

**The Poetics of Subversion and Conservatism:
Popular Satire, c.1640 - c.1649**

Thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of English Language and Literature

University of Oxford

Benne Klaas Faber

Lady Margaret Hall

Hilary, 1992

Title The poetics of subversion and conservatism : popular satire, c.1640-c.1649

Further information Benne Klaas Faber

Author [Faber, Benne Klaas >](#)
[University of Oxford. Faculty of English Language and Literature >](#)

Publisher Details Thesis (D.Phil.)--University of Oxford, 1992

Publication Date 1992

Format 2, 263 leaves : ill. ; 31 cm

Language English

Subjects [Satire, English -- History and criticism >](#)

Related To University of Oxford. Faculty of English Language and Literature. Thesis.

Aleph System Number 010995184

Type Thesis

Miscellaneous Notes
General Note: BLDSC reference no.: D175388/93
Bibliography Note: Bibliography: leaves 246-263

ABSTRACT

The Poetics of Subversion and Conservatism:

Popular Satire, c.1640 - c.1649

Benne Klaas Faber
Lady Margaret Hall
DPhil, Hilary 1992

The thesis deals with the satire produced by the popular print culture in London during the Civil War, examining the satirical texts in the wider context of Renaissance literature as well as in their immediate political and religious setting. The thesis applies the work of historians of popular culture to literary forms of popular expression in order to assess the rôle of the satirical pamphlet in Civil War society and politics. The social function of satire in effecting change in the perception of reality and in public opinion accounts for the deliberate "popular" manner of satirical texts in the 1640s; the satires printed as single-sheet quarto pamphlets exploit the book market and provide a rhetorical vehicle for Parliamentary and Royalist writers. Part I introduces the principal themes examined in the thesis, and provides a methodological framework for the analysis of 1640s popular literature. Furthermore, Part I discusses John Milton's notions of satirical propriety and suggests that Milton's polemical prose has a place among the satires of the 1640s. Part II argues that the ancient understanding of satire as curse provides in the 1640s the basis for the use of anagrams and typographical characters in satirical, formal malediction; the verse satire of John Cleveland (1613-1658) receives particular attention. Part III sets the notion of particular satire in the context of "libel" and the iconological controversy of the

seventeenth century: lampoons and "pasquils" are consciously iconoclastic, marring the image of the person attacked. No more clearly is this seen than in the pamphlets responding to *Eikon Basilike* (1649) which use satire to break the image of the king. Part IV demonstrates the influence of the Greek satirist, Lucian, upon the satire of the 1640s in which heaven and hell feature prominently; Lucian is a particularly interesting example of erudite allusion in popular texts. Part V suggests that the preoccupation with order and disorder is central to the seventeenth century; a study of the function of representations of order, the Ptolemaic model of the cosmos in particular, in satirical and non-satirical texts leads to an examination of the rôle of parody in subverting order. The Appendix consists of a short analysis of *A Satyr Against Hypocrites* (1655) by Milton's nephew, John Phillips (1631-1706), demonstrating the influence of Milton on popular forms of satirical expression; aspects of satire treated in the thesis coalesce in the examination of Phillips's *A Satyr Against Hypocrites*.

CONTENTS

PART I: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Prolegomena.....	1
1.2. The Definition of 'Popular'.....	5
1.3. Popular and Elite.....	21
1.4. The Satirical Milton.....	28

PART II: SATIRE AS FORMAL MALEDICTION

2.1. Introduction: Magic and Satire.....	32
2.2. The Mystical Property of Signs.....	41
2.2.1. Astrology.....	44
2.2.2. Characters.....	52
2.2.3. Anagrams.....	68
2.3. Conclusion.....	83

PART III: THE IMAGE IN SATIRE

3.1. Making and Marring Images	
3.1.1. Introduction: The Image Debate.....	84
3.1.2. Iconoclastic Satire.....	95
3.2. Libel, Satire and Magic.....	101
3.3. Royalist Iconoclasm: Richard Corbett.....	120
3.4. The <i>Eikon</i> Pamphlets (1649-51).....	135
(i) <i>Eikon Alethine</i>	136
(ii) <i>Eikonoklastes</i>	144
(iii) <i>Eikon Aklastos</i>	155

PART IV: LUCIANIC SATIRE

4.1. Heaven and Hell
 4.1.1. Introduction: The Two Kingdoms.....161
 4.1.2. The Classical Models: Lucian and Seneca.....172
4.2. The *Exclusus* and *Divine Sessions* Motifs
 (i) Andrew Marvell, "Tom May's Death".....179
 (ii) *The Great Assises Holden in Parnassus*.....187
4.3. Infernal Authorship and Legitimacy.....200

PART V: A POETICS OF SUBVERSION AND CONSERVATISM

5.1. Order and Disorder
 5.1.1. Introduction: Configurations of Order.....218
 5.1.2. Religious Satire and Decorum.....220
 5.1.3. Order in the Court: Masques.....227
5.2. Parody and Subversion.....236
5.3. Conclusion.....253

APPENDIX: A Satyr Against Hypocrites: Milton and Popular Satire
.....258

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....278

PART I: INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Prolegomena
- 1.2. The Definition of 'Popular'
- 1.3. Popular and Elite
- 1.4. The Satirical Milton

PART I: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Prolegomena.

The late Professor Harold F. Brooks has called for a history of English satire during the Civil War and Interregnum based upon such collections as the Thomason Tracts, 1640-1660, in the British Library: this thesis begins the re-assessment of seventeenth-century satire with an analysis of satirical texts which, by their publication as single-sheet quarto pamphlets and their internal strategies, appeal to a popular readership.¹ The Thomason collection, together with the microfilm series *Early English Books*, is the primary source for this study.² The analysis is divided into four parts, based on four features characteristic of the satirical texts published in the 1640s: the conception of satire as formal malediction; the function of satire as iconoclasm; the rôle of the otherworld in Lucianic satire; and the inversion of order in parody. The social function of satire in effecting change in the perception of reality and public opinion accounts for the deliberate "popular" manner of satirical texts in the 1640s, particularly that of Royalist writers affecting a low style. Thus, perhaps more than in other forms of literature in the 1640s, in satire the categories of "popular" and "élite" can be misleading, as the discussion of the methodological difficulties in defining "popular" suggests (see 1.2.

¹ Harold F. Brooks, "English Verse Satire, 1640-1660: Prolegomena", *The Seventeenth Century*, III.1 (Spring 1988), 17.

² *Early English Books: from Wing's Short title catalogue of books 1641-1700* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1961-).

below). Rather than being preoccupied with the distinction between "popular" and "élite", the thesis analyzes the ways in which satire in the 1640s, exploiting the book market, tries to persuade and be socially affective.

Part II argues that Renaissance theories of decipherment and reading, combined with a belief in the effectual power of satirical expression, are used in representing the object of the satirical attack in typographically significant ways. The satire of the 1640s is aware of the long tradition which conceives of a satirical utterance as a curse or destructive spell, and in which satirical victims are seen as material objects manipulated in the fictional representation by the satirist. The satirist frequently grants extra-significant force to the material objects and physical shapes through which the formal malediction or curse is channelled. Typographical characters and symbols, numbers and names come to signify things immanent in the object of the satire and which are made manifest by the satirist; thus anagrams are used to reveal the true nature of a person or the destiny which the satire helps bring about. The satires of John Cleveland receive special attention for the way they use typographical figures in cursing the satirical victim.

Part III identifies the debate concerning religious images in the English church as a source for the iconoclastic energy of 1640s satire. The controversy is more complex than being merely a clash between Puritans and Laudians, for both parties were keen to expose and pull down non-physical, spiritual images which the other had erected. In the same way in which typographical figures are

manipulated, the satirist breaks the object of ridicule represented in the satire in iconic terms. The Juvenalian satire of Hall, Marston, and Lodge in the 1590s avoided the charge of slander mainly by ridiculing the follies and vices of mankind in general, satirising social types rather than individuals; Ben Jonson defends *Volpone* (1607) by asking "where have I been particular? where personal? except to a mimic, cheater, bawd, or buffoon, creatures for their insolencies worthy to be taxed?"³ The satire of the 1640s, however, is "particular", making particular allegations against particular individuals, in effect assaulting the object of attack in order to break it. When personal satire makes false accusations or strikes too painfully close to persons of authority, it is liable to be tried in a court of law for libel. The frequency with which the term "libel" is used in the 1640s to describe satirical pamphlets and the prominence given to libel laws or their offenders corroborate the evidence that 1640s satire was predominantly personal. The most prominent image-making and -marring exchange of the seventeenth century surrounds the pamphlets published after the death of Charles I and the publication of *Eikon Basilike*; the satirical strategies of the three most prominent of these pamphlets are examined here.

Part IV considers the influence of the Greek satirist Lucian on the satire of the 1640s, particularly in texts which involve a divine or infernal setting; Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* (A.D. 54) is the source of several satires which feature an expulsion (*exclusus*) from the ranks of the blessed. The use of the Lucianic motifs of the

³ Ben Jonson, "Epistle", *Volpone*, in *Three Comedies*, Michael Jamieson, ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966), 43.

divine session and the infernal conference corresponds with the habit of seventeenth-century thought to conceive of moral realities in terms of heaven and hell; the bi-polarisation found in ecclesiastical and political issues, which assigns matters as stemming from either a divine or a diabolical source, is expressed in the satire of the period in Lucianic terms. Ben Jonson, the greatest contributor of Lucianic satire to English literature, continues in his posthumous influence in the satirical dialogues of the 1640s; in this respect, Tucca in Thomas Dekker's *Satiromastix* (1601) speaks for the individuals satirised in these satirical pamphlets: "Thou'lt... bring me and my Heliconistes into thy Dialogues to make vs talke madlie, wut not Lucian?" (IV.ii.98-100). The heaven/hell bi-polarisation ultimately becomes a matter of the legitimacy and authorisation of satirical texts, where scatological imagery adds to the allegation of infernal origins and, inversely and implicitly, confirms the satirist's claim to the divine source.

In Part V, the assessment of satirical forms in the 1640s turns to one of the most fundamental concerns of the seventeenth century, disorder, and discusses notions of society and the representation of order, with the primary focus on the uses to which the sphere model of the universe was put. Royalist satire attacks aspects of the separatist and parliamentary positions which threaten the stability provided by the established authority structures in society and church; Parliamentary and Independent satire envisage a reversal or subversion of contemporary concepts of order. Both these ends are served in parody which alters previous texts or accepted forms of writing.

1.2. The Definition of 'Popular'.

Some preliminary remarks about the methodological problems regarding the definition of "popular" literature in the Renaissance period must be made before entering the four areas in which 1640s satire is engaged. On account of the predominance of critical studies of sixteenth-century popular literature, these remarks react to work done on Elizabethan and Jacobean forms of the popular print culture in an attempt to establish the theoretical basis on which to analyze 1640s satire. Many recent studies of "popular" literature in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have dealt with the subject from theoretically unstable perspectives. The definition of "popular" in terms of readership is undermined by the inconclusive statistical evidence of literacy in the period. Even with a wide margin of error, the demonstration of increased literacy only goes a little way in describing what "popular" entails, for, strictly speaking, the fact of a growing number of readers among the formerly illiterate portion of society does not itself indicate who read what; at best, it tells only who was capable of reading.⁴ Did the now-

⁴ Roger Chartier, probing the bounds of the popular association with the printed word in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century France, suggests that "a relation to printed matter did not inevitably imply individual reading, reading did not necessarily imply possession of books, and familiarity with printed matter did not necessarily imply familiarity with books"; in "Culture as Appropriation: Popular Cultural Uses in Early Modern France", in Steven L. Kaplan, ed., *Understanding Popular Culture: Europe from the Middle Ages to the Nineteenth Century* (Berlin & New York: Mouton Publishers, 1984), 241. For an analysis of the statistics of literacy, see David Cressy,

literate thousands consume the pamphlets they are said to have read? Can a realistic readership be determined by pursuing that shadowy figure, the "implied" reader? Does a knowledge of possible readers bear relevantly on the question of actual readers?

A second method of defining "popular" is through the author, known or conjectured. Even more problematic than the approach through the reader, the author-centred approach aims to give meaning to the text through a conception of the author which inevitably becomes a fiction of the critic's making. The author of an anonymous pamphlet, for instance, is an "implied" author whose education, occupation, and social position are surmised by the reader from the stylistic features of the text, such as diction, classical allusion, even technical virtuosity. With only these ghostly features to project a portrait of the author, the formulation of the author's original intention contributes nothing substantial to the understanding of a text. Furthermore, conclusions drawn from biographical information when the author is known and the information is available, are often irrelevant if not misleading. Lois Potter, examining Royalist writers in the Civil War, implies a distinction between a genuine and spurious "'popular' idiom" based on a writer's political position and social status: "the fact that the same satiric modes can be used by writers of opposed political views makes it difficult... to identify a genuinely 'popular' idiom".⁵ As a result, Potter misreads Royalist texts such as Peter Hausted's *Ad*

Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and writing in Tudor and Stuart England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

⁵ Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 32.

Populum, or, a Lecture to the People (1644) as "only ostensibly an attempt to reach popular support" (26), as if Hausted's social status --he was an Oxford don and an acquaintance of Charles I-- renders him incapable of writing "genuinely 'popular'" literature. However, as the examples of Bishop Richard Corbett (3.3. below) and *Rump Songs* (1660) demonstrate, Royalists near the top of the social register were very capable at writing in the "popular" idiom. The criterion for identifying the "'popular' idiom" should not rest in the author.

The essential problem of both reader- and author-centred perspectives is the necessary dependence on supposition and speculation. In the end, the only objective factors in the study of the "popular" pamphlet are the material artefact, and its production and distribution. The medium through which a particular style of writing now described as "popular" was made public is loaded with significant generic indicators, recognizable from the printing style that early in the 1580s already associated particular typographical and visual features, such as black letter, with a popular style of writing. By the mid-seventeenth century, the single-sheet quarto pamphlet, with its title-page advertisements and woodcuts, and with its distribution by street vendors and travelling "carriers", signalled its popular status. Rather than merely an "idiom", the popular mode in the 1640s becomes a recognized form with its own set of requirements and conventions, ranging from its external features (published format) to its internal, stylistic characteristics. As a particular form, the popular pamphlet also had its particular uses as a vehicle for presenting social, political and ecclesiastical ideas to a vast audience; by the same token, as a tool to manipulate

public opinion and exploit the mass market, the satirical pamphlet can be seen as far from "genuinely" popular. The genuineness of the "popular idiom" is irrelevant to the integrity or credibility of the form, for, as a self-conscious, often self-referential form of expression, the popular pamphlet withdraws from the popular culture to which its origins are traced and by which its genuineness is measured, and operates in its own system of images, symbols, patterns, and forms.

Consistent with an emphasis on the material artefact, this thesis treats the date of a satire's publication as more significant than its date of composition. The accurate dating of Renaissance texts is difficult in most instances and theoretically impossible in many, and the interpretative conclusions drawn from conjectured dates of composition are speculative at best. To avoid this danger and to underscore the importance of the physical dimensions of the satirical pamphlet and its audience, the thesis deals exclusively with printed texts, with manuscript sources occasionally serving a supplementary function. Certainly, the date of composition and, in the case of earlier satires re-issued in the 1640s, the date of first publication are crucial for describing the context in which the material appeared and for determining the factors that contribute to the publication of a satire in the 1640s. For example, the reappearance in the early 1640s both of Marprelate tracts and the anti-Martinist Elizabethan treatises suggests a similarity between the episcopal controversies of the 1580s and early 1640s, whereas the conditions of their production and reception require that these pamphlets be read differently. The printing of the Marprelate tracts in the 1640s was

much less dangerous than that of the original tracts which simultaneously broke old rules and new ground in religious satire. Furthermore, the threat of prosecution under the laws of libel, which had effectively silenced Marprelate after Udall and Penry were punished for their involvement in the tracts, had disappeared with the demise of the Star Chamber in 1641, and *Hay any worke for Cooper* and *The Character of a Puritan* could be reprinted with impunity in March 1642 and January 1643; the conditions surrounding the reincarnation of Marprelate in 1645 and 1646 as Richard Overton's Marpriest perhaps more closely resemble that of the original in the late 1580s, and again demand a thorough comparison of the contexts of their publication. These factors require that the 1640s reprints of Marprelate be read with Caroline rather than Elizabethan eyes.

Similarly, the thesis deals with anti-puritan satires written in the late sixteenth- or early seventeenth-century that appeared in print in the 1640s. The satires of Bishop Richard Corbett, for instance, were received twice by separate audiences in distinctly different religious, political and social contexts: written mostly in the 1620s, when they circulated in limited perimeters in manuscript, the satires were published only in 1647 and 1648, after Corbett's death. The circumstances of the original circulation and reception of a poem such as Corbett's "Against the Opposing of the Duke in Parliament, 1628", for instance, can be partially reconstructed by comparing the dates and states of its various manuscript

versions throughout the early 1630s.⁶ Corbett's attack on the opponents of Buckingham --and, indirectly, Charles I-- was printed in *Certain Elegant Poems* (1647) and *Poëtica Stromata* (1648) where it engaged an audience not only wider than that privy to the material in manuscript, but also affected by the events of the first Civil War. The example of Corbett's satires suggests that the conditions of 1647-48, when both episcopal and Royalist causes were virtually lost, demanded the wider circulation of anti-separatist texts which had previously remained in manuscript. It seems reasonable to conclude that the book market provided the impetus to print satirical material such as Corbett's and other Royalist songs, ballads and short satirical pieces that could perform a more serious function than merely the deliberately "low" entertainment at court, which Lois Potter sees as the sole function of such pieces as Peter Hausted's *Ad Populum*. Corbett's satires were successful enough to warrant two impressions in 1647; the conditions surrounding the 1648 edition were less propitious and *Poëtica Stromata* had to be printed abroad. Corbett's satires, perhaps more than others of the prelatical party, retained their relevance from the time of their composition in the 1620s, particularly when they confront such issues as the iconoclasm of zealous Puritans which entered its third phase in the 1640s after the two phases of purging the church of papist traces during the Henrician reformation and the Jacobean reaction to the Elizabethan settlement. Given their influence on anti-presbyterian and anti-non-

⁶ V.L. Pearl and M.L. Pearl, "Richard Corbett's 'Against the Opposing of the Duke in Parliament, 1628' and the Anonymous Rejoinder, 'An Answer to the Same, Lyne for Lyne': The Earliest Dated Manuscript Copies", *Review of English Studies*, ns 42.165, 32-9.

conformist satire until the Restoration, these satires in particular justify the inclusion of Corbett in this study of the rôle satirical texts played during the Civil War, whether or not they were composed in the years 1640-1649.

