



uOttawa

L'Université canadienne
Canada's university

**FACULTÉ DES ÉTUDES SUPÉRIEURES
ET POSTDOCTORALES**



**FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND
POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES**

Neal Hackler

AUTEUR DE LA THÈSE / AUTHOR OF THESIS

M.A. (English)

GRADE / DEGREE

Department of English

FACULTÉ, ÉCOLE, DÉPARTEMENT / FACULTY, SCHOOL, DEPARTMENT

From Stage to Page: Restoration Theatre and the Prose of Andrew Marvell

TITRE DE LA THÈSE / TITLE OF THESIS

Nicholas von Maltzahn

DIRECTEUR (DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS SUPERVISOR

CO-DIRECTEUR (CO-DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS CO-SUPERVISOR

Victoria Burke

Frans De Bruyn

Gary W. Slater

Le Doyen de la Faculté des études supérieures et postdoctorales / Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

FROM STAGE TO PAGE:
RESTORATION THEATRE AND THE PROSE OF ANDREW MARVELL

NEAL HACKLER

M.A. THESIS IN ENGLISH
SUPERVISED BY DR. NICHOLAS VON MALTZAHN

© NEAL HACKLER, OTTAWA, CANADA, 2010



Library and Archives
Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-73838-2
Our file *Notre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-73838-2

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

Abstract

Andrew Marvell (1621-78), though best known today as a lyric poet, was also the author of a handful of aggressive pamphlets on religious toleration and proto-Whig political values. In comparison to earlier polemic produced by divines such as John Owen, Richard Baxter, or Samuel Parker, Marvell's books appear as a radical aesthetic departure into a witty style of dramatic pamphlet. This thesis argues that Marvell's aesthetic innovation owes to his infusion of theatre and theatricality into ecclesiastical controversy. The hybrid polemic caused a point of contact between smaller separate publics foreshadows the opening of the wider Public Sphere that Jürgen Habermas situates in the wake of the 1688-9 Glorious Revolution. As a new style of public writing, Marvell's hybrid polemic initiated a crossover between the ecclesiastical and theatrical publics that expanded debate to a new idiom and a wider audience.

Contents

Abstract	ii
Contents	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Introduction	v

From Stage to Page: Restoration Theatre and the Prose of Andrew Marvell

Chapter I: The Ecclesiastical Public 1667-1672	1
1. The Ecclesiastical Public 1667-1672	8
2. Public Representations in Print	25
3. Sedition and Dissent	34
4. Peace and Conscience	44
Chapter II: <i>The Rehearsal Transpros'd</i> as English Theatre	55
1. The Political Problem with Francophiles	67
2. <i>The Rehearsal</i> , Transpros'd	73
3. Beyond Buckingham	93
4. A Conflagration	99
Chapter III: Francophilia and Political Theatre	114
1. Deadly Gallicisms	118
2. Fops and Fashion	128
3. An English Tragedy	144
Conclusion	164
Bibliography	171

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the English faculty at the University of Ottawa for its support in writing this thesis, especially the patient and thorough supervision of Nicholas von Maltzahn. I must further extend my thanks to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for its generous support during my research.

Introduction

In the last six years of his life, Andrew Marvell, 1621-78, authored a handful of exemplary pamphlets remarkable for a fusion of scholastic excellence and well-honed wit. These features have their respective origins in Restoration ecclesiastical controversy and Restoration theatre, of which Marvell's prose is a hybrid. Critics and historians have variously understood Marvell's style as offering a good read, opening issues to a larger audience, identifying his work with the politics of playwrights, displaying literary genius, or refining the pamphlet genre into a modern form. Most scholarly commentary acknowledges that theatre and comedy take a central role in his lively literary strategy. But beyond the material that Buckingham, Etherege, *et al* supply for Marvell's comic and tragic prose, the infusion of theatre into ecclesiastical controversy opened new avenues for public debate. Theatre's language, content, and style flowed into the alien arena of pamphlet controversy and altered the ways that many authors handled issues of concern. This influx can be usefully understood as a crossover between publics that were largely separate in the 1660s and 1670s. In causing a point of contact between the ecclesiastical public and the theatrical public, Marvell's prose contributions blended issue and language into works for consumption by a more diverse public. In this respect, Marvell is an informative figure when considering how a larger open public can emerge from contact between separate spheres of concern.

In situating Marvell's prose in the crossover between publics, the historical emergence of the modern public sphere is a logical point of departure. Twenty years have passed since the belated translation of Jürgen Habermas's *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, and this theoretical framework still finds broad application in the study of early-modern print culture. Nevertheless, of late some scholars have expressed anxiety that

Habermas' concept of a public sphere has been, in many cases, oversimplified and stretched beyond its intended scope: "Historians simply point to the vast numbers of pamphlets published in any given period (especially the civil wars of the 1640s) and argue that the production and reception of those pamphlets constituted a 'public sphere', QED".¹ The oversimplification has manifested itself chiefly in a steady antedating of the theoretical framework to times before the long eighteenth century in Europe, where Habermas had located the emergence of a politically critical public. The term 'public sphere', a translation of Habermas's still more open *Öffentlichkeit*, has found ever wider application to all periods of study in English literature, even, in one recent case, reaching back to the reign of Richard III.² Nor is this practice wholly uninformed. Indeed, publics antedate the Glorious Revolution in the form of some "precursor" sphere, "an amalgam that partakes of imperfectly articulated collectives" that is located in the examples of early print culture, theatregoers, academics, clubs, and manuscript news.³

Habermas's historical argument has also been faulted for its overly broad strokes and idealizing description. Specifically, the free and open critical debates that he describes are not entirely plausible in the contexts he places them: "it has never been explained how such inherently separatist institutions as coffee-houses and newspapers could have been

¹ Ethan H. Shagan, "The Pilgrimage of Grace and the Public S

phere?", in *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, eds. Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 2007), 32.

² A.E.B. Coldiron, "Public Sphere / Contact Zone: Habermas, Early Print, and Verse Translation," *Criticism* 46 (2004): 212-3.

³ Joseph Loewenstein and Paul Stevens, "Introduction: Charting Habermas's 'Literary' or 'Precursor' Public Sphere", *Criticism* 46 (2004): 202.

responsible for the creation of a public”.⁴ Similarly, Habermas’s historiography romanticizes the role of the press in the political climate of the Restoration, whereas “In a society where the majority of people remained illiterate [...] traditional forms of oral communication remained vitally important”.⁵ The Restoration offered many contexts for political discourse other than printed matter. Sermons, plays, and public spaces such as St. Paul’s Churchyard supplied venues for oral discourse, and manuscripts, either privately circulated or scribally published, account for a vast quantity of unprinted, unprintable, and/or private written information. Furthermore, the coffee-houses’ capacity for transcending class boundaries were much more limited than Habermas suggests: “Although contemporary critics might have liked to convey the impression that the coffee-houses swarmed with multitudes of people from all social classes, we may wonder whether they were really home from home for many of the labouring poor from town and countryside”.⁶ Claims that the coffee-house was an ideal transformative space for open debate and that the free press was a panacea for political ignorance deserve some suspicion. Habermas’s broad strokes have left some questions unanswered in regards to the emergence of bourgeois society. No single aspect of English culture can be responsible for the rise of political publicity: “Rather than siting communicative action in some ideal, imaginary social space [...] we should be examining the discursive behaviour of individuals as they moved

⁴ Harold Love, “How Music Created a Public,” *Criticism* 46 (2004): 257.

⁵ Tim Harris, “Understanding Popular Politics in Restoration Britain,” in *A Nation Transformed*, eds. Alan Houston and Steve Pincus (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001), 134-5.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 141.

between the engaged spaces of distinct competing publics”.⁷ A homogenous public sphere is an unfeasible notion.

The complication arises from the fact that while it has been applied as a theoretical framework to help explain many socio-political contexts, *The Structural Transformation* is an exploration of a specifically eighteenth-century phenomenon as part of Habermas’s effort to illuminate specific problems of rationality in Enlightenment thought. The “Bourgeois Public Sphere”, an ideological space where debate could occur openly without constraint or direction from institutional pressures, was (and is) a mostly utopian ideal, but “for a brief while, in the [eighteenth] century, this Utopia not only gained intellectual currency, but began to be realized, fleetingly and partially, in social and political reality”, before being co-opted by economic and institutional forces.⁸ The task at hand, then, is not to argue that “The Public Sphere” existed in any particular time or place, nor to apply the label to certain sets of cultural conditions. Indeed, while it may have existed in principle, as Love and Harris have shown, in practice it may not have existed at all in the seventeenth century, or ever.

Instead, the growth of the public occurred owing to the emergence of separate, but interrelated groups built around common interests. As a public is an assembly of private citizens, the public sphere is composed from the multiplicity of smaller publics, with different values and interests. Of the possible foci of the bourgeois public sphere, Habermas privileges economic discourse as central to its emergence. However, economics (or “political economy”) is not the only issue relating to the public interest. Is it possible to

⁷ Love, “Music”, 268.

⁸ James Gordon Finlayson, *Habermas: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005), 13.

identify other topics relevant to the public good in the same fashion? Obviously, groups have as much capacity for conflict and mutual influence as individuals – heterogeneity is the cause of debate. To study the public sphere we might then trace the crossovers that occur as a result of people and ideas migrating between different smaller publics. This determination will depend on how far these publics interact with one another as parts of a larger sociological mechanism.

The Restoration era hosted many such “precursor” spheres. They on one hand influenced one another, and on the other anticipated the emergent bourgeois ideal that gained currency with the 1688-9 Glorious Revolution. In tracking the crossover that Marvell initiates between the theatrical and ecclesiastical publics, this study also follows how theatrical and religious writings connect to ideological conflicts leading into the events of 1688-9. As Francophiles, syphilitics, fops, town wags, and country bumpkins generate humour on the Restoration stage, in theatrical pamphlets they supply a language for disputing economics, church government, and international politics. The controversy began in 1667 with a heated dispute between ministers over comprehension in the Church of England, and Marvell first intervened in 1672. By 1678 his prose had developed into a separate style of agit-prop, specializing in high tragedy and grand political intrigue. This study follows that growth, from its pre-history in the toleration controversy, to its culmination on the eve of the Popish Plot.

Chapter I, broadly speaking, is a historical survey of the ecclesiastical public in Restoration England. This chapter’s aim is to determine who is producing ecclesiastical controversy in the late 1660s and 1670s, and what the conflicting interests are in a broader context. Such a study is crucial because Marvell’s own prose is highly topical. The literary contributions that come as a result of the crossover between religious writing and theatre

are largely invested in the details of that ongoing conflict. Without an initial understanding of the local, national, and international political issues at stake for the broader ecclesiastical public, the fine details of Marvell's work are lost. The 1670s were a political crossroads for England, as the divine-right kingship espoused by the Stuarts and the constitutional and mercantile interests that Habermas credits with transforming the public sphere were moving towards conflict in the 1688-9 Revolution that would define the English political settlement for the long eighteenth century. Although the Popish Plot, the Exclusion Crisis, and the emergence of the Whig and Tory parties were yet to come, the tensions that animated these events were already driving political and ecclesiastical discourse in the 1660s and -70s. Moreover, as Marvell's style in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* was a novel leap forward in English satire, the striking contrast between his and his immediate predecessors' styles invites scrutiny.

Accordingly, Chapters II and III offer a more literary analysis of Marvell's pamphlets and those texts by opposing authors that are equally invested in his controversies. Chapter II focuses largely on *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* (1672) and *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part* (1673) and the ways in which Marvell uses specific plays in developing his style. This study considers how his opponents seize upon certain aspects of his style and content when they respond to Marvell's interventions. Chapter III, on the other hand, examines theatricality as much as plays, and moves chronologically to two of Marvell's later pamphlets, *Mr. Smirke, or, the Divine in Mode* (1675), and *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government in England* (1677/8). As Marvell's style matures, allusion gives way to metaphor, and his handling of political or ecclesiastical events as if theatre proves a recurring feature of his polemical prose. And yet whatever these stylistic changes, the problem of Francophilia in English

politicians and intellectuals remains an issue, beginning with Marvell's appropriation of Buckingham's play *The Rehearsal* and continuing into the *Account*. Even as the original theatrical antecedents from which he initially drew this theme fall into disuse, he continues to develop the Francophile issue in his later prose. In following these political themes, Chapter II and III evaluate some of the protean aspects of Marvell's political identity that have invited scholarly debate.

Chapter I: The Ecclesiastical Public 1667-1672

For the study of public discourse and modern bourgeois society, the Restoration is fertile ground. The late seventeenth century featured an open and visible struggle to determine the right to worship freely and define the boundary of the national church, waged between numerous sectarian controversialists, multiple parliaments, and three kings over four decades. The shifts from the less-than-Habermasian Commonwealth of the Interregnum to the un- or anti-Habermasian reigns of Charles II and James II, to Habermas's exemplary post-revolutionary bourgeois public do not receive satisfactory explanation in *The Structural Transformation*. But Steve Pincus, in his ground-breaking history *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (2009) goes some way to supplying the lack.

Indeed, even though he does not engage Habermas directly, Pincus's history of the Glorious Revolution runs parallel to Habermas's larger historiographical narrative. Pincus's explanation for the events of 1688 begins with the assertion that late seventeenth-century England hosted a power struggle between "two competing modernizing programs", which climaxed with the Revolution. His history rejects the previous interpretations of the events of 1668-9. Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century historians emphasized the conservative aspects of the revolution, a momentous event where English constitutional values were asserted against a regressive and/or incompetent James II. As time passed, so did perceptions of the revolution's importance. Some late twentieth-century scholars interpreted the Glorious Revolution as a minor *coup d'état*, barely a political hiccough. For Pincus, the Williamite Revolution was a traumatic international event that came as a result of a powerful modernizing project initiated by James II in 1685, aimed toward establishing a centralized absolute monarchy following innovations in nearby France and Denmark.

James's progressivism met violent opposition in two waves. First was the religiously justified, conservative, and ultimately unsuccessful rebellion led by Charles II's illegitimate son, the Duke of Monmouth, whose followers "saw their cause as hereditary legitimacy and anti-Catholicism". In Pincus's analysis, Monmouth's rebellion was unable to gain momentum precisely because it was a conservative reaction against James's Catholic modernity: "The conservatism of his cause meant that few political radicals – those who were active in the Exclusion Crisis and would be active again in the heady days of 1688-89 – were willing to risk their all in his cause". Contrary to the "hegemonic" historiography wherein the Glorious Revolution is an orderly, conservative reassertion of English constitutional values, the successful second challenge to James's absolutist regime came in the form of a conflicting modernizing movement. The Williamite movement was invested in the trading and manufacturing interests that Habermas credits for "opening" the civil public sphere in the 1690s. This competing public was extant in the Restoration, with roots in the coffee-houses established in the 1650s and -60s and the postal services established in the late 1650s.¹

Indeed, England's ecclesiastical public was by no means exempt from the vicissitudes of the late seventeenth century. The Church of England was dismantled in the Interregnum, rebuilt in the Restoration, reordered by James, and reconfigured by the Williamite Parliament. Through the late 1660s and the 1670s, the tension between Pincus's two modernizing groups permeates ecclesiastical literature, particularly in documents related to toleration and comprehension. For ecclesiastical authors, these modernizing projects are at odds in the 1660s and 1670s and the ideological undercurrents speak to the

¹ Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven & London: Yale UP, 2009), 45, 114, 115, 27.

conflict between a Stuart absolutist modernity or a Williamite commercial modernity. Overall, this literary dispute corresponds to the terms of Habermas's "Basic Blueprint" in such a way that it suggests a direct precursor to his bourgeois public sphere or the revolutionary politics of Pincus's *1688*. Amidst this fledgling public, Andrew Marvell's highly partisan polemic emerged in support of the constitutionalist and liberal causes that the Whigs later promoted in the 1680s.

The present study begins in *The Structural Transformation's* blind spot. Problematically, while Habermas addresses the issue of the public sphere in relation to literary, commercial, and political communities – not to mention the conversational havens in the salons, lodges, and coffee-houses – he gives little attention to the possibility of a modernizing religious public. Broadly speaking, the Frankfurt School's Marxist theoretical foundation dissolves religious issues into problems of class and social control. Habermas's predecessors at the Frankfurt School, Adorno and Horkheimer, have been described as pessimistic in their attitudes towards modernity and post-enlightenment society in the context of rational capitalist culture. Habermas's *The Structural Transformation*, by contrast, has a more optimistic view of modernity in Western societies that credits philosophy and critical theory with a beneficial transformative power: "It attempts to resolve the problems of first-generation Frankfurt School critical theory, while remaining true to its original spirit and retaining some aspects of its diagnosis of social ills".² While theoretical generalizations are risky, it is no surprise that the Marxist tradition, whose seminal thinker described religion as "the opiate of the masses", would privilege economic issues over spiritual when developing a narrative of secular sociological modernity. *The*

² Finlayson, 6-7, 8.

Structural Transformation's narrative is of post-reformation Europe's growth from a primitive elitist religious society to a modern democratic secular society. The public sphere germinated in the coffee-houses of Protestant England. This public, together with the houses of Parliament, succeeded in limiting the monarchy and liberated the people from the yoke of state-sponsored censorship and religion. A similar narrative unfolds in the Masonic temples of Protestant Germany; it is not until the French revolution demolishes Louis XIV's brand of Gallican Catholic absolutism that a public sphere could emerge from the salons of France. Habermas's narrative is one in which religion is at best a burden on, and at worst an antagonist to, the emergence of modernity. The resulting blind spot deserves consideration, for the emergence of the public sphere owes much to religious developments in the 1660s and 70s.

Generally, discussion of the public sphere and its precursors starts with Habermas's "Basic Blueprint". For Habermas, the object of interest is a "sphere of private citizens come together as a public", which by achieving economic power without possessing land, "undercut the principle on which existing rule was based". That emerging public produced a need for the open news system which initiated "rational-critical public debate" that engaged the "vehicle of public opinion [to] put the state in touch with the needs of society".³ However, this blueprint begs questions owing to its oversimplification in summaries, anthologies, and incomplete readings. Over-enthusiastic scholars of the public sphere have neglected nuanced but crucial issues of state control and political economy: "Habermas believed that, without a space free from domination, individuals could not

³ Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: an Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, tr Thomas Burger & Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, MA MIT Press, 1989), 27, 28, 31

transcend their role as private persons and contribute to a ‘public’ [...] Habermas’s ‘public sphere’ was by definition entirely separate from state authority” and “presupposed the primacy of the public good”.⁴ The problem of state domination is significant when studying the public sphere in a Restoration context: even though Williamite England falls short of the ideal conditions that Habermas prescribes, post-Stuart England was much more open than the hierarchical Franco-absolutist administration that Charles II and James II attempted to construct.

The constitutionalist-absolutist struggle in ecclesiastical literature opened into a larger public sphere in 1672 when Andrew Marvell’s *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* broke with the ongoing conventions of debate. Marvell’s book subordinated the rational-critical aspects of controversy to an aggressive, boisterous satire in defence of toleration. His primary target was Samuel Parker, chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury Gilbert Sheldon, whose proposals foreshadow those of James II’s absolutist modernity. The results were remarkable. Where for years the dissenting authors had literally preached to the choir in pursuit of a more open religious policy in England, Marvell’s intervention was a widely read ridicule of the High Church position. This success owed in part to Marvell’s abilities as a scholar and linguist, which allowed him to support his attack with knowledgeable argument and to his experience as a verse satirist that had honed his skill as a character assassin. Marvell’s success owed even more to the hybrid style of *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*. In several ways, the prose polemic of *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* borrowed extensively from theatre. Theatre and theatricality allowed Marvell, like the authors of dialogue “playlets” of the early 1640s, to distort or dramatize his subject matter for satirical

⁴ Shagan, 32.

effect. The playlet, as the name suggests, is a miniature play that communicates a political message in a popular form. These mini-plays are essentially dialogue pamphlets that provide brief conversational scenes between familiar characters. But unlike those playlets, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* also used allusions to the wealth of English theatrical tradition to animate its argument. Marvell's prose distinguishes itself from playlets and from standard polemic in seamlessly integrating theatrical characters and dramatic techniques into a discursive argument and producing a new hybrid style that exposed the debate to a public sphere wider than the standard ecclesiastical audience.

Marvell, the coffee house wit, fashionable town wag, and MP, seems an unlikely champion for dissenting divines such as John Owen, John Humfrey, and Richard Baxter. The stakes in illegal printing were high, and his personal interests left him with much to lose and little to gain by risking all for an act of indulgence. Personal connections to nonconformity may have motivated him. His home, Hull, had many nonconformists and his correspondence contains several conspiratorial exchanges with Sir Edward Harley, another prominent supporter of dissenters. The blending of animadversion, *ad hominem* attacks, and an extensive repertoire of scholarly knowledge with burlesque comedy was a strategic success. The fruits of his labour, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, and *The Second Part* (1673), were influential on the polemical stage, irrevocably damaging Parker's reputation as an authoritative divine.

However much the same issues remained in discussion afterward, authors started to handle them in a new idiom. The literary salvos between Marvell and a "posse" of Parker's supporters in the subsequent *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* controversy bears little aesthetic resemblance to the previous five years' worth of texts on the same topic. This abrupt shift in polemical style came as a result of movement "between the engaged spaces of distinct

competing publics”,⁵ wherein an author, engaged with the West End theatrical public, leveraged the characteristic cultural features of that sphere to advance the interests of the nonconformist cause. The controversy – *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, *The Second Part*, Parker’s *Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros’d*, and the works by the authors Marvell mocked as the *Posse Archidiaconatus* – is rich with the rhetoric, diction, wit, and content of Restoration comedy, and represents the emergence of a new style of political prose, influenced by popular and fashionable entertainment.

Aesthetic differences aside, Marvell was nonetheless an entrant into a prolonged debate, and in some ways his texts were an extension of those that preceded them. The risks that he took in publishing liberalist anti-clerical literature were the same that dissenters had faced since the Restoration. Some of Marvell’s marketing strategies had found less sophisticated application in ecclesiastical controversy: authors on both sides of the issue relied extensively on character and characterization in smearing opponents and marketing their positions to public opinion. Owing to Restoration censorship, ecclesiastical discourse did not occur in a fully open public sphere. Through its authorized agents, the surveyor of the press, licensors, and the Church of England, the state managed to suppress many dissenting voices. Oppositional books were burned by the common hangman. Author-preachers such as Richard Baxter and John Bunyan were imprisoned. Anti-Catholic anxieties complicated attempts at broad comprehension. In the face of the universalizing attitude promoted by Canterbury and (usually) supported by Whitehall, dissenters fought an uphill battle in seeking toleration. However, despite these barriers, debate continued. In the late 1660s and early 1670s, the English ecclesiastical public engaged in rational-critical debates in appeals for and against religious toleration. Authors

⁵ Love, “Music”, 268.

engaged with state policies and one another's texts in view of what in modern parlance would be called public opinion, applying a variety of marketing or publicity strategies in appealing to ideals such as tradition, godliness, liberty, or authority. Most importantly, Marvell's contributions broke with the existing marketing patterns in including notions such as fashion, play, drama, and theatre.

The entertaining pamphlet in a fashionable style attracted both readers and imitators. Marvell's opponents attempted to counter his efforts by playing the same theatrical games. The dissenters for whom he intervened supported his later efforts: reportedly, a group of nonconformists bought and distributed an entire impression of *Mr. Smirke* at great expense.⁶ Marvell's influence grew when his *Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* became one of the most incendiary tracts of the Popish Plot era. Authors such as Vincent Alsop and later Jonathan Swift follow Marvell's satirical example. The witty style, a new and more sophisticated hybrid of polemic and theatre, rises from the ecclesiastical controversies of this period.

1. The Ecclesiastical Public 1667-72.

Marvell's innovations are necessarily understood in contrast with the conventions that preceded him. The history that I offer contrasts with the traditional (and modifies the Habermasian) accounts on several key points. Where the traditional account divides the Restoration ecclesiastical public in a sharp contrast between the empowered Episcopalian majority and a suppressed minority, an alternative account instead suggests the existence of a single loosely-knit public. The ecclesiastical public, though internally divided, offered a

⁶ Nicholas von Maltzahn, *An Andrew Marvell Chronology* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 173.

platform for public debate on issues that were significant to the public itself and to the nation as a whole, both in person and writing. This debate was able to continue despite reactionary measures including legislation, censorship, persecution, and public backlash at various times and against various members. Even though the independent groups within this public were outlawed, resisting communities and opportunistic merchants helped to support their existence. The suppressed minorities argued in favour of their own existence and in many cases adapted to the changing legal and political theatre. Even though the seventeenth-century ecclesiastical public was, unlike Habermas's transformed public sphere, unable to successfully reconfigure society and rule to achieve proper political power, it managed to undercut the principles upon which its official internal structures were based. The inability of the episcopacy to obtain complete ecclesiastical supremacy indicates that by 1672 this public had been irrevocably transformed from its pre-civil war form.

But is religion, or a religion, best thought of as a public phenomenon? Religious observance is so complex an activity that it challenges simplification into terms such as public and private. Habermas's study begins by considering such concepts' various meanings in the context of political power. "Public", Habermas observes, can mean "open to all". But, buildings that host "state institutions", however open, are also denominated "Public", as the state is the "public authority". Fame (or notoriety) is a "public reputation". Closely related is the notion of "publicity" as an effort to cultivate a desired public reputation: "Originally a function of public opinion, it has become an attribute of whatever attracts public opinion".⁷ This last term, "public opinion" is the core of Habermas's study:

⁷ Habermas, 1, 2.

“publicity continues to be an organizational principle of our social order. It is apparently more and other than a mere scrap of liberal ideology that a social democracy could discard without harm”.⁸ The oppositional term, “private”, receives briefer examination. It refers to the common, the particular, or the household. Or, in political terms,

“Private” designated the exclusion from the sphere of the state apparatus; for “public” referred to the state that in the meantime had developed, under absolutism, into an entity having an objective existence over against the person of the ruler. The public [...] was the “public authority” [...] in contrast to everything “private”.⁹

Public opinion, or “the public sphere”, is thus a blurring of the distinctions between these categories of public and private, so that the multiplicity of private opinions forms a conglomerate that influences the state apparatus. The Church is the exception that complicates this model. Habermas observes that in post-feudal Europe, “the Church itself continued to exist as one corporate body among others under public law”.¹⁰ The ecclesiastical struggles of the Restoration straddle this transition from “The Church” as an exclusive “Public” authority that oversees the lesser “private”, to “churches” as separate autonomous private entities.

In this respect, religious institutions are both public and private entities. On one hand, doctrinal religions are privileged, hence “private”, institutions – clerics of the Church of Rome (and England) must appeal to a hierarchical system of authority and patronage for support and advancement. Public opinion is largely irrelevant to doctrine and institutional policy. The maintenance of orthodoxy seems to require that authority exist inwards and upwards, and the wider public is hedged out of institutional power by the mechanisms of

⁸ Ibid, 4.

⁹ Ibid, 11.

¹⁰ Ibid, 11-12.

expertise and exclusivity. But, state religions can nonetheless find pressure from public opinion. Any church that is sponsored by the state, such as the episcopal Church of England, is public in the governmental sense. In a constitutionalist state, such a church can again find itself at the mercy of the public sphere.

While orthodoxy requires privacy and exclusivity, the Church requires a degree of openness. Services and chapels are public spaces where most citizens are welcome or even required, often acting as social hubs for the community. The act of gathering as a congregation provides for a community a vehicle of self-awareness: which members are or are not present is open knowledge, and the formation of a congregation creates public solidarity through a system of insiders and outsiders. In the Restoration, members of the ecclesiastical public saw that this unifying aspect of worship was at stake. Simon Patrick's *A Friendly Debate* series underscores the role of the Church as a center of community when the Church of England conformist engages his nonconformist neighbour with the query: "what's the reason then that we have not seen you at Church of Late?"¹¹ In his preface, Patrick criticizes separatists for dividing congregations:

*have you not observed at the funeral of a Friend when a Sermon has been preached, how a part of the company, as soon as they come toward the Church door, presently draw off and separate from the rest, as if they were going to some Idolatrous Service? Would not a stranger think that some noisome and offensive vapour or stifling smoak ascended from our Devotions, which made these men so shie to enter till by the singing of a Psalm they had notice given that the air was clean and fit to breath in, and then it may be they came in?*¹²

¹¹ Simon Patrick, *A Friendly Debate Betwixt Two Neighbours, the One a Conformist, the Other a Non-Conformist. About Several Weighty Matters. Published for the Benefit of this City by a Love of it, and Pure Religion* (London, 1668 [EEBO]), 1.

¹² Simon Patrick, *A Continuation of the Friendly Debate. By the Same Author* (London, 1669 [EEBO]), A3^r.

Patrick's attack on Presbyterians reminds us that unity and community are a central issue for the ecclesiastical public in Restoration England. The essential problem he addresses in this image of a divided congregation reflects the anxieties of the religious nation at large. Patrick's image of Presbyterians as a sour, judgemental, and joyless clique situates his opponents as the ones responsible for division and conflict.

Because of the influence of such attacks, it is necessary to clarify the term "Puritan". The image of the staunch, grim Puritan railing against the evils of decadent drama is a seventeenth-century caricature that persists largely as a result of oppositional polemic and biased histories. It is a myth that the radical Protestant body in England had issued any wholesale condemnation of theatre in the 1630s: "The notion that the decade saw a sustained, accelerating moral and doctrinal attack on the playhouses is commonly repeated but it is utterly misleading, for there is not a shred of support for it".¹³ Biased historiography has identified William Prynne's *Histriomastix* (~1632) as having ignited a wave of zeal against the theatre. More careful accounts assert that "it was, rather, the last of its kind".¹⁴ In fact, particularly by the 1660s, "Puritan" does not denote a cohesive party and is best approached in general terms as a horizontal movement that occurred in several denominations. Specific iconic Puritans can be identified throughout English Protestantism, as Church of England Presbyterians such as Baxter, or Independents like Owen. Generally speaking, Puritanism follows a personal conviction of having been saved within a Calvinist sense of election, an activist or utopian attitude towards faith that works toward a model Christian society frequently based upon perceptions of the Apostolic or

¹³ Martin Butler, *Theatre and Crisis: 1632-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984), 95-6.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, 96.

pre-Constantinian church, and a frequent emphasis on an emotional but rationally tempered response to God. Samuel Parker attacked the Puritans on the grounds of being inherently seditious:

The Mystery of Puritanism lies in this Assertion, That nothing ought to be established in the Worship of God, but what is expressly commanded in the Word of God. The Wildness, Novelty, and unreasonableness of this Principle. It makes meer Obedience to lawful Authority sinful. It takes away all possibility of Settlement in any Church or Nation.¹⁵

John Owen's apologetic rebuttal was that the opposition to forms of worship represents an attempt to separate the "Chaffe from the Wheat":

That whatever the Scripture hath indeed prescribed, and appointed to be done, and observed in the Worship of God, and the government of the Church, that is indeed to be done and observed [...] That nothing in Conjunction with, nothing as an Addition or Supplement unto what is so appointed, ought to be admitted, if it be contrary either to the General Rules, or particular perceptive Instructions of the Scripture [...] That nothing ought to be joyned with, or added unto, what in the Scripture is prescribed and appointed in these things, without some Cogent Reason, making such Conjunction: or Addition necessary [...] That if any thing or things in this kind, shall be found necessary, to be added and prescribed [...] they are added.¹⁶

For this Puritan perspective, uniformity was the "imposition on mens practices of the Observation of uncommanded Rites", and consequently an assumption of temporal authority over spiritual.¹⁷ Puritans identified themselves as devoted and sanctified in opposition to a lukewarm and profane society, but also carefully distanced themselves from the more radical and disruptive sects: "Puritans did not relish being lumped together with Quakers and Baptists".¹⁸

¹⁵ Samuel Parker, *A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity* (London, 1670 [EEBO]), 171.

¹⁶ John Owen, *Truth and Innocence Vindicated* (London, 1667 [EEBO]), 306-8, earlier quotation from 313.

¹⁷ Ibid, 323.

¹⁸ John Spurr, *English Puritanism 1603-1689* (New York: St. Martin's, 1998), 131.

Thus, to order better understand the ecclesiastical differences of Restoration England, a brief survey is necessary. The most comprehensive model of the Restoration religious public acknowledges four loose groups – the national episcopacy or the Church of England, Presbyterians, Independents, and Catholics. Charles II's return from exile marked the reestablishment of the Episcopal Church of England in unison with the monarchy. One of many instigating factors in the civil wars of the middle decades was the episcopacy's Counter-Reformation measures: "The royally sanctioned Episcopal policies of the 1630s represented an abrupt discontinuity with those of the early 1600s and, more importantly, were perceived to do so by large numbers of contemporaries".¹⁹ The Church of England, under the authority of William Laud, the Archbishop of Canterbury, had embarked upon a divisive project of forced uniformity. Laud's policies tended toward order and politeness, and the "exalting of the importance of sacraments and ceremony over preaching".²⁰ Laud imposed a book of common prayer, insisted on the construction of rails around the altar, required ministers to wear a surplice, and codified a standard floor plan for parish churches, particularly concerning communion tables. Opponents rejected these reforms as popish, and poorer parishes resented carrying a heavy financial burden for what worshipers perceived as luxury.

When Charles I fell, the Episcopal Church of England fell with him. The episcopacy was abolished under the Protectorate, church lands were sold to private owners, and the Interregnum witnessed attempts at reconstructing the Church of England with a presbyterian structure. Laud was beheaded in 1645 and his reforms were reversed. The

¹⁹ Peter Marshall, *Reformation England, 1480-1642* (London: Arnold, 2003), 204.

²⁰ Ibid, 199.

subsequent “Godly” Interregnum lacked any formally established church and “paved the way for a decade of largely unchecked religious experimentation and speculation”.²¹ A government policy of reformed Christian liberty left parishes to imagine their own structures without the support or guidance of a national church. This freedom made room for error: many preachers took liberties that offended parishioners or fellow divines, sometimes perpetuating “soul-destroying errors”. Cromwell’s eventual policy did not allow absolute religious freedom, but enforced certain minimum requirements to exclude heretical sects: “The fundamental truths were the remissions of sins and free justification by the blood of Christ, and the core of the godly party was among the Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists”. This godly party policed orthodoxy during the late 1650s until the Protectorate’s collapse, variously assessing the fitness of sitting and aspiring divines.²²

Upon Charles II’s Restoration, many of these reforms were undone. The Protectorate’s sales of Church properties were reversed. The bishops were restored to their previous place in the nation’s political climate, supplanting the presbyterian model that found nominal support from the state in the Interregnum. Religious affairs were an exception to Charles II’s Restoration strategy in which he otherwise “employed more of his old enemies than his old friends”.²³ Initially, the expectation was that the restored national church would be broad and generally accommodating, providing for the majority of Protestant divines. As negotiations continued, however, the Presbyterians’ hopes were dashed when the settlement soon returned to the episcopal model and many of Laud’s

²¹ John Spurr, *The Post-Reformation: 1603-1714* (Harlow: Pearson, 2006), 119.

²² Spurr, *The Post-Reformation*, 135, 136.

²³ Ibid, 136.

policies regarding uniform order and worship: “The commons made it plain that it would take steps to enforce clerical conformity, but this was more out of a desire to ensure obedience to authority than out of any clear grasp of the theological niceties of the Book of Common Prayer”. The eventual injunctions aimed to sever all ties to Interregnum allegiances, particularly the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643, and effectively removed those that refused to conform from public office. The Church of England once again became a protected institution to which all citizens belonged by law. But not all was stable: “Despite all this privilege – legal political and ideological – the Restoration Church of England felt persecuted and vulnerable”. The collapse of the Laudian Church of England in 1640-42 was still a recent memory, and like the rest of the English state, the established Church sought stability above all else.²⁴

However, the Church of England was far from unified. The 1670s saw conflicts between ministers and bishops, such as that between Francis Turner and Herbert Croft. These years saw some members of the episcopacy begin to promote a centralized Anglican ecclesiastical structure with strict loyalty to the magistrate, systematically reminiscent of the Gallican Catholic Church in France. Among the divines of present interest, Samuel Parker is the primary example of a High-Church episcopalian. Parker found preferment to the See of Oxford in the reign of James II, and oversaw the university through James’s pro-Catholic reforms. Parker fell ill and died before the Revolution, but we may assume that he would have been among the nonjuring bishops who lost their sees for refusing an oath of loyalty to William and Mary. While he at times focuses on broader political issues, Parker

²⁴ Ibid, 144, 145, 149.

significantly advances the position that it is the church's purpose to enforce a national moral code in accordance with and on behalf of the King's wishes.

Indeed, this High-Church attitude and its universalizing impulse came into conflict with the heterogeneity inherent to presbyterian worship. The political attitude of the Restoration at least nominally aimed to end division and faction in England, but the Act of Uniformity 1662 created the most significant church division. Under pressure from the restored episcopacy, Parliament imposed terms upon prospective Church of England ministers: acknowledging ordination only by bishops, renouncing the Solemn League and Covenant, complete adoption of the book of common prayer (nearly identical to the edition that had been marked as a catalyst of the Scottish rebellions of 1638), and forced subscription to the thirty-nine articles of faith. There was a subsequent exodus from the settled church: "Many ministers who would *in principle* have continued to serve a national church refused to serve under these terms". The rapid enactment of the laws put ministers in the awkward position of swearing to uphold a prayer book without adequate time to review it. As a result, over two thousand clergy, lecturers, dons, and schoolmasters in England and Wales left or were 'ejected' from the institution between 1660 and 1663.²⁵ Many of these, such as Richard Baxter and John Humfrey, were members of the Interregnum's Presbyterian ministry. Such divines still identified with the idea of a national church but refused to conform for specific ecclesiastical reasons. The Presbyterian nonconformist authors appealed to the Crown for Comprehension, a "lifting of the various requirements for clerical subscription".²⁶ This would have presumably brought an end to

²⁵ Ibid, 146, 147.

