

Andrew Marvell and Privacy

Keith A. McDonald

MSc Research, English Literature

[By Extended Dissertation]

August 2007

Declaration

I, Keith McDonald, declare that the extended MSc dissertation submitted for examination in August 2007 is composed solely by myself and is entirely my own work. This has not been submitted for any other degree or academic purpose beyond the present degree at the University of Edinburgh.

Keith A. McDonald

Date

Keith McDonald, MSc.R, English Literature.

M.Sc. (Research: by Long Dissertation), University of Edinburgh

Supervisor: Dr. James Loxley.

Andrew Marvell and Privacy

As an elusive private figure who, by his own admission, was ‘inclined to keep [my] thoughts private’ and favoured ‘modest retirement’, Marvell experienced both extremes of private and public life in times when these structural concepts were developing into what have come to be known as the private and public spheres. Moreover, Marvell interacts with the concept of privacy in several ways: through a recurrent language of privacy throughout his work; the prosody and poetics of enclosure in his poetic composition; his choice to publish very little in a flourishing and popular print culture; and, crucially, his ability to conceal. Marvell’s mastery of ambiguity and ambivalence, the difficulty in ascertaining the chronology of many of his poems (which has tempted critics into categorizing his works too schematically), the limited biography, drawing us to the poems for evidence, and his ability to give little away: these factors combined make the paradigm of ‘privacy’ highly complex in his case. Marvell’s career overlaps the development of the private and presents the rising consciousness of the self from a literary perspective.

This dissertation suggests that Marvell grew to favour privacy through his varied experiences and by becoming disconcerted with the agents of publishing and publicity. It also perhaps became an interest through which to frame his poetics as well as providing a life-model. I argue that current Marvellian critical orthodoxy, weighted heavily towards his political works, belies the private lyric poet, and, as his later public life appears to pose fewer questions regarding privacy, secrecy and anonymity, these issues which shroud the entirety of Marvell’s life and works are left behind. Following an overview of the development of the private in the seventeenth-century, I suggest three fronts by which Marvell interacts with privacy in different ways at different stages of his career: the dilemma of publishing in his early career; commentary on Cromwell’s switch from private to public life and Fairfax’s retirement; and later poetics of enclosure, assuming that some of his lyric verse was composed while engaged in public affairs at Westminster.

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	1
1. 'A Torment to Himself': The Emergence of Privacy	9
2. 'A Fine and Private Place': Marvell's Early Dilemma	37
3. 'Reservèd and Austere': From Privacy to Protectorate	60
4. 'This Delicious Solitude': Poetics of Private Enclosure	83
Conclusion	104
Bibliography	108

Abbreviations

<i>ELH</i>	-	English Literary History
<i>HJ</i>	-	The Historical Journal
<i>HLQ</i>	-	Huntington Library Quarterly
<i>JHI</i>	-	Journal of the History of Ideas
<i>SC</i>	-	Seventeenth Century
<i>SEL</i>	-	Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900

Introduction

In the first piece of Marvellian criticism I encountered, Gordon Campbell's introduction to the Everyman edition, he states, quite innocuously, that 'Marvell was for some reason quite secretive about his poetry'.¹ It is that secrecy, that 'passion for privacy' which Marvell held close to for most of his professional career that creates much of the distance, the elusiveness and the intrigue behind his work. This has not yet been investigated at length, and, given a label of 'passion', is ripe for further examination.² Late in his career, Marvell revealed in his prose that he strongly favoured 'modest retirement', whilst in a constituency letter noting that 'I am naturally [and now more by my Age] inclined to keep my thoughts private'.³ It also became a topic that both interested and concerned Marvell within his writing. There can be little doubt that the Marvell was preoccupied with privacy, especially in an age where the private was not clearly delineated and much harder to attain.

Marvell's work regularly features the language of privacy in terms of solitude, concealment and withdrawal. This stretches from poems composed early in Marvell's career, such as 'To His Coy Mistress' where the grave is described as a 'fine and private place' (31), to the complex pastoral world of 'The Garden' and its 'delicious solitude' (16) possibly written late into the 1660s.⁴ Even when the ostensible subject or theme is one of activity, such as the 'Horatian Ode', we are still aware of the antithetical other, non-'forward' youth, 'languishing' in the shadows (1-4), and perhaps rather perturbed by the

¹ Gordon Campbell (ed.), 'Introduction', in *Andrew Marvell (Everyman Poetry Series)* (London: Dent, 1997), xv.

² Donald M. Friedman, 'Rude Heaps and Decent Order', in Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (eds.), *Marvell and Liberty* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), pp. 123-144 (p. 123).

³ D. I. B. Smith (ed.) *Andrew Marvell: The Rehearsal Transpros'd and The Rehearsal Transpros'd, The Second Part* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), p. 169; H. M. Margoliouth (ed.), *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, 3rd edn, rev. by Pierre Legouis and E. E. Duncan-Jones, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), II, p. 166.

⁴ All references to Marvell's poetry are cited from Nigel Smith (ed.), *The Complete Poems of Andrew Marvell*, rev. edn (London: Longman, 2007).

juxtaposition of Cromwell's emergence from 'private gardens, where / He lived reserved and austere' (30-31) to become the military leader of the Revolution. The language of privacy, like Matthew Harkins' etymological examination of youth, reflects 'a larger cultural anxiety' about the stigma and conscience of the passive life or *otium*, where Marvell 'consciously deploys a contested cultural archetype as a lens through which the reader might observe and then more deeply comprehend England's political troubles.'⁵ As 'the most puzzling, teasing, tantalising poet of his age', such is Marvell's mastery of language and studied ambivalence that a reader comes to expect the unexpected, perhaps even the unknown.⁶

Privacy is a paradigm which works at several levels with Marvell: as a language at work within his writing, as an interest or concern, and therefore a theme, and also a particular way of life. Marvellian criticism, John McWilliams argues, has undergone a contextual revolution, with a current political orthodoxy which tends to focus upon the poet's later public career when he published regularly, and where fewer challenges in terms of secrecy, privacy and anonymity are posed.⁷ Issues which shroud the entirety of Marvell's life and works are often therefore left behind. Alternatively, getting over-embroiled in the political allegiances of the rapturous 'Horatian Ode', it is easy to neglect the value of the poems as texts and the circumstances behind the public or private production. Nevertheless, the language of privacy also permeates Marvellian criticism. Blair Worden's description of the 'Horatian Ode', for instance, sparks curiosity; this poem, ranked as amongst the two finest political poems of the language, is labelled as 'the most private of public poems', perhaps

⁵ Matthew Harkins, "Forward Youth" and Marvell's 'An Horatian Ode', *Criticism*, 45.3 (2003), 343-358 (pp. 343-344).

⁶ Graham Parry, *Seventeenth-Century Poetry: the Social Context* (London: Hutchison, 1985), p. 221.

⁷ John McWilliams, "'Who Would Write?'" Andrew Marvell and the Act of Writing' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Bristol, 2003), ch. 1. notes how even titles of Marvell critical works reveal this change. The attention towards public life is most recently exemplified by Annabel Patterson's revised study of 1978, entitled *Marvell: The Writer in Public Life* (London: Longman, 1999).

even a ‘solitary meditation’.⁸ Elsewhere, Barbara Everett has commented of *Upon Appleton House* that ‘These images of public life, of what we choose to call history, are all held in scrutiny of the detached and private mind’.⁹ To consider critical synonyms here too, Marvell’s work has also been celebrated for its ‘very guardedness’, its ‘famous elusiveness’, and, David Norbrook notes, ‘the phenomenon of ambiguity’.¹⁰

Privacy, Raymond Williams states, is ‘still a complex word’.¹¹ Accordingly, the language of ‘privacy’ within Marvellian criticism is equally ‘textured’ and ‘polyvalent’. When Worden labels the ‘Horatian Ode’ as ‘the most private of public poems’, these abstract concepts of ‘private’ and ‘public’, as adjectives describing the nature of the text, could almost be interchangeable. The developing sense of inwardness, of individual solitude, originated, it has been argued, in the middle of the seventeenth century, and it is noticeable that recent scholarship on the history of the book and the politics of reading and writing has coincided with increasing thought about privacy as a result, process or by-product of, early-modern cultural production.¹² Jean Marie Goulement’s statement that ‘the special status of private

⁸ Blair Worden, ‘Andrew Marvell, Oliver Cromwell, and the Horatian Ode’, in Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker (eds.), *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 147-180 (p. 150). Alvarez notes, ‘Certainly, “An Horatian Ode” is one of the two finest political poems in the language’. A. Alvarez, *The School of Donne* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1961), pp. 106-107.

⁹ Barbara Everett, ‘The shooting of the bears: poetry and politics in Andrew Marvell’, in R. L. Brett (ed.), *Andrew Marvell: Essays on the Tercentenary of His Death* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 62-103 (84-85).

¹⁰ Christine Rees, *The Judgement of Marvell* (London: Pinter, 1989), p. 1; Friedman, ‘Rude Heaps and Decent Order’, p. 123; David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 245.

¹¹ Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), p. 203; Evan Haefeli, ‘Words and Power in Stuart England’, *HLQ*, 69.3 (2006), 469-476 (p. 470).

¹² On the mid-seventeenth-century origin, see Richard Rambuss, *Closet Devotions* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), p. 166, n.9. Examples of bibliographical scholarship include: James Raven, Helen Small and Naomi Tadmor (eds.), *The Practice and Representation of Reading in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998); Kevin Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000); Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker (eds.), *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Stephen Dobranski, *Readers and Authorship in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). These studies coincide with Cecile Jagodzinski, *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth-Century England* (Charlottesville: University Press of

life does not provide grounds for a broad reinterpretation of early modern literature' appears to have held ground to date, although there are questions as to whether such conclusions are derived from inaccurate sociological models.¹³ Nevertheless, Reinhart Koselleck's theory of the development of the public and private domains does refer to a body of criticism which relates in a sense to the ideological debates within which literature is produced.¹⁴ The historical development of privacy as encountered by Marvell, particularly relating to matters of politics, is seminal to understanding the contextual conditions of writing on the one hand, and the themes of privacy within the poems on the other. Chapter one, therefore, provides a background of early-seventeenth-century privacy, as well as considering how literature is to be read against it, since very little has been produced on the history of the private from any kind of literary perspective. It is also concerned with the dilemmas between private conscience and public duty faced by the Stuart kings and the consequences for the developing public and private realms. Such ideological debates on paper were often fraught with hypocrisy, and did not accurately map the forging of the soon-fashionable private and domestic spheres to which the majority settled, making both the contextual climate and the subject of privacy all the more convoluted.

Virginia, 1999); Corinne Abate (ed.), *Privacy, Domesticity, and Women in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003); Joshua Rozenberg, *Privacy and the Press* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); and Marta Straznicky, *Privacy, Playreading, and Women's Closet Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

¹³ Jean Marie Goulemot, 'Literary Practices: Publicizing the Private', in Roger Chartier (ed.) *Passions of the Renaissance, vol. 3 of A History of Private Life*, gen. eds. Philippe Ariès and Georges Duby, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA; London: Belknap Press, 1989), pp. 363-395 (p. 365). Jürgen Habermas' influential study barely recognizes the thriving periodical press operating in England in the mid-seventeenth century, a problem eloquently, and to these ends, necessarily corrected by Joad Raymond. Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. by Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989), p. 16; Joad Raymond (ed.), 'The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century', in *News, Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass, 1999), pp. 109-140.

¹⁴ Reinhart Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis: Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988), pp. 98-123.

The main connections between Marvell and privacy can be condensed into three areas. Firstly, there is the noticeable fact that Marvell seemingly ‘published’ very little, especially verse. Poems he did publish, on the other hand, are of praise, and whilst still personal in their own right, they are very much what may be termed occasional poems, responsible only to that moment. As well as ‘privacy’, the seventeenth-century terms ‘print’ and ‘publish’ also differed from current meanings.¹⁵ As Harold Love notes, the ‘weak definition’ of publishing available given these wider communication networks is when future control over the social use of the text is relinquished.¹⁶ The key to circulation was inclusivity, as Jürgen Habermas highlighted in his development of the ‘public sphere’, and this etymology of printing and publishing determines how the concepts should be understood with equal regard to oral and written networks of communication.¹⁷ Writing was not yet the principle method of spreading the word, which remained word of mouth, and with newsbooks and pamphlets, news and literary genres were becoming more tightly interwoven with distinctions harder to find.¹⁸ Oral culture presented universal availability, but it is likely that, as Dagmar Freist describes, ‘in the process of new presentation and the formation of public opinion residues of oral culture and the characteristics of a literature culture began to merge.’¹⁹ That Marvell managed to maintain his privacy, and that he chose to date and publish barely any of his verse amidst the encroaching public surrounds illuminates him as a character shrouded by privacy. Chapter two examines the early dilemma surrounding publication, suggesting that his public verse is uncomfortable in the

¹⁵ Hackel, pp. 25-34.

¹⁶ Wendy Wall observes alternative and metaphorical uses of ‘print’, in *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993). Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p. 40.

¹⁷ Habermas, pp. 32-33; Adam Fox, ‘Rumour, News and Popular Political Opinion in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England’, *HJ*, 70.3 (1997), 597-620 (p. 598).

¹⁸ Richard Cust, ‘News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England’, *Past and Present*, 112 (1986), 60-90 (p. 65); Kate Loveman, ‘Political Information in the Seventeenth Century’, *HJ*, 48.2 (2005), 555-565 (p. 556).

¹⁹ Dagmar Freist, *Governed by Opinion: Politics, Religion and the Dynamics of Communication in Stuart London, 1637-1645* (London: Tauris Academic, 1997), p. 19.

knowledge of its own publicity, whereas private verse, as Marvell discovered, offered freedom. Reading 'To His Coy Mistress', I suggest ways in which themes of privacy may be found in poetry of his early career.

Secondly, privacy, by its own nature, has to be as much, if not more, concerned about what is *not* known/told as opposed to what is. It is in this context that terms such as 'secrecy' and 'concealment' are used liberally even though not strictly antonymic with 'privacy'. Secrecy, choosing to hold or conceal something, demonstrates a choice and a use or act of privacy. The secret, which could 'create community', and was 'a psychological event' was, in the oral culture of early-modern England possibly the sole application of the power of the private self.²⁰ The Middle English term 'privete' 'designated both the condition of being private and concealment, or secrecy', so at some stage the notions of secrecy and privacy must held congruence.²¹ From the 1620s-1630s when commentators began to distinguish the *use* of the private realm from simply the private individual, the actions and ethics of private *acts* evoked suspicion of secrecy. In the ideological and semantic delineation of the private, secrecy was largely both understood as, and perhaps confused with, privacy. Nevertheless, particularly as we understand the terms now, the two notions have a 'referential overlap', and 'secrecy' also applies strongly to Marvell, particularly given the sparse details of areas of his biography which, we assume, are intentionally withheld.²² The circumstances surrounding Marvell's death are surreptitious, and his marriage to Mary Palmer, the woman who announced his poetry, also exemplifies Marvell as an expressly private or secretive figure.²³ The lack of definitive biographical

²⁰ Ann Marie Rasmussen, 'Introduction', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 30.1 (2000), 1-4 (p. 1).

²¹ Karma Lochrie, *Covert Operations: The Medieval Uses of Secrecy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), p. 136.

²² Rasmussen, p. 2.

²³ For details on the scepticism surrounding the marriage, see Annabel Patterson, 'Miscellaneous Marvell?', in Condren and Cousins (eds.), *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell*, pp. 188-212 (p. 191).

contextual information combined with Marvell's choice not to date his poems allows little biographical information to be extracted from his verse. Yet such vague chronology of areas of his life is connected by the concept of privacy to his works. With Marvell there is often a vacuity created by that core that is the unknown, or what the reader feels is being withheld, and it is normally hoped that language, which in that age 'participated in authority' and 'represented power', presents the clues.²⁴ The ambiguous Marvell leaves few definitive answers, yet plenty of fuel for provocation. Given his vastly contrasting public and private experiences, together with some interesting debate as to the year of authorship of a number of poems drawing upon such experience, it seems a reasonable assumption that these experiences and the attitudes displayed towards the public and private life within his works have a considerable correlation. Chapter three examines the privacy of, and within, the 'Horatian Ode' and *The First Anniversary*, from indecisive allegiances and fears about the use of privacy to dangerous affect, to a celebration of the liberties that allow a greater toleration of privacy. Marvell is neither closed-minded nor provides little to work with, but his quality is in elusiveness; he provides a great range of interpretation to work with and yet gives remarkably little away. Blair Worden emphasises how the power of the ode is maximised by acknowledging and promoting the quality of the elusiveness, and working away from stock categories and labels. This is well reasoned, especially when considering the generic instability of the period, which 'neatly mirrors the parallel uncertainties about the nature of the self', and is perhaps the strongest contextual close-reading of a Marvell poem read through a lens of privation – the idea that what is missing

There is now plausible argument that the marriage was indeed legitimate. Philip Withington, *The Politics of Commonwealth: Citizens and Freemen in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 224-227.

²⁴ Sharpe and Zwicker note this as 'a fundamental tenet of Renaissance humanism', that 'for this age language represented power. And power, in turn, depended on language.' Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker (eds.), 'Introduction', in *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, pp. 1-20 (p. 7).

is an acknowledgement of the quality of Marvell's ability to withhold.²⁵ I also examine the poem reflecting upon the interim period, *Upon Appleton House*, to show the pressurising dilemmas when called to sacrifice the private life for public duty.

Thirdly, there is Marvell's prosody and poetics of privacy. Not only does he employ language of privacy, but a structural concern impacts through the entirety of his poetic composition. Through theme, form and genre (or generic deconstruction), Marvell regularly engages in poetics of enclosure: poems are situated in gardens, galleries, pastoral and idyllic backdrops; there are self-contained dialogues of entities of the self, and consistent use of chorographic imagery of land and nature. In addition, Marvell's style may itself be considered prosody of containment. As John Creaser explains, 'Whereas Milton devises forms which are asymmetrical and expansive, Marvell looks typically for balance and closure'.²⁶ Chapter four provides a close reading of 'The Garden'. Assuming the poem was written in the Restoration, it engages with a reinvigorated debate of the morality of the private life which resumed after the death of Cromwell. Now in public life, 'The Garden' represents Marvell's solitary escape, turning inwards to poetry, and could equally acknowledge victory or defeat in pursuit of the solitude once savoured.

²⁵ Jagodzinski, *Privacy and Print*, p. 18; see also Elspeth Graham, 'Women's Writing and the Self', in Helen Wilcox (ed.), *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 209-233 (p. 212).

²⁶ John Creaser, 'Prosodic Styles and Conceptions of Liberty in Milton and Marvell', *Milton Quarterly*, 34.1 (2000), 1-13 (p. 2).

1. 'A Torment to Himself': The Emergence of Privacy

The late French historian Philippe Ariès, general editor of the *History of Private Life* series, granted England a grand label of 'the birthplace of privacy'.¹ Privacy is a paradigm that has always been both complex and contentious since the term was devised, both in the clarity of its meaning and implication, and certainly by the associated culture and ethics of any given era. The concept undergoes semantic change, evolving with social influences, and over the years has come to interact with other areas including solitude, secrecy, anonymity, intimacy, exclusivity, conscience, censorship and confidentiality. The twenty-first century has inherited a long-evolving tradition of the right to a private life, yet despite some heavy revision to implicate rights to privacy within common law, ongoing cultural concerns regarding the decline of privacy in Western culture which makes this an area of particular interest.² As it is more closely understood today, privacy, the 'deep facet of human nature' has wider implications of culture, sociology and politics.³ Defined by Brandeis as 'the right to be alone – the most comprehensive of rights, and the right most valued by civilised man', on the one hand, privacy concerns the right and need of the individual and the structural ability of society to provide and accept that right.⁴ On the other, it is coupled with the psychology, temperament and character - the *choice* of the individual – 'to choose to mix or not to mix; to

¹ Philippe Ariès, 'Introduction', in Roger Chartier (ed.) *Passions of the Renaissance, vol. 3 of A History of Private Life*, gen. eds. Philippe Ariès and Georges Duby, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA; London: Belknap Press, 1989), pp. 1-11 (p. 5).

² Seventeenth-century print technology played a significant role in articulating a more distinctive boundary between the public and private. However, only recently with the digital age, has technology moved beyond the medium of print to a new scale of electronic communications and networking, one that foresees a destruction of 'privacy'. It threatens to violate the personal sphere, provoking concerns with regards to 'maintaining privacy against intrusion into the intimate, private realms, and protecting the privacy of individuals against intrusion by agents of government'. Helen Nissenbaum, 'Protecting Privacy in an Information Age: The Problem of Privacy in Public', *Law & Philosophy*, 17 (1998), 559-596 (p. 564). See also Fred Cate, *Privacy in the Information Age* (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1997), and Joshua Rozenberg, *Privacy and the Press* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

³ John Young (ed.), 'Introduction: A Look at Privacy', in *Privacy* (Chichester: Wiley, 1978), pp. 1-10 (p. 2).

⁴ L. D. Brandeis and S. D. Warren, 'The Right to Privacy', *Harvard Law Review*, 4.5 (1890), 193-220 (p. 193).

participate or to seek solitude'.⁵ These kinds of concerns occur persistently throughout Marvell's work, and it is in these modernised principles that we can chart the developing progress of the concept of privacy through the seventeenth century, along with the complex issue of conscience and changing worldviews, new fashions and widespread acceptances to accommodate the facility and the individual choice of privacy.

The development of the inchoate notion of early-modern privacy may have been a strongly political faction, and yet, paradoxically, was perhaps interpreted as a necessary form of domesticity, the only conceivable escape from politics. Contemporaries of Foucault insist that if human relations were bound by power, then individual human life - the personal - becomes political.⁶ Yves Castan suggests that the European state eventually recognized the benefits to society with the private life integrated within established norms. Everyone undertook some activities, however inconsequential, in private, and with social dependency still an important aspect of survival, 'proper demeanour in the home' both improved the credibility for an individual to be recommended by a patron or superior, and made people 'more capable of behaving honorably outside it'. The individual or family name now carried greater personal influence in this time of self-fashioning.⁷ Much of Marvell's early professional correspondence was 'excessively deferential and formal', reminding us of his difficult social position, his keen desire to impress, and his 'precarious position' dependant on the generosity of Milton, Cromwell and Fairfax for sustenance.⁸ And yet, as Ariès notes, a frustration born from men who 'inhabited this private realm without participating in public life' gave rise to an alternative way of thinking about politics.⁹ If we consider coffeehouse culture, beginning in Oxford in

⁵ Young, *Privacy*, p. 4. The notion of choice interests Rees, *The Judgement of Marvell* (London: Pinter, 1989).

⁶ Derek Hirst and Richard Strier (eds.), 'Introduction', in *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 1-9 (pp. 3-4).

⁷ Yves Castan, 'Politics and Private Life', in Roger Chartier (ed.) *Passions of the Renaissance*, pp. 21-67 (p. 61, 48).

⁸ John McWilliams, 'Marvell and Milton's Literary Friendship Reconsidered', *SEL*, 46.1 (2006), 155-177 (pp. 158-159).

⁹ Ariès, pp. 10-11.

1650, and a component of the creation of the ‘public sphere’ as premised by Habermas, such establishments also have associations with the private and marshalled a ‘more inclusive’ and yet ‘more secular political culture’.¹⁰ If privacy, as a matter of conscience, was a stance or notion embroiled by politics, then we might consider it among the politicized words of the Stuart era which, as Evan Haefeli notes, continue to influence how we think of it in the present.¹¹ And certainly, by the end of the seventeenth century, public affairs had become sufficiently distinct from private affairs that it was possible to conceive an individually private domain of the self and the family, an underlying but nevertheless prominent development.

The principal cause of the development of privacy in the seventeenth century, as far as any can be articulated, Philippe Ariès suggests, is the changing structure of the state, which altered social roles and changed the ‘forms of sociability’.¹² Services previously delegated to councils and communities were recentralized and the king’s court reclaimed responsibility, relieving many folk of prominent public responsibilities and providing the opportunity for non-public related activities, which forged a new and deeper significance of the family. And yet, as John Walter notes, ‘Revolutions accelerate historical time’. There is certainly some connection between the tumultuous events of mid-seventeenth century and the increased rate in both the material development of the private space and the psychological understanding of the right and choice of a more personal sphere within that domain - an idea which conforms with Reinhart Koselleck’s conception that a private domain of conscience was symbiotic with, and

¹⁰ Brian Cowan, ‘The Rise of the Coffeehouse Reconsidered’, *HJ*, 41.1 (2004), 21-46 (p. 24). On the political significance of coffeehouses, see Steve Pincus, ‘“Coffee Politicians Does Create”: Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture’, *Journal of Modern History*, 67.4 (1995), 807-834; Harold Love, *Scribal Publication*, pp. 203-206.

¹¹ ‘The phenomenon described’, Haefeli states, ‘often existed in a hazy realm of fantasy, fear, and desire embodying the various hopes and anxieties with which Stuart society was riddled.’ Evan Haefeli, ‘Words and Power in Stuart England’, *HLQ*, 69.3 (2006), 469-476 (p. 469).

¹² Ariès, p. 9.

a by-product of, state policy, given the extent of change over these decades.¹³ Resulting from changing ‘forms of sociability’, the development of privacy was fuelled by autonomic reading and writing practices: from the underground ‘guerilla war in manuscript’ in the early seventeenth century, where people exploited opportunities of space and time to perform personal social functions of reading, writing, and networking without public authority; to the print ‘explosion’ of the mid-seventeenth-century, the ‘technologizing of the word’ which helped to formulate domestic and localised ‘reading spaces’.¹⁴ Privacy over the course of the century was largely a cultural response to the revolutionary decades, one of the developments which prompts the expression of the time as a ‘cultural revolution’, and perhaps even one of the factors which portends the current overview of the times as ‘early modern’.¹⁵ This multivalent, secular ‘coffeehouse politics’, Margaret Jacob notes, ‘set one of the preconditions for the emergence of modern democratic society in the West’.¹⁶ To that extent, we might consider that the concept of early-modern privacy was, in principle, ‘different from, yet allied to, our modern notions’.¹⁷

I.

¹³ John Walter, ‘The English People and the English Revolution Revisited’, *Historical Workshop Journal*, 61 (2006), 171-182 (p. 171); Reinhart Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis: Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988).

¹⁴ Thomas Cogswell, ‘Underground Verse and the Transformation of Early Stuart Political Culture’, *HLQ*, 60.3 (1999), 303-326 (p. 314); Walter Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London: Methuen, 1982). On the rise of print and the early-modern public sphere, see Nigel Wheale, *Writing and Society: Literacy, Print and Politics in Britain 1590-1660* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 55-68; Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print, Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). On reading spaces, see Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England*, pp. 34-43.

¹⁵ The expression ‘cultural revolution’ is utilised by S. L. Bethell, *The Cultural Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* (London: Dennis Dobson, 1951), and is also a phrase found in John Morrill, Brian Manning and David Underdown, ‘What was the English Revolution?’, in Peter Gaunt (ed.), *The English Civil War: the Essential Readings* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), pp. 14-32 (Underdown, 31).

¹⁶ Margaret C. Jacob, ‘The mental landscape of the public sphere: a European perspective’, *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 28.1 (1994), 95-113 (p. 96).

¹⁷ Jagodzinski, p. 2.

One key to strong government, as understood centuries ago, was close control over sensitive information. The concept of ‘privacy’ is undermined by the power individuals and the state command over the surveillance of others on the one hand, and the lack of jurisdiction over information submitted to particular agencies, areas that leave individuals obliviously complicit in the breach of their own privacy, on the other.¹⁸ These are issues that Marvell will surely have understood as threats from the voracious print culture. It may have been, as Edward Browne grumbled, a ‘paper age’, but the significance of ‘private’ and ‘public’ domains grew with regard to who had access to which authorial or incriminating documents.¹⁹ Records of that era were charged with ‘political electricity’, and no event triggered such polemical provocation as the sabotage and subsequent publication of intercepted private royal letters, *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, where diplomatic, political secrecy exacerbated the publicity of the material and provided catalytic fuel to the political fire.²⁰

Through this example Marvell would have been acutely aware of the vulnerability of his own written words outside of his own possession, and in one of his constituency letters he warns against any breaches in confidence.²¹ With the rapid increase in the number of publications and the advent of self-referential and self-contained literary genres, such as satire, the libel, and the pamphlet itself, emphasising the coalescent nature of a dynamic and innovative cultural environment, some of these, as representative literary forms draw attention to changes in widespread response.²² Pamphlets demonstrated a progressive movement from private to public insofar as print broke the public exclusion and rectified ignorance or

¹⁸ On the current individual’s oblivious complicity in the informational sacrifice of their own privacy, see Larry Hunter, ‘Public Image’, in Deborah Johnson and Helen Nissenbaum (eds.), *Computers, Ethics, and Social Values* (Englewood Cliffs; London: Prentice Hall, 1995), pp. 293-298 (p. 294).

¹⁹ Edward Browne, *A Paradox Useful for the Times* (London, 1642), sig. A3v. I am indebted to David Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution 1640-1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006) for this reference.

²⁰ James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), pp. 206-207. For differences between ‘secrecy’ and ‘privacy’, see above (p. 6).

²¹ Margoliouth, II, p. 166.

²² See Andrew McRae, *Literature, Satire, and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); James Loxley, ‘On Exegetical Duty: Historical Pragmatics and the Grammar of the Libel’, *HLQ*, 69.1 (2006), 83-103; Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

unawareness through the distribution of news and information. The self-contained libel, meanwhile, speculating on the private lives of other individuals, highlighted the gulf that remained between the private world and the public one. Marvell does become critical of the ‘over-publicising’ agents now rampant within the culture of discursive interaction. As pamphlets ‘spoke to pamphlets’, with authors, engrossed in this liberty, ‘engaged in ironic, self-reflective commentary on the freedom of the press’, Marvell mourns the inability to make the transition from private to public without almost guaranteed plagiarism, response and criticism.²³ In his *Rehearsal Transpros’d* he describes the press as ‘that *villanous* engine’, the orchestrator of ‘mischief’, and in ‘To His Coy Mistress’, a poem which encompasses his poetic career in terms of its supposedly early composition in the 1640s and subsequent revision and publication in 1672, the resonances behind Marvell establishing privacy with the deathbed must only have grown stronger.²⁴ Seventeenth-century life required the individual to learn to be accountable as the people, attaining increasingly more freedom from public responsibility, understood the necessity of being independently governed by their own convictions, virtues and principles.

II.

Although we may find what Jagodzinski labels a ‘gradual acceptance’ to a ‘cherishing’ of privacy as the concept evolved from More to Marvell, and Ariès’ ‘triumph of individualism in daily life’, seventeenth-century commentary on privacy largely regarded it with scepticism, suspicion, and often contempt.²⁵ As writing and written documents started to acquire

²³ Cressy, *England on Edge*, p. 299.