Four factors, of which the first two are least important, must obtain to determine the designation "popular": the reader (actual, intended and implied), the writer (known, obscure or anonymous), the medium (production, size, price, and distribution), and the content. The content of the "popular" satirical pamphlet is the main subject of this thesis which provides a rhetorical analysis of the persuasive strategies, internal systems, vocabulary, characters, and symbols of the satirical pamphlet. With a conception of "popular" as a distinction based on factors such as printing presses and the book market, the author and reader re-enter the scene to confirm the inferences drawn from the medium's indicators. What an author does with the reader's expectations in the text often makes the definition of "popular" difficult for the modern reader, often because the rhetorical effectiveness of the text confounds the low expectations raised by the external features of a popular pamphlet (size, cost, illustrations, typeface). More than merely an additional clue to the main conundrum of its author's intention or its reading public, the intentions expressed by the text's medium provide the most substantial insight into the "popular idiom".

The demography of the readership must, of course, be taken into account, not only because the writers of popular pamphlets themselves thought specifically about their audience, but also because an interpretation of the pamphlets is facilitated by an awareness of

contemporary reading practices. Unfortunately, a definition of "popular" in terms of literacy tends ultimately to seek the lowest common denominator among the "new readership", namely, apprentices, artisans, craftsmen, farm labourers, and yeomen. This tendency inevitably conjures up an "ideal" reader, that is, a composite of "the new reader" described by the social historian. To think of a readership collectively and abstractly in the widest possible sense, including all classes of readers, is to avoid the pitfall of focussing exclusively on a single "ideal" reader. Pamphlets are in a sense classless material objects available to all levels of society without the barrier of cost that prohibited most people from buying books. By dividing society into separate reading classes, by emphasising the fact of rising literacy among the lower orders, and by trying to identify as narrowly as possible those who were most likely to read popular literature, one is in danger of excluding large portions of society that were exposed to the same material. Printed material such as popular pamphlets, newsbooks, broadsheets, and ballads were primarily urban phenomena with a wider audience in the county towns and villages; with a few notable exceptions, pamphlets were invariably printed in London or one of the large provincial centres.⁷ But it is impossible to determine whether the urban market was the primary target and the country audience the secondary; it is even difficult to determine whether the two markets were thought of as separate entities. John Taylor's *The Carriers*

⁷ Richard Overton's "Marpriest" tracts were printed at various clandestine locations in London, the Home counties, and possibly the Netherlands. When John Lilburne was interrogated by the Star Chamber in 1637, he was repeatedly asked to inform on his Dutch connections (*A Christian Mans Triall*, 2nd ed., 1641; A1v-A2r).

Cosmography (1637) demonstrates that an extremely effective distribution network of chapmen radiated from London to all parts of Britain who would carry small books, ballads and pamphlets to sell on their routes. The recipients of this material, therefore, are not exclusively urban but also include the increasingly literate population in market towns and agricultural centres.⁸

Moreover, although popular literature is a printed medium, the consumers of popular literature could be seen more as an audience than a readership, for, as Richard Cust has shown, pamphlets and newsbooks were often read aloud in alehouses and other gatherings, in both urban and country settings.⁹ This fact further undermines the relevance of literacy statistics and alters completely any static image of "the readership"; there need be only one literate person in an alehouse in order for the printed word to reach a greater audience (and depreciate the value of the literacy statistics). In a public reading, for instance, a satirical pamphlet becomes a performance --the written word as political "speech act" in a very real sense-- and a satirical dialogue gains additional effectiveness when it is

⁸ See David Cressy, *Literacy and Social Order*, 11ff.

⁹ "News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England", *Past and Present*, 112 (1986), 60-90. Cust comments on the Buckingham ballads of 1626: "The political allusions would probably have been picked up first and foremost by the educated connoisseur, while the less-refined imagery may have had greater impact in a public performance. None the less, we should beware of drawing too clear a distinction. In this context, it is significant that such material was being presented at all, and this suggests that the separation often made between popular and elite culture was in practice sometimes non-existent. Here, at least, the literate and illiterate shared the same medium" (68-9). Victor E. Neuburg, *Popular Literature: A History and Guide* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977), pictures pamphlets "becoming progressively more tattered as they passed from hand to hand or were read aloud to unlettered audiences agog for lurid details", 87.

read aloud, in an alehouse, possibly in the local accent, with extempore revisions, audience participation, and heckling; each public "reading" would be a new edition of the text.¹⁰ Such participation deepens the collusion between author and recipient, granting a subversive text even greater political influence. Ultimately, however, the collusion could collapse: as liberties are taken with the text, the author loses authority, is erased and replaced by the participants in the performance. In short, oral culture would ascend over the culture of print. But if such an audience-response approach to the popular pamphlet introduces exciting new concepts about the receivers of printed material, it also encounters grave difficulties, for live performances cannot be reconstructed, nor can the size and nature of the aural "readership" be measured.¹¹

In the light of Richard Cust's conclusions about the aural component in the dissemination of news, attempts to recreate the "intended" reader of popular literature must be critically re-assessed. Margaret Spufford's *Small Books and Pleasant Histories* (1981), which was among the first to describe the popular readership in the seventeenth century and which abounds in remarkable facts and insights, in the final analysis reveals most about the man whose

¹⁰ J.G.A. Pocock develops the notion of political speech as act in a revolutionary context, *The Politics of Discourse* (London: Methuen, 1972), 24 and 29.

¹¹ A.L. Lloyd, *Folk Song in England* (St. Albans: Paladin, 1967), in describing a similar interaction between printed and oral cultures in the transmission of ballads, also comments that sixteenth- and seventeenth-century "blackletter" or broadside ballads were "fashionable with all classes", 25.

collection is the actual subject of Spufford's book.¹² As a historical work, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories* stands beside Keith Wrightson's *English Society, 1580-1680* in describing the social milieu of the popular readership but as an interpretive study of the popular fiction in terms of readership, it can only deal with Samuel Pepys, the only known, "actual" reader of the material Spufford examines.¹³ With less success, Sandra Clark in *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers* (1983) looks to the "intended" reader of the popular moralistic pamphlet in order to comprehend the motivations of an Elizabethan hack writer such as Nashe; she has to admit that the task of knowing who the readers were is an impossible one, even leaving aside the literally immeasurable audience who heard the pamphlets read aloud.¹⁴ Like constructing a hypothetical model of missing links in the evolution of man, the attempt to discover or reconstruct the intended reader is merely conjectural.

Sandra Clark begins by culling information about the "intended" reader (gender, education, social standing, occupation) from "epistles to the reader". But, like a dramatic Prologue, "The Epistle to the Reader" is a form of writing that must be read suspiciously, for, rather than delineating dispassionately the features of the "intended" reader, the author sets the pre-conditions which the reader is subliminally urged to meet. The author

¹² Margaret Spufford, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and its Readership in Seventeenth-century England* (London: Methuen, 1981).

¹³ Keith Wrightson, *English Society, 1580-1680* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1982).

¹⁴ Sandra Clark, *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers: Popular Moralistic Pamphlets 1580-1640* (London: Athlone Press, 1983), 21.

predisposes the reader by projecting an image of the author and manipulating the reader's expectations, attributing to "the reader" certain characteristics that will be fulfilled unconsciously. The author's version of "the reader" is a type --not necessarily an ideal-- to which the reader must conform, setting the standard beneath which the reader would not want to fall. The modern reader, including Sandra Clark, cannot assume to be immune to the subtle rhetorical strategies and manipulation of the "epistle". The quest for the individual, perfect "intended reader" must be set aside for more productive ways of revealing the multi-directional forces at play within the texts of popular literature.

Laura Stephenson, in *Praise and Paradox: Merchants and Craftsmen in Elizabethan Popular Literature* (1984), while avoiding the trap of reading "Epistles to the Reader" at face value, nevertheless draws conclusions about the type of reader authors tried to attract.¹⁵ For instance, the plainness of language in most popular pamphlets indicates that the level of education was rudimentary. Despite a cautious use of literacy figures, a thorough investigation of the socio-political milieu of writers of Elizabethan popular literature, and a balanced approach to both the reader and author, Stephenson's definition of "popular" suffers from an overly statistical bent. For her purposes of examining Elizabethan popular literature as a site of paradoxes and conflicting paradigms in a socially and economically changing world, "popular" is taken simply in the sense of "successful", "works that attain popularity" (11).

¹⁵ L.C. Stephenson, *Praise and Paradox: Merchants and Craftsmen in Elizabethan Popular Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 51.

Without denying the legitimacy of Stephenson's conclusions about the social conflict played out in Elizabethan "popular" texts, her definition of "popular" does little to explain its significance as a recognizable form of print culture. It is as true for the 1640s as for the period 1558-1603 that the popularity of a book or pamphlet indicates its relevance to a large number of people, and, subsequently, its value as a document reflecting social perceptions, attitudes, and values. If *Praise and Paradox* demonstrates the rewards of analysing themes in popular literature for the social historian, it also shows the weaknesses of the approach to popular literature on purely social grounds, and reveals the need for an analysis of popular literature by the literary historian contextually involved in the origins, development, and effects of new literary forms.

But Sandra Clark is right to insist on a new type of readership: literacy spread, more women were reading, printing became easier and cheaper, and a non-aristocratic market was forming. But literature was no longer restricted to the system of patronage which previously controlled the production of texts, for writing was no longer exclusively a courtly activity to honour the patron. The fundamental point which the rise of the "hacks" (Greene, Nashe, and others) demonstrates is that a writer was no longer bound to produce what the system of aristocratic patronage demanded (what Clark calls "aesthetic demands"). Theoretically, the court poet wrote only for his patron, and publication in print was simply another step in honouring the patron. Patronage after Elizabeth's death was taken over increasingly by the printers themselves, by Nicholas Ling

(publisher of Robert Greene and Thomas Lodge), John Bodenham (in his *English Helicon*) and the producers of the miscellanies, whose economic control bound the poet to the printer and his demands and restrictions. The pamphleteer dealt with printers who recognized the market potential of authors writing what the "new readership" wanted.

The solution to the problem of which came first, the new readership or the new writing, lies in changes in literary patronage and printing practice which produced the conditions favorable for the exploitation of the printing practices and the book market in the 1640s; the changes in writing and publishing introduced during the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods suggest ways in which the book market could be put to political use during the Civil War. Nashe, Greene and the other "hacks" received the patronage of the press, providing material directed at the people most likely to buy the small pamphlet. In other words, the change in the channels of patronage effected a change in the kind of writing that identified a "new readership" and exploited the market. Prior to the new system of patronage, the majority of the population --that is, those outside the court, university and church-- had virtually nothing to read, nothing to relate to, nothing to stimulate them, and, according to the stereotype, read only Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* and the Authorized Version. The new writer thought hard what his new patron (in effect, the non-court, non-university, non-church reader) would like to read, and created what Sandra Clark, centuries later, calls a "new kind of writing": the popular pamphlet.

Whether based solely on the "Epistle" or composed from internal evidence of the text, a static image of a pamphlet's "intended" or

"ideal" reader denies the potential of the text to function in its social context. Consequently, one should not talk about an author's "ideal" or "intended" reader, but the spectrum of receivers exposed to a particular text. The text comes to play before an "audience" composed of a variety of social, economical, geographical, age, and gender groups, just as the audience in the Elizabethan theatre ranged from groundlings to those in "his Lordship's" box. A picture of the "intended reader" would have to be a composite of the images of known, actual readers of the popular press --William Laud, George Thomason the bookseller, John Selden, Samuel Pepys-- superimposed on those of the persons traditionally expected to consume the pamphlets --the apprentices, artisans, craftsmen, merchants, gentlemen, as well as yeomen, small landowners, and their families. The Civil War pamphlet was sold by booksellers in their shops or indiscriminately on the streets of London by hawkers, male and female, who cried their wares to passers-by. They were also the subject of frustrated ridicule in *The Dovvnefall of Temporizing Poets* (1641) where the mouths of "bawling Hawkers" (t.p.) are open sepulchres inviting all within earshot to partake of death (A3r). The audience exposed to "Parliament Joan", the hawker of phoney Royalist newsbooks in and around Parliament Square, defies generalisations about the lone "reader" and render extremely unlikely any portrait of "the reader" the modern critic would draw.¹⁶

One cannot diagnose positively the motives of publication, but it seems wholly likely that the "hacks" adopted what Lois Potter

¹⁶ On "Parliament Joan", see F.S. Siebert, *Freedom of the Press in England, 1476-1776* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952), 224.

describes as "the 'popular' idiom" simply to exploit the book market. Prior to the collapse of censorship in 1641, the financial incentive for journeymen printers and renegade members of the Stationers' Company was strong enough for them to defy licensing laws and publish unlicensed ephemeral material; the Stationers' monopoly over the number of printers drove them to print illegal goods.¹⁷ The motivation for writers in affecting the "popular idiom" to exploit the market during the "free press" years between the abolition of episcopal licensing (the Star Chamber) and the introduction of Parliamentary censorship in 1643, as well as during the period of reinforced press regulation under Cromwell, was not for the mercenary reasons of the Elizabethan pamphleteers, but for the ideological purpose of influencing (and mobilising) the greatest number of readers. In a few instances, such as that of Marchamont Nedham, writers did seek preferment or monetary reward by politically-motivated writing, either from the court of Charles I or the "court" of Parliament, or from both.

¹⁷ Siebert, *Freedom of the Press*, 8: "The printers of ephemeral materials such as newspapers and pamphlets... were independent entrepreneurs seeking a livelihood from their trade, and their exclusion from profitable printing fields forced them into prohibited pastures." The *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic* for 1637 notes that out-of-work journeymen printers took to printing seditious material (Para. 78, 214).

1.3. Popular and Elite.

The notion of "popular" literature in the 1640s, like that of the late Elizabethan period, seems to be more a conscious adoption of a mode of expression associated with contemporary popular culture than a manifestation of the popular culture in the print medium; in other words, the popular idiom of satirical texts is assumed by otherwise non-popular writers, such as Richard Corbett, Alexander Brome, Abraham Cowley, rather than the expression of popular culture as it has been described by social historians. Nevertheless, it is necessary to understand what popular culture is before determining how the popular idiom relates to non-literary expressions of popular culture.

Popular culture is thought to be the primary site of resistance to established order, with social historians tending to emphasise the features which distinguish "popular culture" from the "national culture" of the nobility, the gentry and the middling ranks.¹⁸ Consequently, a model emerges in which the two cultures are set in opposition, wholly incompatible and alien to each other. The forms which popular culture took in rural Britain, such as shaming rituals (charivari, skimmington, cucking stools) and traditional festivals and activities (May Day, Midsummer Night, morris dancing), are seen

¹⁸ A.J. Fletcher and J. Stevenson, edd., *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), "Introduction: A Polarised Society?", 4.

to embody a distinctly pagan, pre-Reformation system of values. Forms of the "national culture" (drama, poetry, music, portraiture) appear as direct antitheses, embodying a particularly Christian cultural matrix. However, as with Marxist and "Whig" accounts of early Stuart history, such an oppositional view of popular versus national culture denies the existence of a vast area of common ground between the two.

In granting the culture of the illiterate peasant a legitimate academic status, Peter Burke's definition of "culture" as a system of shared values and symbolic forms has the unfortunate effect of isolating folk culture from the culture of the "élite" within the academic framework.¹⁹ Although the seventeenth century did witness a gradual deterioration of the matrix of shared assumptions, there is little evidence to support the claim that a conscious, coherent "oppositional" culture or ideology was formed, either in Marxist terms of "the axis of class fractions" (dominant class versus labouring class) or in "Whig" historical terms.²⁰ Instead, a more

¹⁹ *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (London: Temple Smith, 1978), "Preface".

²⁰ On Marxist theory of dialogic and antagonistic class discourse, see Jameson, *The Political Unconscious*, 83-4 and Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984), 112. On the historians' "revisionism" debate see the following: Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, edd., *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603-1642* (London: Longman, 1989), "Introduction: after Revisionism", 1-46; Derek Hirst, "Revisionism Revised: The Place of Principle", 55-78, T.K. Rabb, "The Role of the Commons", 79-99, and Christopher Hill, "Parliament and People in Seventeenth-Century England", 100-124, *Past and Present*, 92 (1981). On the country vs. court theme, see Richard Cust, "News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England", *Past and Present*, 112 (1986), 76-78; and Robert Ashton, *The English Civil War: Conservatism and Revolution, 1603-1649* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978), 41-2. See also Margot Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge:

subtly nuanced conception of consensus and opposition focuses on the making common, inherent tendencies explicit in various political situations. For example, Thomas Scott, usually portrayed as an atypical radical puritan opponent of the Jacobean regime, from this perspective is seen merely to "develop and express in a polemically coherent and consistent form tendencies inherent in many of the commonplaces of the period"; "Scott was operating within what he and certainly most of his contemporaries assumed to be an ideological consensus".²¹ What distinguishes Scott and the Parliamentarians of the 1640s from others who share a similar world-view is "the particular use made of that world-view by different men confronting the same events".²² The use of cultural givens (Burke's "system of shared meanings, attitudes and values") to explain events, or to contain their effects, can take various forms and produce dramatically different results.