²⁶ Spurr, *Puritanism*, 138.

nonconformity by allowing those who took offense to the terms set forth by the 1662 Act of Uniformity to return to official service. The nonconformists had some internal tensions between the older Presbyterians, the “Dons”, who primarily sought comprehension and reunification, and a younger generation of Presbyterian ministers, dubbed “Ducklings”, who had never known power and were less inclined towards a comprehension with the Church of England.²⁷

Furthermore, the tension between Presbyterians and Episcopalians was put into relief by Independent divines. The second division in the Restoration religious public encompasses Protestant groups that identified themselves as separate from the national church. This includes smaller dissenting denominations such as Quakers, Congregationalists, (Ana)Baptists, and a number of “independent” Puritan ministers such as John Owen. It would be misleading to make any broad claims about the beliefs found in this group – they ranged from moderate to radical, and had many conflicting (and often heretical) opinions about religion, theology, and church government. The denominational lines between individual sects were foggy, at least from outside. Richard Perrinchief attacks Owen on the grounds that Owen’s writing is ambiguous in describing his allies’ affiliations: “Some passages in it perswade us that they are *Independents*, but they being so comprehensive a sect of those strictly so called, and of the other who crowd under that name, as *Anabaptists, Socinians, Antinomians, &c.* We are still in the dark what sort of

²⁷ Goldie, Mark, “Toleration and the Godly Prince in Restoration England,” in *Liberty, Authority, Formality: Political ideas and Culture, 1600-1900*, ed. John Morrow and Jonathan Scott (Exeter and Charlottesville: Imprint Academic, 2008), 62.

men they are”.²⁸ The apocalyptic face of radical anti-authoritarian Protestant worship was in itself a threat to the establishment:

Millenarian discourse, with its imagery of war and destruction, had potential political overtones whether or not the speaker intended them. It is not surprising that the authorities found it difficult to distinguish between passive millenarians, waiting for the Second Coming, and those who intended actively to hurry the day along.²⁹

The blurry categories between independent divines provided opportunities for the Episcopalian authors to strategically conflate all dissenting positions with these more destructive sects. Other concerns were directed towards the Quakers, also known as the Society of Friends, who were still in a formative stage in the 1660’s and represented a different threat to social stability: “They were not pacifists; they indulged in symbolic actions like going naked for a sign (wearing only a loincloth about their middles, for decency’s sake), or disrupting religious services; they wrote large tomes to prove that the Bible was not the word of God”.³⁰ In operating outside of centralized doctrinal orthodoxy offered by the Episcopalian or Presbyterian parties, the more radical sects relied heavily upon group gatherings and inexpensive single-sheet pamphlets to establish themselves as autonomous groups, however prone to collapse or (further) schism. It is wholly unsurprising that the English state would regard the dissenting Protestant public – frequently represented by millenarian, anti-authoritarian, unpredictable, and sometimes violent followers – as dangerous.

²⁸ Richard Perrincheif, *Indulgence Not Justified* (London, 1668 [EEBO]), 4.

²⁹ Christopher Hill, *A Turbulent, Seditious, and Factious People: John Bunyan and his Church 1628-88* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 96.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 79.

Despite their shared status as dissenters, Independents and nonconforming Presbyterians did not have identical interests. That the legislative sum of the so-called Clarendon Code (Corporation Act 1661, Act of Uniformity 1662, Conventicle Act 1664, Five Mile Act 1665) suppressed independents and nonconformists in a single set of regulations creates an illusion that these groups' interests were closely aligned. Presbyterian and Independent authors did frequently make a common case and relied on similar arguments in pursuit of their parallel but distinct goals. But where the primary aim of the Presbyterians was comprehension, the Independent groups were pursuing indulgence, that is, "toleration [...] of the irreconcilable minority", and an end to persecution against those that chose to worship outside of the national church.³¹ This distinction is important to note before lumping all non-Episcopalians into a homogeneous alliance, for in fact the Dissenters, including Independents and Presbyterians, were far from reaching agreement:

Independents, Baptists and Quakers had reason to be suspicious of the Presbyterians as double-dealers. These groups had no interest in comprehension and so were more ready to cleave to the religious pluralism that the Declaration [of Indulgence] offered [...]. Their fear was that, if comprehension were achieved, then the Presbyterians readmitted to the Church would behave just as they had done in the 1640s: they would be as anti-tolerationist as their Anglican brethren and seek to suppress the sects.³²

Consequently, even though dissenting interests were aligned with those of the nonconformists in bringing an end to religious persecution, it is incorrect to suggest that there was a unified set of ecclesiastical interests in opposition to the national church. Overall, "the size of the Dissenting community created by the Act of Uniformity was not

³¹ Spurr, *Puritanism*, 138.

³² Goldie, 63.

large [...] at a generous estimate Dissenters represented somewhere between 4 and 10 percent of the population”, often in larger population centers, and coming from the working and merchant classes.³³ While the most disruptive sects were mostly of the lower classes, there was no clear class division that followed religious inclinations.³⁴

Finally, Catholics form the fourth group, though in the material at hand they are handled as an external threat. The English Catholicism issue was both political and doctrinal. It was distorted by the complexities of xenophobia and slurs, examples of which find extensive usage in ecclesiastical polemic and Marvell’s prose. In print, “Catholic” sees little use in its modern sense, meaning the Papal Church of Rome, because Protestants like Richard Baxter and John Owen appealed to “Catholic” Christianity, meaning of “the Church universal, the whole body of Christians” (OED 5). Though slurs are not applied with universal consistency, it is prudent to consider the different denotations of “papist” and “papal” on one hand and “popish” and “popery” on the other. Generally speaking, the former pair denotes equivalency with the Church of Rome. For example, the utterance, “in defying the test act, the Duke of York showed himself to be a papist”, communicates that James Stuart II is a practicing Roman Catholic. The latter pair, on the other hand, denotes similitude to Roman practice, in an especially anti-clerical tone. The title of Marvell’s pamphlet *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government in England* does not necessarily claim that Roman Catholicism has taken hold in England (even as it suggests the doors are opening). Instead it claims that English clerics are adopting Roman

³³ Spurr, *Post-reformation*, 150.

³⁴ Spurr, *Puritanism*, 144.

ecclesiastical practice, which briefly from an English Protestant perspective consists of greed, domination, and tyranny behind a thin veil of universal religion

Although the problem of “Popery” takes the form of a simple, albeit passionate, confessional struggle, it has national and international political implications. For some authors, Marvell included, the political nuances of “Popery” are of greater gravity than the devotional elements. It has cultural implications, addressing forms of tyranny and government rather than doctrinal content. “The object was to identify Papism with alien Irish barbarism, French despotism, and corrupt Roman luxury”.³⁵ Allowing the denomination “Catholic” would legitimize that tradition’s claims of being the universal religion, whereas “Popery” better describes the “true” nature of those “grievous wolves, / Who all the sacred mysteries of Heav’n / To their own vile advantages shall turn / Of lucre and ambition, and the truth / With superstitions and traditions taint”³⁶ Writers would attempt to “smear their opponents as less perfectly opposed to Papism than themselves”.³⁷ Polemicists used Anti-Catholicism in appeals to Protestant solidarity in England and to accuse opponents of undermining that solidarity. This anxiety is consistently on the fringes of most any dispute over indulgence, as authors formulate arguments to exclude Catholics from the possibility of religious freedom.

Even though the Catholic “bogeyman” terrorized many English minds, educated authors understood the confessional struggle as a complex issue. The Catholic Church in the seventeenth century had its own internal divisions, and that tension was observed by

³⁵ Raymond D. Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660-1745* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998), 13

³⁶ John Milton, *Paradise Lost* in *John Milton: The Complete Poems*, ed. John Leonard (London: Penguin, 1998), Book XII, lines 508-12

³⁷ Tumbleson, 7

many English. Most disruptive were Louis XIV's universalizing ambitions that put him at odds with the Court of Rome. By the 1670s, Louis was battling with French bishops who were loyal to the Papacy. These tensions "between the courts of Versailles and Rome" were, in part due to rumours that Louis planned "a French invasion of papal territories and [...] intended 'to throw off the Pope's authority'". Louis had achieved significant influence among "the increasingly Francophile Society of Jesus" which was regarded by commentators as full "rather [with] adversaries than friends" to the court of Rome.³⁸

The issues of contention between Rome and Versailles in the 1680s also saw public ecclesiastical dispute in London circa 1670. Much of the toleration controversy addressed state versus church authority. In France Gallican bishops were "defending Louis XIV's position and denying both the pope's temporal power and his infallibility".³⁹ In England High-Flying Anglicans offered similar arguments in support of Charles II. Whether the magistrate possesses power over and against the church was often debated in the Restoration. In England, that power was most significantly supported by Samuel Parker. That Louis with his Jesuit support was the most prominent pursuer of that power indicates that quasi-Erastian ecclesiastical absolutism has a particularly French flavour in a seventeenth-century context. That "Popish" threats often implicated crypto-Jesuit agents before openly Catholic recusants further indicates that the distinction held currency in England as well. It is against this threat of French-flavoured churchmanship in England, not against loyal English Catholics, that Marvell makes his stand.

³⁸ Pincus, 122.

³⁹ Ibid, 123.

Fears of Popery were rooted in the same international politics that Pincus follows in the Revolutionary history. Anxieties in many cases were as much with Louis XIV's oppressive brand of Gallican Catholicism as with problems of doctrine, and the concerns of many in the ecclesiastical public were the secular aspects of the religious. In the toleration controversy, spiritual concerns were often subordinate to the socio-political ramifications inherent to regulating religion. The arguments seek the religious legislation that would be most beneficial to England as a nation. Europe at this time was divided between republican-leaning states and absolutist monarchies, the United Provinces the archetype for the former and France the latter. A more comprehensive national religious policy for England – that is, a heterogeneous or pluralist religious nation in the emerging liberalist sense – ran parallel to a commercial republican agenda. The universalizing impulse was favourable to the absolutist cause.

The new liberal religious platform was the target of clerical suspicion. For Samuel Parker's High-Church position, against which Marvell intervenes in 1672, the dissenting resistance to ornate worship is motivated not by a desire to perfect Christianity, but by a paranoid anti-Papist iconoclasm: "And because the Church of Rome had clogg'd Christianity with too many garish and burdensome Ceremonies, they did not immediately strip her naked of all modest and decent Ornaments out of an over-hot opposition to their too flanting Pomp and Vanity, but only cloathed her in such a Dress, as became the Gravity and Sobriety of Religion".⁴⁰ Parker complains that this paranoia leads dissenting and nonconformist authors to fire confused allegations of Popery against the Church of England: "because the Church of Rome by her unreasonable Impositions has invaded the

⁴⁰ Parker, *Discourse*, 24-25.

Fundamental Liberties of mankind, they presently conclude all restraints upon licentious Practices and Perswasions about Religion under the hated name of Popery”. Parker aligns religious pluralism with Popish plotting: “And what do they, but set up a Pope in every mans Conscience, whilst they vest it with a Power of countermanding the *Decrees of Princes?*”⁴¹ The tolerationists take the opposite stance. For the dissenters, the tyranny of a universalizing religion will either raise the bishops above King or Parliament, or invest the King with an absolute power over church and state, following the French model. Both liberal positions would be later championed by Marvell and the Whigs after him. The anti-clerical position feared the revival of even more severe persecutions, while the anti-absolutist position opposed the state’s right to legislate doctrine.

2. Public Representations in Print

Most of the primary literature originating from these four groups was produced by its leadership. This literature, as we shall see, is on one hand highly factional with battle lines that foreshadow those of the 1688 Revolution, but usually offers a theme of peace and reconciliation, however disingenuously. Especially when examining the laity, these groups were indistinct. That a person may identify him- or herself as a Congregationalist or a follower of a Puritan Presbyterian such as Richard Baxter did not mean that person had no ties to the national church: “Almost everyone of note in Charles II’s England was an outwardly conforming member of the Church of England, even if they also frequented Nonconformist conventicles, Roman Catholic masses, or atheist debauches”.⁴² Despite the

⁴¹ Ibid, 24, 210.

⁴² Spurr, *Post-Reformation*, 147.

culture of persecution indicated by the Clarendon Code, the English church-going public could seek religion on many different fronts. Nonconformist or independent ministers, in exiting the episcopacy, found increased independence. But the theological and ecclesiastical freedoms that independence offers come at the cost of a lost patron and possibly more serious sanctions. Consequently, nonconformist ministers would seek economic support from the public. In fact, the nonconformist ministers' separation from the national church caused them to become financially dependent on their congregations, as they had lost the patronage that a bishop provides.⁴³

It is to a wider vehicle of publicity and/or public opinion that Restoration ecclesiastical controversy appeals, whether traditionally or theatrically, but the audience's narrowness fettered these ambitions. In effect, the existence of nonconforming ministries created a fledgling marketplace for English Protestantism to which authors appealed. The act of writing for the ecclesiastical public was a process of self-representation in the face of public opinion. Without more extreme threats such as Elizabethan pyres, private opinion could bear on the configuration of a citizen's religious life: "Choice was a reality for at least some of the English". Ejected ministers, at least until the Five Mile Act became law, were free to enjoy the vibrant ecclesiastical scene from the pews: "Although as clergy they were personally excluded from the ministry by the Uniformity Act, there was nothing to bar them or their lay followers from attending the worship of the Church of England or the sermons of the best Anglican preachers".⁴⁴ Nonconformist and independent ministries offered supplemental biblical education to parishioners that desired to go further than

⁴³ Christopher Hill, *Economic Problems of the Church* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1956), 304.

⁴⁴ Spurr, *Puritanism*, 132, 133.

worship in the Church of England, and “many puritans or nonconformists did attend their parish church, even if they attended for only part of the service or for occasional services”. Conventiclers gathered for a variety of reasons, whether they were seeking unofficial worship, alienated by the national church, or attracted by prospect of an influential minister: “Those lay people who came to the houses of men like Baxter seeking further instruction and worship were drawn by the reputation and charisma of these famous and now silenced divines, and impelled by their dissatisfaction with the church”.⁴⁵

The Restoration culture of censorship added hazards to independent ministers’ bids for public influence. The licensing acts made oppositional publication a dangerous, but not impossible, prospect. The coercive authority of licensing was less than completely effective in establishing state control over public discourse, as indicated by the frequency by which unlicensed texts were printed and sold: “even the existence of Draconian punishments for involvement in the print-publishing of heterodox or treasonable books was not sufficient to prevent the production of dissident texts, either by courageous, ideologically committed printers and booksellers or for under-the-counter sale at high mark-up by the trade at large”.⁴⁶ Roger L’Estrange’s licensing was unable to suppress all oppositional literature for a number of systematic reasons. First, the licensing office was not fully effective due to a lack of manpower in its *ad hoc* structure. Following the Restoration, millenarian sects had persistently produced seditious and treasonous materials that associated the crown and Restoration with the apocalypse and coincided with violent uprisings: “Radical publications triggered proposals for better control of the press in July

⁴⁵ Ibid, 134, 136.

⁴⁶ Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 187-8.

1661”.⁴⁷ Being shorthanded, the Surveyor’s efforts first addressed the suppression of sects that advocated violence and upheaval. Presbyterians and more passive independent dissenters who fell under the same reactionary legislation thus found some room to manoeuvre. Of 458 extant items considered in a survey of the book trade in 1668, “Only 52 books bear some form of license. There are only 79 entries for the year in the Register [... presumably because] licensing could be safely neglected for non-controversial books; and that it *had* to be evaded for controversial ones”.⁴⁸ In practice, licensing and registration only applied to a narrow category of texts on topics that had potential for sedition and/or heresy and further required copyright protection.

The supervision of oppositional literature was further complicated by the prevalence of clandestine publication. Even guild-approved shops participated in the production of unacknowledged works: “The incidence of anonymous printing is over 54%: 268 of the items extant for the year bear no indication of the printer’s name”. D. F. Mackenzie reports that shops often had many times the number of employees than even a liberal estimate would declare necessary to complete their registered output, and many labourers were under employment agreements of dubious legitimacy, unbound and unregistered. Eventually the Surveyors’ complaints to the crown forced the Stationers to take responsibility for policing their own industry. However, rather than destroying illegal materials, they began confiscating print from unregistered presses and reselling – and thus

⁴⁷ Richard L. Greaves, *Deliver us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663* (New York and Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986), 216.

⁴⁸ D. F. McKenzie, “The London Book Trade in 1668”, in *Making Meaning: “Printers of the Mind” and Other Essays*, ed. Peter D. McDonald and Michael F. Suarez (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 118.

distributing – materials for profit in a politically corrupt extortion racket. The offending presses would remain with those criminal printers.⁴⁹

This conflict between the financial benefits of illegal printing and the task of censorship illustrates the battle of interests at work in the Restoration. The illegality of these materials did not stop communication. As with any form of contraband, suppression created a lucrative black-market industry. The futility of licensing and the value of the forbidden word are exemplified by single-sheet nonconformist pamphlet *Two Points of Great Moment* (1672), by J.H.⁵⁰ This text contains a prefatory note to the print industry, apologizing for the act of self-publication, because “*it being against one of your Licensers [Parker], none of you durst do it*”. The author emphasizes the pamphlet’s scarcity as the result of a seizure and the subsequent commercial opportunity that the censored pamphlet offers: “*I intend to give part of them to my friends, and have but Sixty or Seventy to sell. If the buyer gives you not your first price, raise it at next Asking: for if they are not like, in all these Circumstances, to get one of them again upon any Termes*”. Humfrey’s “Sixty or Seventy” illustrates the small audience to which these authors would speak. The exorbitant 20d for the bookseller and a minimum of 2s for the buyer demonstrates how complicit booksellers were willing to undermine the licensing process on the nonconformists’ behalf to further their own commercial and devotional interests. Following the 1666 fire, the illegal print industry increased due to “desperate measures on the part of some printers and booksellers eager to publish sedition to cover their losses”.⁵¹ Despite the threat of the

⁴⁹ Ibid, 115,116-7, 119.

⁵⁰ John Humfrey, though an inscription on the first page of Wing H3713 reads “John Rowley Hemingford”; it is unclear if this is an attribution of authorship or ownership.

⁵¹ Nic

surveyor's office, illegal print had enough market potential that entrepreneurial or sympathetic booksellers handled unlicensed materials. Through such alternate channels, oppositional ideas reached a public.

Indeed, authors' printing habits suggest an awareness of their places within the larger system of communication. Episcopalian authors enjoyed the benefits that membership in the establishment offered. As Samuel Parker was an official licenser he was almost above the law, and, as Humphrey's prefatory apology indicates, he wielded that authority to his advantage. In some cases, authors relied on the appearance of their books as much as on the content in the marketing of a public image. The material characteristics of Simon Patrick's *The Friendly Debate* flaunt the author's official legitimacy for the purposes of projecting a dignified image. The dialogue format uses an excessive amount of space and thus represents a type of literary conspicuous consumption, especially when compared to the usual brevity of the pamphlet genre. The second instalment in the series, for example, contains the following exchange that in the second edition fills seven lines of text on what might have been a thirty-five line octavo page:

N.C. I have many things to say about Forms of Prayer, and yours in particular; especially about the imposing them; if you have the patience to hear me.

C. With all my heart: Only contract what you have to say, because I have some business stayes for me.⁵²

With fifty-five pages remaining in his book, Patrick stops to waste fifth of a page on an appeal to brevity. On the whole, the three instalments in his series are padded volumes that

holas von Maltzahn, "L'Estrange's Milton", in *Roger L'Estrange and the Making of Restoration Culture*, ed. Anne Dunan-Page and Beth Lynch (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 38.

⁵² Patrick, *A Continuation*, 193.

feature circuitous argument and embellished discussion. The dialogue layout leaves a substantial amount of white space.

Patrick is playing a game of image, publicity, and marketing. His book's appearance communicates much about his place in the ecclesiastical public. Patrick offers a complete and dignified trio of volumes with a separate appendix, cleanly printed and properly licensed. His books' clean appearance contrasts the dissenting literature that consists typically of brief, cheap, and often messy pamphlets. The pressures of illegal printing led dissenting voices to prefer frugal formats that could be published covertly and quickly. Humfrey's 31-page animadversion *A Case of Conscience* avoids direct citation in favour of saving space and reducing expense. The contrast between Humfrey's and Patrick's books speaks to the social categories that Patrick repeatedly stresses. In this respect, the dissenting authors are represented as radical, disorganized, uneducated, "mechanickal" vagabonds that exist on the fringes of legitimacy. Because its writers are able to publish without the threat of seizure, the episcopacy is able to make the most of its time in the press. Against rag-tag opposition, the Church of England assumes an air of dignity and stability before the ecclesiastical public that it courts.

Of course, the practical realities of publishing are what allowed Patrick to expend paper for the sake of appearances. The chances of his facing censorship or licensing issues were minimal. Patrick's third volume, *A Further Continuation and Defense*, is entered in the stationer's register for February 25, 1669/70 under the hand of Thomas Tomkyns, the High-Church chaplain who had licensed *Paradise Lost*, and Master Warden White. On September 23 1669, White co-signed with Patrick's colleague and co-contributor Samuel Parker, when Parker licensed his own anonymous *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity*. In Patrick's third volume, he accuses the opposition of publishing a hasty knee-jerk reaction to

the second: “he clapt on this Title as soon as the *Second part* appeared, and before he had duely weighed all things in it; for I know those that saw some of his sheets printed with that Title presently after *May* the 3d”.⁵³ Evidently because Patrick enjoyed benefits from his connections to who oversaw the press, censorship was for him an irrelevant obstacle, and even a tactical advantage in controversy. Unsurprisingly, Patrick thus defends the practice of policing the press: “to think the Nation be thus abused by every forward and daring man, who hath so good an opinion of himself, as to write Books, and become a Publick Instructor of others. If wise men will not take care to remedy it, they must be content to see themselves as well as us over-run with folly”.⁵⁴ Censorship offered Patrick and those like him the advantages of visibility and dignity.

Where Parker and Patrick had little to fear from the Surveyor or the state, they claim to lack a properly free press as a result of public resistance. It is telling that despite their clout, all of the texts they contributed to the toleration controversy lack the author’s name in the Stationers’ register. In the preface to *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Parker advises Patrick, identified obliquely as “that excellent Person, the Author of the *Debate*”, to maintain anonymity for safety’s sake:

[Patrick must] be careful how he lays aside his Vizour; for if ever they discover him, let him look to be pelted to purpose with Slanders, and blasting Reports: and though he be a Person of the Clearest and most unspotted Innocence, that is no fence against the foulest Aspersions; but if they ever find out the place of his Residence, let him assure himself, they will quickly find the next Dunghil to it, how clean soever he sweeps his own Door.⁵⁵

⁵³ Simon Patrick, *A Further Continuation and Defense, or a Third Part of the Friendly Debate* (London, 1670 [EEBO]), 14.

⁵⁴ Ibid, 135.

⁵⁵ Parker, *Discourse*, xviii.

Patrick makes a similar accusation in the third part of *The Friendly Debate* in emphasizing that loyalists and those that attempt to oppose the nonconformist cause are unfairly abused by separatists: “Let any man attempt to apply a Remedy to these Mischiefs, by making a plain Discovery of such Mistakes; presently a terrible Persecution is raised against him, and a Troop, or Army rather, of enraged Zealots not only assault and wound, but endeavour to destroy his reputation”.⁵⁶ Both Church of England authors project images of tradition and stability to distinguish the episcopacy as a bulwark against the chaos threatened by their allegedly “radical” opponents.

So even though the Church of England writers did not face state persecution, their writing is not from a wholly protected position. Their claims suggest that, like their dissenting rivals, they faced a backlash from some members of the public to which they appealed. Patrick and Parker assumed some degree of anonymity as a result. The self-styled risk taking that Patrick and Parker claim allows them to appropriate the dissenting claim of martyr-like suffering for their beliefs. They seek to legitimize their status as controversialists that are doing more than protecting a selfish interest: “You shall not pass for the only nice and tender Conscienc’d men”.⁵⁷ In effect, they seek to have the public opinion regard them as something other than malevolent persecutors; a counter-measure against the representation of selfless piety offered by their “Puritan” opponents.

⁵⁶ Patrick, *A Further Continuation*, vii.

⁵⁷ Patrick, *A Continuation*, 38.

3. Sedition and Dissent

Substantial effort is made on the part of the ecclesiastical authors to define themselves and each other in the sphere of public opinion. The struggle for religious identity sets the context for political debate and conflicts over national public interest. Authors that survived or evaded the licensing process critically engaged with state policy on a platform visible to the open audience, and debated the relationship between political and moral issues. For example the anonymous moderate pamphlet *A Proposition for the Safety and Happiness of the Kingdom* (1667) uses terms of meekness and piety in an attempt to persuade with *pathos*:

Have there not been some, nay many of those Ministers whom you have ejected by your Acts, serious Persons, faithfull Labourers, and worthy of the Vineyard? And why have you imposed such conditions to the entrance or continuance of their Ministry, as they cannot yield unto without going against their Consciences?⁵⁸

The author of this text represents him or herself as existing apart from the state, at least in any obvious official capacity as an author. But in this passage he or she addresses the legislative measures to which nonconformist ministers are subjected and directly appeals to the more open models that gain currency following the revolution. He or she offers a version of events where the persecution is an act of injustice against meek loyal subjects. That such dissenting voices were able to circumvent the censorship and domination measures to offer such images to public opinion indicates not an ideal public sphere, but a functioning one nonetheless. Penalties were indeed exercised against dissenting authors, printers, and booksellers, resulting in numerous imprisonments, substantial fines, and at least one execution – not to mention the numerous livelihoods destroyed by these policies –

⁵⁸ Lover of Sincerity & Peace, *A Proposition for the Safety and Happiness of the King and Kingdom Both in Church and State* (London, 1667 [EEBO]), 80-1

and this persecution cannot be ignored. Nor were the dissenters silent about their persecution. Many dissenters repeatedly stress the trials that they have suffered as a result of their efforts to serve Church and God.

Such marketing and publicity has a theatrical quality. An appeal to public opinion is an act of posturing and characterization in hopes that readers will sympathize and/or identify. Simon Patrick characterizes the non-conforming laity to whom the dissenting authors market as a “*well-meaning and abused people*” whom sectarian leaders exploit to further their financial and political aspirations.⁵⁹ Patrick’s *Friendly Debate* series is a counter-effort to the dissenters’ marketing. He undermines the persecutor-martyr binary suggested above in his dialogue between an articulate conformist and a bumbling nonconformist.

Patrick writes to carefully control reader perceptions. His fictional conformist is especially concerned by the appeal that charismatic preachers have for nonconformist congregations and the political support that they find in the open ecclesiastical marketplace. The nonconformist appeals to the “life and power” of nonconformist ministries, and the conformist rebuts by arguing for content and substance over style:

I told you before, that I find nothing so powerful as the Christian Doctrine rationally handled. And if the Faith of *Christ* be not so preached as I now told you, for my part I fell no force in the loudest words that I hear; but am apt to say as the man did when he shear’d his Hogs, *Here is a great deal of noise, and little wool.*

When the nonconformist renews the claim that the dissenting ministers move “affections” more than the Episcopalians, the conformist further objects to using that criterion for judging the churches. The conformist argues that theatrical spectacle distracts from the actual doctrinal content and undermines the seriousness of worship:

⁵⁹ Patrick, *A Continuation*, a2^r.

there are two ways to come at the Affections: One by the Senses and Imagination; and so we see people mightily affected with a Puppet-play, with a Beggar's tone, with a lamentable Look, or anything of like nature. The other is by the Reason and Judgment; when the evidence of any Truth convincing the Mind, engages the affections to its side, and makes them move according to its direction.

The conformist sees the nonconformist as moved by theatrical embellishments: “melting Tones, pretty Similitudes, riming Sentences, kind and loving Smiles, and sometimes dismally sad looks; besides several Actions or Gestures which are very taking”. The Church of England, on the other hand, refrains from using such appeals, “For the better sort of Hearers are now out of love with these things.”⁶⁰ Patrick has a hierarchical attitude. His gesture towards “better Hearers” offers an image of the Church of England congregations as dignified and intellectual (and likely of a higher class), put against the easily duped followers of the independent divines.

Patrick thus inverts a standard Puritan argument that accuses the Church of England of pursuing outward refinement at the expense of inward spiritual substance. Where nonconformists insisted that High-Church ritual, notably the wearing of a surplice, signifies prelatical greed and distracts from true godliness, Patrick makes the case that the “moving affectation” and eloquence praised in nonconformist ministers is a rhetorical luxury that hides a lack of reasonable substance in their sermons. In this figuration, nonconformist ministries attract members by relying upon the entertainment value of a product to woo and mislead the vulgar. Patrick's critique of theatrical preaching accuses dissenting ministries of engaging in free-market divinity, whereby worshipers are lured away from the national church by the vibrant eloquence of the dissenting sermons.

⁶⁰ Patrick, *A Friendly Debate*, 11.

Patrick further alleges a seditious connection between the nonconformist ministries and the rising merchant class. Nonconformity and commercialism represented similar threats to the status quo. The landed gentry and the national episcopacy both appealed to conservative values and a society with a stable ruling class at its core. Merchants were a new and unpredictable force, for in commercial societies wealth, and therefore power, moves with market fluctuations. England's unlanded merchants were gathering power without the traditional land assets of the aristocracy, and the nonconformist free-market ministries were finding influence without the restrictions imposed by the institutional Church of England. Dissenters were winning congregations through the force of public opinion. The diction points to the political conflict: *zeal*, *fanaticism*, and *enthusiasm* are stock-words used in smearing the Presbyterians, Puritans, and Parliamentarians who in the Restoration took the blame for the bloodshed of the English civil war.

These concerns with the threats of religiously motivated sedition and foreign influence – “Popery”, “Enthusiasm”, and “Zeal” – replace political economy in the open debates of the ecclesiastical public. Habermas defines his transformative public as an open group that debates economic issues in terms of the well-being of the nation, empire, and world. While the policy shift towards wealth and trade, from a land-based economic strategy to labour economy occurs after the 1688 revolution, England by the 1670s had already begun to boast a merchant economy. Ecclesiastical authors' appeals to political economy and “interest” or “state interest” indicate that the struggle over political economy was already occurring by the 1670s. Owen ends *Indulgence and Toleration Considered* with a gesture towards economic concerns that aligns him with the future Williamite interest: “There is no Nation under Heaven, wherein such an INDULGENCE or TOLERATION as is desired, would be more Welcome, Useful, Acceptable, or more

subservient to Tranquility, Trade, Wealth and Peace”.⁶¹ Evidently, Owen writes for an audience with trade and manufacturing interests, whether to the rising bourgeois merchant class, or to entrepreneurial aristocrats such as Buckingham.

On the other hand, the Church of England authors focus on the destabilizing aspects of commercial interests. Both Episcopalian divines in question, the Low Churchman Patrick and the High-Flying Samuel Parker, weave economic arguments into a partially-faulty narrative of a religiously-motivated uprising in the 1640s. The imagery of “zealots”, “infantry”, and “wild youths” taking up a cause against established institutions would grimly resonate of the Interregnum for readers in the late 1660s, when memories of the New Model Army and the regicide were still fresh. Parker’s response to Owen’s commercial appeal directly contradicts the argument that indulgence would further economic interests and stabilize English interests: “’tis notorious, that there is not any sort of People so inclinable to Seditious Practices as the Trading part of a Nation; [...] if we reflect upon our late miserable Distractions, ’tis easie to observe, how the Quarrel [i.e. the Civil War] was chiefly hatch’d in the Shops of Tradesmen, and cherish’d by the Zeal of Prentice-boys, and City-gossips”.⁶² Parker insists that Owen is naive for not seeing that a merchant’s pursuit of personal profit trumps his loyalty to the common wealth, particularly when that self-interest is not supervised by a national church: “He is a very silly man, and understands nothing of the Follies, Passions, and Inclinations of Humane Nature, who sees not that there is no Creature so ungovernable, as a Wealthy Fanatick”.⁶³ Parker prioritizes

⁶¹ John Owen, *Indulgence and Toleration Considered in a Letter Unto a Person of Honour* (London, 1667 [EEBO]), 32.

⁶² Parker, *Discourse*, xxxix.

⁶³ *Ibid*, xli.

the stabilizing effects of a universalizing ecclesiology over liberal pluralist ideologies and merchant interests. Owen in turn counters by openly wondering if Parker ever

really considered what the meaning of that word *Trade* is, and what is the concernment of this Nation in it? or is he so fond of his own Notions and Apprehensions, as to judge it meet that the Vital Spirits and Blood of the Kingdom should be offered in Sacrifice unto them? *Solomon* tells us, that the *profit of the Earth is for all, and the King himself is served by the field*.⁶⁴

Owen appears to subscribe to a more complex (perhaps modern) model of economics than Parker, or at the least he projects an image of such awareness. Owen acknowledges how national finances are driven by commercial interests. The interdependence of trade and toleration leads to his concluding that a heterogeneous public is necessary rather than destructive.

In his own separate response to Owen, Richard Perrinchief broaches another archetypal point of English political economy in suggesting that toleration is only feasible in an absolute police state. The proposed religious diversity both recalls Protectorate policy and foreshadows James II's reign:

a *Standing Army* is necessary to suppress those tumults which often on a suddain like Earthquake do arise among the dissenting Parties, which if not immediately crush'd, may gather strength, while a force is to be formed against them. And that such Tumults may arise from that party which is *Established* by Law as well as the *Tolerated*, who may be insolent in their own power and advantages, and seek to violate the Faith of the Prince which is given to the Tolerated. And therefore the Sword of a *Standing Army* is to be a terroure not only to the Tolerated, but also to the Established Parties.⁶⁵

The overarching issue, for Perrinchief, is that the cultural fallout from heterogeneous worship threatens the constitutional liberties enjoyed by the English. This problem of national health and policy is a major issue for the ecclesiastical public. The interest of

⁶⁴ Owen, *Truth*, 78-9.

⁶⁵ Perrinchief, *Indulgence*, 50.

traders and artisans is but one of many minor points between Owen and Parker, and on the whole specifically economic discussion is a secondary issue in this controversy.

Controversial side issues such as trade or standing armies reflect the larger ongoing political conflicts that occur in the Restoration and Revolution, aligning authors with English constitutional or absolutist, or crypto-French interests.

Consequently, authors' diction helps to map the relationship between political and religious issues. The terms that Owen and Parker attach to issues of trade and wealth – “subservient”, “tranquility”, and “peace” versus “seditious”, “miserable”, and “zeal” – are significant, because these labels are common in the larger religious debate. Both authors are using economic consequences of their competing ecclesiastical models as supporting arguments in their polemical appeals to readers. That ecclesiastical controversy subordinated economics to religious issues does not mean that the other key part of political economy, the growth and well-being of the nation, is absent. The debate concerns what model the nation should choose. The battle is to define the secular aspects of religion and to determine what configuration best serves the health and well-being of the English nation, a “socially anchored ideological conflict”⁶⁶ that establishes a political morality before attempting to define a political economy. Where Habermasian accounts stress the importance of the debate over political economy as a fundamental force in the growth of the bourgeois public sphere, the ecclesiastical public offers a suitable substitute. The focus on religious issues before economic issues is not evidence of pre- or anti-modern naiveté.

⁶⁶ Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, “Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England”, in *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (Manchester & New York: Manchester UP, 2007), 3.

Parker explicitly prioritizes political morality over that of political economy in creating a strong society:

Agreement in [religion] is the first, if not the only foundation of Peace: and therefore, let that be first established upon firm and lasting Principles; (which it easily may by severe Laws faithfully executed, but otherwise never can.) But till it is done, 'tis just as wise and safe for a Prince to enrich his Subjects with Trade and Commerce, as 'tis to load weak and unfinished Foundations with great and weighty Superstructures.⁶⁷

Despite their disagreement, Owen's and Parker's commercial arguments both indicate that the "execution" of "severe Laws" to stabilize England's culture, in support of one faction or the other, is a necessary precursor to the merchant state that opens Habermas's eighteenth-century public sphere. Anxieties over church government, the freedom of radical sects, Catholicism, and French interests are not trivial squabbling: preservation of the English Protestant national identity is at least as essential to the national interest as is improvement of the nation's troubled finances. Each controversialist pursues a set of interests, be it pleasing an episcopal patron, speaking for a congregation that supports his family, or lobbying to be allowed to come within five miles of his own home. The terms of the argument connect that personal interest to the religious or moral interest of the ecclesiastical public in England as a whole, and typically attempt to establish why the argument that represents the author's personal interest also advances the interests of English Protestants. Finally, the connection between ecclesiastical interests and wider public interests receives emphasis, usually in the connections among morality, peace, and stability.

Issues surrounding persecution are a further dimension of political morality.

