. Milton’s continuing hope that Parliament will subordinate the Presbyterian clergy to the secular power is evident in the image of Parliament’s ‘wholesome and preventive shears’, although the threat of physical punishment is invoked only to be withdrawn in the next line: ‘Clip your phylacteries, though baulk [miss] your ears’. ‘Phylacteries’ are the small leather cases containing scriptural verses worn by Jews during morning prayer to indicate their obedience to a literal interpretation of the text. Milton had already used the term in _Tetrachordon_ in accusing the Presbyterians of an excessive and hypocritical display of piety (CPWM ii. 582). The reference to Presbyterian ears invokes the cropping of William Prynne’s ears in 1634 for publishing implicit criticism of Henrietta Maria’s participation in masques in _Histrio-Mastix_ and again in 1637 for an attack on Laud and the episcopacy. Milton reminds the Presbyterians that they are imitating the persecutory regime under which they suffered in seeking to force the consciences of the English people—Prynne was one of the most vocal opponents of Independency and toleration and had denounced the divorce tracts in _Twelve Considerable Serious Questions_ (1644). In the version of the sonnet printed in 1673, which is quoted above, Milton emphasizes that Parliament will subdue the Presbyterians but not physically persecute them, so distinguishing its tolerant rule from the religious tyrannies of the past. However in line 17 of the first draft in the Trinity manuscript, Milton looks forward to Edwards and the other clerics suffering precisely the same punishment as Prynne: ‘Cropp yee as close as marginall P—’s ears’.

We know little about the scribal circulation of Milton’s 1640s sonnets but, as Lewalski observes, ‘they were no doubt sent to friends’ such as Hartlib. There is no evidence in Hartlib’s papers that he saw any of Milton’s unpublished poems, but in July 1648 he knew that Milton was working on the _History of Britain_ (1670) and _Brief History of Muscovia_ (1682). So it is at least possible that Hall could have seen ‘On the New Forcers of Conscience’ before he wrote _A true account_. Whether he had or not, similarities between the polemical imagery and argument of ‘On the New Forcers of Conscience’ and Alexander Brome’s _Cromwells Panegyrick_ indicate why Hall might have been encouraged to believe in


138 Lewalski, _Life_, 203; Turnbull, _Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius_, 40–1.
the potential for an anti-Presbyterian alliance in summer 1647 between his royalist and Independent friends. Brome also associates the Presbyterians with Jewish legalism and Scottish foreignness, and focuses in particular on the ‘circumcised ears’ of ‘marginal Prynne’, whose prolix, margin-filled publications had become the subject of ridicule:

Your great lay Levite Prynne, whose Margent tires
The patient reader, while he blots out whole quires,
Nay reames with Treason; and with Nonsence too,
To justifie what e’re you say or do:
Whose circumcised eares are hardly grown
Ripe for another Persecution:
He must to Scotland for another paire;
For he will lose these, if he tarry here.

Brome relishes, just as Milton does in the first version of his sonnet, the prospect of Prynne and the Pharisaic Presbyterian clergy suffering the same physical persecution under the Army as they had under Laud. Milton evidently noted at some later stage the inconsistency of his threat to punish the Presbyterians in such a manner, given his animus towards them derived in part from their disposition to persecute. The original version of the sonnet, which risks the charge of hypocrisy in its fantasies of violent retribution, reveals the depth of his anger at the Presbyterian reaction to the divorce tracts.

In conflating Presbyterian scripturalism with the Old Testament legalism of the Jews, Milton and Brome invoke the familiar polemical stereotype of the Puritan as Jew that had developed in Jacobean England during the controversy over sabbatarian criticism of the royal promotion of Sunday sports. The Laudian Peter Heylin, who was the first editor of the royalist newsbook *Mercurius Aulicus*, had notoriously resurrected the motif in 1636 in his *History of the Sabbath*, in which he warned that the opposition of Prynne and other activists to Sunday sports indicated the Puritan desire to impose Judaism on the English.139 While royalist satire of the first civil war is unaware of or deliberately blurs differences between Presbyterians, Independents, and sectarians, Milton’s sonnet, in which he ‘takes on the role of spokesman for the nation and specifically the Independent tolerationist cause’, incorporates royalist satirical strategies and imagery to target precisely the Presbyterians. When he accuses them of seeking ‘To seize the widowed whore plurality’ and take the income from more than one clerical living, the reference to their hypocritical ‘stiff vows’ in the previous line exploits the register of sexual bawdy to make the charge of secret covetousness in a manner reminiscent of the comic anti-Puritan and anti-sectarian pamphlets of John

The reference to ‘Scotch What-d’ye-call’ both mocks the Scottish accent and suggests the name is too obscure to recall. Similarly in another of his three satirical sonnets of 1646–7 on the reception of the divorce tracts, ‘A book was writ of late called Tetrachordon’, Milton apostrophizes the great Greek scholar Sir John Cheke (1514–57) to lament an age which hates learning as much as ‘toad or Asp’ and in which booksellers and readers complain about Milton’s use of difficult Greek words while they are happy to pronounce equally foreign Scottish names: ‘Why is it harder sirs than Gordon, Colkitto, or Macdonnel, or Galasp?’ (ll. 8–9) While the first three names refer to officers in the royalist army of Montrose, the last is to George Gillespie, a prominent Presbyterian member of the Westminster Assembly.

In their equation of the Scottish influence on English affairs with intellectual and cultural decline, the sonnets can be compared with John Cleveland’s influential satire ‘The Rebel Scot’, which condemns the intrusion of the Scottish army into England to support Parliament:

could I (in Sir Emp’ricks tone)
Speak Pills in phrase, and quack destruction:
Or roare like Marshall, that Genevah-Bull,
Hell and damnation a pulpit full:
Yet to expresse a Scot, to play that prize,
Not all those mouth-Granadoes can suffice.
Before a Scot can properly be curst,
I must (like Hocus) swallow daggers first.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Nature her selfe doth Scotch-men beasts confesse,
Making their Countrey such a wildernesse:
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Hence then you proud Impostors, get you gone,
You Picts in Gentry and Devotion:
You scandalls to the stock of Verse! a race
Able to bring the Gibbet in disgrace.

The Scots are ‘scandalls to the stock of Verse’ because their presence in England has a corrupting effect on the native wit, forcing the poet to write wild satire in an effort to convey the Scots’ monstrous incivility. ‘A Scot within a beast is no surprise’ declares Cleveland, comparing the Scottish Presbyterians who have come to fight with the Parliamentarians to wolves, leeches, and ostriches. In ‘On the Detraction which followed upon My Writing Certain Treatises’, usually dated

---

140 Lewalski, Life, 205. See e.g. Taylor, The Anatomy of Separatists (1642): ‘though they are superciliously rigid and censorious, yet they seem very charitable, for rather than their sisters shall want food, they will fill their bellies, and rather than they shall be naked, they shall cover their bellies’ (2).

to early 1646, Milton, as we have seen, scorns the Presbyterians as beasts, as ‘owls and cuckoos, asses, apes and dogs’, whose ‘barbarous noise’ drowns out the Orphic harmonies of his learned proposals (ll. 3–4). In *Colasterion* (1645), perhaps Milton’s most vehement piece of prose, the anonymous author of an attack on Milton is dismissed brutally as ‘this pork, who never read any [philosophy]’ (*CPWM*, ii. 737). In employing such animalistic images Milton follows Cleveland in resorting to a recognized language to insult the unlettered which is endemic in ‘humane discourse from Cicero to the Elizabthans and beyond’.142 ‘The Rebel Scot’, which has been described as Cleveland’s ‘major statement in defence of the Cavalier world’, had circulated in manuscript since 1644 in academic and literary circles, and so Milton might have seen it before he wrote the sonnet. Cleveland had been at Cambridge since the late 1620s, becoming a fellow of St John’s in 1634 and contributing, along with Milton, to the 1638 collection of elegies for Edward King; he was ejected from his fellowship in 1645, just before Hall came up to St John’s, and left for Oxford to join the king and propagandists such as Berkenhead.143 As the rhetorical tactics of Milton’s satirical sonnets underline, by the time ‘The Rebel Scot’ was first published in February 1647 its fulminations against Scottish and Presbyterian interference and barbarism were as relevant to Independents as royalists: in this respect at least, the Independents had won the war only to find themselves in the ‘Cavalier world’.

Hall’s letters to Hartlib reveal that Hall tried in the spring of 1647 to bring Stanley and Hartlib (and Milton) together to advance the ‘general learning’ of the English nation in the aftermath of civil war. While Stanley appears to have shown no interest in supporting the activities of the Hartlib circle, in August 1647 Hall saw a further chance to unite the two cultural communities in which he moved by arguing that it was urgently in royalist interests to unite with the Independents against the threat to intellectual liberty posed by a repressive Presbyterian theocracy. The willingness of royalist intellectuals such as Jeremy Taylor to promote an extensive toleration and the shared anti-Presbyterian motifs of the satirical poetry of Milton and Alexander Brome in 1646–7 indicate that such a hope was not entirely without foundation. The strain of Hall’s attempt to forge an anti-Presbyterian alliance between the Stanley and the Hartlib circles, between royalist and Independent, is nonetheless evident in *A true account*. The shared anti-Presbyterianism of the two communities could scarcely conceal the diatric opposition between their attitudes towards the social and political organization of intellectual culture—an opposition that was surely recognized in Stanley’s refusal to lend his patronage to the cause of universal reform. Whereas Brome and other members of Stanley’s ‘scribal community’ looked back with nostalgia to the closed world of court patronage and forward to its restoration, Milton, Culpeper, and others who associated with Hartlib were convinced of

the necessity of change and the virtue of forging what Hall describes in his final letter to Hartlib as the ‘Commonwealth of Letters’. The metaphysical context of Culpeper’s anti-Presbyterianism is revealing in this regard. By early 1646 Culpeper had come to regard the Presbyterians as the next tyrannical, anti-Christian hierarchy to be overthrown after popery and episcopacy. The confrontation between Independent and Presbyterian marked the acceleration of the millenarian process by which original spiritual and political freedoms, usurped throughout Christian history by ‘ecclesiasticall and civill Aristocracies’, would finally be recovered:

The democratical growinge spirite (for the presente not so strong) have taken such roote in this Nation (upon the same reason & grownde) to question the Lord & Presbiter as [themselves] have firste done the [King] & Bishops & thus will every generation thruste out the other: & as we come neerer the center of Spirituall & Civill truethe soe will the motion be quicker & the stay (in any one place or kinde of governmente) will be shorter.

Culpeper’s understanding of the civil war as a conflict between the ‘democratical growinge spirite’ and ‘Aristocratical’ interests in church and state reveals, more starkly than Areopagitica, the political implications of the anti-monopoly rhetoric of the Hartlib circle. Culpeper identifies monopolies of trade and information not only with the ‘monopoly of matters of conscience and scripture’ claimed by clerics—the Scottish Presbyterians stand accused of ‘th’ingrossinge that very tyranny to them selves which they formerly condemned, in others’—but also the ‘monopoly of Power which the [King] claims’. The destruction of religious, intellectual, economic, and also political monopolies is central to the process of ‘restoring the People to their primitive liberty’ and fundamental, God-given rights, just as the advancement of learning through the free exchange of knowledge will reveal the fundamental principles of nature.144

It is here that Culpeper’s interest in the reform of natural knowledge—chemical change is the subject of many of his letters to Hartlib—runs parallel to, or possibly shapes, his political and religious beliefs. In the spheres of politics and religion, as in the sphere of natural knowledge, Culpeper came to believe that ‘human reason, properly applied, could retrieve a lost state of primitive purity and understanding’ that had been obscured by self-interested appeals to tradition and custom. Of course these thoughts remained confined to private correspondence; moreover Culpeper ‘set a high value on civil order in church and state’ and even in November 1648 he continued to hope for a settlement that would include the king.145 Hall shared Culpeper’s views on the reform of natural knowledge and he sounds distinctly like Culpeper in the ‘Politick Observation’ that he extracts from the royalist defeat in the first civil war at the beginning of

144 Culpeper to Hartlib, 11 Mar. 1646, 271; Culpeper to Hartlib, 12 Jan. 1647, 318.
A true account and which jars with the expressions of sympathy for the king later in the pamphlet: ‘That people are never so forward, nor so daring, as to preserve or regaine their Liberties’ (2). The dissonance of language and tone in the pamphlet is a reflection of the particular circumstances in which Hall was writing, when a royalist-Independent alliance seemed necessary to prevent the greater evil of Presbyterian theocracy; but it is also a reflection of the different cultural-political forces at work on Hall in 1646–7 through his involvement with both the Stanley and the Hartlib circles, with both a coterie of royalist poets and a network of cultural reformers, some of whom held increasingly radical political and religious views.
Richard Lovelace and the End of Court Culture, 1647–1649

‘TO MY WORTHY FRIEND MR PETER LILLY’

The threat of authoritarian rule under the Presbyterians in the late summer of 1647 prompted Hall to leave, at least symbolically, the Virgilian shade of Stanley’s patronage and enter the public world of controversial prose. In ‘The Recantation’, the final poem in the book of verses on secular themes in Hall’s 1647 Poems, Hall had in fact already declared his intention to be ‘a renegado to all Poetry’ (l. 30) and ‘turn politician’ (l. 37):

Now sound I a retreat; now I’ll no more
Run all those devious paths I ran before;
I will no more range sullen groves, to lie
Entombèd in a shade; nor basely fly
The dear society of light, to give
My thoughts their birth in darkness[.]

(MPCP ii. 210–11, ll. 1–6)

Hall specifically criticizes the exaggerations and dishonesties of the love lyric:

I’ll no longer deify
A failing beauty; idolize an eye.

Nor will I ravish Nature to dispose
A violated and profanèd rose
Upon a varnished cheek, nor lillies fear
Into a jaundice, to be set where ne’er
White was discovered[.]

(ll. 9–10, 21–5)

‘[S]ullen groves’ suggests an implicit criticism of the sort of cloistered, private world of classical study and amorous verse cultivated by the Stanley circle. The language of pastoral withdrawal from a violent public world was the language in which the circle conceived of itself and its literary projects. In the preface to the Beaumont and Fletcher folio, published a few weeks after Hall’s Poems, Shirley refers to the plays as ‘these immortall Groves’ (sig. A3’). In his ‘Register
of Friends’ Stanley recalls how, ‘withdrawne’ from a ‘sullen Age’ of ‘rebellious Prose’, Shirley’s ‘kind Muse supply’d’ him with poetic ‘pleasures’ (PTTS 357). In ‘The Recantation’ it is rather the groves of poetic retreat that are ‘sullen’ and it is public life, the ‘dear society of light’, that inspires intellectual advancement. At this point the poem might seem to resolve the tensions apparent in Hall’s letters between his advocacy of the public reform of intellectual culture, as espoused by the Hartlibians, and his links with the withdrawn and nostalgic ‘scribal community’ that was gathering around Stanley in the Inns of Court. Yet the sardonic conclusion of ‘The Recantation’ prevents this proclamation of a turn from poetry to politics from being taken entirely seriously: in his life as ‘politician’ the speaker will ‘Feast dunces that miscall the Arts’ (l. 39). Moreover, as we know from his friend Davies, Hall continued to write and circulate poetry among friends. But we do not know whether the later poems that Hall published scribally included love lyrics; all the extant poems after ‘The Recantation’, which must have been composed sometime before January 1647, are either devotional or commendatory (or satirical, if The Presbyterian Letany is indeed Hall’s work).¹

Whether or not Hall gave up writing love poetry with ‘The Recantation’—the renunciation of love poetry is hardly as bitter as Milton’s Latin palinode—his move from Cambridge to Gray’s Inn in May brought Hall into direct and regular contact with the poets who met in Stanley’s rooms, several of whom were already renowned for their accomplishments in amatory lyric. Although Lovelace’s Lucasta was not published until May or June 1649, sometime between late 1642 and early 1645 he was being urged by the playwright John Tatham to return from Holland, resume the convivial literary life, and compose more lyrics in the mode of ‘To Althea, From Prison’, which was evidently circulating in manuscript at this time:

By thy sweet Althea’s voice
We conjure thee to return:
Or we’ll rob thee of that choice
In whose Flames each Heart would burn:
That inspir’d by her and sack,
Such Company we will not lack.
That Poets in the Age to come,
Shall write of our Elizium.²

¹ Davies states that he has ‘by me confusedly shuffled together in b[r]oken papers’ two books of a poem by Hall on chemistry, written ‘in Spencer’s Stanza’ (Hierocles, sig. b7r). This is probably the unfinished alchemical heroic poem ‘Lithochymicus or A Discourse of a chymic stone praesented to the University of Oxford by Basset Jhones’. The manuscript (British Library, MS Sloane 315) has a commendatory poem in Hall’s hand (fo. 3). Hall must have had a copy of Jhones’s poem in his papers and Davies apparently assumed it was all Hall’s work. ‘Lithochymicus’, together with Hall’s commendatory poem, has been published in Alchemical Poetry 1575–1700: From Previously Unpublished Manuscripts, ed. Robert M. Schuler (New York and London, 1995).

² ‘Upon my Noble Friend, Richard Lovelace Esquire, his being in Holland. An Invitation’, in Ostella: or the Faction of Love and Beauty Reconcil’d (1650), 83. The first stanza of Tatham’s poem
Lovelace did not in fact return from the continent on a permanent basis until the end of 1646, after being wounded fighting for the French army at Dunkirk. Given that *Lucasta* was originally licensed for publication on 4 February 1648, it seems certain that Lovelace prepared his collection for publication, initially at least, during the course of 1647, when he was a member of his cousin Stanley’s London circle. Many interpretations over the years of specific Lovelace poems have assumed a post-regicide context; but, as H. M. Margoliouth pointed out a long time ago, ‘there must be a *prima facie* assumption against any particular poem being later than the date of licensing’. We have good reason to assume a *terminus ad quem* of the final months of 1647 for the completion of the main text of *Lucasta*—although I will argue in the next chapter that the commendatory poems, including those by Hall and Marvell, were written towards the end of 1648. It is also possible that the long pastoral poem printed at the end of *Lucasta*, ‘Aramantha’, was written after the volume was licensed in February 1648: the title-page informs us that ‘Aramantha’ has been ‘added’ to *Lucasta*. While we do not know when most of the poems in *Lucasta* were written, several evidently post-date Lovelace’s return to England after the end of the first civil war. As we have seen, he contributed a commendatory poem to the Beaumont and Fletcher folio, which was ready for the press by February 1647, while at least one poem—‘To my Worthy Friend Mr Peter Lilly; on that excellent Picture of his Majesty, and the Duke of Yorke, drawne by him at Hampton-Court’—must have been written sometime after August, when the Army, having put down the attempted Presbyterian counter-revolution, moved the king from Holdenby House to Hampton Court. The Lovelace poem that has attracted most critical attention and has long been central to discussions and definitions of Cavalier verse, ‘The Grasshopper. To my Noble Friend, Mr Charles Cotton. Ode’, is also generally assumed, although without any certain evidence, to have been composed in ‘the aftermath of military defeat in 1646’.

Lovelace is still, as Gerald Hammond puts it, ‘the first name to come to mind when we think of Pope’s mob of elegant gentlemen or hear the phrase *cavalier poet*, with all its overtones of the amorous and the amateurish’. Several of the lyrics in *Lucasta*, such as ‘To Althea, From Prison’ and ‘To Lucasta, Going to the Wars’, have become synonymous with what Earl Miner calls the ‘Cavalier spirit’ of ‘love, wine and Royalism’. The former lyric was written, according to Anthony Wood, in 1642 while Lovelace was confined to the Gatehouse at Westminster for seven weeks after marching from his family estate in Kent, at the head of was set to music by William Lawes, who was killed in Sept. 1645; see Select Ayres and Dialogues (1659), 37.

3 In a review of Wilkinson’s edn. of Lovelace poems in *Review of English Studies*, 3/9 (1927), 89–95 (94).

4 The point is made by Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism*, 309.

5 Ibid. see also e.g. Scodel, *Excess and the Mean*, 228.

several hundred Kentish men, to present a petition to Parliament in support of episcopacy and attacking the Parliamentary assumption of arbitrary power in passing laws without royal assent. The petition distils ‘the essence of what was to become the Royalist cause’. Much of our sense of Lovelace as the flower of Cavalierism comes from Wood’s portrait of ‘the most amiable and beautiful person that ever eye beheld, a person also of innate modesty, virtue and courtly deportment...much admired by the female sex...[and] he became as much admired by the male, as by the female, sex...his common discourse was not only significant and witty, but incomparably graceful’. In Wood’s account, Lovelace becomes a personification not only of the glory of Stuart court culture in the late 1630s but of its tragic decline and disintegration in the 1640s and 1650s: ‘After the Murther of K. Ch. I’, Lovelace, having ‘consumed all his Estate’ in the royalist cause, ‘became very poor in body and purse, was the object of charity, went in ragged Cloaths (whereas when he was in his glory he wore Cloths of gold and silver) and mostly lodged in obscure and dirty places, more befitting the worst of Beggars’.  

If Wood’s account can sound exaggerated, we know he sought information from Edward Sherburne, who knew Lovelace from the Stanley circle, and the account of Lovelace as the quintessential Cavalier is not out of line with contemporary images of Lovelace as handsome lover, courageous warrior, and consummate lyricist, for whom the term sprezzatura might have been invented. Tatham addresses Lovelace as ‘lov’d Adonis’ who left England because he was ‘sated with the Spoil | of so many Virgins Hearts’; since his departure ‘not one lasse keeps Holi-day. | They have chang’d their Mirth for Cares, | and do only sigh thy airs’. The commendatory poems to both the 1649 Lucasta and the elegies attached to Lucasta. Postume Poems (1659/60) repeatedly emphasize Lovelace’s facility with both sword and pen. Hall’s lines in the 1649 volume, addressed to ‘Colonel Richard Lovelace’, are superior in execution but representative in theme:

If the desire of Glory speak a mind
More nobly operative, & more refin’d,
What vast soule moves thee? Or what Hero’s spirit
(Kept in’ts tradition pure) dost thou inherit,
That not contented with one singe Fame,
Dost to a double glory spread thy Name?
And on thy happy Temples safely set

---

Both th’ Delphick wreath and the Civic Coronet?
Wast it not enough for us to know how far
Thou couldst in season suffer, act, and dare?
But we must also witnesse with what height
And what Ionick sweetnesse thou canst write.\(^{10}\)

If he had stopped writing love lyrics himself, Hall was nonetheless impressed by Lovelace’s lyrical facility: Hall must have first seen some or all of the poems in Lucasta during the latter half of 1647, when they were circulated for compliment, criticism, and imitation among Stanley’s friends. As we shall see, Hall may allude to one of the most directly political poems in Lucasta, ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’, in A true account and character of the times.

The chivalric valour praised by Hall and other contemporaries, and with which Lovelace associates himself in lyrics such as ‘To Lucasta, Going to the Warres’ (‘I could not love thee (Deare) so much, | Lov’d I not Honour more’), does not, however, seem to have been displayed on English soil during the 1640s. Lovelace had left Cambridge in 1639 to serve in Goring’s regiment in the Bishops’ Wars in Scotland; the truce at Berwick in June 1639 that was really a defeat for the king is commemorated in Lucasta by the defiant sonnet ‘To Generall Goring, after the pacification at Berwicke’. But there is no evidence that Lovelace fought for the king after being released from the Gatehouse on bail in June 1642. In his elegy for Lovelace, Samuel Holland says nothing of any military exploits during the civil wars but tells us that ‘Holland and France have known his nobler parts, | And found him excellent in Arms, and Arts.’\(^{11}\) Most revealingly, in ‘A Register of Friends’ Stanley writes of Lovelace:

\begin{quote}
Thy boldly-Loyall hand, which durst present
The first petition of thy native Kent,
Wrought its own Chains; well did th’Usurpers know
They were not free themselves, while thou wert so,
But thy unbounded Spirit did elude
The caution of that guilty Multitude;
There thou Love and Loyalty didst sing,
The Glories of thy Mistris, and thy King,
No sooner by the headlesse Rout releast,
But Fortune puts thy vertue to the Test;
During our Civill Wars confin’d to peace,
Expos’d to Forrein Wars, when ours did cease.
The soldier there by thy example fought,
Whose Bounty fed those whom thy Courage taught.
\end{quote}

\(^{10}\) ‘To Colonel Richard Lovelace, on the publishing of his ingenious Poems’, in LP 9–10, ll. 1–12.
\(^{11}\) ‘An Elegie’, in LP 228–9. This poem is included in the elegies for Lovelace attached to Lucasta. Posthume Poems, which was printed in 1659 but published in 1660; it is anonymous in this volume but was published separately under Holland’s name as a broadside, On the Death of my much Honoured Friend, Colonel Richard Lovelace (n. d.).
The reference to Lovelace becoming involved in ‘Forrein Wars, when ours did cease’ does not quite make sense, since we know that Lovelace returned to England after the end of the first civil war. Possibly Stanley is referring to military service on the continent in the early 1650s, when virtually nothing is known of Lovelace’s activities. But Stanley’s lines—which were unknown to biographers before the discovery of the manuscript of ‘A Register of Friends’ in 1957—confirm that Lovelace did not raise his ‘boldly-Loyall’ hand in battle for the king during the civil wars.

Gerald Hammond has argued for the ‘awkwardness of Stanley’s attempt to deal with Lovelace’s failure to fight on the Royalist side’ as part of his larger argument that, despite Lovelace’s long-standing image as the archetypal Cavalier hero, the poems in Lucasta reveal the adoption of a ‘neutralist’ position after the traumatic experience of imprisonment and submission in 1642. It is not clear where exactly Hammond locates Stanley’s ‘awkwardness’; moreover the meaning of Stanley’s ‘confined’ might be quite literal. Lovelace’s release in 1642 may have been conditional on an undertaking that he would not bear arms against Parliament, or even travel in England beyond the Parliamentary lines of communication in London. In the petition Lovelace addressed to Parliament from prison and which apparently led to his release (and which Hammond sees as evidence of a crisis of allegiance), he requests ‘to be admitted to his former Libertie, or if your well-knowne Wisdomes shall conceive this Course more fitt; to be allow’d but a conditional freedome, & for the certaintie of his attendance on your future pleasures he will humblie offer the ingagement of some able friends as a sufficient bayle’. Lovelace’s bail was set at £10,000, with sureties of a further £5,000 each from two Kentish gentlemen. The poet, who had an annual income from his estate of £500 and is unlikely to have actually paid this huge sum, may have felt he had little choice but to respect the conditions placed upon his freedom lest he and his friends were called upon to pay.

It is now some twenty years since Hammond provocatively argued that Lovelace ‘developed politically from an instinctive cavalier into one who shares with Andrew Marvell the claim to be the great poet of the most wide-ranging political belief of the 1640s and early 1650s’. His claim for Lovelace as a poet of disillusioned neutralism has not found much favour. If it is accepted that some post-regicide poems in the posthumously published 1659/60 Lucasta ‘register loss of idealism and even some degradation of character’, the 1649 volume still tends to be seen as, in the words of Thomas N. Corns, a ‘solidly partisan enunciation of die-hard loyalism’, in which ‘courtly love at once validates militarism

---

12 ‘Richard Lovelace and Uses of Obscurity’, 228 n.
13 The former point is made by Corns, although he does not refer to Stanley’s lines (Uncloistered Virtue, 245); LP, p. xl.
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and is validated by it’. Yet Corns and others accept that the concluding pastoral narrative ‘Aramantha’, which ends with Alexis, the Lovelace character, breaking his sword, raises ‘some complications’ in its apparent rejection of military valour and the choice of allegiance. More recently Robert Wilcher has suggested that poems in Lucasta may indeed reveal ‘fundamental doubts about the viability of the royalist cause’, while Joshua Scodel has described ‘The Grasshopper. To My Noble Friend, Mr Charles Cotton. Ode’ as ‘post-Royalist rather than Royalist’. If Hammond’s revisionist claims about Lovelace’s political identity have hardly destroyed Lovelace’s reputation as the ‘epitome of the Cavalier poet’, they have encouraged a reconsideration of the complexity of political meaning in several of the poems in the 1649 collection.

One of the least persuasive aspects of Hammond’s argument is his insistence that the ‘humiliating experience of theKentish petition’ in 1642 was the ‘climacteric moment of Lovelace’s life, when he realized the futility...of the whole Royal cause’ (216). To place such weight upon this moment of brief imprisonment, before the first proper battle of the civil war had even been fought, seems psychologically unconvincing. Moreover the recent discovery of a series of indentures signed by Lovelace between 1642–7 indicate the veracity of Wood’s claim that after his release Lovelace gradually ‘consumed all his estate’ in Kent to ‘keep up the credit and reputation of the King’s cause by furnishing men with Horse and Arms’. Disillusionment with and pessimism about the royalist cause are more likely to have been provoked by military defeat and the imprisonment of the king. It is in those poems in Lucasta that we know or can argue with some certainty were written between late 1646 and early 1648, after Lovelace returned from France and became part of the Stanley circle in London, that we can trace Lovelace’s loss of faith in the king; but in fact his central concern in these poems—the concern that bound the Stanley circle together more strongly, as we shall see, than political allegiance—is with the survival of literary and artistic culture in a post-courtly world. By placing Lovelace’s post-war poems in the context of his involvement with the Stanley circle, we can gauge further the diversity of political perspective among Marvell’s ‘royalist’ literary friends in the late 1640s.

16 Alan Rudrum, ‘Royalist Lyric’, in Keeble (ed.), Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution, 181–97 (188); Corns, Uncloistered Virtue, 246, 79. See also Anselment, entry for Lovelace in ODNB.
17 Corns, Uncloistered Virtue, 78; see also Loxley, Royalism and Poetry, 223.
18 Wilcher, Writing of Royalism, 124; Scodel, Excess and the Mean, 232. See also Rudrum, ‘Royalist Lyric’: ‘it is true enough that Lovelace’s verse cannot be read as a sustained tribute either to Charles I’s version of Royalism nor to the Church of England’ (186).
19 The description is from Post, English Lyric Poetry, 126.
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Lovelace’s return to England is marked by his appearance, alongside Stanley, Shirley, Herrick, Berkenhead, Denham, Richard Brome, and Alexander Brome, in the commendatory poems for Moseley’s Beaumont and Fletcher folio. Moseley’s address to the reader is dated 16 February 1646/7 and Berkenhead’s poem alludes to the £200,000 ransom rumoured in early December 1646 to have been paid to the Scots to hand the king over to Parliament, so the commendatory poems were probably written between late December and early February. As we saw in Chapter 1, Shirley edited the volume, and the contributions from writers in and around the Stanley circle are central to the sense of the folio as a ‘a morale-boosting gesture of defiance, a propagandist reassertion of the Stuart ethic at a crucial moment in the fortunes of the Court’. However Lovelace’s ‘To Fletcher reviv’d’ strikes a conspicuously pessimistic note in its conclusion. Richard Brome is cheered by the news of Charles’s return to England, associating the resurrection of plays from the golden age of Stuart patronage with ‘the Report | of the Kings second coming to his Court’; Stanley regards the folio as an act of counter-cultural resistance against a Parliament which ‘silenc’d wit’ by closing the theatres; the appearance of the plays convinces Alexander Brome ‘That Wit is past its Climactericall’, and Denham compares the plays to the ‘Ghosts of Murdered Bodyes’ who return ‘To accuse the Murderers, to right the Stage | And undeceive the long abusèd Age.’ (He is perhaps thinking of Hamlet or Macbeth as he refers to Shakespeare twice in the poem.) But Lovelace represents the publication of the plays not as a sign of the rebirth of English literary culture but a reminder of its continuing decline:

Thus with thy Genius did the Scene expire,
Wanting thy Active and correcting fire,
That now (to spread a darknesse over all),
Nothing remains but Poesie to fall:
And though from these thy Embers we receive
Some warmth, so much as may be said, we live,

21 See Thomas, Sir John Berkenhead, 134; Berkenhead, ‘On the Happy Collection of Master Fletcher’s Works, never before Printed’, in Comedies and Tragedies Written by Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, sig. F2r. The allusion to the ransom is particularly interesting because it comes in a passage in which Berkenhead appears to link preference for Shakespeare with the uncivilized passions of the rebellious mob: ‘Brave Shakespeare flow’d, yet had his Ebbings too, | Often above Himselfe, sometimes below; | Thou Always Best; if ought seem’d to decline, | Twas the unjudging Rout’s mistake, not Thine: | Thus thy faire SHEPHEARDESSE, which the bold Heape | (False to Themselves, and Thee) did prize so cheap, | Was found (when understood) fit to be Crowned, | At worst twas worth two hundred thousand pound.’

22 Thomas, Sir John Berkenhead, 134.

23 This poem is not even listed in the index of Manfred Weidhorn, Richard Lovelace (New York, 1970). However see Hammond’s comment on the poem’s restraint in Richard Lovelace, Selected Poems, ed. Gerald Hammond (Manchester, 1987), 100.

24 Richard Brome, ‘To the Memory of the deceased but ever-living Author in these his Poems, Mr John Fletcher’; Stanley, ‘On the Edition’; Alexander Brome, ‘Upon the unparallel’d Playes Written by those Renowned Twinnes of Poetry’, and Denham, ‘On Mr John Fletcher’s Workes’, in Comedies and Tragicomedies, sigs. g1r, b4v, f3r, b1v.
That we dare praise thee, blushlesse, in the head
Of the best piece Hermes to Love e’re read,
That we rejoyce and glory in thy Wit,
And feast each other with remembering it,
That we dare speak thy thought, thy Acts recite;
Yet all men henceforth be afraid to write.

(LP 61, ll. 63–74)

Despite its momentary invocation of festivity (‘rejoyce and glory’, ‘feast each other’), this final stanza is marked by a sense of loss and lack (‘expire’, ‘wanting’, ‘nothing remaines’), fear and foreboding (‘darknesse over all’, ‘dare praise’, ‘dare speak’, ‘afraid to write’). While there is no direct political allusion, the aesthetic arguments assume, in the context of the explicit connections between literary culture and royalism in many of the other commendatory poems, a political resonance. Indeed the last lines of the previous stanza introduce the contemporary context of the closure of the theatres, insisting the actors in Fletcher’s virtuous plays were as ‘clear’ from Puritan accusations of immorality ‘as they now are from audience’ (although Lovelace surprisingly accepts that Puritan anti-theatricality may have had some basis, suggesting that even ‘the austere Skarlet’ (l. 60)—the Presbyterian doctors of the Westminster Assembly—may have permitted the theatres to stay open if other dramatists had followed the model of Fletcher’s moral ‘Reformation’ of the drama). This concluding stanza is also characterized by themes and images—of light and darkness, warmth and coldness, dearth and festivity—which we shall see reappear in two better-known poems that explore the place of cultural activity in the post-war world, ‘To my Worthy Friend Mr Peter Lilly’ and ‘The Grasshopper’.

The texts of the plays are no more than ‘Embers’ of Fletcher’s wit, from which Lovelace and other appreciative readers receive ‘some warmth’ but only the bare minimum for survival: ‘so much as may be said, we live’. The like-minded readers—perhaps the Stanley circle—are like beggars gathered around a fading fire: they ‘feast each other’ only on insubstantial memories of public and court performances of the plays, reciting among themselves lines and acts in their private gatherings. For all his optimism in 1647, a few years later Richard Brome was to represent himself as reduced, as a redundant playwright, to the level of the convivial beggars in his play A Jovial Crew: in dedicating the text of the play to Stanley, Brome asks him to recall how ‘Beggars use to stock great mens gates’, admitting that the ‘anti-ingenuous Times’ have ‘cast me in that Mold’.25 Given the identification of Fletcher’s plays with Stuart court culture throughout the commendatory poems, the Beaumont and Fletcher folio seems to have been for Lovelace less a sign of the restoration of that culture than a reminder of ‘anti-Ingenious Times’, of the loss of the courtly patronage that had

25 ‘To the Right Noble, Ingenious, and Judicious Gentleman, Thomas Stanley, Esq.’, in A Joviall Crew, or The Merry Beggars (1652), sig. A2v.
sustained not only Fletcher and a host of other writers and artists but Lovelace’s own youthful literary activities. Wood tells us that after impressing Charles and Henrietta Maria with his (lost) play *The Scholars* during their trip to Oxford in 1636, Lovelace ‘retired in great splendor to the Court’. The obscure lines in which the poet declares Fletcher’s plays to be ‘the best piece *Hermes* to *Love* e’er read’ emphasize through allusion to the vanished splendour of the court that the plays can now only be experienced as text rather than (court) performance: Corregio’s *Mercury teaching Cupid how to read* (c.1525) was in Charles’s great art collection. If, as Wood informs us and the evidence of the indentures indicates, Lovelace had by 1647 sold off much of his estate to assist a failed royalist cause, then the memory of the courtly splendour he had enjoyed in the late 1630s must have been an increasingly bitter one. A comparison of ‘To Fletcher reviv’d’ with Alexander Brome’s ‘On a Comedie called The Passionate Lovers’, though the latter poem was probably written in the early 1650s, illustrates how others in the circle put similar imagery to more positive use and regarded cultural memory not as a dying ember but as a spark of regeneration:

So though we’ve lost the life of playes the stage
If we can be *Remembrancers* to the age,
And now and then let glow a spark in print
To tell the World ther’s fire still lodged i’t’h’flint,
We may agen b’enlightened once and and warm’d,
*Men can’t be civil till they be inform’d.*
Walk wisely on: Time’s changeable, and what
Was once thrown down, is now again reacht at.26

Brome looks forward to a further revolution of time’s wheel and the restoration of the drama (and the subtext of the final lines is surely that patient readers will also see a restoration of the monarchical status quo). The invocation of threadbare conviviality in ‘To Fletcher reviv’d’ is enclosed rather by fear for the future of poetry and poets. ‘That now (to spread a darknesse over all), | Nothing remains but *Poesie* to fall’: these lines pick up the reference to the shutting of the theatres at the end of the preceding stanza and envisage a similar fate of prohibition and obsolescence for poetry in the aftermath of Parliamentary victory. The threat of ‘darknesse’ spreading ‘over all’ assumes added significance in the context of *Lucasta: lux casta*, ‘pure light’, is the mistress-muse of Lovelace’s volume. While Lucasta may well have been a real person—Wood tells she was Lucy Sacheverel—she is also, as Hammond observes, ‘the image of Lovelace’s art’ (224). The lines disclose Lovelace’s anxiety that the ‘pure light’ of his lyrical poetics in *Lucasta* will be obscured by the looming darkness, whether of

26 Brome’s poem was first printed in 1661 in *Songs*, 133–4. It would appear to have been written as a commendatory poem for the publication of the Caroline court tragi­comedy *The Passionate Lovers* by Lodowick Carrell, a former groom of Charles’s Privy Chamber; however Brome’s poem is not included in Moseley’s 1655 edn., so it may have been written earlier and then forgotten about when Moseley actually came to publish the play.
Parliamentary censorship or the poverty imposed by sequestration and lack of court patronage. The lunulae—‘(to spread a darkness over all)’—embody the threat of enclosure and imprisonment. In a poem addressed to Charles Cotton the younger on the occasion of his wedding in the summer of 1656 and included in the 1659/60 Lucasta, Lovelace employs more explicitly the lunulae to express visually a sense of imprisonment: ‘What Fate was mine, when in mine obscure Cave | (Shut up almost close Prisoner in a Grave) | Your Beams could reach me through this Vault of Night, | And Canton the dark Dungeon with Light!’ (‘The Triumphs of Philamore and Amoret’, in LP 169, ll. 7–9). In this poem the images of darkness, obscurity, and imprisonment are metaphors for lack of companionship but also of patronage. Lovelace is asking Cotton to come down from his estate in Staffordshire and visit him in London, but the ‘quickening warmth’ for which he begs is also Cotton’s financial support: according to Aubrey, when Lovelace was poverty-stricken in the 1650s Cotton sent him money ‘every Monday morning . . . for maney months, but was never repayd’.27

In fearing imprisonment, poverty, and the suppression of his poetry, Lovelace was to be proved prophetic. He was imprisoned again in October 1648, following a search of his lodgings in connection with a recent uprising in Kent. He was not released until 10 April 1649: Lucasta was registered for publication the following month, some fifteen months after it was licensed. Political interference as well as Lovelace’s imprisonment may have caused the delay in publication.28 In his commendatory poem Marvell refers to Lovelace as ‘under sequestration’ and predicts that the ‘barbèd censurers’—they could be official censors, or moral critics, or both—who ‘begin to look’ at Lucasta (note the present tense) will examine ‘each line’ of the verse and seek to prohibit the volume on political grounds:

Some reading your Lucasta, will allege,  
You wronged in her the House’s privilege;  
Some that you under sequestration are,  
Because you write when going to the war;  
And one the book prohibits, because Kent  
Their first petition by the author sent.  

(ll. 27–32)

27 Aubrey’s Brief Lives, 265.
28 See Patterson, Marvell, 14–15; MP 18; Anselment, ‘Richard Lovelace’. In MP Smith follows Patterson in stating that orders were made by the Commons in Nov. 1648 to sequester Lovelace’s estate and in May 1649 to reconsider the fine imposed on Lovelace and other ‘delinquents’: the references in the Commons Journal are in fact to ‘Lord Lovelace’. This is more likely John Lovelace, second Baron of Hurley (1616–70), who had fought for the king in the first civil war before compounding for delinquency in 1645. John Lovelace (to whose wife, Anne, Lucasta is dedicated) repeatedly petitioned to have his fine of £18,000 reduced. See Sidney Lee’s entry for his son, John Lovelace, third Baron of Hurley, in the old Dictionary of National Biography. This does not solve Marvell’s description of Richard as ‘under sequestration’. Perhaps ‘Lord Lovelace’ is indeed a mistaken reference to Richard; more likely Marvell is referring to the penalties imposed on the poet as a condition for his release in 1642.
Lovelace will be accused of having illegally assumed a freedom of speech in his poems that the Members of the House regard as a Parliamentary privilege: the implication is that Parliament abuses the law to gag those who question its authority. Given Lovelace's earlier praise of the aesthetic and moral qualities of Fletcher's drama, the ostensible sense of the concluding couplet—‘That we dare speak thy thought, thy Acts recite; | Yet all men henceforth be afraid to write’—is that Fletcher's writing is so powerful that subsequent writers fear they will be unable to reach its level. Indeed Lovelace is echoing the concluding lines of Stanley's commendatory verses for Shirley's 1646 Poems: ‘For while thou dost this age to verse restore, | Thou dost deprive the next of owning more, | And hast so far even future aims surpast, | That none dare write...’. Yet Lovelace's lines lack the lightness of Stanley's tone and the connection of writing and fear recalls the threat to 'Poesie' invoked at the beginning of the stanza. The tone of Lovelace's conclusion is closer to that of another of the commendatory poems addressed to Shirley, cited in the previous chapter, in which Francis Tucker laments

```
this dearth of art, when but to write
Or think in verse, is to be destroy'd quite;
When sergeants too implacable are set
To fill the compters up with wit and debt'.
```

The performance of the plays that Lovelace praises has become a crime, removed to private, marginalized spaces, and writing poetry is now also a furtive activity that risks the poet's liberty: indeed Tucker goes as far as to claim that even to 'think in verse' is dangerous. Shirley had lost his career as both courtier and playwright and Tucker's yoking of 'wit and debt' emphasizes the material deprivation suffered by royalist writers and the consequent impoverishment of literary culture.

Lovelace's jaundiced perspective on the prospects for a return of court culture, in comparison with the defiance and optimism of the contributions to the Beaumont and Fletcher folio by some of his friends in the Stanley circle, can be detected also in a poem that we can date with certainty to the latter half of 1647, ‘To my Worthy Friend Mr Peter Lilly: on that excellent Picture of his Majesty, and the Duke of Yorke, drawne by him at Hampton-Court’. When the king was installed by the Army in Hampton Court in late August 1647, Herrick greeted his arrival with ‘To the King, Upon his welcome to Hampton-Court’. The optimism about the restoration of court culture in Richard Brome's contribution to the Beaumont and Fletcher folio is renewed and intensified as Herrick addresses Charles as ‘Great Augustus’ who, welcome ‘As dearest Peace, after destructive Warre’, is come ‘To re-possess once more your long'd-for home’ (RHP 293). Herrick's model is the second ode of Horace's first book, in which

Horace names Augustus as the divine hero sent to restore civility and harmony—and, crucially for poets, patronage—after the turmoil of civil war. The poem is not quite as ‘heroically naïve’ as some would have it; Herrick does acknowledge that political and cultural restoration is not yet complete and that the king’s negotiation of a settlement with the Army and Parliament is ongoing.\(^{30}\) After Charles enters Hampton Court, ‘our eyes doe waite’:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{For an Ascendant thoroughly Auspicate:} \\
\text{Under which signe we may the former stone} \\
\text{Lay of our safeties new foundation.}
\end{align*}
\]

(ll. 9–12)

The king was confined to a property that had been sequestered by Parliament in 1643. But Herrick suppresses this indignity and with it any suggestion that the reassertion of god-like monarchical power is anything other than a \textit{fait accompli}:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{That done; O Cesar, live and be to us,} \\
\text{Our Fate, our Fortune, and our Genius;} \\
\text{To whose free knees we may our temples tye} \\
\text{As to a still protecting Deitie.}^{31}
\end{align*}
\]

(ll. 13–16)

While Charles was under house arrest at Hampton Court, his children James, Elizabeth, and Henry were kept at the London house of Algernon Percy, the Earl of Northumberland, who had been appointed their guardian by Parliament. The children were permitted to see their father regularly and, as the title of Lovelace’s poem indicates, Peter Lely must have painted his double portrait of Charles and the Duke of York during such visits, sometime between the end of 24 August and 11 November, when Charles escaped, claiming to fear a Leveller plot against his life, to the Isle of Wight. There is no reason to doubt that Lovelace and the Dutch émigré Lely (1618–80) were indeed well acquainted: Lovelace’s ‘Panegyrick to the best Picture of Friendship Mr Pet. Lilly’ is included in the 1659/60 \textit{Lucasta} and both Lovelace and Lely were made freemen of the Painters-Stainers Company on 26 October 1647. No known example of Lovelace’s own painting has survived, but evidently he took more than a passing interest in the visual as well as the literary arts. Perhaps Marvell accompanied Lovelace on a visit to Lely’s studio: in ‘Upon Appleton House’, written in the summer of 1651, Marvell describes the meadow where the cattle graze as ‘A levelled space, as smooth and plain, as cloths for Lely stretched to stain’ (ll. 443–4). The darkness in which Charles is shrouded and the cloud looming behind James in Lely’s portrait become symbolic


\(^{31}\) The claim that Herrick’s image of Charles as returning conqueror is ‘touchingly undercut’ by the suggestion of ‘possible disaster’ in the next couplet—‘That should you stirre, we and our Altars too | May (Great Augustus) goe along with you’—seems to me unconvincing. See Claude J. Summers, ‘Herrick’s Counter-Plots’, \textit{Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900}, 25/1 (1985), 174.
for Lovelace of the context of defeat in which the portraits have been painted, although the poet nonetheless asserts the conventional Stuart analogy of kingly power and solar energy:

See! what a clouded Majesty! And eyes
Whose glory through their mist doth brighter rise!
See! what an humble bravery doth shine,
And grieve triumphant breaking through each line;
How it commands the face! so sweet a scorne
Never did happy misery adorne!

(ll. 1–6)

It has been pointed out that the clouds about to envelop Charles and James in Lely’s painting ‘are no more intimidating than those which feature in royal portraits of the early 1630s’; consequently it is Lovelace, not Lely, who ascribes symbolic value to the clouds, employing a topos which is ‘a common enough feature of attempts to represent the troubled and defeated king’ in post-war royalist writing.32 This interpretation is novel in that it separates poem and portrait: more usually both works have been seen as drawing upon royalist representations of ‘the tragic dignity of the king’ in the aftermath of defeat and imprisonment and to anticipate the image of Charles as a suffering, Christ-like martyr in both frontispiece and text of Eikon Basilike: the Portraiture of His Sacred Majesty in His Solitudes and Sufferings (1649), the purported record of the king’s final thoughts. Corns, for example, finds in both painting and poem ‘an enhancement and deepening of the panegyric tradition, such as we find in Eikon Basilike’.33 As we have just seen, a looming, spreading darkness in Lovelace’s poem on Fletcher at the beginning of 1647 signified the threat to poetry in a post-courtly world. The clouds in Lely’s painting, whether Lely attached symbolic significance to them or not, may have reminded Lovelace of his own recent poem as much as recent representations of the king.

In the second half of the poem to Lely, the focus is shifted from the cathartic ‘passions’ of ‘griefe triumphant’ and ‘victorious sorrow’ which the king and the prince engender in each other, and which the painting engenders in spectators if they see it as Lovelace urges them to see it, to the skill of the painter, who has drawn his subjects ‘as if thou didst inherit | For that time all their greatnesse, and didst draw | With those brave eyes your Royall Sitters saw’ (ll. 18–20). Lovelace praises Lely for what sounds like Keatsian negative capability, for being able to see through the eyes of his subject, feel that subject’s feelings, and convey those feelings to sympathetic spectators without making them crudely explicit (a mode

32 Loxley, Royalism and Poetry, 157. See e.g. John Taylor, The Kings Most Excellent Majesties Wellcome to His Owne House, Truly called the Honour of Hampton-Court (1647), 3.
which is contrasted with old-fashioned iconographic portraits, or ‘Hieroglyphicks’). This uncanny skill is encapsulated in the final couplet: ‘So that th’amazed world shall henceforth finde | None but Lilly ever drew a minde’ (ll. 31–2). In Hammond’s interpretation, this focus on ‘artistic process’ signals Lovelace’s lack of faith in ‘the Royalist vision’ and discloses a desire rather to cultivate in his own poetic art the ‘detached realism’ that he admires in Lely.34 A recognition of the intertextual resonance of the final couplet can help us to refine this claim that the poem stages a retreat, or expresses a longing to retreat, from party politics to a ‘neutral’ world of art.

Stanley’s first published verses appeared under the portrait of Sir John Suckling in *Fragmenta Aurea*, Moseley’s collection of Suckling’s writing published posthumously in 1646, and were published in Stanley’s 1647–8 *Poems* with the title ‘On Sir J. S. his Picture and Poems’. The final couplet of the poem reads: ‘Drawne by the Pencil, here you finde | His Form, by his own Pen his minde’. Knowledge of Stanley’s lines emphasizes the force of Lovelace’s concluding compliment to Lely—the painting of Charles and his son combines the techniques of physical imitation and emotional communication which in Stanley’s lines are divided between visual art and poetry. Stanley’s verses on Lovelace’s friend Suckling (1609–41?), who had died in uncertain circumstances after fleeing to Paris in fear that he would be arrested over his alleged involvement in a pre-war plot against Parliament, are elegiac as well as commendatory: the verbs are in the past tense as Stanley recalls how Suckling’s ‘numbers could invite | Alike to wonder, and delight’, and how Suckling ‘with new spirit did inspire | The Thespian Scene, and Delphick Lyre’. This is in keeping with the tone of remembrance and indeed lamentation which, as we have seen, is cultivated by Moseley’s packaging of the volume: the title, *Fragmenta Aurea*, conveys the disintegration of the rich court culture which produced such work as Suckling’s, while the subtitle, ‘published by a Friend to perpetuate his memory. Printed by his own copies’, asserts the importance of friendship in preserving the remains of Stuart literary culture (as well as the authentic provenance of the texts from within Suckling’s coterie).