As the work of Roger Chartier on the uses of print in French popular culture has demonstrated, the coexistence of popular and élite cultures was never easy, and does not lend itself to easy

Cambridge University Press, 1980), *passim*.

²¹ P.G. Lake, "Constitutional Consensus and Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match", *Historical Journal*, 25 (1982), 807. Lake argues that, although there was no "monolithic party of 'opposition'", the anti-popish consensus formed "an ideologically based campaign of opposition to royal policy" (823).

²² Lake, 820. Richard Greaves and Robert Zaller, editors of the *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century* (3 vols.; Brighton: Harvester Press, 1982), concluded that "radicalism must be judged in the context of the available spectrum of dissent at a given time" (I.ix): "There is then no radical orthodoxy as such, but a periodically shifting response to historical situation. The essence of radicalism is indeed situational, a seizure of the possibilities of the moment for substantive change" (x).

characterisation along the simplistic oppositional lines of pre-revisionist historians. For example, the audience of the *Bibliothèque bleue*, the equivalent to the pennybook in England, "was neither cultured nor popular, a public made up in the city of merchants and wealthy artisans and, in the countryside, of low-ranking officials and the richer farmers and laborers"; "the way the popular classes received the printed word did not create a specific literature but enabled them to handle texts also read by the notability, whether small or great; for example, almanacs, broadsheets, and *livrets bleus*".²³ Although the sharing of common material suggests that this "new relation to the printed word" (250) would bring the popular classes closer to the notability, the new publishing practices in fact "created or reinforced cultural divergencies that were previously less obvious", such as the differentiation of towns and countryside, and led "to a contrast that will grow between two bodies of texts, those that feed the richest or most learned and those that aim to feed the curiosity of the popular classes" (251). Chartier concludes his examination of the two-way acculturation by noting that, even though "popular" printing recovers and reuses for a new public "texts that once belonged entirely to an elite culture", it simultaneously stigmatizes popular literature and creates "systems of appreciation that culturally define the products of printing, that fragment the market, and that draw new cultural boundaries" (252).

Precisely because the shared values and symbolic forms of print

²³ Chartier, "Culture as Appropriation", *Understanding Popular Culture*, 231 and 250-1.

culture diverge at certain places, Chartier argues for critical attention to focus upon the point of departure, the juncture at which the cultures separate, rather than their different destinations; without due consideration of the process of the differentiation in the literatures of the élite and popular, its distinct products seem more alien than they really are. The present study of the English satirical pamphlet of the 1640s implicitly questions the distinction between popular and learned in assessing the appropriation of satirical strategies by authors either cultured or popular for a public that was simultaneously neither and both, made up of university wits, merchants, wealthy artisans, farmers and laborers alike. This study also assumes about the political effectiveness of the popular idiom what Peter Burke has noted about medieval friars and early modern preachers whose rhetorical strategies were taken both from popular and learned traditions:

Their colloquial style was not spontaneous talking, but a conscious literary choice from the three possible styles, the others being the ornate and the plain.... They were mediators between two traditions, learned and popular, rather than representatives of either.²⁴

A good illustration of the troublesome distinction between "popular" and "élite", although it falls beyond the scope of this thesis, is the Restoration prose satires of Andrew Marvell. Critics have never been able to explain why Marvell was widely known by his contemporaries as a satirist and not as the great lyric poet he has

²⁴ "Oblique Approaches to the History of Popular Culture", in C.W.E. Bigsby, ed., *Approaches to Popular Culture* (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1976), 73.

become since T.S. Eliot rediscovered him as a "metaphysical".²⁵ Both parts of Marvell's *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* (1672 and 1673), which respond at great length to Samuel Parker's *A Preface shewing what grounds there are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery and his Reproof to the Rehearsal Transpros'd*, were contemporary favourites, enjoying immense popularity across the social spectrum.²⁶ Charles II, who should have disapproved of Marvell's anti-episcopal stance, allowed the satires to be published without opposition more likely because he enjoyed them than because the satires supported his tolerationist policy. The success of the satires lies not so much in the taste of the Restoration court as in the fine balance Marvell strikes between learned, erudite references and coarse, almost Rabelaisian, or "popular" elements. In the final analysis, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* seamlessly joins what the modern reader, trained to separate élite from popular, is incapable of comprehending simultaneously. The religious satire of the continental humanists in the Erasmian circle attempted to blend the two, particularly through its imitation of Lucian, but remained inaccessibly learned; their satires were written in Latin. English examples of humanist satire, such as Donne's *Ignatius His Conclave* (1610), participate in the same learned circle. It is the Civil War, I suggest, that breaks the exclusivity of treating the issues of church and state that were formerly the

²⁵ Barbara Everitt, for instance, describes the apparent discrepancy between Marvell's satirical and lyrical voices as a "fissure", in "The Shooting of the Bears: Poetry and Politics in Andrew Marvell" in R.C. Brett, ed., *Andrew Marvell: Essays on the Tercentenary of His Death* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974), 63.

²⁶ See *The Rehearsal Transpros'd and The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part*, D.I.B. Smith, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), Introduction.

purlieu of Latinate writers. The debate between More and Tyndale about the decorum of ecclesiastical discussions prepared the scene for Marprelate and his successors in the 1640s who dragged the *arcana imperii et ecclesiae* upon the stage of popular ridicule. Throughout the Civil War, the low and high intersect, producing a literature which involves classical and popular erudition simultaneously; the achievement of Marvell's *Rehearsal Transpros'd* lies in the interaction of the two in the satirical mode, the great leveller among literary genres. The political upheaval of the 1640s, in which Marvell was intimately associated as a Member of Parliament, altered generic decorum, making the blend of high and low not only possible, but, in Marvell's case, hugely successful.²⁷

Consequently, this thesis will not consider the satire of the 1640s narrowly within the context of "Popular Literature" or "Popular Culture", as if these subjects can be hermetically sealed within their own world. I will consider the satirical pamphlet within the complete cultural milieu in which its peculiar forms of expression existed, circulated, and developed. Rather than taking "popular" as a separate entity in the taxonomy of literary studies, I will examine it as a part of the national culture as a whole and investigate the function which the popular idiom performed.

²⁷ Raymond A. Anselment, *'Betwixt Jest and Earnest': Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift & The Decorum of Religious Ridicule* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), analyzes the defence of religious satire on the æsthetic grounds of propriety in these writers.

1.4. The Satirical Milton.

In light of the redirection of "popular" critical study away from the opposition implied in the rigid distinction between elite and popular cultures, it is not surprising that the satirical prose of John Milton plays an important part in the thesis. Milton's fierce involvement in the ideological debates of the 1640s extends beyond his academic contributions to the Parliamentary position regarding church government and monarchy; the satirical strategies of his animadversive tracts and confutations, although destined for an intellectual audience primarily, nevertheless participate alongside the forms of satirical expression found in the penny pamphlets of the 1640s. Although their material dimensions as substantial books should deny Milton's prose tracts treatment beside single-sheet quarto pamphlets, the forms of ridicule they employ suggest that Milton's satirical writing has much in common with the "popular" satires of the 1640s.

Furthermore, Milton is a conscious practitioner of well-considered notions of satire which he defends in his prose tracts. In this manner, Milton articulates an apology for satirical expression that is implied in many satires of the 1640s, satires which do not offer an explicit defence of their art. The Appendix ("*A Satyr Against Hypocrites: Milton and Popular Satire*") demonstrates the influence of Milton on popular forms of satirical

expression in the specific example of his nephew, John Phillips; aspects of satire discussed in the thesis coalesce in Phillips's *A Satyr Against Hypocrites*.

For Milton, the appropriately rough prose of ridicule serves a rhetorical function, and is legitimate in even the most grave context. Milton is at pains to explain in *Animadversions* in which is "mixt here and there such a grim laughter, as may appeare at the same time in an austere visage", evincing "those two most rationall faculties of humane intellect anger and laughter":²⁸

Nor to do thus are we unauthoritied either from the morall precept of SALOMON... nor from the example of Christ, and all his followers in all Ages, who... have wrought up their zealous souls into such vehemencies, as nothing could be more killingly spoken. (I.662-3)

Milton appeals to Scriptural (and, thus, unimpeachable) authority in justifying the satirical mode, and he defends in terms of artistic decorum the combined presence of anger and "a lowring smile when the properest object calls for both" (I.664). The spleen is the source both of laughter and jest and of irascible and ill-tempered behaviour.²⁹ But to think of anger and laughter as "those two most rationall faculties of humane intellect" is untypical of both Medieval and Renaissance humour theory, and Milton's portrayal of satire as grim laughter and an austere visage in rationalistic terms is striking.

The use of ridicule in classical rhetoric --and, consequently,

²⁸ John Milton, *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, J. Sirluck, ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), II.663, 664.

²⁹ See W. Pagel, "The Smiling Spleen" in *History and Imagination: Essays in Honour of Hugh Trevor-Roper*, H. Lloyd-Jones, V. Pearl, B. Worden, edd. (London: Duckworth, 1981), 81-131.

in the Renaissance animadversive style which draws upon it-- serves primarily to discredit the opponent, usually in an epideictic context but also in forensic settings, and is known under the category *vituperatio*.³⁰ In *An Apology against a Pamphlet*, Milton justifies its use for didactic ends, citing Horace as authority:

--laughing to teach the truth
 What hinders? as some teachers give to Boyes
 Junkets and knacks, that they may learne apace.
 Thus *Flaccus* in his first Satir, and in his tenth
 --Jesting decides great things
 Stronglier, and better oft then earnest can. (I.904)

But rather than Horatian, the laughter with which Milton attacks his opponents --whether Joseph Hall in *Animadversions* and the *Apology*, the anonymous critic of Milton's *Tetrachordon* in *Colasterion*, or Charles I and John Gauden in *Eikonoklastes*-- is *sarcasmus*, the rhetorical term for a bitter taunt or gibe.

The etymology of *sarcasmus* ("to tear flesh") is undoubtedly behind Bacon's characterisation of the method of "popular" religious ridicule "to turne religion into a Comedy or Satyr, to search and *rip up wounds* with a laughing countenance".³¹ For Milton, however, decorum requires his satire to be biting, for "a toothlesse Satyr is as improper as a toothed sleekstone" (*Animadversions*, I.670). Although *Eikonoklastes* purports "not to ripp up and relate the misdoings of his whole life, but to answer only, and refute the missayings of his book" (III.342), the sarcasm, which is the form of ridicule favoured by Milton and which gives the pamphlet its

³⁰ Brian Vickers, *Classical Rhetoric in English Poetry* (repr. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1989), 70-1.

³¹ *A Wise and Moderate Discourse Concerning Church-Affairs* (1641), B4r (italics mine).

satirical bite, tears at the person of the king in a further act of iconoclasm. *The Brownists Conventicle* (1641) conceives of its satirical dismantling of sectarianism in similar terms, when it apologises for its incompleteness, "To rip up all the whole rabbit, would take up too much time, and blot too much paper" (A2r). While Milton was writing his satirical prose, the Royalists were composing street ballads against Separatists and against Parliament, especially the weakened remnant after the Army "purged" the House of Commons in 1648. Many of these ballads were collected and published in 1660 under the title *Ratts Rhimed to Death, Or, The Rump Parliament Hang'd up in the Shambles*.

PART II: SATIRE AS FORMAL MALEDICTION

- 2.1.** Introduction: Magic and Satire
- 2.2.** The Mystical Property of Signs
 - 2.2.1. Astrology
 - 2.2.2. Characters
 - 2.2.3. Anagrams
- 2.3.** Conclusion

PART II: SATIRE AS FORMAL MALEDICTION

2.1. Introduction: Magic and Satire.

Shortly after the first military confrontation between Parliamentary and Royalist forces at Edgehill on 23 October 1642, the wits of Oxford published *Musarum Oxoniensium*, a collection of verse welcoming Henrietta Maria to Oxford. Leonard Lichfield, the printer of *Musarum Oxoniensium*, completes the collection with verse of his own about the function of the printing press in the battle:

*Presses of Old, as Pens, did but incite
Others to Valour; This It Selfe did fight:
In Ranks and Files these Letters Marshall'd stood
On Dismall Edg-Hill-day, yet 'twas not blood
They boaded by their Black, for Peace they sought,
And Teem'd with Pardons while the Rebels fought.
Yet those that found it on that Boysterous day
Tooke't for some Dread Commission of Array;
And thought each Letter Theta, every Point
To give a Period to a Life or Joynt;
They Plunder'd, and so turn'd it ore and ore
As th'had ne're used this Neck-verse worse before:
So Anagrammatized each Comma in't
That Babel-London has not put in Print
More confused Nonsense----. (D4v)*

Lichfield conceives of the very letters and characters in the cases of his printing shop as soldiers in the battle at Edgehill. Properly deciphered, the fonts, types, points, and characters of Lichfield's press pronounce peace and pardon, but the rebels in pro-Parliamentary London attacked the significant arrangement of letters, "turn'd it ore and ore" and "Anagrammatized each *Comma*", to read instead of royal clemency a message of death, construing "each Letter *Theta*" for

thanatos. Lichfield's poem suggests that the focus of the confrontation between King and Parliament is the printing press.

Lichfield's army of typographical characters also suggests that the material objects of printing and reading perform an important rôle in the Civil War. The figural arrangement of letters or words in anagrams, emblems, hieroglyphs, acrostics, and other visually significant forms, plays an important function in seventeenth-century religious and eulogistic verse. Recent studies of Renaissance "figured poetry" have helpfully sharpened the focus upon the material shape of poems, words, and typographical characters, and the interplay between the physical appearance of words and their signification.¹ The eulogistic anagrams by which Joshua Sylvester lavishly praises his patrons or by which Francis Lenton graciously honours Britain's beauties have a beatific effect that arises from a significance beyond the literal meaning of letters and characters.² Just as the words of blessing which Old Testament patriarchs pronounced in naming their sons were not so much prophecies as constative utterances, these anagrams of praise pronounce the fact of future glory, fame and honour.

The satirical counterpart to the eulogistic anagram, chronogram, or hieroglyph is similarly an illocutionary act which, like the curses of the Hebrew patriarchs, effects that which it

¹ Elizabeth Cook, *Seeing Through Words: The scope of late Renaissance poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), Ch 2; Martin Elsky, *Authorizing Words: Speech, Writing, and Print in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), Ch 4 and 5.

² *The Divine Weeks and Works of Guillaume de Saluste Sieur du Bartas*, translated by Joshua Sylvester, Susan Snyder, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), II.884; Francis Lenton, *Great Britains Beauties* (1638).

pronounces. J.L. Austin and J.R. Searle have argued that certain "speech acts" bring about a state of affairs simply by their utterance.³ (For example, when the clergyman declares, "I proclaim you man and wife", the words themselves change two single people into a married couple, husband and wife.) The maledictory intent of satire --to bring about the ruin of the victim-- implies as its corollary a beneficent aspect: to bring about a restoration of morality and justice that follows the eradication of the victim. Satirical malediction, whether it appears as curse explicitly or indirectly, attempts to transform the object of ridicule by representing it in a fictional context which assumes reality. In other words, the satirist places the victim within a narrative or symbolical universe parallel to but no less "real" than the actual, physical world. Henry Walker's *Mercurius Britanicus His Vision* (1647) is a response to *Britanicus His Welcome to Hell* (1647), in which Walker is given a triumphal entry into hell and is praised by the Devil for surpassing Rabshakeh, the blaspheming representative of Nebuchadnezzar (II Kings 18:17f), and the curser Shimei (II Sam. 16:14f). Walker's reply takes the form of a vision of hell, where "the Genius" of the author of *Britanicus His Welcome to Hell* is being tormented in effigy, "As witches stab the picture, when they faire / Would kill the substance..." (A4v). Walker's satire not only portrays his opponent's punishment but effectually becomes the instrument of torment: the "substance" is killed by means of the satirical stabbing enacted in the pamphlet.

³ J.L. Austin, *How To Do Things With Words* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962) and J.R. Searle, *Speech Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

In *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art*, R.C. Elliott has suggested that satire is inherently associated with what he calls the "apotropaic function" of magic designed to expell (literally, "turn away") evil spirits and people from the community.⁴ Elliott demonstrates the association of magic and satire in the iambs of Archilochus, the Greek poet of the seventh century B.C., whose *iamboi* literally destroyed his victims.⁵ Archilochus was a participant in the cult of Demeter in his native Paros, and is chiefly remembered for satirizing Lycambes, the father of Archilochus's betrothed, Neobule, who hanged themselves as a result of the satirical utterance.⁶ The rites of the Demeter cult, closely alligned with Dionysian and Phallic rites, included the public performance of *iamboi*, extempore verse invectives against prominent members of the local community. The term *iambos* derives from the mythical figure Iambe who amused Demeter with humorous abuse, which, according to Martin West, is "the mythical prototype of some ritual raillery of a comic, insulting and probably indecent sort, which must have borne the name *iamboi*".⁷ The context of ritual endows *iamboi* with the effectual power of curse, as the *iamboi* of Archilochus against Lycambes and Neobule demonstrated, regardless of whether the word-

⁴ Robert C. Elliott, *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1960), 6. Elliott argues that the magical quality of invective derives from contexts of ritual, such as the cult of Phales and Roman wedding processions.

⁵ Elliott, *The Power of Satire*, 3-15.

⁶ H.D. Rankin, *Archilochus of Paros* (Park Ridge, N.J.: Noyes Press, 1977), 17.

⁷ Martin L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1974), 24.

slaying is historical or legendary. As R.C. Elliott points out, the truthfulness of the legend is made irrelevant by the credence given it by tradition, for popular belief in the story has given the iambic satire of Archilochus its malefic power: "The satirist had access to uncanny powers because the story said he did" (12).