²⁴ Annabel Patterson and Martin Dzelzainis (eds.), *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell: Volume I, 1672-1673* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 1-203 (pp. 44-45).

²⁵ Jagodzinski, p. 3. The connection from More to Marvell was coined by Ronald Huebert, ‘Privacy: The Social History of a Word’, *Sewanee Review*, 105 (1997), 21-38. With both Huebert and Jagodzinski placing Marvell in this fold, he becomes a literary figure representing the end of this attributed development process. Yet despite being named in such a way, Marvell does not feature elsewhere in Jagodzinski’s study.

hegemonic authority, secrecy nonetheless ‘gave rise to vocabularies of “public” and “private”’, and the very meaning of ‘public’ and ‘private’ raised controversy.²⁶ Early uses of the term ‘privacy’ or its linguistic equivalents imply a preoccupied self-interest as opposed to the interests of the state. There is the sense of the private as a mode of being that was, on the one hand, privileged and elitist (*OED*, 4.a), and on the other, unofficial, controversial, suspicious and secretive (*OED*, 2, 3.a). The autocratic early-seventeenth-century dictated that, for the ordinary people, desiring secrecy and privacy was seen as a suspicious, abnormal act, and it was irresponsible to forego the state for one’s own solipsistic selfish interests. The stasis of solitude was associated with idleness, irresponsibility, ignorance, and seen as a privilege afforded to the elite, molded into the fabric and conduct of the distinguished English gentleperson. Philippe Ariès denotes a ‘time lag’ in ideology compared to the ‘triumph of individualism’, but certainly this does not mean that the seventeenth-century commentary on privacy should be ignored or discredited. Reading some early examples of the use of the term in closer historical context shows some interesting developments in the early social history of the term in the early seventeenth century.

An early sceptic of privacy was sermon writer Thomas Gataker (1574-1654), a figure Marvell may have known as a member of the ‘young Presbytery’ he criticised in his poem to Lovelace. Gataker was said to have lived ‘in a disconsolate solitude’ after the death of his second wife in 1613, but he still considered the notion of privacy an unwelcome and suspicious one.²⁷ In his *The Spiritual Watch* (1619/1622), he mentions the private in association with ‘revenge’ (30), before using devotional reasoning against privacy.

²⁶ Paul Griffiths, ‘Secrecy and Authority in Late Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century London’, *HJ*, 40.4 (1997), 925-951 (pp. 925; 927-928); Adam Fox, ‘Custom, Memory and the Authority of Writing’, in Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle (eds.), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 89-116.

²⁷ Simeon Ashe, *Gray hayres crowned with grace: a sermon preached ... at the funerall of ... Mr Thomas Gataker* (London: A.M. for George Sawbridge, 1655), p. 50.

the Apostle exhorteth Christian men *to obserue either other*: that is, to haue an eye one to another, and not each one to himselfe only; to keepe watch one ouer another, and not each one ouer himselfe onely [...] It is not safe for a melancholy man to be much solitary: and it is a matter of no small danger for a Christian man to affect a solitarinesse, or a sullen kinde of priuacy and retirednesse, and by occasion thereof to sequester himselfe from the company and society of others, though it be vpon some good and godly pretence.²⁸

In the early seventeenth-century conscience was assumed to have ‘an objective basis’ and to be shaped by the law of God, and yet it was considered a sin to act either in accordance or against an ‘erroneous conscience’ without guidance.²⁹ Calvinist texts in the 1620s by Bourne, Huit and Bernard declare God’s word as their principal guidance, which gave credence to the individual’s entire devotion to God. However, this worked against the national ideology where private conscience was a trap seen to damage the credibility of the solitary individual.³⁰

Gataker searches for a way to avoid ‘taking liberty to our selues of sinning in regard of secrecy and priuacy’, and the air of suspiciousness is noted when he suggests that ‘wicked wretches take occasion by such opportunities to offend the more freely’.³¹ Yet we soon see this dilemma of conscience re-emerging. Gataker affirms, ‘you will soone see a strange difference betweene that worthy man of God and these, that so highly ouer-prize their owne priuate deuotions’, indicating the required and immeasurable benefit of public worship. However, to ‘frequent the publike meanes’ is not sufficient, he notes, and that ‘priuate helpes must be added’.³² Gataker may be self-consciously berating his own devotions, but there is some indication of a dilemma between the temptations of the private life outside the text and the

²⁸ Thomas Gataker, *The Spirituall Watch* (London: John Haviand, 1622), pp. 59-60.

²⁹ Keith Thomas, ‘Cases of Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England’, in John Morrill, Paul Slack and Daniel Woolf (eds.), *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 29-56 (p. 31).

³⁰ I. Bourne, *The Anatomie of Conscience* (1623), p. 9; E. Huit, *The Anatomy of Conscience* (1626), pp. 229-239; R. Bernard, *Christian see to thy Conscience* (1631), pp. 241-288. I am indebted to Keith Thomas, ‘Cases of Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England’ (pp. 30-31) for these references.

³¹ Gataker, p. 81.

³² *Ibid*, p. 114.

moral conscience and judgement that is found on paper – the kind of dilemma which was to haunt Marvell for most of his poetic career.

Thomas Scott's controversial *Vox Populi* (c. 1620) forced the author into a secretive covert life after heavily criticising the Spanish-match in this anonymous tract which caused a fervent operation to find him. This kind of secret life is not to be confused with the individual enjoying retirement, but covertness is, nevertheless, a use of privacy, and Scott was not alone discussing privacy in connection with foreign policy and facing repercussions. Richard Brathwaite's fervent interest in privacy was demonstrated through devotional manual *The English Gentleman* (1630), in which he comments on the dangers of leaving youth alone, which is followed by his translation of Mariano Silesio's *The Arcadian Princesse*, a text which itself reflects upon privacy in similar vein to the gradually easing opposition from English ideology. In a loose allusion of the Fall, where the 'rich fruits' are designated emblems of 'employments of publike safety', the 'subtill *Aspick*' is said to take advantage of 'mis-employed privacy'.³³

In the 1630s, puritan clergyman Richard Sibbes (1577-1635) addresses the vulnerability of his own words outside of his jurisdiction, something which Marvell was later pressed to warn against. The reason for his publication, Sibbes establishes, is 'to doe my selfe right' after his years of preaching on the text were sabotaged 'when some having gotten imperfect notes, endeavoured to publish them without my privity'.³⁴ Sibbes prefaced a volume of Gataker's sermons, and was also reprimanded before Laud and the high commission for writing on matters, like Scott, relating to foreign policy. In his part of requesting aid for ministers from the upper Palatinate, circulating a letter was seen as an inappropriate intervention against government inactivity. However, into the reign of Charles I, Sibbes demonstrates how

³³ Mariano Silesio, *The Arcadian Princesse*, trans. Richard Brathwaite (London: Printed by Th. Harper, 1635), pp. 183-184.

³⁴ Richard Sibbes, *The soules conflict with it selfe* (London: Printed by M. F for R. Dawlman, 1636), p. 10.

nonconformist religious thought began to reassess the stigma behind privacy and the entrapment of conscience, and therefore to more fully differentiate the private from the individual. “There is an art or skill of bearing troubles (If we could learne it) with out overmuch troubling of our selves [...] We dwell too much upon the grieffe, when wee should remove the soule higher. Wee are nearest neighbours unto our selves’, he muses, reminiscent of Robert Burton’s claim in the *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621) that ‘I write of Melancholy, by being busie to auoid Melancholy.’³⁵ Yet Sibbes seems to encourage some of the faint notions of privacy or at least the inconsistencies involving privacy as addressed Burton’s text. Burton insists on anonymity, ‘suppose the Man in the Moon, or whom thou wilt to be the Author’, and yet is named on his first volume. His text is also published, which refutes any declaration of privacy or detachment. Lois Potter comments on the issue of publication, ‘indecision... reflects doubt as to whether the act of writing can ever be a completely private gesture’, a subject, in part, self-reflexively addressed by Marvell.³⁶ Burton notes that “There is no greater cause of Melancholy then idlenesse, *no better cure then business*’ (p. 6), which presents him at the time as self-mockingly self-defeatist, yet this predicts the emergence of the ‘author’, in justifying the act of writing, private or otherwise, as a form of catharsis to the writer on the one hand, and business - the new *negotium* - to the sceptical critic on the other. This stance was followed thereafter by others looking to excuse judgement from what was seen as that private, irresponsible state of being. One development of this time, therefore, is that claims such as Burton’s, justifying writing contra to the mass of critical opposition for all of the social stigmas surrounding private activity, bring the entity of the ‘author’ more to public attention.³⁷ A further development, initiated by Scott and furthered by Sibbes, is that privacy was seen less as

³⁵ Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (Oxford: John Lichfield and James Short, 1621), p. 6.

³⁶ Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 150. See John McWilliams, “Who Would Write?”.

³⁷ See Kevin Pask, *The Emergence of the English Author: Scripting the Life of the Poet in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

the corrupting state by which man would succumb to sinful practice, but rather a neutral entity which man would use for better or worse.

We see here againe, that *a godly man can make a good use of Privacy*. When he is forced to be alone, he can talke with his God and himselfe; one reason whereof is, that his heart is a treasury and storehouse of divine truthes [...] wherein the childe of God differs from another man, who cannot endure solitarinesse, because his heart is empty; he was a stranger to God before, and God is a stranger to him now. So that hee cannot goe to God as a friend; And for his conscience, that is ready to speake to him, that which he is loath to heare: and therefore, hee counts himselfe a torment to himselfe, especially in privacy.³⁸

As an advocate of the divided-self, with one visionary self, ‘that breeds all disquiet’, and the other defensive, ‘that stilleth what the other hath raised’, Sibbes suggests that each individual is in ‘a state of potential rebellion against unified authority’.³⁹ Yet not only does Sibbes reflect this potential in himself by advocating a more positive ideological approach to privacy, but he also suggests solitude as a necessary preventative cure. If the state allows the individual to establish an accepted, habitual private relationship with God, the individual can return to God to salve his conscience. Alternatively, there is a warning that if the individual cannot be acquainted in this private manner, he becomes a ‘torment to himselfe’, which carries an implication of rebellion or retribution. With Archbishop Laud encouraging ‘Arminianism’, fuelling fears of popery, the early Stuart legacy was filled with ‘ecclesio-political crises’.⁴⁰ In an age where religion, heavily linked with politics, was significant enough to initiate wars and cause Revolution, appropriating ideology benefited by privacy would be one of the key

³⁸ Sibbes, pp. 65-66.

³⁹ *Ibid*, p. 143; Jonathan Sawday, “‘Mysteriously divided’”: Civil War, madness and the divided self, in Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (eds.), *Literature and the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 127-143 (p. 135).

⁴⁰ Peter Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (London: Scholar Press, 1978), pp.1-71; Debora Shuger, ‘Literature and the Church’, in David Loewenstein and Janel Mueller (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 512-543 (p. 512).

influential exponents to a more widespread public acceptance.⁴¹ There is no implication of man's choice here (when he is forced to be alone), exemplary perhaps of Sibbes' cautious approach to reform, but certainly evidence of religious thought conducive of a socially and morally acceptable right to privacy. 'Enforced leisure', as Potter suggests, 'may have provided not only the opportunity but the excuse for something which many of these authors would otherwise have found difficult to justify.'⁴²

III.

If initially 'Charles's own reserved manner made it necessary for the secretive temperament to be elevated into a virtue', by the 1640s it is wholly conceivable that the troubles and factions created by over a decade of Personal Rule, where it was understood that the king was privileged with the ultimate position to choose his own personal and private counsel, may have further complicated or fractured the perception of the private.⁴³ The majority of the hypocrisies, dilemmas and subtexts - most individual crises of faith - were reflected, and no doubt influenced, by monarchical dilemma between public duty and private conscience, as politics brought the use of and connection between the private and the public to widespread scrutiny. The most problematic and opposed example was the ideology of divine right. Throughout the commonwealth, from the individual family to the nation, divine right was an integral part of the authoritarian structure. James I applied a more radically evolved doctrine than the Tudor dynasty with the potential to exalt the king above parliament and the law, and yet saw his role not as exercising power but as a duty to God, 'both in actions and discourse -

⁴¹ On religious causes of the civil war, see John Morrill, 'The Religious Context of the English Civil War', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 1984, reprinted in Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (eds.), *The English Civil War* (London: Arnold, 1997), pp. 159-181, and David Smith, *Oliver Cromwell: Politics and Religion in the English Revolution, 1640-1658* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

⁴² Potter, pp. 150-151.

⁴³ *Ibid*, p. 158.

his exegete.⁴⁴ Charles' choice to dissolve parliament for personal rule amidst rising religious, political and socio-economic crises will have caused anxiety about the legitimacy of the public personality of the monarch, and thus provoked arguments to their fullest about any such rights allowing private 'legislative sovereignty'.⁴⁵ In terms of public approach, James' strategy, leading by example, was 'to remove and deny any barrier between his private and public selves'.⁴⁶ The preface of the *Basilikon Doron* states that anything spoken 'in darknesse, should be heard in the light', and whatever 'spoken in the ear in secret place, should be publickly preached on the tops of the houses', a ploy reiterated in a letter - that he should do nothing 'in private which I may not without shame proclaim upon the tops of houses'.⁴⁷ Kings were sovereign examples of advocating integrity and transparency: for, 'being publicke persons, by reason of their office and authority are as it were set (as it was sayd of old) upon a public stage, in the sight of all the people', kings must be 'the more carefull, not to harbour the secretest thought in their mind'.⁴⁸ With such an assertive example from the king that the people should live devoted lives governed by a public code of conduct, it is understandable that devout loyalists such as Gataker come to regard 'sinning in regard of secrecy and privacy'. Yet even within James' confident discourse there are signs that this documented intension to bring the private to public forum finds complications. James had only permitted seven volumes of the *Basilikon*, he admitted, under close guard and with printers 'sworn for secrecie', but he must have sharply come to realise that his words, spreading in print without his jurisdiction, were now vulnerable and uncontainable. Whilst now 'forced... both to publish and spread the true copies thereof, for defacing of the false copies that are already spread', the

⁴⁴ Conrad Russell, 'Divine Rights in the Early Seventeenth Century' in *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England*, pp. 101-120 (pp. 118-119). Kevin Sharpe, 'Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of James VI and I', *Ibid*, pp. 77-100 (p. 89).

⁴⁵ Russell, p. 109.

⁴⁶ Sharpe, 'Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of James VI and I', p. 87.

⁴⁷ James I, *Basilikon Doron. Or His Maiesties instructions to his dearest sonne, Henry the Prince* (London: for Iohn Norton, 1603), sig. A1. G. P. V. Akrigg (ed.), *The Letters of King James VI and I* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), p. 192.

⁴⁸ *Basilikon Doron*, sig. A2.

initial secrecy in this instance could be discretely transformed into an ideological coup by claiming a mark of sincerity through this publication, with the public now able to scrutinise what would have been a private text. This could have even been a deliberate ploy to promote sincerity, but nevertheless it is a sincerity which, Kevin Sharpe notes, proves to be in its simplest form, straightforwardly hypocritical.⁴⁹ James insisted on absolute private control over foreign and military policy, which came under the realm of state secrets, the *arcana imperii*, and he demanded complete discretion over decision making without having to justify himself.⁵⁰ Moreover, the king tried to prevent the right to private opinion by attempting to disband the ‘underground’ news culture, knowledge of which was public enough for him to feel threatened by public opinion. Such private absolutism had ‘opened a dangerous fissure within the political nation’ and the grave public concern, driven itself to an underground form of transmission, ‘contributed to the political polarization of the early seventeenth century.’⁵¹

Inheriting this public divide caused by private acts contra to his own dictates, Charles lived very much by his father’s word, from the handling of parliament to the control of his own wife, although, ironically, secretly vowing not to follow hypocritical elements of his father’s behaviour. With the troubled political situation left for him, the court of Charles adopted standards of decorum absent from the more licentious James, building a rich artistic tradition. With a prerogative to concern himself more with such political troubles, even if oblivious as to how to mollify them, he intended that ‘affection to the public’ took precedence over private interests. However, this was registered in strange ways, and will have once again seemed hypocritical by a reserved and secretive temperament.⁵² So stoic was the king’s reaction to news of his friend’s murder, Waller’s poem ‘On His Majesties Receiving the Newes of the

⁴⁹ *Basilikon Doron*, sig. A3; Sharpe, ‘Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of James VI and I’, p. 100.

⁵⁰ Thomas Cogswell, ‘The Politics of Propaganda: Charles I and the People in the 1620s’, *The Journal of British Studies*, 29.3 (1990), 187-215 (p. 192).

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 193; Cust, ‘News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England’, p. 87.

⁵² Quoted by Kevin Sharpe, ‘Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of Charles I’, *HJ*, 40.3 (1997), 643-665 (p. 646).

duke of Buckingham's Death' was partly written, Warren Chernaik suggests, to fend off suggestions that the king no longer cared for his friend's wellbeing. Whilst the poem reflects the king's heroism in regal self-control given such bad news, it suggests a permanent strain from upholding the dual roles of man and king.⁵³ James' intentions, at least as he declared them, had been to live entirely by the one conduct of his public persona, and yet by inhibiting the private, had caused both his own internal problems and wider political difficulties. Fortunately for James the leaked *Basilikon Doron* was not to his discredit at the time, but Charles was not so fortunate. The interception of his private letters, which Henrietta Maria had foreseen and warned against, gave rise to accusations of hypocrisy and threatened the legitimacy of his oath and rule, particularly given his assertion of honesty.⁵⁴

This provides a particularly interesting context for the works of Richard Sibbes and Thomas Scott. Sibbes, like James, encountered the problem of his work being published without his jurisdiction. However, both Scott and Sibbes discuss privacy in works critical of foreign policy, which led to repercussions for both writers. Moreover, as Marvell begins to do in his early career, they manage to detach the individual from the concept. Scott and Sibbes begin to argue that it is the use of privacy, the monarchs' contradictory move against their own dictates to act suspiciously and privately with regard to foreign policy. Marvell, it has been argued, manages, for example, to produce a commendatory poem to Richard Lovelace while dissociating himself from the poet's politics. By the 1640s, moreover, commentators' attacks against privacy were decreasing, and those who once criticised it later indulged in it. The early Stuart dynasty demonstrated the problems with promoting an ideology where public duty exhumed their right to the realm of the private, and where the consequence of conflict when personal hypocrisy and dynamic politics caused something to collapse. The principle

⁵³ Warren Chernaik, *The Poetry of Limitation: A Study of Edmund Waller* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1968), pp. 137-143.

⁵⁴ Sharpe, 'Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of Charles I', p. 658.

had been set for people to live honest, devoted and publicly transparent lives, but such stressful times without private respite were unsustainable. The ideology seems to have reflected this: the kings' claims of denying barriers between their public and private selves were discredited; consequently, the notion of the private had started to be criticised less, or had become more widely accepted. The realm of the private, as everyone had discovered, was not to be denied.

This complication or fracture is equally applicable if we consider the use of 'privacy' as euphemistically contorted within an iconic and hugely influential metaphor: the notion of the 'body-politic', and areas of sexuality.⁵⁵ The body-politic, which had become 'an iconic archetype of national unity', was subject to a Cartesian kind of opposition of belief and doubt and consequently both promoted and pilloried through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, featuring heavily in ideological debate.⁵⁶ The 'cogito' theory, it has been suggested, marks a turning point in the history of the perception of the body, and there is little doubt that the cultural changes throughout the early-modern period, complete with dilemmas of conscience, revolutionized in some way how the people thought about the unions between mind, body and nature, and body, nation and God, both in terms of outward perspective, and for greater discovery of the self.⁵⁷ Descartes had argued in his *Meditations* that 'bodies are not conceived through the senses or the imagination but through the same process of purely

⁵⁵ Huebert has attributed the developing notion of privacy into four areas, one of which entails privacy and secrecy and the use of 'private' as a possible term for sexual organs. See 'Privacy: The Early Social History of a Word', pp. 21-38.

⁵⁶ Paul Raffield, *Images and Cultures of Law in Early Modern England: Justice and Political Power, 1558-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 3. Examples include Christopher Lever, *Heaven and Earth, Religion and Policy* (1608); Lancelot Andrews' *Sermons* (1629), Ben Jonson's *The New Inn* (1631), Royalist poets John Cleveland, Thomas Jordan and Abraham Cowley, historiographer James Howell, philosopher Thomas Hobbes, and those like Milton who welcomed the demise. Examples of recent commentary on the 'body politic' can be found in some of the essays in Thomas Corns (ed.), *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), especially Ann Baynes Corio, "'A ball of strife': Caroline poetry and royal marriage', pp. 26-46.

⁵⁷ Suzanne Hatty and James Hatty, *The Disordered Body: Epidemic Disease and Cultural Transformation* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), p. 3. Shuger, p. 512.

intellectual conception that gives us the conception of ourselves as thinking things'.⁵⁸ The body-politic was an instilled entity. Even parliament assumed a modelled contingency plan for a pre-existing 'acephalous' body-politic in case of anti-monarchical despotic conspiracies proving successful.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, the example of the sovereign head of state's secretive temperament, one might assume, was one to be respected and to follow. Throughout the personal rule, however, through the material developments which further defined the private and the public, greater awareness and criticism of the social, hierarchical and ideological forces anthropomorphising this body-politic were peeling layers from this conceptual body, exposing and shaming its nakedness as connected with the conceptions of the suspicious, corrupt nature of the private. One is therefore led to consider the taboo concept of the 'private' responsible for moulding the next generation, yet that which the iconic body-politic metaphor seemed to ignore as clandestine - the [male] reproductive organs - for which the meaning of 'private' became applicable from the 1630s into the personal rule, and it adds further dimension to the frequent allusion to the loss of Eden.⁶⁰ As the fallen couple, through sin, become conscious of their naked bodies, events leading to the civil wars showed the people realising the nakedness and flawed structure of the body-politic, and we can perhaps envisage its advocates and representatives recognizing its indecent nakedness, and hastily trying to cover its dignity in written defence as it was exposed and shamed through seventeenth-century Britain. In the aftermath of the fall, Adam and Eve retain their essence of humanity, and to some degree, their harmony, but the Original Sin that was betrayed by self-consciousness of their naked forms results in the universal punishment. Likewise, the Restoration alleviated the

⁵⁸ Daniel Garber, 'Descartes, René', in E. Craig (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 2003), <<http://www.rep.routledge.com/article/DA026SECT5>>, accessed 10.05.2007.

⁵⁹ Patrick Collinson, 'The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 69 (1986), 394-424 (pp. 416-418).

⁶⁰ The *OED* lists the early examples of the use of 'private' or 'privacy' referring to genitals from 1634: 'a cloth which should couer those parts, made to be priuate'. Sir Thomas Herbert, *A relation of some yeares travaile begunne anno 1626, into Afrique and the greater Asia* (London: Printed by William Stansby, 1634), p. 41. This is followed in 1656 in the Earl of Monmouth's translation of *Boccalini*: 'plucking up her cloaths, and shewing them her privacies'. Traiano Boccalini, *I ragguagli di Parnasso, or, Advertisements from Parnassus*, trans. Carey, Earl of Monmouth (London: Printed for Humphrey Moseley, 1656), I. xxxv.

execution to a form of divorce and the conception of the body-politic was restored, but the public awareness of this shamed system, once sacred and private in association with Charles and now seen naked and exposed, inculcates a universal penance of its own.⁶¹ After the execution, Thomas Hobbes noted that ‘that great LEVIATHAN called a COMMONWEALTH ... is but an Artificall Man’; the body-politic had come to be seen, notes Gil Harris, ‘no longer as a God-given truth, but as a mere rhetorical device’, and later as ‘an inert metaphor’.⁶² This now exposed system did not regain the same cosmological impetus upon the Restoration, and despite ongoing cultural change, was unlikely to be tolerated, and was indeed dismantled by the Glorious Revolution only twenty-eight years later.

Inevitably, far from Eden - to the extent that the idyll could be used as a rhetorical antithesis - the aftermath of the 1649 execution was an overhauled failed political system. One consequence was a social reassessment, and generally, a more widespread acceptance of a more indulgent relationship with the self. Certain social conventions and moral values related to the self were stretched beyond areas of natural affiliation in the late 1640s, and, abandoned with the old system, were left to be re-identified with the new republic.⁶³ Beyond the horizon of Civil War, Frances Dow notes, ‘peace brought its problems no less profound than war’.⁶⁴ Without any evident model of republicanism to be implemented, republican identity was filtered through remnants of European classical republicanism; succinctly described by Pocock as ‘a language, not a programme’, and by Worden as ‘ideological schizophrenia’.⁶⁵ The concept of privacy, developed or otherwise, as part of the framework of the existing culture,

⁶¹ Jonathan Sawday, ‘Re-Writing a Revolution: History, Symbol, and Text in the Restoration’, *SC*, 7.2 (1992), 171-199, (p. 181).

⁶² Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (London: Printed for Andrew Crooke, 1651), p. 1; Jonathan Gil Harris, *Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic: Discourses of Social Pathology in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 141.

⁶³ Sawday, “‘Mysteriously divided’”: Civil War, madness and the divided self, pp. 127-143.

⁶⁴ F. D. Dow, *Radicalism in the English Revolution 1640-1660* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985), pp. 33-34.

⁶⁵ J. G. A. Pocock, *The Political Works of James Harrington* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), p. 15; Blair Worden, *The Rump Parliament, 1648-1653* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), pp., 68-69. See also Jonathan Scott, ‘The English Republican Imagination’, in John Morrill (ed.), *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), pp. 35-54.

necessarily became integrated within the building republican culture: as Nigel Smith suggests, ‘the appeal of republicanism was even greater in the private sphere’.⁶⁶ The complex development of the private and public spheres will have contributed towards a ‘complex political philosophy’ with a ‘duplex theory of constitutionalism’ into the 1650s, and likely intercepted with the ‘many combinations and intersections of legal spheres – common law, prerogative, natural law, reason of state and necessity’.⁶⁷ As Christopher Hill has stated, ‘in no epoch of English history before 1640 did ideas mature and change so rapidly and so fundamentally’; the precepts surrounding the ideological position of privacy had already been sounded and cautiously contested.⁶⁸ However, with a new government, unclear in identity, assuming revolutionary control initiated by an unpopular execution, the material and political circumstances within which a culture or at least a widespread acceptance of privacy would rise or fall were subject to change.⁶⁹

Into the early 1650s, the time of Marvell’s ‘Horatian Ode’, and his subsequent move to Nun Appleton under the employment of Fairfax, the protectorate signalled both interest and intent with relation to the importance of the language and the material space of privacy. The surveyor general, Edward Carter, was reminded of instructions issued in late 1650 to remove all traces of royal insignia ‘whether they be in chambers or windows of chambers, or any other public or private place.’⁷⁰ Yet public doubts over the concept of the private as elitist, suspicious, or self-obsessive may well have been rekindled by the swift move to sell Crown property to reimburse debts, and by some individuals exploiting the opportunity to inflate

⁶⁶ Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 190.

⁶⁷ Sean Kelsey, *Inventing a Republic: The Political Culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649-1653* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997), p. 204. See also Glenn Burgess, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution. An Introduction to English Political Thought, 1603-1642* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992).

⁶⁸ Christopher Hill, *The Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution Revisited* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), p. 378.

⁶⁹ The execution of Charles I, Kelsey suggests, was ‘the one thing that nobody appears to have called for incontrovertibly’, with an absence of ‘publicly avowed intention to harm the king’. Sean Kelsey, ‘The Death of Charles I’, *HJ*, 45.4 (2002), 727-754 (p. 727, 729, 731).

⁷⁰ Kelsey, *Inventing a Republic*, pp. 86-87, quoting P.R.O., SP25/15, 69; SP25/65, 22.

their claims, with others receiving preferential treatment.⁷¹ Additionally, the first Protectorate parliament revealed that many individual MPs were ‘attached to corrupt interests’, further damaging the credibility of the elite with their private agendas.⁷² Nevertheless, what the interregnum offered was opportunities for tolerance. A consciousness of the self, reflecting on events, was one of the liberties extended by the new regime, and a liberty of conscience allowed the ideological evolution of privacy to continue.⁷³ Jeremy Taylor (c. 1613-1667), who Marvell adjoins with other tolerationists in both the *Rehearsal Transpros’d* (Second Part) and *Mr Smirke*, articulates the developing fashion of ‘modesty’ in his rules of *Holy Living*, which included an allowance of privacy.⁷⁴

Let us not enquire into the affairs of others that concerne us not, but be busied within our selves and our own spheres; ever remembering that to pry into the actions or interests of other men not under our charge, may minister to pride, to tyranny, to uncharitableness, to trouble...

Never listen at the doors or windows: for besides that it contains in it danger and a snare, it is also an invading my neighbours privacy [...] if there be any thing for which men keep locks and bars and porters, things that blush to see the light, and either are shameful in manners, or private in nature, these things are their care and their businesse.⁷⁵

Previously, ‘privacy’ had represented an unidentified kind of vacuous material space around which debates were held on whether an individual should or should not seek his own private counsel and the subsequent benefits and drawbacks of that personal state. In advocating what appears to be an early claim for the right to individual privacy, Taylor assumes an idea of its

⁷¹ *Ibid*, pp. 158-162.

⁷² Toby Barnard, *The English Republic 1649-1660* (London: Longman, 1982), pp. 47-50.

⁷³ See Martin Dzelzainis, ‘Ideas in conflict: political and religious thought during the English Revolution’, in N. H. Keeble (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution*, pp. 32-49.

⁷⁴ The quotation is cited in Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 74.

⁷⁵ Jeremy Taylor, *The rule and exercises of holy living* (London: Printed [by R. Norton] for Richard Royston, 1650), pp. 120-121.

role in what we now consider the ‘private sphere’. Yet despite signs of a breakthrough with privacy advocated as an individual right, the overall notion of privacy became strained once again following the death of Cromwell. The publication of decades of royalist material in the early 1660s uncovered a trail of secrecy as material moved from individual possession and close literary circles to wider publication, and indicated that the apparent liberties of the previous decade did not necessarily extend to or diffuse the political ramifications behind writing, although at least we might consider relevant that these writers had the freedom and inclination to write privately as they chose. While the theatre could also now resurface from private and illegal performances back to its public glory, the king had this privatized to a duopoly, meaning that despite their loyalties, many actors and theatre companies were forced out of operation. In the ideological battleground, John Evelyn, responding to Mackenzie, slated ‘*Otium sine literis*’ as ‘the greatest infelicity in the world’, but even as his text casts an eye backwards over the turbulent decades, he had himself at that stage chosen retirement to the country and the private life.⁷⁶ Such hypocrisy, led by the monarchs, was a common feature associated with those who discussed privacy: Gataker lived in disconsolate solitude while writing disparagingly about it; Scott was forced to flee overseas to pursue a secret life; Brathwaite, the main literary protagonist on the subject of privacy, retired to a grand house in Yorkshire; Burton, claiming to want privacy in anonymity from his text, nevertheless revealed his own name; and Evelyn himself chose a life of retirement. One might therefore contemplate the extent to which such writers were aware of their own inconsistency in these matters, and Burton perhaps prefigures Marvell in his particular fashion of pre-empting self criticism. Whereas Burton’s claim to anonymity might lead the way for questioning to what extent writing is a private and personal act, with little evidence of even manuscript publication

⁷⁶ Brian Vickers (ed.), *Public and Private Life in the Seventeenth Century: The Mackenzie-Evelyn Debate: Being a Facsimile Edition of George Mackenzie, A Moral Essay, Preferring Solitude to Publick Entertainment [...] (1665) and John Evelyn, Publick Employment and an Active Life Prefer’d to Solitude [...] (1667)*, (Delmar, NY: Scholars’ Facsimiles & Reprints, 1986), p. 213.

for much of his lyric verse, Marvell seems to more stringently demonstrate this attitude of non-disclosure. By the time Marvell turned to satiric prose, not only was he 'able to negotiate with the underground printers' with whom there was accrued interest in illegal publishing of his work, but his developing relationship with close-knit Restoration printers resulted in telling accuracy to his intricate conventional instructions.⁷⁷ Once Marvell had committed to print, he kept as strong a personal control on his designs, and therefore as close a sense of personal sovereignty, as could have been possible for that age.

