

A CRITICAL STUDY
OF
THE POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF ANDREW MARWELL

by
Caroline Robbins. B.A.

A Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of London. 1926.

ProQuest Number: 10096536

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10096536

Published by ProQuest LLC(2016). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

CONTENTS.

	page
Introduction-----	1
Chapter I. Early Life-----	6
Section i. Parentage, Education and Surroundings-----	8
ii. Marvell's Friends and the early Develop- ment of his Political Thought-----	16
iii. Marvell in Office and in Richard Crom- well's Parliament-----	30
Chapter II. Marvell's early Parliamentary Career and Work for Hull-----	41
Section i. The Convention Parliament-----	41
ii. Marvell in the Cavalier Parliament, his Relations with Hull and Work for Trinity House-----	54
Some biographical notes:	
Marvell's visit to Ireland-----	69
Sir Jerome Smith-----	69
William Rensden and William Popple-----	70
iii. The Earl of Carlisle's Embassy to Russia, Sweden and Denmark-----	71
A note on the account of the embassy-----	80
Some further references to Sweden in Marvell's later work-----	81
Chapter III. Marvell's Parliamentary Activity and the Satires-----	82
Section i. Marvell and Clarendon-----	82
ii. The <u>Last Instructions</u> : Marvell's Views on Finance and Relations with Party Leaders and Personalities of the Day-----	98
iii. Marvell's Attitude to the King-----	121
A note on Parties in 1666-7-----	127
Chapter IV. The <u>Rehearsal Transposed</u> -----	128
Section i. The King, the Bishops and Toleration-----	130
ii. Theories of Marvell and his Opponents-----	151
iii. Distribution and Popularity-----	184
Authorship of the <u>Letter from a Person of Quality</u> -----	195

Chapter V. The <u>Growth of Popery</u> -----	196
Section i. Marvell's Satires and Parliamentary Activ- ities between the <u>Rehearsal Transposed</u> and the <u>Growth of Popery</u> -----	198
ii. Reasons for the Issue and some Discussion of its Sources-----	236
iii. Marvell's Politics-----	259
iv. The immediate Effect and subsequent Influ- ence of the <u>Growth of Popery</u> -----	304
A parallel between the <u>Seasonable Argument</u> and the <u>Growth of Popery</u> -----	330.
Conclusion-----	331
Appendix I. William Dutton-----	352
II. A Note on the Old Parliamentary History as a Source for the History of the Convention Parliament in 1660-----	356
III. <u>The Alarm</u> -----	364
IV. Marvell's Parliamentary Committees, Speeches--	376
V. An Attempt to show Marvell's Contribution to our Knowledge of Parliamentary Debates by the <u>Growth of Popery</u> -----	383
VI. The Marvell Legend-----	389
Bibliography-----	390

Abbreviations used throughout.

- Poems=Marvell's Poems edited by G.A.Aitken. 1901.
Satires=Marvell's Satires edited by G.A.Aitken. 1901.
Grosart II.=A.B.Grosart's edition of Marvell's letters. 1873.
Grosart III.=Grosart's edition of the Rehearsal Transposed. 1874.
Grosart IV.=Growth of Popery, unless specified as Mr. Smirke. 1875.
- Thompson=Thompson's edition of Marvell's works. 1776.
- Thurloe=Thurloe State Papers, 7 volumes. 1742.
- Grey=A.Grey's Debates 1667-1694.
O.P.H.=Old Parliamentary History. 1751-1761.
Parl. Hist.=W.Cobbet's Parliamentary History, volume IV.
- P.C.=Privy Council Registers.
Cal.S.P.Dom.=Calender of State Papers.
S.P.Dom.=State Papers Domestic, Charles II.
Hist. MSS. Com.=Historical Manuscripts Commission.
C.J.=Commons' Journals.
L.J.= Lords' Journals.
- M.L.R.=Modern Language Review.
E.H.R.=English Historical Review.
- Feiling=K.Feiling, History of the Tory Party 1641-1714. 1924.
- Pepys=Pepys' Diary, H.B.Wheatley's edition, 9 volumes. 1903-4.
- Masson=D.Masson, Life of Milton. 1859-1894.
- Baxter=The Autobiography of R.Baxter, edited by Lloyd Thomas. 1925.
(unless otherwise specified.)
- Cont.=Clarendon, History of the Rebellion, Life and Continuation.
Oxford, 1843.

INTRODUCTION.

In the following pages I have attempted a study of the political activities of an ordinary member of Parliament during some of the most eventful years of early party history. Andrew Marvell was not, I think, until the very last years of his life of any very great importance as a politician. In the House of Commons, where Sacheverel, William Coventry, Cavendish and Williams voiced the opinions of their party, Marvell was seldom heard. At the same time, he was regular in his attendance and a list of the committees on which he served shows him an active member there. Outside the House he cannot be said to have been the most important exponent of his party's theories. Locke has, in his famous essay, given the final and complete account of the Whig creed. Marvell never enunciated a theory of any originality, and indeed never definitely stated his politics as such at all. He has, however, left a great deal of work from which his attitude to the passing show may be deduced. His pamphlets made him famous throughout the eighteenth century, and their influence may be traced in many histories. This is due pre-eminently to the nature of his work.

He was called the "Recorder" of his party, and indeed in his Last Instructions, in his Essay on General Councils, in his letters and most of all in his Growth of Popery Marvell is the chronicler of the "country" party, using the most insidious form of propaganda, the historical argument, to support its opposition to the Court.

Many inconsistencies may be found in Marvell's work, but this is inevitable in polemical writing extending over any length of time. Many of the inconsistencies, too, show Marvell only typical of his party and its inconsistencies. The fact that Marvell's record from 1665 is one of consistent opposition makes him yet more useful in tracing the development of his ideas and through him the development of the growing distrust of the Stuarts that was to end in the Revolution of 1688. It is interesting to note in this connection that, if Marvell be typical--and a study of his opinion goes to prove that he must be regarded as such--the Whig of 1688 growing out of the earlier "country parliament man" sprang, not from the republican of the Commonwealth period, but from the Cromwellian. This can be seen over and over again in studying the lives of men like Shaftesbury, Buckingham and Carlisle, and it explains the still important part that the "single ruler" plays in English constitution even after the shocks of two revolutions.

In dealing with the development of Marvell's political

career some historical background is obviously necessary, and if occasionally I seem to wander from the strict bounds of my subject I must plead this as my excuse. Because the work of whig or "country" writers has on account of its pseudo-historical character so often been taken as a source for the history of the period, I have made some attempt to contrast Marvell's representation of passing events with the actual problems which confronted Charles, and to notice the counter-attacks of the court to the efforts of the opposition Shaftesbury was beginning to organise.

Without some biographical details Marvell's later activities would lack a background, and, indeed, lose much of their significance. The friends he made during the earlier and better-known period of his life must be recalled when his political theories are studied, and even the character of his father and the nature of his education and travel must to some extent affect our conceptions of these. The embassy to Russia forms, it is true, what seems an isolated episode in Marvell's life. A tempting amount of material for a chapter on it exists, and any attempt to survey Marvell's political activities would seem incomplete without some account of what was perhaps his most important official position. In a sense Marvell's work for Hull and Trinity House must also be included amongst his political activities, but more than a most cursory survey of these

has been impossible, owing to the refusal of the Hull authorities to allow access to their Corporation documents.

It is with the winter of 1666/7 that Marvell's political activities become definitely involved in the development of an organised opposition to the government. For a while, during the temporary alliance of Buckingham and many of the "country" party with the court, after the fall of Clarendon, Marvell's opinions represent those of a very small minority in the House. It is at this time that his efforts for religious toleration made him notorious. With the break-up of the cabal and the failure of Charles to maintain the policy of the declaration of 1672 Marvell's work again becomes one of the weapons of the opposition. Most space has been given, therefore, to a consideration of Marvell's pamphlets, and to that kind of literature in general. They are of great importance in the period for the study of public opinion and the means taken to educate it. "Though some make slight of libels, yet you see by them how the wind sits. As take a straw and throw it up into the air, you shall see by that which way the wind is, which you shall not do by casting up a stone. More solid things do not show the complexion of the times so well as ballads and libels."⁽¹⁾

(1) Seldon. Table Talk. 1896. p. 185.

Some attempt has been made to discover the sources from which Marvell drew his material for the Growth of Popery, etc. These throw some light on the extent of the organisation which the "country" had evolved by 1678, and besides elucidate a few of the problems raised by L'Estrange's accusations of whig responsibility for, and complicity in, the Popish Plot. The importance and exact significance of the Growth of Popery in the emotionalism of that period to some extent explain the varying estimates of Marvell in the eighteenth century, in which period he is variously represented as either the champion of English liberty against a depraved monarchy and a designing Pope, or the chief example of the bigotry and hysteria which found so dreadful a manifestation in the horrors of the Popish Plot.

In conclusion I have attempted to estimate the extent to which Marvell may be said to have anticipated the theories of Locke and the Whigs of the following century, and to show through a consideration of his opinions the main characteristics of the earlier opposition to Charles II.

CHAPTER I. Early Life.

Any chapter on what is perhaps the most interesting period of Marvell's life is bound to be somewhat scanty. This is disappointing, but in view of the paucity of the material it is inevitable. But scanty as our material is, it is not unilluminating, and a rereading of the poems and letters of the period in the light of Marvell's known activities and friends gives quite a clear idea of Marvell's political position and ideas before 1660.

Two conflicting views have been advanced as to those ideas, neither of which quite fairly represent the truth. One would make Marvell definitely a Royalist in sympathy, though this ignores his later work under Cromwell; the other would endow him with republican ideas: Wordsworth indeed went so far as to class Marvell with Vane. But this is a misconception caused by a failure to distinguish the real significance of parties at this time. It takes into account the influence of a "Calvinistic" but Anglican father, the atmosphere of Hull and the friendship of Milton, but fails to remember Cambridge, Marvell's Cavalier friends and his own scathing comments on the experimenters of the period in his poems to Cromwell and in that letter to Downing recently discovered. It also fails to

realise that a Cromwellian might well be a moderate Royalist, and have been a supporter of the murdered King, who yet felt that only with the strong rule of Cromwell could the nation find peace. It is this idea of Marvell's early views which has caused many to class Marvell as a republican when towards the end of his life he became embittered with Stuart rule, whereas a study of his later work, although it reveals a far more cautious attitude to monarchy than, for example, the poems to Cromwell show, leads to the conclusion that Marvell was not a republican, but a whig, the distinction in his case being that though he would willingly have parted with the Stuarts he would never have supported a republican constitution; of this his description of the English state is ample proof. He would limit a Stuart far more straitly than a Cromwell; his "single person" of the letters to Downing has a more powerful part than that he assigns to the King in the opening pages of the Growth of Popery, but both works alike admit the necessity of a coping-stone to the constitutional edifice, without which the significance of both ideas is lost. Marvell did not start as a Royalist and end as an embittered republican, nor did he cling through the changes of his time to a republicanism learnt under Cromwell and Milton. He did however progress from a whole-hearted acceptance of Cromwell's freely conceded position as monarch through a moderate acceptance of

the Restoration to a position which can only be described as violently anti-Stuart, a state of mind which led at the Revolution to the acceptance by many of James' flight as abdication,^W which led, not to the formation of a republic, but to a limited and senate-ruled monarchy.

Section 1. Parentage, Education and Surroundings, etc.

The Reverend Andrew Marvell, a clergyman of some reputation, was born at Meldreth in Cambridgeshire⁽¹⁾ and educated at Emmanuel College.⁽²⁾ In 1612 he married Anne Pease, of a family well known in Yorkshire,⁽³⁾ a further connection with the county to which he had already come as a curate two years earlier. Throughout the rest of his life he was associated with Yorkshire, and after 1624 with the town of Kingston-upon-Hull. There he was master of the Charterhouse, and minister of Trinity Church.⁽⁴⁾ He was not, however, as was until recently supposed, a schoolmaster in the famous Grammar School where his son was educated.⁽⁵⁾ He is said to have behaved with great courage during the outbreaks of the plague in 1635 and in 1639, preaching in spite of the risk the funeral sermon of the

(1) Fuller's Worthies I. 240. (1840)

(2) Venn. Alumni Cantab. (1922) Part I. iii. 154a. Marvell was admitted 1601, scholar 1604, Bachelor 1604/5, Master 1608, ordained at York 1608/9, Minister of Flamborough 1610, vicar of Winestead 1614-24.

(3) Aitken. Intro. to Poems of Andrew Marvell (1903) p.xx.

(4) D.N.B. and authorities there quoted.

(5) M.L.R. 1922 p.351/2. Some Biographical Notes on Andrew Marvell by H.N.Margoliouth.

(1)
 Mayor, John Ramsden. His preaching was much appreciated,
 and after his death a posthumous volume of sermons was "eager-
 ly awaited"; on one occasion at least his eloquence received
 the tribute of a legacy. (2)
 In crossing the Humber in company (3)
 with a young lady one stormy day in January 1641, his boat
 overturned, and the Reverend Marvell was drowned. (4)

The elder Marvell's character has been preserved for us
 in the tributes of his friends. He was "most facetious in his
 discourse", but "grave in his carriage, one who never breached
 what he had new brewed". (5)
 Eachard, perhaps maliciously, calls (6)
 his doctrine "calvinistical", but some anonymous admirer of
 the Hull minister writes of "a pastor dignified". (7)
 His son refutes the charges of Parker that the Reverend Marvell was
 a rebel, saying:-"He dyed before ever the War broke out,
 having lived with some measure of reputation both for piety
 and learning; and he was moreover a Conformist to the rites
 of the Church of England, though I confess none of the most

(1) D.E.B., also Jackson's Memoirs of De La Prynne, Surtees Society (1870) no.44, p.286, Gent (1735) p.39. Perhaps a reflection of this plague is seen in the younger Marvell's Ode to Charles I. (1637).

(2) Fuller I. 240. One of these sermons is among the MSS. of the Temple library (Hist. MS. Com. report XII. 235) and has recently been printed.

(3) York Arch. Ass. Record series, vol. 9 (1890) p.165, Will of John Lister. See also p.73, Will of John Chambers, Rev. And. Marvell left 40 shillings.

(4) M.L.R. as above pp.356-8. Prof. Margoliouth has resifted the evidence for this.

(5) Fuller, as above. (6) *ibid.*

(7) Eachard, p.260.

(8) Notes and Queries, Series III. ii. 227

over-running or eager in them"⁽¹⁾. As he stepped into the boat to make his last fatal voyage over the Humber, and noticed the storm, he is reputed to have cried, "Ho for Heaven"⁽²⁾, and in that one recorded saying it is easy to see the facetiousness and bravery for which he was noted, and which were to no small extent inherited by his son.

Andrew Marvell was born at Winestead near Hull on the 31 March 1621⁽³⁾, where his father had held the living for some seven years. His godfather is supposed to have been John Duncalfe, of a well-known Yorkshire family and possibly related to the Marvells by marriage.⁽⁴⁾ Marvell was educated at the Hull Grammar School,⁽⁵⁾ and then at Trinity College, Cambridge.⁽⁶⁾ Very little indication of the trend of his early development can be gained from the now remaining material about this period of his life. Perhaps the earliest glimpse we have of the young Marvell is recorded in a later letter of his where he says:—"For I cannot but remember though then a child, those blessed days when the youth of your town [he is writing to the

(1) Grosart III. (Rehearsal Transposed) p.322.

(2) M.L.R. as above.

(3) D.E.B.

(4) Grosart I. xxii. A facsimile of the register is given. G. Foulson, in his Seignory of Holderness (1841) II. 480 and others had already noted the date wrongly given by Thompson and previous biographers.

(5) J. Fletcher, History of Yorkshire I. 14. A Humphrey Duncalfe, son of John, Mayor of Hull is called "cousin" by Marvell in several letters.

(6) Grosart IV. (Dr. Smirke) p.15.

(7) ~~Years as above for the Reverend Andrew Marvell.~~
Matriculated Trinity College 10 December 1699.

Mayor of Hull were trained for your militia and did we thought become their armes much better than any soldiers that I have seen there since⁽¹⁾. His college days however seem to have been ones of activity. The poems which Marvell wrote at Cambridge show already something of a Latin scholar; their sentiments are those of a conventional, though probably sincere loyalty, their subjects the usual ones for a Cambridge undergraduate. The last two verses of the "Ad Regem" are interesting in view of what was to come:-

"Serus in coelum redeas, diuque
 "Lactus intersis populo Britanno;
 "Reve te, nostris vitiis iniquum, Cecerit aura
 "Tollat. Hic magnos potius triumphos,
 "Hic ames dicipater atque princeps, (2)
 "Et nova mortes repartare prole, Te patre, Caesar."

Two incidents of Marvell's college days have become famous. One was his "conversion and capture by the Jesuits", the other his expulsion for either "marriage or absence" in 1641. Marvell's capture by the Jesuits has been the subject of much speculation. It seems to have been in effect an attempt by the Jesuits to convert some Cambridge students, amongst whom was Marvell, and induce them to go up to London to the Catholic services at Somerset House Chapel. A fragment of a letter preserved at Hull from a Mr. Brerecliff to Marvell's father mentions the case of his son and condoles with the Rev. Marvell

(1) Grosart II. 19. Marvell to Hull 17 November 1660.
 (2) Poems p.188 line 45 seq.

over his own similar predicament. The letter also states that the writer intends to take action, and there is some evidence to show that he carried out his intention, though the other father does not seem to have followed his example, and nothing further is known of Marvell's part in the affair or the extent to which he was involved in it. The experience, whatever its exact nature, does not seem to have had much effect on Marvell unless this early contact with the "papists" went to embitter his later campaign against "popery and arbitrary power"⁽¹⁾.

It is possible that the latter incident may explain the mystery of that Mary Marvell who published his poems posthumously, but whose existence as Marvell's wife has otherwise remained unnoted by Marvell or his contemporaries. It has always been concluded that the poet was expelled from College because of non-attendance, that being explained very plausibly by his absence in the clutches of the Jesuits. It is not, however, impossible, from the entry in the College books,⁽²⁾ that Marvell was one of those expelled because he had married. His name is merely among other names, and the reasons given are not specifically applied to any of them. Perhaps then

(1) H.L.R. 1922. Prof. Margoliouth has recently discussed this incident very fully, for the first time scientifically weighing the evidence for its probability and possible place in Marvell's Cambridge career.

(2) Printed by Grosart (I. intro. p. xxxiii) and others many times.

this Mary Marvell, who managed successfully to prove her right to an Act of administration by the Canterbury Court, was Marvell's wife through an indiscretion of his college career. This would account for the silence about her which is otherwise so remarkable.

It is not known how Marvell was enabled to support himself while on his travels. Unless legend is correct in placing him at this period in the office of some Hull merchant⁽¹⁾ these travels probably commenced after his expulsion from College and the death of his father, and lasted until some time after 1645, when he apparently met Flecknoe in Rome.⁽²⁾ It has been recently suggested that he went to Rome at least in the capacity of tutor to one of the Skimmers, who is known to have been in Rome at this time with a "gentleman".⁽³⁾ Marvell certainly had some connection with this family, though he did not inherit the money of that member who was supposed at one time to have been with his father at the time of his death.⁽⁴⁾ Mrs. Anne Sadleir, a connection of the Skimmers, was also known to the Marvells, and the elder dedicated a sermon to her.

(1) M.L.R. 1922. (as above)

(2) A poem on Flecknoe is one of the two which were directly the result of Marvell's travels.

(3) Times Lit. Supp. 5 June 1924 p.356. A letter from Prof. Margoliouth.

(4) M.L.R. as above.

Captain Thompson in his Life of Marvell mentions that he enjoyed a small paternal estate. ⁽¹⁾ The rate books of both Highgate and St. Giles, Holborn for this period having dis-
 appeared, and indeed any other possible source, ^{of information} enquiry fails to ascertain the nature of this estate, which may have been in land or some share in the business of his brother-in-law Edmund Popple who, with his son Will, certainly seems to have acted as Marvell's banker and to have managed his affairs. ⁽²⁾ Whatever his estate, however, tradition and the facts of Marvell's career--his constant employment tutorially and as a secretary--point to its inadequacy when unsupplemented. He received his pay as member for Hull regularly, this apparently being the usual custom at Hull, where his fellow member Gilby as well as his successors were also paid at the same rate. Besides this he received an occasional present of money for services rendered to the town and Trinity House ⁽³⁾ and also some legacies from friends--Sir Jerome Smith left him 40 shillings for his services as executor of his estate. ⁽⁴⁾ At his death an act of administration gave all his property to Mary Marvell, his widow, and John Green, his creditor. ⁽⁵⁾

(1) Thompson vol. III p.480.

(2) See Chap. II. note below p.70

(3) Grosart II. intro. xxxi and letters passim, e.g. p.585 Marvell to Trinity House 25 February 1677/8.

(4) So I am informed by the courtesy of Prof. Margoliouth.

(5) The act has often been printed. See Grosart I. p.liv. I have also checked this copy at Somerset House.

Though the poem On Dr. Joseph De Maniban records a visit to Paris, it does not commemorate the occasion of Marvell's first journey through France; ⁽¹⁾ that remains unchronicled, save in Milton's brief comment. In Spain he learned fencing as well as the language. ⁽²⁾ In Switzerland he at least went to Geneva and its "Bell Heli", and came to know its habits and surroundings thoroughly. ⁽³⁾ Holland provided him with the theme of his best-known satire, and the impression Venice made on him is recorded in many lines of his work. For the rest, little impression is left in his letters or poems.

It is not known that Marvell, even if he returned home in time to do so, took part in the wars. None of his enemies refer to the fact when they are raking up his Commonwealth record. He himself denies any part in public affairs until ⁽⁴⁾ 1657, but this surely not surprising in view of his long absence from the scene of events and the indecision which the varied parts played by his friends at this time must have induced in him, if indeed he ever tried to determine his exact

(1) The research of M. Pierre Legouis, the results of which he has kindly placed at my disposal, shows that the Poem to De Maniban, hitherto attributed to this early period, must be placed at least as late as 1674-6. His article on the poem will shortly appear in the Review of English Studies. See too below p. 70.

(2) Grosart II. 393. Marvell to a friend in Persia 9 August 1671. Spain is referred to Grosart III (R.F.). 454.

(3) Grosart III. 45. cf. the many jeers about "His pilgrimage to Geneva" in replies to the Rehearsal Transposed, e.g. Reproof, p.270, etc.

(4) Grosart III. 322. This denial should also prove that the early story of the embassy to Constantinople is a myth. No record of such an embassy with or without Marvell exists.

sympathies. His birthplace Hull was decidedly rebellious. On the other hand, young Lovelace and Lord Hastings were Cavaliers. The poems which followed Marvell's return home show the balance of his sympathies and help to explain the moderation of his conduct.

Section ii. Marvell's friends and the early development of his political thought.

About 1650 Marvell went to Nun Appleton in Yorkshire as language tutor to Mary, daughter of Lord Fairfax. There he wrote much of the "garden poetry" which has made him famous and the Horatian Ode, first of his poems to Cromwell. By the spring of 1653 his engagement with the Fairfaxes seems to have terminated, as we learn from a letter of recommendation written for him by Milton to Bradshaw that he was anxious for employment under the government. Milton's letter was a very warm commendation of Marvell's ability and character. It laid particular stress upon his command of many languages--Latin, Greek, Dutch, French, Italian and Spanish--which would make him an invaluable addition to the Secretariate. Marvell did not however obtain the post of Latin secretary yet, but perhaps this letter was instrumental in bringing him to Cromwell's notice, thus gaining for him employment as tutor to Cromwell's ward William Dutton, the orphan son of the Cavalier Sir Ralph

(1) S.P.Dom. vol. xxxiii. 75 (Cal. S.P.Dom. 1652/3 p.176)
Milton to Bradshaw 21 February 1652/3.

Dutton, and heir to the large Dutton estate. ⁽¹⁾ One letter only has survived of Marvell's correspondence with Cromwell over his ward, and that, though it shows the care and earnestness with which Marvell was commencing his charge, tells little about the master or pupil. ⁽²⁾ But it is not without significance that Marvell was regarded as a trustworthy guardian for one at that time destined to be Cromwell's son-in-law. It must also have been at this time that Marvell became acquainted with John Hales, author of the Treatise on Schism, ⁽³⁾ and with the Puritan Oxenbridges, ⁽⁴⁾ with whom Marvell and Dutton lodged at Eton.

When Marvell met Milton first is unknown, but he was now becoming more intimate with him and with his circle. In 1657 a more definite relation between them was made by Marvell's appointment as Latin Secretary and assistant to Milton. ⁽⁵⁾ That friendship had however already become well enough known to cause Mrs. Anne Sadleir's mistake about the authorship of Eikonoklastes. Writing to Roger Williams in 1654, she accused

(1) For a brief account of William Dutton see Appendix I. below.

(2) Grosart II. 1. Marvell to Cromwell 28 July 1653, Eton. The original of this letter is among the MSS. of the Society of Antiquaries of London. Letters to Cromwell CXXXVIII. no.66. Grosart makes many mistakes of transcription.

(3) Grosart III. (Rehearsal Transposed) p.126.

(4) Grosart II. p.1. Marvell to Cromwell as before. Further evidence of his friendship with this family is the epitaph Marvell wrote for Jane Oxenbridge and his poem on the Barabas.

(5) See below p. 30-1. for dates etc. of this appointment. Marvell's relation with Milton have often been discussed. See Masson, *passim*, etc.

Marvell of having some share in the work, an accusation supported by no evidence at all, but interesting as suggesting a fairly close friendship as early as that date. Marvell could already, it seems, be classed with the "Roundheads" where his politics were concerned by one who must have known something of him and his family personally. Though Marvell's admiration for Milton is well established, the extent to which he was actually influenced by his opinions is more difficult to gauge. The poems on Cromwell show a fuller acceptance of his regime than the older poet ever entertained, while Marvell's later work shows few if any traces of Milton's political thought. A certain love of freedom, of religious liberty and untrammelled expression of opinion is common to both, but it would be hard to show that this quality was not as native to one as the other. Perhaps the most definite result of their contact was the introduction of Marvell to many Commonwealth men and in particular the Cromwells. In another instance the influence is direct: Marvell's style owes something to Milton.

Marvell's friends and connections, though the information about his relations with them is so meagre, are extremely interesting. Besides the two Cavaliers Hastings and Lovelace

(1) H. Pierre Legouis in the *Modern Language Review* (1923 pp. 516-518) has emphasised and discussed the implications of this letter, which he also reprints in full.

and his numerous relatives in Hull itself ⁽¹⁾ whose influence and position there undoubtedly stood him in good stead, Marvell seems to have known the mathematician Dr. John Pell and James Harrington. ⁽²⁾ If Aubrey is to be believed Marvell composed an epitaph for the latter which could not be used "in case it should give offence". The author of the Transproser Rehearsed ⁽³⁾ mentions a speech of Marvell's in the Rota Club, and he has always been believed a member of that circle, though no actual evidence for that fact exists; his name is not given by Aubrey in his list, though that is expressedly ⁽⁴⁾ incomplete. Discussion there must have educated and enlarged Marvell's political conceptions even though these do not seem, in his later work at least, to have been greatly influenced by the more important and original ideas in the Oceana. Both Marvell and Harrington admired the "Venetian State", but whether the former was led to this by a study of Oceana would be difficult to prove in an age which so generally shared this admiration.

(1) Marvell had three sisters: Anne m. James Blaydes 29 December 1633. Her son Joseph was Mayor of Hull in 1702; Mary m. Edmund Popple 18 August 1636. Popple was often a warden of the Hull Trinity House and was Sheriff of Hull in 1658; their son William was a correspondent of Marvell's and was a friend of John Locke, a fact to be remembered in considering his uncle's possible influence. Elizabeth m. Robert Moore, father by his first wife of Thomas Moore the poet.

(2) Aubrey. Brief Lives (1898) p.293 ll.53-4.

(3) See below Chap. IV. p. 76. for full quotation. Transproser Rehearsed 1672 p.146.

(4) Aubrey I. p.290

It is significant that not only Marvell's birthplace but also most of his friends were "Roundhead" if not actually republican in sympathy. Two of them were among the outstanding thinkers of their age. Two also of his employers, Fairfax and Cromwell, were among the greatest men of action of the age. It is not therefore surprising to find a distinct progression in Marvell's ideas between the poems written after his return from abroad and the last poem before the Restoration. In reading the work of these years, however, it is often hard to find a definition of Marvell's political position. He is still primarily a poet. He is still young and very much inclined to hero-worship. He is also practical--Charles dying is a noble and pathetic figure, but the rising and victorious Cromwell is amazing in his strength and conquests. Marvell seeks and eventually obtains employment under the new hero.

The poems directly inspired by Marvell's acquaintance with Hastings and Lovelace bear the marks of a troubled mind freshly aware of "the infection of our times" that seem indeed "much degenerate" to the returned traveller. Marvell is inclined to blame the rebellious theorists:-

"Therefore the democratic stars did rise,
"And all that worth from hence did estrange."(1)

(1) Poems p.101 ll.25-6 On the Death of Lord Hastings (1649).

But his mood is more that of regret for the old times than of anger with any particular section of the community for destroying that "Candid Age" when:-

"Modest Ambition studied only then
 "To honour, not herself, but worthy men.
 "These virtues now are banished out of town
 "Our civic wars have lost the civic crown." (1)

Again, the poem on Tom May shows Marvell disgusted with the hypocrisy of many around--"those that do pretend"--, reverencing the memory of "great Charles", and, if not a passionate Cavalier, at any rate not a definite or enthusiastic supporter of the new regime.

Soon after the composition of these verses Marvell went north to the Fairfaxes. Hun Appleton inspired many of his best works, and perhaps here he hoped for peace from the troubles of the age, to pass a

"silent age
 "Far off the public stage".(2)

To the influence of the Fairfaxes has been attributed the
 (3)
Horatian Ode, probably written while Marvell was still in Yorkshire. It certainly shows a real admiration for Cromwell, tempered by an equally real sympathy with the fate of the dead King. It is the first definitely political poem by Mar-

(1) Poems p.104-6 ll.9 seq. To his noble Friend Mr. Richard Lovelace, prefaced to that poet's Lucasta, verses on the beautiful Lucy Sacheverel.

(2) Poems p.95 l.6. Translation from Seneca.

(3) Poems p.133. Horatian Ode.

vell, though it is still a poem, and too much stress could easily be laid on it as an enunciation of a political belief. It is important in any study of Marvell's ideas, for it reveals a tempered mind and an enlightened opportunism rarely met with in the conflicts of that time.

The keynote of the poem is this opportunism:-

" 'Tis madness to resist or blame
 "The face of angry Heaven's flame;
 "And if we would speak true,
 "Much to the man is due".

With the realisation of the expediency of accepting the new order is mingled a great, though, it would almost seem, a reluctant admiration for the "man" to whom is due much of the change, who

"Could cast the kingdoms old
 "Into another mould".

Through almost every verse throbs Marvell's consciousness of the fascination of this "greater spirit", his feeling that it is somehow right that he that "can both act and do" should have the power to act ceded him. Marvell even resigns himself to the military element in Cromwell's government for:-

"The same arts that did gain
 "A power, must it maintain."

Something must supplant the ruler who has, though "nothing low or mean", perhaps by natural deficiency lost his place:-

"Though Justice against Fate complain,
 "And plead the ancient rights in vain;
 "(But this do hold or break,
 "As men are strong or weak)."

and who so fit a supplanter as the returning general who has laid his conquests at the nation's feet:-

"How fit is he to sway,
"That can so well obey!" (1)

What this Ode reveals is not the political partisan, but the sympathetic poet who looks on at the changing scene, attuned to understanding with every actor in it, the fate of one equally with the success of another. Marvell dramatises the recent history of his time. He is not as yet criticising the policy of its makers. His ambition is dormant, he:-

"Sings still of ancient right and better times,
"Seeks wretched good, arraigns successful crimes".(2)

But he is also becoming most keenly aware of the possibilities of the new power.

The Character of Holland, written after his stay with the Fairfaxes, is interesting as the work of one who was now a declared Cromwellian, and as an example of a somewhat ill-mannered and abusive patriotism, riotous with the optimism of a successful foreign policy:-

"For now of nothing may our state despair".(3)

As a satire this was much admired, and, alone among Marvell's early poems, was reprinted in the reign of Charles II, during Marvell's own lifetime. His poem on Blake breathes the same

(1) Poems p.133. Horatian Ode (c. 1652).

(2) Satires pp.10-13 ll.69/70. On Tom May's Death. 1650.

(3) Satires p.14 seq. Printed 1653, 1672 etc.

enthusiasm and patriotic pride.

By 1655 Marvell's admiration for the rule of Cromwell had become pronounced, and he remained an adherent to the "court" party of the time until the Cromwells had finally and hopelessly fallen. The poems on the First Anniversary and on the Death of the Protector reveal all we can judge of his views at this time. Much of their sentiment may be discounted as the conventional tribute from a poet to his patron and employer, but undoubtedly they also represent an advance in Marvell's political thought, and a fuller consciousness of the significance of the political experiments and theories of his day. In 1649 Marvell was only recently returned from abroad; he was out of touch with the currents of thought in England. By 1655 he had had opportunities of meeting men like Milton, Lord Fairfax and doubtless Cromwell himself; he had had time also to decide his own standpoint. That was to be one that did not necessarily involve any actual disloyalty to the memory of the Royal "Martyr". Marvell saw in Cromwell the hope of his country and peace, and therefore accepted his rule. He had little patience with the theories of men like Vane. He was pre-eminently practical both in his own interests and those of the nation.

The First Anniversary is a panegyric on Cromwell's successes as Protector. Marvell introduces his theme by a

comparison between Cromwell's vigour and success with the usual lot of man, "declinⁿg always", and that of "heavy monarchs. Cromwell alone proceeds from strength to strength; kings are ineffective creatures, for:-

"One thing never was by one king done."

Kings

" fight by others, but in persons wrong
"And only are against their subjects strong."

Indeed they could easily be dispensed with;-they no more

" contribute to the state of things,
"Than wooden heads unto the viol's strings."

Cromwell, however, has "tuned the ruling instrument" and brought "order and consent" into its music, and has thus achieved what "tedious statesmen" have long sought in vain.

Marvell, though he would have liked Cromwell to be king, wished him still to be part of a well-balanced constitution. The central figure of the constitution would be Cromwell, making the "equal pillars"--the senate--one well-poised whole. That senate would play quite an important part, but Marvell was willing to see Cromwell endowed with more power, more prerogative, than he was ever to concede to Charles II as King. Cromwell would rule:-

" like a star,
"Here shines in peace, and thither shoots a war."

In the constitution Marvell upheld at this time the monarch

had a secure and an important place. Cromwell was obviously the heaven-sent ruler, and as such should be obeyed. If:-

"High grace should meet in one with highest power,
"And then a reasonable people still
"Should bend to his, as he to heaven's will"

then that man should rule, and with his rule would come prosperity:-

"If these the times, then this must be the man."

Although "this man" is loath to reign, would in fact "scorn to be a king", yet surely he will be persuaded when he thinks:-

" 'Tis not a freedom that, where all command,
"Nor tyranny, where one does them withstand;
"But who of both the bounders knows to lay,
"Him, as their father, must the State obey."(1)

Marvell has no patience with men drunk with the wine of liberty; he desires only a "sober liberty" himself, and this may be best obtained under Cromwell's rule.

Perhaps the two words "sober reasonableness" best express Marvell's politics at this time. The man who can inspire obedience--and "What man was ever so in heaven obeyed" as Cromwell--is the man to whom he owes allegiance. Strict justice and ancient rights must go before the need of the moment. A strong man alone can steer the ship of state, and when necessary the right of initiative must be left to his superior wisdom. This is not a basis for a political creed, and Marvell

(1) Poems p.139 seq. Lines on the First Anniversary

was later radically to change his attitude to rule by a single person. That attitude in 1655 was the direct result of events around, and the emergence of one who seemed a heaven-sent adjuster of difficulties. When that man and that need had passed Marvell was to develop a very different theory. Yet he was only superficially inconsistent. He was a monarchist though not a Royalist in the Commonwealth period because he felt that it was the only possible way to peace and therefore to a reasonable liberty; he very nearly became a republican under the monarchy of Charles II because he felt the nation's freedom and stability threatened by the attitude of that monarch. He was thus consistently an opportunist, and consistently anxious for the strongest and most successful government consonant with due liberty.

It is not difficult to picture the young Marvell about this time. A portrait shows large eyes, delicate brows and a sensitive, full mouth, a rather fawn-like and imaginative creature. The ruddiness of Aubrey's description is not yet, we imagine, more than the flush of youth; the stoutness of the respected member for Hull in the later portrait ⁽¹⁾ is not yet apparent. There is however even here indication of that sturdiness which has made "honest Andrew Marvell" a legend in

(1) In the National Portrait Gallery, London.

English politics in the square chin and shoulders.

After his years abroad Marvell had come back to a full tide of appreciation of all things English, above all, English things of the countryside. His ambition is only to live and die "an honest old countryman". He would be content only to

"See how the arched earth does here
"Rise in perfect hemisphere",

and to learn each detail of her "houses-work of no foreign architect", and brouse amongst the legends of the quarries and the stones of his native Yorkshire. He wants time to gaze upon the "low roofed tortoise", "the hatching throstle's shining eye", to seek out the giant grasshoppers of Cawdon Castle and watch the dance of "hamstringed frogs". He would revel in the sounds as well as the sights of the countryside, the "whistling scythe", the nightingale who adorns

"With music high the squatted thorns".

Sometimes he will recall memories of his travels where the Creator

" hangs in shades the orange bright
"Like golden lamps in a green night,
"And does in the pomegranates close
"Jewels more rich than Ormus shows".

or he will "exult in private his muse" and think:-

"Thus I, easy philosopher,
"Among the birds and trees confer
"And little now make me wants
"Or of the fowls or of the plants,
"Give me but wings as they, and I
"Straight floating on the air shall fly."

The "easy philosopher", perhaps because of this passionate love of his countryside, soon changed into the active secretary under Thurloe, and then again into the pamphleteer. Just as he had watched with such refinement of affection the life and flowers of Run Appleton, so Marvell studied his country's "liberties", and saw with immense resentment the Parliament and the spirit of his country's constitution in danger at the hands of Pope and tyrant. He had all the hatred of the countryman for the invader of his privacy and peace, and ^{already had} that impetuosity which was more than once to involve him in brawls both in the House and on his travels.

Marvell's pre-Restoration work contains all the quality of his genius. Without the industrious Aubrey's notes we should know little of his acquaintances or character at this time except what can be gained from the poems. But with only these and the later--so seemingly contrasted--satirical and polemical work to guide us, it should still be possible to postulate the connection between these periods of his development. Not only do the Cromwell poems show the insight and balanced sympathy of the future politician, but the earlier garden poems reveal beneath the grace and gaiety of the poet that tragic and ever-pressing intensity of consciousness that all beauty fades, that all life is transitory, only found elsewhere and in equal degree in this century in the poems of

Donne. That lack of balance and that bitterness which are found in Marvell's later work are explained when the extraordinary vividness of his appreciation of beauty is remembered, an appreciation which seems that of one soon to part with that which he admires. It would take little to make passionately resentful of any wanton destruction of the brief joy of English life and liberty the man who, when dallying with his mistress could cry:-

"But at my back I always hear
 "Time's winged chariot hurrying near,
 "And yonder all before us lie
 "Deserts of vast eternity."

Section iii. Marvell in office and in Richard Cromwell's Parliament.

Milton's influence had in 1653 failed to obtain for Marvell the post of assistant secretary, but his letter and the unofficial help Marvell had occasionally given ⁽¹⁾ doubtless kept Marvell's name before Thurloe, while Cromwell would be reminded of the ambition of one who was teaching his young ward William Dutton. It is therefore not surprising that by the September of 1657 Marvell found employment

(1) The poem to Christiana Queen of Sweden and the lines beneath Cromwell's portrait were probably not the only examples of this. I have been unable to trace the portrait beneath which these were intended to go. They are among the most often copied of Marvell's poems.

(1)
 in the secretariate. It has been suggested that Marvell had even earlier than this, even before his Christiana poems, been engaged in some kind of secretarial work. Captain Thompson in his edition of Marvell's works prints without comment the Latin version of the Declaratio Parliamentariae Angliae, published by order of the House of Commons in 1649, and, in the title-page given by him, stated to have been drawn up by Marvell under Milton's direction. (2) No copy of the Declaration in the libraries of the British Museum or Bodleian contains this statement, and although it is possible that Marvell, anxious for work, may have found it in this way through his facility in Latin, no satisfactory evidence supporting Thompson's assertion has been found. That Marvell took such work when offered him would not however materially affect the conception of him shocked into moderate Royalism by the execution of his monarch, and then an admirer of the conquering Protector.

Marvell, though nominally Milton's equal in the Office, held really a much more subordinate position. By the time he entered it Thurloe had centralised and subordinated the minor posts in the Secretariate, and all the assistants were more

(1) Thurloe VII. 187. Payment of salary in October: "due Xbris 1657 50..."

(2) Appendix to vol. III. of Works. Miss F.M.C. Evans in the Principal Secretary of State accepts this attribution, but has since retracted her agreement.

immediately under his direction. ⁽¹⁾ Marvell's duties included, besides the drafting of Latin dispatches, the writing of news-letters either at Thurloe's dictation or by himself, to foreign ambassadors. Two letters from him, written when Thurloe was too busy to attend to it himself, are among the letters that have been preserved to George Downing, English Ambassador to the Hague. ⁽²⁾ He was also employed to receive the Dutch ambassadors when they visited London in 1658, ⁽³⁾ and to communicate with the embassy from Brandenburg. ⁽⁴⁾ His knowledge of French and Dutch, and probably German, made him invaluable for occasions like these. Marvell continued in the Office until after Cromwell's death, walked in the procession that followed the Protector to his grave, and possibly retained his post until nearly the end of 1659. In the July of that year the last recorded reference to him occurs, when his name is among those for whom lodgings were voted in White-⁽⁵⁾ hall. The experience Marvell thus gained made him an active figure in the Convention Parliament of 1660, and was probably

(1) Miss F.M.G.Evans. Principal Secretary of State (1923) pp.109-121. Here is given the fullest account of the organization of the secretariate in this period, and of Marvell's part in it. cf. Masson V. 624.

(2) Add. MSS. 22919 ff.14, 78.

(3) Thurloe VII. 298. Nieupoort Dutch ambassador to States general 9 August 1658.

(4) Thurloe VII. 273. Schlezer to Thurloe 5 September 1658.

(5) Cal. S.P.Dom. 1659/60 p.27. cf. Masson V. 624/5 for a theory of the exact date--26 December 1659

amongst the reasons for Carlisle's choice of him as secretary for his Russian Embassy of 1665.

It was while Marvell was working under Thurloe that as member for Hull in Richard Cromwell's Parliament he first entered the House of Commons. His election to this has been the subject of a recent article in which the writer suggests that the reasons for his election have not yet been sufficiently explored, and further hints at some "management" of the return by Edmund Popple, Marvell's brother-in-law and Sheriff at this time. Before discussing this suggestion, M. Legouis's argument must be recapitulated. Marvell was not a burgess of Hull until early in the December of 1658, when by the solicitation of Edmund Popple, and by reason of his great "services to the town", he was granted the freedom of the city. He was in London at this time, probably engrossed in public business, ⁽¹⁾ and certain Hull citizens, among whom it is interesting to note two of the Lister family, already ⁽²⁾ benefactors of the Marvells, were deputed to administer the necessary oaths to him in London. On the tenth of January

(1) Thurloe VII. 592. A letter from Col. Bamfylde gives some idea of the quantity of business being transacted in Thurloe's Office.

(2) See above p.9 note(3).

Marvell and Mathew Alured were elected members of Parliament for Hull, although on the fifteenth Marvell had not yet heard this result. No figures are recorded for the voting on the election in the Hull records, and Ludlow states that Marvell was pushed in by "court" influence over the head of the republican Vane. Vane after some trouble was elected for Whitchurch in Southampton, but returned to his old seat for Hull with the Restoration of the Rump. M. Legouis does not feel that Marvell's family connection with Hull is sufficient to account for his election, and though he admits that the case is not yet proven, thinks that Marvell's subsequent "unseating" at the return of the Rump is some confirmation of his theory of a falsified return at the January election. He is further strengthened by the fact that Hull, far from showing displeasure at the return of Vane in 1659, sent congratulations to the Rump.

The question raised is interesting, for, besides its connection with Marvell, any definite answer to it would throw

(1) Ludlow's Memoirs edited by C.H.Firth 1894, vol.II. 51. "Great endeavours were used by the Court to prevent the election of Sir Henry Vane; and the their officers refused to return him at Hull and Bristol, at both which places it was said he had the majority, yet at last he was chosen and returned for the borough of Whitchurch in the county of Southampton."
 (2) M.L.R. 1925 pp.418 seq. For authorities used in the above account see M. Legouis's footnotes. He has carefully sifted the evidence for the election in this article and drawn attention to some points not hitherto noticed in this connection.

much light upon the electioneering methods of the day, and the degree to which Richard, even as early as this, had to rely for support upon the efforts of his father's officials. But the verdict of M. Legouis's case would seem, as he says, to be one of "not proven". Ludlow, who supplies the chief evidence against Marvell, was a partial chronicler. He was Vane's friend. No-one else questioned the election, and Vane sat for another borough without contesting the returns for Hull in the House. That he would have ample support there is obvious from Marvell's own recognition of the eloquence and vigour of his party. ⁽¹⁾ Marvell was twice again elected for Hull, each time with a definite majority. When Vane was in the ascendant, and had, as M. Legouis has himself pointed out, plenty of opportunity for revenging himself on him, Marvell retained his position as secretary. As for Marvell's "retrospective unseating" in 1659, surely that was only shared by him with all those members of Richard's Parliament who had not also sat in the Rump. These were on a later occasion excluded by a special act from sitting in that Parliament. ⁽²⁾ With the Rump's return Vane naturally filled his old seat, and Hull, ever anxious to placate the authorities in London, sent, like so many towns, its congratulatory address. Marvell had

(1) See below p. 178.

(2) Hist. MSS. Com. Report V. p.153. Newport to Leveson 31 January 1659/60.

retained his seat until the April, so that no unseating in the Parliamentary sense of the word--that is, ejection from the House by a decision of the committee of privileges that he was illegitimately in possession of his seat--could have taken place.⁽¹⁾

Thurloe, writing at this time says:--"Others, viz. the Commonwealth's men, stickle all they can to come into the House; as Sir H. Vane, lieutenant-general Ludlowe, Mr. Nevill, Mr. Scott, etc. I doe not heare, that Vane and Ludlowe are yet chosen; but there is noe doubt to be made but they will come in, and see will Lambert, who stands for it in some three places. This is like to be a very troublesome scene; and surely things are to be managed with vigour and life on the one side as on the other..... That, which I most feare, is disunion among freinds."⁽²⁾ In another letter of the same date Thomas Clarges says that Scott had got in for Wickham, but mentions that Vane is still out. Again, after the Hull election, he says:--"I doe not heare Sir Henry Vane or Major Salway are chosen; all the rest of our old friends to a man are chosen."⁽³⁾

None of the letters among the Thurloe papers suggests that any precautions were being taken by Richard's supporters

(1) It is interesting to note that Vane himself was excluded from the Rump when it re-assembled 9 January 1660. C.J. VII. 806.
 (2) Thurloe VII. 588. 4 January 1659. Thurloe to H.Cromwell. See also letter of 18 January p.594, etc.
 (3) Thurloe VII. 590. 4 January 1658/9. Clarges to H.Cromwell.

to keep Vane and the other republicans out, beyond the very mild "juggling" in cases like that of Green and Waller mentioned in a letter of Broghill about the election. This "juggling" consisted of bringing some influence to bear upon the electorate. ⁽¹⁾ Nowhere is there any suggestion of altering the returns to ensure the place of a member of Richard's party. Of "influence" Marvell must have had plenty in Hull, but at present Ludlow's statement and the absence of figures for this election--no very surprising fact in an election of this time--cannot be regarded as sufficient proof of an illegal ⁽²⁾ return.

The atmosphere of Marvell's first Parliament was stormy right from the beginning. The gradual increase of opposition to the "court" party can be traced in the letters to Henry Cromwell from various men in London. In one of these Charges writes that while they have "several men of excellent parts", these will be unable to prevent trouble over the bill for ⁽³⁾ the recognition of Richard. Their opponents will take their stand upon the Humble Petition and Advice, writes Thurloe. Parties have been further confused by the entry of several

(1) Thurloe VII. 597. 22 January 1658/9. Broghill to Thurloe.
 (2) In the article referred to M. Legouis says:- "Though the case for Marvell's retrospective unseating be not proven, yet the bulk of the evidence to my mind weighs decidedly against him, or rather his supporters, for he had no direct responsibility in the matter." Disagreement with this conclusion in no way affects the value of its underlying suggestion that the question of influence in these elections should be investigated.

(3) Thurloe VII 609seq. 8 February 1658/9. Charges to H. Cromwell.

supporters of the Anglican Church into this Parliament. As early as the preceding September the old Royalists had begun to raise their heads. ⁽¹⁾ The difficulties of the government were aggravated by the presence of many able speakers in the opposition. To this both Marvell, in a letter to Downing, ⁽²⁾ and Barwick, one of Clarendon's correspondents, testify. This latter writer defines the parties in the House as three: those for the Protector, those for the Commonwealth, and those moderate men whose vote's being uncertain made any forecast of events difficult. Barwick believed, and rightly, that the question of the army and the militia would shatter Richard's party. ⁽³⁾ By April his prophecy was fulfilled. Thurloe was writing to Henry Cromwell:- "I am not wise enough to understand the present condition of our affaires here." ⁽⁴⁾ Faulconbridge, Ingelsby and Gough alone remained faithful on the army and accordingly lost their positions. Richard's lack of ambition and Henry Cromwell's love of peace ⁽⁵⁾ made the change which brought back the Rump in May comparatively simple for the republicans to accomplish.

During these months Marvell is not known to have spoken in Parliament, but he was fairly active in the House, if his membership of five committees means anything. Fortunately his

(1) Hist. MSS. Com. Report V. p.143. Newsletter.
 (2) Add. MSS. 22919 f.14. Marvell to Downing 11 February 1658/9.
 (3) Thurloe VII. 615. Barwick to Hyde 16 February 1658/9.
 (4) Thurloe VII. 655. Thurloe to H.Cromwell 13 April 1659.
 (5) H.Cromwell to Parliament 15 June 1659. cf. p.686. Barwick to Hyde 21 June 1659.

letters to Downing, though brief, give a vivid glimpse of his opinions. He was enthusiastically for Richard's party. He displayed scorn for those who held that "all power is in the people". The idea of the republicans who would "pretend that they are for a single person but without negative voice, without militia" he ridiculed. ⁽¹⁾ His attitude to the "single person" may be compared with that of Hobbes:- "All the statute prerogatives may be granted away and yet the power to protect his subjects remain. But if he transfers the militia, he retains the judicature in vain, for want of execution of laws: or if he grant away the Power of raising money the militia is in vain: or if he give away the government of Doctrines, men will be frighted into Rebellion with feare of Spirits." ⁽²⁾

Marvell's Parliamentary Committees were mainly concerned with the affairs of the northern counties. His appointment to such committees as that to supply an able ministry for the north, to consider the housing of the records at Worcester House, probably arose out of his employment as assistant secretary and from his connection with the affairs of the north as member for Hull. ⁽³⁾

After the restoration of the Rump we again lose touch with Marvell's activities. He was probably working in Thurloe's

(1) Add. MSS. 22919 f.14. Marvell to Downing.

(2) Hobbes. Leviathan Part II. Chap. 18. Everyman Edition p.95.

(3) A list of these committees was first printed by H. Legouis in the article already quoted. See also below Appendix III.

office until the December, but what he did during the months of Monk's work and diplomacy in London is not known. Excluded from filling the vacancy made in the Long Parliament by Vane's ejection he had, when his secretaryship lapsed, opportunity to return north. It is, however, more probable that he remained in London, working either for Hull or for his brother-in-law's business. He does not seem to have taken any active part in events leading to the Restoration, though, like most other Cromwellians, his patrons the Fauconbergs, Carlisle and Buckingham, he must have welcomed that event as the only possible way to peace and stability. Nothing remains to tell what he was doing or thinking until the May of 1660, when, as their member in the Convention, he writes from Westminster the first of those Hull letters which have survived.

Chapter II. Marvell's early Parliamentary career and work for Hull.

Section 1. The Convention Parliament.

We have but one glimpse of Marvell during the months of Monk's rule and the various stages of the "happy and glorious Reatoration". On the eventful 29th of May, writing to the Commissioners of Militia at Hull, he makes but one bald reference to the day which makes Gumble, Lady Fanshawe and even Pepys lyrical and almost incoherent. "We have received yours of the 25 and would not misse answering you this same post though it be the day of the King's arrivall." We have missed much by the loss of these racy private letters which he may well have written at this time. His attitude may, however, to some extent be reconstructed from later references to the events of this spring. These occur occasionally in his letters to Hull, but the more interesting are found in the Rehearsal Transposed.

It need not be imagined that in 1660 Marvell was anywhere near the bitterness of the "Historical Poem", or that he yet regretted the return of the Stuarts, as he undoubtedly did later in his life. He was no opponent of government by a single person, as such men as Milton and Vane were, and once the Cromwells had fallen he was probably glad to see an end

(1) Grosart II. p.650.

put to all the confusion and constitutional experimenting of the last few years. Twelve years afterwards, writing of Charles' return, he points to one of the most potent reasons for the country's acquiescence in that event:- "The King came in by the miraculous providence of God, influencing the distractions of some, the good affection of others, and the weariness of all towards that happy Restoration, after so many sufferings, to his regal crown and dignity." ⁽¹⁾ This weariness, combined with the uncertainty from day to day of the direction of public affairs and the fear of the huge professional army at large, did much to make the restoration welcome. Men felt that they must at any rate be glad of "Peace, Freedom and a good Conscience". ⁽²⁾ Looking back over the "late troubles", perhaps many would have been found to agree with Marvell that "upon considering all, 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 the whole matter. 'The arms of the Church are prayers and tears', the arms of the subject are patience and petitions.... For men may spare their pains where nature is at work, and the world will not go the faster for our driving. Even as his present majesty's happy Restoration did itself, so all things else happen in

(1) Grosart III. The Rehearsal Transposed (1673) p.286.

(2) Grosart II. p.20. Marvell to Hull 17 November 1660

their best and proper time, without any need of our officiousness⁽¹⁾". This fatalism which had helped Marvell to accept the Restoration was to desert him in later life. By the time he wrote the Growth of Poetry he could not wait to see nature at work, but tried himself to drive her.

Among these things which contributed to the Restoration of the Stuarts the Declaration of Breda must be reckoned as important. This document undoubtedly impressed Marvell, together with other contemporaries, with the King's sincere desire from the first for some measure of religious toleration. Over and over again we find references both in Marvell's letters and in the work of men like Baxter⁽²⁾ to the King's efforts to give toleration against the opposition of Parliament, such as that from the Rehearsal Transposed:- "His Majesty before his most happy and miraculous Restoration, had sent over a declaration of his Indulgence, to tender consciences in ecclesiastical matters, which, as it was doubtless the real result of the last advice⁽³⁾ left him by his glorious father, and of his own consummate prudence and natural benignity; so at his return he religiously observed and promoted it as far as the passions and influence of the contrary party would give leave.... he imposed on himself an

(1) Gosart III. 212. Rehearsal Transposed.

(2) See Chap. V. below for more particular reference to this.

(3) i.e. the advice as given in Eikon Basilike.

oblivion of former offences, and his Indulgence in Ecclesiastical Affairs." So Marvell goes on to tell how the obstinacy of the clergy and others conspired to prevent the accomplishment of that which would have "perfected his Majesty's felicity." Later in the same work he remarks how Charles' efforts to "prepare things for an Accommodation" were defeated. "Notwithstanding this happy conjuncture of his Majesty's Restoration which had put all men into so good a humour, that, upon a little moderation and temper of things, the nonconformists could not have stuck out, some of the men so contrived it that there should be the least abatement to bring them off conscience and (which insinuates into all men) some little reputation." Marvell thus supports Baxter's view that at those conferences all that could have been done was not done to bring things to an amiable end. But whoever was to blame, it was not the King, for "God be praised His Majesty is far of another temper; and he is wise, though some men be malicious."

Marvell once read Parker a lesson on the behaviour of those who have occasion to change their opinions which might well be a description of his own activities after the Restoration. Avoiding the more controversial questions of the

(1) Grosart III. p.692 seq.

(2) Grosart III. p.214.

(3) Grosart III. p.96.

(4) Grosart III. p.67. He was also keeping silent no doubt out of prudence. "The Presbyterian is so inconsiderable in the House that the more prudent men of that party are silent." Hist. MSS. Com. Report V. 207. R. Mulward to Sir Rich. Leveson 16 May 1661.

day, he threw himself into such non-party Parliamentary business as the forwarding of the bill for the augmentation of the income of small vicarages, a bill for the separation of Trinity Church, Hall, from the parish of Hessele, and other matters more or less directly forwarding the interests of the port he served. The moderation of his behaviour was probably responsible, in part at least, for Marvell's retention of his seat, as many others did not, in the election of 1661. The Convention contained many more men whom Marvell must have known and worked with in the Commonwealth days than the later Parliament. Sir John Trot, whose friendship with Marvell is attested by the epitaph on his son and a letter to Sir John from Marvell when he lost his son, was the Convention member for Ash in Southamptonshire, but did not sit in the Cavalier Parliament. Others, like Northcote and Shapcot (who may have owed something to Marvell or Milton when they were secretaries) ⁽¹⁾ were examples of the moderate "Roundheads" who kept their seats. Although this assembly, like the succeeding Parliament, was intolerant, yet the divisions lists and reports of debates show a greater proportion of the old Presbyterian element in action than in the next year, when a tide of Royalism and loyalism swept over the electorate. That it accomplished

(1) Thurloe, State Papers VII. p.627. Shapcote to Thurloe thanking him for help in obtaining a post in Ireland.

nothing more lasting than it did was probably due to the anomalous legal position, the limited time at its disposal, and uncertainty on the part of the minority as to the exact scope of the bill of oblivion.

The Convention sat from 25 April to 29 December 1660 with only one recess in October. During all that time Marvell seems to have been present, though his letters to Hull until the November of that year have unfortunately disappeared. A list of the committees on which he served does not reveal him in any important position in the House, though he probably established a reputation for hard work and moderation.⁽¹⁾ What he himself would probably have regarded as his most important preoccupation during the year--apart from any share he may have had in Milton's release--was the care of the Bill for the Augmentation of Small Vicarages. Unfortunately this bill, which was designed to better the lot of the smaller clergy, did not get on to the statute book. Marvell reported twice on it from the Committee to the House.⁽²⁾

This is not, however, of much interest to us now. More

(1) M.L.R. 1923. p.420. cf. M.Legouis on Marvell in Parliament. M.Legouis gives a list of Marvell's committees and comments on the part played by Marvell in this Convention.

(2) The history of this bill has often been noticed in Memoirs of Marvell: in most detail by M.Legouis, op. cit. It is mentioned also by Marvell; see Grosart III. p.336 Rehearsal Transposed.

significant of Marvell's future attitude is the fact that he was teller for the yeas when the question regarding the bill to make law the Breda declaration was put to the House. (1)

Marvell reports regularly to Hull on the progress of this matter. When it was rejected he wrote:- "There is an end of that bill, and for those excellent things therein. We must henceforth rely onely upon his Majestie's goodnesse, who, I must needs say, hath hitherto been more ready to give than we to receive." (2) He notes among the results of this decision that "It is thought Mr. Calamy, and other moderate men will be resolute in refusing Bishopricks." (3)

Other committees on which Marvell served are connected with his former position in Thurloe's office, as, for example, that to examine the petition of the University of Oxford, (4) or that to prepare a letter in Latin to the Prince Elector. (5) It is strange to find Marvell on a committee to examine seditious papers, though as this concerned an unauthorised proclamation for the uniformity and use of the Book of Common Prayer

(1) C.J. vol.VII. p.191. 24 November 1660.

(2) Grosart II. 26. to Hull the dates given of voting 183 v. 157 differ from those given in Journals (p.194).

(3) Grosart II. 29. to Hull.

(4) C.J. vol.VII. p.74. 25 June.

(5) C.J. vol. VII. p.98. 25 July.

his presence may be a sign that this very Presbyterian assembly did not want its hand forced sooner than need be to such conforality. ⁽¹⁾ Another committee on which Marvell served was on the bill to prevent the voluntary separation of married persons. ⁽²⁾ This bill was provocative of a very amusing debate recorded in the Old Parliamentary History. Mr. Ferrars brought in the bill, and Sir John Northcote spoke on it with the remark that "it was not improper for an old Man to speak on Behalf of the Women". Another member said that "It was fit Women should have Livelihood; and yet not have Power to ruin their Husbands by their own Debts." ⁽³⁾ We may imagine Marvell ⁽⁴⁾ listening to the general levity with great enjoyment.

Though Marvell was on the committee appointed to draw up a bill for settling the Militia, he is not known to have taken any other part in that important matter during the time it was before the House. ⁽⁵⁾ But his attitude is revealed in his letters and later work. He looked back with regret to the days of the old Militia in Hull. The present bill did not please him long, as he soon came to see that it gave an ex-

(1) C.J. vol.VII. p.78. 30 June.

(2) C.J. vol.VII. p.183. 14 November.

(3) O.P.H. XXIII. p.9. Another debate took place on 30 November.

(4) Grosart II. 17. Marvell to Hull 17 November 1660.

(5) C.J. vol.VII p.195 etc. 30 November.

cessive power to the Lords Lieutenant of the counties. In the Growth of Pezery he remarks of the Act as it was passed in the next Parliament:- "which hath by an Act of theirs, determined a question which the wisdom of their ancestors had never decided, that the King hath the sole power of the Militia." ⁽¹⁾ Marvell had, it may be remembered, some interest in the settlement of the Militia question under Richard Cromwell, and was very much against the more professional standing army which the Stuarts, and for that matter Cromwell, would have preferred, and did to some extent succeed in obtaining. His idea of a militia was "A standing strength, but not as ill as a standing army to the nation." ⁽²⁾ The case of Robert Bloom, afterwards Mayor of Hull, but just now in trouble for his violent conduct as a captain of Militia there, must also have given Marvell some practical insight into the difficulties of the Militia there. ⁽³⁾

Opposition to the proposed Militia Bill had started as early as the November of 1660; trouble over its provisions seemed likely, and Sir Henry Cholmley only voiced the opinion of many when, replying to Mr. Knightly's motion for a settlement, he said:- "That the Militia was already in the King's Hands; that it had set them together by the Ears once before;

(1) Grosart IV. p.306.

(2) Grosart II. p.19.

(3) Grosart II. p.649. Marvell to Hull 29 May 1660.

(1)
 and desired it might be let alone." But the matter was not dropped before there had been some interesting debates on it. On the 16 November when the committee (on which Harvell served) brought in the bill, it was very strongly criticised. Mr. Pierrepoint moved for throwing it out because "There was Martial Law provided in it"; another member said that "he never knew a Bill that ever entrenched so far upon the Subject's Privilege as this did." References were made to the "last Mischiefe" occasioned by the Militia. The disorders which had lately taken place as the result of the Lords-Lieutenant acting as commissioners were cited to urge the necessity of the bill, but nothing was then decided upon. (2)

On the 28 November the debate was resumed. Then Mr. Stevens said;— "they ought to take Heed of putting an Iron Yoke about their own Neck and debate the Matter very seriously first." He went on to say that formerly the Posse Comitatus was sufficient to keep the peace. Another member's remedy was to restrain the power given to the Commissioners; another would have left out the clause said to impose martial law. Someone was "against giving too great liberty in that bill", but so little did another member agree with him that he compared it to Oliver's arrangement of Major Generals in 1656. (3)

(1) O.P.H. XXIII. p.2. Debate on 6 November 1660.

(2) Ibid. pp.14-15.

(3) Ibid. p.22 seq.

Marvell, reporting the progress of the matter to the Corporation of Hull, admirably summarises the attitude of the Opposition to the bill:- "The Act for the Militia hath not been called for of late, men not being forward to confirm such perpetuall and exorbitant power by law, as would be in danger if that Bill should be carryed on. Tis better to trust unto his Majestie's moderation, and that the commissioners if they act extravegently, as in some countryes, counties, should be liable to actions at Law."⁽¹⁾

Later Sir Heneage Finch tried to gain a resumption of the debate by showing the need for disciplining the conduct of the soldiers about whom complaints had been made, but although some of the members were now more favourable to a settlement even on the basis of this bill, there was not enough time to carry anything through,⁽²⁾ and the problem, so far as the Militia was concerned, was settled in the next Parliament. Then the aspect of affairs had been somewhat modified by Venner's Rising, and the subsequent re-enlistment of Monk's Coldstream Guards on Tower Hill.⁽³⁾

In December, Milton, who had been in the custody of the House since the summer,⁽⁴⁾ was released. This somewhat surprising

(1) Grosart II. p. 30 Marvell to Hull 24 December 1660.

(2) O.P.H. XXIII. p. 52. Debate on

(3) Fortescue, History of the Army. V. 11. and G. Davies, Coldstream Guards. (1924).

(4) C.J. p. 208 and S.P.Dom. XXIV f. 143.

act of mercy--or justice--has sometimes been attributed to the efforts of Marvell in the House. Masson in his Life of Milton has of course discussed the matter. ⁽¹⁾ It is, however, worth recapitulating here on account of the evidence produced for Marvell's share in it. Edward Phillips, Milton's nephew, in his preface to the Milton State Papers says:- "Particularly in the House of Commons, Mr. Andrew Marvell, a Member for Hull, acted vigorously in his behalf, and made a considerable party for him." ⁽²⁾ In the Journals another action on Milton's behalf is noticed. This was a complaint made after his release by someone whose name is not given about the exorbitancy of the Serjeant's fee charged to Milton. ⁽³⁾ This point is expanded in the Old Parliamentary History, where it is said:- "Mr. Andrew Marvell complained that the Serjeant had exacted 150 £ Fees of Mr. Milton; which was seconded by Col. King and Col. Shapcot. On the contrary, Sir Henesse Finch, observed, That Milton was Latin Secretary to Cromwell, and deserved hanging. However, this Matter was referred to the Committee ⁽⁴⁾ of Privileges to examine and decide the Difference." Unless

(1) Masson VI. 184 seq.

(2) This was published in 1694. p. xxxviii.

(3) C.J. vol. VII. p. 209. 17 December 1660.

(4) O.P.H. XXIII. p. 54. quoted in P.H. IV. 162. The names of King and Shapcot are interesting and not unlikely ones in this connection. Shapcot owed an Irish attorneyship to Thurloe, and may have been indebted to either Marvell or Milton, then in his office, for help in getting it. Thurloe State Papers VI. 627. It has been suggested that King was a relative of the Edward King in whose memory Milton wrote Lycidas. M.L.R. 1922. H.M. Margoliouth. Notes on Marvell.

the authors of this History have very much confused the Journals and Phillips' account, neither of these can be the sole source of information. The History also gives the names of two helpers to Marvell not mentioned elsewhere. It is on the face of it likely that Marvell did what he could for his friend. The question, though not of great importance in an account of Marvell's activities is of much interest in raising the question of the sources used by the compilers of the Old Parliamentary History, and therefore of its reliability as an authority for the parliamentary history of this time. (1)

1. See Appendix III below for a discussion of some of the Sources of the Old Parliamentary History.

Section 11. Marvell in the Cavalier Parliament 1661-1663. (1)
Relations with Hull and Work for Trinity House, Hull.

