

Literature, war, and politics, 1642-1668

Martin Dzelzainis

I

On 12 March 1642, the Prince of Wales (the future Charles II) attended a lavish reception at Trinity College, Cambridge. After dinner there was a performance of *The Guardian*, a comedy composed at just a week's notice by one of the fellows, Abraham Cowley (1618-87). Among those attending were George Villiers, second Duke of Buckingham (1628-1687), and his younger brother Francis (1629-48). Taken into the royal family after their father, the king's favourite, was assassinated in 1628, the Villiers brothers had been educated by the prince's own governors, Brian Duppa, Bishop of Chichester, and William Cavendish, Earl of Newcastle, before furthering their studies at Trinity in 1641. Fellow-poets at Cambridge who would have been keen to see Cowley's latest work included his friend, Richard Crashaw (1612-49), and Thomas Stanley (1625-78). Like Cowley and Crashaw, Andrew Marvell (1621-78), another Trinity poet, had contributed verses to *Συνῳδία, sive Musarum Cantabrigiensium Conventus et Congratulatio* (1637), a volume congratulating the king and queen on the birth of their fifth child (see Marvell 1972: 199-202). But by 1642 Marvell was living in London and so probably missed the event. Among those performing may well have been Martin Clifford (d. 1677), who had befriended Cowley at Westminster School before entering Trinity in 1640. According to the poet Joseph Beaumont, things went well with the prince showing 'all signs of a great acceptance which he could, and more than the University dared expect' (Nethercot 1931: 74).

The occasion was nevertheless overshadowed by developments elsewhere, as Cowley acknowledged in the Prologue:

Who says the Times do Learning disallow?
 'Tis false; 'twas never honour'd so as now.
 When you appear, great Prince, our night is done:
 You are our Morning-star, and shall b'our Sun.
 But our Scene's *London*, now, and by the rout

We perish if the Roundheads be about:
 For now no ornament the head must wear,
 No Bays, no Mitre, not so much as Hair.
 How can a Play pass safely, when we know,
 Cheapside-Cross falls for making but a show?
 Our onely hope is this, that it may be
 A Play may pass too, made *ex tempore*.
 Though other Arts poor and neglected grow,
 They'll admit Poetry, which was always so.
 Besides, the Muses of late time have bin
 Sanctifi'd by the Verse of Master *Prin*.
 But we condemn the fury of these days,
 And scorn as much their Censure as their Praise.
 Our Muse, blest Prince, does onely on you relie...

(Cowley 1650: sig. A2r-v)

By virtue of the royal presence, Cambridge is exempt from the malaise that afflicts learning generally, whereas London is terrorised by Roundheads with all the usual puritan prejudices against images, the arts, the theatre, and the bishops. The satirical edge to Cowley's Prologue and Epilogue to *The Guardian* gave them a political value beyond the immediate occasion, and they went straight into print, the first of several works in which he attacked religious radicalism.

What the two poems could not register (beyond a loaded remark in the Epilogue to the effect that if the play had offended the prince then 'we've now / Three hours done treason here' (Cowley 1650: sig. F3)) was the full extent of the political crisis then unfolding. In January the king had made his ill-fated attempt to arrest five members of the House of Commons, a step which 'lost Charles London' (Kenyon 1966: 195). Hence the staged withdrawal north to York, from which the prince broke off in order to visit Cambridge. Moreover, on 5 March – the day Cowley began work on *The Guardian* – the two Houses passed the Militia Ordinance, declaring that

there hath been of late a most dangerous and desperate design upon the House of Commons, which we have just cause to believe to be an effect of the bloody

counsels of Papists and other ill-affected persons, who have already raised a rebellion in the kingdom of Ireland; and by reason of many discoveries we cannot but fear that they will proceed not only to stir up the like rebellion and insurrections in this kingdom of England, but also to back them with forces from abroad. (Gardiner 1979: 245)

The king's departure from London thus marked a turning point; after this, as Conrad Russell remarks, 'the major task is not to explain why there was a civil war: it is to explain why there was not a civil war for another eight months' (Russell 1991: 454).

War broke out in August 1642 and before long those who had gathered to see Cowley's play were scattered to the winds. The Villiers brothers enlisted in the Royalist army but after the defeat at Lichfield Close in April 1643 their appointed guardian, the Earl of Northumberland, sent them on a grand tour of Europe. Cowley left for Oxford by the spring of 1643, and by 1645 was in France, like Stanley, who had slipped away from England in 1642, and Crashaw, who abandoned his fellowship at Peterhouse in 1644. Other royalist intellectuals were not so fortunate; some were killed in action (Sidney Godolphin), died after being captured (William Chillingworth), succumbed to fever (George Aglionby, William Cartwright, Dudley Digges), or committed suicide (Sir John Suckling). The whole process of cultural decimation was epitomized by Viscount Falkland's suicidal gallantry at Newbury in 1643: rather than 'make *Lawrels* for the *Conquered*', a traumatized Cowley simply abandoned his epic poem, *The Civil War* (Cowley 1915: 9).