IV.

Following this discussion, we might discern that there was no easy development for privacy, and no easy way for people to understand its role. The political climate, aided by cheap print propagating action over repose and 'majoritarian' or 'adversary politics', where the people were expected to take sides, was one fraught with opposition.⁷⁸ Accordingly, the inhabitants of such a climate were often plagued by indecision and dilemma, and, in turn, the distinction between the concepts of the private and public was equally as confused. With established precepts before the inception of the civil wars, privacy, as a response to change, was both dependent on and reflective of the outcome of these revolutionary decades as a 'crisis of order'.⁷⁹ The ideology of the private appears at odds with the material and social developments, to the point of hypocrisy, and by default is lagging behind since the act of publication highlights the very circumstances that make the more personal processes of the

⁷⁷ Annabel Patterson, 'Introduction', in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell: Volume I, 1672-1673* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2003), xxiii, xxvi-xxvii.

⁷⁸ Mark Kishlansky, *Parliamentary Selection: Social and Political Choice in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Mark Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Later Stuart Britain: Partisanship and Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 238-247; Nigel Smith, *Literature & Revolution in England, 1640-1660*, p. 2.

⁷⁹ David Underdown, 'The Taming of the Scold: the Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England', in Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson (eds.), *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 116-136 (p. 116). See also David Cressy, *England on Edge*, pp. 347-376.

production and reception of texts possible. It is this retrospective ‘hypocrisy’ within the ideology which determines some of the modes of understanding. Of modern theorists of privacy, it is evident that some of the principles of Koselleck’s work, modelled in part on Hobbes, are composed with primary ideological sources closer in mind, and have the potential to transpose from the French Revolution to the English equivalent. Although the polarities fit uncomfortably, he opposes an ‘absolutism’ in politics, which would translate to Charles’ personal rule, with an intellectualist ‘criticism’, which, he notes, became hypocrisy and ‘was transformed into the motor of self-righteousness’, of which this trail of ideological thought is a fair example.⁸⁰ The ideology, therefore, exemplifies the confusion and dilemma central to the development of the private domain. That it may ‘lag behind’ highlights the interplay behind two concepts developing in different directions but which held little ‘decisive cleavage’.⁸¹ An integral part of understanding the context of the developing private sphere, therefore, especially given Marvell’s intricate political thought and disparaging commentary on areas of developments on agents of the ‘public’, is to be aware of this interaction between private and public.

The developing culture of privacy is easily overshadowed by the concept of the ‘public sphere’ when the public, as a concept that the people understood at the time, was almost equally as innovative. This is indicative, perhaps, that ‘each domain, private and public, has its own historiographical tradition and, in a sense, its own partisans’.⁸² Proof of this comes from critics, who, in delineating the ‘public sphere’, explain it as a concept evolving from the private. Through a gradual rise in literacy rates and Protestantism following on Calvinist traditions in promoting reading, learning and pride of book ownership, some theorists have a

⁸⁰ Reinhart Koselleck, *Critique and Crisis*, pp. 119-120.

⁸¹ Vanessa Harding, ‘Space, Property and Propriety in Urban England’, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 32.4 (2002), 549–569 (p. 550).

⁸² Dena Goodman, ‘Public Sphere and Private Life: Toward a Synthesis of Current Historiographical Approaches to the Old Regime’, *History and Theory*, 31. 1 (1992), 1-20 (p. 1).

premature formulation of the private when there was not yet necessarily any distinguished mode of the private, almost certainly not sufficient to claim the 'public sphere' evolved from it, nor antithetical to the concept of the 'public sphere' as formulated thereafter. David Zaret, for instance, marks a movement from the beginning of the seventeenth century when 'English politics afforded little place for public opinion' to what he describes as 'the shift from norms of privacy to appeals to public opinion at the level of communicative practice in mid-seventeenth-century England'.⁸³ This implies that English society, while decentralized with localized public responsibility and with policy dominated by autocratic forms of rule, is misinterpreted as private. On the contrary, the will to have more personal control over one's own actions, which was not generally the case in the early seventeenth century, would have left the people in the majority of communities longing for a greater sense of private control that did not already exist. However, Zaret has a more shrewd sense of the chronology behind his thought. Considering theorists' views of the public and private, Roger Chartier follows Jürgen Habermas' premise that a public sphere outside of government 'grew out of the private sphere' at the end of the seventeenth century. However, Zaret is among scholars suggesting that Habermas' chronology needs revision.⁸⁴ By envisaging the 'bourgeois' public sphere implemented into the eighteenth century, and wrongly declaring that periodical news 'became public, that is, 'accessible to the general public' only at the end of the seventeenth century', by then many of the features imbued with the private are already set in place.⁸⁵ Therefore, whilst his theory of the public growing from the private works dialectically for his own timeframe, the chronology fails to accommodate the complex interplay between the two during the mid-seventeenth century before the evolving public sphere was complemented by a greater

⁸³ David Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), pp. 6-7.

⁸⁴ David Zaret, 'Religion, Science, and Printing in the Public Spheres in Seventeenth Century England', in Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993), pp. 212-235 (pp. 215-217).

⁸⁵ Habermas, p. 16.

delineation of the private. However, while Habermas' theory is weakened by chronology, Koselleck's theory, the principles of which I appear to follow more closely, is also less convincing in its more simplified polarity, which, likewise, fails to extrapolate the complex interplay between the two concepts at the right time. Most of the components of this composed 'public sphere' are already set in place well before the eighteenth century, and they exemplify the difficulty in crossing the boundaries between the public and private.⁸⁶ Literary scholar Charlotte Sussman suggests with refreshing simplicity that 'In mid-seventeenth-century England the social structure that has been called the public sphere began to emerge... Around the same time, the area of social relations we now think of as the 'private' of 'domestic' sphere begin to be more sharply defined.'⁸⁷ In correlation with Koselleck, a literary viewpoint, both in ideological sources and the historical practices of reading, presents a historiography with a more parallel development of the public and private.

The people would have sensed some changes in terms of the public networks on the one hand and the new attention towards the self and the family on the other, but neither of these domains were fully specified, and, in the seventeenth century, had a considerable overlap, as Vanessa Harding articulates:

The interface between public and private was by no means a decisive cleavage: There was a continuum from one to the other, and an area of interaction between the two. Public and private were constantly pushing into one another. Private uses invaded the public space, and the public interest restrained private owners' freedom to act on, and modify, the space that they considered their own.⁸⁸

⁸⁶ I am very grateful for personal discussion with Dr. Adam Fox and his assistance in shaping some kind of chronology of the public sphere.

⁸⁷ Charlotte Sussman, 'Women's private reading and political action, 1649-1838', in Timothy Morton and Nigel Smith (eds.), *Radicalism in British Literary Culture, 1650-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 133-150 (pp. 134-135).

⁸⁸ Vanessa Harding, 'Space, Property and Propriety in Urban England', p. 550.

The first relevant example of this interaction comes with Parliament. Marvell's brief foray into London from Cambridge was shortened by his father who persuaded him to return to university, and while he was signed out in the Conclusions book by the autumn of 1641, his spell abroad, coinciding with the conflicts, will have given him by that stage a limited sighting and experience of parliament. With the combination of oral and written culture spreading news and accumulating interest, parliament, at times, 'was clearly the focal point for crowds of interested citizens', and was 'probably willing to permit the public to frequent the palace, its passages and its lobbies, and even the doors of the Houses, as well as the committee chambers.'⁸⁹ Prior to the mid-seventeenth-century, parliament may have been seen as much more secular and enclosed political agency in the minds of the majority, but from the censorship acts and proposals submitted by parliament to the way they in turn began exploiting the agent of the press, such as the methods of circulating the few hundred words of the 1641 'Protestation' oath, they were sharply transforming, through these political methods and agencies, into the image of a much representative 'public' body.⁹⁰ Moreover, the government posts Marvell assumed after leaving Fairfax's estate may well have been considerably more figuratively public roles than in earlier decades, and a sharper contrast in turn to the peaceful, familial environment of Nun Appleton.

The second example relates to coffeehouses, 'a milieu often associated with Marvell'.⁹¹ Popular and fast-spreading, coffeehouses represented an iconic movement towards the public insofar as they were places for discussion of news and political issues, and also facilitated a distribution network for unlicensed texts. However, there has been plenty of suspicion that

⁸⁹ Jason Peacey, 'The Print Culture of Parliament, 1600-1800', *Parliamentary History*, 26.1 (2007), 1-16 (p. 1). Adam Fox, 'Rumour, News and Popular Political Opinion in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England'.

⁹⁰ A 1643 Act required all publications to be licensed by Parliamentary authority, and eventually the army assumed media control in 1647. On the details of the circulation of the Protestation oath, see David Cressy, 'The Protestation Protested, 1641 and 1642', *HJ*, 45.2 (2002), 251-279. On the way parliament used print to inflict political processes, see Peacey, 'The Print Culture of Parliament, 1600-1800'.

⁹¹ Patterson and Dzelzainis (eds.), *The Rehearsal Transpros'd (Introduction)*, p. 4. The editors also provide a useful reference to [Samuel Butler], *The Transproser Rehears'd* (Oxford: Printed for Grotius and Van Harmine, 1673), pp. 35-39.

entry to some, if not all coffeehouses was selective and restricted.⁹² As well as a place for public gathering, it is likely that they would be used equally for solitary musing and small, intimate group discussions and literary circles, where writers could establish their own realm of privacy by trying to stipulate that their controversial texts should be distributed internally to protect members from custodial punishment. Such groups, shrouded in secrecy, conform very much to Alan Westlin's privacy notion of 'small group intimacy', and offered writers the means around oppression and censorship to choose whether to share material or to withhold it.⁹³ With elements of trust and confidentiality, this demonstrated an early instance of writers' attempts 'to control the direction and ordering of one's own affairs'.⁹⁴

V.

Privacy in early-modern England therefore, to reverse Pocock's construction, is not just a language but a programme, albeit one notoriously difficult to pin down because of the difficulty in finding any simple definition, especially given the complexities of the seventeenth century. Common to modern definitions are related notions of right and choice, and in turn, of 'the system of norms'. However, this assumes that '*there are no absolute rights, only normative rights*', and until the mid-seventeenth century the country was governed by the monarchs' claim to absolute rights, and the development of privacy coincides with the dismantling of this order where such rights started to become 'illusory'.⁹⁵ Logically, therefore, we might deduce that modern definitions of privacy started to form when the claim to absolute rights, either divine right or the king's place in ancient constitution, faltered: 'Though Justice against Fate

⁹² Aytoun Ellis, *The Penny Universities: A History of the Coffee Houses* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1956) has suggested that women were not allowed in coffee-houses (p. 88), while Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971) suggests that coffeehouses were limited to middle and upper class men (p. 22).

⁹³ Alan Westlin, *Privacy and Freedom* (New York: Atheneum, 1967); Young, p. 4.

⁹⁴ Young, p. 4.

⁹⁵ Roger Ingham, 'Privacy and Psychology', in Young (ed.), *Privacy*, pp. 35-57 (p. 38).

complain, / And plead the ancient rights in vain' ('An Horatian Ode', 37-38). This might explain why the royal chaplain Taylor, who might in earlier decades have treated privacy with suspicion, is the clearest advocate in 1650. Also, through ideological discussion and sociological change, developing notions of privacy intersperse with other prominent processes of development at approximately the same time. Much of the rich historical context in which Marvell wrote has been well documented, but the development of the private has not yet surfaced. The following chapters will suggest that Marvell's own exhibition of privacy is reflected both within his poems, and in their production, which differed at different stages of his career. Unlike many commentators of privacy, who either lived in solitude, in hiding, or retired in their later careers, Marvell chose to return to the rigours and demands of Westminster, and began writing satirically about areas of public life, albeit bringing a 'kind of hostility... a weariness about writing, ironically, to his more extended pieces of writing' reflective of that public life, and yet, if we speculate on post-Restoration composition, some 'brilliant miniaturist studies', which surely encapsulate the sense of the private he retains now living in the extremity of its opposite.⁹⁶

⁹⁶ McWilliams, 'Marvell and Milton's Literary Friendship Reconsidered', *SEL*, 46.1 (2006), 155-177 (p. 163).

2. 'A Fine and Private Place': Marvell's Early Dilemma

One of the central dilemmas of Marvell's early poetic career was whether or not to publish his work. This chapter follows Marvell's sampling in public and private verse, and his increasing desire not to publish. While the private was still viewed as suspicious, Marvell saw the use of the 'public' as equally suspicious, which influences a desire for privacy in terms of not publishing. Also, Marvell's early self-critical impulses, which may derive from James I's *Basilikon*, render a particular sense of discomfort on the rare occasions he does publish. There are also indications that Marvell's spatial awareness of privacy and its emergence as a developing social fashion begins to impact upon his writing. After all, privacy was not solely a literary interest of Marvell, nor is it applicable solely within his writing – it represents a career-long preoccupation. A reading of 'To His Coy Mistress' aims to demonstrate Marvell's own sense of privacy in relation to the developments stipulated in chapter one. Perhaps the best way to understand Marvell's own developing sense of the private is to keep in mind the political use of the private and public in the decades preceding his writing career and how that relates to the ideological discussions.

I.

Firstly, I will briefly consider Marvell's early religion given the pious nature of commentators on privacy, and that the more radical reformers attempted to appropriate its benefits. Discussion of Marvell's religion proves equally as perplexing and unsatisfying as that of his early politics, but it is worth speculating from what can be deduced.¹ His father, 'a most excellent preacher' and Master of the Charterhouse, will have likely guided the younger

¹ Caroline Robbins offers some speculative suggestions, 'Marvell's Religion: Was He a New Methodist?', *JHI*, 23.2 (1962), 268-272.

Marvell through a Calvinist catechism in his own footsteps. Religious ideas were still ‘shifting modalities that could have different meanings in different contexts’, whose ‘amphibiousness and ambidexterity... allowed them to penetrate English culture, seeping into the myriad crevices in the dominant belief system where ideas and practices were not fully aligned.’ Hence, Ethan Shagan notes, ‘sites of social friction’ like ‘disputes between princes and their people, were exactly the places where new ideas were brought most forcibly to bear.’² The Calvinist ethos and the development of Calvinist literature, described as potentially ‘a godfather to later Puritan literature in Scotland and England’, were wreathed in paradox. Calvinist theology instigated selflessness and devoting all focus towards God, yet the tradition ‘of individual spiritual examination of conscience’ gave rise to ‘an intense anxiety about the self, and a constant surveillance of it’, which, for many, ‘ultimately resulted in literary expression of that self’s concerns and world-view.’³ Marvell’s matriculation at Cambridge University in 1633 would have been facilitated by his father, surely aware from his own university career of the battling dominance of Calvinist theology at the institution.⁴ From Marvell’s later admission in the *Rehearsal Transpros’d* about his lack of enthusiasm for tropes of English identity because of men pushing for power, it might be construed that he had become disillusioned at an early stage with Calvinist soteriology between God and humanity because of the self-driven individualism it encouraged of men.⁵ This personal crisis of faith may, in turn, have caused the brief deferment from university to Catholicism on the one hand, and the journeying abroad on the other. In the long term, it may have led to more radical or nonconformist traits. Yet, aside from the ‘Modest Ambition’ he claims uncomfortably through one of his public poems, Marvell seems to tend towards ‘inner convictions and pursuits rather

² Ethan Shagan, *Popular Politics in the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 7.

³ Catharine Randall, ‘Calvinism and Post-Tridentine Developments’, in Glyn P. Norton (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Volume 3: The Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 466-474 (p. 466).

⁴ Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), pp. 81-83.

⁵ Diarmaid MacCulloch discusses the development of English Calvinism, including the soteriology, Calvin’s salvation. *The Later Reformation in England 1547-1603* (London: Macmillan, 1990), pp. 70-81.

than the outward ‘rites of conformity’, and such insularity is registered by the critic from an early stage.⁶ Very little is known about his time studying and his first period spent abroad in Europe. Details of the latter are speculated through sources of contemporaries such as John Evelyn undergoing similar sojourns, but already it appears deliberate that no record was made.

II.

The realm of the private had, over the decades preceding Marvell’s early career, been the subject of misjudgement and a casualty of hypocrisy. However, he would surely have realised how this came about. From the individual writer to the monarch, there was now a public and private divide associated with writing. If a text was not made public, the writer could neither be held accountable, nor be required to live up to any statements, and so not fall into the trap of hypocrisy in public eyes. Yet the conditions, and to some regard, the corruption of the marketplace of print now meant that public figures risked their works being printed without consent. Commentators on privacy may have isolated its use from the individual subject, but use of the public realm made conditions increasingly dangerous. The consequence from these developments, it seems, is Marvell’s decision to keep silent about his activities, and his lack of desire to publish, unlike a number of cavaliers with whom he acquainted himself in the 1640s. Yet when Marvell did decide to publish, he offers explanation behind the decision. His association with royalist Richard Lovelace led to a commendatory poem for *Lucasta*, ‘To His Noble Friend Mr Richard Lovelace, Upon His Poems’, one of a small number of occasional poems which seems to locate Marvell within royalist topoi, to wide critical debate. From an early stage Marvell expresses a possible dislike of the agents of publicity: presses, licensors and

⁶ ‘To His Noble Friend, Mr Richard Lovelace, Upon His Poems’, l. 9; John Dixon Hunt, *Andrew Marvell: His Life and Writing* (London: Elek, 1978), p. 19.

the problems of censorship are all criticised in his dedicatory poem.⁷ The ‘measure of privacy’, as Ariès stages it, of individuals writing for themselves alone, to set themselves apart and to find themselves, seemed to be disappearing.⁸ The new public arena of discourse meant that writing and the act of publishing was adopting new polemical and propagandist roles, adopting rhetorical topoi of *docere* and *movere*.⁹ With the emerging sides engaging in pamphlet wars, full of ‘Word-peckers, paper-rats, book-scorpions, / Of wit corrupted’ (‘To His Noble Friend Mr Richard Lovelace’, ll. 20-21), quality descended into quantity, and ever more published works meant that every new one had to fight harder to be read.¹⁰ Publishing on the one hand was becoming an increasingly political act, particularly with parliament using the presses to inflict and manipulate political processes, and on the other, it was a declaration within the literary culture that authors deemed their work worthy of its place in the public realm and to be preserved for posterity, a claim that Marvell has to face in his dedicatory poem to Lovelace.¹¹

This commendatory poem, within which one critic finds little critical appreciation of Lovelace on Marvell’s part, addresses the ‘conditions that prevail in the grubby arena of

⁷ The extent of the problem of censorship has been the subject of some debate. Blair Worden suggests that texts could be over-read, while Christopher Hill believes that radical opinion was completely strangled and that the danger was in ‘underreading’. Further suggestions imply that parliament had little power to exert authority in times of wavering prioritisation. Blair Worden, ‘Literature and political censorship in early modern England’, in A. C. Duke and C. A. Tamse (eds.), *Too Mighty to Be Free: Censorship in Britain and the Netherlands: Britain and the Netherlands* Vol. IX (Zutphen: De Walburg, 1988), pp. 45-62; Christopher Hill, ‘Censorship and English Literature’, in *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill. Vol. 1, Writing and Revolution in 17th Century England* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1985), ch. 2; see also Anthony Milton, ‘Licensing, Censorship and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England’, *HJ*, 41.3 (1998), 625-651.

⁸ Ariès, p. 5. Ariès suggests that ‘few sought to publish’, but this is not wholly convincing. We are not made aware of the relevance of the statement to England, and also that conclusions are derived from a fairly narrow generic perspective in autobiography, which may just indicate that a genre was established precisely because it traditionally went unpublished.

⁹ Elizabeth Skerpan, *The Rhetoric of Politics in the English Revolution, 1642-1660* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1992), argues that Royalists used ‘epideictic’ and Parliamentarians ‘deliberative and forensic’ rhetoric; whilst Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England*, suggests that ‘rigorous division’ of this distribution of rhetorical usage is difficult to find (p. 40).

¹⁰ Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing*, p. 5.

¹¹ Jason Peacey, ‘The Print Culture of Parliament, 1600-1800’.

politics', and the threat to poetic tradition.¹² Lovelace's fruitful decade had involved presenting the Kentish protest to the commons, incarceration for his troubles, and fighting overseas. He was also a writer of measured and elusive verse with a style of 'temperate rhetoric and delicate artistry' to 'camouflage a royalist agenda', which surely intrigued Marvell.¹³ Lovelace's dedicated service, together with the inner conflicts between public and private life, between the belief in his cause and the loss of his liberty altogether creates 'the necessary tension that raises his best work above that of most Caroline lyricists.'¹⁴ Yet, if 'faultless' (26) Lovelace is the literary representative of the civic 'virtues now ... banished out of town (11), regrettably, Marvell notes, 'The air's already tainted' (17). The 'barbed censurers' (21) highlight further problems Marvell foresaw relating to public writing. After royal control of the Star Chamber collapsed in 1641, Parliament implemented the 1643 Ordinance, reinforced in 1647, which left royalist authors and booksellers of royalist orientation running dangerous risks against the authorities. The careful arguments of moderate puritan reformers such as Sibbes, also a highly popular public speaker, were slowly finding an ideological acceptance for the private. However, this was undercut again by contradictories, through censorship and increasing restrictions on individual freedom of speech. Noting that 'Some... will allege / You wronged in her the House's privilege' (27-28), Marvell laments that the body claiming to represent the voice of the people is complicit in suppression.¹⁵ If, as Annabel Patterson suggests, the 'House's privilege' refers to 'the privilege of freedom of speech *within* the Commons, a privilege limited, however, to Members of Parliament, and denied to the rest of society

¹² Patsy Griffin, *The Modest Ambition of Andrew Marvell: A Study of Marvell and His Relation to Lovelace, Fairfax, Cromwell and Milton* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1995), pp. 24-25; Robert Wilcher, *Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 111.

¹³ Randy Robertson, 'Lovelace and the "barbed Censurers": *Lucasta* and Civil War Censorship', *Studies in Philology*, 103.4 (2006), 465-498, (p. 468).

¹⁴ Bruce King, 'Green Ice and a Breast of Proof', in William R. Keast (ed.), *Seventeenth Century English Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 324-332 (p. 327).

¹⁵ In later years, Thomas Jordan's 'The Players' Petition to the Parliament', a complaint about the theatre closures, echoes the concerns over parliamentary censorship as exemplary of assuming greater absolute control. Peter Davidson (ed.), *Poetry and Revolution: An Anthology of British and Irish Verse 1625-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 309-312.

specifically by the 1643 Printing Ordinance', this furthers this particular public and private conflict with parliament contradicting its own representational ethos.¹⁶ However, as Randy Robertson highlights, this particular lexis could imply the censorship as exemplary of parliamentary powers, and thus Marvell's concerns could implicate wider problems: "To "wrong" the Houses' privilege was thus to do it — and the Parliament itself — violence. Little wonder, then, that Marvell worried the question of censorship at such length: Parliament would doubtless take umbrage at Lovelace's lines."¹⁷ While not necessarily entwined within the politics of his acquaintances, Marvell still understood a significant threat to literary tradition with such heavy-handed censorship.¹⁸ The use of the private may have been cast as suspicious before, but as he realised, the use of instruments of the public, particularly representational powers - the 'House's privilege' - was also becoming increasingly suspicious. If he forsook publication he would allow himself freedom from censorship, eliminate risk of punishments, and also retain increasing dignity from the hypocrisies of ruling bodies.

Another reason why Marvell might have preferred not to publish is his developing sense of self-criticism. Through equating the King with the sun, Lucasta is aligned with James I's ideal of the monarch as a little God in the *Basilikon Doron*, and, as poet, commentator and a leading exponents of the emergence of the author, James' texts must have been seminal in royalist ideology. One might be curious as to whether Marvell encountered and was influenced by this text. The instruction 'censure your selfe as sharply, as if ye were your owne enemy: For if ye iudge your selfe, ye shall not be iudged' could account for, and certainly reflects, the strong self-critical stance Marvell seems to develop in his early literary career.¹⁹ The occasional poems published in Marvell's early career were either commendatory or elegies, only poems

¹⁶ Annabel Patterson, *Marvell: The Writer in Public Life* (London: Longman, 2000), p. 15.

¹⁷ Robertson, p. 480.

¹⁸ Annabel Patterson, staunchly against evidence of Marvellian royalism, writes of Marvell's stance in the Lovelace poem as 'not an expression of sympathy with the royalist cause, but rather with one particular royalist', suggesting that Marvell disengages himself with Lovelace's political situation. *Marvell and the Civic Crown*, p. 17. See also David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, pp. 172-173.

¹⁹ *Basilikon Doron*, p. 16.

generically designated for tribute and praise. There is no criticism aimed at individuals through which he may himself be judged. Private poems not intended for publication, on the other hand, delivered more colourful personal opinion. Around the time of his return from Europe in 1645-1646, Marvell wrote *Flecknoe, an English Priest at Rome*, a witty riposte reflecting upon his own interest in Catholicism, but one that in its 'hovering sacred seriousness and profane "mocking"', looks to measure itself against the stature of other poets.²⁰ The satire neatly inverts Thomas Jordan's 'A Poet's farewell to his threadbare Cloak', where, as the title implicates, the cloak is the fragile object, to where the thick manuscript cloak covers the fragile Flecknoe.²¹ The 'close jacket of poetic buff' (71) could be mocking Flecknoe's literary abilities, his own, or even perhaps the general loss of poetic tradition as eulogized in the poem to Lovelace. From the confidence of the speaker in *Flecknoe*, Marvell seems content, it seems safe to suggest, to fully intend this as a private poem, for his censure and self-judgement in not publishing prevents judgement on his own freedom of expression.

However, the desire to publish necessarily exudes self-belief in the quality of one's own work. Far from the bounding confidence of the speaker within the private *Flecknoe*, Marvell's early public poems contain a slightly competitive, possibly insecure edge. Compilations of such poems, dedicatory or elegy, by a number of writers, were potential bait for comparison, and if Marvell envisaged it, attention for vital advancement in patronage. The poem to Lovelace pars Marvell with Colonel Francis Lovelace, Richard's brother. Marvell's lines 'Who best could praise, had then the greatest praise, / 'Twas more esteemed to give, than wear the bays' (7-8), coincides with Francis' intention to award the 'bays', an award Marvell later playfully refutes in 'The Garden' as a vain pursuit. However, Marvell's double edged statement here implies not only that he currently holds the award to give, but that his act of giving holds him in higher esteem. This is qualified somewhat by the 'Modest Ambition' (9), a self-

²⁰ Joan Hartwig, 'Marvell's Metamorphic Fleckno', *SEL*, 36 (1996), 171-212 (p. 189, 206).

²¹ Nigel Smith, *Andrew Marvell: The Complete Poems*, p. 167.

negative view of elegy, perhaps as too long, especially here given Hastings' death at a young age. This mystifying ending nevertheless exemplifies a slight air of discomfort surrounding his public poetry, and while this collection divides critical opinion on its defeatist outlook of the royalist tradition, this falls at a time of extreme turmoil, and when the occasion requires private conscience and public duty of the writer to combine.

III.

As was suggested in the introduction, privacy is as much about what is not known as about what is - in a sense, a 'non-behaviour' - a factor that clouds critical appreciation since the critic can only respond definitively to what is there.²⁴ The rest, and Marvell provides plenty of provocation, is left to assumption. Marvell chose to refrain from public records about his early life, or so we assume from the lack of textual or biographical evidence. The poet chooses and appreciates the freedom afforded by the 'act' of privacy, of not publishing, while within his poetry, there are examples of both an 'anti-public' explaining his decision not to publish, and a conscious discomfort at writing with public intentions. I hope now to demonstrate within his verse a language and thought representing the private which begins to emerge in 'To His Coy Mistress', a poem which exemplifies many of the dilemmas of the 1640s and connects the concept of privacy with a number of different entities: space, nature, the body, and sexuality, crossing that interface between public and private possibly more than any other of his poems. If initially private, it was almost certainly distributed by manuscript as the later, amended and 'raunchier' Haward Manuscript in the 1670s, which suggests a change in attitude at some point in his career.²⁵ Although, ultimately, Marvell's quality conquers in the array of possibilities he

²⁴ Ingham, 'Privacy and Psychology', p. 36.

²⁵ The central thesis behind *Privacy and Print* has several weaknesses relevant to the study of Marvell. In arguing that the medium of print created a private interaction whereby author met reader 'anonymously and in private', Jagodzinski assumes the writer publishes. However, this works from a number of assumptions about a mutual process of complicit transmission that do not necessary fit with the enigmatic

offers without offering definite conclusions, in the context of his earlier career, pitching the poem against the semantic history of private may offer some inclination of the time of writing,

It may have been difficult to pinpoint the ‘decisive cleavage’ in the ‘interface between public and private’, but one concern that may have struck the impressionable young Marvell in his early career would have been the spatial configuration of the public and private. The transition of a court culture of classicism during early Stuart rule ‘tended to widen the cultural distance between the court and most of England’, and these sociological and cultural developments promoted change in the face of ‘evolving complexities of private space’.²⁶ While the elite could improve their homes and begin a process of segregation into smaller and more secluded, private areas, the population density of London left many houses extremely crowded, and more were forced to live out on the streets than previous eras.²⁷ Spatial conditions represented ‘not merely an arena in which social life unfolds, but rather... a medium through which social relations are produced and reproduced.’²⁸ Inevitably though, such conditions drew greater complexity if and when an individual observed outside of the locality they were specifically adapted to. Nothing is said of Marvell’s early perceptions of the two extreme standards of living in London from his brief defection from university. However, from his family home in Hull surrounded by gardens on the riverbank, through spells at Cambridge, the polarities of London and travelling in Europe, it is quite feasible that the juxtaposition between the grand renaissance architecture and horticulture of the continent, the pleasant almshouse in Hull, and

Marvell. She notes the rise of authors as ‘highly visible public figures’, not Marvell, juxtaposed to the author who ‘invites the reader to share in a kind of surveillance’. These suggestions fail if the writer does not intend his work to be read. Jagodzinski draws attention to the end of this manuscript era and in the conjunction of reading and writing some of these broad assessments seem to forget all too easily about the fundamental privacy retained at the stage of writing and composition alone. We are also reminded of some of the early qualifications made by Love which refute that manuscript production and/or publication suddenly became redundant with the advent of the press. Jagodzinski, pp. 9-12; Love, *Scribal Publication*.