During the months between the dissolution of the Convention and the meeting of the Cavalier or Long Parliament in April 1661 Marvell was in London. After John Ramsden, his fellow-member in the Convention Parliament, returned to Hull, he writes to the Corporation of that city offering to continue such services as were in his power while he remained in town. Amongst these services were his letters, and also a continued interest in the business of the separation of the parishes of Trinity Church, Hull and Hessle. ⁽²⁾ Of most importance now are the letters which he continued to write until his death. They have often been commented upon as unique in their character; but although at present no other such series from a member to his borough is known, and so, in that sense they are unusual, such letters are by no means uncommon in a period when the provinces depended upon correspondents in town for news of the day.

Marvell's letters are essentially news-letters, and it is probable that the Hull Corporation relied on them instead of--or in addition to--others such as Muddiman's more offic-

(1) I am greatly indebted to the kindness of Prof. H.M. Margoliouth for information about the Hull documents which he has examined lately in order to re-edit Marvell's letters. This edition is due to appear in October from the Clarendon Press.

(2) Grosart II. p.39-40. Letter of 3 January 1660/1.

ial letters. A Mr. Mabbott had been their correspondent, and on his departure for Ireland Marvell definitely took upon himself the labour for which Mabbott had been paid, thereby, he says, saving the town that expense. ⁽¹⁾ It must also be remembered that it is at least probable that Gilby, the second member in the Cavalier Parliament, used also to write fairly regularly to the Corporation. On one occasion Marvell tells his constituents not to suspect any misintelligence between them if, unless upon an answer to a letter from them, they use their own discretion and write separately. ⁽²⁾ He also mentions letters from Gilby on other occasions.

Marvell seems to have taken notes in order that his information might be correct, and these he sometimes lent to Robert Stockdale, the town's intelligencer in London and Mabbott's successor. ⁽³⁾ Although he sometimes differs from the Common's Journals in the information he gives, as a member he would have access to them when he wished to confirm or supplement his notes. His letters are for some periods invaluable as a source of information, but on the whole it is a singularly colourless record which Marvell presents to his townsmen; he seldom gives an opinion on anything that has

(1) Grosart II. p.43. Letter of 12 January 1660/1, and cf. reason given: *ibid.* p.512, where he says:- "It is a tribute due from one in my station to your prudence to inform you from time to time of things that passe in Parliament."

(2) Grosart II. p.58.

(3) Grosart II. p.304, 320. Stockdale was associated with the members in the affair of Wise, pp.263, 264 etc. and is often mentioned in town business, e.g. p.225. For fuller discussion of sources of letter see Chap.V. p. below.

taken place, in great contrast to the freedom of those private letters that have survived, and to his satires. He seldom mentions any speeches other than the Royal speeches. In these letters he is indeed the "gazetteer" he calls himself. A partial explanation of his reticence is found in his references to stoppage of letters⁽¹⁾ and his reiterated advices to be cautious and secret over the information he sends.⁽²⁾ He had to be careful for his own safety and the reputation of the town, which could little bear any additional suspicion of seditious leanings. The parliamentary news in the letters is largely of financial matters, and this, too, is the news most freely commented upon. Apart from this, town business occupies the largest space.⁽³⁾

In April Marvell was re-elected a third time for Hull, and sat until his death in 1678.⁽⁴⁾ Until June 1663 he played an active part, though inconspicuous, in the House, his chief concern being with affairs connected with his position as a member for a large port. One exception to this is the quarrel with Clifford in the March of 1662, which M. Legouis has pointed out. Its cause was obscure, and both members had to be very severely reprimanded by the Speaker before they would apologise for their behaviour. The Journals do not give us

(1) Grosart II. 392. To a friend in Persia. August 1670.

(2) Grosart II. 400. To Hull, June 1672

(3) Grosart II. 478. To Hull, 26 October 1675, also *ibid* p. 339 8 November 1670. See below p. 23, for some modification of view expressed above.

(4) Returns of Members of Parliament I. 531. Grosart gives figures II. xxxv. see letter p. 55 of April 1661

any full information about the matter, but it is interesting in view of the persistent hostility to Clifford shown throughout Marvell's work. Clifford was a courtier and at this time the dependent of Sir Henry Bennet. He was avaricious and--
 not the least against him--he was a Catholic. ⁽¹⁾ Although Marvell's accusations may have been exaggerated they had at any rate the support of public opinion at the time. In 1669 an
 anonymous writer repeats the charges of avarice and servility. ⁽²⁾
 The significance of the quarrel incident is that it shows Marvell thus early in conflict with a Court favourite.

Marvell's Parliamentary work was disturbed by some months' absence in Holland. In May 1662 he writes to the brethren of Trinity House at Hull that "by the interest of some persons too potent for me to refuse" he is obliged to
 go abroad. ⁽³⁾ He did not, however, cease his correspondence, and we have letters from him dated from Vianen, the Flumen Dianae of Ptolemy, a small Dutch village. The Corporation wrote to recall him home, and he found on his return that some people had tried to fill his seat for him in his absence, although in fact the House had only been a week or two without
 him. ⁽⁴⁾

(1) M.L.R. 1923 pp.423-6. Here are collected Marvell's lines on Clifford from the satires and the full extracts from the Journals relating to the quarrel.

(2) The Alarm. S.P.D. vol.266 f.152. see Appendix

(3) Grosart II. 81. While at the Hague he stayed at Downing's house. Downing was Carlisle's brother-in-law.

(4) Grosart II. 82-6.

One other incident disturbed the peace of this period. That was the rather obscure quarrel between Marvell and Gilby, his fellow-member, of which we know nothing besides Marvell's brief though suggestive reference to it. It appears, however, to have been effectually made up before Marvell's departure for Holland, and in spite of their party differences they seem to have worked well together on the town's business for the rest of Marvell's life. ⁽¹⁾

Both Marvell and Giby had a great deal of business to transact in connection with the proposed separation of Trinity Church, Hull from the parish of Hessele. In the last Parliament they had not been able to effect anything owing to the shortness of the time at their disposal and the urgency of more public business. ⁽²⁾ By June 1661, however, they were actively engaged in forwarding the affair. A petition to the King received a favourable answer, ⁽³⁾ and in spite of the somewhat dilatory behaviour of the town, requiring several reminders from their members, a bill had been drawn up and read in the House by the middle of June. ⁽⁴⁾ By the end of that month it reached the committee stage, ⁽⁵⁾ by the end of the session had been carried to the Lords, ⁽⁶⁾ where at the beginning of the

(1) Grosart II. 65 seq. By February 1661/2 again writing jointly.

(2) Grosart II. 32. Marvell to Hull 8 December 1660.

(3) Ibid. 61-2 and Cal. S.P.Dom. 6 and 21 June 1660/1, p.5. Petition and Reply.

(4) Grosart II. 61/2 and also C.J. VII. 273. 17 June.

(5) C.J. VII. 284. Marvell and Gilby both on committee. cf. p. 289, where both serve on committee for a similar bill.

(6) C.J. VII. 307. 22 July.

next it received attention. (1) After some amendment by the Archbishop it received the Royal Assent in December. (2) Mr. Anderson was the first minister, and perhaps was not the less acceptable to his fellow-townsmen for being suspected in some quarters of seditious tendencies. (3)

Another matter occupying Marvell's attention at this time was the problem raised by Charles' grant of the Ballastage, at onetime among privileges granted by Elizabeth to Trinity (4) House, to a certain J. Walter and his associates, the Halsalls. The London Trinity House at once protested at what they regarded as a breach of privilege, (5) but little could be done until the new Parliament was elected. After the new Parliament had assembled we find Marvell writing:- "That Patent of Ballast is greivous alike to all the ports, and if we can pitch upon some common way to seek redresse with that modesty where his Majesty's seale in in the case we shall incite (6) and join with those that have the same interest." Their com-

(1) L.J. XI. p.335, 23 November. (Parliament had adjourned from 30 July to 20 November.)

(2) L.J. XI. p.347/8, 358. cf. C.J. VII. p.335. (Assent received 20 December.)

(3) L.J. XI. p.368. For subsequent record see Cal. S.P.Dom. p.637 etc. 1663/4. Belasye to Bonnet 10 July 1664.

(4) Halsall was granted Ballastage of ships between High and Low water (S.P.Dom. X. 199, XVI. 188, XXII. 97). Petitions of Trinity against him see Hist. MSS. Com. VII. pp.83, 93 etc. A certain William Carlos (see Barrett History of Trinity House p.26 and P.C.Registers 56 pp.17, 145, 160, 166 etc.) with whom Halsall has been confused was given at this time the right to Thames ballastage (Cal. S.P.Dom. 1660/1 p.14 etc.)

(5) L.J. XI. pp.28, 59, 60, 183/4 etc.

(6) Grosart II. p.60-63.

plaint when made in the House was referred to the Committee
 of Grievances, ⁽¹⁾ which upon Marvell's motion was ordered to
 hear them. On the appointed day, however, as Walter came to
 the committee without his patent, Marvell prevailed on the
 Chairman, Mr. Steward, ⁽²⁾ to report to the House the Serjeant's
 neglect to give Walter sufficient notice of the meeting and
 to fix a day for another. The House meanwhile suspended the
 patent. ⁽³⁾ None of the fees to be exacted were mentioned in the
 patent, and in it the King had declared himself willing to
 revoke it if it should prove a nuisance, so that without much
 difficulty an order for restitution where ports had already
 suffered from the exactions of the patentees was obtained from
 the House. ⁽⁴⁾ Marvell on this occasion took some credit to
 himself for the success of the ports. ⁽⁵⁾

Marvell's interest in and work for the Trinity House at
 Hull continued throughout his career. In the first place his
 connection with it grew out of the local position of his
 brother-in-law Edmund Popple, but his constant association
 with naval and mercantile matters, both as member for Hull
 and through his friends, must soon have given him a very real

(1) C.J. VII. 268. Grosart II. 66.

(2) Mr. Steward is mentioned in the Last Instructions (Satires
 p.26 ll.157-160), where he leads a rout of "expectants pale."

(3) Grosart II. 67 seq. 15 June to Hull.

(4) Grosart II. 74. 20 June 1661. Cal. S.P.Dom. 1662 p.415
 Ballastage to remain with the House till decided.

(5) Grosart II. 67 as before.

interest in them for their own sake. We find him helping the Deptford Trinity House Brethren in the House over the matter of Dover Pier. No doubt this and other services were recognised when he was elected to that board as Younger Brother and later as Warden.

Two things chiefly occupied Marvell's energies on behalf of Trinity House. One, and apparently the more protracted, was the business over patents granted at one time and another by Charles to his friends to build lighthouses on the Spurn Head. Sir Philip Frowde and Justinian Angell were two so favoured. The other was connected with a certain Mr. Clipsham's bill. Mr. Clipsham had imported some fir deals and refused to pay primage, to which Trinity House had a right. The letters from Marvell to Trinity House commence in May 1661, when both members profess their readiness to act for them in London. They then continue right through Marvell's correspondence, though his visit to Holland and the more lengthy absence

(1) Grosart II. 410. "I have a generall acquaintance with this Trinity House, having obliged them such in our last Session of Parliament by opposing a new Act for Dover Peere & otherwise" (18 November 1672). See too pp. 304, 384, 388.

(2) Hist. MSS. Com. VIII. app. 1. p. 236; 12 November 1674, p. 255; 27 May 1678. See too this collection for "lights" business.

(3) S.P.Dom. XXII. 95. Frowde asks leave to build.

(4) Grosart II. 494. Grosart assumes that this was also upon the lights business, but the letters do not sufficiently support this idea. The above explanation is given me by Prof. Margoliouth, who has seen the explanation of the matter on Trinity House files at Hull.

(5) Grosart II. 62. May 1661.

(6) Grosart II. 81, 83. Marvell however was in touch in Holland see his account sent from there p. 845.

(1)
 in Russia disturb their sequence and make it difficult to pick up the threads of the disputes. To some extent, however, our information is supplemented by the State papers of the period and the Privy Council Registers. The Trinity House of Hull wished to obtain the right of building a lighthouse on the Spurn Head. This right was contested by Col. Phillip Frowde, secretary to the Duchess of York, and a courtier with some influence to back his claim. In May 1662, after the matter had come before the Council, the King declared that he still retained the grant in his own hands, and that neither of these claimants had been given any patent. (2) The London Trinity House opposed the erection of such lights, on the ground that, being only of use to the locality itself, it was unfair for their expenses to be borne by the whole coast, and was against their own privilege. (3) The exertions of Marvell and Gilby, together with the general conflict over this matter, at least prevented for a time an outsider's being given the grant to build. (4)

(1) Grosart II. 93. When telling of his appointment with Carlisle Marvell speaks of Gilby's part in the work for Hull. Gilby often signed the letter to Trinity House, and doubtless wrote for himself at times.

(2) Grosart II. 79/80. P.C. 2/55 p.633.

(3) P.C. 2/55 p.639.

(4) Grosart II. 84/5 and 89, 97. 1662-1663 *passim*. They were, however, put to some expense for attendance at council etc. See 84/5.

When Marvell returned from Russia in 1665 he found the matter much as before. Frowde and the Trinity House were now discussing a compromise, whereby he should withdraw his claim if they would allow him a share in the profits. Marvell, while trying to reduce his demands, advised Hull to make some such concession, on the grounds that Frowde was otherwise too powerful at Court, and the hazards of a private bill too great, for the town to do anything against his opposition. Even Sir William Coventry, said Marvell, could not carry through a bill for his town, and the probability was that the House would not sit long enough to pass such a bill. The Hull Trinity House having resolved to treat, Marvell and Gilby after some delay met Frowde. He was difficult to deal with, for he was busy, and also had friends to consider who were expecting a share in his gains. It is obvious that Marvell during 1670 lost any hope he may have had of effectually checking Frowde. Probably the dispute was ended by the death of Sir Phillip. A Phillip Frowde esq. is found petitioning for his father's rights over these lights in 1675, and as the Colonel is always referred to as such, or by his title, it seems that this entry would fix a term to

(1) Grosart II. pp.186/7 December 1665.

(2) Grosart II. p.265 and 273.

(3) Grosart II. p.274. 18 September 1669. Marvell to Trinity House

(4) Grosart II. pp.276/7. October 1669. Hull to Marvell.

(5) Grosart II. pp.281, 286, 297 etc.

(6) Grosart II. p.331. 14 July 1670. Marvell to Trinity House.

(1)
to the dispute.

A new claimant had however appeared in Frowde's lifetime. He was a certain Justinian Angell, owner of the land about Spurn Head, and as such anxious to build lights on it and exact dues for so doing. Both Hull and the Deptford Trinity House opposed him. Marvell was now establishing a connection with the latter, perhaps through his friend Sir Jerome Smith, who in 1673 was Master, and was able to do good work for Hull among its members. Both parties petitioned the Council, which then referred the matter to a committee and commanded the Trinity House to make full enquiries. While these were being made the patent granted to Angell was suspended. In spite of this Angell went on building, and was then commanded to rase the buildings to the ground. His petition against this command was apparently well supported, and he received permission to continue the work pending enquiry. In November the Deptford Trinity House had decided against his lights, but came to no decision about the Hull project to build for themselves.

With Angell's renewed activity the next year is occupied.

(1) P.C. 2/65 p.22. 22 October 1675.

(2) Grosart II. 297/8, 404 etc.

(3) Grosart II. 410 (1672), 415 Marvell to Trinity House 24 June 1673.

(4) P.C. 2/64. p.412, 426 and see Grosart II. pp.416-420. In August 1673 Marvell expressed a doubt as to whether Angell knew himself what he claimed.

(5) Grosart II. 422, 427. From November 1674 to November 1676 there is a gap in the series.

Finally, with the aid of one party in Hull, and, it may be inferred, some friends at Court, Angell secured his claim, and both built the lighthouse and exacted dues of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a ton on foreign and $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a ton on English shipping to defray the cost. (1)

There was renewed opposition to Angell in 1677-8, partly caused, no doubt, by rumours of his petition to be allowed increased dues. (2) He had in fact in December applied for leave to do this, (3) and Trinity House was asked to find out public opinion on the necessity for this increase. (4) The Brethren reported against the increase, (5) and in favour of the Hull House. Marvell and Gilby meanwhile drew up a petition to the Council against it, (6) but Angell, again with the support of a part of Hull, managed to obtain his desired concession. (7)

The lighthouse business and the case of Mr. Clipsham, (8) to which there are frequent references in the letters, are only two examples of the many matters with which the two Hull members were occupied. On one occasion Marvell writes of an opportunity for trade with the Greenland merchants. (9) Several

(1) Grosart II. pp.589, 599. See too P.C. 2/66 p.211.

(2) Ibid. p.604 Marvell to Trinity House 28 March 1678 and letters on pp.606-7 etc.

(3) P.C. 2/66 p.211 December 1677.

(4) Ibid. p.230 January 1678.

(5) Ibid. p.287. 9 April 1678.

(6) Grosart II. p.609. Marvell to Trinity House 6 April.

(7) P.C. 2/66 p.352 June 1678.

(8) Grosart II. Starting with 28 November 1676

pp.493, 497, 505, 532, 560, 562, 586. Marvell received a money present for his trouble over this affair.

(9) Ibid. p.267.

letters are full of the tiresome Lieutenant Wise, a refractory militia officer whose behaviour caused Marvell and Gilby a great deal of bother. (1) At the time of the wars the Hull prisoners in Holland were also the concern of the members, (2) who certainly well deserved the Hull ale when it came. (3)

This work on behalf of Hull and her Trinity House shows Marvell as a very active and competent business man. When his literary work after 1667 is remembered, his activity on so many Parliamentary committees and his constant attention in the House, this minute and patient attention to the tedious negotiations over the lighthouses or other such town affairs seems really remarkable, and goes a long way to explain the tradition of honesty and conscientiousness which has always made remarkable his connection with Hull.

While this close attention to the business interests of a great port makes it clear that Marvell must have had a first-hand knowledge of mercantile and naval matters, it also makes more remarkable his entire failure to understand the difficulties of the government in naval administration. His constant lamentations for the sale of Dunkirk are indeed typical of his age and party. But Marvell was not altogether typical of that age in having opportunities for fuller know-

(1) Grosart II. pp.256-7, 259-260, 263, 264, 271. These letters are almost entirely concerned with this affair.

(2) Ibid. p.197. Marvell to Hull 1 December 1666.

(3) Ibid. p.200 and many others.

ledge. Once a matter had become a party cry, however, Marvell's business instincts seem to become lost in the pamphleteer. In certain cases, too, his private friendships help to explain this lack of perspective. Sir Edward Harley, to whom Marvell wrote some of the most familiar of his extant letters, had been governor of Dunkirk, and was so strongly opposed to its sale that before this could be carried out he had to be removed. The attempt to disgrace Jerome Smith in 1667 may also have done something to embitter Marvell against some of the administrators of the navy.

A curious omission strikes the reader of Marvell's work, and that is his entire neglect of colonial questions. These were burning problems of the day, and two at least of the men he must have had much to do with were keenly interested in such matters. The omission is curious indeed in a friend of Harrington and a follower of Shaftesbury. In the whole of the letters only one account of anything colonial occurs, and that merely reports the substance of the King's speech about Jamaica. Marvell mentions Tangier too, but only to say that George's father--Sir Jerome Smith--is there. On another occasion Marvell served on a committee dealing with a petition of Beranda Company, an island also commemorated in his song of an period, about which he must have heard much from his friends

(1) Grosart II. 333 Marvell to Hull 8 October 1670. See too 16: p.197 for a similar reference.

(2) Grosart II. 390. Marvell to Popple (undated, but about April 1671.

(1)
 the Oxenbridges. He also served, as member for a port town,
 on one committee dealing with trade and plantations. (2) This,
 extraordinary as it seems, makes up the sum total of all we
 know of his interest in colonial affairs.

-
- (1) C.J. VIII. 395. 8 March 1676/7.
 (2) C.J. VIII. 273. 22 March 1672/3.
-

Some biographical notes.

Marvell's visit to Ireland. In an undated letter to William Popple (Grosart II. 392 circa April 1671) Marvell says:-
 "I think it will be my lot to go on an honest fair employ-
 ment to Ireland. Some have smelt the court of Rome at that
 distance. There I hope I shall be out of the smell of our..."
 In a letter written on 3 May 1673 to Sir Edward Harley (Hist.
 MSS. Com. XIV. II. 336) Marvell writes:- "Sir, I would entreat
 you to put the learned Scotch gentleman near you in mind of
 drawing up a succinct full narrative of what he remembers
 concerning the man we spake of in Ireland." It is possible
 that this is a reference to that visit he spoke of in the
 earlier letter, but which is otherwise unrecorded. I can find
 no account or clue as to Harley's wanderings between 1670 and
 1673.

Sir Jerome Smith. Marvell's letters supply a few additional
 details to those already noticed in the lives of this Captain.
 He and Smith were evidently on terms of some intimacy. Mar-
 vell was present at the latter's death and followed his body
 to its grave at Hemberough (Grosart II. 477, 483). His letters
 supply the date of Smith's death, 4 November 1675. The George
 of the letter to Ed. Thompson (Grosart II. 390, 423, 435 etc.)
 was Smith's son and executor. Marvell's warm praise of Smith

at the time of his trial is amply justified by other evidence, such as that of Clar: (Cont. 1140). Marvell's enmity to Holmes [the R.H. of the letters and the Growth of Popery], was probably heightened by the share he took in the attempt to disgrace Smith. Marvell's references [are constant (pp. 240, 243, 258, 260, 263, 411, 418, 415, 467)].

William Ramsden and William Popple. I am indebted to the courtesy of Prof. H.H. Margoliouth for the information that Grosart mistakenly addressed some of Marvell's letters to William Ramsden. All these letters are really addressed to William Popple, his nephew and son of that Edmund Popple who had proposed his election as burgess of Hull, and who was a prominent figure in the activities of Hull Trinity House. Popple apparently had business in Bordeaux (Grosart II. 324, 492 etc. and see too letter to Thompson 435), with which perhaps the Thompsons, also friends of Marvell, were connected.

Popple himself had a distinguished career. He was educated under Marvell's direction, and was always upon the most affectionate terms with him. He became a London merchant and later, as has been noticed, went to Bordeaux. There he is supposed to have met the famous de Maniban of Marvell's poem, and to have become acquainted with a large circle of friends. In 1689 he translated for the first time Locke's Essay on Toleration, and in 1696, through his appointment to the Board of Trade, began more intimate friendship with Locke. He had already published in 1687 A Rational Catechism, and composed a Latin epitaph for the town of Hull to erect over Marvell's grave (Add. MSS. 8888 f. 165), but the latter was probably torn down by some enthusiastic "zealots of the King's party", if legend is to be believed. (That would be about 1683, after the disgrace of Shaftesbury and the Whigs.)

I am indebted for much of this information to the kindness of M. Legouis, who will shortly publish it in an article on this subject which will appear in the Review of English Studies.

Section 111. The Earl of Carlisle's Embassy to Russia, Sweden and Denmark.

In June 1663 Marvell writes to his "worthy friends" at Hull that the Earl of Carlisle has used his great influence with him to make him go as his secretary upon his embassy to Muscovy, Sweden and Denmark. Although the position which this letter abruptly announces is by no means a surprising one for Marvell to be offered, his services under Thurloe and his command of languages making him eminently suitable for it, yet the years in which he held it have the appearance of an isolated episode in Marvell's career. In none of his surviving correspondence or verse is there a trace of the influence, or a remark about the events of these two years of travel and diplomatic work. Even Carlisle's name disappears from his pages, and no one of his companions on the embassy is ever mentioned. Carlisle, it must of course be remembered, went out of the country again soon after his return from Denmark in 1665; after that perhaps his politics, which though moderate were not actively "country", may explain the silence. Yet the episode must be remembered in considering Marvell's subsequent work and activities. It kept him out of England during the middle years of Clarendon's ministry. When he returned it was

(1) Grosart II. 93. Marvell to Hull 20 June 1663. The embassy is mentioned p.91.

(2) See above Chap.I. 11. It may be remarked that Marvell not only wrote a poem for the Swedish Queen, but was usually associated with the northern nations in his work for Thurloe.

(3) The author of the Letter from a Person of Quality speaks sorrowfully of Carlisle's lack of action over the Test of 1675.

to a London ravaged by plague and fire and a Parliament by no means so Royalist as it had been when he left. Marvell immediately, it seems, became a fairly active, if not a leading member of the scanty but always variable Opposition in the House, and from the year 1665 his politics became more marked. Perhaps it is not too much to surmise that the experience of a Russian "tyrant" confirmed his confidence in and love of Parliamentary rule.

The embassy was directly due to the petition of the Russian resident John, afterwards Sir John, Hebdon, and to the complaint made by the Muscovy Company of the continued withdrawal of the privilege granted them as early as the reign of Edward VI of free trade with Russia. This trade was very valuable. Russia imported English woollen cloth, wrought iron (an interesting item as early as this), copper and the like, and exported cable, yarn, hemp, flax, cordage, tallow, provisions and furs. Without these, said Hebdon, "We should be deficient of that supply of Navel Material" so essential to the country. This Hebdon was very active in the matter. In a series of interviews and letters he suggested that Charles should immediately send compliments to the Czar, and help--in the shape of an offer of mediation between Russia and Poland and Sweden, and 3000 men under a suitable officer--and arrange for an embassy to Russia to negotiate the return of the

privileges as soon as possible. He saw the difficulty of regaining these, but urged the friendship of the Czar to Charles in exile as a possible ground for hope. He pointed out that the excuse given for the withdrawal in 1649, then a tribute to Charles I.--for the Czar had declared the treatment of that king by his rebellious subjects to be his reason--was, now that the English had returned to their allegiance, no longer valid. ⁽¹⁾

Charles acted on Hobden's advice. He wrote to the Czar announcing his Restoration and offering the 3000 men. He mentioned the matter of the privileges. ⁽²⁾ A Russian ambassador arrived to bring congratulations the next year, but nothing was done about the privileges. ⁽³⁾ By July 1663 matters were well in train for the execution of the third suggestion, that of an Embassy. Carlisle, well fitted by birth and position, was chosen to take it. ⁽⁴⁾

For the history of the Embassy itself ample material exists not only among the State Papers Foreign, but in the delightful account of their journeys and interviews published after the return from Russia by Guy Miège, an attendant on

(1) S.P.F. Russia 3. f.83, 87, 88seq. Letters from Hobden, a narrative of their company by the Muscovy Merchants.

(2) S.P.F. Russia f. 90, 95. Copy of Charles' letter and the reply of the Czar.

(3) A fairly complete account of this visit could be gleaned from P.C. 2/56 passim, the State Papers Domestic and Pepys II 308, as well as from S.P.F. as before.

(4) The Privy Council Registers as before (P.C. 2/56 passim) throw light on the finances of the embassy. An account of its receipts and expenses is in S.P.F. Russia 3. f.117. See Treasury books also: Cal. S.P.Dom. 1663 p.127.

(1)
 the Earl of Carlisle. Miede gives the objects of the Embassy thus:- it was "to obtain a re-establishment of the Priviledges of the English Company, which consisted in this, That the Merchants of the Kingdom did formerly trade in to that place without paying any impost." (2) The large train and numerous presents which the Earl had to take with him occupied two vessels. The first vessel, in which the chief envoys sailed, made a good voyage to Archangel, but there had to await the other, which had a most trying time with storms and delays and a "rocky hearted" (3) captain." While they waited Harvell was sent ashore to announce their arrival, and was "conducted by six gentlemen to the Castle to a regiment of six hundred men." (4)

The train complete, they pushed forward, but found not even the fur coats--purchased on the spot for as little as ten shillings--nor "strong waters (which we began to take now in good lusty draughts)" (5) adequate protection against the cold, nor conducive to good temper. At Vologda they were met by Nestrof, the Russian noble deputed to look after them, from whose rudeness they suffered much. (6) They found the journey tedious; sleep was their only amusement, unless it were

(1) For a note on this account and its authorship see below p.

(2) Miede p.3.

(3) Miede p.23, 21. The captain was quite oblivious of their terror. Captain Teddar, who took Carlisle, gives his report of the journey S.P.Des. LXXXI. 119. Miede was in the second vessel.

(4) Miede p.23.

(5) Miede p.85, 93.

(6) Miede p.96. Nestrof is often mentioned hereafter.

to see the Russians fall down dead drunk after two whiffs of English tobacco. Miego gives many interesting glimpses of events by the way, and of Russian customs; the most important characteristic of the people was their extreme barbarity. The English were even obliged to provide their own sledges. ⁽¹⁾

On 3 February 1664 they arrived at Yaws, and there occurred a curious instance of the Russian carelessness, or rudeness. All the messengers sent by the Czar to guide Carlisle into Moscow lost their way, either through stupidity or, as Carlisle evidently thought, through the deliberate intention of the Czar to slight him, and the entry had to be postponed. Marvell was sent in to protest at the incident and demand adequate explanations. The English irritation was not lessened by their quarters, where swarmed "troublesome insects" ⁽²⁾. Eventually the matter was smoothed over, ⁽³⁾ but even in Moscow they were not well treated, were kept very closely in their quarters, and allowed no audience with the Czar until four days after their arrival. ⁽⁴⁾ Though the Czar himself then seemed friendly enough it was obvious from the first that his commissioners were not, and the delays and annoyances to which Carlisle and his train were subjected in ceremonial as well as

(1) Miego p.96. For the Russian tobacco fiend p.112; for the journey to Yaws p.112

(2) Miego p.116/7, 122.

(3) S.P.F. Russia s. f.107. Carlisle to the King from Moscow 12 March 1663/4, in Marvell's handwriting.

(4) Miego p.140/1 and Carlisle's letter as above.

as in diplomatic matters showed the lack of cordiality as well as the barbarity of the Russians.⁽¹⁾

A letter from Carlisle (though probably composed as well as actually written by Marvell) in June tells of the failure of the Embassy. The Russians put their refusal down to wars with the Poles and Crimeans--"a mere evasion"⁽²⁾. The parting was naturally not of the most cordial. Carlisle refused the presents offered them, and the Czar returned those Carlisle had given him on his arrival. Carlisle felt obliged to complain of the behaviour of a commissioner who had all along falsely represented the state of things in England to the Czar. Miegé amusingly describes the anger of the Russian envoy when the sables were refused:- "he swelled up with rage, as he had been before with vain hope of reward at his coming in; he leapt down the stairs by half dozens, as if he had been mad, and clapping his breast, cried out with a loud voice, That such a thing had never been heard of."⁽³⁾ In equal disgust with everything Russian the train set off for Sweden. They were hardly surprised at the result of the Embassy, for "what else was to be expected in a country where all other beasts change their colours twice a year but the rational beasts

(1) Miegé gives speeches etc. at the conferences 141 seq. and Carlisle's letter.

(2) S.P.F. Russia 3 p.109. Moscow, Carlisle to the King 14 June 1664.

(3) Miegé 278 seq., 303 etc.

change their soules thrice a day."⁽¹⁾

They left Riga on 18 August 1664,⁽²⁾ and their Embassy henceforward, in Sweden and Denmark, was to be a very different experience. There they were to come into touch with western politics again, and the web of diplomacy forming round the now imminent Anglo-Dutch war. Henry Coventry arrived in Sweden just after Carlisle; Talbot was to meet him in Denmark. Both were to work with him in promoting friendly relations and the neutrality of the northern nations, if not their actual help, in the coming struggle. It is interesting to remember this in reading Marvell's later account of the foreign politics of the following years, and his remarks on Henry Coventry's desertion of the Triple Alliance [a more heinous offence] "that no man better than he understood both the theory and practick of honour"⁽³⁾ gain point from our know-⁽⁴⁾ledge of their personal contact in this embassy.

The news of Carlisle's failure in Russia had preceded him to Stockholm, but the English resident reported to Secretary Bennet that he might expect better things there.⁽⁵⁾

(1) S.P.F. Russia 3. f.112. Carlisle to Bennet (Marvell's hand) 14 June 1664. Marvell's old job of news-songer here has official status. A letter amongst those state papers to Williamson (f.115) says "I make not question that most passages and transactions of moment, in this Embassage are understood by you, out of the papers that have been transmitted by Mr. Marvell."

(2) Miegé p.342.

(3) Grosart IV. p.274 etc.

(4) The reasons and success of the Coventry-Talbot mission are well explained by Clarendon in his Continuation (p.1123, 1146). Letter S.P.F. Sweden 5. f.15, Miegé 40174 for Coventry's mission.

(5) S.P.F. Sweden Letters and papers 5. f.149. Fleetwood to [etc] Bennet 23 July.

A letter from Carlisle a little later tells of the confirmation of these hopes. The Regents, he says, are well disposed to a closer union; the Swedes are now relieved of those fears which they had entertained of the English designs in going to Russia. Dutch and French have assiduously worked upon this misapprehension, but now his ill-success with the Czar has relieved them. Things are ripe for an Anglo-Swedish alliance. Coventry soon arrived to take over the Swedish negotiations, and Carlisle left for Denmark. (1)

There he found himself in some financial straits: "I am exceedingly in debt this Embassy, and am undone unlesse you refund mee to help mee out of it." Carlisle writes to Bennet. He also notices the lack of definite instructions from which Coventry and Talbot also suffered. Summing up the results of the Embassies he says:- "The Swedes.... have used me as those who desire to be the best friends of his Mty, the Danes as those who are, but the Muscovites as those who care not to be: and therefore I hope their Envoy will be used accordingly." (2)

Carlisle, with Marvell and others of his suite, went home by land incognito. On the way Marvell embroiled them in a free fight. They had engaged waggons to take them on from

(1) S.P.F. Sweden 5. f.152. Carlisle to Bennet 13 September (Marvell's hand).

(2) S.P.F. Denmark 17. f.209. Carlisle to Bennet in Marvell's hand. Another letter is f.220 (16 November 1664).

Hamburg, and outside Bochstound "the Secretary's waggoner would not stir, unless there might go along with him another waggoner his Comrade, who would have been as useless to us as his waggen. The Secretary not able to bring him to reason by fair means, tried that he could by foul, and by clapping a pistol to his head would have forced him along with him. But immediately his pistol was wrenched from him, and as they were putting themselves into a posture to abuse him, we interposed so effectually that he was rescued out of their hands". But while Marvell thus rescued rode off to tell Carlisle what had happened, the rest were involved in a free fight only stopped with great difficulty⁽¹⁾. It is impossible not to see in this some of that same impetuosity which had already embroiled Marvell on the floor of the House, and was to do so again.

The embassy arrived safely, and Carlisle was able to vindicate himself from the charges brought against him by Russians who had preceded him to England. He gained fame for his part in the Embassy, and some reward⁽²⁾. The results of this embassy to Russia were practically nil; expenses had been heavy, and much time had been taken up in profitless negotiations. Although yet another attempt was to be made to regain the privileges of the Muscovy Company, it was, like its

(1) Migeo. p.430.

(2) Cal. S.P.Dom. March 1665 p.285 and Treasury books passim.

predecessor, a failure, and relations with Russia continued in such the same condition throughout the reign. (1)

What Marvell's share in the gains of the Embassy was we do not know, but he must have received some quite substantial financial advantage from it. He had now a first hand acquaintance with most of the European countries.

(1) See references above to expense, and also W.R.Scott, Joint Stock Companies (1912) II.67.

Note. 1

Robert Harley writing to Charles Whitworth in April 1705, recommends to his notice Mr Marvell's Account of this embassy. (Papers at Welbeck, S.A. Strong, 1903, p 70) In spite of the fact that his father's intimacy with Marvell should have given Harley opportunity of knowing something about Marvell's work, there seems no reason to suppose that Marvell can be credited with an Account. No other is known besides Miegé's book, and the authorship of that is well established by the dedication, signed G.M., and the full name, Guy Miegé, upon the french edition. The book was very popular, and is indeed one of the most readable of seventeenth century travel books. (See Bibliography for full list of editions, etc.)

Note 2. A Slight correction is necessary for the statement on p. 2 that Marvell never mentioned Carlisle again. On two occasions he mentions a Captain Lawson, nephew to the Earl in his letters. (1. Marvell to Sir H. Thompson at Escrick, 2. Marvell to Sir Edward Harley 17 July 1677. Hist MSS Com: XIX.rep:II.355).

NOTE II. Some further references to Sweden in Marvell's later work.

(Grosart's index is extremely meagre, and as no other exists for the prose works perhaps this annotated list will be of use.)

1. Grosart II. p.244/5 Marvell to Hull, 15 March 1668/9, on the impossibility of expecting Sweden or any country to give English merchants as great immunity in the Sound as their own people enjoy.

2. Grosart II. p.382, IV. 265, 266, 274, 316. All these but the last refer to later negotiations with Sweden and the Triple Alliance. The last refers to the position of Roman Catholics in countries like Denmark or Sweden, where "Popery is wholly suppressed."

3. Satires. i. The Last Instructions refers to
 "Hector Harry" ll.225 seq.
 "Harry excellent" ll.449.
 His part in Clarendon's deception of Parliament ll.772 seq.

ii. The Dialogue

"Yet we have one Secretary honest and wise;
 "For that very reason, he's never to rise." l.174,
 though here the reference is intended rather to discredit the other secretary, Williamson, than to praise Coventry.

Chapter III. Marvell's Parliamentary activity and Satires.
(1665-1672).

Section I. Marvell and Clarendon.

In the history of the rise of an organised opposition to Charles I. and his government the fall of Clarendon marks a distinct stage. In that year the crest of a wave of discontent which first manifested itself in the Parliament at Oxford in 1665 was reached. Its full force was by no means spent in the proceedings against Clarendon, and its results may be seen all through the following winter in the debates in the House on supply and the miscarriages of the war. The King, as he could in moments of stress, asserted himself to some purpose, and was by the March of 1669 "never so powerful". Death or dismissal from the Court made room for the rise to office of men like Buckingham, Arlington, Shaftesbury and others who had held only minor posts before. Bribes or satisfied men never consistently in opposition like Littleton and Seymour. Indeed, the unstable nature of any political combinations in the period makes the tracing of party history very difficult. The nucleus of an opposition was, however, always there. Marvell and a few like him remained discontented with the government, and by their writing helped to preserve a "country" tradition. Even Marvell could temporarily support the "Court" side when there seemed any chance of obtain-

ing through it religious toleration, and only the vaguest definition of the varying aims of the cabals and coalitions of these can be made.

In these manifestations of a party spirit Marvell played a fairly prominent though not predominant or influential part. At the height of the agitation against Clarendon he wrote his longest, and in some ways cleverest, satire, the Last Instructions to a Painter about the Dutch Wars, and followed it by Clarendon's House Warning and Upon his House, two extremely scurrilous attacks upon Clarendon's personal life and character. In the House of Commons he was active on many committees and spoke there some seven times, more often, that is to say, than he is known to have done in all the rest of his life. These speeches and satires, together with some private letters of his which have survived give ample material for discovering Marvell's opinions at the time. These opinions throw some light upon the contemporary currents of politics and the personalities involved. They particularly illustrate those views of the small but persistent minority which Marvell most typically represents, and they show how early in the reign what were later to become the Whig party cries were voiced. Even at this time the "Roman" plots, the problems of succession, the growing prerogative and the standing army were part of the stock-in-trade of the "country"

libel-writer, as indeed they had to some extent been of an earlier and rather different opposition. The villain of the piece changes in the "Painter" series but the accusations do not, though in one respect--the fear of Popery--their volume increases after 1672. Clarendon and the failures of the Dutch War provoked the first of the great outburst of libel-writing in the reign, and in this outburst Marvell plays no small part.

In the autumn of 1666 Charles was again obliged to summon the two Houses. The stormy session that then began could have been foreseen by the prophetic eye when the Irish Bill was put forward in 1665 at Oxford, and when that Parliament at its prorogation asked that the "Officers of the navy and Ordnance might give in their accounts the next Session."⁽¹⁾ This session was to be remarkable for the financial activity of the Commons and their continuation of the "objectionable practice" of inserting in acts of supply provisions specifying the object to which the money was to be appropriated; for the emergence of Buckingham as a serious politician and the declared opponent of Clarendon, even temporarily in alliance with Arlington, though on all other subjects they were opposed; for the marked, and now openly voiced dissat-

(1) Grosart II. 186. Marvell to Hull 2 November 1665, from Oxford.

isfaction with the rule of courtiers and the incompetence of the managers of the Dutch War. These three things can be seen in the vote for the supply, which, though breached early in the session, did not materialise, to Charles' great chagrin and disgust, until the following January; in the vigorous prosecution of the bill to prevent the importation of Irish cattle, sponsored by Buckingham in the Lords and by Seymour in the Commons against the King's wishes and the advice of the Chancellor; in the charges brought against the managers of the naval accounts, the Canary patentees and Lord Mordaunt. All these emphasise and help to explain the movement against the court which was in the next session to take active expression against the already fallen Chancellor.

Clarendon is one of the supreme scapegraces of English History. It is difficult now to understand or sympathise with the outcry that caused his fall. The memorial he has left in the magnificent "History", product of two exiles, and the "Life"⁽¹⁾ inclines us today to feel rather with Clarendon than his detractors. He has little of that originality of mind which distinguishes so many of his contemporaries, but his

(1) The excellence of Clarendon's style gained him praise even in the midst of his troubles. See Add. MSS. 36416 f.34. His defence, though ordered to be burnt, was first by command of the Lords copied, that the excellence of the style might not be lost! It pleased Pepys too (VI. p.17), but irritated Marvell, who refers contemptuously to Hyde's "flippant style". Satires p.36. Last Instructions, l.656.

own conservatism, detachment and consistency have themselves all the quality of genius. His character is pervaded by an intangible something that is, perhaps, best expressed as the "English spirit", if by that is conveyed the integrity and solidity, wit and dignified seriousness which his life reveals to us.

Not so did he appear to men like Marvell. To them he seemed one who had over and over again sold his country's honour for his own advancement. Not content with material gain, he must needs flaunt the evidence of it, his building, in the face of plague-stricken London; not content with his own daughter's alliance with the King's brother, he must needs ensure her children's future by marrying the King to a barren wife. His enemies pointed to the huge subsidies voted during the wars, and to the curtailed navy, and asked who had received the balance. No charge was too monstrous to lay to Clarendon's account, and the personal reason seems largely to have been Clarendon's lack of a sense of fitness, of tact in dealing with the public, and dislike of any extension of what he regarded as the proper privilege of the Commons.

It is difficult to say how early Marvell became actively antagonistic to the Chancellor. After his return from Russia he had some time in which to recover from his journey, for Parliament, which had been prorogued on account of the plague,

did not meet until September. In that month Marvell's letters discover him to be at Oxford, combining with his parliamentary duties some reading in the library there. ⁽¹⁾ The three letters which survive confine themselves to the barest summary of news, though it is possible to guess from them that already Marvell supported the Irish cattle bill, which the King refused to approve, the demand for accounts and the bill to prevent the embezzling of prize goods, "in which there have of late been great faults committed". ⁽²⁾ He served on a committee connected with this last bill. ⁽³⁾ To some extent Marvell was occupied after the session was over on the business of the Hull lights, ⁽⁴⁾ and seems to have been in London for at least part of the time before the next meeting of the House. in the September of 1666.

Possibly the beginning of Marvell's distrust of the Chancellor was caused by his religious policy. Looking back, in the Rehearsal Transposed, Marvell remarks on the renewed activity of the King for toleration, "having at last rid himself of a great minister of State who had headed this interest" ⁽⁵⁾ against it, and whose alliance with the bishops was such

(1) Grosart II. pp.183-185. Wood, Fasti Oxon. II. 288.

(2) Ibid. p.184. Marvell to Hull 22 October 1665.

(3) C.J. p.621 (see too p.619) 26 October 1665.

(4) Grosart II, pp.186/7. Marvell to Trinity House 9 December 1665, from London.

(5) Grosart III (Rehearsal Transposed) p.70.

that they "stood almost in defiance of his Majesty's good pleasure, and fought it out to the uttermost" ⁽¹⁾ in defence of their friend.

Clarendon's dislike of Parliament is often mentioned by Marvell, who, indeed, hints that in the retention of men like the Chancellor Charles showed a lack of any real understanding of the lesson of exile. The lines:-

" Twelve years he suffered in exile
"And kept his father's asses all the while."(2)

show a distrust of the old courtiers and a contempt for their ability. It was indeed the misfortune of Clarendon that he could neither gain the favour of the courtiers nor escape the blame of possessing it. This unpopularity with those like Marvell was due in part to the idea that he would "dissolve the vain commons" ⁽³⁾, after obtaining from them a huge subsidy, and then:-

"Blither than hare that hath escaped the hounds,
"The House prerogued, the Chancellor rebounds.....
"What frost to fruits, what arsenic to the rat,
"What to fair Denham mortal Chocolate,
"What an account to Carteret, that and more,
"A parliament is to the Chancellor."(4)

One incident, the summoning of the Houses in July 1667, though

(1) Grosart III (Rehearsal Transposed) p.216-7. See also the reference to this alliance between Clarendon and the bishops in the Last Instructions 1.760 seq.

(2) Satires p.70. An Historical Poem 11.3-4.

(3) Ibid. p.24. Last Instructions 11.127-8.

(4) Ibid. p.32. Last Instructions 11.135-6, 341-4.

only for a few hours' sitting, is made much of by Marvell as additional proof of Hyde's fear and distrust of Parliament, and Tomkins' ⁽¹⁾ behaviour in broaching the matter of the standing army in spite of his displeasure won approbation in the Last Instructions. It is to this incident that we owe one of Marvell's most vivid pictures of contemporary life, though in a vein very different from his usual political satire:-

"Up ambles country justice on his pad,
 "And vest bespeaks to be more seemly clad.(2)
 "Plain gentlemen are in stage-coach o'erthrown,
 "And deputy-lieutenants in their own;
 "The portly burgess, through the weather hot,
 "Does for his corporation sweat and trot;
 "And all with sun and cholera come adust,
 "And threaten Hyde to raise a greater dust."(3)

⁽⁴⁾
 "Hyde's avarice" is the text of most of Marvell's other accusations, and he frequently points to Clarendon's House, supposed fruit of that avarice:-

"See how he reigns in his new palace culminant,
 "And sits in state divine like Jove the fulminant."(5)

In the Poem on his House and Clarendon's House Warning this is the main theme:-

(1) See below p. 92 for a note on Tomkins.

(2) cf. Pepys VI. *passim* for this new fashion at court in 1667.

(3) Satires p. 48 Last Instructions ll. 779 seq. cf. Milward's Diary, Add. MSS. 33413 f. 29. There was a very full House on 25 July. Undoubtedly incidents like this, when followed by the Chatham disasters and the events of that summer, helped materially to discredit Clarendon.

(4) Satires p. 25. Last Instructions l. 129.

(5) *Ibid.* p. 32. ll. 355-356.

"The Scotch forest and Dunkirk, but that they were sold,
 "He would have demolished to raise up his walls;
 "Nay, e'on from Tangier have sent back for mould,
 "But that he had nearer the stones of St. Paul's.
 "His woods would come in at the easier rate,
 "So long as the yards had a deal or a spar:
 "His friends in the navy would not be ingrate,
 "To grudge him some timber, who framed him the war."⁽¹⁾

All these charges, and the additional ones of "smoking" the chimney contractors and being bribed by the Canary Company, are reiterated both in the debates in the House, other popular satires and in the official accusation of Clarendon.

Marvell only repeats the usual cries against Clarendon, adding nothing but his here rather scurrilous wit to them. He displays no deeper understanding of the problems at issue than the rest, although he did see that Clarendon was by no means alone to blame for the misfortunes of the war. At the moment everyone was combining to hound the old man out; the country demanded a scapegrace, and Marvell lent his pen to the cause. Thus it is hardly surprising to find him reiterating such personal accusations as the alleged plot in regard to the succession, proved to the satisfaction of Clarendon's enemies by Ann's marriage ⁽²⁾ and Catherine's childlessness; ⁽³⁾ these are curiously mixed with the more important charges:-

(1) Satires p.57. Clarendon's House Warming, verses xi and xii.

(2) Satires passim, particularly Last Instructions p.22.

(3) Ibid. p.37 Last Instructions l.468: "Who but himself should choose the knig and queen," and elsewhere. But at first the marriage had been very popular: see a letter of 5 February 1660/1 from London (Hist. MSS. Com. Report V. p.266).

"Here lie the sacred bones
 "Of Paul beguiled of his stones:
 "Here lie golden briberies,
 "The price of ruined families;
 "The cavalier's debenture wall,
 "Fixed on an eccentric basis;
 "Here's Dunkirk Town and Tangier Hall,
 "The Queen's marriage and all,
 "The Dutchman's templum pacis."(1)

Marvell saw the key to all these--the sale of Dunkirk, the failure of the war and the financial straits of the country--in Hyde's avarice. In Hyde's desire for power and hatred of Parliament he saw the root of the Chancellor's love of a standing army. It is only one more example of the wildly partisan movement against the Chancellor that this should be laid to his charge. Monk would seem a more obvious instigator--if any such explanation were needed--of the King's desire for a standing force. Marvell speaks quite decidedly of Clarendon's praise of standing armies when he says:-

"And for their pay he writes as from the King,
 "With what cursed quill plucked from a vulture's wing,
 "Of the whole nation now to ask a loan;
 "The eighteen hundred thousand pounds are gone."(2)

Hyde had advocated a loan without Parliament, rather than risk opposition in the House in the critical state of affairs in that summer. It was, however, thought advisable to call the Houses together, and Tonkins managed to bring his motion against the standing army. It was in order to prevent a

(1) Satires p.61 Upon his House.

(2) Ibid. p.37 Last Instructions 11.480 seq. cf. p.24 l.127.

recurrence of this that Hyde, says Marvell, conspired with Turner, the Speaker, to

" come late,
"Lest some new Tomkins spring a fresh debate."⁽¹⁾

Hyde's obvious fear of meeting Parliament and anxiety to end it as soon as possible may well have been construed as an attempt to stifle such protest.

It is very difficult to judge of the justice of the accusations brought against Clarendon. They form a curious mixture, and betray their origin in the mixed character of the opposition to him. This comprised disappointed Cavaliers as well as former "Roundheads", who were perhaps traditionally in opposition. There were men who had an axe to grind, men who wanted office and men who, like Seymour, were out more for efficient government than for the rights of Parliament in this case. There were, too, men like Marvell who were fighting in what they considered a matter of constitutional principle. There were others, like Shaftesbury, who supported the attack, but who for the present showed little of the interest they were afterwards to display in the

(1) Tomkins, the hero of this episode, described by Marvell as "Trusty as steel that always ready hung" (l. 794; see also l. 223), was evidently a member of the "country" party at this period, though his later history is unknown. Clarendon calls him "a man of contemptible parts and worse manners (who used to be encouraged by men of design to set some motion on foot, which they thought not fit to appear in themselves)..." *Cont.* p. 1238. Clarendon's account at the debate of the council whether or not to call Parliament is interesting, and reveals his fear of the House. *Ibid.* p. 1226-7. In October Tomkins proposed that the thanks of the House should be sent to the King for Clarendon's removal. An account of the debate in July is given by Milward. *Add. MSS.* 33413 f. 29.

constitutional issues. Shaftesbury indeed, after the fall of the Chancellor, seems to have been wholly absorbed in his anxiety for toleration. All these parties make extremely difficult any attempt to show the significance of the charges against Clarendon, or to discuss the question of the responsibility for the war failures and the financial chaos.

It is not possible to substantiate the charges of bribery against Clarendon, and with this admission half the case put forward by Marvell against him is destroyed. But to clear him of this and allow the failure of the war to remain to his account would be merely to change the charges from avarice to incompetence, villainy to foolishness. Time has done much to exonerate Clarendon from either of these accusations. The sale of Dunkirk was never forgotten in the party strife of the reign. Yet although Clarendon's share in the matter is not so small as he stated in his Life,⁽¹⁾ the sale was certainly advised by naval experts, and proved as wise a step as it was inevitable. As for the mismanagement of the war,

(1) Cont. p.1105. cf. Coste, Sale of Dunkirk 1728 p.54. where Clarendon, not the Treasurer, seems to have been the first in the secret of the proposed sale. The unpopularity of the measure was fully realised at the time by the King (ibid. p.97).

Clarendon had little actually to do either with its initiation or its progress, and it was due to causes far deeper than the incompetence of one minister. The extraordinary thing is that men like Marvell, who must have had first-hand information on naval matters, and who had besides a most businesslike mind, should have failed to see, when he pointed to the idle dockyards,⁽¹⁾ that it was as futile to blame Clarendon as Pett,⁽²⁾ and that reform of administrative methods rather than the ejection of existing officials was necessary.

The condition of the navy was due in large part to the poverty of Charles. He had started his reign encumbered with debts from his own exile and an enormous burden connected with the disbandment of the army and other such legacies from the Commonwealth period. Throughout his reign he never had sufficient money, and although his income was enormously greater than his father's, it was yet inadequate for his extending needs. It is also doubtful whether he enjoyed as great an income as Cromwell, and certainly some departments had to manage with less.⁽³⁾ Popular opinion is voiced by Marvell when he puts this down to the extravagance of the court

(1) Satires p.39 Last Instructions, etc.

(2) Satires p.46 ibid. for lines on Pett.

(3) Pepys VII. p.300. 14 February 1668. cf. Grey I. p.99. 15 February; Milward 33413 f.58a and 59. 15 February for a statement to this effect in the House.

and courtiers, but the evidence of Pepys and the accounts of the reign show that this and the place-mongering that undoubtedly went on cannot alone account for the shortage. Charles never managed to obtain the full amount voted him by Parliament. Tax-collectors were attacked, false returns were very frequent, and no redress for this would be given by justices. No wonder that letters to the country from London tell how the poll bill "falls so strangely short of what was expected", or that "Chimney is the thing that amazes us--being much less ($\frac{1}{2}$) than expected."

Dr. Shaw suggests that the criminal responsibility for the disasters of the reign, from Chatham to the pensioning of the King by Louis XIV, rests on the Parliamentary opposition for whom Marvell wrote rather than on the King. Did they understand that the revenue was inadequate? he asks, and more than hints that the state of affairs was so patent that they could not have mistaken it. Marvell's description of the navy might be said to confirm this view. There is, however, much to be said on behalf of the Commons even when

(1) P.C.Register 2/57 p.506, 2/61 p.2 etc. for examples of this.

(2) Cal. S.P.Dom. 1665/4 p.371. Pepys quoted in Dowell, History of Taxation (1888) p.29 etc.

(3) Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. XIV. iv. p.76 etc.

(4) Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. VI. p.363. W.Boyley to Sir W.Paston 13 November 1660.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Preface to the Cal. of Treasury books 1660-7, 1667-8 vols.I and II. Another discussion of the finance of the period is given in Kennedy's English Taxation 1640-1747 (1913) and another in J.D.Beresford's Life of Downing (1925).

the entire responsibility of the King and his extravagance is denied. Dr. Shaw himself has pointed out that the demand for accounts may well have been the result of a desire to know the extent of the King's wants. The King did not tell the Commons what he wanted, but only told them how little they had helped him when the supply was settled. The Commons, owing to the extraordinary system, or lack of system, in the auditing and keeping of public accounts, must have had great difficulty in understanding anything about them.

The issue, already clouded by this lack of reliable information, became involved throughout the reign with personal questions. Clarendon was the first to become the butt of the irritation caused by this ignorance:-

"Pride, lust, ambition and the people's hate,
"The Kingdom's ruin, broker of the State."⁽¹⁾

Later successive ministers were to suffer, though not quite in the same way, yet through the same fundamental causes. It is this which gives that appearance of futility to the proceedings against Clarendon and the treatment of the Commissioners of Accounts in the House of Commons. Just as in 1667 it was "Clarendon's House" which was the symbol of the money shortage, so later it was to be Queronal or Castlemaine. Clarendon's reputation suffered through his lack of tact,

(1) Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. III. p.241. Libel on Clarendon 1667, attributed in Poems on Affairs of State (1703-7) to Charles II.

Charles' through his private pleasures; both were distorted by men like Harvell to emphasise their demand for control by the House of Commons and for open accounts of expenditure. But the whole thing moves in a vicious circle of mutual misunderstanding. Charles wants peace, but at the same time an efficient, if small, army, and a thoroughly well-equipped navy. To obtain sufficient money for this he must call Parliament. The actual revenue there voted does not come up to its estimated value, thus involving the executive in bankruptcy. Applying for more, Charles is hampered by the reputation of his mistresses and their demands. Parliament looks no further for the cause of shortage and while refusing to give more, blames the executive for the state of the services. The plan to gain control by limiting supply failed because Charles, driven desperate by poverty, but with constant resourcefulness, had gone elsewhere for help. Parliament then raised the cry of arbitrary government, Popery, etc., but failed to grant Charles the means to do without the French aid they feared. The blame in the matter lies, if anywhere, on successive administrations that failed to evolve a satisfactory system of accounts.

Section 11. The Last Instructions. Marvell's views on finance and relations with party leaders and personalities of the day. 1666-3.

Right through the session of Parliament ending 18 February 1667 and the next--if we exclude for a moment the strangled session of July--from 10 October 1667 to 9 May 1668 bills of supply are the chief sources of friction, and the accounts of the debates on these are most enlightening in any study of the divisions or parties of the time, the general causes of discontent and their particular relation to the fall of Clarendon. A good deal of material exists for reconstructing opinion at this time, for in the Journals, in Grey's record, in Milward's diary, in Clarendon's account, and, as important as any, Marvell's Last Instructions fairly full information about the personalities in the House, their speeches and numbers can be found. It is with the last of these sources that we are chiefly concerned. The character of this satire has often been remarked on as one of the famous series of "Advices to Painters" which ran through this reign and the next, but attention has not been called to the precision with which Marvell reproduces the sequence of events or to the vividness of his description of the excitement in the House over excise and indeed of its atmosphere and parties generally. How much notice the poem excited is difficult

to say, as, unlike Clarendon's House Warning, it does not seem to have been printed until after Marvell's death, and must therefore have circulated only in manuscript. Pepys' reference to "A Fourth Advice to the Painter upon the coming in of the Dutch to the River, and the end of the War" has sometimes been thought to mean Marvell's poem, but is more likely to be a reference to Denham's fourth poem on that subject.⁽¹⁾

It was in no very good temper that the Houses met at Westminster on the 18 September 1666, but it was at first more favourable to the "court" interest than later when the "gentlemen of the country" had come in:-⁽²⁾

"Thick was the morning, and the House was thin;
 "The Speaker early, when they all fell in.
 "Propitious heavens! had not you them crossed,
 "Excise had won the day, and all been lost."⁽³⁾

So thin was it that it was adjourned until some more members should come in. Before they had come "the house of commons being most filled with the King's servants, there was a faint vote procured" for a suitable supply. But "when the numbers⁽⁴⁾

(1) Pepys VII. 108. 16 September 1667. See Aitken's introduction to Marvell's Poems. The Last Instructions was first printed in the third part of a collection of Poems on Affairs of State. 1689.

(2) Cent. p.1195. Clarendon gives a very interesting account of the financial situation.

(3) Satires p.28. Last Instructions l.35 seq.

(4) Cent. p.1195. Milward gives the number present as 150. (Add. MSS.35413 f.1.)

of the members increased, the parliament appeared much more chagrined than it had hitherto done.⁽¹⁾ Apparently the chief instruments in putting off the vote were "Iron Strangeways",⁽²⁾ Temple, "conqueror of Irish cattle", "Daring Seymour", who grappled for long alone, until almost exhausted:-

"When marching in, a seasonable recruit
 "Of citizens and merchants hold dispute,
 "And charging all their pikes, a sullen band
 "Of Presbyterian Switzers made a stand.
 "Nor could all these the field have long maintained
 "But for the unknown reserve that still remained;
 "A gross of English gentry, nobly born,
 "Of clear estates, and to no faction sworn,
 "Dear lovers of their King, and death to meet
 "For country's cause, that glorious think and sweet;
 "To speak not forward, but in action brave,
 "In giving generous, but in council grave;
 "Candidly credulous for once, nay twice;⁽³⁾
 "But sure the devil cannot cheat them thrice."⁽⁴⁾

In fact, the "country" party, led now by "great Garroway and great Lyttleton",⁽⁵⁾ wins one of its first organised victories-- for "the excise receives a total rout"⁽⁶⁾--and gains one of its first descriptions in Marvell's lines.

Excise was extremely unpopular then, as later, when Walpole

(1) Cont. p.1195.

(2) It is interesting to compare this with Marvell's letter (Grosart II, 467. to Popple, 24 July 1657), where he notes his death with ferocious pleasure.

(3) Referring of course to previous grants of 1664 and 1665.

(4) Satires p.37 Last Instructions ll.181 seq. of. the Alarum, p. below, Appendix IV, for another description of the "country" party.

(5) Satires p.30-31 as before. ll.298 seq. of. Cont. p.1197.

Lyttleton had for Marvell the additional merit of being an upholder of toleration. See Starkey. Add. MSS. 36916 f.66, 11 February 1667-8.

(6) Satires p.30-31 as above.

wished to impose it. Instead of being what we now regard as one of the most convenient of taxes, then it was:-

"Excise, a monster worse than e'er before
 "Frighted the midwife, and the mother tore.
 "A thousand hands she has, a thousand eyes,
 "Breaks into shops and into cellars pries."⁽¹⁾

By the middle of October it had become a party issue. Then Richard Temple proposed that £1,600,000 should be given the King. The court party--if Milward is to be believed--thought this too little, and on the following day moved for general excise on all things, "which was in no way pleasing."⁽²⁾ The Presbyterians, in opposition to this court movement for excise, were for a land-tax.⁽³⁾

The difficulty in rejecting excise was to find a substitute. Marvell's letters give some idea of the perplexed debates on this matter. The first letter from him after the session opens mentions the debate, "though nothing yet resolved" upon impositions on sealed paper. This is written on 23 October.⁽⁴⁾ Two days later Edward Walpole reported as to the value of Chimney money.⁽⁵⁾ By the next day they had not advanced

(1) Satires p.25 Last Instructions ll 130 seq. An interesting pamphlet on Excise is in Case F. S.P.Dom. Car.II. Milward f.5d records a debate in which Temple spoke on 4 October which lasted until one in the morning, and so perhaps dates the occasion referred to by Marvell as so exhausting.

(2) Milward's Diary f.8.

(3) Ibid. f.9.

(4) Grosart II. p.188. Marvell to the Mayor of Hull.

(5) C.J. VIII. p.641.

much further, "not from any want of ardour in the House to supply the publick necessities, but out of our House's sense also of the burthen to be laid upon the subject, and a desire therefore to do it in the most prudent, eligible and easy manner." Chiancy money had now become, like excise, a party issue, in so far as a division into parties of "court" and "country" can as yet be made. Swinson, leading the court opposition to the proposed sale of Chiancy money on 17 October raised many objections to it: it would be difficult, now that so much of London had been destroyed by fire, to assess it; poverty would now prevent people from being able to pay eight years' value of it at once, and its settlement would promote differences between landlord and tenant. On the other hand the country gentry, led by Garroway, pushed forward this idea of computation against the renewed efforts of Clifford and Herbert for excise; but the King did not approve of the proposal, and all Garroway's speeches came to nothing.

Marvell, who displayed more freedom in discussing financial issues than any others with his constituents, tells of the progress of these struggles. On 6 November he writes that:-

(1) Grosart II. p.189 Marvell to Hall 27 October 1666.

(2) Milward f.9. 15 October.

(3) Ibid. f.12. 28 October.

(4) Ibid. f.12 seq.

(5) Ibid. f.14. 8 November.1666.

"the House hath ever since my last intricate still in the way raising this money, for the King: whereby we have onely gained that however, almost all possible expedients having been under debate, we are the riper come to a result". They have not come to any definite decision, but he thinks some of the "more tolerable projects" like the Poll Bill or the land-tax will be adopted. ⁽¹⁾ In the following letter he tells them that:-"The House resolved, that a Poll Bill, an imposition upon sealed paper, an imposition (which is likely to be by way of excise) upon foreign commodities, and an eleven moneth tax upon land..... should be the ways out of which to raise the 1,800,000 £." ⁽²⁾ On 5 December he mentions "an enacting proviso that for the better satisfaction of the people, etc., great sums of money having been already granted, there should this act be constituted so many commissioners of Lords and Commons, to inspect and examine thoroughly the former expense." ⁽³⁾ This was first suggested by Garroway, ⁽⁴⁾ and great things were hoped for it by Marvell. ⁽⁵⁾ After some disagreement the Lords agreed to it, and the bill with the proviso was presented to the King.

The bill met with no very gracious reception. Clarendon

-
- (1) Grosart II. p.191-2 Marvell to Hull 6 November 1666.
 (2) Ibid. p.192/3 Marvell to Hull 13 November. cf. C.J. p.612.
 (3) Ibid. p.198 Marvell to Hull 3 December.
 (4) Milward f.19d. 7 December 1666.
 (5) Grosart II. p.205. Marvell to Hull 15 January 1666/7.

calls the proviso mischievous and gives an account showing how angry Charles was when he received it. Earlier in the progress of these debates Arlington had written to Temple that:—"Such a distrust is fallen into the Parliament, of the misapplication of Money given to, and rising from the War, that they are unwilling to finish the dispatch of their new Gift, till they are satisfied of the well expending of the former. This has made them hasten a troublesome Proviso to the Poll now finished,--the regulation respecting which will cause some Strife and Time."⁽¹⁾

The delay indeed had been intolerable for anyone who cared for his navy as did Charles. Pepys is full of complaints over the shortage of ready money or credit, and when the treasury books show how much even of the King's privy purse was spent on the navy it is easy to understand Charles' impatience with the House. Milward mentions as early as 28 October a letter hastening their action,⁽²⁾ and Harvell commemorates another occasion when:

" the loved King, that's never yet denied,
"Is brought to beg in public, and to chide:"⁽⁴⁾

When the supply came, the King's speech shows how inadequate

(1) Cont. 1204 cf. 1208-9. Two of the King's speeches on this supply, 18 January and 8 February 1666. cf. Pepys VI. p.92. 12 December 1666: "The King hath been heard to say, that he would dissolve them rather then pass this Bill with the Proviso."

(2) Arlington's Letters, edited by Bebington 1712, vol.I. p.111. 10 December.

(3) Milward f.12. 28 October.

(4) Satires p.31-2 Last Instructions 11.327-8 of. Cont. p.

(1)
 he felt it, and the disasters of the following summer could almost have been anticipated when the rotting condition of the navy was observed:-

"The timber rots, the useless axe does rust;
 "The unpractised saw lies buried in its dust;
 "The busy hammer sleeps, the toyes untwine;
 "The store and wages all are mine and thine;
 "Along the coasts and harbours they take care
 "That money lacks, nor forts be in repair."(2)

The reason for this seemingly criminal delay on the part of the Commons lies partly in their misunderstanding of the necessities of the moment--defence in England, if there is no immediate and obvious danger, is always difficult to provide for--and partly in their belief, expressed by Whorwood--
 (3)
 Marvell's "Keen Whorwood"--in the House on 12 November, when, speaking against settling the supply with too great expedition, he said:- "When we have raised ye King's supply we may go
 (4)
 home like fooles as we came." Marvell undoubtedly shared this view, and also accuses the Court of pretending to need money for the services when in reality it was spent on favourites and mistresses:-

"To cheat their pay, feign want, the House accuse."(5)
 There were many who shared this idea, and they did not believe in the needs of the court. That if supply were withheld, the

(1) L.J. vol.XII. p.81. 18 January 1666/7.
 (2) Satires p.31. Last Instructions 11.319 seq.
 (3) Ibid. p.24. 1.127
 (4) Milward f.14d. 12 November 1666.
 (5) Satires p.31 Last Instructions 1.314.

condition of things would force the court to disgorge their ill-gotten gains was a common belief. The real trouble going deeper than this, it is not surprising that the fall of Clarendon did so little to appease the opposition, who found that the removal of one whom they had accused of absorbing vast sums did not after all prove a panacea for the country's ills.