Lovelace’s rewriting of Stanley’s lines on Suckling is a compliment that Stanley and his literary friends in the Black Riband were surely expected to recognize, and reveals once more how closely the Stanley circle read and imitated each other’s poetry. The echo of the conclusion of Stanley’s poem in the final couplet of Lovelace’s praise of Lely also reveals something of Lovelace’s perception of the context in which the painting was commissioned and produced. Lovelace praises Charles’s portrait, not Charles; and that portrait is, like the drawing of Suckling in *Fragmenta Aurea*, a memorial of a court culture which has been destroyed. The king lives on, but the court over which he presides at Hampton is in fact a prison. The cultural products of this mock-court are not even the results of royal patronage: it seems that Lely’s picture was commissioned not by the king but

by Northumberland, the Parliamentary guardian of the king’s children, who was
an avid collector and patron of art.\textsuperscript{35} He had been one of the most prominent
Parliamentary peers during the first civil war and was at the forefront of efforts in
the late summer and autumn of 1647 to persuade Charles to accept the \textit{Heads of
the Proposals}, which he had helped to formulate.\textsuperscript{36} Given their friendship and the
interest he apparently took in art, Lovelace surely knew who had commissioned
Lely to paint the picture; and he surely knew also that Lely’s picture closely
imitated a double portrait of Charles and Henrietta Maria painted by Van Dyck
in 1632. James Loxley draws attention to Lovelace’s likely knowledge of Lely’s
patron but maintains that the ‘disquieting reality of Northumberland’s power is
written out’ of ‘To my Worthy Friend Mr Peter Lilly’: “[f]or Lovelace’s poem,
Lely’s greatness lies in his ability to subordinate his abilities and his medium
to the subjectivity of Charles, and thus to restore to the King the authority
of patronage’.\textsuperscript{37} Yet the concluding echo of Stanley’s elegiac lines on Suckling
suggests that Lely’s picture is rather a reminder for Lovelace of the dissolution
of the magnificent court culture, exemplified in the visual arts by Van Dyck’s
Caroline portraits, which had embodied and projected Stuart power. Lely, having
arrived in England around 1643, could not follow Van Dyck’s example and build
a career in the court. As a professional painter without allegiance in a foreign war
he had naturally sought to cultivate the favour of those in positions of power
and influence—by 1647 the Parliamentarian grandees such as Northumberland
and Pembroke.\textsuperscript{38} The example of his friend Lely and the provenance of the
Hampton Court painting were a stark illustration for Lovelace that the structures
of cultural patronage, like those of political power and religious authority, were in
the process not simply of reconstruction but redesign. The dilemma for former
royalists such as Lovelace was whether to accept a post-war settlement dictated
by Parliament and / or the Army, and so qualify their allegiance to Stuart and
episcopal supremacy, or maintain that allegiance and risk (continued) poverty
and ruin from the material and other penalties imposed by Parliament. The
poem was written, after all, not long after Lovelace’s friend and fellow poet Hall
had sought to persuade him and other leading royalist literati to support the
\textit{Heads of the Proposals}, the very settlement which Northumberland had helped to
devise and which, while less constraining than previous terms offered to Charles,
onetheless significantly curtailed the royal prerogative.

The association through intertextual allusion of Lely’s portrait of the king
with the engraving of Suckling conveys a sense, perhaps not yet fully apparent
to Lovelace himself, that the notion of Charles as absolute monarch, as the

\textsuperscript{35} Diana Dethloff, entry for Sir Peter Lely in \textit{ODNB}.
\textsuperscript{36} John Adamson, ‘The English Nobility and the Projected Settlement of 1647’, \textit{Historical
\textsuperscript{37} \textit{Royalism and Poetry}, 167–8.
\textsuperscript{38} ‘[A]s a professional painter from abroad...[Lely’s] only personal interest would be in the
possible extension of patronage which a return of the court might bring.’ (R. M. Beckett, \textit{Lely}
(1951), 8.)
centre of political and cultural power, has already died, even though the man may live on. What is striking about the Order of the Black Riband, after all, is its ostentatious display of mourning when the king was still very much alive, although reduced to the status of Parliament’s prisoner. The black armband worn by Stanley and his friends was a sign of their mourning for the loss of the riches of Stuart literary and visual culture—a loss, indeed, which Cartwright was seen to personify in the commendatory verses by more than fifty writers associated with royalism and the court (including Sherburne, Alexander Brome, and Berkenhead) prefixed to Moseley’s 1651 edition of Cartwright’s works. As we have seen, Stanley proudly remembered his circle as having maintained pre-war traditions of literary sociability and poetic collaboration in ‘anti-ingenious times’. Despite the resonance of the allusion to the Suckling volume, Lovelace’s poem to Lely concludes on an ostensibly positive note; but the optimism is generated not by contemplation of the ‘clouded Majesty’ of the king but of his friend Lely’s technical skill. In ‘The Grasshopper. To my Noble Friend, Mr Charles Cotton. Ode’ we can observe a similar movement from an ambivalent contemplation of the fate of the king to celebration of the friendships that can preserve and facilitate an imperilled cultural life. While the poem to Fletcher ends on a note of fear for the future of poets and poetry and the poem to Lely recognizes, or begins to recognize, the demise of Stuart court culture, the poem to Cotton finds security in the classical poetics practised in the convivial gatherings of the Stanley circle.

‘THE GRASSHOPPER. TO MY NOBLE FRIEND, MR CHARLES COTTON. ODE’

Structurally ‘The Grasshopper’ is like the poem to Lely in that both describe an image of a king—the portrait of Charles, the ‘grasshopper-king’—and then, ‘exactly half-way through, they turn in direct address to a friend’.39 This formal similarity may indicate that both poems were written around the same time; the ‘Golden Eares’ which are cropped by the sickle in ‘The Grasshopper’ have usually been taken to refer to the regicide but, given the date the volume was licensed, the winter of the poem is more likely the period after the defeat and subjugation of the king.40 A further argument for dating the poem to Lovelace’s return to London and association with the Black Riband is his adaptation of classical writers and modes on which Stanley and his friends were working in 1646–8. The first three stanzas are derived from Anacreontea 43, which apostrophizes a cicada, while the stanzas which address Cotton and oppose the warmth of

40 For comments on the date of composition, see Raymond A. Anselment, Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War (Newark, DE, 1988), 98, 199 n. 5.
conviviality and friendship to the wintry conditions outside draw on Horace, *Odes* 1. 9. The final stanza fuses lines derived from the second chorus in Seneca’s *Thyestes* and a neo-Latin Horatian ode by the Polish Jesuit Casimire Sarbiewski (1595–1640). Stanley published the first complete English translation of the anacreontics in 1651; Sherburne published translations of Seneca’s *Medea and Answer to Lucilius* in 1648, and Alexander Brome published the *Poems of Horace* in 1666, which is comprised of previously published translations by the likes of Richard Fanshawe and Cowley but also ‘such as were not translated by others’ done by ‘my self and several friends of mine’. A translation of Sarbiewski’s *Odes* by George Hils was issued by Moseley in 1646 with a commendatory poem by ‘J. H.’. Hall had not been long at Cambridge when this translation appeared, and ‘J. H.’ may be James Howell, who had travelled widely and was conversant with a range of European literature (although he was imprisoned in the Fleet between 1643 and 1651). Yet the poet’s description of Sarbiewski as ‘Giant of wit! that with thy numbers even | Assault’st the starry Orb, and conquer’st heaven!’ is echoed in Henry More’s praise of Hall in the commendatory verses for Hall’s *Poems* as ‘Mad soul! tyrannic wit’, whose ‘satiric rods | May awe the heavens, and discipline the gods’. More may have expected Hall to recognize the allusion to his own praise of Sarbiewski. Hall was certainly familiar with Sarbiewski’s poetry, adapting Sarbiewski’s best-known ode, ‘That adversity is to be endured with a constant mind’ (the ‘ode against tears’), for his 1649 elegy for Henry, Lord Hastings, in *Lachrymae Musarum*. Lovelace had already imitated this ode in a poem addressed to his brother Francis and included in *Lucasta*, ‘To his Deare Brother Colonel F. L. immoderately mourning my Brothers untimely death at Carmarthen’. Given the culture of collaboration and competition in the Stanley circle, Lovelace’s ‘The Grasshopper’ is likely a response to and elaboration of Stanley’s version of *Anacreontea* 43, which also turns the cicada into an English grasshopper. Certainly Stanley was working on his translation in 1646–7: Stanley’s ‘The Grasshopper’ is included in the 1647 *Poems*, substantially revised from the version in the 1646 fair copy of his poems that Stanley had copied in preparation for the 1647 volume. For all the critical attention that Lovelace’s ‘The Grasshopper’ has attracted, the textual notes or ‘excitations’ that Stanley appended to his translations of the *Anacreontea* in the 1651 *Poems* provide hitherto unrecognized insights into Lovelace’s attitude towards the anacreontic

---

44 See Crump’s notes in *PTTS* 94.
values that have become synonymous with Cavalier poetics and his concern with the plight of the poet in an uncertain, post-courtly world.

Stanley follows the anacreontic poet in celebrating the grasshopper’s brief life, without care or fear of ageing, as paradoxically comparable with the immortal existence of the gods:

Grasshopper thrice-happy! who
Sipping the cool morning dew,
Queen-like chirpest all the day
Seated on some verdant spray;
Thine is all what ere earth brings,
Or the howrs with laden wings;
Thee, the Ploughman calls his Joy,
‘Cause thou nothing dost destroy;
Thou by all art are honour’d; All
Thee the Springs sweet Prophet call;
By the Muses thou admir’d,
By Apollo art inspir’d,
Agelesse, ever singing, good
Without passion, flesh or blood;
Oh how near thy happy state
Comes the Gods to imitate!

(LTTTS 94)

Lovelace’s version revises and opposes his cousin’s translation. Whereas in Stanley’s mostly faithful rendering of the Greek the grasshopper is moderate and precise in his drinking (‘Sipping the cool morning dew’), Lovelace’s grasshopper is ‘Drunke ev’ry night, with a Delicious teare | Dropt thee from Heav’n’ (ll. 3–4). Lovelace ascribes a sensuality to his grasshopper, drinking drafts of sleep-inducing ‘Poppy’, which is emphatically absent from Stanley’s insect, ‘Without passion, flesh or blood’. Stanley’s grasshopper is the ‘joy’ of the ploughman because he ‘nothing dost destroy’; the joys of Lovelace’s grasshopper are cut short by both harvest and frost, man and nature:

But ah the Sickle! Golden Eares are Cropt;
_Ceres_ and _Baachus_ bid good night;
Sharpe frosty fingers all your Flower’s have topt,
And what sithes spar’d, Winds shave off quite.

(ll. 13–16)

In Stanley’s version, the grasshopper ‘Queen-like chirpest all the day | Seated on some verdant spray’; Lovelace apostrophizes the dead grasshopper as ‘Poore verdant foole! and now green Ice!’ (l. 17). In fact the mirth of Lovelace’s insect is circumscribed by death from the opening stanza: the dew is sent ‘from Heav’n, where now th’art reard’. The reader, entranced by the description of the joyous, present-tense existence of the grasshopper, tends to miss or forget about this
early, unobtrusive revelation of mortality (l. 4). The reader here becomes like the grasshopper of the opening three stanzas—delighting in the present, ignorant of the signs of future destruction. The grasshopper’s lack of awareness of transience and mortality, which for the anacreon poet and in Stanley’s rendering are god-like qualities, make it for Lovelace an emblem of folly:

thy Joys
Large and as lasting, as thy Peirch of Grasse,
Bid us lay in ’gainst Winter, Raine, and poize
Their flouds, with an o’reflowing glasse.

(ll. 17–20)

Stanley prefers to describe the insect as ‘Queen-like’ in its possession of nature: the anacreontic poet calls the cicada *basileus* and Cowley, in the translation which he published in his 1656 *Poems*, declares the grasshopper as ‘Happier than the happiest King’. Did Stanley feel self-conscious about the direct comparison of the short-lived grasshopper to a king, given the uncertainty over Charles’s future when he was working on the translation? Lovelace avoids altogether the direct monarchical analogy yet, as Scodel argues, ‘his debt to the Anacreontic poem hints that this grasshopper is an emblem of the vanquished Charles I and, more generally, the defeated Royalists’. The phrase ‘Golden eares are cropt’ may pun on the punishment of ear-cropping that had been meted out to William Prynne and other Puritan polemicists in the 1630s. As we saw in the last chapter, Prynne first had his ears cropped in 1634 for publishing an attack on the immorality of the dramatic entertainments performed in the Caroline court. The grasshopper was emblematic of the final days of the court culture that Prynne had condemned as profane: in William Davenant’s *Salmacida Spolia*, which was the final masque presented at court in 1640 and which Lovelace may well have witnessed, the figure in Inigo Jones’s ornamental frontispiece representing ‘Affection to the Country’ is described as ‘holding a grasshopper’. Stanley tells us in his translation of ‘The Grasshopper’ that the insect is admired by the Muses and inspired by Apollo. For royalist writers and artists, the golden cultural achievements that had flourished in the summer of Stuart court patronage had perished in the winter of war, sequestration, and Puritan triumph. In the aftermath of military defeat it was now Charles, of course, who was the prisoner of the Parliamentary-Puritan party while Prynne was in a position of authority, having been appointed by Parliament on 1 May 1647 as one of the commissioners for the visitation of Oxford. As we have seen, Prynne’s mutilated ears were a focus for the anti-Presbyterian scorn of both Milton and Alexander Brome in 1646–7. In his poem in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio Henry Vaughan, apostrophizing Fletcher, scornfully reduces Puritan iconoclasm to the metonym of cropped ears as he suggests that the Westminster Assembly will seek to censor the published text of

the plays: ‘Will not the Eares assemble, and think’t fit | Their Synod fast, and pray against thy Wit?’

The identification of the grasshopper with Caroline court culture, rather than specifically or only with the person of the king, clarifies Lovelace’s purpose in rewriting the anacreontic original. As many commentators have observed, Lovelace invokes Aesop’s opposition of the careless grasshopper and the prudent ant, who diligently labours through the summer to survive the winter. But ‘for the Cavalier party’, as Leah Marcus points out, ‘it was already too late for such prudence. Winter was already upon them.’ When the poet turns to address Cotton, his friend seems to succeed, as Earl Miner suggests, to ‘the Grasshopper’s role in the scheme of things as well as in the verse apostrophe’: ‘Thou best of Men and Friends! we will create | A Genuine Summer in each other’s breast’ (ll. 21–2). The festivity and mirth of the grasshopper in the open fields during the summer are continued indoors during the winter by Lovelace and Cotton, as they drink from overflowing glasses around ‘sacred harthes’ which ‘burne eternally | As Vestall Flames’—with ‘harthes’ punning on ‘hearts’ and ‘sacred’ suggesting a ritualistic or religious aspect to the drinking, as in Stanley’s version of Anacreontea 6:

Now with Roses we are crown’d
Let our mirth, and cups go round:
Whilst a Lasse, whose hand a spear
Branch’d with Ivy twines doth bear,
With her white feet beats the ground,
To the Lutes harmonious sound,
Playd on by some Boy whose choice
Skill is heightned by his voice:
Bright-haired Love, with his divine
Mother, and the God of wine,
Will flock hither, glad to see
Old men of their companie.

(PTTS 77)

While Lovelace has now adopted the Horatian mode of Odes 1. 9, in which Horace calls on Thaliarchus to ‘lavishly pile up logs upon the hearth, and melt the cold away; and with warmer cheer . . . draw from the two-handed Sabine jar the vintage four years old’, the anacreontic values embodied by the grasshopper are not rejected in favour of an Aesopian moral so much as relocated within this

48 See most recently Loxley, Royalism and Poetry, 217–23, who argues that Lovelace and Cotton are identified with the ant against the grasshopper, and that the ‘careful husbandry’ of the ant ‘provides the means for an active resistance, rather than simply allowing survival’ (221).
49 Politics of Mirth, 231; Cavalier Mode, 291.
Horatian context of the hearth, where the poet and his friends continue to cultivate symposiac values in defiance of a harsh external world.\(^{50}\) The grasshopper’s folly lies not in its way of life but in its ignorance of the threat to that way of life; prudence lies not in a more sober existence but in the recognition that changing conditions demand a relocation of festivity. As we saw in Chapter 1, Stanley’s own philosophical preferences were Neoplatonic rather than Epicurean and he would probably have approved of his cousin’s Horatian modulation of the grasshopper’s *carpe diem* hedonism. In his commentary on the final lines of *Anacreonta* 15—

‘All my care is for today; | What’s tomorrow who can say? | Come then, let us drink and dice | And to Bacchus sacrifice’—Stanley criticizes ‘[t]his false inference (frequent with Anacreon)’ and offers a translation of St Amant’s ‘The Debauche’ as ‘a piece suiting with the genius of our Poet’. Earlier he had cited this fifteenth ode as evidence of ‘Anacreon’s luxury’.\(^{51}\)

For Marcus, it is the festive mirth that was promoted as an Anglican rite by the Stuarts through the *Book of Sports* and suppressed by Parliament that Lovelace seeks to relocate within ‘protective enclosures, under the control of intimate groups of Royalists like the poet and his friend Cotton’. The argument is given substance by the invocation of Christmas revels in the eighth stanza, lines 29–32 (which may possibly date the poem to December 1647 or January 1648, when riots broke out in Lovelace’s native Kent over official efforts to proscribe the traditional celebrations):

Drooping December shall come weeping in,
Bewayle th’usurping of his Raigne;
But when in show’rs of old Greeke we beginne,
Shall crie, he hath his Crowne againe!\(^{52}\)

While King Christmas has been usurped in the external or public world, he finds his festive rule restored in the private household where Lovelace and Cotton can maintain the traditional patterns of English devotional behaviour. But the festive rituals practised by Lovelace and his friends also have specifically classical and literary resonances. The phrase ‘showers of old Greeke’ is rarely glossed, although its meaning is hardly self-evident. Lovelace may allude to, and intend Stanley to recognize, the description by the traveller and translator George Sandys (1578–1644), great uncle to both Lovelace and Stanley, of ancient Greek symposiac

\(^{50}\) *Works of Horace*, tr. Lonsdale and Lee, 31. Compare the version by Herrick’s patron Mildmay Fane, second Earl of Westmorland, probably written between 1640 and 1647: ‘Why should we shiv’ring turne with these to ice, | When an increase of fire, with Ale and spice | May thaugh us throngly?’ (‘To My Lord Gerrard My Brother’, in *The Poetry of Mildmay Fane*, ed. Tom Cain (Manchester, 2001), 75).

\(^{51}\) *Poems* (1651), volume of translations, 85, 92. The volume of translations is separately paginated: there are separate title-pages for the translations of classical and neo-classical texts, the ‘excitations’, translations from European languages, and finally the prose translation of Pico della Mirandola. Stanley’s notes are not included in *PTTS*.

ritual as adapted by the Romans for their *convivia*. The ‘convivials at private entertainments’, Sandys tells us in his *A Relation of a Journey* (1615), drank three bowls of wine in three rounds in honour of the three Graces and the nine Muses. He cites (and translates) Horace, *Odes* 3. 19: ‘Let ravish poets drink thrice three | Of whom the uneven Muses be | Beloved’. The ‘convivials’ drank ‘small drafts at the beginning, untill they arrived at the height of intemperancy; and sometimes as many together as there were letters in the names of their mistresses . . . those were proverbially said to Greeke it, that quaft in that fashion’ (79–80). The reference to King Christmas regaining his ‘Crowne’ puns on the ‘crowned’ glass that is full to the brim, as in the opening lines of Stanley’s version of *Anacreontea*, 21: ‘Reach me here that full crown’d Cup, | And at once I’le drink it up’ (*PTTS* 84, ll. 1–2).

Early modern editors of Horace recognized the influence of the Anacreon poet on Horace in odes such ‘To Bacchus’ (3. 25). The Greek mode of ritual drinking described by Sandys is associated by Horace with poetic inspiration and the ‘old Greeke’ in Lovlace’s poem is also the *Anacreontea* themselves and, by extension, the activity of collaborative poetic translation and imitation that was practised by the poet and his friends in post-war London. Ben Jonson paired Anacreon and Horace in his association of symposiac conviviality and poetic creativity in ‘Inviting a Friend to Supper’:

> But that, which most doth take my Muse, and me,
> Is a pure cup of rich canary wine,
> Which is the Mermaid’s, now, but shall be mine:
> Of which had Horace, or Anacreon tasted,
> Their lives, as doe their lines, till now had lasted.
> Tobacco, Nectar, or the Thespian spring,
> Are all but Luthers beer, to this I sing.54

Jonson contrasts the immortality of the verse of Anacreon and Horace with their mortal physical existence; in his ‘Lyrick to Mirth’ Herrick blurs the distinction between reciting the poets’ lines and bringing the poets back to life through the power of Bacchus, invoked by drunken ritual (although the poem is hedged by the acknowledgement, as so often in the *Anacreontea*, that death must claim the speaker):

> Crown’d with clusters of the Vine;
> Let us sit, and quaffe our wine.
> Call on Bacchus; chaunt his praise;
> Shake the Thyrse, and bite the Bayes:
> Rouze Anacreon from the dead;

---

53 Stanley’s mother, Mary Hammond of Kent, cousin of Lovelace, was the niece of George Sandys. See Weidhorn, *Richard Lovelace*, 22. William Hammond’s *Poems* (1655), prepared by his nephew Stanley, includes an elegy ‘On the Death of my much honoured Uncle, Mr G. Sandys’.

And return him drunk to bed:
Sing o’re Horace; for ere long
Death will come and mar the song.

(RHP 39, ll. 5–12)

We do not know when ‘A Lyrick to Mirth’ was written. Herrick is probably describing his experience of the ‘Wit-Conventions’ (the phrase is that of Jonson’s one-time servant Richard Brome) over which Jonson presided in the taverns of Stuart London. In ‘An Ode for Ben Jonson’ Herrick celebrates the memory of ‘those Lyrick feasts, | Made at the Sun, | The Dog, the triple Tunne’, where ‘we such clusters had, | As made us nobly wild, not mad’—the qualification is Horatian in its emphasis on poetic activity stimulated by controlled drinking rather than drunkenness for its own sake (RHP 282, ll. 4–6). But it is possible that ‘A Lyrick to Mirth’ dates from 1647 and Herrick’s involvement with Stanley and his friends, who were engaged in translating and imitating the Anacreon poet, and a range of other classical and neo-classical writers, in the Inns of Court. It must have been on such occasions that Herrick witnessed Hall ‘drink up [the Muses’] spring’ (‘To his worthy friend M. John Hall, Student of Grayes-Inne’, l. 2).

Lovelace’s fusion of anacreontic and Horatian ode places ‘The Grasshopper’ in this Jonsonian symposiac tradition in which drinking with friends is the occasion of poetic experimentation and discussion. It is usually assumed that ‘The Grasshopper’ is addressed to the elder Charles Cotton (d. 1658), who was a member of Jonson’s circle in pre-war London, rather than his son; included in the first Lucasta is an elegy for the elder Cotton’s sister, ‘On the Death of Mrs Cassandra Cotton, only Sister to Mr C. Cotton’. Herrick includes in Hesperides a sonnet to his ‘most Ingenious friend Mr Charles Cotton’, reminiscent of Jonson’s fourteen-line epigrams such as ‘To William Camden’, in which Herrick gives Cotton thanks for his advice on how to improve his verse:

Who with thine own eyes read’st what we doe write,
And giv’st our Numbers Euphonie, and weight.
Tel’st when a Verse springs high, how understood
To be, or not borne of the Royall-blood.
What state above, what Symmetrie below,
Lines have, or sho’d have, thou the best canst show.

(RHP 290, ll. 5–10)

Cotton, although seemingly not a poet himself (or at least none of his poetry seems to have survived), evidently read and commented on his friends’ verses (‘what we do write’, ‘our Numbers’); indeed Herrick indicates that Cotton had

considerable technical facility. We may suppose that Cotton also read and commented on Lovelace’s compositions. Lovelace presumably got to know Cotton in the late 1630s or early 1640s. After Lovelace returned to London in late 1646 he must have been introduced by Cotton to his son, then 16, who ‘moved in literary and social circles which also sheltered his father’. As we have seen, Lovelace addressed his ‘Best of Friends, Charles Cotton Esquire’ in ‘The Triumphs of Philamore and Amoret’, included in the 1659/60 Lucasta, apparently in the hope of (further?) financial assistance as well as renewed friendship. The younger Cotton stood at the head of the elegies attached to the posthumous Lucasta, commemorating ‘the Memory of my Worthy Friend’. He had made his first appearance in print in Lachrymae Musarum, alongside Herrick, Richard Brome, Alexander Brome, Hall, Marvell, Denham, Mildmay Fane, and John Dryden, as well as old drinking friends of his father such as Sir Aston Cokayn. In his 1658 Poems Cokayn addresses a number of poems to both the elder Cotton and ‘the junior’, and recalls drink and poetry sessions at the Fleece Tavern in Covent Garden with Cotton senior and Francis Lenton. Formerly one of Henrietta Maria’s court poets, Lenton (fl. 1629–53) contributed a commendatory poem to the 1649 Lucasta and to Shirley’s Latin grammar Via ad Latinem Linguam (1649), where he appears alongside Stanley, Sherburne, and Alexander Brome. Cokayn wrote a commendatory poem for Richard Brome’s Five New Playes (1653), edited by Alexander Brome. The younger Cotton’s imitations and translations of classical and neo-classical writers, including Anacreon and Secundus, are suggestive of his involvement with the Stanley circle, although most of these were not published until after his death in 1687 and are difficult to date. But clearly there were overlaps—most obviously in the form of Herrick, Richard Brome, and Sherburne—between the Stanley circle and those who remained from the pre-war, Jonsonian literary circles in which Cotton senior had moved.

Indeed the Stanley circle was probably inspired to some extent by the example of the Jonsonian gatherings in Stuart London. Jonson’s ‘Mermaid club’ and related fraternities and clubs had developed an alternative literary culture in the ‘town’ which was semi-detached from the ‘official’ site of the court, although members tended nonetheless to mimic the court’s paternal hierarchy and familial structures (the ‘sons of Ben’) and to be concerned with ‘self-advancement within the available channels of courtly patronage’. Now, in a post-courtly world in which the lines of royal patronage had been cut, such societies provided a model structure of a self-sufficient, mutually supportive circle of poets ‘joined in fraternal affection and esteem’. The name of ‘Order of the Black Riband’

56 Paul Hartle, entry for Charles Cotton the younger in the ODNB; Aubrey’s Brief Lives, 265.
57 Cokayn, ‘To my very good Friend Mr Francis Lenton’, in A Chain of Golden Poems (1658), 161; Jerome de Groot, entry for Francis Lenton in ODNB. The ‘Fra. Langton’ in the commendatory poems for Via Ad Latinem Linguam is surely Lenton, who also called himself one of the ‘Queen’s poets’ in the 1630s and wrote a poem celebrating Shirley’s Masque of Truth (1634).
58 Cotton, Poems On several Occasions (1689), 88, 546–8; 571.
was evidently, as Hall indicates in his ‘Armilla Nigra’, a reference to the Order of the Garter but it also recalls pre-war clubs such as the ‘Order of the Fancy’, of which Herrick had probably been a member—although the scatological doggerel produced by the Fancy, led by Sir John Mennes and James Smith, was rather less high-brow and ambitious than the poetic productions of the Black Riband. The ‘tavern societies’ of early Stuart London were dominated by Inns of Court men and the Inns, where Stanley gathered his circle around him, provided another model of a ‘highly intellectualized alternative to the literary culture of the court’. They also provided a demonstration of how social networks and literary traditions could flourish in London independently of the centre of patronage and political power.60 Jonson’s ‘Inviting a Friend to Supper’ concludes by emphasizing the liberty of conversation enjoyed by the participants in his literary convivium: ‘No simple word, | That shall be uttered at our mirthful board, | Shall make us sad next morning; or affright | The liberty, that we’ll enjoy tonight’ (ll. 39–42). Michelle O’Callaghan argues that friendship here ‘describes a semi-private sphere where like-minded men can air political views that would be dangerous to voice in public’.61 O’Callaghan is thinking of political views that might be considered critical of the court, but in the aftermath of Parliamentary victory this form of ‘semi-private’ literary association could offer royalists—as well as those, such as Hall, who were moving beyond royalist orthodoxy but were emphatic in their opposition to Presbyterian dominance—the liberty to express views that might threaten their liberty in the public world. Wit is linked to liberty, after all, even by Latin derivation: ‘ingenious’, the adjective often used in commendatory poems between writers in the Stanley circle (Hall congratulates Lovelace ‘on the publishing of his ingenious Poems’), comes from ingenium; in celebrating the ‘Genuine summer in each other’s breast’ Lovelace glances at ingenuus, meaning both ‘noble’ and ‘freeborn’. Alexander Brome celebrates in ‘The Safe Estate’ the freedom and security of the man who attends such private meetings of ‘clubbing wit[s]’:

He wears his own head and ears,
And he tipples in safety with his peers,
And harmlessly passeth his time:
If he meet with a cross,
A full bowle he does toss,
Nor his wealth, not his wit, are his crime.
He doth privately sit
With his friend clubbing wit;
And disburdening their breasts

Brome included in his 1661 Songs a translation of the *Leges Conviviales*, the rules that Jonson composed for convivial evenings in the Apollo room of the Devil tavern.

Lovelace’s ‘The Grasshopper’, which surely emerged from conversations about poetry with Cotton senior such as those described by Herrick, embodies the culture of convivial poetic imitation and experimentation that it celebrates and which was cultivated by Jonson in pre-war and Stanley in post-war London. The final stanza (ll. 37–40) stitches together Seneca and Sarbiewski, Latin drama and neo-Latin verse, to produce a defiantly Stoic conclusion to a poem that had seemed to celebrate the Epicurean life (although, as Miner points out, one of the problems of ‘defining seventeenth-century Stoicism or Epicureanism is that self-sufficiency, *sibi vivere*, belongs as much to one Roman or English vision as the other’):

> Thus richer than untempted Kings are we,  
> That ask nothing, nothing need:  
> Though Lord of all what Seas imbrace, yet he  
> That wants himself, is poor indeed.63

The first two lines adapt the second chorus of Seneca’s *Thyestes* 388–90: ‘A king is he who shall fear nothing, | A king is he who shall desire nothing: | Such a kingdom on himself each man bestows’ (Marvell was to translate the next thirteen lines of the chorus, although not, it seems, until the 1670s, as a comment on his distaste for the Restoration court, *MP* 190). The final line is from Sarbiewski’s *Odes*, 4. 34, ‘To Quintus Tibernius’:

> Thou shalt not, Tibernius, call,  
> Him rich, whose every Acre shall  
> Outvie the Eastern glebe, whose field  
> Faire Fortune’s clearest stream doth gild.  
> Nor him, whose birth and pedigree  
> Is fam’d abroad by Heraldrie;  
> Hee who by fleeting glory’s hurl’d  
> In his rich Chariot throughout the world;  
> He’s poor who wants himselfe, yet weighs  
> Proudly himselfe . . .

*(Odes of Casimire, 97–8)*

It is the wealth of friendship and poetry that makes Lovelace and Cotton self-sufficient kings of the hearth, even though they lack external material goods

---

62 Brome, *Songs and Other Poems* (3rd edn. 1668), 295, 81. ‘The Safe Estate’ is not dated but it is placed among other poems dated between 1645 and 1648.

63 *The Cavalier Mode*, 110.
or ‘the Joyes of Earth and Ayre’ possessed by the grasshopper-king. It is in the very act of (collaborative) imitation of classical and neo-classical verse that is undertaken in the poem—of Anacreon, Horace, Seneca, Sarbiweski—that the poet and his friends find contentment and self-sufficiency. The theme shifts in this final stanza from warmth and coldness to wealth and poverty. The warm light of patronage which emanated from the sun-king during the summer of Stuart rule and which nurtured a public literary, visual, and musical culture has gone. In the cold, dark winter of war and Puritan rule, those who once lived in the light of the court can yet find warmth and shelter within poetic communities like the Stanley circle, removed from an ‘anti-ingenious’ public world and living by the traditions of symposiac conviviality established in Jonsonian circles—traditions which had developed in the ‘town’ rather than the court and so could be adapted easily enough to a world without a court. The declaration of the monarchical self-sufficiency obtained in a post-war commonwealth of convivial wit in the conclusion of ‘The Grasshopper’ is echoed in several of Alexander Brome’s drinking songs. In ‘The Safety. Written in 1646’, the kingdom of the imagination is opposed to the material kingdom founded on territorial lines: ‘Let the three kingdoms fall to one of the prime ones, | My minde is a kingdom, and shall be to me.’ The conclusion of ‘The Safe Estate’, in which the happy man ‘tipples in safety with his peers’, similarly opposes the possession of self to the possession of riches: ‘While he that scorns pelf | And enjoys his own self, | Is secure from the Vote of the Sword.’ ‘The Antipolititian’ asserts the pleasures of free speech and safe laughter over those of kingship: ‘If I can safely think and live, | And freely laugh or sing, | My wealth I’ll not for Cresus’s give | Nor change lives with a King.’

It is instructive to compare the conclusion of ‘To Fletcher Reviv’d’ with the conclusion of ‘The Grasshopper’. In the former poem the poet and his friends draw only enough warmth from the ‘embers’ of pre-war court culture, from the printed texts of Fletcher’s plays, ‘to say we live’. Darkness has already taken the stage and is threatening to spread over poetry. In ‘The Grasshopper’, however, Lovelace and his friends are warmed by private communion, by the ‘sacred harthes’ that ‘burne eternally’. The ‘old Greeke’ of the Anacreontea, which they read, translate, and imitate while they drink in the Greek symposiac fashion, heats their rooms like ‘Ætna in Epitome’. Darkness has indeed enveloped the external world, but the light generated by friendship, drinking, and poetic conversation is fierce enough to subdue and repel it from their hearth:

Night as cleare Hesper shall our Tapers whip
From the light Casements where we play,
And the darke Hagge from her black mantle strip,
And sticke there everlasting Day.

(ll. 33–6)

64 Songs, 64, 82, 102.
The final stanzas assert the persistence of collaborative literary culture despite the demise of the court networks—a demise which Lovelace had obliquely recognized in the poem to Lely, which is dominated by an image of ‘clouded Majesty’ as the darkness of defeat and Parliamentary rule obscures a once glorious courtly culture. The community of friends support each other in their poetic endeavours, surviving the destruction of the court while preserving independence from the new Parliamentary structures of power and patronage (under which the neutral foreigner Lely had found employment).

This is how Stanley conceived of his poetic circle. In compiling William Hammond’s *Poems* for publication in 1655, Stanley included a series of ten poems that Hammond had addressed ‘Ad Amicum et Cognatum, T. S.’. These include a translation of Horace, *Odes* 2. 17, in which Horace addresses his great patron Maecenas, declaring that he will die when Maecenas dies. In one of the other poems Hammond praises Stanley for teaching men ‘How with smooth cadence harsher verse to file, | Within soft numbers to confine a stile, | And lastly how to love a friend’; in another he proclaims that from Stanley he can ‘As instantly gain intellectual light, | As by this amphitheatere of air | The sudden beams of Sol imbibèd are’. The ten poems to Stanley are followed by one to Stanley’s wife Dorothy and then by a rendering of the opening of the third ode of Horace’s third book, which Hammond entitles ‘A man with virtue fears nothing’:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{The presence of a tyrant, nor the zeal} \\
\text{Of citizens forcing rebellions,} \\
\text{Can shake a squarely solid soul, the seal} \\
\text{Infringe of honest resolutions.} \\

\text{Untroubled he on stormy Adria sails;} \\
\text{At thunder is undaunted as the oak:} \\
\text{If nature in a general ruin fails,} \\
\text{He with contented mind sustains the stroke.}
\end{align*}
\]

This Horatian declaration of inner security and constancy is followed by the impressive ‘To Sir J. G., wishing me to regain my Fortunes by compliance with the Parliament’. Hammond asserts the superiority of the ‘contented mind’ over the wealth of external goods; his contentment derives both from a ‘clear conscience’ and from the intellectual stimulation offered by friends such as Stanley, for Hammond is one ‘Who drinks with sacred Druids at the brook, | Whose unjust sufferings are for guilt mistook, | And from their mouth, now the forbidden tree, | Alas, of knowledge, sucks divinity’ (*MPCP* ii. 500–1, 507–8). Once again learning and knowledge are presented as ‘forbidden’ in a Parliamentary state but Hammond, Stanley, and their friends create their own Eden of intellectual conversation: the poet ‘With angels on an honest bed of leaves | Redintegrated Paradise conceives’. The ‘honest bed of leaves’ puns on the leaves of the books that the friends read together: one of the earlier poems to Stanley is on the subject of Hammond’s library. In his ordering of Hammond’s verses—eleven
poems dedicated to Stanley and his family, mostly extolling Stanley’s learning, poetic facility, and capacity for friendship, followed by an Horatian ode on inner constancy in times of rebellion and tyranny, and a poem rejecting ‘compliance with the Parliament’ in favour of a private intellectual commonwealth—Stanley communicates his conviction, which he later expressed explicitly in his ‘Register of Friends’, that the circle of poets and intellectuals that he gathered under his patronage in late 1640s preserved literary values that would otherwise have perished in the post-war world.

In the poem to the younger Cotton that Lovelace composed in 1656 the association between light, warmth, poetry, and friendship in ‘The Grasshopper’ is revisited but the celebration of fraternal equality has become an uncomfortable plea from impoverished client to absent patron. Cotton has left London for Beresford, his house in Staffordshire, and Lovelace, comparing himself to the earth in winter when the ‘false Sun her lover doth him move | Below, and to the Antipodes make Love’, adopts the language of the poem in which he had celebrated his friendship with Cotton’s father—except now the poet has become the grasshopper turned to ‘green ice’:

For whilst you fear me Cindars, See! I’m Ice;
A numbed speaking clod, and mine own show,
My Self congeal’d, a Man cut out in Snow:
Return those living Fires, Thou who that vast
Double advantage from one-ey’d Heaven hast;
Look with one Sun, though’t but Obliquely be,
And if not shine, vouchsafe to wink on me.

(‘The Triumphs of Philamore and Amorer’, ll. 25–33)

The traditional simile of the king as sun, the source of all life-giving energy and thus of all bounty, with which Lovelace plays in the poem to Lely is transferred here to Cotton, although with more than a hint of resentment in the comparison to a ‘false Sun’. Given Aubrey’s information about Cotton’s financial support of Lovelace at some stage during the 1650s, the ‘living fires’ that the poet urges Cotton to return to thaw the frozen poet evidently signify Cotton’s material assistance as well as his friendship. Lovelace’s application to himself of the language which he had used to portray the grasshopper is obviously designed to prick Cotton’s conscience and remind him of the bond between his father and the poet; but it also forces us to reconsider the nature of the warm self-sufficiency celebrated in ‘The Grasshopper’. When read in the light of the later poem, we might begin to suspect that the metaphorical riches of friendship and poetry in ‘The Grasshopper’ are secured by the literal wealth of figures such as Stanley and, perhaps, the elder Cotton: Lovelace’s rewriting of the earlier poem in the address to the younger Cotton hints at previous support from his father.65

65 The elder Cotton seems to have spent his money freely, leaving his son ‘an estate heavily encumbered by debt’ (Hartle, entry for Cotton in the ODNB).
In his seminal essay on ‘The Grasshopper’ Don Cameron Allen points out that in a letter commending the poet Celsus to a wealthy patron, Flavius Philostratus compared the poet to the grasshopper, writing that Celsus has, ‘as do the good grasshoppers, devoted his life to song; you will see to it that he is fed on more substantial food than dew’. Allen then observes that in the *Apollonius* Philostratus rather ‘associates the grasshopper with the plight of men who have lost out’: the philosopher Demetrius, banished from Rome by Nero, expresses to Apollonius his envy of the grasshoppers, with their freedom to sing out in the open without fear of persecution. Allen merely adds that the *Apollonius* was ‘popular with men of the Renaissance’: in fact in the textual commentary on his translation of *Ancreontea* 43 Stanley explains how the emblem of the grasshopper is ‘excellently paraphras’d and explain’d in the life of *Apollonius Tyanaeus*’. Stanley translates Philostratus, recounting how Demetrius addressed the grasshoppers: ‘O happy and truly wise; You sing the song the Muses taught you, subject to no censure or misconstruction; by them freed from the slavishnesse of hunger and humane envies’. Stanley goes on to translate the ensuing conversation between Demetrius and Apollonius:

*Apollonius*, though he knew well where these words tended, gently reprov’d him as more cautious than the time requir’d; Why, saith he, desiring to praise the Grasshoppers, dost thou not do it freely and openly, but even here seemest to fear, as if there were an Act against it; *Demetrius* replyed; I did not this so much to shew their happinesse, as our own misery. They are allowed to sing, but we not to whisper our own thoughts: Wisdome as a crime is laid to our charge.

Stanley provides no further explication but the episode is evidently relevant to his own circle of mostly royalist friends, who had lost their livings and estates and, under suspicion from the Parliamentary victors, had ‘withdrawne’ their poetic activity ‘from the dull ears of those | Who licenc’d nothing but prose’. The grasshopper ode signifies for Stanley the plight of those poets and intellectuals whom he regards as having been banished from public life by a hostile Puritan regime and who live in fear of the political ‘misconstruction’ of their writings. Or as Marvell’s predicts in his poem to Lovelace: when the ‘barbèd censurers’ have ‘thee all perused | You shall for being faultless be accused’ (ll. 25–6).

In ‘The Grasshopper’ Lovelace answers Stanley’s interpretation of the anacreontic ode by celebrating the self-sufficiency possessed by like-minded friends within the confines of the hearth, withdrawn from a hostile external world. He revises the opposition between grasshopper and man in Philostratus: in Lovelace it is the grasshopper whose happiness is cut short by singing out in the open, but the poets who withdraw to a private sphere and retain the liberty to speak ‘freely and openly’, ‘subject to no censure or misconstruction’: to ‘sing the song’

---


taught them by the Muses. But crucially this liberty is located in a fraternal rather than courtly context and secured by friendship and the practice of a convivial poetics rather than monarchical authority. Pointedly Lovelace and Cotton are pronounced richer than even ‘untempted Kings’ in the final stanza—‘untempted’ is probably derived from the Latin *intemptatus*, ‘unassailed’. As Scodel shrewdly remarks, the references to kingship in the poem ‘recover monarchy as a value, not a reality’. Or as Brome put it in ‘The New Courtier. Written in 1648’: ‘Since we have no *King*, let the goblet be crown’d, | *Our Monarchy* thus we’ll recover’. The Order of the Black Riband commemorated the demise of court culture while the king was still alive; in ‘The Grasshopper’ the emblem of kingly power and court culture is already dead and gone to heaven by the final line of the opening stanza. It is in this sense that the poem speaks to a post-royalist world which has led Don Cameron Allen and others to date it to the months after the regicide. But by late 1647, in the aftermath of the dissolution of the court, military defeat, and Charles’s humiliating imprisonment, Lovelace and others in the Black Riband were already more concerned with the consolations of wit than with the plight of an impotent king.

‘TO LUCASTA. FROM PRISON. AN EPODE’

In ‘Aramantha’, the long pastoral poem that Lovelace seems to have written after *Lucasta* was licensed for publication in February 1648, the riches of the pre-war court are recovered, like kingship in ‘The Grasshopper’, as a value rather than a reality. The description of Aramantha’s walk from garden to meadow to wood and grove, which it has persuasively been argued is a model for the similar movement of the narrator in Marvell’s ‘Upon Appleton House’, mimics a royal progress. The flowers in the garden ‘in their best aray, | As to their Queen their Tribute pay’; Aramantha ‘inthrones’ the violet ‘in her breast’ and ‘The rest in silken fetters bound, | *By Crowning* her are *Crown and Crown’d*’ (*LP* 108–9, ll. 47–8, 62, 81–2). In the meadow a herd of cows of ‘God-like race’, reminiscent of the sacred cattle which belong to Helios in the *Odyssey*, freely offer her their milk; when she sits by a stream in the wood there is an echo of Jonson’s ‘To Penshurst’ (1616) as the fish throw themselves into her hand, except Aramantha returns them: ‘The happy Captive gladly ta’n, | *Sues ever to be slave in vaine*’ (ll. 106, 143–4). She then enters ‘a well ordered stately grove’:

>This is the pallace of the Wood,  
And Court oth’ Royall Oake, where stood  
The whole Nobility, the Pine,  
Straight Ash, tall Firre, and wanton Vine;  

*Excess and the Mean*, 231; Brome, *Songs*, 61; Maclean (ed.), *Ben Jonson and the Cavalier Poets*, 570, 574.

*Politics of Mirth*, 240–63.
The proper Cedar, and the rest;
Here she her deeper senses blest;
Admires great Nature in this Pile
Floor'd with greene-velvet Camomile,
Garnisht with Gems of unset fruit,
Supply'd still with a self recruit;
Her bosom wrought with pretty Eyes
Of never-plant'd Strawberries;
Where th' winged Musick of the ayre
Do richly feast and for their fare
Each Evening in a silent shade,
Bestow a gratefull Serenade.

(ll. 149–64)

The opulence and eroticism of court culture are naturalized in the grove, with the King’s Musick replaced by the ‘winged Musick’ of the birds. Aramantha sleeps before being woken by the cries of the grief-stricken Alexis, who has lost his lover Lucasta and presumes her dead. Alexis, who has been identified in earlier poems in the collection with Lovelace, is about to kill Aramantha for slighting the beauty of Lucasta when ‘amaz’d he did discover | Lucasta in this Nymph’ (ll. 307–8). Lucasta explains to him how she fled to the wood from ‘Hydraphil’ (lover of the many-headed multitude), who is locked in deadly conflict with ‘Philanact’ (lover of the prince). But Lucasta does not ascribe blame only to the Parliamentary side:

Who whilst they for the same things fight,
As BARD Decrees, and DRUIDS rite,
For safeguard of their proper joyes,
And Shepheards freedome, each destroyes
The glory of this Sicilie;
Since seeking thus the remedie,
They fancy (building on false ground)
The means must them and it confound,
Yet are resolv’d to stand or fall,
And win a little or lose all.

(ll. 329–38)

The wood offers sanctuary from ‘this sad storm of fire and blood’. Alexis responds by renouncing the martial life: ‘His armes hung up and his Sword broke, | His Ensignes folded, he betook | Himself unto the humble Crook’. Alexis and Lucasta vow ‘in her peacefull Cave | To make their Bridall-bed and grave’ (ll. 339, 365–7, 373–4).

For Leah Marcus, ‘Aramantha’ is a revival of the pastoral romance which dominated entertainments at court: ‘the poet and his bride fill the void left by the absent pair [of Charles and Henrietta Maria] and become imaginative surrogates for the king and queen’. But Lucasta’s criticism of the self-deluding extremism of both royalist and Parliamentary sides and Alexis’s breaking of his
sword—neither of which Marcus mentions—indicate a more complex politics. 70

In the poem on Sherburne in ‘A Register of Friends’ Stanley imagines his Middle Temple rooms as a haven for lovers from the storm of the war—‘Kind was the storm, which both for shelter drave, | Like Dido and Aeneas, to one Cave’—which became a fraternal environment of intellectual conversation and literary experimentation. If Lucasta is not only or merely a real lover but ‘the image of Lovelace’s art’, as Hammond argues, then the rejection in ‘Aramantha’ of the public, martial world in favour of life with Lucasta in the hidden grove can be read as a reformulation of the preference for the withdrawn literary life celebrated in ‘The Grasshopper’. (Lovelace, it is worth pointing out, never married.)

To see Lucasta as a symbol of lyric art is not the same as seeing Lucasta as ‘an embodiment of the royalist ideals once celebrated in the Caroline masques’. 71 In the penultimate poem in the collection, ‘Calling Lucasta from her Retirement. Ode’ (which marks, we are told after the final line, the ‘end of Lucasta’), the poet urges ‘Sacred Lucasta’ to ‘Awake from the dead Vault in which you dwell’ and join him in a place where there are ‘No storms, heats, Colds, no soules contentious, | Nor Civill War is found—I meane, to us’ (LP 105–6, ll. 25, 29–30). The unexpected qualification accepts that the war may continue in the public world; it is only in their private sphere that peace is assured. It is a place where conflict is transmuted into conviviality: ‘Shrill Trumpets doe only sound to Eate, | Artillery hath loaden ev’ry dish with meate, | And Drums at ev’ry Health Alarmes beate’ (ll. 19–21). Wilcher misreads when he sees this as ‘a call to arms’; rather, as Jonathan Post argues, the ‘calling’ in ‘Calling Lucasta from her Retirement’ is a ‘powerful controlling speech act’ through which the poet substitutes the ‘high consolatory value of art, especially the art of the lyric’, for material loss and martial defeat. 72 The poet literally transcends the world of the war: he calls on Lucasta to ‘Arise and climb our whitest hill, | There your sad thoughts with joy and wonder fill, | And see seas calm as Earth, Earth as your will’ (ll. 7–9). ‘Will’ suggests their imagined physical rise into ‘joy and wonder’ is accomplished through an act of intellectual self-assertion. In Hall’s ode to Pawson, student and tutor are lifted by the power of learning to the point where they share with the angels ‘a full view of this enamelled ball’. The territorial boundaries over which men fight disappear as Hall and Pawson are elevated by knowledge of history and empire:

Yet shall we ne’er descry
Where bounds of kingdoms lie,
But see them gone
As flights new flown,
And lose themselves in their own breadth, just as
Circlings upon the water, one

71 Anselment, Loyalist Resolve, 99.
72 Wilcher, Writing of Royalism, 309; Post, English Lyric Poetry, 127.
Grows great to be undone;
Or as lines in the sand, which as they’re drawn do pass.

(MPCP ii. 209, ll. 41–7)

The poet and Lucasta similarly rise above the local disputes and conflicts of the world, looking down with the angels; but in Lovelace’s poem this elevation is less a thrilling extension of intellectual horizons than a way of blocking out the pain of earthly experience:

Lovers and angels, though in heaven they show
And see the woes and discords here below,
What they not feel, must not be said to know.

(ll. 31–3)

The value of the ascent to angelic perspective for the poet and Lucasta is in their lack of knowledge of ‘the woes and discords’ below.

Stanley offered Lovelace, Hall, and others a Virgilian shade under which to shelter from Puritan rule and to sustain the supposedly endangered art of the lyric; the final poems of the 1649 Lucasta yearn to shut out the public world and escape with Lucasta to locations removed from the conflict and unstained by its blood—‘our whitest hill’, ‘the well ordered stately grove’, ‘her peacefull cave’. It is the tendency to escapist otium in the secluded rituals of lyric composition and translation practised by the Stanley circle that Hall apparently rejects with his declaration at the end of his 1647 Poems that he ‘will no more range sullen groves, to lie | Entombèd in a shade’. Hall had become convinced through his contact with the Hartlib circle and reading of Milton that the advancement of ‘general learning’, whether poetics or natural philosophy, must be a public concern rather than the monopoly of any ‘Private Conglobation’. We saw in Chapter 2 how in A true account and character of the times, published six months before Lucasta was licensed in February 1648, Hall sought to persuade his royalist literary friends such as Lovelace that the cause of learning would be best served by supporting the Independents’ proposals for a post-war settlement. There may be some indication in one of the lyrics most which most explicitly, if not transparently, engages with politics in Lucasta, ‘To Lucasta. From Prison. An Epode’, that Lovelace had been reading his friend’s pamphlet.

The dating of this poem has caused some consternation. Scholars have taken it for granted that it must have been written during one of Lovelace’s two periods of imprisonment: in May and June 1642 (and so at the same time as ‘To Althea, From Prison’) or between October 1648 and April 1649, when Lovelace was confined to Peterhouse ‘upon pretence of answering some matters contained in papers of his’ relating to the 1648 uprising in Kent.73 The argument for ascribing the poem to the second period of imprisonment rests in part on the syntactically ambiguous opening stanza:

73 The Oxinden and Peyton Letters, 1642–70, ed. Dorothy Gardiner (New York, 1937), 145.
Long in thy Shackels, liberty,
I ask not from these walls, but thee;
Left for a while anothers Bride
To fancy all the world beside.

(LP 48, ll. 1–4)

By the end of the first line it seems that it is ‘liberty’ which is being addressed and which has, paradoxically, shackled the poet; by the end of the second line it is clear that when the poet was physically free he was emotionally enchained to Lucasta. Imprisonment has given him the intellectual space to imagine a world without her. For the next ten stanzas the poet, twice shy after his experience with Lucasta, weighs the suitability of possible new ‘objects’ worthy of his devotion—‘Yet e’re I do begin to love, | See! How I all my objects prove’ (ll. 5–6). The poet considers the claims of ‘Peace’, ‘War’, ‘Religion’, ‘Parliament’, ‘Liberty’, ‘Property’, ‘Reformation’, and the ‘Publick Faith’ but either rejects or is rejected by them, declaring in the end the only ‘fit’ object which remains to be ‘The KING’. In this lyric Lucasta seems to be a real lover: the line ‘Left for a while anothers Bride’ makes sense only in the light of Anthony Wood’s account of how Lucy Sachaverel, whom Wood identifies as ‘Lux Casta’, ‘upon a strong report that Lovelace was dead of his wound received at Dunkirk, soon after married’. This would date the poem to sometime after the battle of Dunkirk ended in October 1646. Although he summarily dismissed Wood as unreliable, Wilkinson in the 1925 Clarendon edition ascribed the poem to Lovelace’s 1648–9 period of imprisonment, a dating repeated in subsequent selections of Lovelace’s verse. For Thomas Clayton the poem was ‘obviously written in 1649, because it alludes to the King’s beheading’.74 This argument for a post-regicide date for the poem rests on the rejection of Parliament as a ‘beheaded’ body in the sixth stanza:

I would love a Parliament
As a maine Prop from Heav’n sent;
But ah! Who’s he that would be wedded
To th’ fairest body that’s beheaded?