²⁶ R. Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), p. 106; Harding, p. 569.

²⁷ Harding, ‘Space, Property and Propriety in Urban England’, pp. 565-567; and also ‘The Population of London, 1550–1700: A Review of the Published Evidence’, *London Journal*, 15 (1990), 111–128.

²⁸ Derek Gregory and John Urry (eds.), ‘Introduction’, in *Social Relations and Spatial Structures* (London: Macmillan, 1985), pp. 1-8 (p. 3).

the congested urban districts and otherwise ‘divided and hideously mutilated’ nation, would have alerted Marvell’s astute sensitivities to this selective spatial privatisation, and perhaps placed the relative privileges of his upbringing starkly into context.²⁹ Contrasts of time within the poem have been well documented, with the poem seen, notably by pre- new historicists critics, as exemplary of the *carpe diem* genre.³⁰ However, Marvell’s poem also contains spatial antitheses. The ‘Indian Ganges’ side’ (5) is compared with the ‘tide / Of Humber’ (6-7). Together are cast ‘empires’ (12) against the speaker’s ‘vegetable love’, (11) an epithet which could, from many, many examples, imply a garden. In the Aristotelian tradition of tripartite souls, vegetative, sensitive and rational (as presented by Burton’s *Anatomy of Melancholy*), ‘vegetable love’ may come to represent the living soul, since a later comparison sees the vast ‘Deserts of vast eternity’ (24) juxtaposed with consequential spatial symbols of the dead, a ‘marble vault (26)’ and the grave, ‘a fine and private place’ (31).

Heightened by the influx of such philosophy, are these conflicts of space responsible for Marvell’s decision to travel to Europe in the height of conflict? With his name in the Trinity College conclusions book, the poet left for Europe in 1641 or 1642, with biographical details to that effect first confirmed by John Milton’s letter of recommendation in the early 1650s: ‘he hath spent foure years abroad in Holland, France, Italy and Spaine, to very good purpose... and the gaining of those foure languages’.³¹ Marvell’s retrospective explanation or apology for this venture abroad, as close as any could be established, seems to be mapped within this claim from his later prose:

²⁹ Hunt, p. 28.

³⁰ For example, Rosalie Colie, “‘My Ecchoing Song’: Marvell’s Poetry of Criticism (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970) describes the poem as ‘Marvell’s most remarkable poem of carpe diem’ (p. 54). J. B. Leishman, *The Art of Marvell’s Poetry* (London: Hutchinson, 1966), sees Marvell here reinvigorating the genre, (p. 77), and Donald Friedman, *Marvell’s Pastoral Art* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), reads the poem as typical of the *carpe diem* genre (p. 117).

³¹ Milton to John Bradshaw, 21 February 1652, in Elizabeth Story Donno (ed.), *Andrew Marvell: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), pp. 99–100.

Whether it were a War of Religion, or of Liberty, is not worth the labour to enquire. Whichsoever was at the top, the other was at the bottom; but upon considering all, I think the Cause was too good to have been fought for. Men ought to have trusted God; they ought and might have trusted the King with that whole matter... The King himself being of so accurate and piercing a judgement, would soon have felt where it stuck. For men may spare their pains where Nature is at work, and the world would not go faster for our driving. Even as his present Majesty's happy Restauration did it self; so all things else happen in their best and proper time, without any need of our officiousness.³²

If this passage is justification of his decision to travel thirty years earlier and to strategically avoid at least three years of the civil war, much of the sentiment here could be traced back to his earlier career. There are different ways to interpret Marvell's measure of the 'Cause', although inevitably it is far more troubled than Milton's relatively straightforward polemic.³³ Marvell seems to have disagreed with the violence: as he saw it, 'to be sure Hell's broke loose', and he could at least distance himself further from an internal crisis of conscience over his abstinence by leaving the nationwide battleground. This is reflected in 'To His Coy Mistress' by breaking the domesticity, imagining the mistress abroad by the Ganges while the speaker 'would complain' by the Humber where Marvell's father drowned, a tragedy which possibly prompted the decision to travel. 'Domesticity', Jonathan Post suggests, 'has little place in an argument that moves from India to England, from the antediluvian to the end of time'.³⁴ Given the awkwardness from his early public elegies, and a notable absence of any elegiac verse on his parents, there may be a sense that Marvell's expedition was part of his private eulogising process. Retrospectively, he can afford to apologise for his own debilitated conscience from any *otium/negotium* dilemma by advocating a systematic *laissez-faire* attitude,

³² Dzelzainis and Patterson (eds.), *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, p. 192.

³³ On Marvell and Milton's interpretations of the 'Cause', see Christopher Hill, 'Milton and Marvell', in Patrides (ed.), *Approaches to Marvell*, pp. 1-30 (pp. 15-16); also McWilliams, 'Marvell and Milton's Literary Friendship Reconsidered'. Sharon Achinstein interprets Marvell's prefatory poem 'On Paradise Lost' less as a defence of the 'Good old Cause' or Milton's 'revolutionary political ideology of radical revolution, than a theory for the defence 'to create inspired poetry', literary toleration, and a revolutionary ideology of 'individual agency'. 'Milton's Spectre in the Restoration: Marvell, Dryden, and Literary Enthusiasm', *HLQ*, 59.1 (1996), 1-29 (pp. 27-28).

³⁴ Jonathan F. S. Post, *English Lyric Poetry: The Early Seventeenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 262.

convincing himself with proof of the Restoration. One also wonders if this is in any way provoked by the debate of the Mackenzie-Evelyn debate of the mid-1660s given that the later anti-*otium* Evelyn also travelled abroad in the 1640s, to savour architectural and horticultural sights.³⁵ To this extent, part of the purpose of this poem could prove a resolution to a private crisis of conscience about the state of his beloved nation. But what nation has he returned to, and what is privacy worth there? A nation that is at greatest threat, it would appear, by active agents of destruction, where Time and Space are closing in.

But at my back I always hear
 Time's winged chariot hurrying near:
 And yonder all before us lie
 Deserts of vast eternity.
 Thy beauty shall no more be found
 Nor, in thy marble vault, shall sound
 My echoing song: then worms shall try
 That long preserved virginity.

(‘To His Coy Mistress’, 21-28)

Marvell's freedom of travelling combined with the advanced structuring of artificial gardens, sights which could only be kept in memory and expressed on paper, would have associated a more advanced structuring of private space with the continent, even if Brathwaite's translation of the Italian text suggested an ideology of acceptance similar to that of Britain. From the macrocosmic deserts, which cannot be desirable - for even having acquired the European languages, Marvell still returned to England - the relative domestic equivalent of the private is not just any metaphor of minutia, but in the aftermath of war, the grave. As Christine Rees notes of the ‘idea of oblivion’ of the vulnerable human in relation to such forces:

³⁵ Hunt, ch. 4, ‘Foure Years Abroad’, pp. 26-55. Incidentally, another English traveller of the decade, ‘historiographer royal’ James Howell, also demonstrated disapproval of a sort about an element of privacy. He complained to Charles II about the ‘mean and mechanical’ people governed by ‘such a general itching after book learning’, implying a preference for privacy as a privilege for an educated elite where more private decision making could pass uncontested if not for a more educated public. Joseph Jacobs (ed.), *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae: the familiar letters of James Howell, Historiographer Royal to Charles II*, 2 vols. (London: D. Nutt, 1890), I, pp. 523-526.

Brilliantly, Marvell translates this fear into images of space, conjuring up two opposite but related phobias: terror of wide open spaces, heightened by the fear of pursuit, and terror of confined spaces. The ‘fine and private place’ becomes a hideous travesty of the *locus amoenus* of the life of pleasure, just as the ‘Desarts of vast Eternity’ suggest a peculiarly bleak version of the contemplative solitude.³⁶

Privacy applies when an individual has sufficient time and space to feel a sense of personal control. Through the mid-seventeenth century, from demographically stretched urban regions with cramped houses to stately homes with a multitude of servants and attendants, this was not an easy prospect, and another polarity with the continent and its alluring gardens. Post argues that ‘In Marvell’s playful reverie, there is no need to worry... about fooling a few household spies’. However, if Marvell lives up to his ‘uncanny reach into his culture’ and ‘ability to frame... many of the more pressing concerns of his day’, the ironies of time and space so widely displaced threaten that ‘privacy’, in Marvell’s own culture, will be annihilated to nowhere other than the grave.³⁷ Sardonicly, Marvell is left to confess, ‘The grave’s a fine and private place / But none I think do *there* embrace’ (31-32).³⁸ If this poem is to be read within the *carpe diem* genre and associated with carnal passions, a reading Marvell certainly promotes if it is not his sole intention, there must surely be automatic concerns with the stifling conditions preventing impulsive passionate acts. Such is the claustrophobic lack of physical time and space of privacy that is required to fulfil any human-driven passion. To wait indefinitely for such privileges to become commonplace, the speaker argues, one may as well foresee the grave.

Rees’ statement, which, although it does not state outright, hints at some comment on Epicureanism, neatly opens up another, quite different way in which to view the poem in

³⁶ Rees, p. 97.

³⁷ Post, p. 255.

³⁸ My italics.

association with privacy: through a philosophy of nature. Marvell's select choice of language has long been recognised for its characteristic ambiguity, and throughout the poem, even when referencing foreign lands or subjects which seem far removed from landscape, the language is chorographic, geographic and occasionally can be taken as biological. 'Coy' raises attention as possibly referring to a ditch or trench,³⁹ while the Ganges offers phonetic closeness to the prominent disease gangrene,⁴⁰ particularly in connection with 'rubies' which carries a sinister connotation in colour, reminiscent of blood or bloodied bodies, particularly given the 'Deserts of vast eternity', vaults, graves and worms, pre-empted by crashing through iron gates/grates.⁴¹ The mistress' breasts, equally, could refer to analogous chorographic features: from hills to mountains, the height of English scenery. There is a possibility, therefore, that the body of Marvell's mistress is synonymous with the land. This would not be a unique poetic device since Raleigh also uses woman as a subject to describe nature, as well as Margaret Cavendish in 'Nature's Landskip'. Luke Gernon's *Discourse of Ireland* (1620) describes Ireland as a mistress, with such stereotypes 'seeping into certain adaptations of the body-politic metaphor':

³⁹ One obscure meaning of 'coy', taken from 1620, implies a ditch or trench. Also of note, is the 'raunchier' Haward Manuscript: "Two hundred to adore your eyes, / But thirty thousand to your Thighes", Bodleian Library, University of Oxford, MS Don. b.8, pp. 283-284. (I am grateful to Nigel Smith (2007, pp. 79-80) for this reference.) According to the *OED*, "Thighes" had a medieval meaning of the trunk of a tree or the slopes of a hill (3), keeping close the chorographic language of nature and of landscape.

⁴⁰ A prominent disease of the time, gangrene appeared frequently in metaphorical contexts, most prominently by Thomas Edwards in 1646 to implicate sectarianism as a disease rupturing the body politic: 'few Sectaries five years agoe, are grown now to many thousands'. *Gangræna* (London: Printed for Ralph Smith, 1646), p. 113. If there is any inclination of disease here, this could implicate a particular historical textual analysis by Marvell. Milton's *Areopagitica* had campaigned for a climate of free-press and free-speech, with the penalties for unlicensed publication in Elizabethan and Jacobean England potentially severe. However, Stephen Greenberg notes that during these early decades of the seventeenth-century, in 'an unfree epoch', plague bills were not just accepted but widely encouraged; a paradoxical concern for the dissemination of public information where otherwise it was almost completely restricted. Stephen Greenberg, 'Plague, the Printing Press, and Public Health in Seventeenth-Century London', *HLQ*, 67.4 (2004), 508-527 (p. 526).

⁴¹ I also suggest that if the colour 'green' in 'The Garden' is understood in a sinister context, which critics have not yet discerned, this allows a method by which to interpret the poem differently. As 'To His Coy Mistress' has attracted praise as a great love lyric, likewise, 'The Garden' attracts descriptions of paradise and perfection where I find an alternative, different interpretation.

Her breasts are round hillockes of milk-yeelding grasse, and that so fertile, that they contend with the vallyes. And betwixt her leggs (for Ireland is full of havens), she hath an open harbor, but not much frequented... in her champion partes she hath not so much as will cover her nakedness.⁴²

The difference lies, Theodora Jankowski notes, ‘in the disposition of the woman/land described’, and Marvell’s standpoint lies mystically undetermined.⁴³ While the role of gender appears important and will have acquired greater significance if the amended and ‘raunchier’ version was released later to counter allegations of homosexuality, Marvell’s mind seems predominantly worried about the state of his nation and ‘dwelling on other forms of desire’.⁴⁴ There is a sensuous, worldly beauty to both woman and land, perhaps as a temptation for men to settle the conflict with the alluring prize at stake. The role of gender is temporarily superseded with the land anthropomorphised to inherit a human life-span, and not just finite, but severely limited, with ‘Time’s winged chariot hurrying near’ at alarming speed, and the frustrated speaker facing the ‘bleak reality’ and an apocalyptic future.⁴⁵

This is not an obvious poem of nature, but such language demonstrates Marvell’s engagement into areas of European philosophy. The *carpe diem* genre, one commentator notes, was traditionally ‘anti-philosophical’. Hence, Marvell is crashing through iron grates of

⁴² Luke Gernon, *A Discourse of Ireland*, ed. Caesar Litton Falkiner, reproduced by Beatrix Färber, ‘Corpus of Electronic Texts (CELT)’, University College, Cork, <<http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/E620001.html>>, 1999-2007 (p. 350). I am indebted to personal communication with Professor Gil Harris for helpful information and references.

⁴³ Most conservatively, Cavendish’s woman/land is ‘viewed’; most radically, the bride of Spenser’s ‘Epithalamion’, constructed by the fruits of the land, is ‘raped’ or conquered. Like Raleigh’s Guiana, tempting but unspoiled and ‘potentially rapable’, Marvell’s standpoint lies somewhere between. Theodora A. Jankowski, ‘Good Enough to Eat: The Domestic Economy of Woman-Woman Eroticism in Margaret Cavendish and Andrew Marvell’, in Corinne Abate (ed.), *Privacy, Domesticity, and Women in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 83-110 (p. 85).

⁴⁴ Paul Hammond, ‘Marvell’s Sexuality’, *SC*, 11 (1996), 87-123 (p. 112).

⁴⁵ Cleanth Brooks, ‘Andrew Marvell: Puritan Austerity with Classical Grace’, in Maynard Mack and George de F. Lord (eds.), *Poetic Traditions of the English Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), pp. 219-28 (p. 221). Marvell’s vision of apocalypse is also considered by David Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics and Polemics in Radical Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 158-162; also by Margarita Stocker, *Apocalyptic Marvell: The Second Coming in Seventeenth-Century Poetry* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1986). Jonathan Bate finds within the poem ‘a vein of apocalyptic thought’. ‘Introduction’, in Donno (ed.), *Andrew Marvell: Complete Poems*, 5th edn (London: Penguin, 2005), xvi.

conventional genre and literary tradition.⁴⁶ Nature, for the individual, becomes the means of expression for that choice and that individual's ethic and conscience. 'Nature is not sought and represented for its own sake', states Ernst Cassirer; rather, 'its value lies in its service to modern man as a new *means of expression* for himself, for the liveliness of the infinite polymorphism of his inner life.'⁴⁷ Through such philosophy, the beauty of the 'sensible' land could not derive from itself, which may explain the poetic device of anthropomorphising the land with alluring female qualities. Rather, 'it is founded in the fact that it becomes, in a sense, the medium *through which* the free creative force of man acts and becomes conscious of itself'.⁴⁸ In such a way, a new place was forged for the individual in the world.⁴⁹ Indeed, Marvell's creative force, especially of nature, becomes detrimentally conscious of itself. From beginning to find such an 'infinite polymorphism', Marvell decides not to publish and to keep his verse private to himself.⁵⁰ On European philosophy, Charles Kay Smith argues that French epicureans such as Montaigne had begun to use the *carpe diem* genre in the later sixteenth century, reflecting beliefs which, if Marvell had not encountered such influences during his European encounter, were introduced by Cowley in the 1640s.⁵¹ If, in the internal or external *otium/negotium* debate, which constantly affected Marvell, we consider traditions of ancient Greece where Epicureans 'advocated the individual's withdrawal from public life and politics' in an attempt 'to find the means to achieve private satisfaction and a self-sufficient quiet life', any such parody in 'To His Coy Mistress' would show Marvell to be confused and still in

⁴⁶ Patricia Coughlan, 'Classical Theory and Influences in the Non-Satiric Poetry of Andrew Marvell', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of London, 1980 (p. 171).

⁴⁷ Ernst Cassirer, *The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy*, trans. Mario Domandi (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), pp. 143-144.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

⁴⁹ Don Parry Norford, 'Microcosm and Macrocosm in Seventeenth-Century Literature', *JHI*, 38.3 (1977), 409-428 (p. 410).

⁵⁰ On Marvell's self-criticism, see McWilliams, 'Who Would Write?', ch. 3.

⁵¹ Charles Kay Smith, 'French Philosophy and English Politics in Interregnum Poetry', in R. Malcolm Smuts (ed.), *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 177-209.

dilemma about the merits of both courses of action.⁵² If he were to publish, he could claim a place in what Cowley would call the ‘war of the pen’, but this would then join the literary tradition that he felt was annihilating in the same way as the poem. This is one of Marvell’s most private poems, and although placing heavy emphasis on my numerous speculations, I would argue that it was written in the late 1640s, which would account for the numerous references to Cowley, and the tensions regarding the private life which Taylor represents as more liberated into the 1650s. Nevertheless, there is nothing to discount a potentially greater inner conflict in the 1650s given these new-found ideological liberties: the poem may be just too ‘private’ for us ever to know for certain.

Finally, we may encounter ideas of privacy in the poem through sexuality. The emphasis on trinity and, to wider degree, multiples of three, for religious, political and social union, assumed greater significance in early Stuart Britain as Charles ruled over three kingdoms all divided over religion, ‘in all of which there existed a powerful group which preferred the religion of one of the others to their own’.⁵³ The significance of such tri-icons can be linked to figures such as George Puttenham, who related the triangle both to the pyramid and as ‘appropriat ... to the ayre’, the geometric hierarchy associated with divine right, and such tri-multiples attracted attention of equal fervour from both the royalist Howell and the antitrinitarian Milton.⁵⁴ Here, the stress on tri-multiples, in this case, ‘the doctrine of the three souls, vegetative, sensitive and rational’, or the ‘tripartite logical syllogism’, is demonstrated,

⁵² Steven Lukes, *Individualism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1973), p. 60.

⁵³ Conrad Russell, ‘The British Problem and the English Civil War’, *History*, 72 (1987), 395-415, reprinted in Cust and Hughes (eds.), *The English Civil War*, pp. 111-133 (p. 114). Christine Rees discusses a ‘threefold harmony’ in relation to Marvell (although not relating to the Coy Mistress), including a *triplex vita* and the ‘beautiful Pythagorean system of world harmony’, pp. 167-197 (p. 168).

⁵⁴ George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, ed. Gladys Willcock and Alice Walker (London: Cambridge University Press, 1936), p. 100. Puttenham’s work was influenced by popular geodetic publications such as Leonard Digges’ *Tectonicon* (1556), which assumes a widespread geometrical illiteracy, and encourages the reader ‘to perceive and conceptualize the world in geometric terms’; one of the factors, we may consider, that worked to affect the creation and reception of literary texts on the one hand, and private gardens on the other. Digges published books on geometry, cartography and geodetic surveying, increasingly popular ‘arts’ of late Elizabethan England. Digges’ *Tectonicon*, originally published in 1556, reappeared seven times up to 1637, proving the worth of such manuals as popular commodities, reproduced to meet a forceful demand. Martin Brückner and Kristen Poole, ‘The Plot Thickens: Surveying Manuals, Drama, and the Materiality of Narrative Form in Early Modern England’, *ELH*, 69.3 (2002), 617-648.

Jules Brody notes, in how ‘these triadic progressions parallel the verbal content and the thematic structure of the poem in the same way that its three stanzas... follow the three moments of the syllogism: three states of the soul, three conditions in nature, three stanzas, three stages in the argument.’⁵⁵ Reading the poem through the more instinctive, traditional *carpe diem* motif, offering an ‘outspoken and vigorous evocation of sexual intimacy’, the elements of nudity and carnal desire relate the tri-multiples to the ‘private’ sexual organs and the body-politic metaphor which would, assuming early composition, still be an extremely potent metaphor.⁵⁶

Influenced by religious movements, sexuality and nudity as part of social convention can be interpreted as progressive and regressive in almost equal measure. On the one hand, the cultural changes of seventeenth-century England initiated the practice of ‘bundling’, pre-marital overnight relations which, initially, were not normally of a sexual nature; as Lawrence Stone notes, a ‘universal practice among the lower and the middling sort’.⁵⁷ On the other hand, Martin Ingram notes how Puritan ethics spread a ‘hardening of attitudes towards sexual morality’, ethics equally reflective, Peter Lake suggests, of godly ideas and of the ‘self-fashioning’ of existence, social practices and changes of the time.⁵⁸ Gone, notes Ariès, was ‘the sixteenth-century practice of covering the male organ with a codpiece that simulated an erection’, as a new modesty emerged, concerned with hiding parts of the body and intimate

⁵⁵ Elizabeth Story Donno (ed.) *Andrew Marvell: Complete Poems*, p. 234; Nigel Smith, *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, p. 77; Brody, p. 54.

⁵⁶ Jules Brody, ‘The Resurrection of the Body: A New Reading of Marvell’s *To His Coy Mistress*’, *ELH*, 56.1 (1989), 53-79 (p. 74).

⁵⁷ See Yochi Fischer-Yinon, ‘The Original Bundlers: Boaz And Ruth, and Seventeenth-Century English Courtship Practices’, *Journal of Social History*, 35.3 (2002), 683-705; Lawrence Stone, *Road to Divorce: England 1530-1987* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 61-62. Social historians, such as Richard Adair, Martin Ingram and Peter Laslett, are fairly unanimous about the existence of pre-marital sexual relations, but this notion of ‘bundling’ demonstrates the emergence of lovers’ privacy and intimacy whilst still holding sexuality at a distance.

⁵⁸ Martin Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 237; Peter Lake, ‘Defining Puritanism - Again?’, in Francis Bremer (ed.), *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on Seventeenth Century Anglo-American Faith* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1993), pp. 3-29 (pp. 17-18).

acts.⁵⁹ The taboo also applied to words, however, with the very naming of such functions or bodily organs now considered shameful.⁶⁰ There were problems, therefore, with literary representation of nudity, but representations of women were also troubled. One study has already examined a ‘nexus between sexuality, sin and disease’, with the authors suggesting that the responses to early renaissance epidemics brought about both ‘perceptions of the contagious, sexualized body of “woman”’, with women viewed as ‘potential vectors’ of disease, and also a ‘subordinated body’ which affected everybody in some fashion.⁶¹ Another has examined a ‘nexus of religious, moral, social and medical meanings of syphilis’ revolving around ‘reconfigurations of the Fall’.⁶² To this extent, the wordplay of Ganges and gangrene, the connectivity between red rubies and the river, and the kinetic act of ‘tearing... through iron gates’ acquire uncomfortable resonances. Margaret Healy notes that early Protestantism was ‘undecided on the merits and role of women’, but it is notable, given Marvell’s Calvinist upbringing, that unlike Luther, Calvin promoted companionship in marriage, adamant that women were in their own way as spiritually capable as men.⁶³ In approximate congruence with the ideology of privacy, women were slowly emerging with their own voice and sense of identity, a threat met by ‘woman-denigrating’ male writers, anxious about social stability, who, in a ‘too-insistent obsession’, protested too much.⁶⁴ Attitudes towards privacy in connection with sexuality and representations of women, therefore, were at odds, and a certain degree of novelty and confusion prompts Marvell to treat the subject as cautiously and stealthily as his political allegiances.⁶⁵ On a more innocent level, one might consider reserved practices such as

⁵⁹ Ariès, p. 5.

⁶⁰ Castan, p. 16.

⁶¹ Hatty and Hatty, *The Disordered Body*, p. 25, 57, 229.

⁶² Margaret Healy, *Fictions of Disease in Early Modern England: Bodies, Plagues and Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), p. 165.

⁶³ *Ibid*, p. 169. See also James Grantham Turner, *One Flesh: Paradisal Marriage and Sexual Relations in the Age of Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 121.

⁶⁴ Healy, *Fictions of Disease*, p. 169.

⁶⁵ We may regard instances of transvestism, gender confusion, as Kathleen Brown notes, ‘hermaphroditism’, and as James Holstun is keen to note, ‘lesbianism’, as fairly novel at this time, but they do add a further twist to the outlook on early-modern sexuality. See Kathleen Brown, “‘Changed... into the fashion of man’: The

'bundling' to explain the exact kind of stasis which fuels the speaker's more playful tensions. On a more explicit level, there are divides between the notions that Marvell was eager to exude a chauvinistic masculinity and 'demonstrate his heterosexual credentials' through this poem, whilst elsewhere it has been described as Marvell's finest love lyric.⁶⁶ In terms of the proscribed area of the genitals, there may be curiosity as to why the speaker's gaze in the 1681 version is more reserved than the Howard manuscript, but Marvell 'reserves the indirectly named lower parts (including the genitalia) for the greatest praise through time'.⁶⁷ The attitude to sexuality as expressed in this poem may be private or covert, conservative or outright deceptive, but within the double entendre of 'vegetable love' and the splenetic imagery of the poem, Marvell achieves several functions. He suggests, or agrees, that there is no place for ignoring the sexual organs for new life over the bleak prospect of marble vaults and graves, with reproductive sperm replaced by deconstructing worms, in terms of the body politic. In the process, as David Loewenstein suggests of Marvell's appropriation and transformation of millenarian language in his Cromwell poems, by expanding the subject matter of the Coy Mistress outwards Marvell stealthily deflects the importance away from issues around his own sexuality.⁶⁸ Rather, he inverts accusations about himself to instead set down a sexually-related challenge for heterosexual masculinity and vitality required to fulfil the charge of activism to rectify a seriously troubled nation.

IV.

Politics of Sexual Difference in a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Settlement', *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 6.2 (1999), 171-193 (p. 174); James Holstun, "'Will you Rent our Ancient Love Asunder?": Lesbian Elegy in Donne, Marvell and Milton', *ELH*, 54.4 (1987), 835-867.

⁶⁶ Marvell's 'ambiguous' sexuality has been investigated by Paul Hammond, 'Marvell's Sexuality', 87-123.

⁶⁷ Smith, *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, p. 77.

⁶⁸ Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics, and Polemics in Radical Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 159.

This reading of the poem is selective rather than structured, for the poem's great diversity presents numerous themes with their threads of language and imagery, and it demonstrates layers of privacy at work as well as any other. The more we search into the poem, the more complications cloud any straightforward judgements and the more open, and therefore, paradoxically, self-enclosed and unrevealing the poem becomes. Like several memorable poems to follow, 'To His Coy Mistress' is finely layered, and by not allowing a single interpretation, for 'the poem is, and it isn't, almost anything a particular critic is capable of seeing – or chooses to see', Marvell consciously retains an element of secrecy about elements of his private affairs.⁶⁹ The release of the amended Haward manuscript in the 1670s, together with deliberately exaggerated impression of masculinity, reflects Marvell's conscious need to respond to more accusatory invective about his private affairs, given his *then* prevalent public reputation.⁷⁰ Yet still the levity precludes any real idea of just how seriously to take this impression or how deeply to read beneath it. If Marvell is trying to assert, defend or, quite possibly, shroud details or suspicions concerning his sexuality, particularly given the more provocative lines of the Haward Manuscript, the poem's title might well be appropriated with another auspicious term new to the era – decoy – of which 'coy' was used as an abbreviation or shorter form.⁷¹

French Fogle summarises that reading more recent themes into the poem, casts it, 'spiced by typical Marvellian irony', as 'only *apparently a carpe diem* poem as a disguise for deep philosophical statement... a sarcastic parody of the theme'.⁷² As Randy Robertson notes, 'even nakedness could serve the purposes of disguise'.⁷³ If we read the poem as 'Marvell's

⁶⁹ French Fogle, 'Marvell's "Tough Reasonableness" and the Coy Mistress', in Kenneth Friedenreich (ed.), *Tercentenary Essays in Honor of Andrew Marvell* (Hamden, CN: Archon, 1977), pp. 121-139 (p. 138).

⁷⁰ On the particularly raucous tradition of invective in the later seventeenth century, see Harold Love, *English Clandestine Satire, 1660-1702* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

⁷¹ The *OED* notes most of the meanings for 'decoy' originate from the earlier seventeenth-century: from as broad as an item of allurement (5, 4.b) to the specifics of a pool with a pipe-system contrived to capture wildfowl (1) or a bird, animal or figure trained specifically to lure another into a trap (3).

⁷² Fogle, p. 137.

⁷³ Robertson, p. 480.

most destructive', which 'having turned against itself in the expected manner of ironic poems... then turns against its own internal objections, leaving us with the desert that is the poem's centre', this poetic self-destruction is consciously tantalizing: one of the poet's most explicit poems about his private life is consciously aware of how it gives remarkably little conclusive information away.⁷⁴ By this point, we would imagine that through the two public poems examined here, which both have an element of discomfort, and both comment on genre or the inhibitions on or of writing, Marvell discovers through his early career a preference for turning inward. Yet even writing for himself there appears still a strong desire for the liberty of the private life: all of the themes available search for it in the Coy Mistress. Chapter three, set after the execution, shows Marvell to be offered a glimpse of the desires apparent here, but this is itself shortlived and surrounded by poetics of further dilemma.

⁷⁴ Balachandra Rajan, 'Andrew Marvell: The aesthetics of inconclusiveness', in Patrides (ed.), *Approaches to Marvell*, pp. 155-73 (p. 163).