As a form of art with an effective force and a social function, publicly performed in a ritualistic context, the *iambos* of Archilochus participates in the popular culture of the Greek mysteries. Likewise, the function of iambic satire in the 1640s is in many respects the equivalent in print culture to the shaming rituals of popular culture as it has been documented by David Underdown, Natalie Zemon Davis, Peter Burke, and others.⁸ The rough music, charivari and skimmington ride of popular culture performs the same function as *iambos*: the formal procession, the symbolic objects of ridicule, such as the wooden ladle of the scold or the horns of the cuckold, and the devastating effect on the victim take part in the tradition of ritual and magic that includes the iambics of Archilochus. The rituals of ridicule in popular culture acquired rules and developed expectations that make them identifiable as forms of public shaming with characteristics common throughout Europe. The

⁸ David Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Natalie Zemon Davis, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France: Eight Essays* (London: Duckworth, 1975); Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (London: Temple Smith, 1978). Also relevant to the relationship between written and performed aspects of popular culture is Mikhaïl Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, Helene Iswolsky, trans. (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1968), as is Leah S. Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell and the Defence of Old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

ritual of ridicule in the print culture of the 1640s is primarily iambic, a genre determined by the norms, conventions, and expectations developed from the iambics of Archilochus.

In aiming to achieve the effect of *iambos*, the satire of the 1640s tends to be personal (or "particular") and partakes, frequently in a self-conscious manner, in the ancient tradition of invective which assigns extraordinary, effectual power to satirical expression. In this way, the satire of the mid-seventeenth century departs radically from Thomas Lodge, John Marston, Joseph Hall, John Weever, Everard Guilpin, William Goddard, Nicholas Breton and other Elizabethan or Jacobean satirists. Whereas their forebears, with the notable exception of Marprelate, practised in the belief that the function of their satirical art was to purge court and society of immoral attitudes and fashions, the satirist of the Civil War used the genre to effect the destruction of particular persons by means of satirical representation; rather than a moralist, the mid-century satirist was a general who --to paraphrase Lichfield-- marshalled his army of letters "In Ranks and Files" to attack particular people, including the king whom the Commons had pledged to preserve and defend.⁹ The effectiveness of personal satire is queried in a dialogue between Citizen and Gentleman in *Sion's Charity Towards Her Foes* (1641):

Gent. yet doe I utterly dislike this disposition which I have observed in many, ... uttering such bitter words against gross offenders, and much more if they write or print Bookes in that nature, to tell you truly, I like not such Satyricall spirits.

⁹ The Solemn League and Covenant, "to preserve and defend the King's majesty's person and authority", was taken on 25 September 1643. S.R. Gardiner, *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906), 269.

Cit. Why, but Sir by your favour, I conceive that such Bookes doe much good....

Gent. Sir, I pray you conceive that it is not the matter of such Bookes that I doe simply condemne, but the manner or stile of them.... Let the sin bee shamed rather than the sinner... but this tart manner spoiles all.... (A3r)

When Martin Parker, the Royalist ballad-writer, suggests in *The Poet's Blind mans bough* (1641) that "More danger comes bith'quill then by the Sword" (A4r), he refers specifically to the malefic power of iambic satire in the Archilochean sense rather than to conventional wisdom concerning "the pen and the sword". Samuel Sheppard's *Epigrams Theological, Philosophical, and Romantick* (1651) expands the notion somewhat in the epigram "To Will. Lee, the Bookseller at Pauls Chaire" (Book 5, #43):

Syrrah; thou are so base a Foole that I,
Think thee not worth my Anger, else I'de try
In *ARCHILOCHVS* tone, so loude to sing,
(With a Quill borrowed from a Ravens wing,
Penning such fatall Scripture) thou (thou Elfe)
But hearing it, should'st streightway hang thy selfe,
But I am mercifull, repent thy ill,
And know no sword, cutts deeper then my Quill. (Iv-I2r)¹⁰

John Milton uses the conceit in *Colasterion* (1645), where he warns the anonymous opponent of his divorce tracts not to cross him again:

Nay perhaps, as the provocation may bee, I may bee driv'n to curle up this gliding prose into a rough *Sotadic*, that shall rime him into such a condition, as instead of judging good Books to bee burnt by the executioner, hee shall be readier to be his own hangman. (II.757)

¹⁰ John Oldham's satire "Upon a Bookseller" (1680) also refers explicitly to Archilochus:

If thou to live in Satyr so much thirst;
Enjoy thy Wish and Fame, till Envy burst,
Renown'd as he, whom banish'd *Ovid* curst,
Or he, whom old *Archilochus* so stung
In Verse, that he for shame and madness hung:
Deathless in Infamy do thou so live,
And let my Rage like his to Halters drive. (44-51)

The Poems of John Oldham, H.F. Brooks and Raman Selden, edd. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

Two points are noteworthy in this passage from *Colasterion*. First, Milton adheres to literary decorum when he distinguishes "this gliding prose" from "a rough Sotadic", suggesting that the two styles are proper for the purpose of each work respectively. Second, Milton clearly perceives fierce satire ("a rough Sotadic") as able to bring about, if not literally at least metaphorically, the effects of an Archilochean curse ("to be his own hangman"). That Milton does not consider *Colasterion* as satire, neither "popular" nor formal, can be inferred by the threat to curse the anonymous critic in the appropriate, "rough" satirical medium. The "gliding prose" of *Colasterion*, like that of other Miltonic tracts, is for Milton a type of discourse that can shift into another type of discourse, the purpose of which is not to persuade but to destroy. Milton's style in *Colasterion* and other polemical tracts of the early 1640s reveals an optimism that his words have the power radically to change beliefs, opinions, even people; in contrast to the inventiveness of such phrases as "curle up this gliding prose", the marked coolness of the prose after 1649 suggests that Milton recognized "the relative powerlessness of the creative writer to influence events through the application of his art".¹¹ Milton's low opinion of "the people" in *Eikonoklastes* perhaps stems as much from a sense of the inefficacy of the word as from a deep disappointment at the people's rejection of Parliamentary freedom. At the time of writing *Colasterion*, however,

¹¹ Thomas N. Corns, *The Development of Milton's Prose Style* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 78 and 103. Sotades (323-247 B.C.) was known for his coarse, personal satires against such figures as the kings of Egypt and Macedonia; although only a few titles and fragments are extant, the Sotadic metre (catalectic tetrameter) carries his fame.

the blessing of gliding prose could curl up into the curse of satire.

John Cleveland attempts to achieve the effect of "a rough Sotadic" by conceiving of his satires in terms of iambic curse; what R.C. Elliott termed the "apotropaic function" of magic is precisely the function that Cleveland's satire means to have. "The Mixt Assembly" summons the Divines of the Westminster Assembly, mocks them and then makes them disappear:

See, they obey the Magick of my words.
Presto; they're gone.... (63-4)¹²

The satire is the poet's magical circle whence the satirist calls whomever he pleases and over which the satirist is supreme; at a word the victim is released or made to cease to exist. The satirist/magician adopts the incantatory discourse and form of utterance of Archilochus, as Milton threatens to do in *Colasterion* and as Cleveland does in "The Rebell Scot", which involves a combination of poetic rage and formal malediction with an invocation to "keen Iambicks":

Before a *Scot* can properly be curst,
I must (like *Hocus*) swallow daggers first.
Come keen *Iambicks*, with your Badgers feet,
And Badger-like, bite till your teeth do meet.(25-9)

In response, *The Scots Constancy* (1647) emphasises the impotence of Cleveland's curse ("Is this the last, to rayle and curse the Scot?"):

such a thing
Of most prophaned cursing, cannot bee
Indur'd by any who love piety. (Alv)¹³

¹² Quotations are from *The Poems of John Cleveland*, Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington, edd. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967).

¹³ George Parfitt, *English Poetry of the Seventeenth Century* (London and New York: Longman, 1985), 131 and 133, also describes the curse/satire as ineffective.

2.2. The Mystical Property of Signs.

Interwoven into the conception of satire as formal malediction is the notion that the material shape of letters and typographical symbols bears a significance beyond its phonetic or syntactical meaning. The figural arrangement of letters and words in emblematic verse, such as in figure poems, is visually significant. The place of visually significant symbols and characters in the satire of the mid-seventeenth century --and of John Cleveland in particular-- is best understood against the background of deciphering cosmic signs, a practice which embraces the forms of reading in astrology, scriptural exegesis, natural medicine, and anagrams.

Michel Foucault describes in his "archeology of the human sciences" the coherence of the Classical ordering of things in terms of four similitudes.¹⁴ Foucault uses the metaphor of a mirror and its reflection to describe the notion of *æmulatio*, "the means whereby things scattered through the universe can answer one another" (19). Rather than reflecting each other in stasis, the opposing objects engage in a reciprocal, dynamic process of giving and receiving influence, the stronger exerting force upon the weaker. In this

¹⁴ Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An archeology of the human sciences* (London: Tavistock/Routledge, 1970), 17ff. The four similitudes are convenience, emulation, analogy, and sympathy --what E.M.W. Tillyard calls the forms of "correspondence" in his *The Elizabethan World Picture* (New York: Vintage, 1964).

cosmic dialogue, extra-terrestrial objects are essentially more influential than sublunary objects, as Foucault's example from the *Traité des Signatures* of Oswaldus Crollius demonstrates:

The stars are the matrix of all the plants and every star in the sky is only the spiritual prefiguration of a plant, such that it represents that plant, and just as each herb or plant is a terrestrial star looking up at the sky, so also each star is a celestial plant in spiritual form, which differs from the terrestrial plants in matter alone..., the celestial plants and herbs are turned towards earth and look directly down upon the plants they have procreated, imbuing them with some particular virtue. (Foucault, 20)

The notion of correspondences not only formed a mental image, it also evolved a literal "world picture" in the Elizabethan representations of the Ptolemaic universe, such as Robert Fludd's famous engravings in *Utriusque Cosmi Historia* (1617-19). Fludd is never far from the Hermetic philosophers (or "magi" as they referred to themselves) such as John Dee who tried to tap the cosmic forces of influence for beneficent ends, notoriously by the raising of angels.¹⁵

Rather than being replaced during the seventeenth century, as Foucault's thesis suggests, the Elizabethan theories of celestial influence continued to be translated into a practice of reading that attributes "virtue", or "power", to the very characters and symbols of the medium being read. This practice was not only common among the Hermetic philosophers and professional astrologers, but also among most writers educated in rhetoric and philology. In other

¹⁵ Elias Ashmole's cypher fills the margins of his copy (Bodley Ashm.580) of Meric Causabon's *A True & Faithful Relation of What passed for many Yeers Between Dr. John Dee... and Some Spirits Tending (Had it succeeded) To a General Alteration of most States and Kingdomes in the World* (1599). On Dee, see Peter J. French, *John Dee: The World of an Elizabethan Magus* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972).

words, the theory of signatures, found in alchemical and mystical works and in linguistic projects, forms the basis of astrology and language, uniting the two sciences as a single endeavour of interpretation.¹⁶

Several examples from the mid-seventeenth century demonstrate that the theory expounded by Crollius --whose work was translated into English in the 1650s, as was that of Porta and Paracelsus-- was not unfamiliar. In 1650, the following work appeared:

Vnheard-of CURIOSITIES: Concerning the TALISMANICAL Sculpture of the *PERSIANS*; The HOROSCOPE of the *PATRIARKES*; And the Reading of the *STARS*. *Written in French, by JAMES GAFFAREL. And Englished by EDMUND CHILMEAD.*

Gaffarel argues that "Natural Power Images, that are made under certaine Constellations" have true virtue (or effective power) through the influence of the stars and the power of resemblance (151). Jakob Boehme, whose *Signatura Rerum* was translated by Richard Ellistone in 1651, imbues the resemblance theory with a mystical conception of nature and develops a natural medicine, such as that of Gaffarel's *Vnheard-of Curiosities*, into a theological medicine of the soul's health, a soteriology through the transcendent reading of the signatures of things. Although Sir Thomas Browne's *The Garden of Cyrus* (1658) introduces itself as an interpretation of "the quincuncial, lozenge, or network plantations of the ancients", it is effectively a reading of the numerical value of five and its representations universally in the natural and artificial realms.¹⁷

¹⁶ In Latin, *interpres coeli* and *interpres linguæ* are "astronomer" and "translator", respectively.

¹⁷ Sir Thomas Browne, *Religio Medici, Hydrotaphia, and The Garden of Cyrus*, R.H.A. Robbins, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 139. The Garden of Cyrus is dedicated to Nicholas Bacon, an amateur hermeticist whose connections include Elias Ashmole and John

Even though Browne seems to range freely and unconclusively through his subject, he is certain that "the surest path to trace the labyrinth of truth" (189) lies in the pursuit of correspondences, analogies, "quaternios" (mystic numbers), and characters, "artificially, naturally, mystically considered" (139).

In what follows, I will argue that the literature of the Civil War is vitally engaged in the mystical reading of the natural and artificial worlds in the way Browne suggests. The war between astrologers over the interpretation of the heavens, a distinctly political battle closely involved with the events of the Civil War, is like the skirmishes between satirists over the anagrammatical reading of names, for both activities concern the correct interpretation of manifest signs. The anagrammatist works with the intersecting planes of the materiality of the sign (the letters of a name) and the mystical significance concealed in the sign (the allegorical reading in the reconfigured name). The mystical reading of the physical appearance of a sign is the basis of the reification of the satirical victim into a signifying character or symbol.

2.2.1. Astrology.

In Book I of *The Civil War*, Abraham Cowley describes the battlefield of Edgehill after the first substantial military encounter of the Civil War there:

A dismall Shade did Heavens sad face oreflow,
Darke as the Night slaine *Rebells* found below.

Dee's family (see Note 15 above).

Noe gentle *Starres* their chearfull glories rear'd,
 Ashamd they were at what was donne, and fear'd:
 Lest wicked men their bold excuse should frame
 From some strong *Influence* given their rayes by Fame.
 To *Duty* they, *Order* and *Law* incline,
 They who nere err'd from one æternall Line,
 As just the ruine of these men they thought,
 As *Sisera's* was, 'gainst whom themselves they fought.¹⁸

Charles Mason's "To his Majestie upon the peace concluded with Scotland", in *Irenodia Cantabrigiensis* (Cambridge, 1641), also refers to Judges 5:20 ("They fought from heaven; the stars in their courses fought against Sisera"):

Such fight against heav'ns cause, whose unjust warres,
 Like Sisera's, are check'd by th'host of starres. (K3r)

The Song of Deborah played a significant rôle in the contemporary representation of the Civil War as a holy war, and not only for the Parliamentary apologists who rallied around the cry "Curse ye Meroz!" (Judges 5:23), as in Stephen Marshall's famous sermon in 1641. In citing that other aspect of the Song of Deborah, Cowley, Mason and other Royalist writers engage several levels of signification. In the reference to Sisera, Cowley places the Earl of Essex, the leader of the Parliamentary forces at Edgehill, in the allegorical equation as the ungodly Canaanite, fatally vulnerable to a woman's hand. Less explicitly, the reference also alludes to the "cult" of Henrietta Maria, as exemplified in a range of Royalist writing from William Davenant's masque *Salmacida Spolia* (1640) to Margaret Cavendish's *Bel in Campo* (pub. 1668), which represents the Queen as a composite of an Amazon, Zenobia, and Deborah.

The theme of *Musarum Oxoniensium* (1643), the collection of

¹⁸ Abraham Cowley, *The Civil War*, Allan Pritchard, ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973), I.297-306.

poems welcoming Henrietta Maria to Oxford from Belgium and northern England, is "Astreae redux" and the central images of the Queen, called "Regina Victrix" (A4r), are those of "Bellona Britannica" (A2v), "Armata Pallas" (A4r), Camilla, Zenobia, Penthesilea (Queen of the Amazons), Artimesia and other figures of heroic status. In her letters to Charles, Henrietta Maria casts herself in military terms as a general leading her troops of loyal supporters to rejoin her liege at Kineton in July 1643.¹⁹ Cowley, in Oxford at her arrival and soon to serve the Queen and her secretary, Henry Jermyn, would not only be aware of this posturing, but would undoubtedly contribute to the mythologizing. Indeed, Cowley does so near the conclusion of Book I of *The Civil War* when he alludes to her martial influence, attributing to her ultimately the victory at Edgehill:

From farr stretcht Shores they felt her spirit and might;
Princes and Gods at any *distance* fight,
At her *returne* well might she a Conquest have,
Whose very *absence* so much Conquest gave. (I.505-8)²⁰

Taken together, the lines telling of Henrietta Maria's "spirit and might" influencing the battle at Edgehill and the allusion to Judges 5:20 ("the stars in their courses fought against Sisera") form a double helix of signification. The "strong *Influence*" of the stars was not on the side of the "slaine *Rebells*", whose destruction was as "just / As *Sisera's* was", but rather the "spirit and might" of a

¹⁹ M.A.E. Green, *The Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria* (London: Camden Society, 1857).

²⁰ Allan Pritchard, in the introduction to his edition of *The Civil War*, suggests that Cowley completed Book I shortly after the Queen arrived in Oxford; the conclusion of Book I reflects the exuberance the Royalists must have felt at the reunion of the King and Queen --for the Royalists an emblem of the unity of England which the Parliamentary forces were breaking-- and the victory at Roundway Down (14-15).