The Last Instructions, besides giving some idea of the financial disputes of the session, also mentions the two other chief activities, the Irish Cattle Bill and Lord Mordaunt's impeachment, but throws little new light upon either. ⁽¹⁾ The foreign policy of Arlington and Bab May is rebuked, and vivid descriptions are given of the coming of Daniel in the year previous with the news of the victory and of the spectacle of the Dutch coming up the river, probably from Marvell's own ⁽²⁾ experience. Its most important contribution to our understanding of that stormy year is the light it throws upon the actors in the House.

Marvell's private relations with many of the men with whom he must have been associated in his political career remain tantalisingly unknown. It is to be supposed that his correspondence, if such private letters as remain are any standard by which to judge it, must have been of a character which

(1) Satires p.32 Last Instructions ll.349 seq.

(2) Ibid. pp.39 seq. and 43.

made its immediate destruction a wise and necessary precaution on the part of the recipient. In no case is this lack of information more to be regretted than in the connection which must have existed between Marvell and Buckingham. That connection, although we have but the vaguest hints as to its nature, presents several suggestive features. In spite of the contempt with which Buckingham was regarded by many of his contemporaries, by men like James of York and probably Charles himself, ⁽¹⁾ and by statesmen like Clarendon and perhaps Halifax, he yet succeeded in impressing many of those who knew him less intimately. Marvell undoubtedly seems to regard him as the natural leader of his party, and always speaks of him with great respect. Only towards the end of his political career does he seem to extend to Shaftesbury any of that deference and respect. The truth of the matter is, perhaps, that Buckingham was really the demagogue that Shaftesbury has usually been dubbed, and had just the right amount of address and inconsistency adequately to fill this role and at the same time to secure himself against any real difficulty at Court.

A direct reference to Marvell's connection with Buckingham

(1) King William's Chest III. 20. James to William of Orange 9 February 1677/8. "In the meane tyme I believe you will have been surpris'd with the newes of the Duke of Buckingham's having leave to come to court, I am sure I was, for I knew nothing of it till he had been with his Ma: but his Ma: knows him too well to let him do any harme."

is found in a satire of about 1675:-

(1)

"From changing old Friends for rascally new ones,
 "From taking Wildman and Marvell for true ones,
 "From wearing Green Ribbens 'gainst him gave us blue ones,
Libera nos domine." (2)

But some connection is obvious much earlier than this. Buckingham was one of the most violent opponents of Clarendon, and one of the leaders of the party supporting the Irish Cattle Bill. This bill, like the excise in the Commons at this period, was a test of party in the Lords. "The Duke of Buckingham appeared at the head of those who favoured the bill, with a marvellous concernment: and at the times appointed for the debate of it, contrary to his custom of coming into the House, indeed of not rising till eleven of the Clock, and seldom staying above a quarter of an hour, except upon some affair which he concerned himself in, he was now always present with the first in the morning, and stayed until the last at night..." (3). The matter not only occupied Buckingham in the House, but out of it. He invited all those concerned in it, like Richard Temple, Seymour, Garroway and Robert Howard, to his table. Clarendon goes on to speak of his capacity for gain-

(1) The date can hardly be earlier from its reference to the Club, which is supposed to have been formed in this year, see below p.249. As Marvell died three years later, the allusion would lose point after 1678.

(2) Poems on Affairs of State. 1704, vol:III. 93. The Duke of Buckingham's Litaney.

(3) Cont: p.1197.

ing popular approval, his address, easiness, humour and wit. "He had always held intelligence with the principal persons of the levelling party, and professed to desire that liberty of conscience might be granted to all..." With all his vices "he found a respect and concurrence from men of different tempers and talents, and had an incredible opinion with the people." Marvell, it is thus not surprising to find, writes approvingly of Buckingham's opposition to Clarendon:-

"First Buckingham that durst 'gainst him rebel,
"Blasted with lightning, struck with thunder fell;"(2)
(3)

In Clarendon's House Warming he is "Great Buckingham".

A link between Marvell and the Duke may have existed in Marvell's former pupil and Buckingham's wife, Mary Fairfax. They had, too, a common acquaintance in Sir Henry Thompson, of York, and if Williamson's note is correct had some common connection with the notorious Blood.

(1) Cont. p.1200.

(2) Satires p.33 Last Instructions 11.357-8.

(3) Ibid. p.60. verse

(4) In the 1715 edition of Buckingham's works are some letters to Thompson on business. The relation may indeed have been entirely of that nature. Marvell writes to Edward Thompson, and less frequently to Henry.

(5) S.P.Dom. 293 no.28. In an almost illegible hand Williamson jotted down notes at one of the examinations of Blood after his attempt on the Crown, and among the names noticed as having some connection with the matter are what seem to be "Marvel & Bucks;". But it would be impossible to build any theory on this, and Marvell's well-known Poem on Blood and references to him give no further clues to the reason for the inclusion of his name on the paper.

About 1670 some coldness towards the Duke is noticeable in Marvell's work, a fact which is easily explained by the part the Duke was now playing in the Cabal ministry,⁽¹⁾ and his behaviour in the Shrewsbury scandal.⁽²⁾ One common aim, however, must always have linked them together politically, and that was their work for toleration.⁽³⁾ Marvell, of course, took the title of one of his best-known pamphlets from Buckingham's play, and it is not without significance that the pamphlet was on behalf of the dissenters. Marvell notes the return of the Duke into opposition with approval in the Growth of Popery. There, speaking of the proceedings against him in the House in 1673, he says:- "But he was so far a gainer, that with the loss of his offices and dependence, he was restored to the freedom of his own spirit, to give thenceforward those admirable proofs of the vigour and vivacity of his better judgement, in asserting, though to his own imprisonment, the due liberties of the English Nation."⁽⁴⁾ Buckingham's behaviour during the debates on the Test gained him tributes in Marvell's letters and in the Growth of Popery.

(1) Grosart II. pp.317 and 326. Marvell to Popple, 21 March and 14 April 1670. cf. Add. MSS. 36916 f.170, Starkey to Ashton, 19 April 1670.

(2) "Buckingham runs out of all with the Lady Shrewsbury." Grosart II. 395. To a friend in Persia, 9 August 1671.

(3) See below Chap. IV. also Grosart II. 292. Marvell to Hull, 25 November 1669. There is perhaps a reference to the Rehearsal in the Satires p.96 Nostradamus Prophecy l.27.

(4) Grosart IV. Growth of Popery p.299.

Writing to Popple in 1675 Marvell says:- "Never were poor men exposed and abused all the session, as the bishops were by the Duke of Buckingham, upon the Test; never the like, nor so infinitely pleasant, and no men were ever grown so odiously ridiculous."⁽¹⁾ It is significant that Marvell here makes no mention of Shaftesbury's part, though in the Growth of Popery he brackets his name with the Duke's.⁽²⁾ In this connection the phrase "General of the Party", applied to Buckingham by the author of A Letter from a Person of Quality, is significant of that popular recognition already noticed of Buckingham rather than Shaftesbury as the leader of the "country" interest.

The description of the Lords' protest at the long prorogation in the Growth of Popery marks a modification of this attitude. Buckingham, "who usually saith what he thinks", made the first protest, but during the debate "the earl of Shaftesbury had opportunity to appear with such extraordinary vigour in what concerned both the Duke of Buckingham's person and his proposal, that the Duke of Buckingham might have stood single in any rational contest, so the Earl of Shaftesbury was more properly another principal than his second."⁽³⁾ This episode may have marked in the minds of men like Marvell at least the definite emergence of another "country" leader.

(1) Grosart II. p.467. Marvell to Popple 24 July 1675.

(2) Grosart IV. p.309.

(3) Growth of Popery, Grosart IV. p.321.

Until now, by Marvell at least, Buckingham seems to have been regarded as leader.

Marvell mentions in the Last Instructions many leaders of small factions in the court interest. Among these were the disciplined troops of Denham, the "old courtiers" led by Ashburnham, of whose bribe-taking Marvell was to write an account to Hull later in the year, ⁽¹⁾ the "tribe" of Steward, Fox and his court officers, Clarendon's "bloated" followers, Mathew Wren and the faction led by Powell in the French interest. ⁽²⁾ Duncombe's incompetence is noticed. ⁽³⁾

It is, however, men on his own side that are described most fully by Marvell. Those he names are the same as those mentioned by Clarendon, ⁽⁴⁾ that is, Seymour, Richard Temple, Robert Howard, Garroway, and Tomkins, to which list Marvell adds Strangeways, Sandys, Holmes, Lee, Lyttleton, Lovelace, Vaughan, Waller, Whorwood and Williams. ⁽⁵⁾ For some few of these we have material for tracing the development in Marvell's attitude to them. Seymour is an interesting example of this. An incident in November, so far as it is possible to reconstruct

(1) Grosart II. p.224. Marvell to Hull 23 November 1667. Marvell also sat on a committee to deal with this incident (C.J. 25 November 1667 p. 25.)

(2) Satires pp.24-8 Last Instructions 11.121-234. For another reference to Steward see above Chapter. II. p. 61. Birch (11.143-6), who has three withering lines, probably added to his offences in Marvell's eyes by his support of Excise: Milward f.13.

(3) Satires p.42, 47 Last Instructions 11.605, 746 seq.

(4) See above p. 109.

(5) See note to this Chap. drawn from the Last Instructions.

it, seems to suggest that already Seymour and Marvell were
 at cross-purposes. ⁽¹⁾ The incident can hardly show a good understanding between the two men. A letter written to one of Marvell's friends in the November of 1670 fixes the final breach ⁽²⁾ between Seymour and the country party of the moment. After this, references to him in Marvell's satires are very rancorous. He is accused of bribery:- "For money comes when Seymour leaves the chair," ⁽³⁾ and he is dubbed "One of the first re-
 canters of the State." ⁽⁴⁾ In 1677, after the second debate on the bill for the Protestant education of the Royal children, and Marvell's longest speech, Seymour, who was Speaker at this time, roused his anger by a reference to his speech in his absence; ⁽⁵⁾ the next day, when Marvell was being called to order for his blow to Harcourt, he replied with some heat to Seymour, and hinted that he should first control his own behaviour before criticising other people's.

(1) Grey gives this account of the incident: (I. 37)

"Mr. Marvell) moves, That whoever brought in the article of 'the King's being unfit for government' would publish the person that gave him that information.

Robert Howard) The person that informed the House of those words will rise up and speak.

Mr. Seymour) What he said was a general expression, and the person that told him receded from what he had said; but referred it to be spoken by Sir John Denham."

Grey gives the date as 11th. November, Parl. Hist. as 6th. (IV. 385) and Milward (f. 40) as 7th. Milward gives the remark about the King as "an inactive person and indisposed for government."

Milward should decide the date as 7 November.

(2) Grosart II, 351. Marvell to Will. Popple 28 November 1670.

(3) Satires p. 63. Farther Instructions to a Painter (1671/2) l. 22.

(4) Ibid. p. 64. l. 42.

(5) See below Chap. V. p. 231.

Carroway, another of those fighting against excise, was quite soon to leave the "country" interest. On 21 March 1670 Marvell refers scornfully to the "Carroway party" who "appeared with the usual vigour, but the country gentlemen appeared not in their true number the first day, so the first blow was against them."⁽¹⁾ In a later satire he too is accused of taking bribes,⁽²⁾ together with yet another of the heroes of the Last Instructions, Lee [in some versions Howard]⁽³⁾. Iytleton, though he was always faintly inclined to the country party, by 1669 had lost the confidence of the extremest sections of it,⁽⁴⁾ and Strangeways when he died received a cruel tribute from Marvell.⁽⁵⁾ Temple, Howard, Car and Hollis had also by 1670 left "their former party",⁽⁶⁾ and a curious illustration of the nature of the parties of this time is afforded by the fact that of all those mentioned as in any way prominent in the "country" struggles of 1666-7, only three are not later to be reviled as "courtiers" in Marvell's satires or letters.

During the winter following Clarendon's disgrace Marvell played a more conspicuous part than usual in the House. On

(1) Grosart II. p.315 Marvell to Popple 21 March 1670.

(2) Satires p.83 Britannia and Helicah l.17. Pepys VI. p.8 diagnoses his complaint in 1666 as discontent.

(3) Poems on Affairs of State 1689.

(4) See the Alarm 1669 (Appendix IV), a country-party libel.

(5) Grosart II. p.426 Marvell to "Strangeways is dead like a dog..."

(6) Grosart II. p.351. Marvell to Popple 28 November 1670.

14 October Milward reports:- "This morning was wholly spent in speeches concerning the Lord Chancellor. Whether the King's laying him aside should be joyned to the other acts of Grace for which we were to give him the thanks of the house: Many excellent speeches were made against it by Sir Rebt: Atkins, Sir John Maynard, Mr. Marvyn [Marvell], Mr. Dowdswell and by the two Goodricks; Coll: Birch, intimating yt it was a precondemning him before any crime was layd to his charge." (1) Again on the 29 (or 30) October Marvell spoke against the immediate imprisoning of Clarendon for "he would have the faults hunt the persons--would not have a sudden impeachment by reason of the greatness of the person or danger of escape, Lord Clarendon not very likely to ride away post--witnesses of that quality not to be had." (2) Probably Marvell, though these speeches at first seem strange from an opponent of the Chancellor, was working to prevent too hasty an action over him, and thus a settlement of his case before he had been properly impeached and thoroughly disgraced. He did not want Clarendon's punishment to end with his mere dismissal from office. In this same month Marvell served on the committees to enquire (3) into the miscarriage of the late war and the sale of Dunkirk, and spoke with Swinzen and Boscowan against sending Pett to

(1) Milward f.30 14 October.

(2) Grey I. 14. 29 October. cf. Parl. Hist. IV. 376. date given as 26. The debate has been reprinted by Grosart I. p.

(3) C.J. vol.IX. p.4/5. 17 October 1667.

(1)
the Tower. He had already written on both these things in the Last Instructions, his lines on Pett being perhaps amongst his best satirical work:-

"After this loss to relish discontent, (i.e. after
the disgrace of July)
"Some one must be accused by Parliament.
"All our miscarriages on Pett must fall,
"His name alone seems fit to answer all.
"Whose counsel first did this mad war beget?
"Who all commands sold through the navy? Pett.
"Who would not follow when the Dutch were beat?
.....Pett. etc.(2)

Really it is Hyde, not the unfortunate Pett who should be the scapegrace, argues Marvell:-

" Hyde provoked, his foaming tusk does what,
"To prove them traitors, and himself the Pett."(3)

One of Marvell's speeches during the winter created something like a stir. This was his speech against Arlington, for whom he had already shown his dislike in the Last Instructions. It had been Bennet's "luxury and vice" that had created the
(4)
necessity for excise, his negligence and ignorance that had
been partly responsible for the faulty preparations for the
(5) war; he it was who had been false to Bristol, and, it might
(6)
be, false to another. It is not surprising then to find Grey during the February of 1667/8 that "Mr. Marvell reflecting

(1) Milward f.37d. 31 October 1667.

(2) Satires p.46. Last Instructions 11.717 seq.

(3) Ibid. p.52. 11.893-4.

(4) Ibid. p.25. 1.129.

(5) Ibid. p.34. 1.397 seq.

(6) Ibid. p.52. 1.884. For possible connection between Marvell and Bristol see below p.

on Lord Arlington, somewhat transportedly said:- "We have had Bristols and Cecils Secretaries, and by them knew the King of Spain's Junto; and letters of the Pope's cabinet; now such a strange account of things! The money allowed for intelligence so small, the intelligence was accordingly-- A libidinous desire in men for places, makes them think themselves fit for them--The place of Secretary ill gotten, when bought with 10, 000 £ and a Barony--He was called to explain himself; but said the thing was so plain, it needed (1) it not." Another reporter mentions this "very sharpe speech", (2) and Arlington himself, writing to Williamsen, speaks of it thus:- "The House of Commons are yet in their enquiry after miscarriages; I leave it to your other correspondents to tell you what votes they have passed therein. But cannot forbear letting you know that Mr. Marvell hath struck hard at me, upon the Point of Intelligence, tho' hitherto unsuccessfully, as to the doing of me any harm thereby. This Day [17 February] he hath given me cause to forgive him, by being the first Man that, in the midst of this enquiry, moved the taking into Consideration the matter of His Majesty's speech, which begat the resolution of doing it on Wednesday morning." (3)

(1) Grey I. 70-71. Friday 14 February 1667-8.

(2) Milward f.58d. 15 February 1667/8. "Mr Marvin made a most sharpe speech against some of ye Councill and especially hinted at ye Lord Arlington as yt he had got 1000l. & a barony."

(3) Arlington's Letters, edited by Bebington 1727, vol. I. p.226. Arlington to Temple 17 February 1667/8. Incidentally this gives the date of another speech by Harvell, 17 Feb. Another reference is found Add MSS. 36916 f.70. Newsletter of 15 Feb; debate on miscarriages "wherain they have been very hot upon a secretary."

Pepys mentions the accusation too:- "The King's bad intelligence was mentioned, wherein they were bitter against my Lord Arlington, saying, among other things, that whatever Horrice's was, who declared he had but £700 a year allowed for intelligence, the King paid too dear for my Lord Arlington's, in giving him £10,000 and a barony for it." Perhaps the Alarum echoes this speech when its author also accuses Arlington of wanting £10,000 and a barony. On 21 February Marvell again spoke on the mismanagement of the war. He said "yt although ye affairs upon hearing may clear themselves, yet it was requisite yt they should be desired to inform the House where ye fault was, for there is no question but they are able to do it." Pepys perhaps refers to the occasion of this speech when he says that on this day a new request for money was made for the Secretary. Marvell had not altered his opinion of Arlington when he wrote in 1675 of Williamson's "perfumed predecessor."

Marvell made one more recorded speech this session. That speech was made 26 March, when the House was debating whether to hear the Merchant Adventurers' case or to adjourn

(1) Pepys VII. 303, entry of 17 February. cf. 14 February, pp. 300 and 302.

(2) The Alarum, Appendix IV. below.

(3) Milward f. 62. 21 February 1667/8.

(4) Pepys VII. 310.

(5) Satires p. 110. Dialogue between two Horses. 1.175.

immediately. Marvell, on behalf of the Adventurers, asked the House to delay the proposed adjournment until they had heard the Merchants' case. (1) The House, however, decided against his motion. It is possible that Marvell's work in the Russian Embassy or his brother-in-laws' business may have brought him into some connection with the Adventurers.

(1) Milward, 33413 F.74. 26 March. In the next year to lead to definite rebellion. It is before this, however, and while the debate lasted of the "country" and "city" parties were still officers and members of parliament, that Marvell's attitude is interesting. It shows a curious appreciation of the government of Charles' society for toleration and a realization of the same time of his absolute tendencies and the danger to parliamentary government they represented.

The letters that survive from the year 1669 are little about the King. They are directed to Hall, and, as always with these letters, are very conventional in their language. The Lord Chancellor would have the artist paint a vivid picture of the King "in a good state of night", while on a "glorious" vision of his grandfather's and his father's fate. His thanks

(1) Milward, 33413 F.74. 26 March. In the next year to lead to definite rebellion. It is before this, however, and while the debate lasted of the "country" and "city" parties were still officers and members of parliament, that Marvell's attitude is interesting. It shows a curious appreciation of the government of Charles' society for toleration and a realization of the same time of his absolute tendencies and the danger to parliamentary government they represented.

Section 111. Marvell's Attitude to the King, 1665-1672.

It is rather difficult to reconcile the decidedly favourable references to Charles in the Rehearsal Transposed with Marvell's professed opinion of him in his private correspondence of the same period. Undoubtedly after 1673 the satires reveal a growing dissatisfaction with Charles' behaviour, and a dread of his heir's religion, but this is merely the part of the growth of a fairly general discontent which, though checked by Charles' cleverness, was in the next reign to lead to definite rebellion. It is before this, however, and while the future leaders of the "country" and "whig" parties were still office-holders and nominally courtiers, that Marvell's attitude is interesting. It shows a curious appreciation of the genuineness of Charles' anxiety for toleration and a realisation at the same time of his absolutist tendencies and the danger to Parliamentary government they represent.

The letters that survive from the year 1665 say little about the King. They are directed to Hull, and, as always with these letters, are very conventional in their outlook. The Last Instructions would have the artist paint a vivid picture of the King "in a dead shade of night", gazing on a grizzly vision of his grandsire's and his father's fate. His throne

(1) Satires pp.50-52 Last Instructions l.837 seq.
"Grandsire", i.e. Henry IV. of France.

is called "uncasy", but the cause of that, as yet, lies in his courtiers--"Spots unknown in the bright star"⁽¹⁾--in evil counsellors:-

"Where few the number, choice is there less hard;
"Give us this Court, and rule without a guard."⁽²⁾

The attitude of the whole satire is very much less directly against the King himself than that of the satires after 1673. It only points the way that princes who have been unwise have taken.

Marvell makes the first opening of Parliament after Clarendon's fall the occasion of a more than usually elaborate display of thankfulness and loyalty. He writes full of optimism at this event to the Mayor of Hull:- "And therefore we ought neither to be wanting to God in praising Him for His good disposall of ill things to this purpose; nor to the King in celebrating his prudence and constancy by which these things are so happily brought about: nor to ourselves in taking hold of the opportunity."⁽³⁾

By 1667 Marvell is writing that "his Majesty declares on all occasions that he is resolved not to part with this parliament."⁽⁴⁾ The absence of comment is remarkable, but the letters

(1) Satires p.53 To the King. 1.2.

(2) Ibid. p.54.11.41-2

(3) Grosart II. 218. Marvell to Hull 3 October 1667

(4) Grosart II. 267. Marvell to Duncalfe, Mayor of Hull, 2 March 1668/9.

were occasionally intercepted, and comment was not safe. The Corporation may have read between the lines more easily than we can, for many of them were personally known to Marvell. An example of when they must have done this is provided by a letter to Hull which it is possible to compare with a private letter of the same period. In the former Marvell writes:- "news coming that his Majesty, in his princely wisdom, had resolved to prorogue us, the debate to send to the King that Sir George (Carteret) might be expelled the court, and deprived of all offices. In the mean time came the Black Rod, and going up we were prorogued by Commission till 14th February. It is enough to tell you that Prorogation makes all Bills, Votes and Proceedings null and voyd, as if nothing had bin don or said. God direct his Majesty further in so weighty resolutions." ⁽¹⁾ In the latter the full irony of that "God direct his Majesty" becomes apparent. He writes to Popple:- "You know that we having voted the King, before Christmas, four hundred thousand pounds, and no more; and being ready to adjourn ourselves till February, his Majesty, fortified by some undertakers of the meanest of our House, threw up all as nothing, and prorogued us from the first of December till ⁽²⁾ the fourteenth of February." It is the difference between the

(1) Grosart II. 297, Marvell to Hull 12 December 1669.

(2) Grosart II. 314/5. Marvell to Popple, who was at Bordeaux, 21 March 1669/70.

Marvell of the Hull correspondence and the Marvell known to his friends that make it difficult always rightly to distinguish between the conventional loyalty of the former and the tribute to the King's wisdom that both Marvells were willing to yield, as over the King's part in smoothing over the quarrels of this year between Lords and Commons. (1)

Except for rare instances like the above, however, a steadily increasing disgust with the court and King is noticeable in the letters of this time. In that same letter of March 1670 Marvell tells Popple:- "It is also my opinion that the King was never since his coming in, nay all things considered, no King since the conquest, so absolutely powerful at home, nor Parliament, nor place, so constantly supplied with men of the same temper. In such conjuncture, dear Will, (2) what probability is there of my doing anything to the purpose?" This shows too a flash of political ambition, rarely, if ever, met with in Marvell's whole correspondence. (3)

In the following April he is again harping upon the power of the court and the impotence of Parliament:- "The Parliament was never so embarrassed beyond recovery", and scornfully reports the lack of protest at the King's appearance at debates:-

(1) Grosart II. 302 Marvell to Hull, 22 February 1669/70. of. with letter above.

(2) Grosart II. 315. Marvell to Popple as above, p.123 note 2.

(3) That is, if the letter about the Rehearsal Transposed and Mr. Spilke are excepted; they indeed show ambition, but of another kind.

"at any other but so bewitched a time as this, it would have been looked upon as an high usurpation, and breach of privilege." Of the proposed proviso restoring the King's ecclesiastical prerogatives he says:- "There was never so compendious a piece of absolute universal tyranny." The same letter, (1) telling of the secession of so many of the "country" to the "court" interest (2) observes that "the House was thin and obsequious. They voted at first that they would supply the King (who spoke of nothing but to have money) namine as it was remarked, contradicente; but few affirmatives, rather a silence as of men ashamed and unwilling." (3) Writing in August to a friend of the events of the preceding year, Marvell again notes the parlous condition of his party, and accuses the King of trying to deceive Parliament into giving him supply. "Such was the number of the constant courtiers increased by the apostate patriots, who were bought off, for that turn, some at six, others ten, one at fifteen thousand pounds in money, besides what offices, lands, and reversions, to others, that it is a mercy they gave not away the whole land and liberty of England. The Earl of Clare made a very bold and rational harangue, the King being present, against

(1) Grosart II, 325. Marvell to Popple, 14 April 1670.

(2) See above p. 115.

(3) Grosart II, 351. Marvell to Popple, 28 November 1670.

the King's sitting among the Lords, contrary to former precedents, during their debates; but he was not seconded..... The House of Commons has run almost to the end of their line, and are grown extreme chargeable to the King, and odious to the people.....We truckle to France in all things, to the
 (1)
 prejudice of our honour."

These letters reveal Marvell constantly opposed to the Court, and latterly at any rate, frankly suspicious of and disgusted with the King's policy and behaviour. They definitely enable us to place Marvell among that extremer section of his party which remained consistently in opposition to the King and Court from as early a date as 1665, if not before. By 1671 have already been voiced the war-cries of the reign, the fear of standing armies, arbitrary rule, Rome and the French interest. In all essentials these are the same as the accusations of the Growth of Popery, and want only the intensity of the later period. Marvell's part in the proceedings against Clarendon could not alone place him in this extremer section of the opposition, but his attitude as it is revealed in his satires and letters of the period to financial questions, to various prominent personalities and to the King are amply sufficient to decide his politics and the group to which he belonged in the House.

(1) Grosart II. 392-396. Marvell to a Friend in Persia, 9 August 1671. The whole letter is very enlightening. Quotation begins p. 394. For an interesting parallel description of "apostate patriots" see A Letter from a Parliament Man 1675, State Tracts Baldwin 1689.

Note to the Chapter. Parties in 1666-7.

Appended to this chapter is a list of men placed by Marvell in the Court and Country interests respectively in his satire the Last Instructions, written c. August 1667. Names marked † are known to have seceded from Opposition, temporarily at least, before the end of 1670.

Court.

Alan	Fitzharding
St. Albans	Fox
Apsley	Goodrick
Ashburnham	Goodrick
Bennet	Higgins
Berkley	Hyde
Bronkard	Legge
Brotherick	May
Birch	Paston
Carteret	Poole
Charlton	Powell
Clifford	Prodgers
Coventry H.	Steward
Coventry W. (afterwards "Country")	Swale
Cornbury (son of Clarendon)	Talbot
Denham	Thurland
Duncombe	Trelawney (brother-in-law of
Eaton	Turner Ed. Seymour)
Finch	Wood
	Wren, Mathew.

Country.

Garroway †	Strangways †
Holmes †	Temple R. †
Howard †	Tomkins
Lee †	Vaughan
Littleton †	Waller
Levelace	Whorwood
Sandys †	Williams (alias Cromwell)
Seymour †	

Chapter IV. The Rehearsal Transposed.

The really adequate history of religious toleration has yet to be written. The literature of the subject is already great, but each newcomer may find some hitherto unexplored material to work on. Such material is provided by the famous Marvell-Parker and Marvell-Turner controversies, for in spite of the fact that few pamphlets attracted so much attention in their time as those issued during its course, these have never yet received any detailed attention. ⁽¹⁾ Yet the very popularity of the Rehearsal Transposed and Mr. Spixie in their own day, the vogue they enjoyed with all the town wits, their immense superiority of style and presentment to the pamphlets they refuted, and finally the sanity and moderation of the views they express surely demand some further notice. Their author, Andrew Marvell, was already a man of reputation, but these works gave him fame and also gave his party and many others mainly interested in religious matters a really witty exposition of moderate toleration and of a not impracticable course

(1) In three of the most recent books on the subject this is noticeable. In the Theory of Toleration (1911) Mr. Seaton, although he devotes some attention to Parker, does not mention Marvell at all--an amazing omission; in Religious Liberty under Charles II and James II (1910) Mr. Russell Smith only quotes a telling phrase or two; the Declaration of Indulgence (1904) by Mr. Bates does not profess to deal with ideas so much as with certain definite attempts at alleviation and their results, and does not therefore do more than mention Marvell. Israel D'Israeli's Quarrels of Authors, often referred to as the authority on the controversy, does little more than name the parties to it and retail gossip about them.

of action. His later connection with Shaftesbury and his group make any of his opinions worth exploring, even without the additional interest given them by his fame in other directions.

The controversies with Parker and Turner have a peculiarly appropriate place in a study of political development, for the arguments on both sides are on the whole the arguments of politicians and laymen. This is true in spite of Parker's position in the Church. His attitude, even more than Marvell's, is based on a profoundly secular view of the problem, and Marvell's views are fundamentally those later to be adopted by the Whigs. They may have been influenced by his religious views, but as these were probably more "calvinistically anglican" than anything else they would not be of a sort to influence him particularly towards toleration. The Presbyterians chiefly desired a toleration for their own sect, and hardly bothered at all about the principle involved--indeed, were not usually in favour of any kind of general toleration. Marvell's views were most probably the result of a realisation of the political inexpediency of intolerance drawn from his own immediate experience. They were also the result of his intense insistence on property rights, among which he included a right to "own an individual conscience". He was, too, one of a small but growing body of men who based their plea for toleration on the practical Christianity of a moderate course. These saw in the efforts

of their fellow-countrymen to enforce a rigid conformity the greatest danger to the peace and security of their country. They were not yet influential enough in Parliament to obtain their objects there, but it was to them and to the known tolerance of the King that the non-conformists looked for some redress as occasion arose.

Section 1. The King, the Bishops and Toleration.

Enforcement of the laws of Uniformity depended very largely on the local justices and juries, ⁽¹⁾ all of whom would, nominally at any rate, be churchmen, but some of whom might be unwilling to see their fellows persecuted. The justices of Oxfordshire were reprimanded for not enforcing the laws against the fanatics, and their case was by no means an isolated example. ⁽²⁾ At other times the justices, though willing to act, were prevented by the refusal of the common people to inform against dissenters, even when tempted by rewards for so doing. ⁽³⁾ In big towns, where as a rule nonconformity was strongest, it was extremely difficult to enforce laws against

(1) The refusal of one jury to give a decision against some dissenters led, of course, to the famous Bushnell case, mentioned by Marvell in several letters. (See Grosart II, 347, Marvell to Hull, 22(?) November 1670; 349-50, Marvell to Popple, 28 November 1670.

(2) Cal. S.P.Dom. 15 October 1665, p.15. cf. Hist. MSS. Com. Report XII. app.vii. pp.33, 35 etc. and Add. MSS.36916 ff.181, 182, 188 etc.

(3) Fox's Journal (Dent) p.217.

the wishes of the townsfolk. Yarmouth, Hull (1) and even Canterbury contained large groups of dissenters. Richard Baxter testifies to the help he was given by Anglican clergy, (2) and in dioceses like Chester (3) and Norwich, where the bishops were sympathetic, laws were very laxly administered. Even where, as in Durham, the bishop was strongly in favour of uniformity, he found it difficult to impose his wishes on a strong, fanatically inclined Corporation like Durham city. (4) Many who were very far from prescribing a general toleration would yet, like Corbet, relax the laws for those dissenters that were "of sound faith and godly life", (5) and would have connived at the practice of their religion by men like Robert Wild (6) and Baxter. "Philagthus", author of a Conformist's Plea for Nonconformists, (7) represented the moderation of many when he advocated a similar indulgence on the ground of Christian charity, and many others of his church who, like Reynolds, Crofts and Marvell himself, had every reason through old associations with the sectaries to wish them at least an

(1) Yarmouth is a notorious example: see Cal. S.P.Dom. 1667-8 pp.68, 85, 161, 232 etc. for only a few reports of this.

(2) Cal. S.P.Dom. 1668-9 p.623. Whittington to Williamson on this, 20 December 1669.

(3) Baxter's Autobiography, edited by Lloyd Williams (1925), p.189. cf. G.H.'s letter to Arlington, 31 May 1670, Cal. S.P.Dom. 1670 p.243.

(4) For an interesting light on Wilkins' election to Chester see Add. MSS. 36916 f.115, 10 October 1668, also f.119.

(5) Cosin Correspondence II. 197-201.

(6) A Discourse of the Religion of England 1667-8 (J. Corbet).

(7) Author of the Loyal Nonconformist, a poem of about 20 stanzas 1666.

(8) Press mark 701 z 24

undisturbed life, helped to spread such views. Still, though such men and some connivance were not uncommon, it is true to say that in most places men were doing all they could to stamp out what they regarded as a menace not only to their church, but to their king.

The Civil War had rather altered the aspect of the question. Though the principle of toleration had undoubtedly gained ground during that period, the immediate effect of this progress at the Restoration was not to increase confidence in it as a workable system, but rather to discredit it by an association with sedition not altogether easy to refute. Unfortunately those most nearly concerned in the fight for toleration were those who by their intolerated position might be expected to have an incentive to revolt against the power that denied them what they claimed as their right. War had brought bitterness to the Anglican church as a whole, though its members had been fairly well treated. "No Bishop, no King" was, however, the most unfortunate party cry that could have been invented, as it put ready into the mouths of these bishops a good reason for the extermination of their opponents. Hence the efforts of men like Marvell to shift to their shoulders the blame for the "late troubles", and to show them to have been at the root of the late King's evil counsels. This, when combined with their failure or refusal

to give adequate terms to the dissenters at the conferences of Worcester House and the Savoy Palace, made good enough arguments for their abuse whenever occasion offered. If the bishops had not misled the King, all those unhappy years would have been spared, they argued; if they had not "stuck upon all that they did" when Charles II gave to both parties the opportunity of agreement, many troubles in this reign too would have been avoided.

Marvell's attitude to the bishops is one of the outstanding features of his work. He may concede something to the ordinary clergy, indeed, pays them some glowing tributes and throughout his Parliamentary career endeavoured to better their lot, but he never says a good word for the bishops. His longest recorded speech--in 1677--⁽¹⁾ is directed against giving them more power than they already possess. Like so many of his contemporaries, he seems afraid of them, as of some malignant force in the State, and this feeling can be illustrated over and over again from his work. The Poem on Blood's stealing the Crown hits at their mercilessness:-

"When daring Blood, his rent to have regained,
 "Upon the English diadem distrained,
 "He chose the cassock, surcingle and gown,
 "The fittest mask for one that robs the crown:
 "But his lay-pity underneath prevailed,
 "And whilst he saved the keeper's life he failed;
 "With the priest's vestment had he but put on
 "The prelate's cruelty, the crown had gone."⁽²⁾

(1) See Chap. V. below.

(2) Satires p.65.

An Historical Poem speaks of their deceptiveness: "Priests
 (1)
 were the first deluders of mankind", and in the Loyal Sect
 he says:-

"Nothing, not bogs nor sands nor seas nor Alps,
 "Separates the world so as the bishops' scalps....
 "The friendly leadstone has not more combined,
 "Than bishops cramped, the commerce of mankind."(2)

Marvell felt "there's no deliver us from a bishop's wrath" and
 dreaded that day:-

"When bishops shall lay all religion by,
 "And strive by law to establish tyranny."(3)

Rightly or wrongly, he and his like always associated the
 bishops with that party which would have made Charles the
 English parallel of Louis XIV. To the question asked by one
 of their pamphleteers, "Which are the Greatest supporters
 of the boundless Prerogative, Prelates, or Dissenting Prot-
 (4)
 estants?" they felt but one answer was possible: the prelates.

The bishops were so unpopular that it is not surprising
 they were the people most frequently blamed for the suffer-
 ings of dissenters. Yet without the enthusiastic support of
 many of the Commons the bishops could never have carried
 through the severities of the Clarendon code or the later
 Uniformity Acts. There is indeed a distinct division in the

(1) Satires p.73 l.80.

(2) Poems pp.129-130. The Loyal Sect, ll.110-111, 114-115.

(3) Satires p.96. Nostradamus Foretold, ll.34-5.

(4) A Letter from a Parliament Man, reprinted in Baldwin's
State Tracts p.53.

governing classes at this period on the subject of toleration, and most usually the bishops and the Commons are found taking sides against the tolerance of the King, the Lords and the oppressed nonconformists. It is this division which explains the curious anomaly that the same government which went further than ever before to enforce rigid conformity, also in order to frustrate the intentions of the various Uniformity acts went further in stretching the prerogative of the King. It is an interesting case of Charles Stuart's being bribed against the King. (1)

Charles II is one of the last of our kings whose personality and opinions must be noticed in connection with every aspect of his reign. His interest in the Marvell-Parker controversy is testified by Burnet (2) and by Lestrange, who in a statement before the privy council declared that Charles had refused to see Marvell's book suppressed, as Marvell had done his right and Parker wrong. (3) There is also evidence in Marvell's work that although he could deplore the King's licentiousness as much as anyone, (4) he had, for some years at any rate, a real belief in the King's sincere desire to help the noncon-

(1) Halifax, Character of Charles II. see below p. 137.

(2) History of his own Times (Airy) I. 467.

(3) Hist. MSS. Com. Report VII. p. 517. 23 January 1672/3.

(4) Satires p. 105. A Dialogue ll. 6-9:

" It would make a stone speak

"To see Dei Gratia writ on the throne,

"And the King's wicked life say, God there is none," etc.

formists. Baxter shared this opinion, and the friendship of William Penn with both Charles and his brother is significant in this connection. There would, indeed, seem to be evidence for supposing not only that Charles would have helped his Catholic subjects if he had been able, but that he was genuinely anxious to help other dissenters as well. Though this has sometimes been pointed out, as a rule his tolerance is questioned or put down to bias for the Catholics.

The phrase of a modern historian who calls Charles a king "who made a power out of vacillation"⁽¹⁾ gives the key to his whole policy. Probably to that end to his great faculty of dissembling which Halifax's Character has made so famous the cause of toleration owed its salvation in a difficult period. Charles, like his famous cousin Elizabeth before him, had a capacity for taking what he could get without endangering what he had by sticking out for more. His persistent return to the attack on rigid enforcement is astonishing when his love of ease is remembered. Why he thus exerted himself if he had no definite object in view is hard to say. Halifax does not explain it:- "It must be allowed," he says, "he had a little Over-balance on the well-natured Side--not Vigour

(1) K. Feiling, History of the Tory Party (1924) p.155.

[1] Halifax, Works, edited by W. Raleigh (1712) p.201.

[2] Diary, 3 September 1685.

[3] Halifax, Works, edited by Scott and Saintsbury, VIII, p.157.

[4] History of his son James (English translation 1727), p.205, 206.

enough to earnest to do a kind Thing, much less to do a harsh one; but if a hard thing was done to another Man he did not eat his Supper the worse for it. It was rather a Deadness than a Severity of Nature, whether it proceeded from a Dissipation of Spirits, or by the Habit of Living in which he was engaged.⁽¹⁾

This character indeed shows him disinclined to severity, but does not show whatever he may have attempted for dissenters to have sprung, as it might with some, from a keen sensibility to pain. Burnet definitely calls Charles cruel, but this charge is borne out neither by his behaviour nor by other testimony about him. Evelyn says he was "not bloody nor cruel"⁽²⁾, and Dryden praises his clemency.⁽³⁾ Parker in a description of Charles remarks:- "Neither was it agreeable to the natural goodness and clemency of his temper that his subjects should be tormented with unnecessary persecution. Lastly that it was always a particular maxim of his Royal Majesty that force was the worst and most improper remedy that could be used to preserve the peace of the Church."⁽⁴⁾

Charles' religious opinions were not such as were likely to make him a persecutor "for righteousness' sake". Halifax thinks him a Catholic, but John Sheffield a deist, and "this

(1) Halifax, Works, edited by W. Raleigh (1912) p.295.

(2) Diary, 4 September 1685.

(3) Dryden, Works, edited by Scott and Saintsbury, VIII. p.137.

(4) History of his own Time (English Translation 1727), p.309,310.

uncommon Opinion" thinks the latter:- "He owed to the Liveliness of his Parts, and the Carelessness of his Temper, than either to Reading, or much consideration; for his quickness of Apprehension, at first View, could discern through the several Cheats of pious Pretences; and his natural Laziness confirm'd in all equal Mistrust of them all, for fear he should be troubled with examining which was best."⁽¹⁾

Clarendon, who had many opportunities of watching the King's behaviour, has much to say that is enlightening about his manner towards the dissenters. He shows the King "who always received them with too much clemency, and dismissed them with too much hope"⁽²⁾, swayed first by one party and then by the other; the Stuarts, he says, "did not love to deny, and less to strangers than to their friends."⁽³⁾ Thus did Clarendon seek to explain to himself that strange "persistent pressure for toleration from the highest quarter"⁽⁴⁾ which he continually noticed. Though he himself regretted that so much that was new was insisted upon in the new Uniformity Act, yet he could see good reasons for supporting the principles on which it and the other acts were based. "Nothing but a severe execution of the law can ever prevail upon that classis

(1) An Edition of Buckingham's Works, together with some by Sheffield and Rochester (1715) II. p.238.

(2) Cont. pp.1080-1.

(3) Ibid. p.1180.

(4) Feiling. p.131.

(1)
of men to conform to government." To this point of view he could never congratulate himself on having led the King, for just as Charles seemed amenable the whole difficulty cropped up again with the access--that easy access which Clarendon so deplored--of some Presbyterian to the King, and a new attempt by Charles to alleviate their lot. Charles' behaviour--his repeated efforts on their behalf--speak even more strongly for his tolerance than any of these tributes.

Marvell's description and appreciation of the King's attempts to redeem the promises of Breda--"sole motive and cause of his happy return"--have already been noticed. (2)
Others of Charles' early efforts to obtain some alleviation for dissenters were the conferences arranged between Bishops and Presbyterians at the Savoy Palace. Marvell frequently cites these as examples of the unwillingness of the bishops to be accommodating, and indeed even their own accounts of things does not put a very pleasant aspect upon their attitude there. (3)
Clarendon did not altogether approve of their behaviour; it is then no wonder that men like Baxter throw all the blame for the failure upon them. (4)
Undoubtedly much of the unpopularity of the bishops was caused by the breakdown

(1) *Cont.* p.1035.

(2) See above Chap. II.

(3) Add. MSS. 28053 f.1. An account of the conference by the Dean of Ely.

(4) Baxter *op. cit.* 165 seq. and *passim.*

of these negotiations, though in London they had not much reputation to lose. Pepys speaks in no doubtful terms of this, and gives his own opinion that they will "ruin all again".⁽¹⁾

Following upon the failure of arbitration came the Act of Uniformity and the tragedy of St. Bartholomew's day, and "an end put to all that liberty and license, which had been practised in all churches from the time of His Majesty's return, and by his declaration that he had emitted afterwards."⁽²⁾ Immediately after the passing of the act Charles was besieged with petitions from the dissenters, asking him to put off the operation of the act for three months and thus gain time to do something to mitigate its effects. Clarendon says that the King's easiness of manner encouraged false hopes among them, but the dissenters were building their hopes not merely upon a kind manner, but upon what they had every reason to believe were serious promises of liberty of worship made to them by the King. Clarendon describes their interviews:- The King received them well, and told them "He had a great compassion for them; and was heartily sorry that the parliament had been so severe towards them, which he would remit if it were in his power."⁽³⁾ That "remitting power" he had already

(1) Pepys II. 253, and compare III. 5 and 367. The London elections in March 1661 were seriously influenced by dislike of the bishops; see Hist. MSS. Com. Report V.p.151: letter of 26 March 1661.

(2) *Ibid.* p.1079.

(3) *Ibid.* p.1080.

tried vainly to obtain in the May of that year. His efforts
 now to induce a more tolerant frame of mind among the bishops
 were no more successful, and it is small wonder that he said
 to Parliament in the November of 1661:- "If we help one an-
 other, we shall, with God's Blessing, master all our Diffic-
 ulties. Those which concern Matters of Religion, I confess to
 you, are too hard for Me; and therefore I do commend them to
 your Care and Deliberation, which can best provide for them."⁽³⁾
 Even at this distance it is easy to hear in this the powerful
 irony of a disheartened man.

In 1662 Charles returned to the attack with a proposal
 for a declaration of Indulgence, though against the advice
 of his ministers. From the first the odds against its being
 permitted by Parliament and public opinion were great. Indulg-
 ence many, like Clarendon, thought a mistake. "It is an un-
 happy policy and always unhappily applied, to imagine that
 the classis of men i.e. dissenters can be recovered and re-
 conciled by partial concession or granting less than they
 demand."⁽⁴⁾ Until 1665 Charles could do little more towards tol-
 eration. Then he became interested in the bill brought in by
 Ashley and Arlington, but was again disappointed, as in spite

(1) Hist. MSS. Com. Report VII. p.162-3.

(2) Cont. p.1083.

(3) L.J. IX. p.323, 20 November 1661.

(4) Cont. p.1075:-cf. Parker, History (1727) Book IV. passim:
 "A bare indulgence of men in any Religion different from the
 established way of worship, does but exasperate them against
 the state."

of this powerful patronage it failed to pass. (1)

After 1667 there are again signs of Charles' renewed (2)
 interest in the matter. A comprehension bill was talked of,
 and Marvell mentions the King's speech for compesure in the
 spring of 1668. (3) But Charles, so long as he was dependent on
 an intolerant House of Commons for supply, could not afford
 to risk their displeasure by pressing indulgence upon them.
 Marvell relates:- "The King told some eminent citizens who
 applied to him against it [i.e. the severity against dissenters]
 that they must address themselves to the Houses, that he must
 not disoblige his friends, and that if he had been in the
 power of their friends he had gone without money." (4) Charles,
 however, tried to obtain a proviso giving him all ecclesiastical
 prerogatives, that is, full remitting power, which was
 to be attached to the renewal of the Conventicle Act--"that
 terrible act" (5)--on its expiry, but even the friends of toleration
 would not allow this to pass. Marvell calls the suggested
 proviso "a compendious piece of absolute tyranny." (6) His

(1) Cont. pp.1129 seq.

(2) Add. MSS. 36916 f.62. 4 February 1667/8. Bridgman supposed to be in its favour.

(3) Grosart II. 258. Marvell to Hull 29 February 1667/8; see also p.249 etc. and Cal. S.P.Dom. 1667/8 p.209.

(4) Grosart II. 316 Marvell to Popple 21 March 1670. Another account of Charles' speech is in Add. MSS. 36916 f.78, a newsletter of 3 March 1667/8.

(5) Grosart II. 315. Marvell to Popple 21 March. The act was declared expired by the judges: see Add. MSS. 36916 f.133.

(6) Grosart II. 325. Marvell to Popple 14 April 1670.

failure on this occasion probably convinced Charles of the impossibility of accomplishing toleration through Parliament, or of obtaining the licence of Parliament to indulge dissent.

All this time, however, Charles' known tolerance and dislike of persecution were working in the country and promoting leniency there. There was indeed some talk before Parliament was summoned of "putting out magistrates for remissness",⁽¹⁾ but in November the heads of the Presbyterians had waited on the King to thank him for this connivance, and Charles told them that "He looked upon them as very good subjects."⁽²⁾ Baxter says that at this time the King "became the sole patron of the nonconformists' liberties; not by any abatement of law, but by his own connivance as to the execution, the magistrates for the most part doing what they perceived to be his will. So Sir Richard Ford, all the time of his Mayoralty in London (though supposed to be one of their greatest and most knowing adversaries) never disturbed them."⁽³⁾ Many conventicles continued undisturbed in London,⁽⁴⁾ where, indeed, whatever Charles' attitude, it would have been difficult to suppress them entirely; and there is evidence to show that some Royal favour was

(1) Add. MSS. 36916 f.139. 13 July.

(2) Ibid. f.119. 18 November 1668.

(3) Baxter pp.217-8.

(4) Add. MSS. 36916 f.107, 4 July 1668; see too ff.140 and 182, and many of Marvell's letters at the time.

being extended at this time even to the Quakers, the Ishmael
 of the sects. ⁽¹⁾

In 1672 the expectations of the dissenters were fulfilled
 by the Declaration of Indulgence. "Thus, from that unhappy
 day, all the tranquility of the Kingdom was destroyed." ⁽²⁾

This is one opinion of the declaration; another is shown by
 a letter of August 1672:- "The Dissenters bless the King and
 look to him to keep his declaration against Parliament." ⁽³⁾

But that the King could not do in spite of his expressed de-
 termination of "sticking" to it. A few like Temple supported
 it for the benefit it would bring to trade and population, ⁽⁴⁾
 but it was generally condemned, and was withdrawn.

If these activities on the part of the King even only
 till 1672 are considered, it will be seen that for a lazy man
 Charles had been astonishingly energetic on behalf of the dis-
 senters. He had faced hostile public opinion as far as it
 could safely be faced; he had shown adaptability in modifying
 his proposals when they met with opposition; when toleration

(1) Cal. S.P.Dom. 1663-4 p.441; a letter to London says they
 are without hope of suppressing Quaker meetings unless they
 are supported at Whitehall.

(2) Parker, History of his own Time (1727) p.311 seq.

(3) Cal. S.P.Dom. 1671-2 p.382. cf. after collapse of Declar-
 ation, S.P.Dom. Car.II. 334, 12 March 1672/3: "All parties
 gather round the King, the dissenters for indulgence, Recusants
 for preservation against the stern." (R.Benson to Williamson
 from York.)

(4) Grey II. 12.

for Roman Catholics was found impossible, he yet persisted a little longer in trying to ensure some measure of toleration for Protestant dissenters. "The Truth is," he said once in a speech to Parliament, "I am in My Nature an Enemy to all Severity for Religion and Conscience, how mistaken soever it be, when it extends to Capital and Sanguinary Punishment, which I am told were begun in Popish times." He had no wish, he said, to force his people needlessly out of his Kingdom. Charles was probably equally influenced by his natural sense of the injustice of persecution, and his fear that it might damage trade. That he so frequently gave way to the intolerant desires of Parliament is best excused and justified in Halifax's Character:— "That Yieldingness, whatever Foundations it might lay to the Disadvantage of Posterity, was a Sacrifice to preserve us in Peace for his own Time..... As a Sword is sooner broken upon a Feather-bed than upon a Table, so his Pliantness broke the blow of a present Mischief much better than a more immediate Resistance would perhaps have done." (1)

(1) L.J. IX. 18 February 1662/3, p.478. Even in 1675, when he was incurring general obliquy for his declaration, and suspicions as to its motive were prevalent, he still made efforts for the Protestant dissenters. Coventry, writing in 1675 to the Lord Keeper, says:— "His Majesty would have you consider what legally may be done in case it would appear to be as it is informed, to prevent so vermin a persecution of such as are Protestant Dissenters." (Add. MSS. 25124 f.35)

(2) Halifax (1912) Works. p.207.

A book published in 1688, but written before the Declaration of 1672, by Arthur Annesley, Earl of Anglesey, gives what is perhaps the fullest exposition of the arguments for the King's exercise of the prerogative in ecclesiastical matters. Anglesey was closely connected with the court and with the cause of the most enlightened tolerance throughout the period. Even during the Popish Plot he, like the King, preserved a comparatively sane and balanced view of Oates' disclosures. Anglesey defines Indulgence as a relaxation of penalties in order to allow men liberty of conscience in matters not sinful of themselves, and whereby there is no disturbance of the public peace. ⁽¹⁾ These penalties are to be so relaxed that no man shall suffer in life or estate for these opinions. To this man has an indisputable right. It is politic for the ruler to grant this, for peace will follow and increasing trade, a greater population, the encouragement of immigration and prevention of emigration, and thus a greater force for defensive purposes. ⁽²⁾ Tolerance is the duty of piety, and besides, what is Truth, and who can decide it? Taylor is the spiritual father of Anglesey's argument about truth, which forms one of the most interesting parts of the pamphlet. ⁽³⁾ Anglesey goes on to prove by examples from ecclesiastical law

(1) The King's Right of Indulgence 1688, pp.1-3.

(2) Ibid. pp.4-9.

(3) Ibid. pp.11, 14 etc. Indulgence (1704) pp.145, 157.

from the time of Henry VIII that such a right of indulgence lies in the King. (1) Anglesey in this section hardly touches the real difficulties of the legal aspect of the matter-- the unlimited ecclesiastical power of the King and its reconciliation with the power of Parliament. On the other hand, he is at his most forceful when he urges expediency as an inducement to toleration. In conclusion, he sums up his argument thus:- "If the right were not in the King, he would thereby be much disabled from performing his Office as King, in preventing Mischief and great Inconveniences to the Publick, in preserving the Trade, Wealth, Strength and Peace of his Kingdoms, in providing for his Own, and his Subjects Security; and in doing that, which will tend to the Honour of God, and the Happiness and Welfare of Himself and all his People, and to the general good of Christendom." (2) It was surely an ironic fate which decreed that it should be Anglesey who had to draft the arguments against Charles' exercising this same right of Indulgence. (3)

After the failure of the Declaration the movement for toleration took on a different character. The dissenters have become "the Politicians of the opposite party". (4) "Give Liberty to Dissenting Protestants, as the best means to keep the Ballance

(1) The King's Right of Indulgence pp.19, 25, 35 etc.

(2) Ibid. p.75.

(3) Bates, Declaration of Indulgence (1902) pp.122, 137.

(4) Feiling p.132-4.

(1)
against boundless Prerogative." was the advice of the author of A Letter from a Parliament Man, which tract itself helps to date the emergence of toleration as one of the "country party" tenets.

There are some four arguments chiefly noticeable in the innumerable tracts on toleration which came out between the Restoration and the Marvell-Parker controversy. The first of these, and the strongest, was the argument of men like Temple, Penn and others that toleration promoted trade, for many of the trading classes were dissenters. Parker, and Patrick, the author of the Friendly Debates, made no serious attempt to answer it, and its force was most generally acknowledged. Writing in April 1670, one London letter-writer says of the Conventicle Act:- "We in London fear it will much obstruct trade, which if true the country will feel the effects."⁽²⁾

A second argument was that of the Quakers and of men like Taylor, that of the impossibility of guiding by law the inner spirit of man which decides what is the nature of Truth. The Quakers received little sympathy, but it was difficult to stop their conventicles on the usual charges of seditious teachings when perhaps the entire meeting had been conducted in silence.

(1) Baldwin, State Tracts 1689. p.70.

(2) Add. MSS. 36916 f.178. 14 April 1670. An interesting pamphlet on the same theme is the Citizen's Complaint for Want of Trade, (1663) Fugitive Tracts, series 2. 1875, press mark 11630 ee 15.

A third argument, which is remarkable, is that of many men who, like Baxter, believed that "it was easy for moderate men to come to an agreement." This led them to argue that comprehension was easy and the only real way out of the difficulty. But as Penn rightly remarked, comprehension is itself a form of intolerance, by excluding all extremists. (1) Baxter's theory is neither so broad as that displayed by Charles himself in his speeches, nor so general as that of the country party and men like John Howe, Owen, Croft and Marvell. (2) It is however interesting to note that even Marvell believed as late as 1676 that some form of comprehension was possible, though then he was anxious to concede as well some further toleration outside the Church. Marvell's views represent those of an ever-growing class of men who argued for toleration from a rather more general standpoint than that of any of the arguments so briefly noted here, and it was these views that received the stigma of disloyalty from their opponents rather than any of the others, for they implied an assumption of some natural right in the people to believe what they thought best, uncontrolled by King and government. Religion is only a form of property, and as such

(1) England's Present Interest 1670. of. Baxter pp.179, 193 and all ch. VI.

(2) L.J. IX. February 1662/3 p.478, already quoted above.

it should have all the privacy and privilege Englishmen have been wont to claim as their right for personal possessions. Parker, like Hobbes, felt this idea to be an infringement on the Sovereign's rights, and felt too that such assumptions would lead ultimately to anarchy.

(1) Grosart IV. Mr. Spizke p.127. "A good Christian will not, cannot allure and indenture his conscience over, to be represented by others." It is more private than secular property which he so represented; it should be indeed the most inviolable sort of property. of. the Rehearsal Transgressed. 519, 521. The Growth of Banery p.80 marks a modification of this view.

(1)

Section 11. The Theories of Marvell and his Opponents.

Of all the controversies that raged during these years none was more bitter nor more renowned than that between Samuel Parker and Marvell, and that later contest in which Marvell engaged with Turner, the animadverter of Croft's Naked Truth. Samuel Parker was the son of a fanatic who is said to have published one of the most bitter of civil war pamphlets. Parker did not escape the contagion of fanaticism, and during his college days belonged to the "Gruellers", one of the smaller and fiercer sects. Marvell says that he put more gruels in his soup than the rest. He was to some extent acquainted with both Milton and Marvell--that is to say, he is known from Marvell's account in the Rehearsal Transposed to have visited the poet and to have met his future opponent there. After the Restoration Parker became converted to the Church of England, and obtained a minor position in the Church. His literary work began in 1666 with A Censure of Plato, and continued in 1669 with the more

(1) By far the best account of the controversy is in Dr. Coech's Political Thought from Bacon to Halifax (1914-5) pp.220-224.

(2) Wood (1813) I. pp.225 seq. of Marvell Rehearsal Transposed p.284 etc.

(3) Marvell Rehearsal Transposed p.285.

(4) The date is somewhat uncertain. In the Term Catalogue p.21 it is entered in the Michaelmas Term, and many answers to it are dated 1669, but Marvell's joke (R.T. p.64, 65) and the title page of the book itself give 1670 as the date of its appearance.

famous Ecclesiastical Polity, thereafter bringing forth, Marvell says, a yearly child. In 1670 he became Archdeacon of Canterbury, and soon rose rapidly in the church, eventually becoming Bishop of Oxford.

His Ecclesiastical Polity, which aroused controversy at once, was probably inspired by Patrick's Exordium, to which Parker pays many tributes. His own book, however, is of a far more profound character, and perhaps owes as much to Hobbes as to anyone in his own church. The weakness of Parker's argument lies in his endeavour to reconcile Hobbes' theories with a Christian religion, which often leads him into ridiculous mistakes and inconsistencies. His theory, however, contains much that is interesting and is in some ways more logical and less open to criticism than that of Marvell.

If a right to think differently from the State is once granted, where then is the authority of that state? asks Parker. Toleration "blows up" the foundation of government. There is an inconsistency between liberty of conscience and fundamental law. To grant this may be the right of the King,⁽¹⁾ but to do so would be unwise. To give everyone the right of teaching what he will is "to open Pandora's box of evils."⁽²⁾

(1) S. Parker, Ecclesiastical Polity (1670) (316pp. & xlvi preface) I have not referred to individual pages, but have found it best to summarise the whole. It is well indexed, having full chapter headings and summaries.

(2) Parker, History p. 359.

If peace is to be maintained the authority of the governor must be upheld in all things, including religion. The origin of the State's power over religion is the same as the origin of its power over secular matters, and arguments against this drawn from early Christian or Jewish history do not hold, for conditions have altered since those times. After all, the Church then had miracles and direct Divine intervention to help her in her double task. She has not, nor does she need these now, for the Magistrate, being Christian, has full sovereignty in civil, that is for Parker all external, matters.

Parker very sensibly remarks that while conscience is the best, if not the only security of government--and here he probably means by conscience what we call consent--yet it is also the greatest cause of disturbance of government. If each is allowed to do what is right in his own eyes, and if prince's and subject's opinions clash, anarchy results. It is easier to control men's vices than their religion. Parker's definition of conscience--in the religious sense--has some wit: it is "but men's judgement and opinion of their own actions"; and so, if exempted from control is fatal to order. Conscience is the best commander for a rebellious army, and very difficult to bring to terms. To that generation the "miseries of a Holy war" were still real enough for Parker's remarks to carry much

weight, but he makes the mistake of forcing this argument too far. It would have been more effective had his language been more moderate. By his violence against the party to which he had himself belonged Parker laid himself open to some of Marvell's most biting retorts.

After some general reflections upon the late war, Parker again turns his attention to the origin of the State. Here he has two opposing ideas to combine. One is the fact, which he cannot deny, that government rests upon the consent of the governed, or as he somewhat confusingly calls it, their conscience; the other is his desire to show that as civil government was before Christ, so it is above the ecclesiastical power, and therefore has supreme authority over that as well, as he claims that Christ himself admitted. He is led away by the fatal charms of historical analogy and proof. He in fact invests Hobbes' Leviathan in the robes of Filmer's paternal governor and in all the contemporary clap-trap of scriptural tradition. Yet no-one was more alive than he to the absurdity of argument from Scripture, and he makes some of his best points in his sixth chapter, where he shows how fatally easy it is to prove anything in that way. But the temptation is too much for him, and he himself shows that Christ taught obedience to his followers--their only arms were to be patience and forbearance. In one breath Parker declares that the civil

power is able to enforce what religion it will; in the next he seeks to show that it has gained that power because it is here to carry out Christ's principles, and so is endowed with a Divine right and sanction. The Divine right of the State to interfere is admitted, Parker says with some force, in the laws against blasphemy, which no-one opposes; but he ignores the fact that these were a special case even then, and now have not entirely disappeared.

Parker was not a profoundly religious man, and he laid himself open to much criticism by his definition of religion as a part of virtue, its object for him being happiness here and hereafter. This is too controversial a point to be discussed here, but to the passionately religious minds of many of his contemporaries it was anathema in a way now rather difficult to understand. Christ, according to Parker, concerns himself not with religion, which was for the Archdeacon apparently a matter of ceremonies, but with behaviour. Nowhere does he lay down rules of church government. It was impossible to make Parker see that something more fundamental than a difference over ceremonies was at stake. Ceremonies, he felt with some cause, were only significant by agreement, just as were meanings of words. In spite of Marvell's angry disagreement with this view, he himself, together with many others anxious to heal the divisions of the Church, rather

underestimates their psychological importance for so many at this time.

In his fifth chapter, with bravery which must be admired, Parker sets out to refute Hobbes, who, he says, is responsible for the growth of indifference and atheism which has been the cause of the development of a party for toleration. Hobbes destroys his own compact by taking away the only thing, conscience, which binds man to keep it. Every man has a right to do good. You cannot alter prime and original rectitude (whatever that may mean). But the compact itself is absurd. The State is organic, and has grown from the family. Man is born a subject of the State, not of the Church. Parker cleverly throws the odium of ecclesiastical jurisdiction on the Popes, and tries to insinuate that those who were for some kind of toleration were so inclined in order that they might impose ecclesiastical jurisdiction upon the people. He accuses the dissenters of working for freedom only to bring back the old days of the supreme and tyrannical Church. His confusion of thought was caused by over-Calvinising the Calvinists of that day, and incidentally condemning the whole dissenting body for the extremes of a few experimenters in sixteenth century Geneva and Scotland.

But to return to Hobbes and Parker: if man is born subject, how can there be an original compact? asks Parker. The

whole idea of such a compact is absurd, and the ruler made by that compact with his supreme power could enforce any religion, however barbarian. Parker failed to see that his own theory equally with Hobbes' led to the same logical conclusion. In chapter two he endows the Magistrate with what seems supreme power, in chapter five he refutes Hobbes for doing the same. This inconsistency Marvell was not slow to point out, and it was no answer for Parker to maintain that he had repeatedly stated that of course the Magistrate must be Christian. Parker's idea that liberty of conscience should be internal only would surely excuse any sin the ruler might cause his subject to commit by forcing his acceptance of another religion. The inner life is all that matters. The greatest sin to Parker in external things is the sin of disobedience to those in authority. (1)

Parker's own greatest crime was violence joined to a lack of humour. Even those in his own party deplored these, and the author of Rosemary and Baven, replying to Marvell's book, remarks that he really does not know which more to deplore, Marvell's scurrility or Parker's violence. Not only this violence

(1) I have tried to notice only some of the more interesting sides of Parker's theories, fuller summaries of which are given by Mr. Birrel and Mr. Seaton in their books (see ante p. 128), I have tried to emphasise only that very secular opposition to toleration as contrasted with the religious view which saw a duty in "compelling the dissenters to come in" which Parker so admirably represents.

but also his pomposity is ridiculed in another reply to the Ecclesiastical Polity entitled Insolence and Impudence Triumphant. Uniformity, it says, may have been honestly thought by some to be a remedy for the divisions of the Civil War, but Parker's abusive language can do nothing but open old wounds again. The only result of what he proposes would be a race of hypocrites. The King has not yet expressed his dislike of that indulgence which Parker so despises, and perhaps the object of Parker's book is to wean him from that clemency for which he is famed. The writer denies Parker's view that persecution is necessary for peace. Toleration, by bringing all discussion into the open, will make men more contented and rebellion a remoter contingency. The writer will always pray, as the Litany directs, for the King in all causes and over all persons, but "Mr. Parker has given that absolute authority which I think no Christian power ever claimed" to the King, and that he cannot acknowledge.

In the Nonconformist not Disloyal another pamphleteer tries to refute Parker's charges of disloyalty against the

the dissenters. This was the charge they most wished to avoid. He urges men to remember the frequent efforts they have made to find a means of reunion, but reminds them that the Anglicans, in spite of the fact that they were well treated by the Puritans when in power, have now forsaken the simple Litany Hales would have considered sufficient and instead have put obstacles in the way of reunion. In yet another reply Parker is accused of contradiction in his statement that the King may command conscience, for has he not already said that conscience cannot be commanded. The Case of Conscience is largely concerned to prove that comprehension for most and some indulgence for the weak would smooth out the present discontent.

The only answer to his pamphlet that Parker bothered to notice was that by John Owen, the Puritan divine, friend of Lord Wharton ⁽¹⁾ and many other well-known men of that day. It is his book that Marvell in his Rehearsal Transposed sets out to defend. Truth and Innocence Vindicated is a sincere rather than a powerful or convincing piece of work. It starts with

(1) It is interesting to find a letter from Marvell to Lord Wharton among the Wharton papers (Bodleian. Carte, 105, f.112.). No other indication of the friendship remains to show how intimate they were, but the acquaintance may have been formed during the Commonwealth period. Marvell mentions "Owen" in a letter to Harley of 7 August 1677 (Hist. MSS. Com. XIV. Rep. II. p. 356), and Dr. Owen was stated by Fender to be the only one he knew to have handled the proofs of the Rehearsal Transposed (Hist. MSS. Com. MSS. of C.H. Finch 1922. p. 10).

the true but damaging admission that those who ask for indulgence injure their own position by the tacit avowal they are mistaken. They make that avowal, says Owen, because it is the only feasible one at the moment; once we embark on a discussion of what truth is we encounter too many difficulties. The discussion can only be as to what is best and most expedient in the present circumstances. Owen's argument is that no harm, but rather good, will be done by allowing the dissenters to live in peace. They do not, as Parker accuses them of doing, merely preach "sin and mysticism"; they do not neglect morals for mysteries. Parker himself neglects some aspects of religion entirely. Neither does nonconformity promote atheism, but rather a deeper religiousness, for dissenters will face persecution for their religion. Many more dissenters exist than Parker allows for, and that trade brings forth dissent is surely no argument for suppressing it. Parker had indeed made the most amazing statements about the inter-relation of religion and trade, and brushed aside the whole difficulty by saying that obedience on the part of dissenters would bring peace, and that would help trade. He underestimated the extent of dissent.