It is of course true that many volumes of Cavalier poetry were published throughout the 1640s. More often than not, however, publishers were retrieving or recycling material from the 1630s or even earlier: for example, Thomas Carew, *Poems* (1640, 1642); Suckling, *Fragmenta Aurea* (1646); Richard Corbett, *Certain Elegant Poems* (1647) and *Poetica Stromata* (1648); and William Cartwright, *Comedies, Tragi-Comedies, with other poems* (1651). While such publications might have served to reiterate Cavalier values, it remains the case that far fewer new ones were being *written* (see Thomas 1991). The closed world that generated this kind of coterie verse no longer functioned, at least in wartime. The publishing of previously private material also testifies in its own way to the enormous expansion of the public sphere in terms of access and generic diversity that took place in the 1640s (see Smith 1994; Achinstein 1994; Raymond 1996). These Cavalier volumes now jostled for

attention in a marketplace in which printed materials performed every conceivable kind of speech act: they informed, declared, petitioned, vindicated, remonstrated, censured, answered, reviewed, observed, animadverted, queried, and questioned. It is fitting therefore that arguably the single most influential pamphlet of the Civil War was Henry Parker's unimposingly titled *Observations upon Some of His Majesties Late Answers and Expresses* (1642).

Yet it would be a mistake to conclude that the Cavaliers simply resigned themselves to the ascendancy of prosaic Roundhead values. As I hope to show, this was not true of the author and audience of *The Guardian*. However, this will not become apparent unless we first dispel some common assumptions about the period. The first of these concerns the stereotypes of Cavalier and Roundhead. Recent scholarship has shown that royalist literary culture, far from being rendered ineffectual by its own aesthetic, proved capable of generating a 'poetics of resistance' (Loxley 1997: 223-34). Conversely, David Norbrook's recent *Writing the English Republic: poetry, rhetoric, and politics, 1627-1660* (1999) has gone a long way towards excavating the poetics of republicanism, the burying of which was one of the major preoccupations of the restored monarchy, and of the literary establishment thereafter. The second assumption is that the topic of politics in this period is coterminous with, and exhausted by, the opposition between the royalists and the parliamentarians. However, it is clear that many of the most intense and significant political exchanges of the time took place *within* rather than between these groups. What we need to keep in the forefront of our minds is that, for the duration of the Civil War and Interregnum, each camp was ideologically divided within itself. Indeed, the aim of this essay is to try to bring out the implications of this fact for our understanding of the group of Cambridge writers that I have been discussing so far. But before doing so something needs to be said in general about these internal divisions.

In the case of the parliamentarians, the main fault-line was visible in a conflict of war aims. Having come close to defeat in 1643, the parliamentary leadership sought to recruit the Scots army (originally mobilized in 1638 to fend off attempts to impose an Anglican liturgy). But the Scots had their own agenda, for 'what Calvinists all over Europe in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries wished to do was to *capture* their monarchs and use their power to establish a Presbyterian system of Church government' (Tuck 1993: 203). These objectives were inscribed in the first

three articles of the Solemn League and Covenant (September 1643); firstly 'to bring the churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity', or, in other words, to introduce Scottish Presbyterianism into England and Ireland; secondly, to 'endeavour the extirpation of Popery, prelacy ...superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness'; and thirdly, 'to preserve and defend the King's Majesty's person and authority, in the preservation and defence of the true religion and liberties of the kingdoms' (Gardiner 1979: 268-9). The loose drafting of the third article allowed for endless debate over which clause was subordinate to which: did true religion take precedence over preserving the king, or vice versa? More importantly, there were those in the parliamentary coalition, especially in the New Model Army, who saw no need for a political settlement which included a monarchical element (at least not one as embodied in Charles I), or those (the Independents) who resented any attempt to impose religious uniformity. Much of what Milton wrote from 1643 onwards, for example, can only be comprehended in terms of his increasing hostility to the Presbyterian project as a whole (see Dzelzainis 1999).

The royalists' failure to press home their early military advantage was the result of comparably deep divisions. The nucleus of the royalist party that Charles acquired in 1641-42, as Thomas Hobbes later observed, 'had declaimed against ship-money and other extra-parliamentary taxes, as much as any; but when they saw the Parliament grow higher in their demands than they thought they would have done, went over to the King's party' (Hobbes 1990: 117). Advisers like Edward Hyde, Falkland, and Sir John Culpepper were anxious above all to preserve the constitutional reforms that the Long Parliament had extracted from the king. In Hobbes's view, however, their constitutionalism 'weakened their endeavour to procure him an absolute victory' because 'they thought that the government of England was not an absolute, but a mixed monarchy; and that if the king should clearly subdue this Parliament, that his power would be what he pleased, and theirs as little as he pleased: which they counted tyranny'. Sheer intransigence would have served the king far better than 'reasonable declarations' (Hobbes 1990: 114-15, 116).

Further rifts opened up once the king surrendered in 1646. His negotiations with various elements of the parliamentary coalition were complicated by the conflicting advice he received from the exiles in Paris and elsewhere (see Tuck 1993: 270). Henrietta Maria and her advisers urged a settlement either with the Independents (promising them religious toleration) or with the Scots and

Presbyterians (promising them to implement the first article of the Covenant). But another faction opposed any deal which compromised the Church of England in the slightest: their leader, Hyde, urged that Charles be kept to 'a resolution of riding out this storm by those principles which will better defend him (whatever new politicks are read) than a union with either faction'. To begin with at least, the king agreed, assuring William Murray in October 1646 that he was 'confident that Religion will much sooner regaine the Militia, then the Militia will Religion' (Dzelzainis 1990: 516-17). But the king's figure of speech, antimetabole, is all-too-easily inverted: how long would it be before he was confident that an army would do more to secure religion than religion would do to secure an army?