Generally speaking, dissenting camps pleaded for an end to Clarendon Code persecution,

⁶⁷ Parker, *Discourse*, xlv.

and the Episcopalians countered that religious non-conformity was equivalent to civil disobedience. Parker's lengthy prefaces reflect on the act of engaging in controversy and present persecution as a justifiable moral and political necessity. He asserts in the preface to *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity* that his writing in support of the established church is intended to advance "true Piety" that "both adorns, and advances Humane Nature" and "is so highly advantageous to the peace and happiness of the World; that it carries in it all that is amiable and lovely, all that is cheerful and ingenuous, all that is useful and profitable". He even adds an apology for engaging in political writing: "And though I dare not be so sawcy as to teach my Superiours, how to Govern the Kingdom, out of Ezekiel, or the Revelations; yet I will presume to put up this single Petition, in order to the security of our Publick Peace and Settlement".⁶⁸ In short, Parker's hierarchical position proposes a French-style absolutist persecuting state that locates authority in royal fiat.

By negative example, Patrick's and Parker's versions make the case that religious indulgence is against the interests of national stability. Even though the nonconformist camps claim to be loyal subjects invested in a project of peace and national unity, they are not to be taken at their word. In Parker's account, the civil war was caused by a Reformation attitude: "that Fanatick Zeal began to alter the present Settlement of the Church, that it ever [*sic*] ceased till it had involved State and all in Ruine and Confusion".⁶⁹ A penal policy is justified in stabilizing the nation against such another seditious threat. Parker's attitude, like Patrick's, is hierarchical, and the nation of "weak, silly, and ignorant" minds seduced by Presbyterians must be corrected and set into order, regardless of the

⁶⁸ Ibid, xxix, xiii-xix.

⁶⁹ Samuel Parker, "a Preface Shewing what Grounds there are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery", in John Bramhall, *Bishop Bramhall's Vindication of Himself and the Episcopal Clergy* (London, 1672 [EEBO]), d5^{r-v}.

motivations of the misguided subjects: “it must expose them to the Correction of the Publick Rods and Axes”.⁷⁰ Parker issues his “grand thesis” in stating the aim of his weighty book: “By proving it to be absolutely necessary to the Peace and Government of the World, that the Supreme Magistrate of every Common-wealth should be vested with a Power to govern and conduct the Consciences of Subjects in Affairs of Religion”.⁷¹ The thesis underscores Parker’s participation in a public debate in the pursuit of a political morality. Whatever the grandiose posturing for which his reputation eventually suffers in Marvell’s writing, Parker’s arguments for persecution profess the public and national good.

The Church of England authors evoke the worst royalist caricatures of the Interregnum in encouraging readers to associate nonconformists with the most radical sects. The Episcopalian position supports the Clarendon Code as a measure for enforcing the necessary political morality. Patrick goes as far as to claim that the measures taken against non-Anglicans are not persecution, but mere law enforcement efforts to preserve “Publick Order”.⁷² Even the Five Mile Act is a measure of kindness rather than malice: “I am such a friend to you [the Non Conformist] that I desire to see you at the widest distance from any sin”.⁷³ Patrick’s conformist holds that the moral stakes in indulgence or comprehension are dire for England:

We know very well, that many men who are converted to you are so far from being good that they become worse than they were before: More haughty and conceited of themselves; more unmannerly to their betters, disobedient to their Masters and

⁷⁰ Parker, *Discourse*, 7, 219.

⁷¹ Ibid, 10.

⁷² Patrick, *A Further Continuation*, 234.

⁷³ Ibid, 41-2.

Governours, unbridled in their language, unpeacable and troublesome to their neighbours.⁷⁴

Although his conformist is addressing a nonconformist, that is the lay-follower of a Presbyterian minister, Patrick clearly intends to draw parallels to anti-hierarchical sects, such as the Quakers, whose contempt for the established social order was notorious. Patrick draws attention to anti-hierarchical attitudes and anti-social behaviour in the dissenting camps. His intent is to direct the heightened national anxiety with civil disorder against the Presbyterian nonconformists.

The exchanges that occur over political economy and political morality indicate that ecclesiastical authors were seeking approval from an audience broader than fellow divines. The Parker-Owen-Perrinchief exchange over economics was an attempt to draw support from financial interests by identifying with either the older landed attitude or the newer commercial attitude. Patrick and Parker regularly appeal to those anxious about civil strife and the decay of traditional forms of authority. In this respect, Marvell's 1672 intervention on behalf of Owen and Baxter is an application of the existing marketing tactics to a new audience, appealing to fashion, wit, and the Habermasian coffee-house public.

4. Peace and Conscience

The dissenting authors whom Marvell later defends cultivate a public image distinct from those groups that are clearly seditious or treasonous. The Episcopalian authors emphasize the Church's institutional role in public peace, and reason that disorder will follow should that role be diminished by an act of indulgence. On the other hand, the dissenters invest that stabilizing power in the moral capacity of the English citizen. This

⁷⁴ Ibid, 282.

aspect of the dissenting position follows a democratic or constitutionalist impulse that locates power in individuals.

To the proto-Tory and/or crypto-Gallican charges of religious liberty as necessarily leading to moral anarchy, the nonconformist responses appeal to “conscience” as a principle of governance. In the terms of the toleration controversy, “conscience” is a guiding principle by which citizens settle contradictions between God’s divine dictates and commands of the magistrate. In the event of indecision,

The Christian conscience must then determine [...] whether the ecclesiastical commands of the magistrate in ‘Obligation or [in] liberty’, according to a personal judgement of the conformity of the magistrate’s commands to those of God. Should the individual determine that a particular command of the magistrate is inconsistent with the commands of God, then the individual takes the liberty of declining active obedience to that command.⁷⁵

The significance of this principle of a subject’s disobedience being contingent upon a guiding “conscience” rests in the uncertain meaning of the term. The issue of “conscience” and “consciences” in the toleration controversy is far more complex and significant than the dominant definitions of the words would indicate.

In fact, there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that in the context of this controversy “conscience” is frequently synonymous with “opinion”. For this reason, Hobbes derisively connects the two terms: “Men, vehemently in love with their own new opinions (though never so absurd) and obstinately bent to maintain them, gave those their opinions also that revered name of Conscience, as if they would have it seem unlawfull to change or speak against them”.⁷⁶ Habermas elaborates: “Hobbes was guided by the

⁷⁵ Gary de Krey, “Rethinking the Restoration: Dissenting Cases for Conscience 1667-1672,” *The Historical Journal* 38 (1995): 59.

⁷⁶ Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. C.B. Macpherson (New York & London: Penguin, 1968), 1.7:132.

experiences of the religious civil war and [...] projected a state based solely on the [authoritative speech] of the prince, independent of the convictions and views of the subjects”.⁷⁷ Hobbes associates conscience with a notion of personal or rational judgement instead of innate moral guidance. He sees those who use “conscience” in resisting the sovereign as appealing to subjective opinion and using a cop-out justification for disobedience. Perhaps following Hobbes, “the later seventeenth-century sees a growing readiness to describe as ‘opinions’ what would earlier have been called ‘beliefs’ or ‘articles of faith’”.⁷⁸ Alternately, Locke may have had the toleration controversy in mind when he wrote that “Persuasion, however got, will serve to set conscience on work; which is nothing else but our own opinion or judgment of the moral rectitude or pravity of our own actions; and if conscience be a proof of innate principles, contraries may be innate principles; since some men with the same bent of conscience prosecute what others avoid”.⁷⁹ For Locke, like Hobbes, conscience is a device to disguise subjective judgment as an inviolable internal guide.

When extended to the multiple – “consciences” rather than “conscience” – the notion begins to take the form of a collective self-reflection. In effect, when the ecclesiastical authors speak of “consciences” in relation to national stability, they speak of what is now called public opinion. Etymologically speaking “con-science” suggests shared knowledge or knowledge together (OED). Later emerged a sense of conscience as a person’s internal moral guide, and to this notion the authors appeal. This sense is a

⁷⁷ Habermas, 82.

⁷⁸ Blair Worden, “The Question of Secularization”, in *A Nation Transformed*, ed. Alan Houston and Steve Pincus (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001), 31.

⁷⁹ John Locke, *An Essay Upon Human Understanding: Complete and Unabridged* ed. Alexander Campbell Fraser (New York: Dover, 1959), 1:71-2.

specifically individualized concept, and a countable noun (OED 4). The plural of that sense, “consciences” is what receives greatest emphasis, meaning a collection of individual rational moral judgements and opinions. The frequently-mentioned “tender consciences” denotes those opinions that are easily impressed or swayed. When dissenting authors suggest that Christian “consciences” will promote peace and stability in the nation, they mean that the modern force of public opinion will serve as a suitable check on church and state power.

Because of the conflicts of the 1640s and 50s, the dissenting platform puts high priority on projecting a peaceful public image. In stark contrast to the Church of England apologists’ grim representations of prospective indulgence leading to further civil war, Baxter writes in a utopian tone, emphasizing that it is in England’s interest as a nation if its citizens strive to cooperate and attempt to be “zealous for Peace”.⁸⁰ Such literature contains numerous disclaimers distancing Dissent from the civil war imagery that Patrick and Parker exploit. Baxter’s “factional” pamphlet *The Cure for Church Divisions* is a lengthy collection of sixty “DIRECTIONS FOR Weak Christians, How they may escape the troubling, dividing and endangering of the Church by their Errours in Doctrine, Worship, and Church-Communion” and twenty-two “Directions to Pastors how to deal with those weak Christians who are inclined to Divisions”.⁸¹ The eighty-two directives are appeals to thoughtful rather than passionate leadership, warnings against faction, pleas for charity and forgiveness, and condemnations of pride and jealousy.

⁸⁰ Richard Baxter, *The Cure of Church Divisions* (London, 1670 [EEBO]), C1^v.

⁸¹ *Ibid*, 1, 412.

The book is yet another effort to influence public opinion, and Baxter's audience is twofold. First, of course, he encourages "Weak Christians" and "Pastors" to pursue a stable political morality. But he also uses his status as a Puritan leader to parry attacks and slurs. One such smear comes from Patrick's conformist, who left-handedly concedes that many loyalists unfairly "brand all that are of strickt and Holy Lives with the Name of *Presbyterian, Phanatick*, or some such like".⁸² The underlying charge is that Presbyterianism is an extreme position. Baxter instead represents himself and his community as moderate and peaceful, rather than radical and zealous. Baxter creates distance between Presbyterianism and Interregnum policy to avoid association with the civil wars. In *The Cure for Church Divisions*, nonconformist Christian zeal is a unifying force that will contribute to stability and prosperity, rather than a destructive one. Baxter offers a pluralist or heterogeneous model for a stable ecclesiastical public.

John Owen promotes the stabilizing aspects of peaceful sects and undermines the efficacy of universalizing ecclesiastical policies. He appeals first to historical precedent in analysing the efficacy and propriety of enforced uniformity and persecution. He equates persecution and the Church of England's vehemence with a lack of Christian love in order to thrust the accusations of schism back upon his detractors: "But suppose we should wave all such considerations, and come up to a *full Conformity* unto all that *is*, or *shall*, or *may* be required of us; will this give us an universally pleadable acquitment from the charges of the Guilt of want of Love, Schism and Divisions?"⁸³ Like his models for church organization, he follows the example of the apostolic church and early fathers. He identifies the

⁸² Patrick, *A Continuation*, 164.

⁸³ John Owen, *A Discourse Concerning Evangelical Love* (London, 1672 [EEBO]) 15.

persecuted religious minority with the earliest Christians: “Upon every occasion of trouble, the common cry was, *Christianos ad Leones*”. The blanket policy of suppressing all sects is precisely the injustice visited upon the early church: “the abominations of the *Gnosticks* of old, was charged upon the whole body of Christianity”.⁸⁴ He maintains that persecution is misguided, wasteful, and counterproductive when pursuing unity: “All the World knows, how full at this day it is of various Opinions and Practises in things concerning Religion; and how unsuccessful the Attempts of all sorts have been for their Extinguishment”.⁸⁵ His thesis is that forced uniformity will be as unsuccessful as the efforts inflicted upon early Christians. A policy of persecution will only serve to create more enemies for the national church. What Owen perceives as anti-Christian persecution counters the practice’s scriptural and theological rationalizations: “Atheisme will be the end of such an Endeavour”.⁸⁶ Owen’s stance is that persecution will undermine the spiritual advancements that England has achieved since the Reformation and smother his utopian Puritan dreams.

Furthermore, Owen pushes towards separation of church and state, in direct ideological conflict with Parker’s universalizing grand thesis. Owen depoliticizes nonconformity in an effort to quell anxieties: they “have no Form of Government, *Civil* or *Ecclesiastical*, to impose on the Nation; nay, no *pretence* unto *Power* to be exercised on the *Persons* of any of his *Majesties Subjects*; have no *Expectations* from *Persons* or *Nations*, that might induce [them] to further or promote any sinister aims of *other men*”.⁸⁷ If

⁸⁴ John Owen, *A Peace Offering* (London, 1667 [EEBO]), 5, 6.

⁸⁵ Owen, *Indulgence*, 18.

⁸⁶ *Ibid*, 16.

⁸⁷ Owen, *Peace*, 8.

dissenting congregations are legitimized, he insists that no revenge for persecution will follow: “we shall endeavour also to exercise all Duties of the same Love, Peaceableness, and Gentleness, towards them by whom we are hated and reviled”.⁸⁸ Owen underscores his party’s loyalty to the nation and the divine right of Charles II, in support of the Declaration of Indulgence.⁸⁹ His politics are not entirely submissive. In locating “coercive jurisdiction” in “the King’s Majesty alone”, Owen implies that neither Parliament nor the Ecclesiastical courts possess the authority to persecute. As much as outwardly conforming citizens, the nonconforming Protestants of England are “willing to contribute to the utmost of their Endeavours, in their several places, unto its Peace and Prosperity”.⁹⁰ Persecution, in this formula, only alienates citizens from the crown and undermines the loyalty that is necessary to advancing the nation’s well-being.

In appealing to a stabilizing power of public opinion, the Presbyterian and Independent authors foreshadow the Habermasian notions that gain currency in the 1688 revolution. In combining economic power by supporting in dissident ministers, the nonconformist public to some extent empowered “subjects [that] were excluded from the public sphere objectified in the state apparatus”.⁹¹ The ecclesiastical public’s entrance into an intellectual marketplace foreshadows the bourgeois public sphere’s translation of social power into political power. This concentration of support represents an empowered force of public opinion that gave pause to royalists such as Patrick, Parker and L’Estrange, and forced Baxter and Owen to repeatedly assure readers that indulgence was not a prelude to

⁸⁸ Owen, *Love*, 258.

⁸⁹ Owen, *Peace*, 14.

⁹⁰ Owen, *Indulgence*, 20.

⁹¹ Habermas, 82.

political upheaval. Owen makes the appeal to the role of reason in religious identity in an attempt to undermine the *de facto* hegemony of the Episcopalian church. Rather than figuring religious affiliation as a given in life, for Owen, “[Every Englishman] is able also by *Natural Reason* to understand [civil law], so far as in point of Duty he is concerned, and is not at liberty to dissent from the Community. But as for Religion, it is the Choice of Men; and he that chuseth not his Religion, hath none”. Here Owen surrenders the protected position that “belief” or “faith” offer. He instead appeals to the place that religion takes in “*Minds and Consciences of Men*”⁹² and effectively moves religious identity into the realm of choice and opinion.

Examples of this usage are many, and this usage consistently indicates a constitutionalist attitude. Richard Baxter’s twenty-fourth directive to the laity implores Christians to make room for heterogeneity by respecting others’ consciences, and by implication, opinions: “it is not your censure of others that will warrant us to use them as Reprobates, forsaken of God. If every man that can be uncharitable enough, to call his neighbours Pharisees or enemies of Christ, without proof, shall keep us from communion with them, then the worse any man is, the more he shall be Lord of all other mens consciences”.⁹³ In *A Christian Directory* he declares that “God changeth not *his* Law and *our duty*, as oft as our opinions change about it. The obligation of the Law is still the same, though our Consciences err in apprehending it otherwise”.⁹⁴ Owen’s *Peace Offering* declares “That no force, coercion or restraint, is to be used in or about the Worship of God, nor outward power in a way of *Penalties*, to be exercised over the consciences of men

⁹² Owen, *Indulgence*, 19.

⁹³ Baxter, *The Cure*, 139.

⁹⁴ Baxter, *A Christian Directory* (London, 1673 [EEBO]), 135.

herein”.⁹⁵ In *Discourse concerning Evangelical Love* he attacks Popish tyranny as shackling the liberty to form an independent opinion: “Especially is it so, where an Empire over the *Reason*, Faith and Consciences of men is affected; which first produced the fatal Engine of *Papal Infallibility*”.⁹⁶ Parker laments of the nonconformists, “what pitiful and incompetent Guides of their Actions their own Consciences are [...] that their Consciences are seized on by such morose and surly Principles, as make them, the rudest and most barbarous people in the World”.⁹⁷ In his “Preface”, Parker foreshadows the political power of public opinion in the problem of “an unsatisfied Conscience in Opposition to the Publick Laws: *i. e.* they must prostitute all the Wisdom and Power of Government to the Humour and Ignorance of the common People”.⁹⁸

In the emphasis placed on pluralism, opinion, openness, and toleration, the ecclesiastical public in Restoration England is a significant precursor to Habermas’ public sphere, especially in that it represents a developing conflict between constitutionalist and absolutist interests. Moreover, the tension between the pluralist and universalizing camps reflects the proto-revolutionary ideologies that Pincus situates in opposition to a French interest. The organization of a nonconformist congregation involves a rejection of the institutional state-sponsored church in favour of an autonomously-selected privately supported ministry. The abstract enfranchisement of non-landed persons allowed the ministries to “undercut the principle on which existing rule was based”.⁹⁹ The

⁹⁵ Owen, *Peace*, 25.

⁹⁶ Owen, *Love*, 9.

⁹⁷ Parker, *Discourse*, x.

⁹⁸ Parker, “Preface”, b2^r.

⁹⁹ Habermas, 28.

nonconformist literature further challenged many of the status-quo church principles and sought to reform the bases of the ecclesiastical public sphere, on the terms of multiple subjectivities. The congregations' acquisition of economic influence over their interests is part of the transformation of the political mechanisms of England. Even though this power was relatively small, nearly inconsequential in terms of the larger English political climate, the significance is not in the weight of the influence, but the growth. Any person that was not a male forty-shilling freeholder would, in supporting a minister, find political representation that non-voters could not receive from the state apparatus.

By endorsing a minister, a non-voting citizen could find in nonconformist sermons and literature a public representation that Parliament would not provide. Essentially, ministries outside of the Church of England allowed less-affluent English an opportunity to participate in the growing public sphere, at least on the ecclesiastical front. What is unclear at this point is the connection between the ecclesiastical public and the other subcultures of England as a whole. Even though authors appeal to non-religious lines of reasoning such as trade, land ownership, or national unity, their audience is still limited to those with interests in ecclesiastical literature and controversy. Those readers whose primary lay elsewhere would be less likely to read ecclesiastical texts: merchants prefer news, and fans of theatre prefer playbooks. In this respect, the ecclesiastical authors, though active internally, were unsuccessful in mobilizing the larger forces of public opinion. The precursors to Habermas's eighteenth-century ideal could not coalesce into the bourgeois Public Sphere while they remained separate insulated spheres. In considering this problem, Harold Love describes the emergence of a musical public beginning in the Restoration, and in concluding he makes some remarks that serve present purposes. He notes that an

English theatrical public had already formed by the end of the sixteenth century, and this theatrical public had a significant overlap with the musical public. Many of those English who visited churches for the sake of public musical performance, or who engaged in social forms of musical expression also regularly went to the playhouses. Because of this crossover, he thus queries: “If this was the situation of two closely intertwined publics with a large degree of overlap, what differences might we not expect from publics of a non-artistic kind?”¹⁰⁰

The example in question is such an overlap, involving a non-artistic public falling under the influence of an artistic one. The literature of the toleration controversy represents a politicized public in the midst of a battle for legitimacy and consequently recalls overlap between the theatrical and musical public. Marvell’s use of theatre opened a connection between theatre fans and readers of ecclesiastical controversy. *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*’s hybrid style packaged the toleration controversy in an appealing form for readers who otherwise remained distant from pitched exchanges on theology and church government. Theatre fans, coffee-house wags, and those simply looking for the fashionable joke on the town, in satisfying the regular desire, were exposed to toleration’s finer details.

¹⁰⁰ Love, “Music”, 269.

Chapter II: *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* as English Theatre

The anonymous manuscript satire “A Love-Letter to the Author of the Rehearsall Transpros’d” (1674) concludes with an ominous warning for its target, “Andrew”, to “Remember Perillus’s Bull”.¹ The connection between Andrew Marvell and Perillus, the legendary architect of the Brazen Bull, an ancient device of torture and execution, is an editorial upon his first pamphlets, and an apt one at that. This parting shot underscores the novelty of Marvell’s working through ecclesiastical controversy in more “literary” terms. As Perillus was an inventor and engineer, the allusion emphasizes how Marvell’s style represented an innovation in polemical strategy. But, as Marvell himself reminds us in his earlier “Flecknoe, an English Priest at Rome”, Perillus fell victim to his own masterpiece, and was roasted alive in the bull’s belly for the crime of its own horrific creation. The anonymous poet’s warning is a grim reminder to Marvell that an ill-intended creation can be turned against its inventor.

Marvell’s invention was the hybrid style of his pamphlets. His polemical debut, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, has a striking number of theatrical allusions, particularly when compared to earlier dissenting pamphlets. Tolerationist literature’s standard appeals to conscience, godliness, and the public good give way to a new literary strategy, one more sophisticated than hoping that the cause will be carried by the argument’s veracity and the author’s virtue. Marvell relies on literature, especially plays, in mocking Parker’s effrontery, and he makes attacking his opponent’s position a secondary concern. *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* makes direct reference to Shakespeare’s *Othello* and *The Merry*

¹ “A Love Letter to the Author of the Rehearsall Transpros’d.” In London, Royal Society MS 32, 41-54, (1673) [54].

Wives of Windsor, to Jonson's *The Alchemist*, Giovanni Battista Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido*, and John Caryl's *Sir Salomon; or The Cautious Coxcomb*. Marvell also relies on ideas, legends, and turns of phrase that, while of ambiguous origin, have strong parallels in or indirect links to *Macbeth*, *Richard III*, *Love's Labour Lost*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *I & II Henry IV*, and Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*. Most of all, there is the debt to the Duke of Buckingham's play *The Rehearsal*, which supplies numerous characters and jokes, as well as the title, for Marvell's entertaining first foray into political satire. In addition to "theatre", Marvell also evokes "the theatrical". He discusses Parker's arguments in terms of scenes, acts, and plays; considers prose as if performance, in terms of wit, railing, and raillery; he handles polemicists as actors, and polemics as burlesque side shows.

The Rehearsal Transpros'd represents a new form of English prose writing because it is the first major example of topical theatrical elements acquiring a central role in a pamphlet's polemical strategy. Gestures toward the similarities between pamphleteering and theatre had long been a convention. Parker's pre-1672 pamphlets against John Owen had already made reference to plays, and the dialogue format employed in Simon Patrick's *Friendly Debate* mirrors the basic style of printed theatre. Long before, Francis Bacon had in 1589 admonished both the Episcopal and the oppositional pamphleteers participating in the Martin Marprelate controversy for engaging in debate "whereby matter of religion is handled in the stile of the stage". Marvell knew of Bacon's critique, which he quotes in *The Second Part*.² Scholars have identified "playlets" and "dramatic pamphlets" as a polemical genre in the 1640s, especially following the Long Parliament crisis and the 1642 closure: "the energy of the theatrical traditions ran into other channels after the closing of

² Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ed. Annabel Patterson (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2003), 1:433.

the playhouses”.³ What sets Marvell apart from these predecessors is the dominant role that theatre and the theatrical take in advancing his arguments. Allusion, equivocation, and simile play a part, but comedy takes the lead in *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*. Marvell’s opponents are addressed in proxy as characters from successful plays, arguments become scenes and plots, and witticisms are constructed by deftly shoe-horning topical issues into the complexities of memorable on-stage gags. While the more common critical approach to reading Marvell’s work regards it as satirical polemic coloured with rhetoric, his debt to Buckingham’s *Rehearsal* is so great that *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* could equally be described as a play re-cast into a pamphlet form, a drama *Transpros’d*.

The measure of Marvell’s success is that his opponents follow his example. As *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* controversy unfolds, the vocabulary of plays carries into the rebuttals that his opponents print. Moreover, the reading of politics and controversy as theatre rapidly gains currency as the authors become aware of the crossover between ecclesiastical and theatrical spheres. Even after the controversy settles, other controversialists follow the example of *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, distorting otherwise serious discourses with theatrical elements such as voice, plot, setting, character, or characterization. The newer entertaining mode of ecclesiastical controversy sits uneasily with authors, who apologize for their own style and admonish others’ breaches of decorum, even as they continue with this tactic.

The remainder of this argument examines Marvell’s short (documented) career as a polemicist from *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* in 1672 until his death in 1678. In this period he published five books as contributions to four separate controversies. Chapter II focuses

³ Butler, *Theatre and Crisis*, 238.

on *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* (1672) which, with its sequel *The Second Part* (1673), drew upon Buckingham's *The Rehearsal* to engage in the toleration controversy as a response to Samuel Parker. Parker in turn published *The Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd*, an aggressive *ad hominem* rebuttal. Other hostile responses to Marvell included those of Henry Stubbe, Edmund Hickeringill, four anonymous contributors, and Samuel Butler, author of *Hudibras* and one of several contributors to *The Rehearsal*.⁴ Sympathetic responses included the Earl of Castlemaine, a high-profile Catholic recusant, who gestured to Marvell in his own ongoing dispute with William Lloyd,⁵ and later, but famously, Jonathan Swift, who in *A Tale of a Tub* praised Marvell's style even while arguing a contradictory position. Later in the 1670s, other pamphleteers such as Vincent Alsop and Thomas Danson take cues from Marvell's successes and employ aggressive burlesque in their own writings.

Chapter III documents the development from *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* into Marvell's later style. The third among Marvell's tracts, *Mr. Smirke; or, The Divine in Mode together with A Short Historical Essay Concerning General Councils, Creeds, and Impositions, in Matters of Religion* was published in 1675. While this tract possesses elements of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*'s hybrid style, the overall satire is noticeably less boisterous than its predecessors. *Mr. Smirke* draws upon Etherege's *The Man of Mode* in a style still reminiscent of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, though with less aggression.

Marvell's fourth known book, *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government in England*, entered into the mode of secret history in a narrative exposing the

⁴ *The Transproser Rehears'd* was long misattributed to Richard Leigh, see Nicholas von Maltzahn, "Butler's Milton" *Studies in Philology* 92 (1995): 482-95.

⁵ Martin Dzelzainis, "Marvell and the Earl of Castlemaine," in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (New York: St. Martins, 1999), 303-5.

English Crown's political concessions to the French State since the Treaty of Dover (1670). The long pamphlet interprets the 1670s as a coherent absolutist plot carried out by shadowy and influential actors working in the French interest, at the expense of England and its people. The *Account* exposes its conspiracy in the context of a Parliamentary history in a framework of acts and scenes. Even so, it avoids the more discursive conversational format of Marvell's other books, focusing primarily upon its grim subject matter and the exposure of political chicanery. It has been characterized as "a highly wrought narrative which, by allusion, authorial distancing, ironic inversion, and the suggestiveness of a sustained metaphorical structure, conveys by the contexture of its words a good deal more than a quick reading might suggest".⁶ The *Account* was the most notorious of Marvell's pamphlets. Marvell wrote to his nephew William Popple that "there have been great Rewards offered in private, and considerable in the Gazette, to any who could inform of the Author or Printer, but not yet discovered".⁷ This notoriety matured into a revered afterlife in Whig politics, and *Account* received the designation of "one of the progenitors and models of a radical historiography [...] designated 'secret history'" and "a sacred text of Whig history".⁸ Hyperbole aside, this book was a staple source for later histories: "That eighteenth-century Whig historians looked to Marvell's *Account* as an explanation of some of the most controversial events in the 1670s appears from the succession of narratives in

⁶ Conal Condren, "Andrew Marvell as Polemicist", in *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell* ed. Conal Condren and A.D. Cousins (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1990), 160.

⁷ Andrew Marvell, *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell* ed. H.M. Margoliouth and Pierre Legoulis (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1971), 2:357.

⁸ Annabel Patterson, "Marvell and Secret History," in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (New York: St. Martins, 1999), 27, 26.

which he is present, if not always cited”.⁹ Marvell’s *Account* lacks a specific theatrical antecedent, instead drawing upon what has been called an “austere economy of relevant fact”.¹⁰ But following the examples set by his own *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* and *Mr. Smirke*, it further explores the negative political ramifications of Francophilia in a dramatic historiography.

Students of Marvell’s prose have shared the view that its use of theatrical elements is chiefly for entertainment and satire. A common assumption is that Marvell used *The Rehearsal* as the starting point in “offering a good read” to his audience.¹¹ This stance expands to include discussion of the value in appropriating Buckingham’s courtly and political status¹² and that *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* represents “the Cabal’s literary memorial”,¹³ that is a monument to the administration in which Buckingham had a central part. Marvell sets aside boisterous and burlesque following *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*. Put next to its predecessor, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d: The Second Part* (1673) is more calculated, though still *ad hominem* and theatrical. *Mr. Smirke* relies on current comedy and theatre in its attack, but the jokes are subordinated to the present task of properly animadverting Francis Turner. It devotes nearly half of its pages to the appended, but deceptively embellished, *Short Historical Essay*. That work, ostensibly a serious analysis

⁹ Nicholas von Maltzahn, “Andrew Marvell and the Pre-History of the Whigs”, in “*Cultures of Whiggism*”, ed. David Womersley (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005), 37.

¹⁰ Condren, 170.

¹¹ Chibnall, Jennifer, “Something to the Purpose: Marvell’s rhetorical strategy in *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* (1672),” *Prose Studies* 9 (1986): 85.

¹² N. H. Keeble, “Why Transpose the Rehearsal?” in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (New York: St. Martins, 1999).

¹³ Martin Dzelzainis, “Introduction” to *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 1:9.

of the mechanisms surrounding the council of Nicaea, carries a significant theatrical and satirical burden. The *Account* has a tragic tone rather than a comic one, relying upon grim irony instead of cool wit or energetic humour, and the reversals and recognitions that Aristotelian criticism identifies as the finer parts of tragedy.

The use of theatrical or dramatic pamphlets for political causes had seen extensive application during the civil wars. Pamphleteers looked to reproduce the energies of theatre in short dialogues texts, sometimes labelled “playlets”, some of which may have been performed: “what plays shared was medium, marketplace, and above all, the persuasive possibilities of the flexible politico-dramatic-serious-scurrilous genre”.¹⁴ Martin Butler has argued that the explosion in pamphlet literature in the 1640s connects the closure of the theatres and re-channelling of creative energies:

It is especially remarkable that among the scores of pamphlets that appeared before the playhouses closed in 1642 were many that were cast in dramatic or semi-dramatic form [...] The sheer volume of controversy that was conducted this way [...] suggests how familiar the public was with having its politics dramatized, as well as how naturally the inversions and freedoms of festive play were transmuted into a language of real political subversion.¹⁵

In the 1640s, many of these playlets were ecclesiastical, with Archbishop Laud by far the most popular target among the texts in Butler’s broad survey. The polemical strategy employed by such authors was one of characterization. Opponents would be vilified in the action on the page: “the dialogue form can have a complex structure while nevertheless allowing the reader to experience the debate as simple and obvious”.¹⁶ Where Marvell attacks at the mere suggestion of French influence in his opponents, his puritan

¹⁴ Sue Wiseman, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998), 38.

¹⁵ Martin Butler, 236.

¹⁶ Wiseman, 33.

predecessors were largely concerned with prelatical injustice. The illustrated single-sheet quarto *A New Play Called Canterburie His Change of Diot ... Which Shewith Variety of Wit and Mirth*,¹⁷ depicts Laud feasting upon the ears of his enemies in “a grim spoof of his real cruelty to [the Puritans] Prynne, Burton and Bastwick”.¹⁸ The frontispiece proclaims the episode to have been “privately acted neare the Palace-yard at Westminster”. In effect, the playlet parodies the play to make a point in a popular form.

Marvell’s application of theatrical elements is more complex than producing miniature plays and dialogues. Instead, he prefers to cultivate an atmosphere of theatre to tap into the same “persuasive possibilities of the flexible politico-dramatic-serious-scurrilous genre”, but carefully credits his opponent for being the original cause. Upon reviewing one of Parker’s more grandiose passages, Marvell quips, “But enough of this trash it is the highest *Indecorum* for a Divine to write in such a stile as this [part Play-Book and part Romance]”.¹⁹ That playbook then supplies fun for “some critical People”, presumably coffee-house wits, who note that Parker confuses the geography of the city of Geneva, situated on “Lake Lemaine”. The conversation is relayed in prose, but it naturally breaks into separate lines of dialogue:

I said, it was well and wisely done that he chose a South Sun for the better and more sudden growth of such a Fruit-tree. Ay, said they, but he means Calvin [...] and the City of Geneva [...] Now it is strange that he having travell’d so well, should not have observed that the Lake lies East and West, and that Geneva is built at the West end of it. Pish, said I, that’s no such great matter, and, as Mr. Bayes hath it upon another occasion, *Whether it be so or no, the fortunes of Caesar and the Roman Empire are not concerned in’t*. One of the company would not let that pass, but if we look’d in Caesar’s Commentaries, we should find their fortunes were concerned,

¹⁷ Wing N702, Thomason, E.177[8].

¹⁸ Martin Butler, 240.

¹⁹ Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in *Prose*, 1:55; parentheses original.

for it was the Hevetian Passage, and many mistakes might have risen in the marching of the Army.²⁰

The witty banter continues and escalates, to the “mirth” of the participants: “It was grown almost as good as a Play among us”.²¹ Marvell, in relaying the conversation to his own readers, allows them to share in a theatrical experience, joining the coffee-house wits in their drolleries at the expense of Parker’s play.

Marvell works with other sorts of performances, as well, in building his theatrical mood. He draws on the sideshow stuntman: “Were you of that Fellow’s diet here about Town, that epicurizes upon burning Coals, drinks healths in scalding Brimstone, scraunches the Glasses for his *Dessert*, and draws his breath through glowing Tobacco pipes [...] you could not shew more *flame* then you do alwayes upon that subject”.²² Similarly, he evokes the wonders of circus spectacle: “those that will dance upon Ropes, do lightly some time or other break their necks”.²³ Italian clowns fill in for Parker and his allies: “no less than six *Scaramuccios* together upon the stage”.²⁴ The addition of trained animals completes the variety show: “it makes me a very good sport to see you play more tricks than a Dancing Bear for the recreation of the Spectators”.²⁵ The brilliant conclusion to *The Second Part* of *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* is a climax among Marvell’s carnivalesque theatrics, drawing a story from Del Rio’s *Disquisitionum Magicarum* (1633):

²⁰ Ibid, 1:69.

²¹ Ibid, 1:70.

²² Ibid, 1:86.

²³ Ibid, 1:102.

²⁴ Marvell, *The Second Part*, in *Prose*, 1:252. See also 1:297 and 1:418.

²⁵ Ibid, 1:387.

Wenceslaus the Emperor, Married the Duke of Bavaria's Daughter; the Duke, knowing the Emperours delights brought along with him a Cart full of Jugling Conjurers, who playing their tricks, Zytho that was Wenceslaus his Magician, *accedens propius, artificem Bavarum cum omni apparatu protinus devorat (ore ad aures dehiscente) calceos duntaxat, quia luto obsiti videbantur, expuens: secessumque inde petens, ventrem insolita esca gravem in solium aqua plenum exonerat, Praestigiatoresque adhuc madidum Spectatoribus restituit passim deridendum, adeo ut caeteri quoque eius Socii a ludo abstinerent.*²⁶

Marvell of course aligns himself with the victorious Zytho, the *Posse* with the gaggle of obnoxious tricksters, and Parker with the regurgitated jester. His final word in the controversy, "I have spit out your dirty shoon", emphasizes Parker's humiliation before a wide audience.

Such theatricality controls the aspects of dispute that are not so rational-critical. In addition to their respective source plays, Marvell's prose works apply theatricality and drama in distinct ways. The two parts of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* draw upon the burlesque and carnivalesque. The later *Mr. Smirke* and its attached *Short Historical Essay* represent religious dispute in terms of fashion and play. The more sober *Account* collapses the distinctions between history, politics, and tragedy. The common thread between these assorted approaches is how Marvell's theatrical devices set the tone for the more specific satires.

The theatricality in Marvell's pamphlets exploits the distinction between theatrical performance and plays in print. Marvell's regular use of Shakespearian allusion in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* provides strong evidence that Marvell had been reading plays as well as watching them. By this time, theatre had found a popular following in print as

²⁶ Ibid, 1:438-9. The editors translate Marvell's Latin anecdote: "coming close (stretching his mouth to his ears) devoured the Bavarian trickster with all his apparatus, spitting out only his shoes, because they looked covered in mud: seeking to depart thence, he relieved his stomach, overburdened with such unaccustomed food, in a tub full of water, and restored the conjuror, soaking wet, to the spectators, for their general derision, such that the rest of his comrades also abandoned the sport".

much as on stage. Pepys, a “considering, though inconsistent” critic of drama both new and old, “made a clear distinction between the effectiveness of plays read and plays seen”,²⁷ and thought several plays better on the page than the stage. When handling material from a printed source rather than through the mediating role of a production, allusion points towards an idealized interpretation of the play and a more direct engagement with the original playwright than when gesturing towards a performance. A reader is left more or less to his or her own interpretation of the text in question. Readers can produce polarizing interpretations of a character or play: the various sympathetic and vilifying interpretations of Shylock are a prime example. Such reactions have less variation when controlled by the inflections of a production. The viewer of a play will take direct and indirect cues from actors, theatre managers, the overseeing eyes of patrons, and the practical limitations of a production. All but the least successful productions are collective events, and each person’s experience is affected by the crowd’s attitude. Reading, in comparison, is often a solitary engagement. A reader can return to passages of interest as he or she sees fit, whereas it takes a rare audacity to request an actor repeat a line. On the other side of the same coin, the actor is perpetually aware of the audience; a printed edition is unaware of the presence or absence of a reader.