Parker brought out an answer to Owen, the Defence and Continuation, in 1671, but in it he weakens his argument by further concessions to the orthodox Christianity of the day.

That is to say, at the expense of his logical position he emphasizes these limitations upon complete secular sovereignty which his position in the Church of England obliged him to admit. To cover the weakness so exposed Parker stresses yet more the need for peace as a justification of his cry for absolute obedience. Faction leads to war, war destroys trade. Destroy faction and you promote peace and prevent war. Geneva--that is, Presbyterianism--would be more intolerant than the English Church is now (though if the English Church had followed Parker it would certainly not have been true to say that one was more rigid than the other). Marvell never attempted to explain away the "Geneva" accusation made by Parker and others, and it would have been difficult to do so, though probably Marvell himself did not wholly accept the Geneva creed of men like Baxter.

The Preface to Bishop Bramhall's Essay, published in 1672, adds little to Parker's thesis except additional abuse of dissenters in general. He accuses Owen of seeking toleration not for liberty to practise his religion, but to plot revolt. Parker reiterates his former statement that the Magistrate must not command evil, but fails to suggest who is to be the judge to decide when the Magistrate has done so, and when he may lawfully be disobeyed. He makes an interesting plea for passive obedience, fearing that the nonconformists by their

persistence in schism will so weaken the Church as to let in "Popery and Irreligion".

An immediate answer to this was the Authority of the Magistrate about Religion Discussed, which now could and did use the effective answer to Parker's arguments that the acknowledged head of the Church having granted indulgence, it was not the place of men like Parker to condemn it. In England the government is "mixed", and to deny the King the extravagant power with which Parker would endow him is far from being disloyal. The fanatics are the King's most loyal subjects. ⁽¹⁾

The most important answer to Parker was Marvell's Rehearsal Transposed, which appeared "like a bolt from the blue" in the autumn of the same year as the Preface. Parker's work had caused a good deal of stir, and several answers had been projected. Baxter had thought of writing, but when he heard of Marvell's book refrained. ⁽²⁾ The Rehearsal Transposed, together with the Second Part which followed it in 1673 and Mr. Smirke, a defence of Bishop Croft's Naked Truth, form our chief material for studying Marvell's ideas on the toleration question of his day. These ideas are interesting in the general development of religious toleration in the seventeenth century, and have some significance in the gradual formation of the

(1) A full list of the pamphlets in this controversy is given in the bibliography p. 394 below.

(2) Baxter (1896) vol. III. p. 101.

country party and later "whig" policy towards dissent.

It is to the Rehearsal Transposed that Marvell owes his reputation for wit. In its own day and for some generations after the brightness of style and humour were very much appreciated. Swift's praise in A Tale of a Tub is well known, and probably only represents the general verdict of the author's day. Much of the bulk of this pamphlet and its sequel is due to the many anecdotes and jests with which Marvell lightened his pages, and which, incidentally, killed his opponent's reputation more effectively than any number of weighty and telling arguments. Marvell's wit, however, is not such as is appreciated today, even when the wit of many of his contemporaries is once more becoming fashionable. He directs much of his satire at the person and private behaviour of his subject, Parker, and does not hesitate to make the most serious though amusingly worded charges against him. His title was a happy chance. Marvell was evidently something of a play-goer, and illustrations from the stage are more frequent than most other allusions to contemporary life in his work. He was to repeat the device with Mr. Smirke, though the allusion here is far less obvious, as the cleric in Etherege's play only appears in the smallest of parts. It was a happy stroke, too, to dub the

(1) Satires p.64 Further Instructions l.48; letters, Hist. MSS. Com.XIV. Rep.II. Marvell to Harley, p.357, 17 November 1677; Grosart III. 234. etc.

pompous Parker Bayes "because Mr. Bayes and he do very much symbolise, in their contempt and quarrelling of all others, though of their own profession" (R.T. 15)⁽¹⁾. Marvell laughs at his own parallel. Bayes and Parker are both railers (p.33). But Parker not only rails at his enemies; he spits on every idea he has relinquished (p.67)--Marvell could not forgive Parker's jeers at his former friends, the dissenters--and he is dwindled now to being a mere preface-monger (p.7). Much play is made with Parker's avowed reluctance to write, and Marvell more than hints that Parker's pleasantries in the country account for that "lazy distemper": "who could in reason expect that a man should in the same moments undertake the labour of an Author and a father?.....But the Author was the pink of courtesy, the bookseller the bur of importunity."(p.10). He seizes the advantage of a mistake of Parker's about the position of Geneva on the Lake. All the points so raised are trivial, but their importance cannot be overlooked, and they undoubtedly did more than ^{all} the rest of the book to discredit Parker's violence.

It is difficult to arrange Marvell's ideas in any kind of logical order. They are represented very haphazardly, and

(1) R.T.-Rehearsal Transposed, Grosart III includes in one volume both parts. M.S.-Mr. Spizke, Grosart IV. pp.1-162.

and it easy to suppose that Marvell never really set out to arrange them, or ever compared one of his statements with another. It will be convenient here to treat of the ideas in Mr. Smirke and the Rehearsal Transposed together. It is worth noting that little development can be found in their ideas regarding toleration, though undoubtedly Marvell's political views had in the meantime undergone considerable modification and intensification. But, as always, Marvell was more concerned with the debate of the moment than with the enunciation of general principles. Yet it is not without significance that while the Rehearsal Transposed, though unlicensed, had little official opposition to it, Mr. Smirke was condemned to be seized as a seditious libel. (1)

In the earlier tract Marvell takes a sentence of Parker's as the peg on which he hangs his refutation of his theory. It is:- "That it is absolutely necessary to the peace and government of the world, that the supreme magistrate of every Commonwealth should be vested with a power to govern and conduct the consciences of subjects in affaires of religion." Marvell divides his own reply into six heads:- "The Unlimited Magistrate, The Publick Conscience, Moral Grace, Debauchery tolerated, Persecution recommended and Pushpin Divinity." (p.77).

(1) Mr. Smirke will be noticed in this connection in Chap. IV. p. 192.

With the third of these, Moral Grace, it is not here necessary to deal, but the rest form a basis for a discussion of Marvell's argument.

The "hinge" of the whole controversy for Marvell was the danger that he felt the policy of men like Parker brought to the country. Hardly less important than this was Marvell's dislike of force and cruelty. The theory of an unlimited magistrate seemed to him a danger to the public weal. It was for him inevitably allied with the supremacy of the bishops, and these were blamed by him for all the troubles that had followed the rule of Laud. The Laud legend was still extraordinarily strong. He was the "Boney" of seventeenth century politics, and a fear of the ideas he had advanced colours all anti-episcopal thought. He was accused of trying to make Charles I supreme; and his successors, of subverting the constitution. Thus when Marvell says that between Pope and bishop the only question is which shall be Pope, he means to imply not only a danger to the English Church of being Romanised, but a menace to the liberty of the nation which episcopal supremacy allied with the King would certainly bring.

This constant fear of the bishops and consequent confusion of thought often make Marvell's ideas seem illogical. But it is clear that what he feared was neither the supreme church

nor the supreme state of the middle ages, but such a state as he saw in France at the time, where a supreme monarch was aided in his supremacy by a supreme and intolerant church. Men like Turner and Parker, therefore, would seem to Marvell to be advocating something of this sort. They would transfer the papal doctrine of an infallible church to England (M.S.p.88). Not only would this involve "arbitrary government", but in the end it would destroy the binding force of all government by removing that most powerful of cementers, conscience. Laws "cannot possibly have any binding vertue upon the minds of men, when they have no other inducement to obedience but only to avoid the penalty." (R.F. p.101-2). Marvell insists on the inexpediency of thus enforcing any claim to absolute government over men's thought and conscience; do so, and you defeat your own ends. Bishops' rule, tyrants' rule will eventually drive all good men out of the church by asking them to act against their consciences, or turn the nation into a race of hypocrites.

But Marvell did not only urge this as a reason against Parker's claim, he went further and stated that he did not "believe that princes have power to bind their subjects to that religion that they apprehend most advantageous." (M.S. p.304-7) To admit that they have indeed such a power is to admit that

they could lawfully impose a Hebrew or a Turkish religion on their subjects. This is contrary to Christ, to whom all princes are subject (R.T. p.335-339). While asserting that "the power of the magistrate does most certainly issue from divine authority", Marvell by no means admits "divine right". "The obedience due to that power is by divine command; and subjects are bound, both as men and Christians, to obey the magistrate actively in all things where their duty to God intercedes not, and however passively, that is, either by leaving the country, or if they cannot do that (the magistrate, or the reason of their own occasions hindring them), then by suffering patiently at home, without giving the least publick disturbance." Marvell, this is to say, believes the subject has a right to resist, for even passive obedience implies a right to resist when he thinks that the prince commands something contrary to God. He admits a case where duty to God can outweigh considerations of duty to prince, and it is in this admission that Marvell's detractors saw the seeds of rebellion, and this that caused him to be dubbed another Junius Brutus, another Buchanan. However much Marvell might urge that dissenters should bear their suffering as long as they could, yet the principle he admitted of a right occasionally to resist struck

(1) cf. Locke, Letter on Toleration I. (Ward Lock & Co., no date) p.29.

at what many regarded as the root of government, the prince's right to command, and had before his time led to actual revolt. But it is difficult to see how, without some compromise of the sovereign's authority, the tolerationists could push their claim at all. Marvell's dilemma was an old one, and even Parker found himself involved in it when he was obliged to modify his "absolute sovereignty" with a proviso that of course the prince must not command anything contrary to Christ.

Marvell's strongest argument, however, was not that of the "right" of the subject to liberty of conscience, but that of the inexpediency of the prince's pushing what rights he has too far. "A prince that goes to the top of his power is like him that shall go to the bottom of his treasure." (R.T. pp.370-373. cf. M.S. pp.1-9). To push the dissenters too far might lead to suffering, loss of trade and emigration in too large numbers of what are--in spite of Parker's estimate--quite a considerable portion of the nation.

Marvell's attitude to the King before 1672 has already been discussed. ⁽¹⁾ He feared the precedent of the suggested proviso in 1670 which might have enabled the King legally to grant indulgence. The Rehearsal Transposed, perhaps because it was written as a non-party contribution to the toleration controversy, seems to suggest a more favourable attitude. It

(1) See ante p. 41 *sup.*; cap. III *iii.*

is an attitude very difficult to reconcile with that revealed in Marvell's letters and in all his other work, with the exception of Mr. Spilke, and the only possible explanation of it is that Marvell had become desparately aware of the plight of the dissenters, and felt even an extension of the King's prerogative would be better than the continual enforcement of the terrible Conventicle Act, "lest we fall into confusion". If Parliament cannot be persuaded to help them we must fall back on the King (R.T. p.162-3). If the Church had been more "tractable" the question of prerogative need never have arisen; as it is, it would be ungrateful to grumble "when the King has so indulged and obliged the Nonconformists by his late mercy" [the Declaration of 1672] (R.T. p.178), when ever since his return he has laboured to follow the policy of the Breda declaration (R.T. p.443), when he has continually tried to effect many other constant promises of indulgence (R.T. p.291), though the hatred of the Church towards Dissent in his reign has in fact "induced him to more severity than in all the reigns since the conquest" (M.S. p.155). Parker misrepresents his generosity and would prevent his clemency. The fact is, declares Marvell, Parker is angry over the Declaration of Indulgence, which is more merciful than he would allow his so-called sovereign (though church puppet would be a more proper name) to be (R.T. pp.117, 175, 188). Parker indeed would like

a sovereign who did exactly what Parker wished; so long as he persecuted the dissenters against whom Parker had all the venom some cherish against those they have ill-treated, he could be absolute. Parker's theory was only so much proof to Marvell of the dangerous tendencies of the Church officials.

Marvell goes on to discuss the amount of good done by the magistrate's interference in matters of opinion. Parker admitted that the inward conscience is never reached, and Marvell wonders whether more harm is not done by imposing beliefs on those who do not share them than by running the risks of some subjects' being led into outward dissent by the practise of a religion different from that of the State. Christianity does not confine her teaching to obedience, as does Parker, but exhorts us to good works and sincerity (R.T. p.391), and Paul, who most earnestly preaches obedience when possible, himself never ceased to preach or to practise his religion at the command of a magistrate.(M.S. p.74). Parker thinks it better to tolerate debauchery than to allow freedom of religious observance, but this, says Marvell, is openly refuted by the action of the King, who has issued his declaration for the welfare of the nation (R.T. p.89). In opposition to his policy men like Parker and Turner would make it the greatest crime even to discuss the best way to serve Christ.(M.S. p.13). Men cannot be compelled to believe. Parker admits this, and Marvell

evidently feels this cannot be over-emphasised. (M.S. p.72). Other methods of persuasion into the Church have not yet been given fair trial (M.S. p.70-71). The King himself has recognised the hopelessness of force (M.S. p.81), and the dissenters under his support need not fear the tirades of "Mr. Bayes" (R.T. p.57-8, 94). The King's grandfather advocated toleration (R.T. p.516), and indeed, says Marvell, "I have never observed any great success by reviling men into Conformity.....I think it ought to be highly penal to impose other conditions upon his Majesty's subjects than the King expects or the Law requires" (R.T. pp.57-8, 94). To revile such a large class of men "blows up government" by causing fear and discontent (R.T. p.261. cf. M.S. p.38). There are many honest if some mistaken men among the fanatics, and it is against all charity and Christianity to persecute (R.T. p.293. cf. M.S. p.38) ⁽¹⁾ Non-conformists are part of the body politic, and "to lay one part therefore of the Body on a Pillow, and the other on a Rack, sorts our wisdom little, but our Justice worse."

Marvell had little patience with what he called "Push-pin Divinity", that is to say, with that section of the Church who would regard every iota of her creed as essential to the

(1) Marvell's letter to Ed. Harley 7 August 1677 (Hist. MSS. Com. XIV. Rep. II. p.356) about the sufferings of the dissenters in Scotland, and his letter to Popple 10 June 1678 (Grosart II. p.631) show his keen compassion for the oppressed.

welfare of the whole. What degree of modification Marvell himself was prepared to concede he does not say. Neither does he definitely say that some such modification or toleration was due to the dissenters as their right, but suggests that religion is a kind of property, and as such is the private affair of each person. He says:- "For the English have always been very tender of their religion, their liberty, their propriety, and (I was going to say) no less of their reputation" (R.T. p.210). Two years later Buckingham, speaking in the Lords, curiously echoes Marvell's phrase:- "There is a thing called Property, which (what ever men may think) is that the People of England are fondest of, it is that they will never part with, and it is that his Majesty, in his Speech, has promised us to take particular care of. This, my Lords, in my opinion, can never be done without giving an Indulgence to all Protestant Dissenters." (1) Toleration to both these members of the "country" party was a form of property; men had a right to own opinions, thus to persecute for religious opinion was an infringement of the privacy of the "Englishman's Castle." The supreme exponent of this view of toleration was, of course (2) Locke, in his famous Essay.

(1) Buckingham, Works (1715) vol. II. 202 November 1675.

(2) This Essay was first translated by Marvell's nephew, William Popple, in 1689.

Marvell thus advocated toleration on a variety of grounds. It was inexpedient to force men to believe, expedient to tolerate so large a portion of the community--trade and population might otherwise suffer; it was useless to attempt conversion by force; it was, moreover, against true Christian charity to do so. The most important of his arguments is that dissenters have a right to dissent, so long as they do not disturb the public peace; their right is a form of property and so should be immune from interference without their own consent. This was to become the attitude of the Whigs and Locke.⁽¹⁾ With the appearance of the Letter from a Person of Quality in 1675 the creed that Marvell voiced, though but tentatively, in the Rehearsal Transposed became the acknowledged policy of the "country" in Parliament. Shaftesbury and Buckingham voiced this view in the Lords, and many pamphleteers throughout the country. The dissenters, besides their powerful friends in the opposition, had now the additional advantage of being a "Balance to the unbounded Prerogative" and a safeguard against the "Roman terror".

Though Marvell undoubtedly deplored persecution as such, and so was in favour of indulgence even to Quakers, yet he also hoped for some kind of comprehension in the Church of

(1) cf. Locke, Essays (Ward Lock & Co. no date) pp.29, 45 etc.

in the magistrate by the consent of the people, should he
 man can so far abandon the care of his salvation as wholly
 to leave it to the choice of any other....etc."

England, to which he had a traditional attachment. Crofts, in his Naked Truth had advocated widening of bounds, and a modification of ceremony, and Marvell adopts his views. He rather under-estimates the difficulties of this policy, and hopes much from a little "condescension and submission" on either side (M.S. p.84). A broadly comprehensive Litany should leave the church members some freedom of opinion within it. He objected to a policy which would cause "that things indifferent, and that have no proper signature or significancy to that purpose, should by command be made a necessary condition of church-communication." (R.T. pp.148-158). Some things ought not to be determined except by each for himself:- "For a good Christian will not, cannot, attorn and indenture his conscience over, to be represented by others" (M.S. p.127, cf. R.T. pp.519-521).⁽¹⁾ Marvell would seem thus to recommend a toleration of all Protestant dissenters, and at the same time a modification of the Church ceremony itself, in order to allow more freedom that more may be united within it.

The influence of John Hales' Tract on Schism is very strongly marked in Marvell's work, and he pays it the warmest tributes. Long passages in the Rehearsal Transposed, and practically the whole of the Essay on General Councils append-

(1) cf. Locke, Essays pp.5-6: "Nor can any such power be vested in the magistrate by the consent of the people, because no man can so far abandon the care of his salvation as blindly to leave it to the choice of any other....etc."

ed to Mr. Smirke are merely expansions and illustrations of Hales' theory of schism as the act of the corrupt party, not the act of those who technically break away. Episcopal ambition has caused more schism than the endeavours of many dissenters to find truth. (R.T. pp.125-130). Marvell devotes his essay to an attack on this episcopal ambition and uses arguments drawn from early church history to prove its effect. (1) To this ambition is due the loss of that spirit of enquiry and accommodation which has impoverished the church and embittered its disputes. He ends his account by a summary of these disputes and points to one of the main obstacles to the coming of peace when he says:- "For whereas truth for the most part lies in the middle, but men ordinarily look for it in the extremities" (M.S. p.115).

Marvell's attack on Parker in the Rehearsal Transgressed provoked many replies, of which we have six which directly attack the first part of Marvell's book, and one only which

(1) The Essay on General Councils traces the effect of a growing prosperity on the Church. Safeguarded from persecution from without, she began to persecute those who slightly differed from the heads of the Church within. The humility of Constantine at the Council of Nice quite turned the heads of the Bishops, and they took his devotion to the symbol of the Church as a tribute to their power. From that time they increasingly dwelt on ceremonies rather than creeds, and arranged councils--falsely called "general" to ratify their pride. They talked of apostolic descent, at best but problematical, and their immense pride as the centuries passed led to those discords and differences which mortify us today.

(1)

replies to the second. Though all of these have some interest for the curious, only three make any serious attempt to refute Marvell's theories. These are mostly occupied in discrediting Marvell through his old association with Cromwell and his friendship with Milton, and hardly do more than contradict his more important statements. The author of Rosemary and Bayes, one of the first replies to Marvell, says that he cannot understand quite what Marvell wants, but is sure that he is a Presbyterian. The Commonplace Book out of the Rehearsal Transposed lightly assumes that Marvell's book is nothing but a plagiarism, and devotes most of its space to brief extracts from it designed to show how seditious a book the Rehearsal Transposed is. What Marvell did not get from the play he plagiarised from the Presbyterians. To speak of the King's Indulgence⁽²⁾ as if the King meant thereby to help the dissenters is a mistake; indulgence was granted in order to gain time to

(1) A fuller account of these is given below p.394. but the following are their titles and the order in which they probably appeared:-

- i. Rosemary and Bayes Anon. (1672)
- ii. A Commonplace Book (1672) "by one Hodges" (H. Stubbe).
- iii. Transposed Rehearsal, Oxford (1673)
- iv. Stiles him Bayes (attributed without any evidence to Dryden, 1672)
- v. Gregory Father Greybeard (Ed. Hickeringill 1673).
- vi. The Renroad to the R.T. S. Parker 1673. (See R.T. 276 and Hist. MSS. Com. XIV. Rep. II. Marvell to Ed. Harley, May 1673)
- vii. An Apology and Advice in reply to the second part of R.T. (1674)

(2) A reference to Marvell's mock title-page "Printed by A.B. for the Assigns of John Calvin and Theodore Beza, at the sign of the King's Indulgence, on the South side of the Lake Lemane; 1672."

reinforce the strength of Church and State. Marvell himself-- hinted at by plays upon the words Marvel, Marvells, Marvellous etc.--the author tries to discredit by telling tales of his secret cabals in coffee-houses with those who plot to bring back the Commonwealth. Marvell's employment as Latin secretary is remembered and brought against him. S'itea him Bayes makes much play on Marvell's association with Presbyterianism. He is seeking, the author says, to undermine the Church by introducing toleration. He pretends to argue for "Geneva" and "Liberty" and concludes for "mere Lutherism".

The Transposer Rehearsed and Gregory Father Greybeard are two much more effective and witty replies. Their authors obviously know much of Marvell's life and activities, and these pamphlets have besides more merit of presentment. The Transposer Rehearsed makes many charges against Marvell, and compares him with many earlier writers, among them the Diggers, Buchanan and Junius Brutus. The contemporary influences noticed are Baxter, through his Holy Commonwealth, Harrington, Buckingham and Hales, and indeed much of the book is accused of being but a plagiarism of the two last of these. Milton's name is suggested: ⁽¹⁾ he is Marvell's Latin coach, and one is not more "Italianised" than the other--a reference to their

(1) Marvell, in the second part of the Rehearsal Transposed, indignantly denies that Milton had any hand in his book, and pays his friend a moving tribute, making Parker's jeers the subject of a very bitter rebuke to him on his change of opinion after the Restoration, and subsequent behaviour to his old friends. (Grosart III. p.67, 468 etc.)

known admiration of "Venetian Liberty". "The Odds (says the author) between a Transproser and a blackberry poet is not great." He goes on to remark on Marvell's absence of qualification for writing on the questions touched in his book:- "Certainly not every man that has set his foot in Holland and Venice, or read Baxter's Holy Commonwealth, and Harrington's Oceana, and made a Speech once in the Rota, is statesman complete enough for such an undertaking." ⁽¹⁾ Hickingill's book adds little new abuse to the Transproser Rehearsed but the accusation that Marvell was paid by the dissenters for his work. There is a rather interesting opening passage, where the author in his pretended role goes to the coffee-houses and finds a circle of old and young very merry over the Rehearsal Transprosed. Both these replies make much of Marvell's connection with certain coffee-house clubs which plot sedition, though how much truth was contained in this charge it is impossible to say.

Of Parker's Reproof, which was expected in the May of 1673 Marvell writes to Harley:- "I perceive by what I have read of it it is the rudest book, one or other, that ever was published (I may say) since the invention of printing. Although it handles me so roughly yet I am not at all ⁽²⁾amated by it."

(1) Transproser Rehearsed p.147

(2) Hist. MSS. Com.XIV. Rep.II. p.357 Marvell to Harley
3 May 1673.

Parker indeed added little but abuse to his former theories, though he occasionally strikes a telling phrase, such as:- "Liberty is the school of Seditious". Such phrases are all too scarce in the dreary expanse of seven hundred pages which Parker covers. He lacked the lightness of touch necessary to make others ridiculous by his abuse, and more usually succeeds by his conceits and exaggerations in making himself ridiculous. "What I have written I have written," he concludes with what is perhaps pardonable pride in the writer of some twenty-eight hundred pages in three years.

Only one answer to the second part of the Rehearsal Transposed appeared. Parker took refuge in silence, but an anonymous pamphleteer made one more attempt to defend him against Marvell in An Apology and Advice for some of the Clergy who suffer under False and Scandalous Reports. In many ways this writer displays a far more unequivocal acceptance of Parker's theories than any on that side had done hitherto. He commences his letter by deploring that personalities have so marred the dignity of the controversy. While he advises his readers not to believe everything told about Parker and the clergy, yet he would adjure them not to lay themselves open to such charges as Marvell's by a too "jovial demeanour". As for Parker's theories, his very originality is against him; to refute the sects is to court unpopularity, and to reprove wit

is to draw it upon himself again. The course he would advise Parker to adopt is to retire into privacy, to devote himself to duty, but without the least appearance of rancour at what
(1)
has been said against him.

Mr. Smirke, although a warrent was issued for its seizure and for the discovery of its printer and author, and although it was one of the libels condemned by the Libels Committee in
(2)
1676, yet did not attract so many replies. Lex Talionis is the most interesting of the replies to Crofts' Naked Truth, which Marvell's tract defended. Crofts is accused of wishing to set up a Christian Oceana, though the connection between Crofts' and Harrington's theories is far from clear. Crofts, this goes on to say, pays too little attention to ceremonies, for these surely have their place in religion. Without clothes the body dies, and without ceremonies the church would die too.

While this controversy involved some discussion and talk in the town, its end is no more easy to date than the earlier one. Neither of Marvell's pamphlets achieved any immediate concrete results, but they admirably ridiculed the extremes

(1) This pamphlet, which takes the form of a "Letter to a friend and by him published" is dated 1674. The initials of the writer there given are, curiously enough, A.E., the same as those appended to the Letter from a Parliament Man. The pamphlet is short (12 pp. and t.p.), and although catalogued among Marvell's work etc. in the Museum catalogue, has not hitherto been noticed. Its main interest is to refute the assertion that the second part of the Rehearsal Transposed was not answered by anyone.

(2) See below p. 192.

(1)
 opponents of toleration. By the time Mr. Smirke was written, many more were coming to see in toleration a necessary expedient for peace and a safeguard against Rome, but the adoption of toleration as a party cry by the opposition caused that pamphlet to have a fairly wide circulation.

It is more difficult to estimate the exact part played by Marvell in the struggle for toleration. His greatest contribution to the cause was wit and the capacity to laugh his opponents out of court and public favour. Marvell brought no new solution of the problem to light, nor did he make any new analysis of its difficulties. He well represents, however, the feelings of many moderate churchmen, and admirably puts all the more moderate arguments for toleration in his book. These were read because the book was read, and their influence may have been greater than it appeared to be through the popularity of the Rehearsal Transposed.

Marvell's ideas on the toleration question belong to two periods. Some, and these are on the whole the less important, derive from an earlier, almost pre-Rebellion phase of the controversy, and did not have much influence. Of such, the

(1) An excellent bibliographical note on the Naked Truth and its defence, Mr. Smirke, together with other libels in the controversy, is given in a reprint of Crofts' book by the librarian of the Dr. Williams Library. See Naked Truth, edited by Henson (then Bishop of Durham), Chatto and Windus 1919 (now out of print).

arguments Marvell advanced in favour of comprehension are perhaps most typical. These were survivals of a time when an expansion of the Church such as would enable most sects to find comprehension within it was considered the only alternative to ecclesiastical anarchy. They are mainly remarkable for their continued prevalence after the Restoration, in spite of the bitterness of divisions, the repeated failure of compromise and the rise of the Quakers, who regarded such a scheme as both absolutely impracticable and radically unjust.

Marvell's other ideas have a more general interest as they were to persist well into the eighteenth century. It would be hard to say by whom he was most influenced, but perhaps his debt is greatest to John Hales, Jeremy Taylor and the Cambridge Platonists. Undoubtedly most of Marvell's anxiety for toleration was caused not so much by the theories of others or the abstract considerations of the dissenters' case, but to a large extent by his own observation of the sufferings of his friends and from his political convictions. Among these ideas most noticeable are his realisation of the importance of the nonconformist trading element in the nation, a point later to be much stressed by the Shaftesbury group, and his acceptance of dissenters of all kinds but the Catholics as good citizens and peaceable subjects. Marvell insisted on

the futility of persecution and pointed out its bad moral effect on the nation; he steadfastly upheld the right of each to think for himself on matters of religion, so long as his beliefs did not lead him into sedition and revolt. He was also insistent on the necessity for consolidating the nation by accepting as citizens all within it who would live peaceably. Strength and unity, he felt, could never come while one part of the body politic was "on the rack".

The spread of such ideas as his ultimately brought some measure of relief to the dissenters, and if not complete toleration and acceptance, at least security and freedom of thought.

There is an interesting descriptive entry in the manuscript of G. S. Finch, Esq. This is a statement made by L. H. Burrows before Secretary Conway in the January of 1812/3. There he is reported to have said that until the second impression—and it is not quite clear what he meant by impression—was made; it was never printed—he had not noticed the book. Then he made arrangements to have it printed at the printer's (he was told by Evans was printed for Parker), as he did not

[1] Grouart III, p. 277.

[2] The second edition which appeared after the first was "revised and corrected" is called "second impression", and is indeed exactly this, having differed only in the title-page and the errata. In a sense, therefore, there was but one edition of the *Intellectual Excursion*.

Section III. Distribution and Popularity of the Rehearsal Transgressed and Mr. Swirke.

Marvell's later work was to come definitely into the category of "illegal" libels, but there is some doubt as to whether his Rehearsal Transgressed was so regarded. About its licence there is some confusion of evidence. Marvell in the second part of the pamphlet mentions the fact that by the influence of some persons unnamed the licence of his book was taken away under the pretext that it was theological in character. (1) There is, however, no other evidence that the book was ever licensed at all. When it appeared L'Estrange seems to have become active and to have taken steps to suppress it. About his activity there is an interesting deposition among the manuscripts of G.H.Finch, Esq. This is a statement made by L'Estrange before Secretary Coventry in the January of 1672/3. There he is reported to have said that until the second impression--and it is not quite clear what is meant by impression here; it may mean edition-- he had not noticed the book. (2) Then he made arrangements to have it seized at the printer's (he was told by Brome was printed for Pender), as he did not

(1) Grosart III. p.272.

(2) The second edition which appeared after the spurious "second edition corrected" is called "second impression", and is indeed merely this, having different only the title-page and the errata. In a sense, therefore, there was but one edition of the Rehearsal Transgressed.

consider it a fit book to license. He was prevented from acting further, however, by the intervention of Lord Anglesey, who sent for him with Ponder the printer to his house. Anglesey then said that he had spoken to the King about the Rehearsal Transgressed, and that the King had said that "he will not have it suppressed, for Parker has done him wrong, and this man Marvell has done him right." L'Estrange then, after altering certain passages which he pointed out to Anglesey as not fit to be printed--notably that about "the wisdom of the King and Parliament exposed"--was obliged to license the book. The clerk to the Stationer's Company objected, and only complied with the demand when threatened by Anglesey with the matter's being brought before the King and Council. The printed copy did not follow L'Estrange's correction, and the license was withdrawn. The second was granted on condition of a new title-page. ⁽¹⁾ It is just possible that the "second edition corrected"--the spurious edition--was the one issued under the aegis of L'Estrange. Thus far L'Estrange, but he is not contradicted. Ponder, who was examined two days after, said that he did not know anything about the matter of "King and Council", but so far confirmed the other's testimony by reiterating the statement L'Estrange had quoted to show that he

(1) Hist. MSS. Com. VII. Rep. p. 517, reprinted as MSS. of G.H. Finch Esq. in 1922. pp. 9-11.

had powerful backing. He had meant by this, he explained, Anglesey and the Lord Chancellor. ⁽¹⁾ There is indeed nothing intrinsically improbable in the story that either of these-- Shaftesbury's opinions were well known, and Anglesey was actually a Presbyterian--should have promised the printer or even Marvell support for the book. The matter did not apparently end with the three examinations of L'Estrange, the Darbys and Pender. ⁽²⁾ In 1676 L'Estrange, who was then in trouble with the Stationers, was accused of wrongfully claiming to have the King's permission for licensing the Rehearsal Transposed, the implication being that he was bribed to license the book and invented the story to cover his action. ⁽³⁾ L'Estrange's character was such that this accusation could easily be well-founded, if it were not for two things. One of these is the confirmatory evidence of Pender, which at least shows that influence of some kind was commonly thought to be at work for Marvell, and the other is Marvell's known poverty and the enmity L'Estrange bore him which would hardly seem to point to any such understanding between them as this implies.

There is a strong tradition of help from the highest quarter for Marvell in his difficulties with the licenser. Burnet's

(1) MSS. of G.H. Finch Esq. (not in first edition, VII.Rep.)p.10.
 (2) L'Estrange's took place 23 January 1672/3, Darby's (see Hist. MSS. Com. IV. Rep. p.254) on 24th and Pender's 25th of same.
 (3) Hist. MSS. Com. IX. Rep. II. 78. MS. of House of Lords.

comment on "the liveliest droll of his age" is well known. He said that the book was read from the King down to the tradesmen with the greatest pleasure, a remark not without significance in this context. ⁽¹⁾ Baxter goes further and, speaking of Marvell's reply to Parker says:- "Mr, Andrew Marvell, a Parliament Man, Burgess for Hull, did publish an Answer so exceedingly Jocular, as thereby procured abundance of Readers, and Pardon to the Author." ⁽²⁾

Apart from this tradition of "pardon" there is only the character of Anglesey and the likelihood of his so befriending Marvell to support the story. Anglesey was a well-known protagonist of religious toleration, and had delivered speeches in its favour as early as the Conventicle Parliament, in which he sat as member for Carmathen. He made some attempt to shield Ponder the printer on another occasion, ⁽³⁾ and was not an unlikely person to have helped a book of the character of the Rehearsal Transgressed to a safe passage through L'Estrange's hands. There is no known connection between him and Marvell, whose only reference to him is far from complimentary; he in

(1) Burnet edited by Airy I. 467.

(2) Baxter 1696. p.102 vol.III.

(3) Cal. S.P.Dom. 1676 p.107. S.P.Dom. Car.II. vol.366 no.161

(10 May 1676).

(4) Cal. S.P.Dom. 1676. p.107. S.P.Dom. Car.II. vol.366 no.161. Marvell's evidence was given the day after L'Estrange's; 24 January 1676/5.

(1)
fact calls him "Enave Anglesey". Anglesey mentions Marvell
once in his "Memoirs", but then only in connection with his
(2)
Growth of Poetry. With Ashley there was a more definite con-
nection later, and his well-known views on toleration make
the story that he liked the book and intervened quite probable.

When L'Estrange set on foot proceedings against the
printers and distributors of the Rehearsal Transposed it was
ascertained that 1,500 copies of the second impression were
to be printed, and one of the printers, John Darby, gave evid-
(3)
ence that Marvell was the author. How many copies were printed
altogether it is impossible to say, but if Darby were correct
in his figures the second impression was very large for the
average libel of the day, and we know that there were other
impressions.

There were three editions of Marvell's book in the first
year that it came out. The first was published in the autumn
of 1672, and apparently met with such immediate success that
an enterprising printer pirated it in a spurious "second edit-
ion corrected". The printer of the first edition then brought

(1) Satires p.86 Britannia and Raleigh l.124. Perhaps Anglesey's
attitude to the Irish Cattle Bill and his tolerance of Cath-
olics had annoyed Marvell and made him suspicious of his politics.
(2) Memoirs 1693. p.110.
(3) Hist. MSS. Com. IV. Rep. MSS. of the M. of Bath. p.254.
Darby's evidence was given the day after L'Estrange's, 24 Jan-
uary 1672/3.

out the "second impression", really the third edition, or impression, since its issue. This second impression, except for some corrections, ^{and} the addition of a note about the spurious edition, made few alterations, and was probably printed from the same type. The Rehearsal Transposed, unlike both the Essay on General Councils and the Growth of Popery, was not again reprinted until the mid-eighteenth century, when Captain Thompson brought out an edition of Marvell's Works.

The popularity of the Rehearsal Transposed is attested by many witnesses. ⁽¹⁾ Marvell himself playfully refers to the stir made by it in the Second Part:- "I am told by one..... that there was a new disease, which spread through the nation last Autumn"; this was nothing else but the Rehearsal Transposed. ⁽²⁾ In another place he disclaims credit for its success, saying that "nothing could have come out at that time against him [Parker] but must be assured of welcome." ⁽³⁾ "Never" he says, ⁽⁴⁾ was such a hubbub made about a sorry book." Swift's praise of Marvell is well known, and his style is thought to have been

(1) The author of the Transposer Rehearsed speaks of the sale of Marvell's book p.46. One copy at least went to Scotland, being bought for the Lauder library, which also received other copies of Marvell's works and those of his antagonists. (Scotch Hist. Soc. Lauder Diary p.283 seq.

(2) R.T. p.244.

(3) Ibid. p.267.

(4) Ibid. p.274.

influenced by Marvell to some extent, ⁽¹⁾ Dryden called Marvell the "Martin Marprelate of his age", though the epithet was not a new one and had been used during the pamphlet war in 1672 and 1673. ⁽²⁾ It is interesting to find among other references a tribute from Rochester--the only man in England Marvell thought to have the vein of satire--in his Tunbridge Wells, ⁽³⁾ where he pokes fun at Parker as "Pert Bayes" and his promotion to an Archdeanery through his fight against liberty. ⁽⁴⁾ Even Wood allows the odds of victory to have been on Marvell's side, and ⁽⁵⁾ says that he set a new fashion in writing.

Parker's last mention of the affair shows that time had not healed the wounds made by Marvell's ridicule. Speaking of various schools of sedition, amongst which "the most famous was a meeting at a tavern at the sign of King Henry the Eighth against the Temple", ⁽⁶⁾ he relates Marvell's part in them. "Amongst these Lewd revilers the lewdest was Marvel", son of a Presbyterian teacher and so poor that he was obliged to take five shillings a day from his borough for sitting in Parliament. He was an enemy to the King's affairs, and one of a band

(1) Swift (1629) vol.X p.22, and an article by Pierre Legouis in the Anglo-American Review, January 1924, on their connection.

(2) Dryden, Preface to Religio Laici .

(3) Aubrey, Brief Lives (1896) II. pp.54, 304.

(4) Works (1709) pp.60-62.

(5) Wood edited by Bliss, IV. p.230-1. See also Life and Times II. (1892) p.240.

(6) In one edition (9525.615)(1728 with remarks etc.) this is called the King's Head tavern near Chancery Lane in Fleet Street (p.214).

of sixty--mostly lawyers--the remains of the rebellion who had pledged themselves to give all the trouble they could: "If at any time the Fanaticks had occasion for this libeller's help, he presently issued forth out of his cave like a gladiator, or a wild beast". Parker accuses Marvell of being the secretary and advocate of his party, the head of which was Shaftesbury. (1)

Mr. Sparks, although it attained some fame on its appearance has not since been so widely read as the former libel. Perhaps this is due to the fact that, on the whole, the style is more serious and has less of that wit which had made the Rehearsal Transposed so widely read. Marvell himself, in an amusing letter to Sir Edward Harley, suggests this reason. He says:- "Here are diverse books come out lately.....Dr. Stillingfleets answer to Godwin, where in his prefatory Epistle to the Bp of London dated May the 30th (2) he seems to have read the sheet so seditious and defamatory to Christian Religion. The book said to be Marvels makes what shift it can in the world but the Author walks negligently up and down as unconcerned. The Divines of our Church say it is not in the merry part so good as the Rehearsall Transpos'd, that it runs dreggs: the Essay they confesse is writ well enough to the purpose he intended it but that was a very ill purpose. The Bp

(1) Parker's History IV. pp. 331-335.

(2) This A Defence of the Discourse etc. refuting Godwin on Idolatry. 1676. (5935. bb.8)

of London's Chaplain said it had not answered expectation.....
 Marvell if it be he, has much staggered me in the Business
 of the Nicene & all Councils, but have better taken a rich
 Presbyterians money that before the book came out would have
 bought the whole Impression to burne it. Who would write?"⁽¹⁾

In the same letter Marvell says that the Bishop of Lon-
 don had tried to get the council to take some notice of Mr.
Smirke. He had not then been successful, but Mr. Smirke was
 one of those libels about which enquiry was made by the House
 of Lords later in the year.⁽²⁾ Its printer was arrested after
 the Lords' enquiry, and the book seized,⁽³⁾ in spite of the fact
 that at the enquiry Pender denied all knowledge of it. No
 further action seems to have been taken against the printer,
 who, if it were indeed Pender, was in action again quite soon
 and printing a book on toleration by Anglesey.⁽⁴⁾

There are several nearly contemporary references to
⁽⁵⁾
Mr. Smirke. Wood, Dryden and others use the term a "Mr. Smirke"
 to denote the comically pompous parson, and as the original

(1) Marvell to Harley 1 July 1676, communicated by the kindness
 of Prof. Margoliouth. The letter is among the MSS. of the Duke
 of Portland, but is not printed in the Hist. MSS. Com. Report.
 See too Marvell's letter to Popple of 15 July about the book.
 Printed by Grosart as four letters, to Popple and to Bishop
 Crofts and from Crofts, but in reality all one (Grosart II.
 pp. 488-492,). By the kindness of Prof. Margoliouth.

(2) Hist. MSS. Com. IX. pp. 78 seq.

(3) (Cal. S.P.Dom. 1676-7 p. 51) S.P.Dom. 380 no 77, minute, to seize
Naked Truth and the Letter from a Person of Quality.

(4) A Letter to a Person of Honour, 1681.

(5) Wood, Life and Times, edited by Clark 1892. II. p. 16 n
 and III. 359 etc.

Smirke in Etherege's play only performs a marriage ceremony, it is obvious that this use of the term comes from Marvell's book and not the play. A letter written at the time of the book's appearance mentions the stir it was making and its scurrilous abuse of Dr. Turner. ⁽¹⁾ Though all this seems to point to its being quite widely read, Mr. Smirke was at the time issued in only one, or at the most, two impressions, ⁽²⁾ nor was it reprinted until Thompson included it in his edition of Marvell's works.

This, however, was not the case with the Historical Essay on General Councils, which was several times reprinted between 1676 and 1709. It appeared separately and under Marvell's name in 1680, and again in 1687 with a slight alteration in the title-page. ⁽³⁾ In 1703 it was again reprinted, again with slight differences in the title-page, and six years later formed part of a collection of tracts entitled the Growth of Deism. Only the edition of 1680 had any material alteration in the text. There the last sentence is changed; instead of running:-
 "And upon this condition 'let my book also "(yea, myself,

(1) Hatton Correspondence pp.125, 128. Hatton to his brother 23 May 1676. Probably the book was only just out.

(2) Some copies of Mr. Smirke have the preface To the Cautious Reader in a different type from others, and the librarian of the Dr. Williams Library, in a biographical note on the Naked Truth (reprinted 1919) suggests that a new title-page and preface were set up as it was realised that more copies of the impression would be needed. They are all the same in other respects.

(3) See below p. 395. for a bibliographical note on the editions.

if it were needful) "be burnt by the hand of the Animad-
 verter" it runs "be burnt by the hands of the Enemies of the
 Religion and Liberties of England." This alteration was doubt-
 less an attempt to carry out the promise of the title-page,
 which proclaimed the book "Very Seasonable at this Time".

Various reasons may be suggested for the popularity of
 this Essay. It was shorter and in some ways more readable than
 Marvell's other work, and so lent itself to reprinting. It was
 witty, and not so seditious as the Growth of Popery, and would
 therefore not be likely to meet with any determined opposition.
 It was also of some interest to a class hardly affected by the
 other pamphlets, the class of antiquarians, or indeed any who
 would read the Essay for the sake of the facts it presented.
 Its chief appeal, however, must have lain in its diatribe against
 the papal system. This appeal was as fresh in 1687 as when it
 was published, and even by 1707 the interest would not complete-
 ly die away. Many of the references of the Rehearsal Transposed
 and the Growth of Popery would by then have become obscure, as
 all such topical allusions must. The Essay had the advantage of
 dealing with the same subject, but with that subject illustrated
 from a period too far away to be affected by the lapse of years
 instead of one too near to be regarded objectively. This is
 probably the main reason of the advantage of the Essay over the
 other works in the matter of reprints.

Note to Chapter IV. The Authorship of the Letter from a Person of Quality.

This pamphlet, which is one of the most important of the period, was at one time thought to be the work of Locke. His own statement, however, and the evidence of style prove this conjecture to have been wrong, and more modern editions of his works do not include it. It has also been ascribed to Shaftesbury, and indeed its connection with him is attested by the use of his name in the many replies to it at the time of its appearance.⁽¹⁾ But again the evidence does not seem sufficient, and the references to the Earl in the pamphlet would seem to be the work of an admirer rather than of the Earl himself, though it must always be considered a possibility that he did indeed write it. A further suggestion has been made that Marvell had some hand in its writing.⁽²⁾

There seems to be no definite evidence in favour of this theory, but there are, on the other hand, certain indications of a similarity of touch and method in the Letter and the Growth of Popery. Both are accounts of debates in Parliament, one of the Commons, the other of the Lords. Both are written to give by these accounts such a light on the doings of the "court" party as to discredit them. Both profess great admiration for Buckingham and Shaftesbury. Both advocate some degree of toleration for Protestant dissenters, and both display distrust of the same things: bishops, Roman influences, prerogative, etc. Both look to the "country" interest to save England from ruin.

Marvell is often called the record-keeper of his party,⁽³⁾ and his connection with Shaftesbury was commented on in a Letter to the Earl of Shaftesbury⁽⁴⁾, in Honesty's Best Policy and later by L'Estrange and Parker⁽⁵⁾. An answer to the Letter remarks that "His Lordship was not a stranger to its compilation; though it is writ in the style of some other person."⁽⁶⁾ The style is not altogether similar to Marvell's, though as the pamphlet is very largely in reported speech that is not such an important consideration as it would be in a purely didactic tract. Marvell mentions the fate of the Letter in his Growth of Popery⁽⁷⁾ but not in such a way as to affect any theory of its authorship. He also answers two of the replies to the Letter which had appeared between its appearance in 1675 and that of the Growth of Popery in 1677 in that pamphlet, and so seems to take upon himself the duty of its defence⁽⁸⁾. It is not improbable that Marvell should have written the tract, but at present in the absence of any definite proof one way or the other the verdict must be "not proven".

(1) Wood (ed. Bliss) vol. IV. pp. 7-8 so attribute it. [1924.

(2) The Country Party and Danby. A Thesis by E.S. de Beer (London)

(3) By Parker, for example. See above p. 91, and below Chap. V.

(4) Printed in 1680. The reference is to "Little Andrew Marvell's unhoopable wit."

(5) Parker 1727. 347-8 and on various occasions. (Pressmark 292.126) See Chap. V below.

(6) Advice to the Men of Shaftesbury 1676. (Pressmark E.1959)

(7) Grosart IV. pp. 309-310.

(8) *Ibid.* pp. 316-317, 375.

Chapter V. The Growth of Popery.

The Rehearsal Transposed brought Marvell fame and some notoriety, but it was the Growth of Popery which made him a political figure to his own and the succeeding generation. The one had proclaimed him a champion of the dissenters, the other was to show him equally the champion of liberty and Protestantism against the arbitrary tendencies of the Court and Rome. One secured his reputation among men of letters as a wit and satirist, the other earned him a place in almost every eighteenth century history either as the writer of the "standard libel of his time" or as the divinely inspired historian of events which justified a prolonged Whig rule and added glory to the Revolution. Six years divide one pamphlet from the other, and a great progression can be noticed in Marvell's ideas, a progression whose stages are seen in his few private letters and in his satires. But there is more than a mere development between them. There is a difference. That difference can be partly accounted for by the difference in subject; the Rehearsal Transposed dealt with the troubles of the dissenters and possible remedies, while the other was mainly concerned with the rousing of a party to action in a crisis of national life. "Our all is at stake"--cried Shaftesbury--"and therefore you must give me leave to speak freely before we part with it,"⁽¹⁾ and throughout

(1) Baldwin, State Tracts 1693. p.57. 20 October 1675.

the Growth of Popery this same note of urgency is heard. But the difference is more than one of subject, and can only be fully explained by an estimate of Marvell's political aims and ambitions, and the change that took place in them during these six years.

At the beginning of those years Marvell was a political free-lance; at the end his party was daily growing in numbers and power, and something at least was being attempted to organise the various elements within it. In that organisation it is probable that Marvell played a not inconspicuous part as a writer and publicist, and a consideration of this work suggests some interesting possibilities as to the manner in which some of the party pamphlets were compiled. In the Growth of Popery, too, may be found Marvell's main contribution to the political ideas of his period. The earlier pamphlet, mainly polemical in character, was also necessarily less a statement of any theory than an attempt to discredit a definitely dangerous one. In order to do this Marvell used every weapon in his power, and cited with telling effect the opinions and actions of the King on this matter of toleration. It is not therefore surprising to find some inconsistencies between this and that later work in which he was opposing the Court in every direction. In the Growth of Popery Marvell was not trying to discredit the theories of one section of the community on a matter mainly

affecting another section only, but was trying to expose the actions of the government in every department of national life in the sinister light of an attempted plot to subvert the constitution. It was his duty to select the evidence against the government and plead the case against it. The way in which he puts his case illuminates the whole state of opinion within his party at this time.

Section 1. Marvell's Satires and Parliamentary Activity between The Rehearsal Transposed and The Growth of Popery.

Up to the early seventies Charles retained much of his popularity. Few ventured to look back at the Rebellion except to condemn. While the "Court" party stood for King and prerogative, the "Country" party professed to stand for King and Parliament. Until the prolonged prorogation of 1676, few indulged in any open defiance of the King, though a gradual crescendo of distrust had been spreading through the country long before this date. Perhaps the immediate cause of the distrust was James' open avowal of his conversion after the passing of the Test Act. At any rate, this, together with James' marriage, the failure of the Dutch War and the increasing friction between King and Commons over finance, resulting in less frequent sessions of Parliament, combined to support the fears of the nervous and to give some pause even to some hitherto staunch

"courtiers". Men began to feel:-

" 'Tis forty to one, if he play the old game,
"He'll reduce us ere long to rehearse forty-eight."(1)

The opposition, with the break-up of the Cabal ministry, began to strengthen. Before this its leaders were in office and allied with the Court, and, perforce, with some of the bitterest enemies of the "country" like "Groom Clifford", Finch, "the worst attorney" of the time, and the "motley council board at Arlington's"⁽²⁾. With the disgrace of Buckingham and the dismissal of Shaftesbury it gained two vigorous members. Another in itself minor, but disgraceful, affair, the cutting of Sir John Coventry's nose,⁽³⁾ roused the Commons to real anger and disgraced the reputation of several of the Court. Then the Stop of the Exchequer, the marriage of James following the Declaration of Indulgence, the Test Act, the Dutch War and the too frequent prorogations of Parliament provided the opposition party with its war-cries for the rest of the reign. Many who had regarded one or other of these things as bearable evils, or even, as in the case of the Declaration, a positive benefit, when confronted with them all saw them as part of a huge conspiracy against the religion of the country.

(1) Satires p.90. The Statue at Charing Cross verse vi.
 (2) Ibid. pp.63-4. Farther Instructions to a Painter, passim.
 (3) Marvell gives one of the fullest accounts of this incident, and the way in which it was regarded, in an undated letter to Popple, Grosart II. 388-90. He refers to it in his Farther Instructions to a Painter as the "Humble fate of a plebeian nose."
 (Satires pp.63-4)

In A Poem on a Statue in Stocks-Market, written about 1672-3, Marvell laments "Bankers defeated and Lombard Street broken", and in the Growth of Popery gives a fuller description of the stop of the Exchequer which his poem had celebrated. "Upon the first of January 1671, to the great astonishment, ruine and despair of so many interested persons, and to the great terroure of the whole nation by so arbitrary a fact, the proclamation issued whereby the crowne, amidst the confluence of so vast aids and revenues, published itself bankrupt, made prize of the subjectoy, and broke all faith and contract at home in order to the breaking of them abroad with more advantage. Marvell here voices the general opinion of his day, and one of the chief causes of the government's unpopularity.

To some extent the public misunderstood the action.

These "vast aids and revenues" so often talked of by Marvell and his like were totally inadequate for the King's needs. Not only was he thus without ready money, but his nominal revenue was far in excess of its net value--for the returns seldom, if ever, came up to the Commons' estimates--and Charles had not the advantage of a good credit system. The Stop was due to the

(1) Satires p.66 seq. verse 1. See also verses iv, v, xiii. Another reference to the affair is ibid. p.103 Dialogue l.45: "The Bankers quite broken to maintain the whore's pride."

(2) Grozart IV. 276-7.

(3) For my information in this paragraph I am indebted to Dr. Shaw's article in Owens College Essays (1902, edited by T.F.Fout and J.Tait) pp.391-422, and his introduction to the Cal. Treas. Books. I have also used notes of an as yet unprinted lecture delivered by Dr. Gregory at the London School of Economics.

break-down of the inadequate system to hand.

The reasons for it were clearly stated by Charles in a meeting of his council on 5 January 1671-2. "Nothing could have brought his Majie to an art of this nature, but such a Conjunction of Affayres where all the neighbouring princes and States were making such threatening preparations, that his Majies Governm^t would not be safe without appearing in the same posture." The revenue, he told his councillors, was already so much anticipated that he could not borrow more. Every safeguard was to be taken so that the smallest creditor should not be ruined. While no ⁿmoney warrant was to be payable, all small sums were to be paid as usual by the departments. Six per cent. interest was to be paid on all debts. ⁽¹⁾ The necessity for the stoppage was real, and the most surprising part of the whole matter is the fact that it had not come before, and that its results were not more disastrous.

Far from deploring or even admitting the necessity which drove Charles into bankruptcy, the opposition took advantage of it to make themselves unpleasant over the "land army" or "Blackheath Project", so called from the gathering of the troops ⁽²⁾ there, and over the war with Holland. These, together with the Stop of the Exchequer and the Declaration of Indulgence, were

(1) Privy Council Register 2/63 pp.144-5 and see too *ibid.* pp.151-153, 352-353.

(2) Satires p.72. An Historical Poem l.59.

regarded as signs of the "growth of Popery and arbitrary power".

The renewed feeling about the army in its connection with the disgrace of Clarendon has already been noticed. His fall, however, by no means satisfied the Commons that the menace was destroyed. The confidence shown by the Militia Act, never shared by men like Marvell, had now gone. Although the troops at Blackheath were ostensibly there in case of need during the Dutch War, that was not the reason to which their presence was ascribed by such men as Marvell. He saw in that army "the gathering of a storm to fall on London", a weapon by means of which Popery could be forced on the nation. It was more than hinted that this army was trained up under French discipline that it might the better "execute the same counsels". James' ambition was feared just as much on account of his religion as of his known military interests. Marvell suggests that he was "vaunting his popish myrmidons" to over-awe the nation and supplant

(1) Chap. III above p. 91.

(2) Grosart IV. p.306:- "And moreover to put the crown in full security, this Parliament hath by an Act of theirs, determined a question which the wisdom of their ancestors had never decided, that the King hath the sole power of the Militia." The author of A Letter from a Person of Quality puts prominently among the steps towards Popery this Militia Act, "which establisheth a standing Army by a Law, and swears us into a Military Government". (Baldwin, State Tracts 1689 p.37).cf. Chap.II. p.46-51, above.

(3) Grosart IV. 393.

(4) Ibid. p.303.

(1)
the King. Undoubtedly, too, the Stuarts' well-known ability and keenness for military and naval matters sharpened this suspicion.

Apart from the fear of James' possible intentions regarding the army, there was that which arose from the numbers of Englishmen serving in France. These, it was suggested, were being trained in that service in order to absorb those ideas of Popery, absolutism and military government with which France was invariably associated. Marvell shows a keen interest in the question of the recall of these Englishmen in French service, both in his letters and in the Growth of Popery.⁽²⁾ Reports of debates in the House during 1675, when the question was receiving most attention, show how this matter and that of the troops on Blackheath were associated with the fear of Popery and France. Lee tells the House that "One way to secure the nation is to quiet peoples' minds, and that is to keep men at home from service beyond the seas."⁽³⁾ When the King indicated that though he would prevent further troops going over, he could hardly recall those already there, Sir Thomas Lyttleton said that to thank the King for his message would be to thank him for sending troops into France.⁽⁴⁾ Debates grew so heated on

(1) Satires, An Historical Poem and Advice to a Painter passim.
 (2) Grosart IV. pp.303, 308; Grosart II. pp.428, 446 etc.
 (3) Grey III. 22. 22 April 1675.
 (4) Ibid. p.116. 10 May 1675.

(1)

the matter that on one occasion swords were drawn in the House. This merely affords a precise example of that confusion of ideas and that hatred of an army which in this period arose directly from fears of Popery and "French counsel". Every accusation against the government is this monotonous never changing cry, and Marvell is only typical of his age when he echoes it over and over again in stanzas and prose.

The fear of a standing army was partly responsible for the immense unpopularity of Lauderdale. He was supposed to be training the troops he had under him in Scotland in order to descend over the Border and take away the English liberties. In the House Mr. Fowle reminded members of "an army upon the same continent that may invade you at home, meaning the Scotch army." (2) And his accusation was by no means a new one. Lauderdale's rule in Scotland was rousing the indignation of many-- (3) Marvell in his letters remarks on its severity--and the high-handed methods used by him to enforce order at a time when fears of an "arbitrary government" were prevalent naturally gave rise to suspicions. Added to this, of course, was his influence and friendship with both Charles and James of York. Marvell.

(1) Grey III. p.128. cf. Marvell's letter of 11 May 1675 (Grosart II. pp.449-450 and letter to W.Popple 24 July 1675 (Grosart II. p.446)

(2) Grey III. p.23. 22 April 1675.

(3) Grosart II. 631. Marvell to W.Popple 10 June 1678. Hist. MSS. Com.XIV. Rep.II. p.356 Marvell to Harley. Also Satires p.114 Scaevola Sesto-Britannus, a later poem on the fall of a Scots dissenter.

summarises the case against Lauderdale thus:-

"This haughty monster, with his ugly claws,
 "First tempered poison to destroy our laws;
 "Declares the council's edicts are beyond
 "The most authentic statutes of the land;
 "Sets up in Scotland, a la mode de France
 "Taxes, excise, and armies does advance.
 "This Saracen his country's freedom broke,
 "To bring upon their necks the heavier yoke;.....
 "Of all the miscreants ever went to hell,
 "This villain rampant bears away the bell."⁽¹⁾

(2)

Marvell condemns him as an atheist and a liar, and digs at him in the Mock Speech.⁽³⁾ On another occasion he remarks that Lauderdale deserves a "Halter rather than a garter".⁽⁴⁾ In spite of this unpopularity Lauderdale retained his position and his influence with the King.

The accusations against Charles made in connection with the Stop of the Exchequer and the standing army had at least some foundation of truth even if they grossly exaggerated the King's responsibility for them. The charges that were made about his foreign policy have little to support them, though they have often since been echoed.⁽⁵⁾ Charles has been generally condemned for his breaking of the Triple Alliance, his secret

(1) Satires p.74. An Historical Poem ll.114-121, 124-125.

(2) Satires p.83. Britannia and Raleigh l.19.

(3) Grosart II. pp.431-433.

(4) Ibid. p.314. Marvell to Popple 21 March 1670, also *ibid.* p.440. Marvell to Hull 24 April 1675, where Marvell gives a full account of the proceedings against Lauderdale, when Dr. Burnet was summoned to give evidence; cf. Grey III. 31 seq. 23 April 1675, Grosart II. 466 Marvell to Popple 24 July 1675.

(5) Lingard and Dalrymple give two sympathetic accounts of Charles' foreign policy; Lingard (1849) vol.IX. p.503, Dalrymple (1790) vol.I. pp.37, 60-61.

diplomacy, his supposed subservience to France and his betrayal of the Protestant religion.

(1)
A pamphlet which appeared in 1675--England's Appeal from the Private Cabal at Whitehall to the Great Council of the Nation--is only one expression of the general feeling at the time about foreign policy. It is the most famous of the pamphlets, and the only one with a more than ephemeral life, but it said practically the same as the rest. It advocated war with France and alliance with the Dutch. France was England's hereditary foe, and the safety of Flanders from her aggression should be England's primary consideration. It says nothing of the danger to English trade from Dutch competition which had been the cry before the last Dutch War. To the author, as to so many, the Triple Alliance was the only sound foreign policy for England.

There are many reasons for this change in public opinion. (2)
By now the successful policy of Colbert was frightening the trading part of the nation more than they had been frightened over the Dutch traders. This fear was openly voiced on more than one occasion in the House by Sir William Coventry and his party. He said that he feared that the prevalency of France would spoil (3)
the English markets more than anything. Public opinion substituted France for Holland as the chief enemy, and therefore

(1) Baldwin, State Tracts 1689. Lisola is supposed to have been the author (See E.H.R. XXXIX, 86).

(2) Harvell mentions this reason in his Growth of Rapery (Grosart IV, 288).

(3) Grey III, 125. 10 May 1675.

supported the cause of Holland against that nation. Marvell shared in the great reversal of feeling towards Holland, and an illuminating difference separates the Character of Holland (1) which he had written in 1652 and the satires of the seventies (2) and the Growth of Popery. Had he lived a few years longer he might have changed his attitude again with the rest of his party, for nothing is more unstable than the opposition policy towards foreign affairs in this reign. "How they chicaned, and fly from what they have formerly say'd," writes James in 1687; "those who seemed most zealous for a war with France last session are those who obstruct most the giving of a supply." (3)

The immediate cause of Marvell's distrust of Charles in this matter of foreign policy, and so of his reversal of feeling about Holland, was his fear of Popery and the rumours of secret treaties with France which sold the country "into French slavery". (4) The text of the most famous of these secret agreements provides at once an insight into Charles' methods and an answer to his accusers. The Treaty of Dover arranged for an alliance between Charles and Louis. Charles was to help Louis to make good any new claim which should turn up enabling

(1) A hitherto unnoticed copy of the 1672 reprint (abridged) of this satire is among the pamphlets in S.P.Dom.Car.II. Case F.
 (2) For examples of his changed attitude see Satires p.67 The Statue in Stocks-Market verses vii etc. Also Grosart IV. pp. and passim.

(3) King William's Chest, Bundle III. nos.17-18, James to William, February 1678.

(4) There is an article in the E.N.R. LXXIX. 86-89 about the opposition propaganda against the secret treaties.

him to gain advantages in Spain. Charles was also to make war with Holland when Louis should decide. The whole force of this notorious clause was obviated by the corollary that he was only to make this declaration after he had made public his change of faith, that moment of change being entirely dependent on his own decision as to its feasibility. For this war he was to provide some thousands of troops, ⁽¹⁾ but Louis was to be responsible for the rest of the army. For these problematical services Louis was to help the English Navy with thirty ships and to hand over immediately and unconditionally 2,000,000 livres (about 80,000 pounds). All that Charles had engaged to do was to declare himself Catholic when he thought it possible. His declaration of war depended on this, and so did all his other promises. The treaty, that is to say, bound him to nothing that he could not escape from by omitting--as he did--to declare his Catholicism, while it definitely enriched him to the tune of some thousands, and perhaps--an even more valuable asset to his diplomacy--deceived Louis into thinking him a fool. Charles never made any serious attempt to change his religion publicly, unless the correspondence with certain Catholics over the matter was really a sign of sincerity. And this alone should clear him from the charges that have so frequently been made that the treaty was only designed to betray his

(1) The number is variously stated as 6,000 or 8,000 men. See E.H.R. XXXIX. 58.

country's religion in return for a French pension. (1)

The question however arises as to what was Charles' real motive in the treaty, the principles of which, he must have known, were opposed by practically all parties of the day. Curiously enough, Harvell himself suggests a reason in his Growth of Papery:— "It was by the diminution of that beam of his glory (i.e. trade), that the Hollanders had raised his indignation." (2) Charles perhaps thought to engage the Dutch and French, both commercial rivals to English trade, in war, and thereby take trade out of their hands. He was ambitious, willing to take risks, and needing money. He did not fear French action in the Netherlands. At any moment, if they were endangered, he could rely upon the traditional English fear of French aggression there to assist him to prevent it. Meanwhile he felt that a good opportunity was offered for striking a blow at a trade rival lulled into a sense of security by the Triple Alliance, and using the resources of another rival to do so. Such a policy, moreover, would please his sister and gratify his own natural leaning towards the French people. He took a risk, however. The Dutch War was not successful, partly on account of the refusal of the Commons to grant adequate supplies. The failure at Smyrna and Surinam further

(1) The text of the treaty is printed by Mignet: Negotiations etc. (1832-1843) III. p.118. It is interesting to note that Dalrymple was forced into admiration of Charles' masterly inactivity over his religious obligations imposed by this treaty. (vol.I. 48-49).

(2) Grosart IV. 288.

convinced the Commons of their wisdom in this refusal. The failure may condemn Charles' policy. It cannot justify Marvell's picture of him as "the Priapus King, led by the nose,"⁽¹⁾ or wholly conceal the ability he displayed in foreign diplomacy. Both he and James were determined to keep the control of that in their own hands:- "Such things as cannot subsist with Monarchy, and was never before pretended to by a House of Commons,"⁽²⁾ writes James of the limitations the House attempted to impose on that control. The attitude of Charles and his brother revealed in this letter was regarded as a proof of their absolutist tendencies and ambitions, and opposition to their foreign policy was regarded as one of the best ways of thwarting this.⁽³⁾ The King, whatever his precise objective, undoubtedly understood more of the European situation than the Commons, and this the situation arises of the expert's being hindered by the ignorance of the Commons and the confusion of ideas caused partly by his very expertness.

Charles' foreign policy had laid him open to charges of a French or Popish bias. Suspicions of this were thought to receive confirmation by the Declaration of Indulgence. With the consequent outcry and the insistence in Parliament upon the

(1) Satires p.72. An Historical Poem 1.62.

(2) King William's Chest III. 17. James to William of Orange 2 February 1672.

(3) James clearly believed that all this vacillation on the part of the Commons was due to their design "to engage the King in a war, that they may the easier ruine him." King William's Chest III. 35. James to William 10 May 1678.

Test Act the agitation which led to the Growth of Popery and the panic over the Popish Plot may be said to have begun. This fear for the Protestant religion was perhaps the deciding factor that led Marvell from a reluctant acquiescence in the Stuart rule in 1672:-

"For though all the world cannot show such another
"Yet we'd rather have him than his bigoted brother"(1)

to a frankly admitted regret for the days of the Commonwealth:-

"I freely declare it I am for old Holl."