Hyde's quarrel with the queen's party was not simply about religion. He seems to have had almost as much trouble coming to terms with their philosophy. When he fulminated against those 'in France, who (comforting themselves with their old subtle resolutions, of breaking any agreement as soon as it shall be in their power) do heartily wish ... that the king would sign every article' (Dzelzainis 1990: 517), he was in part protesting about a generation of moral relativists who no longer lived by the values he recognised (for an insistence to the contrary on Hyde's 'modernity', see Trevor-Roper 1989: 211-12). One paradox here is that the thinker to whom this younger set was most drawn actually belonged to the generation *before* Hyde (1609-74); namely, Thomas Hobbes, who was born in the year of the Armada, 1588, and died in 1679. Not surprisingly, Hyde's own relationship with Hobbes became increasingly strained before snapping in the 1650s (see Dzelzainis 1989). What we need to look at next therefore is how the group of writers broken up in 1642 managed the increasingly complex demands of war and politics in the later years of the decade and beyond.

II

The Trinity cohort in fact began to reassemble itself quite quickly, albeit in different configurations. By the autumn of 1643 Marvell had embarked on what turned into a four-year tour of Holland, France, Italy and Spain. In the winter of 1645 to 1646, his path crossed that of the two Villiers at Rome, where Buckingham was presiding over a 'Poetical Academy', and it has been suggested that Marvell's satire on one of the member of the academy, the Catholic priest-poet Richard Flecknoe, was a bid for

Buckingham's patronage (see Chaney 1985: 348; Norbrook 1999: 167-8). Paris not Rome, however, was unquestionably the nerve centre of émigré activity. The Marquis of Newcastle – Buckingham's old mentor and the patron of Hobbes – arrived there in the spring of 1645, and immediately joined the court of Henrietta Maria. When the Prince of Wales ended his journey into exile there the following summer (significantly, Hyde did not accompany him from Jersey but stayed behind), Newcastle arranged for him to be taught mathematics by Hobbes, who was also tutoring Buckingham as well as the son and nephew of the poet Edmund Waller (Tuck 1993: 321-2; Sommerville 1992: 21). By 1646, Cowley was not only handling Henrietta Maria's confidential correspondence but also 'managed a vast Intelligence in many other parts' ('An Account of the Life and Writings of Mr Abraham Cowley. Written to Mr M. Clifford', Cowley 1668a: unpaginated). Naturally, the circle was tolerant of Catholicism, and this was especially true of Hobbes and Cowley, whose friend Crashaw had converted to Rome. In his *Ode on the Death of Mr. Crashaw*, Cowley indulgently remarked that

His faith perhaps in some nice tenets might
Be wrong; his life, I'm sure, was in the right.
And I myself a Catholic will be,
So far at least, great saint, to pray to thee.

(Maclean 1974: 335)

This kind of *rapprochement*, however, only deepened Hyde's suspicions about the 'new politicks' at Paris.

When hostilities ceased in June 1646 some émigrés took the opportunity to return to England. Thomas Stanley moved into the Middle Temple in 1646, while his cousin, Richard Lovelace, returned at around the same time after spending three years in Holland and France. Marvell came back the following year and seems to have associated with members of Stanley's literary circle (on Stanley and Marvell, see Kelliher 1978: 33-4). Before long, Buckingham too was allowed to return to his estates with his brother. Like many others, they may simply have assumed that in the normal course of events the king's military defeat would be followed by a political settlement, only to be confounded in December 1647 when the king signed an Engagement with the Scots: in return for their military intervention on his behalf, he

agreed to introduce 'Presbyterial government' for three years (see Gardiner 1979: 347-52). By the following spring, civil war had broken out again

An early notable casualty was Buckingham's brother, killed in a skirmish near Kingston in July 1648, and commemorated by Marvell in 'An Elegy upon the Death of My Lord Francis Villiers'. But many other high-ranking victims were to follow since the war was prosecuted with exceptional severity. After every set-piece battle or siege, as Morrill points out, 'the leading royalists were tried and executed' (21). By refusing to accept that his defeat in 1646 represented a divine judgement, and resorting to arms a second time, Charles had sealed his reputation as a 'man of blood', and those guided by the Bible had no doubt what this entailed: 'the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it' (Numbers 35:33; see Crawford 1977). The cleansing process began in December 1648 when the Army purged Parliament just as the Presbyterian majority seemed on the verge of restoring Charles to power. By 30 January 1649, Charles had been tried and executed, and by 19 May, after the office of king and the House of Lords had been abolished, England was declared a republic.

These were truly cataclysmic events. As was evident to most observers, however, the removal of Charles I from the scene did not mean that the war was over. It would end only when the English republic had subdued the Irish and the Scots or, conversely, they had helped the royalists to topple the republican regime in England. Cromwell's campaign in Ireland had largely removed one factor from the equation by mid-1650, so when the Scots began to make overtures to Charles II, the 'Louvriars' (so-called after the palace where Henrietta Maria now held court) responded positively (see Tuck 1993: 322-3). Newcastle and Buckingham backed the initiative, as did Cowley: 'the mutual necessity of an accord is visible; the King is perswaded of it, and all Mankind but two or three mighty tender Consciences about him' (Cowley to Henry Bennet, 30 April 1650, Cowley 1967: II, 345).