(LP 49, ll. 21–4)

As we saw in the last chapter, however, Lucasta was licensed for publication in February 1648 and it is unlikely that any of the poems, other than ‘Aramantha’, were written later than the date of licensing.

In making this point about the date of licensing in his review of Wilkinson’s edition, Margoliouth went on to argue that ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’ ‘almost certainly was written during the 1642 imprisonment’, claiming that there are echoes in the list of ‘objects’ to which the poet considers pledging himself of clauses in the Kentish Petition over which Lovelace was arrested. Moreover

74 LP, p. xlix. See e.g. Maclean (ed.), Ben Jonson and the Cavalier Poets, 312; Clayton (ed.), Cavalier Poets, 264.
the ‘Public Faith’ to which Lovelace refers in stanza ten—money borrowed ‘on faith’ by Parliament from public coffers—was ‘pledged by Parliament on June 10th 1642 when Lovelace was still in prison’. Hammond enthusiastically adopted Margoliouth’s hitherto ignored argument for the 1642 date, making the final stanzas of ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’ the foundation of his argument that Lovelace’s realization of the ‘futility’ of the whole Royalist cause’ began with the ‘humiliating experience of the Kentish petition’.75 Having exhausted his list of ‘objects’, the poet turns to ‘the KING’:

Since none of these can be
   Fit objects for my love and me;
What then remains, but th’only spring
   Of all our loves and joys? The KING.

He who being the whole ball
   Of day on Earth, lends it to all;
When seeking to eclipse his right,
   Blinded, we stand in our own light.

And now an universal mist
   Of error is spread o’er each breast,
With such a fury edged, as is
   Not found in th’inwards of th’abyss.

Oh, from thy glorious starry wain
   Dispense on me one sacred beam
To light me where I soon may see
   How to serve you, and you trust me.

(ll. 41–56)

Hammond emphasizes the universality of the mist and suggests that even the ‘stability of this image [of the king] is threatened as Lovelace sees the clouds obscuring the divine light of majesty’. Consequently ‘the import of the final stanza…is hard to determine’. While most scholars have rejected or been wary of Hammond’s wider argument, regarding the lyric rather as ‘undeniably royalist’ and a ‘reaffirmation of [Lovelace’s] commitment’ to the royalist cause, subsequent discussions of the poem have nonetheless accepted the argument that it was written during the 1642 imprisonment.76 ‘The exception is Nigel Smith, who considers the possible changes in meaning if the lyric is given a pre- or post-regicide dating. If the latter, Smith suggests that ‘the KING’ may be ‘God as Creator’ rather than Charles I; whoever the king may be, the ‘disturbance in the last four stanzas of the poem elides the figures of King Charles, God, and Lucasta’, to whom the poem is of course addressed. Wilcher comes closest to accepting Hammond’s position, locating the poem in the context of the

1642 imprisonment and seeing the ‘ambivalent apostrophe’ of the final stanza as perhaps a sign that ‘Charles’s apparent weakness’ had provoked in Lovelace ‘fundamental doubts about the viability of the Royalist cause itself’.77

The consensus that ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’ must have been written when Lovelace was in prison in 1642 rests on shaky foundations. It assumes first that the conceit of imprisonment must have a grounding in the reality being experienced by the poet at the moment of composition. But there are numerous examples of poems from this period which adopt the voice of an imprisoned speaker. The speaker of ‘The Royalist. Written in 1646’ by Lovelace’s friend Alexander Brome addresses his fellow prisoners, declaring ‘Though we’re in hold, let cups go free’. Brome was never imprisoned during the Civil Wars. Moreover, it is ‘often hard to tell whether poems of imprisonment derive from real experience or merely, say, the idea of the body as the prison of the soul’. Henry Vaughan addresses the first poem of *Thalia Rediviva* (1658) to ‘His Learned Friend and Loyal Fellow-Prisoner’ Thomas Powell, but neither Vaughan or Powell had any experience of gaol: Vaughan’s ‘imprisonment’ appears to mean ‘something more like exile or restraint’.78 As Hammond himself observes, imprisonment in ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’ is ‘more a metaphor than a reality’; the focus is overwhelmingly on the figurative shackles in which Lucasta has confined the speaker. Secondly, Margoliouth’s (unsubstantiated) claim that stanzas in Lovelace’s poem echo clauses of the 1642 Kentish petition does not stand up if one actually looks at the petition. Margoliouth connects, for example, the stanza on Parliament with clause seventeen, but it is hard to see even a general resemblance: ‘we beseech you to consider the sad Condition that we and the whole land are in, if a good Understanding be not speedily renewed between his Majesty and the Houses of Parliament’.79 References to Parliament’s abuse of the ‘public faith’ can be found throughout the 1640s, as is evident in Milton’s ‘Digression’ on the Long Parliament. Milton denounces the Presbyterian Parliament for its misuse of power in the aftermath of victory in the first civil war: ‘That faith which ought to be kept as sacred and inviolable as anything holy, the public faith, after infinite summs receiv’d & all the wealth of the church, not better imploy’d, but swallow’d up into a private gulfe, was not ere long asham’d to confess bankrupt’ (*CPWM* v/1. 445). In his sonnet ‘On the Lord General Fairfax at the Seige of Colchester’, written in July/August 1648, Milton similarly declares that the ‘public faith’ needs to be ‘cleared from the shameful brand | Of public fraud’ if Fairfax’s bravery is to mean anything (*MPS* 325, ll. 12–13). Thirdly and finally, the 1642 date can offer no explanation for the line ‘Left for a while another’s bride’, which Margoliouth acknowledged was ‘puzzling’.

78 Brome’s poem, which is indebted to Lovelace’s ‘To Althea, from Prison’, is included in Davidson (ed.), *Poetry and Revolution*, 422–3; Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing*, 136.
Lovelace categorizes ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’ as an ‘epode’ and this generic classification points us towards the period between Lovelace’s return to England at the end of 1646 and the licensing of *Lucasta* in early 1648 as the period in which it was composed. Horace’s epodes were written at the critical moment in Rome’s history when the Civil War ended the Republic; they bridge the earlier Satires and the later Odes in their sometimes uneasy combination of the lyrical and the satirical. In its mixture of lyric complaint about Lucasta and satirical survey of the state of civil war England, Lovelace’s poem alludes to Horace’s fifteenth and sixteenth epodes. In the fifteenth episode Horace ‘complains of the broken faith of one Neaera, who had abandoned him for a wealthier rival’; the sixteenth ode is the best known, in which the poet ‘describes the threatened ruin of Rome by civil wars: ‘this city we shall ourselves destroy, an impious age whose blood is doomed, and again wild beasts shall be the lords of the soil. A conqueror and a barbarian, alas! Shall trample on our ashes’. Civility and humanity have been destroyed by a bestial barbarism. Indeed Horace goes on in the sixteenth ode to exhort ‘his countrymen to bind themselves by oath to a voluntary and perpetual exile’. There is no mention of voluntary exile in Lovelace’s poem, but the Horatian subtext indicates that ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’ was written in the aftermath of royalist defeat, after Lovelace had returned from the continent (and discovered the real Lucasta’s broken faith). It also suggests that behind the despairing final plea for guidance is the poet’s sense that he will once again have to exile himself, and perhaps permanently this time, from an England dominated by a triumphant Puritanism.

The imagery of looming, obscuring cloud and enveloping darkness in ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’—the ‘universal mist | Of error’—is, as we have seen, a feature of two poems that Lovelace certainly wrote in 1647. The commendatory poem for the Beaumont and Fletcher folio fears, with the court dispersed and the theatres closed, ‘That now (to spread a darkness over all) | Nothings remains but poesie to fall;’ while in ‘To My Worthy Friend Mr Peter Lely’ the looming cloud of war behind Charles and the Duke of York in Lely’s painting provides the key image of ‘clouded majesty’ in the poem. In Lovelace’s post-war verse imagery of mist, clouds, and darkness is a motif of defeat and, as I have argued in this chapter, of the eclipse of the life-giving warmth of court patronage. In ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’ the ‘universal mist’ emerges from ‘th’ inwards of th’ abyss’, invoking the ‘bottomless pit’ of Revelation 9: 2–3: ‘And he opened the bottomless pit, as the smoke of a great furnace pit; and the sun and the air were darkened by reason of the smoke of the pit. And there came out of the smoke locusts upon the earth: and unto them was given power, as the scorpions of the earth have power.’ Civil war England becomes an apocalyptic landscape, as the ‘wild beasts’ of Horace’s epode are merged with the locusts and scorpions of Revelation. It was common in Reformation biblical
commentary to see the apocalyptic locusts of Revelation, as well as the locusts of Exodus 10 who were one of the plagues visited upon the Egyptians and who ‘covered the face of the whole earth, so that the land was darkened’, as a ‘figure for worldly ministers, spiritually deformed and corrupted by devouring greed and false learning’.81 In April 1646 Sir Cheney Culpeper lumped together the ‘Papall, Episcopall, Presbyteriall’ clergy as ‘Locustes’ who feed off the people through suppression and exploitation; in _A true account_ Hall dismisses the Parliamentary sequestrators, under whom Lovelace had suffered, as ‘a vermine which might well make a seventh plague in Ægypt’.82 As Thomas Browne points out in *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* (1646), the English tended to mistranslate the Latin _cicada_ as ‘grasshopper’ and so confused two different insects: the cicada was an insect not found in England.83 The ‘grasshopper’ in Lovelace’s poem to Cotton (and Stanley’s translation of Anacreon) is certainly the classical insect which is an emblem of the pleasures of drink, friendship, and the lyrical poet rather than the biblical locust. In his other poems of 1647, and particularly ‘The Grasshopper’, the anacreontic values of friendship and artistic association—whether with the literary patron Cotton, the consummate painter Lely, or the poets of the Stanley circle as assembled in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio—are figured as pockets of light amid the enveloping darkness of Puritan philistinism. In ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’, however, the poet calls despairingly for just ‘one sacred beam | To light me where I soon may see | How to serve you, and you trust me.’ The apocalyptic darkness that arises from the bottomless pit is about to envelop the poet.

Who then is the ‘you’ to whom the poet pleads? Two stanzas earlier the poet had declared ‘the KING’ to be ‘the whole ball | Of day on Earth’—in other words the sun. This is a conventional image for the monarch but the biblical allusions—very rare in Lovelace, apparently the least religious of poets—add substance to Nigel Smith’s speculation that ‘the KING’ may be God. But, as Smith notes, God cannot be eclipsed; this must rather be ‘clouded majesty’ of the defeated Charles described in ‘To My Worthy Friend Mr Peter Lely’. Yet the poem is addressed ‘To Lucasta’: logically Lucasta must be the ‘you’ in the final stanza. If so, then the poet has come full circle from his rejection of Lucasta’s ‘shackles’ in the opening lines: the alternatives to Lucasta are all found inadequate and the poet finally yearns to return to the unfaithful lover whose hold over him he despises. The reference to ‘thy glorious Starry Waine’ heightens the ambivalence: this could be the seven brightest stars in Ursa Major known as ‘Charles’s Wain’, as most editors

83 See Edwards, ‘Days of the Locust’, for illuminating discussion of Browne’s comments. Edwards suggests that Lovelace may deliberately call the Anacreontic cicada a ‘grasshopper’ in a gesture of defiance against Parliamentarian images of rapacious Cavaliers (244).
suggest—a common pun in royalist writing at the time—or it could be Lucasta, who is called ‘that bright Northerne star’ in ‘Amyntor from Beyond the Sea to Alexis’. The epode as a poetic genre is split between lyric and satire, between public and private modes: this ‘ambivalent apostrophe’ conveys Lovelace’s sense of waiting for a sign that will show him whether he will be able re-enter public service under a monarch who has been defeated, captured, and humiliated, or must exile himself from a ravaged, Puritan-dominated public world and retire into the private affairs of love and lyric.

Charles kept his supporters guessing about what the post-war world would look like for most of 1647 while he weighed up the proposals for a settlement from the Presbyterians and the Army and tried to play the two sides off against each other. Herrick’s ‘To the King, Upon his Welcome to Hampton Court’ conveys more directly and in more positive terms this royalist sense of waiting for a sign from the heavens: Herrick has (seemingly) no doubt that the new Caroline court will soon be founded. By contrast the situation which Lovelace found on his return to England, with the court dissolved and the king the prisoner of first the Scots and then the Parliamentary Army, seems to have left him fundamentally uncertain about the future of not only the Stuart cause but also the nation’s public life. Another contrast with the plaintive last stanza of ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’ is Edward Sherburne’s dedicatory preface to Charles of his translation of Seneca’s Answer to Lucius his quaere: why good men suffer misfortunes seeing there is a divine providence?, published in 1648 after the end of the second civil war: ‘Sir, whilst the times are such, that they deny me according to my particular Duty to serve the just Commands of Your Majesties Will, I presume (though by so mean a Demonstration) to shew Your Majesty that yet I have a Will to serve You’ (3–4). While Sherburne can no longer fight for an imprisoned king, as he did in the first civil war, he sees his literary efforts as testimony to his will to serve. The speaker of Lovelace’s poem is unable to ‘see | How to serve you’: Lovelace does not seem to have regarded lyric verse as a substitute for political or military service.

In A true account, published in August 1647, John Hall sought to convince his friends among the royalist literati such as Lovelace and Stanley, and perhaps also Marvell, that the king’s acceptance of the Heads of the Proposals and an alliance with the Independents would regenerate public and cultural life in England. As we saw in the last chapter, Hall explicitly appeals to a royalist audience in the opening sections of the pamphlet, writing that when ‘the government of the Kingdome removed from White-hall to Westminster...[n]ow began the whole frame of State to bee taken in peeces: but it is easie for a child to discompose a Watch, but tantum non impossible to set it right againe’ (2). In ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’ the poet considers and rejects ‘Reformation’ as a fit object of devotion using the same image of a watch taken apart by those who lack the knowledge to make it work again:
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A Reformation I would have,
As for our griefs a Sov’reign salve;
That is, a cleansing of each wheel
Of State, that yet some rust doth feel.

But not a Reformation so,
As to reform were to o’erthrow;
Like watches by unskilful men
Disjointed, and set ill again.

(ll. 29–36)

Lovelace continues the watch-making metaphor when he asks two stanzas later: ‘What then remains, but th’ only spring | Of all our loves and joys? The KING’ (ll. 43–4). The king is both the source of his subjects’ love and joy and the crucial part which makes the whole mechanism of state work properly. Lovelace anticipates the most famous use in the period of the analogy between the workings of the body politic and the mechanics of a watch, in the first page of the introduction to Thomas Hobbes’s *Leviathan* (1651): ‘why may we not say, that all *Automata* (Engines that move themselves by springs and wheels as doth a watch) have an artificial life? For what is the *Heart*, but a *Spring*; and the *Nerves*, but so many *Strings*; and the Joynes, but so many *Wheels*’. The use by Lovelace and Hall of the same watch-making image to describe the state of civil war England would seem to be more than a coincidence given that the two were friends and both central members of Stanley’s literary circle in London in the summer of 1647. David Norbrook notes Hall’s use of the image and suggests it implies that the ‘process of reintegrating the nation then was a mechanical rather than an organic one, involving a careful balancing of opposing interests’.84 If Hall picked up the metaphor from reading Lovelace’s unpublished verse, then it reveals how closely Hall tailored his argument for the complementary interests of the king’s party and the Independents to an audience among his friends in Stanley’s circle. Hall doubtless expected Lovelace to recognize the image. If Lovelace took the image from Hall, then we can date ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’ to sometime between August 1647 and the licensing of *Lucasta* in February 1648. But this would also mean that Hall’s argument for reintegration of the state through ‘the balancing of interests’ had not persuaded Lovelace, who in this lyric is on the verge of despairing not only of the future of the royalist cause but also of his own role in a post-war English culture and society; while in poems such as ‘The Grasshopper’, ‘Calling Lucasta From Her Retirement’, and the (probably) post-1649 ‘Aramantha’ he shuns a chaotic and philistine society for the retired civility of drink, verse, and friendship.

In November 1647 Charles escaped from Hampton Court to the Isle of Wight, claiming to fear a Leveller plot on his life; confined by the Army to Carisbrooke Castle, he signed the Engagement with the Scots agreeing to establish Presbyterianism in England for a trial three-year period if the Scottish army returned him to power. By the spring of 1648 the second civil war had broken out and John Hall had re-entered the world of controversial print, but now as the writer of a Parliamentarian newsbook. He continued to address his Cavalier friends, but adopted a more satirical rhetoric to persuade them of the consequences of a Scottish victory and rouse them from the reveries of drink and disillusionment that sometimes envelop Lovelace’s verse. Yet Hall also continued to contribute verse to the literary enterprises of these friends, appearing alongside Marvell in 1649 in both Lovelace’s *Lucasta* and Richard Brome’s collection of elegies, *Lachrymae Musarum*. Hall’s declarations of allegiance to the Parliamentary side in the second civil war, and even his employment as a propagandist by the Commonwealth government in the immediate aftermath of regicide, did not break the bonds forged with Stanley and his circle in the mid-1640s.
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ALLEGIANCES, ANTICLERICALISM, AND
THE CAVALIER ETHOS

John Hall’s arguments for a royalist-Independent alliance against the Presbyterians in the late summer of 1647 were anticipated and probably influenced not only by his reading of Milton but also by Marchamont Nedham. Nedham (1620–78) had been at Oxford in the mid-1630s and was a clerk at Gray’s Inn when he became in 1643 the founding editor, with Thomas Audley, of the Parliamentary newsbook Mercurius Britannicus. This newsbook was commissioned to respond to the popular success of the royalists’ Mercurius Aulicus, based in Oxford and edited mostly by John Berkenhead. Nedham took full responsibility for Britannicus from October 1644 and became increasingly outspoken in his personal attacks on the king and queen, to the point where he was imprisoned by his own side in May 1646 for suggesting (indirectly but unmistakably) that Charles was a tyrant who should be held to account for the blood shed in the war.1 Nedham was quickly released on condition that he stopped publishing; but in July he issued Independencie No Schisme, in which he attacked the Presbyterian clergy and apologized for Independency in terms that closely anticipate Hall’s A true account a year later. Nedham argues in this pamphlet for the moral virtues and practical benefits of religious toleration, identifies the Presbyterian drive for religious uniformity with the episcopal tyranny against which the Presbyterians themselves revolted, applauds the moderation of the Independents’ 1643 manifesto, the Apologetical Narration, and pours scorn on the Presbyterian here-siographies, particularly Edwards’s Gangraena, as ‘Tales of a Cock and Bull’ (10). His ad hominem attacks display his distaste for the Presbyterian clergy through animalistic imagery: John Vicars is ‘this Paper-worme, this great Benefactor to the Magazine of Wast-paper’ (sig. A2v). There are also passages reminiscent

of the more dynamic vision of *Areopagitica* in Nedham’s defence of liberty of conscience, although he also sounds like the emergent Levellers, with whom he had some contact in 1646:

> it hath pleased God to stir up mens hearts wonderfully at present, to search the Scripture themselves, to take upon them to question, reason cases, and *try spirits*, and not to pin their soules and understandings upon Presbyters slaues now, as they were wont to do upon the Prelates...we see no reason why mens consciences should be burdened with outward ordinances, or that they should be bound to this or that opinion in carnal formalities, which they cannot be perswaded of, and perhaps can allledge evidence from the Word for the contrary. (3)²

However arguments of reason of state rather than spiritual advancement finally underpin Nedham’s discussion. It is ‘meerly Prudential’ that Parliament holds ‘chief power’ over the matter of religious government rather than any clerical party, whether prelatical or Presbyterian, with their unprovable and self-interested claims to *jure divino* authority (8).

Nedham’s imprisonment by Parliament apparently prompted him to reconsider his political allegiance. *The Case of the Kingdom Stated* addresses pre-eminently the royalist interest. When Thomason collected the pamphlet on 12 June 1647, the king had just been moved to Hampton Court and was continuing his negotiations with the Presbyterians on the one hand and the Army on the other. Nedham advises Charles to accept the *Heads of the Proposals*, for the Independents will leave civil government ‘wholly in the hands of the Magistrate’ while the Presbyterians will ‘borrow...so much from the Magistrate, as will enable them to *compell* mens consciences’ (3). Nedham’s pamphlet is notable for its innovative analysis of the current political situation in terms of the interests of competing factions and its claim to dispassionate investigation into how those factional interests can best be balanced—a theory of interest derived from Guicciardini by way of the Hugenot rebel the Duc de Rohan and his *De l’interest des princes & des Etats* (1634).³ The Independents are presented as ‘the *ballancing* power betwixt’ the king and the Army because they ask only for liberty of conscience and will allow ‘Bishops and their Clergie, with all that are for the Liturgie and that Government’, as long as the episcopacy is not given powers of compulsion (4). Presbyterians, however, will wreck the balance of power by making that ‘Ridiculous plea for a *Jus Divinum* with *Compulsive* power’ and will seek to ‘mingle *Interests* with *State* or the *Prince*...then whosoever shall presume to move the one, must shake the other, and presently incurr the *brand* of seditious disturbers of *States* and *Kingdomes*’ (4, 10). Nedham is keen here to ensure that anticlericalism is not confused with sedition. An immediate attack entitled *Anti-Machiavell* (1647) was launched on Nedham’s arguments

---

² Worden ascribes at least part of an anonymous pamphlet in defence of the Levellers published in November 1646, *Vox Plebis*, to Nedham (‘“Wit in a Roundhead”’, 320).
³ Ibid. 317–18; Tuck, *Philosophy and Government*, 38–9, 91.
about interest and this was a shrewd assessment, for these pamphlets reveal what Jeffrey R. Collins describes as Nedham’s ‘Machiavellian sense of the deep political importance and dangers of religion. A conviction that state-dominated religion, freed from clerical authority, was critical to political stability alienated Nedham from both episcopal and Presbyterian factions’ and drew him towards the ‘Erastian implications of Congregationalist ecclesiology’. The ‘struggle to secure state authority over religion’ is seen by Collins as ‘the one constant of Nedham’s career’, which was notoriously marked by a series of abrupt switches of political allegiance. The first of these came in September 1647 when Nedham went to Hampton Court to beg the forgiveness of the king for his Parliamentarian past; in the same month he began the royalist newsbook Mercurius Pragmaticus, which he edited until he was arrested by Parliament in June 1649. The second came in the summer of 1650, when Nedham was employed as editor of the Commonwealth’s official newsbook, Mercurius Politicus.

One of the distinctive aspects of Nedham’s polemical strategies in Britanicus had been his claim that the royalists’ deceptions and self-deluding fantasies about their successes in the war were an anachronistic and incongruous continuation of the aesthetic principles of Caroline literary culture. Britanicus mocked Aulicus as a woeful spectacle and object of dullness and tribulation, not to be recovered by the Protestant or Catholique liquor, either Ale or strong beer, or Sack, or Claret, or Hippocras, or Muscadine, or Rosasolis, which hath been reputed formerly by his Grand Father Ben Johnson, and his Uncle Shakespeare, and his Couzen Ger mains Fletcher and Beaumont, and nose-less Davenant, and Frier Sherley the Poets, the onely blossoms for the brain, the restoratives for the wit, the bathing of the wine muses, but none of these are now able either to warme him into a quibble, or to inflame him into a sparkle of invention[.] This passage hits its mark by indirect association as much as direct attack: Aulicus’s supposed polemical wit is connected with excessive boozing in the list of increasingly exotic drinks and the weak but nonetheless amusing pun on the ‘wine muses’, while royalism is associated with both sexual disease (‘nose-less Davenant’) and Catholicism (‘Frier Sherley’) in the one-word descriptions of Aulicus’s literary ancestors. In a sense Britanicus was right to trace the ancestry of royalist propaganda to Laudian court culture and to Jonson and his ‘tribe’ of acolytes: Berkenhead had been part of William Cartwright’s circle at Oxford and it was Oxford Laudians who had commemorated Jonson in Jonsonus Virbius in 1638 who were at the forefront of royalist propaganda. Berkenhead was a friend of Shirley who, as we have seen, turned the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647 into an assertion of the persistence of court culture in the absence of a court.

6 The point is made by Thomas, Sir John Berkenhead, 102, although Thomas is perhaps a little quick to accept Nedham’s characterization of royalist literary culture as more interested in fantasy than truth.
At the same time Nedham’s identification of royalist literary taste, in particular for Jonsonian drama and verse, with a Catholic religious sensibility and a delusional politics was a rhetorical tactic that was forced on him. Royalist polemicists repeatedly invoked the long-standing dramatic stereotype, which can be traced back at least to *Zeal-of-the-Land Busy* in Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), of the Puritan as witless philistine. *Mecurius Anti-Britanicus*, published in three parts in August 1645 and the work of Berkenhead in collaboration with John Cleveland, exemplifies the royalist appropriation of ‘wit’. ‘Were I to say [Britanicus] hath a good wit (as to speak ingenuously I never knew a worse) yet to prostitute it to the recreation of a herd of readers . . . is to defile and strumpet one of the greatest ornaments God and nature have bestowed upon us; and to make wit, which was born to rule, the fool and jester of the people.’ For Berkenhead and Cleveland, ‘the first article of faith is that royalists have a sort of divine right’ to wit and eloquence: this notion, ‘which rests on certain assumptions about class and education, is one that became an increasingly active force in Cavalier prose and poetry in the 1640s and 1650s’. The fact that *Britanicus* with its single ‘n’ was itself a misspelling (presumably the fault of Audley rather than the Oxford-educated Nedham) had been seized on by *Aulicus* as evidence of Roundhead illiteracy. The author of *Britanicus Valpulans* (1643) advised Nedham that ‘your party for which you are hired for a Mercurian angel a weeke to write, are as I take it a kinde of rigid, heavy, phlegmaticke or melancholy, not witty, but dull complexioned creatures, creatures full of fears, full of jealousies, full of darke plots and invisible conspiracies, of Close Committees, or Orders and Speeches, and such serious follies, full of any thing but wit’. *Britanicus* may lay claim to wit, but the notion of ‘Wit in a Roundhead’ is ‘monstrous’, simply a contradiction in terms (2–3).

*Britanicus* here is reduced to the stock images of the Puritan familiar from the theatre—Shakespeare’s Malvolio, Jonson’s Busy. But this was, as Blair Worden observes, ‘a palpable hit’: Nedham ‘wrote for the Puritan cause’ in *Britanicus* and so adopted, or had to adopt, its anti-theatrical, anti-festive, and moralistic stance. Consequently Nedham cedes drama and poetry to royalism—‘wit’ in the sense of inventive literary talent—when he identifies *Aulicus* with Stuart literary culture: Berkenhead would hardly have been upset to be associated with his literary heroes Jonson, Beaumont, and Fletcher, and his friend Shirley. However in *Mercurius Pragmaticus* Nedham was free to adopt precisely the tactics of the anti-Puritan polemic which had been aimed against *Britanicus*, mocking in his opening pages the dullness of the Roundheads, whose ‘Bags must be made as empty as their Noddles, ere they learne wit’, and the barbarism of the Scots with their ‘Presbytery and Bagpipes’. Each issue of *Pragmaticus* was introduced by satirical verses which repeatedly ridiculed the Presbyterians and the Scots—scornfully.

---

called the ‘saints’, the ‘brethren’, and the ‘Jockies’.\(^8\) In Pragmaticus Nedham could freely display his interest in Jonsonian drama: he characterizes the Army leaders as ‘resolved to follow the example of Catiline in Ben Jonson’ and gives them lines from Catiline’s opening speech: ‘The ills which we have done cannot be safe, | But by attempting greater.’\(^9\) Anthony Wood tells us that Pragmaticus was ‘very witty, satirical against the Presbyterians, and full of loyalty’, making Nedham ‘known to, and admired by, the bravadoes and wits of those times’.\(^10\) The king’s engagement with the Scots and agreement to introduce state Presbyterianism, made public in February, did not stop Nedham from continuing his weekly attacks on the hypocrisy and avarice of the ‘saints’. Although the Scots and Presbyterians were now supposedly on his own side, Nedham rejected the notion of their good faith in the most virulent terms. The magnificent invective has the passion of true hatred:

And what else can we expect from our Presbyterian Jewes of the City, but they mean to crucifie our King afresh with their Faction, when they have set it up again, seeing they are in no wise active for the Royall Interest of his Majestie... This will appear very evident, if we consider with what a whorish impudence, their sister-Kirk of Scotland advances her forehead against the Estates of the Realme: who cannot proceed to any Publique Judgement, but they are scolded out of it by the furious cot-queanes of Presbyterie, who make no more of the Parliament-robes than of a dish cloth, and keep them but to serve for the Drudgery of the Generall Assembly. And therefore it is, in despight of the Parliamentary resolutions, they have issued forth Orders to the Pulpitier-jockies, which ride the people in their severall Presbyteries, that they shall charm the Consciences of their Auditories against the present Design of Parliament, and like true Boanerges of the Kirk, levell their Thunderbolts against all such as shall presume to be obedient to their Civill Governors.\(^11\)

As this extract from the issue of 16 May 1648 makes very clear, Nedham had not changed his mind since his pamphlets of 1647 about the incompatibility of Presbyterianism and civil government, whether monarchical or Parliamentary.

On the same day that this issue of Pragmaticus was published, John Hall launched Mercurius Britannicus Alive Again, which appeared for sixteen issues from May to August. According to John Davies, his Cambridge friend and fellow recipient of Stanley’s patronage, Hall began the newsbook because the royalist ‘wits’—presumably men like Nedham, Berkenhead, Cleveland, and Samuel Sheppard, who in February had revived Mercurius Aulicus—were winning the propaganda battle:

[Britanicus] came abroad in a conjecture of time when the affections of the City were extremely retrograde, absolutely alienated from an adored Parliament to a persecuted King, whose cause was devoted from Arms to Pens. The wits of the ruin’d party have

---

\(^8\) Worden, ‘“Wit in a Roundhead”’, 308–9; Mercurius Pragmaticus (14–21 Sept. 1647), 1–3.

\(^9\) Mercurius Pragmaticus (9 Nov. 1647), 63.


\(^11\) Mercurius Pragmaticus (23 May 1648), [2–3].
their secret *Clubs*, these hatched *Mercuries, Satyres*, and *Pasquinado’s*, that travelled up and down the streets with so much impunity, that the poor weekly *Hackneyes*, durst dare hardly communicate the ordinary Intelligence. This was the true state of affairs when *Mr Hall* made that appearance for the State, not disconsonant to his former principles, even in the University, which were sufficiently anti-monarchicall, and subservient to the interests of a Common-wealth.12

The reference to Hall’s desire to serve ‘the interests of a Common-wealth’, although written after Hall’s death and so in the retrospective light of his work for the post-regicide governments, chimes with the development of Hall’s ideas in his correspondence with Hartlib: indeed in the last extant letter, written from Gray’s Inn three months before he launched *Britanicus*, he assures Hartlib that he will ‘not faile to be (where I am able) subservient to the Com[m]onwealth of l[ette]rs’.13 But *Britanicus* in this analysis is also Hall’s attempt to assert the possibility of wit in a Roundhead. The decision to retain the infamous misspelling of *Britanicus* suggests that Hall was responding directly to Nedham’s change of allegiance, reminding Nedham and everybody else who knew about Nedham’s authorship that only two years earlier *Pragmaticus* had espoused the principles of *Britanicus*. It seems likely that Hall and Nedham knew each other by this point, given Nedham’s close connections with Gray’s Inn, where Hall had enrolled the previous year. Worden observes that ‘Hall’s writings resemble Nedham’s so often and so much, and reproduce or anticipate the idiosyncrasies of his prose so frequently, that the two authors can be indistinguishable. There must have been intimate friendship and co-operation between them.’ It has been assumed that this ‘intimate friendship and co-operation’ dates from 1650, when Nedham joined Hall as a salaried apologist for the Commonwealth. But Worden suggests it began earlier, when they were ostensibly on opposing sides: ‘[Hall’s] *Britanicus* and Nedham’s *Pragmaticus* appeared on the same day of the week and its editors evidently colluded—in what must have been entertaining conversations—to present diametrically opposed viewpoints.’14

Worden cites as evidence of this collusion the issues of *Britanicus* and *Pragmaticus* published on 13 June 1648 in which Hall and Nedham both invoke Roman history to present contrasting images of the radical MP and future regicide Henry Marten, who had been expelled from the Commons in 1643 for suggesting that it was better the Stuarts should perish than the whole nation—the sort of comment for which Nedham himself was imprisoned in 1646. For *Britanicus*, Marten is ‘our English Brutus, that durst in the beginning of these times speak more than others could, and whose continued endeavours ever since hath made the noble love he bore his country sufficiently appear’. *Pragmaticus* presents Marten not as a hero acting against tyranny but as a

12 ‘An Account of the Author’, in Hierocles, sig. b3’.
13 Hall to Hartlib, 8 Feb. 1648, HP 60/14/20A–21B.
14 Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England, 76.
treasonous conspirator motivated by personal ambition: ‘having played Catiline in the senate, he means to trace him in his tragedy’. This, Worden argues, was a ‘prearranged’ confrontation. Even given Nedham’s earlier career as a Parliamentarian propagandist and his future career as editor of the Commonwealth’s newsbook, it is a startling challenge to our preconceptions about ‘sides’ in the propaganda wars of the 1640s to imagine Nedham and Hall having an editorial meeting before they went to press with newsbooks attacking each other.

Yet there is one crucial point of agreement: Nedham’s Pragmaticus and Hall’s Britanicus speak the same vehemently anticlerical and anti-Presbyterian language. Given the arguments Hall put forward in 1647 in his first ventures into public controversy in A true account and (perhaps) The Presbyterians Letany, the very real threat that a persecutory Presbyterian church government could be imposed upon England must have played a major part in persuading him to re-enter the world of polemical print and declare his allegiance to Parliament. Few on Parliament’s side would have known the workings of the Cavalier mind as well as Hall; and from the beginning he sought to address an audience of royalist wits and remind them of the potential consequences of the king’s alliance with the Scots and the Presbyterians. As in A true account he invokes the Egyptian plagues in Exodus, describing the ‘Jockeys’ as ‘Grasshoppers’ who ‘would bring in their Lice and Presbytery once more amongst us . . . Goths and Vandalls, come, if they could, to over-run us once more . . . a People that have left us as ugly and hideous a memory behind them, as the Frogs, Lice, and Flyes ever did among the Egyptians . . . catapillars, things good for nothing but destruction’. As we saw in the last chapter, Lovelace alludes to the biblical locusts in ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’ to convey his sense of the devastation of English civility by the wars. As in Cleveland’s ‘The Rebel Scot’, Hall presents the Scots in animalistic images and as savages, their skin ‘so tassled and characterized by the injuries of the Weather, as if they were no other, but their ancestors the Picts again’. In language which recalls the characterization of the dull and heavy Roundhead in Britanicus Vapulans, Hall describes the Presbyterians as a ‘rabble blacker and more hideous, than can ever be in the most melancholike and depraved fancies’. But if the influence of royalist anti-Puritan polemic is consistently apparent in Hall’s Britanicus, so is that of Milton’s prose. Hall cites the Presbyterians’ efforts to use licensing laws to impose morality and orthodoxy as indicative of the violently repressive clerical tyranny that they seek to establish: ‘for were this New-Atlanticall, Utopian advice once followed, no sooner should an honest man open his mouth and speke, but he should be hit in the teeth and be forced to be quiet’. The allusion,
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15 Ibid. 111–13; Mercurius Britannicus (13 June 1648), 35; Mercurius Pragmaticus (13 June 1648), 7.
16 Mercurius Britannicus (8 June 1648), 29; (27 June 1648), 52; (18 July 1648), 73–6.
17 The influence of Areopagitica is noted by Norbrook, Writing the English Republic, 175; while Norbrook lays more emphasis on what he identifies as the ‘distinctively republican associations’ of Hall’s language, he similarly sees the newsbook as leaving ‘open the way for a common cause between Independents and royalists against Presbyterians’ (176–7).
which somewhat contradicts Hall’s interest of 1646–7 in the utopian societies of Bacon, Campanella, and Andreae, is to Milton’s discussion in *Areopagitica* of how the desire to regulate printing according to a religious or moral code is a hopeless desire to ‘sequester out of the world into Atlantick and Eutopian polities’ because it would logically also entail the regulation of behaviour and conversation; Milton compares Plato’s stipulation that poets should be banished from his ideal republic (*CPWM* ii. 526). Significantly this passage in *Areopagitica* leads into Milton’s pivotal defence of rational choice and free will (‘reason is but choosing’) against Calvinist theology.

The characteristic use of Milton reminds us that Hall is certainly not suggesting a return to the pre-war status quo. It is true that Hall says little about the thorny issue of the person of the king in *Britanicus*, and this is doubtless part of his strategy to open up a channel of communication with a royalist audience. Indeed he is keen to present the Army as protecting the king’s dignity. In response to complaints about the lack of sightings of Charles since his imprisonment in Carisbrooke Castle, Hall speaks in the theatrical language of royalism, although the allusion implicitly emphasizes Charles’s miserable condition: ‘Would you have him carried up and down (as *Tamburlaine* did Bajazeth) to shew the people?’ (Significantly Hall has just referred in the previous line to Cromwell, who is thus implicitly identified with Tamburlaine.) But Hall does accuse the Presbyterians of seeking to re-establish the episcopal tyranny that led to war in the first place and much of the first issue of *Britanicus* is spent attacking the clerics who speak and write for the royalist cause: ‘those that are distinguished by their Beards and Cassocks, your Exorcists that binde and loose you with the charm of conscience; those that command you as Conjurors doe Spirits, with the force that you give unto them’. In the issue of *Pragmaticus* that was published on the same day, Nedham uses exactly the same image in lamenting that both ‘governors’ and ‘the people’ are ‘affronted by every ranting Presbyter, that raves within his pulpit like a Conjurer in his circle, and dares first raise the Divell with false Doctrine’.18 Were Nedham and Hall collaborating on *Britanicus* from the beginning, as friends divided by (current) political allegiance but united in their determination to prevent clerical power from usurping the civil government? And was their shared anticlericalism finally more powerful than their allegiance to either royalist or Parliamentarian politics? The two were certainly agreed in their contempt for what they regarded as the hypocritical moralism and religiosity of the Presbyterians, whom they both believed would not only impose a foreign (as in Scottish) and tyrannical form of church government on the English people, but also suppress the circulation of ideas and the exercise of wit.

It was an easy polemical tactic for Hall to point out the glaring contradiction in the king’s policy of alliance with the Scots and Presbyterians. He seems to have also written the three issues of *Mercurius Censorius* which appeared in June

18 *Britanicus* (16 May 1648), 2, 7; *Pragmaticus* (16 May 1648), [3].
1648—apparently, as we shall see, as a way of defending himself in the third person against personal attacks from those who knew he was behind *Britanicus*. In the first issue he put the incongruity of their situation to the Cavaliers in the plainest terms: ‘It seemes you are resolved to swallow the *Nationall League*, and gladly entertain those things which (if you have not deceived your friends) ye have all this while fought against, the *Scotticismes* of the *Presbyteriall Government* and the *Covenant*. *Britanicus* and *Censorius* offered wise counsel from a friend, Hall insisted, wiser than the royalists got from their own side. While Hall admits *Mercurius Elenticus* is popular with his friends among the ‘silly madcaps of *Greisinne*’—he might be thinking of Alexander Brome, who had joined Hall at Gray’s Inn in 1648—‘there are some that wish the Cavaleers better than *Elenticus*, and would give you better counsel, if they would hearken to it...promote not the *Interests*, which if you would examine, you would find unjustifiable’.19 Hall’s style in the newsbooks is characterized by satirical exposure of the incongruity of an alliance between the (outwardly) morally zealous Presbyterians and the Cavaliers with their fondness for wine, women, and song. Hall is playing on the stereotype of the Cavalier but so did the Cavaliers themselves: friends of Hall such as Herrick, Lovelace, and Alexander Brome appropriated the polemical image of the wastrel Cavalier and refracted through it the more erudite anacreontic values of the good life. But the drinking among members of the Stanley circle seems not to have been merely a literary motif. In ‘To his worthy friend M. John Hall’ Herrick alluded to their practice of combining verse and drink and Alexander Brome addressed a poem ‘To his Friend J. H.’ on the poetic inspiration provoked by drinking cider. Hall writes in his first issue with the relish of someone who knows intimately the habits of those he addresses:

Consider, consider (Knights and Gentlemen such as ye are) it if it be good for you to runne all these dangers and make such hazard and endeavours to be a second time routed. Were it not better for you to eschew all these Inconveniencies and timely contain yourselves at your Clubs, and there under the *Rose* vent all your set forms of execrations against the Parliament and the Army (who care as much as the *Grand Seigneure* does for the curses of drunken *Germaine Fryers*) and then like *Persians* consult in your drink of your great affairs and speak of such attempts as in cold blood next morning you would dread to think on[?] This were the fittest employment for your Degeneracies, and if you want any Rulers, sixe beer-glasses of Sack brings the King and all his Progeny unto you; and the glasses inverted in a *Grecian* health represents you with those lovely Idaeas of your Mistresses and Whores[.]

The phrase ‘showers of old Greeke’ in Lovelace’s ‘The Grasshopper’ refers, as we have seen, to both the practice of translating Anacreon in the Stanley circle and the ancient Greek drinking ritual described by George Sandys, the great uncle of both Lovelace and Stanley: ‘those were proverbially said to Greeke it, that
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19 *Mercurius Censorius. Or, Newes from the Isle of Wight* (1 June 1648), 4; (8 June 1648), 15–[16].
Marvell and the End of Court Culture

quaf in that fashion'. The phrase ‘those lovely Idaeas of your Mistresses’ recalls Herrick’s ‘To His Lovely Mistresses’, printed in *Hesperides*, in which the poet asks that ‘One night i’ th’ year, my dearest beauties, come | And bring those dew-drink offerings to my tomb.’ (ll. 1–2). Hall may also be thinking of the attitude exhibited in poems such as Brome’s ‘The Royalist. Written in 1646’, which like most of Brome’s verse was not published until after the Restoration:

We do not suffer here alone,
Though we are beggar’d, so’s the King,
’Tis sin I have wealth, when he has none,
Tush! poverty’s a *Royal* thing!

When we are *larded* well with drink,
Our *heads* shall turn as round as theirs,
Our *feet* shall rise, our bodies sink
Clean down the wind, like *Cavaliers*.

Fill this unnatural *quart* with *sack*,
Nature all vacuums doth decline,
Ourselves will be a *Zodiac*,
And every month shall be a sign.
Me thinks the *Travels* of the glasses,
Are circular like *Plato’s* year;
Where every thing is as it was,
Let’s tipple round; and so ‘tis here.

Hall evidently wants to amuse his Cavalier friends in *Britanicus*—the tone is, as Norbrook argues, ‘conciliatory’ rather than puritannical. But this is hardly surprising given Hall’s continuing association with leading royalist poets—after dashing off an edition of *Britanicus*, Hall might have gone round to the Middle Temple to join Stanley, Shirley, and Lovelace (and perhaps Marvell) for an evening’s discussion of poetry and translation and even debate about the content of the newsbook. The serious point is that the king to whom the Cavaliers drink is in alliance with a clerical power—‘embowelled in the belly of the *Trojan Horse of Presbytery*’—which regards the Cavalier values as anathema. In the event none of Hall’s friends in the Stanley circle were actively involved in the series of uprisings that constituted the second civil war. But it is not simply restraint from counter-revolutionary action that Hall is asking of his readers. There is also the sense in his newsbooks (which tend to contain little news) that, by ‘contain[ing]’ themselves in their ‘Clubs’ and refusing to engage with the new conditions of the post-courtly world, the Cavaliers are wasting talents that could serve the public interest and develop the ‘common-wealth of letters’ that Hall excitedly envisaged in the Hartlib correspondence: ‘In the meantime Gallants
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22 *Writing the English Republic*, 178; *Mercurius Censorius* (8 June 1648), 13.
make much of your selves; any thing swallowed down with good liquor may pass for Newes...I appeale to yourselves; when in the heat of wine and wenches...Is it not sufficient that you fool away your lives in this manner? The Stanley circle were busy producing lyric verse and developing the classical resources of English poetry; but they remained, as Hall put it to Hartlib in commenting on the plans of ‘some gentlemen’ for an ‘Academy of Ingeniuities’, ‘too slight, to advance any way the Publique being rather a Private Conglobation’.

We have seen that in his commendatory verses for Hall’s 1647 Poems, John Pawson, Hall’s tutor at St John’s, referred to Hall’s ‘ignorant Detractors’ in the College as ‘such plumèd Estrages, ’tis hard to say | Whether the feathers or the head outweigh’. Pawson goes on to address his young student:

Couldst thou bedwarf thy soul, thou mighst descend  
Perhaps, to please these gallants, and so blend  
Words with them now and then, and make a noise  
’Bout some gay nothing, or themselves such toys  
Couldst thou like, they would thee[.] (MPCP ii. 184, ll. 19–23)

Hall’s distaste for aristocratic indulgence and ignorance, which John Davies links in his biographical account to the development of Hall’s aversion to monarchy, is apparent in Britancus’s attack on 11 July on ‘Puff-Paste Tituladoes and Mushroome-Gallants, creatures born to make cringes’. That ‘power that can give titles’, Hall insists, ‘cannot give worth and enoble the minde, the true seat and source of Nobilitie’. Yet he accepts that ‘many of this ranke’ are ‘the bones and pillars of the Common-wealth, and such who being but indeed the more publicke servants, deserve to be followed by all eyes and hearts’. Again it is public service which distinguishes men in Hall’s eyes. A few lines later he recounts a humiliating rout in Surrey of royalist forces on their way to join the Earl of Holland’s uprising, but cites as an exception the courage of their aristocratic commander: ‘the Lord Francis Villiers, a fine yong Gentleman expiated part of the folly of his companions, and dyed by a many wound, which had been brave enough, had they been received in another cause’. The following week Hall recounted how the Earl of Holland had been captured and would ‘perhaps be admitted to London to make cringes and shew himself before the Ladies, who may be as glad of the recovery of this old Otho as they were lately sorrowful for the death of the young Adonis’. Holland’s imagined cringing links him to the ‘Puff-Paste Tituladoes’ mocked in the previous issue: Otho was a Roman emperor famed for his extravagance and vanity. The ‘young Adonis’ is evidently Villiers (MP 17).

How did Marvell react to Hall’s Britanicus? We know Marvell admired Hall’s verse and we know that they appeared alongside each other in two volumes

23 Britanicus (16 May 1648), 8; Censorius (1 June 1648), 6; (8 June 1648), 14.  
24 Hall to Hartlib, 20 April 1647, HP 60/14/32A–33B.  
25 Britanicus (11 July 1648), 70; (18 July 1648), 75.
published in 1649, Lovelace’s *Lucasta* and the elegies for Hastings in *Lachrymae Musarum*. The elegy for Hastings, written after the regicide, will be discussed in the next chapter. The rest of this chapter relates Marvell’s elegy for Francis Villiers, probably written and published soon after Villiers’s death, and the verse epistle to Lovelace, which Smith dates to later 1648, to both Hall’s arguments in his newsbooks and the poetic practices of royalists close to the Stanley circle. The tonal dissonance of the Villiers elegy reflects Marvell’s exposure to different ideas about the dissolution of court culture and the virtue of the Cavalier ethos; the more confident poem to Lovelace engages with ideas about poetry and the conditions in which poetry can flourish, and so speaks a language that continued to bond Hall with his royalist friends. The poem to Lovelace clarifies the obscured themes of Lovelace’s 1647–8 verse: in the context of Marvell’s friendships with Hall and the Lovelace who emerged in the last chapter, the poem appears not as an ‘unequivocally royalist utterance’ but a letter of support for the cause of wit.26

AN ELEGY UPON THE DEATH OF MY LORD FRANCIS VILLIERS AND THE CAVALIER ETHOS

*An Elegy Upon the Death of My Lord Francis Villiers* is known for its ‘unevenness’ (*MP* 13). This is usually put down to Marvell’s youth and poetic inexperience, when it is not used to argue against Marvell’s authorship. But Marvell was 27 when he composed the elegy—six years older than Hall—and the unevenness may reflect rather the various and inconsistent political influences acting on Marvell in the summer of 1648. The opening address to Fame invokes Virgil’s description in the *Aeneid* of a ‘loathed goddess’ who ‘for every feather on her body, has as many wakeful eyes beneath, (wondrous to tell) as many loud tongues and mouths, as many ears that she pricks up to listen’ (4. 181–2). Fame brings the poet ‘the news’ of Villiers’s death and it seems that Marvell finds out about the death through the newsbook reports, such as this gory (royalist) account of how Villiers was run through from behind by Parliamentarian troopers, who

(after he was dead) cut off his Nose, and then run him thorow and thorow the neck and cut and mangled his body in a most barbarous and inhumane manner: But that gallant Spirit expired with more honour then ever the proudest of the Rebels, or any of their tainted race will do to the worlds end: He scorned to ask quarter of a Rebel, and fought with 8 or 9 of the stoutest Butchers of the Army. But he is dead.

When they dishonour’d and defam’d shall die,  
Valour and Fame shall crown his memory.27

26 Craze, *Life and Lyrics of Andrew Marvell*, 56.  
27 *The Parliament Kite* (29 June 1648), 44–5, quoted in *MP* 11–12.
Marvell’s poem seems to begin almost in response to the newsbook’s ‘But he is dead’: ‘’Tis true that he is dead’ (l. 1). It is as if the poet turns from reading the account of the desecration of the body to begin immediately to write his elegy. ‘But he is dead’ also sets off in Marvell’s mind memories of Milton’s ‘For Lycidas is dead, dead ere his prime’ (l. 8). The poet reminds Fame that she was ‘Far from the dust and battle’s sulph’ry heat’ when Villiers fell; but suddenly concludes: ‘Yet what could’st thou have done? ’Tis always late | To struggle with inevitable fate.’ (ll. 10–12). Is the poet still addressing Fame or momentarily himself here? The latter possibility is suggested by the echo of ‘Lycidas’, line 57: ‘Had ye been there . . . for what could that have done?’

Marvell no doubt knew ‘Lycidas’ from its appearance in Justa Eduardo King naufrago (1638), published while Marvell was at Cambridge. But if Marvell had been reading the 1645 Poems, then he would also have known the headnote added by Milton which turns the elegy for Edward King into a prophecy of ‘the ruin of our corrupted clergy then in their height’. ‘Inevitable fate’ in the 1645 ‘Lycidas’ encompasses both the personal (the death of a young friend) and the political (the defeat of the episcopal party). The Miltonic echo might thus reveal Marvell’s (perhaps only half-conscious) sense that Villiers’s nasty death is emblematic of the inevitable failure of the royalist cause in the second civil war, which amounted to no more than ‘series of isolated and uncoordinated’ royalist risings, which had been crushed by the time the Scots made it to Preston and were defeated by Cromwell in mid-August.28 Marvell immediately conjures images of the violent deaths of ‘heavy Cromwell’ and ‘long-deceivéd Fairfax’; yet the fantasies are not straightforwardly the poet’s but ascribed to cowardly Fame: ‘Much rather thou I know expect’st to tell | How heavy Cromwell gnashed the earth and fell’. Those critics who have argued that Marvell’s elegy is above all an expression of personal grief for a friend (and possibly former patron) rather than of royalist politics can find some justification in this distancing of the poet from a discredited Fame’s ‘bloodthirsty fantasies’. The argument that Marvell’s poem has little in common with ‘a specifically royalist practice of elegy’ developed during the 1640s might also find credence in what appears to be one elegiac model for Marvell’s opening address to Fame.29 Thomas Stanley’s ‘In Excuse for having no sooner celebrated the memory of Mr Sandys’ begins:

When the sad rumour of thy Fate
Fame, wing’d with ill newes, did relate,
Extreame griefe language did orecombe:
Light sorrowes speak, but true are dumbe.

(PTTS 330, ll. 1–4)

28 Ashton, Counter-Revolution, 424.
Stanley’s subject is the initial inadequacy of language and poetry to express the depth of his grief at the death of Henry Sandys, his uncle by marriage:

For language is too weak th’ excesse  
And height of sorrow to expresse,  
And Poetry gives not releife,  
But onely wantons with a greife.

(ll. 7–10)

Sandys died by drowning sometime between 1639 and 1642 and presumably Stanley’s poem was written not very long after the death, despite the apology for his tardiness. (If it was written in 1642, Stanley was still only 17.) Importantly, ‘In Excuse for having no sooner celebrated the memory of Mr Sandys’ was never published—the only extant copy of the poem is in Cambridge University Library MS Add. 7514, the manuscript which Stanley used in preparing his 1647 Poems. The echo of the opening lines in the elegy to Villiers again indicates that Marvell was associating with Stanley and his friends in 1647–9 and participating in their London literary circle, with its culture of poetic exchange and competition.