3. 'Reservèd and Austere': From Privacy to Protectorate

So far I have been concerned with the circumstances surrounding the private or public nature of Marvell's early career in light of the political events and social changes altering the historical development of the private, and how concerns of privacy, explicit or oblique, are addressed in a selection of individual poems. This chapter offers a critique of several poems through the first half of the 1650s, a period of great transition, and aims to demonstrate that Marvell's conception of privacy alters from the carefully guarded and private 'Horatian Ode' to *The First Anniversary*, which was not only published but surrendered his long-held private allegiances. Firstly, I will consider how, outside the poem, Marvell's interpretation of an increasingly polemical literary tradition may affect the public or private nature of the 'Horatian Ode', a poem which attracts labels of 'public' or 'private', but for which the circumstances of production have not been sufficiently addressed to substantiate such labels. Secondly, it will trace Marvell's reaction in the Ode and *The First Anniversary* to the adverse crossover between the public and private realms for both Cromwell and Fairfax, particularly the conflict between new liberties which should promote privacy and the threat of private ambitions which could revoke them. In the background lies Marvell's quest for settlement as a non-publishing, private poet, a modesty matched by his decision to move to Fairfax's residence as tutor to his daughter. By the end of this short period, demonstrated by *Upon Appleton House* which reflects upon the interim period, Marvell shows that the state of privacy is not an automatic cure from the aftermath of war.

I.

Prior to the 1650s, Marvell had commented publicly on parliamentary suppression and censorship damaging literary tradition, and also on the inadequacy of public elegy for private

grieving. Through 'To His Coy Mistress' he sought a more private outlet for the whirlwind that was his own confusion. By the end of the 1640s, for all the ideological and devotional writing surrounding privacy, which itself lessened in scope through the civil wars, it was evident that the use of the public and of the private were politically embroiled, and to that extent, both corrupted. The army had assumed a public voice, disenchanted by the dominance in Parliament of corrupt men with damaging private interests, requiring Cromwell and Fairfax, who both preferred to abstain from politics, to allow the army to filter Charles' Parliamentary support.¹ There was more evidence of private conscience and public duty causing affray in political circles, as key Levellers, including some civilians from London with a new 'taste for arbitrating in politics', could exploit grievances to advance themselves.² This movement took advantage of the public sphere and the 'mass propagandist techniques' to procure support.³ The king's 'near obsession' on his boundaries of personal privacy, and to that extent, his secrecy - his use of privacy - had also contributed to his downfall.⁴ The outbreak of the second civil war stretched Cromwell and Fairfax while suppressing a dangerous uprising orchestrated furtively by the king. The aftermath meant that it was difficult to condone a future strategy which included Charles as Head of State, and thus followed what might be considered an inevitable trial and inexorable punishment, although Marvell in the Ode acknowledges royalist accusations of Cromwell's involvement in plotting the king's escape from Hampton to secure the trial. The execution of Charles I in 1649 saw the state lose its head alongside the king. Once stripped of all defences and left completely naked and exposed, the loss of modesty of the body-politic was even reflected by 'naked expressions of kingly

¹ Mark Kishlansky, 'The army and the Levellers: the roads to Putney', *HJ*, 22.4 (1979), 795-824.

² Toby Barnard, *The English Republic 1649-1660* (London: Longman, 1982), p. 6.

³ F. D. Dow, *Radicalism in the English Revolution 1640-1660*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985), p. 31.

⁴ Kevin Sharpe, 'The Image of Virtue: The Court and Household of Charles I, 1625-1642', in David Starkey (ed.), *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the English Civil War* (London: Longman, 1987), pp. 226-260, notes the extensive measures Charles undertook to restrict access to what he deemed personal (pp. 244-245).

powerlessness'.⁵ James' controversial 'mantle of mystery' which he brought to Stuart rule, the theology of the king's body, had developed through the early seventeenth century into a 'theology of the secret person'.⁶

Back in the 1630s the likes of Sibbes and Brathwaite understood - even if only the former advocated it - that privacy was tied into social conduct, and required freedom of conscience to be accepted. However, it is consistently shown to be a double-edged sword. Sibbes' spiritual sermon *The Bruised Reed*, for example, is focused on the inner self and the individual soul's passage to private resolution as exemplified by representatives of God such as David who 'was bruised, until he came to a free confession'.⁷ Puritan teachings seem to suggest that the integral individual path to righteousness was being misinterpreted for immoral privacy. Even defying established religious authority in discussing the inner self and private relationship between soul and God could be personally disturbing, and the voices of Sibbes and his contemporaries are ridden with doubt, confusion, anxiety and despair.⁸ Yet, if the moral right to privacy was not more liberally accepted, on the other hand, circumstances had already shown overwhelmingly that the realm of the private, as a natural human desire, could not remain dormant. The monarchic dichotomy had demonstrated the risk of hypocrisy and breach of public trust having forged a split between the public and private persona in the very attempt to deny one. Charles, after all, was still content to excuse his obsession with privacy in a physical sense by his claim of integrity in the *Eikon Basilike*, which leaves the public conception of the private in 1649 potentially sceptical. However, Thomas Edwards' *Gangræna* in 1646 suggests an awareness of a significant change in ideology over the course of the 1640s

⁵ James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (London: Macmillan, 1997), p. 148.

⁶ Cecile Jagodzinski, *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth-Century England* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999), p. 81.

⁷ Richard Sibbes, *The Bruised Reede, and Smoaking Flax* (London: Printed [by M. Flesher] for R. Dawlman, 1630), p. 17.

⁸ Deborah Shuger, 'Literature and the Church', in David Loewenstein and Janel Mueller (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 512-543 (p. 524).

and that, aside from radical sects, the civil wars could prove the key to toleration and liberty. Edwards lists Sibbes as amongst a group of libertarians who ‘would wonder to see things come to this passe in England’.⁹ Seven years prior to writing, any such thoughts towards a stance of toleration would have been categorically dismissed, Edwards remarks, but this helps to situate Sibbes’ understanding of privacy in connection with a campaign for liberty. The constitutional crisis and the war’s religious causes would presumably unite men in its aftermath to initiate liberty and toleration, and as Keeble suggests, literature was ‘rhetorically refigured’ and ‘imaginatively refracted’ in all genres, from Marvell to Jeremy Taylor.¹⁰ And accordingly, the tone of Jeremy Taylor’s 1650 conduct guide *Holy Living* assumes libertarian rights when addressing privacy that did not exist before the execution. Cromwell sought rule ‘more liberal and humane’ with a ‘quite exceptionally generous policy of religious toleration’ which may have found some consolation with royalists who, while republican sectaries argued over the extent of such toleration, made ‘secrecy, mystery and the transcendental meaning of private places’ part of the ‘royalist project’ over the 1640s and 1650s.¹¹ A renowned campaigner, Sibbes did not live to experience the increased liberty and subsequent reduction of moral boundaries for privacy that he sought. However, one caveat he stresses: ‘It is no easie matter to bring a man from Nature to Grace, and from Grace to Glory; so unyeelding, and untractable are our hearts’ predicts the heart of the dilemma within Marvell’s ‘Horatian Ode’ two decades later.¹²

The ‘Horatian Ode’, the ‘most private of public poems’, is a culmination of Marvell’s self-conflict, where private confusion is woven into layered ambiguity through an engaged and

⁹ Edwards, *Gangraena* (London: Printed for Ralph Smith, 1646), I, p. 121.

¹⁰ N. H. Keeble, ‘Introduction’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 1-9 (p. 7).

¹¹ N. H. Keeble, *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), p. 7; Jagodzinski, p. 81. See also Leah Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

¹² Sibbes, *The Bruised Reede*, pp. 18-19.

articulate demonstrative argument.¹³ If Marvell intended this to be a private poem, written entirely for himself and his own cathartic gratification, and uncontaminated by ulterior forces of censorship or patronage, then the uncompromising indecision reached by the poem's conclusion is Marvell's very own war for truth in light of the increasing public partisanship, private political ambition, and literary ambition exalted in publication. The layers of privacy at work can be demonstrated initially with a comparison between Marvell and Hobbes. Both show profound awareness of this crucial point in history but Hobbes' *Leviathan*, the kingpin of his literary career, although published, lacks, according to Francis Barker, a 'model of subjection' because 'private belief or mere opinion... remain truly private, an ineffable, unconstituted area when dominion does not run'.¹⁴ Marvell's model of poetry as a vehicle for private opinion is itself more complicated since the conditions of writing publicly or privately impose the authority or intellectual integrity of opinion. The Ode reads like a public poem, but there is nothing to suggest that it was published at the time. We might consider though how differently the poem could be read if we knew with more assertion just how public or private it actually was in terms of both intended and actual readership. Steven Zwicker, for instance, suggests that Marvell 'designed the poem to withhold opinion', but this could be misinterpreted for neutrality or apathy in reminiscence of Douglas Bush's unyielding claim of 'detachment'.¹⁵ The language of the Ode, like Hobbes' volume, is no 'prophylaxis against violence and desire', and Marvell reflects the role of language in forging partisanship and

¹³ Blair Worden, 'Andrew Marvell, Oliver Cromwell, and the Horatian Ode', in Sharpe and Zwicker (eds.), *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 147-180 (p. 150).

¹⁴ Francis Barker, 'In the wars of truth: violence, true knowledge and power in Milton and Hobbes', in Healy and Sawday (eds.), *Literature and the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 91-109 (pp. 106-107).

¹⁵ Steven N. Zwicker, 'Habits of Reading and Early Modern Literary Culture', in Mueller and Loewenstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature*, pp. 170-198 (p. 193); Douglas Bush, 'Marvell's Horatian Ode', *Sewanee Review*, 60 (1952), 363 - 376. By making this comparison, perhaps I am contemplating that to regard the Horatian Ode as public or private will incur the same absolute differences as found in the new critical debate between Bush and Cleanth Brooks in the *Sewanee Review* from 1947-1953.

political feud.¹⁶ By its very nature, the language is too evocative and dynamic to withhold opinion. Cromwell is hinted at as Caesar (23); described as ‘restless’ (9) and ‘like three-forked lightning’ (13); who moves ‘burning through the air’ (21) and ‘indefatigably on’ (114), and, in the future, ‘shall climacteric be’ (104). The poem, I would argue - to suggest a subtlety - like ‘To His Coy Mistress’ withholds conclusive information. The difference is derived from how publicly the critic interprets the poem. Zwicker considers ‘the reading Marvell may have anticipated’ to have ‘shaped and inflected’ the ‘Horatian Ode’, implying that the conditions of writing for other than himself, some form of self-censorship, influence the Ode. On the other hand, if the Ode is a private poem, written uninhibited of such concerns, the lack of conclusive opinion can show by the end the depth of indecision, confusion and perhaps even fear, since the privacy of its composition allows language of uninhibited truth, and therefore self-surety of that truth. While Milton at this point is fervently trying to prevent Charles’ image becoming one of martyrdom, Marvell sees ‘another mould’ cast by Cromwell, ‘The force of angry heaven’s flame’ (26), which is left nervously undistinguished.¹⁷ Marvell’s conclusive Machiavellian warning, much more allusive than Milton’s sonnet to Cromwell, provides not relief, but at least some internal settlement.

As Zwicker suggests, Marvell is affirming himself here within a rich literary tradition, one that acquiesces with the conditions of polemical culture, but he works against several trademark conventions.¹⁸ As has been more widely noted, Marvell works against partisanship, most notably in the ‘Horatian Ode’. The ironies of the Ode, Blair Worden notes, ‘yield most

¹⁶ Barker, p. 106. Barker implies that Hobbes was unsuccessful in using language as a ‘prophylaxis’ rather than writing conscious of this. Aware of the insufficiencies of his writing, shown by the elegy to Hastings and to be shown here, Marvell uses language aware of its limitations against external and internal forces. On the tradition of committed poetry, where it was long seen as critics as passive and withdrawn, see James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars*, especially ch. 3 (pp. 96-128). On the role of language in developing political feud, see John Spurr, ‘England 1649-1750: Differences Contained?’ in Steven N. Zwicker (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature, 1650-1740* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 3-32 (p. 6).

¹⁷ Sharon Achinstein, ‘Milton and King Charles’, in Thomas N. Corns (ed.), *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 141-160.

¹⁸ Zwicker, ‘Habits of Reading and Early Modern Literary Culture’, p. 193.

when we explore them not in search of a partisan allegiance on the poet's part but with a willingness to accept the poem's openness and to recognize in it a victory over the narrowing partisanship of most civil war literature'.¹⁹ Marvell also, so far, works against the attempts by the likes of Sidney to position poetry and the station of the poet. As Zwicker notes elsewhere, Sidney 'took as his task the elevating of poetry into public view, clearing a space for poetry among the modes of public discourse', which Marvell has been careful to avoid.²⁰

So, in what ways does this literary tradition or the conditions of production in the revolutionary late 1640s and early 1650s contribute to reading privacy into the Ode? Outside the poem, certainly, Zwicker's argument is valuable in highlighting that we cannot easily ascertain the public or private nature of the Ode, and to insist on the poem being private is, in a sense, to categorise it. If we are prepared to accept Marvell as a master of wit and ambiguity, a 'great master of words', a poet who can offer 'exactly pitched ambivalence, which leads us beyond clear-cut interpretation into the doubtful territory of myth and imagination', then accordingly we realise that part of the attraction and maybe even fear of reading Marvell is that such unanswerable questions remain after so many attempts to contain them.²¹ The problems of category facing Gerard Reedy force a concession that they 'will never be completely answered, for that which presents the problem, the relevant poetry, is also our basic source of evidence', suggesting difficulty in determining any element of publicity or privacy through the poem itself.²² However, the public and the private, as well as not being polar opposites at the time, work both inside and outside of the poem and cannot be categorized in such a way.

¹⁹ Worden, pp. 172-173. It is interesting to note that this is from the paragraph reworked from the earlier version, 'The Politics of Marvell's Horatian Ode', *HJ*, 27.3 (1984), 525-547 (p. 540). The altered passage previously rendered Royalist interpretation as somewhat detrimental to the Ode, although the poem has 'taken on a larger life in the writing'.

²⁰ Steven N. Zwicker, *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649-1689* (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 1993), p. 13.

²¹ Elsie Duncan-Jones, 'Marvell: A Great Master of Words', *The Proceedings of the British Academy*, 61 (1975), 267-290; Blair Worden, 'Andrew Marvell, Oliver Cromwell, and the Horatian Ode', p. 173.

²² Reedy asks: 'Cromwellian or anti-Cromwellian? Royalist or rebel? Presbyterian or Independent? And when was Marvell each, if ever?', Gerard Reedy, "'An Horatian Ode" and "Tom May's Death"', *SEL*, 20 (1980), 137-151 (p. 138).

Paradoxically, if Marvell writes the Ode as a public poem with a readership in mind, any withholding that occurs as a consequence is Marvell exercising what Westlin terms as the private state of ‘reserve’ - that ‘ineffable, unconstituted area’ suggested of Hobbes.²³ Westlin’s concern with groups and institutions in determining the control of information communicated with others is rejected by Lubor Velecky, who believes privacy relates solely to the individual.²⁴ This concern is arguably more relevant to the period of the Ode, when the values of the private were under a period of change, and, as Marvell was well aware, even trusted groups had generally shown lack of discretion when it came to controversial texts.

The form Marvell uses and even the statement within the title, locates the poem within a particular tradition which has moulded itself as private. Some of the characteristics of being ‘Horatian’, Donald Friedman notes, were ‘to cultivate the cooperative powers of perception, analysis, and evaluation, to preserve a sense of personal integrity... and to insist on the interdependence of the poet’s privilege and responsibility to speak truth to power’.²⁵ The poem’s statement of genre as Horatian Ode evokes ‘royalist admiration’ of Horace, David Norbrook notes, whilst the celebration of the hero’s return, a *prosphonetikon*, marks a ‘demonstrative or panegyric oration’.²⁶ Moreover, such panegyric, Nigel Smith suggests, was ‘confused’ by the civil war, and royalist panegyric in particular was ‘characterised by its desire for privacy’. Royalist Mildmay Fane, he points out, penned twenty Horatian odes in a collection ‘addressing pointedly but privately public issues’ which was retained in private manuscript.²⁷ Theoretically, Norbrook’s republican reading of the poem would class this as parliamentary panegyric, a more public genre of the time, and more likely to be published in

²³ *Reserve* is the most complex of Alan Westlin’s four states of privacy, where, by right or choice, an individual does not reveal certain aspects of himself to others.

²⁴ Lubor C. Velecky, ‘The Concept of Privacy’, in John Young (ed.), *Privacy* (Chichester: Wiley, 1978), pp. 13-34 (p. 21).

²⁵ Donald M. Friedman, ‘Andrew Marvell’, in Thomas N. Corns (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Poetry: Donne to Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 275-304 (p. 277).

²⁶ David Norbrook, ‘Marvell’s “Horatian Ode” and the politics of genre’, in Healy and Sawday (eds.), *Literature of the English Civil War*, pp. 147-169 (p. 149).

²⁷ Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), pp. 278-279, referring to Harvard fMS Eng. 645.

newsbooks.²⁸ Marvell is, perhaps, satirising the limits of royalist tradition and partisan assumptions, and yet he does not want the Ode to reflect the tradition of straightforward parliamentary panegyrics published to bolster the new state.²⁹ Certainly, it is likely that Marvell used the scribal medium for his own ends at some point in the 1650s while his maintenance relied on established officials, but for this reason it seems absurd to suggest, as Harold Love does, that the Ode, a poem so provocative that it was surreptitiously withdrawn from publication over thirty years after the execution and after Marvell's own death, was 'very probably meant to reach his [Cromwell's] hands'.³⁰ Several critics argue that a royalist poetics and/or sympathies either level the radical politics or satirise Cromwell, which suggests that transmitting the poem down partisan channels would not have many political advantages.³¹ Even David Norbrook's republican reading of the Ode notes enough drawbacks to explain Marvell's lack of incentive for publishing.³² There seems little reason to share a poem that would provoke such controversy. Notably, the one element of the poem not discussed in Worden's exemplary essay is circulation. While he does not discount the possibility, if not a 'solitary meditation', he speculates, 'it scarcely seems addressed to the public audience of Marvell's tribute to Cromwell in "The First Anniversary"'.³³ The circumstances surrounding the Ode present a plausible argument to render it a private poem, but Marvell's acquiescence

²⁸ Without wishing to get involved in debates of allegiance, this can be reserved by noting elements of Norbrook's own partisan, where the king's sensitively handled execution is labelled as 'a digression', and even more strangely, as an 'emotional release'. 'Marvell's "Horatian Ode"', p. 159.

²⁹ *Ibid.* Norbrook explains: 'It gives too much credit to Cromwell to please many parliamentarians and radicals, but is too Machiavellian and republican to please Cromwell. And before long Marvell was about to enter the service of Fairfax, who had opposed the Scottish war... the poem's moment was a very brief one' (p. 158).

³⁰ Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p. 62. Love is influenced by Hilton Kelliher, whom he quotes to suggest that Marvell was Cromwell's 'official verse-propagandist of the new state', a statement which still sounds bombastic considering that the panegyric *First Anniversary* is not without ambiguity. See Kelliher, *Andrew Marvell: poet and politician 1621-1678; an exhibition to commemorate the tercentenary of his death* (London: British Museums, 1978), pp. 56-59.

³¹ See R. H. Hyfret, 'Marvell's "Horatian Ode"', *Review of English Studies*, 12 (1961), 160-172; Barbara Everett, 'The shooting of the bears: poetry and politics in Andrew Marvell', in R. L. Brett (ed.), *Andrew Marvell: Essays on the Tercentenary of His Death* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 62-103; R. I. V. Hodge, *Foreshortened Time: Andrew Marvell and Seventeenth Century Revolutions* (Ipswich: Brewer, 1978), pp. 118-131.

³² Norbrook, 'Marvell's "Horatian Ode"', p. 158.

³³ Worden, p. 149.

of polemical culture and his exploitation of literary pretexts even work to resist an easy denomination of 'public' or 'private' the same as other categories. It still, therefore, remains largely speculative.

II.

How, therefore, is privacy represented *within* the Cromwell poems? Reedy's methodology regarding dilemmas of category provides a reminder that, speculation aside, the poems prove the most telling evidence in answering, or perhaps *not* answering, questions regarding Marvell's private thoughts.³⁴ Firstly, we encounter his trademark self-conscious poetics, partly addressed above. The royalist panegyric was traditionally private, and with Marvell already having scrutinized the publication of his own elegy alongside others, a poetic genre intended for private grievance, there are incentives to keep the ode private, perhaps even for literary reasons. To delve inside the poem, Worden notes, 'We enter an imaginative landscape beyond politics, outside the moment of history'. At a time of personal confusion and crisis, and when the new republic were quickly recognising the prominence of the private space, the act of writing in the face of polemical pressures provided private autonomy, an escape to an untouchable realm outside of and away from politics. Hence, it was unreservedly Marvell's choice, given that space and time, to reflect on political matters in such a way, as powerfully or reservedly as he desired. Yet, if Hobbes' own 'system' is one 'breaking down under its own absurdity' because of a distinct absence of opinion, Marvell's is one that survives through ironic awareness of how poetry is limited in containing opinion.³⁵ For all the powerful, dynamic language, Marvell is aware of a kind of futility trying to map the progress of the intimidating commander: 'to inclose' within the poem 'is more than to oppose' (19-20), an

³⁴ Reedy, p. 138.

³⁵ Barker, p. 106.

irony encased by parentheses. ‘Tis madness to resist or blame’ (25), he notes two stanzas later. The Ode certainly transcends its context in the writing, and using Everett’s ‘remarkable thinking metre’, it is notable that Marvell is working to convince himself of the limits of poetics and why this should be private to himself just before he refers to Cromwell’s past life of privacy.³⁶

And, if we would speak true,
Much to the man is due:

Who, from his private gardens, where
He lived reservèd and austere,
As if his highest plot
To plant the bergamot,

Could by industrious valour climb
To ruin the great work of time,
And cast the kingdoms old
Into another mould.

(‘An Horatian Ode’, ll. 27-36)

The Latinate structure of this section, with the relative clause contained within a stanza, presents Marvell’s understanding of Cromwell and privacy with discouraging ambiguity. Cromwell is stated formerly of private gardens, which signify a privileged English gentleman of leisure. As Rosalie Colie notes of the ‘problematics’ of Cromwell’s situation, he ‘was not born to heroism; he chose it and was chosen for it, emerging from his private life (“the Bergamot”) to the public stage’.³⁷ His sudden insurgence is characteristic of the ‘forward youth’: ascending upwards from privacy, the poetic structure here captures the speed of Cromwell’s rise to prominence. From the life of retirement to his great act of ‘ruin’ only five lines later, the moment of the poem, despite facing centuries of historical tradition, is a brief

³⁶ Everett, p. 74.

³⁷ Rosalie L. Colie, *“My Ecchoing Song”: Marvell’s Poetry of Criticism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970), p. 65.

one, and there is no definite indication as to whether the ‘ruining’ has happened in Marvell’s eyes or is yet to come. Judgement on this ascent from privacy, therefore, is very carefully guarded.³⁸ If much is ‘due’ to Cromwell, is the state indebted to his decision to leave behind his private garden, or is this a more bluntly objective statement that, because of his emergence, much has been caused by him? The carefully selected adverbs ‘reservèd’ and ‘austere’ imply a passivity and grace in accordance with the conduct and demeanour expressed by the likes of Brathwaite, and seen by Wallace as a temperance of virtue.³⁹ Yet equally they could adopt a more menacing context – Cromwell ‘is no passive instrument of fortune but so active and “virtuous” an agent that he becomes the fortune and the fate of others’.⁴⁰ With typical Marvellian irony, it is the point when the poet shows arguably the clearest respect, the simile highlighting Cromwell’s great prowess even within horticultural pursuits, that Marvell strikes a blow in naming the bergamot, the pear of kings. With this, suddenly a suggestion arises that Cromwell’s use of privacy is one of suspicion and conspiracy, to ‘plot’ and ultimately usurp the throne. Certainly, reports of Cromwell’s leading an unforgiving massacre in Drogheda which saw off three thousand Irish defendants, and even hints of Cromwell’s enjoyment of the slaughter, would have unsettled anyone with cause to doubt the commander’s private ambitions. Marvell acknowledges Cromwell’s political skill ambiguously through his ‘wiser art’, entertaining royalist accusations that Charles’ escape from Hampton Court was carefully orchestrated. Such ‘art’ in this case, however, comprises initiative, cunning, secrecy and ambition - attributes, Marvell nervously recognises, relating to the private character, the individual’s use of private space and their private faculties of character and conscience. Joseph Mazzeo, studying the Machiavellianism of the Ode, likens Cromwell in this section to

³⁸ John S. Coolidge, ‘Marvell and Horace’, *Modern Philology*, 63 (1965), 111-120.

³⁹ John Wallace, *Destiny His Choice: the Loyalty of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. 75.

⁴⁰ Joseph Anthony Mazzeo, ‘Cromwell as Machiavellian Prince in Marvell’s “An Horatian Ode”’, *JHI*, 21.1 (1960), 1-17 (p. 8).

Cincinnatus, the individual manifestation of high *virtù*.⁴¹ Mazzeo also suggests, presumably through the act of planting, that Marvell privately hopes Cromwell will return to the gardens once everything is settled, thus rendering the private garden a kind of enclosure related to the enclosure acts associated with his garden-poetry. Passivity was the kind of quality associated with a poetic ‘brand of sentimental expression’, and through the dynamic agent of Cromwell, Marvell moves away from the melancholic tone of ‘A Nymph Complaining’. Addressing the same historical events, ‘A Nymph Complaining’ is useful point of comparison in demonstrating a different, more personal perspective than the Ode. As Anne Carson notes of ‘The Nymph Complaining’: ‘to evoke a commiserative reaction to Charles’s downfall’, the central character, ‘while maintaining a royal posture’, must be ‘not unlike the common man’ and ‘cannot be the untouchable potentate; he must be a being who can feel and who can bleed.’⁴² The Ode’s ‘royal actor’ (53) is, indeed, no ‘untouchable potentate’. We are drawn to the image of the bleeding head (69), which offers potentially frightening omens for the future, but the present participle forces attention to the reality of the moment of the poem.⁴³ The frightened architects impart that Cromwell’s emergence from privacy has scattered others, notably Fairfax, to their own private grounds.

Marvell’s representation of privacy is reflected in a similar ‘king/man’ dichotomy to that proposed by Carson: that of man and agent of the heavens.⁴⁴ Like John Wallace, I suggest that there are two Cromwells present.⁴⁵ When Cromwell is admired as a Caesar-like predator - the awe-inspiring heavenly agent beyond the common man and, as noted in the later elegy, untouchable - the private gardens of the Ode represent an enclosure with the capability of

⁴¹ *Ibid*, p. 10.

⁴² Anne Elizabeth Carson, ‘The Hunted Stag and the Beheaded King’, *SEL*, 45.3 (2005), 537-556 (pp. 552-553). Nigel Smith suggests of the ‘wiser art’ that the image of weaving a net to catch the king echoes Horace’s *Carmina*, I. xxxvii, 17-21, where ‘Octavius’ pursuit of Cleopatra is likened to the hawk pursuing a dove, and the hunter chasing a hare’. *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, p. 275n.

⁴³ Hodge discusses the implications of the head in the tale of Tarquinius Superbus and the rise of the Roman Empire (p. 126).

⁴⁴ Carson, p. 553.

⁴⁵ Wallace, p. 70.

great nurture, and echo Marvell's attitude to form as prosodic enclosure.⁴⁶ On the other hand, privacy becomes the method, perhaps even the weakness, through which Marvell pinpoints Cromwell's human character and the possible temptations facing a man of his standing. There are suspicions over the private realm as the prime opportunity for Cromwell to orchestrate plots 'To ruin the great work of time'. This 'great work' is the summation of history, everything leading to that moment, and everyone's lives in-between who have maintained the order of the nation. Part of the 'great work', therefore, is Marvell's faith in his country, in fellow men, and in his own convictions, with the world around him constantly in crisis. There is no easy way for the peaceful and private poet to contemplate the realm of the private as a corrupt one, even if it is the traditional practices of the Stuart dynasty and the influential works and equally notorious foreign policies of James I who have caused the suspicion.

Foreign policy was often the exposure of private misdemeanour, and the event of the Ode, on Cromwell's return from Ireland, is demonstrative of Cromwell's decisive and 'climacteric' (104) overseas policy. Yet if the realm of the private is threatened, however, the attention is deflected towards Cromwell's character. Marvell introduces Cromwell's more gritty and chivalric 'inglorious arts of peace' (10) as reminiscent of the Machiavellian prince; such arts of peace are symbiotic with those of war, and necessary for the stability of the nation.⁴⁷ However, these are counterposed with the suspect 'wiser art', of cunning and ambition, which align more with Marvell's Calvinist concerns between tyrants and legitimate rulers, and 'between actions legitimate for inferior magistrates and illegitimate for private individuals'.⁴⁸ Order 'is grounded in domestic relations and the primacy of the individual', suggest Armstrong and

⁴⁶ John Creaser, 'Prosodic Styles and Conceptions of Liberty in Milton and Marvell', *Milton Quarterly*, 34.1 (2000), 1-13 (p. 4). The later elegy *A Poem upon the Death of his Late Highness the Lord Protector* notes that 'him the adverse steel could never pierce' (196).

⁴⁷ Mazzeo states that 'It cannot be stressed too much that Machiavelli understood the danger of absolute authority. His primary intent in politics was to find the means of assuring the stability of the state, an almost obsessive concern' (p. 4n).

⁴⁸ Creaser, pp. 4-5. In comparison, Creaser argues that the argument of *Tenures of Kings and Magistrates*, reflective of Milton's radical individualism, is 'explosive' and 'blasting away' such Calvinist orthodoxy.

Tennenhouse. 'Political order ideally depends on the individual's consent, just as morality depends on his conscience'.⁴⁹ To that extent, it is Cromwell's use of privacy, his choice to emerge from the private to the public, and his own private ambitions that cause concern. It may indeed be these concerns which cautiously moderate the successes of the 'angry heaven's flame' throughout the Ode. I suggest, therefore, that Marvell is aware of the sequence of ideological attitudes towards privacy in the Ode, but unlike Taylor who reacts quickly to produce devotional writing reflecting the greater liberties, Marvell cannot yet see past the devastating circumstances which caused such liberties, allowing for the possibility that the creation of these liberties might reveal the opportunity for the tyrannical retribution which will thereafter deny them.

This is set to change, however, with time. Privacy in the Ode is linked heavily with private character, and with most concerns about private ambition from the earlier Ode alleviated by Cromwell's refusal of the crown, Marvell is keen in *The First Anniversary* to enhance the idea of sacrifice and redeem privacy from the earlier suspicions.⁵⁰ Annabel Patterson describes Cromwell's sacrifice of personal privacy in the Ode as his 'most exemplary act so far', but not only does Marvell qualify the worth of privacy – indeed, whatever Cromwell's critics thought of his personal campaign, his meteoric rise had cast the *vita contemplativa* to shame – he also holds enough concerns about Cromwell's ambition, destiny and divine providence to worry about the private 'reserve', that which Marvell himself cannot know.⁵¹ Four years later,

⁴⁹ Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse, *The Imaginary Puritan: Literature, Intellectual Labor, and the Origins of Personal Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), p. 109.