Deborah (Henrietta Maria) brought victory for "heav'ns cause", a significant phrase for Charles Mason, a Royalist, to deploy against a Parliament zealously devoted to "the Cause". Henrietta Maria was to Parliamentarians the cause of England's darkness, as one pamphlet argued: *The Great Eclipse of the Sun; otherwise, Charles our King eclipsed by the destructive perswasions of his Queene* (1644). But William Cartwright, in his contribution to *Musarum Oxoniensium*, configures the Queen's positive influence in astrological terms:

As some Bright Starre, that runnes a diverse Course,
 Yet with Anothers force,
 Mixeth its vertue in a full dispence
 Of one joynt influence,
 Such was Her mind to th' Kings, in all was done;
 The Agents Diverse, but the Action One. (Dlv)

Cowley ascribes to the stars moral qualities based on notions of the subject ("To *Duty* they, *Order* and *Law* incline"); thus the Parliament's taking up of arms against the King conforms to the greatest archetype of insurrection:

Still they Rebellions end remember well,
 Since *Lucifer* the *Great*, that shining *Captaine* fell.
 (I.307-8)

The fictive allegorisation of Old Testament history such as the Song of Deborah is common to both Parliamentary and Royalist writers and, as Cowley demonstrates, of vital strength and subtlety when combined with astrological notions. The theory of celestial influence expressed in terms of moral principle not only played a crucial role in the attempt to perceive stability in contemporary events, it also provided the axle on which the meaning of things, natural and artificial, turned.²¹ On the political plane, the writing

²¹ In *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in popular beliefs in 16th and 17th century England* (London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1971), Keith Thomas notes that astrology flourished for

of the stars justified the Parliamentary claim to a divine approbation of its actions in the English revolution. Royalists, such as Cowley in the passages quoted from *The Civil War*, made similar assertions of divine protection for the righteous followers of God's anointed king even though military losses made the claim less convincing as the Civil War progressed. At the root of the disputes among the astrological forecasters, primarily John Booker and William Lilly for Parliament and George Wharton for the Royalists, was the allegation of a fundamental mis-reading of the stars.²² Basic to much literary activity, for it is not exclusively a concern of the political prognosticators, is the conception of the heavenly bodies as the key to reading and writing the past, present and future, a key that enables a writer with an extra-mundane authority.

The ecclesiastical debate that aroused what many historians argue was the catalyst to the escalation of anti-royalist sentiment revolved around the reading or mis-reading of such words as "presbuterion" in I Timothy 4:14, while the constitutional debate quickly came to depend on the interpretation (or "reading") of the expression "no power but from God" in Romans 13:1. In both

"its provision of a coherent and comprehensive system of thought", 330. Barry Reay, in *Popular Culture In Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. B. Reay (London: Routledge, 1988), concludes that "the religion of the bulk of the people was... syncretic in form, a mixture of Christianity, magic and folklore, blurred at the edges where it intersected with the world of astrology", 111.

²² See Derek Parker, *Familiar to All: William Lilly and Astrology in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1975); Bernard S. Capp, *Astrology and the Popular Press: English Almanacs 1500-1800* (London: Faber, 1979); and F.P. Wilson, *Some English Prognostications* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1938).

instances, the crux concerns the correct reading of a divine book.²³ Milton's vociferous arguments against prelacy are grounded in a conception of Scripture as needing a Spirit-inspired reader to receive and interpret the divine Will.²⁴ Joseph Hall, the episcopal apologist, insists on reading the Bible according to the traditions of the church. But the seventeenth century recognised that the Bible was not the only means of divine revelation since God continues to write His Word in the "book of the universe", the stars in particular.²⁵ The reading of the God-inscribed universe, often linked with an interpretation of Scripture, is an important preoccupation of those interpreting and translating the characters written as stars, as natural objects, or as words, the names of things.

William Lilly's *Christian Astrology* (1647) is prefaced with a series of commendatory poems about the nature of astrology that characterize the art in terms of reading and writing:

"Upon this WORKE"
 The Author's God, Composer and the Setter
 Of all his workes, and therin every letter.
 Heaven is his Book; the Stars both great and small
 Are letters Nonperill and Capitall
 Disperst throughout; therin our learnings dull,
 In this thy Work it is compleat and full:
 Could man compose or set Heavens letters right
 he would, like Printing, bring to publick sight

²³ In a way the constitutional debate consisted of claims to the correct reading of fundamental laws and liberties enshrined in the Magna Carta. Later, key phrases and expressions in the National Covenant and Propositions received various interpretations, as at the time of the trial of Charles I, when Royalists and Presbyterians focussed on Parliament's promise to protect the king's person.

²⁴ W.J. Readings, "The Restoration and the Fall of Language: The Search for Meaning in the Poetry of Marvell and Milton" (unpublished Oxford D.Phil thesis, 1985), Ch V, "The Miltonic Bible".

²⁵ Psalm 119: 89, "For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in the heaven."

All what was done, nay what was thought upon;
For by this way, I see it may be done.
I.P. (b)2v

The stars are the characters or letters in the book of nature by which God continues to reveal His decree and will for mankind, and astrology is essentially an interpretive art, similar to Biblical hermeneutics, but working in a less mundane medium than language.

Although the analogy of heaven as God's book over-simplifies the problem of translating a message from a non-linguistic, natural medium into human language, a process which involves the transfer of supra-mundane signs to a readable form, the analogy is apt. Since the number of astrologers remained extremely small despite the heavy reliance upon astrology and the central place it held in the quotidian affairs of people across the social and political spectrum, the influence of the three main writers, William Lilly, John Booker and George Wharton, was considerable. Although the respective political positions the astrologers took during the Civil War, their success in "predicting" events, and their effectiveness as propagandists are important aspects of the role of astrological writing in the seventeenth century, I will restrict myself to the way in which astrology was considered as a textual activity and the astrological disagreements take the form of a linguistic contest rather than a grammar of the stars.²⁶

When the diametrically opposed John Booker and his Royalist rival, George Wharton, react to each other's almanacs and

²⁶ Bernard Capp, *Astrology and the Popular Press: English Almanacs 1500-1800* (London: Faber and Faber, 1979), 72-82, discusses the political use of astrology in the 1640s. See also Harry Rusche, "Merlini Anglici: Astrology and Propaganda from 1644 to 1651", *The English Historical Review*, lxxx (April 1965), 322-333.

prognostications, their satire inevitably involves the inability of the other to read properly. Booker's *A Bloody Irish Almanac* (1646) not only predicts Parliamentary success for the Irish campaign, he also criticizes Wharton's ability to read the stars, abusing him in strange terms:

I need not be a *Ductor in Linguas*; ...You Puppy, You *hic, hæc, hoc*; You *qui, quæ, quod*, You Neuter, You Commune of two, of three; You Doubtfull, you Epicene Gender: *Tu quæ Genus, Tu Heterocliton, Tu Disjunctive, Tu Metathesis, Tu Antithesis, Tu Apocope, Tu Paragoge*; Thou *Aulicus*, Thou *Mercury* very *Ridiculous*, Thou *Bloxford flye*, Thou *Moon calfe*,...; Thou *Vocativo o Georgi*.... I know what *quæ* signifies, and the difference between that and *qua*.... (A3v)

In this profusion of abuse, Booker forces Wharton through a chain of bizarre linguistic metamorphoses from one gender to another, through rhetorical tropes and newsbook personæ, presumably to demonstrate that he is qualified to read, not only words such as "quæ" and "qua" or stars, but also human characters such as Wharton. When Wharton replies with *Bellum Hybernicae* (1647), he refuses to stoop to the "immodest Language" of his opponent (A2r), making instead very serious allegations about Booker's credentials as an astrologer. Booker, along with William Lilly, his political partner, is a counterfeit astrologer (A3r), who breaks the rules of the art (A2v) and is incapable of representing aright the message of the stars.

In *A Sermon, Preached Before the Society of Astrologers* (1650), Robert Gell warned his audience of "making others too credulous in your predictions, especially those of the rude multitude" (G3v). Instead, the astrologer, regenerated in Christ, must convey the Christian assurance "fear not thou the signes of heaven" (G2v, Jer. 10:2). James Gaffarel appends to his *Vnheard-of Curiosities* "2 Tables of the Celestial Constellations, expressed by Hebrew

Characters" to illustrate his contention that the ancient Hebrews were avid readers of the divine letters in the sky. The stars themselves are signifying symbols, and, when they rearrange themselves in the sky, they convey meaning. The Christian astrologer must translate these celestial symbols into language, which, according to one of the commendatory poems in Lilly's *Christian Astrology*, is what Lilly's book achieves:

Wonder you may! the volumes of the Skye
In our owne Characters you here descry. ((b)1v)

2.2.2. Characters.

Francis Lenton used the word "epitomise" to describe what the anagram achieves: the anagram represents the true essence of an individual in a condensed, abstracted form. It comes as no surprise that Lenton also wrote a book of characters, the genre of verbal caricature which reifies individuals into types or "characters".²⁷ The epistle to the reader in *The Character of a Cavaliere* (1647) explains succinctly what a "character" is:

The Title has informed you what we intend in this narrow roome, it speaks the Pamphlet in an Epitome, 'tis a *Character*, and according to the Nature of it, writes much matter in a little roome, and time. (A2r)

As a "character" is a monograph of the reified subject, so the anagram is a *monad*, the individual's essential nature symbolically

²⁷ J.W. Smeed, *The Theophrastan 'Character': The history of a literary genre* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), Ch. 1, describes character-writing in the seventeenth century.

condensed in a significant arrangement of letters. The anagram and the metaphorical conceit of reification lend themselves naturally to character-writing, as John Cleveland seems to imply in his satirical sketch of a Country Committee-man:

Methinks a committee hanging about a governor, and bandileers
dangling about a furred alderman, have an anagram resemblance.
There is no syntax between a cap of maintenance and a helmet.
The Character of a Country Committee-Man, 1649

The conflation of "character" in a typographical, or orthographic, sense with the generic sense reveals an association of physical symbol with metaphorical, even moral, interpretation. This polysemy will be the subject of the ensuing discussion of the signifying character in a satirical context, the poems of John Cleveland in particular.

Commentators on Cleveland's "The Kings Disguise" have remarked on the idea of reduction (reification and abstraction) of the monarch into a paradoxical symbol of his sovereign person:

Oh the accurst Stenographie of fate!
The Princely Eagle shrunke into a Bat. (47-8)²⁸

The idea of "Stenographie" or shorthand is central to Cleveland's poetry, not only in the metaphysical conceit of paradoxical reduction (such as in the royal eagle, the ruler of the day, being transformed into the foul bat, the sinister marauder of the night), but also in the "strong" satirical manner which Dryden dismissed as "common thoughts in abstruse words".²⁹ Significantly, the problem which Charles I in disguise presents for Cleveland is a textual one, for he

²⁸ See, for instance, Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing*, 62-4.

²⁹ *An Essay of Dramatic Poesy in Critical Theory Since Plato*, Hazard Adams, ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971), 237.

has difficulty *reading* what he sees:

Thy visage is not legible, the letters,
Like a Lords name, writ in phantastick fetters. (63-4)

As the poem proceeds, the textual and hermeneutical terms of reference provide the key both to the king's disguise and to "The Kings Disguise", and the meaning of the previously unintelligible emblem begins to appear:

Me thinks in this your dark mysterious dresse
I see the Gospell coucht in Parables.
The second view my pur-blind fancy wipes,
And shewes Religion in its dusky types.
Such a Text Royall, so obscure a shade
Was *Solomon* in Proverbs all array'd. (93-8)

The disguised Charles is like an obscure passage of Scripture which needs to be re-read before it can be rightly interpreted; and, as with the parables which the unbelieving Pharisees could not understand, so the true meaning and significance of the disguised king is gained only through perceptive, faithful reading. Consequently, the unbelieving Parliamentarians will never read the true meaning revealed in the king's concealment nor understand the nature of kingship emblematised in the person of king:

Keys for this Cypher you can never get,
None but *S. Peter's* op's this Cabinet. (109-10)

The predominant textual and hermeneutical images are self-conscious and self-reflexive, and "The Kings Disguise" is a reading of the king's disguise, a reading that must in turn be interpreted by the reader; in other words, we read Cleveland trying to read the king in disguise.

A satirical relative of "The Kings Disguise" is "The Hue and Cry After Sir John Presbyter" (1649), where the caricature of Cleveland's victim, the hypocritical Presbyterian, is primarily a

verbal icon to be read, and then a speaking picture to be heard:

With Hair in Characters, and Lugs in text;
 With a splay mouth, & a nose circumflect;...
 The Bush upon his chin (like a carv'd story,
 In a Box knot) cut by the *Directory*....
 The Beast at wrong end branded, you may trace
 The Devils foot-steps in his cloven Face....
 (1-2; 9-10; 27-8)

As with the disguised king, the essential activity is reading and interpreting the Presbyterian character in the appearance and physiognomy of the satirical victim. Such an essential activity demands intelligence in the etymological sense of "reading between the lines", an intelligence which the Pharisees lacked when confronted with the parables and which Cleveland displays in the description of Sir John Presbyter. Basically, Cleveland is teaching his readers how to read, not words or the signs of things, but the *signatura hominum*. Cleveland's satires assert that there is an art to find the mind's construction in the face (*Macbeth*, I.iv.11-12) and suggest that the face must be read and decyphered. Just as the signatures of plants are the keys to unlocking their medicinal virtues, so the outward appearances of men are symbols, or "characters", of their internal natures. Men, like plants and stars and letters, are signatures to be read and interpreted, and the orthographic "character" is in a sense the psychological character of a person.³⁰ In terms of "The Kings Disguise", the "Stenographie of fate" must be written in longhand, the symbol explained, the textless *impresa* completed with its motto. The abstraction of the object of

³⁰ Cf. II Corinthians 3: 2-3: "Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men: Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart."

praise or blame into a type or character is a favoured device with Cleveland, and, using primarily "A Dialogue between two Zealots" and "Smectymnuus, or the Club-Divines", I will argue that the satirical process involves the reification of the victim into a significant character or sign, which gains a talismanic force as satire becomes the ritualised expression of the curse.

Cleveland begins "A Dialogue between two Zealots, upon the &c. in the Oath" (1642) with a characterisation of a Puritan priest "Sir Roger" based sparsely on one feature, his impecunity; Sir Roger's body is so gaunt, his soul is barely clothed.³¹ The other Zealot, despite being the only speaker actually quoted in the poem, is not named or described, being simply "a Brother of the Cloth" (9), merely another example of the "zealous" type. The two Zealots are essentially one, and even though the two argue fiercely and fall "to Cudgells with the Oath" (10), they express only variations of a shared distaste for the so-called "Etcetera Oath", making the satire's title ("A Dialogue") somewhat ironic. All clergy were required to take the "Etcetera Oath" (May 1640) and affirm the government of the Church of England "by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, &c.". Those who sought the reform of the Church's government seized on the weakest aspect of the Oath, the conveniently indeterminate "&c.", contending that not only is "et cetera" theoretically infinite, it also flies in the face of Scripture and

³¹ Cf. Andrew Marvell, "Fleckno":
 Nothing now Dinner stay'd
 But till he had himself a Body made.
 I mean till he were drest: for else so thin
 He stands, ... (57-60)

the apostolic tradition. Instead of a direct defence of the Oath or an anamadversive engagement with the criticism of it, Cleveland chooses to caricature its enemies and turns the weakness of the Oath --"&c."-- into the poem's satirical strength. Cleveland's editors are right to insist on the textual significance of the ampersand, but they fail to realise the extent of its figural force.³²

With the two central characters cast in a few descriptive lines in a single generic mould, the significant focus of the satire becomes the subject of their dialogue, "&c.", the ampersand used in the Etcetera Oath:

The Quarrell was a strange mis-shapen Monster,
 &c. (God blesse us) which they conster,
 The Brand upon the buttock of the Beast,
 The Dragons taile ti'd on a knot, a neast
 Of young *Apocryphaes*, the fashion
 Of a new mentall Reservation. (11-16)

Just as Sir Thomas Browne's *The Garden of Cyrus* was a study of the quincunx, "mystically considered" (139), so Cleveland's Zealots mystically read the "&c." of the Oath. More than lightly playing with its orthographical shape, Cleveland develops the physical characteristics of the ampersand into a talisman which gains the power to curse the fanatical Zealots at the poem's conclusion. In the poem, "&c." takes on a life of its own, separate from that of the Oath, and becomes the third character in the dialogue. In its usual form, a dialogue is a conversation among three parties in which

³² *The Poems of John Cleveland*, 82. Cleveland's sense of "&" in this satire approaches George Herbert's conception of the hieroglyphic poem. In "The Altar", for instance, the physical arrangement of words and letters as an altar ("this frame", 11) makes possible the metaphorical altar of the broken heart; the visual figure on the page can be said to be doubly significant, conveying meaning by and in its form.

contrary opinions are expressed and then resolved, usually by the third party.³³ Although "A Dialogue between two Zealots" seems more a monologue and a harange than a dialogue, "&c." is the dialogic catalyst between the two static Zealots, causing the dynamic reaction between them, and becomes their curse in the final lines of the satire. The true subject of the satire is, then, the nature of the typographical character, "&c.", and its figural force.

The Zealots interpret ("conster", 11) "&c." mystically, allegorising the ampersand into a speaking symbol of the anti-christian elements threatening the Church of England. To them "&c." is both the hieroglyphic sign of the Beast that marked all his followers and the representation of the Dragon's tail, curled to form a nest for "young *Apocryphaes*" (15), in this case, extra-Biblical additions to the doctrine of church government.³⁴ This moralistic interpretation of "the Text" (17) is elaborated by the second Zealot:

I never read on't, but I fasted twice,
And so by Revelation know it better
Then all the learn'd Idolaters o' th' Letter. (21-2)

Here Cleveland neatly combines the attack on the sectarian policy of deliberate ignorance with an allegation of enthusiastic

³³ An example of a typical dialogue is *A Dialogue Betwixt Rattle-Head and Round-Head, Neutralis being Moderator betwixt both, With their peaceable agreement, and their Conference for maintaining their severall Opinions.... Full of mirth, and repleat with witty Inventions* (1641).