As we saw in Chapter 1, Marvell’s elegy dwells on personal knowledge of Villiers’s life and relationships, and the poet later makes it clear he knew Villiers personally, having either watched him practise swordsmanship or sparred with him in Rome in 1646–7: ‘I know how well he did, with what delight | Those serious imitations of fight’ (ll. 55–6). Marvell’s recollection of Stanley’s elegy for Sandys also suggests a preoccupation with personal loss before political allegiance: the echoes of both Stanley’s poem for the drowned Sandys and Milton’s elegy for the drowned Edward King in the opening twelve lines indicate that the death of his friend and patron Villiers brought back memories for Marvell of the death of his father by drowning in 1641. The fate of his father as much as admiration for Milton may help to explain why there ‘was no poem that Marvell echoed more often than “Lycidas”’. Yet other, more explicitly royalist elegists of Villiers seem to have read the politics of Marvell’s poem unproblematically. One of three elegies for Villiers in a manuscript miscellany of mostly royalist verse resembles the beginning of Marvell’s poem:

Fame th’art deceivd, Lord Francis is not dead  
But thou wert by him, when his pure soule fled  
From his sadd body, yet thou art deceivd  
Tis wee alone, wee only are bereavd.

While it is impossible to say with certainty whether this poem, ‘On the Death of Lord Francis Villers’ by ‘G.T.’, pre- or post-dates Marvell’s, the similarity between Marvell’s opening and the opening of Stanley’s elegy for Sandys suggests

30 Craze, Life and Lyrics, 55.
that G.T. was indebted to Marvell who was indebted to Stanley, to whose manuscripts Marvell gained access through his friends Lovelace and Hall.  

The manuscript miscellany in which G.T.’s elegy for Villiers is found begins with an elegy for Charles I and Smith notes that Marvell seems to have been ‘moving in the same circles as the undoubtedly royalist poets collected in this volume’ (MP 13). The writers who contributed to the miscellany might have formed one of the ‘clubs’ of Cavalier wits that, according to John Davies, provoked Hall to take up the pen in support of Parliament in Britanicus. Another link between An Elegy Upon the Death of My Lord Francis Villiers and royalist literary circles can be traced through an elegy for Villiers, ‘Obsequies on the untimely death, of the never to be too much pitied Francis Lord Villiers’, printed anonymously in Vaticinium Votivum, published in March 1649 and also containing elegies on Arthur Capel and Charles I. Although the poem bears little close resemblance to Marvell’s elegy, it shares ‘marked similarities’ with an elegy on Capel in Vaticinium Votivum and also with ‘In Honour to the Great Memorial of the Right Honourable Henry Lord Hastings, deceased’, published in Lachrymae Musarum and attributed to ‘J.B.’. As James Loxley observes, ‘if “J.B.” is indeed the author of both a poem on Villiers and one on Hastings, this offers a poetic trajectory similar to the one postulated for Marvell in 1648 and 1649, and makes that more convincing by providing corroboration’.  

Loxley offers no speculation as to the identity of ‘J. B.’, but it is most likely John Berkenhead, the friend of Stanley and Shirley and former editor of the royalist newsbook Aulicus. Berkenhead signed many of his published verses and prefaces with his initials, including his elegy for Charles I, Loyalties Tears (1649). He had also previously appeared alongside several of the writers who gathered in Lachrymae Musarum—Richard Brome, Alexander Brome, Herrick, Denham—in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647, to which he had contributed Latin verses under the frontispiece portrait of Fletcher as well as a vernacular commendatory poem.

Berkenhead was at the centre of royalist polemic in the 1640s—in February 1648 he had launched another newsbook to support the royalist war effort, Mercurius Bellicus. That Marvell followed the same ‘poetic trajectory’ as Berkenhead by composing elegies for Villiers and Hastings—but not for Charles I—emphasizes how close Marvell was to the centre of the royalist propaganda effort (and as we shall see in the next chapter, ‘The Unfortunate Lover’ may qualify as an elegy for the king of sorts). But John Hall was also involved in those circles; and we can detect Marvell’s reading of Hall, or conversations with him, in the
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focus in Marvell’s elegy on Villiers’s ‘unimitable handsomeness’ and his affairs with ‘the ladies’. Marvell’s stress on Villiers’s ‘identity as a lover’ rather than a loyal subject—even after his death, when he is compared to Adonis—marks the poem out from royalist elegy of the period. Indeed loyalty and love, public and private, seem to be in tension around the middle section of the elegy. Villiers’s sister, Mary Duchess of Richmond—whose husband’s brothers, Lord John and Bernard Stuart, had been at Trinity with Marvell and had both already been killed fighting for the king—is unable to persuade Villiers to hold back from the fight, but the charms of the ‘the matchless Chlora’ apparently succeed, at least initially:

But he resolved breaks carelessly away.  
Only one argument could now prolong  
His stay and that most fair and so most strong:  
The matchless Chlora whose pure fires did warm  
His soul and only could his passions charm.  
You might with much more reason go reprove  
The am’rous magnet which the north doth love.  
Or preach divorce and say it is amiss  
That with tall elms the twining vines should kiss  
Than chide two such so fit, so equal fair  
That in the world they have no other pair.  
Whom it might seem that Heaven did create  
To restore man unto his first estate.  
Yet she for Honour’s tyrannous respect  
Her own desires did and his neglect.

(ll. 66–80)

It is hard to see how Chlora could be anyone else but Mary Kirke, daughter of the court writer Aurelian Townshend. The former Parliamentarian soldier Edmund Ludlow, although hardly an unbiased source, recounts in his memoirs that Villiers was surprised by the Parliamentarian troopers because he had sent his company on before him so he could make ‘a splendid entertainment’ for ‘Mrs. Kirk’, to whom that night he ‘made a present of a plate to the value of a thousand pounds’: ‘after his death there was found upon him some of the hair of Mrs. Kirk sew’d in a ribbon that hung next his skin’. In Ludlow’s account, it is implicitly Villiers’s typically Cavalier profligacy and weakness for women (and in this case a married woman) which holds him back from the manly business of war and leads directly to his death. The fate of Villiers is for Ludlow emblematic of the inevitable and deserved defeat of the Cavaliers. Whether or not

34 Loxley, ‘Prepared at last to strike in with the tye?’, 48. On the unexpected emphasis on Villiers as beautiful lover, see also Hammond, Figuring Sex between Men, 212–13.
35 As first suggested by E. E. Duncan-Jones, ‘Notes on Marvell’, Notes and Queries, 198 (1953), 102.
Marvell had heard this rumour, Chlora does indeed persuade Villiers to delay his journey to war. While their mutual attraction is presented as natural (‘the am’rous magnet which the north doth love’, ‘twining vines’), the phrase ‘preach divorce’ introduces the element of moral censure to which Chlora submits a few lines later, suppressing her adulterous desire ‘for Honour’s tyrannous respect’—apparently unlike Mary Kirke in Ludlow’s account.

The phrase ‘Honour’s tyrannous restraint’ recalls Thomas Carew’s ‘A Rapture’, written around 1634 but first published in 1640, where ‘Honour’ is condemned as ‘the tyrant’ and ‘proud usurper’ who ‘Should fetter your soft sex with chastity, | Which Nature made unapt for abstinence’. In the ‘Love’s Elysium’ portrayed by the poet:

No wedlock bonds unwreathe our twisted loves;  
We seek no midnight arbour, no dark groves,  
To hide our kisses; there the hated name  
Of husband, wife, lust, modest, chaste, or shame,  
Are vain and empty words, whose very sound  
Was never heard in the Elysian ground.

One model for Carew’s poem is the second poem in the Basia sequence of Secundus; Marvell’s comparison of the natural sympathy of the lovers to the vine kissing the elm is an image which shapes the opening stanzas of Stanley’s translation of Secundus:

As in a thousand wanton Curles the Vine  
Doth the lov’d Elme embrace;  
As clasping Ivy round the Oak doth twine  
To kiss his leavy face;  
So thou about my Neck thy Arms shalt fling,  
Joyning to mine thy Breast;  
So shall my Arms about thy fair Neck cling,  
My lips on thine imprest.37

The notion that Villiers and Chlora make such a perfect couple that it seems as though they might have been created ‘To restore man to his first estate’ can be compared with Lovelace’s conflation of Carew’s pagan sexual utopia with Edenic free love in ‘Love Made in the First Age. To Chloris’:

In the nativity of time,  
Chloris, it was not thought a crime  
In direct Hebrew for to woo.  
Now we make love as all on fire,  
Ring retrograde our loud desire,  
And court in English, backward, too.

Thrice happy was that golden age,
When compliment was construed rage,
And fine words in the centre hid;
When cursed no stained no maid’s bliss,
And all discourse was summed in Yes,
And naught forbade, but to forbid.

(LP 146, ll. 1–12)

‘Love Made in the First Age’ (which like ‘A Rapture’ ends in bitterness, though directed specifically against Chloris for her rejection of the poet’s ‘offer’d bliss’ rather than the tyranny of ‘Honour’) did not appear in the 1649 Lucasta but Lovelace may of course have been working on a draft in 1648 and the lyric gives a sense of the influence of Carew on Lovelace and others in the Stanley circle. Sherburne had, after all, been a close friend of Carew in the 1630s, while Carew seems to have deliberately recast at least one of Shirley’s lyrics, presumably in the same emulative and competitive spirit that Stanley sought to foster.38

Carew’s ‘A Rapture’ is in fact a significant and hitherto unremarked presence in An Elegy Upon the Death of the Lord Villiers. After his death in Marvell’s elegy Villiers, his eyes ‘closed up in an eternal sleep’, is transported by Venus to a world very like the ‘Love’s Elysium’ of Carew’s poem: ‘Where in her gardens of sweet myrtle laid | She kisses him in the immortal shade’ (ll. 112–13). The image of the slain Adonis slumbering in Venus’s garden was a common motif of natural love in early modern verse, but compare Carew:

There a bed
Of roses and fresh myrtles shall be spread
Under the cooler shades of cypress groves;
Our pillows of the down of Venus’ doves,
Whereon our panting limbs we’ll gently lay,
In the faint respite of our active play[.]

(ll. 35–40)

In the lines immediately preceding these the poet writes of how Celia’s ‘virgin-treasure’ shall be ‘Expos’d, still ready for mintage lie | And we will coin young Cupids’ (ll. 33–4). The metaphor is used by Marvell to convey Villiers’s beauty:

We do but faintly God’s resemblance bear
And like rough coins of careless mints appear:
But he of purpose made, did represent
In a rich medal ev’ry lineament.

(ll. 47–50)

38 See Davidson (ed.), Poetry and Revolution, 97, 523, which prints the different versions of ‘Would you know what’s soft?’ in Carew’s 1640 Poems and Shirley’s 1646 Poems, concluding that Carew revised Shirley.
The tone of Carew’s poem switches abruptly in the closing lines, as the poet voices his anger about how much blood men have shed in the name of ‘Honour’. The poet still addresses Celia but the tone is now harsh and resentful, with images of wounded and broken rather than pliant and writhing bodies:

If thou complain of wrong, and call my sword
To carve out thy revenge, upon that word
He bids me fight and kill; or else he brands
With marks of infamy my coward hands.

(ll. 159–62)

Marvell’s tone in the last two verse paragraphs of the elegy is similarly ‘radically different’ from the immediately preceding representation of Villiers as Adonis. Carew bitterly turns from the natural expression of love and desire to the social conventions of revenge and honour. Marvell makes a similar shift from the contemplation of love, beauty, and nature to an acknowledgement of the demands of revenge and honour, but the bitterness towards Villier’s killers turns into unpleasant (and somewhat unconvincing) triumphalism, as he imagines the carving of revenge upon the bodies of other men as Villiers’s writing of his own epitaph:

Yet died he not revengeless:
And with his steel which did whole troops divide
He cut his epitaph on either side.

(ll. 115, 119–20)

The phrase ‘did whole troops divide’ could mean individual bodies as well as groups of soldiers: it seems the gruesome description in The Parliament Kite of the dismemberment of Villiers’s body returns to haunt the end of an elegy which has spent so much time pondering his beauty. If Marvell presented the elegy to Villiers’s sister and her husband, the Richmonds, then he must have expected that a copy would also reach the Duke of Buckingham, who had fled England days after the death of his brother and the rout of Holland’s force, having been declared a traitor by Parliament. Despite the apparent incongruity of incorporating Carew’s most notoriously erotic poem into an elegy, it would have been appropriate to think of Carew if writing for such an audience. Carew had written two elegies for the first Duke of Buckingham, assassinated in 1629 and to whom Marvell refers as ‘Great Buckingham, whose death doth freshly strike | Our memories, because to this so like’ (ll. 25–6). Carew had also been a close friend of Mary Kirke’s father, Aurelian Townshend.

39 Loxley, ‘Prepared at last to strike in with the tyde?’, 48.
40 Hammond argues for the ‘homoerotic sensibility’ of the elegy in Figuring Sex between Men, 214.
41 Craze, Life and Lyrics, 8, argues that Marvell presented the poem to the Richmonds, who then had it printed.
One of the manuscript elegies for Villiers in the royalist miscellany cited earlier addresses Townshend, encouraging him to write an elegy for his daughter’s lover: ‘To my Worthy Friend A. T: inviting him to write an elegy on the Lord Francis Villers slayne in their uncivall Warrs at Kingston upon Thames’. One of Carew’s most significant poems is his response to Townshend’s elegy on the King of Sweden, Gustavus Adolphus, who was killed leading the Protestant armies against the Holy Roman Empire at the battle of Lützen in 1632. In ‘An Answer of an Elegiacal Letter, upon the Death of the King of Sweden, from Aurelian Townshend, Inviting Me to Write on that Subject’, Carew rejects Townshend’s suggestion that he should compose an elegy to the Swedish king, arguing that the English should rather enjoy the ‘peace and plenty’ bestowed on the land by Caroline rule than intervene in the quagmire of the European wars:

Then let the Germans fear if Caesar shall,
Or the united provinces, rise and fall;
But let us that in myrtle bowers sit
Under secure shades, use the benefit
Of peace and plenty, which the blessed hand
Of our good king gives this obdurate land;
Let us of revels sing, and let thy breath,
Which filled Fame’s trumpet with Gustavus’s death,
Blowing his name to heaven gently inspire
Thy pastoral pipe, till all our swains admire
Thy song and subject, whilst they both comprise
The beauties of the Shepherd’s Paradise.

As in Marvell’s elegy, we have a reference to Fame’s announcement of the death of a noble figure in battle. The description of Caroline England is close to the description of ‘Love’s Elysium’ in ‘A Rapture’, with its ‘fresh myrtles’ and ‘cooler shades’; and so it also resembles the ‘gardens of sweet myrtle’ with their ‘immortal shade’ to which Venus spirits the dead Villiers in Marvell’s elegy. Villiers is removed ‘Out of the noise and blood, and killing war’ (l. 112) by Venus; but it seems the place she takes him to is Carew’s version of the Caroline court in 1632.

For any reader of Carew’s lines in 1648, of whatever political persuasion, the reference to Charles’s successful husbandry of ‘this obdurate land’ must have had particular and ironic resonance. Gerald Hammond argues that ‘obdurate’ sinks ‘shafts of discontent into the poem’. This is to place too much emphasis on one word, given the poem stretches to over a hundred lines. Yet ‘obdurate’ does signal Carew’s awareness of an ‘underlying division’ in the domestic realm—a division which by 1648 had split the country apart in two civil wars. Marvell’s
elegy transports Villiers back in time to the ‘halcyon days’ (l. 96) celebrated by Carew, associating him with the ‘poetry of love and nature’ which was the predominant aesthetic of the Caroline court and embodied in works cited by Carew such as Walter Montague’s play The Shepheard’s Paradise (performed 1633) and Townshend’s masque Tempe Restored (performed 1632).\(^{45}\) Carew’s poem to Townshend had sought to shut out ‘the noise and blood, and killing war’, to seal England off from the religious wars in Europe. During the 1640s such religious conflict had riven England from within: only in death can Marvell’s Villiers recover the peace, harmony, and beauty of the Caroline golden age. The poet, who must continue to live in the world from which Villiers has been transported, consequently has to return in his final lines to the continuing cycle of domestic violence.

Carew maintained at the end of his poem to Townshend that the civilized arts could only flourish in peaceful conditions—‘Tourneyes, masques, theaters, better become | Our halcyon days. What though the German drum | Bellow for freedom and revenge?’ (ll. 96–8)—but at the end of Marvell’s elegy fighting trumps writing:

\[
\text{And we hereafter to his honour will}
\]
\[
\text{Not write so many, but so many kill.}
\]
\[
\text{Till the whole Army by just vengeance come}
\]
\[
\text{To be at once his trophy and his tomb.}
\]

(ll. 125–8)

In his notes to these lines, Smith cites in comparison an anonymous manuscript poem ‘To King Charles’: ‘Strew all the pavement where hee treads | With loyall hearts, or Rebels heads.’ (MP 17 n.) These lines are actually taken from the conclusion of Carew’s ‘A New-Yeares gift To the King’, presented to Charles on 1 January 1631:

\[
\text{Let his strong vertues overcome,}
\]
\[
\text{And bring him bloodlesse Trophies home:}
\]
\[
\text{Strew all the pavements, where he treads}
\]
\[
\text{With loyall hearts, or Rebels heads;}
\]
\[
\text{But Byfront, open thou no more,}
\]
\[
\text{In his blest raigne the Temple dore.}\]

The poem is addressed to Janus and the final lines allude to the reign of Augustus Caesar, when the doors of the temple of Janus were closed as a sign of peace throughout the Roman empire. Carew insists that Charles’s virtuous refusal to become involved in the European wars will itself win him imperial renown, ‘bloodless Trophies’; yet the threat of brutal royal violence is immediately made


against any domestic opposition in the gruesome image of English pavements strewn with ‘Rebels heads’. Confrontation between rebels and ‘loyal hearts’, which exists only in potentia in Carew’s panegyric, occupying two words in thirty-four lines, has become the grim reality in which Marvell’s elegy lives. Carew celebrated Charles as Augustus, presiding over a golden age for the arts, ‘a great continued festival’, a season ‘With laurel wreaths, and trophies crown’d’ (ll. 4, 14). At the end of Marvell’s poem, poetry is found to be an inadequate response in a time of war: those who mourn Villiers should ‘Not write so many, but so many kill’. Stanley in his elegy for Henry Sandys had also insisted on the inadequacy of verse to express true grief.

There is hardly anything as direct as an allusion in the Villiers elegy to Carew’s poems to Townshend and Charles I; but the two Carew poems nonetheless shed light on the submerged preoccupation in the elegy with what went wrong with Caroline court culture; with how civil war and gory murder have emerged from the ‘halcyon days’ and their poetic invocations of love and beauty, harmony and transcendence. The desecration of Villier’s beautiful body becomes emblematic of the transformation. The representation of Villiers’s father, ‘Great Buckingham’, sitting in the ‘eternal court’ of heaven, perhaps hints at the relationship in Marvell’s mind between finding an explanation for Villiers’s death and understanding the origins of the war: ‘And here a favourite there found a throne’ (l. 28). ‘Favourite’ is a charged term to use: the accusation of being the king’s ‘favourite’ was repeatedly levelled at Buckingham in the 1620s, often invoking Tacitus’s image of the court favourite in his account of the rise and fall of Sejanus. Carew responded to these accusations in one of his epitaphs by insisting that Buckingham was, or should have been, ‘Safe by favour, safe by merit’. Whether or not Marvell links Villiers’s death in civil war to the chain of events which began with the murder (and perhaps behaviour) of his father, Villiers in the poem nonetheless seems to belong and finally be restored to Caroline court culture—born in 1629, just after his father was murdered, he had indeed grown up in that culture. Charles and Henrietta Maria had sought to have their relationship represented in paintings and entertainments as a mythological, cosmic love that guaranteed the harmony of the kingdom; Marvell ascribes to Villiers’s sister rule over ‘The last and greatest monarchy of love’ (l. 60). It has been suggested that Villiers in his ‘unimitable handsomeness’ and physical perfection is represented in the ideal terms of court portraiture, as though he were one of the paintings his father had collected and which his brother had sold off to fund Holland’s uprising. Villiers had indeed been painted twice by Van Dyck, who had also painted his parents as Venus and Adonis.

Nostalgia for a golden age of cultural achievement under Stuart patronage, shattered by Puritan violence and philistinism, is, as we have seen, a defining
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trope of royalism. The full title of Humphrey Moseley’s 1651 edition of Carew ‘reads like an obituary for a way of life’: *Poems. With a Maske, by Thomas Carew Esq; One of the Gent. Of the privie-Chamber, and Sewer in Ordinary to His Late Majesty. The Songs were set in Musick by Henry Lawes Gent: of the Kings Chapell, and one of his late Majesties Private Musick.*50 Yet the similarities between Carew’s ‘A Rapture’ and the Villiers elegy suggests Marvell is less concerned with lamenting a lost age than with interrogating the Cavalier ethos—an ethos that John Hall had been gently satirizing in *Britanicus.* Hall, as we saw in Chapter 1, included in his 1647 *Poems* a piece entitled ‘A Rapture’ which rewrites Carew’s notorious poem as an ecstatic celebration of disembodiment rather than fleshly abandon. Carew’s libertine energies are channelled into a vision of spiritual release and angelic insight that resembles Hall’s rapturous ascent to knowledge with his Cambridge tutor in the ode to Pawson:

Come, Julia come! let’s once disbody what
Strait matter ties to this and not to that;
We’ll disengage; our bloodless form shall fly
Beyond the reach of earth, where ne’er an eye
That peeps through spectacles of flesh, shall know
Where we intend, or what we mean to do.

(*MPCP* ii. 199–200, ll. 1–6)

The imagination in Carew’s poem is limited to the flesh; Hall’s imagination soars beyond the bodily to attain the sublimity of revelation. Hall’s rewriting of Carew in 1646–7 fits with his later criticism of the Cavaliers for squandering their talents on ‘wine and wenches’, for placing the indulgence of appetite before the advancement of learning and the national interest: ‘Is it not sufficient that you *fool* away your lives in this manner?’

It is worth pointing out that while Chlora in Marvell’s elegy refuses to compromise her marriage vows, despite her desire for Villiers, there is no mention of such restraint or moral scruples on Villiers’s part. The echoes of Carew’s libertine speaker in ‘A Rapture’ seem appropriate for a Cavalier whose desire has been thwarted not by his own sense of honour but by his beloved’s adherence to her marriage vows. (Carew’s verse had in fact been cited in a petition to Parliament in 1640 for its encouragements to libertinism.51) It is only after Chlora has denied him that Villiers finally sets off to war—he does quite live up, then, to the Cavalier motto that concludes Lovelace’s ‘To Lucasta. Going to the Wars’:

| I could not love thee, dear, so much, | Loved I not honour more | (*LP* 18, l. 12). Nonetheless Villiers is represented, as Lovelace was to be in most of the commendatory poems for *Lucasta*, as the epitome of both courtly lover and aristocratic warrior: ‘How comely and how terrible he sits | At once and war as well as love befits!’ (ll. 91–2). Smith comments on how Villiers at this point is

---

placed in ‘a heroic romance narrative’, which in generic terms makes the elegy ‘unique and outstanding in its time’ (MP 13). Yet lines 93–6 are peculiar and might rather be read, although no critic seems to have done so, as bathetic and mock-heroic:

Ride where thou wilt and bold adventures find:
But all the ladies are got up behind.
Guard them, though not thyself: for in thy death
Th’ eleven thousand virgins lose their breath.

The obscure allusion is to St Ursula, who brought 11,000 British virgins to Rome to be converted to Christianity only for them all to be slain by the Huns on their return.52 There is something rather comic about the size of Villiers’s virginal following, and the standard early modern pun on ‘death’ as orgasm implies that Villiers’s libertine appetites would hardly be satiated by one married woman but could encompass even 11,000 virgins. Virginities tend to be lost easily and in huge quantities in Cavalier verse, as in Lovelace’s ‘Love Made in the First Age’:

‘Lasses like Autumn Plums did drop, | And Lads indifferently did crop | A Flower, and a Maiden-Head’ (LP 146, ll. 16–18).

There is also something absurd in the image of ‘all the ladies’ riding up in the saddle behind Villiers, as though the horse were buckling under the weight of admirers who will not let Villiers out of their sight. As we have seen, Hall referred scornfully to the attractions of aristocratic royalists for ‘the ladies’ in his discussion in Britannicus of the capture of Holland, who might ‘perhaps be admitted to London to make cringes and shew himself before the Ladies... lately sorrowful for the death of the young Adonis’. Did Marvell pick up on Hall’s association of Villiers with ‘the Ladies’ who adore the defeated Cavaliers—defeated in part, it is implied in Britannicus, through their unmanly vanity and sensual weakness? Had Hall and Marvell been discussing the significance of the killing of Villiers before Marvell penned his elegy? Marvell immediately introduces an extended Homeric simile in lines 97–104, in a disorientating switch from mock-heroic to epic, and the subsequent representation of Villiers as Adonis has no hint of irony—perhaps it is an annoyed response to Hall’s lightly sarcastic reference. And yet Hall had praised Villiers’s bravery in the previous issue of Britannicus and called him ‘a fine young Gentleman’—doubtless a tactful nod to the feelings of friends who had been close to Villiers, such as Marvell and Stanley (who had been admitted MA at Cambridge with Villiers in 1641).

Nonetheless the subtle exploration of Villiers’s adulterous desire for Mrs Kirke, the incongruous allusions to Carew’s poetic visions of an erotic utopia, and the oddly comic introduction of both ‘the Ladies’ who ride with Villiers into battle and the 11,000 panting virgins whose ‘death’ depend on his, all help to destabilize the tone of the elegy. The influence of Hall’s satirical engagement in both his verse

52 Craze, Life and Lyrics, 61.
and *Britanicus* with the libertine values celebrated by some of his Cavalier friends may account for this uneven tone. Norbrook argues for the sympathy in Marvell’s elegy ‘for Cavalier eroticism, a sympathy which Hall to some degree shared’. But in fact we can identify in the Villiers elegy hints of the sceptical, amused attitude towards ‘Cavalier eroticism’ that we find in Hall, as well as an impulse to try to understand why the magnificent court culture which produced and was celebrated by Carew, and with which Marvell identifies Villiers, lay in ruins a decade later. Did Marvell feel at all self-conscious or guilty about the challenging and sceptical elements, registered in tonal instability, that he introduced into an elegy for a friend, and possibly patron, who had died horribly at 19? It is unsettling that in the poet’s description of his eyewitness experience of Villier’s facility with a sword—‘Nor in his mistresses’ eyes that joy he took, | As in an enemy’s himself to look’—the poet, as fencing partner, becomes the enemy: ‘I know how well he did, with what delight | Those serious imitations of fight’ (ll. 53–6). In the verse epistle to Lovelace, the poet is again cast in the role of his subject’s enemy; and Marvell also returns to the relationship between his Cavalier friends and the ladies.

‘TO HIS NOBLE FRIEND MR RICHARD LOVELACE’ AND THE POETS’ TOWN

The entry of John Hall, poet and friend of the Cavaliers, into polemical print on the side of Parliament did not go unnoticed among the royalist propagandists. On 24 May 1648, a week after the first edition of *Mercurius Britanicus Alive Again* appeared, *Mercurius Elencticus* launched a stinging *ad hominem* attack on Hall. The attack has always been ascribed, logically enough, to the founding editor of *Elencticus*, George Wharton. But Samuel Sheppard, a former Parliamentarian who turned to royalist polemic after the imprisonment of the king, took over as chief writer of *Elencticus* when Wharton was imprisoned ‘in the spring of 1648’ until his own imprisonment in June. Interestingly, Sheppard was probably the author of *The Parliament Kite* between May and August 1648, and so was also responsible for the description of the mutilation of Villiers’s body that seems to have so profoundly affected Marvell. Sheppard was a prolific writer across a variety of genres, with a particular habit of plagiarizing pre-war authors, especially Suckling and Webster. Lois Potter has linked this plagiarism with Sheppard’s uncertainty about his political as well as literary identity, making a provocative comparison with Marvell’s numerous poetic ‘borrowings’. Sheppard was arrested a second time for writing *Elencticus* soon after the regicide and remained in
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prison for a year, where he began but never finished an epic poem entitled ‘The Faerie King’, which discloses his ambivalence about the behaviour of Charles I; on his release he wrote several (ambiguous) panegyrics on Cromwell. As we shall see in the next chapter, Hall was involved in getting royalists released at this time. It is true that Wharton had a running personal and political feud with his fellow polemical astrologer William Lilly, and one of Elencticus’s main claims against Hall is that it was Lilly who persuaded him to write Britanicus on the promise of ‘a weekly stipend from the Rebells’. (John Davies tells us that Hall’s ‘acquaintance with Mr Lilly’ was rather a consequence of writing Britanicus.) Yet that charge is repeated in The Last Will and Testament of Tom Fairfax (1648), ascribed by Potter to Sheppard, where Hall is said to have received £6 per annum ‘to quit his charges for pen, ink and paper’; but as for his weekly salary, ‘I leave that to Lilly and Booker . . . whose hireling he is, and who allow him money, for tobacco and beer, besides a Sunday dinner of beef and pudding to rail against Elencticus and the Scots’ (3). Moreover the author of the attack on Hall in Elencticus declares he will waste no more paper responding to Britanicus on ‘my Brother Pragmaticus, Melancholius, Bellicus, or Master Whartons behalfe’.

Sheppard knew or had been told a great deal about Hall’s background. His initial theme is Hall’s mercenary readiness to sell his pen and turn on his friends and king for money: ‘that Apostate Hyreling . . . Jack Hall, the Rhymeing Whistle-Cap of Grayes-Inne: He that studies Lyes (instead of Law) to Lard the Leane Ribbs of his hungry Carcase . . . the Duresmer that hath dribbled out his fortune upon Drabbs, & hath sacrificed the poor stock of his Loyalty to betray his Sovereigne King’ (205). The author knows, then, that Hall is from Durham, is a poet—or rather ‘rhymer’—and is studying at Gray’s Inn; he goes on to defend the fellows of St John’s, Cambridge, against the accusations ‘of him that should so unnaturally, so Nero-like, rip up the Bowells of his and your mother’. And he also knows all about Hall’s involvement with the Stanley circle:

But does this manner of living become a Cambridge scholler, a pretender to learning, to poetry, to wit? Can this be acceptable to thy Loyall countryman, or plausible to thy Father and friends, who so much detest the Parliament, and all their Works? How will thy Acquaintance esteeme of thee? Art thou a fit Associate for such Ingenious and candid souls as Col. Lovelace, Captaine Sherburne, Mr Shirley, or Mr Stanley? They shall kick thee out of their acquaintance and tel thee thou art no legitimate Son of the Muses, but a Traytor to Ingenuity, a meere excrementitious scabb of Learning.]

The structuring principle of this blistering onslaught—perhaps all the more blistering because Sheppard himself had changed sides—is the common motif of royalist polemic in the 1640s: the impossibility of wit in a Roundhead. Hall

56 Andrew King, entry in the ODNB for Samuel Sheppard; Raymond, Invention of the Newspaper, 61; Potter, Secret Rites and Secret Writing, 122–30. I am grateful to Andrew King for sending me his entry on Sheppard in advance of publication.
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has turned Roundhead and so by definition has turned his back on ‘learning’, ‘poetry’, and ‘wit’. His alleged betrayal of his king is at once a betrayal of the muses and his fellow poets in the revered Stanley circle; to write against the king is automatically to become a ‘Traytor to Ingenuity’. As we have seen, ‘ingenuity’ is derived from *ingenium*, a term which encompasses both creative intelligence and witty word-play. Although the *OED* lists the first use of ‘scab’ to mean a traitor to an organization or a group as 1777, there seems to be a sense here in which Hall is such a ‘scab’—someone who has betrayed the union of poets and the commonwealth of letters which Hall himself held in such esteem. Sheppard switches to verse, a habit that had developed in the royalist newsbooks since 1647 and that Hall had mocked in his first *Britanicus* (after some satirical verses of his own) as ‘the accustomed ceremonies of abusing the people’ (1):

A Fellow borne to thy Friends disgrace,
Thy Countries shame: A scandall to the Place
Where thou thy Education hast: Nay more,
A stigmatized Traytor, that would gore
The Bowells of thy King; while thou erects
Trophies of Honour to the purblind sects
Of this Rebellious Age; And fondly cries
Up Ignorance to Close the Muses eyes.
Goe perjur’d Man, and when thou thinkes of mee
Know then thou think’st of thy Enemy.

(207)

The satirical verses here function as a curse—a ritual and emphatic expulsion of Hall from Stanley’s magic circle of Cavalier wits.58 In the second issue of *Mercurius Censorius*, published on 8 June, Hall responded. What upset him most, it seems, was the apparently invented charge that he had been ‘Kick’t out of Cambridge for [his] Lewdnesse’. Hall, able as *Censorius* to avoid accusations of vanity by defending himself in the third person, insists it is well known that ‘Jack Hall of Greisinne’ had ‘endeared the greatest men in the University to his acquaintance; and his worthy contributions to the Common-wealth of Learning while he was there, have not undeservedly conciliated a precious memory of him among all good men’.59 The phrase ‘contributions to the Common-wealth of Learning’ is indeed characteristic of Hall’s letters to Hartlib; his defence of his own efforts in Cambridge to advance learning also complements his criticism in *Britanicus* and *Censorius* of the refusal of royalists to become involved in the post-war intellectual life of the country. Hall continued to satirize the Cavalier readership of *Elencticus* as motivated by their libido rather than any sense of the *salus populi*. The area around Gray’s Inn

58 I find it hard to agree with Norbrook that the tone of the attack on Hall in *Elencticus* is ‘relatively mild’ (*Writing the English Republic*, 178). On the use of verse in royalist newsbooks in 1647–8, see Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, 164–8.
59 *Censorius* (8 June 1648), 13–14.
was well known for prostitution, and the purchase of *Elencticus* is equated with the purchase of sex in a comic vignette of an Inns of Court man obtaining his copy (14): ‘But who would think so admired an author as *Elencticus* should be found lurking under a woman’s petticoats? Commonly the young Gentleman, who softly enquires for him, feels and finds him in her placket, and when he hath got him, hastily pockets up two pennyworth of lies, least another standing by, might chance have the first sight of them.’ All the same, this passage seems designed to attract precisely a Cavalier reader in search of lewd wit.

Those who knew Hall personally or though members of the Stanley circle were more tolerant of his ‘apostasy’ than Sheppard. In *Mercurius Bellicus* Berkenhead, who had links with Stanley, Shirley, and Hall’s close friend John Davies, and could have met Hall at one of the literary gatherings in Stanley’s rooms in the Middle Temple, offered Hall counsel rather than criticism. He was disappointed that ‘Jack Hall of Cambridge (whom because I know to be a man of parts sufficient, I will not divulge him) should so far lose himselfe, as to justifie the Rebels in a weekly Gazet’. Berkenhead, careful to grant Hall the dignity of identification with his university and to acknowledge his talents, addresses him in the manner of a concerned friend, although Hall is still presented as a hireling: ‘prithree Jack let not so money so farre sway, as to forfeit thy loyaltie and honesty, for a poore pension, give o’re, give o’re thy scribbling while thou maist with safety, ere thou involve thy selfe too farre in this wild laborinth the Rebels wander in, and with them be taken to thy ruine’.60 There is a threat in the familiar address; but Berkenhead’s plea with Hall to give over ‘scribbling’ seems to be an encouragement to return to poetry—and so to the Cavalier fold. Berkenhead and Hall not only shared friends and an interest in classical literature, they shared a satirical scorn for Presbyterianism. Peter Thomas suggests Berkenhead and John Davies knew each other from 1648, when Berkenhead was travelling the country as a royalist agent, because in the preface of his translation of Savorsano (1665) Davies quotes Berkenhead’s ballad *The Four Legg’d Elder*, published in August 1647. The ballad recounts an act of sodomy between a Presbyterian Elder’s maid and her dog, to the tune of William Lawes’s setting of Herrick’s (as yet unpublished) ‘To the Virgins, to make much of time’. As Thomas observes, the musical setting turns the episode into an unnatural inversion of ‘a Cavalier amor’.61

The last issue of *Britanicus* appeared on 16 August. Hall probably felt there was no need to continue his polemical activities after Cromwell’s victory over the Scots at Preston on 17–19 August had effectively ended the second civil war, with only the besieged royalists at Colchester holding out. It may also be the case, though, that Hall retreated into silence while he waited to see if Parliament had really deserved his public (as Sheppard and Berkenhead had made it) proclamation of allegiance. For a Presbyterian system of national church discipline, ‘with
complicated rules for internal governance and censorship’, was again approved by
Parliamentary ordinance on 29 August, a measure conceded to the Presbyterians
in the Westminster Assembly after they refrained from supporting the royalist
uprisings. The Presbyterians in Parliament also pressed for new negotiations with
the king, who agreed in September to maintain a Presbyterian system for three
years—exactly the same terms he had agreed with the Scots at the end of 1647 in
return for military assistance. In his sonnet ‘On the Lord General Fairfax at the
Siege of Colchester’, written in July or early August 1648, Milton urges Fairfax,
triumphant on the battlefield, to turn now his attention away from the beaten
royalists and towards civil corruption:

O yet a nobler task awaits thy hand;
For what can war, but endless war still breed,
Till truth, and right from violence be freed,
And public faith cleared from the shameful brand
Of public fraud. In vain doth valour bleed
While avarice, and rapine share the land.

(MSP 324–5, ll. 9–14)

The sestet reveals Milton’s primary concern at the end of the second civil
war to be less the problem of what to do with the king than the continuing
influence of the Presbyterians in Parliament. Milton was likely composing his
‘Digression’ to the third book of the History of Britain at this time. As Lewalski
observes, the ‘specific evils pointed to by these personifications [in the Fairfax
sonnet]—greed, corruption, fraudulent use of public monies, defaulting on debts
guaranteed by the public faith, religious repression—are laid at the door of the
Presbyterian Parliament in the “Digression” to Milton’s History of Britain’ (Life,
215). Milton complains bitterly about both the violation of the public faith,
‘which ought to be kept as sacred and inviolable as any thing holy’, and the
‘greedy sequestration’ of royalist estates, although his ostensible point is that
indiscriminate sequestration had prevented Parliamentary supporters like himself
from collecting debts (CPWM v/1. 445). The plea in the sonnet to Fairfax and
the rage of the ‘Digression’ must have been prompted by the Parliamentary con-
cessions to the Presbyterians, despite the recent military victories over royalism.
Given Hartlib knew that Milton was working on the History in July 1648, there
is at least the possibility that Hall obtained access to the manuscript through
Hartlib. Milton’s charge of Presbyterian repression and Parliamentary misuse of
privilege in the ‘Digression’ finds an echo, as we shall see, in Marvell’s poem to
Lovelace.

Hall’s appearance beside Marvell in the commendatory verses for Lucasta
would seem to indicate that the Stanley circle did not after all ‘kick [Hall] out
of their acquaintance’ for writing for Parliament, as Elencticus had predicted, and

62 MP 21; Ashton, Counter-Revolution, 294; David L. Smith, ‘The Impact on Government’, in
Morrill (ed.), The Impact of the English Civil War, 43.
that Marvell and Hall had not fallen out over their different (but not entirely opposed) evaluations of the killing of Villiers. But this assumption depends on the date of composition of Hall’s commendatory poem. As we have seen, Lucasta has a complicated publishing history: it was registered for publication on 14 May 1649 and Thomason received his copy on 21 June, but the volume was apparently licensed on 7 February 1648. Lovelace was again arrested in October 1648 following a search of his lodgings and ‘upon pretence of answering some matters contained in papers of his’—including perhaps the manuscript of Lucasta—and not released until 10 April 1649.63 Scholars disagree about the date of Marvell’s commendatory poem, which is the most alive to contemporary events of any of the poems prefacing Lucasta. Marvell’s use of the present tense in lines 21–2—‘The barbed censurers begin to look | Like the grim consistory on thy book’—has been taken by some to indicate that the commendatory verses were written before the volume was licensed.64 At the same time Marvell refers to Lovelace’s arrest in 1642 for taking the ‘first’ Kentish petition to Parliament (l. 30), which for Hilton Kelliher suggests Marvell was writing after the Kentish petition of May 1648, while John Pinchbacke’s commendatory poem refers to ‘our seven yeers paines | In the past wars’, leading Thomas N. Corns to plump for a date of composition close to publication.65 Smith argues that the commendatory poems were likely written between licensing and publication, ‘so that the licensers could not have seen verse that openly attacks them’, and prefers a date in late 1648, but before the trial and execution of the king given the ‘absence of regicidal lament’ in the commendatory poems (MP 18). Norbrook, however, maintains Marvell’s poem reflects ‘the immediate post-war era when Lovelace was planning publication’ and ‘has many points of contact with Hall’s A True Account’, published in summer 1647.66 But ‘To his Noble Friend Mr Richard Lovelace’ engages more explicitly with Hall’s polemical language and argument in Britannicus—and indeed with the terms of Sheppard’s attack on Hall in Elencticus. Marvell’s verse epistle also engages with the problem that he pondered with less directness and poise in the elegy for Villiers and which is well defined by Leah Marcus: ‘the problem of cultural survival, with discerning or creating continuities’ between pre- and post-war cultural life.67 Consequently the poem is dated here to late summer and autumn 1648, after the death of Villiers and perhaps shortly after the Parliamentary ordinance for Presbyterian church government at the end of August, but probably before Lovelace was arrested in October (an event of which the poem shows no knowledge). We can assume that Hall’s poem was written

63 Anselment, entry for Lovelace in the ODNB. It is still widely stated that Lovelace was arrested in June 1648 (e.g. MP 18) but, as Wilkinson reported in his revised 1930 edn. of Lovelace, a letter from James Thompson to Henry Oxinden on 26 Oct. 1648 reveals that Lovelace had just been arrested; the ‘Captain Lovelace’ arrested on 9 June, as recorded in the Commons Journals, was probably Richard’s brother, Dudley (LP 345).
64 See e.g. Craze, Life and Lyrics, 34.
65 Kelliher, Andrew Marvell, 37; LP 5, ll. 26–7; Corns, Uncloistered Virtue, 225.
66 Writing the English Republic, 172.
67 Politics of Mirth, 215.
Marvell and the End of Court Culture

around the same time: Marvell’s ‘Our civil wars have lost the civic crown’ (l. 12) resembles Hall’s description of Lovelace wearing ‘Both th’ Delphick wreath and Civic coronet’ (‘To Colonel Lovelace, on the publishing of his ingenious Poems’, in LP 10, l. 8). However the reference to the Roman civic crown, awarded for saving the life of a fellow-citizen, is put to quite different, punning use by Marvell, who adopts it as a symbol of what has been lost in the national culture rather than what has been gained by Lovelace. This suggests Hall’s poem may have been written first and then shown to Marvell, who responded to some of its images and themes. There are evident similarities also between Marvell’s poem and ‘To my Noble and most ingenious Friend, Col. Richard Lovelace, upon his Lucasta. Another, Upon the Poems’ by John Pinchbacke (about whom virtually nothing is known). Pinchbacke laments the calamitous effect of the ‘wars’ on poetry and looks back to a time:

When wit had praise, and merit had reward,
And every noble spirit did accord
To love the Muses, and their Priests to raise,
And interpale their brows with flourishing bayes.

Marvell’s verse epistle take its initial inspiration though from Sheppard’s attack on Hall as a ‘Treason to the Muses’ at the end of May 1648:

Sir,
Our times are much degenerate from those
Which your sweet Muse with your fair fortune chose,
And as complexions alter with the climes,
Our wits have drawn th’ infection of our times.
That candid age no other way could tell
To be ingenious, but by speaking well.

(ll. 1–6)

The pairing of ‘candid’ and ‘ingenious’ in lines 5–6 recalls the description of ‘Col. Lovelace’ in *Elencticus*: Sheppard had asked Hall if he really thought himself ‘a fit Associate for such Ingenious and candid soules as Col. Lovelace, Captaine Sherburne, Mr Shirley, or Mr Stanley’. Marvell must have expected Hall and Lovelace to recognize the allusion. ‘Candid’ derives from *candidus*, which can mean ‘clothed in white’, beautiful’, ‘radiant’, ‘sincere’; ‘ingenious’, as we know, comes from *ingenium*, meaning ‘talent’, ‘genius’, ‘clever’, with a link to *ingenuus*, ‘noble’. The apparent recollection of Sheppard’s furious charge that Hall had betrayed learning, poetry, and wit by turning from lyric verse to the writing of a Parliamentary newsbook is appropriate to the subject of the opening verse

---

68 LP 5, ll. 13–16. I see little basis for Guild’s assertion that Marvell must have written before Pinchbacke because Marvell’s poem reflects ‘a happier state of mind’ (‘The Contexts of Marvell’s Early “Royalist” Poems’, 126). It seems more likely (and more characteristic) that Marvell had access to the commendatory poems of Hall and Pinchbacke before he composed his own and responded to aspects of those poems that interested him.
paragraph: the ‘infection’ of wit by the factional politics of the times (and here Lovelace may allude to the title of Hall’s *A True Account and Character of the Times*). ‘Wit’, literary creativity, is no longer an ideal that stands above faction, but has been absorbed into the discourse of party polemic and personal abuse. Marvell uses ‘wit’ and ‘wits’ three times in the first twenty lines of the poem, on each occasion linked to disease and corruption. The times in which Lovelace first wrote, however, are separated from this present corruption of wit by the careful use of pronouns. The opposition created through repetition of ‘our’ and ‘your’ is aptly described by Martin Dzelzainis as a ‘wall dividing the way things were from the way they are now’.69

It might seem odd that Marvell should contrast Lovelace’s age with ‘our times’—‘our’ is repeated four times in the first twelve lines, emphasizing a common infection, whose victims presumably include Marvell himself. But was Lovelace not also living in ‘our times’ and therefore similarly infected? After all Lovelace was only three years older than Marvell and they had both been at Cambridge in 1637. Indeed Marvell addresses Lovelace as ‘Mr’ rather than ‘Colonel’, the form of address used by Hall and in five other commendatory poems, because they are both graduates and therefore equals (Hall of course left Cambridge without completing his degree).70 Moreover Lovelace wrote much of the verse included in *Lucasta* during the 1640s; as we have seen, the poems that he wrote on his return to England in 1647 engage, obliquely but insistently, with the post-war political and cultural situation. But then Marvell does not follow *Elencticus* in praising Lovelace himself as ‘candid’ and ‘ingenious’ but rather the times which first nurtured his literary talents. We saw in the Villiers elegy how Marvell portrayed the young nobleman, though eight years his junior (but also a Cambridge contemporary), as an anachronistic figure in the ferocious world of the civil war, with its mutilated bodies and bloodthirsty newsbooks. In death Villiers is returned to the mythical Caroline landscape of love and honour in which he grew up. Lovelace had been a court favourite in the final days of the Caroline era, renowned, like Villiers, for his beauty. His (lost) play *The Scholars*, seen by Charles and Henrietta Maria at Oxford in 1636, had secured his entrance to the court, and one of his first datable poems is an elegy for the infant Princess Catherine in the Oxford University collection *Musarum Oxoniensium Charisteria* (1639). As Smith notes, Marvell’s poem to Lovelace ‘is a panegyric, but also, by its occasion, an elegy, not for Lovelace, but for the lost halcyon days of pre-war culture’ (*MP* 19) The opposition between Lovelace’s pure past and the corrupt present invokes a characteristically royalist nostalgia for a golden, pre-war literary world, such as we find in the commendatory poems to the Beaumont and Fletcher folio, or in Pinchbecke’s commendatory poem for *Lucasta*, or in Stanley’s

69 ‘Literature, War and Politics, 1642–1668’, 12.
70 See Craze, *Life and Lyrics*, 34. The two other poems which address Lovelace as ‘Mr’ or ‘Domino’ are by academics, William Rudyerd and John Harmer.
‘A Register of Friends’, in which we are told that the light of Lovelace’s muse was eclipsed ‘By interposition of the Rebell-Throng’ (*PTTS* 360).

Yet problems remain. Although Marvell never joined Lovelace in the Caroline court, his first published poem, *Ad Regem Carola Parodia*, was also occasioned by courtly events, the birth of Princess Anne in 1637, and similarly printed in a university collection. And while Marvell’s complaint about the disease of faction which has infected English wit during the civil wars is ‘classically royalist’, James Loxley points out that, ‘in the semantic complex of royalism’, faction is ‘seen as a rebel imposition and not something that the King’s defenders find in themselves’—a perspective at odds with the inclusiveness of ‘Our wits have drawne th’infection of our times’.71 Crucially, Marvell looks back in the Lovelace poem not to the Caroline court but specifically to the ‘town’ as a place where poets praised ‘worthy men’ and advanced civic virtue through ‘speaking well’ (ll. 6, 10–11).72 In the prologue to *The Scholars*, which survives along with the epilogue from a performance at Whitefriars, Lovelace had assured his audience that ‘Tho the Scene and Gown’s | The Universities, the Wit’s the Town’s’ (*RLP* 65, ll. 3–4). ‘Town’ is a term with a particular Jonsonian resonance, appearing in Jonson’s verses to his literary friends and acolytes about the proper relationship between wit and virtue, poetry and morality. In ‘The Vision of Mr Ben Jonson, on the Muses of his friend M. Drayton’ (1627) Jonson insists that his poetic communication with Drayton does not mean that he plans to start a new ‘riming club | About the towne’. In ‘An Epistle Answering to One that Asked to be Sealed of the Tribe of Ben’ (1623) Jonson condemns those

That to speak well, think it above all sin,
Of any company but that they are in,
Call every night to supper in these fits,
And are reveived for the covey of wits;
That censure all the town, and all th’affairs,
And know whose ignorance is more than theirs:
Let these men have their ways, and take their rhymes;
I have no portion in them, nor their deal
Of news they get, to strew out the long meal.

Jonson used the verse epistle, along with the epigram and the commendatory poem, to give poetic representation to the communities of friends, poets, and wits that he gathered around him in the taverns of Stuart London.73 In Jonson’s circles, these forms were regarded as a semi-public mode of communication between virtuous, cultivated men, in which they could freely and fairly compliment and

71 ‘Prepared at last to strike in with the tyde?’, 49.
72 A point made by Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 173.
censure one another’s writing.\textsuperscript{74} In Epigram XCVI, ‘To John Donne’ (first published, 1616), Jonson accepts Donne’s authority to judge and censure Jonson’s verse ‘evenly’:

\begin{quote}
That so alone can judge, so alone dost make;  
And, in thy censures, evenly, doest take  
A free simplicity to disavow,  
As thou hast best authority to allow.
\end{quote}

\textit{(Complete Poems, 67–8, ll. 3–6)}

‘To My Chosen Friend, The Learned Translator of Lucan, Thomas May, Esquire’ (1627)—a poem to which I shall return when considering ‘Tom May’s Death’—is an example of one of Jonson’s commendatory poems ‘written in honour of admired and trusted contemporaries, that engage in substantial ethical and political criticism’, the most substantial of which is the poem for John Selden’s \textit{Titles of Honour} (1614). Jonson at first expresses his misgivings about the effect the \textit{Pharsalia} might have on English readers’ conceptions of the world (and by implication the monarchical order under which they live), before accepting and applauding the eloquence of both Lucan’s epic and May’s translation.\textsuperscript{75} One example of a ‘son of Ben’ offering his literary ‘father’ criticism as well as compliment is Carew’s ‘To Ben Jonson. Upon occasion of his Ode of defiance annex’d to his play \textit{The New Inn}’ (1629); an example of Jonson’s use of the verse epistle to emphasize his paternal role is ‘To My Old Faithful Servant: And (by His Continued Virtue) My Loving Friend: the Author of this Work, M\[r\] Rich\[ard\] Brome’ (1632). Both poems complain about the current decline in literary standards, indicating how such complaint had become a motif of the verse epistle addressed from one poet to another: the purpose of the verse epistle in Jonson’s circles was ‘show that one can discriminate between virtue and vice’, good and bad poetry.\textsuperscript{76}

As we have seen, many of the commendatory poems collected in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio at the beginning of 1647 express nostalgia for the Stuart era, and the whole exercise of gathering together writers in tribute can be seen as an attempt to recreate a Jonsonian sense of poetic community at a time when some hoped the end of the (first) war to mean, in the phrase of Alexander Brome, that ‘Witt is past its Climactericall’.\textsuperscript{77} In fact Richard Brome’s contribution to the folio is partly a response to Jonson’s verse epistle from seventeen years earlier: Brome makes much of his time as Jonson’s assistant (‘Master of his Art and me’) and recalls with nostalgic fondness the ‘Wit-Conventions’ held by Jonson in London taverns and attended by writers such Fletcher (sig. g1r). The
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gathering of writers in the folio looks back to the example of the elegies collected in the 1638 *Jonsonus Virbius* and Jonson himself is even ‘revived’ (as the title-page of *Jonsonus Virbius* had promised) in the form of his commendatory poem for the publication of Fletcher’s *The Faithful Shepherdess* (1608). Through the gathering of commendatory verses which they prefixed to each others’ volumes, the Stanley circle sought to preserve this Jonsonian notion of community in post-war London, and to maintain the social mode of Cavalier literary culture. The reappearance of poems of address and tribute in different volumes issued by members of the circle cultivated and advertised the sense of flourishing intellectual and social exchange under Stanley’s wing: Shirley’s ‘To his Honoured Friend Thomas Stanley Esquire, Upon his Elegant Poems’ appears in both his own collection and before Stanley’s 1647–8 *Poems and Translations*, as does Hall’s ‘To my honoured Noble Friend Mr Thomas Stanley, Esq.’. Hall echoes Jonson’s commendatory poem for the 1623 Shakespeare folio in applauding Stanley as ‘Sweet swan of silver Thames!’ (*MPCP* ii. 199, l. 45).