By the date of this declaration Marvell felt that things would never be better until:-

"The reign of the line of Stuarts is ended."(2)

But already only one year after the Declaration of Indulgence Marvell had gone almost as far in his opposition to the King and had written:-

"The royal evil so malignant grows,
"Nothing the dire contagion can oppose,
"In our weal-public scarce one thing succeeds,
"For one man's weakness a whole nation bleeds;
"Ill-luck starts up, and thrives like evil weeds,
"Let Cromwell's ghost smile with contempt to see
"Old England struggling under slavery."(3)

Perhaps if any one of the events which led to this attitude must be emphasised separately it is the conversion of James and its public acknowledgement after the Test Act. At

(1) Satires p.69 The Statue in Stocks-Market ll.59-60.
 (2) Ibid. pp.110-111 Dialogue between two Horses ll.157 and 177.
 (3) Ibid. p.74-75 An Historical Poem ll.128-134. of. letter to Thompson Grosart II. p.424, 5 November 1674.

first Marvell had welcomed the Declaration, if the Rehearsal Transposed is to be believed. He disapproved of the principle by which it was granted, but rather than see the dissenters suffer under the "arbitrary malice" of the Commons he would admit the extension of the prerogative involved. It is difficult to say how long this mood lasted. The satire just quoted was written only a year after the second part of the Rehearsal Transposed and some time before Mr. Smirke, and the evidence they afford is contradictory. The Growth of Popery may, however, supply some key to the mystery; there he can be seen trying to reconcile his anxiety for tolerance with his dislike of anything that might enlarge the King's powers. One fact however emerges quite clearly from consideration of his work. Marvell undoubtedly between 1672 and 1677 became convinced of the conspiracy against English liberty which for the rest of his life he was to try to expose. This liberty he felt to be of more value than the temporary inconvenience of the dissenters, and he became the more willing temporarily to let their interests lie neglected because the opposition, now led by Shaftesbury and Buckingham, had definitely adopted their cause as its own, and once the major issue was solved would relieve their distress.

(1) Grosart IV. (Growth of Popery) pp.279-280, but see below, pp. 168 seq., section III. of this Chapter for a fuller analysis of Marvell's views on the problem.

The satires belonging to the years before the publication of the Growth of Popery show very vividly the kind of things that was influencing Marvell to fear for English "lives, liberties and Estates". Not only the factors just mentioned--the disastrous wars, the financial stoppage, the army on Blackheath and the fear of Popery--but other in themselves less important influences at Court were helping to confirm his fears. The "security and lust" and the "French Dame"⁽¹⁾--Carwell--that held sway at Whitehall disgusted the Puritan in Marvell as well as the great majority of his countrymen, and must be considered in any account of the rise of opposition.

It was not however such things that ultimately weighted the scales against Charles. It was the conviction that all the other omens predicted the setting up of a "French Tyranny" and the consequent destruction of Parliamentary government. Marvell shows Britannia realising at last the uselessness of trying to:-

"Present to's thoughts his long-scorned Parliament,
"The basis of his throne and government."

She tells how long in vain she has tried:-

"The Stuart from the Tyrant to divide",⁽²⁾

but is forced to the conclusion that such division is impossible

(1) Satires p.86 Britannia and Balgish ll.117 and 121; cf. ibid. p.83 ll.25 seq., where Marvell laments the "colony of French" pervading the Court, "pimps, priests, buffoons" etc. Throughout the satires this disgust is frequently expressed.

(2) Ibid. p.87, ll.135-136, 141 and (next page) 149-151.

and that the only remedy is to put away the tyrant:-

"Tyrants, like leprous Kings, for public weal
 "Should be immured, lest the contagion steal
 "Over the whole."

Violent though these satires appear, it is yet doubtful whether they really imply the republicanism with which Marvell has sometimes been credited. When he says:-

"To the serene Venetian State I'll go
 "From her sage mouth famed principles to know"(1)

he seems to be voicing rather an academic admiration for that State than suggesting seriously an English imitation of it. He is also thinking of the Venetian maintenance of Parliamentary principles. There the Parliament had an important place, while in his own country those institutions for which so much had been suffered seemed to him to be in danger from the absolutist tendencies of the King and his brother. The satires show his distrust of their politics; his pamphlets and those of his party show the practical remedies for which they pressed.

Dissolution was the remedy most advocated by the country party in 1675 and later for most of their troubles. Could they but rid themselves of the bribe-ridden House of Commons and substitute for it the free-thinking and uncorrupted members that would be elected in their place all would be well. In the House at present little could be achieved. Consistent opposition was impossible, and the bribery of the Court made any

(1) Satires p.88 Britannia and Raleigh ll.155-156. cf. ibid. p.96 Nostradamus Prophecy l.48.

concerted efforts difficult. With an uncorrupted House the King could be properly restrained, his ministers when unsatisfactory easily removed. This was the policy of men like Marvell and his party rather than a policy of definite republicanism. A few, it is true, were later to advocate something very like republicanism, because they saw no other way possible out of their troubles, but on the whole the restraint of Charles by a strong Parliament was the object of the opposition in 1675/6.

Charges of bribery had been made as early as the winter of Clarendon's fall, and continued to be made right through the reign. The Seasonable Argument of 1677 was little more than a new edition of the Flagellum Parliamentum of 1672.⁽¹⁾ In the satire the Statue at Charing Cross and the Dialogue Marvell anticipated the charges of his Growth of Popery. Undoubtedly much speculation and corruption went on, but the question at issue was not merely that of the actual matter of bribe receiving but of the pernicious effect it was having upon the prestige and utility of Parliament.

Besides recapitulating these allegations, the author of A Letter of a Parliament Man to his Friend (1675) gives other reasons for a dissolution. "We are," he says, "such a pled Parliament that none can say of what Colour we are; for we

(1) See below p. 314-315, for a note on the authorship of these libels and the relationship between them.

(1)
 consist of old Cavaliers, old Roundheads, Indigent Courtiers,
 and true Country gentlemen; the two latter are the most num-
erous, and would in all probability bring things to some
 Issue, were they not so clogged with the numerous uncertain-
 ties of the former.....So that the Roundhead had rather
 enslave the Man than the Conscience; the Cavalier rather the
Conscience than the Man." These divisions, he continues, are
 used by the Courtiers to gain a majority, for the wrangling
 spirit which prevails has destroyed any real sense of values.
 The author laments the lack of any clear programme on the part
 of the country gentry against the encroaching prerogative. (2)

Two things helped to give the country gentry a programme,
 even if that programme were only negative in character. One
 was the Test bill of 1675, the other the long prerogation of
 the following year. These roused the Lords to opposition, and
 gave the country party something definite to work against.
 They brought to a head at last the agitation for dissolution
 which had long been growing up. The Test was to these a con-
 spiracy against the safety of the nation, a plot to bring in
 "arbitrary government". "This same cath," says Marvell some
 time later, "had been brought into the House of Commons in

(1) The old Cavaliers, "those honest old Cavaliers" have often
 been said to have done more than the old Roundheads to bring
 about the second fall of the Stuarts. Marvell's attitude to
 them shown in his satires (On Blood, Clarendon satires pp.61,
 82, 97, 105 etc.) and in his Growth of Popery he supports this
 view (Grosart IV. 261 etc.).

(2) Baldwin, State Tracts p.69.

the plague year at Oxford, to have been imposed upon the nation, but there by the assistance of these very same persons that now introduced it [Danby, Lindsey and Bertie] it was thrown out, for fear of a general infection of the vitals of this kingdom:.....there is nothing more portentous and of worse omen, than when such an oath hangs over a nation, like a new comet foreboding the alteration of religion or government.⁽¹⁾ Marvell goes on to describe its object, which was simply to obtain a commission to take away English liberties and to destroy all "law and reason" in England. "No conveyancer could ever in more compendious or binding terms have drawn a dis-⁽²⁾ settlement of the whole birthright of England."

Another writer thus summarises the objects of the Test. It intended "to make a distinct party" of the old Cavaliers by overthrowing the Act of Oblivion, and to join with them the "high episcopal men". It was an attempt to secure open recognition of "divine right". It was hatched "As almost all the Mischiefs of the World have hitherto been" among the great church men.⁽³⁾ Both in this pamphlet--the Letter from a Person of Quality⁽⁴⁾--and in the Growth of Popery, graphic descriptions

(1) Grosart IV. p.305. cf. Letter from a Person of Quality (1689) p.47.

(2) Grosart IV. p.308.

(3) Baldwin, State Tracts (1689) Letter from a Person of Quality. cf. Grosart IV. pp.303-304, 312.

(4) This pamphlet is referred to in the Growth of Popery as giving a full account of the events of the sessions (Grosart IV. p.309-310). It can mean no other account; the allusion to its burning by order of the Lords is obvious.

of the Lords' debates on the Test are given. Marvell says in the latter:- "They were overlaid by numbers: The noise of the House, like the wind, was against them, and if not the sun, the fireside was always in their faces.....It might be injurious, where all of them did so excellently well, to attribute more to any one of these Lords than another, unless because the Duke of Buckingham and the Earl of Shaftesbury, have been more reproached for this brave action it will be requisite by a double proportion of praise to set them two on equal terms with the rest of their companions in honour."⁽¹⁾

Before the Lords could bring that matter to a division:- "there arose a great controversy betwixt the two houses concerning their privileges.....which the commons whether in good earnest, which I can hardly believe, or rather some crafty parliament men among them, having an eye upon the Test and to prevent the hazard of its coming among them, presently took hold of, and blew the coals to such a degree, that there was no quenching them.....In this manner that fatal Test..... died the second death."⁽²⁾

The chief result of this dispute over privileges, apart from the blow it dealt at the Test, was an immediate prorogation. When the Houses again met in the autumn both Shaftesbury

(1) The King was present at this debate.

(2) Grosart IV. p.309.

(3) Ibid. p.310 cf. Grosart II. 453, 44; Marvell to Hull 20, 22, 27 May etc. 1675 describing the dispute between the Houses.

and Buckingham protested at this, and used the dispute as an argument to support their demand for dissolution. Every effort to induce Charles to dissolve Parliament failed. Instead he prorogued the Houses for over fifteen months.

Arguments for dissolution now took on a rather different character; whereas they had before mainly consisted of vague allegations about the composition of the House, the length of time it had been sitting, the numbers who had come of age since the last elections and who had had no chance of choosing their representative, they now mainly comprised certain legal maxims. The character of Parliament itself demanded frequent changes, as well as frequent sessions, neither of which had taken place since its inception fifteen years before. Some attempt had been made to show that Parliament ought to be dissolved on this account. In 1677 a new line of attack was opened up by the length of the prorogation. Basing their case on two statutes of Edward III and Richard II, Shaftesbury and Buckingham, supported by several other Lords, declared their opinion that Parliament was actually dissolved. These statutes, they claimed, provided for annual Parliaments, therefore as these had not been held, Parliament was legally non-existent until an election took place. Such arguments had already been disseminated in many pamphlets under the guidance of the country leaders. In the Reasonable Question and an Useful Answer (1676),

in the Long Parliament Dissolved and in many others the question of the legality of the session due in February 1677 was discussed, and always with the same conclusion, that Parliament was indeed dissolved. The argument had but a doubtful legal basis, for the statutes so much quoted only stated that annual Parliaments should be held; they made no provision for Parliament's automatically ceasing when this condition was not complied with. The whole point of the argument was not, however, of the legal quibble involved; it was an attempt to force the King's hand, to shame him into dissolving the Houses; to discredit the present House so much that he would be obliged to dissolve. Charles was not so easily frightened. He sent the five most dangerous of the Lords to the Tower, and by that action effectively silenced the worst of the opposition. The Commons had never displayed the same energy on the subject of their own existence. (1)

The result of the imprisonment of the Lords was to make them the martyrs of the "country" cause. Marvell takes up the cudgels in their defence in his Growth of Popery. He mentions many books that came "printed by license, writ, some by men of the black, some by men of the green cloth wherein the absolutishness of the English monarchy is against all Law asserted." (2) He abuses roundly the authors of two in particular,

(1) Grosart IV. 320-322.

(2) Ibid. 308. Black cloth-clergy. Green-officers of the Household.

the Advices to the men of Shaftesbury being one, which had made various accusations against Shaftesbury and the other "country" lords. He says:- "The name of the author was concealed, not out of any spark of modesty, but that he might with more security exercise his impudence, not so much against these noble lords, as against all public truth and honesty. The whole composition is nothing else but an infusion of malice, in the froath of the town, and the seam of the University, by the prescriptions of the conspirators." He ascribes the pamphlets to the efforts of the two lords "the black and the white", or they may be the work of a "vulgar scribbler, hired by the conspirators at so much a sheet, or for day wages."

In view of the output of seditious libels and pamphlets on this question of dissolution, it is not surprising that the government decided to close the coffee-houses where many of these were supposed to originate. Marvell's last English satire protests at this action:-

"It is wine and strong drink make tumults increase,
 "Chocolate, tea and coffee are liquors of peace;
 "No quarrels or oaths are among those who drink 'em,
 "'Tis Bacchus and Brewers swear, damn 'em and sink 'em.
 "Then, Charles, thy late edict against coffee recall,
 "There's ten times more treason in brandy and ale."(4)

(1) Grosart IV. p.317.

(2) i.e. Lords Arundel and Frechville.

(3) Grosart IV. p.375.

(4) Satires p.112 The Dialogue between two Horses ll.198 seq.

Contemporary allusions to Marvell's satires are not very frequently found. They were probably circulated in manuscript and read in the coffee-houses he defends. That they undoubtedly were quite well-known is shown by their publication when the press was freed in the series of Poems on State Affairs. Then Marvell's name was affixed to many of the earlier satires of the reign; indeed, any satire that could possibly have been written before his death seems to have been attributed to his pen. This speaks for his fame, though not always for the common-sense of the editors. Wood, in his notes, mentions the Dialogue,⁽¹⁾ which may have been printed at the time it was written. An allusion to it is also found in a satire called the Hypocritical Christian, which was published in 1682 by an opponent of the country party:-

"Well! for a careful foresight, sober wit,
 "Give me a Godly, zealous, Whiggish Cit.....
 "Be loyal and defend the King's Just Right,
 "He'er read a factious Pamphlet with delight,
 "He'er fee on Horse flesh; read Discourses,
 "Twixt Charing Cross and your Wool Church Horses.
 "He'er have a bitter thought 'gainst his Majesty,
 "But let all Treason Talkers silenced be,
 "Those Vermin that do gird at Monarchy."⁽²⁾

(1) Wood, Life and Times edited by Clark. p.330.

(2) Anonymous. London 1682. 4pp. fol., Pressmark Poetry 1582-1710. 11630 ff 2. "Hodge" is mentioned by L'Estrange in The Case Put, 1679.

It is almost impossible now to ascertain which satires were Marvell's and which were wrongly ascribed to him. Some, like Hodge's Vision, seem in the earlier versions as though they might quite possibly be his; ⁽¹⁾ others well authenticated, like the Historical Poem, contain lines which must have been the insertions of a later editor. Such would be the lines:-

"Here for an ensign's, or lieutenant's place,
"They'll kill a judge or justice of the peace",⁽²⁾

which surely refer to nothing but the murder of Godfrey in the autumn of 1678.

Even from those only which are usually accepted as Marvell's it is possible to see the trend of his opinion at the time in a rather franker version than that of the Growth of Popery. Nevertheless, too much stress can easily be laid upon their remarks about the King. Marvell obviously wanted a change of monarch, but as obviously had no real scheme for effecting that change. He republican could have described the constitution as he did in the opening pages of the Growth of Popery, and, besides, his whole attitude to the executive part of the government demanded a head, a single ruler of some sort. The satires must be read with his prose works in the light of

(1) The 1689 edition of the Poems on State Affairs, p.5-6, contains an abbreviated version which omits most, though not all, of the references to the Popish Plot, and the MS. version (Stowe 655/59) gives even fewer. It is not, however, very Marvellian in style, and has usually been rejected on this ground.
(2) Satires p.75. An Historical Poem ll.149-150.

his earlier opinions of republicans like Vane and the policy later to be developed by men of his party. (1)

Marvell's Meek Speech was yet another literary contribution to the controversies of these years. Apparently it was a manuscript libel. It ridiculed the King's speech at the opening of Parliament in April 1675, and seems to have been distributed in the House in the same manner as the Alarm of an earlier date. (2) A copy is found among the State Papers of the period, placed there possibly by Williamson as the Alarm had been. (3) Another manuscript copy is among the Stowe manuscripts. (4) These two differ slightly, the former giving the figures of the pension to Lauderdale (£4,000), which are not given by the latter, or by Grosart or Thompson. The Speech was first printed under Marvell's name in the 1704 edition of the Poems on Affairs of State. (5) The mention of a pension to Lauderdale fixes the date of these versions nearly enough to 1675-6, and a contemporary letter among the Verney papers, dated 25 November 1676 says:— "I have not heard of the Meek Speech but if I light on it you shall have it." (6) This would all seem to point to a confirmation of the usually accepted date of the Speech. Some doubt, however,

(1) See below p. 254 ^{opp.}

(2) See Appendix IV.

(3) S.P.Dom. Car. II. 369 no. 197 (April? 1675).

(4) Stowe MSS. 180 f. 27.

(5) Vol. III. pp. 84-85.

(6) Hist. MSS. Com. VII. Rep. p. 47. Ed. Verney to Sir Richard Verney.

is thrown on this by a hitherto unnoticed copy of what appears to be the same satire in an early single folio sheet.

This is entitled Horse and A-Hay, or, a S-before Parting, by Parson Hickeringsill. It contains besides the Speech a satire: Vox et Lachrymae Anglorum, or, the True Englishman's Complaint humbly offered to the serious Consideration of their Representatives in Parliament at their next Sitting, the authorship of which is unknown. ⁽¹⁾ The whole is said to be printed by C. Barker of the Strand in "AN. MDCLXIX". The style of the paper and format suggest quite an early date, certainly before 1679 (MDCLXXIX), which would otherwise be a possible misprint, Barker being active as a printer between 1640 and 1680. The other misprint possible would be 1671 (MDCLXXI). The speech is almost identical as far as it goes with the later copies, but omits any reference to the pension to Lauderdale.

It is difficult to estimate the value of this sheet. It is possible that Hickeringsill was responsible for it, as the printer says, or it is equally probable that Hickeringsill was the author of the satire and, as in the case of Clarendon's House-Warming and Denham's Directions to a Painter, Marvell's Speech ⁽²⁾ was printed with it without acknowledgement. In any case the

(1) Press Mark 1882.e.2.(232). I am indebted to Mr. A. Esdaile, (of the British Museum) for an expert opinion on the date of this sheet.

(2) Printed 1667 with Denham's Directions to a Painter (Aitken, Poems, bibliographical note).

copy would definitely suggest an earlier date for the first use of the Speech. The omission of the details of Lauderdale's pension, and the appointments of the bishops are almost sufficient in themselves to prove the earlier date, and this is clinched by the fact that the printed version of the Speech has "May" instead of "April" as the month in which the speech is supposed to have been delivered. The House was adjourned on the 9 May 1668,⁽¹⁾ and as its title suggests--A S-before Parting--the Speech would seem to be a satire on some speech delivered on that occasion, and printed the following year.

Various hypothesis may be invented to explain the differences between the two/^{main}versions of this Mock Speech. The most probable if we ignore for the moment the possibility that Marvell never wrote such a speech at all, is that having written this speech to suit one occasion and having allowed it to creep out in print, the author in 1675 decided to recast it and bring it up to date. It was then scattered over the House as the Alarum had earlier been scattered, and so got into the hands of Williamson and thus in to the State Papers and, copies being numerous, into many other collections. The Speech remained in this form in manuscript, until the editors of the State Poems decided in 1704, to print it. They then attributed on what grounds is not known, to Marvell. It is possible that as so many since have done, they thus attributed it on account of the style. For want of evidence the matter must be left thus, the chief result of these considerations being to cast a doubt upon the authorship of this Speech.⁽²⁾

(1) C. J. IX. 97. (2) See below p. 401 for a note upon the chief differences in copies of the Speech.

The Speech itself, if indeed it be Marvell's, is in a lighter vein than many of his satires. It approaches the realm of pure fun more nearly than anything else he wrote, except perhaps a few private letters. "Some of you perhaps," Charles is made to say, "will think it dangerous to make me too rich; I do not fear it; for I promise you faithfully whatever you give me I will always want; and although in other things my word may be thought slender authority, yet in this you may rely on me, I will never break it." Representing his financial straits Charles continues:- "Here's my Lord Treasurer can tell, that all the money for next summer's guards must, of necessity, be applyed to the next year's cradles and swaddling-cloths.....The nation hates you already for giving me so much, and I'll hate you too if you do not give me more. So that if you stick not to me, you must not have a friend in England.... I have to please you given a pension to your favourite my Lord Lauderdale; not so much that I thought you wanted it, as as that you would take it kindly.....I have made a considerable retrenchment in candles and charcoal, and do not intend to stop there, but will, with your help, look into the late embezzlement of my dripping-pans and kitchen-stuffs: of which upon my conscience, neither my Lord Treasurer nor my Lord Lauderdale are guilty."⁽¹⁾

(1) Grosart II. 431-433. Also printed by Thompson, I. 431-2. The versions differ slightly.

Marvell's Parliamentary activities, though of a less striking kind than his other work in this period, were numerous and sustained. A list of his committees would show him engaged on the varied business of the House, and also indicate his politics at the time. He was one of the tellers--the other being Sacheverel--for the opposition when the matter of the Newarke election was put to the House. (1) He was again their teller with Sacheverel when the question of Richard Temple's chairmanship of the committee for supply was put to the House, (2) and again for the "yeas" for a bill to prevent members of Parliament taking office. (3) His religious interests are shown in a committee on a bill to hinder Papists from sitting in Parliament, (4) and on one to consider the repeal of the writ de Haeretico Comburendo. (5) Together with Gilby and many of the members for Yorkshire Marvell also served on a commission appointed in 1674 to put down recusancy in the East Riding of that County. (6) He continued his interest in finance, and his name is found on many committees on such matters as Hearth Money and the drafting of instructions to the counties about

(1) C.J.IX. 389a. 26 February 1676/7.

(2) C.J.IX. 386a. 21 February 1676/7. cf. Grosart IV. (Growth of Popery) p.

(3) C.J.IX. 321. 22 April 1675. Marvell teller for the yeas with Sir Richard Carew.

(4) C.J.IX. 365a. 23 October 1675.

(5) C.J.IX. 406 a. 26 March 1677. cf. Grosart IV. (Mr. Smirke) p.43.

(6) Cal. of Treas. Books. vol.IV. 1674-5 p.695.

(1)
 the excise. In the spring of 1678 he served on a committee to report on Williamson's abstract of alliances, one of the public announcements of policy from the King for which he had agitated in his Growth of Popery.⁽²⁾

On the whole these committees were routine work. Some dozen at any rate must be so classified. Marvell, however, distinguished himself towards the close of his life not only by the Growth of Popery but by his longest and most famous speech. This was delivered in the spring of 1677, and in spite of his apologies for his lack of practice in speaking, must have held the attention of the House for a very long time.⁽³⁾ Its immediate occasion was the second reading of the bill for educating the children of the Royal Family in the Protestant religion, the text of which Marvell prints in full in his Growth of Popery. Possibly he used a copy from which to connect his indictment. The bill gave some powers to the bishops not ordinarily assigned to them. They were to administer an oath of fidelity to the Protestant religion to the heir to the throne immediately upon the death of the King. Certain powers were given them in case the King should refuse to take this

(1) C.J.IX. pp.316, 372. 18 February 1673/4 and 10 November 1675, etc.

(2) C.J.IX. p.472. 30 April 1678.

(3) Possibly Marvell lent Grey a copy of his speech to insert; it is very much longer than most of the speeches he reports, and on another occasion Grey makes a note to the effect that a specially full report has been lent him.

oath; on them virtually would devolve the maintenance of the Protestant religion. The bill provided no safeguard against the bishops themselves proving venal, and undoubtedly allowed loopholes for either corruption on their part or for enabling them to establish an independent hierarchy of bishops uncontrolled by anyone but themselves. (1) Marvell objected strongly to the bill. It was in itself a treasonable act, he said, to suppose the King's death, which, he thanked God, was not likely to happen yet. "God be thanked for the King's age and constitution of body! The King is not in a declining age....His age may confirm you in no danger suddenly of the consequences of the bill, but for that of "Popish successor", he hopes 'tis a matter remote in the event, and would not precipitate that evil." With an ironic optimism he continued:- "He would cast as little umbrage on the Successor, as might be. There is none yet in sight, but whose minds are in the hand of God, who turns them like the rivers of water. Whilst there is time there is life, and whilst life, time for information." Marvell ingenuously decided to call the bishops "Physicians" in order the more easily to avoid offence. He suggested that if they were to be a body dependent on the King they would be drawn

(1) Marvell prints the text in his Growth of Popery (Grosart IV. 340 seq.). A table of differences between this and the copy among the Lords' MSS. is given in Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. IX part II. p.81a. The first debate on the bill is reported by Grey (IV. 284 seq.) 20 March 1676/7.

the way he went. The frequent changes under Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth would then be repeated, and such a bill would in no way safeguard the Protestant religion.

"What ever sort of Prince God gives us, we must trust his.... Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." Marvell then ended by condemning the whole principle of oaths and tests. "All these oaths and Test are of no use, they are but Phantoms... ." More harm than prevention would be done by entrusting power to such as the bishops, for " 'tis Power that makes Popery."⁽¹⁾

In spite of his speech the bill reached committee stage,⁽²⁾ and Marvell was one named for that committee. Some of the committee met and elected Robert Sawyer chairman, but never dared go any further with the matter.⁽³⁾ The House had not, however, heard quite the last of it nor of Marvell, for the next day, in the grand committee on supply, Marvell being absent, the Speaker--Edward Seymour--said:- "And no man believes, but that if the Gentleman (Marvell) spoke irreverently of the 'Physicians',⁽⁴⁾ he would have done the same of the 'Bishops'." On the following day Seymour had occasion to rebuke Marvell "for seeming to give Sir Phillip (Harcourt) a box on the ear."

(1) Grey IV. 321-325.
 (2) C.J.IX. 407. 27 March 1677.
 (3) Grosart IV. p.353.
 (4) Grey IV. 327. 28 March 1677.

Marvell refused to apologise and instead attacked the Speaker for his remark the day before:- "What passed was through great acquaintance and familiarity betwixt us. He neither gave him an affront, nor intended him any. But the Speaker cast a severe reflection upon him yesterday, when he was out of the House, and he hopes, that, as the Speaker keeps us in Order, he will keep himself in Order for the future." Sir John Ernly tried to smooth the matter over, and tried to show that the Speaker had spoken the day before in Marvell's favour, but another member, recalling a blow given by Clifford to Harcourt, wanted the matter examined. Charlton wished Marvell to be sent to the Tower, and both Williamson and Sandys wished him to be rebuked for his reflection upon the Speaker. Harcourt himself made light of the matter. Marvell declared that although he would withdraw his reflection on the Speaker he still had matter of complaint with Mr. Seymour, an obvious quibble over the latter's public and private capacity. Holmes, who if he had read any of Marvell's satires can have had little cause to like him, declared that the blow was a double one, but by the efforts of Garroway and Howard the affair was smoothed over, and with an admonition from Meres about the decadence of Parliamentary manners through their sitting so long together,⁽¹⁾ the House passed to other business.

(1) Grey. IV. 328, seq.

Except as a member of some other committees Marvell's name does not again appear in the reports. Though his name was not to appear, however, one of his books was to cause a debate there, for after the advertisement in the Gazette for the Growth of Popery and the Seasonable Argument a discussion took place on the charges made in them against certain sections of the House. ⁽¹⁾ It would be interesting to know if, as is quite likely, Marvell sat in the House while this debate was in progress. By then his responsibility for these works was well known. Had the incident with Harcourt occurred after these books had appeared instead of before it is not likely that he would have escaped so lightly.

Of Marvell's private life during this period we know, as usual, very little. Though he must have spent the greater part of his time in Town ⁽²⁾ we know of several absences either in Hull ⁽³⁾ or visiting friends in the country. ⁽⁴⁾ It is also possible that he visited France during this period. ⁽⁵⁾ Letters to his friends which have survived show him still on affectionate

(1) Grey VI. 103 seq. For debate on Seasonable Argument etc. see below p. 316.

(2) The dating of his letters is from Westminster, Highgate, 9 Maiden Lane, Covent Garden. The last is the most frequent.

(3) Grosart II. 418. 640 n. etc.: references to visits to Hull.

(4) Hist. MSS. Com. XIV. Rep. II. 353. K. Bromfield to Sir Ed. Harley, 11 April 1676. Ibid. p. 337 Marvell to Harley 3 May 1673 etc.

(5) See Chap. I above p. 15. M. Legouis on Marvell's de Maniban.

terms with young William Popple (since 1670 at Bordeaux)⁽¹⁾, with the Thompson family at York⁽²⁾ and with the Harleys. In spite of his own statement that he had no occupation but idleness⁽³⁾ he must have been extremely busy. Not only had he much Hull and Trinity House business to transact; he had also sufficient literary occupation if half of what is attributed to his pen is his. He wrote the majority of his satires, his Mr. Smirke, the Essay on General Councils, the Growth of Popery with, possibly, its supplement the Seasonable Argument, and a Defence of John Howe's On Divine Providence. These, with the constant stream of letters which flowed from his pen, must have kept him sufficiently occupied, when his regular attendance in the House is remembered and his work there on various committees.

Marvell's friendships as shown in these activities are illuminating and suggestive. His nephew's future friendship with Locke in itself makes that connection important. Even more important perhaps are Marvell's connections with two men whose families, if not already so, were in the succeeding century to become politically important. It is surely not without significance that Edward Harley, father of the more famous Robert, should have been intimate with the "country" party pam-

(1) Grosart II. 313. Marvell to Popple 21 March 1670, but see *ibid.* p.269. 30 March 1669.

(2) Grosart II. pp.423, 435 etc. and see also letters in the Thibaudau Catalogue of the Norison Collection of Autographs.

(3) An unpublished letter to Edward Harley. Portland MSS.

phleteer, and, indeed, allied with him on many matters, such as the treatment of dissent and policy in the House. ⁽¹⁾ Marvell was also on sufficiently intimate terms with Sir Phillip Harcourt (also father of a famous son) to visit him at his seat, ⁽²⁾ Stanton Harcourt, and to be admitted to friendship with him ⁽³⁾ in the House.

A third interesting friendship is mentioned by Captain Thompson, who in his edition of the Works states that Marvell was very friendly with the Duke of Devonshire. This statement seems supported by insufficient evidence and for that reason is refuted by Professor Firth in the Dictionary of National Biography. There may, however, have been some truth in it. Until 1684 Devonshire was a member of the House of Commons, and a vigorous advocate of "country" party politics. Marvell ⁽⁴⁾ mentions his disgrace with the Court in 1675 and his action ⁽⁵⁾ over the adjournment in 1677. It was Cavendish who quoted ⁽⁶⁾ the Growth of Penury in the House in the following May, and who on at least two other occasions seems to have made rather ⁽⁷⁾ more veiled references to its charges. This evidence as a

(1) Besides the letters to Harley published in the Hist. MSS. Com. reports, there are several others to be included in Prof. Margoliouth's forthcoming edition of Marvell's letters.

(2) Hist. MSS. Com. XIV. Rep. II. p. 337 etc.

(3) Grey IV. p. 32. O. Parl. Hist. IV. 858.

(4) Grosart II. p. 466. Marvell to Popple 24 July 1675.

(5) Hist. MSS. Com. XIV. Rep. II. p. 355. Marvell to Harley 17 July 1677.

(6) Grey V. 332. 7 May 1678. See below p. 316.

(7) Grey VI. 98. 18 June 1678, V. 243 etc.

proof of their friendship is, it is true, still inconclusive, but it supplies a more definite basis for such a statement than any suggested by Thompson. Whether actually acquainted with Marvell or not, Cavendish was familiar with his works, and this affords another instance of Marvell's reputation with the Whigs, among whom Cavendish was later to have great influence.

Section 11. Reasons for the Issue of the Growth of Popery and some Discussion of its Sources.

The Growth of Popery was not part of the Country Party campaign that followed the prerogation dispute. It was rather the herald of a new conflict between Court and Country which led directly to the succession dispute, and as such was obviously designed to weaken the prestige of the government and prepare for the next session of Parliament. The precise object of its issue has remained a disputed question, and this indecision is due to the terror of the Popish Plot which spread through the country a month after Marvell's death, but soon enough after the appearance of his pamphlet to make men see a connection between the two. The nature of that connection varied according to the politics of the reader. L'Estrange
(1)
and others saw something more than a mere coincidence in it, and accused the dead author of being privy to a gigantic hoax. He chose the time of his accusation well, and the cloud that hung over Shaftesbury after the Rye House Plot was made darker by the "Observer's" suggestion that the Earl and Marvell had

(1) An example is afforded by A Letter to the Earle of Shaftesbury from Tom Tell-Treth, a Downright Englishman (1681):—"I protest, my Lord, that after having read over abundance of such ware as little Andrew Marvell's unhoopable Wit and Polity, and the Independent's Comments amongst it, together with the Growth of Popery etc. as also the Naked Truth, Treatises about French Interest and the Succession of the Crown and all the books they have made amongst them...I do not see the need of them." The writer's implication is the same as that of L'Estrange, and he sees in "this bugbear of 'arbitrary government'" merely a plot to bring back the upheavals of 1641.

long ago conspired with Cates to frighten the country with the Popish bogey from its true allegiance. On the other side, there were many who were willing "to canonise Mr. Marvell (now in his grave), if not for a Saint yet for a Prophet." From these (1) has come direct to the present day the legend of "honest Andrew Marvell", one of the few incorruptible and clear-sighted men in an age of Stuart tyranny. The question, then, why Marvell wrote this pamphlet in the winter of 1677/8 is important in any estimate of the Whig complicity in the shameful events following Cates' revelations.

Marvell himself gives the following account of his reasons for writing the Growth of Popery:- "But my intention is only to write a naked narrative of some of the most considerable passages in the meeting of Parliament the 15th of February 1676: such as have come to my notice, which may serve for matter to some stronger pen, and to such as have more leisure and further opportunity to discover and communicate to the publick. This in the mean time will, by the progress made in so few weeks, demonstrate at what rate these men drive over the Necks of King and people, of religion and government; and how near they are in all human probability to arrive triumphant at the end of their journey." (2) At the end of his book Marvell

(1) L'Estrange The Parallell, preface (second edition 1679).

(2) Grosart IV. pp.263-264.

again attempts a justification of it:- "Some" he says, "will represent this discourse (as they do all books that tend to detect their conspiracy) against his Majesty and the Kingdom, as if it too were written against the government. For now of late, as soon as any man is gotten into publick employment by ill acts, and by worse continues it, he, if it please the Fates, is thenceforward the governaent, and by being criminal pretends to be sacred. These are, themselves, the men who are the living libels against the government....But this book, though of an extraordinary nature, as the case requires, and however it may be calumniated by interested persons, was written with no other intent than of mere fidelity and service to his Majesty." ⁽¹⁾ Marvell thus ingenuously defends a both partial and propagandist work, but he gives no real hint of the precise reason for his attack on the government at that period which would serve to refute L'Estrange's accusations, though, on the other hand, the general principles by which he was actuated are obvious enough.

L'Estrange is really the fountain-head of the accusations against Marvell in connection with the Plot. He answered the Growth of Popery early in the spring of 1678 with two pamphlets of his own. At that time of course he could not know of the

(1) Grosart IV. pp.413-414.

Popish Plot, but he at once brought the charge against Marvell of trying to bring back the ideas of '41, and of being involved in a Presbyterian conspiracy against the King and nation. After the events following Cates' disclosures he brought out new editions of these with the further accusation that Marvell had all along been privy to that hoax of the Plot; that with Shaftesbury and with the help of a "Club to his Pen" he had attempted, under the pretence of fears for religion, to prepare the way for a revolt against the government. He says:- "You would have no guess at the author....but I think I may call him Legion, for they are many, and there's a Club to his Pen, as well as to his Pocket."⁽¹⁾

This accusation is the same as that made in his Simeon and Levi,⁽²⁾ or in The Cloak in its Colours, or the Presbyterian Unmasked.⁽³⁾ These declare that Papist and Presbyterian equally plot to subvert the English Church and State. One pamphleteer in A Seasonable Address to Both Houses of Parliament says quite distinctly that only "the spawn of those seduced or concerned in the late Rebellion" talk about the Court being Popish.⁽⁴⁾ The idea was, of course, far from new. The notion of toleration

(1) The Growth of Knavery etc., or the Parallel 1678. p.45. (second edition 1679).
 (2) Date ?1678. Press Mark 1897.c.20.
 (3) 1679. Press Mark 1704.1.3.
 (4) 1681.

as a help to Popery, even in such moderate views as those of A Letter sent from beyond the seas to one of the Chief Ministers of the Non-conforming Party, was very prevalent, and dates itself back to the Rebellion. Marvell notices the accusation and attempts to refute it, both in his Rehearsal Transposed and in the Growth of Popery, but it was not without some basis, and so was difficult entirely to combat.

A Letter from Amsterdam and Honesty's Best Policy, both libels published in the spring of 1678, repeat the cry of Presbyterian plotters. They both try to discredit Marvell's pamphlet by this connection, and the latter definitely calls Marvell the "Record-Keeper" of his faction, and notes his relationship with the "Shaftesbury gang". These thus anticipate the later statements of L'Estrange in the Observer. Not only do they repeat the usual accusations of sedition and Presbyterianism; they also introduce a new idea into it. That is the idea of an organised opposition, for which Marvell and the unknown friend of Shaftesbury who wrote the Letter from a Person of Quality acted as general secretaries and "record-keepers".

~~1. Printed in 1674, supposed to have been written by Hicker.~~

Another pamphlet which also harps on this theme is entitled: - A Parallel between Popery and Phanaticks in a Letter to T.S. (1682) and begins:-

"Rome and Geneva are a sort of Twins,

"Sworn Sisters, and sworn enemies to Kings." (Pressmark, C20 f. 1)

2. Grosart, III, pp. 279-282. 304

3. Printed Ap: 1678.

4. Printed 1678; see p. 9. for reference above. The whole pamphlet was written to celebrate the the release and submission of Shaftesbury in 1677/8. It is calandered, Cal. S. P. Dom: 1678, 84.

5. Marvell's own phrase. (To Harley, 17 Nov: 1677, Portland MSS, p357).

6. The Observer. 1681-3, reprinted, 1685-7.

This supports L'Estrange's later attacks in giving Marvell a place in the inner circles of party plotters. The idea that such a club existed is not, moreover, altogether new; quite early in the reign such clubs, purporting to consist of old "Roundheads", were said to be active, and Marvell after his Rehearsal Transposed was alleged to be a member of one of them. The description of their activities in Honesty's Best Policy, however, is much clearer and more circumstantial in its details, and there is other evidence to support that description. in the subsequent records of the Green Ribbon Club's activities. ⁽¹⁾

L'Estrange's position has strong arguments in its favour. Even the defenders of Marvell's pamphlet can hardly call its doctrines anything but seditious at the moment of publication. It plays upon the prejudices of the people, and parts of it could easily be construed as an incitement to persecution. It talks of a plot to sell the nation into a "French slavery", and more than hints at evil counsellors in high position, and the dangers of a Popish succession. ⁽²⁾ It even goes so far as to suggest that plots are hatching against Charles' life. The fear of the plot scares of 1673-4 had passed before Marvell wrote this, and the Monmouth scare had not yet begun. It is

(1) The best and indeed almost the only modern account of the Green Ribbon Club is given by Sir George Sitwell in his First Whig (1901).

(2) See below p. 259 seq. for a fuller account of these ideas. For contemporary accounts see S.P.Dom. Car. II. 411 no. 22 (Cal. S.P. Dom. 1679-80 p. 21), Honesty's Best Policy and North's Examen 1740 p. 541 seq.

hardly surprising, then, that many besides L'Estrange saw in the narrative of Oates an amazing fulfilment of Marvell's prophecies, and explained the coincidence by finding between the two a more intimate connection than that of mere coincidence. Oates' tales were reminiscent of such allegations as those of the Growth of Popery, and bore on the face of them the marks of a hasty improvisation. Yet they were accepted by the great country lords, and the informer himself was feted and pensioned. Those who saw him as the liar he was wondered why, if the hosts had not arranged his part for him to support their campaign against James of York, they should be so gracious to an obvious impostor. The Observer and later the Examiner made the most of their case, and succeeded to some extent in throwing doubt on the honesty of Shaftesbury and the Whigs.

But in making these charges L'Estrange overlooked one or two considerations which the more acute Dryden, though as anti-Whig as himself, saw and pointed out. Oates' story would have been much better had it not been so hastily put together, and had a Shaftesbury or a Sacheverel had a hand in its construction it would not have proved as feeble as it did on one or two famous occasions. ⁽¹⁾ Nothing better illustrates the sanity and

(1) The First Whig p.37 etc.

moderation of Charles' character than his behaviour over this affair, and the nonchalance with which he treated the accounts of the deepest plots against himself alone would justify some admiration for his brain. (1) As Dryden pointed out, though few believed him at the time, the want of commonsense in the tales was hardly the result of a long-prepared narrative, foreseen as early as 1677 and hinted at by such pamphlets as the Growth of Popery in order to work up a panic.

Gates may well have derived from Marvell, as he seems to have derived from Haberfield, some of the circumstances of his tale. The debates in the House on the state of the nation only needed a plot to give them real credence. Thus the revelations of Gates were well-timed, and played most opportunely into the hands of the opposition, to whose advantage it was to modify his tale.

" That plot, the nation's curse,
"Bad in itself, but represented worse"

was heaven-sent to Shaftesbury:-

"The wished occasion of the plot he takes;
"Some circumstances finds, but more he makes:
"By buzzing emissaries fills the ears
"Of listening crowds with jealousies and fears
"Of arbitrary council brought to light
"And prove the King himself a Jebusite."(2)

(1) An illuminating manuscript concerning the Plot is printed in E.H.R.XL. p.240: Journal of Ed. Warcup.
(2) Dryden, Works, Scott and Saintsbury 1884, IX. 234, 244 seq. Absalom and Achitophel ll.108-9 and 208 seq.

Dryden well summarises the evidence for the Plot in another couplet:-

"Some truth there was, but dashed and brewed with lies,
"To please the fools, and puzzle all the wise."⁽¹⁾

He does not, therefore, support L'Estrange's theory of a deeply-laid conspiracy between Shaftesbury and Gates, contenting himself only with pointing out how convenient the "wished occasion" was.

One piece of evidence L'Estrange makes great play with in the Observer is the List supposed to have been found with other papers in Shaftesbury's closet after his arrest in 1681. This contained, said L'Estrange, the names of those whom Shaftesbury thought Worthy Men, amongst whom the dead Marvell found a place, and those he thought Men Worthy [to be hanged]⁽²⁾. From this the Observer deduced the fact that Marvell was privy to the plot, and that as he had died before its actual announcement, it must have been contrived some time before Gates' actual revelations. With this list was found what was afterwards printed as the Association, and this latter was much read and commented upon. With it, however, was printed no list of names, and when the evidence is sifted we have only L'Estrange's word for the existence of that list at any time. It cannot be

(1) Dryden IX. 237 Abuhalom and Achitophel ll.114-115.

(2) Observer vol.II. no.14. 9 February 1685. No earlier number mentions it, though Marvell is quoted freely to show the wickedness of the opposition plot.

found among such Shaftesbury papers as have survived, nor among the State Papers of the period; it was unnoticed at the time it was discovered until mentioned in the Observer, and, significantly, not in the early numbers even of that, though Harvell's connection with Shaftesbury had been examined. Afterwards the list is only used by such as would have derived their information from L'Estrange, among whom North is noticeable.

It is strange, too, that of all its contents no other name, either from among the Men Worthy or from among the Worthy Men, other than that of the author of the Growth of Popery, has ever leaked out. The one man mentioned was dead and unable to answer the charge brought against him. At the one time when the possession of such a list by the prosecution would have been absolutely decisive in their favour, that is, at the trial of Shaftesbury in 1681, the list, which would effectually secured his conviction, was not produced, and the jury returned their famous Ignoramus verdict. This consideration in itself should surely be enough to destroy any credence which may have been given to the existence of such a list. There are, however, yet others which throw doubt upon this, and amongst these is the improbability of Shaftesbury's preserving such a document, even had he ever been childish enough to draw it up.

The idea of a list was not new, and during the Civil War

rumours of such things were spread to discredit people. Possibly L'Estrange derived his idea from this, unless indeed, as one pamphleteer remarked, the list had its origin in "the Observer's needle"⁽¹⁾ alone. So much evidence was forged at that time that it is hardly surprising to find so vigorous a partisan as L'Estrange attempting the same against one who was to him the arch-villain of the age. His reputation is not so reliable that this suggestion is unjust on the face of things. He may have had, of course, this much foundation for his charge: that among the papers taken from Shaftesbury was a copy of the Flagellum Parliamentarium, or the Seasonable Argument, which were both lists, if not exactly of "men worthy", at least of men of whom Shaftesbury disapproved. He may have had a list of men he knew to be trustworthy similar to the lists that have been found among the Danby and Williamson papers.⁽²⁾ It seems, however, almost certain that the absence of evidence is in this case conclusive that no such list as that described by L'Estrange was found among Shaftesbury's papers. The one certain conclusion that can be drawn from L'Estrange's account of his friendship for Marvell is that some such relat-

(1) The Observer Observed. Burney 81, 1681, 1-3. For another reply to L'Estrange see also Epistle to the Tories (11626.e.41) which also attacks Dryden's Epistle to the Whigs.

(2) Add. MSS. 28091 144, 146 etc. and S.P.Dom. Car.II.313, no. 179, 186. A discussion of these lists and a table of them is given in Danby and the Country Party, a thesis by E.S.de Beer, (London) 1923.

tionship must have existed, even if it were only the acquaintance of a leader with one of his most vigorous literary advocates. It seems impossible that the two did not meet in some of the coffee-houses about town, and it is possible that they there discussed politics, and even the policy of the Growth of Popery.

One piece of evidence to show that Marvell foretold a plot which he had already planned thus falls to the ground, and with it the most definite proof that he did so, for the others, as already noticed, are mere suppositions founded on the coincidence of his book with what followed. Other suppositions equally probable can be made which discredit these. It must be remembered that the Growth of Popery was by no means the only or the first work in which Marvell had foretold such a plot to betray the kingdom. He was constantly and consistently afraid of a Popish conspiracy. His agitation in 1677 was only the culmination of an almost life-long fear, shared by him with the majority of his contemporaries, that under the secret direction of the Pope and the Jesuits a conspiracy was on foot to take England back to the days of "Bloody Mary". As early as 1671 he is painting "In one scene London and Rome",⁽¹⁾ and a year later depicts the Duke of York "vaunting his Popish myrmidons", for indeed:-

(1) Satires p.63 Farther Instructions.

1671/2.

"Our fleets, our ports, our cities and our towns,
"Are manned by him or by his Holiness."(1)

Already James is accused of plotting that "his brother, sneak-
ing heretic, shall die."⁽²⁾ This early Popish plot was prevented
by the action of Ashley:-

"Such a plot was laid,
"Had not Ashley betrayed,
"As had cancelled all former disaster."(3)

History for him only repeated itself in 1677 as he saw the same men in power and the same dangers of a Popish successor. It is not surprising that he should tell once again of this Popish plot, and that given an Oates his cry of Wolf! Wolf! should for once seem justified. When a whole nation is obsessed by a fear of this kind, it is inevitable that occasionally that fear should provide itself with new fuel for its credulity. Although Marvell must plead guilty to the charge that he had put the nation into a fit frame of mind to believe even the tallest stories, he may surely be cleared of the more serious accusation of actually planning a hoax. It is impossible to believe that all the hundreds of Protestant anti-Popery pamphlets from the Civil War until then were designed as preparation for the lies of one man. Oates planned and brought off--

(1) Satires p.75 An Historical Poem 11.143-4.

(2) Ibid. p.76. l.160.

(3) Ibid. p.92. On the Lord Mayor, verse x. cf. the Advice to a Painter, circulated in MS. until printed in 1679 (see Saville Correspondence p.107, letter of 17 July 1679) which tells of this plot and the part played in it by James' servant, Fitzgerald, Loftus, Porter and Scott.

to use a slang term--a gigantic scoop, but his operations were not so far-reaching as that would imply. It is more likely that he looked to Marvell's book to justify and support him than that Marvell should anticipate that Cates would provide a justification of the charges made in his tract.

To clear Marvell from the charge of complicity in the plot is not to refute entirely the allegations of his opponents. Among these the suggestion that Marvell was assisted in his work by some organisation or club that was deliberately fostering feeling against the government must be considered. It has much more to support it than the other charge. During the Rehearsal Transposed ^{Controversy} several had already hinted that Marvell belonged to a club of old Commonwealth men who met at the sign of the King's Head in Chancery Lane. Such clubs were in existence even in Clarendon's time. ⁽¹⁾ Possibly this club was the fore-runner of that described in Honesty's Best Policy, one of the most informed court pamphlets of the time, as growing up about three years later. The description runs thus:- "Soon after this [the disgrace of Shaftesbury], the Clubs and Committees of good Fellowship and Sedition were erected, and there all, and more than all the Infirmities of Court, and Errors of State were Arraigned and Condemned...." Another

(1) Clarendon Cont. p.1190 (1666). See pamphlet on the Coffee-Houses in the Harleian Miscellany (1810) vol.VIII. pp.7, 78.

activity of the club was thus described:- "There the contrivances were first set on Foot, to institute Offices of Intelligence to Give News for the Coffee Houses; and an Academy for inventing Seditious and Treasonable Pamphlets, with Directions how to Print and Spread these, to edify both City and Kingdom into an Oblivion of their Allegiance, and a belief of more Inventions, that so they might be rendered tractable towards any design of their Factious Leaders, and for the quickness of the Directors at London." Of this Club Marvell was supposed to be recorder and secretary. (1)

There are several indications in Marvell's own work, and in connection with certain incidents of his career which further suggest some connection with such a club. Marvell himself defends the Coffee Houses in his Dialogue, and his pamphlets, as more than one writer remarked, were greatly enjoyed there. (2) When Williamson was collecting information about Marvell's Growth of Popery after its condemnation as a seditious libel, it was at the King's Head Tavern that certain information was given about Cartwright's printing press. It was also here that Leigh failed to discover from the informers Paxton and Webb the press from which that libel had come, and it was here

(1) Honesty's Best Policy, or Penitence the Sum of Prudence, 1678 p.13.

(2) Gregory Father Gray-beard (1673) opens with a description of the laughter in a coffee-house over Marvell's Rehearsal Transposed, and its popularity in such places is also attested by the author of the Transposed Rehearsal and others.

that Packer, the printer arrested for dispersing Marvell's book, took it from Leach the stationer when he had stitched it. ⁽¹⁾ There must be something more than mere coincidence in this connection of the Growth of Popery with one of the haunts of the Green Ribbon Club.

The theory of a "Club" to Marvell's pen provides a very plausible explanation of how he was enabled to write so full an account of the Parliamentary proceedings of the past few years. L'Estrange, indeed, in his Growth of Knavery calls the author of the tract he was answering "Legion". There certainly seems in one or two cases at least the sign of more than one hand in the collection of the information contained in the Growth of Popery. This would seem to be supported by the fact that after Marvell's death a second part of the Growth of Popery was issued, the author of which--if Southwell and Wood ⁽²⁾ are right in ascribing it to Ferguson-- was not in Parliament and must therefore have depended upon the notes of a friendly member or the common clearing-house of information provided by some of the clubs.

Marvell himself was, of course, a member, and it is known from his own testimony on more than one occasion that he took

(1) See below section iv of this Chapter. p. 305

(2) Southwell's note on the copy in the British Museum (C55.e.20) Wood vol.IV. p.80. (1820)

(1)
 notes. These were in such a form as to be readable by another
 news-writer--Stockdale, the Hull intelligencer-- and were
 probably fairly full. On them Marvell may to a large extent
 have depended. But even in his Hull letters for the purposes
 of which he took the notes he sometimes mentions that he is
 indebted to one or another for his information. Lord Bristol
 on one occasion helped him in this way, (2) and may have been his
 informant on other occasions of affairs in the House of Lords.
 He also mentions copies of speeches etc. not allowed to be
 printed for distribution, which he sent to Hull when obtained.
 Such a one was the Lord Keeper's speech in 1673, of which both
 in his letter to Hull in that year and in the Growth of Popery
 he states that it was hard to obtain a copy. (3) He also mentions
 the Journals, which he must have used.

For one occasion at least he is known to have borrowed
 material, and that was for his account of the debates in the
 summer of 1677 in the Growth of Popery. (4) A country party cir-
 cular which is practically identical with Marvell's report and

(1) See Chap. II section 11. above p. 56. He must occasionally
 and in haste have written without them, as when he writes from
 the post-office (Grosart II. 352), or actually from the House
 (453)

(2) Marvell seems to have had some connection with this Lord.
 In the Convention he was one of a committee to award him repara-
 tion for losses during the Wars (C. J. VIII. p. 40^b). He is known
 to have been acquainted with him from the incident given above
 (Grosart II. 288, to Hull 13 November 1669) and it is not perhaps
 without significance that one of Marvell's charges against All-
 ington is that he was false to Bristol (Satires p. 52. Last In-
 structions 1. 885.

(3) Grosart II. 350-1 and IV. 267 seq.

(4) Grosart IV. pp. 376-408.

of which several copies exist in collections of contemporary manuscripts ⁽¹⁾ was completely incorporated by Marvell in his pamphlet. It is of course not possible to prove that a second such circular was also used by him, but the debates recorded for 12 April 1677 are tabulated in the same way as those in May, ⁽²⁾ but are not reported by Grey, who was out of town on that occasion. ⁽³⁾ They are, then, obviously from some very full account taken either by Marvell himself or someone within the party, and may very well have been from similar sources to those of the May circular.

Another occasion reported by Marvell only was that of a debate on some libels and the pensioners in the House. ⁽⁴⁾ This is only otherwise found in the Seasonable Argument, which there is reason to suppose was also by Marvell. ⁽⁵⁾ In yet another place Marvell has information not found elsewhere, and that is in part of the report of the debates on 26 March and 30 March. Here the report he gives, which is a summary of the arguments on both sides on both days, is so like that given by Grey that they might almost be said to derive from the same source.

(1) S.P.Dom. Car.II.393. no.179 and Stowe MSS. 182,56, Chandler [1742] Vol. I. 249 seq., etc.

(2) Grosart IV. 361-369.

(3) Grey IV. 351. 12 April.

(4) Grosart IV. 322-3. Thompson II. 583.

(5) See below p.

Marvell, however, gives at least two arguments not identifiable in Grey, and occasionally gives a phrase more vividly noted which is obviously from an independent source. (1) It is thus impossible to imagine that Marvell used Grey's notes of debates. Grey may indeed have used Marvell's, as he is known to have used other people's. On the other hand, the fulness of Marvell's reports, and the fact that three at least of them are probably from his own notes worked up into a literary form, lead to the surmise that perhaps Marvell himself supplied the information for that other country-party circular, instead of being supplied by it with information for his pamphlet. In that case the epithet of "Recorder" would indeed have some justification. The discovery of the sources of some of the reports of debates of this time would probably throw much light on the country party organisation.

On the whole, evidence that Marvell belonged to one or other of the clubs is unsatisfactory, though tradition points that way. He used certain pamphlets that issued from them, but it seems likely that he himself was responsible for their authorship. The internal evidence afforded by the Growth of Popery leads to no definite conclusion, and an enquiry into a

(1) e.g. Grosart IV. p.371 etc. II. 581 to Hull 18 February 1677/8. cf. Ormond IV. 405. The figures are not in Grey or C.J. Appendix V. below attempts to estimate Marvell's original contribution to our knowledge of Parliamentary proceedings.

possible connection with the Green Ribbon Club through his friends is not very much more so. Such an enquiry, however, yields certain results.

Buckingham, whose connection with Marvell has already been noticed, appears to have been a member of this club, and indeed the Litany ⁽¹⁾ definitely suggests a common bond between them in the club. Wharton, ⁽²⁾ to whom Marvell is known to have written on at least one occasion, Falconberg, ⁽³⁾ the hero of one of Marvell's complimentary poems, the younger Ireton and Claypole, possible acquaintances of Commonwealth times, ⁽⁴⁾ Blood the crown-stealer, and a Mr. Starkey who may have been the publisher of the Embassy to Muscovy and some of Marvell's own works, ⁽⁵⁾ were some of the members of this club. Sacheverel, associated with Marvell and praised by him on several occasions, ⁽⁶⁾ was a famous member, and Jo. Ayliffe, the author of Marvell's ⁽⁷⁾ Chest and possibly also of the commendatory verses on Marvell's ⁽⁸⁾ death, belonged to the Club.

(1) See p. 109 above. The Litany may be repeated:-

"From Changing old Friends for rascally new ones,

"From taking Wildman and Marvell for true ones,

"From wearing Green Ribbons 'gainst him gave us blue ones,
Libera nos.

Poems on Affairs of State (1704) vol.III. p.93.

(2) Wharton MSS.103. f.122, 258-9.

(3) Poems. p.113. At the marriage of the Lord Paulconberg and the Lady Mary Cromwell (1657).

(4) See above p. 30.

(5) I have used the lists printed by Sir George Sitwell in an appendix to the First Whig.

(6) C.J.IX. pp.389; 326. Grosart IV. 339. Grey helps us to identify the speaker against Popery and tyranny as Sacheverel. Lucasta, of course, was written to Lucy Sacheverel.

(7) A Third Collection of Poems 1689 (1072.n.32. (3)) p.5.

(8) Poems on Affairs of State 1697 vol.I.

Shaftesbury was a member of the Green Ribbon Club and probably the chief organiser of its activities. Apart from the consideration already noticed which would suggest a connection between Marvell and Shaftesbury we have little tangible evidence to support this. In July 1675 Marvell writes, but without comment, that "Shaftesbury of the Lords, Cavendish and Newport of the Commons are forbid the court."⁽¹⁾ Later in the Growth of Popery he pays him a warm tribute, and tells how courageously⁽²⁾ he "opposed the conspirators" in their design about the Test and about the long prerogation, where "the Earl of Shaftesbury had opportunity to appear with such extraordinary vigour."⁽³⁾ In the August of 1677 Marvell again mentions the Earl in a letter to Sir Edward Harley, and this time with obvious approval. Telling of the release of Buckingham and Wharton he says of the former:- "Whereupon I hear that he was yesterday by the same rule dismissed (i.e. from the Tower). People were full of vain imaginations what changes he would make in Court, but he loves pleasure better than revenge, yet this last is not the meanest luxury. The earl of Shaftesburie's Lady the other day petitioned that he might have a month at St. Giles: but the King received it without any further notice or usual respect. Yet there are some that say the Court would be glad

(1) Grosart II. 466. Marvell to Popple 24 July 1675.

(2) Grosart IV. 309.

(3) Grosart IV. 321-322.

to be rid of him on easier terms than the other Lords, but that he is too scrupulous of honour." ⁽¹⁾ This is a more pronounced opinion about the Earl than any other that Marvell wrote, ⁽²⁾ though the only reference to him in the satires is favourable. There is perhaps no gap in the material for writing Marvell's life so tantalising as that which prevents a fuller knowledge of the precise relationship he enjoyed with men like Shaftesbury and his group.

One other member of the Green Ribbon Club must be mentioned, and that is Robert Ferguson, the author of innumerable pamphlets, among others the second part of the Growth of Popery. His He Protestant Plot was said by Dryden to be a mere imitation of the Growth of Popery. ⁽³⁾ He is known to have written two of the replies to Parker in the controversy over his Ecclesiastical Polity. He is said, on the somewhat doubtful authority of L'Estrange, to have been with Marvell the "secretary" of the Shaftesbury group, and is, indeed, known to have had a fairly intimate connection with it, though perhaps not quite in that capacity. No definite evidence except this links

(1) Hist. MSS. Com. XIV. Rep. II. 355-6. Marvell to Harley 7 August 1677. Ibid. p. 357. to Harley 17 November 1677; this letter also mentions the Earl. A play, Six Popular Wisdom, had been written about him, and was to be acted that day. No trace of this play can be found. Marvell kept Hull informed of the progress of Shaftesbury's imprisonment and release. Grosart II. pp. 509 (February 1676/7), 577, 580, 583, 584, 587 (February 1677/8).
 (2) Satires. p. 92. On the Lord Mayor verse x.
 (3) 1681-3. Dryden vol. IX. 425. Epistle to the Whigs prefixed to the Medal. March 1682.

(1)
his name to Marvell's.

On the whole the evidence that Marvell belonged to some such club as the Green Ribbon Club amounts to this. L'Estrange and the authors of replies to his pamphlets say that he did. His work, while it has obviously borrowed from some notes on Parliamentary proceedings, cannot definitely be said to have done so until the author of the pamphlet incorporated in the Growth of Popery is known to have been another than Marvell himself. There were many people probably known to Marvell who belonged to such a club. While it is possible that Marvell did, (2) an admission of this does not involve any support to the theory that Marvell was in any way implicated in a Whig conspiracy to launch the Popish Plot. That does not seem supported by sufficient evidence, and against it may be weighed Marvell's reputation for sincerity and honesty, qualities which, moreover, appear self-evident from a perusal of his works and letters.

(1) Ferguson's life and work have been most fully described by J. Ferguson (1885) in Ferguson the Plotter. Wood has much to say about him.

(2) A letter of Marvell's among the Portland MSS (partially printed in XIV rep: Hist MSS Com: II.357) contains references to one of the Club's most famous activities-Pope-Burning. "I am afraid they burne Popes tonight".... "To cure your gout at any time the Chandlers boys have got a trick of making squibs exquisitely in candles.....", etc.: Marvell was perhaps, watching the burning as he wrote.

Section iii. Marvell's Politics.

Marvell's political activities place him beyond any shadow of doubt in the country party, and, moreover, in that small section of the party which was consistently in opposition throughout the reign. To place him there does not, however, sufficiently define his position, for within that section were both republicans and those who were later to become Whigs. Both by his opponents at the time and by many subsequent writers Marvell has been called a republican, yet his more moderate and considered work hardly suggests such a conclusion, and even in his satires his republicanism is doubtful. This difference of opinion about his politics is largely due to the fact that only in one very famous passage does he ever seek to expound those fundamental principles which underlie his reactions to the politics of his day. His principles must be deduced from his general handling of constitutional issues.

Evidence thus obtained shows that Marvell's ideas are a part of the traditional development of constitutional theory which can be traced from Hooker to Locke through the great documents of seventeenth century history--the Petition of Right, the Acts of the Long Parliament and the Revolutionary Settlements of 1688 and 1701. Although it has been usual to credit Marvell in his later career with the politics of his

friends and associates of the Commonwealth period, he will be found to have more in common politically with a later and no less famous group of men, among whom may be mentioned Shaftesbury, with whom after the Restoration he was connected by his activities in the House and by his literary work. Like these, Marvell does not seem to have been a republican, unless a desire to see an end of the Stuart tyranny made him one, and like these, his politics incline to a pronounced "Whiggery" rather than towards a more doctrinaire constitutional theory.

In nothing is Marvell more of a Whig than in his idea of the King's position in the machinery of the State. Marvell's early attitude to monarchy has already been noticed; govern-⁽¹⁾ment under a single person, when that person was a Cromwell, does not seem to have offended Marvell's ideas as it did those of a Vane or a Milton. He accepted the strength of the Cromwellian regime, and saw in it a welcome relief from the time when:-

"Tedious statesmen many years did hack,
"Framing a liberty that still went back."⁽²⁾

But his view of Cromwell was that he was a strictly constitutional ruler; constitutional, that is to say, in our sense of the word:-

(1) See above Chap.I. section iii.

(2) Poems p.141. On the First Anniversary 1.69-70.

"The Commonwealth does through their centres all
 "Draw the circumference of the public wall;
 "The grossest spirits here do take their part,
 "Fastening the contignation which they thwart:
 "And they whose nature leads them to divide,
 "Uphold, this one, and that the other side;
 "But the most equal still sustain the height,
 "And they, as pillars, keep the work upright;
 "While the resistance of opposed minds
 "The fabric, as with arches, stronger binds;
 "Which on the basis of a senate free,
 "Knit by the roof's protecting weight, agree."⁽¹⁾

Although this is an idealised vision of that "wondrous order and consent" under Cromwell--or indeed under any ruler--in its essentials it represents the Englishman's idea of the constitution. Much the same idea is shown in the opening paragraphs of the Growth of Power, although here it has crystallised into a more definite shape and more conventional form. "For if first we consider the State, the Kings of England rule not upon the same terms with those of our neighbour nations, who, having by force or by address usurped that due share which their people had in the government, are now for some ages in the possession of an arbitrary power (which yet no prescription can make legal) and exercise it over their persons and estates in a most tyrannical manner."⁽²⁾ The assumption underlying this passage is that kings rule by consent--"on terms"--and that the subject has a natural inalienable right, the

(1) Poems p.142. On the First Anniversary 11.87-98.

(2) Grosart IV. pp.245.

cession of which "no prescription can make legal". Marvell absolutely assumes the existence of such rights belonging to the subjects. When the King's rights are asserted, however, it seems he considered it a case of "he shall keep who can" for:-

"Though Justice against Fate complain,
 "And plead the ancient rights in vain;
 "(But these do hold or break
 "As men are strong or weak)."(1)

It is indeed a commonplace that the party to which Marvell belonged always supported the contract between King and people which carried all obligations on one side and all penalties on the other.

In a later satire Marvell carries this contract theory to its logical conclusion. Where the ruler breaks the "terms" he must be removed. When "for one man's weakness, a whole nation bleeds"⁽²⁾, the remedy is obvious:-

"Tyrants, like leprous kings, for public weal
 "Should be immured, lest the contagion steal
 "Over the whole. The elect Jessean line [=the Tudors]
 "To this firm law their sceptre did resign;
 "And shall this base tyrannic breed invade
 "Eternal laws, by God for mankind made?"(3)

The last two lines of this satire seem to prove the existence of that new crusade against tyrants for which contemporaries

(1) Poems p.134. An Horatian Ode ll.36-40.

(2) Satires p.75. An Historical Poem l.131

(3) Ibid. pp.87-88. Britannia and Raleigh ll.149-154.

alleged Marvell to be working.

In 1673 at any rate, Marvell would have regarded this as a very last resort. "If princes shall not take advantage of their errors to deduce them to reason; this work, being on both sides [i.e. Church and State] neglected, falls to the people's share, from which God defend every good government! For though all commotions be unlawful, yet by this means they prove unavoidable. In all things that are insensible there is nevertheless a natural force alwayes operating to expel and reject what ever is contrary to their subsistence." ⁽¹⁾ Marvell allows a right to rebel, but commends its use only in the direst need.

Magistrates, it seems, are bound by two contracts, one with their people and the other with God. Their power "does ⁽²⁾ most certainly issue from the divine authority" and they are under a divine obligation not to be "grievous in the exercise of their dominion." ⁽³⁾ They are "responsible to him that gave them their commission for the happiness or infelicity of their subjects during the term of their government." ⁽⁴⁾ But the power so given them is held within strict limits. The prince is accountable to God, "nay even to his subjects", and for what

(1) Cromart III. (Rehearsal Transposed II) p.382.

(2) Ibid. p.370.

(3) Ibid. p.376.

(4) Ibid. p.372.

he is accountable, and in what sense, is explained by Marvell
 in a passage which runs on from that quoted above:—⁽¹⁾ "The
 very meanest commoner of England is represented in Parliament,
 and is a party to those laws by which the Prince is sworn to
 govern himself and his people.⁽²⁾ No money is to be levied but
 by the common consent. No man is for life, limb, goods, or
 liberty,⁽³⁾ at the Sovereign's discretion: but we have the same
 right (modestly understood) in our propriety that the prince
 hath in his regality; and in all cases where the King is con-
 cerned, we have our just remedy as against any private person
 of the neighbourhood, in the Courts of Westminster Hall or
 in the High Court of Parliament."⁽⁴⁾ The value of this passage
 is not in its originality, but in its more than usually clear

(1) See above p. 261.