The way that Marvell exploits the differences between print and performance is a major part of what distinguishes his work from the playlets of the early 1640s. The playlets such as *Canterburie His Change of Diot*, are, as the label suggests, pamphlets modelled after the example of plays. *Canterburie* is a single-sheet quarto dialogue complete with illustrations of Archbishop Laud in a number of humiliating and vilifying positions: a

²⁷ Robert Latham and William Matthews, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys: Volume X – Companion* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983), 10:339, 338.

decadent Laud feasts on ears, has his “nose held to the Grinde-Stone”, and suffers imprisonment in a “birdCage [*sic*]”. If as the frontispiece proclaims these scenes were “privately acted near the *Palace-yard* at Westminster”,²⁸ that is largely irrelevant to a reader’s experience. What the reader engages with is a messily printed piece of dialogue propaganda.²⁹ The satire is communicated exactly like a printed play, with speech and stage direction, though supported by illustrations. It hesitates to directly engage with the reader, instead opting to present detached events. It is a closet drama.

Marvell’s hybrid pamphlet style goes well beyond that of the playlet authors. His work is in proper prose, rather than dialogue. More importantly, he seems to be acutely aware of the literary difference between a printed and performed play. At different points Marvell is a narrator, a spectator, or a participant in the action. His books maintain the dramatic intensifiers that the playlet authors sought to exploit, but in “transprosing” his source material, he compensates for the detachment that comes with the reader’s experience. For example, in the above-quoted “Lake Lemaine” episode, the dialogue is interspersed with barely enough commentary to maintain the scene’s humorous context. The reader engages with more than disembodied speech. He supplies the inflections normally reserved for production (“to continue the mirth”) along with the informal dialogue. Little space is left for a reader to mistake the conversation of these, “some critical People, who will exact Truth in Falsehood”,³⁰ for serious argument. Marvell takes advantage of the most effective devices of stage and page.

²⁸ *A new Play Called Canterburie His Change of Diot* (London, 1641 [EEBO]).

²⁹ Both copies examined, from the British Library and the Thomason collection, feature numerous smears and ink transfers from reverse pages: evidently, the printer stacked the sheets while still wet.

³⁰ Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in *Prose*, 1:69.

1. The Political Problem with Francophiles

One of Marvell's more important "transprosals" is in his satire of English Francophilia. Jokes that rely on quirks shared by Buckingham's Mr. Bayes and Etherege's Sir Fopling Flutter jab at perceived "Frenchness" to make butts of Marvell's antagonists, Samuel Parker and Francis Turner, respectively. The relationship between English and French culture in drama is a point of self-consciousness for Restoration authors. Dryden's *Essay on Dramatick Poesie* is largely a dispute over whether English playwrights are in "a servile imitation of the French".³¹ A parallel struggle plays out between French and English ideologies in the political and ecclesiastical arenas. The divine-right theory of kingship to which the Stuarts aspired was strongly influenced by Louis XIV's model of governance. The universalizing impulses of the High Churchmen, such as Parker or Turner, take cues from Gallican Catholic ecclesiology. England also had a simmering anxiety with French influence. French agents were among those blamed for the Great Fire of London. France's conquering ambitions gave even Dryden, a well-known royalist, occasion for critical reflection on the ambitions of magistrates: "the Examples of our Neighbours teach us, that they are not always the happiest subjects, whose Kings extend their Dominions farthest".³²

Amid these tensions is Marvell's ambiguous attitude towards France and all things French. The issue of French influence is a point of contention among students of Marvell's poetry. Because T. S. Eliot's influential assessment of Marvell, from a 1921 essay on that

³¹ John Dryden, "An Essay of Dramatick Poesie", *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. H. T. Swedenberg, Jr. (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1971), 17:54.

³² John Dryden, preface to *All for Love*, in *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. Maximillian E. Novak, (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1984), 13:7.

poet, has been decried by many scholars of Marvell and the Whig tradition, Eliot's position on the Roundhead and Restoration poets deserves quotation at length:

Being men of education and culture, even of travel, some of them were exposed to that spirit of the age which was coming to be the French spirit of the age. This spirit, curiously enough, was quite opposed to the tendencies latent or the forces active in Puritanism; the contest does great damage to the poetry of Milton; Marvell, an active servant of the public, but a lukewarm partisan, and a poet on a smaller scale, is far less injured by it [....] Marvell, [...] more a man of the century than a Puritan, speaks more clearly and unequivocally with the voice of his literary age than does Milton.³³

This passage has prompted dissent from more recent scholars, especially those who study Marvell's place in the Whig tradition. One responds: "I venture to say that when he wrote those sentences, Eliot had forgotten *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and was ignorant of *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*", and adds that "Marvell had become politically suspicious to an extreme of the 'French Spirit of the age' as represented by Charles II and his French connections".³⁴ Another seeks to "further disembarass Marvell of this later reputation" as a "Francophile poet of tradition".³⁵ Objections to Eliot's assessment rise from the ongoing project to reconcile Marvell's poetry with his prose and political career. Eliot's distancing of Marvell from the "Puritan" attitudes in favour of a handful of his early poems and his suggestion that Marvell's (and Milton's) corpus has somehow become "damaged" by political activism are at the heart of this debate. Such rebuttals are quick to point to the hard-line anti-French polemic of the *Account*, to his correspondence complaining of pro-French legislation, or to poems such as the "Painter" satires that coolly sympathize with the Dutch enemy over England's French allies. This

³³ T. S. Eliot, "Andrew Marvell" in *The Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot*, ed. Frank Kermode (San Diego, New York, & London: Harcourt, 1975), 162-3.

³⁴ Patterson, "Marvell and Secret History". 24, 29.

³⁵ von Maltzahn, "Pre-History", 32.

scholarly attitude may be guilty of anachronistic projection. The Whig tradition developed a strong anti-French stance in the political arena before and after the Glorious Revolution, escalating to direct conflict in the Nine Years' War (1688-97). Caution is appropriate when projecting too entirely upon Marvell the Francophobic platform advanced by the movement that posthumously venerated him.

Nonetheless, in the pamphlet controversies at hand, Marvell jabs at the expense of perceived Francophilia in his opponents. Parker, Turner, and the shadowy conspirators of the *Account* all meet accusations of having fallen into French ways and a French style. While he frequently stages this theme through theatrical content, especially in comparison to the Francophile fops Mr. Bayes and Sir Fopling, for Marvell these accusations are of a serious political and ecclesiastical nature and not just xenophobic humour. That Marvell does not direct this brand of attack at Simon Patrick, Parker's close ally in the toleration controversy who also receives other assorted admonishments in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, indicates that the charge of Francophilia describes a far more specific problem than English-French identity politics.

Is it possible that Marvell's attitude towards France and the French is, as Eliot's evaluation would suggest, more complex than a simple identification or opposition? After all, Marvell's political and religious expression is rich with tension and contradiction. In the 1640s he penned an elegy for the cavalier Francis Villiers that wishes for the deaths of the Parliamentary generals: "Much rather thou I know expect'st to tell / How heavy Cromwell gnashed the earth and fell, / Or how slow Death far from the sight of day / The long-decieved Fairfax bore away".³⁶ He also wrote "Tom May's Death" around 1650,

³⁶ Andrew Marvell, "An Elegy upon the Death of My Lord Francis Villiers", in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell: Revised Edition*, ed. Nigel Smith (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007), lines 14-17.

representing that republican propagandist as banished by Ben Jonson for crimes against state and literature. Famously, Marvell's "Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland" remains deeply ambivalent about the changing times, and offers seemingly left-handed praise: "So restless Cromwell could not cease / In the inglorious arts of peace".³⁷ But Marvell in the late 1650s also wrote a sublime funeral elegy for Cromwell, where he can exclaim "O Cromwell, Heaven's favourite! To none / Have such high honours from above been shown";³⁸ and he had earlier written a number of poems for his employer, Lord Fairfax, including a long country-house poem, telling how "From that blest bed the hero came, / Whom France and Poland yet does fame".³⁹ Later, Marvell publishes a panegyric for Milton's anti-prelatical *Paradise Lost* in 1674 and within two years intervenes on the behalf of a sitting bishop when he defends Herbert Croft in *Mr. Smirke*. Moreover, Martin Dzelzainis's exploration of Marvell's sympathetic "*rapprochement*" with the Catholic Earl of Castlemaine convincingly demonstrates that Marvell's anti-Catholicism, which at one time was the singular point of consensus in discussions of his religious identity, is in fact a complex issue.⁴⁰

Furthermore, much of Eliot's assessment of Marvell is reasonably accurate. Although it is dubious to label a polemicist, however protean, who flaunted censorship laws and flirted with political imprisonment as a "lukewarm partisan", Marvell was beyond all doubt a man "of education and culture, even of travel". That he was a thorough reader of

³⁷ Marvell, "An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland", lines 9-10.

³⁸ Marvell, "A Poem upon the Death of His Highness the Lord Protector", lines 157-8.

³⁹ Marvell, "Upon Appleton House, To My Lord Fairfax", lines 281-2.

⁴⁰ Dzelzainis, "Castlemaine", 290-293.

Montaigne is evidence of his exposure to French literature and thought.⁴¹ Marvell was a linguist, and John Milton recommended his skills to the protectorate administration.⁴² Marvell's French was practiced enough to address visiting diplomats and, when himself on embassy, the Swedish and Danish royal families in an official diplomatic capacity.⁴³ Moreover, *Mr. Smirke* is written under the pseudonym "Andreas Rivetus Jr.": this is on one hand a play on Marvell's own name, but on the other it takes that of a "revered" French Protestant theologian.⁴⁴ Marvell had already visited France in the 1640s, and he spent a great part of 1656 tutoring an English gentleman's son among French protestants in Saumur.⁴⁵ His political and literary ally, the Duke of Buckingham, was himself a Francophile who spent extensive periods of time in the court of France and even wrote a French-language play in a French tradition.⁴⁶ A simple Francophobe, Marvell was not. Whatever the argument over Eliot's critical proclamation, Eliot had at least one thing right: beyond all doubt Marvell was in touch with some "French spirit of the age".

This chapter follows Martin Dzelzainis in arguing that Marvell's politics were not informed by the wholesale anti-Catholic bias for which he is often credited, and expands

⁴¹ For Marvell and Montaigne, see *Prose*, I:xxix, 12, 62 n.135, 122 n.440, 144 n.577, 173, and II:68 n.188. Additionally, note Marvell, *Prose*, I:110, "Take care lest I swallow your pin", and Montaigne, I:XXI "De la force de l'imagination", wherein "Une femme, pensant avoir avalé une épingle avec son pain", but her suffering ends miraculously when a clever man tricks her into thinking she has vomited "une épingle tortue". *Essais de Michel de Montaigne, Livre I*, ed. Emmanuel Naya (Paris: Gallimard, 2009), 1:251.

⁴² von Maltzahn, *Chronology*, 38.

⁴³ Ibid, 54, 85-7.

⁴⁴ Annabel Patterson, "Introduction", to *Mr. Smirke*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 2:19.

⁴⁵ von Maltzahn, *Chronology*, 43-4.

⁴⁶ For Buckingham's foray into French theatre, see Robert D. Hume & Harold Love, *Plays, Poems and Miscellaneous Writings Associated with George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007), 1:123-230.

upon that assertion to add that his relationship with France is similarly complex. Other interdependent tensions are at work in his published prose. If indeed, as Steve Pincus claims, “the English by 1685 had begun to move beyond identity politics”,⁴⁷ is it unlikely that by 1672-9, a highly-educated and well-travelled Englishman such as Marvell could have begun to do the same? Richard Ashcraft identifies the same constitutionalist and absolutist political ideologies operating in the seemingly religious toleration controversy.⁴⁸ Marvell’s connection to the apologetics of the overtly Catholic Roger Palmer, Earl of Castlemaine further distances Marvell’s prose interventions from the category of simple confessional politics.⁴⁹ The politics against which Marvell takes issue are those of the absolutist Gallican regime: it is not the French people, nor French culture, but the French state that is corrupting the English government. Similarly, it is not a broad Catholicism to which Marvell’s texts are opposed, but more specifically Gallican Catholicism, represented in the figure of the Francophile Jesuit, at odds with Rome and English Catholics: “There was, then, a long tradition of sophisticated, cosmopolitan, anti-Jesuit, and antiregular sentiment within the English Catholic community. These divisions, no doubt, became increasingly intense when the French province of the Jesuits aligned themselves with the absolutist principles espoused by the Gallicans”.⁵⁰ In this respect, the relationship between English ecclesiastical politics and Catholicism was far more complex than the threat of a merciless Counter-Reformation.

⁴⁷ Pincus, 94.

⁴⁸ Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics & Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986), 39-74.

⁴⁹ see Dzelzainis, “Castlemaine”.

⁵⁰ Pincus, 140.

Marvell develops these political and ecclesiastical issues in the social and cultural humour of theatre. In some cases, he relies on allusion simply as a source for pithy analogies to satirize humorously his opponent's style or to disparage grimly his opponent's attitude. In others, especially in the later pamphlets, he moves beyond allusion into broader applications of theatre in his prose. For Marvell, politics are aptly handled in the metaphor of theatre: partisan grandstanding is naught but play or acting, and international intrigues are the stuff of meaty tragic plots. But theatre, like politics, has international implications. Ecclesiastical and political discourse focuses on English interest and policy in a European context. Similarly, English Restoration theatre draws on French styles, Francophile characters, dramas, plots, and witty wordplay that supply fodder for Marvell's hybrid pamphlet style. This boisterous and energetic genre of political prose humour picks up such cues from entertainment and repackages them for the exploration of more serious issues, such as religious persecution or absolutist government. Where Mr. Bayes's and Sir Fopling Flutter's status as comic butts owes to their misguided sacrifice of English sense for French style, his opponents have fallen under a more dangerous French influence, to be explored in the language of theatre.

2. *The Rehearsal*, Transpros'd

This most prominent instance of theatre influencing an ecclesiastical controversy begins with George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham's burlesque *The Rehearsal* (1671). *The Rehearsal*'s meta-theatricality – it is a Restoration play about Restoration plays – provided Marvell with ammunition for an easily accessible satire that a wide audience could appreciate. The play was popular in print and on stage. The *English Short Title Catalogue* records that six print editions appeared between 1672 and 1682. It was a standard in

London theatrical repertoires through the eighteenth century, and widely known: “Frequent offhand allusions in such places as the *Spectator* and the letters of Horace Walpole suggest the degree to which Buckingham’s creation had attained iconic status”.⁵¹ The argument could be made that *The Rehearsal* is among the most commercially and critically successful works of literature produced by an English statesman. *The Rehearsal* follows its author’s chosen trade in that its meta-theatre satirizes Restoration politics beneath the surface of literary satire. In effect, Buckingham opened a link from theatre to politics and provided an example for Marvell to follow in his pamphlets.

Buckingham’s play features one Mr. Bayes, a foppish playwright originally conceived in the 1660s as a caricature of William Davenant, while later versions are thought to spoof John Dryden. The play is set in the contemporary Drury Lane theatre, where two men out on the town, Johnson and Smith, watch the King’s Company prepare Mr. Bayes’s forthcoming heroic feature: a formulaic mess of sappy love scenes, plot-wrenching romance, and dramatic implausibility. The Johnson and Smith characters are significant in themselves, beyond their role as a sort of chorus. The play opens with their meeting on a West-End street near the King’s Company’s theatre, and their genial greetings soon reveal their respective conditions:

Johns. Honest *Frank!* I’m glad to see thee with all my heart: how long hast thou been in Town?

Smi. Faith, not above an hour: and if I had not met you here, I had gone to look you out; for I long to talk with you freely, of all the strange new things we have seen and heard in the Country.⁵²

⁵¹ Hume and Love, 354-5.

⁵² George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, *The Rehearsal* (1671), in *Restoration Drama: an Anthology*, ed. David Womersley (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 143-4, Act 1, scene 1, lines 1-6. See also Hume and Love ed., *Buckingham*, 1:333-453. Hume and Love use the 1672 Q1 edition as a copy text, Womersley elects to use the 1675 Q3 edition, which I have followed.

Smith's return from the country immediately touches on a trope of Restoration theatre: conflict rising from such a return is, for example, the primary plot of Wycherley's *The Country Wife*. They disdain the company of "men of business", whom Johnson disparages as "those solemn Fops" and Smith as "the dullest of men". They seek entertainment: Smith is interested in seeing the "new plays" that have received praise from "our Country-wits", but Johnson, the more jaded city dweller, prefers other entertainments (including a private "she-friend") and is suspicious of the theatres' "hideous, monstrous things", despite the recommendation of "some of our City-wits [...] of the new kind [...] your Virtuosi".⁵³

As their encounter near the Drury Lane theatre indicates, these men are creatures of the new West End. Their disdain for businessmen separates them from the merchant class. Their mobility between city and country identifies them as gentry. The metropolitan gentleman was a novelty that prior to the Interregnum had been discouraged by the crown, which desired that such persons instead be "performing their necessary functions of local government and political control". Upon the Restoration, this policy changed, and the social composition of London changed drastically with it:

Many such families did exactly what had been feared by becoming urban dwellers for substantial parts of the year, returning to their estates only in the summer. Avoiding the City, they purchased houses in the newly created squares and streets [...]. It is important to realise that this internal migration was an act of colonization, by the gentry, of a metropolis that until that time had been the preserve of the manufacturing and mercantile classes. Its effect was to create a second urban entity, contiguous with but distinct from the older one and outside its system of government.⁵⁴

⁵³ Ibid, lines 17, 23, 28, 38-9, 31-2, 41-3.

⁵⁴ Harold Love, "Dryden's London", in *The Cambridge Companion to John Dryden*, ed. Steven N. Zwicker (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004), 116-7.

The growth of the West End, accelerated in part by the Great Fire that left it mostly unscathed, created the “Town”. This was the space where the coffee-houses flourished and because of which “late-seventeenth-century London was a shopper’s paradise”.⁵⁵ This space, like the dissenting congregations discussed in Chapter I, is fundamentally aligned with merchant interests and an open society. The novelties of the posh West End were then laying the foundation for the drastic shifts in political discourse that Habermas identifies as transforming the public sphere and the “two competing modernizing programs” that Pincus credits as a central cause of the 1688 Glorious Revolution.⁵⁶ Johnson and Smith are the representatives of this blossoming society: well-to-do, urbane, and cosmopolitan. They are classy Englishmen in touch with current fashion and style, but not to the extent that they become Francophile caricatures. Unlike merchants or tradesmen, they are urban by choice rather than necessity. Though their space flourishes alongside the merchant interests, culturally they are far removed from the “fanatics”, “zealots”, and nonconformist public that Marvell defends. They are endowed with wit, sense, and, unlike the rural “bumpkin” gentry that Wycherley satirizes in *The Country Wife*, they are not easily impressed by glittering novelties offered in the new London. As a chorus, Smith and Johnson use their position fashionable social privilege to elevate themselves and to comment sardonically on Bayes’s absurdities.

Bayes, however, is associated with cultural milieux other than the growing merchant interest and the dissenting congregations. Bayes’s diction expresses a tension between a traditional rural English background and a newer French influence, which

⁵⁵ Pincus, 60.

⁵⁶ Pincus, 45.

combine to flavour his ridiculous scenes. And ridiculous his scenes are: peppered with sugary couplets, embellished speeches, implausible plot points, and hyperbolic characters. Meanwhile, Bayes himself dances in and out of the action, singing his own artistic praises in a key of self-justifying criticism, oblivious to the ridiculousness of his product and the dissatisfaction of the humiliated players. The humour is a mix of burlesque and satire, simultaneously playing off of the immediate silliness of the on-stage antics and Bayes's delusions of grandeur and popular glory. Bayes is not of the same class as Johnson and Smith, set apart by his foppish lack of taste, by inferior wit and by ideas that are "superficial and without judgement".⁵⁷ What is more, Bayes is a Francophile, needlessly peppering his speech with foreign words such as the self-directed (and most likely mispronounced) "*Beau Gerson*", and "*tuant*", meaning "sharp" or "witty", a French word that the OED records as finding English usage only in *The Rehearsal* and its politically-charged descendents. But, unlike Johnson or Smith, Bayes is a bumpkin, and his façade has several holes, exposed when his Latinisms and Gallicisms are interspersed with vulgar English expressions such as "ifackins" and "udzookers". More sinister, the language shows that Bayes carries the contamination of French fashion and thought, without sensible moderation. The shallow false-French nonsense to which he plays host is in direct opposition to the good "English" sense embodied in the gentlemen Johnson and Smith.

Moreover, *The Rehearsal* has a political edge that goes beyond the theatrical and cultural aspects of heroic drama. The case has been advanced by Margarita Stocker that Buckingham's play is a complex set of political allusions. This political subtext is present in all aspects of the play, but it falls short of an allegorical critique. The argument is that

⁵⁷ Thomas H. Fujimura, *The Restoration Comedy of Wit* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1952), 36-7.

Buckingham's primary target in Mr. Bayes was his colleague and rival Lord Arlington, and that he coached Bayes's original actor, John Lacy, in Dryden's mannerisms. This may have been a tactic to protect his oppositional critique from the censorship that had foiled Buckingham's earlier attempts at staging politically-charged plays. The fictional kingdom, Brentford, takes its name from the site of the 1642 Royalist victory that marked "the high-watermark in the king's [Charles I's] advance on London". Consequently, its two kings, who, "hand in hand" are "usurped and restored in equally unlikely fashion", as well as their corresponding conspiratorial usurpers, probably represent Charles II and his brother James, the Duke of York. The secret army that Bayes hides at Knightsbridge speaks to those who feared "that the Duke of York was especially anxious to acquire and control a standing army".⁵⁸

Johnson and Smith, sitting outside of Bayes's fourth wall, connect with attitudes outside of the court at Whitehall. If we follow Stocker's political reading, the "men of business" that the gentlemen wish to avoid are not merchants and tradesmen, but politicians performing on a political stage. She conjectures that Smith, hailed as "Honest Frank!" in the play's first line may correspond to Francis Smith, Richard Baxter's publisher, and an overall "notorious nonconformist printer of [...] unlicensed pamphlets". She then rightly observes that Smith carries "the larger political burden of the critique". Conversely, Johnson is an "avatar" of Ben Jonson, and "carries the larger literary burden". Stocker further identifies Buckingham's Johnson with Marvell's portrait of Ben Jonson, the "arbiter of poetic and political truth" in "Tom May's Death".⁵⁹

⁵⁸ Margarita Stocker, "Political Allusion in *The Rehearsal*", *Philological Quarterly* 67 (1988): 19.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 22, 23.

Much of *The Rehearsal*'s political subtext conveys a suspicion of Francophile statesmen and French politics. Lord Arlington, in particular, was by 1671 working in favour of the French interest in England: "He subsequently led the negotiations with the French, being fully aware of the proposals for the king to become a Catholic and the English and French to attack the Dutch, and although some doubted his loyalty to the plan, Charles II did not".⁶⁰ Moreover, Arlington was one of the English ministers who signed the 1670 Secret Treaty of Dover with France. Cultural Francophilia aside, Arlington's perceived political Francophilia is of that more dangerous breed which Marvell warns against in the *Account*. This further aligns Mr. Bayes, and subsequently Parker, with absolutist interests and French political ideology, and the play's satire against the Francophile trends in English government:

the target of the literary ridicule is a systematic embodiment of the Stuart kings' divine-right theory of monarchy [...] if we allow 'Buckingham's frivolous reputation' to dictate our reading of his play, then it seems no more than an 'enjoyable trifle' [...] at the expense of Dryden's literary pretensions and a fad for inflated heroic drama. But if we look at the content of the mock-play and its relationship to current events and Stuart ideology, then perhaps we see a radically different enterprise.⁶¹

These "current events", without a doubt, constitute the Stuarts' attempts to move closer to a French-style absolute rule, and it is this overall theme of encroaching absolutism, both political and ecclesiastical, packaged together in the brand of Francophilia that Marvell draws from Buckingham's play.

The Rehearsal's value to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* was multiple, as a source of literary, cultural, and political satire. First, by advertising the title of a play, the

⁶⁰ Alan Marshall, "Bennet, Henry, first earl of Arlington (bap. 1618, d. 1685)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2008 [Online edition]).

⁶¹ Hume and Love ed., *Buckingham*, 1:352-3.

frontispiece would have “attracted the attention of a reader in touch with the latest town news” and appeal to play-goers and fashionable gentlemen to associate Marvell’s arguments with “company ordinarily excluded from religious discourse”. Second, in connecting with Buckingham’s play, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* aligns with the court’s champion of non-conformity, “the courtier usually ‘in the greatest favour with the king’” against the High-Flying Archdeacon Parker, “encouraging Cavaliers to laugh at their own ecclesiastical champion by adopting a manner that they would recognize and appreciate”.⁶² There is the apparent similarity in style between Mr. Bayes’ grandiose drama and Parker’s exaggerated and hectoring style of argument: Bayes’s attempt at a great play by means of scale and spectacle is analogous to Parker’s attempt at a grand argument by means of aggression and railing. In *The Second Part* Marvell defends his use of the theatrical mode against his opposition’s attacks, asserting that his adaptation of Buckingham’s burlesque to his purposes is more than simple jest:

[Parker] does indeed complain of it something pathetically that I should have fix’d that name upon him, and in good earnest could I have yet in all this while have invented any name more consonant and agreeable to his Character, I would have chang’d for it. Neither did I at first make use of the *Rehearsal* so much in order to make merry with him as for a more publick and serious advantage [...] I had mind to show [...] by this example, that there was not so much need of Prophaneness to be ridiculous, or to take the Sacred writings in vain.⁶³

In aligning Parker with the foppish playwright, Marvell “finds Parker guilty of just those extravagances and absurdities which affront Johnson and Smith in Bayes”, and in doing so, Marvell “adopts a point of view very like that of the plain-speaking and plain-dealing

⁶² Keeble, 250, 252, 251.

⁶³ Marvell, *The Second Part*, in *Prose*, 1:283.

Johnson and Smith”.⁶⁴ In taking the spectator’s seat beside Johnson and Smith, Marvell identifies with his newly expanded audience, and places himself among that new breed of urbane gentlemen of quality. Marvell’s identification with Buckingham’s play also breaks with the class and identity politics surrounding toleration, helping to move the issue of toleration beyond the labels of “enthusiasm” and “zeal” that Parker’s and Patrick’s writings attach to dissenting attitudes.

Furthermore, Marvell twists identity politics back upon Parker. When Marvell thus styles Parker’s arguments in the terms of Bayes’ plays, he follows Bayes’s simple, though extravagant, literary strategy. In *The Rehearsal*, Bayes’s new “Virgin” play “shall read, and write, and act, and plot, and shew, ay, and pit, box and gallery, I gad, with any Play in *Europe*”.⁶⁵ He believes that he surpasses in greatness all other playwrights by taking his plays to extremes of magnificence and originality. His works defy all conventions of theatre and plot, and Bayes justifies this by bragging, “I am for fetching it purely out of my own fancy, I”.⁶⁶ The plot is nonsensical, at times literally: his conspirators whisper inaudibly to each other in center stage, because “matters of State ought not to be divulg’d”;⁶⁷ his kingdom of *Brentford* is inexplicably imagined as governed by two kings, a notion curtly justified “because it’s new”; his hero Drawcansir is a rude brute without chivalric virtue or honour because Bayes claims to “prefer that one quality of singly beating whole Armies above all your moral virtues put together”.⁶⁸ Bayes, anticipating the great

⁶⁴ Keeble, 255.

⁶⁵ Buckingham, Act 1, scene 1, lines 80, 84-6.

⁶⁶ Ibid, Act 2, scene 1, lines 70-1.

⁶⁷ Ibid, Act 2, scene 1, lines 76-7.

⁶⁸ Ibid, Act 4, scene 1, lines 118-9.

tradition of literary hacks, achieves “state, shew, and magnificence” by simply enlarging the terms of his production. For example, he justifies the use of four cardinals in one scene for the sake of being “grander”,⁶⁹ and thereby of supposedly higher quality, than a previous play that used only two bishops in similar circumstances. In his pursuit of the sublime, the self-absorbed Bayes mistakes scale for excellence, and progressively enters into a mode of solipsism from which little but nonsense emerges.

Indeed, it is upon the charge of having sacrificed sense for greatness that Marvell first aligns Parker and Bayes in *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, and he does this by blending the two fops’ voices. He styles Parker as deluded by a sense of self-importance and awed by his work’s magnificence: “this Extravagance and Rapture of our Author”.⁷⁰ In the first paragraph of his *Preface*, Parker disingenuously apologizes for his rough handling of ecclesiastical matters,⁷¹ and Marvell seizes upon this with a flat quotation of Parker’s disclaimer: “*But yet he knows not which way his Mind will work it self and its thoughts*”.⁷² Marvell immediately connects Parker’s accidental suggestion of being nonsensical, even to himself, by quoting a handful of lines from *The Rehearsal*: “This is Bayes the Second.— ‘Tis no matter for the Plot – The Intrigo was out of his head – But you’ll apprehend it better when you see’t. Or rather, he is like Bayes his Actors, *that could not guess what humour they were to be in: whether angry, melancholy, merry, or in Love*”. He returns to his opponent’s *Preface* and finishes relaying Parker’s apology: “Nay, insomuch that he saith, *he is neither Prophet nor Astrologer enough to fortell*. Never Man certainly was so

⁶⁹ Ibid, Act 5, scene 1, lines 7-8.

⁷⁰ Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in *Prose*, 1:48.

⁷¹ Samuel Parker, “Preface”, A2^v.

⁷² Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, 1:48.

unacquainted with himself”⁷³ The use of three different voices from two sources allows Marvell strategically to conflate Bayes’s words with Parker’s, and Bayes’s actors with his own commentary The passage reads as a unified witticism at the expense of Parker’s style, but it is in actuality a collage of disparate quotations Marvell’s commentary on Parker’s character frames that opponent’s original words “But which way my mind will work it self and its thoughts, I am neither Prophet nor Astrologer enough certainly to foretell”⁷⁴ That quotation in turn frames two seamlessly integrated comic remarks by Bayes and one commentary at Bayes’s expense It is difficult for a reader to distinguish the alternating sources in the absence of direct citations for each separate quotation, and Marvell’s habit of strategic reconfiguration (or misquotation) amplifies the ambiguity The effect is that the voices merge Marvell’s comments absorb those of the frustrated actors, and Parker’s become those of Mr Bayes

Furthermore, Marvell uses Bayes to demonstrate how little information or deep argument there is in Parker’s sprawling books Building upon the merger of the archdeacon and the foolish author/playwright, Marvell makes the case that Parker values superficial form over content To do this, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* adopts a non-standard approach to animadversion that attacks using a thematic structure Marvell forgoes the standard citation/response approach wherein the animadverter refutes the original text point-by-point – see, for example Milton’s *Animadversions* (1641) or Humfrey’s more concise *A Case of Conscience* (1669, briefly discussed in Chapter I above) Instead, Marvell favours the

⁷³ Ibid, 1 48-9, emphasis original “Tis head”, Marvell quotes from Buckingham 1 1 ll 78-9, person changed from first to second, “you’ll see’t”, Qtd from Buckingham 1 2 ll 123-4, “that love”, Summary of Buckingham 1 2, with qtn from l 6 The first part, “that in”, only loosely resembles the original dialogue to which it refers and need not have been italicized, “He fortell”, Qtd from *Preface*A2^v, person changed from first to third

⁷⁴ Parker, “Preface”, A2^v

relaxed thematically-oriented structure that gives him the freedom to address Parker's entire corpus in a more logical, rather than sequential manner. Standard animadversion was rigid:

The main drawback of the method was its inflexibility in that those replying to a given work had to accept its arrangement of topics and arguments as a template for their own. Complaints about being forced to attend the vagaries of the opposing case were a conventional feature of the genre, as were various ploys for evading obligation. One of the most important of these was to search out contradictions between the work under scrutiny and the author's other writings and play off these texts against each other.⁷⁵

Marvell, in accordance with the genre's conventions, complains against Parker's style:

“there being no method at all in his wild rambling talk; I must either tread just on in his footsteps or else I shall be in a perpetual maze”.⁷⁶

But, here Marvell disguises his methods. This complaint occurs “while he is actually organizing things behind the scenes”.⁷⁷ Following his established theme, Marvell divides Parker's wide-ranging arguments into three broader categories: “for brevity and distinction sake, I must make use of the same privilege by which I call him Mr. Bayes, to denominate also his several Aphorisms or Hypotheses”.⁷⁸ The three “informal” categories were directed against various parts of Parker's corpus.⁷⁹ As he styles Parker a playwright, his “Aphorisms” and “Hypotheses” are put under the “Titles” and summarized in “some

⁷⁵ Dzelzainis, “Introduction” to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 1:11.

⁷⁶ Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in *Prose*, 1:124.

⁷⁷ Dzelzainis “Introduction” to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 1:11.

⁷⁸ Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in *Prose*, 1:95.

⁷⁹ Dzelzainis, “Introduction” to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 1:11.

short Rehearsal of Mr. Bayes his six Playes”.⁸⁰ In Marvell’s assessment, Parker’s six plays (*The Unlimited Magistrate*, *The Public Conscience*, *Moral Grace*, *Debauchery Tolerated*, *Persecution Recommended*, and *Pushpin-Divinity*)⁸¹ are mostly redundant restatements of his grand thesis asserting the sovereign’s unlimited authority over all things ecclesiastic. The superficial repackaging of the same argument in multiple “playes” plays off Mr. Bayes’s theory of writing from recycled premises: “as every one makes you five Acts to one Play, what do me I, but make five Playes to one Plot”.⁸²

In addition to the links that he demonstrates between Parker and Bayes, Marvell also exploits the parodic qualities of Bayes’s hero. Drawcansir spoofs Dryden’s Moorish protagonist Almanzor from *The Conquest of Granada*, who repeatedly sways battles and wars in his capricious and frequent changing of allegiance in a complex three-way conflict, his loyalty dependant on the present status of his relationship with the royalty and nobility of Granada. Inflating Almanzor’s arrogant and idealistic defiance of the King, Drawcansir shows not a trace of grace or decorum and “does what he will, without regards to numbers, good manners, or justice”.⁸³ Bayes’s excessive forays into heroic greatness lead him to an audience-clearing heroic battle scene in which Drawcansir slaughters two entire armies single-handedly. Bayes’s dramatic climax in his fourth (but unexpectedly final) act, and Buckingham’s comic climax, comes when “*A Battel is fought between foot and great Hobby horses. At last, Drawcansir comes in and kills ‘em all on both sides. All this while*

⁸⁰ Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in *Prose*, 1:110.

⁸¹ *Ibid*, 1:95.

⁸² Buckingham, Act 4, scene 1, lines 37-9.

⁸³ *Ibid*, Act 4, scene 1, lines 111-13.

the Battle is fighting Bayes is telling them when to shout, and shouts with 'em'.⁸⁴

Immediately following his victory, Drawcansir boasts to the entire theatre: "Others may boast a single man to kill; / But I, the blood of thousands daily spill. / Let petty Kings the names of Parties know: / Where e'er I come, I slay both friend and foe".⁸⁵ Bayes in turn quixotically boasts of his hero's prowess and poetic originality, "You may talk of your *Hector*, and *Achilles*, and I know not who; but I defie all your Histories, and your Romances too, to shew me one such Conqueror as this *Drawcansir*," provoking Johnson's final deadpan response to Bayes before quitting the farce, "I swear, I think you may".⁸⁶

The laconic wit of which Johnson is an example is central to Restoration comedy and has been described as a distinct rhetorical category in English literature. New comedies following 1660 increasingly draw upon wit as a function of applied intellectual refinement and a decorum that "represented an ideal of conduct and speech to which a cultivated gentleman aspired; and though it was learned through social intercourse, it was based on judgement and not convention".⁸⁷ Samuel Butler emphasizes the rational elements of true wit:

For as there is a trick in arithmetic by giving a false number to find out a true one, so wit by a certain slight of the mind delivers things otherwise than they are in nature by rendering them greater or less than they really are [...] or by putting them into some other condition than nature ever did [...] But when it employs those thing which it borrows of falsehood to the benefit and advantage of truth [...] it is of excellent use, as making a deeper impression into the minds of men than if the same truths were plainly delivered.⁸⁸

⁸⁴ Ibid, Act 5, scene 1, stage direction.

⁸⁵ Ibid, Act 5, scene 1, lines 343-6.

⁸⁶ Ibid, lines 354-8.

⁸⁷ Fujimura, 23.

⁸⁸ Samuel Butler, *Hudibras Parts I and II and Selected Other Writings*, ed. John Wilders and Hugh de Quehen (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973), 273.

The difference between the superficially similar terms “to rail” and “to railly” is important to note in this context. All permutations come from French roots: to “rail” (OED v⁵) means “*intr.* To complain persistently or vehemently *about, against, at, of, on, upon, with, etc.*”; in contrast, to “railly”, means “*intr.* To tease, to joke; to engage in banter; to express criticism or mockery *at*”, though there is occasional crossover in sense. The noun “raillery” can denote either form of speech, but “railleur” corresponds usually to wit and not to abuse. Wycherley’s vocabulary in *The Country Wife* indicates a distinction in Restoration usage: “I was discoursing and raillying with some Ladies yesterday”, versus “Hold, do not rail at him, for since he is like to be my Husband, I am resolv’d to like him”.⁸⁹ In the former statement, “raillying” apparently denotes a light-hearted teasing, where the latter statement’s “railing” is the ranting form of abuse common to the polemical mode.