It is hardly unexpected, then, that in his commendatory poem for *Lucasta* we find Francis Lenton wanting to crown Lovelace as ‘another Ben’, to turn Lovelace into a Jonsonian arbiter of literary and social conduct for the post-war age. Although Lovelace, like Marvell, was ‘born too late to be a “son of Ben”, Lenton, like Herrick, Sherburne, Richard Brome, and Charles Cotton senior, had moved in the Jonsonian circles of Caroline London. It is this Jonsonian, rather than courtly, golden age that Marvell associates with Lovelace’s poetry. The distinction between court and town is emphasized if Marvell expected Lovelace to recall Henry Glapthorne’s *White-Hall* (1642), dedicated ‘To my Noble Friend and Gossip, Captaine Richard Lovelace’, a form of address echoed in Marvell’s poem. In Glapthorne’s curious poem the building itself complains of the peril it faces with the outbreak of civil war, and looks back to its halcyon days of the 1620s and 1630s:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{The Muses then did florish, and upon} \\
\text{My pleasant mounts planted their Helicon.} \\
\text{Then that great wonder of the knowing age,} \\
\text{Whose very name merits the amallest page} \\
\text{In Fames faire book, admired Johnson stood} \\
\text{Up to the chin in the Pierarian flood,} \\
\text{Quaffing crowned bowles of Nectar} \
\end{align*}
\]

(sig. B2v)

In his dedication Glapthorne offers his poem in recognition of Lovelace’s patronage—was Marvell also thanking Lovelace for introducing him to Stanley’s patronage? Smith points out that that Marvell’s verse epistle is concerned, like

78 Marcus, *Politics of Mirth*, 217; ‘To the Honourable, Valiant, and Ingenious Colonel Richard Lovelace, on his Exquisite Poems’, in *LP* 11, l. 22. Sir Aston Cokayn includes a number of comic drinking poems to Lenton and Cotton, senior and junior, in his *Poems* (1658).
Horace’s verse epistles, with the place of the poet in public life, but that Horace’s poets ‘assume the patronage of the great, including Augustus’, which contrasts with Marvell’s complaint about ‘decayed times’ (MP 19). In comparison with Glapthorne’s poem, Marvell’s emphasis on the ‘town’ and silence about Whitehall significantly displaces the site of virtuous letters in Caroline London. But then this emphasis may testify to Marvell’s attentive reading of Lucasta and perhaps to discussions about the state of the ‘commonwealth of letters’ with Lovelace, Hall, and others in the Stanley circle, for it is this displacement of the context of artistic endeavour from a dissolved court to the friendship of peers that we have measured in Lovelace’s post-war verse. Lovelace’s ‘The Grasshopper’ is addressed ‘To My Noble Friend Charles Cotton’, again a form echoed by Marvell: at once Horatian ode and anacreontic, ‘The Grasshopper’ is also an adapted version of the Horatian epistle.  

Marvell looks back to the Horatian and Jonsonian connection between eloquent praise, ‘speaking well’ in both senses, and civic virtue:

Who best could praise, had then the greatest praise,  
’Twas more esteemed to give than wear the bays:  
Modest ambition studied only then,  
To honour not herself, but worthy men.  
These virtues now are banished out of town,  
Our civil wars have lost the civic crown.  
He highest builds, who with most art destroys,  
And against others’ fame his own employs.  

(ll. 7–14)

In their commendatory verses for each others’ verse, the Stanley circle made efforts to revive this tradition of praise as the most praiseworthy form of eloquence. Shirley ingeniously imagined that not only his verse but his very body might do honour to Stanley’s poems in an image which offers an interesting counterpoint to the opening of Marvell’s ‘The Garden’ (especially since Shirley’s ‘The Garden’, in which the poet yearns for a place where ‘No woman shall find me out’, is a neglected model for Marvell’s lyric):

I know not where I am, when I peruse  
Thy learned loves; how willingly I lose  
Myself in every grove, and wish to be,  
Might it contribute to thy wreath, a tree.

But for Marvell, the Jonsonian virtues are not being reintroduced in post-war England but are ‘banished out of town’. Both the ‘Delphick wreath and Civic

79 Miner, Cavalier Mode, 263.  
80 Maclean (ed.), Ben Jonson and the Cavalier Poets, 191, ll. 9–12; 194–5, l. 29. Shirley’s poem is not cited in MP. Smith dates ‘The Garden’ to the 1660s but of course the version that was published in 1681 may be a revision of an earlier piece, written perhaps in response to Shirley’s lyric in the manner encouraged by Stanley.
Coronet’ that Hall places on Lovelace’s brow are absent from Marvell’s London. The Jonsonian ethos, founded on classical principles of literary and ethical discrimination, could encompass a range of political opinion. It was to this aspect of the Jonsonian inheritance that Milton appealed in imitating a Jonsonian epigram in his sonnet ‘To My Friend Mr Henry Lawes’. Hall’s very appearance in the commendatory verses to Lucasta, after his appearance in Britannicus, was testament to the desire of Lovelace and the Stanley circle to maintain this ethos and to place the cause of wit and friendship above party allegiance. Marvell though dwells rather on the vicious ad hominem insults of the newsbooks, his perspective apparently clouded by the personal attack launched by Elencticus on Hall and its division of Hall from Lovelace, Shirley, Sherburne, and Stanley in moral and literary as well as political terms. Marvell could be taken to be referring in his lament about the infection of wit by faction very specifically to Hall, who had contributed with Lovelace to the Stanley circle’s poetic endeavours only to turn to Parliamentary polemic, and who of course then follows Marvell in the commendatory poems. But the inclusivity of ‘our wits’ again resists such personal or partisan identification—university wits turned royalist propagandists such as Berkenhead and Cleveland were evidently equally implicated in the business of factional polemic. This is not though to say that Marvell does not blame anyone for the condition of English letters, for at this point he is unable to maintain the elevated tone of the verse epistle and in the second verse paragraph the poem modulates, like many of the epistles of Horace, into satirical vituperation, aimed at those whom Marvell holds responsible for the corruption of the Horatian and Jonsonian ethos. Marvell shows himself not to be immune from the universal infection, although his invective remains generalized rather than ad hominem.

Before considering the nature and object of Marvell’s satirical attack, it is illuminating to compare another commendatory poem written for Lucasta by one of the Stanley circle. Alexander Brome’s ‘To Colonel Lovelace on his Poems’ was not, for some reason, published until 1661 and has consequently been ignored in all critical discussions of Lucasta or Marvell’s verse epistle. The poem was certainly written for the first Lucasta rather than the posthumous second volume: Brome states of his lines that ‘the cause why these are fixed here, | Is livery-like to shew some great man’s near’ (ll. 37–8). Might Brome’s poem have been removed by the licensers? This seems unlikely in terms of content: although Brome refers to ‘Pulpitpeers’ whose ‘Prose unhing’d the State’ (ll. 21, 23), he does not explicitly attack the licensers or the Presbyterian clergy in the manner of Marvell’s poem. Nonetheless perhaps Brome felt that publication of his poem might put him at risk of the imprisonment that Lovelace had suffered. Brome’s language is less subtle and allusive than Marvell’s but there are clear resemblances

81 The poem is included in the introduction of LP, pp. lxxxvi–lxxxvii. It was first printed in Brome’s Songs and other Poems (1661), 138–9.
between the two poems. Lovelace’s poetry emerges, like the first ray of light at the creation,

Through the thick darkness of these verseless times,
These antigenious dayes, this boystrous age,
Where there dwells nought of Poetry but rage:
Just so crept learning forth the rav’rous fire
Of the Schismatick Goths, and Vandals ire:
As do those in these more barbarous dayes our times,
When what was meant for ruine, but refines.

(ll. 4–10)

Marvell refers to the degeneration of poetic wit in ‘our times’ twice in his first four lines; Brome refers to ‘these verseless times’ and ‘these more barbarous dayes our times’. Brome also writes of ‘These antigenius dayes’; Marvell associates Lovelace with the ‘ingenious’ eloquence of the Jonsonian era. ‘Antigenius’ is a word of Brome’s invention, but it strongly conveys the sense of Marvell’s complaint. Brome then goes on, rather as he did in his contribution to the Beaumont and Fletcher folio, to express the hope that the publication of Lucasta might herald the ‘Restauration’ of ‘ancient Poets Townes’ and a time ‘when again we may see / Wits like themselves, club in an harmony’ (ll. 19–20). Brome’s translation of Jonson’s Leges Conviviales, ‘Ben Jonson’s Sociable Rules for the Apollo’, begins: ‘Let none but Guests or Clubbers hither come’.82 As in Marvell’s poem, there is no mention of king or court or royal patronage: it is the Jonsonian literary clubs of Stuart London that Brome identifies with the harmonious life of letters.

Brome’s poem is closer to Marvell’s than any of the printed commendatory poems to Lucasta and further illuminates the Jonsonian note struck by Marvell; as we shall see in a moment, Brome also concludes his poem by dwelling on Lovelace’s popularity with the ladies. Given that Brome’s poem was not published until 1661, the conclusion must be that Marvell saw Brome’s poem in manuscript while he was composing his own, or vice versa, or that they collaborated. Brome hopes the publication of Lovelace’s verse has the miraculous Orphic power to refine the times and restore the Jonsonian ethos, even though that hope is couched in negatives (‘Why mayn’t we hope’, ‘I can’t but think’). In the satirical second verse paragraph, Marvell undermines Brome’s comparison of Lovelace’s verse with ‘the first born ray’ which ‘form’d the World’, cutting through ‘the thick darkness of these verseless times’, with an image of Lovelace and his book rather being enveloped by ‘swarms’ of the enemies of wit:

I see the envious caterpillar sit
On the fair blossom of each growing wit.
The air’s already tainted with the swarms
Of insects which rise against you in arms:
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Word-peckers, paper-rats, book-scorpions,  
Of wit corrupted, the unfashioned sons.  
The barbèd censurers begin to look  
Like the grim consistory on thy book;  
And on each line cast a reforming eye,  
Severer than the young Presbytery.  
Till when in vain they have thee all perused,  
You shall for being faultless be accused.

(ll. 15–26)

Initially Marvell maintains the Jonsonian note of his verse epistle: Jonson had written in ‘An Epistle Answering to One that Asked to be Sealed of the Tribe of Ben’ of those ‘that merely talk and never think, | That live in the wild anarchy of drink, | Subject to quarrel only’ that they will jest ‘On all souls that are absent, even the dead, | Like flies or worms which man’s corrupt parts fed’ (Complete Poems, 73–4, ll. 9–11, 17–18). The indiscriminate censurers Jonson condemns are unable to ‘speak well’ (l. 19), either eloquently or in praise of others: Carew characterizes them in his epistle to Jonson on the reaction to The New Inn by their ‘swollen pride and empty scribbling’ (l. 3).

Yet this Jonsonian language of the 1620s and 1630s, which defines an elite literary community (‘the tribe of Ben’) characterized by its humanity (a term which in the seventeenth century denoted a knowledge of classical languages and literature) against a world of savage scribblers, is itself infected with the factional politics of the 1640s, as Jonson’s attack on ignorant censurers becomes Marvell’s attack on ignorant censors. It is usually assumed that the ‘Word-peckers, paper-rats, book-scorpions’ are ‘partisan pamphleteers and journalists bred from the corruption of wit’ (MP 20). But Lovelace’s friend Hall, a poet whom Marvell evidently admired, had become one of these partisan pamphleteers; and the portmanteau terms are in fact derived from the satirical journalism of Hall and his friend Nedham. After Berkenhead had stopped publishing Mercurius Aulicus, it was replaced by the Richard Little’s short-lived Oxford journal Mercurius Academicus, a title which was scorned by Nedham in Britanicus. For all Berkenhead’s misguided politics, Nedham acknowledged (now that he regarded Aulicus as defeated) that he and Berkenhead shared an education in and appreciation of classical eloquence: ‘we are both Athenians’. As for Academicus: ‘a mere paper-worm it is, a caterpillar that devours many a good leaf which might be better employed; and leaves neither fruit nor pleasure behind: sure this is some Witty-\_would-be in print’. 83 The Jonsonian origins of Nedham’s language of literary censure are hinted at in the allusion to Sir Politic Would-Be, the pretentious and foolish English traveller in Venice in Jonson’s Volpone (1606). If Marvell remembers the language in which Nedham had discriminated between the quality and

culture—the wit—of polemical prose, it may not be the case that Marvell simply condemns newsbook writers outright, but the ‘empty scribbling’ of the culturally inferior writer.

Nedham also tended to use such portmanteau terms of abuse when addressing the Presbyterian clergy, as in *Independence No Schisme*: ‘I must needs throw away some ink upon this paper-worm, this great benefactor to the magazine of waste-paper.’ The Presbyterian position is identified with ‘empty scribbling’. Nigel Smith cites Nedham’s use of ‘Paper-pellets’ and ‘Water-rats’ within a few lines of each other in *Pragmaticus* at the end of February 1648 (*MP* 20). In this issue Nedham’s central theme is the condemnation of his writings by the Presbyterian clergy, whom he styles as ‘a curious Tribe of Criticks . . . offended, because I mingle Scripture-phrase with my Relations’. Nedham justifies his satirical style as a means of exposing Presbyterian hypocrisy and cunning: ‘what I doe in this way, is but in derision of them, who set both Scripture and Conscience upon the wracke, to bring about their own ends’.84 The Presbyterian clergy are the target of Nedham’s animalistic language of abuse in works written in support both of Independency and royalism. Such imagery of corruption and barbarism also structures Hall’s anticlerical and anti-Presbyterian polemic in *Britanicus*. In the first issue of *Britanicus* Hall had attacked the number of clerics writing against Parliament, ‘distinguished by their Beards and Cassocks’, as ‘croaking Frogs . . . equivocally generated of heat and putrefaction’—an image recalled in Marvell’s notion of the ‘barbèd censurers’ as insects bred from the dung of wit. Equally the Scots are ‘things good for nothing but destruction’, who would ‘bring in their lice and Presbytery once more amongst us’.85

‘Swarm’ was frequently used to describe sectarian activity in the 1640s, as in John Taylor’s *A Swarme of Sectaries and Schismatiques* (1641), which blamed, from a royalist position, the explosion of sectarian belief on the rise of Presbyterianism. The term also alludes once more to the clouds of flies and locusts sent to plague the Egyptians in Exodus 8–10, which were conflated in the early modern mind with the locusts which emerge from the bottomless pit in Revelation, who were ‘given power, as the scorpions on earth have power’ (Revelation 9: 3). In *The Locusts, or Apollyonists*, his poem about the Gunpowder plot (first published 1627), Phineas Fletcher identifies the Jesuits with these biblical locusts: ‘See how they rise, and with their numerous swarmes | Filling the world with fogges, and fierce alarms’.86 In Joel 2: 4 several of the creatures who appear in Marvell’s poem are placed together in a vision of universal corruption and forthcoming apocalyptic destruction: ‘That which the palmer-worm hath left hath the locust

85 *Mercurius Britannicus* (16 May 1648), 4; 10 (18 July 1648), 74, 76.
eaten; and that which the locust hath left hath the cankerworm eaten; and that
which the cankerworm hath left the caterpillar hath eaten.’ Marvell’s invocation
of these biblical devourers and destroyers of the fruit of the land to convey the
looming threat to Lovelace and his book suggests his careful reading of Lucasta:
as we saw in Chapter 3, in the penultimate stanza of ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’
the poet invokes the locust-scorpions of Revelation in expressing his fear that
he will be enveloped by the ‘universal mist | of Error’, ‘With such a fury edg’d,
as is | Not found in th’ inwards of th’ Abysse’ (ll. 49–52). Lovelace opposes in
Lucasta the motif of the festive, lyrical anacreontic grasshopper—by which he
really means the Greek cicada—to that of the devouring, destructive Puritan
locust. (It is a theme which seems to have caught Marvell’s imagination, for he
returns to it, as we shall see, in ‘Upon Appleton House’.) Hall alluded more
directly to the biblical plagues in Britanicus in his insistence that the presence
of the Scots in England during the first civil war had left behind a memory as
‘ugly and hideous ... as the Frogs, Lice and Flyes ever did among the Egyptians.’
And Milton was to liken Presbyterians ministers to the apocalyptic locusts in The
Tenure of Kings and Magistrates (1649), written during the trial of the king, in
their ‘covetousness & fierce ambition, which is the pitt that sent out thir fellow
locusts, hath bin ever bottomless and boundless, to interpose in all things, and
over all persons, thir impetuous ignorance and importunity’ (CPWM iii. 258).
The ‘fellow locusts’ are presumably Jesuit priests or Laudian bishops, or both: the
gloss on Revelation 2 in the Geneva Bible identifies the locusts as ‘worldlie suttill
Prelates’.88

Marvell’s satirical imagery of caterpillars, insects, and ‘paper-rats’ has its origins
in pre-war Jonsonian abuse of ‘empty scribblers’ but its biblical associations and
resemblances to the newsbook polemic of Hall and Nedham suggest his target
is less uncultured polemicists than the Presbyterian clergy. The association of
the corruption of wit with Presbyterianism in Marvell’s mind becomes clearer
as the second verse paragraph progresses. The ‘censurers’ are not only ignorant
literary or moral critics, but the censors of the Parliamentary committee estab-
lished under the Licensing Act of 1643, renewed in October 1647; although
the following lines only compare the ‘censurers’ to the Presbyterian consistory or
court, the licensers are already characterized as Presbyterians by their ‘barbèd’
or bearded appearance, invoking the long-standing stereotype of the Puritan
cleric as legalistic, sabbatarian Jew. It had indeed been Presbyterian clerics in the
Westminster Assembly who had pushed for the Licensing Act of 1643 to suppress
heresy and who had been charged by Milton in Areopagitica with seeking to
legislate, in a move to secure their own dominance in the manner of the papacy,
against freedom of thought, belief, and interpretation: the renewal of the Act
in 1647 coupled with the Parliamentary Ordinance for a Presbyterian church
system in August 1648 emphasized the continuing influence of the Presbyterians

over matters of state. Marvell accuses the Parliamentary authorities of behaving like Presbyterians in their ‘barbèd’ or barbarous treatment of Lovelace’s poetry, both in their hypocrisy and their misguided literalism:

Some reading your *Lucasta*, will allege
You wronged in her the House’s privilege;
Some that you under sequestration are,
Because you write when going to the war[.]

(ll. 27–30)

The first couplet ‘alludes to the privilege of freedom of speech *within* the Commons, a privilege limited, however, to Members of Parliament, and denied to the rest of society specifically by the 1643 printing ordinance’. The second couplet echoes the title of the second lyric in *Lucasta*, ‘To Lucasta, Going to the Warres’: the implication is that the censors have read *Lucasta* in the foolishly literal way that Presbyterians read scripture, assuming that when Lovelace writes ‘To Warre and Armes I flie’ (*LP* 18, l. 4), he really is on his way to take up arms against Parliament.

In ‘To his Noble Friend Mr Richard Lovelace’ Marvell holds the Presbyterians responsible for the corruption of wit in post-war England; but it should now be clear that this does not make it a royalist poem. In lamenting the Presbyterian influence on civic society and its disastrous effects on learning and literature, Marvell adopted a theme that had obsessed Milton since *Areopagitica*, which recurs throughout the writings and correspondence of members of the Hartlib circle, that dominates Hall’s controversial prose in 1647–8, and is the consistent principle of Nedham’s publications in 1646–8, whether in ostensible support of Parliament or the king. In *Pragmaticus* in October 1648 we even find Nedham advising Cromwell that it is not in his or Parliament’s interest to ally with the Presbyterians: ‘Yet let them *juggle* and do what they can, I warrant you *Oliver* is more wise, than to admit of a *Scottish* Prebyterie in *England*, since wheresoever it settles, it layes an intollerable *Burthen* upon all, from the *King* to the *Beggar*, without exception.’ There seems to be a typically theatrical allusion to the witches in Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*, the logic of which aligns Cromwell with Macbeth, the future regicide: ‘And be these juggling fiends no more believ’d’ (5. 9. 19). Not long before Marvell was writing the poem to Lovelace, if we accept the dating proposed earlier, Milton was writing the sonnet to Fairfax, in which he insists that the Presbyterian influence in Parliament is the most urgent issue facing the country in the aftermath of victory in the second civil war. Animalistic images of the Presbyterians are to be found in Milton’s 1646–7 satirical sonnets as well as Cavalier touchstones such as Cleveland’s ‘The Rebel Scot’. In *The Reason of Church-Government* Milton had declared that he could not write the epic poetry that he had been destined to write until ‘the Land had once infranchis’d herself
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from this impertinent yoke of prelaty, under whose inquisitorious and tyrannical duncery no free and splendid wit can flourish’ (CPWM i. 819). I suggested in Chapter 2 that after the reaction to the divorce tracts Milton transferred the charge of ‘inquisitorious and tyrannical duncery’ from episcopacy to Presbytery. The conflation of a Jonsonian language of judgement with anti-Presbyterian invective in ‘To his Noble Friend Mr Richard Lovelace’ indicates that by the end of 1648 the renewal of civil and literary society in post-war London also depended for Marvell upon ridding the state of Presbyterian dominance. Leah Marcus, noting the ‘Jonsonian note’ struck by Marvell, thinks the final effect of the poem ‘is to divorce Jonsonian ideals from the implied social setting which has given them their urgency’. But in Marvell’s poem it is evidently the Presbyterian clerics, and the Parliamentary censors who act under the influence of the Presbyterians, who are held responsible for the continued dislocation of Jonsonian ideals of wit and virtue from post-war public life.

Crucially in the verse epistle, unlike the elegy for Villiers, Marvell shows no sign of regarding the court as the key site of cultural activity. We might look to the influence of Hall’s friendship and ideas to explain Marvell’s interest in the renewal of a Jonsonian ‘town’ rather than the restoration of the court, as we did in discussing the curious mock-heroic moment in the Villiers elegy—certainly Marvell had *Elencticus*’s attack on Hall as a ‘Traitor to the muses’ in his mind as he wrote to Lovelace about ‘our times’. Sheppard accused Hall not only of being *Britanicus* but of being the author of ‘the Answer to the Scots Demands’, an attribution which has been missed in all accounts of Hall’s life and works. *An Answer to the Scots Declaration. Or, a Survey of a Paper presented to the Parliament of England, with the Title of Seven Demands, from the Estates of Scotland*, was published anonymously in London in May 1648 by ‘T[homas] B[anks]’ who also published *Britanicus*. Interestingly the title-page describes it as ‘Published by Authority’, although there is no record of Hall being in the pay of Parliament at this time. The pamphlet is an indignant response to demands from the Scots regarding, among other things, the Long Parliament’s treatment of the king and the failed institution in England of a compulsory Presbyterian system of church government. The pamphlet, the views of which are entirely consonant with those of Hall’s *Britanicus*, is addressed to the Scots. It opens and ends with consideration of the relationship between environment and behaviour which might find an echo in Marvell’s ‘And as complexions alter with the climes, Our wits have drawn th’infection of our times.’ The author begins by pondering ‘how great a difference there often appears between Common-wealths, although of one Clime, one mold, nay, the same customes’ (1). The Scots and the English may live beside each other on the same strip of land, but the character of the Scots is debased, above all by their adoption of a persecutory Presbyterianism that they now seek to impose on an English people whose natural tendency is towards
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liberty of conscience: ‘can you desire to obtrude a government dissonant to the spirit and genius of our nation (unlesse ye be like maids in the green sickness, that think all ought to eat chalk as well as your selves) . . . who gives you a superintendency of our consciences? Or why can we not demean ourselves without your tuition? . . . the Conscience is a thing inviolable, and cannot be forced’ (8). By the end of the pamphlet the author has decided that the ‘climes’ of the two countries are very different after all: ‘But since Providence hath disposed of you to a clime and soyle not so absolutely happy, you would do well to contain your selves in it . . . you might presently grow so numerous . . . and like the Goths and Vandals your predecessors, overflow the richest and fattest pieces of the habitable earth’ (12). This resembles Hall’s declaration in Britanicus that ‘the barrenness and strangeness’ of Scotland ‘renders it as inhospitable to goodnesse and justice, as their dearly beloved Mistresse of England to wolves’. The idea is borrowed from Cleveland’s ‘The Rebel Scot’ (a satire that Marvell certainly knew well as he was to rewrite it as ‘The Loyal Scot’ in the quite different context of the early 1670s, when Parliamentary union between England and Scotland was being proposed): ‘Since they came in, England hath wolves again . . . Nature her selfe doth Scotch-men beasts confesse, | Making their Countrey such a wildernesse’ (ll. 40, 47–8). In Britanicus Hall had similarly compared the Scots to ‘Goths, and Vandalls, come, if they could, to over-run us once more’—language echoed in his friend Brome’s image of the ‘rav’rous fire | Of the Schismatick Goths and Vandals ire’, out of which ‘crept learning forth’ in the form of Lovelace’s verse (ll. 7–8).

Yet this is the only point of resemblance between Brome’s poem and Hall’s ‘To Colonel Richard Lovelace’; and, apart from the significant shared reference to the civic crown, there is little similarity between Marvell’s ‘To his Noble Friend Mr Richard Lovelace’ and Hall’s contribution to Lucasta. Indeed while Marvell represents Lovelace’s poetry as anachronistic, a reminder of a type of civil and literary society that is unable to function during war or under clerical domination, and Brome sees it as perhaps presaging the restoration of the Jonsonian ‘town’, Hall sees Lucasta as offering a new form of poetry in which the poet himself becomes his own heroic subject:

How many fiery Heroes have there been,  
Whose triumphs were as soone forgot, as seen?  
Because they wanted some diviner one  
To rescue them from night and make them known.  
Such art thou to thy selfe  
For none so fit to sing great things as He  
That can act o’re all lights of Poetry.  
That had Achilles his owne Gest design’d,  
He had his Genius Homer far outshin’d.

(LP 10, ll. 21–5, 29–32)
Hall suggests that the involvement of writers in war has developed a new mode of poetry which is superior even to classical forms in its collapse of the distinction between the poet and the man of action, between *otium* and *negotium*. Whereas in 1648 Mildmay Fane, in his collection *Otia Sacra*, was recommending to royalists retreat from public life into poetry and contemplation, Hall praises Lovelace as a royalist who has transcended the classical separation of poetic and martial activity. Far from causing the decline of wit, Hall sees the civil wars as having launched a new mode of heroic poetry. This notion is at odds with the movement I have charted in Lovelace’s post-war verse, away from public affairs (including the court) towards intimate literary and artistic friendships which preserved Jonsonian values but at the expense of Jonson’s link between good poetry and the conduct of public life: Marvell was apparently a more attentive reader of Lovelace’s verse than Hall. But Hall’s poem does chime with his conviction, evident particularly in the Hartlib correspondence, that the end of the civil wars represented an unprecedented opportunity to advance English learning and letters beyond old courtly boundaries and into new realms of achievement.

Of course Lovelace did not actually fight in the civil wars, which may be why Hall feels free to praise his martial prowess with such gusto. Unlike most of the commendatory poems, Marvell’s contribution makes no mention of Lovelace the soldier. Indeed his joke about the comically literal misunderstanding of ‘To Lucasta, Going to the Warres’ by the censors perhaps leads Marvell to consider Lovelace’s non-involvement in the English wars, for the third verse paragraph abruptly moves from satirical attack on Lovelace’s enemies to mock-heroic description of Lovelace himself. A group of ‘beauteous ladies’, having heard ‘that their deare Lovelace was endangered so’, run to protect him: ‘They all in mutiny, though yet undressed, | Sallied, and would in his defence contest’ (ll. 33–4, 39–40). This is a more extended instance of the tonal shift that we encountered in the Villiers elegy, with the ‘beauteous ladies’—who are, as Lois Potter observes, ‘typically “cavalier” themselves in their dishabille’—taking the place of the eleven thousand virgins who are ‘got up behind’ Villiers as he rides to his death in battle.93 Here though the ladies are not defended by Lovelace, but spring to his defence. The shift of tone is more perplexing in the context of the elegy but is nonetheless a surprise in the verse epistle, particularly in the context of the praise of Lovelace’s heroism in most of the other commendatory verses. Marvell evidently plays on his friend’s reputation as ‘one of the handsomest men in England’, and probably also alludes to one of the poems included in *Lucasta*, a commendatory poem for Anthony Hodges’s translation from the Greek of *The Loves of Clitophon and Leucippe* (1638). Lovelace addresses his poem ‘To the Ladies’ and plays the charmer, asking them to ‘Unfold the smoothness of this book, | To which no Art (except your sight) | Can reach a worthy Epithete’.94 But again Marvell also seems to be playing off aspects of Brome’s commendatory
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poem, for Brome concludes his otherwise serious musings on the perilous condition of letters in an England dominated by the prose of ‘Pulpiteers’ by turning to Lovelace’s ‘amorous fancy’:

Ladies love
To kiss those accents: who dares disprove
What they stile good? Our lines, our lives, and all;
By their opinions either rise or fall:

(l. 34–6)

Given Brome’s taste for bawdy and occasionally obscenity, there is likely a pun in the notion that poets ‘rise and fall’ depending on female approval. While there is a similar progression in Brome’s poem, as he moves from attack on the barbarity of the times to light-hearted admiration for the ardour of Lovelace’s female fan-club, Brome does not adopt the unsettling mock-heroic tone which distinguishes Marvell’s lines. We might again discern the influence on Marvell of Hall’s satirical representations of the Cavalier in *Britanicus*, where Cavalier energies are seen as directed towards empty erotic adventure rather than military victory or learned achievement—as in Hall’s image of the defeated and captured Holland, entering London to ‘make cringes and shew himself before the Ladies’.

Marvell though seems self-conscious about his mildly satirical representation of Lovelace as Cavalier lover rather than fighter, for he then makes himself a character in the mock-heroic romance narrative in which he has placed Lovelace. Challenged by one of the ladies, ‘the lovliest that was yet e’er seen’, Marvell assures them that he is not one of the ‘rout’ and that he ‘In your defence, or his cause, would die’ (ll. 41, 43, 46). The term ‘rout’ again has associations with a Jonsonian language of censure: in his verse epistle to Jonson on the reaction to *The New Inn*, Carew scorns as ‘the rout’ those in the ‘detracting world’ who relish the declining creative powers of Jonson (ll. 28–9). At the same time Hall had dismissed the Presbyterian clergy in *Britanicus* as ‘a rabble blacker and more hideous than can ever be in the most melancholike and depraved fancies’.95 This anxiety about being mistaken for one of the ‘rout’, whether of ignorant censurers or Presbyterian censors, suggests that the attack in *Elencticus* on Hall as ‘Traaytor to the Muses’ and betrayer of his ‘ingenious’ and ‘candid’ friends Lovelace and Stanley is still on Marvell’s mind. If Marvell’s association with Hall was well known among the London literati—and their appearance beside each other in 1649 in both *Lucasta* and *Lachrymae Musarum* indicates that it was—then Marvell must have been concerned that the charges of treason and apostasy made publicly against Hall after his appearance for Parliament might also be made against him. In the light of its opening allusion to Sheppard’s charge that Hall was a traitor not only to his king but to his fellow poets, the peculiar conclusion of the verse epistle suggests less Marvell’s sense of himself ‘as somewhat on the
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outside of Lovelace’s circle’ than his fear of expulsion from those circles, whether because of his friendship with Hall or because he was beginning to find himself persuaded by Hall’s arguments.96

What, then, is the ‘cause’ for which Marvell insists he would die in his dialogue with the ‘beauteous ladies’ who rush to defend Lovelace? Is it the cause of wit or the cause of the king? Royalist polemicists such as Elencticus insisted that the two causes were indistinguishable—to support the king was to support poetry, and vice versa. Thomas Stanley and most of his friends, including Lovelace and Alexander Brome, regarded, at least some of the time, their exercises in classical imitation and translation as ‘both poetic and political in nature’.97 Yet for Hall, a founding member of the Stanley circle, increase of the ‘commonwealth of letters’ was no longer linked to the restoration of royal and court patronage; it was dependent though, as it was for Milton, on ridding England of clerical domination. At the end of the verse epistle Lovelace’s ‘book’ is given the most Jonsonian of tributes: it finds ‘judgement’, in the sense of discernment rather than censure, among ‘valian’st men’. But only after Lovelace has been taken out ‘of time’, lifted above the ‘envy’ of the rout (ll. 47–50). In Marvell’s poem to Lovelace, with its echoes of both royalist and Parliamentarian anti-Presbyterian rhetoric, the ‘cause’ is the cause of wit against Presbyterian censorship and moralism; but the conviction that literary culture is dependent upon Stuart rule, which had become ingrained in royalist mythology, is absent.
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John Hall was not yet 29 when on 1 August 1656 he died in his native Durham from a long illness. In his elegy for Hall, included in John Davies’s 1657 edition of Hall’s translation of Hierocles Upon the Golden Verses, Richard Lovelace acknowledged their political differences but insisted that ‘justice’ and ‘truth’ demanded that he commemorate ‘the Genius of Mr John Hall’:

Alas! Our Faiths made different Essays,
Our Minds and Merits brake two several ways;
Justice commands, I wake thy learned Dust
And truth, in whom all causes center must.1

Lovelace recalled the commendatory poem that Hall had contributed to Lucasta—‘Th’ immortal Grove of thy fair order’d bay, | Thou planted’st around my Humble Fane’—but insisted that his elegy was not ‘cheap thanks’ written out of a sense of mere obligation (ll. 1–3). Lovelace, like his cousin Thomas Stanley, maintained respect for Hall and for his learning and literary ability—even after the regicide and Hall’s service from 1649–55 as propagandist for both Commonwealth and Protectorate regimes. My final chapter and conclusion explore the reactions to regicide of Marvell, Hall, Lovelace, Stanley, and writers associated with Stanley’s circle such as Alexander Brome; although, as we shall see, Stanley’s own immediate reaction to the execution of Charles I was to leave London and so presumably put an end to regular gatherings of the circle in the Middle Temple.

The resolution made by the Army officers who gathered for a prayer meeting in Windsor Castle in April 1648 to ‘call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to an account for the blood that he had shed’ heralded the beginning of a new phase in the civil wars in which the king was now openly charged by the Army and their supporters as personally responsible for the continuing conflict. Exasperated by
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the continuing negotiations with the king pursued by the Presbyterian majority in the Commons, on 6 December the Army had occupied London and prevented more than a hundred MPs from taking their seats. While ‘Pride’s Purge’ involved the seclusion not simply of Presbyterians but of those MPs who supported negotiations with the king, ‘there can be no doubt that among such persons Presbyterians were the most prominent, and even more strongly represented among those who were not only secluded but also imprisoned’. The ‘purged’ Parliament acted quickly to try Charles, who was beheaded at Whitehall on 30 January 1649. In *An Humble Motion to the Parliament of England Concerning the Advancement of Learning: And Reformation of the Universities*, entered in the Stationers’ Register on 5 May 1649, Hall applauded Parliament for having ‘cleared our liberties, and set them now on the right Base, having by a transcendent comprehensive peece of Justice, removed the common oppressour’. It was probably this unusually direct praise of the regicide that brought Hall to the attention of the Council of State. On 14 May 1649 Hall joined his exemplar Milton in the employment of the Commonwealth government, on a salary of £100 per annum (£188 less than Milton, who had been employed as Secretary for Foreign Tongues in March), with a brief to ‘Make Answere to such pamphletts as shall come out to the prejudice of this Com[m]onwealth’.3

Lovelace’s *Lucasta* was entered in the Stationer’s Register on the same day that Hall was hired by the Council of State. Lovelace had been released, after some six months, on 10 April; his diminished circumstances are indicated by the sale of the family house in Kent, Lovelace Place, soon after his release. Little is known of his whereabouts during the 1650s but it seems he stayed mainly in London, increasingly reliant on the charity of friends such as Charles Cotton the younger and writing the lyric verse that appeared in the posthumous 1659 *Lucasta*.4 In Hall and Lovelace, whose ‘Faiths made different Essays’, Marvell had two contrasting examples among his literary friends of how he might live in the post-regicide world. As the opening of the verse epistle to Lovelace reveals, Marvell was acutely aware of the charge of treason to the Muses levelled at Hall in the royalist newsbooks; yet the Parliamentarian army had saved England from the Presbyterian dominance that Marvell had bitterly attacked in the verse epistle and that Charles I had agreed to establish in return for the restoration of kingship. And then, of course, there was the question of patronage and income for a man who could not live, as Stanley did, off a family inheritance. In this final chapter I consider how several of the recurring themes of this book—Marvell’s friendships and the social contexts of his verse, the loss of the patronage structures of the Stuart court, the perceived threat of clerical power to liberty of wit, intellect, and conscience—can suggest new approaches to the notoriously
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enigmatic occasional poems of 1650, ‘An Horation Ode’ and ‘Tom May’s Death’. One of the reasons for the perplexity which these poems have caused among scholars looking for Marvell’s political, and indeed psychological, consistency is, as I pointed out in my introduction, the perdurable assumption that ‘Marvell’s best poetry was unknown to his contemporaries until after his death’. But it will be clear by the end of this chapter that this is simply not true. The work of Cowley, Dryden, Lovelace, and Alexander Brome in the 1650s and 1660s all exhibits some knowledge of either the ‘Ode’ or ‘Tom May’s Death’. This is an impressive and significant list of poets by any standards. We can take a more historically convincing approach to the problems of allegiance posed by these poems by asking how they were read by friends and associates.

The Advancement of Learning, as its title suggests, is a continuation of Hall’s efforts in Cambridge in 1646–7 to secure support and funding for Samuel Hartlib’s vision of the reformation of education and intellectual communication. The language is often reminiscent of the excited letters to Hartlib, except now the foundation of the Commonwealth rather than Parliamentary victory in the first civil war is seen as the occasion to reorganize intellectual culture and transform the nature and purpose of institutions of learning or ‘litterary Republicks’ (5). This passage is characteristic in its fusion of Baconian philosophy and Miltonic cultural politics:

What meanes were used before, for a bare historical knowledge, must now be turned into a censorious justice upon our old opinions, and into severe and eager disquisitions of new truths; for knowledge hath no limits nor Land-marks but being ubiquitary, and therefore desirous to diffuse it selfe, she endeavours by all means her promotion and dilatation. Nor doth she ever meet with any that would enlarge her Empire, but shee ambitiously encourages them, and willingly crownes them. Now for any one to thinke, that one and the same meanes are to be used to preserve a State, either new curdled and moulded into form, or else by outward violence retired to its last seat and almost first principles, and the same state when it hath overcome either its infancy or misery, and like a wakened Gyant begins to rowze it selfe up, and looke where it may conquer, is utterly unvers’d in the affaires of the world, and below instruction. (18–19)

The initial section of this passage is derived from Bacon’s description of the aims of Salomon’s House in the New Atlantis, one of the models for Hartlib’s Office of Address: ‘The End of our Foundation is the Knowledge of Causes, and secret motions of things, and the enlarging of the bounds of Human empire, to the effecting of all things possible’. The concluding line is derived from Areopagitica, where England is imagined, Samson-like, as ‘a noble and puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep’ (ii. 558).

Bacon’s empire of knowledge seems to shade here, by way of Milton’s image, into a vision of territorial expansion: Hall predicts that Parliament will ‘enlarge our Territories with wide forraigne acquests, or else pull downe those powers which are now the hate and burdens of the face of the earth’ (15). But the public reform and patronage of learning will not only help to lay the foundations for imperial and military power but also defend the Commonwealth against the propaganda of its internal enemies:

What better meanes have you to confute all scandalls and imputations of your deadly adversaries, who have not spared to speake you worse then *Goths and Vandalls*, and the utter destroyers of all Civility and Literature, then by seriously composing your selves to the designe of cherishing of either. What director caus-way could you finde to the arrandization of your owne glory, then entertaining the celebrated care of so many kings, the onely splendour of so many Republicks, the life and lustre of so many Ages? (13–14)

‘Goths and Vandalls’ is, as we saw in the previous chapter, the phrase that Alexander Brome applied in his poem to Lovelace to ‘the Pulpitiers’ who care nothing for poetry and have ruined learning; it is also the phrase that Hall applied to the Scots in *Britanicus*. Hall must have been acutely conscious of how his friends and associates among the Cavalier literati automatically identified the new Commonwealth regime with a stereotypically Puritan lack of wit. He evidently recognized that repeated assertions of the ‘philistinism of those in power and the monopoly over learning and culture held by those excluded’ would undermine the political legitimacy of the regime by invoking the early modern commonplace of ‘arts united with empire in a properly constituted polity’. Here he urges Parliament to explode this identification through the patronage of ‘Civility and Literature’—a policy which will not only have short-term propagandist benefits for Parliament but secure its ‘glory’ in historical record. Hall does not though want to return to a courtly or aristocratic system of patronage, which encourages flattery rather than virtue and learning, but looks forward to a time ‘when rewards fit themselves to men, and men are not forced to distort themselves to rewards’ (30).

Hall’s tract was probably part of a coordinated campaign by Hartlib and his associates to lobby the new government. In *A seasonable discourse written by Mr John Dury upon... What the grounds and method of our reformation ought to be in religion and learning*, published by Hartlib in April 1649, Dury called on the Commonwealth to establish an ‘Agency towards the advancement of Universall Learning’. He makes comparison with the wise State of *Venice*, the most Ancient and setled Republican society of the World, [which] hath amongst many other excellent Constitutions, this for one, that whosoever doth shew unto that State any thing that may advance the Publicke Good, shall receive a

---

reward answerable to that which he doth offer; by this means the Aime of a Common Good is upheld in the spirits of men, and Industry for the publike...by the Publike itself. (sig. D1v)

Dury argues such public patronage of private endeavour will promote the ‘Advancement of Vertue and Learning’. What distinguish Hall’s tract are its rhetorical flights, which are reminiscent of Milton’s vision of ‘a knowing people, a Nation of Prophets, Sages, and of Worthies’ in Areopagitica. Hall represents the regicide as an act of stunning innovation that has torn through conventional forms of thought and so, like Baconian experimental philosophy, could potentially open up fantastic new realms of knowledge: ‘you that are men of sublime mindes, that have carried before you all the doubts and objections of flesh and blood, above the extent of your owne designs, or almost the latitude of your owne wishes, beyond the dictates of common Law and reason, will not give over while there remains so great a Worke’ (15). This passage recalls the rapturous lines on the dizzy ascent to new forms of knowledge that Marvell so admired in Hall’s ‘Ode’ to Pawson: ‘O let us tear | A passage through | That fleeting vault above’. The terms in which Hall celebrates the attainment of liberty in The Advancement of Learning were the same terms in which he had celebrated the revelation of knowledge in his lyric verse three years earlier.

The description of the MPs as ‘men of sublime mindes’ emphasizes the connection in Hall’s mind between Parliament’s actions in support of political and religious liberty and the flourishing of English cultural and intellectual life. In 1652 Hall published his translation of the Greek treatise on rhetoric and poetics ascribed to Longinus, On the Sublime. Hall’s was the first translation in English and apparently regarded as a considerable achievement: Davies tells us that Hall’s Longinus was ‘a piece very elaborate, and accordingly much esteemed in both Universities’; Hartlib noted the publication of the work. In his address to the reader Hall mentions that ‘the Generosity and Spirit of this Author, besides the exercise of the Tongue, engaged mee some yeares past to adventure this Translation’. It seems likely that the translation was begun in 1647–8 in the context of Hall’s involvement with the Stanley circle: Stanley, Sherburne, Hammond, and Fairfax would all have been interested in and encouraged the project, given their own intensive work on Greek translation and poetics. Translating Longinus was evidently a respectable scholarly activity, with no particular connection to political allegiance, for the Oxford don Gerard Langbaine (1609–58) had published the Greek text with Latin translation and commentary in 1636; by the time this edition was reprinted in 1650 Langbaine had issued a defence of episcopacy, Episcopall Inheritance (1641), and led opposition to the Parliamentary visitation of 1647. Hall must have been working on his translation before he wrote or while he was writing Britanicus, for he incorporates Longinian

---

8 Davies, ‘An Account of the Author’, in Hierocles, tr. Hall, sig. b5v; HP 28/2/42A.
descriptions of the power of sublime eloquence or 'height', which tend to involve similes drawn from the natural world, into his praise of Fairfax, Cromwell, and the New Model Army. In verses at the head of Britannicus in June 1648, Fairfax, then commander-in-chief of the Army, is compared to 'a fire that more enclos’d | More violently burnes, | And wasts that matter that oppos’d.' The Army acts 'As quick as thought or fire | Or any whirl-winde'. In Hall’s rendering of Longinus, we are told that ‘Height wheresoever it seasonably breaks forth bears down all before it like a whirlwind, and presently evidences the strength and ability of the speaker’ (2–3). Demosthenes, the orator held up by Longinus as the epitome of ‘height’ or sublimity in eloquence, ‘is so forcible that with his fierceness, swiftness and strength, as a whirlwind or thunderbolt, he overthrows and burns all...a man may sooner open his eyes to a flash of lightening then look upon his motions and wonderful agitations’. Pindar and Sophocles, sublime poets, similarly ‘burn up all before them’ (24, 62, 64).

The connection in Hall’s mind between the victories of the Army and the classical poetics of sublimity is related to his conviction that poetry will only flourish in England with the defeat of the Engagers and the subjection of clerical power, ‘under whose inquisitorious and tyrannical duncery no free and splendid wit can flourish’, as Milton put it in The Reason of Church-Government. In Of Education Milton had called poetics ‘the sublime art’ and recommended Longinus as set text for classes in rhetoric in his ideal academy (CPWM ii. 404). In the final section of On the Sublime the anonymous philosopher with whom Longinus is in debate considers the relationship between eloquence and liberty of speech:

\[\text{'tis impossible for a servile man to be a true Orator, for presently his Liberty and his boldness decayes and consumes, and being as it were by custome used to buffeting we dare never speake out but onely mutter. Woe lose one half of our vertue (sayes Homer) in one day of our servitude. And as (if it be true which I have heard reported) they say the cages in which Pigmies commonly called dwarifes are nourished not only hinder the encrease and growth of them, but can steighten them by a muzzle [or band] put about their mouthes: So may we say any slavery be it never so just, may truly be called a cage for the soul and a common Gaol of it. } \] (79–80)

Hall ‘accentuates the theme of censorship’ in his rendering of this passage, which recalls his attacks, shaped by Areopagitica, on the Presbyterian drive to establish licensing laws in A true account and Mercurius Britannicus, where the effects of licensing are described in equally brutal physical terms: ‘no sooner should an honest man open his mouth & speake, but that he should be hit in the teeth and be forced to be quiet’. One might object that Hall’s own understanding

9 ‘To the Reader’, in Peri Hypsous, Or Dionysius Longinus of the Height of Eloquence, tr. [J]ohn H[all] (1652) sig. B6; Britannicus (8 June 1648), 27–8, [30]; (21 June 1648), 41; (27 June 1648), 49.

10 Annabel Patterson, Reading between the Lines (1993), 264; Britannicus (18 July 1648), 77.
of the persuasive power of sublime rhetoric is equally violent; but the images of
censorship and imprisonment are images of the prevention of speech rather than
the force of persuasion.

In The Advancement of Learning Hall, who even coins the term ‘Areopagitick’
to describe his tract, insists that Parliament must get rid of ‘the hatefull gagg
of licensing’ if learning is to increase under the new state: licensing ‘silences
so many Truths, and frights so many ingenuities, and makes them abhorre the
publick’ (28, 30). While the ‘hand of Providence’ had guided Parliament to the
further victories of the second civil war, the continued negotiations with the
king by Presbyterians members (‘some who sate in counsell among you [and]
retarded you by cunning cross debates’) enabled Charles to ‘stroke with you
such concessions, as you had far more reason to dread, then any of his former
Proclamations or menaces’ (3–4). This is evidently a reference to one of the
‘concessions’ agreed by Charles in the Treaty of Newport—the establishing of a
Presbyterian church government for a trial period of three years, exactly the same
terms Charles had agreed in the Engagement with the Scots. Hall apparently sees
the prevention of Presbyterian rule as the most important victory of the civil wars;
more vital indeed to securing the liberty of the English nation than the deposition
of the Stuarts. The comment that Pride’s Purge freed the remaining members
‘from those charms where with you before were maleficiate’, or bewitched, recalls
Nedham’s association in Pragmaticus of the Presbyterian clergy with the witches
of Macbeth. Milton had followed Nedham in invoking Macbeth, 5. 9. 19–20
(‘And be these juggling fiends no more believ’d | That palter with us in a double
sense’), in The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates, published within two weeks
of the regicide: the Presbyterians had ‘juggl’d and palter’d with the world’ and
‘spoken with a double contradictory sense’. The Presbyterians are for Milton like
Shakespeare’s Scottish witches in their demonic duplicity (and indeed like Jesuits,
which is one association that Shakespeare may have had in mind in portraying
the witches the first place), but also like Lady Macbeth in their hopeless efforts
to evade responsibility for regicide: they ‘were men themselves that depos’d the
King, and cannot with all their shifting and relapsing, wash off the guiltinesse
from thir own hands’. 11 But Hall’s use of maleficiate carries deeper resonance,
emphasizing the opposition in his mind between Presbyterian dominance and the
advancement of learning. The previous citation for maleficiate in the OED is from
William Rawley’s preface to his edition of Bacon’s Sylva Sylvarum: or A naturall
historie (1627) ‘and [Bacon] knew well, that ther was no other way to unloose
Mens minds, being bound; and, as it were, Maleficiate by the charms of deceiving
Notions and Theories’ (‘To the Reader’, sig. A1’). Hall’s persistent association
of Presbyterian clericalism with the obstruction of learning, coupled with his
representation of Pride’s Purge and the regicide as sublime acts of innovation

11 Dzelzainis (ed.), Political Writings, 4, 6, 26. See also Martin Dzelzainis, ‘Milton, Macbeth, and
Buchanan’, The Seventeenth Century, 4 (1989), 55–66; Gary Wills, Witches and Jesuits: Shakespeare’s
that could lay foundations for the Baconian reform of the nation’s cultural and educational institutions, reveal how the king’s alliance with the Scots and the Presbyterians drove Hall’s intellectual radicalism into republicanism. Yet less than two months after *The Advancement of Learning* was published, Hall appeared alongside his Cavalier friends and Marvell in *Lachrymae Musarum*.

Henry, Lord Hastings, son of the Earl of Huntingdon, died, aged 19, of smallpox on 24 June 1649—the day before he was due to be married to Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Theodore Turquet de Mayerne, former physician to Charles I and future physician to Oliver Cromwell. Richard Brome quickly assembled a volume of elegies probably published within a month of Hastings’s death (*MP* 23). In compiling the thirty-five elegies in *Lachrymae Musarum*, Brome apparently sought to make a poetic statement of royalist solidarity and civility in the aftermath of regicide similar to that made by the Beaumont and Fletcher folio in the aftermath of defeat in the first war, with the senseless early death of Hastings becoming an analogue for that of the king. Most of the contributors, observes Lois Potter, ‘are really using the occasion to lament the general state of the world from which the young man has mercifully escaped, and to suggest that his death is a punishment for the sins of others’.12 ‘J.B.’, who, as we have seen, is almost certainly John Berkenhead, explicitly connected the death of Hastings with that of the king in the final couplet of his contribution: ‘Whither, Great Soul, th’art fled and now dost reign | Above in Majestie, near Charles his Wain.’13 John Denham, presumably writing from the exiled court in Paris where he had fled in August 1648 after his activities in England as a royalist intelligencer were discovered, asked whether ‘The late Great Victim that your Altars knew, | You angry gods, might have excus’d this new | Oblation’.14 Other poets connected to the Stanley circle who appeared in *Lachrymae Musarum* were Herrick, Alexander Brome, and Hall, who contributed, at over one hundred lines, the longest elegy in the collection of thirty-five. Hall’s appearance in *Lachrymae Musarum* should give us pause for thought: his presence indicates that even public support for the regicide and employment by the Commonwealth government did not lead to a fatal rupture with his friends in the Stanley circle.