Cowley's narrative of events in 1650 can be extracted from the intelligence summaries he provided for Bennet. In prose of compelling poise and clarity, he kept Bennet abreast of developments in France (itself in the throes of civil war), and Holland (where the negotiations with the Scots were taking place) as well as significant events in Ireland, Scotland, and England. His main anxiety was whether an agreement would be reached at Breda before the Commonwealth sent an army to Scotland. Late in April he reported that the 'Affairs of *Ireland* do every day grow

worse and worse', and that Cromwell 'conceives himself very near the end of his work there' (Cowley to Bennet, 30 April 1650, Cowley 1967: II, 345). In June, at the very moment that Marvell was composing 'An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland', Cowley despatched a crisp analysis of the intelligence reports:

Cromwell was receiv'd with great Triumph and Magnificence at *London*; and it is believed, will have some new great Title conferr'd upon him (as Protector of the People's Liberty, or some such like) on purpose to put out *Fairfax*, and give the Command of all into his Hands. (Cowley to Bennet, 21 June 1650, Cowley 1967 II: 348)

The effect of the passive constructions ('was receiv'd', 'is believed') is to cast Cromwell in the role of recipient, one who in due course 'will have' further honour 'conferr'd upon him'. But the phrase 'on purpose' reveals him as an active orchestrator of events. On re-reading, the auxiliary 'will' (giving future form to 'have') takes on instead the sense of Cromwell's *intending* to have happen something that serves the 'purpose' of ousting Fairfax as Lord General. So a sentence which began with a Roman military triumph ends in a Renaissance political conspiracy to gain 'Command of all' under cover of 'the People's Liberty'. Before long Cowley is reporting that, as predicted, '*Fairfax* has laid down his Commission, they say, because he would not enter with his army into Scotland ... and *Cromwell*, you may be sure, is made General, and already gone from *London* towards the *North*' (Cowley to Bennet, 16 July 1650, Cowley 1967: II, 349). Cowley's Cromwell is thus an open book (at least to those versed in the literature of reason of state) compared to the enigma of Marvell's 'Horatian Ode' – an out-and-out Machiavellian whereas this is only one aspect, though a significant one, of Marvell's portrait (see Vickers 1989).

Crucially, however, there is a lacuna in the correspondence with Bennet between August and November 1650, which means that there is no record of how Cowley took news of Cromwell's victory over the royalists at Dunbar in September. Hyde later observed that Dunbar 'was looked upon, in all places, as the entire conquest of the whole kingdom' (Tuck 1993: 323). While there may be touch of *schadenfreude* in Hyde's account of the failure of an enterprise he had opposed from the start, even Buckingham seems to have thought of it as a conclusive defeat, advising Newcastle in December

to make your peace if it bee possible, in England, for certaynly your Lordship's suffering for the K. has been enough to excuse you if you looke a little after your self now, when neither he is able to assist you, nor you in a possibility of doing him service. (Tuck 1993: 323)

Nevertheless his dejection must be attributed in part to another setback for the royalists in the interim: the death in November of their Dutch ally, William II, Prince of Orange, who was married to Charles I's daughter, Mary. Cowley regarded this as 'a greater blow than any thing at home can recompence, if we were to have never so good News', because it allowed the Dutch republicans to seize power, which in turn reduced the pressure on their English counterparts (Cowley to Bennet, 18 November 1650, Cowley 1967: II, 351). Cowley did not despair entirely; however, some promising intelligence the following month, he assured Bennet, 'puts us again into a way of hope' (Cowley to Bennet, 5 December 1650, Cowley 1967: II, 351). Buckingham rallied also, and was with Charles II at Worcester in September 1651 when a reconstituted royalist army again confronted Cromwell. The outcome was another comprehensive defeat that finally extinguished any realistic hope of restoring the monarchy through force of arms.

Charting the impact of these events is particularly important to any attempt to come to terms with the poems which Marvell wrote during this period: some commendatory verses in the form of a verse epistle *To His Noble Friend Mr Richard Lovelace, upon His Poems*; the Villiers elegy; another elegy 'Upon the Death of the Lord Hastings', a minor royalist figure who served as a kind of surrogate for the executed king; 'An Horatian Ode'; 'Tom May's Death'; and 'In Legationem Domini Oliveri St John ad Provincias Feederatas' ('On the Embassy of Lord Oliver St John to the United Provinces'). Commentators have been troubled by the idea of Marvell writing these poems in this sequence to the extent that it seems to them to defy political, and perhaps even psychological, coherence. The conclusion of the Villiers elegy, for example, sounds a rabidly royalist note which is completely at odds with the sober treatment of relations between the sister-republics in the St John poem, while 'Tom May's Death' appears systematically to undermine the classical foundations upon which 'An Horatian Ode' is reared. Rather than continue to be perplexed by these conundrums, some editors have simply cut the Gordian knot and

excluded the Villiers elegy and/or 'Tom May's Death' from the canon (see Marvell 1971: I, 432-5; Marvell 1984: xxxii-xxxiii; Chernaik 1983: 206-14, 236-7; Norbrook 1990: 180; on the history of Marvell attributions, see now von Maltzahn 1999).

However, such drastic measures may not be needed. These hypomanic swings in political mood are far from incomprehensible given conditions of prolonged uncertainty – as we have just witnessed in the royalist camp between 1647 and 1651. Exactly when was the moment finally to pronounce royalism dead or republicanism triumphant? Was it after the regicide, or after Dunbar, or after Worcester, or after the death of William II? The view from Paris was unclear, but so was from it London too. The tendency to wait on events influenced even the Commonwealth's own propagandists. As Blair Worden has observed, whereas before Worcester they defended the regime largely in terms of *de facto* power, afterwards they felt able to switch from this cautious line of argument to an assertion of republican doctrines (Worden 1994: 61-2). In Marvell's case, what may finally have persuaded him that it was no longer necessary to keep all his options open was the eclipse of the Orangist party in Holland. Perhaps it was not the execution of Charles I that 'first assured the forced power' ('An Horatian Ode', l.66; Marvell 1972: 56) but the smallpox which carried off William II.