(2) cf. Locke (Moxley's Edition 1882) Essay on Civil Government, p.202. "The liberty of man in society is to be no other legis-
 lative power but that established by consent." and T. Smith (1906) De Republica II. Cap.1. "For everie Englishman is entended to
 bee there present either in person, or by proculation and at-
 tornies, of what preheminence, state, dignitie, or qualitie so-
 ever he be, from the Prince (be he King or Queene) to the low-
 est person of England."

(3) The old phrase of Magna Carta, the Petition of Right (Stubbs Documents p.67) and the same insistence on property as Locke (e.g. Essay on Civil Government p.264).

(4) Grosart IV. p.249. This passage may be compared with a more famous one from Hooker (Kebley 7th. Ed. Bk.VIII. c.ii. par.12. p.352) "Happier that people whose law is their king in the great-
 est things, than that whose king is himself their law. Where the king doth guide the state, and the law the king, that common-
 wealth is like an harp or melodious instrument, the strings whereof are tuned and handled all by one, following as laws the rules and canons of musical science." Perhaps Marvell's picture of Cromwell tuning the ruling instrument is reminiscent of this (Poems. pp.140-1. On the First Anniversary ll.44, 48, 67 seq.).

statement of the "Englishman's rights" as then understood, and of the essentially legal nature of the restraint that binds both King and people. In this insistence on the supremacy of law--"eternal law"--as also in his attitude to Parliament as a "High Court" Marvell is typical of his age and particularly of the party that all through that century opposed the Stuart Kings.

On the prerogative Marvell makes an unusually clear statement. Though his attitude to religious questions for a while modified his views, yet on the whole from first to last the same essentials are seen to underlie his opposition to its extension. The issue of the prerogative had not been defined by the Restoration. Although the concession of the Militia Bill, the dating of the reign from the year of Charles I's death and the revulsion of feeling about the Acts of the Long Parliament had seemed like acknowledgement of their mistake and a victory for the Stuart supporters, yet a change had taken place, and they in their turn had conceded much. That is shown very plainly in the Epitaph, which, while it sanctified the memory of the dead King, also enunciated something very like the moderate ideals of men like Clarendon in 1641. The "advice of his father" was quoted frequently by country party politicians to show Charles the way of constitutional rule.

Marvell confined the prerogative power of the King very strictly, and a distinct narrowing of the "discretion" allowed the monarch may be seen after the Rehearsal Transposed. Then for the sake of argument, and because he could see no other way of alleviating the sufferings of dissenters, Marvell was willing to concede to the King some dispensing power in this particular instance of religious indulgence. In the Growth of Rensay he discusses this question of Indulgence over again, with some bitterness at having been deceived into a defence of it previously. He states his general attitude to the King's prerogative first:- "His very Prerogative is no more than what the Law has determined. His Broad Seal, which is the legitimate stamp of his pleasure, yet is no longer current, than upon trial it is found to be legal. He cannot commit any person by his particular warrant. He cannot himself be witness in any cause: the balance of publick justice being so delicate that not the hand only but even the breath of the Prince would turn the scale. Nothing is left to the King's will, but all is subjected to his authority: by which means it follows that he can do no wrong; and a King of England keeping to these measures, may without arrogance, be said to remain the only intelligent Ruler over a rational people." Marvell goes on to

(1) Grosart IV. 249.

enumerate the English ruler's advantages: his large income, the readiness of his people to supply him when extraordinary occasion warrants, his position as the fountain of all honours, and his distribution of all offices. With the last enters a note of dissatisfaction, for it seems as if the "Nation could scarce furnish honest men enow to supply all these imployments. In short"--Marvell concludes--"there is nothing that comes near-⁽¹⁾ or in Government to the Divine perfection, than where the Monarch, as with us, enjoys a capacity of doing all the good im-⁽²⁾aginable to mankind, under a disability to all that is evil."

So much for the general power of the King. Marvell enlarges and modifies several points. One of these is his revised position as regards declarations of Indulgence. In a sense, of course, to say his position was revised in the Growth of Popery is misleading. Long before Marvell had written:-
 "In this session [Spring 1670], the Lords sent down to us a proviso for the King, that would have restored him to all civil

(1) cf. Two Seasonable Discourses (Baldwin 1689) p.66. "Human Reason can hardly contrive a more excellent Government."

(2) Cresart IV. 250. cf. Hoeker (as before, par.13, 14 p.353): "In that respect [that of the limitation of power] I cannot choose but commend highly their wisdom, by whom the foundations of this commonwealth have been laid; wherein, though no manner of person or cause be unsubject to the King's power, yet so is the power of the King over all and in all limited, that unto all his proceedings the law itself is a rule. The axioms of our regal government are these: "Lex facit regem": the King's grant of any favour made contrary to the law is void; "Rex nihil potest, nisi quod jure potest."

or ecclesiastical prerogatives which his ancestors had enjoyed at any time since the conquest. There never was so compendious a piece of absolute universal tyranny, but the Commons made them ashamed of themselves and retracted it." ⁽¹⁾ This suggests a question whether in the Rehearsal Transgressed Marvell's defence of the Declaration were not more a weapon against Parker than the sign of a sincere approval. Yet more than once in some of his earlier letters to Hull and in the Rehearsal Transgressed itself Marvell seems to strike a note of genuine appreciation of the difficulties of the position, and of Charles' efforts to benefit the Protestant dissenters in so far as he was able.

If there is a doubt about his attitude to the Declaration in the earlier work, in the Growth of Popery that doubt has gone. Faced only by the religious issue Marvell might have given credit to Charles for the tolerance which he had often, even if reluctantly, admitted in him. His terror by 1677 of the threat to the English constitution and to English liberty was, however, so great that for the moment the lesser evil must be borne that the greater might be avoided. "For it appears at first sight, that men ought to enjoy the same propriety and protection in their consciences, which they have in their lives, liberties and estates; but that to take away these in

(1) Grosart II: 325-6. Marvell to Popple. 14 April 1670.

penalty for the other is merely a more legal and gentile way of padding along the road to Heaven, and that it is only for want of money and for want of religion that men take those desperate courses.⁽¹⁾"

After all his diatribes against Parker Marvell is obliged in part at least to accept his doctrine of obedience: pointing to the Spartans under Lysurgus, he extols their ancient virtue of restraint. Yet he still upholds his principle that the magistrate should be moderate, should not go to "the bottom of his power". He tries to advocate moderation on both sides:—"Because obedience for conscience sake was there [in the Scripture] prescribed, the less conscience did men make in commanding; so that several nations have little else to shew for their Christianity (which requires instruction only and example) but a parcel of severe laws concerning opinion or about the modes of worship, not so much in order to the power of religion over it. Nevertheless"—Marvell continues half reluctantly—"because mankind must be governed in some way and be held up to one law or another, either of Christ's or their own making, the vigour of such human constitutions is to be preserved untill the same authority shall upon better reason revoke them; and as in the mean time no private man may without the guilt of sedition or rebellion, resist, so neither by the

(1) Grosart IV. 280.

nature of the English foundation can any publick person suspend them without committing an error which is not the less for wanting a legal name to express it." ⁽¹⁾ Perhaps in themselves these words are sufficient to explain the anxiety of the government to suppress this pamphlet, and their outspokenness does Marvell's courage credit.

Marvell goes on to a worse accusation than that of "error", an allegation that the Declaration was part of a deliberate plot against the constitution:- "But it was the master piece therefore of boldness and contrivance in these conspirators to issue this declaration, and it is hard to say wherein they took the greater felicity, whether in suspending thereby all the Statutes against Popery, that it might henceforward pass like current money over the nation, and no man dare refuse it, or whether gaining by this a precedent to suspend as well all other laws that respect the subject's propriety, and by the same power to abrogate and at last inact what they pleased, till there should be no further use for the consent of the people in Parliament." ⁽²⁾ Thus the Declaration of Indulgence had, by the time this was written, acquired the significance it was so long to bear of being the first step in the Stuart and Popish plot to overturn English liberty.

(1) Grosart IV. pp.281-282.

(2) Ibid. p.282.

The King's prerogative in ecclesiastical matters had often been the subject of dispute, and there were many of both parties who would not admit his right to declare the uniformity laws suspended. His right to make war or to negotiate peace was less generally questioned. The increasing interest of the Commons in foreign policy, as well as their fear of the French and Popish influences was partly responsible for the many disputes between the House and the King on this matter throughout the reign of Charles II. Marvell voices the opinion of his party in the Growth of Popery when he states that no alliances should be made without the consent of Parliament, and no treaties involving either war or peace without the advice of Parliament. He even suggests that the King should first consult the Houses before entering upon any negotiations whatever, but this suggestion is only tentative at first, and emerges as a corollary of his party's attitude to the arrangements made by the King without that advice.

The first point is thus uncompromisingly stated:- "The proper course and practice" is shown by the King's speech of February 1677: "That Kings first communicate their alliances made, before they demand supplies upon the account of them."⁽¹⁾ The root of this comparatively recent opposition to the King's

(1) Grosart IV. p. 594. I have corrected Grosart's misprint of "cause" for "course".

prerogative of war and peace is thus revealed as a fear of being involved in the necessity of granting supply, or in Marvell's phrase, of being "gulled to the giving of money"⁽¹⁾ for some war or purpose not approved by Parliament. There was, too, the fear that money so demanded might, when received, be appropriated to some other use, notably that of "enslaving the nation". Marvell gives a careful summary of one debate on this question, and an account of the same debate was apparently copied and sent out into the country by the opposition. It is obvious from Marvell's account and from the speeches made in the House that the country party regarded a settlement of the matter along these lines of restriction as urgently desirable. It is as obvious that this, perhaps more than any other matter, made Charles determined to have as little as possible to do with a House which thus attempted to infringe one of his most ancient rights.⁽²⁾

In the opening pages of his Growth of Penury Marvell described the King as the "fountain of honour". It is plain, however, that he wished this function to be very much constricted, and indeed devoted almost more attention to it than to any part of the King's prerogative. He laid great stress on

(1) Grosart IV. p.266.

(2) See above p. 210, for quotation from a letter of James of York, showing how deeply they resented the Commons' attitude of dictation.

the desirability of having independent judges and justices whose tenure was not merely durante bene placito, a wholesome reform advocated by Shaftesbury among others which was to come in after the Revolution with the Act of Settlement. Marvell lamented the existing state of the administration of justice:- "Alas! the wisdom and probity of the law went off for the most part with good Sir Mathew Hales, and justice is made a meer property. The poysonous arrow strikes to the very heart of government, and could come from no quiver but that of the conspirators. What French counsel, what standing forces, what parliamentary bribes, what national oaths [a hint at the Test of 1675] and all the other machinations of wicked men have not yet been able to effect, may be more compendiously acted by twelve judges in scarlet."⁽¹⁾

Marvell then harps on this throughout his work. Speaking of the Barnard^{ist} case, he says:- "If the gentleman agrieved seek his remedy against the Sheriff in Westminster Hall, and the proofs be so palpable, that the King's Bench cannot invent how to do him injustice, yet the major part of the twelve judges shall upon better considerations vacate the sheriff's fine, and reverse the judgment: but those of them that dare dissent from their brethren are in danger to be turned off the

(1) Grosart IV. 315. cf. Grosart II. 326 Marvell to Popple 14 April 1670 about a change of all the justices throughout the Kingdom.

the bench without any cause assigned.⁽¹⁾ If the charges Marvell brought against Sir Thomas Jones⁽²⁾ and Justice Twisden were true, that the latter being absent, Jones had answered for him to obtain a majority for the remand of the Earl of Shaftesbury,⁽³⁾ the reforms of William III's reign were indeed very urgently necessary.

Marvell would further limit the King's power in the disposal of offices by some amendment in the method of holding them. The place bill he advocated would have entirely changed the relations between executive and legislature. It failed at the debates on it in 1675, and a similar Act was to have but a short life in Anne's reign. Its principles were incorporated⁽⁴⁾ in the Act of Settlement, but had afterwards to be discarded. In nothing is Marvell so characteristic of his party and of the usual Whig point of view at this time than in his advocacy of such a bill. Had it become a permanent part of their constitutional theory, the modern system of cabinet government could not have developed in the way it has. "This bill," said Sir Robert Holt when it was debated in 1675, "is in direct terms, that no man that serves the King shall be capable

(1) Grosart IV. 330. For comment on the case in a letter, see Grosart II. 256, 257 etc.

(2) Jones himself was dismissed by James II for not being compliant enough about the dispensing power.

(3) Grosart IV. 409.

(4) 12913 Will.III. Cap.II.1701. "That no Person who has an Office or Place of Profit under the King or receives a Pension from the Crown shall be capable of serving as a Member of the House of Commons." Modified in 1706 and 1707.

of being a Parliament man." (1) It is, in short, a practical attempt to put into practice the theory that Locke afterwards upheld, and that influenced the creators of the American constitution who interpreted his theory. (2) With the reign of Anne the idea passed out of the realm of practical politics in England, though one or two attempts were made to reintroduce the question. The theory itself undoubtedly had a much longer vogue than even its Parliamentary career would suggest.

The reasons given by Marvell in support of this separation are almost all based upon a fear of undue court influence in the House. In this he shares the fears of his party, and of those who at any time advocated such measures. He says:- "For it is too notorious to be concealed, that near a third part of the House have beneficial offices under his Majesty, in the privy-council, the army, the navy, the law, the Household, the revenue both in England and Ireland, or in the attendance upon his Majesty's person." (3) Such officers, he complains, crowd into the House, ousting thence the real country interest by "managed returns", and then let "their gratitude to their master"

(1) Grey III. 54. Debate on second reading. Strangeways advocated re-election after acceptance of office--the modern procedure. See Grosart II. 439, 444 for Marvell's account of the Bill. He was the teller for the "yeas"--to commit the bill--on April 22. (C.J.IX. 321).

(2) Locke Of Government II. Chap.XII. "Of the Legislative, Executive, and Federative Power of the Commonwealth. Chap.XIII.cont.

(3) Grosart IV. 325 seq. A list of these men is given in the Reasonable Argument and similar tracts.

tempt them beyond their obligation to their country. "How improper would it seem for a privy-counsellor if in the House of Commons he should not justify the most arbitrary proceedings of the council-table, represent affairs of State with another face, defend any misgovernment, patronise the greatest offenders against the kingdom even though they were too his own particular enemies, and extend the supposed prerogative on all occasions, to the detriment of the subject's certain and due liberties." ⁽¹⁾ Marvell more than hints at two officers whom the opposition were particularly anxious to undermine at this time. One was Sir Richard Temple, a lawyer, ⁽²⁾ the other the famous Mr. Pepys, for only he can be meant when Marvell says:- "What officer of the navy but takes himself under obligation to magnify the expense, extol the management, conceal the neglect, increase the debts and press the necessity, rigging and unrigging it all at once in a good and bad condition?" ⁽³⁾ But these were by no means the only officers to be chastised by his pen. Duncombe, Secretary Coventry and Danby are only a

(1) Grosart IV. 325.

(2) Grosart IV. 325. "What self-denial were it in the learned counsel at law, did they not...step into the chair of a money bill and pen the clauses so dubiously, that they may be interpretable in Westminster Hall beyond the House's intention, misled the House, not only in point of law, but even in matter of fact, without any respect to veracity, but all to his own further promotion." This is a very different attitude from that of the Last Instructions; see above p. 101. Marvell and Sacheverel were tellers against Temple's taking the chair, 21 February 1676/7 (C.J.IX. 386).

(3) Grosart IV. 326.

few of those who were reviled all through Marvell's satires
 or, in a rather more discreet way, in the Growth of Popery.⁽¹⁾
 The office-holders formed, according to Marvell, a distinct
 party in the House, and were helped by the pensioners and the
 "expectants". These last were of course an unstable element
 in the House, their behaviour depending on their treatment.⁽²⁾

There can be little doubt that Marvell intended his
 charges of corruption against the ministers and the House as
 one of the main contributions to the party campaign of the
Growth of Popery and the Seasonable Argument. These charges
 are the ones chiefly noticeable in debates where the influence
 of the pamphlets can be traced, and indeed, if they had succeed-
 ed in discrediting the ministers so that Charles had called
 another Parliament, much of their immediate programme would
 have been accomplished. The charges of bribery were the sub-
 ject of a spirited debate in the House in June, when Marvell's
 pamphlets were named,⁽³⁾ and on other occasions they were openly
 hinted at, as, for example, when Lord Cavendish said:- "Offices
 that have large profits and do little service if you please,
 I will give you a list of for your pleasure,"⁽⁴⁾ by which list he

(1) Grosart IV. 326. Williamson is hinted at; cf. Satires p.110
 l.171 etc.

(2) Grosart IV. 326-7 and Satires passim, e.g. p.106 ll.90-95
 etc.

(3) Grey VI. 103 seq.

(4) Grey V. 198.

can mean no other than the Seasonable Argument.

If the King is to be a limited monarch, then it follows that the Parliament must play a very great part in the government. In a sense, however, Marvell's conception of the functions of that Parliament, ⁽¹⁾ perhaps because they are positive, is less definitely enunciated than his more negative and destructive view of the King's place in the constitution. It is significant of Marvell's general attitude that he calls Parliament a "senate" so frequently. This is reminiscent not of the Roman, but of the Venetian senate, which, with so many contemporaries, Marvell regarded as a type of free democratic ⁽²⁾ government.

The senate, in his view, is a check upon the prince. It ⁽³⁾ "should headstrong princes stay", and is thus not only "the ⁽⁴⁾ basis of their throne and government", but also the means by which they are to be restrained and prevented from breaking their "terms" with the people. To do this it must be freed from court influence by the removal of court-appointed ministers,

(1) The sources of Marvell's idea can be traced to some extent from his references to various legal treatises. He mentions the work of "Cap^t Eldson", which cannot be traced, the Mirror of Justice and Hakewell's Modus Tenendi Parliamentum, probably Hakewell's edition of that work which had appeared in 1659 (Thomason Tracts E.1930). A note on the Modus is appended to A.F. Pollard's Evolution of Parliament 1926 (2nd Edition).

(2) See above p. 178

(3) Satires p. 72. An Historical Poem (1672) l. 72.

(4) Ibid. p. 87. Britannia and Raleigh (1673-4) l. 136.

and should freely represent the people by frequent renewal of its mandate--that is to say, by frequent dissolutions.

Marvell emphasises the representative functions of the House of Commons:- "For although the House of Peers, besides their supreme and sole judicature, have an equal power in the legislature with the House of Commons, and as the second thoughts in the government [a telling phrase for a second chamber] have often corrected their errors; yet it is to be confessed, that the knights, citizens and burgesses there assembled, are the presenters of the people of England, and are more peculiarly impowered by them to transact concerning the religion, lives, liberties, and the propriety of the nation."⁽¹⁾

This emphasis on the representative character of the House helps to explain the demands for annual or frequent Parliaments, and in particular the dissolution agitation of 1676/7. Something of Marvell's attitude to this question has already been noticed.⁽²⁾ Marvell based his support of dissolution on his conviction that "the laws of England require, and the very constitution of our government, as well as experience, teaches the necessity of our frequent meeting and change of parliaments."⁽³⁾ Of the long dissolution itself he says that whatever the actual fault committed by the Lords and Commons in their

(1) Grosart IV. 324. cf. Grey VI. Powle's speech p.22 on 27 May 1678.

(2) See above p. 214, seq.

(3) Grosart IV. 323.

dispute over privilege in 1675:- "There was a great [fault] committed in proroguing the Parliament from the 22nd November 1675, unto 15 th February 1676, and holding it after that dismission, there being no record of any such thing done since the being of Parliaments in England, and the whole reason of law no less than the practice and custom holding contrary."⁽¹⁾ His view is virtually the same as that of the author of the Seasonable Discourses, who states:- "That it is according to the Constitution of the Government, the ancient Laws and Statutes of this Realm, that there should be frequent and new Parliaments, and the practice of all Ages, till this last, hath been accordingly."⁽²⁾

Without frequent dissolutions many who would otherwise have done so would have no opportunity of serving their country by serving as members. Without frequent dissolutions, too, Marvell could see not only no way of augmenting the "true country interest" in the House by fresh members, but also no way of getting rid of those members who had "by Offices, Dependencies, Hopes of Preferment...become, as to the major part of them, rather the obsequious Flatterers of the Court, than the true supporters of the publick and English Interest."⁽³⁾ There were thus many weighty reasons for his Majesty's dissolving

(1) Grosart IV. 314.

(2) Baldwin State Tracts (1689) p.65. Two Seasonable Discourses.

(3) Ibid.

this Parliament, deduced from the nature and behaviour of the present House of Commons,⁽¹⁾ for with these "flatterers" and "pensioners within its ranks the members could not perform their proper function as "the Sense, the Mind, the Information, the Complaints, the Grievances, and the Desires of all those people for whom they serve."⁽²⁾

Marvell had one other complaint arising out of this question of the "prerogation without precedent", and that was from a side issue. He complained that by "the imprisonment without example"⁽³⁾ the rights of Parliamentary freedom of speech were infringed. These rights he obviously thinks to be more valued and more protected by the Lords at this time than by the Commons, their natural defenders, whose lack of energy he laments.⁽⁴⁾

Marvell's views of this question of dissolution show quite plainly his disapproval of the long continuance of Parliament, and his adoption of the view that the long prerogation was illegal.⁽⁵⁾ They reveal a conviction shared by all his party that frequency and independence were the indispensable attributes of a really representative House. They help to stress that overwhelming importance he gave to the position of Parliament, and particularly to its representative House in the Constitution.

(1) Grosart IV. 313.

(2) Baldwin p.66. Two Seasonable Discourses.

(3) Grosart IV. 322.

(4) Grosart IV. 320, 407 etc.

(5) Grosart IV. 410. "4 never the vitious adjournments -" etc -

Marvell expresses the desire of the House of Commons to the representative element in the government--to obtain fuller control over the executive--when he advocates the Place Bill already noticed. He has also something to say on the question of the responsibility of ministers to Parliament. The Place Bill would, he and his party hoped, prevent undue pressure from the court, and if some doctrine of responsibility of ministers were adopted it would ensure their dependency on the Commons. It is difficult to say how far Marvell realised the full implications of his own phraseology. Quite clearly the King can do no wrong, and therefore, he says, "His ministers only are accountable for all, and must answer for it at their perils."⁽¹⁾ It is due to their present invulnerability that "the House hath lost all the ancient weight and authority, and being conscious of their own guilt--that is to say their pensions--and weakness, dare not venture, as heretofore, the impeachment of any man before the Lords, for the most heinous crimes of State, and the most public misdemeanors; upon which confidence it is, that the conspirators have so long presumed, and gone unpunished."⁽²⁾

Marvell quite clearly suggests that "accountability" equals liability to impeachment, and in this form there is, of

(1) Grosart IV. 249.

(2) Grosart IV. 331.

course, nothing new in his statement. He sees, however, a powerful court able to some extent to protect its ministers and realizes that the system as he has seen it in action is not altogether effective. It had become a "court maxim":- "That no State minister ought to be punished, especially not upon parliamentary applications."⁽¹⁾ Though impeachment had got rid of Clarendon, it failed to get rid of Arlington or Danby in quite the same way. Marvell himself tacitly admits the ineffectualness of impeachment by using a different weapon. In his Growth of Popery and in his Satires he tries to force the King to discharge ministers because they have been discredited. Though Charles II was able to withstand popular disapprobation to a large extent, under his successors abuse was found to be as effective as actual disgrace. Marvell never definitely suggested that ministers should be chosen to represent Parliament, yet his work plays a very definite part in the rise of the influence of public opinion as a deciding factor in their appointment.

Marvell's failure to suggest any real solution of the difficulties over the appointment and dismissal of ministers is extremely characteristic of his party as a whole. For some time longer they failed to arrive at any workable solution of

(1) Grosart IV. 299.

the problem. It is not at all clear how they expected the King to keep in touch with the House of Commons. They assumed that he ought to be in touch with them, that he should consult them on matters of peace and war, and indeed on every subject. Yet they suggested no means of communication between the King and the House. If ministers were excluded from it they could hardly make pronouncements of policy there, and yet if they were not in the House it is difficult to see how the House would have controlled their actions, or on what system they would have been appointed. This deficiency reveals one of the greatest gaps in the Whig theories, and their policy suffered accordingly from the vagueness engendered by it.

Concerning the legislative powers of Parliament Marvell's thought again is not very definite or constructive. While the general tendency of this thought is obvious, the immediate implications of what he says about law and law-making are not always easy to ascertain. With many of his statements, if they are taken on their face value, it is difficult to disagree:-
 "Laws are but the probationers of time; and though meant for perpetuity, yet, when unprofitable, do as they were made by common consent, so expire by universal neglect, and without
 (1)
 repeal grow obsolete." What he seems to suggest, however, is

(1) Grosart III. (Rehearsal Transposed) p.401. cf. *ibid.* 397 seq.

not this commonplace of legal observance, but a feeling that sometimes laws may justifiably be disregarded--a very different matter. "As long," he says, "as the magistrate shall provide laws that appear useful in the experiment, the whole people will stand by him to exact obedience from the refractory, and pursue them like a common enemy. But if it fall out otherwise, that the laws are inconvenient in practice, men are so sensible of that, and so dull in divinity [i.e. apparently the divine right of the magistrate to obedience] that, should the legislator persist never so much, he would [be in] danger to be left in the field very single;....Indeed, how is it possible to imagine, and to what purpose, that ever any magistrate should make laws but for the general advantage? and who again but would be glad to abrogate them when he finds them pernicious to his government?" Marvell indeed goes farther even than this suggestion of possible disobedience when he says:- "The stress and force of laws lyes in their aptitude and convenience for the general good of the people."⁽¹⁾

L'Estrange and many of Marvell's other antagonists condemned him as a new Junius Brutus, a Buchanan and "a bitter republican", and these sentiments explain their attitude. Marvell certainly felt that such laws as went against the general

(1) Grosart III. pp.400, 399.

good of the people could be disobeyed, and that men have a natural right to ignore unjust laws. And so it is not difficult to imagine that he would, if he felt the occasion sufficiently serious, have justified open rebellion. Such an occasion he almost suggests would be the succession of James II to the throne:-

"If e'er he be King, I know Britain's doom,
 "We must all to a stake, or be converts to Rome.
 "Ah, Tudor! Ah, Tudor! we have had Stuarts enough;
 "None ever reigned like old Bess in her ruff."(1)

On the other hand, in the person of the "Charing Cross Horse", he cautions against hasty incitement to revolt:-

"Enough, my dear brother, although we speak reason,
 "Yet truth many times being punished for treason,
 "We ought to be wary, and bridle our tongue,
 "Bold speaking hath done both men and beast wrong."(2)

Grievances must, however, he declares, be aired:-

"When they take from the people the freedom of words,
 "They teach them the sooner to fall to their swords.
 "Let the city drink coffee and quietly groan,
 "They who conquered the father won't be slaves to the
 son."(3)

On the whole his satires and the ideas in the Growth of Poetry do not give the impression that Marvell advocated rebellion then, but at the same time they make it quite clear that he would not have had any scruple in rebelling against James later on. It is equally clear, too, that Marvell had no objection to

(1) Satires p.110. Dialogue between two Horses. ll.166-169.

(2) Ibid. p.107-8. ll.116-119.

(3) Ibid. 112. ll.194-197. *ibid.*

monarchy as such; his objection was to a Stuart tyranny, and no one could admire a Cromwell or a Tudor more than he. This distinction is made clearer by his ideas on law and the extent to which obedience was due to its exactments than by any of his other ideas.

Marvell's objection to the proposed Test of 1675 was based on his conception of the subject's right to resist.⁽¹⁾ That the Test proposed to take away by giving a general commission "any man's estate, or his life by force"--in short, to make legal a restriction of a private right which never in its nature could be legal. Finch, in a rather ill-advised speech on the subject, said:- "Away with that ill meant distinction between court and country Natural and Politic capacity, and let all who go about to persuade themselves that there are two several entities, have a care of that Precipice to which such Principles may lead them; for the First Men that ever began to distinguish of their Duty never left off, till they had quite distinguished themselves out of All their Allegiance,"⁽²⁾ and Marvell, commenting on this says:- "He is too well read to be ignorant that without that distinction there would be no law or reason of law left in England."⁽³⁾ Carried to a logical con-

(1) Also for its religious implication. Grosart IV. (Mr. Spinks) p. 52.

(2) L.J. XIII. 38-39. 15 February 1675. cf. Grosart IV. 307.

(3) Grosart IV. 307-8.

clusion, if such a conclusion is indeed justified by a theory which depends entirely upon a due balance and restraint, what can this mean but that after a certain point of endurance has been reached everyone has a right to rebel? Marvell makes no attempt to define the difference between justifiable and non-justifiable rebellion, and his failure to do this has caused him to be regarded as a rebel, whereas by nature he was a law-abiding citizen, and only when he felt that "all was at stake" would he rise up against the tyrant.

his Such a pretext was given Marvell by the 'plot' he describes in

Growth of Popery. While the King remained Protestant--and Charles was, of course, too clever not to realize the strategic value of his Protestantism--Marvell and his like might remain inactive although allowing themselves a "quiet groan" occasionally. Had Charles shown any more signs of turning Catholic, then certainly Marvell would have become an active protagonist of rebellion. His haunting dread of Popery clouds all his work and blinds him to many issues. Not only does his fear find voice in the title of his best-known pamphlet, but all the way through his work is seen this same fear as a background to the political conspiracy to bring in arbitrary power against English liberty which Marvell makes it his business to expose. Half the danger of that plot, he would suggest, lies in the

alliance of the unscrupulous French politicians with the "Popish faction". It is not only arbitrary government, but "Popery and arbitrary government" which runs like a refrain through the debates in the House and the pamphlets of the period.

It was, however, rather an ironical fate that made the author of the Rehearsal Transposed also the author of the Growth of Popery, the former being written among other things in order to discredit A Preface Showing the Causelessness of the Fears and Jealousies of Popery. Marvell rebuked Parker in some of his most telling passages for "making a needless Apology for another in a Criminal subject". Parker had, of course, put the blame for these fears upon the dissenters, and Marvell attempted to clear them, but he incidentally denies the necessity even for denying such fears. Marvell's real complaint against Parker's Preface is that it attempts by "beating up the guns against Popery" to deprive the fanatics of Indulgence and to frighten men by fears of Popery into also fearing any relief for dissent whatever. In the Growth of Popery Marvell is guilty of the same fault, though in a modified form, and admits a fear of Indulgence lest it allow of too great freedom for Popery.

(1) Grosart III. (Rehearsal Transposed) 187 seq.

Some signs of alarm at the growth of Popery appear in Marvell's work very early, and they become more prominent with the marriage of James to Mary of Modena. But it is not necessary to go further afield than the Growth of Popery to understand the dangers he saw in that religion. So much was his statement of the grounds of the English fear of Rome appreciated that the part of his pamphlet in which he describes the Roman church was later reprinted separately as Mr. Marvell's
 (1)
Character of Popery. The form Marvell gives that Character well explains his attitude. "And as we are thus happy in the constitution of our state, so we are yet more blessed in that part of our Church; being free from the Romish Yoke, which so great a part of Christendom do yet draw under. That Popery is such a thing that cannot, but for want of a word to express it, be called a Religion; nor is it to be mentioned with that civility which is otherwise decent to be used, in speaking of
 (2)
 the differences of humane opinion about Divine matters.... The wisdom of the fifth Religion, this last and insolentest attempt upon the credulity of mankind, seems to me (though not ignorant otherwise of the times, degrees, and methods of its

(1) Printed by R. Baldwin, 1686/7. Baldwin republished several other of Marvell's works: the Growth of Popery, the Historical Essay, about this time.

(2) Marvell here inserts a comparison between Popery and Judaism and Mohammedanism, much to the disadvantage of the first. L'Estrange makes great play with his comparison, both in the Growth of Knavery and the Observer vol. I.

progresse) principally to have consisted in their owning the Scriptures to be the word of God, and the Rule of Faith and Manners, but in prohibiting at the same time their common use, or the reading of them in publick Churches but in a Latin translation to the vulgar." Undoubtedly in putting first in his indictment the Roman Catholic usage regarding the Bible Marvell was voicing what was then, and what is still to many, the completest condemnation of that system. Seventeenth century England used no book so much, valued no other so highly, and the thought of being deprived of its consolations in the vernacular could not be endured by the contemporaries of Bunyan and Milton.

To the Puritan of that age, moreover, the elaboration of ceremonial was no recommendation; "incredible miracles and palpable fables", confession and the rites of the Mass revolted their senses and alienated their sympathies. At a time when, as Parker says, every man was his own priest and any "redcoat a preacher", there was little attraction in the "thousand impossibilities"⁽¹⁾ a Roman priest could do.

All this shows one aspect of the dislike and fear of Popery--the fear that many precious religious privileges were

(1) Grosart IV. 250 seq. I have corrected an occasional misprint by Grosart.

endangered. Another aspect, and in the present connection a more interesting one, was the dread of Popery as a force in the state. "It is almost inconceivable," says Harvell, after stating his religious objections to Popery, "how princes can yet suffer a power so pernicious, and a doctrine so destructive to all government. That so great a part of the land should be alienated and condemned to, as they call it, Pious Uses. That such millions of their people as the clergy, should, by remaining unmarried, either frustrate human nature if they live chastly, or, if otherwise adulterate it. That they should be priviledged from all labour, all publick service, and exempt, from the power of all secular jurisdiction. That they, being bound by strict oaths in vews of obedience to the Pope, should evacuate fealty due to the sovereign the old cry of ["Imperium in Imperio"]--Hay and here is the heart of the whole business that not only the clergy, but their whole people, if of the Romish persuasion, should be obliged to rebel at any time upon the Pope's pleasure." So firaly were these ideas fixed in the minds of Harvell and his contemporaries that they could cause them to believe an Oates, and the possibility of an imminent conspiracy on the part of the few Papists in their midst to kill or injure the greater part of the nation. Undoubtedly the

(1) Grosart IV. 257 seq.

feeling that certain of their fellows owed allegiance to a higher power than their own prince contributed much then, as indeed always in a national state, to a jealousy, if not a hatred, of the power of the Pope.

By analogy with the monarchy of Louis XIV Marvell invariably associated Catholicism with a tyrannic ruler. Popery would mean a "French slavery". Thus he at the same time regarded that religion as a danger to the sovereignty of the State in its claims on the allegiance of its subjects, and a support to any ruler who wished the supreme sovereignty of the State to be entirely in his own hands. Marvell writes:- "And the whole process of affairs will manifest further, that both here and there, it was all of a piece, as to the prospect of religion, and the same thread ran through the web of the English and French counsels, no less in relation to that, than unto government."⁽¹⁾ No crime could be more wicked than that of the conspirators, "For, as to the matter of government, if to smother the King be, as certainly it is, a fact so horrid, how much more heinous it is to assassinate the Kingdom? and as none will deny, that to alter our Monarchy into a Commonwealth were treason, so by the same fundamental rule, the crime is no less to make that Monarchy absolute....But what lawless and

(1) Grosart IV. 287.

incapable miscreants then, what wicked traytors are those wretched men, who endeavour to pervert our whole Church, and to bring about that in effect, which even to mention is penal, at one Italian stroke attempting to kill the body and damn the soul of our nation?"⁽¹⁾

This plot would be less heinous if the conspirators were either "honest old Cavaliers" or "avowed Papists"; the wounds of the one would excuse a little wildness, and the religion of the other. Clifford, Strickland, even James of York-- "there being in all history perhaps no record of any prince that ever changed his religion in the circumstances"⁽²⁾--have at least sincerity to recommend them, and are indeed better than "such as lie under no temptation of religion; secure men, that are above either honour or consciences; but obliged by all the most sacred ties of malice and ambition to advance the ruin of King and Kingdom, and qualified much better than others, under the name of good Protestants, to effect it."⁽³⁾

In spite of the double menace of this Popish conspiracy to subvert the government and destroy the religion of the country, Marvell sees certain safeguards for these. Property and the fear of taxation are safeguards, "for the lands that were formerly given to superstitious uses, having first been applied to the publick revenue, and afterwards by several alienations and contracts distributed into private possession, the

(1) Grosart IV. 261. (2) Ibid. 262; another tribute to his ability is on p.294. (3) Ibid. 260.

alteration of religion would necessarily introduce a change of property.....and the people, instead of those moderate tithes that are with much difficulty payed to their Protestant pastors Marvell never forget his parentage will be exposed to all the exactions of the Court of Rome, and a thousand artifices by which in former times they were used to drain away the wealth of ours more than any nation." Another safeguard is the Church, which thus became a bulwark of English liberty. Marvell gathers up every reason for reassurance and every reason for fighting the menace in one sentence. "So that in conclusion?" he says, "there is no Englishman that hath a soul, a body, or an estate to save, that loves either God, his King, or his Country, but is bound by all these tenures bound to the best of his power, and knowledge, to maintain the Protestant Religion."⁽¹⁾

Besides the reasons Marvell openly avows for his distrust of the Catholics and his grounds for fearing their presence in any state, there must always be considered his personal position. His religion, says one of his detractors, lies like Henry VIII's, "betwixt Moses, the Messiah and Machivel"⁽²⁾, but Marvell's poems, or letters, or pamphlets hardly justify the indifferentism implied here. Though perhaps he was not religious in the sense that Harley and Owen were religious, it is

(1) *Govart* iv. 260-261.

(2) A Letter from Amsterdam to a Friend in England. An. 1678 by G.H.

impossible to deny to the author of the Coronet or the Dialogue between Soul and Body a deep interest in metaphysical problems and intense consciousness of the presence of transcendental powers. If Marvell was not obviously Christian in his piety, the gloomy realisation of an ever-present evil, common perhaps to many of his friends, Milton being the supreme example, is shown in such lines as these:-

"Alas! I find the Serpent old,
 "That, twining in his speckled breast,
 "About the flowers disguised, does fold,
 "With wreaths of fame and interest."⁽¹⁾

and reveals the seriousness which distinguished the Puritan wit.

Without, too, a very real anxiety for the welfare of the Church, Marvell's many strenuous endeavours in Parliament and his defence of such men as Howe and Owen would lose much of their significance. He had a true respect for the Church of England as by law established, and as by his rather "calvinistical" father interpreted. This tendency towards Geneva does not prove his Presbyterianism so much as his sympathy with an older, pre-Laudian phase of the Anglican development.⁽²⁾ His fears of Popery were certainly increased by his religious convictions and his affection for the church of his fathers.⁽³⁾

(1) Poems p.34. The Coronet. See too pp.43 seq. and 45 seq. of Grosart III. 277. for a remark on Donne.

(2) See note on the Defence of John Howe in the bibliography p.400.

(3) Grosart III. p.377 etc. and Grosart IV. (Mr. Smirke) p.5 etc.

Marvell's ideas on foreign policy, both in the Growth of Popery and in his letters, are very typical of his party. He had very little grasp of the foreign situation, and apparently took very little interest in it apart from its immediate reactions on English politics. The lack of comment on foreign news in his letters might be more surprising were it not possible that this was due to the fact that the Gazette gave most space to such matters, and practically none to home or Parliamentary events,⁽¹⁾ and the letters were designed to supplement rather than supplant the Gazette. In the Growth of Popery it is chiefly the more narrative sections that deal with anything but English politics.

In his criticisms of the government's policy Marvell follows fashion more closely than in any other matter. When the country is wildly enthusiastic against Holland, he produces a biting satire on her character. When the war with Holland has lost its first excitement, and some setbacks have occurred, Marvell, like the rest, is all for peace and alliance. The Triple Alliance was the be-all and end-all of his ideas on policy for the rest of his life. He never ceased to lament its

(1) Parliamentary news was, of course, supposed to be private, and the troubles of L'Estrange and Muddiman prevented other news being available.

(1)

rupture, or to blame the government for the second Dutch War. Two main ideas were responsible for this: Marvell's dread of French aggression in the Low Countries and his conviction therefore that an alliance with Holland to prevent this threat to their neighbour was the only possible preventive, and his firm belief that the French were plotting to subvert the English constitution. In short, "We cannot have peace with France and Holland both" was his feeling. (2)

Marvell only voices the opinion of his day when he says that a great part of the Spanish Netherlands "had always been considered as the natural frontier of England." (3) Flanders was the "bulwark" of England, and must at all cost be defended. (4) "France was potent and subtle", and "the old perpetual enemy of England". (5) Her machinations are behind the breaking-up of the Triple Alliance, and her diplomacy is working to ruin English trade. "By a Peace with the Hollander the greatest part of the trade and navigation of Europe, as long as the French King disturbed it, would of course fall into the English management." (6) In his distrust of the French King--"because he has great force, and extraordinary thinking men about him,

(1) Grosart IV. 264, seq., 274 etc. Satires p.67, The Statue in Stocks-Market verses vii, xiii etc.

(2) Grosart II. 400 Marvell to Popple June 1672.

(3) Grosart IV. 265.

(4) Grosart II. 400. Marvell to Popple June 1672.

(5) Grosart IV. 260.

(6) Grosart IV. 300.

which manage his affairs to a wonder"⁽¹⁾--Marvell was typical not only of the Whig view, the country party view of his day, he was also with the majority of the House. Even a "Courtier" like Danby always worked throughout against the French influence, arranged the popular marriage between Mary and William of Orange and urged war in the spring of 1678. Everything combined to make this anti-French feeling almost universal. The French were Papists; they had an absolute monarch; they had designs on Flanders; their trade under Clobert was flourishing. There seemed no reason, till bribes closed their mouths, why war with France, or at least a renewal of the Triple Alliance (a Protestant league), should not prove all gain and no loss. In nothing was the opposition so unanimous, nor Marvell's book so appreciated, as in this French enmity, and about nothing did Charles become so impatient with the Lords and Commons.

With these ideas in mind it is not difficult to supply an answer to the question as to which party Marvell belonged. Even without his own statements on the subject he would have to be placed within the ranks of the "country" party. His own description of that party places his particular part in it exactly. He was not, like "Iron Strangeways", in one debate a leader among them and in another the hated opponent, nor, like

(1) Grosart IV. 367, in part of a debate in the House.

Garroway and Lyttleton, men who could not be relied on not to support the "court" at some critical juncture. He was one of a small body consistently in opposition. Notwithstanding all the changing parties of the House, "there is," he says, "an handful of salt, a sparkle of soul, that hath hitherto preserved this gross body from putrefaction, some gentlemen that are constant, invariable, indeed Englishmen; such as are above hopes, or fears, or dissimulation; that can neither flatter, nor betray their King, or country: but being conscious of their own loyalty and integrity, proceed throw good and bad report, to acquit themselves in their duty to God, their prince, and their nation; although so small a scantling in number, that men can scarce reckon of them more than a quorum." Among these (1) Marvell must have been one of the most "constant" and most "invariable". Before 1675 there can have been few so consistent; after then he must perhaps share the honour with the more conspicuous opposition of Sacheverel.

It is possible to trace a certain progression in Marvell's ideas from the Restoration until his death. At first he accepts, if he does not welcome, the return of the Stuarts as the only way to peace and good government. For the same reason he had

(1) Grosart IV. 329. On the division in the ranks of the "courtiers" see *ibid.* pp. 323-331. cf. description of the country party quoted above p. 100, and *The Alarm*, Appendix III. below.

perhaps accepted Cromwell's rule, though his acceptance of that was quickly turned to an enormous admiration. Marvell gives the impression of being pleasantly surprised at the King's tolerance and real anxiety to give some relief to his dissenting subjects. For some time he believes Charles to be sincerely in favour of toleration for the Protestant nonconformists, and even supports the Declaration of Indulgence, though in itself an arbitrary act, because he feels the King to be the one hope of the persecuted sects. In other ways, however, dissatisfaction soon appears. By 1665 the King seems to be seriously misled and cheated by his ministers, and by 1667 the agitation for the removal of one of them reaches a climax, and Clarendon is exiled. His departure makes little difference, for the Cabal seems every bit as unsatisfactory, and with the Dutch War and the rupture of the Triple Alliance, James' conversion and marriage to Mary of Modena, real bitterness is seen in Marvell's satires against the King himself and the "French and Papist" counsellors. By the long prerogation charges of corruption are openly bandied about, and the threat of "forty-one" is now used not as a reproach by the Court so much as a threat by the Country party. In the last of his satires Marvell avows a conviction that the only remedy for the public misfortunes and safeguard for English liberties is the removal of the Stuarts. All the accusations made against the

Stuarts which were to be made at the Revolution and to be remedied in the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement are already voiced by Marvell. They are plotting to set up absolute monarchy, destroy the Church, betray the country to her enemies abroad--most notably France; justice is no longer free; the rights of the subjects in the Commons and in the country are infringed; elections to Parliament are tampered with; grievances are not given redress; a standing army is maintained. The heir to the throne is a Catholic and therefore the Protestant succession cannot be ensured. Marvell sighs for the days of "old Nell", but it must not be forgotten that he had wished Cromwell to be King, and that his most glowing lines are reserved for the Tudor monarchs. He has no solution to offer, for the days of a succession bill are not yet, but his whole attitude suggests that he would have supported that bill and that later he would have approved the succession of William of Orange. There is much in his work to show that he deplored what he regards as the Stuart tendency to absolutism, but none to suggest that he favoured a republic rather than a limited monarchy such as was afterwards set up. As his outlook when he wrote the Growth of Popery is typical of the later Whig view, it is most probable that had he lived till that time he would have accepted the later Whig settlement of the Revolution. To call Marvell a republican is to credit him with a more abstract

political theory than he ever evolved. He was essentially an opportunist.

Marvell owes much of his reputation as a politician to his style, which presents a bare recital of events in a telling and significant manner. He is seldom profound; he is almost the "elegant stater of the obvious". Yet to dismiss him so would be to misrepresent his peculiar merits. If he failed to see certain issues clearly or to make due allowances for administrative difficulties, his criticism has the merits of sincerity and disinterestedness; hence his peculiar fame as a politician. He continually and strenuously fought for what he regarded as the essentials of English liberty and order, and his interpretation of the forces against which he fought was generally adopted in the succeeding century as the traditional view of Charles II's reign. Some disagreement with that interpretation does not, however, now imply an attempt to detract from his importance; it merely revises our estimate of the part he played in party politics. Marvell's value is not that of the critic so much as of a recorder of opinion, a type of opposition, and an exponent of his party's constitutional theories in a period between two important constitutional changes.

Section iv. The immediate Effect of the Growth of Popery and its subsequent Influence.

The importance of the Growth of Popery at once impressed the authorities. It was, of course, an unlicensed production, and in spite of the "Amsterdam" of its title-page, was printed in England at one of the private presses that all L'Estrange's efforts had not yet stamped out. It was dated 1677, and was probably being distributed early in February 1677/8, as it is in the middle of that month that notices of it begin to appear, though it may have actually been printed at Christmas. On the 19th February Samuel Mearne was given a warrant to search in any house for it, ⁽¹⁾ and William Whitwood was later given a certificate by Williamson to show that on the 21st he had apprehended Thomas Bedwell for publishing a pamphlet entitled The Growth of Popery, and that this man had been committed to Newgate on that charge. ⁽²⁾ He was by April aware of the reward offered in the March Gazette for information about the Growth of Popery and the Seasonable Argument. ⁽³⁾ In June, however,

(1) S.P.Dom., Entry Book 334 p.457. 19 February 1678.

(2) S.P.Dom. 403. p.27. of P.C.Register (P.C. 2/66 p.248): Bedwell committed to Newgate, 22 Feb.

(3) Gazette no.1288, 1289. March 1678. This extract has been reprinted several times. It offers £50 reward for printer's or publisher's name; £100 for him who delivered it into their hands. Anyone in the trade was also offered substantial advantages for turning informer. No one who was concerned in its production would be punished if he discovered the author. It should be noted that the reward brackets the Growth of Popery and the Seasonable Argument together. The terms applied to either.

(1)
 he had not yet received this, and the reason is not far to seek.

Other information had come into the council about Sam. Packer, "one of the clerks of the Poultry Compter". The informer was William Leach, a stationer, who said that about three weeks before (he was speaking on 1 March) Packer had come to his shop, bringing a book entitled The Growth of Papery and of Arbitrary Government in England to be stitched. To the best of his remembrance Packer told him that it had been given him that morning, and he was very unwilling to let him see the title. Since then Packer had absented himself from his employment. (2) Apparently no steps were taken immediately to find Packer. Perhaps Williamson hoped that the information of another stationer received a few days after Leach's would lead him to the real printer. Leigh had a story about a press run by Cartwright, which had been told him by William Paxton and Webb at the King's Head tavern, St. John's Street. Soon after this he heard of the printing of the Growth of Papery. Leigh hoped to discover its printer through his friends Paxton and Webb, but they proved strangely reluctant to tell him anything about it. They did, however, lead him to a press at Bethnall

(1) S.P.Dom. 404 no.248. June 1678. Whitwood to Williamson, asking his help to obtain the reward. He speaks of applying to Mr. Bertie in the House for help too.

(2) S.P.Dom. 401 no.237. 1 March 1677/8.

Green, which later turned out to be connected with some coin-
 clippers there. ⁽¹⁾ The interesting thing about this story is the
 reluctance of Webb to tell anything about this particular tract.
 They, like Packer later, seemed to act under some unknown di-
 rection, and could not be bribed into giving this piece of
 information away. Another suggestive point is the mention by
 one of them of Harrington's name as connected with the business.
 Later Harrington's Case was discovered by Atwood in the house
 of a draper when he was searching for the Growth of Popery. ⁽²⁾

Meanwhile L'Estrange had become interested in the affair.
 On 25 February he had applied for and obtained from the Lords
 permission to inspect the MSS. of the libels they had examined
 the March before, in order to discover by that means the author
 of "a dangerous Libel now abroad". ⁽³⁾ This is almost certainly
 the Growth of Popery. Probably the reward offered in the Gazette
 was also the result of the Lords' action.

The authorship of the pamphlet was, however, already hinted

(1) S.P.Dom. 402 no.143. 26 March 1678. A curious alliance!

(2) S.P.Dom. 403 no.155. July? But see p. 310, of this
 chapter for more about Atwood's activities. Marvell mentions
 this tract in his Growth of Popery p.333. An account of Harring-
 ton's trial is printed at the end of the French edition of the
Growth of Popery (1680) p.255.

(3) L.J.XIII. p.161. 25 February 1677/8. Notice that Honesty's
Best Policy speaks of this:-"Book being now in hands of the
 House of Peers, deserves their most severe injunction". (p.17)

at. L'Estrange himself must have guessed fairly soon. His own Growth of Knavery of the April of this year shows that he already had information on the subject. (1) As early as 2nd March Southwell, who had already noted the libel as an example of those "Prognostics that always bede evil", (2) had written to Ormonde "of two bitter libels that are out; the one of bulk. I can never believe that the Lord Halifax his pen is in it; many also do guess at Mr. Mervin [Marvell], who surely knows how to employ his time much better." (3) In April an anonymous writer in the Letter from Amsterdam to a Friend in England mocks at the fears of Popery and arbitrary government, and Presbyterian pretences in the pamphlet, and says of "Andrew":- He's a shrewd man against Popery, though for his religion, you place him as Passarin at Rome placed Harry the Eighth betwixt Moses the Messiah and Machiavel with this motto in his mouth, Quo me vertam, nescio. 'Tis well he is now transposed in to Politics, they say he had much ado to live on Poetry." (4)

A hint as to why Marvell was not taken is given in a letter to Popple, where he says:- "There came out, about Christ-

(1) See below p. for editions of this answer to Marvell.

(2) Hist. MSS. Com. new series IV. p.408. Southwell to Ormonde, 28 February.

(3) Ibid. p.411. Southwell to Ormonde, 2 March 1677/8.

(4) Published 1678. The author was G.H.--unidentifiable initials. The "transposed" is significant as yet another indication of Marvell's authorship of the Growth of Popery.

was last, here, a large book concerning the growth of popery and arbitrary government. There have been great rewards offered in private, and considerable in the Gazette, to anyone who could inform of the author or printer, but not yet discovered. Three or four printed books since have described, as near as it was proper to go, the man being a Member of Parliament, Mr. Marvell, to have been the author; but if he had, surely he should not have escaped being questioned in Parliament, or some other place.⁽¹⁾

Perhaps for some time in spite of the light tone of this letter Marvell did feel in some danger. Cooke prints in his Life of Marvell the fragment of a letter:- "Praeterea magis occidere metuo quam occidi! In quod vitam tanti aestimam, sed ne imparatus morior."⁽²⁾ This might be an ingenious forgery to support the view taken by some that Marvell died by poisoning,⁽³⁾ or, if true, it may show that he was for a time in real danger. Perhaps what this danger was may be discovered from the poem on the Pensionary House of Commons, which suggests surprise that "Marvell" "yet wears his ears".⁽⁴⁾

Whether L'Estrange hoped to convict Marvell or not, he

(1) Grosart II. 631-2. Marvell to Popple 10 June 1678.

(2) Cooke, Life of Marvell 1772, vol. I. 13.

(3) The well-known verses; but whether "Fate or Art untwin'd his thread" (Thompson III. 486) suggests some doubt as to his manner of death.

(4) Add. MSS. 34362 f. 111. In the printed versions of this poem Marvell's name is not mentioned, S-- being substituted.

was certainly active in tracking down the hands through which the Growth of Popery had passed. In May warrants to search for any seditious pamphlets were issued, and in particular one for searching for the Widow Brewster, who was suspected of having had a share in the giving of the libel into the printer's hands. ⁽¹⁾ By July other game, in the shape of Axtell, was in his ⁽²⁾ bag.

Meanwhile Packer was not to escape. On 6 July warrants were issued for his arrest and for him to be brought next day before Williamson. ⁽³⁾ By the 12th he was "under restraint", and, with a porter who was expected to have new information, to be sent for to answer his charges before the council. ⁽⁴⁾

When he was examined Packer said that he had found the Growth of Popery in his seat in the table. He had only read the title-page before he took it to Leach to be stitched. He asked him to bring it when done to the King's Head tavern, which Leach did, giving it to him before Webb, an exciseman, and Ketnesse, a Scotsman. He had hidden because of his debts, though he admitted to having got out of the way when he heard of the search to be made for the libel. He was asked about a

(1) S.P.Dom. Entry Book 28. f.212. 25 May 1678.

(2) S.P.Dom. 405 no.42. 16 July L'Estrange applies for a warrant S.P.Dom. Entry Book 334 p.522, Warrant granted the same day to seize Axtell for having a "treasonable and Seditious Libel" entitled the Growth of Popery.

(3) S.P.Dom. Entry Book 334. p.514. 6 July 1678.

(4) S.P.Dom. 405. no.77. 12 July, Order in Council; of. P.C. 2/66 p.270.

phrase in one of his letters to his wife about being "not without advice". He said that it meant the advice of relations
(1)
only.

Obviously Williamson was trying to find out who were his patrons or protectors. His suspicions had been aroused by the letters seized (now among the State Papers) from Packer to his wife. He had said, "In such a weighty affair I want not advice, and all agree for me to appear is voluntarily to destroy myself." He mentions the money he is sending to his wife, speaks of the £1000 being bid for him, and also asks her to entertain a gentleman "friend to them both" who is to call on her. It would be interesting to know if this were Marvell himself. It is, however, sufficiently suggestive to account for the line of questioning at Packer's examination.
(2)
Apparently Goodman Atwood, deputy Marshall of the King's Bench, seized Packer, for he is found obtaining a certificate from Williamson to this effect, in order to secure the reward.
(3)

On 26 July Packer petitioned to be let out on bail, and obtained the necessary permission on condition that his bail was found to be satisfactory.
(4)
Apparently it was not, for in a manuscript note by Southwell on a copy of the Growth of Penury

(1) S.P.Dom. 405. no.122. 22 July 1678.
(2) S.P.Dom. 405. no.135. 135 i-v. July ?
(3) S.P.Dom. Entry Book 334. p.518. 8 July.
(4) P.C. 2/66 p.378. 26 July 1678.

it is stated that the book had been seized 21 February by Whitwood, "in ye hands of Sam: Packer in Cornhill who after dyed in ye King's bench." ⁽¹⁾ Bedwell, one of the other printers concerned with the Growth of Popery, was subsequently released, but what happened to Axtell is not known. Perhaps he too died in prison.

After Marvell's death in August 1678 the search was more or less abandoned. The authorship of the pamphlet, already guessed at, was now openly attributed to Marvell, ⁽²⁾ and in the following year a folio edition was issued with his name to it, and the addition of an appendix showing a list of ships taken by French privateers. ⁽³⁾ There is no reason to suppose that this list formed part of Marvell's own plan, and it was probably added by the person or persons responsible for the new issue. In the reprint of the pamphlet in the State Tracts this list ⁽⁴⁾ is still further enlarged. It rather supports the theory that Marvell was working in some kind of party organisation.

It is difficult to estimate the importance of this prolonged search for those concerned with the pamphlet. Certain printers and distributors obviously suffered for their share in

(1) Press Mark C 55 & 20. The Growth of Popery 1677 Part I.
 (2) S.P.Dom. 406. no. 158. T. Barnes to Williamson (?) 22 Sept. 1678.
 (3) It is this edition that Grosart reprints. Thompson does not print the list of ships. It is noticed in a letter to Lord Conway (S.P.Dom. 421. Conway Papers no. 60. 8 November 1679).
 (4) 1689. Baldwin State Tracts. Growth of Popery pp. 69-135.

it, but Marvell seems to have continued with his ordinary duties in Parliament and for Hull without any great inconvenience. It is true that he is supposed to have gone in some fear, but on the other hand the tone of the letter (already quoted) to Popple hardly supports this statement. While the House was sitting, at any rate, he was secure from arrest. That alone explains his immunity, for there was no secret about his authorship of the pamphlet very soon after it appeared, and L'Estrange certainly knew its authorship at a very early date, but probably felt it useless to attack a fairly prominent member of the opposition, and thus concentrated on trying to seize the pamphlet and hamper its further distribution.

He tracked it down to the widow Brewster, and writes about his search to Williamson a few days after Marvell's death. (1) He says that he has found this widow, and can prove that she brought in the manuscripts of three libels, the Letter about the Test, the two Speeches by Buckingham and Shaftesbury and Jenks' Speech. She lodges with an old officer of Cromwell's who can write in different hands. He probably copied the libels

(1) Marvell died 16 August 1678, and was buried in St. Giles in the Fields. Various notices of his death appear among the Hull correspondence (as I am kindly informed by Prof. Margoliouth), in the L'Estrange correspondence (see below 313, and Rawl. MSS. C. 963 (18)), in a letter in Hist. MSS. Com. XIII. Rep. VI. 8. See also Wood (II. 414 Life and Times) and a MS. in Popple's hand containing a Latin epitaph, presumably that voted by the town for Marvell and subsequently removed (Thompson III. 480-3, Add. MSS. 8888 - p. 165 - etc.).

she brought him from the authors' manuscripts. "It is very probable that the libels concerning the Growth of Fevery, and the List of Members of Parliament (i.e. the Seasonable Argument) passed through the same hands.....if she be questioned, probably she will cast the whole blame on Mr. Marvell who is lately dead, and there the enquiry ends."⁽¹⁾

It seems probable that L'Estrange's attribution of the List to Marvell is correct; it is supported by "G.H." in a Letter from Amsterdam. Grosart rejected it on insufficient grounds. Certain evidence points to Marvell as the author. The format of the book itself shows it to come from a very similar press, if not the same; both are printed in "Amsterdam"; the title-pages of both are very similar. The same charges are made in them, the shorter pamphlet summarising on its title-page the chief of the charges made against ministers by Marvell in his Growth of Fevery. Both mention a debate not otherwise recorded in which charges of bribery were brought in the House itself,⁽²⁾ and it seems at least probable that a report only found in these two places was from the same source. L'Estrange, though he was rather inclined to put down to Marvell's account anything he could not trace to another, in this case had no particular object in deliberately deceiving Williamson, particularly as

(1) S.P.Dom. 406 no.37. 23 August 1678. cf. Marvell's own account of private printing etc. Grosart IV. p.61, and see below p.330.
 (2) Grosart IV. 322 and Thompson III. 583. A comparative table of titles and this passage is appended to this chapter, p.

it was not to his advantage to put the blame after his long search on a dead author. As he remarked in his Growth of Knavery, the Seasonable Argument was only the nineteen sheets of the Growth of Popery reduced to three, ⁽¹⁾ and they indeed admirably supplement each other. It is also significant that they were classed together in the Gazette advertisement, and in most notices of them which appeared. In the House when the famous debate on their charges took place no distinction was made between the two, references simply being to the libels advertised for in the Gazette notice. ⁽²⁾ L'Estrange had been given every facility by the Lords to pursue his search, and his story has all the sound of conviction.

The Seasonable Argument has often been confused with the Flagellum Parliamentarium printed by Harris Nicholas in 1827 from the manuscript in the Lansdowne collection, ⁽³⁾ but, as others have already noticed, this list is of an earlier date altogether from that of the Seasonable Argument. It is however most probable that Marvell (or the author) used the earlier list as a foundation upon which to work, or he may, of course, have been responsible for both productions. It is, at any rate,

(1) The Growth of Knavery 1678 (1st Edition).

(2) See below.

(3) Lansdowne MSS. 805 r.83. See note in the bibliography p. 405, below.

impossible entirely to separate them. Later lists enlarged
(1)
and continued the idea.
(2)

(1) An example will best illustrate this:

Flacellum (1827)

Bedford.

Sir Hum: Winch. Of the Council of Trade of our Plantations, for which £500 per annum, with a promise of being Privy Councillor.

Buckinghamshire

Sir Richard Temple...

Sir William Smith...

Sir William Drake...

Reasonable Argument (1677)

Bedford.

Sir Humphrey Winch, Baronet, hath from the court 500£ per annum salary; and was of the council of Trade for plantations.

Buckinghamshire.

Sir Richard Temple...

Sir William Smith...

Sir Robert Sawyer, a lawyer of as ill reputation as his father, has had for his attendance this session 1000£ and promised (as he insinuates) to be attorney general, and speaker of the House of Commons.

Sir William Drake...

Dorset.

Anthony Ashley. Son to the Lord that looks on both sides and one wry who is the great Bribe-taker, and had got and cheated £150,000.

omitted

Essex.

Thomas King. A poor beggarly fellow who sold his voice to the Treasurer for 250 bribe.

Essex.

Barwich. Thomas King, Esquire, a pensioner for 50£ a session, etc. seat and drink, and now and then a suit of clothes.

These examples show omissions, as of Ashley, easily explained by Marvell's politics in 1677 or by differences of date, vacancies in the House, etc., and additions, as of Robert Sawyer, whom Marvell had already chastised in the Growth of Rapery, and whom he particularly opposed. The similarity, on the other hand, between two entries like these about Humphrey Winch could hardly be mere coincidences, and the earlier list must have been known to the author of the later.

(2) e.g. A List of the Late Unanimous Club of Veterans 1679 etc.

The Seasonable Argument, though sharing the notoriety of the Gazette advertisement, did not immediately cause so much stir on the part of L'Estrange and the authorities. In April, however, a warrant was issued to search for it, ⁽¹⁾ and later on Humphrey Kimes informed Williamson that Jones, a bookseller in Little Britain, had discovered the printer at a press in Moorfields, ⁽²⁾ but would not divulge his name. In August L'Estrange, as already noted, thought he had traced it to the widow Brewster, but then the death of Marvell, its supposed author, prevented further activity about it.

Apart from all this commotion over the appearance of the two libels, there is much else to show the great and immediate impression they made. In the House of Commons debates, as recorded by Grey, many speeches seem reminiscent of the Growth of Popery, and quotations seem to have been made from it quite freely. It is, however, not always easy to decide when speeches are drawn from it or only resemble its general tone, as the ideas expressed in the pamphlet were, of course, very prevalent. On one occasion Meres quoted a phrase of Marvell about the speech that had been published in the Gazette after ⁽³⁾ the adjournment the previous May ⁽⁴⁾ in its actual words. In

(1) S.P.Dom. Entry Book 334. p.475. 6 April 1678.
 (2) S.P.Dom. 403 no.52. 18 April 1678.
 (3) Grosart IV.406.
 (4) Grey. V. 245. 14 March 1677/8.

a speech in the February following the issue of the Growth of Popery. Sacheverel repeated many of its charges of "French counsels" and "French money"⁽¹⁾. A day or two later Powell recalled the money given for the Dutch War and the peace that ensued, which may have been suggested to his memory by Marvell's description of the event.⁽²⁾ Fears of "arbitrary government" pervaded speeches of men like Williams and were refuted by courtiers like Pepys.⁽³⁾ In June there is an echo of the stir caused by Marvell's pamphlet in the Chancellor's speech, when he said:- "Shall we endure them that dare say in coffee-houses and public places, that the nation is enslaved."⁽⁴⁾ References to "conspirators" and a "black design" are frequent, especially in connection with the army, supply⁽⁵⁾ and policy towards France.⁽⁶⁾ One rather different sign of the wide distribution of the Growth of Popery is Sir William Hickman's statement in early February that Crown Lands, previously in the hands of abbeys and so on, "are the great bulwarks" against Popery,⁽⁷⁾ which surely comes too near Marvell's exactly similar remark to be a mere coincidence of thought.⁽⁸⁾

(1) Grey V. 73 seq. 4 February 1678. cf. Grosart IV.

(2) Ibid. 105-6. 6 February. cf. ibid. p.165, 18 February 1677/8: Waller on supply.

(3) Grey V. Williams' speech p.84, Pepys' 86. Debate on supply, 5 February 1677/8.

(4) Grey VI. 52. June 1.

(5) Grey V. 226-7. 1 March

ibid. 295. 2 May, (Williams); VI.41. 31 May, (Talbot, Powell etc)

VI. 69. 1 June, (Coventry)

(6) Grey VI.98. 18 June, Cavendish.

(7) Grey V. 329 (2nd. p. thus numbered) 7 May, Sacheverel on Treaties.

(8) Grey. V. 175. 20 February.

The most famous occasion on which the pamphlet was mentioned in the House was that in June, when Sir William Coventry, after a discussion on a motion to bring in an account of all pensions charged upon the revenue, broached the subject of the charges made by the pamphlets. He said that such accusations, now so much advertised by the offer of a reward in the Gazette for their author's discovery, could not be ignored by the House. "Let not the reputation of all your members lie under scandals; else the very laws you make will not meet with that cheerful obedience they ought to have. I hope, therefore, that this House will do something in vindication of themselves, the thing now being made Gazette-matter in the face of the whole world." Clarges said that the auditor of the privy Seals should inform the House of extraordinary charges upon it, but Charles Harbord suggested that each member should come forward on oath and protest he had received nothing for voting. A motion to enquire further into the matter and to impose such a test was carried, but a snap division taken as the House was emptying to commit the matter was defeated. The debate had a

(1) All through the Growth of Popery and the Reasonable Argument charges against ministers of receiving pensions are made. These are perhaps echoed by Cavendish (VI. 98. 18 June), by Carew: "I hope we shall find out the instruments of our long prerogation and French Counsels, as if they had been pensioners to the French King" (Grey V. 226), by Clarges: "The French King had thoughts to make himself master of all; and his best way to keep off England, was to bribe the chief Counsellors, and they did receive pensions." (ibid. V. 234). cf. Grosart IV. 263 and others.

(2) Grey VI. 103-105.