The hasty compilation of *Lachrymae Musarum* is indicated by the inclusion in the first edition of a ‘postscript’ containing a further eight elegies, presumably submitted after the volume had reached the printer and including poems by


14 During the summer of 1649 Denham was at the Louvre, where he wrote verses to ‘divert and put off the evil hours of our banishment’ on subjects proposed by Charles II (‘To the King’, in *Poems* (1668), sig. A3’).
Marchamont Nedham and Marvell. Nedham began his elegy as though Hastings had died in battle against Parliament rather than of smallpox in his bed:

It is decreed, we must be drain'd (I see)
Down to the dregs of a Democracy.
Death's 't the Plot, and in his drunken mood
Swills none of late, but streams of Noble Blood.
Was't not enough the Hatchet did hew down
Those well-grown Oaks, and Pillars of the Crown,
But that the tender Sapling too must fall
Thus, to inhanse the Kingdom's Funeral?15

Nedham presumably penned his elegy in Newgate, where he had been imprisoned in mid-June and was to remain until November. Nedham's elegy, like Berkenhead's, is signed only with his initials: presumably because both were well-known royalist newsbook writers and their obvious presence in the volume would alert the licensers. The contribution by Dryden, then only 18, is his earliest known poem. Dryden follows Nedham (from whose poem Dryden later borrowed some lines in *Absalom and Achitophel*) by linking the demise of Hastings to the civil wars; indeed Dryden blames the smallpox on the pestilent conditions created by sinful rebellion, invoking the stock image of the monarch as the sun and recalling the cloud and smoke imagery of Lovelace's post-war verse: ‘The nation's sin hath drawn that veil which shrouds | Our dayspring in so sad benighting clouds.’ The notion that the pimples of the pox were ‘rebel-like’ in making an ‘insurrection’ against their ‘lord’ is indebted to images in royalist polemic of the Parliamentarian party as a disease in the body politic.16

*Lachrymae Musarum* has all the trappings, then, of a Cavalier literary enterprise. Many of the elegies for Hastings make it clear they are also elegies for Charles I and the Caroline court—the volume appeared four months after the hugely influential representation of the king as tragic martyr and Christ-figure in the *Eikon Basilike*. At one point Marvell seems implicitly to connect the death of Hastings with the civil wars by alluding to the tradition in ancient Athens of banishing individuals who were too virtuous in case their popularity reached the point where they could seize monarchical power: ‘Therefore the democratic stars did rise | And all that worth from hence did ostracize’ (ll. 25–6). There is an echo of Nedham's poem, which is placed before Marvell's elegy in most copies of the first edition: Blair Worden has suggested the possibility of collaboration, although he does not note that Nedham was in prison when Hastings died.17

It may be significant that Marvell’s classical allusion inverts Sallust's dictum in

Bellum Catilinae on the hatred of tyrants for men of outstanding virtue, to which Milton had referred in the opening page of the Tenure: Marvell could be read as responding to the claims of Hall and Milton that a republic would encourage virtue. Yet there is once again also an echo of the great Stuart poet Carew and his verse epistle ‘To Master W. Montague’, in which he chastizes Montague for having left the country:

More, y’are accused of ostracism, the fate
Impos’d of old by the Athenian state
On eminent virtue; but that curse which they
Cast on their men, you on your country lay;
For thus divided from your noble parts,
This kingdom lives in exile, and all hearts
That relish worth or honour, being rent
From your perfections, suffer banishment. 18

Might Marvell be thinking here of how the first civil war forced talented literary men like Lovelace, Stanley, and himself to leave for the continent? Or of how royalist poets such as Denham, Cowley, and William Davenant remained in exile, in fear for their life if they returned to England under the Commonwealth regime?

As we have seen, in the second edition of Lachrymae Musarum, published in January 1650 in apparent commemoration of the first anniversary of the regicide, Marvell’s elegy is moved forward from the postscript, where it had been placed beside Nedham’s, and inserted after Denham’s contribution and before Hall’s poem. 19 Yet several scholars have argued that Marvell’s elegy shows no clear sign of royalist allegiance and ‘could have been written in the 1630s’. 20 It is true that, in comparison with Nedham’s elegy and with others in the volume, Marvell’s contribution ‘offers royalist associations’ without ever becoming obviously royalist: the poem assumes its politics in the context of the other elegies. James Loxley argues that the volume as a whole ‘seems to mark an elision of pointedly royalist sentiments with formal expressions of grief of a much less politically interested nature’. He regards Hall’s contribution as one of the conventional elegies in Lachrymae Musarum that ‘merely coincide in places with Royalist semantic complexes and structures of signification’ that are to be found elsewhere in the volume and consequently, like Marvell’s elegy, ‘has the misfortune to be accounted monarchical’. 21 In fact there are hints of Hall’s political sympathies:

19 See MP 23. In the 1st edn. Marvell’s elegy appears on pp. 78–80; in some copies of the 1st edn. and in the 2nd edn. it appears on unpaginated leaves between pp. 42 and 43, with the instruction ‘Place this after fol. 42’ at the foot of the page.
21 ‘Prepared at Last to Strike in with the Tyde?’, 53–4.
his is the only elegy to take the form of a verse epistle addressed to Hastings's father, the sixth Earl of Huntingdon, who had refused to assist the king and had showed some support for Parliament at the beginning of the first war.\footnote{McWilliams, ‘“A Storm of Lamentations Writ”’, 279.} Hall does not ascribe agency for Hastings's death to the disruption of natural order caused by the civil wars; rather, comparing the renewal of nature with the finality of human mortality, he emphasizes necessity and natural law: ‘The Laws by which the World is governed are | As Indispensable as Regular.’\footnote{‘To the Earl of Huntingdon on the Death of his Son’, in \textit{Lachrymae Musarum}, 43, ll. 9–10.} Berkenhead’s distinctively royalist elegy may accept Hastings’s death as ‘Heaven’s Decree, who knows best what is fit’ (l. 58), but Berkenhead still bemoans ‘Earth’s inconstancy’ (l. 62) and the overthrow of nature’s order in a manner similar to his elegy for Charles, \textit{Loyalties Tears Flowing after the Blood of the Royal Sufferer Charles I}, published in late June 1649 and presumably written just before the elegy for Hastings. In a regicidal world, Berkenhead advises, we should envy, not lament, Hastings’s translation to a heaven where he can again be in the presence of his king.\footnote{\textit{Loyalties Tears Flowing after the Blood of the Royal Sufferer Charles I} was received by Thomason on 25 June 1649; the 2nd edn. of this elegy was published, like the 2nd edn. of \textit{Lachrymae Musarum}, on 30 Jan. 1650, presumably to commemorate the regicide.} In his contribution Samuel Bold had angrily represented Parliamentary England as a world out of joint: ‘A Soil that fosters Brambles, Shrubs, and Thorns; | Slaughter’s the Lamb, and sets up Beasts with Horns.’ In heaven, however, there is ‘both Monarch, and an House of Peers, | Yea there are Bishops too’.\footnote{‘A Funeral-Elegie upon the Right Honourable the Lord Hastings’, 32–4, ll. 37–8, 50–1.} The anger, despair, and disillusionment that mark these and other elegies in the volume is replaced in Hall’s poem by a hard-edged realism; he concludes by urging Huntingdon to accept his son’s death—which in this volume is of course a ‘metonymic focus’ for the loss of the king—as part of the natural process: ‘He’s now at peace, disturb not with Fears, | Nor violate his Ashes with your Tears’ (ll. 121–2).

Hall’s emphasis on the ‘indispensable’ laws of nature that govern the world is reminiscent of defences of the Commonwealth that argued for the \textit{de facto} power of the regime in terms of the natural law of self-preservation. In an argument first published in 1648 but reissued after the regicide, Anthony Ascham insisted that whereas ‘Nature is always uniforme, and alike in its operations’, civil or human law proceeds from ‘a mutable and variable Principle’. Civil laws had originally proceeded from the necessity of self-preservation and governments can only demand our allegiance if they can secure our safety: the legality of a power is of no consequence beside its capacity to protect us.\footnote{Ascham, \textit{A discourse: wherein is examined, what is particularly lawfull during the confusions and revolutions of government} (July 1648), 6–7; this tract was reissued in an expanded form in Nov. 1649 as \textit{Of the Confusions and Revolutions of Government}. See Tuck, \textit{Philosophy and Government}, 254–5.} Although his defence of \textit{de facto} power was designed to convince neutrals and royalists to submit to the

\footnote{22 McWilliams, ‘“A Storm of Lamentations Writ”’, 279.}
new regime, the position Ascham chose to adopt ‘proclaimed his sympathy with the sufferers, not the victors…he caught the elegiac mood which was to sweep the country on the publication of the *Eikon Basilike*.\textsuperscript{27} In this context Hall’s poem, addressed to the neutral Earl of Huntingdon and appearing alongside royalist elegies for the death both of a young nobleman and England’s ‘natural’ order, seems already to be quietly doing the propagandist job that Hall had been hired by the Council of State to do a month before Hastings’s death. Hall’s emphasis on necessity and natural law resembles an (unpublished) rendering of Seneca by Thomas Stanley. Written around 1646, the poems indicates that Stoic attitudes to defeat—the Stoics regarded the instinct for self-preservation as the fundamental impulse of all creatures—were circulating privately among Hall’s royalist friends:

\begin{quote}
No other refuge left to fly,  
The lawes of strict necessity  
Then cheerfully to entertaine  
What she commands us to sustaine[.]\textsuperscript{28}
\end{quote}

While it would be a misrepresentation of Hall’s elegy to say that it was strikingly at odds politically or stylistically with the other contributions, the (subtle) differences in language and tone compared with some of the more stridently royalist poems make sense given Hall’s anomalous political allegiance. These differences are all the more noteworthy given that Marvell’s ‘Upon the Death of Lord Hastings’ has a closer relationship with Hall’s ‘To the Earl of Huntingdon on the Death of his Son’ than with any of the other thirty-three poems in *Lachrymae Musarum*. As we have seen, the one seemingly royalist image in Marvell’s poem echoes the polemical opening of Nedham’s elegy, which it preceded in the batch of poems submitted at a late stage. But the resemblances to Hall’s elegy, which Marvell’s preceded in the second edition, are more sustained. First they describe Hastings’s virtue in similar language. Hall writes: ‘Nothing in him was crooked, lame or flat, | But *Geometrically* proportionate’ (ll. 49–50). Marvell suggests that while Hastings’s virtues ‘did out-run his age’ on earth, in heaven ‘they number not as here, | But weigh to man the geometric year’\textsuperscript{29} (ll. 9–10, 17–18). Towards the end of his elegy Hall turns to the man who would have been Hastings’s father-in-law had Hastings survived one day longer, Sir Theodore Turquet de Mayerne, and considers how all Mayerne’s medical art was insufficient to save Hastings and so the future progeny of the Hastings–Mayerne union:

\textsuperscript{27} Wallace, *Destiny his Choice*, 36–7.
\textsuperscript{29} See *MP* 26: ‘a year calculated with geometry would pass more quickly a normal year’. Smith notes the resemblance here to Hall.
Yet his Genius made a sad depart
Maugre those strong Resistances of Art,
Which the wise-powerful MAYERN, (who can give
As much as poor Mortality can receive)
Could, like a Father, make;

Maugre those Hopes which did so bravely feign
That a great Race should spring from him again;
A Race of Hastings', whose High Deeds should raise
New lustre to their Grand-Sires Images.
But ('las) these Hopes are meer Dreams become,
And all those Glories buried in his Tomb.
Too rigorous Fates, 'tis but an envious sport
To make those live that are most brave, most short.

("To the Earl of Huntingdon on the Death
of his Son", ll. 73–7, 81–8)

Compare Marvell's final twelve lines:

Mayerne
Like some sad chemist, who, prepared to reap
The golden harvest, sees his glasses leap.
For, how immortal must their race have stood,
Had Mayerne once been mixed with Hastings' blood!
How sweet and verdant would these laurels be,
Had they been planted on that balsam tree!
But what could he, good man, although he bruised
All herbs, and them a thousand ways infused?
All he had tried, but all in vain, he saw,
And wept, as we, without redress or law.
For man (alas) is but the heaven's sport;
And art indeed is long, but life is short.

(ll. 48–60)

Marvell’s poem is distinguished by the alchemical imagery around which he structures his depiction of Mayerne—a nod to Mayerne’s interest in Paracelsus. But the depiction of Mayerne in both elegies is otherwise very similar, both thematically and linguistically. The shared rhyme of ‘sport’ and ‘short’ does not seem to have been noted before—Marvell’s concluding couplet is usually glossed by an aphorism from Hippocrates, which makes good sense in the context of the classical and medical allusions earlier in the poem.30 While Hall’s couplet has nothing to do with Hippocrates, the resemblance to Marvell’s conclusion is striking: both bemoan the manner in which heaven/the fates ‘sport’ with man, while Marvell incorporates into his final couplet the parenthetical lament,

30 See MP 29: ‘Life is short, the Art long, opportunity fleeting, experiment treacherous, judgement difficult.’
'(las)', that appears in the lines immediately preceding the sport/short rhyme in Hall. Marvell's reference to Mayerne's ‘art’ finds an echo in Hall’s description of Mayerne’s ‘strong Resistances of Art’. Might Marvell have read Hall’s poem and connected the references to art and the brevity of life with the Hippocratic aphorism? It seems more likely that Marvell was working from Hall’s elegy rather than vice versa, given that Marvell’s was one of the poems submitted late. Smith suggests it probable that Marvell saw some of the earlier compositions ‘either before or during the writing of his own poem’. There are also recurring images (of tears, flowing water, the figure of Hymen) throughout the poems in *Lachrymae Musarum*. But the strong resemblance to elements in Hall’s elegy, and our knowledge of their earlier relationship, suggests again the continuing personal and poetic relationship between Marvell and Hall, even after Hall had praised the regicide and entered the employment of the Commonwealth press office.

Stanley did not appear in *Lachrymae Musarum*; he had left London in sorrow and disgust by the time the volume was published. The publications of the Stanley circle in the latter months of 1648 reveal increasing pessimism about the king’s future. Alexander Brome boldly impersonated the king in *A Copie of Verses, said to be composed by his Majestie, upon his first Imprisonment in the Isle of Wight*, collected by Thomason as a broadside on 29 September 1648:

```
Imprison me ye Traytors! Must I be
Your fetter’d Slave, whilst you'r at Liberty?

We see againe
A second Cesar by a Senate slaine:
A state disturb’d by the Gracchi; and the times
Spawning with the Syllas and Catilines.

Alas! Though I’m injur’d, my mind’s so free,
Ile make my very Gaole your Liberty.
Plot, do your worst; I safely shall deride,
In my crown’d soule, your base, inferior pride,
And stand unmov’d, though all your plagues you bring,
Ile die a Martyr, or Ile live a King.
```

(l. 1–2, 9–12, 35–40)

There is an echo of ‘To Althea, From Prison’ in the assertion of liberty in confinement, but the defiance is obtained from the expectation of the king’s death and martyrdom. Brome is not afraid to identify Charles with the Caesar murdered by Brutus, Cassius, and their fellow conspirators as a tyrant: Dante, after all, had placed Brutus and Cassius in the final ring of the ninth and last circle of hell, as the arch-traitors punished with and by Satan. But of course Charles was not ‘A second Cesar by a Senate slaine’ when Brome published his verses; rather he had just entered into new negotiations with Parliamentary commissioners.
at Newport on 18 September. Brome ignores the tortuous negotiations taking place to present a stark choice: dead or alive, martyr or king. Brome’s poem anticipates not only the regicide in imagining the king’s murder but the polemical strategy of the *Eikon Basilike*, the supposed record of the king’s final thoughts on the events of the 1640s, in representing Charles as a Christ-figure who ‘stands unmov’d’ with a ‘crown’d soule’. Edward Sherburne, with the help of Stanley, conflated Christian and Stoic notions of suffering in his verse translation of Seneca’s *Answer to Lucilius His Quaere; Why Good Men suffer misfortunes seeing there is a Divine Providence?*, dedicated ‘To His most Sacred Majesty’. Sherburne offered Charles the piece ‘In acknowledgement of Your new acquest of passive Glory (a Glory which till your Majesties sufferings manifested the contrary, was held inconsistent with that of a Crowne) saluting you with the sad, yet sacred title of the King of Sorrows’ (sig. A2v). The king is now characterized by his suffering rather than his magnificence, by the sort of ‘passive Glory’ exhibited by Christ before his death, and so has redefined the notion of earthly kingship—Sherburne tries in vain to make this sound like a positive development. Perversely he looks forward to Charles’s death, when God will ‘Crowne you with Glory on a Heavenly Throne’ (A4r–v). Even in late 1646 the Order of the Black Riband seemed to be anticipating regicide by the wearing of a black armband for the king; by late 1648 its members were explicitly imagining him dead even as they addressed him.

Soon after the regicide Stanley, accompanied apparently by Hammond, Fairfax, and Sherburne, left London for the family estate at Cumberlow Green. Stanley describes this withdrawal from London in ‘A Register of Friends’ just after his discussion of Sherburne’s dedication to Charles I of *Answer to Lucilius His Quaere*, which he calls the king’s ‘Epicedium’, or funeral ode.

And thy great Master was well pleas’d to see
His Epicedium writ by Loyall Thee.
He dead, Thou didn’t withdraw from thence, an air
More innocent choosing with me to share,
Begg’ring the place guilty of Royall Blood,
By bringing from it all was left of good.

*(PTTS 364, ll. 39–44)*

In the margin Stanley has written ‘at Flowre in North’tonshire, and Cumberlow Green in Hertfordshire’. It was at Cumberlow that Stanley began intensive work on the *History of Philosophy*: the first volume, which pays particular attention to Socrates, appeared in 1655 and the second, comprising detailed accounts of Plato, Aristotle, and Stoicism, the following year. The author of a manuscript epigram entitled ‘Upon Mr Stanley’s Booke of Philosophers supposing itt the worke of his Tutor W: Fa:’ evidently felt that it was Fairfax’s skill in Greek that provided the intellectual basis of the *History*; yet both Hammond and Fairfax were dead by 1655 and Sherburne left on a European tour in 1654 as tutor to Sir
John Coventry. By 1653 Stanley had also begun work on the edition of Aeschylus which he published ten years later.31

One poetic project on which Stanley was apparently at work by the summer of 1649, alongside the expanded edition of his Poems and Translations which appeared in 1651, was a versification of the prose meditations which concluded each of the twenty-seven chapters of the Eikon Basilike. Stanley’s version was eventually published as Psalterium Carolinum in 1657, set to music by John Wilson and dedicated ‘To his Sacred Majesty Charles the Second’. Milton wrote in Eikonoklastes, published in early October 1649, that the Eikon Basilike ‘wanted only Rime, and that, they say, is bestowed upon it lately’ (CPWM iii. 406). How did Milton know about Stanley’s work? Anne Sadleir, ‘an informed patron of letters who had long known [Marvell’s] father’ and was aunt to Cyriack Skinner, friend and biographer of Milton, claimed in a letter probably written in 1653 that due to the state of his eyes Milton was only able to finish Eikonoklastes thanks to ‘the help of one Andrew Marvell’.32 The claim has always been dismissed because there is no evidence of contact between Milton and Marvell before Milton’s letter of February 1653 to John Bradshaw, recommending Marvell for a Latin secretariship, and because of the assumption that Marvell’s poems to Lovelace and on Hastings exhibit his royalist allegiance in 1649. The likelihood is that the information about Stanley’s verse translation of the Eikon Basilike came from Hall, Milton’s new colleague in the Commonwealth press office. The pairing of their poems in Lucasta and Lachrymae Musarum indicates that Marvell and Hall were associated with each other by contemporaries and it may be that Sadleir confused the two friends.

Yet it is always unwise to presume we know better than contemporaries. Might it have been Marvell who passed on to Hall the information about Stanley’s verse translation, who then discussed it with Milton? Marvell’s ‘The Unfortunate Lover’ suggests that he had seen something of Stanley’s work. ‘The Unfortunate Lover’ invites political allegory while retaining, in Nigel Smith’s words, ‘the ability to ruin the effectiveness of any interpretation, however subtle, which attempts to render it clear’. However Smith maintains in his next sentence that ‘it is also evident that the poem is related to the poetry of embattled royalism and eventual lament for the execution of Charles I’ (MP 88). He dates the poem to 1648–9, in part on the basis of the strong echo of Lovelace’s ‘Dialogue—To Lucasta’, lines 15–16: ‘Love near his standard when his host he sets | Creates alone fresh-bleeding bannerets.’ The most convincing recent political analysis is Robert Wilcher’s modification of Margarita Stocker’s extended and sometimes strained reading of the poem as a cryptic and elliptical account of the king’s experience of the events of the 1640s.33 While Stocker connects the poem to

31 Bodleian MS Fairfax 40, fo. 611 32 Von Maltzahn, Andrew Marvell Chronology, 38.
33 Wilcher, Writing of Royalism, 306–7; Stocker, Apocalyptic Marvell, 267–305. The value of such precisely allegorical or topical readings has recently been rejected in favour of a subtle reading of ‘The Unfortunate Lover’ as a work which exemplifies how in Marvell’s lyric verse ‘the contours
a range of Caroline masques, Wilcher observes that ‘closer to the time of the poem’s composition was the king’s own book, which had been lauded in elegies and sermons for both its “Musick”—the elegance of its style—and its “Story” of the events that led through “Love” and “Warrs” to martyrdom’. Wilcher alludes to the final stanza:

This is the only banneret
That ever Love created yet:
Who though, by the malignant stars,
Forced to live in storms and wars;
Yet dying leaves a perfume here,
And music within every ear,
And he in story only rules,
In a field sable a lover gules.

(ll. 57–64)

In Stanley’s versification of the *Eikon Basilike*, modelled on the Psalms and set to music by Wilson, who became Professor of Music at Oxford in 1656, the king’s death really did leave ‘music within every ear’. Marvell’s allusion to the Lovelace lyric in the final stanza alerts us to the possibility that ‘The Unfortunate Lover’ was written for an audience of grieving royalist writers in the Stanley circle in the months after the regicide, perhaps before Stanley left London, ‘the place guilty of Royall Blood’, or perhaps during a visit by Marvell to Cumberlow in the summer of 1649, when Stanley had his work on the *Psalterium Carolinum* performed for his guests from the city. Certainly there are many similarities of language and imagery between ‘The Unfortunate Lover’ and the *Psalterium Carolinum*, which is constituted of twenty-seven odes, in a variety of rhyming schemes, in which the king speaks in the first person and which follow the events of the 1640s from the calling of the Long Parliament to the regicide. Marvell’s ‘poor lover’ is caught in a shipwreck ‘when the seas | Ruled, and the winds did what they please’ (ll. 9–10); in Stanley’s ‘Ode III. Upon the insolency of the Tumults’ the king laments:

The floods, the floods, o’re-swell their bounds,
Danger my threatened soul surrounds.
Mine and my Realms inquity,
(The tumults of our souls ’gainst thee)
These popular inundations cause,
That bear down Loyalty and Lawes.

(PTTS 275)

of a particular psychology discover an unusual or obscure fit with the hinted shape of external events’. (Derek Hirst and Steven N. Zwicker, ‘Eros and Abuse: Imagining Andrew Marvell’, *English Literary History*, 74/2 (2007), 380.) My own argument for the possible relationships, both formal and social, of the poem with Lovelace’s love lyrics and Stanley’s versification of the *Eikon Basilike* does not preclude such a reading. At the same time the claim of Hirst and Zwicker that royalist sympathies in the lyric ‘are surely cast in doubt by Marvell’s use of the Parliamentarian term of art “Malignant” to type the times in which the Lover is forced to live’ is undermined by Marvell’s (ironic) dismissal in ‘Tom May’s Death’ of the Parliamentarian polemicist May as ‘Malignant poet and historian both’ (l. 42).
In the fifth Ode the king calls on God to ‘In this darke Storme my Pilot be | Which to make home, nor suffers me | Nor elsewhere, with security’ (277). Marvell writes in his third stanza:

No day he saw but that which breaks
Through frighted clouds in forkèd streaks;
While round the rattling thunder hurled,
As at the fun’ral of the world.

(ll. 21–4)

In the seventh stanza the lover ‘nak’d and fierce doth stand, | Cuffing the thunder with one hand’ (ll. 49–50). Stanley’s king, ‘Eclips’d by unexpected Nights, | By sudden Stormes ore-cast’, defiantly reminds his listeners of the fate of Sir John Hotham and his son, who had initially fought against the king’s party, then turned to royalism only to be captured and executed by Parliament: ‘The thunder that was thrown | So dreadfully at one, | Be a just terror to the rest’ (ll. 280–1).

Wilcher suggests (pp. 306–7) the ‘corm’rants black’ who kept the lover in ‘cruel care’ and ‘fed him up with hopes and air, | Which soon digested to despair’ (ll. 27, 29, 33–4), are the ‘the Scots at Newcastle and Parliament at Holdenby [where Charles] was denied the service of his chaplains and subjected to continual efforts to persuade him to sign the Covenant and accept a Presbyterian settlement’. In Stanley’s verses Charles scorns the ‘loathsome black disguise, | Of new rebellious Heresies’ and the ‘malitious black Designe’ of his enemies (ll. 279, 281). More significantly, in ‘Ode XXIII. Upon their denying his Majesty the attendance of his Chaplains’, the king declares:

O my forsaken widow’d Soul preserve,
Let not thy Truth and sweet Effusions fail
My memory and heart, but so prevail,
Kept from accustom’d food, I may not sterve.
But better sterve than by their Hands to feed,
Who mix my Bread with Ashes, and infect
My Wine with Gall; who torture, not direct;
Prone to reproaches, which their Pray’rs exceed.

(307)

Marvell’s cormorants similarly starve the lover while feeding him:

And as one corm’rant fed him, still
Another on his heart did bill.
Thus while they famish him, and feast,
He both consumèd and increased:
And languishèd with doubtful breath,
Th’ amphibium of Life and Death.

(ll. 35–40)
Stanley’s language of spiritual starvation and contamination is taken directly from the meditation at the end of the twenty-fourth chapter of the *Eikon Basilike*; but Stanley’s versification, which is rarely mechanical, turns the prose of the king’s book into poetic tropes that gather disorientating intensity in Marvell’s lyric. Finally, it is covered in his own blood, and not just in death but in the ‘story’ of that death, that Marvell’s lover retains his power: ‘And all he says, a lover dressed | In his own blood does relish best’; ‘And he in story only rules, | In a field sable a lover gules’ (ll. 55–6, 63–4). As early as the ninth ode in the *Psalterium Carolinum*, the king courts martyrdom: ‘Yet if my Blood | Can onely quench my Kingdoms flames, | Let my own Subjects sluce the Flood’ (283). Charles tells his God that if he has proved an unfortunate lover—‘If I have sought or lov’d my Kingdomes woes’—“Then let thy hand my fathers house destroy” (289). In Marvell’s lyric ‘angry Heaven | would behold a spectacle of blood’ (ll. 41–2). There is a masochistic quality to some of the king’s pronouncements in Stanley’s verses that is echoed in the perverse relish which the lover takes in his own pain and blood: ‘The ills they force me to inflict, I bear; | And in their punishments, my own embrace, | Victor or vanquish’d!’ (‘Ode XIX. Upon the various events of War, Victories, and Defeats’, 299).

‘The Unfortunate Lover’ may, then, have been composed for a literary audience including Stanley and Lovelace, who would recognize the allusions both to Lovelace’s lyrics of frustrated and injured love and to the paradoxical iconography of regicidal lament in which Stanley was immersed in late 1649. It was perhaps written during a visit to Cumberlow and in an effort to retain a patronage link with Stanley now that he had left London. Marvell did not compose an elegy for Charles I in the manner of John Berkenhead who, like Marvell, wrote elegies for Francis Villiers and Henry, Lord Hastings. Berkenhead’s *Loyalties Tears Flowing after the Blood of the Royal Sufferer Charles I* is hardly elusive in its message, which is that the king is triumphant in his bloody death through the love inspired by his book (4):

What though his betray’d Sword appear too weak  
To vindicate his honour? Yet his Pen  
Doth all the Rebels proudest Conquests break;  
And oh how much more than his Britain win!  

For all the world now bowes down to the look  
Of his illustrious most triumphant Book.  
That Book, on which astonishment must dwell  
For evermore: whilst every Reader there  
Beholds what miracles of worth did swell  
The Authors soule. Nor shall his Murderers dare  
(Though bloody Malice at his life repines)  
Not to admire and love Him in his lines.

Nonetheless if Marvell did, even indirectly, supply Milton with the information that Stanley was putting the *Eikon Basilike* ‘into rhyme’, then Milton, who in
the same passage in *Eikonoklastes* attacked the ‘Simily’ of a storm-tossed ship employed in the king’s book as ‘a garb somewhat more Poetical than for a Statist’, would probably not have appreciated ‘The Unfortunate Lover’ (*CPWM* iii. 406). Yet if the lyric conveys Marvell’s fascination with the regicide and with representations of the dead king, it hardly confirms his allegiance to the Stuart cause.

‘AN HORATIAN ODE UPON CROMWELL’S RETURN FROM IRELAND’: LIGHT AND SHADE, POETRY AND WAR

Marvell wrote the ‘Horatian Ode’ around eighteen months after the regicide, if we are to assume the occasion to which the title refers is the moment of composition. ‘The Unfortunate Lover’ exhibits Marvell’s interest in the tropes of royalist lament, but the tropes are incorporated into what is ostensibly an amatory lyric rather than an elegy. The portrayal of the regicide at the centre of the ‘Horatian Ode’ is nothing if not direct: we look through the king’s eye at the axe’s edge. The lines on Charles evidently retain something of the pathos of the *Eikon Basilike* and Stanley’s version of it in the *Psalterium Carolinum*, and so recall aspects of the imagery of blood and pain in ‘The Unfortunate Lover’. Yet the passage of time is registered in the contrast of tone between Marvell’s stanzas and the depiction of the regicide in Berkenhead’s *Loyalties Tears*, published a year before Marvell composed the ‘Ode’. The similarity between the ‘Ode’ and *Loyalties Tears* does not seem to have been noted before but it suggests how recognizable this section of Marvell’s poem would have been to royalist readers:

Thus though the People-cheating Pageantry
Of specious formall Court, and Judge, and Barre,
(That he might be mock’d, as well’s oppressed die)
He convey’d is to his last Theatre:
Where how he acts his passions part, may they
Who to this martyrdom did bring him, say;

Say, wretches, was Deaths bloudy face to him
So dreadfull as the thought of it to you?
Of’s Scepter did he e’er tender seem
As of the Ax? Taught he not Princes how
To reigne in death, when he gave strait command
Not that his Throne, but Blocke should firmly stand?

And wish’d he not that Block had higher been,
That all bloudthirsty eyes that thither came,
Might thereire deare draught have had, and fully seen
How little ashamed he was of shame?
Yet though thus low, it serv’d him for his step
From earth to heav’ns high kingdom to get up.

(*Loyalties Tears*, 5)
Marvell similarly absolves Charles of shame on the scaffold but, despite the scorn for the ‘armèd bands’ who ‘Did clap their bloody hands’, the ‘Ode’ shows little of the anger and none of the defiance of Berkenhead’s poem (ll. 55–6). History had made its judgement on the Stuarts: eighteen months on, England remained kingless.34

Stuart court culture is a matter for historical record in the ‘Ode’. As in the Villiers elegy and, to a lesser extent, the Lovelace verse epistle, it is also a matter for nostalgia; but we should beware the hazard identified by Blair Worden of ‘confusing Cavalier nostalgia with political commitment’. The resemblance to Berkenhead’s angry elegy lends some substance to Worden’s suggestion that the ‘Ode’ may ‘have begun life as a royalist poem’ in the months after the regicide. This might explain why Stanley rewrites, sometime between 1646 and 1651, his rendering of the second poem in Secundus’s Basia sequence in the distinctive metre of the ‘Ode’. If Marvell began writing an elegy for the king in this metre, he could have shown an early draft to Stanley and other royalist poets with whom he had been associating in London the later 1640s. By the summer of 1650, however, the stanzas on the regicide had become a hinge around which move the powerful images of ‘restless Cromwell’ (l. 9).35 Nobody argues anymore that the ‘Ode’ is a royalist or even a covertly royalist poem: the debate is about the extent and nature of its Cromwellian and/or republican sentiment, and about whether the poem ‘merely assumes a public mode of address but was always envisaged as a vehicle for private reflection’ or was written ‘in pursuit of patronage from the new regime’.36

The opening of Marvell’s verse letter to Lovelace reveals how struck Marvell was by the hostile public reaction to Hall’s decision to appear for Parliament, even though in the privacy of Stanley’s circle Hall seems to have maintained his reputation. After the regicide Hall had gone further by committing himself to the employment of the Commonwealth government. As The Advancement of Learning makes clear, Hall wanted men of talent in all spheres of learning and knowledge to appear for the state and he wanted the state to establish mechanisms to encourage and reward them. Doubtless he regarded Marvell as such a man of talent. Nedham, with whom, as we have seen, Hall seems to have had a close working relationship even when they were writing on different sides in 1648, had in November 1649 taken the Engagement, the oath of allegiance to the new government, and in May 1650 he published The Case of the Commonwealth of England, Stated, or, The equity, utility, and necessity, of a submission to the present government; cleared out of monuments both sacred and civill, against all the scruples and pretences of the opposite parties. Nedham opened the tract with an

34 The most eloquent discussion of time in the ‘Ode’ remains Everett, ‘Shooting of the Bears’: ‘the action of Charles belongs to the past, the action of Cromwell to the future.’ (50)
address to the royalist reader: ‘Perhaps thou art of an Opinion contrary to what is here written: I confess that for a Time I myself was so too, till some Causes made me reflect with an impartial eie upon the Affairs of this new Government’ (sig. A2'). The Council of State was sufficiently impressed to reward Nedham with £50 pounds on 24 May and an annual salary of £100; in June Nedham launched *Mercurius Politicus*, the Commonwealth's official newsbook, beginning his editorials with excerpts from *The Case of the Commonwealth*.37 Nedham made it clear that his arguments in *The Case of the Commonwealth*, discussed in some more detail below, were not aimed at royalists in exile such as Denham and Cowley, hopeless of return or recovery of their estates, but those ‘humerous Royalists’ who have only ‘an obstinate and *vain-glorying* humour for the grounds of their behaviour, without any respect of Advantage to Themselves’ (2nd edn., 42). He must have been thinking of the sort of talented writers and wits who had appeared with him, and with Hall, in *Lachrymae Musarum*; Mildmay Fane, Aston Cokayn, Herrick, Alexander Brome, Dryden—and Marvell. As soon as Nedham was employed by the Commonwealth he appealed to his royalist friends, as Hall had done in *Britanicus*, to rise from their drinking and realize that wit could after all flourish under the new liberty of a republic: ‘How sweet the Air of a *Commonwealth* is beyond that of a *Monarchy*! Is it not much better then to breathe freely, and be lively, upon a new score of *Allegiance*, than pine, and fret, and fume, in behalf of the old *Non-entity*, till wit, soul, and all be drowned in *Ale* and *Melancholy*?’38

Marvell could, then, follow the path of Hall and Nedham, his fellow contributors to *Lachrymae Musarum*, and risk being ostracized—a word on which he puts some pressure in the Hastings elegy—from the London literary circles in which he had moved since his return from Europe; or indeed risk being charged with treason to the monarchy as well as the Muses if the Commonwealth was overthrown by Charles II. The option of retirement to the country, in the manner of Stanley and Mildmay Fane, was only available to Marvell if he entered into service—a choice which he was of course to make later in 1650 when he became tutor to Fairfax’s daughter. Yet there was another path, which ensured that one’s loyalty to the king and to the Muses could not be questioned: members of the Stanley circle such as Herrick, Shirley, and Lovelace remained in and around London and refused to reconcile themselves with their new rulers. But this meant eking out a living through schoolteaching (Shirley, who published a Latin grammar in 1649), or relying on the continued support of an absent patron (Herrick, who retained a small quarterly stipend from Mildmay Fane), or on the kindness of friends (the increasingly destitute Lovelace). The much-debated opening stanza of the ‘Ode’ presents a stark opposition, if we take ‘would’ in the first line to signify desire; but what scholars have missed is that it is an opposition

37 See Raymond, entry for Nedham in the *ODNB*.
that only a royalist would insist upon: ‘the Muses dear’ of lyric verse or public service to the Commonwealth. The lives of lyric poet and public servant are apparently incompatible in the post-monarchical world:

The forward youth that would appear  
Must now forsake his Muses dear,  
Nor in the shadows sing  
His numbers languishing.  

(ll. 1–4)

Jonathan Post comments on the ‘tonal difference if Marvell had simply used the offhand “forget” instead of the reluctant “forsake”’. In royalist polemic, wit and poetry were by definition qualities of loyalty: ‘forsake’, with its sense of the repudiation of an allegiance, emphasizes the royalist perspective from which the decision to ‘appear’ is regarded. At the same time ‘forsake’ also suggests a painful and self-dividing act of self-interest, as in Shakespeare’s ‘For himself himself he must forsake’ in *The Rape of Lucrece* (1593):

Such hazard now must doting Tarquin make,  
Pawning his honour to obtain his lust;  
And for himself himself he must forsake:  
Then where is truth, if there be no self-trust?  
When shall he think to find a stranger just  
When he himself himself confounds, betrays  
To slanderous tongues and wretched hateful days?  

(ll. 155–62)

*The Rape of Lucrece* may indeed have been on Marvell’s mind when he wrote the ‘Horatian Ode’, not only because the act of rape that Tarquin debates in the lines above leads to the overthrow of the Roman princes and the founding of the republic. Nedham had begun to refer habitually to Prince Charles in *Politicus* as ‘young Tarquin’. Hall had been accused in *Elencticus* precisely of ‘Pawning his honour to obtain his lust’ for money and status; Marvell had witnessed how the appearance for Parliament had exposed Hall to the ‘slanderous tongues’ of royalist newsbook polemics who charged him with treason to the king, to poetry, and to friendship. Marvell was now faced with the decision of whether to make ‘such hazard’ in seeking state employment.

The ‘forward youth’ in the opening line is not Cromwell (who was hardly known for his love lyrics) and probably not Marvell (who was 29 in 1650), although there is a ‘parallel between the youth and the poet’ and between them both and Cromwell. The youth is a generic figure, derived from Virgilian pastoral and faced with the archetypal choice of the *vita activa* or the *vita umbratilis*,
private contemplation or public engagement. Yet it is hard not to see some connection with Hall, whose youthful precocity is mentioned in every poem written about him, from Henry More in 1646 (‘Young monster! born with teeth’), to Herrick in 1647 (‘Tell me young man’), to Lovelace’s 1657 elegy (‘None but the sun was ere so young and old’). Moreover Marvell’s opening lines echo the opening of Hall’s own (mostly ironic) renunciation of love poetry for public life in ‘The Recantation’:

I will no more range sullen groves, to lie
Entomb’d in a shade; nor basely fly
The dear society of light, to give
My thoughts their birth in darkness[.]

The link with Hall suggests a more personal occasion for the poem than Cromwell’s return from Ireland. In July 1650 Hall was given the opportunity to see at first hand the country that he had repeatedly abused in his polemical writing as ‘a sanctuary whither none resort but Thieves and Vagabonds for shelter’. Davies tells us that in ‘the yeer 1650 [Hall] was commanded by the Councell into Scotland to attend his Excellencie, now the Lord Protector, and to make such observations on affairs there, as might conduce to the settling of the Interests of the Common-wealth’ (‘An Account of the Author’, sig. b4v). Interestingly Davies gets his titles confused here: Cromwell was not yet Lord Protector, but had been made commander-in-chief of the Army on 26 June 1650, after Fairfax had refused to lead a Scottish campaign without provocation. Cromwell had returned from Ireland at the end of May having achieved a series of overwhelming victories over the royalist and Catholic alliance. Hall seems to have been what would be called today an ‘embedded’ reporter, sending reports on the campaign back to the Commonwealth’s official newsbook, *Mercurius Politicus*. For the next nine months Hall was paid £7 per month from the army and received £20 for ‘extraordinary service’. His first dispatch about events in Scotland, subtitled ‘An exact Diary of the Proceedings of the L. Gen. Cromwel, and the Scots Army’, was collected by Thomason on 22 July 1650.

Blair Worden wonders if the ‘Ode’ was ‘written, after Horace, for a forward youth now unknown to us’. In the list of maxims at the end his first piece of political prose, A true account, Hall had warned ‘That people are never so forward, nor so daring, as to preserve or regaine their Liberties’ (2). The commission confirmed Hall’s complete integration into the new republican order—an order to which Hall was surely seeking to reconcile Marvell. If ‘forsake’ gives the

42 *MPCP* ii. 181, l. 1; *HP* 292, l. 1; *LP* 191, l. 30.
44 J[ohn] H[all], *The Declaration and Speech of Colonel Massey Concerning the Inthroning of Scots* (1650).
opening two lines a royalist colouring, the phrase ‘numbers languishing’ (l. 4) assumes a republican resonance in the context of the work that Hall wrote later in 1650 while with Cromwell in Scotland, *The Grounds and Reasons of Monarchy Considered. In a Review of the Scotch Story, gathered out of their best Authors and Records*. Davies tells us that Hall presented Cromwell with this work ‘in Manuscript, printed soon after at *Edenburgh* in quarto, and since at *London*’ (‘An Account of the Author’, sig. b4v). In this, Hall’s most strident attack on hereditary monarchy, the history of Scottish kings is shaped into a gothic narrative of rape, murder, madness, and witchcraft, designed to demonstrate to the Scots that they can only be prevented from ‘enslaving and ruining themselves’ under a ‘Tyrannizing Nobilitie and Clergie’ by incorporation into a British republic. Hall writes of how people under kings ‘languish under a brutish servitude (Monarchy being truly a disease of Government) … [they] languish when their Princes are fullest, and like leeches, rather willing to burst then fall off’. Hall associates the failure to take action against degenerate monarchies with ‘contemplative men… fighting only with Pen, Ink, and Paper’, ‘speculative men’ guided by books that are usually biased towards monarchy. The opening four lines of the ‘Ode’ oppose letters and arms, courtly poetics and public service, but they do so from both a royalist and an anti-royalist perspective, held in a tension that is reflected formally here, and throughout the poem, in the ‘interplay of tight quatrains and constantly resumptive syntax’. The Horatian form of the poem is usually related to the imitation and translation of Horatian odes by Richard Fanshawe and Mildmay Fane, who in the aftermath of royalist defeat were attracted by Horace’s praise of retirement from public life. But Lovelace was the poet closest to Marvell who had been writing Horatian verse in praise of withdrawal to a private world of drink, friendship, lyric verse, and classical imitation, most impressively in ‘The Grasshopper’. In this first quatrain of the ‘Ode’ we can measure, and see Marvell measuring, how the ‘Minds and Merits’ of his friends Hall and Lovelace ‘brake two several ways’. Which way were Marvell’s mind and merit to break? It would be helpful to know what Lovelace thought of the ‘Horatian Ode’ and Marvell may himself tell us. The forty-seventh stanza in ‘Upon Appleton House’—‘Marvell’s most vertiginous stanza’, according to John Creaser—has surprisingly not been connected in any purposeful way to Marvell’s knowledge of Lovelace’s verse:

And now to the abyss I pass
Of that unfathomable grass,
Where men like grasshoppers appear,

---


But grasshoppers are giants there:  
They, in their squeaking laugh, contemn  
Us as we walk more low than them:  
And, from the precipices tall  
Of the green spires, to us do call.  

(ll. 369–76)

Editors note the biblical allusion to Numbers 13: 33: ‘And there we saw the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants: and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight.’ But the reference to the ‘abyss’ of ‘unfathomable grass’ also invokes the ‘bottomless pit’ of Revelation 9: 2–3, from which the locusts emerge to take power over the earth, by way of the penultimate stanza of ‘To Lucasta. From Prison. An Epode’:

And now an universal mist  
Of error is spread o’er each breast,  
With such a fury edged, as is  
Not found in th’ inwards of th’ abyss.

As we saw in Chapter 4, Marvell recalls this stanza in the verse epistle to Lovelace in comparing the Presbyterian censors to ‘swarms of insects which rise against’ Lovelace and his poetry, while in ‘The Grasshopper’ Lovelace implicitly opposes the anacreontic cicada of Cavalier verse to Puritan apocalyptic locusts. In the final section of the verse epistle Marvell is mistaken, to Marvell’s alarm and embarrassment, for one of Lovelace’s Presbyterian enemies by the fairest of the ‘ladies’ in Lovelace’s female fan-club.

In ‘Upon Appleton House’, however, Marvell descends to the ‘abyss’ while the grasshoppers look down from their ‘green spires’ and condemn ‘Us as we walk more low than them’. Could this be a reference to the distaste of Marvell’s Cavalier friends, and specifically Lovelace, for Marvell’s efforts to solicit Commonwealth patronage through verse? We may have here Marvell’s sense of the reaction of his royalist associates to the ‘Horatian Ode’—although a few months before he composed ‘Upon Appleton House’ Marvell had made a rather more straightforward bid for preferment in the form of a Latin poem for Oliver St John’s visit to the Dutch republic to seek an alliance with the Commonwealth, ‘In Legationem Domini Oliveri St John ad Provincias Foederatas’. The speaker does not deny that he walks ‘more low’ than the grasshoppers and so accepts the charge that he is unable to reach their lofty heights: the ‘green spires’ evoke the magnificence of the Caroline court, or perhaps royalist Oxford. Marvell, it seems, is acknowledging that he could not—whether for ideological or material reasons, or both—follow Lovelace’s path and remain aloof from the new

49 ‘Prosody and Liberty in Milton and Marvell’, 53.
republican structures of literary patronage into which their mutual friend Hall had been quickly incorporated. For Lovelace, the route that Marvell is taking is a descent to the abyss, into the centre of the Puritan hell into which the country had been plunged by civil war and regicide. As Paul Hammond has brilliantly observed, ‘pronouns of self-definition and mutual definition, “I” and “we”, the grammar of commitment, did not come easily to Marvell’s pen.’ In this stanza, which is all about the complexities of commitment, the ‘I’ of line 369 becomes ‘us’ and ‘we’ by line 374; in the final line thegrasshoppers ‘to us do call’. Is this Lovelace and other royalist friends in the town (‘they’) trying to shame Marvell, Hall, and Nedham (‘us’, ‘we’) into reconsid-ering the offer of their pens to the Commonwealth? The division into us and them suggests it may be too late for any such *rapprochement*. ‘The poetry of community, in a nation fractured by civil war, will inevitably be a poetry of displacement, fragmentation, and loss’: Marvell’s pronouns here register these fractures, just as they did in the opening four lines of the verse epistle to Lovelace, in which the apparent invocation of community in the first line—‘Our times’—is immediately undermined by the repetition of ‘your’ and the separation of Lovelace from the civil wars which have infected the wit of Marvell and his peers:

Sir,
*Our* times are much degenerate from those
Which *your* sweet Muse with *your* fair fortune chose,
And as complexions alter with the climes,
*Our* wits have drawn th’infection of *our* times. 51

The interest of members of Stanley’s circle in translating and imitating Horace is underlined by Alexander Brome’s *The Poems of Horace, Consisting of Odes, Satyres, and Epistles, Rendered in English Verse by Severall Persons* (1666). Brome collected translations out of published volumes by Fanshawe and Cowley ‘and other Printed Books’ but ‘such as were not Translated by others, my self and several friends of mine at my request have attempted’ (‘Epistle Dedicatory’, sigs. A5r−v). Brome gives us no indication of the identity of these friends but it seems likely that his work on Horace had originally been related to the intensive study and translation of classical verse fostered by Stanley and practised by Brome’s friend Lovelace. The ‘forward youth’ of the first two quatrains of Marvell’s ‘Horatian Ode’ leaves the shade and privacy of such lyric practice and ‘becomes suddenly yoked to Cromwell at the ninth line by a decisive “So” that lifts him out of traditional frameworks’. From this point, argues Norbrook, ‘the poem’s sublime aspirations break its Horatian framework’: the regicide ‘may have destroyed some forms of beauty, but it has opened the way to the sublime…Marvell is establishing a similar relationship between his forebears the Cavalier poets

51 ‘Marvell’s Pronouns’, *Essays in Criticism*, 53 (2003), 224, 232 emphasis added.
and the new and more innovative genre of poetry he is now founding.” Yet the Horatian form and spirit of the poem—‘the quiet formality, the brevity of the lines, the refusal of the incantatory’—is maintained throughout and might be read rather as a counter to Cromwell’s apocalyptic force, with Marvell’s strict prosody an attempt to enclose within a conventional structure the wild power of ‘restless Cromwell’. But the poet tells us that any such attempt to restrain Cromwell will put an admirer at as much risk as a critic, his parentheses visualizing his vain gesture at control:

(For ’tis all one to courage high,
The emulous or enemy;
And with such to inclose
Is more than to oppose.)
(ll. 17–20)

In Britanicus Hall had compared Fairfax to ‘a fire that more enclos’d | More violently burnes, | And wasteth that matter that oppos’d’. As we have seen, Hall derived this language from Longinus and, although Norbrook does not cite this instance, the resemblance illustrates his claim that ‘the poem’s diction again and again parallels not only Hall’s political writings but his Advancement of Learning and Longinus translation’. Cromwell flies ‘burning through the air’ (l. 21). Longinus regards Euripides’s (lost) account of the flight of Phaeton as symbolic of the risks taken by those who seek the glory of sublimity in their writing, and he quotes Euripides on how Phaeton and his father the Sun ‘sharply lashing the swift fiery steeds | Gave rein; they threw the airs blew convex flew’ (33). Marvell transmits to Cromwell the images of sublime, elemental power that Hall had ascribed in Britanicus to Fairfax and the New Model Army; this would seem appropriate, given that Cromwell had taken over from Fairfax to lead the Scottish invasion. Cromwell indeed flies through the air and tears through the clouds rather like tutor and student in Hall’s ‘Ode’ to Pawson—and so like poet and mistress in ‘To His Coy Mistress’. All of them break violently through the boundaries of convention, whether intellectual, sexual, or political. Yet the echoes of The Advancement of Learning in the ‘Ode’ are more problematic. In this tract it is the (unpurged) members of the Long Parliament who have displayed unprecedented valour in obtaining ‘many happy and signal Victories’ during the civil wars and who ‘have cleared our liberties’ through the ‘transcendent comprehensive peace of Justice’ of the regicide. They are the ‘men of sublime minds’ who embody the ‘restless Genius in this age’ (21–2). It is they who have gone ‘beyond the dictates of common Law and reason’ in their forwardness and ‘will not give over while

52 Writing the English Republic, 269; ‘Marvell’s “Horatian Ode” and the Politics of Genre’, in Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (eds.), Literature and the English Civil War (Cambridge, 1990), 156.
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there remains so great a worke’ as the reform of learning (15). It was their ‘power to act more vigorously, and by a happy Antiperistasis to grow more intense’, which enabled them to ‘bravely brake through that stiffe circumstance that beset’ them, by which Hall means the backsliding Presbyterians (3). ‘Antiperistasis’, from the Greek for ‘against circumstance’, denotes in ‘philosophy’, according to Ephraim Chambers in his *Cyclopedia* (1728), ‘the Action of two Opposite qualities, one whereof, by Opposition, excites and heightens the force of the other’. It had been believed by some that it was as a result of antiperistasis that ‘Thunder and Lightening are excited in the middle region of the air, which is continually cold’ (111). Hall’s admirer and Hartlib’s friend Robert Boyle tested and found wanting the theory of antiperistasis in his *New Experiments and Observations Touching the Cold* (1665), and it seems that Hall has in mind the advancement of experimental philosophy that he believes can occur under the public patronage of a state freed from clerical control. Marvell looks rather to such analogies with the inexorableness of natural process (‘And therefore must’) to express Cromwell’s force:

Nature that hateth emptiness,
Allows of penetration less:
And therefore must make room
Where greater spirits come.

(ll. 41–4)

In other words, the terms of Hall’s ‘republican sublime’ in *The Advancement of Learning* are incorporated into the portrayal of a single military leader: ‘Much to the man is due’ (l. 28).