⁵⁰ Wallace, pp. 110-111. See also C. H. Firth, 'Cromwell and the Crown', *EHR*, XVII (1902), 429-442.

⁵¹ Annabel Patterson, *Marvell and the Civic Crown* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978), p. 64. On Cromwell's rise making privacy seem lesser, I am reminded of Christopher Wortham's suggestion that Marvell is initially trying to identify himself so closely with Cromwell that either could be the subject of the opening eight lines. 'Marvell's Cromwell Poems: an Accidental Triptych', in Conal Condren and A.D. Cousins (eds.), *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1990), pp. 16-52 (p. 19). Unlike Robert Ellrodt's argument that the power of the Ode is its avoidance of engaging emotions of pity, love or fear, there is a fear within the Ode, and a melancholic sense to the patriotic, providential concerns, the grave misfortune of living in times when war and revolution were inescapable. 'Marvell's mind and mystery', in C. A. Patrides (ed.), *Approaches to Marvell: The York Tercentenary Lectures* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul,

however, it does retrospectively become an ‘exemplary act’ as Marvell more deeply appreciates the sacrifice made.

For all delight of life thou then didst lose,
 When to command, thou didst thyself depose;
 Resigning up thy privacy so dear,
 To turn the headstrong people’s charioteer;
 For to be Cromwell was a greater thing,
 Than ought below, or yet above a king:
 Therefore thou rather didst thyself depress,
 Yielding to rule, because it made thee less.

(*The First Anniversary*, 221-228)

With many of Marvell’s initial fears allayed, there is a different view of privacy here in the light of different literary and political contexts. *The First Anniversary* was published in 1655, possibly as some kind of propagandist move, and Marvell’s first venture into publication, one assumes, since the late 1640s. The circumstances of the poem are underlined then by a rare publication, Marvell’s first public poem of this genre and of this length, although still poetics of praise. Marvell’s career at this time was dependent on men of governmental rank, and the necessity for praise compromises the guarantee of the same personal integrity of the Ode, but given the Ode’s concerns and concessions, Marvell must surely have been relieved and pleased with governmental developments. Even with crises to contend with, the Protectorate had performed well to that point, settling a long-standing turbulent relationship with Europe. The Dutch war had ended on positive terms for England, and treaties were established with France, Portugal, Sweden and Denmark. The new republic had demonstrated awareness of the prominence of private space in the early 1650s, awareness which aided the progress of toleration and forms of liberty, allowing people greater moral conviction of their right to

1978), pp. 216-233 (p. 217). On the conflict between justice and fate, see Ruth Wallerstein, *Studies in Seventeenth Century Poetic* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1950), pp. 283-284.

privacy and reducing the sense of corruption surrounding public and private domains.⁵² The implications of plotting and conspiracy from the Ode are still prominent in the memory, but they are also still linked to the character and use of the private realm by the individual. Cromwell now has faced ‘poniarding conspiracies’ and ‘lying prophecies’ (171-172), but Marvell’s obscure image of Cromwell delivering himself newborn, a renewed reflection of the general from the Ode, shows him secure from and ‘undaunted’ (170) by suspicious, underhand use of the private realm. Cromwell is able to mollify the negative implications of the private with his fearless character far superior and resistant to private conspiracies. Inevitably, a greater moral value placed upon privacy accentuates the praise for Cromwell’s sacrifice in ‘resigning’ his ‘privacy so dear’. The sacrifice is one made by choice, and the moral righteousness associated with Cromwell’s role in establishing liberty and privacy and forsaking his own elevates his private conscience and public duty beyond that of kings. Accordingly, Cromwell’s refusal of the crown retains his status above that of the ‘heavy monarchs’ (15) and indicates to Marvell that his private conscience is more attuned to his public duty than the Stuart monarchs before him.

Finally, of these Cromwell poems, it is worth considering the changing implication of the ‘arts’. The Ode’s ‘inglorious arts’, influenced by the more destructive figure of Caesar, implore the ‘wiser art’ to be linked to personal character in the same vein. In comparison, *The First Anniversary*’s ‘Angelic Cromwell’ (126) and ‘angel of our commonweal’ (401), supported by fitting allusions to figures of musical arts, Amphion (49-66) and Orpheus (201-214), demonstrate Cromwell as the orchestrator and conductor of the ‘ruling Instrument’ (68).⁵³

⁵² A good summary of the establishment of liberty and toleration which has proved helpful is John Coffey’s ‘Puritanism and Liberty Revisited: The Case for Toleration in the English Revolution’, *HJ*, 41.4 (1998), 961-985. See also Norah Carlin, ‘Toleration for Catholics in the Puritan Revolution’, in Ole Peter Grell and Robert W. Scribner (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 216-230.

⁵³ I suggest the link to Orpheus as the depiction of nature mourning, and the hyperbole of the earth tearing and the sun falling away are reminiscent of the scene from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses XI* when the mutilated Orpheus passes down the river to nature’s eulogy. There is, it must be noted, a fair difference between the poem’s relation of Cromwell to Caesar, and Mazzeo’s relation of Cromwell to Cincinnatus.

The ‘arts’ of the Ode’s conclusion, on the other hand, ‘The same arts that did gain / A pow’r must it maintain’ (119-120) are particularly elusive. They could refer to Cromwell’s ‘inglorious arts’ of war, his ‘wiser art’ of private ambition, or even a self-reflexive commitment to the privacy of Marvell’s own art. Marvell’s dedication to private poetry and to ‘my silent judgement keep’ (‘Mourning’, l. 33) has earned him a power of private liberty hard to come by in literary quarters. By the end of the Ode, the layered ambiguity within the poem and the circumstances of its private production allows the poet to retain his freedom. Although there are select differences between ‘privacy’ and ‘liberty’, John Creaser’s comment that ‘Liberty is the very air that Marvell’s poems breathe’, is true in terms of Marvell’s ability to write poetry justifiable only to himself.⁵⁴ At the same time, Marvell has been victorious over partisanship, keeping his thoughts, or at least the carefully guarded portrayal of thoughts, private. As concluded of ‘To His Coy Mistress’, Marvell gives precious little away, and it is the Ode’s intersection between the public and private which denotes Marvell’s own art as a power which can only be retained by the same choice not to publish and his own valuable ‘guardedness’.⁵⁵ And yet, four years later, whatever personal or career related reasons are behind the published *First Anniversary*, the poem can be read as a propagandist celebration of Cromwell as the Providential ruler.⁵⁶ The privatised ‘arts’ of the Cromwell poems, from Cromwell’s to Marvell’s own, have changed.

III.

⁵⁴ I distinguish between ‘privacy’ and ‘liberty’ insofar as Creaser’s stance is firmly within the poetry, suggesting that Marvell’s ambiguities present the reader with ‘intimacy of collaboration’ and ‘strenuous liberty if exploring diverse modes of interpretation’, whereas mine lies between the language of the works and the circumstances of production. Thus, my assumption that Marvell writes under conditions of privacy, solely for himself, means that he creates for himself a liberty to express himself in his own way. John Creaser, ‘As one scap’t strangely from Captivity’: Marvell and Existential Liberty’, in Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (eds.), *Marvell and Liberty* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), pp. 145-172 (pp. 166-167).

⁵⁵ Christine Rees, *The Judgement of Marvell* (London: Pinter, 1989), p. 1.

⁵⁶ Derek Hirst, ‘That Sober Liberty: Marvell’s Cromwell in 1654’, in John Wallace (ed.), *The Golden and the Brazen World: Papers in Literature and History, 1650-1800* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), pp. 17-53 (p. 23).

With Cromwell's rise to prominence came the withdrawal of Fairfax, whose private conscience was savaged by public accusations from royalists against his honour in 1648.⁵⁷ Fairfax reviled the execution and the Scottish campaign, not willing to lead the military into unprovoked conquests, and his resignation in 1650, one of the frightened 'architects' of the Ode (70), must be considered a part of the Cromwellian sacrifice. Fairfax's natural successor was Cromwell, whose decisive victories in Scotland and Ireland ensured that although he did not enter the fray until Naseby in the mid-1640s, he would be man to uphold the new order.⁵⁸ The poem we know that reflects back upon this interim period, although with no guarantees of its dating, is *Upon Appleton House*.⁵⁹ I will discuss the implications of the possibility of Marvell's pastoral verse being dated after the Restoration in the next chapter. As a reflection of the times though, whenever written, we note that between the two Cromwell poems discussed, as well as Cromwell's performance drawing a public commendatory poem that praises his sacrifices which include the retirement of Fairfax, Marvell has for some reason come to reject the quiet life he sought longingly in earlier verse. This colossal poem has been described as 'topographical panegyric', and I will highlight a few instances where areas previously related to privacy resurface in a fashion that collectively make the poet question and doubt his own disposition and conviction of privacy.⁶⁰

'At the epicentre of the poem', Hirst and Zwicker note, 'is a man facing a very specific decision, whether or not to take up arms for a certain cause'.⁶¹ Retrospectively, Marvell can be

⁵⁷ Barbara Donegan, 'The Web of Honour: Soldiers, Christians, and Gentlemen in the English Civil War', *HJ*, 44.2 (2001), 365-389 (p. 383).

⁵⁸ Austin Woolrych, 'Cromwell as a Soldier', in John Morrill (ed.), *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (London: Longman, 1990), pp. 93-118.

⁵⁹ Although Derek Hirst and Steven Zwicker declare a case for the contextual importance in dating the poem to the summer of 1651, 'High Summer at Nun Appleton, 1651: Andrew Marvell and Lord Fairfax's Occasions', *HJ*, 36.2 (1993), 247-269.

⁶⁰ David Evett, "'Paradice's Only Map": The *Topos* of the *Locus Amoenus* and the Structure of *Upon Appleton House*', *PMLA*, 85.3 (1970), 504-513 (p. 504).

⁶¹ Hirst and Zwicker, 'High Summer at Nun Appleton', p. 256.

grateful for the decisiveness of the Ode's Cromwell, the poem then having no place for Cromwell's own dilemma. Here, however, Marvell places himself alongside Fairfax's dilemma. In the political reading of the poem, the life of withdrawal already has an uncomfortable stigma given the pressing correspondence to Fairfax pleading for his help and the pamphlet literature of the time spreading public nervousness of war. Describing the house and grounds early in the poem, Marvell's oxymoronic impasse on his own art, lines 'By which, ungirt and *unconstrained*, / Things greater are in less *contained*' (43-44) show the limits of verse, even epic poetry which attempts the unconstrained.⁶² As the 'forward youth' of the Ode is directed to forsake his muses, in this scenario the poem comes with an early caveat that poetry is still severely limited. If man, 'the unity of being' and art and nature are combined towards the poem's conclusion, Marvell's purpose, made symbiotic with his writing, is put on the same kind of trial as the poem casts over Fairfax.⁶³ As the military figure, Fairfax is presented in both past and present as 'the Master great' (50), greatly humbled by his justified reputation of 'magnitude' (53), but the 'laden house... / scarce endures' him (49-50), and the average man does not match to him as, hyperbolically, the 'square grows spherical' (52). To forsake the seriousness of the expression of the nature of the self here, as Harold Skulsky could be accused of doing, misses the notion that alongside Marvell's predicament of poetic containment, the public worth of the military Lord Fairfax, the moral yardstick, is too great for his own private halls.⁶⁴ The eponymous square, which could refer to anything from a portrait on the walls to Marvell's own poetic squares of composition, is not made circular but spherical, acquiring a dimension that implies, at first instinct, the world, or at the very least outside the walls which, Marvell reminds in his historical account, 'restrain the world without'

⁶² John Wallace notes this stanza in his argument that the poem may be replying to William Davenant's *Gondibert: An Heroick Poem* (1651), *Destiny His Choice*, pp. 239-242. My italics.

⁶³ See Don Parry Norford, 'Marvell and the Arts of Contemplation and Action', *ELH*, 41.1 (1974), 50-73. Norford notes that the 'unity of being and reconciliation of art and nature is [...] rare in Marvell's poetry' (p. 55).

⁶⁴ Harold Skulsky, 'Upon Appleton House: Marvell's Comedy of Discourse', *ELH*, 52.3 (1985), 591-620 (pp. 592-593).

(99). This hypothesis is teased later by the reference to the painting of the creation in Davenant's *Gondibert* where 'appeared / Dav'nant with th'universal herd' (455-456). Moreover, what follows, "They seem within the polished grass / A landskip drawn in the looking-glass' (457-458), begins to piece together a narrative where perception is being questioned. From William Fairfax's early dilemma 'What should he do?' (225), Marvell notes his own inability to confront his own dilemma with apostrophic 'Unhappy' (329) and 'Unhappy birds' (409). Between the two laments, the attention is drawn to conscience, 'that heaven-nursèd plant' (355), from which the landscape adopts militaristic characteristics with 'invisible artillery' (362), 'the abyss' with 'unfathomable grass'. As Norford recognizes, 'the arts of contemplation are themselves subject to corruption'.⁶⁵ The times had advocated liberty to allow the private, notably by Jeremy Taylor and Thomas Fuller, but as Marvell sees iconic imagery of war from the past and for the indefinite future, the individual still faces extreme dilemmas of conscience appealing to their sense of public duty. As Marshall Grossman notes, 'Marvell's narrative of Fairfax's family and political affairs mirrors these mirror-image choices with a lyric evocation of the poet as he moves between the poles of social engagement'.⁶⁶ The self-consciousness of Marvell's art, even if we forget the bondage of verse, is extended to the dilemma of the private life which is becoming something of a curse.

The dilemmas of the Ode, Marvell understood, were firmly in the hands of Cromwell's conduct, and yet *Upon Appleton House* show the dilemmas to be uncomfortably firm in Fairfax's own hands, and, most of all, in Marvell's own. The appearance of Mary Fairfax, meanwhile, connected by Cousins with Christian wisdom, and, reminiscent of 'To His Coy Mistress', associated by Hirst and Zwicker with sexual tensions - to the extent that, similar to

⁶⁵ Norford, p. 55.

⁶⁶ Marshall Grossman, *The Story of All Things: Writing the Self in English Renaissance Narrative Poetry* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), p. 201.

Norford's claim, we face virginity and corruption - is a startling factor of instability.⁶⁷ That nature responds to Mary Fairfax and that the Sun is aware of her, seems to demonstrate that nature here is apparently literal. However, drawing back to the philosophical implications of nature as a means of self-expression in 'To His Coy Mistress', elsewhere, nature here adopts new resonances relative to the self. In its literal self, it shows stagnant limits without room for advancement and self-improvement. Something about the surrounds of nature has become constrained and claustrophobic for Marvell when 'No leaf does tremble in the wind / Which I returning cannot find' (575-576). However, with 'heaven's centre' (767) and 'Paradise's only map' (768), Nature itself maps self-discovery. With the young Mary's power, 'in heaven tried', 'Nature is wholly vitrified'. Turned to glass, Marvell's physical surroundings and his own means of self expression are either transparent and superficial (perhaps an implication of narcissism, which is implicated in 'The Garden') or, given the 'landskip drawn in the looking-glass', a reflection which shows Marvell the clearest picture of his own dilemma and his own doubt in questioning his earlier literary and personal privacy. By the end of the poem, there is no judgement passed upon Fairfax, but the poet has undergone his most rigorous 'self-enclosed self-division' yet.⁶⁸ For Fairfax and especially Marvell himself, this is the poet's strongest contemplation of 'destiny his choice'.

IV.

Earlier in his career, Marvell may have understood the predicament that privacy was not to be denied. As this chapter has displayed, his early presentation of Cromwell, notable for its

⁶⁷ A. D. Cousins, 'Marvell's "Upon Appleton House, to my Lord Fairfax" and the Regaining of Paradise', in Condren and Cousins (eds.), *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell*, pp. 53-84 (p. 75); Derek Hirst and Steven Zwicker, 'Andrew Marvell and the Toils of Patriarchy: Fatherhood, Longing, and the Body Politic', *ELH*, 66.3 (1999), 629-654 (p. 637).

⁶⁸ Judith Haber, *Pastoral and the Poetics of Self-Contradiction: Theocritus to Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 98.

demonstrative action over repose, still finds doubt in the private realms of enclosed space and the individual mind. Marvell and Cromwell could be the same subject for the opening stanzas of the Ode, but once 'restless Cromwell' has embarked on his active mission, Marvell dissociates himself from that Cromwellian character. Critics have read the Ode with their own degree of partisan bias, but there is no reason to suspect the validity of the poem's concerns about Cromwell's private ambitions, which tarnish the move from private realm to public. Marvell can conclude that his best course lies with his private art with the humble Lord Fairfax, but the plights of war, past, present and future, have followed Marvell to Nun Appleton, and in the position this time to engage with Fairfax's own dilemma, we encounter a number of doubts emerging about the private. Marvell is no escapist: for the first time, perhaps, under these circumstances, the private life is not the answer to all struggles of conscience. Moreover, having left Fairfax's grounds, Cromwell's strong command in increasingly difficult circumstances attracts Marvell to forsake his careful guard of allegiance and publicly defend the Lord Protector under increasing criticism. We are reminded that in *The First Anniversary* Cromwell is an advocate of privacy whilst occupying a public role. Privacy is a liberty worth fighting for, and is a worthy sacrifice, and while Marvell can appreciate the choice of the morally accepted private life that Cromwell's regime has helped create, there is also honour, he surely recognises, in sacrificing measures of the private to maintain the order which affords such liberties.

4. 'This Delicious Solitude': Poetics of Private Enclosure

Once Marvell engages in his public duties, although critics wound in the new politically weighted orthodoxy might imply that he never looked back, influential critical arguments that some of his later lyric verse was composed after the Restoration and during his time as an active member of parliament at Westminster imply that some of these dilemmas continue. For having found the idyllic solitude seemingly craved and reflected through the Latin 'Hortus', the dilemmas against the private life for Fairfax seem to have enacted their influence upon Marvell quickly. If, as Craze suggests, Marvell wrote 'Hortus' in the spring of 1651, a Horatian celebration of peace which speaks yearningly of repose and simplicity sought in vain in cities, and the strongest admission yet of his own desire for privacy, this is soon uprooted by the 'high summer' composition of *Upon Appleton House* with its complications of the private life.¹ Through a close reading of 'The Garden', this chapter will work through debates of Marvell's method of composition to address different contextual implications, and continues to map a number of influences involved in the growing discourse of, in many ways, a regressive privacy. Echoes of intertextuality within Marvell's own work emerge reflecting the same kinds of desires from his earlier career, before, we might assume, he is left with little choice but to accept his own sense of duty.

I.

As with the 'Horatian Ode', I begin by addressing the issues outside the poem, and how reading privacy into Marvell is enriched by the debates surrounding the date of authorship.

¹ Michael Craze, *The Life and Lyrics of Andrew Marvell* (London: Macmillan, 1979), p. 12; Derek Hirst and Steven N. Zwicker, 'High Summer at Nun Appleton, 1651: Andrew Marvell and Lord Fairfax's Occasions', *HJ*, 36.2 (1993), 247-269. On the Horatian attitudes in 'Hortus', see John M. Potter, 'Another Porker in the Garden of Epicurus: Marvell's "Hortus" and "The Garden"', *SEL*, 11.1 (1971), 137-151 (p. 141).

Elizabeth Story Donno suggests the poem ‘very probably’ dates to Marvell’s time with Fairfax, adding that it is ‘thematically... in harmony with his other poems extolling the Yorkshire locale.’ Yet Allan Pritchard’s argument that the poem dates to the Restoration, influenced by the poetry of Cowley and Phillips, is compelling.² Before the advent of the new historicist emphasis on contextualisation, Frank Kermode described this debate as ‘wasteful’ because of the impossibility of knowing the true date of this private lyric.³ Yet, Pritchard notes, ‘there is no more possibility of maintaining a stance of innocence in chronology than in any other matter, and if we do not adopt some approximation of the date suggested by the evidence then we are likely to have a series of critical theories about the poem based on false assumptions about dating’.⁴ Furthermore, John Potter begins his evaluation of ‘The Garden’ by locating that very ‘critic’s context’ that Kermode avoids, and George Williamson’s essay on context precedes Pritchard in looking at exchanges in the 1660s between Cowley and Evelyn on the theme of retirement.⁵

Pocock’s discussion of reading historical texts as multivalent might challenge how much assertion any one reading into any particular text can be given.⁶ Such multiagency is particularly resonant for Marvell, the master of wit and ambiguity, and one therefore has to question the prevalence of the concept of privacy, for example, in poetry where Marvell is particularly evasive. However, premeditating such an approach to reading historical texts, John Potter suggests of criticism, particularly to Marvell where such problems of ‘multivalency’ are

² Elizabeth Story Donno (ed.), *Andrew Marvell: The Complete Poems*, 5th edn (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2005), p. 255n; Allan Pritchard, ‘Marvell’s “The Garden”’: A Restoration Poem’, *SEL*, 23.3 (1983), 371-388.

³ Frank Kermode ‘The Argument of Marvell’s Garden’, *Essays in Criticism*, 2 (1952), reprinted in William R. Keast (ed.), *Seventeenth Century English Poetry*, rev. edn (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp. 333-347 (p. 334).

⁴ Pritchard, p. 381.

⁵ George Williamson, ‘The Context of Marvell’s “Hortus” and “Garden”’, *Modern Language Notes*, 76.7 (1961), 590-598.

⁶ J. G. A. Pocock, ‘Texts as Events: Reflections on the History of Political Thought’, in Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker (eds.), *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England* (London / Berkeley: California University Press, 1987), pp. 21-34 (p. 29).

faced, that additional singular contextual approaches complement and enhance understanding of the poem rather than detract from it:

Each critic of Marvell's poem views it within a particular context, and this choice of context affects the meaning of the whole poem [...] That each of these contexts adds to one's knowledge and appreciation of the poem, rather than diminishing it, is the best proof of Marvell's ability to synthesize diverse intellectual trends and create from them something new which is altogether his own.⁷

As Worden has suggested of the openness of the 'Horatian Ode', Potter is surely right in attributing the source of multivalent poetry to Marvell's poetic genius. Marvell is somehow able to combine his engagement with many threads of historical, cultural and political thought in often very open and suggestive verse while somehow keeping his intentions private. To that extent, however we are instructed to read 'multivalent texts', while we appreciate Marvell's private lyric poetry we must also accept that however allusive such texts may be, notions of privacy are necessarily drawn into his verse. Gladly taking critical license from Potter to approach 'The Garden' from a complex standpoint of privacy, Pocock's work nevertheless advocates a narrowing of contextual parameters if any particular reading of a historical text, which itself will be wide-ranging, is to hold ground. In previous chapters, I have been fortunate in analysing poems somewhat easier to date. 'The Garden', however, poses more problems. As follows the approximate chronology of this study, I am preliminarily stating an assumption that the poem dates after the Restoration. The other side of the debate is not to be completely ignored, and there are some references in the poem dating more closely to the 1650s. Earlier references could, of course, appear in later poetry, and Nigel Smith's suggestion that the poem may have been first composed in the interregnum with a later revision is a plausible one.⁸ The sentiments may even be similar from the early 1650s to the late 1660s, and

⁷ Potter, 'Another Porker in the Garden of Epicurus', p. 137.

⁸ Nigel Smith (ed.), *The Complete Poems of Andrew Marvell* (London: Longman, 2007), p. 152.

if it was started early, that may be the reason for revising the poem to relocate it to a more specific temporality.

Cromwell's dual statement of intent: not to obsess over the press, in belief that his government could withstand polemic scribal assault, and, as Marvell suggested, that he may not obsess over the private realm with his capability to crush uprisings, meant that privacy was addressed more liberally in texts after the execution. Previously, by the contextual use of the term, privacy had become more detached in different stages from what became separate concepts: firstly from secrecy, and secondly, when seen as something less morally corrupt, from liberty. From the mid-1650s discussion of privacy expanded, reflecting for one the changes to domestic property, particularly stately homes, with increasing reference to private corners, areas, and walks becoming part of a process differentiating privacy from solitude.⁹ Jeremy Taylor confesses in a collection of sermons that the majority of sins are performed privately, and so the private man is to be divinely judged, but reiterates some of the advantages of the private life:

The private life, that which is freest from tumult and vanity, noise and luxury, businesse and ambition, nearest to nature and a just entertainment to our necessities; that life is nearest to felicity [...] despise the swellings and the diseases of a disordered life, and a proud vanity [...] enjoy the present temperately, and you cannot choose but be pleased to see that you have so little share in the follies and miseries of the intemperate world.¹⁰

Yet this is moderated itself in a further sermon which begins to differentiate privacy from solitude. The private life can be sustained by marriage, which tempers the more troublesome desires of a lonely, solitary life.

⁹ For example, Nathaniel Ingelo, *Bentivolio and Urania* (London: printed by J.G., 1660), pp. 83-91.

¹⁰ Jeremy Taylor, *XXV sermons preached at Golden-Grove* (London: printed by E. Cotes, 1653), p. 197.

Although single life hath in it privacy and simplicity of affaires, such solitarinesse and sorrow, such leasure and unactive circumstances of living [...] concerning the state of marriage we are taught from Scripture and the sayings of wise men, great things and honourable. *Marriage is honourable in all men*, so is not single life; for in some it is [...] *a trouble in the flesh*, a prison of unruly desires which is attempted daily to be broken. Celibate or single life is never commanded; but in some cases marriage is; and he that burns, sins often if he marries not, he that cannot contain must marry, and he that can contain is not tyed to a single life, but may marry and not sin. Marriage was ordained by God, instituted in Paradise, was the relief of a naturall necessity, and the first blessing from the Lord...¹¹

Incidentally, following this, the topic of privacy became incorporated within a new wave of devotional romance texts into the mid-1650s by Fuller, Dauncey, and a historical romance, *Theophania* (1655), released by Thomas Newcomb, the government printer behind the anonymous publication of Marvell's *First Anniversary* the previous year. So, now partly differentiated from solitude and the state of spending time alone, privacy was becoming increasingly defined as the control and choice over one's own affairs, with such romances demonstrating that search for time and space that 'To His Coy Mistress' could not foresee the previous decade.¹²

Political instability was often the cause of a reassessment of privacy. Following Marvell's dilemma of moving into public life soon after 'Hortus' had demonstrated thankfulness at realising his quiet life, the influential debate was fuelled from both sides. 1657, Craze notes, was Marvell's '*annus mirabilis*, a wonderful year', in which case thoughts of the insufficiency of the private life or the rewards of public life would have appeared to be the right ones.¹³ He was declared Latin Secretary to the government, and the campaigning of brother-in-law Edmond Pople in Hull two years later suggests that Marvell's position had already been of considerable benefit. However, the death of Cromwell in 1658 coincided with an attack on

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

¹² Thomas Fuller, *Triana, or, A threefold romanza of Mariana. Paduana. Sabina* (London: printed for John Stafford, 1655); John Dauncey, *The English Lovers* (London: printed for H. Brome, 1662), [Sir W. Sales], *Theophania* (London: Printed by Thomas Newcomb, 1655).

¹³ Craze, p. 17.

‘the privacy of affections’ by Anthony Burgess, a member of the ‘young Presbytery’ Marvell condemned in his poem to Lovelace, but a close accomplice of, and recommended for a bishopric by, Richard Baxter, who holds some common ground with Marvell in his letters and prose.¹⁴

The privacy of them, they do inordinately impropriate all things to a mans self, so that they are self-affections, not affections for Gods glory, or the publique good, they are private affections, not publique affections; so that herein they are greatly distempered, in that they are not carried out to the most common and universal good, but to what is selfish and particular, whereas if our affections did retain their primitive integrity, they would have been in the first and most principal manner carried out to what is the chiefest, and most principal object, whereas naturally every man is a *Nero* [...] Let Heaven and Earth be mingled together when I am dead; And thus though God have no glory, though the publique be ruined, so as he have his self-affections promoted, he mattereth not!¹⁵

Burgess was ejected as a non-conformist, presumably for rejecting the 1662 Act of Uniformity and the Thirty-Nine Articles in an effort by the reinstated Charles II to press for religious uniformity, while others later had to apply for licenses to public worship, struggling for any foothold within the national church.¹⁶ This kind of reflection on the irresponsible and frivolous nature of the private life is now by no means unique. Using the 1648 sermon of casuist Robert Sanderson as an example, James Loxley suggests that royalist ideology, permeated with a language of public activity, determined the ‘maintenance of good conscience’ as ‘necessarily linked to public action’.¹⁷ This kind of discourse had fallen most strongly in years of constitutional turmoil, with Burgess’ words perhaps noting the end of the liberty of conscience with Cromwell’s passing. Pending the Restoration of monarchy,

¹⁴ H. M. Margoliouth (ed.), *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, 3rd edn, rev. by Pierre Legouis and E. E. Duncan-Jones, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), II, p. 315; Annabel Patterson and Martin Dzelzainis (eds.), *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell: Volume I, 1672-1673* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 1-203 (pp. 62n, 79-83).

¹⁵ Anthony Burgess, *A Treatise of Original Sin* (London: [s.n.], 1658), p. 345.

¹⁶ N. H. Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth Century England* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987), p. 59.

¹⁷ James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (London: Macmillan, 1997), p. 211.

supported by Marvell, Charles II offered reassurances of learning from past mistakes. ‘By the time of the Restoration’, notes James Sutherland, ‘the monarch had learnt how the power of language and of literature could prove decisive in radical social revolution’, and the April 1660 Declaration of Breda promised ‘liberty to tender consciences’ in maintaining the liberties and tolerance instigated through the interregnum.¹⁸ Such liberty, however, was not ultimately forthcoming. It was into the 1660s that the debates surrounding the legitimacy of the private life re-emerged, and these will become more apparent when examining the poem.

II.

‘The Garden’, arguably Marvell’s most complex poem and that most obviously reflective of issues of withdrawal and solitude, is perhaps best understood by ‘the fashion of the *theologia negativa*’.¹⁹ The way it is read alludes to the very nature of privacy as we know it today - the attention is more drawn to what is *not* known than to what is - and with such tantalising poetic provocation, there is curiosity to find meaning. For how do we begin to interpret a poem which is, paradoxically, webbed so tightly in layers of privacy, and yet so open that critics approach the poem with questions about what it does not represent rather than what it does? The intellectual critical approaches to ‘The Garden’, from neo-Platonism to Cartesian, demonstrate the open forum, or indeed the ‘heterogeneity’ of pastoral itself, through which this private poem seeking private venue can be read.²⁰ The poem’s private location, its ‘quintessential Marvellian locale’ as Bate describes it, is one of enclosure, and therefore follows

¹⁸ James Sutherland, *English Literature of the Late Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), pp. 154-155.