Another approach may be to ask how royalists read Marvell's "royalism". It has been known for some time that Richard Lovelace was interested in 'Tom May's Death', the poem in which Marvell satirically relates an encounter between the ghosts of Tom May, the translator of Lucan and the historian of Parliament who died in November 1650, and of Ben Jonson, who denounces May as a 'Most servile wit, and mercenary pen' (l. 40; Marvell 1972: 59). Lovelace's satire, 'On *Sanazar's* being honoured with six hundred Duckets by the *Clarissimi* of *Venice*, for composing an *Eligiack Hexastick* of The City', is likewise concerned with misplaced republican literary patronage; mocks suggestions that England is a second Rome; and invokes the ghost of Jonson as the arbiter of literary values (see Rees: 486. Rees also notes that Lovelace like Marvell refers to Vandals and Goths, but this was a commonplace: see, for example, Alexander Brome, 'To Colonel *Lovelace* on his Poems', Lovelace 1963: lxxxvi.). However, it appears not to have been noticed that 'On *Sanazar's* being honoured' also embodies Lovelace's reading of the commendatory verses by Marvell

prefixed to Lovelace's *Lucasta* (1649) – a potentially very revealing arrangement of textual mirrors.

Marvell's poem opens by linking the decline in literary manners to the rise of faction:

Our times are much degenerate from *those*
 Which *your* sweet muse with *your* fair fortune chose,
 And as complexions alter with the climes,
Our wits have drawn the infection of *our* times.
That candid age no other way could tell
 To be ingenious, but by speaking well.
 Who best could praise had *then* the greatest praise,
 'Twas more esteemed to give than wear the bays:
 Modest ambition studied only *then*
 To honour not herself but worthy men.
These virtues *now* are banished out of town,
Our Civil Wars have lost the civic crown.

(1-12; Marvell 1972: 32-3; my emphasis)

However, this is not a straightforward Cavalier diatribe against those responsible for cultural decline, as when Cowley in Cambridge denounces Roundheads in London. It is true that Marvell later singles out the Presbyterians from the

swarms

Of insects which against you rise in arms:
 Word-peckers, paper-rats, book-scorpions...

(ll. 17-19; Marvell 1972: 33).

But the studied deployment of pronouns, adjectives and adverbs in the opening twelve lines tells a different story. Brick-by-brick ('our', 'those', 'your', 'your', 'our', 'our', 'that', 'then', 'then', 'these', 'now', 'our'), Marvell builds a wall dividing the ways things were from the way they are now – and makes it clear that he is on the other side of it from Lovelace. He is thus to be found with Lovelace's enemies, though he is not

one of them (the point being made when Marvell fends off one of Lovelace's female admirers who mistakenly thinks 'that I too of the rout had been' (l. 42)).

Lovelace echoes several of Marvell's images: 'Gnats and Wasps'; 'mist of Insects'; 'Scorpions'; and 'swarms' (ll. 145, 222, 228, 259). He also connects civil war and internecine literary strife:

Could there nought else this civil war compleat,
But Poets raging with Poetick heat,
Tearing themselves and th'endlesse *wreath*...

(ll. 155-7; Lovelace 1963: 197)

Most tellingly of all, he mimics Marvell's lexical technique for differentiating between past and present (in this case ancient Rome and 1650s England):

A chain or fasces *she* could *then* afford
The Sons of Phœbus, *we* an Axe, or Cord;
Sometimes a Coronet was *her* renown,
And *ours* the dear prerogative of a Crown.
In marble statu'd walks great Lucan lay,
And *now we* walk *our own* pale Statua:
They the whole yeer with roses crownd would dine,
And *we* in all December know no wine...

(ll. 31-8; Lovelace 1963: 193; my emphasis)

When Lucan is introduced into this Marvellian impromptu, as an emblem of the pastness of the past despite May's modern renderings, it represents a final tightening of the intertextual knot.

'On *Sanazar*'s being honoured' was first published in *Lucasta. Posthume Poems* (1659) where it was placed immediately after Lovelace's elegiac tribute 'To the Genius of Mr. *John Hall*', the poet and republican propagandist (1627-56). Like Marvell, Hall contributed verses to *Lucasta* (1649) and, assuming that the arrangement of *Posthume Poems* embodies Lovelace's intentions, the implication is that the earlier twinning of Hall and Marvell was now being recalled. However, while Lovelace was at liberty to acknowledge his political difference with Hall ('Our *Minds*

and *Merits* brake two several ways' (l. 10; Lovelace 1963: 190)), this was not the case with Marvell. For by the time the poem on Sannazaro was composed in December 1656 (see Duncan-Jones 1956), Marvell was already established as a supporter of Cromwell's Protectorate. Yet it was precisely this new political and literary establishment that Lovelace wished to satirize: his ostensible target was an instance of sixteenth-century state patronage, but the actual one was the phenomenon of 'Protectoral Augustanism' (see Norbrook 1999: 299-325, 337-50):

And now me thinks we ape Augustus state,
So ugly we his high worth imitate,
Monkey his Godlike glories; so that we
Keep light and form, with such deformitie,
As I have seen an arrogant Baboon
With a small piece of Glasse Zany the Sun.

(ll. 19-24; Lovelace 1963: 193)

As a repository of techniques for satirizing, or merely distancing oneself from, a given literary culture, Marvell's two poems were obviously useful to Lovelace. However, it seems he was not so much enlisting Marvell as attacking him, and that the reworking of the poems constituted a critique of him and, by extension, the regime he now supported. This being the case, what must have been significant about these poems, as far as Lovelace was concerned, was that they embodied the commitments from which Marvell had apostasized by throwing in his lot with the Protectorate.