Marvell relies on this distinction to remove Parker from the association with intellectual refinement that Butler praises in “wit”. Thus, when in *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* Marvell enters into a brief digression to reflect on Parker’s railing against John Owen, we can determine some useful elaborations upon these categories of wit in Marvell’s usage:

He could never have induced himself to praise one man [Bp. Bramhall] but in order to rail on another. He never oyls his Hone but that he may whet his Razor; and that not to shave, but to cut mens throats. And whoever will take the pains to compare, will find, that as it is his only end; so his best, nay his only talent is railing.⁹⁰

First, although the “combative” aspect of railing is emphasized, Marvell characterizes Parker’s actions in “cutting throats” as brutish behaviour, not as a more genteel form of

⁸⁹ William Wycherley, *The Country Wife*, in *Restoration Drama: An Anthology*, ed. David Womersley (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), Act 1, scene 1, lines 362-3; Act 2, scene 1, lines 314-5.

⁹⁰ Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in *Prose*, 1:64.

intellectual combat. Even though Parker aspires to intellectual supremacy, his ill intentions, not in “raillying” but as a “railing” character assassin, negate the good work that Parker claims to be doing in eulogizing Bramhall. For Marvell here Parker is not a witty gentleman, but an ill-tempered fool stepping beyond his place: a mean-spirited coxcomb.

Accordingly, Marvell’s critique of Parker’s mode of speech connotes a tension in class and culture. When Johnson’s cool irony carries into Marvell’s abuse of Parker/Drawcansir, Marvell further aligns himself with the fashionable court and city parties by using his cultivated wit as a counter to Parker’s railing. On Parker’s denouncing half of Europe’s ecclesiastical and political policies, Marvell calls him the “Ecclesiastical Draw-Can-Sir”, and resurrects the hero’s victorious boast:

He kills whole Nations, he kills Friend and Foe; Hungary, Transylvania, Bohemia, Poland, Savoy, France, the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, and a great part of the Church of England, and all Scotland (for these, besides many more, he mocks under the title of Germany and Geneva) may perhaps rouse our Mastiff, and make up a Danger worthy of his Courage.⁹¹

In effect, Parker is like Drawcansir, in that he “does what he will”, and pursues a universalizing attitude by which he extends his criticisms far beyond the jurisdiction of the Church of England. This, for Marvell, is an embarrassing example of High-Flying clerical arrogance.

Moreover, when Parker jabs at anxieties related to the Great Fire, Marvell’s responses push back against Parker’s overly dismissive attitude. Marvell reports Parker’s claim that some “discry Popery in every common and usual Chance, and a Chimney cannot take fire in the city or Suburbs but they are immediately crying Jesuites and Firebals”,⁹²

⁹¹ Ibid, 1:64-5.

⁹² Ibid, 1:127.

which Marvell summarily connects to Bayes's nonsensical prologue where actors portraying Thunder and Lightning "Strike men down" and "Fire the Town".⁹³ This notion of "making up a Danger worthy of his Courage", gestures toward the conspiracy-hungry English attitude following the Great Fire. Dryden's *Annus Mirabilis* speaks to concerns of the fire having been deliberately started by anti-government (though not necessarily foreign) agents: "Yet *London*, Empress of the Northern Clime, / By an high Fate thou greatly didst expire: / Great as the Worlds, which, at the death of time, Must fall, and rise a nobler frame by fire. // As when some dire Usurper Heav'n provides / To scourge his Country with a lawless sway".⁹⁴ Marvell himself was a member of the Parliamentary committee appointed to investigate the causes of the fires. One prominent executed arsonist, Robert Hubert, claimed to have been acting with other conspirators on orders from the Pope, though he was posthumously exonerated. Others who suspected a deliberate fire blamed Jesuit agents. In later years, Marvell was appointed to multiple committees charged with fire-related business.⁹⁵ In this context, the use of Bayes's "Thunder" and "Lightning" characters against Parker equates the two butts' trivializing attitudes towards the Great Fire's destruction and their downplaying of anxieties surrounding foreign threats.

Again Parker provokes a similar personalized rebuke with his discussion of the Parliament of 1628-9 and its passing of the Petition of Right (1628), which imposed limitations upon Charles I's right to tax. Because of that Parliament's stance against divine-right kingship, he calls them "most notorious Rebels by all the Laws of the

⁹³ Buckingham, Act 1, scene 2, lines 270-88.

⁹⁴ John Dryden, "Annus Mirabilis" in *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. Edward Niles Hooker (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press), 1:91, stanzas 212-13.

⁹⁵ von Maltzahn, *Chronology*, 93, 126, 141.

Gospel”.⁹⁶ The Petition of Right resonates with ongoing Parliamentary conflicts over supply, and thus Parker’s vilification carries a personal bite for Marvell. Although we lack primary documents on this topic dating to the time of *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* controversy, Marvell’s correspondence with his nephew William Popple before and after this event tells a tale. His pair of 1670 letters to William summarizes the complicated process whereby Parliament provided the crown with funds, a bill in which he participated. From his perspective this money was wasted, in sharp ideological contrast with Parker’s hostile analysis of the 1628-9 petition:

The King of *France* is at *Dunkirke*. We have no Fleet out, though we gave the Subsidy Bill, valued at eight hundred thousand Pounds for that Purpose. I believe indeed he will attempt Nothing on Us, but leave Us to dy a natural Death. For indeed never had poor Nation so many complicated, mortal, incurable, Diseases.⁹⁷

As discussed below, the language of disease and contagion is a frequent metaphor for corruption in Marvell’s political poetry and prose. The “complicated, incurable diseases” to which Marvell refers almost certainly include Charles II’s breach of trust that he insinuates in the letter to Popple as owing to royal corruption and collusion with the absolutist Louis XIV. Similarly, in his 24 July 1675 letter to Popple he relays the past session’s proceedings, including resolutions declaring it to be “Treason to levy Mony without, or longer than, Consent of Parliament; and that it should be lawful to resist”.⁹⁸ The Parliamentary power over taxation, as reasserted by the 1628-9 sitting, is a significant issue for Marvell.

⁹⁶ Samuel Parker, *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros’d* (London, 1673 [EEBO]), 376.

⁹⁷ Marvell, *Letters*, 2:323.

⁹⁸ *Ibid*, 2:342.

This legislative problem of taxation and consent was an issue in which Marvell had a personal investment. Parker's self-important charge of treachery against Parliament's defence of its prerogative in financial matters struck a nerve with Marvell. As with Parker's dismissive attitude towards anxieties over the fire of London, Marvell treats Parker as trivializing serious matters. He responds by again equating this arrogance of Parker's with a Drawcansir attitude:

But it is too much for you to make their Process however, and to arraign a Parliament as Traytors by an Ecclesiastical Bill of Attaindor. *You dare*, you say, *determine them so*. 'Tis indeed like your fellow Bayes his Draw-can-Sir---
You huff, you strut, look big and Stare,
*And all this you can do because you dare.*⁹⁹

This is a repeated gag whereby Marvell mocks Parker's self-appointed infallibility and championing of his Episcopalian and Anglican cause by equating him to the ridiculously over-the-top Drawcansir. Along with Bayes, these figures are effective against the "High-Flyer"¹⁰⁰ Anglican, whose singular combative posture and self-indulgent style fit with both.

An ongoing, but more acute, adaptation of content from *The Rehearsal* is in Marvell's exploitation of a series of contradictory statements in Parker's various books. This method is common in pamphlet combat, but in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* it becomes a theatrical activity and distinctly funny. In integrating some of Bayes flowery poetics with Parker's ranting, Marvell turns the often pedantic interplay between argumentative quotations into an entertaining and striking episode. Drawing upon *The Rehearsal's* repeated couplet, "That ere a Full-pot of good Ale you can swallow, / He's here with a

⁹⁹ Marvell, *The Second Part*, in *Prose*, 1:314. The quoted verse is from Buckingham 4:1, 267-9, Marvell changes the person from *Draw*. 's first- to second-.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*, 1:268.

whoop, and gone with a holla”,¹⁰¹ Marvell points out Parker’s mutable arguments in four specific instances:

Tis true, that being distracted betwixt his desire that the Consciencies of men should be persecuted, and his anger at Princes that will not be advised, he confounds himself every where in his reasonings, that you can hardly distinguish which is the *Whoop* and which is the *Holla*, and he makes Indentures on each side of the way wheresoever he goes.¹⁰²

Each iteration of the figure takes the same form. He begins with one of Parker’s propositions, “*Whoop Mr. Bayes, pag 49. With what conscience does the Answerer tell the people that I have represented all Tradesmen as seditious, when ‘tis so notorious I only suppose that some of them may be tainted with Seditious Principles?’*”, and follows with a contradictory statement, “*Holla Mr. Bayes! But in the 49th page of your first Book you say expressly, For ‘tis notorious that there is not any sort of people so inclinable to Seditious Practices as the Trading part of a nation’*”.¹⁰³ In actuality, this section contains little input or argument originating with Marvell. On one level, Marvell is playing with Parker as if in motion, he’s “here”, that is his argument takes one position, “with a whoop” and “gone” to another “with a holla”.

On another, Marvell’s “whoop” and “holla” is a theatrical presentation of a basic technique of animadversion. The connection to Bayes’s flowery couplet establishes an odd form of argumentation wherein he sets up a quasi-theatrical dialogue between Parker’s own books. Most often, this device is used to complicate the opponent’s position. Instead, Marvell uses it to comic effect. The burlesque aspects of the “whoop” and “holla” episode in *The Rehearsal* – a boisterous toast – accentuate the hypocrisy, associated absurdity, and

¹⁰¹ Buckingham, Act 5, scene 1, lines 93-4, 95.

¹⁰² Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in *Prose*, 1:116.

¹⁰³ *Ibid*, 1:117, 118.

Parker's universalizing claims. Instead of merely gesturing to argumentative inconsistency, the theme sets Parker up to make fun of himself in a colloquial tone. Marvell's commentary merely draws attention to the scene's ridiculousness.

3. Beyond Buckingham

The Rehearsal Transpros'd controversy draws on the longer history of English theatre. Indeed, *The Rehearsal* – the current and fashionable play – provides the backbone of Marvell's attack and riposte, but a wider bibliography finds use in the larger controversy. All of the active controversialists draw from Shakespeare and Jonson, but many other plays, old and new, are present in the texts. Marvell's application of secondary material tends towards putting older and more venerable works in subordinate or subtle positions while building block quotations and larger gags out of material from *The Rehearsal*.

Critics of Marvell's poetry, especially of the lyrics, have frequently observed Shakespearian parallels. Imagery in "The Nymph Complaining for the Death of her Fawn" recalls bloody scenes in *Julius Caesar* and *Macbeth*.¹⁰⁴ "The Picture of Little T.C. in a Prospect of Flowers" has been read beside Laertes' speech to Ophelia in *Hamlet*.¹⁰⁵ There are echoes of *Love's Labour's Lost* in the colourful imagery of "The Garden". The tense political attitude in "An Horatian Ode" compares to Shakespeare's technique of writing "dialectical" histories: "analysing political events and the moral dilemmas they present in terms of a balance of opposing forces, a dramatic debate between alternatives".¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ David Roberts, "Two Shakespearian Allusions and the Date of Marvell's 'The Nymph Complaining for the Death of her Faun'", *Notes and Queries* 49 (2002), 338-43.

¹⁰⁵ Ann E. Berthoff, *The Resolved Soul: A Study of Marvell's Major Poems* (Princeton: Princeton UP 1970), 128-9; Berthoff connects Marvell's poem especially with *Hamlet* 1.3, 33-44.

¹⁰⁶ Warren Chernaik, *The Poet's Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983), 15.

Shakespeare's "The Phoenix and the Turtle" may have supplied the structure for "Daphnis and Chloe", while "Venus and Adonis" provides a stanza to "The Fair Singer" and a title to "Eyes and Tears".¹⁰⁷

Marvell similarly draws from Shakespeare in his pamphlets. The best prose evidence of Marvell having read, as opposed to watched, Shakespeare is in his application of *The Merchant of Venice*. In admonishing Parker's sustained attacks on John Owen through several rounds of printing, Marvell sourly remarks: "who but such an Hebrew Jew as you, would, after an honest man had made so full and voluntary Restitution, not yet have been satisfied with so many pounds of his flesh over into the bargain?"¹⁰⁸ This is, of course, a broad allusion to the agreement between Shylock and Antonio. Complicating the issue, however, is the absence of recorded performances of this play between 1605 and 1741.¹⁰⁹ The only mention of *The Merchant of Venice* in Restoration theatre records is that in January, ca the 16th, 1668/9, the King's company was given exclusive license for its performance among many other plays.¹¹⁰

There are a few possibilities, then, as to where Marvell picked up what, in the context of 1672, qualifies as an obscure Shakespearian flourish. The idiomatic usage of a "pound of flesh" was not common in its own right in this period. The OED cites Shakespeare's use as the earliest. Database searches for "pound of flesh" and close

¹⁰⁷ Michael Craze, *The Life and Lyrics of Andrew Marvell* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1979), 37, 50, 93.

¹⁰⁸ Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in *Prose*, 1:80.

¹⁰⁹ Michael Dobson, Anthony Davies, "The Merchant of Venice" *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare* ed. Michael Dobson and Stanley Wells (Oxford University Press: Oxford Reference Online, 2001); see also William van Lennep, *The London Stage: 1660-1800*, Part 1: 1660-1700 (Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1965).

¹¹⁰ van Lennep, 151-2. The index to the series suggests a performance at the Bridges Theatre in January 1669, but van Lennep makes no mention in his entries for 1669.

variations on *Early English Books Online* produce for the most part references to edible meat in documents related to military supply and in cookbooks. Exceptions are few: a character in John Shirley's play *The Bird in a Cage* (1633) makes reference to "a pound of flesh, a Jewes demand once",¹¹¹ a likely allusion to Shakespeare; "The Forfeiture: A Romance" in Thomas Jordan's *A royal arbour of loyal poesie* (1663) merely summarizes the plot of Shakespeare's play, as does the anonymous single-sheet ballad *A new song: shewing the crueltie of Gernutus a Iew* (1640); *Certaine Characters and Essays of Prison and Prisoners* (1618) by Geffray Minshull (G.M.) apparently conflates Shakespeare's and Marlowe's Jewish plays in asking, "If with the Iew of *Malta* in stead of coyne thou requirest a pound of flesh next to thy debtors heart, wilt thou cut him in peeces?".¹¹² Neither EEBO nor the OED offer any other examples of "*fig.* pound of flesh *n.* something strictly or legally due, but which it is ruthless or inhuman to demand" (OED) previous to Marvell's usage, aside from Shakespeare's. The scarcity of this saying makes it unlikely that Marvell uses it in an idiomatic fashion without direct reference to the play.

It is unlikely, though not impossible, that Marvell attended a now-forgotten staging of *The Merchant of Venice*. It is significantly more likely that he encountered Shylock and Antonio in print. Unfortunately, the claim that "the famous collection of the earl of Anglesey, whose holdings, as catalogued for sale in 1686, can account for almost everything that Marvell read for the two parts of *Rehearsal Transpros'd*"¹¹³ does not hold true for Shakespeare. Nor do records of John Owen's library, the likely source of the "few

¹¹¹ James Shirley, *The Bird in a Cage* (London, 1633 [EEBO]), E2^r, Act 2, scene 1.

¹¹² G.M. (Geffray Minshull), *Certaine characters and essayes of Prison and Prisoners* (London, 1618 [EEBO]), B5^v.

¹¹³ Annabel Patterson, "Introduction", in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 1:xxx.

texts that do not appear in the Anglesy catalogue”,¹¹⁴ include Shakespeare in folio or quarto. That Marvell makes the allusion only in the broadest of terms – briefly summarizing the play’s conflict– suggests that *The Merchant of Venice* may have neither been at hand nor fresh in memory. Moreover, that Marvell’s opponents refrain from attacking the passage in question suggests the relative obscurity of the allusion.

On the other hand, the longest sustained Shakespearian by-play in the *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* controversy is reference to Sir John Falstaff, drawing upon both parts of *Henry IV*, and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Falstaff is another appropriate character for Marvell to draw upon for, like Bayes, Shakespeare’s popular comic knight frequently engages in self-aggrandizing behaviours that usually end in embarrassment. Marvell evokes Falstaff in an explicit simile: “I cannot but observe, Mr. Bayes, this admirable way (like fat Sir John Falstaffe’s singular dexterity in sinking) that you have of answering whole Books and discourses, how pithy and knotty soever, in a line or two, nay sometimes with a word”.¹¹⁵ This “admirable way” of answering is again Parker’s Drawcansir-esque combative mode of argument. Falstaff’s sinking in question is a multiple-scene incident in the third act of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Falstaff, in a desperate escape from a hopping mad Mr. Ford, whose wife he has been courting, is coaxed into a large basket of “foul linen”, spirited by servants away from the angry husband, but is then shocked to find himself thrown into the Thames as per Mrs. Ford’s instructions. After the fact, Falstaff complains: “The rogues slighted me into the river with as little remorse as they would have drowned a blind bitch’s puppies, fifteen i’ the litter: and you may know by

¹¹⁴ Ibid, 1:xxxi.

¹¹⁵ Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in *Prose*, 1:137.

my size that I have a kind of alacrity in sinking; if the bottom were as deep as hell, I should down".¹¹⁶ Again Marvell's irony supplies a somewhat scatological, left-handed compliment at Parker's expense.

In comparison to his use of *The Merchant of Venice*, Marvell's application of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is far more detailed. This may owe to the play's presence in the Drury Lane company's repertoire. Pepys's remark on a 1667 staging records the known performance closest to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. The diarist's "considering" assessment was not kind: the play "did not please me at all, in no part of it".¹¹⁷ Its presence on stage may explain why Marvell works closer to Shakespeare's dialogue in that he maintains the sense but substitutes similar words for the original: "singular dexterity" in place of Falstaff's self-described "alacrity". If he had no desk copy of the *The Merry Wives of Windsor* when he wrote his jabs against Parker, Marvell's (or an actor's) memory could be responsible for that minor discrepancy.

Whatever the source, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and *The Second Part* have a substantial number of other tropes that can be traced to Shakespeare. Some are of less likely, though possible, theatrical origins. The last of "Bayes's plays" is "Push-pin divinity", a term that Parker coined for describing what he perceived as the amateurish practices of independent and non-conforming ministers. The OED's first recorded usage of "push-pin", a children's game, is in *Love's Labour's Lost*, and that usage is in a similar figurative sense, describing adults diverted by childish things: "To see great Hercules

¹¹⁶ William Shakespeare, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, (New York & London: Norton, 1997), Act 3, scene 3; Act 3, scene 5, lines 7-11.

¹¹⁷ Cited in van Lennep, 111.

whipping a gig, [...] And Nestor play at push-pin with the boys”.¹¹⁸ In accusing Parker of writing attacks under many names, Marvell’s jab recalls the deceptive battle strategy of *I Henry IV* 5:3: “I believe he imitated the Wisdom of some other Princes, who have sometimes perswaded by their Servants to disguise several others in the Regal garb, that the enemy might not know in the battle whom to single”.¹¹⁹ Marvell’s literature review contains a natal joke that finds parallel in *Richard III*, which had seen a revival “in, or shortly preceding,” the 1672 season: Parker was “happily delivered of his second Child, the *Defence of the Ecclesiastical Policy*, in the year 1671. It was a very lusty Baby, and twice as big as the former, and (which some observed as an ill sign, and that if it lived it would prove a great Tyrant) it had, when born, all the Teeth”.¹²⁰ Marvell’s version is in better humour than when Queen Margaret cries to Richard’s mother the Duchess of York, “From forth the kennel of thy womb hath crept / A hell-hound that doth hunt us all to death: / That dog, that had his teeth before his eyes, / To worry lambs and lap their gentle blood, / That foul defacer of God’s handiwork, / That excellent grand tyrant of the earth”.¹²¹ While proverbial, two early and widely-known usages of “Confess and be Hanged” are in *Othello* (4:1 ll. 38-40) and Marlowe’s *The Jew of Malta* (4:1 ll.151-2).¹²² This runs parallel to Marvell’s apology for Owen, “after so ample a Confession as he hath made, must he now

¹¹⁸ Shakespeare, *Love’s Labour Lost*, Act 4, scene 3, lines.163, 165.

¹¹⁹ Marvell, *The Second Part*, in *Prose*, 1:252.

¹²⁰ Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in *Prose*, 1:111. For details on the revival of *Richard III*, see van Lennep, 188.

¹²¹ Shakespeare, *Richard III*, Act 4, scene 4, lines 47-53.

¹²² Also found in John Ray, *A Collection of English Proverbs* (London, 1670 and 1678 [EEBO]), which Annabel Patterson notes that Marvell uses elsewhere.

be hang'd too to make good the Proverb?"¹²³ Similarities have been noted between Marvell's "but as once the Incense of Arabia was spent on one Funeral, so the Lice of all the World must be consumed upon his malady"¹²⁴ and Lady Macbeth's "All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand".¹²⁵ More certain references exist as well. Marvell writes, "Had he Acted Pyramus he would have been Moon-shine too, and the Hole in the Wall".¹²⁶ In presenting Parker as "Acting Pyramus" in proximity to less-plausible roles such as "Moonshine" and the "Wall", Marvell evokes the mechanicals' bumbling performance of the Ovidian Pyramus and Thisbe myth in the final act of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. While few of these passages can be declared deliberate allusions beyond any doubt, the reading habits suggested by the allusion to *The Merchant of Venice* or the viewing habits made possible in his use of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* put the resources within Marvell's reach, if at an unknown distance.

4. A Conflagration

Overall, Marvell's successes with *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* brought him notoriety, if not acclaim, among contemporary readers. The first part was widely read, even by the King, who intervened on its behalf against L'Estrange and likely censorship.¹²⁷ Marvell's invention of this hybrid style was well-executed, but the other entrants in the

¹²³ Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in *Prose*, 1:80.

¹²⁴ Marvell, *The Second Part*, in *Prose*, 1:233-4.

¹²⁵ Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, Act 5, scene 1, lines 43-4.

¹²⁶ Marvell, *The Second Part*, in *Prose*, 1:224.

¹²⁷ Dzelzainis, "Introduction" to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 1:1-33, esp. 1:28.

controversy who attempted to follow his example in their responses did not fare so well.

The larger controversy had already supplied precedent for applying theatrical elements in print:

Marvell partly took his cue from an exchange between Parker and Owen on the propriety of the dialogue form used in Patrick's *Friendly Debate*. When Owen adduced Aristophanes' attack on Socrates in *The Clouds* to illustrate the destructive use of comedy for "personating" an opponent, Parker replied that Jonson's anti-Puritan satires *The Alchemist* and *Bartholomew Fair* would have been a more apt – though still inapplicable – comparison.¹²⁸

What sets Marvell apart from his contemporaries, then, is the capability with which he integrates the material into his overall argument, either by adapting the larger themes to his purposes, or casually inserting subtle allusions into his prose. In the responses to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, generally speaking, the theatrical content is awkwardly inserted into their arguments as part of an aggressive, *ad hominem* railing tone, without taking the time to properly integrate the wit into their style. The exception to this trend is Samuel Butler, a most accomplished satirist: "Of the Posse, Butler knew best to stay within the world of wit and what is internal to it, speaking to problems of invention, sense, appositeness, accuracy of cultural reference, and lack of poise".¹²⁹

The remainder of the *Posse Archidiaconatus* falls between these two poles. Some of the respondents avoid the theatrical. The anonymous *A Common-Place-Book Out of the Rehearsal Transpros'd* stays away from games and instead elects for a direct attack on Marvell. Hickeringill's *Gregory, Father Greybeard* counters scene with scene, and offers his response in the form of an episode much like Marvell's own "Lake Lemaine" exchange:

¹²⁸ Ibid, 1:10.

¹²⁹ von Maltzahn, "Pre-History", 48.

At the *Rainbow-Coffee-house* the other day, taking my place at due distance, not far from me, at another Table sat a whole *Cabal* of wits; made up of Virtuoso's, Ingenioso's, young Students of the Law, two Citizens, and to make the Jury full, *vous avez*, one old Gentleman: his bald Pate cover'd with a huffing Peruke, without an *Eye* of gray in't, or one gray hair.¹³⁰

The coffee-house scene unfolds in the same way as Marvell's except in this case the book under scrutiny is *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. Hickeringill's scene features conversational dialogue, but it lacks the witty energy of Marvell's example, merely engaging in animadversions.

The anonymous manuscript *Love Letter* largely avoids theatrical content, instead pursuing the conventions of verse satire. The satirist does engage with characters from *The Rehearsal* briefly, in encouraging the Transproser to hang himself:

'Twill be y^e most heroick thing
Resolv'd like a true Brentford-King,
Who, by his own hand, would have fell a
Sad Sacrifice to dead Lardella.¹³¹

Additionally, the satirist acknowledges Marvell's debt to theatrical content, reaching to *The Rehearsal*'s antecedents:

The Poets had given you their Baies,
Which you dispos'd of otherwaies,
Without their leave – y^e young ones snufft
At that, y^e Laureat swore, and hufft,
That men should steal out of their Garden
Garlands, & never ask them pardon.¹³²

The “huffing” Laureate gestures towards Dryden via the Bayes caricature, and the theft in question is doubtlessly the satirical appropriation made by Marvell and Buckingham.

¹³⁰ Edmund Hickeringill, *Gregory, Father Greybeard*, (London, 1673 [EEBO]) 5.

¹³¹ “Love Letter” (Royal Society MS 32), [50].

¹³² *Ibid*, 42-3.

Henry Stubbe supplies a pointed but more neutral contribution. Of all the direct responses to *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, his *Rosemary & Bayes* is the only one that attacks Parker as well, playing off the herbal “Bayes” moniker in dubbing Marvell “Mr. Rosemary”. Stubbe’s response is among the strongest, as he dryly addresses scholarly issues in a casual tone. Parker and Marvell engage in an extended debate on the nature of Jewish Zealots, drawing heavily from John Lightfoot and John Selden, “the two greatest Christian Hebraists of seventeenth-century England”.¹³³ Stubbe takes an interest in this exchange, passing judgment:

Well, if Mr. *Rosemary* may say without offence, that *Christ did take upon him the person*; yet *He Cannot*, he doubts, say *He took upon him the person of a Jewish Zealot*, that is, of a NOTORIOUS ROGUE & CUT-THROAT. I do concur with Mr. *Rosemary* in the latter clause, that *none ought to say, That Christ took upon him the person of a NOTORIOUS ROGUE & CUT-THROAT*. Oh! Mr. *Bayes*, Mr. *Bayes*.¹³⁴

Much of *Rosemary & Bayes*’s strength owes to Stubbe’s ability to play along passively with Marvell’s jokes, like Butler, and not awkwardly resist like Parker. In doing so, Stubbe maintains the momentum of the controversy, but is able to bring his knowledge to bear against Marvell’s arguments.

The perplexing *Sober Reflections* (1674), under the pseudonym “Theophilus Thorowthistle” was the final response, published after *The Second Part of The Rehearsal Transpros’d*. This ten-page quarto pamphlet shows the marks of an experienced author, possibly an otherwise notable poet or playwright. It is multilingual, with asides in Spanish, Italian, French, Greek, and Latin, and it demonstrates an acrobatic capacity for wordplay.

¹³³ Jason P. Rosenblatt, *Renaissance England’s Chief Rabbi: John Selden* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006), 112.

¹³⁴ Henry Stubbe, *Rosemary & Bayes* (London, 1672 [EEBO]).

The pamphlet is also aggressively theatrical, touching on acting, plays, railing, stages, astrology, and masquerade in its rapid-fire attacks. There is also direct reference to the famous lip-synching serenade in Dryden's *Martin Mar-all* (1667). Most tantalizing is the post-script that seems to hint at the author's identity while nonetheless flaunting his or her anonymity:

If this *Modicum quid* [Lat. meagre thing] should peep forth in Print now, we should have you at it, Resolute Bat; the License *Numps*, the License, *Where's the License?* [...] But, since this contains nothing against *God* nor the *King*, unless it be Blasphemy to speak against your Person, I am no more afraid than he who hid his head in a Bush, *Non timeo circumspicio tantum* [Lat. I am not afraid, I am only looking around]. Although the Woodcock hide his Bill, he is to be found by a white feather in his tail: *Tirar la piedra, y nasconder la Mano* [Span: throw the stone and hide the hand. Proverbial, meaning to do wrong and then act as if innocent], curries too much of the Poltron along with it; wherefore, whenever you command the Curtain to be drawn, you may see the Effigies of your humble servant; and then, if you have skill in *Palmistry*, look on my Forehead and tell me my Fortune.¹³⁵

The lengthy meditation on license, anonymity, courage, and literary transgression builds towards the author's hidden face. The "effigy" behind the curtain may refer to the author's association with the theatres. Alternately, "Palmistry" may perhaps be a veiled pun suggesting an unknown relationship to Roger Palmer, Earl of Castlemaine, who had expressed admiration of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. This sort of radical speculation is what Thorowthistle's tangled clues seem designed to provoke. The anonymous author's literary performance is a deliberate exercise in masquerade upon the public stage.

For the most part, Parker's *Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd* simply parrots Marvell's references in a tone of sarcasm and indignation. His only original theatrical contribution to the controversy is an awkward attempt at evoking a character from

¹³⁵ Theophilus Thorowthistle, *Sober Reflections* (London, 1674 [EEBO]), 10 The verb "nasconder" in the Spanish passage is a corruption of the Spanish "esconder" and/or a conflation with the Italian "nascondere", both meaning "to hide"

Etherege's *Love in a Tub*: "methinks according to your notion, there is nothing so patly emblematical of Sovereign Princes, as *Dufoy* in his Tub, or a Pig under a washbole".¹³⁶ Du Foy is a syphilitic French valet who a group of servants, as revenge for his impertinence, drug with opium and dress in a tub, or barrel. Marvell deflects the connection by denying knowledge and moving on: "I must here acknowledge the defect of my reading. For Du Foy I have not heard of".¹³⁷ Other than this single prominent attempt, Parker generally operates in a mix of his previously-established polemical style and simple retorts of Marvell's jokes and neologisms.

Thus Parker attempts to follow Marvell's hybrid style of pamphlet containing a theatrical twist, but is unable to properly apply the material to his present purposes. Parker's overall response to Marvell's use of theatre and *The Rehearsal* is awkward at best, and his lack of familiarity with the material frustrates his attempts to restore dignity to his case. The Dufoy allusion is exemplary of his clumsy attempts to play at Marvell's game, in that the majority of his theatrical interpolations lack proper knowledge of the plays. His central complaint is that Marvell has breached decorum and he constantly hammers on this point in his *Reproof*:

Will it not be an admirable jest to repeat the word *Bayes* three or four hundred times for the pleasant conceit, and the pure elegance of avoiding Tautologies? Yes by all means, it is just as much wit as if the word had been in the language of *Charing-Cross* or *Lincolns-inn-fields* plainly *Bastard*, or more politely *Son of a Whore*.¹³⁸

¹³⁶ Parker, *Reproof*, 11.

¹³⁷ Marvell, *The Second Part*, in *Prose*, 1:282-3.

¹³⁸ Parker, *Reproof*, 249.

The majority of his arguments against *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* are haranguing repetitions of Marvell's words and specific jokes, some of them resurfacing dozens of times.

So, in staying true to his alleged character, Parker in turn attempts but fails in a series of simple retorts. He uses the "Fat Sir John Falstaff" simile three times in the *Reproof*, but the usage suggests that he does not quite understand that Falstaff's "alacritous" or "dexterous" sinking is ungraceful and unskilful. Parker's usage handles the matter as though it denotes a subject that capably sinks other objects, perhaps in the sense that a new warship might be praised for "a kind of alacrity in sinking" enemy boats. This is of course backward. In the scene in question, Falstaff hides in a basket of dirty laundry and is thrown off London Bridge into the Thames. In complaining of the injustice against him, Falstaff remarks "that I have a kind of alacrity in sinking",¹³⁹ meaning that when he sinks, he sinks quickly. In the context of floundering in a river, this is probably the least desirable characteristic to possess. To give Parker's intellect the benefit of the doubt, it seems apparent that he was unfamiliar with *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, missed the wordplay, and was left unaware that Falstaff is the object of the sinking. This misunderstanding is apparent several times. First, in disparaging Marvell's Latin, Parker claims that Marvell's "way of translating is *not*" like Falstaff's sinking and that Marvell has "truanted so long about *Charing-Cross* and *Lincolns-inn-fields*, that you have forgot all your Latin".¹⁴⁰ This insult attempts to insinuate that Marvell's time in the fashionable and theatrical West End, in line with the Johnson/Smith type archetype, has caused his Latin to rust and lose grace.

¹³⁹ Shakespeare, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Act 3, scene 5, line 10.

¹⁴⁰ Parker, *Reproof*, 209.

In suggesting that Marvell's Latin lacks Falstaff's sort of dexterity, which in the corresponding scene from *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is a negative and potentially fatal characteristic, Parker unintentionally compliments Marvell. Had he wished to properly reflect the joke, it would have been necessary to equate Marvell's supposedly poor Latin with Falstaff's sinking, perhaps in having Marvell "sink into error". In failing to handle Shakespeare's ironic diction properly, Parker unwittingly reveals to the controversy's expanded theatre-going audience, those that "truant about Charing-Cross and Lincolns-inn-fields", that he does not get the joke. The matter further proves embarrassing for Parker in that his corrections to Marvell's Latin were themselves in fact erroneous. Second, Parker commits the same gaffe when directly addressing Marvell's original Falstaff simile, when he writes "I cannot but make use of this admirable way (like fat Sir [...] *John Falstaff's* singular dexterity in sinking) of answering whole Books or Discourses, how pithy and knotty soever, in a line or two, nay sometimes in a word".¹⁴¹ Following the notion that Falstaff's alacrity/dexterity is of a bad sort, Marvell's jab accuses Parker of poorly answering his opponents' arguments when he does it in a line or a word. Again seemingly unaware of the joke's finer points, Parker proudly accepts the label. Finally, perhaps forgetting what he had written on previous pages, Parker ungracefully attempts the simple retort, accusing Marvell of all-too-brief rebuttals, for the third time repeating the same line, verbatim.¹⁴²

However, where Parker awkwardly mimics the hybrid style and gets tangled in the combined ironies of Shakespearian and Marvellian wordplay, Samuel Butler shows a

¹⁴¹ Ibid, 228-9.

¹⁴² Ibid, 234.

greater awareness of the Falstaff character and his exploits. *The Transproser Rehearsed* mentions Falstaff twice, and in close proximity. First, Butler makes reference to “Sir *Iohn* Falstaff’s more capacious *Buckbasket* [laundry basket]”.¹⁴³ Butler shows a direct understanding of the sinking scene in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, touching on content that Marvell omits, and displays knowledge that Falstaff is the butt of the joke. Shortly thereafter Butler uses Falstaff to counter Marvell’s “Drawcansir” allegations against Parker “singly beating whole Armies”:

You sum up a whole Battell in two Representatives, so lively that any one would swear, not only ten Thousand men, but ten Armies, and more, were at it, really engag’d: for besides *Hungary, Transilvania, &c*, which for brevity, you omit [....] Nay, what is more monstrous yet, that the united Armies of ten Nations (like *Falstaffe’s* Buckram-men) have started out three.¹⁴⁴

Butler here diverts into another of Falstaff’s appearances, this time from *I Henry IV*. In this comic episode, Prince Henry disguises himself and stages a false robbery as a practical joke at Falstaff’s expense, wherein Henry and a single companion set upon Falstaff’s entourage. The entourage is scattered, and Falstaff fights briefly before fleeing. Afterwards, Falstaff recounts the robbery for Henry but boastfully distorts the facts to save face: “two of them I sure have paid, two rogues in buckram suits. I tell thee what, Hal, if I tell thee a lie, spit in my face, call me a horse. Thou knowest my old ward; here I lay and thus I bore my point. Four rogues in buckram let drive at me-- *Prince*. What, four? thou saidst but two even now. *Fal*. Four, Hal; I told thee four”.¹⁴⁵ The comparison between Falstaff’s multiplying enemies and Marvell’s inflating battle with the long list of added kingdoms is reasonably apt. This usage also indicates that Parker’s so-called *posse* is not as unified as it otherwise

¹⁴³ Samuel Butler, *The Transproser Rehears’d* (London, 1673 [EEBO]), 23.

¹⁴⁴ Butler, *Transproser*, 23-4.

¹⁴⁵ Shakespeare, *I Henry IV*, Act 2, scene 5, lines 76-82.

appears, for if Parker had indeed been in consultation with Butler, he likely would have benefitted from that poet's superior knowledge of Shakespeare. Instead of flipping Falstaff's sinking episode back at Marvell, Butler demonstrates that he has a much broader knowledge of English theatre than Parker, and is consequently a more formidable opponent in a battle of satirical wits.