(3) C.J.IX. 500. 18 June 1678. cf. Southwell to Ormonde, same day (Ormonde Papers IV. 435-438).

sequel next day in the reprimanding of the clerk by those in favour of the motion against bribery for not entering it upon the books. Southwell mentions that there had already been some dispute as to having such a disreputable matter upon the books at all. Of the debate itself he writes:- "It was fit rather to apply such a test [i.e. as that suggested by the country party] and protestation to every member there: that they had no hand in the making or distributing that libel which was printed to the defamation of so many of their members."⁽²⁾

The Growth of Popery may not have the credit of starting a campaign against the politics it disapproved, but it certainly provided in convenient form arguments against the government, and by its popularity spread those ideas through the party and the country generally. To this it probably owed such influence as it had in the House of Commons.

Marvell's last pamphlet, while it attracted a great deal of notice, did not immediately provoke the same number of direct answers as the Rehearsal Transposed. The reason for this probably lies in the fact that the outbreak of the Popish terror robbed most people of the wish to criticise a book that seemed to present their fears and the reasons for them so penetratingly. To doubt the truth of them was, while the terror

(1) Grey VI. 106.

(2) Hist. MSS. Com. Cal. of Ormonde MSS. IV. 437. Southwell to Ormonde as above. cf. *ibid.* 151, H. Coventry to Ormonde, 18 June 1678.

lasted, almost a criminal offence; indeed, those who disbelieved Oates are actually known to have been imprisoned.

L'Estrange, it is true, rushed into print, but not, it may be noted, while the worst was on. Though he reprinted the Parallel in 1679 he did not add to his answers until 1681, when it was possible to use the Shaftesbury conspiracies to add point to his tale.

The chief answers appeared in the April of 1678. They were L'Estrange's Growth of Knavery,⁽¹⁾ another tract with a similar title⁽²⁾ not directly mentioning Marvell's work, but obviously designed to discredit it, A Letter from Amsterdam and Honesty's Best Policy. Some of the counter-charges brought by these against the author of the Growth of Popery have already been noted.⁽³⁾ The rest were on similar lines. The Growth of Popery was a seditious tract. It was inculcating the same sort of ideas as those which led to the rebellion of '41. It was, in short, scaremongering, and that for no reason or just cause except the discontent of the author and his friends. It was an endeavour to make trouble between the King and his people and to embarrass

(1) The Growth of Knavery and Popery under the pretended Fears of Arbitrary Government and Popery. With a Parallel betwixt the Reformers of 1677, and those of 1641 in their method and devices. 1678.

(2) The Growth of Knavery and Popery under the Mask of Presbiterary Tyranny and Popery lording it over the Consciences Liberties & Estates both of King and People. 1678. I have given a complete list of these answers in the bibliography, as some confusion (even in Kitchen's Life of L'Estrange) seems to prevail over these tracts.

(3) See above Chap.V Section 11.

the government by wild suggestions about the succession at home and their policy abroad, and further, to hamper the King by refusing supplies. The author could be nothing but a Presbyterian and a discontented "Commonwealth" man. Which was more dangerous, Presbyterianism or Popery, men must judge for themselves. Both set up tyranny and destroy freedom, so Geneva at least is no better than Rome.

Bohn in his diary, echoing Honesty's Best Policy, remarks of "an infamous libell", the Growth of Popery, that "the Author is doubtless an honest puritane; his maine designe to tell the world the necessity and lawfulness of another rebellion; and to that end, representing all the errors of government as intended crimes, and all the governors of the nation as a pack of fooles and knaves; whereas, in truth, all the danger we ly under of popery and arbitrary government comes from men of his faction..."⁽¹⁾ As Bohn notes, Honesty's Best Policy, or Penitence the sum of Prudence gave a "most excellent character" of Marvell's libel, and in the passage he quotes indeed points directly to the weakest part of that pamphlet. That Marvell was hardly likely to profit his country by embarrassing the government and by invariably criticising its policy was the obvious

(1) Diary of E. Bohn, edited by S.W. Rix, 1853. p.40-41. 18 May 1678. On p.3, under the date 29 March 1677, Bohn notices "A delightful little book entitled, 'A Packet of Advice,' etc."

and most potent criticism of his work, and is most forcibly and yet moderately stated in this pamphlet.⁽¹⁾

L'Estrange and some others also criticised the constitutional theories of Marvell's work. They accused him of republicanism, and saw in his reservation of an occasional right to rebel a principle subversive of the State and all order in it.⁽²⁾ Another criticism is expressed in the title of a pamphlet written to support L'Estrange's Growth of Knavery, namely, The Absurdity of that newly devised State Principle (Viz) That in a Monarchy, the legislative Power is Communicable to the Subject, and is not radically a Sovereignty in one. But in more.⁽³⁾ L'Estrange held the theory of the divine right of Kings, and believed too that the constitution should depend absolutely upon their power. He had no conception of any system of checks and balances; complete sovereignty was the prince's inalienable right--such is the gist of his somewhat confused statements on this subject. He swept away anything he deemed derogatory to kingship with the epithet of "Presbyterian" or "seditious". Any talk, even of representative government, seems to have been

(1) A copy of this pamphlet is in S.P.Dom. Car.II. Case G. Another is bound up with the Letter from a Person of Quality, under the Press Mark E.1959.

(2) The Growth of Knavery (L'Estrange), Three Great Questions 1680, etc.

(3) S.P.Dom. Car.II. Case G. I do not think this pamphlet has been noticed before. cf. A Plea for the Suggestion (1682, Press Mark 1897 c 20), A Seasonable Address to both Houses of Parliament (1681) etc.

anathema to him, as indeed was anything which implied a possibility of criticism. The force of his arguments lies, however, not in their constructive power, but in their implications of sedition in the theories of the opposition. He partially succeeded in associating Marvell's ideas with rebellious projects and with disorder in the State, and so to some extent with some parties discredited them.

It is very interesting to trace the influence of the Growth of Popery in the pamphlet literature of the next few years. This is not altogether easy, for the plot it discovers became merged in the general discovery of plots during the succeeding year. There are, however, some five pamphlets which bear unmistakable signs of Marvell's influence, besides others which may have been inspired by his libel.

The first in point of time, though not of importance, is The Character of Popery (1680) by Phildaus, which is certainly an imitation of Marvell's own "Character of Popery" in the Growth of Popery. The form is very much the same; the title, with its association of Popery and Arbitrary Government, suggests that of the earlier work. The main accusation in it, besides that of a general plot to bring in the Popery described, is that of bribery and corruption amongst the conspirators. It points out, too, that the Presbyterians whom everyone is accusing of sedition and Popery did not bring in the present

government, and are guiltless of its faults. ⁽¹⁾

A more avowed imitation of Marvell's book is one bearing the same title, whose pagination runs on from the first edition of Marvell's pamphlet. The Growth of Popery Part II. is supposed to have been written by Robert Ferguson. After commenting upon Marvell's virtues and his design in showing up the Popish Plot, the author, following the plan of the Growth of Popery, ⁽²⁾ proceeds to narrate events since its publication. ⁽³⁾

The same moral is pointed, and the work is indeed what it purports to be, a continuation of the good work begun by Marvell.

Another, though unacknowledged, imitation of Marvell's pamphlet is again the work of Ferguson. His No Protestant Plot is said by Dryden in his Epistle to the Whigs (itself something of a reply to Marvell, whom he had indeed little cause to love) to be "stolen from your dead author's pamphlet, called the Growth of Popery." ⁽⁴⁾ One passage will justify Dryden's remark:- "Such is the happiness of the English Government, that as we do always need the care of our Prince, so does he always need the love of his people. And, as no King is greater than

(1) Press Mark 807 95(20) 8pp.

(2) 1682. Press Mark C55 d 21. Said to be "printed at Cologne". Philoveritas is the author's pseudonym.

(3) North p.289 mentions an account of a debate in which Marvell's pamphlet is mentioned, printed in a pamphlet form (now under Press Mark 816 m 2(8)), and which may have been one of Ferguson's sources of information.

(4) Epistle to the Whigs, first edition 1682, [11626 f.9].

the King of England, so he is possess'd of the hearts of his subjects, and in terms of fair correspondence with his Parliament; so nothing can sooner lose him that love which he ought to have in the hearts of his people, nor perpetrate and heighten differences with his Parliament, than the permitting what was done by the body of that Assembly to prove an occasion of spleen against a particular person; or the suffering them to fall by sinistrous means, whom the people looke upon as having served his Majesty with fidelity, and regarded them with tenderness and compassion."⁽¹⁾

A Tory Plot by Philanax Misopappas (1682) commences with a paragraph more than reminiscent of Marvell:- "That there has been a design carried on for many years, of extirpating the (miscalled) pestilent heresie of Protestantism, and re-establishing the Roman Catholick Religion in this Kingdom, none after so evident and repeated proofs of it, can have the impudence to deny." The same charges of designs to support a standing army, a French tyranny and a fear of Popery form the whole of the pamphlet, and make it seem like smaller edition of Marvell's book.⁽²⁾

North was among the first to point out the debt owed by

(1) No Protestant Plot 1681 p.5.

(2) A Tory Plot 1682 (701 s 13 (4)) cf. A Certain Way to Save England 1682. (599 i 24 (7)). Marvell is also largely quoted by Philecthus in A Second Plea for the Nonconformists 1683 (701 f 24) p.21.

White Kennet to Marvell. That author, according to North, depended largely upon Marvell's Growth of Popery for the material for his History. The Examen was chiefly written in order to discredit Kennet and refute Marvell's accusations against Charles II. North laments that no one has yet completely answered the Growth of Popery, and declares it deserving of a "distinct confutation". The events most misrepresented by Marvell, and thus by his imitators, North says, are the visit of Madam (Charles' sister) in 1670, the Declaration of Indulgence and the Blackheath project. The Growth of Popery has become the "Standard Libel" of the age, and to this fact is due the unfortunate attitude generally adopted to recent happenings. Though North's criticism largely consisted of a contradiction of what Marvell says rather than an analysis of his mistakes, he often points out just those very parts of Marvell's work which now seem most prejudiced and unwarranted. He is among the first to notice the historical nature of Marvell's work and to show how already the Growth of Popery was colouring historical comment.

(1)

The influence of the Growth of Popery was also plainly to be seen in another History, had North cared to go into the matter.

(1) North, R. Examen 1740, pp.141, 249 and passim. White Kennet, Register...of Events since the Restoration of King Charles II. 1728. Note parliamentary intro. chapter for the year 1673-7.

This is a shorter version of the earlier-Complete History of England. 1706, 3 vols: It was this which North attacked in his Examen.

Oldmixon published 240 years after the appearance of the History, a History of England in three volumes, practically all of which describing Charles II's reign was drawn from Marvell's account. Oldmixon sometimes mentions his debt, but more often echoes the accusations of the Growth of Popery, or its accounts of debates, without acknowledgement. ⁽¹⁾ Ralph, writing rather later, also shows indebtedness to Marvell, not only taking his narrative as the source for the history of the reign, but ⁽²⁾ accepting his conclusions about the tendencies of those events. From Ralph the editors of Grey's Debates take many of the notes which they insert as a running commentary on the more important debates, and occasionally, though they also acknowledge quotations from Marvell, they attribute to the later historian the words of the pamphleteer. ⁽³⁾ Ralph, it is interesting to note, uses Marvell's Epistles, that is, those letters (to Popple) which had been published in 1726 by Cooke from manuscripts lent by the poet's nieces. ⁽⁴⁾ By the time that Ralph's history was written, Marvell was being used, not as an exponent of the party point of view, but definitely as a source of impartial accounts of Charles II's reign. Until Dalrymple

(1) Oldmixon History of England 1730, pp.600, 607 seq. On p.728 he pays a glowing tribute to Marvell, mentioning the Rehearsal Transposed'd.

(2) Ralph History of England 1744, p.377 (the events of May 1677) etc.

(3) Grey IV. 334 n.

(4) Ralph pp.275, 330 etc.

(whose papers Thompson in his life of Marvell says he has ever "regarded with horror and detestation") reviewed the work of Charles in a more impartial vein, no one attempted to weigh Marvell's charges in the light of any other evidence but his own. North's Examen, which is, in its own way, as partial a piece of pamphleteering as the work he condemns, cannot be regarded as such an attempt. Even Eachard did not seriously set out to combat the main arguments of the Growth of Popery, though he mentions its appearance as a "seditious" work. (1)

Very soon after his death Marvell's name had become a kind of legend with the opposition to the Stuarts. His "Ghost" is twice invoked to rebuke their tyranny or abuse those who did not welcome the coming of William of Orange, and "Andrew Marvell Junior" right until the nineteenth century has been the pseudonym for writers against "Popery". (2) (3) (4)

His reputation is more seriously honoured by the many poems and tributes to his fame in the eighteenth century. Of these his

(1) Eachard History, 1720, pp. 957, 960 etc.

(2) Marvell's Ghost, by Mr. Jo. Ayloffe. (A New Collection of Songs against Popery, 1869). 47 lines commencing "From the Dark Stygian Lake I come, / To acquaint poor England with her Doom."

(3) Marvell's Ghost. Being the true copy of a Letter sent to the A. Sp. of England, upon his sudden sickness, upon the Prince of Orange's first Arrival into London. 1688/9. (Poems on Affairs of State 1707, IV. 318, 83 lines.

(4) A full list is given in an appendix.

biographer and editor, Captain Thompson, gives a long list,⁽¹⁾ to which may be added Wordsworth's well-known sonnet and an anonymous contemporary poem found among the manuscripts of Sir F. Gratian,⁽²⁾ both of which accept Marvell as a "prophet", the idea against which L'Estrange had so early protested.

When Marvell died the town of Hull voted £50 for a monument to his memory, but it is extremely doubtful whether this was ever placed over Marvell's tomb in St. Giles in the Fields. Tradition relates that it was indeed set up, but that it was soon after demolished by persons who disliked Marvell's politics.⁽³⁾ William Popple wrote the inscription, which was to have been engraved on the monument, and it is the most dignified of all the tributes to Marvell's virtues.⁽⁴⁾ In constant intercourse with Marvell for so many years Popple was well qualified to write of his uncle's qualities in the restrained way he himself would have preferred, and so, after a sentence or two upon Marvell's character and "singular penetration of judgment" Popple chooses to leave the rest to the memory of that character "engraved in the minds" of his generation and "always legible in his inimitable writings."

(1) Thompson III. pp. 482-493.

(2) Hist. MSS. Com. VI. Rep. p. 343. Mr. Marvell's Character.

24 lines commencing, "Tho' faith in oracles has long since ceased"

(3) Thompson III. 481, 491. cf. Aubrey, Wood, etc.

(4) Add. MSS. 8888 f. 86. contains the MS. version of this epitaph, so often reprinted, but not, I think, before identified as Popple's work. It was brought to my notice by the kindness of H. Legouis. cf. Thompson III. 482.

A Note to Chapter V.A Parallel between the Seasonable Argument and the Growth of Popery.Growth of Popery

An/ Account/ of the/ Growth/ of/ POPERY,/ and/ Arbitrary Government/ in/ England./ More Particularly from the Long Proseration, of November, 1675, Ending the 15th of February, 1676,/ till the Last Meeting of Parliament, the 16th of July 1677
Printed at Amsterdam 1677.

Seasonable Argument

A/ Seasonable Argument/ to persuade all the Grand Juries in England/ to petition for/ A New Parliament./ Or,/ A List of the Principal labourers/ in the/ Great Design of Popery and Arbitrary Power;/ Who have betrayed their Country to the Conspirators, and bargained with/ them to maintain a standing Army in England./ Under the Command of the Biggoted Popish D-./ Who by the Assistance of the L.L.'s Scotch Army, the Forces in Ireland, and/ those in France hopes to bring all back to Rome./ Amsterdam 1677.

Grosart IV. p.322:

"And yet it is remarkable that shortly after upon occasion of discourse among the Commons concerning libels and pamphlets, first one member of them stood up, and in the face of their House, said, 'That it was affirmed to him by a person that might be spoke with, that there were among them, thirty, forty, fifty, God knows how many, outlawed.' Another thereupon rose, and told them, 'It was reported too, that there were diverse of the members Papists;' a third, 'That a multitude of them were bribed and pensioners.

Thompson III. p.583:

"but in general, the House was, if they please to remember, this last session, by three of their own members told that There were several Papist, fifty out-laws, and pensioners without number."

Marvell in the following passage denies any wish to name the conspirators (Grosart IV.p.413):

"Some on the other side will expect, that the very persons should have been named; whereas he only gives evidence to the fact, and leaves the malefactors to those who have the power of inquiry. It was his design indeed to give information, but not to turn informer. That those to whom he had only a publick enmity, no private animosity, might have the privilege of statesmen, to repent at the last hour, and by one signal action to expiate all their former misdemeanors. But if anyone delight in the chase, he is an ill woodman that knows not the size of the beast by the proportion of his excrement."

CONCLUSION.

Marvell's political activities vary very greatly in importance, and, on the whole, increase in interest and significance towards the latter half of his life. This is partly due to the fact that knowledge of the later period is much fuller, and partly because in his earlier period, though in contact with politics and many famous political personages, Marvell's position was more that of the onlooker and of the civil servant than of a politician actively involved in the questions of the day. His poems, an occasional letter, or a report of his work under Thurloe give us some idea of his opinions and activities, but do not show him actually engaged in politics until after his return from Russia in 1665.

Until that time, though he may have felt deeply on the questions of the day, there is no evidence that his sympathies led him to take anything more than a passive part in affairs.

This study has thrown some light upon one or two details of Marvell's earlier career which help to fill in its always rather scanty outlines; such are his tutorship of William Dutton and more particularly his experiences and work in Russia with Carlisle. Though his friendships of the Commonwealth period are famous--the names of Dr. Pell, Harrington

and Milton are sufficient to ensure that--not only do they remain tantalisingly distant, but they prove to have less significance in a study of his political career than his later intimacies with his nephew William Popple, Edward Harley or Phillip Harcourt, and his relations with the country party leaders and politicians of the Restoration period like Carlisle or Buckingham and Shaftesbury. His work for the Hull Corporation and Trinity House, beginning in the earlier phase of Marvell's career, continues through the later period, when his definite partisanship is marked by the satires and the pamphlets.

Though Marvell's relations with the city he served as member have always been the subject of admiring comment and notice, the extent and nature of the services he rendered have not before been precisely estimated. There is no reason to suppose that many of the services which Marvell undertook for Hull were in any way exceptional for a member to undertake. Gilby often shared Marvell's activity, and Marvell's correspondence alone would supply examples of other members who were similarly employed on behalf of their constituents. Such matters as the separation of Trinity Church from Hessle, or the trouble over Lieutenant Wise are merely examples of the routine work of the member of that time. Even the work for Trinity House--and in this latterly Marvell took a decreasing share as his interest in the London House grew more pronounced--

was only what would be expected from the representative of a seaport.

The relations of Marvell with Hull are exceptional in the persistent and prolonged effort of Marvell on their behalf, the nature of his correspondence and the friendly relations between most of the Corporation and their member. It is probably to this unique relationship that we owe the preservation of the letters, and their detail and continuity.

These hand down to us a very complete and vivid picture of the work of a seventeenth century Member of Parliament. The business transacted is in itself rather tedious, but the record of it often gives an unusually clear view of otherwise obscure subjects, in such instances, for example, as the trouble over the lights, which shows the perennial conflict between King and chartered companies, and the affair of the Militia officer, which reveals the persistent disagreements between local authorities. Again, knowledge of the activities of both the London and the Hull Trinity Houses is enlarged by a study of these letters.

An intimate acquaintance with the letters suggests a qualification of the traditional views about them. They are usually cited as Marvell's most famous service to the city, and their nature presents some interesting problems. The series has often been called unique, and it is true that no other such series is known to exist. Yet it is obvious that Marvell

did not regard the letters as a particularly new or unusual departure. They are avowedly business letters between the member, who was mainly in London, and the town. Some such letters must at one time and another have been written by every member to his corporation or county. All this may well be admitted, and yet the claim stand that the letters remain unparalleled.. This is largely due to their continuity and to the relations already noticed between Marvell and Hull.

• Marvell took a great deal of trouble over the letters. He seems to have taken notes of events in the House, though how full these were it is difficult to say. It is probable that they mainly contained orders of the day, financial news, the sort of information a big commercial town would want to have, and moreover, the kind of information which could safely be handed over to Mr. Stockdale, the town's intelligencer, in the event of Marvell's being too busy to send his usual letter. In his own letters he could, of course, use his discretion as to the filling in of details, and when he did so could, and did, urge secrecy and care on the part of his readers.

Hull must have been exceptionally well informed with Marvell's letters and Mr. Stockdale's news-letters, as well as the copies of Acts, King's speeches and the like which Marvell so constantly sent. It is very unfortunate that the Hull

(1).

documents are not more generally accessible. A comparison of Stockdale's news-letters with Marvell's correspondence might prove extremely enlightening. It would show, perhaps, that remarks in Marvell's letters which now seem so reticent would really indicate to the Corporation something of what Marvell thought of happenings in the House. Stockdale would have the bare narrative from the notes, and Marvell's restrained comments would fill in Stockdale's recital. Such a case would seem to be suggested by Marvell's remarks on the prorogation of 1670. Stockdale would have had the fact from him, but Marvell in his letter to Hull remarks, "May God direct his Majesty," and, as we know from a letter of the same period to Popple, this exclamation conveyed, not anxious loyalty, but disgusted impatience. The interception of "seditious" letters, or of information about debates in the House was frequent, and some such reticences must have been a necessary device adopted by Marvell to cover his indiscretions. With a good knowledge of his personal bias, the Corporation would doubtless read more easily between the lines than we can, and that Marvell should trust them to do so when this personal connection is remembered is not surprising. Without a supposition that Marvell intended

(1) Prof. Margoliouth, who has, of course, had access to the Hull documents for the purpose of re-editing the text of Marvell's letters, kindly informs me of the existence of some hundreds of letters from Stockdale. It is greatly to be regretted that more general access is not allowed to searchers, in view of the richness of the material there.

his readers to understand a great deal more than he actually expressed it is hard to understand why he should bother to write to a town already so well supplied with a news-sender.

Marvell's activities in Parliament, though not prominent, except for rare occasions, are numerous and sustained. His silence there has often provoked comment, and he himself testifies to it, but research shows that he spoke there at least half-a-dozen times more than have hitherto been noticed, while a list of the committees on which he served throws new light on the part he played in the House. The evidence afforded by this material supports what the satires and pamphlets reveal of his party inclinations. During the winter following Clarendon's fall he speaks against the Chancellor, against Pett's going to the Tower, and in favour of the Merchant Adventurers. He is teller against Temple's taking the chair of the debate on supply and he is with Sacheverel teller against the government candidate for Newarke. He is found on a committee to draw up a bill against Popery and upon one to report upon the abstract of alliances read by Williamson. Possibly if rather more detailed accounts of debates existed he might be found to have spoken on yet other occasions when all that now shows his interest in the questions involved is his name on a committee list or as a teller. Indeed, with the evidence afforded by his Parliamentary activities alone, it would not

be hard to place fairly accurately Marvell's party politics, his position as a port member and his interest in religious toleration.

While the length of his membership would suggest that Marvell during the course of his Parliamentary career made many friends, it is extremely difficult to obtain information about his relations either with those known to have been his friends or with his party leaders. His satires give a clear idea of the members whose policy he deplored, while some letters survive to show his friendship with Harley, and a chance reference in one of these letters and Grey's account of the dispute in the House give us the fact of his friendship with Harcourt. Similarly, a single letter to each shows his friendship with Wharton and Trott, while occasional references reveal a close intimacy with Sir Jerome Smith, a famous Captain and an important member of the Deptford Trinity House. To two of the most important men in his party Marvell's attitude, though not his degree of intimacy of acquaintanceship is well defined. His remarks about both Buckingham and Shaftesbury are puzzling and suggestive.

These seem to indicate a revised estimate of Buckingham's position as a party leader, and also to suggest that the recognition of Shaftesbury as the leader of the opposition must be dated rather later than it has usually been. Buckingham's

work and speeches, as well as his spasmodic activities, show him to have possessed great ability, if little stability. He must, however, have managed to impress his sincerity upon a great many of the opposition, and he was definitely regarded by them as their leader until about 1676. Then Marvell's description of Shaftesbury as "not properly a second, but another principal in the fight" appears. The two leaders drifted apart after their release from the Tower, and indeed, some signs of jealousy on the part of Buckingham can be traced in his faint support of a motion to obtain Shaftesbury's release in 1678. Probably Buckingham, while he had more than the attributes of a successful courtier, had not quite sufficient qualities for the role of demagogue. He could not, like Shaftesbury (who bore his confinement with much more spirit) endure martyrdom for more than a month or so, and if he had to choose between public support and the pleasures of the Court, chose the latter, at any rate until he had forgotten his last period of disgrace.

Shaftesbury supplies the link between the theories of the country party and those of the Whigs of the Revolution. His influence on Locke must have been considerable, as it seems to have been upon all with whom he came in contact. Though it is probable that Marvell developed his ideas along independent lines--there is no reason to suppose that until after the Test

controversy Marvell had come at all into contact with the Earl-- yet he must have been in sympathy with him when the Growth of Popery was written. The statement, too, that Shaftesbury admired the Rehearsal Transposed, even if only the invention of Ponder, is sufficiently likely, as both were convinced of the necessity of toleration for all Protestants. Shaftesbury gave a degree of organisation and a more definite programme to the party to which Marvell belonged, and the extent of his influence may be seen in the differences between the politics of the satires and those of the Growth of Popery. The difference is not only that between satirical verse and considered prose, for the former are the rather chaotic efforts of a solitary opponent of the "court"; the latter is obviously part of a party programme to discredit that government.

Through Shaftesbury, or perhaps through William Popple, Marvell may well have had a direct influence on Locke, an influence already suggested by the similarity of many of their ideas. Any attempt to estimate that influence must be affected by the consideration that both were indebted to Hooker and to the growing body of "Whig" thought, if this is rightly interpreted by that curious mixture of confused theories and practical courage for which Marvell stands.

Though it is possible to gain a fairly clear idea of Marvell's politics from his activities and friendships in the House,

without his prose work their precise significance would be lost, and indeed, it would be difficult to explain the reputation he has enjoyed as a politician. The thought in the pamphlets, as might be expected, is not only more moderate, but also more constructive than the ideas developed in the satires. The latter may have increased Marvell's reputation; they were not in themselves outstanding enough to have created it, and without his prose his political fame would chiefly be in his own county and the borough for which he did so much.

On the other hand, the influence exerted by the pamphlets is illuminating and remarkably lasting. It can be traced in almost every eighteenth century historical work, and indeed in many subsequent accounts of the period. Those which show most acquaintance with Marvell's "standard libel", however, are the orthodox Whig histories, and this fact alone should serve to define Marvell's political position. They read his work and accepted his ideas for several reasons. It was, of course, well presented, and presented moreover in the palatable form of history, not that of speculative politics. The way in which Marvell comments upon events and interprets them fortified their own ideas. In fact, his ideas were to a great extent their own.

This in itself hardly supports the frequent assertion that Marvell was a republican. If he had been, it is not likely that the eighteenth century would have admired him so much,

and there is no ground for ascribing to him any influence upon extremer theorists. Such considerations lead directly to a discussion of the arguments that would bring Marvell's a republicanism .

Marvell's pre-Restoration position, although often used to confirm this idea, affords no evidence for so doing, and indeed indicates an opposite conclusion. Quite distinctly a Cromwellian, Marvell was further an advocate of making the de facto "government by a single person" into a permanent dynasty. This is of great importance when his later constitutional views are considered, for these must then be seen as the ideas of a man who had fundamentally no objection to rule by a single person, provided that single person was suitable, successful, and ruled by constitutional means. Such an attitude would more naturally lead to a wish to change the King or the succession than to alter entirely the constitution, when that constitution under an unsuccessful or otherwise unsuitable ruler showed signs of strain. If Marvell could accept, even welcome, the rule of Cromwell, there is little likelihood that he would have much sympathy with the republicanism of a Sidney or a Vane. And there is no reason to suppose that such a fundamental change was advocated by Marvell when, in his last satires, he hinted at the desirability of a change of dynasty. Neither can Marvell's whole idea of the constitution be reconciled

with a republican creed. That constitution, in his view, provided a definite place for the monarch, and so long as the King enjoyed the confidence of his people he might well be accorded a certain freedom of action.

Marvell's so-called republicanism arose out of his distrust of the Stuarts and his terror of Popery and arbitrary power. A good example of this is found in his attitude to Charles II's efforts to relieve the dissenters. With one breath he proclaims his horror of entrusting the King with any power he might misuse, with the next, in despair at the behaviour of his fellow-members, he is "for leaving all to the King" and benefiting by his clemency. He was as willing to concede such power to a Stuart as earlier he had been willing to allow a Cromwell the control over Militia. When he trusted the ruler he would leave something to his discretion, and for some time Charles' undoubtedly tolerant spirit and repeated endeavours on behalf of dissenters impressed Marvell and elicited his confidence. The moment however that Marvell, whose suspicions were perhaps natural in an old Cromwellian and in so sturdy a Protestant, became obsessed with the idea of a Popish successor, his attitude even on this point became one of distrust.

It is extremely doubtful whether this distrust would ever have led Marvell into republicanism while Charles lived. When

he was dead another remedy was becoming increasingly obvious, that of an altered succession with a foreign Protestant ruler. Consequently at the Revolution, instead of the republic such as Vane or Sidney would have advocated, the Whigs were perfectly contented with a limited monarchy which had a flavour of legitimacy to soothe the Tories. It is not an unreasonable assumption to deduce from the trend of Marvell's opinions that he would have accepted such a solution, and that thus what the Tories were fighting was not a republican menace but simply a certain view of the monarchy. That even Marvell, who may be counted among the more extreme section of the opposition, does not appear to have cherished republican ideas, is yet another illustration of how rarely these have gained a secure footing in practical politics in England. It may be contended that Marvell is not a legitimate example of Whig views, that as a man of great intelligence, with the mind of a poet, he may well have anticipated later ideas. As a politician, however, Marvell is not unique; he is very typical of his party and his time. It is this which makes his work important, and illuminating of Whig ideas in embryo.

The most original thing about Marvell's career as a politician is his consistency in a period of kaleidoscopic politics. Though the changes in personnel are confused to a degree, there was always a certain constant residuum on either side. The

fundamental principles of the opposition are the same at moments of crisis, as are certain questions of policy which would drive numbers into the country party and which would be contested by the court with more than usual vigour.

Among the great dividing questions was that of supply. On the whole those at all inclined to the country side would join its ranks when excise was proposed, for excise was supposed to encroach upon the Englishman's privacy, and two of the watchwords of the opposition were, perhaps inevitably, "liberty" and "estates". In the same way, when money was demanded for the armed forces, a strong opposition appeared in the shortest space; and nothing is more extraordinary than the persistent fear of a standing army--or of the navy, though everyone paid at least lip-service to our sea power--and the unwillingness to give adequate supply to the services. Such an attitude has appeared frequently in Whig or Liberal oppositions. The opposition to Charles often made the mistake of underestimating the necessities of the state, but it may be that their opposition prevented possibly dangerous tendencies.

The country party also professed the greatest concern for trade. With this concern was closely associated a support of a policy of toleration. For a while they allied with the King to obtain this relief. Eventually they became obsessed by the Popish terror, and for a time left the King to combat the

intolerance of the country alone. While they proclaimed this concern for trade, they had little understanding of the objects of foreign policy and the difficulties in the way of obtaining them. When the King attempted to make use of one continental rival against the other, he received only blame and the additional suspicion that he was actuated by religious and political ambitions to subvert the nation to a "French interest" and "tyranny". The narrow and perverted views of the opposition, which on matters of foreign policy included many of the court faction, were at any rate typical of the opposition to the Stuarts throughout their rule. It is a defect to which representative institutions are perhaps peculiarly susceptible.

One thing more than most explains the apparent futility of the change in personnel, the outcries against ministers in the reign and the success of Charles in maintaining his power; that is, a tendency among the opposition in favour of the separation of the executive from the legislature. Marvell's insistence upon this is typical, and is a convincing example of his "Whiggish" proclivities. The views of Locke and Shaftesbury are well known. Such were not, however, merely the views of a few outstanding men, but the convictions of practically a whole party. The place bills of the period are almost sufficient evidence of this, without the additional testimony of the ideas of the Growth of Popery, or indeed of any of Marvell's libels. All his satires are directed against ministers. He

strikes the note early in his Last Instructions, when he says:-

"Where few the number, choice is there less hard;
"Give us his Court, and rule without a guard."

This idea was of course much more elaborately given in the Growth of Popery, where the diatribes against ministers taken from the House of Commons, the charges of bribery and the mistakes into which Marvell alleges ministers to have led the King are emphasised.

Apparently what was wanted by such as Marvell was a ministry in a position somewhat resembling that of the permanent heads of departments today, and such men liable to instant dismissal if not acting in accordance with the sympathies of the House. Ministers were to be responsible without the additional security of being representative. They were sure of criticism, yet had no sort of security that anything they did would be supported. They were to be the King's servants, but if orders from Crown and Parliament were conflicting they were to act as the Houses directed. In the same way the King, following a counsel of perfection, was to have every capacity to do good-- a term apparently synonymous with the commands of the House-- and none to do evil. Yet it would perhaps be no exaggeration to say that without some liberty to do evil King and ministers would have little effective power to do good. A divinely appointed Parliament was to supersede a divinely appointed King.

The initiative was to lie with the legislative body, never with the executive.

Such a system would prove impossible to work. It failed to provide any adequate means of enabling the King to know the mind of the House. Was he to address it on every question, to ask its permission before any negotiation, or else to act in such cases without the least security that his efforts would be supported? No link was suggested between the body carrying out and the body dictating orders. Nor was there any suggestion of appointing ministers by the Houses. It would in any case have been difficult for so large a body to make such appointments directly. The elaboration of the American constitution was not thought of, nor was the comparative simplicity of cabinet government. If Charles had been a less capable manager things might have gone hardly in foreign politics. Such a matter obviously demands a responsible negotiator with assurance of support. This support the House would not guarantee, and indeed did everything it could to embarrass the King in the direction of policy. His authority in foreign negotiations was to be that of a delegate merely, and not of a representative. It is curious, looking back on the many attempts of the preceding generation to pass place bills, and indeed to embody their principles in the Act of Settlement, that cabinet government should have developed when it did. In Charles II's

reign, if one is to study contemporary opinion without reference to what followed, it would seem that development would be more on American lines than along those actually taken. The opposition certainly never foresaw anything like the cabinet system.

If the opposition were not quite clear what they were fighting for beyond the rather vague "lives, liberties and estates" of so many speeches, Charles at any rate cannot be accused of the same vagueness. As far as it is possible to judge now, he had a pretty clear idea of what his immediate objects were, whatever their ultimate import. He had the ambitions of a clever man for his army and navy; he was interested to watch their development and work for their interests. He did not very much mind what happened to his ministers and was quite prepared to change them often enough to prevent the opposition's persisting too long in any one effort. He was determined to keep the direction of foreign affairs in his own hands. He felt, with some justice, that he knew very much more about them than his critics, but he went to some trouble to conceal the fact that he knew so much, and occasionally to conceal that he was acting at all. He seemed quite prepared to cut his coat according to his cloth, and thus succeeded in making the opposition think that with the right advice and away from his ministers he would be manageable. There never seems to have been any real agitation for his removal, or any real threat to his crown.

The opposition could make out a case that he threatened Parliamentary rights, but they were unjust in identifying his reluctance to accept the Parliamentary restrictions they wished to impose on him with an incompetence in affairs. The two issues became and have to a certain extent remained hopelessly confused. It would be difficult to deny that Charles, while not perhaps wishing to set up a "French tyranny", thought that Parliamentary government as the opposition conceived it unduly hampered his activities, and that he prevented as far as he could the restrictions the opposition wished to impose from becoming too irksome. On the other hand, to suggest that he was engaged in a plot to ruin the kingdom is absurd. He was probably as capable and as adroit a politician as the reign produced, and certainly succeeded as few could have done. The fault in his system, if such it can be called, lay in the unlikelihood of a successor's carrying on in the same way unless possessed of the attributes Charles undoubtedly had: address, tact and tolerance. Charles, unlike his brother, had no mission; he had too much wisdom to attempt the conversion of his people, and this fact, added to his appearance of nonchalance, helped him to remain astonishingly popular and astonishingly balanced. His essential sanity gained him eventually the support of Halifax, in itself a striking testimony to his innocence of most of the opposition charges.

The shadow over Charles was his brother's religion, and without the scare of Popery it is doubtful whether the opposition could have been even as effective as it was. If Marvell were in any sense a republican it would be because he could see no other way out of the succession problem, and the sombre figure of James loomed larger in his imagination than any figure in power. James had not the cleverness to cloak his ambition, nor the insincerity to put his religion in the background. Behind his tyranny Marvell saw not only the force of Rome but the alliance of France, and many even of the moderate men shared this fear.

The Popish scare permeated and distorted everything for the opposition even before the Plot. It modified their attitude to toleration, though at the same time many began to see in the Protestant dissenters "a balance against Rome and the boundless prerogative." It pervaded all their ideas on foreign politics, even at a time when many of them were taking French money. Still it is difficult to gauge the precise objectives of a man like Shaftesbury, especially during those last confused years. His activities can be explained neither by a fear of Popery nor by a passionate attachment to Parliamentary rights. This fear of Popery does, however, explain the attitude of a great number of his contemporaries.

The historical importance of Marvell depends not on his activities in the House, where he played a comparatively inconspicuous part, but on the influence he exerted by his writings and by a personal reputation which has been handed down almost as a tradition. That reputation at the time was indeed based upon his political work, and not upon the poems by which he is now chiefly remembered. To the historical student he is interesting as an outstanding and vigorous opposition pamphleteer, regarded by his contemporaries as a voice crying in the wilderness of Stuart vices, and by succeeding generations as the prophet of the Popish Plot and the "Glorious Revolution".

Appendix I. William Dutton.

In the seventeenth century the Duttons were landed gentry, who although of little importance in the political world, were sufficiently wealthy to attract a certain amount of notice. It is possible to trace their activities and to ascertain their politics during the period of the Great Rebellion in some detail. Much information about them may be obtained from the calendar of family documents privately printed by their descendant Lord Sherborne.⁽¹⁾ More may be gathered from scattered references in the Glendars of the Committees for Compounding and for Advancing Money and from wills of the family preserved at Somerset House. The Dutton estate was very largely situated in Gloucestershire, and local records, a collection of which is printed as Bibliotheca⁽²⁾ Gloucestrensis contain various references to their affairs. The great Colt Dutton case, a case between William Dutton and his cousins the Colts, attracted much attention in 1657.

Sir Ralph Dutton, father of the young William Dutton whom Marvell taught, was a royalist whose gallantry brought him some fame.⁽³⁾ Besides his activity in his own county of Gloucester where he served for some time as sheriff he was

1. Sherborne, C.D., A History of the Family of Sherborne, (2 Vol: 1901 with additions in typescript to 1917)

A Calendar of the Charters, etc: at Sherborne House. (1900)

Memorials of the Duttons of Dutton in Cheshire. (1901)

2. Printed in 1825.

3. See below, John Dutton for fines etc: mentioned as father of William, Cal. Com. for Com. p. 512. see too Clarke Papers. II. 159. etc.

the author of a small manual of prayer.(1) At the outbreak of war he seems to have placed most of his resources at the King's service, and these, if the amount of the fine later imposed by the roundheads is any guide, were very large. After various adventures, legend reports that he met his death at sea while escaping to France. (2)

His brother John Dutton--"One of the richest men in England"--served in the long Parliament as member for Gloucester, (3) but was ejected from the House for his royalist proclivities early in January 1643/4. After his formal ejection, he was brought up before the House and charged with his action at Tewkesbury where he had served as leader of the royalist army. (4) At the same time Dutton was fined by the Committee for Compounding, but soon after by a change of politics due to his friendship with Cromwell, and that general's intervention on his behalf, obtained some remission of his penalties. (5) Dutton had a daughter Elizabeth Colt, but owing to some differences with her and with her husband, left his estate entirely to his nephew and ward, William Dutton, under the trusteeship of William Brownlow, (6) and also under the guardianship of Cromwell.

1. Bib: Glouc: xxiii, & lxxiii, etc: Memorials of the Duttons, intro:.

2. Ibid. his death is also referred to, Cal: of Com: for Com: 1646, p 87, p 1273-1274, etc.

3. Returns of Members of Parl: , I. 489.

4. C. J. III. 355. (1 Jan: 1643/4), ibid, 562, (15 July, 28 July 1644)

5. Cal: of Com: for Adv: Money. Cases, part. I 424-6, 1154. also, Cal: of Com: for Com: , pp 85-86, 400, 1273, etc:.

6. Copy of Will at Somerset House. Ruthen. 1657. f. 249. dated Jan : 1655, proved, 30 June 1657.

John Dutton died in 1657, and his death was followed by a dispute over his estate which did not finish until the November of that year. ⁽¹⁾ The exact date of his death is variously stated. Wood, who also tells us that John was a patron of learning, ⁽²⁾ says that he died in 1658, but the evidence of the will, the date of the conclusion of the case, and a letter from Cromwell to Mrs Dutton referring to her recent sorrow, and his own responsibilities for William Dutton suggest the earlier date of winter 1656/7, probably sometime in January or even December. ⁽³⁾

William Dutton was evidently under his uncle's care soon after his father's death. His mother had also died sometime before 1646. His case as a royalist liable to a fine, came on in 1651 and, doubtless by his uncle's efforts, for he is mentioned as being an infant at the time, his penalty was remitted. ⁽⁴⁾ In 1653 William was placed by the influence of Cromwell, who already seems to have been directing his education, under Marvell's care at Eton, where they lived with the Oxenbridges. ⁽⁵⁾ The reason for Cromwell's interest in him, apart from his friendship with John Dutton is explained by the reference in John Dutton's

(1) Thurloe. VI. 610. also see, Hist MSS. Com: VII rep: p 96. and Cal: of Sherborne muniments, passim.

(2) Wood. Fasti. Oxen: III. 42, 439.

(3) Calendar of Sherborne Muniments. p 159/160. Cromwell to Mrs Dutton. 23 Jan: 1656/7.

(4) Cal: of Com: for Com: , p 512, (2 Dec: 1651)

(5) See above Chap: I. ii, 16/7.

will to a marriage projected between William and Cromwell's daughter. This did not however take place, for Cromwell's daughter married Lord Faulconberg, and William later married Mary Russell. (1)

William's age is not known, but he apparently came of age sometime in 1662 for in that year Sir William Brownlow received an indenture of release from his trust in connection with John Dutton's will. (2) If William was then eighteen years of age, he must have been under twelve when taught by Marvell. By 1667 he was in very bad health and applied for licence to live out of Gloucestershire, where he was sheriff. This was granted (3) and he went to live at Oxford near his physician. In 1675 he died leaving all his estates to his brother Ralph. (4) (5)

(1) Cal: of Sherborne Muniments. etc, p. 16/7, 242, etc:.

(2) Ibid, p. 18. dated 19 June 1662.

(3) Cal: S. P. Dom: 1667, pp. 484, 486.

(4). Memorials of Duttons. xxv, (5 Ap: 1675), Hist. MSS. Com: VII rep: p. 464. "General Dutton is dead [possibly a reference to his position in the county militia] and having no children the estate falls to his brother who married R. Pool's daughter". (newsletter, 8 Ap 1675).

William must not be confused with an earlier William Dutton who compounded for delinquency in 1649 (Cal: for Compounding, p 1273/4, 2088), or who was paid £50 by order of Parliament (Cal: of Com: for Adv: Money, 1501). A William Dutton obtained a passport for France in May 1654 (Rawl: MSS: A 328 f 35), and later returning was taken prisoner, but appealed for his liberty on account of ill health. (Cal. S. P. Dom: 1654, p 286.)

(5) Will at Somerset House. Bence. 63. (1676). Marvell is not mentioned. Ralph was subsequently knighted. (Cal. S. P. Dom: 1678, p. 182).

Appendix II.

A Note on the Old Parliamentary History as a source for the History of the Convention Parliament of 1660.

Contemporary writers of the year 1660 seem to have exhausted their energies in writing up descriptions of Charles' triumphal return. They have left us very meagre accounts of other events. Pepys is engrossed in his own good fortune and the office; Milward is not in Parliament yet, nor the invaluable Anchtell Grey. The Commons' Journals are, if possible, barer than ever, and the newspapers give very little Parliamentary news, for the very good reason that the members did their best to prevent the publishing of debates. Among the State Papers Domestic, it is true, there is a diary of sorts by Williamson, but it is very disappointing, and gives little besides what is in the Journals. The calendar of Sunderland Manuscripts ⁽¹⁾ has some interesting references. There is, however, one great exception to all this, and that is the surprisingly full and coherent reports of debates given in the Old Parliamentary History. But this is not a contemporary work, though it professes to be based on such. Its authors or compilers are unknown.

(1) Hist. MSS. Com. Vth. Report, part I.

The first edition seems to have issued like a bolt from the blue during the years 1751/61. ⁽¹⁾ A second edition was soon found necessary, owing to the demand for the book and the additional material which had come to light since the beginning of the venture. This second edition was issued in 1762/3/1. ⁽²⁾ In 1757 the compilers note in the Advertisement to the nineteenth volume that they have been "favoured by his Reverence the Dean of Exeter with the Minute-Book belonging to a Member of that Convention which restored the King, found in the Lyttleton Family, containing an exact Diary of the Debates of that assembly, from April 1660, to their dissolution in December following". They again mention this "Curious Manuscript" in their preface to volume XXII in 1760. This is but one example of additional material brought to their notice, though it is the only one that need concern us here. It was received in time to find a place in the first edition of volumes dealing with the Convention, and the pagination and contents of both editions for this period are the same.

(1) Vols. 1-9, 1751; 9-13, 1753; 13-18, 1755; 19-20, 1757; 21-22, 1760; 23-24 (Index), 1761.

(2) Vols. 1-3, 1762; 4-9, 1763; 10-13, 1762; 14-23, 1763; 24 (Index) 1761. There is a third copy in the British Museum of which vols. 1, 2, 14-18 and 21-23 are second edition and the remainder first. The second differs from the first mainly in the first three volumes. The History is from the earliest times to the Dissolution of the Convention Parliament in Dec. 1660, Restoration (see Advertisement vol. 19 p. iv.).

This diary was, besides the Journals of both Houses, the chief source of the compilers' information. It is apparently because of the editors' access to this source that the Parliamentary History's reports are so full, and its authenticity therefore is of prime importance in any discussion of the value of that History. The compilers describe it on the first occasion of its being used as a "curious Manuscript" which had certainly been "the note book of some member of this Parliament", and which had been sent in to the compilers since their last advertisement to the public. ⁽¹⁾ In a footnote to this statement they say:-"This Manuscript is by Way of a Diary, and begins with June 18 1660; but is broke into sometimes by Lacerations, etc. It is wrote in the Hand of the Times, coincides exactly with the Journals of the Commons, but is much more particular in the Names of the Speakers in each Debate. It was communicated to the Editors of this Work by the Rev: Charles Lyttleton, LL.D., Dean of Exeter, to whom they are also obliged for many other Favours of this Kind, in the Course of this History." ⁽²⁾ It will be seen that June is here cited as the beginning of the Diary, while in 1757 April was the date given. From this time onwards the Diary is constantly noticed as the source of their information, and differences ⁽³⁾

(1) O.P. xxii. 351 .

(2) O.P. xxii. 351.

(3) O.P. xxii. 366.

between it and the Journals recorded. The compilers were interested in the authorship of the Diary, but beyond a tentative suggestion that it was the work of a member of a certain committee, whose activities are so fully chronicled as to suggest an eye-witness's account, they can give no more definite clue.⁽¹⁾ On another occasion they remark of Sir Thomas Widdrington that he is "a Man whose History these Memeirs are full of",⁽²⁾ but it is hard to say what is the suggestion in this hint.

There are then two main clues to the whereabouts and authorship of this Diary. One is the reference to the Reverend C. Lyttleton, the other to that committee which managed the conference with the Lords on 24 August about the Bill of Indemnity.

The Rev. Charles Lyttleton was president of the Society of Antiquaries, to which society he left his manuscripts when he died.⁽³⁾ Presumably many of these were not in his actual possession at death, and so many are also found in the British Museum and in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. As far as can be traced no such diary is now amongst these collections of Lyttleton Manuscripts, nor has any mention of it been found in his correspondence, much of which was with other historians

(1) O.P. xxii. 446.

(2) O.P. xxii. 369.

(3) D.N.B.

and antiquarians of that time. This evidence is not encouraging, though there is evidence at least against the diary's being a forgery. It is hard to imagine the eighteenth century compiler who would invent such a blatant fiction about the great antiquarian; and so well-known a scholar would hardly let such a forgery pass without protest. There is no evidence that he did so protest. Lyttleton was a member of an old family, one of whom had sat in this Convention Parliament. The statement that the Diary was found in the family archives ⁽¹⁾ is probable on the face of it. He knew many of the most learned men of the day and it may possibly have come into the family possession by gift from one who knew his tastes. However it came into Lyttleton's hands, the likelihood is that once it left them for the compilers' it never returned.

The other clue to the authorship of the Diary is contained in the suggestion that it was written by a member of a certain committee. It is astonishingly difficult to reap the full benefit of this hint. Apparently it was the custom for the same committee to manage the conferences with the Lords time after time. Thus the entry in the Journals will read "That it be referred to the committee that managed the last conference," etc., or "That so, and so be added", and working backwards from a given date such as this it seems

(1) O.P. xix. 4.

impossible to find out exactly who did serve. It is, however, possible to find out who were usually named in this connection. Certain people, lawyers for the most part, seem more frequently "added" or noticed in some way than others when a conference on the Bill of Indemnity or the disbandment of the army was imminent, and of these a few will be briefly noticed here.

Among these Anthony Ashley Cooper is interesting, but nothing whatever to our purpose can be gained from his papers, as almost all have disappeared. Another man frequently on such committees in the Convention was the Diarist Sir John Northcote, member for Devonshire, and a noted Roundhead.⁽¹⁾ His note book for the Parliament of 1641 is well known. Printed with it are a few pages of notes about that of 1661, in which, however, he did not sit as a member. It is not unreasonable to suppose that such an assiduous note-taker may have been the author of the Diary under discussion. His name is frequently mentioned in the Old Parliamentary History reports. He most probably knew Harvell and Shapeott, men of his own party.

Sir Thomas Widdrington, whose name has already been noticed, served on the committee mentioned and on many others which met the Lords over this and the army business. It is interesting to note that he married a sister of Lord Fairfax.

(1) D.H.B.

During the spring of 1660 he was one of the Lords-Commissioner of the Great Seal. Apart from his distinction as a lawyer he has some reputation as a historian,⁽¹⁾ and thus had both the instincts and the opportunity for collecting the information given by the Diary. Again, nothing more definite may be presumed.

Curiously enough, yet another historian may have served on this committee, that is, the well-known brother-in-law of Monk, Sir Thomas Clarges. Other members of the committee and speakers in its deliberations were Denzil Holles, Sir George Booth of Cavalier fame, Sir Heneage Finch, Falkland and Mr. Trevor, all well-known men. Of Cott and Swinson, two other speakers, little else is known save that they were in all probability in the legal profession, and the latter was to retain his seat in the House in the next Parliament.

To discover from internal evidence alone the authorship of this Diary would be an impossible task, but there are some fairly clear indications of the writer's sympathies and tastes. He was inclined to that more moderate section to which perhaps Marvell himself belonged. He carefully reports debates on religion,⁽²⁾ noting mainly here, as in debates on the Militia the views of the moderate men. Probably although

(1) He was the author of "Analectae Eboracensis", now edited by Caine from MS. Egmont 2578.

(2) e.g. vol. xxii. pp.385-388, 20 July 1660.
xxiii. pp.27-30, Debate on 8 Nov. 1660

he was interested in the passage of the Bill of Indemnity he was not too nearly affected by it, and hardly devotes the space to it that might have been expected. Neither does he devote much attention to finance, though he was obviously keenly interested in the Militia question, and would seem to be anxious for a quick settlement consistent with liberty and order. ⁽¹⁾ This evidence is but vague, and so the whole question must be left for the present an interesting mystery.

(1) O.P. vol. xxiii. pp.14-15 and 22-24.

Appendix III.

(1)

THE ALARUM.

Like the duab man who found his tongue when he saw an arme fitted to kill his father, so I who never meddled with anything beyond my private concernments, being an enemy to knowing much more to writing state matters, cannot yet forbear, when I see my country in danger by the united villany of so many that conspire against it, when I see it is become the office of men in power to lay snares for our Liberties, and the practice of men in trust to betray them; when all the industry which should be used to maintayne the government, is applyed to alter it: when I see the end is resolved, and that they differ onely in the means, the onely question remaining, being whether it is by deceipt or violence that we are to be enslaved. I can no longer suppress those English thoughts that boyle within mee; my heart swelleth with a iust anger against men who would raise their fortunes out of the ruines of their country, and having accidentally some knowledge of the steps by which we are to destroyed, I could not let that guilt ly upon mee as not to impart some of those fears and the grounds of them to some of those few English gentlemen the corruption of this Age has left us. It is to men of that glorious character I chiefly direct this. I do

(1) S.P.Dom: 266. no.152.

not mean everyone that hath a coat of armes, that hath a coach in town or a fawconer in the country, but men made up of a well tempered mixture of liberty and allegiance, remember they are subjects, but do not forget that they are Englishmen: love due obedience as much as they hate slavery, have an inate love of freedome and a generous obstinacy to maintayne it: men that laugh at the poor temptation of profit and greatness, when that they ow to their country cometh in competition: of such men however reduced of late there are, I doubt not, enow remaining to rise up, and with a nolumus leges Angliae mutam, blow away the designs that are laying to destroy us. Know then my dear Countrymen, that the present Councells go upon these foundations; first if possible to gaine this present Parliament to such a compyanee that they shall be liberall of their money and sparing of their grevances, supply the King without looking back on ill conduct, or falling heavey upon the Authors of it. If this fayle it must be dissolved and a new one chosen: and if that should not answer what is expected from it: force is to bee got up as the last and surest expedient: towards the first these arts are used viz: the threatening those members who either out of vanity or interest are leath to part with their Authority, that the King wil infalliably desolve them upon their noncomplyance, intimating they have no Way of securing themselves to be Magistrates for life but by adhering to the

Court, which will bee a mutuall support to them: to the well meaning and disinterested men it is pressed of what ill consequence it may bee to cavle into things past, which they miscall flying in the King's face: that his Majesty being sensible of what hath been amisse; is now resolved to take new measures, such as shall bee agreable to his people: that all things conspire to make us the happiest nation in the world if the King hath the concurrence of Parliament in such things as he expected from them, but if the peevishe- nesse and faction of some, the iltimed zeal of others, shall destroy these fayre hopes, by insisting on such things to the King, as tend to his diminution, and by wounding him through the sides of his Ministers, if instead of supplying the King's wants and putting him in a position to support himselfe and protect us, they shall mispend their time in greviances and complaints, they will turn his heart from them, and drive him into a necessity of following those counceels which in his nature hee is averse to, by which they will lay the ground- work of such confusions as perhaps in our time we may not see the way out of. Such arguments as these are the more danger- ous to men who have an extraordinary tendernesse for the government; allegiance being no lesse than religion capable of superstitions; which maketh some good men so afraid to hurt the King or discompose the publick that they will duti-

fully let both bee undone: our Statesmen therefore fall upon the weak part of such men who may bee surprised though they cannot bee corrupted. To those members who are courtiers too there needs no other argument than the gentleman used to a little confessor hee had in his house, who making some scruples to absolve him upon such easy terms as hee required, was told hee might do as he pleased, onely if hee did not, hee should have no shirts: so if these gentlemen refused to vote obediently, they may all do as they please, but then they shall have no shirts. Therefore for these look upon them as so many [pawns] drawn up in the house of Commons against Magna Charta and the petition of right: but there is another sort of men harder to bee treated with, men of a more refined understanding and so exact in the calculation of mens parts, that will iudge them to a farthing, their measure being according as a man gets more or lesse by them: yet they are self denying men, for they renounce the vain glory of a good name and the vanity of aquitting themselves well of their trust; they leave it to well meaning fools to think doing ones duty carrieth any reward with it; they must have something more essential and yet they love the King to such a degree that they worship his image but then it must bee upon his coyne. Their idolatry goeth no further: the good men have drunk all in the boale and desire some of his

medals, onely to wear for his sake, this goeth hard with an empty exchequer, but what will not an able Minister that is afraid do to soften the angry men? if a little money will turn these mastiffes into spaniells is it not well bestowed? therefore these gentlemen must bee represented to the King as well meriting men that have not had due recompense: hee must bee told these are the heros of the house, the best but a dull heard wholely at their dispose: that everyone of them hath a legion of members in his belly, so that in purchasing them he buyeth the whole house. That though his Maiesty soweth in tears, he shall reap in ioy since every shilling so bestowed, shall produce, a thousand in a subsidy: these arguments prevailing money that is wanting to pay wages is found to corrupt a Parliament. The great instruments of this distribution are, first my Lord Arlington who besides promises of this or that place, telleth out ready money to these hirelings who engage to betray their country for it. You may imagine his Lordship desireth the King may bee put in a condition not to want Parliaments. He knoweth that they are saucey things, and make bold to enquire both into the faults and the abilities of men in power, and he hath iust wit enough to bee sensible he cannot bear the scrutiny. The poor man is but the signe of a Secretary and can do nothing that belongs to his place, but receive the profits of it: and to do him

right hee loveth businesse no better than business loveth him, but he hath not yet got ten thousand a year, and till then he will not leave the box though hee cannot drive: Were this man freed from the fear of Parliament hee would bee as insolent as he is ignorant. The next in the negociation is his man Clifford, who you may bee sure layeth about him, Here's one hath a great mind to be Minister perhaps because his father was one, hee playeth no small game nor catcheth at small profits by which he would seem to neglect his fortunes, but it is that hee may make it all at once. He sets up to bee a generous man, by being free of the King's wine, at his table, and of his money in the treasury, but do not mistake the man he hath too much ambition and too little money to be content. Hee would bee at the top and thinketh of it at this very houre, and if things succeed as he hath layd them you will see him throw off my Lord Arlington's livery and set up for himself. but in order to do this the great work of cheating the Parliament must bee carryed on, in which he neither spareth his own paynes nor the King's Money. It may bee worth observing how hee will behave himselfe when anything concerning my Lord of Sandwich cometh in question: what part hee had with him in the miscarriage or should have had in the plunder at Bergen is with great care concealed from us: but there is so great a dearnesse that it

maketh men guesse they know that of one another, which the world suspects of them. Shall I forget my Lord Ashley? Good God! what a knave is here? this is knavery bound up in little, the very abridgement of villany. The world called him an ingenious man. I suppose it is because hee is not yet hanged, a thing hee deserveth at least once a day. To speak truth hee hath some good nature for he pitieth an honest man, and wonders at his mistake: hee is said to understand the King's revenue, no wonder, for he has a share in every farme so in one sense he maketh it his business. This spider goeth up and down to poyson and corrupt men, and is thankful for the employment; hee obligeth him that maketh a rogue of him, for there lyeth his talent, and hee is proud of showing it. His business at this time is to go privately to Parliament men to convince them by his own experience how wise a thing it is to be a knave. What shall I say of Sir Thomas Lyttleton that angry man against the court till hee was silenced by a good place: he is now at least content, every thing should be let alone, he is grown very descreet and mighty tender of discomposing things, now hee hath got what hee grumbled for: you would find him of opinion the King's ministers ought to be sacred, that his Maiesty must be supplied with the rest of those dutiful maxims that are natural to men that hope to get by them. Hee will not bee very earnest,

but if anybody is disposed to betray the trust and vote against their conscience he will conceive they do exceeding well in it. This is the game now playing. These men go up and down cheapening all wee have and if care be not taken wee shall have no other security for being sold but that there is not money enough to buy us. these gentlemen are indeed very zealous to get the King supplied but we must not mistake them so as to think it is for his sake: they onely do as a gamster I knew, who sollicited and took great paynes to procure money for a country gentleman not out of kindnesse but with the prospect of playing with him for it and cheating him. but to the point: if these arts succeed here's a Parliament to be kept like a ded horse that at last will kick us out of our liberties. but if these designes do not take then here's a great deal of money all layed out. My gentlemen must cast about to get it back againe. The natural expedient to men that are uneasy is to change, if these cards are unkind they will take another pack: upon this logick the king must desolve Parliament, if you ask why? it is for not betraying the trust. Marke the contrivance; it hath perhaps been a greviance, that it hath continued so long and now it will be so cunningly ordered that the natives will dislike the breaking them but let them do so let that pass our great men are resolved to try in this case

and they will find nothing will do but their last remedy and thats an army. Well, this will be plain dealing worth a hundred of all their small tricks to pick our pockets. This will bee brave open robbery. in the mean time it is a pious designe to persuade a good King to bee a Tyrant, and to endeavour to make a free people slaves, and honourable contrivance to make a Prince destroy the liberties of a people that called him in, a deep advice to bid him throw away the he hath to govern by law to take up that of force, to which any man hath an equal right that can attain to it. When this is to bee done, Sir Thomas Clifford will bee no small man, a great part of the military model of government will bee left to him in his nature he loveth absolute power and therefore whispereth it to the King; a plausible text to Princes, and to make it more so he persuadeth it easy to be compassed; by this he recommendeth himself to favour and insinuateth himselfe into power, gets to be trusted with the secret and the contrivance, in short he's one that needeth a civill warre, and therefore sure to promote a standing army. Upon the whole let's state the case a little and wonder at it. Here's the King still beloved in spite of the ill conduct of his Ministers; hee hath mispent some money, the nation doth not very much repine at it, onely desireth that they who have made so fayre a progresse towards his ruine,

may not be suffered to finish it; what hurt is this to the King? or what want of modesty in the people, who desire the king may bee rich but withal that they may not bee undone? Yes Sir, says the men in power, you give up your crown if you do not support your Ministers. Let us bee never so guilty if wee are touched you are lessened. what logick is this? and what misery that it should prevail? is it not wonderful the King should let these men come in the balance with the whole Nation? Do they not use him as Smith did the Indian in Virginia where being set upon he tyed one he had with him to his girdle to receive the arrows that were shot at him. Do not these men iust so ty the King to their girdle, and expose him to the shot which is levelled at them by the Parliament. There must bee fate or enchantment can induce the king to protect these whom hee of all men living ought most to prosecute: bee it what it will, the charme must bee dissolved. were the consequence of preserving these men in their greatnesse anything lesse than the Ruine of the Nation, men might be persuaaded to lament and aquies; but in this case it is become part of our allegiencie to take care the King may not bee undone. We need not fear but he will forgive the importunity of a people that love him, or that he will take it ill, if in this exigency wee wrestle with him for a blessing. Gentlemen this is the critical time of saving

England. Yet a little sleep and a little more slumber and want cometh upon us like an armed man. let these weeds take a little deeper root, and they may perhaps grow out of the reach of a Parliament. Pluck them up before they grow too big: shew the Nation a Parliament can do something else as well as give away their money: relieve the King from his wants, but at the same time rescue him from his Ministers; acquit your selves of the duty you ow him, but remember you ow something to those that chose you.

FFarewell

[dorso.] For Mr. Garroway

[Note by Williamson.] The Alarme A libell scattered in Westminster Hall Oct: 20 1669 at ye meeting of Parliament.

NOTE. This libel presents some interesting features. The first is the manner of its distribution, which seems to have been similar to that of Marvell's mock speech in 1675, though we do not know if that were, as this is, addressed to members by name. The ideas in the pamphlet are not new, but a curious parallel to the Last Instructions runs through them. This has been noticed in connection with the description of the country gentry (I. 286 seq:). The charges in the connection of the plot of the "courtiers" to gain supply and then dissolve Parliament (I. 124) and for a standing army (ibid passim) are exactly similar.

Marvell's pendant to the Last Instructions "To the King" is interestingly parallel to the last paragraph of the Alarme. The outcry, not against the King, but the courtiers, the certainty that Charles will be grateful for the advice given, were obviously the ideas prevalent among the country gentry, and were also, of course, a tactful way of rebuking the King. But the Alarme follows so closely this poem that perhaps it was written by someone who followed Marvell's work. This idea is strengthened by the repetition of the Charge made by Marvell against Arlington, though in a slightly modified form. But the figure of the bribe is the same. It makes the same charges as those brought by Marvell against Clifford in his letter to Popple 21 March 1670 (Grosart II. 315).

The authorship of the libel is unknown. Williamson does not attribute it to anyone. But in the catalogue of ALL SOULS' COLLEGE, Oxford, a copy there is listed under Marvell's name, though no grounds for doing so are given. Perhaps the points noted above were taken to show a more direct connection. The fact, too, that it starts as Marvell once prefaced a speech of his by a disclaimer of frequent speaking may have been considered. The style has the merit of point and wit, but lacks a certain neatness (perhaps due to the faulty and often non-existent punctuation) which Marvell's too most often lacks. The method of working in an allusion is similar to his. Yet on the whole it does not strike one as Marvellian. I would suggest, however, that it shows his influence in moulding the clichés and methods of attack of his own party.

Joseph Ayliffe, or the author of the poem On the Death of his excellent friend, Mr. Andrew Marvell, may have intended a reference to this Alarme when he said that it was Marvell

"Th' alarum strait their courage did excite,

"Which checked the haughty foes' bold enterprize." etc.

But of course too much stress must not be laid on a reference which could easily bear other interpretations.

Appendix IV.

Marvell's Parliamentary Committees, Speeches etc.

1. In Richard Cromwell's Parliament:

Committees

- 5 February 1658/9, to consider Elizabeth Lilbourne's petition.
 5 February 1658/9, to consider the supply of an able ministry for the five Northern counties.
 31 March 1659, to consider whether Durham should be represented in Parliament.
 13 April 1659, to examine the petition of the disbanded forces in Lancashire.
 14 April 1659, to consider where to place the records then at Worcester House, which is to be returned to its owner.

II. In the Convention Parliament:

Committees

- 25 June 1660, to examine the petition of the University of Oxford.
 30 June 1660, to examine the reports of seditious papers derogatory to the authority of Parliament.
 23 July 1660, to prepare a letter to the Prince Elector.
 29 August 1660, to consider reparation to the Earl of Bristol out of the land of Carew Raleigh.
 3 September 1660, to consider the spending of money to redeem captives at Algiers.
 4 September 1660, to report on the draining of the fens.
 6 November 1660, to prepare a bill for the settlement of the Militia.
 7 November 1660, to prepare a bill for the endowment of vicarages.
 9 November 1660, to consider the petition of M. Clarke.
 14 November 1660, to consider a bill for the voluntary separation of married persons.
 15 November 1660, to settle a chapel of ease in the forest of Waltham.
 26 November 1660, to consider a bill about Cleveland's estate.
 18 December 1660, to consider (as member for a seaport) a bill for the encouragement of fisheries.

iii. Parliamentary Privilege, etc.