¹⁹ The ‘*theologia negativa*’ is quoted and described as ‘not what it *is*, but what it is *not*’. C. A. Patrides (ed.), ‘The Sublunar Poetry of Andrew Marvell’, in *Approaches to Marvell: The York Tercentenary Lectures* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978), pp. 31-55 (p. 49).

²⁰ Joan F. Adkins, ‘Neoplatonism in Marvell’s “On a Drop of Dew” and “The Garden”’, *The Bulletin of the Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association*, 28. 4 (1974), 77-92; Daniel Stempel, ‘The Garden: Marvell’s Cartesian Ecstasy’, *JHI*, 28. 1 (1967), 99-114; Paul Alpers, ‘What is Pastoral?’, *Critical Inquiry*, 8.3. (1982), 437-460 (p. 438).

a tradition of locations deliberately confined: from the inner dialogue between soul and body, to the drop of dew, the gallery, and even Nun Appleton House, which, despite the expansiveness expressed in ninety-seven stanzas, is still an environment of claustrophobic boundaries when the narrator can return to the same leaves.²¹ Even ‘To His Coy Mistress’, experimenting beyond the traditional *carpe diem* motif, expresses time as uncomfortably limited, where neither the prospect of the beloved homeland nor any notion of eroticism can subside the mind’s innate desire for adequate personal space and time. Many have approached the poem pondering how Marvell uses nature, and my reading of the poem focuses upon its contribution to an intense self-division.²² Given Marvell’s frequent references to ideology of the private, and poetical influences who are themselves part of a debate between *otium* and *negotium*, locates ‘The Garden’ deeply within Marvell’s own debate between the public and private life.

How vainly men themselves amaze
 To win the palm, the oak, or bays;
 And their uncessant labours see
 Crowned from some single herb or tree

(‘The Garden’, 1-4)

The opening lines provide particular echoes of Marvell’s earlier poetic sentiment. The intensity of human competitiveness is moderated by levity, but the ‘bays’ which Marvell metaphorically presented to Lovelace recaptures the discomfort of Marvell’s public verse when he involved himself in that competitive process. If Marvell started composing the poem in the early 1650s, there is a relief at returning to private poetry, even if he does mock his own

²¹ Jonathan Bate, ‘Introduction’, in Elizabeth Story Donno (ed.), *Andrew Marvell: The Complete Poems*, 5th edn (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2005), xix.

²² Joseph H. Summers, ‘Marvell’s Nature’, *ELH*, 20.2 (1953), 121-135; Maren-Sofie Røstvig, ‘Andrew Marvell’s “The Garden”: A Hermetic Poem’, *English Studies*, 40 (1959); Margaret Ann Carpenter, ‘Marvell’s Garden’, *SEL*, 10.1 (1970), 155-171.

participation in such practices in the previous years. On the other hand, if the poem is dated entirely to the Restoration, there is, perhaps, a comfort in turning to private poetry as a more antithetical practice now to public life and political ambition. The ‘equivocalities of the situation’, A. J. Smith suggests, are ‘elegantly played on in a tautly graceful performance whose poise depends upon its detachment’.²³ Yet such detachment, or ‘self-distancing’, Jonathan Crewe notes in his essay on Marvell’s poetics of enclosure, should call to attention the absence of a ‘true originary moment’ in a poem ‘marked by abrupt shifts’. The indulgent fantasy, he argues, ‘seems like a belated and defensive response to more troubling fantasies of pastoral origin’.²⁴ The opening of the poem thus procures a sense of structural dislocation. If this uprooted structure is given the prominence Crewe requests, nature may no longer be the principal concern. We learn to expect the unexpected from Marvell, and, writing for himself, we cannot necessarily expect measures of consistency. The weight of philosophical scholarship determines that nature will almost certainly have some role in the expression of the self, but even in ‘To His Coy Mistress’ with an apparent and explicit feminine subject, we were still left to contemplate ‘other forms of desire’, which included the necessity for personal time and space.²⁵ If uncommitted to nature, Marvell may be, David Kalstone states, ‘only halfway donning the pastoral mask’.²⁶

The following stanza indicates a notable difference from ‘Hortus’. The speaker’s interrogatory point, ‘Fair Quiet, have I found thee here’ (9) is much less convincing than the gratifying assertion of ‘Hortus’: ‘Alma Quies, teneo te!’ (7). If we place ‘The Garden’ as a Restoration poem preceded by ‘Hortus’ in the early 1650s, the contextual differences place ‘Hortus’ at an interesting crux in Marvell’s *oeuvre*. The Latin poem does initiate witticism taken

²³ A. J. Smith, ‘Marvell’s Metaphysical Wit’, in Patrides (ed.), *Approaches to Marvell*, pp. 56-86 (p. 71).

²⁴ Jonathan Crewe, ‘The Garden State: Marvell’s Poetics of Enclosure’, in Richard Burt and John Michael Archer (eds.), *Enclosure Acts: Sexuality, Property, and Culture in Early Modern England* (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 270-289 (p. 273).

²⁵ Paul Hammond, p. 112.

²⁶ David Kalstone, ‘Marvell and the Fictions of Pastoral’, *ELH*, 4 (1974), 174-188 (p. 184).

to further extreme in ‘The Garden’ – for the annihilation takes place in the English poem for a reason – but there appears to be less ambiguity and more enjoyment in ‘Hortus’ than many Marvellian poems that can be traced to the early 1650s. The earlier poem finds the inner peace, the privacy of leisure (*otium*) permitted by the liberties procured through the revolutionary Ode and protected from moral judgement (in *umbra*).²⁷ Yet the vague cities and palaces where repose was initially sought in ‘Hortus’ indicate that it is not just public occupation amongst men which denies personal time and space, but also concerns of movement, occupation, and urbanity. Yet ‘the busy companies of men’ (12) in the later poem possibly suggests the role of men in establishing an ethnicity which, in the public privacy debates of the 1660s, makes the desire for privacy morally reprehensible and thus more dilemmatic from the earlier, more felicitous tones of ‘Hortus’. The end of this stanza is where the self-division begins to intensify: ‘Society is all but rude, / To this delicious solitude’ (15-16) marks a parallel with Katherine Philips’ ‘A Country-life’

Then welcome dearest Solitude,
 My great Felicity;
 Though some are pleas'd to call thee rude,
 Thou art not so, but we.²⁸

(ll. 29-32)

The syntactic ambiguity leaves confusion as to whether Marvell notes society’s attitude to solitude, or makes a comparison between the more public and private life. This is mirrored by particularly provocative language. The term ‘solitude’ could provide a telling reference to Cowley’s published essays, including ‘Of Solitude’, a committed defence for the private life. Aware of concerns such as Jeremy Taylor’s regarding the potential dangers of the solitary life,

²⁷ See Potter, p. 141.

²⁸ Katherine Philips, *Poems by the incomparable Mrs. K.P.* (London: Printed by J.G., 1664), pp. 177-182.

to be resolved by marriage, Cowley not only promotes the supreme credentials of the private life, ‘the one has but part of the affairs of one nation, the other all the works of God and nature under his consideration’, but also sets down a superior moral standard for the kind of man who befits solitude:

The truth of the matter is [...] that solitude can be well fitted and set right but upon a very few persons. They must have enough knowledge of the world to see the vanity of it, and enough virtue to despise all vanity; if the mind be possessed with any lust or passions, a man had better be in a fair than in a wood alone[...] The first work, therefore, that a man must do to make himself capable of the good of solitude is the very eradication of all lusts, for how is it possible for a man to enjoy himself while his affections are tied to things without himself? In the second place, he must learn the art and get the habit of thinking; for this too, no less than well speaking, depends upon much practice; and cogitation is the thing which distinguishes the solitude of a god from a wild beast.²⁹

Cowley’s argument follows a paper debate between Sir George Mackenzie, whose essays between 1663 and 1669 included a controversial support of solitude, and John Evelyn’s retort for the virtues of public life.³⁰ Many of Mackenzie’s works upheld philosophical principles of neo-Stoicism, and yet his defence of solitude went against principles of virtuous activity supported by many ancient Stoics, noting that ‘there is no vice commisable in Solitude, to which Men in publick lie not yet more open’, serving to bait himself to any number of critics.³¹ Yet, as David Allan notes, Mackenzie uses Classical sources, Cicero and Seneca, to argue that ‘rustic landscapes constitute the distinctive natural environment of the genuine patriot’.³² Rustic landscapes were defined by Virgil, and it is interesting, therefore, that elsewhere

²⁹ Abraham Cowley, ‘Of Solitude’, *Project Gutenberg*, < <http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/3549>>, (accessed 10th August, 2007).

³⁰ It is perhaps unusual, given the apparent opposition in ideology, that Evelyn and Cowley were such close friends, although differences may be over-exacerbated by the nature of public discourse. Their tributes to each other are presented by Williamson, pp. 591-593.

³¹ George Mackenzie, *A Moral Essay Preferring Solitude to Publick Employment*, 2nd edition (London, 1685), p. 31.

³² David Allan, ‘“A Commendation of the Private Countrey Life”: Philosophy and the Garden in Seventeenth-Century Scotland’, *Garden History*, 25.1 (1997), 59-80 (p. 75).

Marvellian pastoral has been read as conventional of Virgil, with both compared as ‘notoriously self-conscious poets’.³³

Marvell’s first sign of opinion, engaging with the language of the moral public and private debates surrounding him, arrives in the curious lexical choice of ‘delicious’, which offers plentiful ambiguity.³⁴ There appears to be a slight mismatch of senses, which draws attention to a further influence. Nathaniel Ingelo, who became a good friend of Marvell after his departure from Nun Appleton, and to whom Marvell addressed and sent a 1654 poem to Sweden, notes some cautions about aspects of privacy in his 1660 fictional narrative *Bentivolio and Urania*, in which the father notes about attuning senses in awareness of such suspicion:

keep a strict guard upon your *Eyes* and *Eares*: for they will attempt by wicked Arts to make them Instruments of your harm. Drink nothing presented to you in a Golden Cup; for they give their deadly Poison in the form of Delicious Wine. When your Senses begin to be seiz’d upon with delectable Objects, hearken presently to a soft Voice, which from within your bosomes will tell you what you should do. Be sure you never retire into any of their privacies; for there they have such a sort of Nets, made of invisible Wires, as *Vulcan* us’d to entangle *Mars* and *Venus* when he made a sport of them to the Gods.³⁵

Privacy is involved in abject traps according to Ingelo’s tale, to which the senses have to be highly alert, and Marvell’s questionable lexical co-ordination portends a measure of doubt about the state of ‘solitude’ and thus the paradisaal setting the poet is embarking on.

Furthermore, the ‘delicious solitude’ marks the beginning of an extended hyperbole which crescendos until the moment of annihilation.

³³ Paul Alpers, ‘Convening and Convention in Pastoral Poetry’, *New Literary History*, 14.2 (1983), 277-304 (p. 298).

³⁴ The *OED* notes that ‘delicious’ is ‘less dignified’ and of ‘less quality (1.a.), and indulgently addicted (3.b).

³⁵ Ingelo, p. 77. Compare this to Rosalie Colie’s statement, that ‘After prolonged exposure to Marvell’s poetry, one feels in it more than meets eye or ear; and even after one has worked hard to define this “more,” it still remains elusive, indefinite, recessive. In “The Garden,” it seems to me, this device is most successfully exploited’. Colie, *“My Echoing Song”: Marvell’s Poetry of Criticism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970), p. 16.

The narrative theme which continues through the following stanzas, with bizarre and thankless romantic or sexual encounters for the acquisition of laurel or reed, is possibly Marvell's spin on the devotional romance texts of the 1650s within which discussion of privacy is entwined. This would cast further doubt on the status of 'solitude', or 'retreat' (26), with these texts emerging after Jeremy Taylor's distinction between privacy and solitude, where the latter becomes '*a trouble in the flesh*, a prison of unruly desires which is attempted daily to be broken'.³⁶ The possible interplay with sources that could be occurring here demonstrates the ideological division which is to be mirrored yet again in self-division. The more dulcet tone of 'Hortus', which enjoys the long-awaited and unchallenged indulgence of the private life, and the troubled nature of *Upon Appleton House* with mounting circumstances for public duty, show Marvell's reaction to the private life, even in his own private verse, to be heavily influenced on ideology and devotional tradition. Accordingly, such debate was currently in fashion and high profile in the 1660s, where any choice made has its counterarguments.

The eloquent structure of 'The Garden', with stanzas comprising of eight lines of tetrameter forming poetic squares reflecting the nature of the square as described by George Puttenham: 'the figure of most sollicitie and steadfastnesse [...] inconcussable steadinesse likened to the earth'.³⁷ With nine itself being the square number of three, the nine stanzas construct the poem itself as a form of square, augmenting the fifth stanza structurally, as well as numerically, to the centre. Accordingly, it is within this fifth stanza that the largest divide takes place.

³⁶ Taylor, p. 222.

³⁷ George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, ed. Gladys Willcock and Alice Walker (London: Cambridge University Press, 1936), p. 100. Also, see John Dixon Hunt's essay, 'Loose Nature and the Garden Square', which introduces some of the visual ideas which may have 'shaped or conditioned Marvell's thinking', in Patrides (ed.), *Approaches to Marvell*, pp. 331-351.

What wondrous life is this I lead!
 Ripe apples drop about my head;
 The luscious clusters of the vine
 Upon my mouth do crush their wine;
 The nectarene, and curious peach,
 Into my hands themselves do reach;
 Stumbling on melons, as I pass,
 Insnared with flow'rs, I fall on grass.

(‘The Garden’, 33-40)

In the context of this study, this can be read in two possible ways. On the one hand, the scene of serene and sensuous beauty, close to achieving a harmony between man’s correlation with nature, creates echoes of Eden. After all, Lawrence Hyman asks, ‘what kind of garden is this where all the pleasures of passion can be enjoyed amongst trees and flowers, where plants are sexual and man is not?’³⁸ One thread of Allan Pritchard’s argument for a Restoration dating of the poem is the lack of verbal parallels from *Upon Appleton House*, and certainly, unlike ‘To His Coy Mistress’, *Upon Appleton House* and three of the ‘mower’ poems we notice the distinct and unnatural absence of female presence in Marvell’s garden setting, which detaches the poem from Cowley’s celebration of marriage, ‘The Garden’. The other interpretation to this stanza, as the ‘pastoral hyperbole’ begins to take force, renders it more deliberately unnatural.³⁹ The sensuous colours, scents and tastes of the garden become so oppressive that the softened fall goes almost unnoticed, overshadowed by the claustrophobic feel of the speaker ‘stumbling’ and ‘insnared’ as the surroundings close in, forming the sort of net of invisible wires forewarned by Ingelo. Reminiscent of ‘To His Coy Mistress’, nature appears anthropomorphised again through the animated fruits and flowers, where a seemingly

³⁸ Lawrence Hyman, ‘Marvell’s Garden’, *ELH*, 25 (1958), 13-22 (p. 13).

³⁹ J. B. Leishman, ‘Some Themes and Variations in Marvell’s Poetry’, in Arthur Pollard (ed.), *Andrew Marvell Poems* (London: Macmillan, 1980), pp. 86-106 (p. 104). For a useful summary of critical approaches to this stanza, see Jim Swan, ‘At Play in the Garden of Ambivalence: Andrew Marvell and the Green World’, *Criticism*, 17 (1975), 295-307.

innocent love of nature is, Geoffrey Hartman argues, ‘reciprocated with alarming intensity’.⁴⁰ Hartman also intriguingly states of this stanza, ‘nature seems more knowing and intense than the poet in his strange naivety’.⁴¹ Perhaps this relates to Marvell’s tutorship of Mary Fairfax, who, having gone through some of the battle sieges with her father may have privately stunned the poet with tales of her ordeals given his apparent avoidance of war. Hence, Marvell’s garden, which is convincingly presented as an allurements, comes with a degree of shame and guilt at the escape or retirement from public life, where endorsement of the private life is respectable but, indeed, naïve.

Meanwhile the mind, from pleasures less,
 Withdraws into its happiness:
 The mind, that ocean where each kind
 Does straight its own resemblance find;
 Yet it creates, transcending these,
 Far other worlds, and other seas;
 Annihilating all that’s made
 To a green thought in a green shade.

(‘The Garden’, 41-48)

Into the sixth stanza, once again, the opening provides an element of instability. With the metre drawing anachronism of uncertainty in stanzas two and five already, we encounter the uncertain shift of ‘meanwhile’, which, for all we may discern, undermines the whole poem to that point with what is to come and reminds us that ‘the energies which constitute the fictive world are also instrumental in undermining what they create’.⁴² In ‘withdraws’, Marvell once again engages in the language of – or, this time in the movement between – the public and private domains. The ‘pleasures less’ draw attention to a strike of realism in Cowley’s essay,

⁴⁰ Geoffrey Hartman, ‘Marvell, St. Paul, and the Body of Hope’, *ELH*, 31 (1964), 175-94 (p. 175). See also R. I. V. Hodge, *Foreshortened Time: Andrew Marvell and Seventeenth Century Revolutions* (Ipswich: Brewer, 1978), p. 88.

⁴¹ Hartman, p. 179.

⁴² Balachandra Rajan, ‘Andrew Marvell: The aesthetics of inconclusiveness’, in Patrides (ed.), *Approaches to Marvell*, pp. 155-173 (p. 167).

who notes that even the solitary life cannot surpass without a certain dedication to self-activity: ‘the soul of man is not by its own nature or observation furnished with sufficient materials to work upon; it is necessary for it to have continual resource to learning and books for fresh supplies, so that the solitary life will grow indigent, and be ready to starve without them.’⁴³ If the mind is choosing to ‘withdraw into its own happiness’, we find echoes to the conclusion of Philips’ poem: ‘In this retir’d Integrity [...] / I live not by Necessity, / But wholly by my Choice’ (85, 87-88). Philips, like Cowley, finds a conclusion favouring the private life: ‘But I [...] In Privacy intend to spin / My future Minutes out’ (73, 75-76). Accordingly, Marvell begins to consider the safety and seclusion of the private garden. If we date the poem to the Restoration, the choice of ‘ocean’ and ‘seas’, reminiscent of the flood in *Upon Appleton House*, reignites the perils of the urbanity of public life and the 1665 Great Fire of London, which decimated St. Paul’s Cathedral and threatened the Court at Whitehall. Yet, as soon as he indulges such thoughts, there are immediate counterarguments. Water, Gil Harris notes, was ‘life-blood’, analogous of the restored body-politic, and where private body politics depended on enclosure to uphold boundaries against water, manor gardens had been damaged and destroyed by overflowing springs.⁴⁴ Furthermore, if we read the role of nature as an expression of the self, water is the cause and the carrier of such self-reflection, associated with narcissistic fashion of the early Stuart court. Of James’ encounter with reflection, Harris notes: ‘His self recognition prompted him and his speculating subjects to invest in the very notion of the conduit with the Neoplatonic associations characterizing his own self-image as a life-giving source within the body politic’.⁴⁵ From Francis Bacon’s summary of Narcissus’ shortcomings, which criticises excessive attention to self-reflection, ‘For it is the propertie of men infected with this humour not to come much abroad, or to be conuersant in ciuill

⁴³ Cowley, ‘Of Solitude’.

⁴⁴ Jonathan Gil Harris, ‘This Is Not A Pipe: Water Supply, Incontinent Sources, and the Leaky Body Politic’, in Burt and Archer (eds.), *Enclosure Acts: Sexuality, Property, and Culture in Early Modern England*, pp. 203-228 (pp. 204-205).

⁴⁵ *Ibid*, p. 219.

affaires', Marvell's broader theme in this stanza, it seems, is to similarly comment upon excessive attention towards one's own private life, which the public debates demonstrated.⁴⁶ There are surely sympathetic jibes at Philips in the poem for breaking her intended poetic privacy in releasing manuscripts and afterwards expressing regret, while Marvell, in his internal debate, maintains his own.

In the second half of this stanza, the crescendo of the hyperbole escalates to an alarming scale. Marvell's garden, in that sense, has now been reduced to a mere microcosm of a potential galaxy of greenery, to which the once-wondrous garden becomes redundant. As Worden described the Ode, imagining a realm beyond politics, here, as A. J. Smith notes, the equivocalities are poised by detachment as the poem transcends its immediate context while the poet, the architect of the enclosed poetics, transcends the poem to marshal its annihilation. For Marshall Grossman, the poet is 'caught between two matrices of experience'; for Jonathan Bate, the garden 'stands on the boundary between bloody history and timeless beauty, between culture and nature', and to this must be added the boundaries between imagination and reality, in connection with the public and private.⁴⁷ The juxtaposition between the garden, which, from the poem's structure to its idyllic sensuality, is notably artificial, and the realities of the outside world, a context which Marvell's private poem does not need to provide beyond his influences that represent voices from it, comes to a summit. As the garden evolves into further worlds, the illusion can only go so far; like Marvell's drop of dew which uncomfortably shivers in its purity until it evaporates, the comparison between the microcosmic idyll and reality becomes excruciatingly unsustainable and must be annihilated – to a 'green thought in a green shade'. In many studies on 'The Garden', the symbolism of the colour green has almost always produced the same response. Rosalie Colie suggests green 'is

⁴⁶ Francis Bacon, *The Wisdome of the Ancients* (London: Imprinted by Iohn Bill, 1619), sig. A6v. I am indebted to Harris, p. 220 for this reference.

⁴⁷ Marshall Grossman, *The Story of All Things: Writing the Self in English Renaissance Narrative Poetry* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998), p. 26; Jonathan Bate, p. xix.

one colour for truth, for retirement, for singleness, newness, innocence [...] as well as the colour of finished perfection', while Donald Friedman labels it as 'the sign of growth and the essence of naturalness'.⁴⁸ However, the alternative meaning could be applicable, indicating sickness or disease, and reminiscent of the more misogynistic lines to John Cleveland's 1652 poem 'The Antiplatonick': 'Verrue's no more in Woman-kind / But the green sicknesse of the mind' (25-26).⁴⁹ The title of Cleveland's poem notes an opposition to traditions of the Stuart court, which it is mirrored here by the references to water which formulate a critique of Stuart led self-obsession. Incorporating this idea of sickness into the poem provides a very different outcome. At the very point where the pastoral creation reaches its peak, in a similar vein to the apocalyptic tension within 'To His Coy Mistress', the poet demonstrates a conscious dismissal of everything created before as a perturbed thought from a troubled mindset.

Finally, I turn to the 'happy garden-state' (57), which shows a regular feature of Marvell's acute irony: his adaptation of Renaissance poetic tradition, here the pastoral tradition, for his own metapoetic purposes. However critics approach this poem, many by the later stages have adopted standard criterion that the poet refers to Adam's state in the garden before the creation of Eve. To read Marvell's garden as Eden, the absence of the female figure attracts claims of misogyny, for to recall Eden, Crewe asserts, 'is also to recall Eve's role in its loss'.⁵⁰ However, this idea might be perpetually conceived through misdirected conditions. Crewe notes of the execution: 'the dethroning of Charles I entails imaginative and identificatory as well as political loss. A need both to mourn and to recoup this loss is revealed in "The Garden"; in the wake of political monarchy the only masculine absolutism may well be the displaced, solitary absolutism of the imaginary garden state.'⁵¹ If the poem is to be dated to the

⁴⁸ Colie, p. 164; Donald Friedman, *Marvell's Pastoral Art* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), p. 168.

⁴⁹ *OED*, s.v. *green*, (3.A, 3.B.). Cleveland, 'The Antiplatonick', in Peter Davidson (ed.), *Poetry and Revolution: An Anthology of British and Irish Verse 1625-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 54-55.

⁵⁰ Crewe, p. 270.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, pp. 272-273. This is qualified by Crewe as leading from an 'overdetermined reading' of cultural fantasy, with Jonathan Goldberg in mind, yet a reading he extrapolates and does not oppose.

Restoration, surely this notion no longer applies, or must hold a lesser weighting within Marvell's poem. While this Edenic allusion cannot be discounted, there is every reason to believe, given the variety of links to notions and sources of privacy and even thematic links within his own verse, that it is in fact the poet, in a similar vein to 'To His Coy Mistress' who is looking for the liberty to spend time alone if he chooses, without conditions, guilt or interruption, reminiscent of 'Hortus'. The Latin poem and English equivalent could therefore feasibly be a generation apart. Such liberties yearned for in 'To His Coy Mistress' were not yet experienced. In 'The Garden', levity and frustration are confounded in the poem's running duality as such times were founded, but only a glimpse of what might have been. If Marvell is trying to invoke original sin, a parallel is drawn with Anthony Burgess' *Treatise*, which is cynical both of privacy and of self-orientated thoughts. Such texts, as Marvell has displayed throughout this poem, have added to his confusion. Yet, Marvell eventually offers some resignation, that 't'was beyond a mortal's share / 'To wander solitary there' (61-62). As has become clear, in terms of public acceptance, privacy suffered regression following the death of Cromwell, and yet in poetic voices, notably Cowley and Philips, and a prominent governmental one in Mackenzie, there is a sign of a tradition prepared to debate for the privilege. The result, however, is a different kind of privacy: one displaying pride and arrogance in its defence; one which requires a particular quality of person; and one which cannot escape the cynics.

Marvell's biography in the mid-1660s presents a similar pattern to the 1640s, when 'To His Coy Mistress' expressed a private desire for privacy with the poet having travelled to Europe and returned to a country divided and at war. By 1668, Marvell had undertaken a second spell abroad on embassy to Scandinavia and Russia, returning to find England at war with Holland and the London fire encapsulating the strains of public life. The emergence of 'party' activity earlier in the century, which encouraged public obligations not always largely governed on

principles, and that parliamentary buildings were probably frequented by the public, remind us of the extremely limited scope for privacy for the majority of seventeenth-century London.⁵² Marvell was no escapist, and did not forsake his public roles. For that matter, the self-critical impulses of 'The Garden', taken to extreme, can be regarded as a kind of anti-pastoral sentiment, a critique of 'avoiding full concentration upon the facts of man's present existence'.⁵³ But as in 'To His Coy Mistress', where to await privacy for intimacy was to foresee the grave, the same implausibility is expressed through his own created paradise: 'Two Paradises 'twere in one / To Live in Paradise alone' (63-64).

III.

By the end of this remarkable poem, the desire for privacy is still potent, for even an apparent acknowledgement of defeat does not quench the evident desire for the solitude celebrated before. Certainly we are not left to forget the preceding 'Hortus' with its celebratory tone later juxtaposed in 'The Garden'. Nor, for that matter, is earlier verse forgotten - from repetition of anti-public sentiments to similar concerns found in 'To His Coy Mistress'. Yet the regression of privacy from its pure paradise as Marvell sees it makes it less desirable. The green of nature, at once new and invigorating, can equally show sickness and decay. Smith notes that 'Marvell's garden poetry never lets us forget the world outside the garden, or our own incapacity to sustain such a paradisaical life for more than a moment', and yet

⁵² Derek Hirst and Richard Strier (eds.), 'Introduction', in *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 1-9 (p. 2); Jason Peacey, 'Order and Disorder in Europe: Parliamentary Agents and Royalist Thugs 1649-1650', *HJ*, 40.4 (1997), 953-976. On the accessibility of parliament to the people, see Chris R. Kyle and Jason Peacey (eds.), "'Under Cover of so Much Coming and Going": Public Access to Parliament and the Political Process in Early Modern England', in *Parliament at Work: Parliamentary Committees, Political Power and Public Access in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002), pp. 1-23.

⁵³ Peter Lindenbaum, *Changing Landscapes: Anti-Pastoral Sentiment in the English Renaissance* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986), p. 17. Lindenbaum singles Spenser and Marvell in particular as two who 'undertook pastoral but found themselves opposed'; see pp. 16-21.

we can never forget Marvell's private disposition.⁵⁴ The number of different critical interpretations shows a colossal body of thought at Marvell's disposal, and not one can assume any leading authority. As Rosalie Colie states of Marvell's puns, they 'go on yielding until we find ourselves experiencing not so much objectively separable meanings as shaded meanings along a gamut, sometimes a gamut running between polar opposites.'⁵⁵ Marvell's language branches like trees, allowing the poem to be read from a convincing paradise to a pastoral pretence to a philosophical exercise - so many interpretations remain possible. Therefore the poem is, to some degree, a celebration of the freedom of private writing, of openness, of ambiguity and of poetics justifiable only to Marvell himself in the ever increasing and ever influential publicised climate. 'The Garden' can be linked to an astonishing number of texts engaged in some way with the concept of privacy, and for this study it proves particularly useful in potentially tracking two decades of interchanging attitudes on the private life. 'The Garden', free from feminine charm unlike the alluring woman/land of the Coy Mistress, speaks of older experience where the urge for privacy is not now driven by metaphorical testosterone, and where Marvell, victorious poetically in defeat, maintains the ultimate sovereignty of his private work in comparison to the writers who put their lives and ideologies up for scrutiny.

⁵⁴ A.J. Smith, p. 71.

⁵⁵ Colie, p. 152.

Conclusion

Either within his poetry or observing his life as writer, so little is simple with Marvell. It is easy to simplify and regard him as a royalist prior to 1649 and a republican afterwards, and to categorise his works too schematically in the process, which betrays the complexity of his private demeanour. It is easy, in another sense, to see Marvell as a man who lived a private life up until the mid-1650s and then one dedicated to public service thereafter, which his biography would appear to promote. In a similar vein to Marvell's political identity, which, for the interim years after the execution remained obscure and confused, weaved within layers of ambiguity in privately composed verse, his later lyric poetry demonstrates similar obscurity and dilemma surrounding the private life. For all his avoidance of partisanship at pivotal moments and working against particular conventions of popularised literary tradition, Marvell is still influenced by those traditions, alongside many aspects of philosophical and political thought and social change. It is in this discovery that a different perspective has been brought to already well-known poems.

The development of privacy itself, as we have seen, is a complex sequence. Gradual improvements to houses, with surrounds, gardens and segregations gradually improved to offer the individual more enclosure, the principle. However, the material private realm was dominated by the ideological realm. The right to privacy, as we might consider it then, was dictated by popular attitude and opinion. Of course, this was manipulated in subtle ways by the metaphorical body politic, Renaissance philosophy and academic endeavours, and radical reformers who sought the individual connection with God so chastised in the first few decades of the seventeenth century. Yet Marvell experienced the English Revolution, the fall of kings, where the newly fashioned and threatening private realm was involved. The Stuart

kings had tried to deny privacy and to set an example for a transparent kingdom, and yet with inconsistency and hypocrisy, the loss in trust denied them. Through the period we have covered, almost the full span of Marvell's poetic career, only Cromwell's protectorate allowed the liberty and tolerance to indulge unmolested; the rest of the time is spent dealing with the desires, the disappointments, and occasionally, the dangers associated with privacy. It might seem disappointing therefore, in summarising the development of the private. By the late 1660s, there was no real acknowledged acceptance any more than earlier in the century, but debates had broken out, and as chapter four highlights, poetical voices other than Marvell's private verse began to join devotional voices on the subject for the first time. As 'The Garden' wryly seems to acknowledge, the private could have found more acceptance, and regressed upon the death of Cromwell. However the poem is read, it addresses what has become a concept and a firm tradition of privacy, an explicit subject matter for political public exchange. At the beginning of the poem, the poet seeks solitude free from guilt of conscience and the heavy demands of seventeenth-century London, and yet that same desire as a vice must consciously be annihilated.