Furthermore, Butler's wider theatrical knowledge extends into the other plays that Marvell cites. As Butler is credited as a possible contributor to Buckingham's *The Rehearsal*, it is unsurprising that his contribution extends to the comedy's "transposition". *The Transproser*, subtitled *Or The Fifth Act of Mr. Bayes Play*, plays along with the theatrical elements of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, instead of immediately pursuing the ecclesiastical arguments. Beginning with the title, Butler's book proclaims itself to be operating on similar theatrical terms to Marvell's. To this effect, Butler unpacks the subtitle in the second paragraph of his book:

I say, this great Author (of *Play-bills*) having in conformity to his promising Title *Transposed the Rehearsal*, or at least of all of Mr. Bayes his Play extant, *four Acts*. I thought it was a great pitty so facetious and Comical a work should remain incompleat, and therefore I have continued it on, and added the *Fifth*, the Argument of which, and its dependence on the other *Four*, I shall give you an account of after a preliminary examination of the Characters and Plot in our Author's *Transposed Rehearsal*.¹⁴⁶

His tract begins with a literary-theatrical analysis of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and ends with a further extension of *The Rehearsal* into an argument for a fifth fictional act for Mr. Bayes play, and these two additions frame the body of his largely *ad hominem* text.

¹⁴⁶ Butler, *Transproser*, 2.

Indeed, in following this strategy, Butler is true to his own theory of wit. Using that “certain sleight of the mind”,¹⁴⁷ Butler substitutes theatrical terms for the standard diction used to describe print argument: “Now ‘tis very probably, that which gave the principal hint to our Authors *Rehearsal Transpros’d* was the near accord he observes betwixt the Preface and *Mr. Bayes* his Prologue, [...] I cannot but applaud his admirable dexterity that could extract four Acts of a *Farce* from a single Prologue”.¹⁴⁸ Butler makes certain that Marvell is held to his own terms and style. For Butler, Marvell is treated as a playwright himself, having pulled a “farce” from Parker’s “preface/prologue”, and is thus held accountable for his book’s failings as a novel comedy: “If after all this any one should be so impenitently inquisitive, as to demand a reason why our *Prologue Critick* would have *Prologue* with a *Plot*, and not written in *Play-Book-Style*, he will answer him, no doubt, because ‘tis *New*”.¹⁴⁹

Generally speaking, Butler’s critical response is an ironic animadversion consisting of faux-qualitative analyses of Marvell’s satire. This early section focuses largely on Marvell’s justification for calling Parker “Bayes” than any other name, and like most animadversions alternates between Marvell’s words and Butler’s responses. Butler explicitly enters into the context of a theatrical interpretation when opening this section: “From the Prologue, pass we to the *Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in which the Characters, the Action, and the Humour offer themselves to our consideration. The principal person concerned in this Farce is *Mr. Bays*, whom our *Transproser* makes to be of the same Character with the Writer of the Preface [i.e. Parker]”. He then works through a handful of

¹⁴⁷ Butler, *Hudibras & Other Writings*, 273.

¹⁴⁸ Butler, *Transproser*, 3.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid*, *Transproser*, 5-6.

Marvell's justifications for entering into the theatrical mode, and provides vague qualitative remarks upon Marvell's performance, using some of Bayes's "vulgar" diction: "*First, Because he [Parker] hath no name, or at least will not own it (Good)*", "I would not distaste him with too frequent repetition of one word, (*Very good I-faith.*)", or, "Because both their Talents do peculiarly lye in exposing and personating the Non-conformists. (*I gad sir, and there you have nickt the present juncture of Affairs*)".¹⁵⁰ To the end of Marvell's list of reasons, Butler attaches another from *The Rehearsal*, using Bayes's flustered response from when asked why two of his cardinals wear hats, and two caps: "*because---By gad I won't tell you, Which, after a pause, is a reason beyond all exception*".¹⁵¹ Butler's strategy is to frame *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* production about Mr. Parker-Bayes as a comedy in itself, and treat Marvell as the defective playwright. In this early section, Butler puts some of Bayes's words into Marvell's mouth, but himself avoids the taking the place of Johnson and Smith.

The "Fifth Act" to Mr. Bayes's play, which in *The Rehearsal* is never reached owing to the production's implosion, comes in the closing movement of *The Transproser Rehears'd*. The basis for this passage is foreshadowed much earlier in the text, when Butler questions the accuracy of Marvell's title and highlights the crossover between ecclesiastical and theatrical writing: "yet though your Title promise us so fairly, you have not *Transpros'd* three whole Verses in all your Book. But be it the *Rehearsal Transpros'd*, or *transcrib'd*, or if you will, *Reprinted*, for your Pamphlet is little else but a *Second*

¹⁵⁰ Ibid, *Transproser*, 6.

¹⁵¹ Ibid, *Transproser*, 7. Butler plays on Buckingham, Act 5, scene 1, line 12.

Edition of that *Play*, and Mr. *Hales* his Tract of *Schism*".¹⁵² It is in a gesture back to this supposed-false advertisement that Butler gestures when he introduces his extension of *The Rehearsal*:

Thus have you had the *Transproser Rehears'd*. And now perhaps you may be in expectation of the *Fifth Act* promis'd you in the Title; but because it is the Bookseller's as well as Poet's Art to raise your Expectation and bring you off some extraordinary way, I will not deprive you of the Pleasure of being Cheated: but since the *Transprosing Muses* are gone to Dinner, I shall at present, according to a late Precedent only read you the *Argument* of the *Fifth Act* [...] from that which was found in Mr. *Bayes* his Pocket.¹⁵³

Butler here seems to have seen into Marvell's strategy for using Buckingham's (and possibly Butler's) comedy in ecclesiastical controversy, and objects to his packaging of tolerationist polemic behind a frontispiece advertising a more literary performance. This hostile reaction on Butler's part suggests that he regarded Marvell's merger of ecclesiastical and theatrical publics as problematic.

Butler's "Fifth Act" to Mr. Bayes's play extrapolates from "*The Argument of the Fifth Act*" read from Bayes "foul piece of paper" by a frustrated player at the end of the theatrical original:

Cloris at length, being sensible of Prince *Pretty-man*'s passion, consents to marry him; but, just as they are going to Church, Prince *Pretty-man* meeting, by chance, with old *Joan* the Chandlers widdow, and remembering it was she that first brought him acquainted with *Cloris*: out of a high point of honour, brake off his match with *Cloris*, and marries old *Joan*. Upon which, *Cloris*, in despair, drowns her self: and Prince *Pretty-man*, discontentedly, walks by the River side. This will never do: 'tis just like the rest. Come, let's begone.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵² Ibid, 29-30.

¹⁵³ Ibid, 137.

¹⁵⁴ Buckingham, Act 5, scene 1, lines 386-399.

Butler blends this argument with jokes from *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, especially the setting alongside “Lake Lemaine”,¹⁵⁵ in admonishing nonconforming ministers for “*their Contempt and quarrelling of all others* that are not in love” with Calvinist theology.¹⁵⁶ In general, his fifth act is a pastoral and Ovidian allegory that anticipates Marvell’s *Mr. Smirke* by portraying priestly figures in the trivializing vocabulary of fashion: “The divines there are notable Good Companions. They are incomparable *Pall-Mall-Players*. And very good *Bowlers* too no doubt (would they were as *honest Men*)”.¹⁵⁷

The Rehearsal Transpros'd was a leap forward in prose literature. Marvell successfully created a new style that relied on a blend of wit and reason, specifically for intervention on behalf of the nonconformist and independent parties in 1672’s ecclesiastical public. To do this, he used plays – Marvell’s tract is, as his title suggests, a development of Buckingham’s *The Rehearsal*, both on the surface and in subtext. Moreover, Marvell’s innovation was not a simple addition of plays to ecclesiastical polemic. Rather, as Samuel Parker’s disastrous rebuttal and Samuel Butler’s more skilful response show, a successful foray into dramatic prose satire required a toolbox more diverse than the polemicist’s. A solid knowledge of English theatre provided a foundation for topical humour that would transcend the social categories marked by the interests of the zealous, godly, or prelatical stereotypes that are seen as the members of the ecclesiastical public.

But, as Marvell’s corpus expanded, he began to abandon the plays that had contributed to his debut’s success. *The Second Part* is far more issue-oriented than the

¹⁵⁵ Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in *Prose*, 1:69.

¹⁵⁶ Butler, *Transproser*, 139.

¹⁵⁷ Butler, *Transproser*, 140-1.

first; *Mr. Smirke* makes light usage of its primary source; and the *Account* contains no significant theatrical allusions. Nonetheless, these pamphlets maintain the theatrical edge of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* by pursuing metaphors and themes with connections to the playhouse. Most significantly, an attack upon Parker's perceived Francophilia, developed through Gallicisms and disease, a favoured metaphor in Marvell's poetry, has its roots in Mr. Bayes and his later version, Sir Fopling Flutter. This theatrical form of Francophilia carries through the later pamphlets, and provides further insight into Marvell's notoriously elusive political character.

Chapter III: Francophilia and Political Theatre

A thematic bridge between *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and Marvell's later pamphlets is the Francophilia that Marvell identifies in Parker's attitudes and the divine-right theory that Buckingham had already attacked in *The Rehearsal*. As Buckingham's and Etherege's plays and Dryden's *Essay on Dramatick Poesie* indicate, the cultural exchange between England and France was a point of anxiety for many of the English: Dryden's Neander's extended speech is aimed "to clear us from a servile imitation of the French".¹ In the same respect, Marvell often attacks his opponents, particularly Samuel Parker and Francis Turner, on cultural terms, faulting their style and language, even as he takes issue with wider considerations in their polemics. In most cases, these accusations speak rather to how his targets have succumbed to a French-styled ideology. As this tension plays out in Marvell's adaptation of Restoration theatre, the issue of Francophilia becomes a symbol for political concerns. The sentiment expressed here is not simple xenophobic anxiety in a binary of Francophobe and Francophile. When Marvell attacks perceived Francophilia, in language, style, or disease, the stroke is directed at not a cultural but a political affliction: the influence of Louis XIV on English clerics and statesmen.

The cultural divide between Marvell-as-Smith/Johnson and Parker-as-Bayes echoes the division between the revolutionary parties that the historian Steve Pincus identifies as competing in the 1688 Revolution: low-church sympathizing, Whig constitutionalist, merchant interests on one hand and high-church absolutist interests on the other. Just as Bayes's style relies upon French inspiration, Parker's polemic draws from contemporary

¹ John Dryden, "An Essay of Dramatick Poesie", *The Works of John Dryden*, edited by H. T. Swedenberg, Jr., 17: 54.

French ecclesiastical policy. His “Grand Thesis” of the Magistrate’s ecclesiastical supremacy foreshadows James II revolutionary model of church and government in 1685-8, when Parker would find preferment, and which was in turn modeled upon Louis XIV’s Gallican-Catholic absolutist regime. Marvell’s opposition to the prospect of a Gallican-absolutist style of government is clear in his later *Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government in England*, for which the sly jabs at Parker’s Francophile leanings prepare the way.

The later pamphlets go through a noticeable stylistic evolution. The rapid-fire play of allusions in *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* yields already in *The Second Part* to more studied argumentation. Marvell, in a 1673 letter to Sir Edward Harley, expresses some reservations as to how to react to Parker’s counter-attack in *The Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros’d*:

I must desire the advice of some few friends to tell me whether it will be proper for me and in what way to answer it. However I will for mine own private satisfaction forthwith draw up an answer that shall have as much spirit and solidarity in it as my ability will afford & the age we live in will [e]ndure. I am [...] drawn in, I hope by a good Providence, to intermeddle in a noble and high argument w^{ch} therefore by how much it is above my capacity I shall use the more industry not to disparage it.²

Overall, *The Second Part* uses a different, more focused style than *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*: “It is less a display of disconnected firecrackers and more a series of sinuously extended arguments [...] though these were framed and interspersed with displays of the scatology, literary sophistication, and general high spirits that had made the original work an instant best-seller”.³ This focused style, balancing scholasticism and satire, made

² Andrew Marvell, *Letters*, 2:328.

³ Martin Dzelzainis and Annabel Patterson, “Introduction” to *The Rehearsal Transpros’d: The Second Part*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 1:210-1.

The Second Part Marvell's most scathing literary assault. The incident proves embarrassing for his haughty opponent. Marvell corrects Archdeacon Parker's theology, his Latin grammar, and exposes Parker's father as having authored radical republican tracts in the Interregnum, but Marvell keeps the most extreme of the elder Parker's thought in reserve as insurance against another printed salvo.

Despite the more systematic approach, *The Second Part* still relies on theatre. The public character assassination that Marvell ends up concocting against Parker still draws on content from Buckingham, and Parker is still called Mr. Bayes for much of the text. The pamphlet is especially theatrical in how Marvell adopts certain Francophile aspects of Mr. Bayes's character in equating Parker with that foppish playwright. One minor Gallicism that Marvell draws from *The Rehearsal* for use in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* becomes a major point in the controversy at large, and in *The Second Part* he continues to press at French contamination in Parker's character.

Mr. Smirke, or, the Divine in Mode (1676) has even fewer references to plays than *The Second Part* of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. Now Marvell's opponent, Francis Turner, and his position become still more central to a more sustained argument. In *Mr. Smirke*, the hybrid style relies on theatricality more than theatre. *Mr. Smirke* has only a handful of direct references to its source, Etherege's *The Man of Mode*, and the problem of infectious fads. The conflict and humour of *The Man of Mode* are in the various characters' attempts at self-fashioning. It is a play about style, dissemblance, acting, and pretention. In the case of Sir Fopling, he dresses in a French suit, acts with a French attitude, and becomes ridiculously French. He is an Englishman acting a French part. Moreover he is only the most conspicuous among many similarly guilty parties. Both parts of *Mr. Smirke* apply this same theme of fashion and identity to English divines, though in Marvell's adaptation what

was otherwise foppish folly becomes a dangerous ethical defect. Marvell again treats ecclesiastical controversy in theatrical terms: scenes, plot, “play”, and acting. Marvell’s pamphlet satirizes priesthood in the same terms. Etherege puts into question the town’s fascination with fashion. Similarly, *Mr. Smirke* accuses Church of England clerics of modifying their ideologies to fit the political climate as easily as the changing of a surplice; the appended *Short Historical Essay* discovers those trivializing concerns already in the Athanasian bishops during the reign of Constantine.

An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government (1677-8) goes a step further than *Mr. Smirke*. The *Account*, unlike its predecessors in Marvell’s corpus, lacks any evident theatrical antecedent, and makes no references to specific plays. Nor, as a work of historiography, or “Secret History”, does the *Account* rely on a theatrical antecedent. Rather than adapt others’ ideas, this tract instead offers a new dramatic premise. It is its own play. Its plot and characters come from events in recent memory. As with most plays in print, this story has already been staged. But instead of having been acted in a playhouse, the *Account* first performed in a carefully timed ballet that extended over several years on a political stage. The plot is one of international intrigue, and the genre is tragic; the climax to which it is building will end poorly for England and the English people, at least from the constitutionalist and proto-Whig perspective that Marvell represents. Marvell outlines his theatrical historiography with theatrical cue words, marking acts, scenes, and sequels, and a significant portion of the story is expressed in parliamentary speeches laid out as a loose form of dialogue. Key plot points are consistent with the recognitions and reversals inherent Aristotelian rules of tragedy. In comparison to its predecessors, the *Account* is not a pamphlet that refers to theatre, but rather is a theatrical pamphlet. Again, following its predecessors, the conflict has its roots in France

and French influence, but the scope has moved beyond *ad hominem* controversy. Here, the French influences goes beyond the demeanour of one individual. Marvell handles the French problem as it afflicts the English state.

1. Deadly Gallicisms

Seventeenth-century French churchmanship was part of the political struggles of the period. The shifting balance between clerical and civil power animated conflict all over Europe, but in Restoration England it was of special concern. Paranoia surrounded the link between the English crown and French Catholicism. The version of Catholicism to which James Stuart converted in 1669, and to which Charles II pledged conversion in the 1670 Secret Treat of Dover was this Gallican variety:

That religion from the first had a French orientation. When James first told his brother Charles II in 1669 that he had rejoined the Catholic Church, the brothers discussed ‘the ways and methods fit to be taken for advancing the Catholic religion in his dominions’, concluding “that there was no better way for doing this great work, than to do it in conjunction with France”.⁴

The mounting threat of absolutism was entangled with an aggressive universalizing religious policy that supported the inviolable power of kings and demanded active obedience from subjects. Most appealing to the Stuarts and most disturbing for English Protestants was the French-Catholic attitude towards royal prerogative: “Gallican Catholicism clearly went much further in extending royal authority than most High Churchmen were willing to go [... most] Anglican defenders of the royal prerogative asked only for a passive obedience to kings”.⁵ Parker was an exception to this generalization.

⁴ Pincus, 125.

⁵ Pincus, 133.

His universalizing attitudes, neatly summarized in his “Grand Thesis”, go beyond the attitudes of most High Churchmen and into a caricature of the Erastian position wherein the magistrate is supreme over the church. Images of Louis XIV’s forthcoming *Dragonnades* haunt the English Archdeacon’s cry for forced conformity and persecution: “People through ignorance and inadvertency to be betrayed into such unhappy Errors, as may tend to the Publick Disturbance, which though it be not so much their Crime as Infelicity, yet is there no remedy but it must expose them to the Correction of the Publick Rods and Axes”.⁶ Towards the end of his life, Parker was also an active participant in James II’s attempts in the 1680s at establishing an Anglican version of the Gallican ecclesiastical model.

The pamphlet controversies of the 1670s foreshadow this conflict. In *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, Parker’s supposed Frenchness proves a hot point for the controversy, even though the Francophile accusations are more subtle than other attacks. Against Parker, these attacks generally find development through *The Rehearsal* and London’s theatrical culture. Marvell draws a peculiar Gallicism from Buckingham’s *The Rehearsal* in justifying giving Parker a nickname: “to say Mr. Bayes is more *civil* than to say *Villain* and *Caitiff*, though these indeed are more *tuant*”.⁷ The neologism, “*tuant*”, suddenly finds widespread application in this controversy. From French, meaning “deadly” or “killing”, it finds no precedent in English usage. It appears only in texts with direct connections to the *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* controversy. Marvell draws it from *The Rehearsal*, where in praising his own work, Mr. Bayes blathers on in his typical style,

⁶ Parker, *Discourse*, 219.

⁷ Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in *Prose*, 1:51

needlessly peppering his naturally bumpkinish speech with self-aggrandizing “high-brow” terminology: “Ay, I gad, but is not that *tuant* now, ha? is it not *tuant*?”.⁸

This one little word sparks a conflagration. Several of Marvell’s respondents seize on “*tuant*”, and the odd Gallicism becomes a battleground. Parker picks it up in again addressing Marvell’s practice of nicknaming “now because neither Author nor Chaplain nor pink of Courtesie, nor Priest, nor buffoon, nor Prince *Volscius*, nor *Cicero* are *tuant* enough, what think you if three or four times in every page I call my Adversary Mr. *Bayes*?”.⁹ And again, in disparaging Marvell’s aggressive style and “throwing of dirt”, he sarcastically repeats the theatrical usage: “if you had told me all along that I disputed with a dirty Face, it had been full as *Tuant*”.¹⁰ Parker’s droning repetition marks a contrast with Samuel Butler’s wittier application of the same material. His reply in *The Transproser Rehears’d* relies on a hostile but pithy response rather than the archdeacon’s indignation at Marvell’s nicknames. Butler twists Marvell’s terminology against him, remarking that the excluded “Villain” and “Caitiff” are still more charitable than other terms Marvell uses: “these are not so *tuant* as *Malapert Chaplain*, *Buffoon-General* (and because it is an accomplishment to rail in more Languages then one) *Opprobrium Academiae* and *Pestis Ecclesiae*”.¹¹ With less wit, Edmund Hickeringill too seizes upon the word, evoking it thrice in a less playful and more descriptive sense. First, he accuses Marvell’s new form of argument as being mindless novelty: “It had been but converting the *Colledges* and *Halls* into *Laboratories*, the *Inns of Court* into *Coffe-houses* [...] and all *antiquated* Terms of Art,

⁸ Buckingham, *The Rehearsal*, Act 4, scene 1, lines 178-9.

⁹ Samuel Parker, *Reproof*, 249.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, 251.

¹¹ Butler, *Transproser*, 1:44, 1:65, 1:67.

into *Tuants*, *Flambos*, [...] &c. above *all* keeping the head warm the while with a *Perriwig* instead of a *Square Cap*".¹² Second, he integrates it into one of his many satirical verses: "Now, Master Speaker, if there be, / Within you so much Repartee, / As to ragoust now what I mean, / By this Harangue tuant and clean". Thirdly, he dismisses Marvell's wordplay as "disorderly scribbling", and calls for an end to what he perceives as disruptive nonsense: "let me not have one such tempting word, as *Trinkles*, *Tuants*, *Unhoopable* jurisdiction, or *ferreting upon the stage*, and the like to sport with; as he loves me, my ease, my quiet, and repose".¹³ Finally, the anonymous *S'too Him Bayes* quotes it once, against Marvell's perceived lack of genteel decorum: "that a man ought not to *talk* like a *Ninny-hammer* but when it were *evidently Courteous* and *Gent*, or *Tuant*, or *Great*".¹⁴

The spread of "tuant" through the controversy is informative on several counts. That Marvell's casual use of what had been a word unique to Buckingham's Bayes drew an aggressive response from four of eight opponents indicates that it struck a common nerve. The pamphleteers' responses hint that some of them had seen *The Rehearsal* performed. Only Butler's response addresses "tuant" specifically as a French word, in the context of Marvell's multi-lingual attack. Thus, the response then owes either to *The Rehearsal* or wider casual usage of Gallicisms by English speakers.

The subordinate placement of Bayes's line in the printed editions of *The Rehearsal*, disconnected from any of the more burlesque features of the play (or even from the more ridiculous events happening about it), further suggests a flamboyant delivery on the part of Bayes's actor, John Lacy, to underscore the humour of the character's Francophilia.

¹² Hickeringill, 30.

¹³ Ibid, 142, 274.

¹⁴ *S'too Him Bayes* (London, 1673 [EEBO]), 3-4.

Although we have virtually no knowledge of the earliest productions of *The Rehearsal*, what we do know is of Bayes: “we may presume that a vital part of the performance impact of *The Rehearsal* derives from body language and miming, whether personally aimed at Dryden or not. There is strong evidence for a performance tradition handed down from Lacy to Hayns to the Cibbers and Garrick”. Garrick’s performance in some ways broke with the earlier tradition: where previously the Bayes character was handled as a jester, he instead played deadpan and chose to “enter into the part rather than mock it”. Garrick’s reinterpretation of the character as oblivious to his own folly was noteworthy among eighteenth-century theatregoers. From this perceived contrast we can infer that Lacy’s Bayes was likely an “obnoxious fop part”, clownish and overemphasized.¹⁵

Could perhaps “tuant” have been a hyperbolic catchphrase in Lacy’s repertoire? Such speculation would seem to fit with the disproportionate responses from the Posse. That this pointedly French jab drew such attention indicates that it managed to strike some particular nerve beyond the surface association with Bayes’s character. The large-scale reaction to “*tuant*” indicates that Gallicisms and French style were noteworthy among Marvell’s readers. Marvell’s usage credits Parker with a fascination with the Gallic, but the overall hostility of the reactions demonstrates that the allegation has more depth than a mere linguistic tic.

Anxiety over French influence has deep roots in Marvell’s prose. He largely puts Francophilia or French influence into a repulsively carnal category. To do this, Marvell revisits the disease metaphor in his 1670/1 letter to William Popple.¹⁶ Hitherto, Marvell

¹⁵ Hume and Love, 357, 373, 371.

¹⁶ Marvell, *Letters*, 323.

used disease as a metaphor for political corruption in his poetry throughout his career. A fascination with *morbus Gallicus* is first expressed in “Flecknoe, an English Priest at Rome” (1645-6). The title character is a Catholic recusant. In the concluding movement of the satire, Flecknoe’s writing is given a contagious French flavour:

But how I loathed to see my neighbour glean
Those papers, which he pillèd from within
Like white flakes rising from a leper’s skin!
More odious than those rags which the French youth
At ordinaries after dinner show’th
When they compare their *chancres* and *poulaines*.¹⁷

The recusant is compared to a diseased leper or syphilitic Frenchmen, and his papers are likened to a contagion. More generally, a famous passage in the estate poem “Upon Appleton House” (1651) approaches political corruption in similar terms of disease.

Marvell figuratively examines the regicide and civil war in his description of a woodpecker striking at a rotten tree:

Who could have thought the tallest oak
Should fall by such a feeble stroke!
Nor would it, had the tree not fed
A traitor-worm, within it bred.
(At first our flesh corrupt within
Tempts ignorant and bashful Sin.)¹⁸

The oak, symbolizing Charles I, has been undermined by an outside parasitic interloper, rendering it feeble when tested by the “hewel”, symbolizing the royal executioner specifically, or the rebellion generally.

In the later verse satires, the disease metaphor makes even more regular appearances, and its French connotations begin to develop. In “The Second Advice to a

¹⁷ Marvell, “Flecknoe, and English Priest at Rome”, lines 132-7.

¹⁸ Marvell, “Upon Appleton House”, lines 551-6.

Painter” (1666), Marvell denounces the Earl of Sandwich for maritime looting and financial corruption:

He meets the French, but to avoid all harms,
Slips to the Groin (embassies bear not arms!)
There let him languish a long quarantine,
And ne’er to England come till he be clean.¹⁹

Some point in Sandwich’s fiscally-debauched career has taken him through “Groin”, a sailor’s nick-name for Corunna in Spain, where Sandwich has contracted a contagious sickness. This is presumably a moral strain of syphilis from French influence which necessitates his quarantine in order to prevent further infection among the English. Again, in “The Third Advice to the Painter” (1666-7), Marvell’s speaker, Ann, the Duchess of Albemarle, decries embezzlers in the same terms:

See that the men have pay and beef and beer;
Find out the cheats of the four-millioner.
Out of the very beer they steal the malt,
Powder out of powder, from powdered beef the salt.
Put thy hand to the tub: instead of ox,
They victual with French pork that has the pox.²⁰

This time, the even more explicitly French pox again afflicts the English administration, and once again threatens to spread and contaminate the navy. The pox is syphilis, and “tub” puns on the sweating tub treatment for that disease (OED n.1b). Like “Upon Appleton House”, “The Last Instructions to a Painter” (1667) brings disease near to the crown itself. The closing address “To the King” continues the metaphor’s application:

And so his bold tube man to the sun applied,
And spots unknown to the bright star descried;
Showed they obscure him, while too near they please,
And seem his courtier, are but his disease.²¹

¹⁹ Marvell, “The Second Advice to a Painter”, lines 313-6.

²⁰ Marvell, “The Third Advice to a Painter”, lines 327-32.

The sun is a traditional symbol for the King, and the spots may be a sign of moral disease that causes outward spotting: ambiguously smallpox, syphilis, or, as a recent editor suggests, venereal disease.²² That the courtiers prove a plague upon the crown is a grim assessment of the state's health. For Marvell, syphilis is a grotesque outward symbol for the intellectual and spiritual disfigurement caused by a French influence.

Marvell's prose is like his poems in this respect. The disease metaphor finds extensive application in the attack on Parker in *The Second Part*. Now the insinuations are still more scurrilous. In a revealingly intricate passage, Marvell discloses that Parker has fallen under the effects of a mysterious ailment:

Some indeed will have it, that under those Terms of a dull and lazy distemper he calumniates a more and active and stirring Disease, (as the Spleen and the Scurvy do oftentimes bear the blame of another infirmity) and that it is no Grecian malady, but derives its name from a Countrey much nearer. But that *Distemper is so unsuitable to the Civility of his Education*, and the *Gravity of his Profession*, that I question much whether it could be *so Clownish and Licentious* (bold though it be) *to accost* a Personage of his Figure and Character.²³

As the editorial footnote reminds us, the disease of a "country much nearer" is syphilis, disparagingly known as "French Pox". For the English, syphilis was at times an outward manifestation of too-close contact with French things. In the same grotesque vein, the early versions of Mr. Bayes in the now-lost "*Ur-Rehearsal*" reportedly satirized William Davenant, or as he styled himself D'Avenant, himself a Francophile playwright disfigured by syphilis. In evoking the so-called "French" disease against Parker, in play with *The*

²¹ Marvell, "The Last Instructions to a Painter", lines 949-52.

²² Nigel Smith, ed., *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, 395, note 950-2.

²³ Marvell, *The Second Part*, in *Prose*, 1:227.

Rehearsal, Marvell gestures towards the Anglo-French culture of which Davenant was a representative and that Dryden's *Essay of Dramatick Poesie* seeks to reform.

Such syphilitic jokes at Parker's expense recur, and the satire consistently uses the disease as a way of discussing Parker's Frenchness. Immediately following a vignette featuring a whale chasing a tub, and a sly Hebraist pun attacking both Parker's masculinity and his loyalty,²⁴ Marvell alludes to "Cornelius his Tub",²⁵ the same therapeutic sweating cabinet that appears in "The Third Advice to a Painter". To the conclusion of the latter, revised, editions of *The Second Part of The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, Marvell adds in direct address to Parker, "*Et vous avez passé Monsieur par la Baviere*", translated as "And you, [Sir], have passed through the stage of la bavière",²⁶ the late stage and side effects of mercurial treatments for syphilis. *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* provides a further clue as to the inner literary workings of this affliction when Marvell associates Parker's divinity with "a scurvy disease" in an anecdote about false mercy leading to accidental cannibalism:

the Genouese in their Warrs with Venice took some of their Noblemen, whom they cut to pieces and barrl'd up like Tunny [Tuna], and so maliciously vented it to the Venetians, who eating it ignorantly, broke out in those nasty botches and ugly symptoms, that are not curable but by Mercury.²⁷

The equation of Parker's divinity with a contagion, and a French one at that, is a serious development of the seemingly lighter French jabs with more direct roots in *The Rehearsal*. This disease of divinity and compromised loyalty that Parker contracted, carries, and spreads, is likely the quasi-Erastian ecclesiology propounded in his "Grand Thesis". This is

²⁴ Neal Hackler, "A Subtle Circumcision in Andrew Marvell's *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part*," *Notes and Queries* 57 (2010): 57-58.

²⁵ Marvell, *The Second Part*, in *Prose*, 1:282.

²⁶ *Ibid*, 1:437 and note 1157, editor's translation.

²⁷ *Ibid*, 1:110.

the attitude which found effective application in the policies of Louis XIV and his Gallican Church, and it was now in Canterbury – a “French pox” for the Church of England.

The riskiest of Marvell’s disease metaphors in his prose are the final words of the *Account*, and it shifts from ecclesiastical accusations back to political. The larger narrative, examined in greater depth below, is one of French-instigated corruption in the English Parliament, state, and court, even going as far as to insinuate Royal collusion. This time, however, the disease is other than syphilis:

His *Majesty* having discerned the Disease, may with his Healing Touch apply the Remedy. For so far is the Relator himself from any Sinister surmise of his Majesty, or from suggesting it to others, that he acknowledges, if it were fit for Caesars Wife to be free, much more is Caesar himself from all Crime and Suspition.²⁸

In handling Charles II in the middle of the conspiracy, explicitly, Marvell declares that a king is beyond suspicion and corruption, and the threatening conspiracy could be ended by his intervention. Implicitly, Marvellian irony turns the respectful absolution into an accusation. The disease cured by the healing touch of a king is scrofula, also known as “the King’s Evil”. In calling the state’s corruption the “King’s” evil, as opposed to the “French” pox, it suggests that Charles II is the source of the conspiracy as much as a potential cure. The subsequent allusion to Caesar’s wife, Pompeia, has a similar bite: in failing to be above suspicion, she lost her seat at Caesar’s side. If the same logic applies to Charles II, should he be unable to bring himself beyond suspicion, he is thereby fit to be removed from power. The consequent conclusion suggested by the wordplay of disease gestures towards the fate of his father, executed in rebellion, or the future fate of his brother, exiled in revolution.

²⁸ Marvell, *Account*, in *Prose*, 2:376-7.

2. Fops and Fashion

Marvell's tract, *Mr. Smirke, or, The Divine in Mode* (1676), is decidedly less theatrical than *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* or its *Second Part*. Marvell's target in *Mr. Smirke* was Francis Turner, a High Churchman who later found preferment in the early 1680s, was among the seven bishops imprisoned in the tower by James II for defying an order to read the declaration of indulgence from the pulpits, became a nonjuror who opposed William and Mary's coronation, and then in the 1690s was implicated in a Jacobite plot. His encounter with Marvell notably anticipates the later turns of his career. While an otherwise dignified author, Turner published what has been called a "clumsily sarcastic"²⁹ attack, entitled *Animadversions upon a Late Pamphlet* (1676), against Bishop Herbert Croft's *The Naked Truth* (1675), animadverting Croft's appeals for comprehension for the ejected ministers. Parker and Turner's shared disdain for toleration and/or comprehension makes them an unsurprising pair of victims for Marvell's pen.

The pamphlet, and its title, follows from Marvell's appropriation of Etherege's *The Man of Mode or Sir Fopling Flutter*, in a strategy similar to his previous appropriation of *The Rehearsal*. Like *The Rehearsal*, the rake-comedy *The Man of Mode* was new, fashionable, and written by a courtly author. The setting is once again the malls and streets of the contemporary West End, and the central characters are again refined men of fashion and style. The title character Mr. Smirke is a peripheral one in Etherege's play, a subservient minister brought into the action for the sake of shanghaiing another character with a surprise wedding scheme and kept in a closet until needed. The peripheral character in the title signals a shift in the targets of satire: "It is not now the harmless fops of

²⁹ Paul Hopkins, "Turner, Francis (1637-1700)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2006 [Online edition]).

Restoration society at whom one is to laugh, but the fashionable clergymen like Turner, whose convenient doctrine of enforced conformity, religion *à la mode*, is decidedly sinister”.³⁰ Marvell takes exception to the junior Turner’s attack on the senior Bishop Croft. For Turner, Croft’s published beliefs are of the wrong sort, and in a patronizing tone, Turner’s *Animadversions* sets forth to chastise and correct.

Mr. Smirke deals with such ecclesiastical problems in the terms of fashion and play. What the tract lacks in direct theatrical allusion it makes up in theatrical metaphor: for Marvell, the modern English divines, of whom Turner is a representative, are unserious beings, equivalent to children at play, actors in a farce, or witless fools dressing up to follow the latest fads. He deals primarily with two characters, Bishop Croft, referred to as “the Author”, and the Chaplain Turner, “the Animadverter”. The tract is divided into sections under two headings that address different parts of Turner’s *Animadversions*. The first and shorter of the headed sections is “*Annotations upon his Animadversions on the Title, Dedication &c*”.³¹ Turner’s attack identified an “*Enthusiastic*” style in Croft’s title, and to this Marvell inquires, “What is the *Stile* of a *Title* [...] If the stile of the Epistle before the *Naked Truth* be Enthusiastic and Fanatical, the stile of the Animadverter is presumed, and so allowed of, as Spiritual, Divine, and Canonical”.³² Following this he scrutinizes Turner’s self-proclaimedly thorough reading habits. In sardonically drawing attention to Turner’s efforts against Croft’s title, Marvell demonstrates that cleric’s fixation with superficial dressings. Rather than passing judgement on Croft’s argument, Turner begins by critiquing outward signs and proclaiming his opponent to be dressed in a zealot’s

³⁰ Patterson, “Introduction” to *Mr. Smirke*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 2:13.

³¹ Marvell, *Mr. Smirke*, in *Prose*, 2:43.

³² *Ibid*, 2:44.

clothing rather than the more fashionable, and as Turner would have it canonical, episcopal style.

Next, Marvell moves into Turner's animadversions on the body of Croft's argument. His first sentence makes clear his opinion of Turner's work: "The Play begins". This section continues, satirically addressing Turner's animadversions, until the sudden diversion at the close into the *Short Historical Essay*. Marvell's first jab sets the tone. Upon Turner's having sarcastically called Croft's pamphlet a "Jewel", Marvell questions his target's use of irony:

That word *Jewel* is commonly used in a good sense, and I know no reason why this Book of the authors might not be properly enough called so, though the Animadverter hath debased the meaning of the word to deprave and undervalue the worth of the Treatise. For I perceive that, during his Chaplainship [to James, duke of York], he hath learned it in conversation with the Ladies, who translate it frequently to call Whore in a more civil and refined signification.³³

Like Dorimant and Sir Fopling, Turner consorts with the fashionable ladies and picks up their parlance. Not least of all, the implicit reminder of Turner's association with the by-then openly Catholic James suggests a readiness to subordinate orthodoxy to personal ambition.

To *Mr. Smirke* Marvell attaches to *A Short Historical Essay Concerning General Councils, Creeds, and Impositions, in Matters of Religion*, which gives an overview of early church councils, focusing on the conflict between Athanasian and Arian camps. Whatever scale suggested by the title, the *Short Historical Essay* is nearly as long as the animadversion. In a similar bind, the title *Mr. Smirke*, with its reference to Etherege's comedy, is deceptive. In drawing on a current comedy, it hints that the animadversion will be in a satirical style, like *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, and more entertaining than the

³³ Ibid, 2:58.

presumably serious appended *Essay*. In fact, the comic difference between the two is less than the titles suggest: when seeking theatrical vocabulary, the *Short Historical Essay* has an unexpectedly high proportion compared to *Mr. Smirke*. While *Mr. Smirke* contains some satirical and humorous elements, and sometimes speaks in the burlesque voice of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, *Mr. Smirke* is a more typical example of *ad hominem* animadversion. Comparatively, the *Short Historical Essay* is the deadpan counterpart. It speaks in learned but ironic voice that offers a historical narrative in subtly unscholarly terms and a coolly farcical rendition of its intellectual subject matter.