³⁴ The woodcut accompanying the poem in *The Decoy Duck* (1642) depicts a dragon with several headed tails, A4r.

interpretation.³⁵ The second Zealot juxtaposes two types of Biblical hermeneutics, the antinomian and the literalist, and, choosing the former, claims a mystical insight into "&c." surpassing that of those who cannot see beyond the typographical marks (the "Idolaters o' th' Letter"). Cleveland parodies the antinomian tendency to draw fantastic allegories and contemporary judgments from passages of Scripture, in fact, extracting everything but the literal meaning.³⁶ Ironically, however, the Zealots' obsession with the material appearance of "&c." amounts to an idolatry of the typographical figure, for the second Zealot raises "&c." from the inanimate to the animate, anthropomorphizing the figure in order to exorcise it:

I say to thee &c. thou li'st,...
Accurst &c. thou.... (25, 33)

Throughout the satire, the Zealots conceive of "&c." simultaneously as a hieroglyphic, meaningful figure and as a textual sign that must be read. On the semiotic level, "&c." is a symbol representing the Latin words "et cetera". On the semantic level, "et cetera" is an undefined word that contains at once everything and nothing, demanding that the reader complete and define its perimeters. In the satire, "&c." equivocates continuously between

³⁵ In *The Character of a London Diurnall* (1644), Cleveland "reads" the separatist faction: "Holy men (like the Holy language) must be read backwards. They ruffle Colledges, to promote Learning; and pull downe Churches for Edification" (A4v).

³⁶ John Taylor's *A Seasonable Lecture* (1643) is also a parody of sectarian exegesis: "This word and standing betwixt forth and departed, hath a mysticall sense, that a man may goe forth and not depart, that he may also depart and not goe forth, And that hee may both goe forth and depart, and likewise he may neither depart or goe forth" (A3r).

its semiotic and semantic dimensions, an ambivalence affirmed by its metrical value. Despite its glyphic compactness, "&c." reads as "et cetera" and scans as two iambic feet throughout the poem, continually reminding the reader that "&c." is simultaneously in shorthand and full. (For the reading of the poem at least, tongues are not "confounded in &c.", 28). In describing "&c." as "abdominous" (44), the second Zealot refers to both the physical shape of the ampersand and the undefined semantic range of "et cetera":

Yet here's not all, I cannot halfe untruss
 &c. it's so abdominous.
 The *Trojan Nag* was not so fully lin'd,
 Unrip &c. and you shall find
 Og the great Commissarie, and which is worse,
 Th' Apparatour upon his skew-bald Horse. (43-8)

Much like the "Dragons taile ti'd on a knot" (14), "&" is drawn by a single line and defies "untrussing" or untying since, like a knot, it would cease to exist in the undoing.

Its physical shape associates "&" in the Zealot's mind with the "*Trojan Nag*", a richly connotative allusion. Not only does the physical symbol of the ampersand look pregnant, or "abdominous", the word "et cetera" also semantically conceals a host of hidden meanings, a fact not lost to those who spoke and wrote against the

Oath.³⁷ The "&c." in the Oath was feared to contain a hidden army of ecclesiastical and civil officers, commissaries and apparators, empowered by the Oath to control dissident clergy. In Virgil's account of the legend, the Trojan horse is consistently referred to as female and pregnant, with her womb filled with disaster for Troy.³⁸ To the Zealot, the ostensibly harmless Etcetera Oath hides ecclesiastical agents of destruction, "Og the great Commissarie" and "Th' Apparatur upon his skew-bald Horse". Cleveland's editors trace in the reference to Og, king of Bashan and archetypal enemy of God's people, an allusion to Doctor William Roane, a zealous Laudian in the ecclesiastical courts; the apparator riding a skewbald horse seems to gallop out of Revelation 6 with the four horsemen of doom.³⁹

Throughout the satire, "&c." develops into a polysemous, multivalent character, both as a participant in the dialogue and as a significant typographical symbol. In the second Zealot, Cleveland has explored the fanatical imagination and its mystical

37 George Digby (9 November 1640) spoke about what he called "the bottomless Perjury of an Et caetera". John Rushworth comments: "This Clause is administer'd with an &c. which we conceive was never tendered in any Oath before now" (*Hist Coll*, III.ii.1206). *The Prentices Prophecie* (1642) attacked the Bishops and the Oath in these terms:

an Oath these men they did invent,
 Though short in words, yet was of large extent;
 This Canon finished was by them at last,
 By which they thought that they would all things wast.
 They with (Etcetera) charged this Gun,
 And then they conceived that all was done. (A2v-3r)

38 *Aeneid* II.20, "uterum armato milite complent"; II.237-8, "machina / feta armis". The conceit is also used in *The Trojan Horse of the Presbyteriall Government Vnbovvelled* (1646).

39 *Poems*, 95. Dr. Roane came under heavy satirical fire in 1641 after fleeing to the continent (for example, *A Letter from Rhoan in France, Written by Doctor Roane one of the Doctors of the Late sick Commons*).

interpretation of "&c.". Nevertheless, while parodying the allegorical style of sectarian preaching, Cleveland convinces the reader of the potential power of signs, in this case, the ampersand. In the process of reading "A Dialogue" and inhabiting the mind of the two Zealots, the reader must acknowledge that "&c." means more than simply "and so forth". Although Sir Roger has the inspired idea to "swear in words at large, and not in figures" (54), the reader, like the Zealots' audience in the poem, cannot escape applying a figurative reading of "&c." to the two Zealots themselves in the final lines of the satire:

While all that saw and heard them joyntly pray,
They and their Tribe were all &c. (61-2)

Throughout the poem, the reader is asked to judge the various semantic values of "&c." offered by the Zealots; in the final lines, the reader himself must supply the value. The principle criticism levelled against the Oath was the fact that "et cetera" is theoretically infinite; this concern is now used by Cleveland to curse the zealous kind infinitely. In this way closure indefinitely escapes the poem, as indefinitely as the reader must provide the semantic perimeters of the final "&c." and complete the poem.

The satirical subject of Cleveland's "Smectymnuus, or the Club-Divines", similar to that of "A Dialogue between two Zealots", is a textual conundrum, "S.M.E.C.T.Y.M.N.U.U.S", the acronym formed by the initials of the five anti-prelatical divines who collaborated on the presbyterian answer to Bishop Joseph Hall's *An Humble Remonstrance*

concerning the Root and Branch Petition.⁴⁰ The texts in the Hall-Smectymnuus controversy are not "popular" in that they do not consciously adopt the idioms of popular literature; as such, Cleveland's satire of the "Club-Divines" also is not directly toward a "popular" audience. Nevertheless, the satirical strategy of "Smectymnuus", particularly in reducing the five divines to a significant single unit in order to exorcise it, takes part in the tradition which assigns magical force to satirical expression and which is related to the shaming ritual and its function in popular culture.

From the opening lines on, the central concern of the poem is the unscrambling of the linguistic puzzle:

SMECTYMNUUS? The Goblin makes me start:
 I' th' Name of Rabbi *Abraham*, what art?
Syriac? or *Arabick?* or *Welsh?* what skilt?
 Ap all the Bricklayers that *Babell* built.
 Some Conjuror translate, and let me know it:
 Till then 'tis fit for a West-Saxon Poet. (1-6)

As in "A Dialogue between two Zealots", the satirist's main interest is the semiotic symbol, "SMECTYMNUUS", and its interpretation. The identities of the five who compose the initials are not significant, and Cleveland deliberately refuses to engage in particularizing "SMECTYMNUUS", concluding that such an activity is incidental to the substantive reading of the name the satire has been offering:

I could by Letters now untwist the rable;
 Whip *Sme*c from Constable to Constable.
 But there I leave you to another's dressing.... (93-5)

"SMECTYMNUUS" has an existence and a significance separate from the

⁴⁰ The five divines, Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcommen, and William Spurstow, published their *Answer* in March 1641 and were defended by John Milton in *Animadversions* (1641).

five names that compose it, and its meaning must be read in the sign itself.

The key to the solution of the "SMECTYMNUUS" riddle lies in the concept of the *penetration of dimensions*, an expression from natural philosophy "used for a supposed or conceived occupation of the same place by two bodies at the same time". To illustrate the definition, the *Oxford English Dictionary* cites the *Lexicon Technicum* (1704) of John Harris:

Penetration of dimensions, is a Philosophical way of expressing, That two Bodies are in the same Place, so that the Parts of the one do every where penetrate into, and adequately fill up the Dimensions or Places of the Parts of the other; which is manifestly impossible, and contradictory to Reason.⁴¹

Penetration, in the philosophical sense, informs the anguished impossibility of physical oneness in metaphysical love poetry, as in Donne's "The Ecstasy" ("So to' intergraft our hands, as yet / Was all our means to make us one", 9-10).⁴² Marvell uses the notion, with an added allusion to the Trinity, in "Fleckno, an English Priest at Rome" to satirize Richard Flecknoe's inhospitable lodgings:

there can no Body pass
Except by penetration hither, where
Two make a crowd, nor can three Persons here
Consist but in one substance. (98-101)

The brief analysis of "The Kings Disguise" above demonstrated Cleveland's preoccupation with emblematic images in trying to reconcile the paradox of King Charles in disguise. In the halcyon

⁴¹ OED: "penetration", 1b. The OED also cites Robert Boyle: "I don't see how the... condensation can be performed without penetration of dimensions: a thing that philosophers in all ages have looked upon as by no means admitted by nature" (1661).

⁴² The concept of *penetration* also underpins the metaphysical paradox of the androgyne, as in Cleveland's "Upon an Hermaphrodite" and "The Authour to his Hermaphrodite".

years before 1640, triumphant masques showed the glorious penetration of the monarch with various divine personæ, there being no separation between the god on stage and the man seated in the centre of the masquing hall; in "The Kings Disguise", the penetration is a treasonous degradation of the royal person.

The concept of penetration in "Smectymnuus, or the Club-Divines" dominates the characterisation of that extra-linguistic, non-translatable neologism "SMECTYMNUUS". In appearing in print as Smectymnuus, the five divines have reified themselves into a single linguistic marker --and an object of satire-- even before Cleveland's reductive process gets to them; this is the obvious reason for Cleveland's treating "SMECTYMNUUS" rather than the five individuals in the satire. The five men, their beings and names, have performed the penetration of dimensions in the unnatural "SMECTYMNUUS":

Th' *Italian* Monster pregnant with his Brother,
Natures *Dyæresis*, halfe one another,
He, with his little Sides-man *Lazarus*,
Must both give way unto *Smectymnuus*. (25-8)

Although "SMECTYMNUUS" is a single linguistic unit and must be deciphered as such, its multiplex nature precludes a simplistic reading. Unlike Sir John Presbyter, whose appearance allows for an unequivocal, uncomplicated reading, "SMECTYMNUUS" is multiplicity in unity and "Five faces lurke under one single vizzard" (32).

The images of "SMECTYMNUUS" range from the commercial ("The Saints' Monopolie", 11), zoological ("a Porcupine", 12), philosophical ("The Purlew of *Metempsychosis*", 40), to the typographical and linguistic. "SMECTYMNUUS" is "a name in Rank and File" (9), which, as Cleveland's ever-perceptive editors note, is to be taken not only in the sense of a file of soldiers, but also as "a

mysterious, acrostic formation".⁴³ "SMECTYMNUUS" is an arrangement of letters which, like any mysterious formation, is in itself significant to those who can recognize and decipher the arcanum. In "SMECTYMNUUS", as in an acrostic, two planes of signification interact simultaneously: when read horizontally, "SMECTYMNUUS" are the initial letters of the names of the five divines, but when read vertically, "SMECTYMNUUS" forms a new entity, generated by the names, but acting as an independent signifier:

Like to nine Taylors, who if rightly spell'd
 Into one man, are monosyllabled.
 Short-handed zeale in one hath cramped many,
 Like to the Decalogue in a single penny. (45-8)

The satire continues to decipher the multiplicity of this creature and to demonstrate that the Puritan menace lies in marrying various dissenting forces into a single destructive force. "SMECTYMNUUS" thus epitomizes the principle of unnatural penetration that the satire claims will destroy the church in England.⁴⁴

In conflating the "character" in the typographical or orthographic sense with a literary or generic sense in "A Dialogue between two Zealots" and "Smectymnuus", Cleveland demonstrates that the physical sign bears metaphorical, even moral, meaning. "&c." and "SMECTYMNUUS" are signifiers that possess intrinsic force and that require deciphering. While the two Zealots attempt to decipher "&c.", the reader is led both to dismiss the "zealous" interpretation of the sign and to complete the poem with a curse; "A

⁴³ *Poems*, 103.

⁴⁴ The notion of many-in-one was applied satirically to Smectymnuus on many occasions, as in *A Satyre Against Separatists* (1642) where he is the many-headed hydra (A4v).

Dialogue between two Zealots" is a critical reading of the Zealots' reading of "&c." manipulated by the satirist. "Smectymnus", like the attempt to solve the condundrum of Charles in disguise in "A Kings Disguise", asks the reader to accept its interpretation of the linguistic puzzle. All three poems involve a reification of the subject, satirical or otherwise, into a significant material symbol.

Rather than being exclusive to Cleveland and the formal Theophrastan character-writers, the combined processes of satirical reification and penetration are not uncommon in English polemical satire. Edward Hoby, for instance, in the Jacobean pamphlet *A Counter-snarle For Ishmael Rabshacheh* (1613), interprets the initials of his opponent ("I.R.") as a combination of "Ishmael", the outcast son of Abraham (Gen. 16), and "Rabshacheh", the blaspheming emissary of Sennacherib king of Assyria (II Kings 18: 17f):

if I bee not mistaken in the *Hieroglyphicks*, his familiars may salute him by the name of *Ishmael Rabshacheh*, he is so wholly compact of mocking and rayling, that hee seemeth to haue the mixed quintessence of them both. (B2r-v)

"I.R." is a composite hieroglyph representing the penetration of two bodies (Ishmael and Rabshacheh) in a single person, who contains the compiled ungodliness of both. Richard Overton's anti-Presbyterian satire, *A Sacred Decretall* (1645), features the protean figure Sir Symon Synod --like Legion, one individual composed of many-- who embodies the tyranny of "Classical Supremacy" (C1r). In a similar manner, *The Beacons Quenched* (1652), a pamphlet responding to proposals by Presbyterian stationers advocating a system of state censorship, mocks the signatories of the proposal in an apt typographical image:

And for the *Stationers* subscribing to the first & second *Beacons*, do all those golden *Characters* of zeal and holiness,

spell any more than plain *Presbytery*? (B3r)

Like "SMECTYMNUUS", the Presbyterian stationers are compacted into a single word, and, like Overton's Sir Symon, "Presbytery" is one and many. Overton calls Sir Symon "an *Ubiquitory*" (B2v), alluding first to his ecclesiastical status ("A clergyman having no settled benefice but taking duty anywhere", "ubiquitary" *OED* 1c), but also to the paradox of his nature: the many are concentrated in his one, yet the one is everywhere present. The "Stationers" in *The Beacons Quenched* is in effect an anagram which spells "Presbytery".

2.2.3. Anagrams.

The anagram is a textual code which reconfigures the letters of a word or name to reveal the fundamental truth concealed in the word or name. In a culture which recognizes the intrinsic power of characters, a ritualistic mode of language, such as satire, contains a force beyond the simply semantic. With a belief in the virtue of the sign and the power of the word (as in signature theory, *Natursprache*, astrology), the words of the satirist can have an illocutionary power beyond the phatic. Seventeenth-century books on shorthand, or "secret writing", and universal language schemes have in common an understanding of language as code, and recent studies on Renaissance secret hermeneutics further demonstrate the widespread understanding of reading and writing as encoding and decoding, cyphering and decyphering.⁴⁵ The name/cypher is decoded by the

⁴⁵ G.A. Padley, *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe, 1500-1700. Trends in Vernacular Grammar I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), Part II; Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*

anagram, which is, in Thomas Browne's phrase, a sure path "to trace the labyrinth of truth".

The encoded meaning of the anagram interested Ferdinand de Saussure who investigated the apparent randomness of the anagrams he found in Latin poetry and filled several hundred notebooks with queries and hypotheses about a non-rational, interior grammar or subcode within language itself.⁴⁶ Whereas Post-Structuralists argue with advocates of psycho-linguistics about the nature of the anagrammatical system in language, whether it is merely fortuitous or evidence of an autonomous unconscious in language, readers in the seventeenth century believed in anagrams. The habit of perceiving correspondences and resemblances, as we have seen, fostered an awareness of the forms and shapes of things, both natural and artificial, and their constituent parts. As Jonathan Culler observed about Saussure's interest in anagrams, the materiality of the elements of the sign and the motivation behind their arrangement are as significant as the sign itself.⁴⁷

Seventeenth-century writers liked to demonstrate the perfection of Hebrew and the impossibility of randomness in the first language given to Adam directly by God, in which words reflect the nature of

(Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984); Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

⁴⁶ See Jean Starobinski, *Words Upon Words: The Anagrams of Ferdinand de Saussure*, Olivia Emmet, trans. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979). Cf. Frederick Ahl, "Ars Est Caelare Artem (Art in Puns and Anagrams Engraved)", in Jonathan Culler, ed., *On Puns: The Foundation of Letters* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988), 17-43.