III

One influential early modern handbook for those seeking guidance about how to conduct themselves in times of civil war was *De constantia* (1584; translated into English as *Two Bookes of Constancie* in 1594), by the Flemish neo-stoic, Justus Lipsius. In one way, Lipsius was quite specific about what could be done when: 'If thou see by certain and infallible tokens that the fatall alteration of the State is come', then 'yeeld to God, and give place to the time' (Langley 1976: 48). But this advice begged the question of which signs were 'certain and infallible' and which were not. For Thomas Hobbes, Dunbar appears to have signified a 'fatall alteration of the State'

just when he was close to completing *Leviathan*. Not only did Hobbes find himself 'with a book supporting a cause already lost', but some of its arguments now 'gave comfort to his enemies more than his friends' (Burgess 1990: 677, 681; see Hobbes 1996: xi-xii, xliii-xlv). Anxious to address some of these issues, he appended 'A Review, and Conclusion' to *Leviathan* shortly before its publication in the spring of 1651.

This last-minute addition proved to be highly controversial, above all because of the thoroughness with which Hobbes set out the arguments for submission to the new regime:

because I find by divers English Books lately printed, that the Civill warres have not yet sufficiently taught men, in what point of time it is, that a Subject becomes obliged to the Conquerour ... it is then, when the means of his life is within the Guards and Garrisons of the Enemy; for it is then, that he hath no longer Protection from him, but is protected by the adverse party for his Contribution. Seeing therefore such contribution is every where, as a thing inevitable, (not withstanding it be an assistance to the Enemy,) esteemed lawfull; a totall Submission, which is but an assistance to the Enemy, cannot be esteemed unlawful. Besides, if a man consider that they who submit, assist the Enemy but with part of their estates, whereas they that refuse, assist him with the whole, there is no reason to call their Submission, or Composition an Assistance; but rather a Detriment to the Enemy. (Hobbes 1996: 486-7)

Given the relation between protection and obedience, all that is needed to determine the exact 'point of time' at which subjects become obliged to the enemy rather than their former sovereign is a simple judgement about the source of their protection. This was not a particularly original argument, but by 1656 Hobbes (having returned to England himself early in 1652) was claiming that he had 'framed the minds of a thousand gentlemen to a conscientious obedience to present government, which otherwise would have wavered in that point' (Sommerville 1992: 67). From exile, Hyde beadily noted down that Hobbes 'could not abstain from bragging in a Pamphlet ... that he alone, and his doctrine, had prevail'd with many to submit to the Government', and filed it away as ammunition for his later indictment of 'the Enormities of Mr. *Hobbes* and his *Leviathan*' (Hyde 1995: 237, 297).

One of the gentlemen whose minds were framed to obedience was Cowley. Without mentioning Hobbes by name, Cowley's biographer, Thomas Sprat (1635-1713), makes it clear nevertheless that the clinching argument for Cowley was Hobbes's subtle suggestion that resistance actually strengthened the new regime more than submission. When and how Cowley broke his exile is still unclear. He opens the Preface to the 1656 edition of his *Poems* by remarking nonchalantly, 'At my return lately into England....' (Cowley 1915: 1), but he was in London in the summer of 1654 and was observed at Dover the following March brokering a meeting between Buckingham and one of Cromwell's agents (Nethercot 1931: 143, 146). Arrested in April in the aftermath of an abortive royalist uprising, he was interviewed by Cromwell personally before eventually being released on bail. In addition, it seems certain that was expected to make a public avowal of his submission to the Protectorate.

Cowley complied with a flourish in the 1656 Preface:

Now though in all *Civil Dissentions*, when they break into open hostilities, the *War of the Pen* is allowed to accompany that of the *Sword*, and every one is in a maner obliged with his *Tongue*, as well as *Hand*, to serve and assist the side which he engages in; yet when the event of battel, and the unaccountable *Will of God* has determined the controversie, and that we have submitted to the conditions of the *Conqueror*, we must lay down our *Pens* as well as *Arms*, we must march out of our *Cause* it self, and *dismantle* that, as well as our *Towns* and *Castles*, of all the *Works* and *Fortifications* of *Wit* and *Reason* by which we defended it. (Cowley 1915: 9)

It would be fair to say that this sentence hung over the rest of Cowley's life. As editor of the posthumous *Works of Mr Abraham Cowley* (1668), Sprat did everything he could to extenuate the offence. He removed the offending passage from the Preface, and, in the 'Life', insisted that it all boiled down to 'maintaining one false Tenent in the Political Philosophy', and 'the error of one Paragraph, and a single Metaphor' ('Life', Cowley 1668a: unpaginated). But the metaphor *is* the problem. For taking the parallel between the pen and the sword to its logical conclusion means that Cowley ends up by endorsing complete and unilateral ideological disarmament. This

baffled contemporary observers like David Lloyd who in 1668 voiced his regret that Cowley

laid down his Pen, when his friends did their Armes ; that he marched out of the Cause as they did out of their Garrisons; dismantling the Works and Fortifications of Wit and reason, in his power to keep, when they did the Forts and Castles not so in theirs. (Loxley1997: 97)

Why should the royalist surrender what was 'in his power to keep'? Cowley's gesture was supererogatory, his show of submission excessive. However, Cowley never really accepted the force of these objections. Even with the Restoration imminent, and when he was actively seeking to return to royal favour in France, the only error to which he would admit was having written (by a slip of the pen) something that it was possible for others to misconstrue::

I am fully satisfied in conscience of the uprightness of my own sense in those [two] or three lines which have been received in one so contrary to it ...yet because it seems they are capable of being misunderstood otherwise than I meant them, I am willing to acknowledge and repent them as an error, hoping that his Majesty ... will pardon the slip of that man's pen in one expression... (Cowley to Ormonde, 26 December 1659, Nethercot 1931: 189).