In these two voices, the twin tracts of *Mr. Smirke* address a set of issues similar to those handled by way of theatre in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. The problem of Francophilia in English divinity is central, and Etherege's play provides a strong starting point. Like *The Rehearsal*, *The Man of Mode* features an extravagant Francophile, Sir Fopling Flutter, as the crux of its comic plot. Where Bayes had been indicted on charges of the quasi-French theatrical nonsense from which he takes his name, Sir Fopling, as the man of mode, upon one short visit to France has with a clownish effrontery adopted the latest Parisian fashions of dress and dance, accented with his brand-new periwig and faux-French accent. Fopling congratulates himself for his great sense of style and fashion. Critical of simplicity in others, he remains oblivious to his own folly.

Moreover, Sir Fopling's Francophile tendencies carry hints of a personal relationship between Etherege and Marvell's political allies. Sir Fopling's arbitrary preference for French things over English equivalents is clearly demonstrated when he shows off his train of footmen: An interlocutor inquires as to whether the servants are all French, and he replies "There's one damn'd English blockhead among 'em, you may know him by his Meine [demeanour]". Upon just at that moment learning his servant's name to

be “John Trott”, Sir Fopling cries, “O unsufferable! *Trott, Trott, Trott!* there’s nothing so barbarous as the names of our English Servants”, and then renames Trott after the footman’s home county, Hampshire.³⁴ Comedy aside, John Trott was the name of a Hampshire baronet, an MP and friend of Marvell’s. Marvell’s correspondence contains a 1667 letter to Trott consoling his friend on the loss of his last surviving son that August; John’s sons’ monuments in the Church of St. Mary the Virgin in Laverstoke Hampshire are each engraved with Latin verses authored by Marvell. Why Etherege would insert Trott of all people into his play as a footman who receives abuse at the whim of the central Francophile fop is somewhat mysterious. If the Trott episode is taken as a sign of aggression it could owe to tensions between court and country parties. If interpreted as a light-hearted joke, it could be a gesture to that MP’s country virtue, and instead come at the expense of abusive Francophile statesmen under whom Trott works and suffers.

Indeed, in the comedy, Sir Fopling is regarded as a senseless buffoon. He is put in opposition to Dorimant, a fashionable town wag and one of English theatre’s most famous rakes. Dorimant is usually interpreted as not being guilty of the same fashionable excesses as Sir Fopling, nor has he decidedly subordinated his English identity to an assumed French one. Dorimant, unlike Sir Fopling, enjoys French culture without falling into the “servile imitation” that Dryden seeks to escape. Nonetheless, that he is able to engineer a mistaken identity plot in which the ridiculous Sir Fopling is mistaken for the notorious debauchee Dorimant suggests that he too may suffer from Francophilia, merely in a less overbearing strain. Curiously, although most readings of *The Man of Mode* interpret Dorimant as a sympathetic protagonist and at worst a likeable anti-hero, Marvell handles him roughly:

³⁴ George Etherege, *The Man of Mode, or, Sir Fopling Flutter*, in *Restoration Drama: An Anthology*, edited by David Womersley (Oxford: Blackwell), Act 3, scene 3, lines 27-9, 35-7.

“So that there was more to do in equipping Mr. Smirke then there is about Doriman[t]; and the Divine in Mode might have vyed with Sir Fopling Flutter”.³⁵ When one might expect Marvell to align himself with the likeable character, as he does with Smith/Johnson from *The Rehearsal*, he in fact identifies Turner in terms that are equal parts the Mr. Smirke character, Dorimant, and Sir Fopling.

Marvell’s attitude toward Dorimant may result from an emphasis on the character’s Francophilia in the earliest productions. An explanation is found in the production and print chronology of *The Man of Mode* in respect to *Mr. Smirke*. *The Man of Mode* premiered to great fanfare on Saturday, 11 March 1676, at the Dorset Garden theatre. The first printed edition was licensed by L’Estrange on 3 June, entered with the stationers on 15 June, and advertised in the November term catalogues. *Mr. Smirke* is more difficult to date, but internal evidence puts it in press before the end of April that year.³⁶ Marvell must have either seen a performance or heard anecdotes of Etherege’s hit play already in March or early April. Additionally, unless he somehow had access to the actors’ or Etherege’s own manuscripts, this means that Marvell was unlikely to have possessed a text of the play when writing *Mr. Smirke*. In that case, lacking a textual reference, Marvell’s borrowing of *The Man of Mode* would have been entirely from memory. This possibility is consistent with the relatively light usage that the play finds in the pamphlet, with a near absence of direct quotations, instead preferring broad thematic strokes. The compelling evidence, however, is that Marvell drops the “t” from the lead rake’s name. Where Etherege’s *dramatis personae* uses the now-standard spelling, “Dorimant”, Marvell printed his single

³⁵ Andrew Marvell, *Mr. Smirke*, in *Prose*, 2:43.

³⁶ von Maltzahn, *Chronology*, 170.

reference to the character as “Doriman”, a spelling that has no other known usage. That this orthographical discrepancy occurs in an account written between the premiere and the printing suggests that in early productions “Dorimant” was pronounced with a French inflection. While Marvell’s orthography could be a printer’s error, it may also be an effect of a soft or silent “t” phoneme from the stage version of *Man of Mode* to the page of *Mr. Smirke*. One can thus speculate that in the earliest productions of the play in March-April 1676, the Doriman[t] character’s own Francophilia was more pronounced than in later interpretations, leading to Marvell’s development as a satirical butt in unison with Sir Fopling.

It seems that for Marvell’s purposes, Dorimant’s Franco-dandyism is equivalent to Sir Fopling’s senseless pursuit of fashion. The fashionable “ladies” among whom Dorimant mingles, and from whom Turner has allegedly acquired certain euphemisms are of the same type. The Duke of York ran in the same circles, and his affinity for French culture developed into a political catastrophe. Perhaps Dorimant’s moderate Francophilia is still more than should be tolerated in the Church of England? In *Mr. Smirke*, Marvell figures Turner and those clerics like him as dangerous, in the terms of fashion, extravagance, and sense:

But these are the Divines in Mode, who, being by their Dignities and Preferments plump’d up beyond Humane Proportion, do whether for their Pride or Ignorance, neither understand themselves, nor others, (men of Nonsense) much less do they understand to speak of God, which ought to be their study, with any tolerable *Decorum*.³⁷

Marvell’s consistent use of the word “mode” insinuates Frenchness as well. This usage, a, “A prevailing fashion, custom, practice, or style, *esp.* one characteristic of a particular place

³⁷ Marvell, *Mr. Smirke*, in *Prose*, 2:85.

or period,” is a “sense derived from French” (OED 7). Similarly, in the *Short Historical Essay*, a line from *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* by which Marvell makes subtle accusations of Francophilia finds new use in discussing early Church history. In his narrative of early creeds, he draws upon an analogy with contemporary French-inspired fashion: “As the Arts of Glass Coaches and Perriwigs illustrate this Age, so by their Trade of Creed-making, then first Invented, we may esteem the Wisdom of Constantine’s, and Constantius his Empire”.³⁸ Glass coaches and periwigs were novelties in Marvell’s time. His associate the Duke of Buckingham owned a productive glazery that supplied windows for those coaches. But as wondrous as they could be, they were also luxuries and ornamentations: things unnecessary. Just as Sir Fopling dons his luxurious powdered periwig to project an air of affluence and to elevate himself above the cropped heads of tradesmen or mechanicals, the Constantinian bishops adorn the apostolic faith with glittering creeds. As Marvell, or dissenting church critics, would have it, Turner and the other “divines in mode” are no different.

Marvell’s historical narrative traces the changing fortunes of the Athanasian and Arian camps by using trivializing terminology, until he arrives at the death of Constantine and the accession of his son Constantius. The new Emperor reversed the fortunes of the camps and “inverted the Poles of Heaven” by favouring the heretical Arians over the orthodox Athanasians. At this time, “Arrianism was the Divinity then in Mode, and he was an ignorant and ill Courtier, or Church-man, that could not dress, and would not make a new Suit for his Conscience in the Fashion”.³⁹ The overall metaphor that Marvell builds in

³⁸ Ibid, 2:152-3.

³⁹ Marvell, *Mr. Smirke*, in *Prose*, 2:150.

this sub-textual thread is of the ecclesiastical public as a theatre of sorts, and the play is Etherege's *Man of Mode* adapted to a new setting. The suggestion is that these clergymen are simply acting a part perceived to be modern and advantageous, all for an audience's "laughter" and "horror". This harkens back to the "bulky folly" of Sir Fopling, and comes at the expense of his contemporary "Divines in Mode" who dress their attitudes for the political climate: Parker and Turner. The idea of fashionable divinity again gestures towards the problem of clerical comprehension: the less-tolerant Episcopalians having demanded that their Presbyterian colleagues shed their current garments and theology for a surplice and a ready-made substitute. Could these fashion-obsessed clergymen follow the example of the inconstant Athanasians and abandon the orthodoxy of the Church of England in favour of a convenient substitute should royal succession present the opportunity?

Between the two parts of the volume, *Mr. Smirke* shows little of the boisterous theatrics that set *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* apart, and relies on Etherege only on a thematic level. Marvell attacks Turner and his arguments fairly directly, without relying upon the circuitous style of joking that is especially prevalent in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. Sir Fopling and Mr. Smirke earn two mentions each, while Doriman[t] only one. Turner is addressed as "The Animadverter" instead of in a more creative nickname. Rather than constructing a complex networks of voices as in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in *Mr. Smirke* Marvell speaks consistently with his own. Only one obvious quotation from *The Man of Mode* makes its way into the body of the text, drawn from John Dryden's epilogue that provides the social "moral" for Etherege's play, the caution that Sir Fopling's folly is a widespread problem among all of the English who have aspirations to fashion:

Legion his name, a People in a Man,

And instead of Sir Fopling Flutter, he Mr Smirke,
*Be Knight oth' shire and represent them all.*⁴⁰

Or, as it would appear in the later, first print edition of the play:

True Fops help Nature's work, and go to school,
 To file and finish god'a'mighty's fool.
 Yet none Sir *Fopling* him, or him can call;
 He's Knight o'th' Shire, and represents ye all.
 From each he meets, he calls what e're he can,
 Legion's his name, a people in a Man.
 His bulky folly gathers as it goes,
 And, rolling o're you, like a Snow-ball growes.⁴¹

When read side-by-side, the reliance of Marvell's passage upon familiarity with the original is apparent. Again, Marvell makes use of flat quotation (his improved "Legion his name" versus the original "Legion's his name" or "represent them all" versus "represent ye all"), and this once again suggests that Marvell was working from memory when interpolating the Etheregean content. Even though he only quotes two lines, Marvell's excerpt nonetheless echoes the theme of fashionable folly and infectious fashion that Dryden advances in the verse. The surrounding passage in *Mr. Smirke* jabs at Turner for stepping out of place and putting words into the mouths of the Lords and Commons, "to Represent in his peculiar person the whole Representative".⁴² Simultaneously, Marvell insinuates that the problem of fashionable religious values is not unique to Turner, and is rather a wider problem for the episcopacy. To complete the larger connection between the persecuting spirit that Marvell locates in the "Divines in Mode" and Sir Fopling's pathological pursuit of cutting-edge fashion is left to the reader's familiarity with the play.

⁴⁰ Marvell, *Mr. Smirke*, in *Prose*, 2:48.

⁴¹ George Etherege with John Dryden, "Epilogue" to *The Man of Mode*, lines 13-20.

⁴² Marvell, *Mr. Smirke*, in *Prose*, 2:48

Moreover, the light use of direct allusion does not undermine the significance of the crossover between theatre and ecclesiastical controversy in this text, even though Marvell neglects inserting dense and layered allusions to English theatre that are found in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. Marvell instead uses theatricality on a metaphorical level. Indeed, the debate for both sections – *Mr. Smirke* and the *Short Historical Essay* – is in terms of entertainment, play, theatre, and acting. *Mr. Smirke*'s introduction looks at England, and London more particularly. Marvell's first word in the controversy is on the nature of the conflict at hand. After briefly warning his readers of the aggression that follows, Marvell explains that he has chosen to step into the fray on behalf of a sitting Church of England prelate so that the "Author of *The Naked Truth*", Herbert Croft, could maintain the dignity of his station: "He could have best writ a Defence proportionable to his own Subject; had he esteemed it necessary or that it was decent for him to have enter'd into the Pit with so Scurrilous an Animadverter".⁴³ In a 17 July 1676 letter to William Popple, Marvell relays how "y^e foole", Croft, sent a personal letter expressing gratitude for the intervention: "I hope this will happily arrive to render him due thanks for yⁱ humane civility & Christian charity showed to y^e author of naked truth soe bespattered wth y^e dirty language of foul mouthed beasts". Marvell's reply to Croft emphasized that "a good cause receives more injury from a weake defence yⁿ from a frivolous accusation".⁴⁴

The "pit" into which he steps is an exercise in complex Marvellian wordplay that suggests theatre in several ways. Of course, the "pit" is the space in the theatre where the most raucous and critical spectators tend to gather. In this reading, Croft's animadverter,

⁴³ Ibid, 2:37.

⁴⁴ Marvell, *Letters*, 2:346-347.

Turner, is an unruly member of the audience and Marvell is another spectator who intervenes so that the performer can continue acting in his proper place on the stage. Alternately, a “pit” can refer to the space in which cockfights take place, and in Marvell’s own words this would put aggressive divines like Turner and Parker in “an Ecclesiastical Cock-pit”.⁴⁵ Cockfighting was another theatrical event. Like bear-baiting, it served as a diversion and entertainment for crowds of spectators. In this respect, Marvell himself is serving as a ringer or a mercenary champion for Croft in a combat sport. But lastly, cockpits also frequently served as theatres. The Drury Lane cockpit was also known as the Phoenix Theatre, and it doubled as a theatrical stage as early as 1609. After the Restoration several companies used this space, including the Duke’s company prior to the construction of the nearby permanent playhouse.⁴⁶ Pepys’s references to this site usually simply call it the “Cockpit” and omit the word “Theatre”.⁴⁷ The Whitehall palace cockpit also played host to a number of productions after the Restoration.⁴⁸ With these multiple meanings in mind, Marvell’s “pit” is space for an even blend of literary violence and professional theatre, and it stages the conflict which follows.

Clearly, this is a stage upon which battling divines can grandstand for a wide audience at the expense of their dignity. Whichever sense the reader takes from the word “pit”, the emphasis on entertainment is present. But, as in his handling of Parker, Marvell externalizes the humour and undermines the seriousness of Turner’s position:

⁴⁵ Ibid, 2:138.

⁴⁶ van Lennep, xxxii-iii, 5-8, 16. Also Leslie Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1962), 88.

⁴⁷ Latham and Matthews, 10:70.

⁴⁸ van Lennep, xxxvi.

It hath been the Good Nature (and Politicians will have it the Wisdom) of most Governours to entertain the people with Public Recreations; and therefore to incourage such as could best contribute to their Divertisement. And hence doubtless it is, that our Ecclesiastical Governours also (who as they yield to none for Prudence, so in good Humour they exceed all others) have not disdained of late years to afford the Laity no inconsiderable Pastime.⁴⁹

Marvell's basic position is that Turner is not a qualified essayist, but rather a satirist, or a rude "Ecclesiastical Droll".⁵⁰ Marvell stops short of generalizing all ecclesiastical controversy as theatrical entertainment, and he avoids labelling all English clergy as performers on this buffoonish stage. In stark contrast with his attack on Turner, he praises Croft's work as "a Treatise, that, were it not for this its opposer, needs no commendation", prior to heaping praises upon its sobriety and moderation, and Croft himself he styles a "Judicious, Learned, Conscientious, a sincere Protestant, and a true Son, if not a Father, of the Church of England".⁵¹ Marvell has no pretensions to his own seriousness in *Mr. Smirke*, for he is not excluded from his own definition: "an Animadverter, that is an Animal which hath nothing Humane in it but a Malicious Grinne, that may provoke indeed, but cannot Imitate so much as Laughter".⁵² The animadverter is a failed comedian; his (or its) act falls short of entertainment. This suggests a genre division between "dramatic" prose works such as Turner's, Parker's, or Marvell's own, and the serious ecclesiastical tracts being produced by sensible authors such as Owen, Baxter, or Croft.

What is more, Marvell's pseudonym for this tract, "Andreas Rivetus Jr.", expresses tension in the Francophile problem. On one hand, he plays on his own name: *rivet*, OED

⁴⁹ Marvell, *Mr. Smirke*, in *Prose*, 2:37-8.

⁵⁰ *Ibid*, 2:39.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, 2:41.

⁵² *Ibid*, 2:53.

v.4 “To fix intently (the eye or the mind); to command or engross (the attention)” is synonymous with the verb “to marvel”. (Marvell delights in wordplay: he also plays with his own name in his poetry, for example in “The Mower against Gardens”: “Another world was searched, through oceans new, / To find the *Marvel of Peru*”.⁵³) Marvell used “Andreas” in his own signature for Latin documents.⁵⁴ On the other, he evokes the name of a French controversialist from a previous generation: “the revered Protestant theologian and combatant Andre Rivet, tutor to the young prince William of Orange and author of a series of scholarly critiques of Catholic patristics”. Rivet, like Marvell, had written extensively on early church fathers and worked from many of the same sources that Marvell cites, albeit with a different purpose. Nonetheless, “his example and reputation were of use to Marvell in returning to these materials with a different set of objectives”.⁵⁵ Indeed, Marvell’s identification with a French Protestant theologian is more evidence that Marvell’s cause for concern is more complex than simple Francophobia. Marvell here aligns himself with a French Protestant thinker who wrote against a French Catholic opposition.

Even though *Mr. Smirke* transitions into the *Short Historical Essay* with Marvell’s ironic claim that he is “weary” of literary conflict, the *Essay* continues the vicious characterizations that *Mr. Smirke* begins. The *Essay*, overtly, is a narrative of early Church history through the Arian controversy and the first council of Nicaea, specifically focusing on creeds and changing theological opinions. The specific theological dispute in question is the Athanasian Creed, which was for Marvell’s purpose a thinly veiled proxy for the

⁵³ Marvell, “The Mower against Gardens”, 17-18.

⁵⁴ von Maltzahn, *Chronology*, 83.

⁵⁵ Annabel Patterson, “Introduction” to *Mr. Smirke*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 2:17.

Thirty-Nine Articles which had caused an impasse in efforts at clerical comprehension shortly following the Restoration. Marvell's father, also a minister, shared in a wider "suspicion of the Athanasian Creed" on the grounds that it was "Romish and Popish".⁵⁶ In "The Loyal Scot", Marvell questions the moral basis for the same tradition of creed-making: "No wonder if the orthodox do bleed, / While Arius stands at th'Athanasian Creed".⁵⁷ The accusation is against Croft's opponents, particularly those such as Parker and Turner who promote oaths in opposition to comprehension and toleration, of being politically opportunistic clerics like those of the early church. In particular, his account of pre-Constantinian priestly rows and the "Arts by which Ambition climes" bears a striking resemblance to matters at hand:

But so I find that both before, and then, and after, they cast such Crimes at one another, that a Man would scarce think he were reading an History of Bishops, but a Legend of Divels: and each took such care to blacken his adversary, and he regarded now how he smutted himself and thereby his own Order, to the Laughter or Horror of the by-standers.⁵⁸

A reader may wonder if these "Divels" are of the same species as the Animadverter with the "malicious grin", particularly in that both debase their profession to the entertainment of an audience. The above-cited "Ecclesiastical Cock-pit" is a figurative way of discussing this disorder preceding Constantine's council, and it again situates the divines *à la mode* in front of an eager audience: "a man might have laid wagers either way".⁵⁹

⁵⁶ Nicholas von Maltzahn, "Milton, Marvell, and Toleration", in *Milton and Toleration*, ed. Sharon Achinstein and Elizabeth Sauer (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007), 93; See also, von Maltzahn, *Chronology*, 3.

⁵⁷ Marvell, "The Loyal Scot", lines 166-7.

⁵⁸ Marvell, *Mr. Smirke*, in *Prose*, 2:127

⁵⁹ *Ibid*, 2:138.

These church fathers receive a hostile treatment for their very theatricality. Marvell selects an account of St. Athanasius as a boy, summarized from Ruffinus and Sozomen. This vignette tells how a young Athanasius and some other boys, in playing, caught the attention of St. Alexander of Alexandria in “imitating it seems the Rites of the Church and office of the Bishops” and that Athanasius “baptized some of them that were not yet initiated in those Sacred Mysteries”. Despite the innocent and childish nature of the game, Alexander and the other clerics “approved of that Mock Baptism”, took “the boys that had acted the parts of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*” into clerical education, and “left them [...] at liberty to regenerate any more Lads upon the next Holy day as they thought convenient”.⁶⁰ Marvell’s rendition of this story emphasizes the “mock”, “act”, and “play”, thereby undermining the seriousness of the bishop’s duties. Shortly thereafter, he figures prelatical seriousness and specialization in terms of acting and performance: “what were the *Clergy* then but Lay-men disguis’d, drest up perhaps in another habit?”.⁶¹ Disguise is a theme in Marvell’s anti-clerical verse. In his lines on Colonel Thomas Blood’s 1671 attempt to steal the crown jewels, Marvell blurs the distinction between priest and thief:

He chose the cassock, surcingle and gown,
The fittest mask for one that robs the crown.
But his lay pity underneath prevailed,
And while he spared the keeper’s life, he failed.
With the priest’s vestments had he but put on
A bishop’s cruelty, the crown had gone.⁶²

Here, and in *Mr. Smirke*, Marvell insinuates that the clergy have no more authority than any form of actor, be it a child at play, a layman in the appropriate robes, or a thief in disguise.

⁶⁰ Ibid, 2:134-5.

⁶¹ Ibid, 2:149.

⁶² Marvell, “Epigram: Upon Blood’s attempt to steal the Crown”, lines 3-8. Also “The Loyal Scot”, lines 194-9 and the Latin version of the same verse, “Bludius et Corona”.

Turner and those like him are opportunists. In adjusting their ideologies to the vicissitudes of the age, they lack conviction and merely wear the most advantageous theological suit.

3. An English Tragedy

Finally, *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* takes a different approach to theatre than *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* or *Mr. Smirke*, electing to offer its subject matter directly instead of through the content of any specific play. In this respect, most scholarly readings of the *Account* put it into a mode of historical writing: Marvell's more serious and less literary prose contribution. Of all Marvell's pamphlets, the *Account* is the most political and least specifically ecclesiastical. Immediate responses treated it as an inflammatory libel and it was burned by the hangman. It has been called "the archetype of the forbidden book", and "a model exposition of Whig principles". Moreover, it was "retrospectively recognized [...] as one of the progenitors and models of a radical historiography, something which came to be designated 'secret history'".⁶³ The overall scholarly response to the *Account* emphasizes its relative sobriety: compared to the earlier tracts, "in the main the *Account* is far from such 'sportive and jeering buffoonery'",⁶⁴ "Marvell poses as a mere relater of events";⁶⁵ and that "Marvell's stance in the *Account* was two-fold. One half was that of the objective newsman [...] One half was that of a liberal parliamentarian".⁶⁶

⁶³ Patterson, "Secret History", 26, 27.

⁶⁴ Nicholas von Maltzahn, "Introduction", to *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 2:195

⁶⁵ Conal Condren and A.D. Cousins, eds. "Introduction", in *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell*, (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1990), 13.

⁶⁶ Patterson, "Secret History", 30.

But Marvell's plain-dealing is complicated by the *Account*'s "highly-wrought narrative"⁶⁷ and extensive irony: "the *Account* often reveals the distance between its professed and real intentions".⁶⁸ In many cases dramatic irony is the device of choice, making the most incendiary accusations by means of insinuation and allusion to knowledge that the readers, but not his characters, possess. Any too "plain-dealing" interpretation of the *Account* is problematic, despite the currency that reading has historically enjoyed. Insofar as it relies on an "austere economy of relevant fact",⁶⁹ that can be said of most narratives – as psychologically detailed as *Hamlet* may be, Shakespeare refrains from presenting trivialities such as shoe-tying. Marvell carefully picks and chooses the scenes and speeches that he includes to create an impressionist conspiracy in broad strokes, with just enough fine details to add an air of plausibility. In this respect, the *Account* reads as a play of its own, narrating the spread into the Crown and Parliament of the "French Pox" that Marvell has elsewhere diagnosed in Parker and Turner.

Chronologically, this pamphlet, if in a genre of secret history, became a prelude to Titus Oates and the Popish Plot. It appropriately featured a plot of its own that, reminiscent of a theatrical prologue, finds disclosure in the first paragraph of the book:

[T] Here has now for divers Years, a design been carried on, to change the Lawful Government of England into an Absolute Tyranny, and to convert the established Protestant Religion into down-right Popery: than both which, nothing can be more destructive or contrary to the Interest and Happiness, to the Constitution and Being of the King and Kingdom.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Condren, "Andrew Marvell as Polemicist", 160

⁶⁸ von Maltzahn, "Introduction", to *Account*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 2:165.

⁶⁹ Condren, "Andrew Marvell as a Polemicist", 170.

⁷⁰ Marvell, *Account*, in *Prose*, 2:225.

This striking first paragraph, with the title page that covers it, suggests a complex awareness of readers' habits in encountering and judging books, despite the *ad hoc* and clandestine history of its printing. In the early editions of 1677-79, the words "GROWTH", "POPERY" and "ENGLAND" stand out on the cover as the only three printed in large upper-case letters, forming a second, attention-grabbing statement, much as the plays of Behn, Dryden, and Wycherley advertise genre in the most visible text on the frontispiece. The factotum drop-capital "T" leading off the first paragraph, which in the first edition⁷¹ has an unusually thick decorative border and wide spacing, distinguishes itself from the subsequent upper-case "H" – is the plot perhaps both "There" and "Here"? This first paragraph has the elements both of a good rumour, providing just the striking plot points, and of a theatrical argument that can make an impression on even a passing reader. Should a reader abandon the tract after the first paragraph, he or she nonetheless will have a unified summary of the tract's grim allegations. Even in this first paragraph, the theatricality and dramatic manipulation begin. Marvell's earlier tracts rely on comic or carnivalesque theatricality. The *Account* instead seizes on "design" and "destruction" to spin its material into a unified plot and conspiracy. Perhaps as part of this aggressive self-presentation, Marvell's frontispiece and first paragraph comprise a well-calculated dissemblance wherein popery takes the dominant position. However, in the text at large, confessional divisions are subordinate to the threats of absolutism and French influence under which Roman religion is a menial servant.

⁷¹ 77a Wing M860.

An account of the Growth of POPERY, and Arbitrary Government in Eng- land, &c.

THere has now for diverse Yeare, a design
been carried on, to change the Lawfull
Government of *England* into an Absolute
Tyranny, and to convert the established
Protestant Religion into down-right Po-
pery: than both which, nothing can be
more destructive or contrary to the Interest and Happi-
nesse, to the Constitution and Being of the King and King-
dom.

For if first we consider the State, the Kings of *England*
Rule not upon the same terms with those of our neighbour
Nations, who, having by force or by adresse usurped that
due share which their People had in the Government, are
now for some Ages in possession of an Arbitrary Power
(which yet no Prescription can make Legall) and exercise
it over their persons and estates in a most Tyrannical man-
ner. But here the Subjects retain their proportion in the
Legislature; the very meanest Commoner of *England* is re-
presented in *Parliament*, and is a party to those Laws by
which the Prince is sworn to Govern himself and his people.

A 2

No

Marvell provides a “satirical ‘character’ of Popery”,⁷² that bore his name on the 1689 reprint in excerpt. This character of popery is weighted towards civil and ecclesiastical grievances moreso than doctrinal, and it is much more an anti-clerical invective against tyrannical practices of “Popery” than an actual denouncement of any “Papist” Catholic laity. Of the section reprinted in 1689, just over six pages in the 77a edition, a single paragraph of roughly one and one half pages is devoted to matters of worship and belief. Marvell opens the characterization with an apparent fumble in vocabulary owing to the complexity of the matters at hand, and removes the issue from matters of faith: “*Popery* is such a thing as cannot, but for want of a word to express it, be called a *Religion*, nor is it to be mentioned with that civility which is otherwise decent to be used, in speaking of the differences of *Human Opinion* about *Divine Matters*”.⁷³ The categorical separation of “*Popery*” from “*Religion*” has an ironic depth. The dominant meaning is a derogatory attack on the Church of Rome and its liturgy, accusing them of failing to meet basic criteria necessary to be considered “a religion”. But simultaneously, in making a distinction between the two terms, Marvell suggests that the target of his ire is something other than the liturgical or spiritual content of Roman Catholicism: “Popery” is distinct from the “Religion” in question. Thereafter, he refers to popery as the “fifth *Religion*, this last and insolentest attempt upon the credulity of Mankind”, following a historical sequence of paganism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. In this context, Marvell is subtly distinguishing between European Christian tradition and a new popish development, a relative novelty in Europe’s ecclesiastical arena.

⁷² von Maltzahn, “Introduction” to *Account*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 2:209.

⁷³ Marvell, *Account*, in *Prose*, 2:227.

Overall, the characterization of “Popery” that Marvell constructs in this passage bears a greater likeness to the threats of French absolutism than to Roman Catholicism. The specific complaints have a dramatized structure that brings into doubt the seriousness of the doctrinal attack: “The ‘character of popery’ [...] is plainly something of an interpolation, related to but distinct from the burden of political analysis that follows [...] Popery gains a less confessional and more secular sense; in sum, the work is written not against Rome, but against France”.⁷⁴ He begins with the stock Protestant talking point against the reading of scripture “in *publick Churches* but in a *Latin Translation* to the vulgar”,⁷⁵ and progressively works through a number of increasingly trivial complaints against idolatry and outward forms. These complaints are standard attacks that could very well have originated in any anti-clerical tract from the earlier part of the century. The criticisms of Catholic belief and doctrine are presented in caricature form, and his points are seemingly half-hearted and under-supported. This all climaxes in his attack on “Transubstantiall solacisme”, which he presents as a sarcastic burlesque, less at the expense of the believer, than against the influence of the Romish clergy:

that glorified Body, which at the same time they allow to be in Heaven, is sold again and crucified dayly upon all the Altars of their Communion. For God indeed may now and then do a miracle, but a Romish Priest can, it seems, work in one moment a thousand Impossibilities. Thus by a new and antisciptural Belief, compiled of Terroures to the Phancy, Contradictions to the Sense, and Impositions on the Understanding of the Laity have turned Tenants for their Souls, and in consequence Tributary for their Estates to more then omnipotent Priesthood.⁷⁶

The problems of doctrine, in Marvell’s summary, culminate in a scheme to increase the power and influence of the Papal clergy, and increase the “*Authority of the Pope*”. These

⁷⁴ von Maltzahn, “Introduction” to *Account*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 2:181-2.

⁷⁵ Marvell, *Account*, in *Prose*, 2:227.

⁷⁶ *Ibid*, 2:229.

abuses are the key to this “character” and are peppered with catchwords from constitutionalist social-contract theory. The Pope “by his *Indulgences*” provides an escape from damnation, “So that who would refuse to be vicious here, upon so good security”. Similarly, he “by his *Dispensation* annuls *Contracts* betwixt man and man, dissolves Oaths between *Princes*, or betwixt them and their People”. For all of the ink put towards Marvell’s warning against Popery, its growth appears a minor threat: “Nor therefore is there any, whether Prince or Nation, that can with less probability be reduced back to the *Romish* perswasion, than ours of England”. The implications of a “Growth of Popery” are, then, fraught with threats civil more so than spiritual. The Pope is a temporal tyrant rather than a religious one, as he sets up “what is *Just* to be *Unjust*, and what is *Vice* to be *Vertue*” and “all Laws are in the Cabinet of his Breast”,⁷⁷ and is as such a ruler by fiat and an arbitrary monarch. While one scholar defends Marvell from accusations of Francophobia by painting him as anti-Catholic, arguing that “Marvell’s allusions to Europe indicate that his perspective is more insular; his hostility to France is less parochial xenophobia than a hatred of the vanguard of the Roman advance”,⁷⁸ that order of conquest can just as easily be reversed.

The half-hearted nature of the religious prong of the attack suggests that for Marvell, doctrine and belief are minor issues in the “character” that he provides. The arguments that Marvell levels against Catholicism are unserious, especially when considered beside the detailed religious scholarship in *The Second Part of The Rehearsal Transpros’d* or *A Short Historical Essay*. A better analogy for Marvell’s character of

⁷⁷ Ibid, 2:229, 2:235, 2:230.

⁷⁸ Condren, “Andrew Marvell as a Polemicist”, 162.

popery is Ben Jonson's representation of puritans. For example, Jonson has the aggressive puritan Zeal-of-the-Land Busy rail against a Puppet Dionysius: "you are an abomination; for the male among you putteth on the apparel of the female, and the female of the male".⁷⁹ To compare, Marvell writes, "Nor is there any, whether Prince or Nation, that dissents from his Usurpations, but are marked out under the notion of *Hereticks* to ruine and destruction whensoever he shall give the signal".⁸⁰ Neither case is impossible, nor entirely without precedent, but both authors distort their targets into hyperbolic images for dramatic effect. Johnson represents the puritan as fixating upon a puppet's clothing as evidence of moral decay and abomination; Marvell depicts the Church of Rome as an organization that uses religious power to enforce political subservience.

Indeed, the hiding of temporal motives behind universal religious claims is key to the *Account's* plot. Although Marvell disguises his own civil politics with the veil of a confessional conflict, he later accuses the French of doing the same. Marvell exposes that Louis XIV made a placating claim "to other Popish Princes" in insisting that his expansion into the Spanish Netherlands and the United Provinces was "a War of Religion and in order to the Propagation of the Catholick Faith". The *Account* concedes that the terms of surrender offered to the Dutch included the establishment of a stable Catholic Episcopacy, but that it was a subordinate issue to the commercial and territorial gains France was pursuing: "he made indeed twelve Demands more, and notwithstanding all this devotion, the Article of Commerce, and for revoking their *Placaets* [*fig.* trade sanctions] against

⁷⁹ Ben Jonson, "Bartholomew Fair", in *The Alchemist and Other Plays*, ed. Gordon Campbell (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995), Act 5, scene 5, lines 86-8.

⁸⁰ Marvell, *Account*, in *Prose*, 2:231.

Wine, Brandy, and French manufactures was the first, and took the place of the *Catholic Apostolick Romane Religion*”.⁸¹

In this respect, a perceived threat of “popery” to English Protestantism is simply the preface to the *Account*, and the true danger is instead against English sovereignty and commerce. This threat advances by the motions of a shadowy group of conspirators: “there are those men among us, who have undertaken, and do make it their business, under so Legal and perfect a Government, to introduce a French slavery, and instead of so pure a Religion, to establish the Roman idolatry”. Marvell accuses in a vocabulary that on one hand recalls Parliamentary apologetics from the Civil War and on the other foreshadows later Whig jargon:

For, as to matter of Government, if to murder the King be, as certainly it is, a Fact so horrid, how much more heinous is it to assassinate the Kingdom? And as none will deny, that to alter our *Monarchy* into a *Common weatlth* were *Treason*, so by the same Fundamental Rule, the Crime is no less to make that *Monarchy Absolute*.⁸²

And despite the more serious tone and subject matter, the theatrical vocabulary still seeps into the tract. The pamphlet’s central purpose is to discover a “plot”, in the dual sense of a conspiracy and a story. Where in his earlier works Marvell takes few pains to hide the witty distortions and spin that he puts into the issue, in the *Account* he instead proclaims himself a plain dealer: “my intention is only to write a naked Narrative of some of the most considerable passages in the meeting of *Parliament* in the 15. of Feb 1676[/7]”.⁸³ But overall, the narrative aspect of the *Account* is at odds with the self-proclaimed intention of

⁸¹ Marvell, *Account*, in *Prose*, 2 262-3

⁸² *Ibid*, 2 238.

⁸³ *Ibid*, 2 241

being serious, plain-dealing, and journalistic. The text is an embellished drama in its own right, containing acts, scenes, settings, and players.

Marvell relies on a sprawling and mostly un-credited *dramatis personae*. The *Account* boasts a large cast of the Lords, the Commons, the Crown, the Bishops, numerous discrete members of Parliament, the French state, the righteous, the corrupt, and the shadowy conspirators. The latter are the otherwise well-known members of the English state, who in the “design”, or plot, are piloting the nation towards constitutional collapse. The body of the *Account* consists of a variety of often disjointed elements through which the narrator is a ghostly guide: Parliamentary speeches, bills, debates, and narratives that expose corruption and double-dealing throughout the English government and state. The opening consists of Marvell’s character of popery and includes a narrative of the Anglo-Dutch wars, the failed Triple Alliance, and the “Invisible League” formed with France in the Secret Treaty of Dover, at the negotiation of which King Charles’ sister, Princess Henriette-Anne, was allegedly poisoned and thereafter died. This dark event receives treatment as the beginning of an extended series of events: “the reconciliation with France were not to be celebrated with a less sacrifice then of the Blood Royal of England: The sequel will be suitable to so ominous a beginning”.⁸⁴ That the sickly Henriette-Anne was the subject of an autopsy by both French and English physicians goes unmentioned: the empirical fact of her natural death is subordinated to the suggestive intrigue of a political assassination. In this vignette, Charles II violates the alliance of the Triple League in favour of a political, military, and religious promise to his cousin Louis XIV.

⁸⁴ Ibid, 2:244.