⁴⁷ Jonathan Culler, *Framing the Sign: Criticism and its Institutions* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988), 223.

the things they signify. Thomas Granger refers back to the Adamic language in *Syntagma Logicum, or, The Divine Logike* (1620) when he discusses the rhetorical concept of *notatio*:

the interpretation of a name, or word from the originall thereof; whereby a reason is shewed, why such a name is giuen to such a thing, that by the name, the thing it selfe may be interpreted, explicated, and knowne. For as the nature of the thing giueth a semblable name: so the name is a note, signe, image, or symboll noting, and representing the nature of the thing. (X2v)

Granger continues with the example of "Adam", for "his name representeth and noteth his nature... because he was formed of redd earth", and asserts that "the names of all things named by *Adam* were essentiall, and true, according to the trueth, or nature of Gods workes" (X3r). Since the descendants of Eber did not participate in the building of the tower at Babel, they retained the original language, making Hebrew the only language to escape the confusion of tongues. "The main business of mankind, besides the doing of Gods will," Henry Edmundson notes in his *Lingua Linguarum, The Naturall Language of Languages* (1655),

is the redeeming himselfe from those Curses which he gained by his Sin;... and the Curse in the Confusion of Tongues at *Babell*,... is repaired by Arts, Learning, and Languages.... (A3r)

The degeneration of languages since Babel further separates *res* from *verba*, as external influences undermine the integrity of particular languages. The main criterion in the hierarchy of tongues in C. Butler's *The English Grammar, or, The Institution of Letters, Syllables, and Words, in the English tongue* (1633) seems to be the military strength of a nation:

the Teutonick (whereof the English is a dialect) being the language of unconquered Conquerors, hath continued in its primarie seat of Germanie, with little alteration, from the

Confusion untill this day. (*2r)

Butler concludes his introduction to *The English Grammar* with a call to end the "uncertaintie of writing" (*3r) of English, due to its confused orthography, by proposing an expanded phonetic alphabet. Butler's new orthography is "according to the sound now generally received" (*4v), being based on an *oral*, rather than a *graphic*, conception of language that would adapt to changes in the accepted pronunciation. Francis Lodwick seeks to avoid the arbitrariness, as well as problems such as standardizing regional pronunciation, of a system like Butler's, and proposes a whole new language in *A Common Writing* (1647):

a kind of hieroglyphical representation of words, by so many severall Characters, for each word a Character, and that not at *Random*.... (A2r)

The possible randomness of the elements of words and names, their characters and letters, is directly challenged by the seventeenth-century conception of the anagram. Just as Adam's act of naming the creatures was not an arbitrary allotment of verbal signs to things, so an individual's name is not an arbitrary arrangement of letters chosen at random from the twenty-four letters of the Roman alphabet. The single most important influence on a person's identity begins with baptism or christening, when the name is given and existence truly begins in terms of the church and society. Although the act of naming, by differentiation, creates the individual, the name nevertheless contains an attendant significance that reaches back into the individual's family history and forward into the individual's future: the name a child receives is determined by its parents' (predominantly its father's) position in society and its own

place in the family, both of which will significantly determine the course of its life. The correspondence between an individual's name and his persona reduces the arbitrary nature of naming further as he begins to live out the expectations immanent in his naming; this process depends not so much upon the literal meaning of the name as upon the factors that contributed in the naming. The anagram reconfigures the letters of the name into a signifying pattern that reveals the meaning implicit in the name.⁴⁸

The most meaningful analogy of the anagram, often drawn by writers in the seventeenth century, is the Kabbalah, the ancient Jewish system of interpreting the manifestations of God and His attributes in the universe. David S. Katz has written admirably on the consequences of the academic interest in Hebraic studies at the universities in the mid-seventeenth century, demonstrating the influence of the Kabbalists' interpretation of the Hebrew scriptures upon the philosophical language planners in the circles of Comenius, Hartlib, and Liebnitz.⁴⁹ Not only was the Kabbalah a factor in the development of the scientific philosophy of Henry More, the Cambridge philosopher even wrote a defense of "the Philosophick Cabbala" in *Conjectura Cabbalistica, or a Conjectural Essay of interpreting the Mind of Moses* (1653).⁵⁰ Nicholas Bacon, Elias Ashmole and Isaac

⁴⁸ Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981), 65: "it was believed that a man's name concealed his destiny, and that destiny could be revealed by ingenious rearrangement of the letters of his name".

⁴⁹ David S. Katz, *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England, 1603-1655* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 79-85.

⁵⁰ A. Rupert Hall, *Henry More: Magic, Religion and Experiment* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 110-11.

Causabon communicated regularly on matters kabbalistical, both theoretical and practical. The *temurah* of the Kabbalistic tradition reconfigures the letters of the five books of the Torah to reveal the Tetragrammaton, the divine name, on which it constructs a model of the universe called the "Tree of the Sephiroth". Texts such as the medieval *The Secrets of the Letters of the Divine Name from the Zohar*, which influenced Renaissance Neo-Platonic philosophers, forms the basis of traditional Kabbalistic practice. It treats the characters of the four letters of the divine name, JHVH, as the symbolic framework of the universe:

The picture which the Zohar paints is woven around a single central image: the four letters of the Divine Name - YHVH. This picture of the Name is a *map* of the transition between unknowable simplicity above and unknowable multiplicity below.⁵¹

The Torah, although superficially meaningful in itself, conceals within its letters the supreme meaning of the divine name that can be perceived only through mystical contemplation and *temurah*, or unscrambling. The entire history of the universe, from before its creation even, contains the divine attributes of God, and the Kabbalah is the key to its deciphering.

By the seventeenth century, the Kabbalah has become a metaphor for esoteric systems of interpretation, sometimes favourable but mostly not. John Wilkins, in his handbook on secret writing *Mercvry, Or The Secret and Swift Messenger* (1641), suggests a cypher which transfers the "power" of letters ("as suppose L for A, and A for L or the like"):

⁵¹ Stephen Wald, *The Doctrine of the Divine Name: An Introduction to Classical Kabbalistic Theology* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 52 and 115. See also Moshe Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 3.

Answerable to that kind of Cabilisme in the Jewish learning, which the Rabbies call... *Combinatio*, when the letters of the Alphabet are severally transposed, and taken one for another, after any knowne order. (E3r)

The "Jewish Doctors", Wilkins comments, think Isaiah and Jeremiah "to be of more especiall note for their skill in Cabilismes" (E3v).

The ambivalence with which Kabbalistic references are made can be demonstrated in a knotty poem by Thomas Stanley:

Yet love's severest lawes
 Allowe his subjects this redresse,
 By some inversion to expresse
 What Saint is of their suffrings cause;
 Thy name still binds my soule though I
 The mystick letters do unty.

As Jewe's the sacred Name
 With a religious feare conceale,
 Yet dare the letters steale,
 Transposed some new sense to frame;
 So though from whence I dare not tell,
 Care in my breast must ever dwell.⁵²

As a translator, Stanley would have been conscious of contemporary linguistic issues concerning the original language, the "second curse" of Babel, universal language systems, and the arbitrary nature of sign systems. Furthermore, as a member in the 1650s of the secret Royalist society *Armilla Nigra*, Stanley would have had practical experience in forming and decoding cyphers, and he seems to have had contact with those amateur hermeticists, Sir Thomas Browne and Elias Ashmole. It seems wholly appropriate, therefore, that Stanley should use the Kabbalah, the occult system of making manifest the hidden things of God and His universe, as a metaphor in a poem about his mysterious, concealed love.

In a fundamental way, Stanley's poem transposes or translates

⁵² *The Poems and Translations of Thomas Stanley*, G.M. Crump, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 349-50.

personal experience from an esoteric into an interpretable medium, while at the same time telling without revealing his secret love. The Kabbalah is the subtext that informs and interprets, not only the short poem, but also the poet's experience of fatal love. The first stanza offers a secular version of the Kabbalistic *temurah* in the anagrammatical process of inverting and "untying" the "mystick letters" by which Love allows its victims to comprehend and, consequently, control their destiny. For the poet, however, the knot refuses to untie and the Kabbalistic process, referred to in the second stanza, cannot construe the reading (or "new sence") which the poet craves. In other words, when Stanley turns to the occultist Hebraic system of decipherment in order to express the paradox of destiny and free will, he does so with scepticism and suspicion. It may work for others, the poet says, but it failed me.

Paradoxically perhaps, both Parliamentarian and Royalist writers distrusted the use of mystical or "cabbalistic" writing in the other, and the Kabbalah referred to approvingly only infrequently. Although "cabbalistic" comes to mean "secret, mysterious", it never loses the connotation of Jewish mystical interpretation of the Torah. In his *Vnheard-of Curiosities: Concerning the Talismanical Sculpture of the Persians*, James Gaffarel rejects the opinion that "talisman" in Hebrew means simply "scutcheons or shields", dismissing the notion as "the Issue of some Ignorant Cabalists Fantasticall Braine" (151). It comes as no surprise that Richard Ellistone, the translator of Jakob Boehme's *Signatura Rerum*, treats language in a mystical way, for he describes the work itself as "a short hidden Signature or Character of natural

& Divine Knowledge" (Dd3r). In the postscript concerning the translation, Ellistone advocates a mystical reading of the work:

I cannot say I have every where attained to the full and lively expression of the Authors meaning; for as Nature did open its knowledge to him, so likewise its language; ... Words they are, but *Vehicula rerum*, they are formed to express things, and not bare Sounds or empty Aysr. Now He that rightly understands the ground of the *Cabala* and *Magia*, and knows how the Language of Nature speaks in every Tongue, may well translate this Author.... (Dd4r)

Writers throughout the seventeenth century held "the Language of Nature" in high esteem, among universal language planners, mystical writers, and anti-sectarian satirists alike. In *A Seasonable Lecture* (1643), John Taylor, writing under the ironical anagram "Thorny Ailo", does more than merely mock the prevalence among "the zealous" to record sermons in shorthand:

A most learned Oration: Disburthened from *Henry Walker*.... Taken in short writing by *Thorny Ailo*; and now printed in words at length, and not in figures. (t.p.)

The writing "in figures" of the zealous has, for Taylor, a sinister aspect that evokes images of an arcane language revealed only to the initiate.

When Parliamentarians published "the King's Cabinet" in 1645, Royalists accused them of mystically mis-reading the cypher which Charles used.⁵³ John Beesley, writing in *Musarum Oxoniensium* (1643), takes the opportunity to make precisely this charge whilst complimenting Henrietta Maria:

Arrested Packets are ript up and read
All backwards. A. perhaps must now be Z.
Or in their Analyticks C. is D.
And this must meane dreadfull State Mystery....
Come then dispell and scatter (*Queene of Light*)
These foggy vapours of the dreadfull night....
Henceforth let no *Pythagoras* of theirs

⁵³ See Lois Potter, *Secret Rites*, Ch. 2.

Tempt to descry some bloody Characters
 In your bright Orbe, as some say, that sage wight
 Could doe upon the Planet of the Night. (C2v)

A response to *The Kings Cabinet Opened* entitled *A Satyr, Occasioned by the Author's Survey of a Scandalous Pamphlet* (1645), argues that, even though the King's cypher was decoded, the revealed words were yet impenetrable to the Parliamentarians whose scandalous pamphlet did nothing to implicate Charles of any wrongdoing:

it cannot stain
 Lines so cleare, yet so Majestick straine;
 A most Transparent, yet a close-wove Veine;
 Which when we reach its Sense, we may descry,
 We see more by its Light, then our own Eye....
 Yet this expressive clearnesse is but barke,
 An Out-side Sunne which guards us from the dark.
 Here the Bright Language shuts in Brighter sense,
 Rich Diamonds sleep within a Crystall Fence....
 No winding Characters, no secret Maze,
 Could so perplex, but they have found their wayes.⁵⁴

The paradox of obscure clarity in the king's letters and the problem of decipherment are entirely lost to the Parliamentary reading of the king's cabinet.

Although Ellistone writes in his translation of Boehme that words are "*Vehicula rerum*", important primarily for the ideas they convey, the vehicle itself is significant, especially in a context where, as in an anagram, the particular arrangement of the components of a word or name carries further significance and meaning exists more in the *graphic* or *glyphic* than the *oral* dimension. Whilst Kabbalistic theories are denounced by many, anagrams continued to have an important function in the literature of praise and blame

⁵⁴ By Martin Lluelin, first published in *Men-Miracles* (1646), here quoted from *Rump*, i.178.

throughout the seventeenth century.⁵⁵ The anagram dominates the dedicatory poems of Joshua Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas's *Divine Days and Works*, where King James I ("JAMES STUART") is read anagrammatically as "A just Master", Prince Henry ("Henricus Stuartus") as "Hic strenuus ratus", the Earl of Pembroke ("William Herbert") as "With liberal arm". William Drummond of Hawthornden wrote anagrams for many purposes: to eulogize Prince Henry under his mythical name (MOELIADES = *Miles a Deo*) and to mock acquaintances (IOHN SMITH = Shit On Him).⁵⁶ Francis Lenton's *Great Britains Beauties* (1638) honours the "female glory" of England in a series of anagrams:

Epitomised, In Encomiastick Anagramms, and Acrostiches, Upon the highly honoured Names of the Queenes most gracious Majestie, and the Gallant Lady-Masquers in her Graces glorious Grand-Masque. (t.p.)

Both anagrams and acrostics spell out the attributes of the Queen and her circle hidden in their names, and the anagrams "MARIA STVART - I AM A TRV STAR" and "MARYE STVART - A TRVSTY ARME" reveal the true essence of the Queen.

The converse is also true of satirical anagrams, where, as with the eulogistic anagram, the satirical reconfiguration of a person's name reveals the true nature of the satirical victim hidden in the name. In the pamphlets of the rivals Henry Walker and John Taylor

⁵⁵ Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd*, 252, discusses the complimentary Caroline anagrams such as "CHAROLVS STVARTVS = CHRISTVS SALVATOR" in *Eikon Basilike*.

⁵⁶ Francis Lenton, *Great Britains Beauties*, Blv; *The Divine Weeks and Works*, Susan Snyder, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), II.884; *William Drummond of Hawthornden: Poems and Prose*, Robert H. MacDonal, ed. (Edinburgh and London: Scottish Academic Press, 1976), 197 (Prince Henry) and xiii (John Smith).

satirical anagrams abound, Taylor describing Walker as "Knave Reviler Hell" (*The Hellish Parliament*, 1642) and Walker returning with an anagram of "John Talour the Poet": "Art thou in hel o poet?" (*Taylor's Physicke*, 1642). The satirical anagrams on "William Laud", such as "Dam lawe will I", caused Christopher Syms, *Great Britans Alarm* (1647), to comment:

Long before death of him by them is hinted,
These anagrams were's omen, though not printed. (Flv)

Syms seems to suggest that the downfall and death of the Archbishop were implicit in the name even before the published anagrams made the judgment explicit. Both the eulogistic and satirical anagrams purport to be more a *true*-naming than a *re*-naming of the person in question.

Numerology, closely related to the use of anagrams in satire, relates to the Kabbalistic *gamatria* which extracts meaning from the numerical value of letters of sacred texts. *Mercvries Message* (1641), for instance, offers a numerological reading of VVILL LAVD ("The mans name / With Beasts the same"):

VV	-----	10	L	-----	50
I	-----	1	A	-----	0
L	-----	50	V	-----	5
L	-----	50	D	-----	500
		666			(Alv)

As in the Kabbalah, the nature of numerology in the 1640s tends to be apocalyptic, and the interpretation of symbolical numbers in Daniel and Revelation are standard features of commentaries on these Biblical books.⁵⁷ Christopher Syms's Royalist *Great Britans Alarm*,

⁵⁷ See *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance thought and literature: patterns, antecedents and repercussions* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), C.A. Patrides and Joseph Wittreich, edd., especially Ch. 4 and 5. David S. Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, 98-9, discusses the application of the numerology of Daniel to the dating

reads the symbolical chronology of Daniel to arrive at the year 1625 as a year of glory:

That was th'auspicious year of joy renown,
Our Sov'raign Lord King Charles came to the crown. (E1r)

The Recantation of the Prelate of Canterbury (1641) not only offers anagrams of the Archbishop's name (C2r), it also reads his name numerologically; "Laud", the speaker of the recantation, confesses that he is the fulfilment of the prophecy of the Beast in Revelation:

I must tell you some think that Prophetie (thirteene Revelation the last) about the beast coming out of the earth, which spoke as a Dragon, even now to be fulfilled, and the mystery thereof revealed in my name, the numerall letters whereof being thus written WILL. LAVD make directly the number of the Beast. (E2r)

"Laud" also demonstrates that the numerical value of Psalm 111:3, which "mystically foretold" an apocalyptic event for the year 1640, is numerically significant both in Hebrew and English:

[the] numerall Letters predict directly that strange yeere, even the yeere 1640, wherein by the dread Covenant of *Scotland* most especially... the God of Truth seemed to make a vow against us. This computation doth hold in English, As in the *Hebrew*, HIS Worke Is honoVrabLe, and gLorIoVs, and hIs rIghteoVsnesse enDVreth foreVer.... (E4r)

The mystical reading of immanently significant words and numbers in the seventeenth century makes manifest the divine will for state and individual alike.

The anagram, like another of its analogues, translation, transfers an esoteric cypher into an exoteric form. In the prefatory epistle to *Great Britains Beauties*, "To the Criticall Age", Francis Lenton associates anagrammatists with translators, both being "confin'd to narrow lists" (B1r). In fact, anagrams frequently move through several stages of translation, as in John Taylor's A

of Christ's return and the universal conversion of the Jews.

Delicate, Dainty, Damnable Dialogve, Between the Devill and a Jesuite

(1642) which ends with an anagram of the Pope's title in Latin:

"Supreamus Pontifex Romanus"

ANNAGRAMMA

O Non Sum Supra Petram fixus.

Dev[il]. This gives your Holy Father a shrewd knock,
It sayes he is not fixed on a Rock:
Let him fix where he can, let's make an end,
As long as hee'l serve me, I am his friend. (A4v)

In *A Remonstrance to the People* (1649) an anagram of Oliver Cromwell's name in Latin reveals the Machiavellian character of the Lord Protector: "OLIVERUS CROMWELL Anagr. *Velo lucri moverus*" (12; B3v). The Latin expression needs further decyphering, and the final obscuring layer is stripped away in a short poem:

His ominous nature here decypher'd stands,
Obeying Satans wiles in his commands.
The Peoples Liberty he makes traine,
But seeks through blood a Kingdome to obtaine:
Trace him, but trust him not; his Soule is true
To profit, and ambition; false to you
For power that way controule, when it descends,
Their bondage whom it fawns on, it intends,
But when this Spider, and the web he spins
You have destroy'd, your Liberty begins.

Indeed, this last stage of interpretation goes beyond a literal translation of the Latin phrase and offers a *reading* of Cromwell's "ominous nature"; the poem, however, is not truly the last stage of decyphering, since the reader of the pamphlet must complete the poem in a final act of interpretation.⁵⁸

The connection between anagrams and translation takes on special significance when names are translated into a Hebrew anagram and then interpreted in a poem. Henry Walker, in his weekly newsbook *Perfect Occurrences* in 1648-49, praised Parliamentary heroes in

⁵⁸ In Latin, the translator is linked with the astronomer in a similar act of interpretation (cf. Note 16 above).