Committees

- 31 March 1659, to consider whether Durham should be represented in Parliament.
- 11 May, 1661, to consider elections and privileges.
- 14 May 1661, to confirm public acts.
- 18 February 1662/3, to consider elections and privileges, also in November and January 1663/4, twice named for this committee while in Russia.
- 21 September 1666, to consider elections, etc.
- 18 January 1666/7, to look into defaulters (absentees).
- 21 October 1667, added to a committee of privileges.
- 25 November 1667, to enquire into a charge of corruption, and the French Merchant Company.
- 13 November 1669, added to a committee of privileges.
- 7 November 1669, teller for the noes against the election of Mr. Palmer (Bridgwater, Rolle v. Palmer).
- 22 March 1669/70, Added to committee of elections etc.
- 1 February 1672/3, to consider elections and privileges.
- 31 January 1673/4, to examine the case of Mr. Masters and a charge of bribery.
- 22 April 1675, teller for the yeas for a bill to prevent M.P.s' taking office.
- 23 October 1676, to hinder Papists' sitting in Parliament.
- 26 February 1676/7, teller for committee of privileges on question of Newark burgesses.
- 23 May, 1678, to consider privileges.
- 24 May 1678, to consider temporary laws that are expiring.

iv. Financial:

Committees

- 3 September 1660, to consider the spending of money to redeem captives at Algiers.
- 5 January 1666/7, to consider a bill about the price of wine.
- 22 March 1669/70, to consider a bill for the recovery of arrears on his Majesty's Royal aid on offices.
- 26 January 1670/1, for settling between his Majesty and James about the wine licences.
- 2 March 1670/1, to inspect a former bill for regulating hearth money.
- 18 February 1673/4, to consider a bill for hearth money.
- 7 May 1675, to suppress pedlars.
- 10 November 1675, to instruct the counties about the excise.
- 21 February 1676/7, teller against Temple's chairmanship of the committee on supply.

v. London:

Marvell, though of course not a Londoner by birth, was by residence a Londoner for many years. After his return from the Fairfaxes in 1652, with the exception of his stay at Eton with Dutton, his embassy to Russia and several smaller journeys to "enjoy the spring" (see letter to Harley 3 May 1673, Hist. MSS. Com. XIV, II. 343), he was continuously in residence either at Highgate or Covent Garden and thereabouts.

Committees

- 2 October 1666, to enquire into the causes of the late fire (added).
- 28 November 1666, *ibid.* renewed.
- 5 March 1669/70, *ibid.* (added).
- 11 March 1669/70, to consider the repairing of churches.
- 30 March 1671, to consider the differences of compensation due between houses burnt or blown up in the Great Fire.
- 10 April 1671, to consider perpetrating powers for rebuilding London in the Mayor and Corporation.
- 28 February 1672/3, to consider a bill touching the blowing up etc. of houses for preventing the fire.
- 24 March 1673/3, to consider a bill for the paving of London streets.
- 2 April 1677, to consider erecting a court of conscience for the city.

vi. Religious:

- 5 February 1658/9, to consider the supply of an able ministry for the Northern counties.
- 7 November 1660, to prepare a bill for the endowment of vicarages.
- 15 November 1660, to settle a chapel of ease in the forest of Waltham.
- 24 November 1660, teller for yeas for making the Declaration of Breda law (the yeas lost, 117-131).
- 29 June 1661, to consider the separation of Hessele and Trinity Church.
- 4 July 1661, to consider the separation of Wrotham and Plexell.
- 5 March 1661/2, to consider the maintenance of ministers in Corporation and market towns.
- 11 November 1670, to consider pluralities.
- 2 March 1670/1, to consider a bill to prevent the growth of Popery.
- 19 May 1675, to settle for charitable uses land for the parish of Kells Hall, Suffolk.
- 26 March 1677, to repeal *de Haeretico Comburendo*.
- 27 March 1677, to deal with a bill for securing the Protestant education for the children of James II.
- 22 March 1678, to consider rectories in Llanrhayds.

vii. Committees on semi-legal matters, such as the selling of land, petitions, etc.

Committees

- 5 February 1658/9, to consider Elizabeth Lilbourne's petition.
 25 June 1660, to examine the petition of the University of Oxford.
 29 August 1660, to consider reparation to the Earl of Bristol, out of the land of Carew Raleigh.
 9 November 1660, to consider the petition of M. Crake.
 26 November 1660, to consider a bill about Cleveland's estate.
 28 June 1661, to consider about Cleveland's estate.
 11 January 1661/2, to consider a bill about Sir W. Brownlow, trustee for Lady Wandesford's lands.
 3 April 1662, to consider vesting the land of C. Morley (of Yorks.).
 10 April 1662, to consider a bill for the sale of Copleston's lands.
 11 April 1662, to consider a bill from the Lords about bankrupts.
 12 May 1663, to consider the vesting of Copleston's lands to pay his debts.
 27 October 1666, to consider a bill for selling the estate of Mildmay, deceased.
 10 November 1666, to consider a bill to prevent suits against tenants (added).
 16 November 1666, to consider a bill to make void a lease by T. Pride.
 4 February 1666/7 to consider Lord Abergeromy's bill (about land).
 11 March 1667, to consider the petition of Mr. Will. Carr.
 7 April 1668, to consider raising £6,000 out of Lenthall's estate etc.
 16 April 1668, to vacate a degree in alimony (Whorwood's estate).
 18 November 1669, to settle differences between E. Lee and the daughters of Sir T. Pope.
 2 December 1669, to consider a bill about jurors.
 1 March 1669/70, to consider Davidson's case.
 14 March 1669/70, to consider the stealing of children.
 19 March 1669/70, to consider the sale of Prettyman's land.
 3 March 1670/71, *ibid.* (added).
 22 March 1670/71, to consider the sale of Clarke's land.
 31 March 1671, to consider the sale of T. Harleken's land.
 7 April 1671, to enable Chas. and Mary Howard to levy and suffer a fine.
 27 February 1672/3, to confirm an award and to end the difficulties of Sir T. Woolrich.
 3 November 1675, to confirm the sales made by the heirs of Leonard Robinson's estate.
 5 March 1676/7, to rectify mistakes in the marriage settlement of Lord Maynard.
 12 March 1676/7, to enable Mr. Aubrey's trustees to sell sand.
 15 March 1676/7, to suppress pedlars.
 12 February 1677/8, to consider the case of several bankrupts
 4 Richard Thompson (?), Ed. Nelthrop.

vii. (continued).

- 2 April 1677, to confirm agreements about execution of writs
in Cirencester.
19 June 1678, to consider the case of J. Fortescue and children.

Bills of naturalisation.

- 13 December 1666, to naturalise several persons (added).
16 November 1675, to naturalise Jacob Daniel.
2 April 1677, to naturalise Peter Renew.

viii. Foreign Policy.

- 17 October 1667, to consider the miscarriage of the late war.
17 October 1667, to consider the sale of Dunkirk.
3 February 1673/4, to prepare reasons to be used at a confer-
ence with the Lords on a vote of Advice for
peace with Holland.
30 April 1678, to report on Williamson's abstract of alliances.

ix. Committee about Draining various "Fenny Lands".

- 4 September 1660,
20 March 1668, teller for the yeas that Lindsey level bill
be postponed.
5 March 1669/70, on a bill for draining Deepening Fen.
11 November 1670, to discuss a bill of Henry Williams for
draining certain fenny lands.
15 March 1677/8, a bill to repair the bridge over the river
Vyrnwy.

x. Naval or Maritime Affairs:

Committees

- 29 January 1661/2, to deal with a bill to prevent Customs frauds.
 26 October 1665, on the matter of Price goods (added).
 17 October 1667, on the sale of Dunkirk.
 23 April 1668, to deal with Chamberlain's bill to improve navigation.
 30 March 1670, to discuss a bill to prevent ravages of pirates.
 10 November 1670, to deal with a bill to navigate the rivers Boston and Trent.
 10 November 1670, to deal with a bill for the encouragement of shipping, etc.
 23 November 1670, to deal with a bill for providing for the repair of the port of Boston.
 14 April 1671, to discuss a bill to prevent seamen's disturbances. (22 March 1673, committee of all port M.P.s about plantations etc)
 23 April 1675, to discuss a bill for the preservation of piscary.
 8 November 1675, to deal with a bill for making the Derwent navigable.
 9 November 1675, to consider the petition of clothiers and seamen about the East India Company.
 8 March 1676/7, to examine the petition of John Wise, Robert Stephens, Perient, Trott, merchants of the Bermuda Company.

 Marvell's Poems contain much about naval matters, especially
 The Poem on Blake, 1655.
 The Last Instructions, 1667.
 The Loyal Scot, 1665.

xi. Trade and miscellaneous:

- 6 November 1660, to settle the Militia.
 17 February 1661/2, teller for yeas on a proviso to a bill on poor relief about soldiers in garrison towns.
 11 March 1661/2, to prevent the importation of bonelace.
 28 April 1662, to encourage the growth of flax and hemp (added).
 1 June 1663, to inspect the act about transporting wool (as member for a port).
 5 January 1666/7, to consider the price of wine.
 9 March 1667/8, to regulate the silk-throwers' trade.
 8 February 1670/1, to help indigent loyal officers.

xii. Speeches, reports from committees, teller, etc:.

- 15 Nov:1660. Reports from committee on the bill for the augmentation of small vicarages.
- 24 Nov:1660. Teller for the yease on the Breda Declaration bill.
- 27 Dec:1660. Speaks on behalf of Milton.(?)
- 14 May 1661. Presents petition about the separation of Trinity Church, Hull from Hessle.
- 17 Feb:1661/2 Teller for yeas for a provison to a bill about poor relief.
- 18 Mar:1661/2 Marvell and Clifford dispute in the House.
- 20 Mar:1661/2
- 14 Oct:1667 Speaks against thanking the King for removing Clarendon.
- 29 Oct:1667 Speaks against imprisoning Clarendon.(Date? 30 Oct)
- 31 Oct:1667 Speaks against sending Pett to the Tower.
- 7(?)Nov:1667 Speaks on Seymours statement about Clarendon saying the King was not fit to govern.
- 14 Feb: 1667/8 Speaks against Arlington.
- 17 Feb:1667/8. Speaks on the miscarriages of the war.
- 26 Mar:1668. Speaks on behalf of the Merchant Adventurers.
- 27 Mar:1668. Teller for yeas that the bill for draining Lindsey Level be postponed.
- 7 Dec:1668. Teller for noes, i.e. against the election of Palmer.
- 29 Nov:1670. Teller for noes, against the election of Jay.
- 22 Mar:1670/1. Teller for noes, against the reading of a proviso that those punished by the Conventicle Bill(Then being debated)should not be punished by any similar act.
- 22 Ap:1675. Teller for yeas on a bill to prevent M.P.s taking office.
- 21 Feb:1676/7. Teller for noes, against R.Temple being in the chair at committee of supply.
- 26 Feb:1676/7. Teller for noes, against election of the government candidate for Newarke.
- 27 Mar:1677. Speaks against the bill for educating the royal children in the Protestant religion.
- 29 Mar:1677. Defends himself from the Speaker's accusation of attacking Harcourt, and against the Speaker's attack on him in his absense the previous day.
-

Appendix V.

An attempt to show Marvell's contribution to our knowledge of Parliamentary debates by his Growth of Popery.

Abbreviations used:

where Marvell's account is cited the Growth of Popery.
 Grosart's edition, is referred to.
 Grey-A. Grey's Debates.
 C.J.-Commons' Journals. Vol V III. IX.
 L.J.-Lords' Journals. Vol XII. XIII.
 Grosart II. or Letters-Marvell's letters edited by Grosart.

The first part of the narrative section of the Growth of Popery contains little material not easily accessible elsewhere. The chief problem it presents is that of how Marvell managed to gain access to material only available in the Lords' Journals.

24 Oct: 1670. Marvell p.267 seq: Bridgemen's speech in full from a written copy, source unknown, although Marvell mentions in a letter to Hull at the time of the speech (Letters p.350-1) the difficulty of obtaining such copies. Grey (I.269) has a précis of the speech only.

27 Oct: 1670. Marvell p.273. The form of the supply only is noted, and might easily have been remembered by the notes of his own letters of the time to Hull, or from the Commons' Journals (514-519). Grey gives accounts of many debates throughout this session (I.270 etc).

4 Feb: 1672/3. Marvell p.291 gives merely King's and Carleton's speeches, now printed in L.J.524-5. Marvell's source unknown.

27 Oct: 1673. Marvell p.295. The phrase "Pro aris et focis" is not in Grey's account. Marvell summarises debates, but no quotation can be identified with Grey's report. (II.202-3)

13 Ap: 1675. Marvell p.305. The Test Controversy. The Letter from a Person of Quality (1675) gives, as Marvell himself remarks, the fullest account of this.

13 Oct: 1675. Marvell p.312. A summary only, perhaps from the Journals.

Lists, Marvell p. 318. I cannot find where Marvell obtained these.

The second part of the narrative deals with the session beginning 15 Feb: 1676/7, and is that to which Marvell devotes his detailed attention. Pages 319-410 with some comments are occupied by an account of parliamentary proceedings.

15 Feb: 1676/7. Marvell p.320 seq:

King's speech (reported in L.J.36/7). Grey (IV.63) gives a longer account. Finch's speech (L.J.36/7) Grey does not mention at all, but Marvell gives no details of its contents, only noting its effect. The debates in the Commons about the long prorogation are telescoped together by Marvell, who is not nearly so full as Grey (IV.67 etc.). The speaker Marvell ridicules for suggesting the prorogation was an adjournment, and afterwards mentions again as asking whether he might have liberty to address the house, is shown by comparison with Grey to have been Sacheverel..Marvell contributes nothing to our knowledge of the day's events (p.320) (Grey IV.64, 75, 81 seq:). Note Marvell dates Sacheverel's speech as "Munday", but Grey reports it on Saturday 17 (p.81). Monday 19 was occupied by other business (C.J.

The debates in the Lords given by Marvell (p.321 seq) are not in Grey, nor are they in the Lords' Journals, having been expunged thence later in the reign. (Burnet II 116) gives substantially the same account, but does not mention the part played by Arundel and Frechwell; he does, however, mention Holles and Wharton as speakers. Buckingham's speech on this occasion is printed in his Works (1715) (p.220, 276). Marvell mentions the progress of the affair in his letters (p.507), but as usual gives there no details.

The debate in the Commons (p.322/3), mentioned by Marvell here and in the Seasonable Argument, on the pensioners in the House, is not reported by Grey, though Grey reports several debates on libels and pamphlets, e.g. that on Cary, etc. It is impossible to identify the speech here quoted. The date of the debate also is unknown.

Dr. Cary's Case (March 1677): see L.J.54/6, Grosart II. 515, 523 and here, Marvell Growth of Popery p.333. Marvell gives nothing of the Commons debate on the matter, merely commenting upon their complaisance in it.

Harrington's Case (16/17 March 1676/7) (p.333-6). Marvell devotes some space to his charge, mentions his fortune in being able to get a friend to present his petition to the House [Sacheverel: see Grey (IV.261)] and gives some account of the debate on that occasion [mentioned as "intricate" (Grosart II.528)]. Williamson's speech noted by Marvell (335) is given much more

fully by Grey (IV.262). The divers members who attested that soldiers had affirmed Harrington's statements to them are not, however, identifiable in the debate, which continued through several days' sessions (Grey IV.261-283) as he gives it.

Wednesday 21 Feb: Marvell pp.336/7 gives the result of the debate more fully reported by Grey (V.112-130).

A dispute over the Chairmanship of the Committee on Supply is referred to by Marvell (p.325) and noticed in his letters to Hull for 20, 22 Feb: (Letters pp.510,511). Marvell was one of the tellers in the following division.

27 Feb: Marvell (ibid) does not in any way supplement Grey, but his letters to Hull (Letters p.514 etc.) give the same information as that here.

The financial news in the Growth of Popery may well have been supplied from the notes Marvell himself took at the time, in order to transmit to Hull.

The debates on the Act for educating Royal Children and Act for the conviction of recusants: pp.338/9, 340, 353.

Marvell treats these in reverse chronological order. The debate on the first took place on 20 March 1677 (Grey IV. 284-296) and 27 March 1677 (Grey IV.318,326). He prints the text of the bill in full (for an account of the differences between his text and that of the Lords' MSS. see Hist: MSS: Com: IX, 81a.), the only version of it we have printed. He only mentions further in connection with it two debates (p.362), and the fact that some of the committee (on which he served) elected R.S. [=Robert Sawyer] chairman. This was the occasion of his longest speech.

The debate on the second bill, which Marvell dismisses before dealing with the first (p.339), follows the report of Grey (IV.334 seq.; 4 Ap) fairly closely, without mentioning any names of speakers. Marvell notes the speech of (i) Sacheverel, "a gentleman of great worth & apprehention", Garroway (ii), a speaker noted by Grey, who does not however mention the phrase "a particular mark of infamy". Williams would be the third speaker (iii), "desiring to see if any would speak for it". Marvell slightly exaggerates when he says it was forthwith rejected, for Grey gives us particulars of thirteen more speeches before this, though, it is true, all more or less supported Sacheverel's motion. Ralph uses Marvell's account.

Marvell now goes on to remark (p.353) on the unanimity of the remainder of the session, but goes back to 6 March to show this. He does not give any particulars of debates (see Grey IV.188 seq; Sawyer was in the Chair), but prints, perhaps from C.J. xp.393, the resolution of the House. A copy of the address was sent by Marvell to Hull, and is also printed among his letters (p.523). Grey also prints the King's answer, 17 March (IV.268); the "comfortable answer" is referred to in the letter on p.528.

Marvell prints the second address (26 March Motion, cf: C.J.406/408) as does Grey, under the date of March 30th. (IV.331). Grey notes two debates, one on the Motion (26 March, p.305) and one on the address itself (30 March, p.331 seq:). Marvell gives copious notes about these debates, but it is difficult to distinguish between the two days (pp.356-360), as he divides up all the arguments into those for and those against, and does not bother to keep to any order, a method which would only be possible, however, if he had fairly good notes before him of what happened. If these were Grey's the close similarity between the two accounts is explained. They must otherwise have taken very similar notes and remarked the same points, a very possible eventuality, however. Marvell summarises the arguments for and against the address, and it is often difficult to identify the speakers, though he sometimes seems to quote verbatim.

(1)

- p.356. Par:1. Grey IV.332. Ernly on 30 March or Williamson (p.314) 26 March.
 Par:2. Grey IV.305. Trevor on 26 March.
 Par:3. Grey IV.314. Williamson on 26 March.
 Par:4. Grey IV.332. Ernly on 30 March and Williamson (p.314) 26 March.
 Par:5. Grey IV.310. Williamson on 26 March.
 Par:6. ibid.
 Par:7. ibid.
 Par:8. ibid.
 Par:9. and over page. Grey IV.307/8. Ernly on 26 March.
 Marvell has retained a more expressive phrase "slip collar" where Grey's report runs "give us the slip".
- p.357. Par:1. Grey IV.309. (Williamson on 26 March) ?
 Par:2. (ibid) E

(1) Grosart does not number Marvell's prose lines, so that here I have for convenience taken the paragraphing as a guide, counting as no.1 on p.357 that beginning "It was alledged.."etc. and no.1 on p.358 that beginning "That it was next.."etc.

Arguments for the address begin:-

- p.357. Par:3. Grey IV.332. Meres on 30 March.
 Par:4. Grey IV.332/3. Powle on 30 March.
 Par:5. Grey IV.305. Clarges on 26 March.
 Par:6. Grey IV.311. Powle on 26 March.
 Par:7 and over page. Grey IV.315. Eliab Harvey on
 26 March ; also Littleton. Grey IV.308/9.
- p.358. Par:1. Grey IV. Littleton on p.308 ?
 Par:2. ibid ?
 Par:3. Grey IV.311. Powle and Vaughan both are "sorry"etc.
 Par:4. Grey IV.309. Littleton on 26 March.
 Par:5. ibid.
 Par:6. ibid.
- p.359. Par:1. Grey IV.304/5. Robert Thomas and Birch. p.307
 26 March.
 Par:3. Grey IV.311. Powle on 26 March.
 Par:4. Grey IV.334 or 306. Speeches of Birch.
- p.360. Par:1. Grey IV.312. Sir Henry Capel on 26 March.
 Par:2. and 3. Neither argument here is reported among
 Grey's speakers on any occasion.

It is very interesting to compare Marvell's and Grey's accounts. My impression is that they are from two separate sets of notes taken by members actually present. Marvell only gives the sense of the arguments, though nearly enough to the reported speech given by Grey to make identification of speakers possible. He must, however, have had access to some notes of the debates in the original form, for his phrases frequently follow so closely the original speech.

April 11th., 1677 Marvell prints the King's message (C.J. 418, Grey IV.343) and comments on the anxiety of the House at the long delay in sending it (p.360-361). He says that Coventry presented it; Grey says Williamson (p.343). Grey gives an account of the "somewhat" said that day which Marvell only mentions (343-351). His letter to Hull (Grosart II. p.542, 12 Ap: 1677) says Williamson, and adds here that the debate grew difficult. He does not give any account of the debate on the 12th, merely stating that it took place, beginning at ten o'clock.

18 Ap: 1677. Grey has nothing but extracts from the Journals, as he was out of town on this day. Marvell's account is

full, and occupies pp.361-369.

13 Ap: 1677. The address is printed by Marvell p.369 and by Grey p.351.etc:.

16 Ap: 1677. The King's Message p.370-1 (Letters p.545), in Grey 353/4, but Grey has no account of the debate mentioned by Marvell, 371/2.

16 Ap: 1677 p.372, Commons' Address, in Grey 354/5, C.J.IX, 423.

21 May 1677 - 16 July. Marvell 375-408 seq.: This account is substantially the same as that in S.P.Dom:393.no 179, and in Chandler, etc: . Grey gives more detail in names of speakers etc:-(Grey IV 355-388).

Marvell is fuller for 26 May; on the 28 May Grey reports an incident not in Marvell(p.389). He further supplies details about the protests Marvell notes on p.405 at the adjournment. Grey.IV.390/1:cf: Marvell to Hull 29 May 1677(Grosart II 557).

16 July. Marvell p.407. Mentions a mover and seconder of the motion to have the order for adjournment read. In a letter to Harley(Hist:MSS:Com:XIV.rep:II.p.355), Marvell gives the names of Cavendish and Williams, and a rather more spirited account of the excitement than that given by Grey.(IV.391), but it may be noticed that he writes throughout the letter as though he had the information second hand, not as an eye witness.

3 Dec: 1677 p.409-410. Grey V.I. only mentions the meeting but Marvell relates that some protest was offered by a worthy member(?) trying to speak, though Mr Seymour (the Speaker) a third time adjourned them without putting the question. The incident is mentioned in a letter to Hull of a day later. (Grosart.II.565), but no clue given to speaker's names.

(1) Possibly Sacheverell; he is once before referred to as "worthy" (p.339).

The Appendix to the Growth of Poetry. List of Ships, etc:.

This does not appear in the first edition of 1677(8). It is printed for the first time in the folio edition of 1678, whence Grosart reprints it. The State tracts also reprint it, but Thompson follows the first edition. There is no reason to suppose that it has anything 'Marvellian' about it. It must have been the addition of some other pamphleteer after his death. Its precise object, too, is doubtful as Marvell had made very little reference to its subject in his text.

Appendix VI.

The Marvell Legend.

Marvell's Ghost, by Mr. Jo. Ayloffe (Poems on Affairs of State) 1689) etc. starts

"From the dark Stygian Lake I come
"To acquaint poor England with her Doom." 47 lines.

Marvell's Ghost, Being a true copy of a Letter sent to the A.Bp. of England, upon his sudden Sickness, upon the Prince of Orange's first Arrival into London. 1688/9.
(Poems on Affairs of State, 1707. IV. p.318) 83 lines.

The Limehouse Dream, by Andrew Marvell Junior, 1710.

19th Century:

1829 The Danger of the Removal of Catholic Disabilities considered by Andrew Marvell Junior.

1838 A Letter to the Rev. Miller, etc. with Respect to Baptism, by Andrew Marvell Junior.

1855 No Better than we should be, or Travels in Search of Consistency (2nd Edition), by Andrew Marvell Junior.

All are tracts against "Popish innovation".

Poems on Marvell:

Thompson III. pp.482-493 gives a list of poems and notices of Marvell with extracts from them. There are absolutely no grounds for supporting his attribution of "On his excellent Friend Mr. Marvell" to Sheffield, To his list may be added the following

Mr. Marvell's Character, Anon. Hist. MSS. Com.VI. 343a.
"Tho' faith in oracles be long since ceased..."

Wordsworth, Sonnets. England. 1802. III.

"Great men have been among us: hands that penn'd
"And tongues that uttered wisdom--better none:
"The later Sidney, Marvell, Harrington,
"Young Vane, and others who called Milton friend."

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

PART I.

I. COLLECTED EDITIONS OF MARVELL'S WORKS.

1. Verse.
2. Prose.
 - a. Letters.
 - b. Pamphlets.

II. PAMPHLETS.

1. The Rehearsal Transpos'd.
The Rehearsal Transpos'd Controversy.
2. Mr. Smirke.
 - a. Mr. Smirke
The Naked Truth Controversy.
 - b. The Historical Essay.
3. Pamphlets on Religious Toleration.
4. The Defence of John Howe.
5. The Mock Speech.
6. The Growth of Popery.
Imitations of the Growth of Popery.
Answers to the Growth of Popery.
7. The Seasonable Argument.
8. Pamphlets on Popery, Shaftesbury etc.
9. Pamphlets on the Duration of Parliament.

III. SATIRES OF THE PERIOD.

IV. LIVES OF MARVELL, MARVELL CRITICISM etc.

V. THE RUSSIAN EMBASSY.

PART II.

I. BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

II. GENERAL HISTORIES.

- a. 18th Century.
- b. Later Works.
- c. Party Histories.
- d. The Popish Plot.
- e. Constitutional History.

III. BOOKS ON PARTICULAR SUBJECTS.

- a. Hull and Yorkshire.
- b. Trinity House and the Navy.
- c. Foreign Policy.
- d. Parliamentary Affairs.
- e. Journalism.
- f. Biographies.
- g. Political Ideas.
- h. Miscellaneous Memoirs.

Part I.

I. COLLECTED EDITIONS OF MARVELL'S WORKS.

1. Verse.

There are innumerable reprints of Marvell's verse, but for the purposes of this thesis the most useful have been

1681. Miscellaneous Poems. Andrew Marvell. Published posthumously by his wife, Mary Marvell. One copy only--in the British Museum--contains the Cromwell poems, which appear to have been cut out of the other copies after the edition had been printed off. Thompson afterwards printed these from a manuscript version.
1923. Miscellaneous Poems. A reprint of the above by the Honesuch Press.
1872. Collected Works of Andrew Marvell, edited by A.B.Grosart, vol.I.
1894. etc. Poems and Satires, edited by G.W. Aitken. This has superseded the above, and contains a very valuable introduction and biographical note.

2. Prose. a. Letters.

1726. Works, 2 vols. T. Cooke. This includes, besides the Poems and some Satires, the private letters to Popple.
1772. Reprint of the above.
1776. Complete Works, 3 vols. Contains many of the Hull letters, the letters printed by Cooke with some additional letters, among which is the one relating to Mr. Smirke from the Lambeth Library.
1875. Complete Works, A.B.Grosart, vol.II (4 vols.). This contains many not previously published, but both text and notes are far from being reliable or complete.

b. Pamphlets.

There are only two collected editions.

- i. Complete Works, E.Thompson, containing
- The Rehearsal Transpros'd.
 - The Growth of Popery.
 - Mr. Smirke.
 - A Seasonable Argument.
 - A Seasonable Answer.
 - The Mock Speech.
 - Declaratio Parliamenti Angliae.

- ii. Complete Works, A.B.Grosart, containing
- The Rehearsal Transpros'd.
 - The Growth of Popery.
 - Mr. Smirke.
 - A Defence of John Howe.
 - The Mock Speech.

II. THE PAMPHLETS.

1. The Rehearsal Transpros'd. Part I.

i. First Edition (Press Mark 3935 aa 23).

The/ REHEARSAL/ TRANSPROS'D:/ or,/ Animadversions/ upon a late Book, intituled/ A PREFACE/ showing/ what grounds there are/ of Fears and Jealousies/ of Popery.

London, Printed by A.B. for the/ Assigns of John Calvin and Theodore/ Beza/ at the sign of the Kings Indulgence, on the South side of the Lake/ Lemane. 1672.

(4^o title page pp.326, errata on p.326.)

ii.a. Second Edition (Spurious) (Press Mark)4103 a 28).

The/ REHEARSAL/ Transpros'd:/ or,/ Animadversions upon a/ late Book, intituled,/ A PREFACE/ shewing/what Grounds there are/ of Fears and Jealousies/ of Popery.

The Second Edition, corrected.

London, Printed by A.B. for the/ assigns of John Calvin and Theodore/ Beza, at the Sign of the King's Indulgence, on the South side of the Lake/ Lemane. 1672.

(12^o title page 181pp.

ii.b. Second Edition (Press Mark 1019 e 12).

The/ REHEARSAL/ Transpros'd;/ or, Animadversions/ upon a late Book, intituled,/ A PREFACE/ Shewing/ What Grounds there are/ of Fears and Jealousies/ of Popery.

The Second Impression, with Additions/ and Amendments.

London, Printed by J.D. for the Assigns of/ John Calvin and Theodore Beza, at the sign/ of the King's Indulgence, on the South-Side/ of the Lake-Lemane; and sold by N.Ponder in Chancery-Lane. 1672.

4^o title page pp.326.--dorse of title-page: An/ Advertisement from the Bookseller./ This book having wrought itself thow many difficulties, it/ hath newly incountred with that of a Counterfeit Impression/ in 12^o under the Title and pretence of the 2d Edition Corrected. Whereas in truth that Impression is so far from having been/ Corrected, that it doth grossly and frequently corrupt both the/ Sence and the Words of the Copy./ N.P.

(1. The Rehearsal Transpros'd Part I. continued)

Reprints: Thompson 1776 , reprint in Vol.II. 2a.
Grosart 1874, reprint in Vol.III. 2b.

The Rehearsal Transpros'd Part II.

The/ REHEARSALL/ Transpros'd:/

The Second Part.

Occasioned by Two Letters: The first/ Printed, by a nameless Author./ Intituled, A Reproof, etc./ The Second Letter left for me at a/ Friends House, Dated Nov.3, 1673. Subscribed J.G. and/ concluding with these words; If/ thou'd rest to Print or Publish/ any Lie or Libel against Doctor/ Parker. By the Eternal God I will cut thy Throat.

Answered by ANDREW MARVELL.

LONDON,/ Printed for Nathaniel Ponder at the Peacock in/ Chancery Lane near Fleet-Street, 1673.

Facing title-page: REPROOF, p.67/ If you have any thing to object against it, do your worst/. You know the Press is open.

Licensed the 1st of May By the Author and Licensor of the
1673 Ecclesiastical Polity.

4^o 414 pp.

Reprinted by Grosart and Thompson.

The Rehearsal Transpros'd Controversy.

1666. Parker's Censure of Plato
(520 c 18 (6))
1669. The Friendly Debates, by Patrick (224 a 2)
- 1669? A Discourse on Ecclesiastical Polity, by Parker (852 f 5)
- 1669 The Friendly Debate cont. (1019 g 13)
1670. A Letter to a Friend concerning Dr. Owen (Vernon?)
1670. A fourth cont. of the Friendly Debates (1019 e 18)
1670. An Appendix to the Friendly Debates (1019 g 14)
1671. Cont. of the Ecclesiastical Polity. Parker (861 k 1).
1672. Preface to Bishop Bramhall, Parker (3938 aa 28).
1672. Rosemary and Bayes (Bodleian)(1)
1672. A Commonplace Book out of the Rehearsal Transpros'd (Bodleian) H.Stubbe. (1)
1673. The Transproser Rehearsed (1077 d 39).
1673. S'Too him Bayes (Dryden Bod. Catalogue) (1077 d 40)
- 1673 (May) Gregory Father Greybeard, Hickeringill (4103 aa 37)
- 1673.(May or June) A Reproof to the R.T.Parker. (1019 i 22).
1674. An Apology and Advice to an Answer to Part II. of the Rehearsal Transpros'd. (4109 aaaa 17)
1669. A Case of Conscience (4103 e 16)
1669. A Sober Answer to the Friendly Debates, by Philagthus (4106 aa 62)
1669. A Humble Apology, by Rolle Watt (1114 a 6)
1669. Insolence and Impudence Triumphant (Bodleian only).
1669. Truth and Innocence Vindicated (J.Owen) (4103 b 54).
- 1670? The State of the Kingdom (Owen's collected works).
- 1671? Evangelical Love (Owen) (collected works).
1672. The Authority of the Magistrate, by H.J. (4103 aa 11)
- 1672 (Sept. or Oct.) The Rehearsal Transpros'd, first impression.
- 1672 (Nov. or Dec.) second impression.
1673. A Sober Inquiry into the Nature of Moral Virtue, Ferguson (Bodleian).(1) etc. in answer to three books: Eccl. Polity, Cont., Reproof to Rehearsal Transpros'd.
- 1673.(Aug. or Sept.) The Rehearsal Transpros'd, Second Part.
1675. The Interest of Reason in Religion being reflections on Mr. Sherlock and Dr. Parker, by R. Ferguson (1019 e 20).

(1) These three pamphlets are not in the British Museum.

2. Mr. Smirke and the Essay upon General Councils.

a.i.a. First Edition (Press Mark 701 g 10 (14)).

Mr. SMIRKE; / or, the / DIVINE in MODE; / being / Certain
Annotations, upon the Animad- / versions on the Naked Truth. /
Together with a Short Historical Essay. / concerning General
Councils, Creeds, and Im- / positions, in Matters of Religion.

Nuda, sed magna est veritas, et prevalebit.

by / Andreas Rivetus, Junior. / an gr: / Res Nuda veritas. /

Printed Ann Domini MDCLXXVI.

Title page, To the Captious Reader, Errata iii-iv, pp.76
(actually 86).

On p.44 begins - A Short Historical Essay, touching General
Councils, Creeds, / and Impositions in Religion.

- i.b. A slight difference can be traced in some copies, where a colon follows Mr. Smirke, the before Animad- is italicised and certain misprints in the preface are corrected. Such a copy is 108 d 55.

Reprinted by Thompson and Grosart.

b.i. First Edition 1676, as above (see Mr. Smirke).

- ii. 1680. A Short / Historical / ESSAY / touching /
General Councils
Creeds, and
Impositions in Matters of Religion.

Very Seasonable for Allaying the Heats of the / Church. /

Written by that Ingenious and Worthy Gentleman / Mr Andrew
Marvell, / who died a member of Parliament.

London: / Printed in the Year MDCLXXX.

4^o pp.38. (Press Mark 702 e 3 (15)) Last sentence is altered to:- "Let my Book also (yea, myself if it were need-
ful) be burned by the hand of these Enemies to the Peace
and Tranquility of the Religion of England."

iii. 1687. A Short/ Historical ESSAY/ touching/
General Councils,
Creeds and
Impositions in Matters of Religion.

Very Seasonable at this Time.

Written by / Andrew Marvel, Esq;

London,/ Printed for R.Baldwin, 1687.

The same as the above no.ii, except for the title-page and printer's name. Obviously from the same press and type. The last sentence is the same. (Press Marks T 692 (30) etc.)

iv. A short/ Historical Essay/ touching/ General Councils,
 Synods,/ convocations, Creeds,/ and/ Impositions in Religion./

Andrew Marvel, Esq.

London,/ Printed for E.Mallet near Fleet Bridge. 1705.

4^o pp.64. (Press Mark 1534 aa 18). The last sentence as in 1676.

Reprints:

1. in the Growth of Deism etc. 1709, pp.339-401, from no.iv.
2. Thompson vol.III. no.1. Prints "Crofts' Legacy" as an addition to Marvell.
3. Grosart vol.IV. no.1. Prints "Crofts' Legacy" as an addition to Marvell.

The Naked Truth Controversy.

1675. The Naked Truth by an Hum-
ble Moderator. (702 g 10)
Three impressions in 1675.

1676. The Man of Mode, Etherege.
(644 h 35)

1676 (23 Feb.) Animadversions upon
a Late Pamphlet entitled the
Naked Truth (F. Turner)

1676? Second Edition (702 g 10)

1676. Mr. Spirke or the Divine
in Mode. (72 g 10 etc.)
(The date is in some confusion
as Marvell in an unpublished
letter mentions that his book
has been noticed in a preface
by Stillingfleet dated 30 May
1676. (1)

1676 (26 May) A Modest Survey of
the Most considerable things in
a Discourse lately published.
G.M. Burnet. (702 g 10)
(Second Edition date?)

1676 (12 June) Lex Talionis etc.
(Gunn or Fell?) (108 d 55).

(Second Edition Nov. 22) (855 e 4).

1680. The Naked Truth, Second
Part, Hickeringill.

1680. The Naked Truth, First
Part (i.e. Crofts reprinted).

1919. The Naked Truth reprinted,
with an introduction by
H.H. Henson, and a bibliograph-
ical note by Mr. Stephen K.
Jones, of the Dr. Williams
Library, which must be consult-
ed for the fullest account of the
above controversy.

3. Pamphlets on Religious Toleration.

a. Collected volumes.

Collections:

- the Harleian Miscellany (1810, 12 vols.)
- the Somers Tracts (18 15 vols.)
- Tracts on Liberty of Conscience, edited by E.B. Underhill.
- Baldwin's State Tracts, 1689 etc.
- Fugitive Tracts, Hazlet, W.C. 1875.

Collected Works of individuals.

- Baxter, R., edited by Orme. 1830, 23 vols.
- Owen, J., edited by T. Russell. 1826, 21 vols.
- Howe, J., edited by H. Rogers. 1862, 6 vols.
- Taylor, J., edited by Heber. 1822, 15 vols.
- Harrington, edited by Toland. 1746.
- Hickeringill, Miscellaneous tracts, 1707-1715,
new edition 1716.
- Milton, Bohn's edition, 5 vols. 1884.
- Hallifax, edited by W. Raleigh. 1912.
- Locke, J., Ward Lock and Co.
Morley's Universal Library 1884.

b. Single Pamphlets.

A most useful list of these is given by F. Bates in the Declaration of Indulgence, 1908.

The following have been useful or interesting for the particular purposes of this thesis. When the book is difficult to find the Press Mark of the British Museum Catalogue has been given.

- 1637. The Liberty of Religion. Junius Brutus.
- 1642. A Tract concerning Schism. J. Hales.
- 1644. The Bloody Tenet of Persecution. R. Williams (edited by E. Underhill).
- 1666. The Loyal Nonconformist. W(att) R(olle).
- 1667. A Discourse of the Religion of England. J. Corbet.
837 e 58.
- 1667. Liberty of Conscience. C. Wolsey. 4135 b 45.
- 1668. Indulgence not Justified. 701 e 42 (1)
- 1668. Delus an Virtus. 111 b 53.
- 1669. A Modest and True Conference. (Burnet) 4175 de 42.
- 1670. The Great Case of Liberty and Conscience asserted.
T 407 (5)
- 1670. Some sober and Seasonable Queries. Penn. 4151 de 6(3).
- 1670. The People's assertion of their liberties (an account of the trial of Penn and Mead). 518 k 1(4).
- 1670. Toleration disproved and condemned. 702 g 10.

1670. Nonconformists no schismatics. 702 g 10.
 1670. Toleration discussed in two Dialogues. L'Estrange.
 894 d 24.
 1670. Reason in Affairs of Religion. 702 g 10.
 1670. The Popish Informer. H. Thorndike. 4152 ee 17(8).
 1671. The True Nonconformist. 702 g 10 ?
 1671? The Conformist's Plea for Nonconformists. Philagthus.
 701 f 24.
 1673. A Sober Enquiry. F.R. 694 e 31(1).
 1673 Of True Religion. Milton.
 1674. A Nonconformist's Plea for Uniformity. 4105 de 4.
 1674. A Letter sent from beyond the Seas. (Hickes)
 4136 aa 2.
 1675. Separation yet no Schism. 702 g 10.
 1675. England's Present Interest Discovered. Penn. E 1959(2)
 1676. The Judgment of the Nonconformists of the Interest
 of Reason in Religion. 702 g 10.
 1676. The Presbyterian Unmasked. 4136 a 22.
 1676. A Defence of a Discourse. (Stillingtonfleet) 3055 bb 8.
 1679. Certain Considerations tending to Promote Peace
 and Goodwill. 698 i 2.
 1681. An Humble Essay towards the Setting of Peace and
 Truth in the Church. (E.Harley) 702 e 3(16).
 1682. The Conformist's Second Plea for Nonconformists.
 (Philagthus) 701 f 24.
 1685. Considerations moving to a toleration. (Villiers)
 5083(5).
 1688. The King's Right of Indulgence. (Annesley) 702 e 11(5).
 1689. Four Letters on Toleration. Locke, translated by
 W.Popple. 698 i 2.
 1689. The unreasonableness of a new separation. Still-
 ingtonfleet. F 679 (2).
 1690. English Nonconformity. Baxter. 702 e 34.
 1696. Reliquiae Baxterianae. 203 e 9.
 1716. A Summary of the penal Laws. 1379 e 19.

(1)

4. The Defence of John Howe.

i. First Edition.

Remarks/ upon a Late Disingenuous/ DISCOURSE,/ Writ by one
T.D./ Under the pretence/ De Causa Dei,/ And of Answering/
Mr. John Howe's Letter and Postscript/ Of/ God's Prescience,
etc./ Affirming as the Protestant Doctrine,/ That God doth by
Efficacious Influ-/ence universally move and Deter-/ mine
Men to all their Actions, even/ to those that are most wicked./

By a Protestant.

London,/ Printed and are to be sold by Christopher Hussey,
at the/ Flower-de-luce in Little-Brittain. 1678.

8vo.

(Press Mark 480 a 18 (1))

Reprinted by Dr. Brown, Theological Tracts (1853) vol.III.
Grosart, Collected Works of Marvell, vol.IV.

(1) This pamphlet is mentioned by Wood, Fasti Oxon. (1813)
IV. 590, and see Grosart, preface vol.I. lvi.

5. The Mock Speech.

There are two main versions of this, dated respectively c.1669
and c.1675.

- i. Horse and A-Way/ Or, A S-/ Before Parting./ By Parson Hicker-
eringil./

With this is printed on f.2 (1)
Vox et Lachrymae Anglorum/ or Certain Considerations etc.

f2 d. Printed for C.Barker in the Strand. AN.MDCLXIX.

(Press Mark 1882 c 2(232).

- ii. His Majesty's Most Gracious Speech to both Houses of Parlia-
ment.

Printed in Poems on Affairs of State 1675, 1704,
1710, 1716.

Thompson vol.I.
Grosart vol.II.

Manuscript versions:

Stowe MSS 180 f 77.
S.P.Dom. 369 no.197.

The following table will show the differences between the version
of 1669 and that usually dated 1675.
(Grosart's version will be used for the later speech, and the
lines are numbered from p.431, My Lords...=1.1.

<u>1675.</u>	<u>1669.</u>
p.431. 1.5. April	May.
7. parched	----
17-19 I must speak...	----
.....heavy upon me.	
p.432. 1.9. Two or three years	A few years
40-42. For example...	I have brought up all my Children
.....begetting them.	in the Protestant Religion. and
	('twould etc.)
p.433. 1.1-10. But as I.....	----
...Chichester	
23. My Lords Treasurer	(Possibly a misprint here).
(Note: in S.P.Dom. version the figures of Lauderdale's pension are given.)	
32. Since my happy	----
Restoration.	

(1) The satire Vox et Lachrymae printed with version 1. is re-

6. The Growth of Popery.

i. First Edition (Press Mark C 55 d 20).

An Account of the/ GROWTH/ of POPERY,/ and/ Arbitrary Govern-
ment/ in ENGLAND./ More Particularly, from the long Prorog-
ation,/ of November, 1675, Ending the 15th of/ February 1676,
till the last meeting of/ Parliament the 16th. of July. 1677.
MSS note: by Andrew Mervill

AMSTERDAM, Printed in the Year 1677.

MSS. note: Seized Feb. 21. 77: W. Whitwood in ye hand of Sam
Paeker, in Cornhill, who afterwards dyed in ye King's Bench.

Ends God Lord Deliver us.

No list of ships or appendix as afterwards printed.

4° 156pp. Errata p.156.

ii. Second Edition. (Press Mark 4707 h 12 and T 88x (1))

An/ ACCOUNT/ of the/ Growth/ of/ POPERY,/ and/ Arbitrary Gov-
ernment/ in/ England./ More Particularly from the long Prorog-
ation, of Nov-/ ember, 1675, Ending the 15th of February, 1676./
till the last Meeting of Parliament, the 16th of/ July 1677.

Printed at Amsterdam And Recommended to the Reading of/ All
English Protestants. 1678.

Folio. pp.68. Appendix, List of Ships. pp.55-68.

iii. French Edition. There is a copy of this at Hull and one in
the Cambridge University Library, Aton e 25.15. I have not
traced one in the British Museum.

RELATION/ DE/ l'Accroissement de la/ PAPAUTE/ Et du Gouverne-
ment Absolu en/ ANGLETERRE,/ Particulièrement/ Depuis la longue
Prorogation de/ Novembre 1675. laquelle a fini/ le 15 Fevrier
1676./ Jusques a present./ Traduit en Francois de la Copie
Angloise.

MSS. note: Ex libris Johannis Clerici.

A Hambourgh,/ Chez Pierre Eladt, Libraire, 1680.

12° pp.245. Text begins p.3. p.230 ends: Concluons donc par
cet endroit de nos communs prieres, de toute conspiration
secrete, ac, Delivrez nous, Seigneur. p.231: Proces/ de/
Mr. Harrington/ a/ L'occasion de ces troubles. to end.

Reprints of the Growth of Popery:

- i. 1689, Baldwin, State Tracts pp.69-135.
 - ii. 1697, a new impression of the above.
 - iii. 1689, Mr. Marvell's Character of Popery (Grosart IV. 250-258) with an introduction by another hand. 4^o.
 - iv. Thompson 1776.
 - v. Grosart 1875.
- (i, ii, iv, and v follow the 1678 edition.)

Imitations of the Growth of Popery, etc.

- i. A Character of Popery, 1680, Philolaus. 807 95(20).
- ii. The Growth of Popery Part II, by Philoveritas. Cologne 1682. C 55 d 21.
- iii. No Protestant Plot (3 Parts), Part III. R. Ferguson, 1681-2. 1130 d 6 (2).
- iv. A Tory Plot, by Philanax Misopappas. London 1682. 701 g 13(4).
- v. A Certain Way to Save England, 1681. 599 i 24(7).
- vi. A Second Plea for Nonconformists 1683, by Philagthus. 701 f 24.
- vii. White Kennet, A Complete History of England, 3 vols. 1706.
- viii. Popery and Tyranny in relation to Government, Trade, Manner of the People, and Nature of the Country. As it was sent in a Letter from an English Gentleman abroad to his friend in England.

Wherein may be seen the Tyranny the subjects of France are under, being Enslaved by the two greatest Enemies to Reason as well as to Christian or humane Liberty, I mean Popery and Arbitrary Power.

12 May

LONDON/ 1679

Tunc tua res actua Paries cum proximus ardet.

18 pp. 4 p. 1127 g 4(1).

- ix. The Ghost of the Late House of Commons. 1681. 714 i 8(7).

Answers to the Growth of Popery--Pamphlets that even if not direct answers are concerned to refute its charges.

- i. The Growth of Knavery and Popery under pretended fears of Arbitrary government and Popery. With a Parallel betwixt the Reformers of 1677 and those of 1641 in their method and device. Printed for Henry Brome. (by L'Estrange) 1678. 6122 c 1.
Second edition as the Parallel, 1679, with new preface. 6122 i 29.
- ii. The Growth of Knavery and Popery under the Mask of Presbytery, (Sub-title) Tyranny and Popery lording it over king and People. the Consciences Liberties and Estates of. 6122 aaa 18.
Second edition as Tyranny and Popery etc. 1681. 108 e 18.
This does not mention Marvell, but obviously had his tract in mind. Its immediate object is Toleration Discussed.

- iii. A Letter from Amsterdam to a Friend in England. G.H. E 1959.
- iv. Honesty's Best Policy, 1680. E 1959.
- v. A Letter to the Earl of Shaftesbury. Tom Tell Troth.
8122 i 1(32).
- vi. A Seasonable Address to both Houses of Parliament concerning
the Succession and Fear of Popery and Arbitrary Power.
517 k 16(13).
- vii. The Observer. L'Estrange. (especially nos. 189, 204, 329,
vol.II. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 214, vol.III. 21. 193 c 6,7.
Answers to this are:
a. The Observer Observed, 6 May 1681 (Burney 81, 1-3).
b. Horse Flesh for the Observer. (J.Phillips) 1682.
123414 c 48.
c. The Observer proved a Trimmer. 1685. 8133 i 24.
- viii. The Absurdity of the Newly devised principle, etc. A
defence of the Parallel. 1681. P.R.O. S.P.Dom. Case G.
- ix. An Epistle to the Whigs. Dryden. 1681.
- x. Three Great Questions concerning the Succession and the dangers
of Popery. 1680.
- xi. A Plea for the Succession. 1682. (Defends the Growth of Knave-
ry, attacks Ho Protestant Plot.) 1897 c 20.
- xii. Salus Britannica, Or the safety of the Protestant Religion
against the present apprehensions of Popery. 1685. 599 i 24(8).
- xiii. The Examen. Roger North. Written soon after Kennet's
History (1706) had appeared, published 1740.

7 a. The Seasonable Argument. (Press Mark 100 g 10).

A Seasonable Argument/ to Persuade/ All the Grand Juries/
in England, to Petition for/ a/ New Parliament./ or,
A LIST/ of the/ Principal Labourers in the Great/ Design of
Ponery and Arbitrary Power; who have/ Betrayed their Country
to the Conspirators, and Bar-/ gained with them to Maintain
a Standing Army in/ England, under the Command of the Big-/
gotted Popish/ D. Who by the assistance of the L.I.'s Scotch
Ar-/ my, the Forces in Ireland, and those on France, hopes/
to bring all Back to ROME./

Veritas non quaeret Angulos.

Munc omnia Romae Venalia.

AMSTERDAM, Printed in the year 1677. (1)

Folio, pp.23.

Reprinted:

E.Thompson, Works of Marvell.

W.Cobbett, Parliamentary History, vol.IV.

b. Flacellum Parliamentarium.

A very sarcastic notice of the first Parliament after the Rest-
oration. Edited by Harris Nichol from MSS. in the British Museum,
1827. (Lansdowne 805 f 8).

This was reprinted in 1881 by the Aungervyle Soc. Pub.I.

The manuscript version in the British Museum (Add. MSS. 4106
f. 166-176), stated by Grosart and others to resemble this, is
really a replica of the Seasonable Argument printed by Thompson,
and even reproduces the title-page. Half of this being torn away,
it is impossible to tell whether an author were there mentioned.
The MS. is stitched, and in every respect a manuscript reprod-
uction of the pamphlet.

8. Pamphlets against Shaftesbury, concerning the Plot, and of interest in connection with the Growth of Popery.

1677. Considerations touching the True way to suppress Popery. J. Lloyd. 108 a 63.
1678. The Presbyterian Unmasked. 4135 a 22.
1678. The Unreasonableness of Popery. 699 f 1(3)
1679. Sober and Seasonable Queries. 8122 i 1(10)
1680. A Chronology of the Rise of Popery. 695 k 8(2).
- The Great Question about Popery. 8122 bb 2.
- Englands Calamity. 816 m 22(59)
- Dangerfield's Narrative. 193 d 12(7,8).
- Catalogues of Books relating to the Popish Plot. 128 a 3(1).
- A Short Answer to a Whole Litter of Libels. (L'Estrange) T 935(1).
- A Parallel between Popery and Phanaticks. E1960(12).
- 1681 Advice to a Painter G 20 f 2(304)
- A Modest Vindication of the Earl of Shaftesbury. G 40 m 11(96).
- Advice to the Men of Shaftesbury. 8133 i 1(3)
- An Account of the Late Presbyterian and Shaftesburian Plot. 8122 i (1)
- Ignoramus and other verses. 1851 e 10(11x).
- Several Weighty Queries. Intt. II. 102.
- A Collection of Letters, G. Treby. 808 g 4, & 8122 i 2(12)
- Mr Smith's Discovery of the Plot. 816 m 2(3)
- A Letter from a Person of Honour. 601 d 10.
- Some Memoirs of the Plot. fol. T. 2^x(32)
- The Papers found in Shaftesbury's Closet. T 1^x(76).
- 1682 A Gentil Reflection upon a Modest Account 599 i 24(15)
- A Character of the True Blew Protestant Poet. 1897 e 20(144)
- A Plea for the Succession. (Coleman) T. 100^x(160)
- The Knot Unty'd 701 g 13(3)
- The Medal. Dryden.
- The Tory Plot 11630 ff 2(8)
- The Loyal Medal Reversed 11626 e 41(2)
- The Medal of John Bayes 11641 h 10(2)
- An Answer to the Medal. H. E. 11641 h 10
- The Charge of a Tory Plot maintained 104 a 60.
- 1683 Many Songs about Shaftesbury 1871 e 9(74)
- 1683-5 A Collection of Anti-Popish Tracts. 3936 de 1.
- 1685 The Complete Statesman 615 a 8.
- 1693 Memoirs Annesley, Earl of Anglesey. G 14400

9. Pamphlets on the Duration of Parliament. 1675-1676.

i. Before the Long Prorogation.

1675. A Letter from a Person of Quality . E 1959.
 Two Speeches. (Buckingham and Shaftesbury. 1675.)
 Two Seasonable Discourses. The Debate for dissolving
 this Present Parliament in House of Lords.
 A Letter from a Parliament
 man to his Friend. E 1959.
 A Letter to my Lord Carlisle. (Grey III. 96)
 Jenks Speech. 24 June, with and account of the
 Proceedings at the Guild hall petitioning for
 a New Parliament. (S. P. Dom. Car II. Case G)
 (?) Vox Populi. (State Tracts. 1693)

ii. After the Long Prorogation had commenced.

1676. A Seasonable Question and a Useful Answer. (Marvell's
 Works. 1776)
 The Long Parliament Dissolved. (Helles) 8132 d 17.
 The Grand Question debated. (Cary) (?)
 Some Considerations upon the Question
 whether the Present Parl. is dissolved. 518 k 1(9).
 1677 A Young Plea. S. P. Dom. Car II. 391 no 67
 An Account of the Proceedings against the four
 Lords. (?)

iii. Answers to any of Above.

- 1676 A Packet of Advice to the Men of Shaftesbury. E 1959
 1677 A Second Packet of Advice. E 1959.

III. SATIRES.

i. Collections.

There are numerous seventeenth and eighteenth century collections under various titles, the most important being:-

A New Collection of Songs About Popery. 1689
 Poems on Affairs of State. 1689
 Poems on Affairs of State (new ed. with additions. 1697.
 Poems on Affairs of State (new ed. with additions. 1704-7.
 4 vols.

(The Above are indexed -Notes and Queries. Vser. vi. p401 seq.)

Four more Modern Collections are:-

The Roxburgh Ballads, ed. by J. Ebsworth. 1869.
 The Bagford Ballads, ed. by J. Ebsworth. 1878
 Cavalier Lyrics, ed. J. Ebsworth. 1887.
 Political Ballads of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, ed. W. W. Wilkins. 1880.

ii. Collected editions of Satires by Individuals.

Buckingham, Works, in 2 vols. 1704, new ed. 1715.
 The Rehearsal, M. Summers. 1910.
 Dryden, Works, ed. Scott and Saintsbury. 1888, etc. 23 vols.
 Etheredge, Works, ed. Verity. 1888.
 Sheffield, (afterwards Duke of Buckingham) Works, 2 vols. 1740.
 Wilmot, (Earl of Rochester.) Works. 1709. 2 vol.

IV. LIVES OF MARVELL. CRITICISM etc.

Very few lives of Marvell devote much attention to his politics, or even to his political career. A few that have been useful are:-

- Aubrey, J., Brief Lives. 1898, 2 vols.
 Wood, A., a. Fatti Oxon. 1813, edited by Bliss, 4 vols.
 b. Life and Times. 1891-1900, edited by A. Clarke, 5 vols.
 Cocks, T., Life and Works of Marvell, 1726. 2 vols.
 Thompson, E., Life and Works, 1776, 2 vols.
 Rogers, H., Essay on Marvell, 1854. (Collected Essays vol. I.)
 This is a very useful article.
 Grosart, A.B., Memorial Introduction to Complete Works (1872-5).
 Although Grosart contributes some new information to the existing lives of Marvell, his work is marred by extraordinary inaccuracies and positive errors.
 Aitken, G., Introduction to the Poems, 1894 (2nd edition 1901).
 Firth, C.H., Life, D.N.B. A very valuable article.
 Venn, Alumni Cantab. A useful account of Marvell's Cambridge career, but inaccurate in one or two biographical details.
 Birrel, A., Life, 1905. A not very trustworthy account.

Many biographies, histories and other works have references or useful notices of Marvell's work. Among the most useful are:-

- Cam. Hist. Eng. Lit., 2 Articles, vols. VII, VIII.
 Masson, D., Life of Milton.
 Kitchen, G., Life of L'Estrange, 1912.
 Evans, F.M.G., The Principal Secretary of State, 1923.
 Alden, R.M., The Rise of Formal Satire in England, 1899.
 Walker, E., English Satire and Satirists, 1925.
 This suffers from a lack of historical background.
 Elliot, T.S., Essays, Andrew Marvell (Hogarth Essays) 1924a
 Perhaps the best appreciation on general lines.
 Tercentenary Tribute, 1922.
 A volume celebrating the tercentenary of 1921. It contains little of value except a hitherto unpublished letter contributed by Prof. H.H. Margoliouth.

The most useful modern studies on Marvell are two articles contributed to the Modern Language Review:-

Some Biographical Notes on Andrew Marvell, by H.M. Margoliouth, 1922.

Some further Biographical Notes, by M. Pierre Legouis.

To these and to much personal help from their authors I am very greatly indebted.

Professor Margoliouth is re-editing Marvell's Poems, Satires and Letters for the Clarendon Press, and very kindly allowed me to read the proofs of the letters before completing my work. To him I owe much information about the Hall documents, the sight of some unpublished letters, and other help.

M. Legouis, who is writing on Marvell to introduce him to the French public, has also placed a great deal of information at my disposal, and has constantly helped me with advice and criticism throughout my work.

V. THE RUSSIAN EMBASSY.

Letters about the embassy are to be found amongst the State Papers Foreign--Russian, Swedish and Danish (Letters and Papers), uncalendered. Those among the Domestic State Papers and Treasury Papers are calendered quite fully.

The Account of the Embassy by Miede.

1669. French edition. By Guy Miede. (10291 aa 43).
1669. English Edition, dedication signed by G.M.
Licensed March 1669 by L'Estrange, though apparently
written some years before. (1056 a 34, 35, and G 2480)
1672. Second French Impression. (150 a 31)
1700. Third French Impression. (1056 b 14)
1705. Reprinted in English by J.Harris in his "Voyages".
1857. Reprinted with a very useful bibliographical note by
Galitzin. French Edition. (12234 b 9)
1875. Portions of the English Edition reprinted by Grosart,
Vol.II. Grosart's transcription is not always accurate.

PART II.

I. BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

- Adair, E. R., *The Sources for the History of the Council in the Seventeenth Century.* 1924.
Although not primarily a bibliography of general history for the period covered (16th & 17th centuries)-this is often a valuable guide to such information.
- Aitken, G. A., *Poems of Andrew Marvell.* Introductory note.
This is by far the best bibliographical note on Marvell's works.
- Cam. Mod. Hist. Vols. IV and VI. Bibliographies to relevant chapters.
This would be of more value were any indication of the reliability of the books, etc., given.
- Cam. Hist. of Eng. Lit. Vols VII and VIII. Bibliographies.
- Firth, C. H., *Sources of Seventeenth Century History.*
Trans. R. Hist. Soc., 3rd ser. Vol. VI. 25-48. 1913.
Vol. VII. 1-16. 1914.

An Article of great value on Clarendon's History, E. H. R. vol. XIX. pp. 26 seq. 246, seq. 464 seq..
- Gerould, J. T., *Sources of Eng. Hist. in the Seventeenth Century. (1603-1681).*
Although a Catalogue rather than a bibliography this is so well edited that it affords much help.
- Lodge, R., *Political History of England. Vol VIII.*
(Longmans Pol. Hist.) Note on Authorities.

II. GENERAL HISTORY.

(a) Early Histories of the Period.

Clarendon. History of the Rebellion; Life and Continuation of the Life. (ed. cited. 1843).

Baker. Chronicle. Cont. by J. Phillips. 1696.

Kennet. W., Complete History of England. 3 vols. 1706.

Eachard. History of England. etc. 1720.

Burnet. G., History of my Own Time. ed by T. Burnet. 1726-1736. The best modern edition by O. Airy and H. Foxcroft. 1897-1902.

Parker. S., History of his own Time. Eng. Trans. 1727.

Oldmixon. History of England. etc. 3 vols. 1730.

Ralph. History of England. etc., 2 vols. 1744.

(b) Modern Histories.

Lingard. History of England. 9 vols. (7th ed.) 1849.

Lodge. R. History of England. 1660-1702.

Cam. Mod. Hist. relevant articles in vols. IV and V.

Fortescue. J. History of the British Army. 1899, etc.

(c) Party History.

Felling. K. The History of the Tory Party. 1640-1714. (1924.

de Beer. E. S., Danby and the Country Party. A Thesis for the London degree of M.A. (1923.

(d) The Polish Plot.

Pollock. J., The Polish Plot . 1903.

(e) Law.

Holdsworth. W., A History of English Law. vol. VI. 1924.

III. BOOKS ON PARTICULAR SUBJECTS.

(a) Hull and Yorkshire.

- Gent.T., History of Hull-(Annales Regioduni
Hullini)-York, 1735.
- Ticknell.J., History of Hull. 1798.
- Sheahan. History of Yorkshire. 1864.
- Fletcher.J., History of Yorkshire. 1901. 14 vols.
- Park.G., Parliamentary Representation in York-
shire. 1886.
- Wildridge.T., Old and New Hull. 1884
Hull Letters. 1887.
- Shepherd.T., The Municipal Museum of Hull. 1901.
- Raine. J., Wills and Inventories of Yorks. 1853
Surtees Society.
- Caly.J., Yorkshire Wills. 1885. Yorks. Top. Soc.
Record Series. Vols 1 & 9.
- Jackson.C., Yorkshire Diaries. 1877. Surtees Soc.
vol. 65.
Diary of de la Pryme. 1870. Surtees Soc.
vol. 54.
- Fuller's Worthies. (1840, 3 vols).

(b) Trinity House and the Navy.

- Barret.C.B.R., Trinity House. 1893.
- Mayo. W.H., Trinity House. 1905. (Adds but little
to Barrett's History.)
- Roscoe. English Prize Courts. 1924.
- Tedder. The Navy of the Restoration. 1889.
- Pett. Autobiography. ed. W. Ferrin. 1918.
Navy Records Society. vol. 51.

(c) Foreign Policy.

Very few dispatches or other original material have been used for this thesis, but the following have been consulted either upon particular points; or for the light they throw upon English politics.

Materials for English Diplomatic History, 1509-1783. Compiled by H. Davenport, and printed in eighteenth report of the Hist. MSS. Com. Appendix II, pp 357-402.

This is a very useful bibliography of a part of the subject.

Baschet Transcripts. P.R.O. (1659-1685).

King William's Chest. P.R.O. Bundle III contains interesting letters from James of York to William of Orange.

Mignet. Negotiations, etc., vols III & IV. (1832-42) This contains the text of many treaties relating to the period, otherwise difficult to see.

Dalrymple. Memorials.. 1790. 3 vols. prints many documents.

Combe. E., The Sale of Dunkirk. 1727. The text of letters and treaties relating to this matter.

Bebington. Letters to Sir William Temple, etc. 1701, 1727. 2 vols. Contains some interesting letters among others from Arlington to Temple.

Buccleugh MSS. (Hist. MSS. Com.). Some useful letters are printed in the Hist. MSS. Com. Calendar of these MSS.

(d) Parliamentary Affairs.

i. Debates.

- Journals of the House of Commons, vols VII, VIII, IX.
 Journals of the House of Lords., vols. XI, XII, XIII.
 Burton's Diary. (For Parliaments of 1658 & 1659), 1839.
 The Old Parliamentary History. vols 21-24. 1751-61.
 Cobbett. W. Parliamentary History. vol. IV. 1806-20.
 Milward. Diary. Add. MSS. 33413. (for years 1666-8)
 Grey. A. Debates. (1667-1689.) 9 vols. 1763.

ii. Miscellaneous information and gossip.

- Various volumes of the Hist. MSS. Com.
 MSS. of Marquis of Sunderland.
 Marquis of Bath.
 Duke of Ormond.
 S. le Fleming.
 Duke of Portland.
 Duke of Leeds.
 Earl of Lindsey.
 G. H. Finch.
 House of Lords. (1660-1689).
- Nicholas Correspondence. (Eg. MSS. 2539).
 Coventry Papers. (Add. MSS. 25122-4).
 The Starkey Newsletters. (Add. MSS. 36916).
 Danby Papers. (Add. MSS. 28091). (passim)
 Hatton Correspondence. (Add. MSS. 29577.) and printed.

iii. Monographs.

- Abbott. W. C., The Long Parliament of Charles. II.
 E. H. R. XXI. (1906).

(e) Journalism.

Williams.J.B., History of English Newspapers until the publication of the Gazette. 1908. supplemented by 2 articles in the Times Literary Supplement.(4 & 11 Dec.1924)by Prof.Griffith.

The Times Printing Number.(10 Sept.1912).

Kitchen.G. Roger L'Estrange. 1913.

Muddiman.J.D.,The King's Journalist. 1924.

(f) Miscellaneous Biographies.

Only a few of these specially useful can be mentioned.

Barbour.V., Life of Arlington. 1923.

Beresford.J.B.,Life of Dowling 1925

Christie.W.D., Life of Shaftesbury. 2 vols.1871.

Clarke.J., Life of James.II. 2 vols. 1816.

Foxcroft.H.Life of George Saville,Marquis of Halifax (2 vols.1898)

Ferguson.J.,Ferguson the Plotter. 1887.

Lister. Life of Clarendon. 3 vols. 1838.

Martyn.B.,Life of Shaftesbury. 1790,new ed.1836.

Masson.D.,Life of Milton. 7 vols. 1859-1894.

Powicke.F.,Life of Baxter. 1925.

Sitwell.G., The First Whig. 1901.

The D.N.B. of course contains many valuable accounts of men whose lives have not otherwise been written.

(g) Political ideas.

Very few histories of political thought devote any space to Marvell's ideas.

Among those most useful for a study of English thought in the period are:-

Gooch.G.P., English Democratic Ideas in the 17th century. 1898.
Political thought from Bacon to Halifax. 1914/5.

Russell-Smith, Religious Liberty under Charles II and James II. 1910.

Seaton.A.A., The Theory of Toleration. 1911.

Gwatkin. Toleration under the Stuarts.C.M.H.V.cap.xi.

Marsden. History of the Puritans. 1852.

Bates.J., The Declaration of Indulgence, 1672. 1908.
Useful for the ideas of the period covered although not primarily concerned with them.

Hertz.G.B., English Public Opinion after the Restoration. 1902. A poor account of "imperial" ideas.

Russell-Smith, Harrington and his Oceana. 1919.

Saurat.D., La Pensee de Milton. 1921.

Bastide.C., John Locke. Ses Theories Politique et leur Influence en Angleterre. 1907.
The only attempt to deal with Locke's ideas on the scale they deserve.

Firth.C.H., Cromwell's Army. 3rd ed. 1921.
Gives much information on the opinions of the time.