Hall does not in fact mention Cromwell once in *The Advancement of Learning*. Yet Marvell lays bare the facts of military power that Hall mystifies in his praise of Parliament. Referring to the crisis of the summer of 1647, when Independent MPs were forced to flee and Presbyterians sought to drive through a bill to invite the king back to London, Hall declares that if Parliament ‘had not been miraculously aided with an almost immediate hand of Providence, you had never overcome, and yet you suddenly, and ere your selves could imagine, wrastled out of it’ (3). Of course it was the occupation of London by Cromwell and the Army that had allowed the Independent members to return and resulted in the expulsion of eleven Presbyterians, just as it was the Army that had purged Parliament of Presbyterian opposition to the regicide. The Parliament did not act to free itself from Presbyterian control but was acted upon: ‘you being loosed from those charms wherewith you before were maleficate’. Marvell’s image of Cromwell as ‘controllable falcon’ may be there, as Michael Wilding suggests, ‘to counter the memory of the Army resisting Parliament’s orders to disband, and ultimately marching on London and occupying it’. But, as has often been pointed out, ‘yet’ and ‘still’ in lines 81–2—‘Nor yet grown stiffer with command, | But still in the Republic’s hand’—are ‘ominous, as though the Commander’s future
impatience with Parliament could already be discerned’. At the same time it was the power of Cromwell’s army to subordinate Parliament through force that had dispelled the Presbyterian clerical repression lamented by Marvell in the verse epistle to Lovelace and bitterly attacked by Hall and Nedham throughout their polemical prose. Marvell must be thinking of the Army’s occupation of Parliament in August 1647 and November 1648, the institution for which they were theoretically fighting, when he describes Cromwell’s sublimity:

And like the three-forked lightening, first
Breaking through the clouds where it was nursed,
Did thorough his own side
His fiery way divide.

(II. 13–16)

As Marvell wrote these lines, Cromwell was preparing to invade Scotland and to head off once more the threat of a Presbyterian–royalist alliance that would bring with it, if victorious, an imposed Presbyterian church government. The polemical writing in 1649–50 of the Commonwealth’s three major apologists—Milton, Hall, and Nedham—had targeted above all the Presbyterians and the Scots. In his first commissioned publication for the Commonwealth government, Observations Upon the Articles of Peace with the Irish Rebels (May 1649), Milton had reserved his greatest polemical ire not for the coalition of English royalists and Irish Catholics who had concluded the Articles of Peace but for Scottish Presbyterians: more than half of Milton’s commentary is devoted to the brief ‘Representation of the Scotch Presbytery at Belfast’, made against the legitimacy of the Commonwealth. In language reminiscent of the satirical sonnets, he targets their alleged ignorance: ‘We may then behold [their] pitiful store of learning, and theology … But wherefore spend we two such prejurious things as time and reason upon Priests, the most prodigal mis-spenders of time, and the scarest owners of reason?’ (CPWM iii. 322–3, 329). The Belfast Presbyterians serve as a cipher for the continued threat to the security of the Commonwealth of the Scots, who had accepted Charles II as their king. John Hall’s first appearance in print on behalf of his new employers was an attack not on Cavalier resistance to the new state but on the veteran Presbyterian polemicist William Prynne, in response to whose criticism of Henrietta Maria’s involvement in court masques James Shirley had composed The Triumph of Peace for performance before the king and queen in 1634. Prynne is comically dismissed by Hall as one of nature’s ‘dullest Beasts’ for his ‘most laborious writing’: ‘Verily had you been Amphion, and gone about to build the walls of Thebes with your Harpe, the stones out of meer rage would

have rained and pelted you to death.’ As Davies puts it, Hall ‘ensnared [Prynne] in the entangled nets of his own citations, and dismissed [him] to the abuses of the people’. 57

Nedham’s *The Case of the Commonwealth* has been principally discussed for its place in the Engagement controversy and its articulation of the arguments, previously advanced by Commonwealth apologists such as John Dury and Anthony Ascham, that submission to the new regime was justified, first, because the regicide had happened and therefore was part of God’s providential plan and, secondly, because, in Nedham’s words, ‘the Power of the Sword is, and ever hath been, the Foundation of all Titles to Government’. 58 In the second page of the tract Nedham prefers to quote Seneca on providence rather than scripture, although he insists that Seneca writes ‘almost in the language of Scripture’: ‘It is (saith Seneca) that Providence which pulls down one Kingdom or Government, and sets up another; nor is this done leisurely, and by degrees, but it hurles the powers of the world on a sudden, from the highest pinnacle of glory, to nothing’ (2). Nedham doubtless calculated that Senecan references would appeal more to royalist readers such as the members of the Stanley circle than biblical injunctions, which they would associate with Puritan fundamentalism: as we saw in the previous chapter, Stanley had been translating Seneca on fate and Hall appealed in his elegy for Hastings to the ‘Laws by which the World is govern’d’. In the appendix to the second edition of the tract, also 1650, Nedham emphasized to royalist readers the impeccable rationality of arguments for the *de facto* legitimacy of the Commonwealth on the grounds of right of conquest by extensively quoting from the recently published *De Corpore Politico* (May 1650) of Thomas Hobbes, then still in exile with the Stuart court in Paris.

It has been argued that aspects of Nedham’s arguments about the workings of Providence and the ‘Power of the Sword’ in *The Case of the Commonwealth* and the early issues of *Politicus* are echoed in the ‘Horatian Ode’. 59 Less notice has been taken, however, of Nedham’s argument not only for the equity and necessity of the Commonwealth government, but for its utility in preventing Presbyterian tyranny. Nedham presents the anti-Presbyterian argument for submission to the new regime as of vital and urgent importance, as is indicated by the conclusion to his brief prefatory address: ‘I have only one word more: & that is to

57 *A Serious Epistle to Mr William Prynne* (1649), 4, 8; Davies, ‘An Account of the Author’, sig. b4v.
our Modern Pharisee, the Conscientious Pretender, & principall Disturber of the Publique Peace ... all this noise of Church Reformation, Conscience & Covenant, is a meere malicious Designe to drive on a Faction, for the casting down of our present Governors, that they may set up Themselves in the Seat of Authority’ (sig. A3v).

Nedham set out, much as Hall had done in Britanicus, to persuade royalist readers that an alliance with Presbyterians and Scots against the Commonwealth will prove disastrous for the English nation. He reminds them of the ‘Hypocrit-icall pretences and Encroachments’ of the Scots, lamenting that he has to ‘waste paper upon this Nation’ (56, 61). The English Presbyterians ‘combine in interest’ with the Scots in seeking to subject the nation to their self-interest: ‘every Prayer is a strategem’ to further their ‘Popish Trick’ of ‘drawing all secular affairs within the compasse of their spirituall jurisdiction’. ‘It will be impossible’, Nedham maintains, ‘to keep such a Church-Discipline, within its limits in any Commonwealth, which makes the same Persons Civil Subjects and Ecclesiastical Superiours.’ He argues for the benefits of religious toleration and against Presbyterian forced uniformity, insisting most royalists ‘will never comply, in a course so destructive to every mans Interest of Conscience and Liberty’ (71–2, 75–6). Men living under censorship are compared to pygmies in cages in Hall’s Longinus; Nedham similarly invokes physical disfigurement in his attack on Presbyterian intolerance, insisting ‘those high imperious Uniformity-Mongers’ are the ‘greatest disturbers of States’ and comparing them to the ‘tyrant Mezentius’, who ‘if his guests were too long for his Bed, cut them shorter, and if they happened to be too short, he had Engines of Torture to stretch them longer’ (2nd edn., 99). For all his arguments about the irresistible workings of providence and the greater encouragement of virtue and ambition under a republic, Nedham thought the purging of the Presbyterian influence on civil government a sufficient justification of the Commonwealth regime:

All which being considered, you may see, how exceedingly we are obliged to our present Governors, that they strove so mightily against the stream to prevent [the Presbyterians and the Scots] in all severall Designings; and what necessity lay upon them to expell that corrupt Interest out of Parliament, and to follow the Counsell of the Poet [Ovid], in cutting off a rotten Part for the Preservation of the whole, by the Power of the Sword.

(2nd edn., 71)

Although Nedham’s sincerity about anything has been questioned in his own time and since, we have seen the consistency of his anticlericalism, whether in his Roundhead or Cavalier prose, and it seems that the subordination of the Presbyterians at Pride’s Purge was indeed a genuine justification for his latest switch of allegiance.

Scholars have become more alert in recent years to the occasion of the ‘Ode’—Cromwell’s return from Ireland and his imminent invasion of Scotland—and to how the poem ‘entails the affairs of the three kingdoms, and implies an ongoing
interplay of political events among them’. Again, less attention has been paid to the religious politics implicated in the poem’s emphasis on Cromwell’s Irish and Scottish campaigns. As we have seen, for Milton in 1649 the Irish problem was really one aspect of the Scottish problem, which was an external manifestation of the Presbyterian problem in England. Similarly, despite its title, the ‘rhetorical energies’ of the ‘Ode’ turn on the preparations to invade Scotland. Marvell follows Hall and Nedham in emphasizing the duplicity, barbarism, and cowardice of the Scots:

The Pict no shelter now shall find
Within his parti-coloured mind;
But from this valour sad
Shrink underneath the plaid:

Happy if in the tufted brake,
The English hunter him mistake,
Nor lay his hounds in near
The Caledonian deer.
(ll. 105–12)

‘Pict’ equates the Scots with the Celtic ‘barbarians’ encountered by the Roman soldiers who guarded Hadrian’s Wall and who were supposed to have worn nothing but blue body paint. In *The Rebel Scot* Cleveland had addressed ‘You Picts in Gentry and Devotion’ (l. 112); Hall had mocked the weather-worn Scots as looking ‘as if they were no other, but their ancestors the Picts again’. The ‘tufted brake’ invokes the wild, barren landscape repeatedly scorned by Hall and Nedham, as well as Cleveland, while ‘parti-coloured’ leads on from the association with the body-paint of the Picts to encapsulate the charge of political treachery and double-dealing against the Scots and Presbyterians, made most bitterly by Milton in his 1649 prose. Nedham had written in *Pragmaticus* in his royalist phase of the ‘party-colour’d coat of Presbyterie’. Cromwellian virtù will overwhelm the Scots as it had overwhelmed the Irish: in *Britanicus* Hall was fond of accusing the Scots of lack of courage in battle. Milton charged the Presbyterians with both treachery and cowardice in the *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* for their backsliding from the campaign against the king that they had initially prosecuted: he declarared on the title-page that his aim was to show ‘that they, who of late did so much blame Deposing, are the Men that did it themselves’. Marvell incorporates this charge into the ‘Ode’ in his reference to discovery of a head in the foundations of the Roman Capitol: ‘A bleeding head where they begun | Did fright the architects to run’ (ll. 69–70). The association of

---

the Scottish Presbyterians with the perfidy of witchcraft, and specifically with the witches of *Macbeth*, is a theme found in the work of Nedham, Milton, and Hall in 1648–9. Marvell seems to glance at this association in the final two stanzas of the ‘Ode’: ‘the War’s and Fortune’s Son’ must keep his ‘sword erect’ as he marches into Scotland, which may mean ‘upside down, to make the sign of a cross’ and frighten off the ‘spirits of the shady night’ (ll. 113, 116–18; *MP* 279, 116 n.). Interestingly, in the third line of the ‘Ode’ the ‘forward youth’ must leave the ‘shadows’ in which he writes verse; in the third line from the end, line 117, ‘the War’s and Fortune’s son’ must enter ‘the shady night’ of Scotland. There is also at line 113 one of the many grammatical ambiguities in the ‘Ode’: ‘the War’s and Fortune’s son’ may not necessarily be Cromwell, as is always assumed, but could be the ‘forward youth’, now setting off for Scotland. Does the poem begin with Hall leaving behind his verses to answer the call from Cromwell and end with Hall crossing with Cromwell into the dangerous, superstitious land that Hall had so often invoked in his polemical prose?

‘AN HORATIAN ODE’: CROMWELL AND THE PROTECTION OF WIT

The splitting of the Parliamentarian party into Presbyterian and Independent factions had complicated views of Cromwell among royalists who regarded Presbyterian dominance as the worst possible outcome of the civil wars for writers and for literary culture. We have seen this process in action in Alexander Brome’s *Cromwell’s Panegyrick*, published as a broadside in September 1647. Brome incorporates all the usual points of royalist attack on the character of ‘King Oliver’ as a social-climbing, Machiavellian schemer, plotting to usurp the crown for himself, but the bathos is destabilized by acknowledgement of Cromwell’s almost miraculous martial strength:

who goes to wring
His Nose, is forc’d to cry, *God save the King*.
He that can rout an Army with his name,
And take a City, ere he views the same.

(ll. 17–20)

Brome’s greatest vitriol is reserved not for Cromwell but for the ‘Scottish zealots’ and Presbyterians in the Westminster Assembly who are scattered and subordinated by Cromwell’s invasion of London. To that extent the poem really is Cromwell’s panegyric and the degree of irony is unclear, perhaps even to Brome himself, in the declaration: ‘What honour does he merit, what renown, | By whom all these oppressions are pul’d down’ (ll. 89–90). Brome’s reputation as an unswerving Cavalier in fact needs some qualification, for in May 1653 he offered indirect but unmistakable praise of Cromwell in the aftermath of the dissolution
of the ‘Rump’ Parliament. In the prefatory poem to his edition of *Five New Playes* by his recently deceased friend Richard Brome, it is the Commons rather than Cromwell whom Alexander Brome holds responsible for the civil wars and the ruin of wit:

> See the strange Swirle of *Times*! When such poore things  
> Out-live the dates of *Parliament*, or *King*!  
> This *Revolution* makes exploded *Wit*  
> Now see the fall of those that ruined it.

Cromwell’s undivided power hopefully signals a revival of literary patronage and traditional modes of panegyric, under the protection of military might:

> May this *Work* prove successful, and we finde  
> Those men, that now are *Powerfull*, to be kinde!  
> And give encouragement to *Wit*, and *Worth*,  
> That things of Weight may come with boldnesse forth!  
>  
> Poets are the *Custodes* of our *Fame*,  
> Were’t not for Homer, where’s Achilles Name?  
> Let *Souldiers* then protect, while *Poets* praise;  
> Since that, which *Crownes* the Browes of Both, is *Baies*.63

Brome was not the only former royalist writer who saw in Cromwell’s dissolution of Parliament the potential for a return to a unified, monarchical system of patronage; but Brome’s praise of Cromwell’s protective power can be seen to have its roots in his satirical panegyric of 1647 and its reluctant admiration for Cromwell’s routing of the Presbyterians.

Some of the famous ambivalence of Marvell’s portrait of Cromwell in the ‘Horatian Ode’ stems from the realization, apparent also in the rather cruder *Cromwell’s Panegyrick*, that the awesome martial power which makes Cromwell a potential tyrant is also the power that enables him to obliterate the Presbyterian threat both within and without England. If history tends to remember Cromwell as a Puritan zealot, contemporaries were more likely to view him as ‘a strongman, an ambitious practitioner of statecraft’, a ‘Machiavellian realist, aiming at power and willing above all to manipulate religious sentiment to achieve it’.64 One of the writers who had done as much as anyone to project the image of Cromwell as a ‘State Machiavel’ was Nedham, who habitually referred to ‘King Oliver’ in *Mercurius Pragmaticus* in 1647–8. Nedham may not be the author of *The second part of Crafty Crumwell. Or Oliver in his Glory as King. A Trage Comedie* (1648), which advertises itself as by *Pragmaticus*; but the work is nonetheless a revealing example of satirical royalist representations of Cromwell. Although he only makes a brief appearance at the end, Cromwell ‘shows the high spirits and inventiveness of a

---

63 ‘Upon the Ingenious Comedies of Mr Richard Brome’, in Richard Brome, *Five New Playes* (1653), sig. a4r. Thomason collected his copy on 20 May.

Richard III’, asking the cabal of advisers who have just crowned him in a travesty of religious ceremony: ‘What shall we do now to conforme our Kingdom? What lawes shall we invent meet for our purpose[?]’ (16). Yet Nedham was himself charged with a Machiavellian attitude towards religion in 1647 and the charge was largely justified: from his earliest civil war writing he had portrayed the conflict as a struggle to secure state authority over clerical power, first episcopal and then Presbyterian. An Erastian anticlericalism is similarly the most consistent theme in Hall’s various political writings, from A True Account of the Character of the Times to his pro-Cromwellian tracts of the 1650s. Nedham and Hall are cited by Jeffrey Collins as the writers of the period who best demonstrate ‘the capacity of Independency to attract supporters with little Puritan zealotry, but who appreciated the Erastian implications of Congregationalist ecclesiology . . . [they] were motivated towards Independency by the force of their Erastian objections to sectarians and clericalists, who alike denied the spiritual competence of the state’. ‘Clericalists’ were also seen by Hall, as they were by Milton and members of the Hartlib network, to threaten the liberty of wit and the advancement of learning through licensing, censorship, and intolerance of ideas that did not agree with their own rigid forms of Christian doctrine. Thomas Hobbes’s satirical attacks on clerical religion and endorsement of Independency in Leviathan (1651), and his subsequent return to England from exile in Paris, reveal how intellectuals in royalist circles could see in Cromwell’s martial strength and subordination of the Presbyterians the prospect of a more ordered and tolerant state than could ever be obtained under clerical domination of the civil power. Hall and Nedham in turn found aspects of Hobbesian thought attractive and useful in their defence of the Commonwealth: through Nedham’s quotation of Hobbes in the second edition of The Case of the Commonwealth and in the editorials of Mercurius Politicus in 1651 Hobbes’s account of political obligation ‘attained the invidious status of official propaganda for the Commonwealth’, while Hall enlisted the authority of Hobbes’s De Cive (1642) in his The Grounds and Reasons of Monarchy (49). We have seen the vigorous and vituperative anticlericalism of members of the Hartlib network, such as Cheney Culpeper. William Rand, a doctor living in Amsterdam, commended Leviathan to Hartlib and Benjamin Worsley as containing ‘many things to your palate’, foremost among them being Hobbes’s insistence that the clergy should be purged from the universities and have no part in education: ‘In a word’, declared Rand, ‘I perceive [Hobbes] is cominge over to the parliament side.’ Indeed Hobbes and Hall appear to have become acquainted after Hobbes returned to England, although in the
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comments on Hall that John Davies attributes to Hobbes, republican allegiance is typically represented in terms of uncontrolled appetite: ‘had not his debauches and intemperance diverted him from the more serious studies, he had made an extraordinary person; for no man had ever done so great things at his age’. Once again we find contemporaries commenting on Hall’s forwardness and youthfulness. Hall and Hobbes may have met through Hall’s great Cambridge friend and biographer Davies, who was responsible for the publication in 1654 of Hobbes’s *Of Liberty and Necessity* and who wrote a preface for the work in which he predicted that clerical readers would be ‘discontented that these Prerogatives of Religion are taken away . . . and are invested in the Supream power of the Nation, be it of what perswasion it will’.  

John M. Wallace related the ‘Horatian Ode’ to Hobbes’s ideas about political obligation some forty years ago in situating the poem in the context of the Engagement controversy. Wallace finds in the ‘Ode’ a change of allegiance that should actually be understood in terms of an underlying ideological continuity: Marvell, like many others in the period, was not a royalist or a republican but a ‘loyalist’ who deferred the ‘transference of his allegiance until after the death of his former sovereign’ in a passive acceptance of the dictates of providence and the political realities of force. But, as Jeffrey Collins has persuasively argued in *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*, it was Cromwell’s subordination of the Presbyterian clergy which impressed Hobbes and encouraged him to emphasize the *de facto* sovereignty of the Commonwealth as conquering power. The bitter anti-Presbyterianism of Marvell’s verse epistle to Lovelace and the relish with which he looks forward to Cromwell’s scattering of the Scottish Presbyterians in the ‘Ode’ suggest that Marvell was particularly struck by Cromwell’s growing reputation, demonstrated in Ireland and about to be put to the test in Scotland, as a scourge of clerical power. Moreover arguments for the necessity of taming the Presbyterians and the Scots to ensure the stability of the English state, liberty of conscience, and the advancement of learning were being put forward by men such as Hall, whose abilities Marvell knew well and whose poetry and prose he read closely, and Milton, whose verse Marvell certainly knew by 1650 even if he had yet to meet the man. Crucially, however, Marvell followed Hobbes, and anticipated former royalists such as Alexander Brome in identifying Cromwell, rather than Parliament, as the agent of sovereign control of British church and state.

Hall’s anticlerical convictions proved to be stronger than his republicanism. His first publication on behalf of the Commonwealth after returning from Scotland was to defend the execution of Christopher Love, the Presbyterian cleric
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70 *Destiny his Choice*, 4–5; on Hobbes, see also 62–4.
involved in a royalist plot against Parliament, in which he was less concerned with Love’s royalism than his Presbyterianism. Love’s treasonous plot was a suitable illustration of the inconsistency of Presbyterian doctrine with ‘civil power and human society’. Hall wrote several tracts defending the dissolution of the Long Parliament in 1653, most notably *A Letter Written to a Gentleman in the Country*, collected by Thomason on 16 May 1653 (and which, interestingly, Thomason ascribed to Milton). Hall turns to Hobbesian arguments for the de facto authority of the regime that can ensure the safety of the people (‘the determination of [Cromwell’s] power determines my obedience, which is correlative to protection’) but he also argues that without the dissolution ‘the Presbyterian party (which is meerly a Jesuit in a Genevah cloak, but somewhat more insupportable)’ may have taken control of the country (11). In other words the overriding principle of *salus populi* required that Cromwell take action to prevent a Presbyterian tyranny. We have seen how the dissolution of the ‘Rump’ led that deeply anti-Puritan friend of Lovelace and Hall, Alexander Brome, to seek reconciliation with the new Cromwellian government and raise the possibility of a new era of literary patronage: ‘Let Souldiers then protect, while Poets praise’. In the same poem Brome looks back to the pre-war days of the theatre:

```
Time was, when Plays were justly valu’d, when
Poets could laugh away the Crimes of men.
And by Instructive Recreations teach
More in one hour, than some in ten do preach.
```

(sig. A3v)

Brome opposes playing to (presumably Puritan) preaching; but he also associates the potential revival of literary culture and the giving of ‘encouragement to Wit’ with Cromwell’s rule. Brome may have been convinced by discussions with Hall, whose influence is indicated by the striking description of plays as ‘instructive recreations’, taken from the opening of Hall’s commendatory poem to the printed text of Richard Brome’s *A Joviall Crew*, published in 1652: ‘Plays are instructive Recreations: | Which, who would write, may not expect, at once, | Nor with every breeding, to write well’ (sig. A3v). Hall appeared at the head of the commendatory poems for *A Joviall Crew*, which Richard Brome dedicated to Stanley, preceding Berkenhead (again writing as ‘J.B.’), Shirley, Lovelace’s friend John Tatham, and Alexander Brome. Hall’s appearance in print in this company underlines again his continued association after his employment by the Commonwealth with prominent royalists and writers who had moved in Stanley’s circle.

Given Hall’s belief in the value of drama as an educative and instructive art form—as early as *A True Account* in 1647 he had called for the reopening of the
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72 The pamphlet was signed ‘[Joh]N. [Ha]LL.’ Thomason was usually well informed and Worden thinks Milton may indeed have had a hand in the tract (*Literature and Politics*, 282–5).
theatres—and the maintenance of his friendship with Shirley, who appears with Hall in Stanley’s ‘Register of Friends’, it seems likely that Hall was involved in organizing the official performance of Shirley’s masque Cupid and Death before the Portuguese Ambassador on 26 March 1653: ‘Portugal was one of the first European powers to recognize the republic and in 1653 its ambassador, the Count of Peneguiaõ, was admitted to several private conferences with Cromwell before he met the Council of State.’ Hall perhaps sought to persuade Cromwell of the potential instructive efficacy of a reformed drama by arranging the staging of the masque, for which Shirley was presumably paid. Cupid and Death is indeed characterized by its (mild) criticism of the morality of Caroline court culture. The masque concludes with Mercury descending to banish the antimasque not only of satyrs and apes, but Cupid: ‘Love must no more | Appear in princes’ courts’ (5. 101–2). We might read these lines as a variation on the forsaking of the languishing numbers of love lyric for public life under a new Cromwellian order. Shirley’s anxiety that he might be charged with being a turncoat is evident in the note from ‘the Printer to the Reader’ before the text, authorized by Shirley as ‘according to the author’s own copy’ and published later in 1653: ‘This masque was born without ambition of more than to make good a private entertainment, though it found, without any address or design of the author, an honourable acceptation from his Excellency the Ambassador of Portugal.’

We might begin to wonder if Hall had a hand in the proposal that Shirley’s fellow former court poet William Davenant (1606–68) made to the Council of State, soon after his release from a Commonwealth prison, for a reformed theatre established on Hobbesian principles of education. The Baconian title of A Proposition for the Advancement of Morality by a New Way of Entertainment of the People, published anonymously in 1653, and the discovery of a scribal copy ascribed to Davenant in the Hartlib papers indicate that Hall was probably involved in some capacity in encouraging Davenant’s proposal, which eventually came to fruition in the ‘operas’ staged under the Protectorate in 1656–8.

The most remarkable example of Hall’s persuasion of former royalist writers, and indeed royalist prisoners, that Cromwell’s rule was a preferable alternative to Presbyterian dominance is Sir Thomas Urquhart (1611–60), laird of Cromarty and the first English translator of Rabelais. Urquhart, knighted at Whitehall in 1641, fought alongside the Scottish Presbyterians under the banner of Charles II at Worcester in September 1651. He was arrested after what he himself describes as ‘the total rout of the regal party at Worcester’. Urquhart was still in custody

75 The next few paragraphs are derived from my ‘Urquhart’s Rabelais: Translation, Patronage, and Cultural Politics’, English Literary Renaissance, 35/2 (2005), 273–303.
in June 1653 when his translation of the first two books of *Garagantua and Pantagruel* (five books, 1532–64) was published, with a long dedicatory poem before the first book by ‘John De La Salle’—the occasional (and not very mysterious) *nom de plume* of John Hall of Durham. Condemned by Calvin for his ‘filthie and ribauldly writings’, the name ‘Rabelais’ had become a signifier in early modern England of atheistic attitudes and ungodly behaviour, synonymous with a drink-soaked, scoffing libertinism. Rabelais stood accused, with Machiavelli, of threatening the foundations of Christian morality—a reputation exacerbated in England by the lack of a translation before Urquhart’s triumphant rendering, which is still in print today. For all his notoriety, and partly because of it, Rabelais was read and admired within the confines of elite social and intellectual circles in pre-war England. As Anne Lake Prescott has shown, among the ‘sophisticated’, ‘especially those in the university, court, and legal worlds’, Rabelais was regarded as a ‘wellhead of wit’ and prized for his ‘impatience with moralistic solemnity’. The series of mock panegyrics attached to *Coryats Crudities* (1611) by a collection of Jacobean poets and wits is full of references and allusions to *Garagantua and Pantagruel*; allusions in plays and masques by Jonson (whose copy of Rabelais, with some marginal notes, survives), Carew, and Shirley indicate that the work was known to writers in and around the Stuart courts. Rabelaisian drinking had become directly associated with Jonson’s ‘tribe’ through the verse that Jonson placed ‘Over the Door at the Entrance into the Apollo’, in which the Apollo Room of *The Devil* tavern becomes identified with the oracle of classical myth by way of the Oracle of the Holy Bottle that Panurge and Pantagruel seek in the *Cinquième Livre*.78

Hall’s sixty-six line poem opens by praising Rabelaisian wit, insisting that only ‘dull souls’ condemn the ‘noble leave’ of Rabelais as ‘Antick and Gottish’. For Hall, *Garagantua and Pantagruel* exemplifies the affective and educative power of wit, by which men may be ‘laught aright, and cheated into trust’. Hall contrasts the persuasive efficacy of wit with the grim beratings of the Presbyterian preacher, the ‘black piece of Flegme’, vainly seeking to terrify the ‘rout’ into virtuous behaviour with ‘dull menaces’. We might recall Hall’s mockery of Prynne as one of nature’s ‘dullest Beasts’. John Davies tells us Hall ‘thought it indeed no great devotion to hear a sort of people whose Tenets are as different as the laces of their caps, or the colours of the cushions they beat’, although he is then careful to insist that Hall should not be charged with atheism and numbered among the ‘Rabelais’, the *Aretines* due to ‘that liberty of exercising his Wit, which he did many times with more freedom than was suitable with the Tenents of those

77 Hall used the pen-name ‘De La Salle’ in the 2nd edn. of his *Paradoxes* (1653), having published the 1st edn. of 1650 under his real name, and for his translation of Michael Maier’s alchemical animal fable *Lusus Serius* (1654). Davies includes in his edn. of Hall’s *Hierocles* a previously unpublished poem signed ‘J. De La Sall.’ (sig. A8).
with whom he was engaged’. In the final section of his commendatory poem Hall addresses Urquhart, praising him for having restored something of the tarnished reputation of the Scots for learning:

> So undeceiving us that now we see
> All wit in Gascone and in Cromartie,
> Besides that *Rabelais* is conveigh’d to us,
> And that our Scotland is not barbarous.\(^\text{79}\)

This is a direct response to Urquhart’s pledge in *The Jewel*, a work that he had published from prison in 1652, to ‘undeceive’ those in England who would tar all Scots with the brush of the Presbyterians’ uncivilized values and duplicitous behaviour:

> there being nothing in the mouthes almost of all this country more common than the words of the ‘perfidious Scot’, the ‘treacherous Scot’, the ‘false brother’, ‘the covetous Scot’, and the ‘knot of knaves’ and other suchlike indignities fixed upon the whole nation for the baseness of some—I resolved on a sudden (for the undeceiving of honest men and imbuing of their minds with a better opinion of Scottish spirits) to insert the martial and literary endowments of some natives of that soyle, though much eclipsed by coclimatory wasps of a Presbyterian crue. (51)

*The Jewel* is in fact written under flimsy persona of ‘Christianus Presbyteromastix’ (‘Christian eater of Presbyterians’); Urquhart provides a lengthy survey of the historical achievements of various Scots to show how the ‘ecclesiastical tyranny’ erected in Scotland by ‘rapacious varlets’ masked with ‘the vizard of Presbyterian zeal’ has stained the ancient honour and pan-European reputation of his nation (50, 91). Cromwell’s plans for the union of Scotland and England, which were not formalized as a Protectoral ordinance until April 1654, were welcomed by many of the Scottish gentry as a means of getting rid of Presbyterian domination. *The Jewel* is ‘the most remarkable exposition of the views of this class’. In *Politicus* Nedham argued for the ‘incorporation’ of Scotland into England and the award of Parliamentary representation to the Scots: ‘Nedham want[ed] England to become, in Machiavelli’s language, a commonwealth for expansion.’\(^\text{80}\) Urquhart uses precisely this Machiavellian language of ‘incorporation’ in *The Jewel*, promising to deliver ‘many pregnant arguments inferred for the incorporating of both nations into one, with an indissolubility of union for the future in an identity of privileges, laws, and customs’ (49). In *The Grounds and Reasons of Monarchy* Hall sought to build up in Scotland the kind of anti-Presbyterian ‘alliance between
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Independents and royalists ... for which [Hall and Milton] had campaigned in the late 1640s. Urquhart’s support for this alliance was unequivocal: ‘Therefore, in my conceit, to use [the Presbyterians’] cavilling idiom, a malignant and an independent wil better sympathize with one another than either of them with the presbyter’ (183).

By encouraging the impressive translation by a royalist prisoner of a French work condemned by Calvin and associated in Cavalier circles with the Jonsonian culture of wit and conviviality in the ‘town’, Hall could demonstrate to his friends who thought of themselves as the ‘Sons of Ben’ that cultural nostalgia need not be the only response to the regicide; that literary culture could flourish in a kingless England. In *The Advancement of Learning* Hall had after all urged Parliament to undermine accusations of philistinism through the patronage of literary and scholarly endeavours. But by the time Urquhart’s rendering of the first two books appeared in June 1653, Cromwell had dissolved Parliament. Hall’s defence of the dissolution in *A Letter Written to a Gentleman in the Country* exhibits his recent reading of Urquhart’s Rabelais:

What [the Parliament has] done as to Establishment and Liberty I am to confesse they altered the Title of Writs, they have told us we have a Commonwealth but, for any essential fruits thereof, a man may (drolling) say, they have cut off the head of a King, and set a Commonwealth upon his shoulders, which Epistemon in Rabelais (who was beheaded in a fight) are so finely sewed together, that they may return out of Hel, and tell things they did there. (5)

Hall’s reference is to *Pantagruel*, chapter 30: ‘How Epistemon, who had his head cut off, was finely healed by Panurge, and of the News which he brought from the Devils, and the damned people in Hell’. After a battle Panurge reincarnates Epistemon by smearing excrement on his neck and sewing his head back on ‘veine against veine, sinew against sinew’. In a version of Lucian’s Menippean satire, Epistemon comes to life and tells of his experiences in hell, where the devils were ‘boone companions’ and he saw the great kings, warriors and intellectuals of classical history engaged in comically inappropriate mechanic trades. Perhaps recalling news reports of the king’s head being sewn back on immediately after his execution, Hall uses the analogy from Rabelais to suggest that, rather than pushing through comprehensive reform of the structures of the body politic, Parliament has merely indulged in a form of political necromancy and conjured a grotesque zombie-monarchy. In *The Advancement of Learning* Hall had envisaged England under Parliamentary rule ‘like a wakened Gyant begin[ning] to rowze it selfe up, and looke where it may conquer ... in her vast and stupendous symmetry’ (19). Now the ‘Rump’ is pictured as one of Rabelais’s bibulous buffoons, and a half-dead one at that. In his 1654 apology for the collapse of

82 *Works of Mr. Francis Rabelais*, i. 319–26.
83 For the sewing back on of the king’s head, see Raymond (ed.), *Making the News*, 249.
the Nominated Parliament and installation of Cromwell as Lord Protector, Hall recalled his optimistic imagery of 1649: ‘But as it happens in all things humane, to be corruptible, so it fell out in this great Body (and all Governments may well be said to be artificiall men) that though it rose as a Gyant in the morning, and ran its race swiftly before noon, yet sitting long after, it grew Catharrack and lazy, nay diseased and troublesome.’ Hall alludes here to the first page of Hobbes’s Leviathan, from which he derives a good deal of his pamphlet’s arguments about the salus populi and the necessity of separating civil and religious government. 84

In contrast to the image of Parliament as a grotesque, diseased, and stitched-up giant, Hall’s Cromwell embodies the sinewy sovereignty of the Leviathan in his heroic act of dissolution: ‘it was [the people’s] action as well as his; a n d i t was no more his action than it is the action of the Head moved by Tendons and Muscles, which are parts of the Body, and without which the Head it self could not possibly move’. 85 Parliament is first imagined as Milton’s awesome English Samson, is then pathetically reduced to Rabelais’s comic Epistemon, and is finally subsumed into Hobbes’s vast personification of power in the frontispiece to Leviathan.

Hall and Urquhart seem to have formed a genuine friendship based on a shared appreciation of Rabelaisian wit, and consequently Hall may have been able to convince Urquhart intellectually that his own future as well as the future of Scotland would be better served by a British republic than by a king who had allied himself with the Presbyterians, on whom Urquhart blamed both the loss of his own estate and Scotland’s ‘disreputation for covetousness and hypocrisie’. 86

For Urquhart, almost certainly working in conjunction with Hall, published an anonymous defence of Cromwell’s dissolution of Parliament within two weeks of Hall’s pamphlet. Reasons Why the Supreme Authority of the Three Nations (for the time) is not in the Parliament, but in the new-established Councel of State is dated 17 May and advertises, praises, and quotes at length from Hall’s A Letter Written to a Gentleman. Reasons Why the Supreme Authority also follows Hall’s epistolary form, being presented as an ‘answer to a letter sent from a Gentleman in Scotland to a friend of his in London’. David Norbrook has assigned this pamphlet to ‘one enthusiast’ of the idea of Cromwell as another Caesar, quoting it as an illustration of how the dissolution of Parliament opened the way for ‘a renewed form of literary Augustanism’. In fact Urquhart’s authorship was tentatively proposed by Hugh Candy as long ago as 1934 as his own copy of the pamphlet was signed in Urquhart’s hand. In 1948 C. H. Wilkinson confirmed Urquhart’s involvement

84 [John Hall], Confusion Confounded. Or, A Firm W a y of Settlement Settled and Confirmed (1654), 2. ‘For by Art is created that great LEVIATHAN called a COMMON-WEALTH, or STATE, (in latine CIVITAS) which is but an Artificiall Man’ (Hobbes, Leviathan, ed. Richard Tuck (Cambridge, 1991), 9).
85 A Letter Written to a Gentleman, 15; cf. Leviathan, 9–10.
86 The Jewel, 88.
on the strength of internal stylistic evidence.\textsuperscript{87} Several of Urquhart’s singular turns of phrase appear, as in the closing assurance that the Scottish author ‘hath ever from his years of discretion upward, studied the promoal of the honour of his native country’ (30). The attribution has been ignored by all subsequent criticism. Perhaps the notion that such a ‘wildly enthusiastic’ and ‘verbally extravagant’ rendering of Rabelais could be the work of a propagandist for the Cromwellian government, rather than the ‘staunch royalist’ and ‘dashing and high-spirited Cavalier’ preferred by critics, begs too many awkward questions about the construction of English literary and cultural history.\textsuperscript{88} Urquhart’s presence becomes more consistently visible as the focus of the pamphlet shifts to Scotland. He quotes Hall’s characterization of a Presbyterian as ‘a Jesuite in a Geneva cloak, but somewhat more insupportable’ with particular approval and then goes on to claim that Cromwell’s precipitate action against the Presbyterians in England can also help to free Scotland from its ‘Knoxian slavery’ by paving the way for parliamentary union of the two countries. The pamphlet concludes by listing the legal, economic, and military benefits of such a union for the Scottish; the foremost benefit, however, is the opportunity to get rid of the Presbyterians, who have made the country ‘despicable to all the other Nations of the World’ (19, 29). Sir Thomas Urquhart, who had fought for Charles II at Worcester in 1651, wrote propaganda for Cromwell in 1653 seemingly because he was convinced by John Hall that the only way to rid his country of Presbyterian ‘ecclesiastical tyranny’ was through ‘incorporation’ into a Cromwellian British state; and perhaps also because Hall persuaded him that his Rabelais would find acclaim and reward in a post-royalist Britain.

It may seem incongruous to yoke the tense Horatian poise of Marvell’s ‘Ode’ to the unbuttoned scatological prose of Urquhart’s translation of Rabelais but the same relationships and tensions—between England and Scotland, anti-Presbyterianism and Cromwellianism, allegiance and patronage—condition the creation of both works. It might be objected that this implicit argument for the consistency of Marvell’s anticlericalism and more specifically his anti-Presbyterianism would need to take account of his employment by the Presbyterian Fairfax soon after writing the ‘Ode’ and of his cooperation after the Restoration with moderate Presbyterians such as Philip, Lord Wharton, and John Howe, whom he defends in \textit{Remarks Upon a Late Disingenuous Treatise} (1678). Indeed it has been influentially argued that Marvell’s own religion, at least in

the (very different) circumstances of the Restoration, is best characterized as a ‘moderate Presbyterianism’ of the kind exemplified by Richard Baxter.89 Yet the qualifier ‘moderate’ is significant: the Presbyterians satirized by Marvell in the verse epistle to Lovelace are the ‘high’ Presbyterian clergy attacked by Hall in all his political writing and by Milton throughout his 1640s poetry and prose. Marvell has in mind the heresiographers such as Thomas Edwards who excoriated Independency and toleration as the seed-beds of sectarian heresy and sought official sanction against any person (or book) deemed by the clergy to be spreading irreligious or immoral ideas. In any case the evidence for Marvell’s sympathies with Presbyterianism before or after the Restoration is coming under scrutiny. Hirst and Zwicker contend that Prioress Langton in ‘Upon Appleton House’ is a representation of Fairfax’s more zealously Presbyterian wife, who had protested during the trial of the king from the public gallery and seems to have been instrumental in convincing her husband to resign his command in June 1650. The episode involving the nunnery and the attempted conversion of Isabella Thwaites is included as ‘Marvell’s discreet and carefully veiled way of seeking to distance his patron from the pro-Scottish and pro-Stuart advice his wife had offered in 1650 and which she was in all probability offering again’, as the Scots formed a military alliance with Charles II.90 Certainly Hall, Nedham, and Milton had repeatedly identified Presbyterians with Catholics—‘New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large’—as they charged both with seeking to assert clerical power over civil government. It was in June 1651, around the time Marvell was writing ‘Upon Appleton House’, that John Hall defended execution of the Presbyterian cleric and royalist Christopher Love as a necessary step to protect civil liberty from clerical tyranny.

Nicholas Von Maltzahn has recently argued that Marvell’s cooperation with Presbyterians in the Restoration should be seen as essentially strategic and was ‘not designed to foster Presbyterian orthodoxy in a national church, but was directed toward emancipating Christian inquiry from institutional constraints’. Von Maltzahn emphasizes Marvell’s ‘Hobbesian regard for the royal prerogative in matters of religion’, which ‘remained profoundly at odds with Milton’s distrust of royal supremacy’: hence Marvell’s encouragement of Charles II in 1667 to bypass the ‘Cavalier’ Parliament and impose a wider Comprehension in the national church. Marvell’s Erastianism can be characterized as Hobbesian and as very clearly distinct from the main target of his satire in The Rehearsal Transposed (2 pts., 1672–3), Samuel Parker. The title of Parker’s most controversial work encapsulates his authoritarian, clerical Erastianism: A discourse of ecclesiastical polite wherein the authority of the civil magistrate over the consciences of subjects in matters of external religion is asserted : the mischiefs and inconveniences of toleration

90 ‘High Summer at Nun Appleton: Andrew Marvell and Lord Fairfax’s Occasions’, 262.
are represented, and all pretenses pleaded in behalf of liberty of conscience are fully answered (1670). Marvell believed rather that the sovereign power, whether the Parliament or the monarch or a Protector, should ensure liberty of conscience, ‘understood by Marvell as non-interference in others’ beliefs, a negative liberty, where we can agree to disagree’. Von Maltzahn connects this attitude with an Erasmian tradition of wit and learned free-thinking, seeing Marvell as ‘an early and influential type of a significant early English Enlightenment figure’. He cites the admiration of the early deist John Toland (1670–1722) for ‘the most ingenious Andrew Marvell’.91 Toland saw in Marvell a fellow traveller, as he did in John Hall: Toland included Hall’s The Grounds and Reasons of Monarchy in his 1700 edition of the works of the republican theorist James Harrington, although he acknowledged that it was not the work of the same ‘J.H.’. Through Toland’s edition of Harrington, Hall was in the mid-eighteenth century ‘the only widely available author who rejected hereditary monarchy in all its forms’ and his tract seems to have been a source for Thomas Paine’s Common Sense (1776).92 In Hall’s influence on Marvell, Toland, and Paine we can see that the Whig critique of ‘priestcraft’ has at least some of its roots in the anti-Presbyterian republicanism of the civil wars.93

It was not Presbyterianism per se that Marvell regarded as a threat to liberty of conscience and wit (as Milton did) but any religious movement which sought control over the civil state. My claim that Marvell admired above all Cromwell’s power to protect the state against religious tyranny is clarified if we consider the relationship between Hall’s subsequent apology for Cromwell’s dissolution of the Nominated (‘Barebone’s’) Parliament and Marvell’s The First Anniversary of the Government under his Highness the Lord Protector. Hall’s Confusion Confounded: Or, A Firm Way of Settlement Settled and Confirmed was acquired by Thomason on 18 January 1654, and was printed by one of the government’s printers Henry Hills. In this (anonymous) pamphlet Hall argues that the threat of disorder that Cromwell had to quell came from the religious radicals who had taken control of the Assembly, specifically the Fifth Monarchists. The ‘despised ones of Christ (as they call themselves)’ are ‘ambitious and seditious men’ who claim inspiration only to further their attempts to seize political power: their ‘main pretence was Religion, or according to their odd and fanatick Notions, the setting up of the Kingdome of Jesus Christ’ (3, 9). In response to the Fifth Monarchists’ biblical
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literalism and desire to impose Mosaic law, Hall maintains that the Bible has nothing to do with civil government, which is rather a product of ‘circumstances, sense, experience, and the judgement of our reason’ (19). Hall alludes on several occasions to the civil science of his friend Hobbes, the ‘learned Modern’, and repeatedly argues, in language which echoes *Leviathan*, for the necessity of subordinating religion to civil power:

By drawing all *Politick* debates into matter of *Conscience*, that is confounding them matters of Divinity, they… raise up an insupportable *Tyranny* upon all *Experience* and good *Induction*… if they become once Magisterial, [they will] oblige us to quit our Discourse, our natural Reason, our experiences drawn even from common sense, the means God hath ordained to direct us in civil matters, and to follow those *Wills-with-Wisps*, or *ignes fatui* of revelation and pretended *Spirit*. (3, 8)

Hall’s objection to the Fifth Monarchists is the same as his objection to the Presbyterian clergy. Both groups seek to subordinate the state to an ecclesiastical power which they falsely claim is *jure divino*; like the papists and the prelates before them they do so out of self-interest and private ambition, and they foment instability in the civil state through their attempts to impose their doctrines on mens’ consciences. Nedham, who had attended Fifth Monarchist meetings as a spy, argued for the necessity and efficacy of Cromwell’s actions in very similar terms in *A True State of the Case of the Commonwealth* (1654).

Milton’s letter to Bradshaw on 21 February 1653 recommending that Marvell be appointed assistant Latin secretary had failed to win Marvell that position or any other government post. But with his appointment as tutor to Cromwell’s ward William Dutton in the summer of 1653 Marvell appears to have been into allowed into Cromwellian inner circles and to have gained an official audience for his poetry. *The First Anniversary of the Government under his Highness the Lord Protector*, published anonymously in mid-January 1655, was printed by a government printer, Thomas Newcomb, and advertised by Nedham in *Mercurius Politicus* (MP 281). Marvell continues in *The First Anniversary* the representation of the sublime Cromwell who dominates the ‘Horatian Ode’: the Lord Protector is an astonishing, elemental, and providential force of destruction and renovation. But this praise of the soaring, sublime Cromwell is rooted in earthy satire of the radical religious opposition to the Protectorate. Marvell celebrates the Protector in terms of his suppression of the sectarian threat to the security of the state, focusing on his scattering of the ‘frantique Army’ of the Fifth Monarchists. He works up to a violent denunciation of sectarians, representing them as hypocritical and deceitful in their claims to Adamic purity and a Satanic threat to both true religion and civil liberty:

Accursed Locusts, whom your King does spit
Out of the Center of th’ unbottom’d Pit;
Wand’rers, adult’rers, liars, Münzers’s rest,
Sorcerers, Atheists, Jesuites, Possessed;
You who the Scriptures and Laws deface
With the same liberty as Points and Lace;
Oh Race most hypocritically strict!
Bent to reduce us to the ancient Pict;
Well may you act the *Adam* and *Eve*;
Ay, and the Serpent too that did deceive.

(ll. 311–20)

Marvell isolates and controls in the order of his couplets the sectarian anarchy forecast in the apologies of Hall and Nedham for the removal of the Nominated Parliament. But Marvell’s hostile images of Fifth Monarchists also have their origins in the hostile images of the Presbyterians in his earlier verse. Once again there is the apocalyptic image of swarms of locusts rising from the bottomless pit, recalling threat of clerical censorship in the verse epistle to Lovelace: ‘The air’s already tainted with the swarms | Of Insects which against you rise in arms’ (ll. 17–18). Marvell’s warning that the sectarian groups will reduce the English to the barbarous condition of the ‘ancient Pict’ reminds us of ‘the Pict’ who no shelter now shall find | Within his part-coloured mind’ in the ‘Horatian Ode’, and so of Cromwell’s campaign against the Scottish in 1650 and his impressive track record in destroying religious threats to English liberty (ll. 105–6). Cromwell ordered in May 1654 that Hall be paid £50 for *Confusion Confounded*. Marvell evidently believed that anti-sectarian verse would find favour with those in authority and with the Protector himself, although it was not until September 1657 that he finally gained the post of Latin Secretary to John Thurloe. Marvell’s representation of the threat to the nation of religious extremism in the *First Anniversary* legitimates, like Hall’s pamphlet, Cromwell’s action against the Nominated Parliament. The elision of anti-sectarianism and anti-Presbyterianism in Marvell’s poem suggests he believed it preferable, and sought to convince his former royalist friends that it was preferable, to accept Cromwell’s unified sovereign power than risk godly tyranny, whether Presbyterian or Fifth Monarchist. It also suggests that Marvell already tended towards the Erastian ecclesiology promoted by Nedham and Hall (and Hobbes), who initially accepted the Cromwellian regime in large part because its church settlement ‘provided the closest approximation’ available to a civil religion subordinate to the authority of the secular state, rather than the separatism of Milton, who ‘eschewed all coercive authority over matters of faith’. The commitment to republicanism of Hall, Nedham, and also Milton—who, for all the suspicions of the *Defensio Secunda* (1654) defended the Protectorate—was qualified by their

94 The tracts of Hall and Nedham are linked with Marvell’s poem in David Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution in Milton and his Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism* (Cambridge, 2001), 148–9, 163–5.
desire to thwart both clerical and sectarian claims to divinely endowed authority over the civil state. But the commitment to royalism of figures such as Hobbes, Brome, Urquhart, and, I would argue, Marvell was compromised by the same desire.

‘AN HORATIAN ODE’ AND ITS READERS: DRYDEN AND COWLEY

John Hall had apparently accepted by 1653, if not before, that it was Cromwell rather than Parliament who could best ensure that England remained free from religious tyranny. Hall takes as his epigraph in *Confusion Confounded* a quotation from Tacitus on how Augustus Caesar had assumed power to put an end to civil discord. In adopting the Horatian mode in his 1650 poem on Cromwell, Marvell offers, if he does not necessarily endorse, the analogy between Cromwell and Augustus—one of the ironies of the Horatian model is that Horace celebrated Augustus for the peace that he brought to Rome, whereas Marvell praises Cromwell as he returns from one war and sets off to fight another. Yet in his routing of the Catholic enemy in Ireland and imminent victory over the Presbyterians in Scotland, Cromwell preserves England from clerical domination. In Marvell’s images of a sublime Cromwell, we might see the poetic fruits of liberty of thought and conscience that are promised at the end of Hall’s *Longinus*. Of course Longinus connects sublimity specifically with the ancient democracies and in 1649 Hall had represented the Members of Parliament as the ‘men of sublime minds’ whose actions and patronage would advance learning in the post-monarchical state. Yet Marvell’s Cromwell might be compared to Augustus, the great Roman patron of the arts, in that his martial power protects the political, religious, and intellectual liberty in which the arts of eloquence, as exemplified by Marvell’s ‘Ode’, can flourish. Or as Alexander Brome put it in 1653: ‘Let Souldiers then protect, while Poets praise; | Since that, which Crownes the Browes of Both, is Baies.’

John Creaser bluntly voices the problem with any such definition of the ‘Ode’ as Cromwellian panegyric: ‘Those who would read the ode unequivocally as an encomium on Cromwell are implicitly accusing Marvell of incompetence, since…phrase after phrase bears ironic or hostile implications.’ Creaser quotes lines 31–2 by way of example: ‘As if his highest plot | To plant the bergamot’. The poet chose ‘plot’ instead of a more positive term such as ‘plan’ either ‘because he is technically inept and at a loss for rhymes or in order to express some deep reservations about Cromwell’s ambitions’. Creaser does not add that the ‘bergamot’ was known as the fruit of kings (*MP* 274, 32 n.). Readers conditioned by royalist satire would have been amused by the notion that Cromwell’s interest
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in kingship was limited to varieties of garden plant. Cromwellian power is ambivalently represented because while that power has ensured liberty from clerical power and foreign invasion, it is also always potentially the source of a new tyranny. The passage in Thomas May’s rendering of Lucan’s *Pharsalia* to which Marvell alludes in the image of Cromwell as a lightning bolt comes just before Caesar crosses the Rubicon and enters Rome with the army—the moment at which he first flouts the law of the republic and sets in motion a historical cycle of imperial rule which culminated in Lucan’s own time in the tyranny of Nero.98 Such ambivalence is part of the aesthetic effect as well as the political meaning of the ‘Ode’ because it is integral to the Longinian formulation of the sublime. As Longinus’s constant analogies with thunder, lightning, fire, and whirlwinds suggest, the sublime is defined by danger and violence and should properly elicit ‘dread’ and ‘fear’ as much as delight and rapture. Marvell was to draw attention to this ambivalence in ‘On Mr Milton’s *Paradise Lost*’ (1674). It is essential to Milton’s ‘theme sublime’ that both ‘delight and horror on us seize’ when we read his epic poem (ll. 35, 53). The implicit criticisms that some have detected in Marvell’s poem to Milton may in part reflect the tensions that necessarily make up the sublime. Marvell tells us he was initially anxious that Milton ‘would ruin’ the ‘sacred truths’ in his ‘bold’ attempt to retell the Genesis narrative (ll. 1–2, 7–8).