Marvell's verse has shown regular interaction with the developing notions of privacy, although his early verse involves experimentation with publishing which helps him feel, poetically speaking, for the private and the solace of his own freedom. He moves from an anti-public stance on the conditions of writing and of censorship, to investigating elements of privacy through space, time, philosophy, nature and sexuality. It is unusual in a sense to consider a man with a 'passion for privacy' searching for privacy in all sorts of allusive ways.¹ Of all the intellectually based scholarship on Marvell, this slightly more unusual examination is considering him truly finding himself and his own psyche, and providing fascinating interpretations of his works in the process. But perhaps the strongest evocation of Marvell's

¹ Donald Friedman, 'Rude Heaps and Decent Order', in Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (eds.), *Marvell and Liberty* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), pp. 123-144 (p. 123).

respect for privacy comes in *The First Anniversary*. Marvell is prepared not only to publish, but also to risk declaring his guarded allegiances in his praise of Cromwell and his praise of the private realm. Privacy proved the nurturing ground, which Cromwell was prepared to sacrifice to allow others to indulge.

Hopefully the ideas evoked in this study may present further contextual avenues. Certainly, engaging etymologically not only with seventeenth-century language, but a politically and ideologically fragile condition, finds a deeper and yet more oppressive historical context. I hope to have addressed some questions that seem to have been overlooked. Examining the private composition of, and privacy within, his work, allows us to ask what the implications are for a private poem as opposed to a public one. Chapter two suggests that the consciousness of publicity changed Marvell's poetic approach from what we might expect, although there is nothing to say that he did not consciously change his style after that. Chapter three on the other hand, grapples with the same question of the tougher 'Horatian Ode'. Even if we do not know of the private or public nature of the poem, it does not make it a pointless attribute given the varying hypotheses that come with different writing conditions. Additionally, in trying to read 'The Garden' firmly in a historical context of the late 1660s in chapter four, this will hopefully fend off simplified ideas that he is a lesser poet when he enters his career in government, and that he leaves his private lyric career behind when he does so. Alternatively, we need to consider placing 'The Garden' in a much more publicly orientated context.

There is comfort in the knowledge that Marvell can always look inward and express himself in verse; he is the poet who establishes the private sovereignty of seventeenth-century poets. In the 1660s Marvell elevated beyond Milton as a prominent public figure. He had passed from the crowded London houses to the architectural delights of continental Europe, and experienced both extremes of private and public life, all too aware of the dilemmas and the

desires the split caused. However, for all his experience, although he does on to publish prose works, he does not forsake the deep roots of his privacy. 'The Garden', however, exemplifies the majority of poems read in the context of privacy. There is a sense of defeat at the physical state of privacy wittily parried against a sense of victory found in private writing, finding no safer place to turn that inwards and to poetry. I sincerely hope that reading Marvell in the historical context of privacy opens up a new wealth of possibilities, since, as John Potter declares, they would all belong to Marvell.² Returning full circle to the *theologia negativa*, that which is not known, in questioning whether I am any closer to answers of the infinite questions surrounding Marvell's works, I respectfully acknowledge that he is just too private to ever know for sure.

² John M. Potter, 'Another Porker in the Garden of Epicurus: Marvell's "Hortus" and "The Garden"', *SEL*, 11.1 (1971), 137-151 (p. 137).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Akrigg, G. P. V. (ed.), *The Letters of King James VI and I* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

Ashe, Simeon, *Gray hayres crowned with grace a sermon preached at Redrith near London, Aug. I, 1654, at the funerall of that reverend, eminently learned and faithful minister of Jesus Christ, Mr. Thomas Gataker* (London: A.M. for George Sawbridge, 1655).

Bacon, Francis, *The Wisdome of the Ancients* (London: Imprinted by Iohn Bill, 1619).

Boccalini, Traiano, *I ragguagli di Parnasso, or, Advertisements from Parnassus*, trans. Henry Carey, Earl of Monmouth (London: Printed for Humphrey Moseley, 1656).

Browne, Edward, *A Paradox Useful for the Times* (London, [s.n.], 1642).

Burgess, Anthony, *A Treatise of Original Sin* (London: [s.n.], 1658).

Burton, Robert, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (Oxford: Iohn Lichfield and Iames Short, 1621).

Campbell, Gordon (ed.), *Andrew Marvell (Everyman Poetry Series)* (London: Dent, 1997).

Cowley, Abraham, 'Of Solitude', *Project Gutenberg*, < <http://www.gutenberg.org/etext/3549>>.

Dauncey, John, *The English Lovers* (London: printed for H. Brome, 1662).

Davidson, Peter (ed.), *Poetry and Revolution: An Anthology of British and Irish Verse 1625-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Donno, Elizabeth Story (ed.), *Andrew Marvell: Complete Poems*, 5th edn (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2005).

----- (ed.), *Andrew Marvell: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978).

Edwards, Thomas, *Gangræna* (London: Printed for Ralph Smith, 1646).

Fuller, Thomas, *Triana, or, A threefold romanza of Mariana. Paduana. Sabina* (London: printed for John Stafford, 1655).

Gataker, Thomas, *The Spirituall Watch* (London: John Haviland, 1622).

Gernon, Luke, *A Discourse of Ireland*, ed. Caesar L. Falkiner, reproduced by Beatrix Färber, 'Corpus of Electronic Texts (CELT)', University College, Cork, <<http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/E620001.html>>, 1999-2007.

Herbert, Sir Thomas, *A relation of some yeares travaile begunne anno 1626, into Afrique and the greater Asia* (London: Printed by William Stansby, 1634).

Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan* (London: Printed for Andrew Crooke, 1651).

Ingelo, Nathaniel, *Bentivolio and Urania* (London: printed by J.G., 1660).

Jacobs, Joseph (ed.), *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae: the familiar letters of James Howell, Historiographer Royal to Charles II*, 2 vols. (London: D. Nutt, 1890).

Mackenzie, Sir George, *A Moral Essay Preferring Solitude to Publick Employment*, 2nd edn (London, 1685), p. 31.

Margoliouth, H. M. (ed.), *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, 3rd edn, rev. by Pierre Legouis and E. E. Duncan-Jones, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).

Philips, Katherine, *Poems by the incomparable Mrs. K.P.* (London: Printed by J.G., 1664).

Puttenham, George, *The Arte of English Poesie*, ed. Gladys Willcock and Alice Walker (London: Cambridge University Press, 1936).

Sibbes, Richard, *The soules conflict with it selfe* (London: Printed by M. F[lesher] for R. Dawlman, 1636).

-----, *The Bruised Reede, and Smoaking Flax* (London: Printed [by M. Flesher] for R. Dawlman, 1630).

Silesio, Mariano, *The Arcadian Princesse*, trans. Richard Brathwaite (London: 1635).

Smith, D. I. B. (ed.), *Andrew Marvell: The Rehearsal Transpros'd and The Rehearsal Transpros'd, The Second Part* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).

Smith, Nigel (ed.), *The Complete Poems of Andrew Marvell*, rev. edn (London: Longman, 2007).

Stuart, King James, I, *Basilikon Doron. Or His Maiesties instructions to his dearest sonne, Henry the Prince* (London: for Iohn Norton, 1603).

Patterson, Annabel, and Martin Dzelzainis (eds.), *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell: Volume I, 1672-1673* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2003).

Taylor, Jeremy, *XXV sermons preached at Golden-Grove* (London: printed by E. Cotes, 1653).

-----, *The rule and exercises of holy living* (London: Printed [by R. Norton] for Richard Royston, 1650),

Vickers, Brian, (ed.), *Public and Private Life in the Seventeenth Century: The Mackenzie-Evelyn Debate: Being a Facsimile Edition of George Mackenzie, A Moral Essay, Preferring Solitude to Publick Entertainment [...] (1665) and John Evelyn, Publick Employment and an Active Life Prefer'd to Solitude [...] (1667)*, (Delmar, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1986).

Secondary Sources

Achinstein, Sharon, 'Milton and King Charles', in Thomas N. Corns (ed.), *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 141-160.

-----, 'Milton's Spectre in the Restoration: Marvell, Dryden, and Literary Enthusiasm', *HLQ*, 59.1 (1996), 1-29.

Adkins, Joan F., 'Neoplatonism in Marvell's "On a Drop of Dew" and "The Garden"', *The Bulletin of the Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association*, 28. 4 (1974), 77-92.

Allan, David, "'A Commendation of the Private Countrey Life": Philosophy and the Garden in Seventeenth-Century Scotland', *Garden History*, 25.1 (1997), 59-80.

Alpers, Paul, 'Convening and Convention in Pastoral Poetry', *New Literary History*, 14.2 (1983), 277-304.

-----, 'What is Pastoral?', *Critical Inquiry*, 8.3. (1982), 437-460.

Alvarez, A., *The School of Donne* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1961).

Armstrong, Nancy, and Leonard Tennenhouse, *The Imaginary Puritan: Literature, Intellectual Labor, and the Origins of Personal Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

Barnard, Toby, *The English Republic 1649-1660* (London: Longman, 1982).

Bethell, S. L. *The Cultural Revolution of the Seventeenth Century* (London: Dennis Dobson, 1951).

Brandeis, L. D., and S. D. Warren, 'The Right to Privacy', *Harvard Law Review*, 4.5 (1890), 193-220.

Brody, Jules, 'The Resurrection of the Body: A New Reading of Marvell's *To His Coy Mistress*', *ELH*, 56.1 (1989), 53-79 (p. 74).

Brooks, Cleanth, 'Andrew Marvell: Puritan Austerity with Classical Grace', in Maynard Mack and George de F. Lord (eds.), *Poetic Traditions of the English Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), pp. 219-28.

Brown, Kathleen, "'Changed... into the fashion of man": The Politics of Sexual Difference in a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Settlement', *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 6.2 (1999), 171-193.

Brückner, Martin, and Kristen Poole, 'The Plot Thickens: Surveying Manuals, Drama, and the Materiality of Narrative Form in Early Modern England', *ELH*, 69.3 (2002), 617-648.

Burgess, Glenn, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution. An Introduction to English Political Thought, 1603-1642* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992).

Burt, Richard, and John Michael Archer (eds.), *Enclosure Acts: Sexuality, Property, and Culture in Early Modern England* (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1994).

Bush, Douglas, 'Marvell's Horation Ode', *Sewanee Review*, 60 (1952), 363 – 376.

- Carlin, Norah, 'Toleration for Catholics in the Puritan Revolution', in Ole Peter Grell and Robert W. Scribner (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 216-230.
- Carpenter, Margaret Ann, 'Marvell's Garden', *SEL*, 10.1 (1970), 155-171.
- Carson, Anne Elizabeth, 'The Hunted Stag and the Beheaded King', *SEL*, 45.3 (2005), 537-556.
- Cassirer, Ernst, *The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy*, trans. Mario Domandi (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963).
- Cate, Fred, *Privacy in the Information Age* (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1997).
- Chartier, Roger (ed.), *Passions of the Renaissance, vol. 3 of A History of Private Life*, gen. eds. Philippe Ariès and Georges Duby, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA; London: Belknap Press, 1989).
- Chernaik, Warren, and Martin Dzelzainis (eds.), *Marvell and Liberty* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999).
- , *The Poetry of Limitation: A Study of Edmund Waller* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1968).
- Coffey, John, 'Puritanism and Liberty Revisited: The Case for Toleration in the English Revolution', *HJ*, 41.4 (1998), 961-985.
- Cogswell, Thomas, 'Underground Verse and the Transformation of Early Stuart Political Culture', *HLQ*, 60.3 (1999), 303-326.
- , 'The Politics of Propaganda: Charles I and the People in the 1620s', *The Journal of British Studies*, 29.3 (1990), 187-215.
- Colie, Rosalie L., *"My Ecchoing Song": Marvell's Poetry of Criticism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970).
- Collinson, Patrick, 'The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 69 (1986), 394-424.
- , *The Religion of Protestants* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).
- Condren, Conal, and A.D. Cousins (eds.), *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1990).
- Coolidge, John S., 'Marvell and Horace', *Modern Philology*, 63 (1965), 111-120.
- Corns, Thomas N. (ed.), *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Coughlan, Patricia, 'Classical Theory and Influences in the Non-Satiric Poetry of Andrew Marvell', (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of London, 1980).
- Cowan, Brian, 'The Rise of the Coffeehouse Reconsidered', *HJ*, 41.1 (2004), 21-46.
- Craze, Michael, *The Life and Lyrics of Andrew Marvell* (London: Macmillan, 1979),

- Creaser, John, 'Prosodic Styles and Conceptions of Liberty in Milton and Marvell', *Milton Quarterly*, 34.1 (2000), 1-13.
- Cressy, David, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution 1640-1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- , 'The Protestation Protested, 1641 and 1642', *HJ*, 45.2 (2002), 251-279.
- Cust, Richard, and Ann Hughes (eds.), *The English Civil War* (London: Arnold, 1997).
- , 'News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England', *Past and Present*, 112 (1986), 60-90.
- Donegan, Barbara, 'The Web of Honour: Soldiers, Christians, and Gentlemen in the English Civil War', *HJ*, 44.2 (2001), 365-389.
- Dow, F. D., *Radicalism in the English Revolution 1640-1660*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985).
- Duncan-Jones, Elsie, 'Marvell: A Great Master of Words', *The Proceedings of the British Academy*, 61 (1975), 267-290.
- Ellis, Aytoun, *The Penny Universities: A History of the Coffee Houses* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1956).
- Everett, Barbara, 'The shooting of the bears: poetry and politics in Andrew Marvell', in R. L. Brett (ed.), *Andrew Marvell: Essays on the Tercentenary of His Death* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 62-103.
- Evelt, David, "'Paradice's Only Map": The *Topos* of the *Locus Amoenus* and the Structure of *Upon Appleton House*', *PMLA*, 85.3 (1970), 504-513.
- Firth, C. H., 'Cromwell and the Crown', *EHR*, XVII (1902), 429-442.
- Fischer-Yinon, Yochi, 'The Original Bundlers: Boaz And Ruth, and Seventeenth-Century English Courtship Practices', *Journal of Social History*, 35.3 (2002), 683-705.
- Fox, Adam, 'Rumour, News and Popular Political Opinion in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England', *HJ*, 70.3 (1997), 597-620.
- , 'Custom, Memory and the Authority of Writing', in Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox and Steve Hindle (eds.), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 89-116.
- Freist, Dagmar, *Governed by Opinion: Politics, Religion and the Dynamics of Communication in Stuart London, 1637-1645* (London: Tauris Academic, 1997).
- Fogle, French, 'Marvell's "Tough Reasonableness" and the Coy Mistress', in Kenneth Friedenreich (ed.), *Tercentenary Essays in Honor of Andrew Marvell* (Hamden, CN: Archon, 1977), pp. 121-139.
- Friedman, Donald M., 'Andrew Marvell', in Thomas N. Corns (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Poetry: Donne to Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 275-304 (p. 277).
- , *Marvell's Pastoral Art* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970).

- Garber, Daniel, 'Descartes, René', in E. Craig (ed.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 2003), <<http://www.rep.routledge.com/article/DA026SECT5>>, accessed 10.05.2007.
- Goodman, Dena, 'Public Sphere and Private Life: Toward a Synthesis of Current Historiographical Approaches to the Old Regime', *History and Theory*, 31. 1 (1992), 1-20.
- Graham, Elspeth, 'Women's Writing and the Self', in Helen Wilcox (ed.), *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 209-233.
- Greenberg, Stephen, 'Plague, the Printing Press, and Public Health in Seventeenth-Century London', *HLQ*, 67.4 (2004), 508-527.
- Gregory, Derek, and John Urry (eds.), 'Introduction', in *Social Relations and Spatial Structures* (London: Macmillan, 1985), pp. 1-8.
- Griffin, Patsy, *The Modest Ambition of Andrew Marvell: A Study of Marvell and His Relation to Lovelace, Fairfax, Cromwell and Milton* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1995).
- Griffiths, Paul, 'Secrecy and Authority in Late Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century London', *HJ*, 40.4 (1997), 925-951.
- Grossman, Marshall, *The Story of All Things: Writing the Self in English Renaissance Narrative Poetry* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998).
- Haber, Judith, *Pastoral and the Poetics of Self-Contradiction: Theocritus to Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Habermas, Jürgen, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. by Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989).
- Hackel, Heidi Brayman, *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender and Literacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Haefeli, Evan, 'Words and Power in Stuart England', *HLQ*, 69.3 (2006), 469-476.
- Halasz, Alexandra, *The Marketplace of Print, Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Hammond, Paul, 'Marvell's Sexuality', *SC*, 11 (1996), 87-123.
- Harding, Vanessa, 'Space, Property and Propriety in Urban England', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 32.4 (2002), 549-569.
- , 'The Population of London, 1550-1700: A Review of the Published Evidence', *London Journal*, 15 (1990), 111-128.
- Harkins, Matthew, "'Forward Youth" and Marvell's 'An Horatian Ode'", *Criticism*, 45.3 (2003), 343-358.
- Harris, Jonathan Gil, *Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic: Discourses of Social Pathology in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Hartman, Geoffrey, 'Marvell, St. Paul, and the Body of Hope', *ELH*, 31 (1964), 175-94.

- Hartwig, Joan, 'Marvell's Metamorphic Fleckno', *SEL*, 36 (1996), 171-212.
- Hatty, Suzanne, and James Hatty, *The Disordered Body: Epidemic Disease and Cultural Transformation* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999).
- Healy, Margaret, *Fictions of Disease in Early Modern England: Bodies, Plagues and Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001).
- Healy, Thomas, and Jonathan Sawday (eds.), *Literature and the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- Hill, Christopher, *The Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution Revisited* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997).
- Hirst, Derek, 'That Sober Liberty: Marvell's Cromwell in 1654', in John Wallace (ed.), *The Golden and the Brazen World: Papers in Literature and History, 1650-1800* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), pp. 17-53.
- , and Richard Strier (eds.), 'Introduction', in *Writing and Political Engagement in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 1-9.
- , and Steven N. Zwicker, 'High Summer at Nun Appleton, 1651: Andrew Marvell and Lord Fairfax's Occasions', *HJ*, 36.2 (1993), 247-269.
- , and Steven N. Zwicker, 'Andrew Marvell and the Toils of Patriarchy: Fatherhood, Longing, and the Body Politic', *ELH*, 66.3 (1999), 629-654.
- Hodge, R. I. V., *Foreshortened Time: Andrew Marvell and Seventeenth Century Revolutions* (Ipswich: Brewer, 1978).
- Holstun, James, "'Will you Rent our Ancient Love Asunder?": Lesbian Elegy in Donne, Marvell and Milton', *ELH*, 54.4 (1987), 835-867.
- Huebert, Ronald, 'Privacy: The Social History of a Word', *Sewanee Review*, 105 (1997), 21-38.
- Hunt, John Dixon, *Andrew Marvell: His Life and Writings* (London: Elek, 1978).
- Hunter, Larry, 'Public Image', in Deborah Johnson and Helen Nissenbaum (eds.), *Computers, Ethics, and Social Values* (Englewood Cliffs; London: Prentice Hall, 1995), pp. 293-298.
- Hyfret, R. H., 'Marvell's "Horatian Ode"', *Review of English Studies*, 12 (1961), 160-172.
- Hyman, Lawrence, 'Marvell's Garden', *ELH*, 25 (1958), 13-22.
- Ingram, Martin, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- Jacob, Margaret C., 'The mental landscape of the public sphere: a European perspective', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 28.1 (1994), 95-113.
- Jagodzinski, Cecile M., *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth-Century England* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999).

Jankowski, Theodora A., 'Good Enough to Eat: The Domestic Economy of Woman-Woman Eroticism in Margaret Cavendish and Andrew Marvell', in Corinne Abate (ed.), *Privacy, Domesticity, and Women in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), pp. 83-110.

Kalstone, David, 'Marvell and the Fictions of Pastoral', *ELH*, 4 (1974), 174-188.

Keeble, N. H. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

-----, *The Restoration: England in the 1660s* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002).

-----, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth Century England* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987).

Kelliher, Hilton, *Andrew Marvell: poet and politician 1621-1678; an exhibition to commemorate the tercentenary of his death* (London: British Museums, 1978).

Keast, William R. (ed.), *Seventeenth Century English Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).

Kelsey, Sean, 'The Death of Charles I', *HJ*, 45.4 (2002), 727-754.

-----, *Inventing a Republic: The Political Culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649-1653* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997).

Kishlansky, Mark, *Parliamentary Selection: Social and Political Choice in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

-----, 'The army and the Levellers: the roads to Putney', *HJ*, 22.4 (1979), 795-824.

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

Koselleck, Reinhart, *Critique and Crisis: Enlightenment and the Pathogenesis of Modern Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988).

Kyle, Chris R., and Jason Peacey (eds.), "'Under Cover of so Much Coming and Going": Public Access to Parliament and the Political Process in Early Modern England', in *Parliament at Work: Parliamentary Committees, Political Power and Public Access in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002), pp. 1-23.

Lake, Peter, 'Defining Puritanism - Again?', in Francis Bremer (ed.), *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on Seventeenth Century Anglo-American Faith* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1993), pp. 3-29.

Leishman, J. B., 'Some Themes and Variations in Marvell's Poetry', in Arthur Pollard (ed.), *Andrew Marvell Poems* (London: Macmillan, 1980), pp. 86-106.

-----, *The Art of Marvell's Poetry* (London: Hutchinson, 1966).

Lindenbaum, Peter, *Changing Landscapes: Anti-Pastoral Sentiment in the English Renaissance* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986),

Lochrie, Karma, *Covert Operations: The Medieval Uses of Secrecy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), p. 136.

- Loewenstein, David, and Janel Mueller, *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- , *Representing Revolution in Milton and His Contemporaries: Religion, Politics and Polemics in Radical Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Love, Harold, *English Clandestine Satire, 1660-1702* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- , *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- Loveman, Kate, 'Political Information in the Seventeenth Century', *HJ*, 48.2 (2005), 555-565.
- Loxley, James, 'On Exegetical Duty: Historical Pragmatics and the Grammar of the Libel', *HLQ*, 69.1 (2006), 83-103.
- , *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (London: Macmillan, 1997).
- Lukes, Stephen, *Individualism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1973).
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *The Later Reformation in England 1547-1603* (London: Macmillan, 1990).
- Marcus, Leah S., *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).
- Mazzeo, Joseph Anthony, 'Cromwell as Machiavellian Prince in Marvell's "An Horatian Ode"', *JHI*, 21.1 (1960), 1-17.
- McRae, Andrew, *Literature, Satire, and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- McWilliams, John, 'Marvell and Milton's Literary Friendship Reconsidered', *SEL*, 46.1 (2006), 155-177.
- , "'Who Would Write?' Andrew Marvell and the Act of Writing' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Bristol, 2003).
- , "'A Storm of Lamentations Writ': 'Lachrymae Musarum' and Royalist Culture After the Civil War', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 33 (2003), 273-289.
- Milward, Peter. *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (London: Scholar Press, 1978).
- Milton, Anthony, 'Licensing, Censorship and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England', *HJ*, 41.3 (1998), 625-651.
- , *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Morrill, John, Brian Manning and David Underdown, 'What was the English Revolution?', in Peter Gaunt (ed.), *The English Civil War: the Essential Readings* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), pp. 14-32.
- , Paul Slack and Daniel Woolf (eds.), *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).

- Nissenbaum, Helen, 'Protecting Privacy in an Information Age: The Problem of Privacy in Public', *Law & Philosophy*, 17 (1998), 559-596.
- Norbrook, David, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 245.
- Norford, Don Parry, 'Microcosm and Macrocosm in Seventeenth-Century Literature', *JHI*, 38.3 (1977), 409-428.
- , 'Marvell and the Arts of Contemplation and Action', *ELH*, 41.1 (1974), 50-73.
- Ong, Walter, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London: Methuen, 1982).
- Parry, Graham, *Seventeenth-Century Poetry: the Social Context* (London: Hutchison, 1985).
- Pask, Kevin, *The Emergence of the English Author: Scripting the Life of the Poet in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- Patrides, C. A. (ed.), *Approaches to Marvell: The York Tercentenary Lectures* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978).
- Patterson, Annabel, *Marvell: The Writer in Public Life* (London: Longman, 1999).
- , *Marvell and the Civic Crown* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978).
- Peacey, Jason, 'The Print Culture of Parliament, 1600-1800', *Parliamentary History*, 26.1 (2007), 1-16.
- , 'Order and Disorder in Europe: Parliamentary Agents and Royalist Thugs 1649-1650', *HJ*, 40.4 (1997), 953-976.
- Pincus, Steve, "'Coffee Politicians Does Create": Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture', *Journal of Modern History*, 67.4 (1995), 807-834.
- Pocock, J. G. A., *The Political Works of James Harrington* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).
- Post, Jonathan F. S., *English Lyric Poetry: The Early Seventeenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1999).
- Potter, John M., 'Another Porker in the Garden of Epicurus: Marvell's "Hortus" and "The Garden"', *SEL*, 11.1 (1971), 137-151.
- Potter, Lois. *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- Pritchard, Allan, 'Marvell's "The Garden": A Restoration Poem', *SEL*, 23.3 (1983), 371-388.
- Raffield, Paul, *Images and Cultures of Law in Early Modern England: Justice and Political Power, 1558-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Rambuss, Richard, *Closet Devotions* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998).
- Randall, Catherine, 'Calvinism and Post-Tridentine Developments', in Glyn P. Norton (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Volume 3: The Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 466-474.

Rasmussen, Ann Marie, 'Introduction', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 30.1 (2000), 1-4.

Raymond, Joad, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

-----, (ed.), 'The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century', in *News, Newspapers, and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass, 1999), pp. 109-140.

Reedy, Gerard, "'An Horation Ode" and "Tom May's Death"', *SEL*, 20 (1980), 137-151.

Rees, Christine, *The Judgement of Marvell* (London: Pinter, 1989).

Robbins, Caroline, 'Marvell's Religion: Was He a New Methodist?', *JHI*, 23.2 (1962), 268-272.

Robertson, Randy, 'Lovelace and the "barbed Censurers": *Lucasta* and Civil War Censorship', *Studies in Philology*, 103.4 (2006), 465-498.

Røstvig, Maren-Sofie, 'Andrew Marvell's "The Garden": A Hermetic Poem', *English Studies*, 40 (1959).

Rozenberg, Joshua, *Privacy and the Press* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Sawday, Jonathan, 'Re-Writing a Revolution: History, Symbol, and Text in the Restoration', *SC*, 7.2 (1992), 171-199.

Scott, James C., *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

Scott, Jonathan, 'The English Republican Imagination', in John Morrill (ed.), *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s* (London: Collins and Brown, 1991), pp. 35-54.

Shagan, Ethan, *Popular Politics in the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Sharpe, Kevin, 'Private Conscience and Public Duty in the Writings of Charles I', *HJ*, 40.3 (1997), 643-665.

-----, 'The Image of Virtue: The Court and Household of Charles I, 1625-1642', in David Starkey (ed.), *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the English Civil War* (London: Longman, 1987), pp. 226-260.

-----, and Steven Zwicker (eds.), *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).

Skerpan, Elizabeth, *The Rhetoric of Politics in the English Revolution, 1642-1660* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1992).

Skulsky, Harold, 'Upon Appleton House: Marvell's Comedy of Discourse', *ELH*, 52.3 (1985), 591-620.

Smith, David, *Oliver Cromwell: Politics and Religion in the English Revolution, 1640-1658* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

- Smith, Charles Kay, 'French Philosophy and English Politics in Interregnum Poetry', in R. Malcolm Smuts (ed.), *The Stuart Court and Europe: Essays in Politics and Political Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 177-209.
- Smith, Nigel, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994).
- Smuts, R. Malcolm, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987).
- Spurr, John, 'England 1649-1750: Differences Contained?' in Steven N. Zwicker (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature, 1650-1740* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 3-32.
- Stempel, Daniel, 'The Garden: Marvell's Cartesian Ecstasy', *JHI*, 28. 1 (1967), 99-114.
- Stocker, Margarita, *Apocalyptic Marvell: The Second Coming in Seventeenth-Century Poetry* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1986).
- Stone, Lawrence, *Road to Divorce: England 1530-1987* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
- Sussman, Charlotte, 'Women's private reading and political action, 1649-1838', in Timothy Morton and Nigel Smith (eds.), *Radicalism in British Literary Culture, 1650-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 133-150.
- Summers, Joseph H., 'Marvell's Nature', *ELH*, 20.2 (1953), 121-135.
- Sutherland, James, *English Literature of the Late Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).
- Swan, Jim, 'At Play in the Garden of Ambivalence: Andrew Marvell and the Green World', *Criticism*, 17 (1975), 295-307.
- Thomas, Keith, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971).
- Turner, James Grantham, *One Flesh: Paradisal Marriage and Sexual Relations in the Age of Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).
- Underdown, David, 'The Taming of the Scold: the Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England', in Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson (eds.), *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 116-136.
- Wall, Wendy, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993).
- Wallace, John M., *Destiny His Choice: the Loyalism of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968).
- Wallerstein, Ruth, *Studies in Seventeenth Century Poetic* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1950).
- Walter, John, 'The English People and the English Revolution Revisited', *Historical Workshop Journal*, 61 (2006), 171-182.
- Westlin, Alan, *Privacy and Freedom* (New York: Athenaeum, 1967).

Wheale, Nigel, *Writing and Society: Literacy, Print and Politics in Britain 1590-1660* (London: Routledge, 1999).

Wilcher, Robert, *Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

Williams, Raymond, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976).

Williamson, George. 'The Context of Marvell's "Hortus" and "Garden"', *Modern Language Notes*, 76.7 (1961), 590-598.

Withington, Philip, *The Politics of Commonwealth: Citizens and Freemen in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Woolrych, Austin, 'Cromwell as a Soldier', in John Morrill (ed.), *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (London: Longman, 1990), pp. 93-118.

Worden, Blair, 'Literature and political censorship in early modern England', in A. C. Duke and C. A. Tamse (eds.), *Too Mighty to Be Free: Censorship in Britain and the Netherlands: Britain and the Netherlands* Vol. IX (Zutphen: De Walburg, 1988), pp. 45-62.

-----, 'The Politics of Marvell's Horatian Ode', *HJ*, 27.3 (1984), 525-547.

-----, *The Rump Parliament, 1648-1653* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).

Young, John (ed.), *Privacy* (Chichester: Wiley, 1978).

Zaret, David, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

-----, 'Religion, Science, and Printing in the Public Spheres in Seventeenth Century England', in Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993), pp. 212-235.

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