Interestingly, Henriette-Anne's sympathetic representation highlights a cautious tension, perhaps a dramatic irony, in Marvell's characterization. On one hand, the entire *raison d'être* of the *Account* is to expose and disclose the conspirators' crimes. Marvell's representation of the events at Dover makes quite apparent that Henriette-Anne was in collusion: she was the closest familial link between the Stuart court and the Bourbons, and a heavily involved negotiator of the "Popish" and "Abitrary" secret treaty. However, even though she is at the center of events, and her tight proximity suggests that she is one of the shadowy conspirators, Marvell handles her gently. When presented in-name, she is the "Blood Royal of England" and her possible assassination is treated with the pathos of a "sacrifice". On the other hand, when her sinister deeds are the matter of focus, Marvell with hostility treats the agent responsible as a faceless conspirator. This cautious irony is the same used in Marvell's discussion of Charles II's "healing touch" (page 120-1, above). Throughout the entire text this tendency remains relatively consistent, in that Marvell hesitates to name names, preferring instead to credit the plot to secret and unknowable authors. In this respect Marvell develops the point through dramatic irony: even though the narrator remains silent, and the various loyal actors remain oblivious to the identities of the conspirators, his readers are given ample opportunity to assign names to the responsible parties. Perhaps owing to his experience as an author protected by a shroud of anonymity, Marvell understands that implication and rumour, when used properly, can have greater effect than direct accusation.

On a similar principle, the plot is drawn with an implied line rather than a solid one. The *Account* contains multiple movements, several of which are marked by theatrical cues, signifying a careful timing of the events in which these actors play. The figurative second act begins with declaration of the "sequel" following the death of the princes. This section

contains Lord Bridgeman's speech, the arbitrary violation of the triple-league, and secret frauds in support of France at the English expense. Marvell remarks on the representative aspects of the events that he narrates, emphasizing the delicate timing in the conspirators' performance in the conflicts on the continent: "The 15th of February 1676 came, and that very same day the French King appointed his March for Flanders. It seemed that his motions were in Just *Cadence*, and that as in a *Grand Balet*, he kept time with those that were tuned here to his measure".⁸⁵ Louis XIV is assigned the role of a conductor, choreographer, or perhaps a director in the plot as it plays out on the European stage. This loose structure of acts and scenes is another improvement on the dramatic playlets of the 1640s. Rather than chop his plot into distinct episodes, Marvell uses smooth transitions when turning from one act to the next. The effect is unity of action even while his temporal setting reaches back more than a decade and his physical setting dances between England and the continent.

This first act concludes with the declaration of the long prorogation, 22 November 1675, and climaxes when the four lords, Buckingham, Shaftesbury, Wharton, and Salisbury, are "committed to the Tower, under the notion of Contempt. That Contempt was their refusing to recant their Opinion, and ask pardon of the King and the House of Lords". Marvell's role as an "objective newsman" should come into question in relation to passages such as this, for he represents the proto-Tory party in dramatized terms: "And being thus flush, but not satisfied with their Victory, they fell upon their Adversaries in cool blood". As with the death of the princess, the attacks upon the four Lords evoke blood to emphasize the moment's gravity. All the while, he takes a moment to editorialize and moralize: "A

⁸⁵ Ibid, 2:295.

sad instance and whereby the Dignity of Parliaments and especially the House of Peers, did at present much suffer, and may probably more for the future”.⁸⁶ In the theatrical sense, Marvell may be drawing upon the distinction between reading and seeing a play performed. On one hand, he is exposing the events and dialogue in a sequence, which is the basic role of the playwright. However, on the other hand, at the moments such as this where he inflects and interprets the events, he is also undertaking some of the theatrical duties of the actors and directors. An “economy of fact” it may be, and the events of the late 1660s to mid 1670s may be presented in a serious tone, but Marvell’s narrative is carefully constructed using these theatrical tools of inflection and interpretation to produce a dramatic response in his audience.

Following the imprisonment of the Lords, Marvell provides the back-story on the two so-called “anti-Popery bills”. Marvell here plays with words, particularly “act”, which, with a single exception at the conclusion to the book, in every use denotes Parliamentary legislation. The bill that he includes, for the education of the children of the Duke of York, is a substantial digression on Marvell’s part – eleven pages in the 77*a* edition – and it is justly said that it “massively disrupts” the *Account*’s plot. The bill’s exposure serves to justify Parliament’s rejection:

Its inclusion has the virtue of making Marvell’s argument against French power also into an antiepiscopal tract. Again, as in other poetry and prose in which Marvell attacks Episcopal presumption, his irritation is extreme. In the *Account*, the longer the bill goes on, page after page, the more demented seems the bishops’ fantasy in making every kind of provision for their own role or rule.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ Ibid, 2:297.

⁸⁷ von Maltzahn, “Introduction” to *Account*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, 2:192.

On one hand, Marvell narrates the history of the two bills, “*An Act for securing the Protestant Religion by educating the Children of the Royal Family, and providing for the continuance of the Protestant Clergy*”, and “*An Act for the more effectual Conviction and Prosecution of Popish Recusants*”. But even in these legislative cases, he puns on the theatrical sense of “act”, in that the bills pretend to be something that they are not.

Parliament rejects these bills, “these two *Cockatrice Eggs*”, on grounds of dissemblance and disguise: “*Because the Body of the Bill was contrary to the Title*”.⁸⁸ While the bill “claims” to be “*for securing the Protestant Religion*”, its actual effect would be the authorization of a uniquely Anglican tyrannical “Popery” for the episcopacy’s pleasure. In the end the acts are defeated, and Marvell again presents it in the most dramatic of terms: “And thus let these two Bills perish like unseasonable and monstrous Births, but the Legitimate issue of the Conspirators, and upon the hopes of whose growth they had built the succession of their projects”.⁸⁹ In representing of the writing of the bills in the metaphor of a birth, the *Account* recalls *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, where, possibly evoking *Richard III*, Marvell had described Samuel Parker’s *Defence of the Ecclesiastical Policy* as “his second child [...] a very lusty baby” and remarked “if it had lived it would prove a great Tyrant”.⁹⁰ Even though the tone of the *Account* is more serious compared to Marvell’s earlier burlesque satire, he relies upon similar dramatic strokes of wit in seasoning his prose.

The next clear theatrical plot-marker follows the anti-Popery bills and provides transition into the debate section of the *Account*: “Hence-forward another Scene opens: the

⁸⁸ Marvell, *Account*, in *Prose*, 2:311, 2:312.

⁸⁹ Ibid 2:323.

⁹⁰ Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in *Prose*, 1:111; see 93, above.

House of Commons throrow the whole remainder of this Session, falling in with some unanimity, and great Vigor against the French Counsels”.⁹¹ This scene is an extended exchange between the houses of Parliament and the Crown. Marvell forms the framework and context for Parliamentary dialogue from the various resolutions and addresses beginning 6 March 1676/7. In the dispute at hand, the Commons pleads for an alliance with the United Provinces against France and the Crown chastises them for meddling in foreign policy and interfering with Royal prerogative.

The section is a two-tiered conversation. The passages in between the back-and-forth resolutions are filled with snippets of partisan debate. Numerous points of argument that had been secretly recorded from Parliamentary sittings are included in single-sentence paragraphs, under broad headings, in a passive voice, but with distinction made between the two sides of the house that would soon come to be known as the Tories and Whigs, respectively. For example, “It was alleged against this Address [...] That it was a dangerous thing to hastily Incite the King to a War [...] That he would fall upon our Plantations and take Plunder and annoy them”. And then, “*On the other side, it was said;* That they did not Address for making War but making Leagues, which might be a means to prevent War. That the best way to preserve Peace was to be in a preparation for War”.⁹² For the most part during these passages Marvell subordinates his own voice to those of Parliament, and the overall effect is that the narrative forms in the speeches. In print, each separate chunk of speech or debate starts on a fresh line, reproducing the visual effect of published drama.

⁹¹ Ibid, 2:324.

⁹² Ibid, 2:326-7.

The plot shows the growing rift between Parliament and the Crown over issues of supply and foreign policy. Marvell's voice returns as the act climaxes. Parliament assembles and presents an aggressively anti-French address, which "was carried by *Forty* that it should stand".⁹³ Two days later, the House is suddenly summoned by the King: "The House being sate, they received notice by Secretary Coventry, that the King expected them immediately at the Banqueting House".⁹⁴ Charles, in a stunning, though perhaps unsurprising, speech that Marvell reprints, delivers a sharp rebuke to the House, rejects the bill, and adjourns with "no further liberty of speaking".⁹⁵ This plot twist is figured with intense response and reaction words:

All the house being astonished at so unheard of a violation of their inherent Privilege and Constitution. And that which more amazed them afterwards was that while none of their own transactions or addresses for the Publick Good are suffered to be Printed, but even all Written Copies of them with the same care as Libels suppressed: Yet they found this severe Speech published in the next days News Book, to mark them out to their own, and all other Nations, as refractory, disobedient Persons, that had lost all respect to his Majesty. Thus were they well rewarded for their *itch of perpetual Sitting*, and of *Acting, the Parliament* being grown to that heigh of contempt as to be *Gazetted* among Run-away Servants, Lost Doggs, Strayed Horses, and High-way Robbers.⁹⁶

The Parliament, which Marvell claims "deserved commendations" for its efforts in protecting English liberties, is at the climax of the tract instead subjected to public condemnation.

The primary plot mechanics by which the *Account*'s climax gains narrative force are those central to Aristotelian criticism of tragedy. The reversal, the "change of the actions to

⁹³ Ibid, 2:365.

⁹⁴ Ibid, 2:367.

⁹⁵ Ibid, 2:368.

⁹⁶ Ibid, 2:369.

their opposite [...] in accordance with probability or necessity” is relatively straightforward: the plot, at least from Parliament’s perspective, was drawing towards a victorious conclusion in favour of an alliance with the Dutch against the French. The reversal occurs when, “in accordance with probability or necessity” of the conspiracy, the bill is suddenly defeated and all further debate is smothered. The recognition, the “change from ignorance to knowledge, and so either to friendship or enmity, among people defined in relation to good or misfortune” is the collapse of the dramatic irony and the revelation that the King is among the conspirators against the English people. This allegation is left implicit to avoid *lèse majesté*, but veiled accusation of Royal collusion is consistent with Marvell’s previous accusations, such as that against Princess Henriette-Anne. Of course, the placement of this recognition is calculated on Marvell’s part, for “A recognition is finest when it happens at the same time as a reversal”.⁹⁷

The climax engages with the reader in different ways, depending on his or her proximity to the events. For a contemporary reader, a person threatened by the conspiracy in question, the desired effect is agitation and outrage. Rather than the catharsis of fear and pity, the measured emotional response is one of fear and loathing. Marvell was successful on this account. His long-time nemesis Roger L’Estrange credited the *Account*’s posthumous republication in part to an attempt “to *Canonize Mr. Marvell*, (now in his grave) if not for a *Saint* yet for a *Prophet*; in shewing how pat the *Popish Plot* falls out to his conjecture”.⁹⁸ As time passes, the *Account* moves further into the genre of secret

⁹⁷ Aristotle, *Poetics*, in *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism* (2nd edition) ed. Vincent B. Leitch, tr. Richard Janko (New York & London: Norton, 2010), 96-7 [1452a].

⁹⁸ Roger L’Estrange, *The Parallel, or An Account of the Growth of Knavery* (London, 1679 [EEBO]), A2^r. *The Parallel* was an expanded second edition of L’Estrange’s *Account of the Growth of Knavery* (1678), which was one of the immediate rebuttals of Marvell’s *Account*.

history (as opposed to current events), and a fourth wall is established between the plot and the reader. For this distanced reader, the emotional impact of climax becomes closer to the catharsis of fear and pity for the good MPs. Marvell's text deserves commendation from the Aristotelian critic, in that he draws loathing, pity, and terror from his plot rather than spectacle, and demonstrates the ongoing suffering in what should be a friendly relationship between Crown and Parliament. The plot quickly resolves thereafter. The end of the pamphlet again darkly evokes the theatrical sense in warning of what is yet to come: "It is now come to the fourth Act, and the next Scene that opens may be Rome or Paris, yet men sit by, like idle Spectators and still give money towards their own *Tragedy*".⁹⁹ In this four-part structure, the Parliamentary session of 1676/7, as advertised on the frontispiece, forms the central two-act play, the prequel of which was the secret treaty of Dover, and sequel to which is yet to be seen.

This gesture to the forthcoming act also reveals the *Account*'s crucial *hamartia*. The "*Tragedy*" comes about as "men sit by": the fatal flaw is thus this lack of vigilance. The heroes are, of course, the four imprisoned Lords and the few incorruptible MPs who fight the good fight in the ongoing French-driven struggle. As Marvell would have it, these are men of rare virtue whose presence slows the spreading corruption, "an handful of *Salt*, a sparkle of *Soul*, that hath hitherto preserved this gross Body from Putrefaction, some *Gentlemen* that are constant, invariable, indeed English men, such as are above *hopes*, or *fears*, or *dissimulation*, that can neither flatter, nor betray their King, or Country".¹⁰⁰ Although neither kings nor epic heroes, they are of "a great reputation and a good

⁹⁹ Marvell, *Account*, in *Prose*, 2:375.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*, 2:303.

fortune”,¹⁰¹ and these men risk that good fortune in opposing the growing concerns. The tragedy and their possible downfall comes as the result of their having put too much trust in others, failing to be perpetually vigilant for corruption, and assuming that the crown is above wrongdoing. By the point of the fateful revelation, it is too late, and the parliamentary battle against “Arbitrary Government” has suddenly ended with a demoralizing defeat.

That the *Account* concludes with an Aristotelian climax underscores how dramatic devices can embellish an otherwise “serious” text. The success of Marvell’s pamphlet, a text that most aesthetic evaluations would dismiss as sub-literary, hinges upon his careful application of literary devices in creating a compelling dramatic historiography. The disclosure of secrets can be damaging, but when those secrets are assembled into a good story, the issue gains far more currency with a reading public. The sequels to Marvell’s “play” tell the tale. Marvell’s dramatic inflections give way to Titus Oates’s embellishments and fictions. By the 1680s, the “plot” serves as a staple of English political culture.

The concluding question, then, is in what other ways do “sub-literary” texts take cues from the staples of literary canons and composition? Marvell’s corpus is a strong indication that a proper application of the literary can have a significant bearing on public discourse, and in the case of the *Account*, even on political events. Even if, as many aesthetic perspectives would insist, true literature transcends the material, topical, or political, the reverse – that such imminent concerns are removed from literature – is shown

¹⁰¹ Aristotle, 98 [1453a].

by this case to be false. Literary texts have a two-way relationship with other discourses, and literary or artistic spheres are in a constant by-play with the public or political.

Conclusion

A point of consideration for Marvell's theatrical prose can be found in the editions of Jonathan Swift's *Tale of a Tub* that include "An Apology for the Author". Swift evidently felt it necessary to justify his own handling of religious matters in a satirical mode. According to the apology, the "greatest part" of the offending book had sat for eight years prior to publication: "the author was then young, his invention at the height, and his reading fresh in his head", and thus resolved to produce a religious satire "that would be useful and diverting". This young author thus elected to "proceed in a manner that should be altogether new; the world having been already too long nauseated with endless repetitions upon every subject". Swift also reflects on the temporary nature of print controversy, for the responses to his volume by the time of this expanded edition "are already sunk into waste paper and oblivion, after the usual fate of common answerers to books, which are allowed to have any merit [....] They are indeed like annuals that grow about a young tree, and seem to vie with it for a summer; but fall and die with leaves in autumn, and are never heard any more". Despite his dismissive attitude towards hostile literary engagements, Swift allows for some few controversial texts to enjoy praise: "There is indeed an exception, when any great genius thinks it worth his while to expose a foolish piece. So we still read Marvel's Answer to Parker with pleasure, tho' the book it answers be sunk long ago".¹ Some later eighteenth-century editions of *Tale of a Tub* underscore,

¹ Jonathan Swift, *Tale of a Tub*, in *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962-68), 1,4-5.

perhaps distort, Swift's point about the temporary nature of animadversion by adding an explanatory footnote for the Marvell-Parker reference.²

But to what extent can *Tale of a Tub* be considered "altogether new"? Swift's admiration for Marvell is apparent. His title was likely inspired by *The Second Part of The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. His three brothers and their glorious coats make their satirical point with a blend of theatrical caricature and sharpened wit. The numerous "Digressions" and the "Treatises wrote by the same author" are of the same self-mocking humour as Marvell's, such as his identification with the master fool, Zytho. While Swift's text is not obviously directed at a specific person, nor is it a contribution to any ongoing literary exchange, his handling of religious topics in smart satire treads on the ground that Marvell broke in the 1670s. The stylistic difference between Samuel Parker's *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Polity* and Swift's *Tale of a Tub* is so pronounced that it can be difficult to notice what they have in common at the core: both books are pro-episcopal attacks by conservative authors against Calvinist dissenters and Catholics. Parker's aggressive proclamations are in such hard contrast with Swift's ironic allegory that the two texts hardly bear comparative scrutiny.

Where Swift's (and other subsequent satirists') debt to Marvell is apparent, the source of Marvell's own inspiration has been less obvious. There is, of course, Marvell's famous friendship with and admiration for John Milton, but little in Milton's extensive body of prose suggests *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* or *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*. Stylistically, Milton's forceful tracts share more with Parker's

² See, for example, C. Cooke's 1797-8 duodecimo edition of *Tale of a Tub* and other works; ESTC No. N13643, available via Eighteenth-Century Collections Online (ECCO). "Parker, afterwards Bishop of Oxford, wrote many Treatises against the Dissenters, with insolence and contempt, says Burnet, that enraged them beyond measure, for which he was chastised by Andrew Marvel, under Secretary to Milton, in a little book, called the Rehearsal Transposed", viii

work than Marvell's. These otherwise opposed authors both argue by inflating their own positions and importance by the support of scholarly authority, and then aggressively denouncing the opposition on those same terms. This strategy is easy prey for Marvell's, which acidic humour causes it to fall victim to its own boastful pretensions: self importance can rapidly become "comfortable importance".³

The ecclesiastical texts that immediately precede his 1672 debut in the late 1660s bear little resemblance to Marvell's satirical works. The closest resemblance is found in the coffee-house style used by authors such as Marchamont Nedham or Roger L'Estrange from 1660 onwards, but Marvell goes much further down the same path. In fact, much of Marvell's early success owes to the distinct difference between his writing and other contributions to public ecclesiastical discourse. Those predecessors' appeals for and against the power of public's opinion, handled in the concept of "conscience" or "consciences" do surprisingly little in offering something appealing to any broader public. The playlets of the 1640s represent another extreme against which Marvell is a hard contrast. Those texts offer caricature, drama, and dialogue like Marvell, but lack argumentation, evidence, or the appearance thereof.

Instead of looking to such influences, this study has pursued a different sort of connection, looking to other genres, more "literary" inspirations, in examining Marvell's innovations in political prose. Marvell's debt to theatre is extensive, but it changes during the course of the 1670s. His earlier interventions, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and *Mr. Smirke*, openly borrow material from fresh contemporary plays. *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* is a heterogeneous hybrid, assembled from many different parts. Marvell uses

³ Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, in *Prose*, 1:65, 86, 102, and elsewhere; Marvell's nickname for Parker's wife.

plays to construct elaborate systems of recursive jokes that handle serious political or ecclesiastical issues in the lighter tone of comedy. Moreover, his infectious style provides for a read that has a greater focus on the reader's enjoyment than those offered by his serious predecessors, making his text all the more damaging for his opponents. His layered and casual allusions reach back to Elizabethan and Jacobean plays, some popular, some more obscure. This ease with plays helps Marvell establish an authorial identity as a good-humoured gentleman instead of the sour Presbyterian caricature that Parker and Simon Patrick's texts offer as the archetypical pursuant of toleration. In the early efforts, theatre supplies material, attracts an audience, and helps Marvell control how that audience will react.

In the later works, *Mr. Smirke*, the *Short Historical Essay*, and the *Account*, Marvell begins to abandon theatre in favour of theatricality. As theatricality takes over, the texts take on a smoother, more homogeneous type of hybridity, maintaining the tone of the playhouse without the content of plays. *Mr. Smirke* and the *Short Historical Essay* handle religious controversy, new and old respectively, as an exercise in play and acting. The *Account* steps further in this direction. In that text, Marvell abandons comedy for tragedy, and develops his issues in plots with recognitions, reversals, climaxes, and dramatic irony. Marvell's move away from his own example of burlesque comedy to grim tragedy in the last six years of his life may reflect a maturing style, a growing cynicism, or a perceived increase in the gravity of contemporary politics. The change perhaps owes to some combination thereof.

The fascinating aspect of Marvell's having adapted plays and theatre to his prose is the instance of the literary influencing the political. Marvell's pamphlets had a measurable bearing on public discourse. *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and *The Second Part* broke the

rhythm of the ongoing toleration controversy. His vicious and widely-read attacks are the likely cause of Parker's absence from English-language ecclesiastical publishing following the *Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd* in 1673, until 1681, after Marvell's death. *Mr. Smirke* was successful enough of a rebuttal to Francis Turner that it received distribution support from nonconformists and warranted a personal letter of thanks from Bishop Croft. The *Account* was the prelude to the Popish Plot, and Roger L'Estrange, no friend of Marvell's, drew attention to the degree of its influence. Moreover, the *Account* was a primary source document for subsequent generations of Whig historians. Marvell's hybrid style of pamphlets and theatre brought about these successes.

Marvell's innovations also have implications for the understanding of the early novel, upon which this study has touched in only the most oblique terms. That Marvell's contributions occurred in prose is a significant point of interest, especially when we consider his skill as a poet and verse satirist. His texts are largely middle-class, identifying with urban gentry and bourgeois merchant interests. His style suggests many of the basic concepts that Bakhtin observes in the novel as a genre. His basic literary strategy is one of hybridity and dialogism. The grotesque and the carnivalesque are at the heart of Marvell's aesthetic. His is historically situated amidst the earliest English novels: *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* predates the publication of Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko* by sixteen years. These connections rise from this study of theatre and pamphlets. Questions remain about Restoration plays and pamphlets in relation to the emergence of the English novel as a genre.

Marvell's pamphlets indisputably represent a transitional point in prose literature. Some features of his prose look back to the pamphlet wars and verse satires of the earlier parts of the seventeenth century, other features look forward to the bourgeois public sphere

of the eighteenth. His various books are mixes of pamphlets, novels, and prose satire. An animating feature of this hybrid style is Marvell's literary affinity for theatre. The efforts of the King's and the Duke's companies gave from the stage; the works of Shakespeare, Jonson, and others gave from the press. The result is not a novel, but a novelty, that directly engaged the ecclesiastical and political climate of Restoration England.

Another novelty was the nature of Marvell's victories over Parker and Turner, in that they were victories for public opinion over the Church. Admittedly, it is difficult to make any claims that Marvell's work had any large-scale bearing on the future growth of the Church of England, but his publications were part of a larger movement that brought that Church under the auspice of public opinion. That development is still unfolding. In July 2010, the embattled Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams spoke with journalists about the Church's ongoing impasse over female consecration. Of his seemingly impossible quest for a compromise between conservative and liberal demands, Archbishop Williams said, "We believe in freedom of conscience, in religious freedom".⁴ For the chief prelate of the Church of England to express such a position would have been unfathomable in the Restoration. It was such a compromising attitude in Bishop Herbert Croft that provoked attack from Francis Turner. It was to reinforce orthodoxy against public appeals that Samuel Parker prescribed renewed persecution. Since the time in which Marvell forced contact between the ecclesiastical and theatrical publics, the Church of England (in fact, most protestant churches) has become a public entity that struggles to appease the multiplicity of private citizens. The immobile bulwark that the High-Flyers imagined as

⁴ CNN, "Women bishops vote threatens to split Church of England", *blogs.CNN.com*, <http://religion.blogs.cnn.com/2010/07/11/women-bishops-vote-threatens-to-split-church-of-england/?hpt=T2>.

defining the morality of the nation was washed away, bit by bit, as the separate publics of the early-modern era connected into the modern bourgeois Public Sphere.

Bibliography and Works Cited

I – Primary

“A Love Letter to the Author of The Rehearsall Transposed”. London, Royal Society, MS 32, 41-54.

A new Play Called Canterburie His Change of Diot. London, 1641. (EEBO)

Baxter, Richard. *A Christian directory, or, A summ of practical theologie and cases of conscience directing Christians how to use their knowledge and faith.* London, 1673. (EEBO)

Baxter, Richard. *The Autobiography of Richard Baxter.* Abridged by J. M. Lloyd Thomas, ed. N. H. Keeble. London and Melbourne: Dent, 1974.

Baxter, Richard. *The Cure of Church Divisions, or, Directions for weak Christians to keep them from being dividers or troublers of the church with some directions to the pastors how to deal with such Christians.* London, 1670. (EEBO)

Butler, Samuel. *Hudibras Parts I and II and Selected Other Writings*, ed. John Wilders and Hugh de Quehen. Oxford: Clarendon, 1973.

Butler, Samuel. *The Transproser Rehears'd.* London, 1673. (EEBO)

Dryden, John. *The Works of John Dryden* (20 vols), ed. Edward Niles Hooker and H.T. Swedenberg, Jr. Berkely, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1961.

Etherege, Sir George. “The Man of Mode or Sir Fopling Flutter.” *Restoration Drama: An Anthology*, ed. David Womersley, 287-336. London: Blackwell, 2000.

Fisher, Samuel. *The Bishop Busied Beside the Business.* London, 1662. (EEBO)

G.M. (Geffray Minshull). *Certaine Characters and Essayes of Prison and Prisoners.* London, 1618. (EEBO)

Hickeringill, Edmund. *Gregory, Father Greybeard.* London, 1673. (EEBO)

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan.* Ed. C. B. Macpherson. New York & London: Penguin, 1968.

Humfrey, John. *Two Points of Great Moment, the obligation of humane laws. And the authority of the magistrate about religion discussed. Together, with the case which gave such occasion to the first point. In opposition to the two authors, of the Friendly debate, and of the Preface to a late book of Bishop Bramhalls.* London, 1672. (EEBO).

- Jonson, Ben. *The Alchemist and Other Plays*, ed. Gordon Campbell. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995.
- L'Estrange, Roger. *The Parallel, or An Account of the Growth of Knavery*. London, 1679. (EEBO)
- Locke, John. *An Essay Upon Human Understanding: Complete and Unabridged* (2 vols), ed Alexander Campbell Fraser. New York: Dover, 1959.
- Lover of sincerity & peace. *A proposition for the safety and happiness of the King and kingdom both in church and state, and prevention of the common enemy. Tender to the consideration of His Majesty and the Parliament against the tenth of October. By a lover of sincerity and peace. The second edition, revised, corrected and enlarged by the author. Together with a reply to the pretended answer to it.* London: 1667. (EEBO)
- Marvell, Andrew, *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell* (2 vols), ed. Martin Dzelzainis, Annabel Patterson, Nicholas von Maltzahn and N. H. Keeble. Yale: Yale UP, 2004.
- Marvell, Andrew. *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell, Third Edition*. (2 vols), ed. H.M. Margoliouth and Pierre Legoulis. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1971.
- Marvell, Andrew. *The Poems of Andrew Marvell: Revised Edition*, ed. Nigel Smith. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2007.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. In *The Complete Poems*, ed. John Leonard. London: Penguin Classics, 1998.
- Montaigne, Michel de. *Essais de Michel de Montaigne*, (3 vols.) ed. Emmanuel Naya, Delphine Reguig-Naya and Alexandre Tarrête. Paris: Gallimard, 2009.
- Owen, John. *A discourse concerning evangelical love, church-peace and unity. With the occasions and reasons of present differences and divisions about things sacred and religious. Written in the vindication of the principles and practice of some minsters and other*. London, 1672. (EEBO)
- Owen, John. *A Peace-Offering in an Apology and Humble Plea for Indulgence and Liberty of Conscience. By sundry Protestants differing in some things from the present establishment about the worship of God*. London, 1667. (EEBO)
- Owen, John. *Indulgence and toleration considered in a letter unto a person of honour*. London, 1667. (EEBO)
- Owen, John. *Truth and innocence vindicated: in a survey of a discourse concerning ecclesiastical polity; and the authority of the civil magistrate over the consciences of subjects in matters of religion*. London, 1669. (EEBO)

- Parker, Samuel. "a Preface Shewing what Grounds there are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery". In John Bramhall, *Bishop Bramhall's Vindication of Himself and the Episcopal Clergy*. London, 1672. (EEBO)
- Parker, Samuel. *A discourse of ecclesiastical politie: wherein the authority of the civil magistrate over the consciences of subjects in matters of religion is asserted; the mischiefs and inconveniences of toleration are represented, and all pretenses pleaded in behalf of liberty of conscience are fully answered*. London, 1670. (EEBO)
- Parker, Samuel. *A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd*. London, 1673.
- Patrick, Simon. *A Continuation of the friendly debate. By the same Author*. 2nd Edition. London, 1669. (EEBO)
- Patrick, Simon. *A Further Continuation and Defence, or, A Third Part of the Friendly Debate. By the same Author*. London, 1670. (EEBO)
- Patrick, Simon. *A friendly debate betwixt two neighbours, the one a conformist, the other a non-conformist. About several weighty matters. Published for the benefit of this city by a lover of it, and pure religion*. London, 1668. (EEBO)
- Perrinchief, Richard. *Indulgence not justified being a continuation of the Discourse of toleration, in answer to the arguments of a late book entituled A peace-offering, or plea for indulgence, and to the cavils of another call'd The second discourse of the religion in England*. London, 1668. (EEBO)
- Ray, John. *A collection of English proverbs digested into a convenient method for the speedy finding any one upon occasion : with short annotations : whereunto are added local proverbs with their explications, old proverbial rhythmes, less known or exotick proverbial sentences, and Scottish proverbs*. London, 1670 and 1678.
- Selden, John. *Table-talk, being discourses of John Seldon, Esq or his sense of various matters of weight and high consequence, relating especially to religion and state*. London, 1696. (EEBO)
- Shagan, Ethan H. "The Pilgrimage of Grace and the public sphere?" *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*. Eds. Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, 31-58. Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 2007.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt. New York & London: Norton, 1997.
- Shirley, James. *The Bird in a Cage*. London: 1633. (EEBO)
- Stubbe, Henry. *Rosemary & Bayes*. London, 1672. (EEBO)

- Swift, Jonathan. *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift* (14 vols.), ed. Herbert Davis. Oxford: Blackwell, 1962 - 1968.
- Thorowthistle, Theophilus. *Sober Reflections*. London, 1674. (EEBO)
- van Lennep, William. *The London Stage 1660-1800, Part 1: 1660-1700* (5 vols). Carbondale: Southern Indiana UP, 1965.
- Villiers, George, Second Duke of Buckingham. *The Rehearsal*. In *Restoration Drama: An Anthology*, ed. David Womersley, 141-170. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.
- Wycherley, William. *The Country Wife*. In *Restoration Drama: An Anthology*, ed. David Womersley, 171-222. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.

II – Secondary

- Aristotle. *Poetics*. In *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism* (2nd edition), ed. Vincent B. Leitch, tr. Richard Janko, 88-115. New York & London: Norton, 2010.
- Ashcraft, Richard. *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986.
- Berthoff, Ann E. *The Resolved Soul: A Study of Marvell's Major Poems*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1970.
- Butler, Martin. *Theatre and Crisis: 1632-1642*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Chernaik, Warren. *The Poet's Time*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.
- Chibnall, Jennnifer. "Something to the Purpose: Marvell's rhetorical strategy in *The Rehearsal Tranpros'd* (1672)". *Prose Studies* 9 (1986): 80-104.
- CNN. "Women bishops vote threatens to split Church of England". *blogs.CNN.com*. <http://religion.blogs.cnn.com/2010/07/11/women-bishops-vote-threatens-to-split-church-of-england/?hpt=T2>. (11 July 2010).
- Coldiron, A.E.B. "Public Sphere / Contact Zone: Habermas, Early Print, and Verse Translation". *Criticism* 46 (2004): 207-222.
- Condren, Conal, and A.D. Cousins, ed. "Introduction". In *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell*, 1-15. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1990.
- Condren, Conal. "Andrew Marvell as Polemicist", In *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell*, ed. Conal Condren and A.D. Cousins, 157-87. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1990.
- Craze, Michael. *The Life and Lyrics of Andrew Marvell*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1979.

- de Krey, Gary. "Rethinking the Restoration: Dissenting Cases for Conscience, 1667-1672". *The Historical Journal* 38.1 (1995): 58-83.
- Dobson, Michael , and Anthony Davies. "Merchant of Venice, The." In *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. Michael Dobson and Stanley Wells. Oxford University Press, 2001. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press.
- Dzelzainis, Martin. "Marvell and the Earl of Castlemaine." In *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis, 290-312. New York: St. Martins, 1999.
- Eliot, T.S. "Andrew Marvell." In *Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot*, ed. Frank Kermode, 161-71. New York: Harvest, 1975.
- Finlayson, James Gordon. *Habermas: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005.
- Fujimura, Thomas H. *The Restoration Comedy of Wit*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1952.
- Goldie, Mark. "Toleration and the Godly Prince in Restoration England". In *Liberty, Authority, Formality: Political ideas and Culture, 1600-1900*, ed. John Morrow and Jonathan Scott, 45-66. Exeter & Charlottesville: Imprint Academic, 2008.
- Greaves, Richard L. *Deliver us from Evil: The Radical Underground in Britain, 1660-1663*. New York & Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: an Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, tr. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.
- Hackler, Neal. "A Subtle Circumcision in Andrew Marvell's *The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part*". *Notes and Queries* 57 (2010):57-8.
- Harris, Tim. "Understanding popular politics in Restoration Britain". *A Nation Transformed*, ed. Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, 125-53. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.
- Hill, Christopher. *A Turbulent, Seditious, and Factious People: John Bunyan and his Church 1628-1688*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Hill, Christopher. *Economic Problems of the Church*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1956.
- Hopkins, Paul. 'Turner, Francis (1637–1700)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004.
- Hotson, Leslie. *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1962.
- Houston, Alan, and Steve Pincus, ed. *A Nation Transformed*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

- Hume, Robert D. and Harold Love, ed. *Plays, Poems, and Miscellaneous Writings associated with George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham* (2 vols). Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.
- Jones, David Martin. *Conscience and Allegiance in Seventeenth Century England: The Political Significance of Oaths and Engagements*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1999.
- Keeble, N.H. "Why Transpose the Rehearsal?" In *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis, 249-68. New York: St. Martins, 1999.
- Lake, Peter, and Steven Pincus. "Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England." In *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, ed. Peter Lake and Steven Pincus, 1-30. Manchester & New York: Manchester UP, 2007.
- Latham, Robert and William Matthews. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys: Volume X – Companion* (11 vols). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983.
- Loewenstein, Joseph, and Paul Stevens. "Introduction: Charting Habermas's 'Literary' or 'Precursor' Public Sphere". *Criticism*, 46 (2004): 201-5.
- Love, Harold. "Dryden's London." In *The Cambridge Companion to John Dryden*, ed. Steven N. Zwicker, 113-130. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Love, Harold. "How Music Created a Public". *Criticism* 46 (2004): 257-71.
- Love, Harold. *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Mackenzie, D.F. "The London Book Trade in 1668." In *Making Meaning: "Printers of the Mind" and Other Essays*, ed. Peter D. McDonald and Michael F. Suarez, 109-125. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002.
- Marshall, Alan. "Bennet, Henry, first earl of Arlington (bap. 1618, d. 1685)". In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.
- Marshall, Peter. *Reformation England 1480-1642*. London: Arnold, 2003.
- Patterson, Annabel. "Marvell and Secret History". In *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis, 23-49. New York: St. Martins, 1999.
- Pincus, Steve. *1688: The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven & London: Yale UP, 2009.
- Roberts, David. "Two Shakespearian Allusions and the Date of Marvell's 'The Nymph Complaining for the Death of her Faun'". *Notes and Queries* 49 (2002): 338-43.

- Rosenblatt, Jason P. *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi: John Selden*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006.
- Smith, Nigel. *Perfection Proclaimed: Language and Literature in English Radical Religion 1640-1660*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.
- Spurr, John. *English Puritanism 1603-1689*. New York: St. Martin's, 1998.
- Spurr, John. *The Post-Reformation: 1603-1714*. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2006.
- Stocker, Margarita. "Political Allusion in *The Rehearsal*." *Philological Quarterly* 67 (1988): 11-35.
- Tumbleson, Raymond D. *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660-1745*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Turner, Dorothy. *Roger L'Estrange and the print culture of the Restoration*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Ottawa, 1996.
- von Maltzahn, Nicholas. "Andrew Marvell and the Pre-History of the Whigs". In "Cultures of Whiggism", ed. David Womersley, 31-61. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005.
- von Maltzahn, Nicholas. "Butler's Milton." *Studies in Philology* 92 (1995): 482-95.
- von Maltzahn, Nicholas. "Milton, Marvell, and Toleration", in *Milton and Toleration*, ed. Sharon Achinstein and Elizabeth Sauer, 86-104. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.
- von Maltzahn, Nicholas. *An Andrew Marvell Chronology*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- von Maltzahn, Nicholas. "L'Estrange's Milton." In *Roger L'Estrange and the Making of Restoration Culture*, ed. Anne Dunan-Page and Beth Lynch, 27-52. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.
- Wiseman, Sue. *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Worden, Blair. "The Question of Secularization." In *A Nation Transformed*, ed. Alan Houston and Steve Pincus, 20-40. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.
- Worden, Blair. *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity*. London: Penguin, 2002.