The title-page of Langbaine’s 1636 edition of Longinus depicts Phaeton’s chariot soaring into the sky, indicating that Longinus’s analogy between the risks taken by Phaeton and the sublime poet was recognized as central to the text. Of course Phaeton finally could not control the chariot of the sun and devastated the earth before being destroyed by a thunder-bolt from Zeus. Longinus tells us the sublime poet soars like Phaeton but is just as liable to fall in his over-reaching ambition to obtain the heights of eloquence: ‘But Pindar and Sophocles as they burn up all before them, so flaming oftentimes above the measure of their fewell they extinguish and miserably decay.’99 At the end of *The Second Part of Crafty Crumwell* the Chorus, who explicitly oppose Charles and Cromwell in a sort of cosmic dual, warn that there is only space for one of them to reign and ascribe to Cromwell the hubris of Phaeton:

*Why Oliver, shouldst thou so high aspire.*
*Phaeton like, to mannage Charles his Waine,*
*When thou art in, thou canst not back retire.*
*That man is Mad who glory for to gaine*
*Doth cast himselfe upon the Lightening Fire.*


Kings do admit no fellowes if thou Reigne
Charles must surrender, but I surely hope
To see him Rule, thou Ruled in a Rope.

We have seen that Hall and Nedham were collaborating in 1648 even while writing on opposite sides, as *Mercurius Britanicus* and *Pragmaticus* respectively, and that the images applied to the New Model Army in *Britanicus* show that Hall was already working on his translation of Longinus by 1648. If *The Second Part of Crafty Cromwell* is by Nedham, then Marvell’s representation of Cromwell as sublime artist may have its inverted mirror-image in Nedham’s royalist satire. The comparison of Cromwell and Phaeton at the end of *Crafty Cromwell* encapsulates the way in which ‘the energetic figure of Cromwell complicates the play’s royalism’ in his domination of the page/stage as a type of ‘Marlovian anti-hero’: ‘to present Cromwell in these terms was undoubtedly to satirize him, but it was also to acknowledge his greatness’.\(^{100}\) As *Crafty Cromwell* exemplifies, it was royalist polemicists who personalized the civil wars as a struggle between Cromwell and Charles I for kingship (‘if thou Reigne | Charles must surrender’).

The constant ambiguity of language and syntax in the ‘Ode’ leaves open the possibility that Cromwell’s martial energy and ambition may, Phaeton-like, already have scorched the English earth, irreparably damaging the landscape: ‘What field of all the civil wars | Where his were not the deepest scars?’ (ll. 45–6). The scars could be Cromwell’s own, signs of his courage, or the scars he inflicts on his opponents, signs of his victories; but these lines also permit ‘a wilder image of the fields themselves bearing the ugly marks of this one soldier’s aggression’.\(^{101}\) The notorious concluding couplet of the ‘Ode’—‘The same arts that did gain | A pow’r must it maintain’—leaves in doubt the potential for cultural reformation under a leader defined by the military arts. The maxim may derive from Machiavelli: it can be read as ‘a dispassionate endorsement of the prince’s policies by a self-appointed counsellor; but it can also be a prediction of the new series of ruthlessly violent acts which will be needed if “gain” is to be balanced with “maintain”’.\(^ {102}\) If we follow the first reading, the maxim can be related to the passage into a superstitious and dangerous Scotland of ‘the War’s and Fortune’s Son’, who carries his ‘sword erect’ to ward off evil spirits. The same military power that was required to purge the Presbyterians from Parliament in 1647 and 1648, and to see off the Catholic forces in Ireland, is now required to extinguish finally the threat to English liberty and religion from the Scottish Presbyterians. If we follow the second reading, the sublime eloquence elicited from Marvell by Cromwell’s martial energy may not herald the beginning of a new Augustan golden age for the arts but, with the echo of the forsaking of
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\(^{100}\) Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell*, 17; Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, 77. Smith, like Knoppers, ascribes *The Second Part of Crafty Cromwell* to Nedham.


the Muses in the opening lines, mark the ‘transmutation of the aesthetic arts into the new arts of the military junta’. Significantly, the concluding couplet inverts Hall’s insistence in *The Advancement of Learning* on the folly of believing ‘that one and the same means are to be used to preserve a State, either new curdled and moulded into forme, or else by outward violence returned to its last seat and almost first principles, and the same state when it hath overcome either its infancy or misery’ (19). Cromwell’s physical might may have ‘cast the kingdoms old | Into another mould’ (ll. 35–6), but for Hall the ‘new-mould[ing]’ of the state, as he refers to it in the *Advancement*, depends upon long-term cultural and educational reform after the military and political victory has been won (20).

Was the ‘Horatian Ode’ written in search of patronage from the Commonwealth? It is likely, given the echoes of their recent writing, that Marvell would have shown the ‘Ode’ to Hall and Nedham, but whether Marvell was looking for more than their praise for his poetic achievement seems less certain, given both the complexities and ambiguities of the poem and Marvell’s provocative choice of Cromwell rather than Parliament as his subject. Yet he may also have hoped that praise from two out of three of the new government’s most prominent propagandists would secure him some sort of preferment. The designation of the ‘Ode’ as ‘Horatian’ raises from the outset the themes of political allegiance and literary patronage in the aftermath of civil war. Alexander Brome’s *Poems of Horace* was published after the Restoration, in 1666, but was seemingly compiled, as we have seen, over a period of twenty years and included translations by ‘several friends of mine’ (‘Epistle Dedicatory’, sigs. A5r–v). Brome prefixed a brief ‘Life of Horace’ to his volume in which he explains the complexities of Horace’s allegiance:

In the Civil Warr betwixt Augustus and Brutus and Cassius, [Horace] being the Familiar Friend of Brutus, took his part in the battle of Phillipi... Augustus having won the battle, it appeared that Horace had taken the wrong side, for which his great friend Mecenas, a very rich noble man of Rome, and in great esteem with Augustus, obtained a pardon: And Augustus, like a good-natured Prince, not only pardoned but rewarded him for being against him, and (had it then been in fashion there) would have knighted him.

In the light of his representation of Cromwell as protector of poets in 1653 it is hard not to see here some self-consciousness on Brome’s part about his own apparent accommodation with the republican side, who turned out of course to be the losers in the end. He may also be thinking about his non-appearance for the king on the battlefield in the 1640s when he writes that it is not clear whether Horace fought or not in the wars: ‘Some have traduced him for running away,
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103 Wilding, ‘Marvell’s “An Horatian Ode Upon Cromwell’s Return from Ireland”’, 11.
which if true, is excusable... Nor is it prudent for a man of Wit and Learning to have his brains beaten out by one that has none’ (sigs. a2v–a3r). Marvell, who had spent the whole of the first civil war on the continent, probably agreed with Brome on that one. Brome would have been thinking of Charles II as Augustus to his Horace; in the ‘Ode’ Marvell implicitly identifies Cromwell with Augustus.

Since Hall retained the respect and friendship of leading royalist writers despite his public support for the regicide and employment by the Commonwealth, there is no reason to assume that figures such as Stanley, Lovelace, and Alexander Brome would have ostracized Marvell on seeing the ‘Ode’. They would surely have recognized some of the ironies of form and phrasing which have led modern scholars to read it equivocally. Yet at least two of Marvell’s poetic contemporaries, John Dryden and Abraham Cowley, seem to have read the ‘Horatian Ode’ as Cromwellian panegyric. Dryden appeared in print for the first time, as we have seen, alongside Marvell and Hall in *Lachrymae Musarum* and he worked in the same government office as Marvell from 1657. From the moment of the Restoration, Dryden began a campaign in the traditional manner to sue for court patronage through verse; these early Restoration poems look to make a future for Dryden in the court, but they also have to deal with the memory of his employment by the Protectorate and of his ‘Heroic Stanzas’ consecrated to the Glorious Memory Of his most Serene and Renowned Highness Oliver, Late Lord Protector of this Commonwealth’. Dryden presented ‘To My Lord Chancellor’ (1662) to Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon and Charles’s Lord Chancellor, on New Year’s Day, a traditional date for a writer to present a poem to his patron. Dryden represents Hyde and the king as ‘orbs of different greatness’ that perfectly compliment each other, although the king is emphatically the dominant, ‘enclosing’ force:

> Yet both are each other’s use disposed,  
> His to enclose, and yours to be enclosed:  
> Nor could another in your room have been,  
> Except an emptiness had come between.¹⁰⁴

Marvell had warned that Cromwell could not be ‘enclosed’ by anybody, whatever their talents, least of all those on his own side:

> (For ’tis all one to courage high,  
> The emulous or enemy;  
> And with such to inclose  
> Is more than to oppose.)

While Hyde and the king coexist in the same space without leaving any ‘emptiness’, the elemental energies of Cromwell, who is like ‘three-forked lightening’

¹⁰⁴ *The Poems of John Dryden*, i. 1649–1681, ed. Paul Hammond (Harlow, 1995), ll. 39–42. All references to Dryden’s verse are to this edn.
(l. 13), will not leave ‘room’ for the coexisting rule of any lesser force, specifically Charles I. Praising Hyde for his efforts to bring stability in the aftermath of the Restoration, Dryden declares: ‘How strangely active are the arts of peace, | Whose restless motions less than war’s do cease!’ (ll. 105–6). Marvell’s Cromwell scorned such ‘arts’ as ‘inglorious’ rest: ‘So, restless Cromwell could not cease | In the inglorious arts of peace’ (ll. 9–10). Dryden’s recollection of the ‘Horatian Ode’ at the moment when he celebrates Hyde’s skill in the arts of peace may be sparked by the image of the previous lines, in which Pallas Athene strikes her spear into the ground and it is ‘enclose[d]’ by ‘sprouting leaves’ and ‘peaceful olives’ (ll. 103–4).

Is Hyde imagined as a peaceful Oliver, bringing, like Cromwell, security after internal conflict but, unlike Cromwell, bringing security through reconciliation rather than domination?

It is possible that Dryden intends Hyde to pick up on these allusions to the ‘Horatian Ode’, although this assumes that Hyde was also familiar with Marvell’s poem in manuscript. It is also possible that the allusions to Marvell are unconscious, revealing how Dryden’s bids for literary patronage from the Restoration regime are haunted by the memory of his poetic service for Cromwell. For all his insistence that poetry could not be written in England during the Civil Wars—‘When our great monarch into exile went, | Wit and religion suffered banishment’ (ll. 17–18)—Dryden knows Hyde knows better, and that almost-repressed knowledge breaks through the surface orthodoxy of ‘To My Lord Chancellor’ in the form of allusions to a poem that was written, like his own ‘Heroic Stanzas’, in celebration of ‘Victor Oliverus’.105 The pressure to erase the past may show in the early Restoration panegyrics, but as the years passed and the post of laureate was obtained, Dryden seems to have convinced himself (if not all his enemies) that his version of literary history in the 1650s was the true version. In Annus Mirabilis (1667) the description in the ‘Horatian Ode’ of Cromwell as the ‘force of angry heaven’s flame’ which ‘palaces and temples rent’ (ll. 26, 22) is invoked to provide an analogy with the Great Fire of London, but this time Dryden confidently uses the Marvell allusion to attack Cromwell directly rather than praise his enemies:

As when some dire usurper heaven provides
To scourge his country with a lawless sway . . .
Such was the rise of this prodigious fire,
Which in mean buildings first obscurely bred,
From thence did soon to open streets aspire,
And straight to palaces and temples spread.

(ll. 849–50, 857–60)

Dryden even dares to employ the same distinctive stanza form, derived from William Davenant’s Gondibert (1651), that he had used in ‘Heroic Stanzas’,

105 The phrase is from Marvell’s ‘A Letter to Doctor Ingelo’ (1654), l. 103.
suggesting his sense of having rewritten the past and purged the memory of Cromwellian patronage. And the memory of that patronage is bound up in Dryden’s mind with Marvell’s ‘Horatian Ode’.

Cowley, whose lyric verse Marvell knew and admired, also had a history during the Protectorate that he would rather have people forget after 1660: in the preface to his 1656 Poems, prepared in prison after being arrested on suspicion of involvement in royalist uprisings in March 1655, Cowley had called, in notably Hobbesian terms, on royalist writers finally to accept the reality of a post-Stuart world and give up the cause of a polemical wit:

when the event of battel, and the unaccountable Will of God has determined the controversie and that we have submitted to the confitions of the Conqueror, we must lay down our Pens, as well as Arms, we must march out of our cause it self, and dismantle that, as well as our Towns and Castles, of all the Works and Fortifications of Wit and Reason by which we defended it. (sig. a4v)

In his 1668 edition of Cowley’s Works, Thomas Sprat excised this passage while nonetheless drawing attention to its absence by claiming Cowley feigned obedience to the Protectorate in a ‘few lines in the Preface to one of his Books’ to secure his release. Sprat’s contradictory actions might be explained by self-consciousness about his own recent past, having contributed, with Dryden, an elegy on Cromwell to Three Poems Upon the Death of his late Highnesse Oliver Lord Protector of England, Scotland, and Ireland (1659)—Marvell’s elegy for Cromwell, which had been one of the Three Poems when the volume was entered in the Stationers’ Register in January 1659, was replaced by Edmund Waller’s ‘Upon the Late Storm, and of the Death of his Highness ensuing the same’ by the time it was actually published later in the year. The curious and little-discussed mixture of prose and verse that Cowley published in 1661 under the title A vision, concerning his late pretended highnesse, Cromwell, the Wicked containing a discourse in vindication of him by a pretended angel, and the confutation thereof, by the Author might be regarded as a blatant attempt to reassert his loyalty to the Stuarts if Cowley had not already published it anonymously the previous year as The Visions and Prophecies Concerning England, Scotland, and Ireland, of Ezekiel Grebner, ‘written in the time of the late little Protector Richard’. Cowley’s narrative purports to be the account of one Ezekiel Grebner, a supporter of Parliament in the civil wars who had then been horrified by the act of regicide. Grebner describes attending Oliver Cromwell’s funeral; musing on the destructive effect of Cromwell’s ‘reign’ on the British isles, Grebner falls asleep and dreams that he is visited by ‘the figure of a man taller than a Gyant’ his body painted ‘after the manner of the ancient Britons’ with scenes from Civil War battles (8). The awesome figure calls himself

the guardian angel of the British Isles, and he proceeds to defend Cromwell, declaring him ‘the greatest man that ever was of the English nation, if not (said he) of the whole World’, who has left ‘a name behind him, not to be extinguisht, but with the whole World, which as it is now too little for his praises, so might have been too for his Conquests, if the short line of his Humane Life could have been stretch out to the extent of his immortal designs’ (11, 14).

Grebner immediately recognizes that this self-proclaimed guardian angel of Britain is really the devil, but engages him in debate anyway. Grebner speaks for Cowley and other royalist polemicists of the late 1640s and 1650s in his admission that ‘sometimes I was filled with horror and detestations of [Cromwell’s] actions, and sometimes I inclined a little to reverence and admiration of his courage, conduct and success’ (7). Yet in his dialogue with the devil he insists on the tyrannical nature of Cromwellian rule and the damage it has done to Britain, leaving behind ‘too deep wounds to be ever closed up without a Scar’ (21).

The devil begins to threaten Grebner, calling him ‘an obstinate and inveterate Malignant’ and declaring he will ‘go the Tower.’ ‘I was almost in the very pounces of the great Bird of prey’, Grebner tells us,

When, Lo, ere the last words were fully spoke,  
From a fair clowd, which rather ope’d, than broke,  
A flash of Light, rather than Lightning came,  
So swift, and yet so gentle was the Flame.  
Upon it rode, and in his full Career,  
Seem’d to my Eyes no sooner There than Here,  
The comelyest Youth of all th’ Angelique race;  
Lovely his shape, ineffable his Face.  
The Frowns with which hee strook the trembling Fiend,  
All Smiles of Humane beauty did transcend.  
His Beams of Locks fell part dishevel’d down,  
Part upwards curld, and form’d a nat’ral Crown,  
Such as the British Monarchs us’d to wear[.]

(79–81)

Cowley shifts from prose to verse to mark the appearance of Charles II, in the form of St George, England’s true guardian angel, who chases the devil of Cromwellianism away. The contrast between Cromwell and Charles II is established in the first four lines of verse by the very direct response to Marvell’s description of Cromwell’s sublimity in the ‘Horatian Ode’: ‘And like the three-forked lightening, first |

| Breaking the clouds where it was nursed’ (ll. 13–14). Marvell is himself indebted to the description of Julius Caesar the conqueror in Thomas May’s rendering of Lucan’s *Pharsalia*—‘As lightening by the wind forc’d from a cloude | Breaks through the wounded aire with thunder loud’—but Cowley evidently has in mind the application of Lucan’s image to Cromwell in
the ‘Ode’. The preceding comparison of the Cromwellian devil to a ‘great Bird of prey’ recalls Marvell’s comparison of Cromwell to a falcon, ‘heavy’ with food. Indeed Cowley replaces Marvell’s terrible Cromwellian sublime with the ‘gentle’ courtly beauty of the Stuart prince, with his ‘lovely’ shape and curling hair. When both Cowley and Dryden sought to establish themselves with the Restoration court and erase the memory of their accommodations with the Protectorate, their own recollection of the relationship between poetry and Cromwellian allegiance seem to have been bound up with their reading of Marvell’s ‘Horatian Ode’. For all the ambiguity and ambivalence that scholars have found in the ‘Ode’ in the last century, Marvell’s contemporaries—and Cowley and Dryden are hardly readers whose interpretative powers we should underestimate—apparently regarded the ‘Ode’ as a panegyric of Cromwell and a poetic bid for patronage from the new ruling power.

Conclusion

‘TOM MAY’S DEATH’ AND THE ANCIENT RIGHT OF THE POET

It is possible that Dryden and Cowley first read the ‘Horatian Ode’ in manuscript after Marvell had written *The First Anniversary* at the end of 1654, or indeed after he was employed as Latin Secretary to John Thurloe in September 1657, and so read it in the light of Marvell’s later relationship with the Cromwellian regimes. Yet the allusion in ‘Upon Appleton House’ to the disapproval of Lovelace and other royalist ‘grasshoppers’ when the poet descends to the ‘abyss’ hints that Marvell had already been accused by his Cavalier friends of serving Satan. In the satire that Marvell probably wrote less than six months after the ‘Ode’, ‘Tom May’s Death’, the ghost of the Parliamentarian propagandist Thomas May (c. 1596–1650) descends to the underworld in punishment for the hellish company he kept while alive. The poem belongs to the satiric genre of the underworld journey, with its roots in Lucian and valued by humanist satirists, including Erasmus and Rabelais, as a means of resolving issues of political and religious controversy through ridicule. We have seen how Hall tries to lighten the tone of his defence of the dissolution of Parliament in 1653 through reference to Epistemon’s journey to hell in *Gargantua and Pantagruel*. Marvell was to refer to Epistemon’s account of what he saw in hell in the second part of *The Rehearsal Transprosd*: he compares Samuel Parker’s constant use of the word ‘must’ in his *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie* to ‘Doctor Rabelais his setting Julius Caesar to beat *Mustard*’ (although in fact Marvell misremembers his Rabelais here as Epistemon sees Xerxes selling mustard in the underworld, not Julius Caesar).¹ Thomas Urquhart tells us he was encouraged to continue his translation of Rabelais in prison by ‘some frolick men’ of his acquaintance, including, presumably, Hall and Nedham.² ‘Tom May’s Death’ is a poem similarly written for the entertainment of ‘frolick men’, one of whom may have again have been Hall; for other members of the now fragmented Stanley circle, Lovelace and Alexander Brome, certainly knew ‘Tom May’s Death’.

Thomas May had been one of Jonson’s foremost sons in the 1620s and 1630s, when May made his name as a poet, dramatist, and translator. Jonson wrote

¹ *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, i. 272. ² *Works of Rabelais*, ii. 169.
a commendatory poem for May’s translation of the *Pharsalia*, ‘To My Chosen Friend, The Learned Translator of Lucan’ and May contributed an elegy to *Jonsonus Virbius*. May was a friend and drinking partner of the Jonsonian wits of the town: among the members of the Stanley circle, Sherburne, Shirley, and Herrick had been acquainted with May before the outbreak of the war. Sir Aston Cokayn, a contributor to *Lachrymae Musarum* and friendly with men of the younger generation such as Alexander Brome and Charles Cotton the younger, refers to his pre-war acquaintance with both Jonson and May in a poem to Cotton. After his decision to support Parliament with the outbreak of civil war May was associated with one of the publications that most outraged royalist opinion in the 1640s, *The Kings Cabinet Opened* (1645), which printed private letters between Charles and Henrietta Maria. May seems to have composed in the same year *The Character of a Right Malignant*. Royalists were deeply offended by the use of ‘malignant’, the term applied to those whose estates were to be sequestered for their support for the king, as Hall recognized in *A true account and Character of the Times*: ‘it is a brave and gallant way to peace, to extinguish the names of parties, and not to discountenance Malignants’ (8). Norbrook suggests that the inclusion of commendatory verses by May in Shirley’s 1646 *Poems*, where May appears beside Stanley, shows that May retained pre-war contacts with royalist poets despite his propagandist writing for Parliament. But this poem also reveals the cultural as well as political distance between May and Shirley by 1646. May immediately resists conventional royalist lament for the closure of the theatres as the epitome of the barbarous times, declaring that the theatre is ‘fitly silenc’d by the Lawes’ (l. 2). While Shirley had earned his living from writing dramatic entertainments, the closure of the theatres means his wit can be judged by the literate, who can read his printed verse, rather than ‘ignorant spectators’ (l. 11). May concludes by emphasising, presumably with the Cavaliers in mind, that English literary culture requires moral reformation, but that Shirley’s verse is, or can be, appropriate for the post-courtly world: ‘All Muses are not guiltlesse; but such strains | As thine, deserve, if I may verdict give, | In sober, chast, and learned times to live.’ (ll. 14–16).

Ben Jonson had often enough and in vitriolic language condemned the ignorance of the audiences who paid to see his plays in the early Stuart public theatres (or did not pay to see them in the case of his classical tragedies); but the Jonson who pronounces judgement on Thomas May in Marvell’s poem is ‘Jonson the court poet and entertainer’ (*MP* 120). The final lines of the poem, when Jonson’s judgement is made and May is spirited away to Hades, allude to the witches’ antimasque in *The Masque of Queens* (1609), composed for and performed by Queen Anne and her ladies-in-waiting at Whitehall. The verses to
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3 Hugh De Quehen, entry for Sherburne in the *ODNB*.
4 ‘To My Honoured Cousin Mr Charles Cotton the Junior’, in *Poems*, 134 [234].
5 David Norbrook, entry for Thomas May in the *ODNB*.
Shirley suggest that in the 1640s May renounced this theatrical culture that had nurtured him in his pre-war career as a writer and dramatist: indeed the poem declares this renunciation to the literary circles in which he had once moved. In the issue of *Mercurius Elencticus* in which Hall is excoriated as an ‘Apostate Hyreling’ and ‘no legitimate Son of the Muses, but a Traitor to Ingenuity, a mere excrementitious scabb of Learning’, Hall’s treasonous ambitions are seen to stretch to reaching ‘Tom May’s place’ as ‘the Rebells Secretary’—May had been appointed by Parliament as its official historian and issued *The History of the Parliament* (1647). However Hall’s commendatory poems to the published texts of plays by Shirley and Richard Brome show us why Hall retained the friendship of the ‘Sons of Ben’ while May was accused, as Marvell’s Jonson puts it, of ‘Apostatizing from our arts and us, | To turn the chronicler to Spartacus’ (ll. 73–4). In his verses for the publication of Shirley’s tragedy *The Cardinal* in 1652, ‘To the surviving Honour and Ornament of the English Scene, James Shirley’, Hall sounds impeccably royalist in describing how

> when our English Dramma was at its hight,  
> And shin’d, and rul’d with Majesty and might,  
> A sudden whirlwind threw it from its seat,  
> Deflower’d the Groves, and quench’d the Muses heat.  

(sig. A4v, ll. 5–8)

Hall goes on to play perhaps on Shirley’s Catholicism when he compares the printed text of Shirley’s plays to the ‘Reliques, and ashes men preserve’ from ‘Saints, and Martyr’d bodies’ (ll. 9, 11). But it is clear that Hall regards the closure of the theatres as a form of persecution and his language also echoes that of his favourite book, *Areopagitica*, and its images of books under licensing as martyrs to truth. As we have seen, Hall had called for the reopening of the theatres from 1647 and through his association with Shirley and (possibly) Davenant he sought to reintroduce theatrical performance to England in the 1650s. Hall declares at the end of his poem that Shirley should be ranked fourth amongst English playwrights after ‘Johnson (the Nations Laureat)’ and Beaumont and Fletcher. In his fourteen-line commendatory poem for Richard Brome’s *The Jovial Crew* Hall presents Brome’s plays as relics not of Brome’s but of Jonson’s wit; appropriately, given Brome had been Jonson’s apprentice, Hall recalls, as Milton does in ‘To My Friend Mr Henry Lawes’, Jonson’s epigrammatic variation on the sonnet in ‘To William Camden’:

> Your Fate is other: You do not invade;  
> But by great *Johnson* were made free o’th’ *Trade*.  
> So, that we must in this your *Labour* finde  
> Some Image and fair Relique of his Minde.  

(sig. A3v, ll. 11–14)

---

7 *Elenctius* (31 May 1648), [212].
We have seen throughout this book how in the aftermath of civil war writers looked back to and sought to preserve the civilized values of Jonsonian literary culture. One way of doing this was through the public demonstration of solidarity by writers who regarded themselves as of the tribe of Ben, as in the collections of commendatory poems in the 1647 Beaumont and Fletcher folio, edited by Shirley, and the 1651 edition of William Cartwright’s works, or the elegies collected by Richard Brome in Lachrymae Musarum in 1649. Another way was through the cultivation of wit, conviviality, and Horatian ideals of fraternal esteem in exclusive literary societies, most eminently Stanley’s Order of the Black Riband. In his post-war verse, in particular ‘The Grasshopper’, Lovelace holds on to such Jonsonian values as a rule by which to live in retirement from a hostile and mutable public world, in which the structures of court patronage have disintegrated; in his verse epistle to Lovelace, Marvell looks back to the literary culture of the Jonsonian town rather than that of the Stuart court for a sense of what has been lost by war and what is under threat from Presbyterian intolerance. As Marvell recognizes in ‘Tom May’s Death’, Jonson’s ghost was the representative voice of post-war royalist literary culture: Jonson even appears in the commendatory poems for the Beaumont and Fletcher folio, as if still alive. As we saw in the opening chapter, in his poem for the Beaumont and Fletcher folio John Denham had imagined Fletcher rising from his grave to condemn the effect of Parliamentary dominance on literary culture:

But now thy Muse inrag’d from her urne
Like Ghosts of Murder’d Bodyes doth return
To accuse the Murderers, to right the State
And undeceive the long abused Age.

(‘On Mr John Fletchers Workes’, sig. b1v)

This example would seem to exemplify James Loxley’s argument that ‘Tom May’s Death’ is the poem by Marvell which ‘is most deeply structured by the isotopy of royalism’, by which Loxley means the characteristic tropes of royalist verse. Yet the comparison of May and Hall suggests that it was not simply May’s writing for Parliament and the Commonwealth that upset his former friends but rather his betrayal of the Jonsonian values to which May had once subscribed. The critical tendency has been to regard Jonson’s speech, which constitutes fifty-seven of the poem’s hundred lines, as a dramatic voice which is virtually inseparable from Marvell’s own. But then why adopt that particular dramatic voice? The assumption that everything Jonson says, Marvell thinks, informs the notion that ‘Tom May’s Death’ constitutes a ‘staggering reversal’ of the ‘Ode’. While most

---

8 ‘Prepar’d at last to strike in the tyde?’, 56.
10 Norbrook, Writing the English Republic, 272.
royalists automatically identified literary culture with monarchy, the dissolution of the court and the defeat of the king in the first civil war led both Lovelace and Marvell, if in rather different ways, to begin to separate Jonsonian values from royalist allegiance. As Andrew McRae has recently argued, ‘the trajectory of Jonson’s diatribe ultimately privileges poetry over politics, as Marvell shifts subtly away from the absolutist rhetoric of the enraged laureate’.\footnote{Literature, Satire, and the Early Stuart State, 222.} As we shall see, the ultimate allegiance of ‘Tom May’s Death’ is to the cause of wit; but the occasion of the poem may have been as much Marvell’s desire to maintain his relationships with what remained of the Stanley circle as to mark the death of a court poet turned Parliamentarian propagandist.

Marvell’s incorporation of royalist tropes and concern with the proper uses of poetry is unsurprising if Marvell wrote the poem specifically for an audience of friends and associates in the ‘town’ who had been part of Stanley’s circle before the regicide and continued to meet, though Stanley had left for Hertfordshire. The materials of Marvell’s poem would have been familiar to such men. One unremarked model for ‘Tom May’s Death’ is Herrick’s ‘The Apparition of his Mistresse calling him to Elizium’, published in *Hesperides*, in which the souls of the poet and his mistress ‘flie to’ th’ shades’ where they meet the poets who ‘sing the stories of our love’, including Horace, Virgil, and Lucan; the visit concludes in

\begin{quote}
In which thy Father Johnson now is plac’t,  
As in a Globe of Radiant Fire, and grac’t  
To be in that Orbe crown’d (that doth include  
Those prophets of the former Magnitude)  
And he one chiefe[,] 
\end{quote}

\footnotesize*(RHP 204, ll. 56–61)*

Alexander Brome’s sense of his debt to Jonson is evident in his translation of Jonson’s *Leges Conviviales* as ‘Ben Jonson’s Sociable Rules for the Apollo’ and he seems to have been among the intended audience for Marvell’s presumably (given the absence of surviving scribal copies) tightly circulated satire. In his ‘Upon the Ingenious Comedies of Mr Richard Brome’—the poem in which he envisages a new age of literary patronage under Cromwell’s protection—Alexander Brome laments the effect of the wars on the fortunes of poets and dramatists and looks back to a time ‘when Learning, Poesie, and Wit, | Were counted Sacred things’. He contrasts the suffering of the hands of poets at the hands of Parliament with the indulgence of Presbyterian and sectarian preachers:

\begin{quote}
And the Stern Poet, challenging as due  
His ancient right, with freedome to speak true;  
Div’d into secrets, and cause he’d not be brib’d
\end{quote}
To silence, nor compliance, was proscrib’d.
While those in Cloakes, and double Caps, so long,
So long did thrash in their inspired throng;
Till at the last, instead of Curbing Sin,
By corrupt lives, and jars, they brought it in. 12

The opposition of the moral efficacy of literary wit to the counter-productive pulpit-thumping of the Puritan preacher recalls Hall’s poem on Urquhart’s Rabelais. But Brome is remembering above all here what have become the most frequently quoted lines of ‘Tom May’s Death’, when the register of Jonson’s ghost ascends from ad hominem satire to ‘a ringing endorsement of a poet’s responsibility to remain true to his principles even in the most adverse of circumstances’. 13 The lines seem to have made an impression upon contemporaries as well as modern scholars:

When the sword glitters o’er the judge’s head,
And fear has coward churchmen silencèd,
Then is the poet’s time, ‘tis then he draws,
And single fights forsaken Virtue’s cause.
He, when the wheel of empire whirleth back,
And though the world’s disjointed axle crack,
Sings still of ancient rights and better times,
Seeks wretched good, arraigns successful crimes.
(ll. 63–70)

Marvell’s use of the phrase ‘ancient rights’ here has caused some consternation, because it is the ‘ancient rights’ that are pleaded for in vain by Justice against heedless Fate in the ‘Horatian Ode’ and so these ‘ancient rights’ tend to be associated with Charles I’s claims for the illegitimacy of his trial and execution, although the phrase invokes not divine right rule but the role of the monarch within the ‘ancient constitution (MP 275, l. 38 n.). 14 But Brome understands the phrase as very specifically the ‘ancient right’ of the ‘Stern Poet’ with ‘freedome to speak true’—an invocation of parrhesia, as the figure of speech was known by the ancient Greeks. 15 The ‘Stern Poet’ exposes the ‘secrets’ of those in power and holds them to account if they fall short of the ethical principles by which men should properly be judged and which the poet himself should uphold in his resistance to the personal corruption of bribery and sycophancy. Marvell’s lines, as Brome recognizes, offer a vitally Jonsonian conception of the poet’s role within the state—a role which is finally not defined by allegiance to any monarch

13 Chernaik, ‘Was Marvell a Republican?’, 83. See also Chernaik, The Poet’s Time, 174–82.
14 See e.g. Corns, Uncloistered Virtue, 223–4.
15 See the discussion of the history of attitudes to parrhesia in David Colclough, Freedom of Speech in Early Modern England (Cambridge, 2005), 12–76.
or political structure, but to the nation and to the ancient tradition of the poet as disinterested spokesman for virtue. This is a role which the clergy would claim but are unable to assume: the reference to ‘coward churchmen’ in ‘Tom May’s Death’ is developed with more distaste by Brome, who makes it clear he is talking about Presbyterians.

Brome’s reading of the ‘ancient rights’ in ‘Tom May’s Death’ as the licence that should properly be given to the poet—the Romans translated **parrhesia** as **licentia**—rather than in terms of any specific allegiance to Stuart rule is made very clear by his turn in the subsequent lines to the potential for the poet to regain both his freedom and his social status under Cromwellian patronage: ‘But now new Stars shine forth, and do pretend, | Wit shall be cherisht, and Poets finde a Friend’. Brome might have been thinking about recent events such as the release of William Davenant, who was in prison under sentence of death when Marvell wrote ‘Tom May’s Death’ and who makes two appearances: indirectly in the accusation of Jonson’s ghost that May was motivated to write for Parliament out of injured merit after Davenant was chosen by Charles as the successor to Jonson as Poet Laureate, and then as ‘surviving Dav’nant’, ‘Who laughs to see in this thy death renewed, | Right Roman poverty and gratitude’ (ll. 78–80). May is charged by Jonson’s ghost of abusing the ‘ancient rights’ of the poet, the right of **parrhesia**, by polemically applying classical history and exempla (‘some Roman-cast similitude’) to current events in return for a Parliamentary salary (l. 44): ‘Most servile wit, and mercenary pen. | Polydore, Lucan, Alan, Vandal, Goth, | Malignant poet and historian both’ (ll. 40–2). We have seen how the phrase ‘Goths and Vandals’ was aimed at Presbyterian ‘Pulpiteers’ by Alexander Brome in his poem for **Lucasta**; it was used by Hall to attack the Scots in **Britanicus** and it is the charge which he advised Parliament in *The Advancement of Learning* was made against it by ‘deadly adversaries’ who wished to portray the Commons as ‘the utter destroyers of all Civility and Literature (13). Hall’s good friend Sherburne is nothing if not direct in his equation of the corruption of wit with the triumph of Parliament and the rise of popular radical movements such as the Levellers and the Diggers in his poem for the 1651 Cartwright edition:

> How subject to new Tumults is this Age!  
> With War less vexed now than Poetick Rage!  
> Were not State-Levellers enough! That yet  
> We must be plagu’d with Levellers of Wit?  
> Delvers in Poetry, that only skill  
> To make Parnassus a St George’s Hill!17

17 ‘On the Publication of the Posthume Poems of M. William Cartwright’, in Cartwright, *Comedies, Tragicomedies, and other poems*, sig. b8v. It seems Marvell read the poems in the Cartwright edn., for Hirst and Zwicker have shown that in ‘Upon Appleton House’ Marvell recalls the poem by Robert Waring (‘High Summer at Nun Appleton’, 250–1).
May is identified then with the archetypal Puritan philistinism from which Hall sought to disassociate the Commonwealth, in part through the revival of the theatre. ‘Malignant poet’ reverses the charge of May’s infamous 1645 pamphlet by charging May with being a rebel against poetry, just as Hall had been stigmatized in *Elencicus* as ‘no legitimate Son of the Muses’. The opening lines of Marvell’s verse epistle to Lovelace reveal the impact that the attack on Hall as a traitor to poetry made on Marvell, motivating him to consider the loss of Horatian and Jonsonian values during the 1640s: ‘Our civil wars have lost the civic crown’ (l. 12). In the defiant invocation of the ‘poet’s time’ by Jonson’s ghost, Marvell reasserts the civic and cultural importance of those values.

Yet it must be again emphasized that it is Jonson’s ghost who speaks these lines, just as it is Jonson’s ghost who launches the vicious attacks on May that use very similar language to the attacks made on Marvell’s friend Hall in 1648: ‘But thou, base man, first prostituted hast | Our spotless knowledge and the studies chaste, | Apostatizing from our arts and us’ (ll. 71–3). ‘Our’ and ‘us’ invokes the community of poets from which May has ostracized himself; *Elencicus* had asked Hall if he really believed he was any longer ‘a fit Associate for such Ingenious and candid soules as Col. Lovelace, Captaine Sherburne, Mr Shirley, or Mr Stanley? They shall kick thee out of their acquaintance’. The theme of broken friendship in ‘Tom May’s Death’ reverberates in the noble portrayal of the poet by Jonson’s ghost through echoes of the opening lines of Jonson’s own commendatory poem for May’s rendering of the *Pharsalia*:

> When, Rome, I read thee in thy mighty pair,  
> And see both climbing up the slippery stair  
> Of Fortunes wheel by Lucan driv’n about.  
> And the world in it, I begin to doubt,  
> At every line some pin thereof should slack  
> At least, if not the general Engine crack.18

Yet Hall retained the acquaintance of the Stanley circle, seemingly through his constant support for the revival of the Jonsonian values by which the circle defined itself even more fundamentally than by allegiance to a defeated royalist cause. Hall sought throughout his career to maintain links with royalist writers and intellectuals and to persuade them through reasonable argument and gentle satire that they could continue their careers in a post-monarchical state that would ensure creative liberty by fostering tolerance and excluding clerical power. He did much, probably more than has yet been brought to light, to encourage the reintroduction of forms of official literary patronage in the early 1650s.

---

May's view that the theatres were 'fitly silenc'd by the Lawes' in his poem to Shirley, combined with his involvement in the humiliation of Charles in *The King's Cabinet Opened* and his popularization of the hated term 'malignant', may help to explain his rough treatment in 'Tom May's Death'.

We do not need to explain the writing of 'Tom May's Death' a few months after the 'Horatian Ode' by speculating that they were 'rival experiments' or exercises in arguing *in ultamque partem*, on both sides of the question. The satire has much in common with the verse epistle to Lovelace in its concern with the function of poets and poetry and the preservation of Jonsonian values in the post-war world: as Brome's interpretation of 'Tom May's Death' reveals, the allegiance of the satire, like the verse epistle, is to an ideal of virtuous letters rather than the Stuart cause. Far from an instance of Marvell 'haranguing an empty room', 'Tom May's Death' was probably composed in an effort to maintain social connections with 'frolick' poets such as Alexander Brome, and perhaps to retain some patronage connection with Stanley. Interestingly Hall published in 1650 a collection of prose *Paradoxes* in the *joco-serio* mode which 'Tom May's Death' adopts. The Renaissance genres of the paradox and the mock-encomium—one of the most celebrated examples of which is Panurge's speech in favour of debt in *Gargantua and Pantagruel*—were 'exercises of wit designed to amuse an audience sufficiently sophisticated in the arts of language to understand them' and consequently flourished in the Inns of Court. Hall presumably wrote them for the amusement of his literary friends, and perhaps to reassure them that his Roundhead allegiance had not nullified his Cavalier wit. A second edition appeared in 1653, edited by John Davies and with a commendatory poem by none other than Sir Thomas Urquhart, in which he praised the 'rationally *Para-doxicall* witt of his 'very honoured Friend'. If Marvell did show the 'Horatian Ode' to members of the Stanley circle, as Stanley's use of its verse form suggests he might, and some readers interpreted it as Dryden and Cowley did, Marvell may have written 'Tom May's Death' in an effort to recover something of his standing. If the 'Ode' was not circulated among his royalist friends when it was first written, it is hard not to see in the furious attack of Jonson's ghost on May for having betrayed poetry a projection of Marvell's own anxiety about the reaction of these friends to his decision, or to any future decision, to seek the patronage of the Commonwealth through verse. Within a few months of writing 'Tom

---

19 Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 280. See also Chernaik, *The Poet's Time*, 177. The comments of Derek Hirst and Steven N. Zwicker on 'Tom May's Death' come closer to my own position: 'The values and commitments, and the range of political feeling, arose not from a program of ideas—those were an afterthought, a rationalization—but from a structure of attachments: to men, and not to forms. And May, historian of the Long Parliament and of common triumphs, had violated these' ('Andrew Marvell and the Toils of Patriarchy: Fatherhood, Longing, and the Body Politic', *English Literary History*, 66/3 (1999), 640).


May’s Death’ Marvell had, after all, composed the sixteen-line Latin poem ‘On the embassy of Oliver St John to the United Provinces’, which was surely a bid for official preferment. In late 1656, in probably the last poem that he wrote before his death a few months later, Richard Lovelace looks back both to ‘Tom May’s Death’ and ‘To His Noble Friend Mr Richard Lovelace’ in satirizing the decline of wit and the rise of hack work in Cromwellian England.22 What remains unclear is whether he invokes these poems because they express the virtuous ideals which Lovelace believes should characterize English literary culture, or because he wants to ridicule Marvell’s own failure to live up those ideals.

‘On Sannazar’s being Honoured with six hundred ducats by the Clarissimi of Venice, for composing an Elegiack Hexastick of the City. A Satyre’ is the final poem in the posthumous 1659 Lucasta, if we exclude the series of short translations from classical and continental texts. Gerald Hammond has made justified claims for the poem, which is over 250 lines in length, as standing ‘right at the beginning of Augustan satire, with its strong concern with the poet’s role’.23 The poem deserves to be better known. Lovelace begins by ridiculing the huge sum given to the early sixteenth-century poet Sannazaro by the Venetian senate in return for writing a mediocre hexastich in honour of the republic. This episode only prompts, however, jaundiced reflection on the conditions of literary patronage in Cromwellian England and the grotesque representation of the Protector as a new Augustus:

And now me thinks we ape Augustus state,
So ugly we high worth imitate,
Monkey his Godlike glories; so that we
Keep light and form, with such deformitie,
As I have seen an arrogant Baboon
With a small piece of Glasse Zany the Sun.

(LP 193, ll. 19–24)

Lovelace, according to Anthony Wood, lived his final years in a state of poverty and ‘lodged in obscure and dirty places, befitting the worst of servants . . . He died in a very mean Lodging in Gun-Powder Alley near Shoe-Lane’. The deprivation that Lovelace had suffered in spending his estate on the failed royalist cause and from refusing to accommodate himself to Commonwealth or Protectorate issues here in a grim but powerful bitterness at those poets who have profited from switching their allegiance. He may have Edmund Waller in mind, who in A Panegyrick to my Lord Protector (1655) was at the forefront of the ‘Protectoral Augustanism’ of the mid-1650s and was appointed a commissioner of trade by Cromwell in return:

23 Lovelace, Selected Poems, ed. Hammond, 18.
As the vexed world to find repose at last
It self into Augustus’ Arms did cast;
So England now, doth with like toil oppressed
Her weary head upon your bosom rest.24

The absurdity of the notion of Cromwell as Augustus immediately then leads the poet to reflect on the stark contrast between Augustan Rome and Protectoral England. Jonson’s ghost in ‘Tom May’s Death’ had ridiculed May’s efforts to make equivalence between republican Rome and the English Commonwealth; it may be the memory of the satire which leads Lovelace to rewrite the opening of the verse epistle that Marvell had addressed to him:

Rome to her Bard, who did her battails sing,
Indifferent gave to Poet and to King;
With the same Lawrells were his Temples fraught
Who best had written, and who best had fought;
The Self same fame they equally did feel,
One’s style ador’d as much as the other’s Steel.
A chain of fasces she could then afford
The Sons of Phoebus, we an Axe, or Cord;
Sometimes a Coronet was her renown,
And ours the dear prerogative of a Crown.
In marbled statu’d walks great Lucan lay,
And now we walk our own pale Statua:
They the whole yeer with roses crownd would dine,
And we all in December know no wine[.] (ll. 25–38)

Lovelace recalls the language and rhythm of several of Marvell’s lines: ‘Who best could praise had then the greatest praise’; ‘Our Civil Wars have lost the civic crown’ (ll. 7, 12). He also recalls Marvell’s use of pronouns (‘they’, ‘she’, ‘we’, ‘our’) to seal the past off from the present, their ‘then’ from our ‘now’. Any attempt to make comparison between the literary culture of Augustan Rome and Cromwellian England only serves to emphasize the massive contrast: Lovelace could certainly agree in 1656 with Marvell’s declaration that ‘Our wits have drawn the infection of our times’ (l. 4). But is Lovelace remembering Marvell’s verse epistle because of the appropriateness of its sentiments about the loss during the wars of the Horatian and Jonsonian ethos—the ‘ancient rights’ invoked by Jonson in ‘Tom May’s Death’ and later by Alexander Brome—or is he remembering Marvell’s poem ironically, as an embodiment of ‘the commitments from which Marvell had apostatized by throwing in his lot with the Protectorate’?25

Conclusion: ‘Tom May’s Death’

Once more the phrase ‘Goths and Vandals’, used by Jonson’s ghost in his diatribe against May, appears in Lovelace’s vituperative depiction of Cromwellian literary life:

There is not in my mind one sullen Fate
Of old, but is concentrated in our state.
Vandal o’er-runners, Goths in literature,
Ploughmen that would Parnassus new manure[.]

(l. 206–9)

There is an echo here also of Sherburne’s ‘Delvers in Poetry, that only skill | To make Parnassus a St George’s Hill’. Lovelace looks back to pre-war exemplars of virtue and learning: to George Sandys, the translator of Ovid who was great uncle to both Lovelace and Stanley, and to Lucius Cary, Lord Falkland, subject of Jonson’s great Pindaric ode ‘To the Immortal Memory and Friendship of That Noble Pair, Sir Lucius Cary and Sir H. Morison’ (1629). Cary (1610–43) had died fighting for the king and so embodies for Lovelace the devastation of letters by civil war.

The recollection of the denunciation of May in ‘Tom May’s Death’ and the association of Cary with Jonson leads the poet to summon Jonson’s ghost to pronounce judgement on the corruptions of the age. Lovelace looks desperately to the authority of ‘Father Ben’ to restore the connection between poetry, patronage, and virtue:

Arise thou rev’rend shade, great Johnson rise!
Break through thy marble natural disguise;
Behold a mist of insects, whose mere breath,
Will melt thy hallowed leaden house of death.
What was Crispinus that you should defy
The age for him? He durst not look so high
As your immortal rod, he did still stand
Honoured, and held his forehead to thy brand.
These scorpions with which we have to do,
Are fiends, not only small but deadly too.
Well might’st thou rive thy quill up to the back
And screw thy lyre’s grave chords until they crack.
For though once Hell’s resented music, these
Devils will not, but are in worse disease.

(ll. 220–33)

The reference to Crispinus, a character in Jonson’s Poetaster (1601), alerts us that the ‘Apologetical Dialogue’ to that play is one model for Lovelace’s address to Jonson’s ghost. The images of the Cromwellian hacks as ‘a mist of insects’ and ‘scorpions’ resemble, however, the ‘swarms’ of insects, ‘Word-peckers, paper-rats, book-scorpions’, that rise against Lovelace in Marvell’s verse epistle. But then, as we have seen, Marvell may have himself been referring back to Lovelace’s own
use of the image of the apocalyptic abyss in ‘To Lucasta. From Prison’. While several scholars have noted in Lovelace’s satire general similarities of theme with ‘Tom May’s Death’, the rhyme of ‘back’ and ‘crack’ in lines 230–1 invokes very specifically the great speech of Jonson’s ghost in defence of the ‘ancient rights’ of the true poet in ‘Tom May’s Death’:

He, when the wheel of empire whirleth back,
And though the world’s disjointed axle crack,
Sings still of ancient rights and better times,
Seeks wretched good, arraigns successful crimes.26

Lovelace probably saw ‘Tom May’s Death’ when it was first written, at the same time as his friend Brome. Their thorough knowledge of the satire indicates that they and their fellow poets in the ‘town’, members of the now scattered Stanley coterie, were the audience for whom Marvell wrote ‘Tom May’s Death’. The grasshoppers in ‘Upon Appleton House’ condemn ‘Us as we walk more low than them’ (ll. 372–3). In ‘On Sannazar’s being Honoured’, probably his final poem, does Lovelace deride Marvell as one of the poetasters who have sought the patronage of a philistine regime? It may be significant that the poem which immediately precedes ‘On Sannazar’s being Honoured’ in the posthumous Lucasta is the tribute ‘To the Genius of Mr John Hall’. Martin Dzelzainis suggests that the pairing of Marvell and Hall in the commendatory poems of the first Lucasta is recalled by this sequence. But while Lovelace acknowledges and subordinates his political differences with Hall, ‘he was not so much enlisting as attacking’ Marvell.27 If this is the case, the simple fact that Hall had died may have been enough to make Lovelace look more kindly on this allegiance; or perhaps Lovelace, like Stanley, retained respect for Hall because of his constant efforts to encourage and foster literary, and indeed Jonsonian, community in the aftermath of civil war. While Hall always maintained a profound scepticism of Presbyterian and sectarian religiosity, aspects of Marvell’s apocalyptic celebration of Cromwell in The First Anniversary may have been too much for Marvell’s Cavalier associates. Yet we should not exclude the possibility that Lovelace found in Marvell’s verse epistle and satire a powerful expression of the poet’s ultimate allegiance, whatever the fluctuations of history and politics, to the cause of wit—a cause to which Lovelace felt himself to be a martyr.

In Milton’s comparison in ‘To My Friend Mr Henry Lawes’ of a reunion with Lawes to Dante’s encounter with the shade of Casella, Dante meets his former musical collaborator ‘in the milder shades of Purgatory’ (l. 14). ‘Milder’, presumably, than the fires of hell: the implication is that Milton and Lawes have

26 See Weidhorn, Richard Lovelace, 157; Rees, ‘“Tom May’s Death” and Ben Jonson’s Ghost’, 486.
come through the hell of civil war together.\textsuperscript{28} When Jonson’s shade warns us in ‘Tom May’s Death’ about what goes on down in Hades, where May will shortly be dispatched, he takes his details from Dante: ‘And how a double-headed vulture eats | Brutus and Cassius, the people’s cheats’ (ll. 17–18). The Rabelaisian underworld of the satire becomes, for a moment, Dante’s Inferno. As we saw in Chapter 2, Cato, the republican hero of Lucan’s \textit{Pharsalia}, scolds Dante for delaying the arduous journey to liberty to listen to Casella’s sweet song. Cato was for Dante an exemplar of moral virtue and integrity; for Milton, Cato was an exemplar of the equation between republican liberty and moral virtue and integrity. Jonson’s ghost scorns the drunken, mercenary May for his flattery of ‘novice statesmen’ through false classical analogy: ‘Or thou, Dictator of the glass, bestow | On him the Cato, this the Cicero’ (ll. 47–8). Yet the lofty image projected by Jonson’s ghost of the true poet fighting ‘forsaken virtue’s cause’ echoes not only Jonson’s commendatory poem to May’s version of Lucan but the speech of Lucan’s Cato in the second book of the \textit{Pharsalia}, as translated by May:

\begin{quote}
We confesse \\
Brutus, that civil war’s great wickednesse: \\
But where the Fates will lead, vertue shall go \\
Securely on; to make me guilty now \\
Shall be the gods own crime; who would endure \\
To see the world dissolve, himselfe secure? \\
Who could look on, when heaven should fall, earth fail, \\
And the confus’d world perish, and not wail?\textsuperscript{29}
\end{quote}

If we do not hear Milton’s republican Cato in ‘Tom May’s Death’, we can yet hear Dante’s exemplar of virtue speaking through Marvell’s Jonson against ‘coward churchmen’ and in defence of the Horatian values that Jonson held dear. In this hall of textual mirrors we may also glimpse Marvell’s future image as a constant warrior against ecclesiastical tyranny who joined ‘the most peculiar graces of wit & learning with a singular penetration [and] an unalterable steadiness in the ways of virtue’.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{28} I owe this point to John Creaser.
\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Lucan’s Pharsalia}, book 2, sig. C3’; the relationship is noted in Shifflett, \textit{Literature, Politics, and Stoicism}, 126.
\textsuperscript{30} William Popple’s 1688 epitaph for Marvell, as inscribed on the monument to Marvell in St Giles’s Church in 1764 (Kelliher, \textit{Andrew Marvell}, 125).
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