Even using the good offices of Martin Clifford, it appears that no mutually agreeable text could be hammered out. Next Cowley next tried publishing a violent attack on Cromwell (*A Vision, Concerning his late Pretended Highnesse Cromwell, the Wicked*; London 1659; Cowley 1915: 45-98). But the real obstacle was the disapproval of Hyde, now Charles II's chief minister and in a position to settle old scores. As with Hobbes, so with Cowley: Hyde kept himself informed. Writing to Ormonde with the news that royalist funds had been sent to Cowley in England, Hyde assured him that 'You will think it strange after you have read the preface to his book' (Hyde to Ormonde, 10 May 1656: Nethercot 1931: 160).

One of the last glimpses we get of Cowley shows him retrospectively in a very different milieu. In 1689, John Evelyn wrote to Samuel Pepys about the meetings of a committee to improve English, which had been set up in 1664 under the auspices of the Royal society:

in order to it three or fowre Meetings were begun at Grey's Inn, by Mr. Cowley, Dr. Sprat, Mr. Waller, the D. of Buckingham, Matt. Clifford, Mr. Dryden, & some other promoters of it. But by the death of the incomparable Mr. Cowley, distance & inconvenience of the place, the Contagion & other circumstances intervening, it crumbled away and came to nothing. (Evelyn to Pepys, 12 August 1689, Jones 1971: 72)

Over the years, this group had built up a dense network of overlapping affiliations. For example, as we saw, Cowley, Buckingham and Clifford were all at Trinity in the early 1640s; Cowley, Buckingham and Waller shared exile in Paris; Buckingham, his secretary Clifford, and his protégé Sprat were at the centre of a circle of wits (and later collaborated on a play, *The Rehearsal*, satirizing Dryden's heroic drama); and Dryden, Waller and Sprat contributed to *Three Poems Upon the Death of his late Highnesse Oliver Lord Protector of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (1659).

As Norbrook points out, *Three Poems* 'marks the weary end-point of Protectoral Augustanism, speaking for a generation for which the passions of the Civil War had little meaning' (Norbrook 1999: 394). All three contributors made the transition to life under the restored monarchy with relative ease (though the Cromwell elegies were cited against them periodically). But if they did have a passion, then it was science rather than politics. This is especially true of Sprat. His elegy for Cromwell (in fact, a Pindaric Ode inspired by the example of Cowley, though 'infinitely below the full and lofty Genius of that excellent Poet') was dedicated to Dr John Wilkins, Warden of Wadham College, Oxford, and brother-in-law of Cromwell (*Three Poems* 1659: sig. C2). Wadham during the 1650s was the centre of science at Oxford, though not really *because* of its links with the Protectorate. In fact, as Michael Hunter has argued, displaced Anglican clerics were often diverted into science while defeated royalists looked to it for 'new sources of authority and opinion' (Hunter 1981: 26). Waller, Dryden and Buckingham were all associated closely with the Royal Society, but in many ways Cowley is the best example of the

royalist whose interests took a philosophical or scientific turn in the 1650s (or, in his case, perhaps even earlier, during his time in Paris). In 1657, Cowley was incorporated as a Doctor of Physic at Oxford (although he never practised), and in 1661 published *A Proposition for the Advancement of Experimental Philosophy*. Science also featured prominently in his verse. The Ode 'To Mr. Hobbes' considered him exclusively in his capacity as a natural philosopher; 'On the Death of Mr. William Hervey' mourned the discoverer of the circulation of blood; and when Sprat published his *History of the Royal Society* in 1667 another Ode by Cowley was prefixed to it.

In the last stanza of the Ode addressed 'To The Royal Society', Cowley praises Sprat above all for his stylistic achievement:

So from all modern follies he
Has vindicated eloquence and wit.
His candid style like a clean stream does glide...

(ll. 174-6; Maclean 1974: 347)

This was not damning with faint praise because the reform of language was seen as central to the development of science itself. Sprat was especially aware of this since his mentor at Wadham, John Wilkins, was working on *An Essay towards a Real Character, and a Philosophical Language* (1668), which epitomised the drive towards perspicuity. Sprat was also a great admirer of Cowley's prose. One of his most important tasks as Cowley's editor was to see the *Essays* into print for the first time. Remarkably, however, one of the main reasons why he valued the irregularity of Cowley's Pindaric Odes so highly was because of their *prosaic* aspect:

But that for which I think this inequality of number is chiefly to be preferr'd,
is its near affinity with Prose: From which all other kinds of *English Verse* are
so far distant, that it very seldom found that the same Man excels in both way.
But now this loose, and unconfin'd measure has all the Grace, and Harmony
of the most confin'd. And withal, it is so large and free, that the practice of it
will only exalt, not corrupt our Prose: which is certainly the most useful kind
of Writing of al others: for it is the style of all business and conversation.
(‘Life’, Cowley 1668a: unpaginated)

Hobbes, notoriously, was not elected to the Royal Society (see Malcolm 1990). But it is clear that he was in fact working towards an end shared by many of its propagandists – the fashioning of a tone of voice at the furthest possible remove from the enthusiasm and obscurantism of the Interregnum, a tone of voice that came to dominate English philosophical discourse (see Skinner 1996: 435-7). Cowley like other royalists played a significant part in this process, prompting the thought that perhaps in the long run Cavalier *prose* had its victories too.

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

- Achinstein, Sharon 1994: *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Burgess, Glenn 1990: Contexts for the Writing and publication of Hobbes's *Leviathan*. *History of Political Thought*, 11, 675-702.
- Chernaik, Warren 1983: *The Poet's Time: Politics and Religion in the Work of Andrew Marvell*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaney, Edward 1985: *The Grand Tour and the Great Rebellion; Richard Lassels and 'The Voyage of Italy' in the Seventeenth Century*. Geneva: Slatkine.
- Cowley, Abraham, 1650: *The Guardian: A Comedie. Acted before Prince Charls His Highness At Trinity-Colledg in Cambridge, upon the twelfth of March 1641*. London.
- 1668a: *The Works of Mr Abraham Cowley*, ed. Thomas Sprat. London.
 - 1688b: *Abrahami Couleij Angli, Poemata Latina*, ed. Thomas Sprat. London.
 - 1915: *The Essays and Other Prose Writings*, ed. A. B. Gough. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 - 1967: *The Complete Works in Verse and prose of Abraham Cowley*, ed. A. B. Grosart, 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1881: reprint New York: AMS Press.
- Crawford, Patricia 1977: 'Charles Stuart, That Man of Blood'. *Journal of British Studies*, 16, 41-61.
- Duncan-Jones, E. E. 1956: 'Two Allusions in Lovelace's Poems', *Modern Language Review*, 51, 407-9.
- Dzelzainis, Martin 1989: Edward Hyde and Thomas Hobbes's *Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*. *Historical Journal*, 32, 303-17.
- 1990: 'Undouted Realities': Clarendon on Sacrilege. *Historical Journal*, 33, 515-40.
 - 1999: Miltron's Politics. In Dennis Danielson (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Milton*, second edition, 70-83.
- Gardiner, S. R. 1979: *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660*, third edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Griffin, Julia 1998: *Selected Poems of Abraham Cowley, Edmund Waller and John Oldham*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hobbes, Thomas 1990: *Behemoth or the Long Parliament*, ed. Ferdinand Tönnies, with an introduction by Stephen Holmes. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

- 1996: *Leviathan*, ed. Richard Tuck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunter, Michael 1981: *Science and Society in Restoration England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyde, Edward, Earl of Clarendon 1995: *A Survey of Mr Hobbes His Leviathan*. In G. A. J. Rogers (ed.), *Leviathan: Contemporary Responses to the Political Theory of Thomas Hobbes*. Bristol: Thoemmes, 180-300.
- Jones, R. F. 1971: Science and English Prose Style in the Third Quarter of the Seventeenth Century. In Stanley Fish (ed.), *Seventeenth-Century Prose: Modern Essays in Criticism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kelliher, Hilton 1978: *Andrew Marvell: Poet & Politician 1621-78*. London: British Museum Publications.
- Kenyon, J. P. 1966: *The Stuart Constitution 1603-1688: Documents and Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Langley, T. R. 1976: Abraham Cowley's 'Brutus': Royalist or Republican? *Yearbook of English Studies*, 6, 41-52.
- Lovelace, Richard 1963: *Poems of Richard Lovelace*, ed. C. H. Wilkinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Loxley, James 1997: *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Maclean, Hugh 1974: *Ben Jonson and the Cavalier Poets*. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company
- Malcolm, Noel 1990: Hobbes and the Royal Society. In G. A. J. Rogers and Alan Ryan (eds), *Perspectives on Thomas Hobbes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 44-66.
- Marvell, Andrew 1971: *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, ed. H. M. Margoliouth, revised by Pierre Legouis with the assistance of E. E. Duncan-Jones, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1972: *The Complete Poems*, ed. Elizabeth Story Donno. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- 1984: *Complete Poetry*, ed. George deF. Lord. London: J. M. Dent & Sons.
- Morrill, John 1993: *The Nature of the English Revolution*. London and New York: Longman.
- Nethercot, Arthur H 1931: *Abraham Cowley: The Muse's Hannibal*. New York: Russell & Russell.
- Norbrook, David 1999: *Writing the English republic: poetry, rhetoric and politics, 1627-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Raymond, Joad 1996: *The Invention of the Newspaper, 1641-1649*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rees, Christine 1976: 'Tom May's Death' and Ben Jonson's Ghost: a study of Marvell's satiric method. *Modern Language Review*, 71, 481-8.
- Russell, Conrad 1991: *The Fall of the British Monarchies 1637-1642*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Skinner, Quentin 1996: *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Nigel 1994: *Literature and Revolution in England 1640-1660*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Sommerville, Johann P. 1992: *Thomas Hobbes: Political Ideas in Historical Context*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Thomas, Peter W. 1991: The Impact on Literature. In John Morrill (ed.), *The Impact of the English Civil War*. London: Collins & Brown, 123-42.

- Three Poems Upon the Death of his Late Highnesse Oliver Lord Protector of England, Scotland, and Ireland.* London.
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh 1989: *Catholics, Anglicans, and Puritans: Seventeenth-Century Essays.* London: Fontana.
- Tuck, Richard 1993: *Philosophy and Government 1572-1651.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vickers, Brian 1989: Machiavelli and Marvell's 'Horatian Ode'. *Notes and Queries*, 234, 32-8
- Von Maltzahn, Nicholas 1999: Marvell's Ghost. In Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (eds), *Marvell and Liberty.* Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Worden, Blair 1994: Marchamont Nedham and the Beginnings of English Republicanism, 1649-1656. In David Wootton (ed.), *Republicanism, Liberty, and Commercial Society, 1649-1776.* Stanford: University of California Press.