Hebrew anagrams, including Fairfax and Essex. The privileged position which ancient Hebrew held as the original language, the only language to survive the confusion at Babel, was widespread throughout the seventeenth century, among groups as disparate as the radical sects, universal language planners, and professors of rhetoric.⁵⁹

Robert Ashley, in his *Of the Interchangeable Covrse, or Variety of Things* (1594), argues that Hebrew most perfectly resembles nature,

imitating the mouing of the Heaven, which is from the right hand to the left, and is most perfect according to Aristotle, approaching nearest to the vnitie, which of Plato is called the motion of similitude, or of vniformity. (E2r)

The use of Hebrew among presbyterians and independents as well as sectarians reflected the myth of the English people as the new Israelites, necessarily speaking "the language of Canaan". If this was literally the language of Canaan, as opposed to the zealous jargon or godly-speak frequently parodied by the anti-sectarians, so much the better. For, if the anagram already possesses the intrinsic virtue of revealing the essential truth of a person through his name, then a Hebrew anagram has further power in revealing this truth in a divine, perfect, unfallen medium. The intermediary steps of translation and interpretation for the anagrammatist fall away, giving the Hebrew Parliamentary writers an access to divine clairvoyance. Sir John Birkenhead, in his satirical catalogue of fictitious titles *Paul's Church-Yard* (1651?), mocks Henry UUalker in an anagram ("Luke Harruney") as the author of "Six hundred *Texts* of

⁵⁹ See Nigel Smith, *Perfection Proclaimed: Language and Literature in English Radical Religion 1640-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), Part III; G. Lloyd-Jones, *The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: A Third Language* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983).

Scripture in Hebrew Anagrams" (Blv). The Royalists never wrote Hebrew anagrams --probably because of the strong Puritan associations with Hebrew-- favouring instead the Latin language as in the anti-Cromwellian anagram instanced above.⁶⁰

2.3. Conclusion.

Mock as they might the use of Hebrew anagrams, the Royalists participated as much as their opponents in a "cabbalistical" system of satirical representation. John Cleveland deciphers the characters of SMECTYMNUUS, &cetera, and John Presbyter, and, in the same way as John Wilkins's "secret writing" transfers the "power" of letters in *Mercvry*, Cleveland redistributes the semantic values of his subjects. Whereas the Kabbalist achieves an apprehension of divine truth through meditation and ecstasy, the satirist gains ascendancy over the victim through invoking the *furor poeticus* of Archilochean curse by which the satirist gains control over the material characters within the magician's circle. The satirical poem or pamphlet is a fictional representation of reality which not only reveals intrinsic and hidden actualities, but also brings about the destruction of the satirical victim. The notion of satire as a form of malediction with an effective power over material objects, whether people or typographical symbols and characters, combines with the idea of natural and artificial material signs as bearing meaning.

⁶⁰ A satire on Henry Burton, in the form of a mock-sermon on the text "Hee that hath Eares to heare, let him heare", is entitled, *A Zealovs Sermon, Preached at Amsterdam, By a Jew, Whose Name is NOT-RVB, It being a Hebrew Word, you must read his Name backward* (Amsterdam, 1642).

PART III: THE IMAGE IN SATIRE

- 3.1. Making and Marring Images
 - 3.1.1. Introduction: The Image Debate
 - 3.1.2. Iconoclastic Satire
- 3.2. Libel, Satire and Magic
- 3.3. Royalist Iconoclasm: Richard Corbett (1582-1635)
- 3.4. The *Eikon* Pamphlets (1649-51)
 - (i) *Eikon Alethine*
 - (ii) *Eikonoklastes*
 - (iii) *Eikon Aklastos*

3.1. MAKING AND MARRING IMAGES

3.1.1. Introduction: The Image Debate.

The apprehension of the figural power inherent in material signs and characters through transcendent, mystical decipherment involves concepts of imaging which engage profound ideas about the perception of religious, political and moral truth. The Renaissance world is constructed around images of the cosmos, the workings of fate and providence, the natural world, human society, monarchy and authority, images by which reality is perceived, at times even formed.¹ The act of reading is itself an act of perceiving through images (physical symbols representing concepts) in which the very atoms of language, the typographical characters, are sensual objects acting on the mind through an optic medium.

The mid-seventeenth-century ecclesiastical crisis manifested itself in the treatment of religious images, particularly with Parliamentary soldiers promiscuously breaking statues and altar rails. The concern in satirical pamphlets, poems and ballads over images, whether their lamentable destruction or their scandalous toleration, reflects the century's concern with the function of images. The number of pamphlets published in 1643 around the removal of Cheapside Cross, for example, demonstrate the important symbolical

¹ Francis Bacon, *The Essays*, John Pitcher, ed. (London: Penguin, 1985), describes the formation of such systems as "Idols of the Theatre": "in my judgement all the received systems are but so many stage-plays, representing worlds of their own creation after an unreal and scenic fashion" ("Appendix 4: Idols of the Mind", 287).

position such religious images held in the ecclesiastical controversy; the religious issue at stake in the Cheapside Cross pamphlets serves as the focus of political issues such as the sovereignty of the citizens of London or the repudiation of English history represented by the crosses. To comprehend the depth and extent of the part played by images and iconoclasm in the satirical literature of the 1640s, one must consider the nature of the iconological debate.

Pamphlets published around the introduction in 1640 of the practice of bowing at the name of Jesus, perhaps the most novel of the contentious Laudian "innovations", focussed the anti-episcopal attack on the idolatrous nature of religious symbols.² Throughout the 1620s, when renewed anti-Spanish sentiment revived the anti-Catholic paranoia that had ebbed and flowed since the reign of Queen Mary, the papist strategy was thought to be the gradual infiltration of the court, which indeed succeeded in securing a remarkable toleration of Roman Catholic priests and nobility in Henrietta Maria's circle in the 1630s. More worrying than an enclave of Catholics around the Queen was the Roman influence in the Church of England, such as William Laud and Matthew Wren, whose Arminian

² Thomas More, *A Dialogue Concerning Heresies and Matters of Religion* (also known as *The Dialogue Concerning Tyndale*), 1528, (*English Works*, I.2, 21): "If then ye set aught by the name of Jesus, written or spoken: why should ye set naught by his image painted or carven that representeth His holy person to your remembrance, as much, and more too, than doth his name written? ... And yet these heretics [followers of Luther and Tyndale] forbear not villainously to handle and cast dirt upon the holy crucifix, an image made in remembrance of our Saviour Himself, and not only of His most blessed person, but also of His bitter passion" (quoted in W.E. Campbell, *Erasmus, Tyndale and More*, London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1949, 126).

tendencies made them suspiciously sympathetic to Roman Catholic practices. The steady promotion of William Laud, first to the see of London (1628) and then Canterbury (1633), is indeed an indication of the powerbase controlled by those who sought to steer the church back to its Henrician state, away from any continental Reformed (especially Genevan) model and towards strong prelatical episcopacy.

Perhaps nothing signalled the repudiation of Reformed doctrine and practice more provocatively than the Canons of 1640 which contained, beside the notorious "Etcetera Oath", a declaration concerning the position and nature of the altar in churches. The Scots had reacted dramatically in 1637 when the prescribed liturgy of the *Book of Common Prayer* was forced upon them; the combination of their strong anti-papist tradition and independent, nationalistic impulse made the "Bellum Episcopale" particularly fierce and, in the words of *Vox Borealis* (1641), "set the English a faire Cobby" of Rebellion (D1r). Although no one in England threw a stool at any bishop (as Jenny Geddes did in Edinburgh on 23 July 1637), opponents of episcopacy strenuously denounced the Laudian innovations as denials of essential Reformed beliefs. In particular, the placing and elevation of altars, the insistence on altar railings, the figure of the cross at baptism, and the bowing to the name of Jesus were visual statements, speaking images that partook in the Roman Catholic error of ecclesiastical imagery and in the sin of idolatry.³

3 Ann Kibbey, *The interpretation of material shapes in Puritanism: A study of rhetoric, prejudice, and violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 43, notes the Puritans' "extension of iconoclastic motives to nonviolent symbolic acts" (such as refusal to kneel at the Lord's Supper), and suggests that "By the late sixteenth century..., nonviolent acts of iconoclastic disobedience to Anglican authority became the Puritans' most characteristic trait"; "Nonviolent symbolic acts, however peaceful they may seem, remained

The controversies concerning crosses, altars and the bowing at the name of Jesus are essentially one dispute about the religious symbol in worship. The debate moves almost inevitably through the ecclesiastical to the philosophical plane and involves the fundamental human problem of the inability to apprehend reality immediately, the inadequacy of sensory perception, and the impossibility of accurately representing metaphysical truth by material means. In other words, the rejection of imagery in religious worship is integrally related to the conception of language and the material sign as essentially flawed and incapable of expressing really and truly. The debate on "Jesu-worship", as Henry Burton called it, focussed on the nexus of the visual and the verbal, for the visible response (genuflexion) to a phonetic image (the name "Jesus") involves the notion of an image as a bearer of meaning. In the instance of bowing at the name "Jesus", the apprehension of the truth represented in both verbal and visual icons is possible only through an interpretation that transcends their material dimensions; the acceptance or rejection of the possibility of a transcendent interpretation informs the basis of the response to images of any nature, physical or conceptual, visual or verbal. Thus, when the declaration in the *Canons* of 1640 concerning "Rites and Ceremonies" had encouraged "doing reverence and obeisance" upon entering and

closely tied to the rationale for material destruction." Patrick Collinson's Stenton Lecture, *From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia: the Cultural Impact of the Second English Reformation* (Reading: University of Reading, 1986), describes the internalisation of iconoclasm into a logocentric fear of images. The standard treatment of English iconoclasm is John Phillips, *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1660* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973).

leaving churches, it joined the outward obeisance with an inward reverence to legitimate the image which the action presents:

the Church is the house of God, dedicated to his holy worship, and therefore ought to minde us, both of the greatnesse and goodnesse of his Divine Majestie, certain it is that the acknowledgement thereof, not onley inwardly in our hearts, but also outwardly with our bodies, must needs be pious in it self, profitable unto us, and edifying unto others.⁴

The benefits of the gesture of obeisance, like the two-sided nature of the physical image, move inwards (pious and profitable) and outwards (edifying to others), being translated internally into a spiritual currency and operating externally as a metaphor to instruct others.

Since an image presents an object obliquely by means of similitude or semblance, the iconological debate involves the metaphorical function of imaging, the nature of metaphor, and, consequently, the very foundations of knowledge, because the human understanding conceives of reality mediately and analogically. Milton, for example, seems to approach the subject of reason and the senses with typical English Protestant suspicion, but never without evincing a curious fascination with sensual objects. On the other hand, the devotional verse of Patrick Cary, the crypto-Catholic poet, like that of Henry Vaughan and Thomas Carew, is highly visual, and the meditations involve contemplating pictures of divine truth. Not only do the emblematic drawings which accompany Cary's "Divine Poems" (1651) in manuscript demand a dual graphic and verbal reading, the poems themselves rely heavily on sensual perception. The poem "Crucifixus pro Nobis", for example, consists of four tableaux in

⁴ From *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. E. Sirluck (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), I.992-3 ("Appendix D").

which the life and death of Christ are presented to the reader's eyes ("Looke, how Hee shakes for cold!").⁵ Not that the picturing-forth of Christ is a specifically Catholic or High-Church phenomenon, for Calvin in his commentary on Galatians 3:1 urges preachers to portray Christ's passion to the people in vivid pictures, showing Him to their minds.⁶

The opponents of Laudian ecclesiastical imagery writing in the early 1640s strenuously denied the ability of visible images and metaphors to convey truth: fallen, carnal humanity cannot penetrate the surface of the similitude to grasp the reality it means to represent. The response to this is the optimistic view that an image can be an efficacious medium for the apprehension of truth: the mind needs similes, metaphors, images, and analogies in order to comprehend reality.

Engaging as it does such fundamental principles, the iconographical debate continues well after the official abolition by the House of Commons of the offensive Laudian practices. On 1 September 1641, the Commons ordered:

I. That the Communion table should stand East & West (as formerly) & that the Raile about it should be pulled downe.
 III. That all pictures, and *Images* of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the like, in Churches, Chappels, or Chancells, should bee taken away.⁷

However, with the obvious "superstitious" elements removed from the

⁵ *The Poems of Patrick Cary*, Sister Veronica Delany, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 52.

⁶ See Ernest B. Gilman, *Iconoclasm and Poetry in the English Reformation* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 151.

⁷ *The Orders from the House of Commons For the Abolishing of Superstition, and Innovation* (1 September 1641), A2r.

physical church, the years after the fall of prelatical episcopacy, when Presbyterian church discipline was instituted, nevertheless saw a continuation of attacks on the alleged elevation of human ordinances to *de jure divino* status. Nicholas Rust's *Roma Ruens*, a sermon preached before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London in 1650, speaks of the prelatical and Presbyterian phases in similar terms, and is dominated by the fear of falsehood perceived as truth, of religion that is really an empty, lifeless idol. Consequently, the controlling metaphor for truth and falsehood in *Roma Ruens* --the ark of Israel's God and Dagon, the Philistine idol, lying prostrate and broken before it-- is iconographic:

the truth of God carrieth all before it, dashing the brats of *Babylon* against the stones, breaking not only her Idols of coursen materials, as of wood and stone, but even those of purer matter, as of gold and silver and precious stones; discovering not onely the mysterie of iniquity in grosse formes, but even that which is more specious and spun with a finer thread.... Thus the glory of Christs truth and worship, doth overshadow and put out the glory of all humane & carnal ordinances.⁸

Rust associates reminiscences of the physical images of the Laudian church with the figurative idolatry of "will-worship" which admitted the popish innovations and which continued to promote human ordinances in the English church under the Presbyterians in Parliament and the Westminster Assembly of Divines.

We have had experience of this, for we set up the Dagon of mans invented worship before the Arke of God, but the power and Majesty of the truth of God made him lick the dust, for down he tumbled before the Arke, and though the hand of God was exceeding against us in this designe, yet such was our blind zeal, that we would not desist, but lent Dagon our hand again, and gave him the other lift, and helped him to his seat again; yea we have fasted for him, and prayed for him until we had set him up, but in the morning, this *Dagon* was fallen unto the

⁸ Nicholas Rust, *Roma Ruens. Dagon falling before the Arke, or, The Glory of Christ over-shadowing all other glories* (1650), C1r-v.

earth again, and had broke his neck and hands, and nothing but the stump of *Dagon* remaines, for nothing doth so deface and deform mans worship as the light of truth shining forth.

(D2r-v)

Rust's summary of the previous ten years of the English church brings together the notion of England as God's covenant people, the iconoclastic urge that sustained the Parliamentary side throughout the armed struggle, and the seventeenth-century concerns of perception and the apprehension of truth. Objects fashioned to carnal, human designs, which appear to be beautiful and true, are images of falsehood that are defaced and deformed by "the light of truth shining forth". The preacher, like the satirist, often posing as a prophet enraged with divine ire, is also an agent of the light of truth devoted to breaking the images, material or figurative, with which falsehood seduces the people.

The homily "Against perill of Idolatry" extends the Elizabethan conservative ("puritan") impulse through the Laudian years, when the sermon continued to be preached but without any degree of true ideological sympathy, so that in the 1640s the sermon on idolatry was almost exclusively the property of Puritan preachers and Parliamentary chaplains, whose main aim was to deny the Laudian distinction between an idol and an religious image or symbol. George Salterren, for instance, published *A Treatise against Images and Pictures in Churches* (1641) to demonstrate from scripture, the church fathers, and logical deduction that the toleration of any physical representation of God or the saints is contrary to the second commandment. Following Augustine's lead, Salterren argues that, since "the words of Gods Law are to be taken by a *Senechdoche speciei, pro genere*" (A2v), the absolute prohibition of idols includes religious

images of any sort. Interestingly, Salteren internalises the religious icon and overcomes the problem of the apprehension of religious truth through carnal means so that the Christian's mind becomes the shrine where a true image of God holds the mind captive. Thus, quoting Epiphanius, Salteren turns the negative affective power of religious icons into a positive force:

Be you carefull that you bring no Images into Churches, nor into the Chappells of Gods people; but alwayes carry God in your hearts; for it is not lawfull that a Christian should be held in businesses of the eye, but in contemplation of the minde. (C4r)

Two aspects of Henry Ainsworth's *An Arrow Against Idolatry* (1640), a strident treatise for the removal of popish vestiges from the English church, are noteworthy. Like Salteren, Ainsworth (1571-1622) takes the word "idolatry" beyond the physical representation of God, but, unlike Salteren, he extends the scope of "idolatry" to include any improper form of worship:

Idolatrie is a Greek word, compounded of *Idol*, which signifieth any similitude, image, likeness, form, shape or representation, exhibited either to the body or the minde; and *latrie* which signifieth *service*. Wherevpon *Idol-latrie*, or *Service-of-similitude*, is the performance of any religious dutie to that which hath a supposed similitude to God, but *is not* God indeed: or the performance of that unto the true God, which hath a similitude, shew and resemblance of his service, but is not so in deed. (A3r)

The expression "exhibited to the body or the minde" reflects the development of the conception of images from a physical object affecting the mind through bodily senses, to any agent which shows a false image of God immediately to the mind. Furthermore, such a definition prepares the way for the anti-prelatical attacks of the early 1640s, as well as the anti-presbyterian attacks of the late 1640s, which describe as idolatrous any form of "will worship".

Ainsworth follows the traditional depiction of the antichristian (read: Roman Catholic) church as the Great Whore with great relish, asserting that Rome is "Jezebel" and "*Priapus* the Pope is *bridegroom* of this spouse" (F2v). In the gender scheme of sexual excess, Idolatry is personified as the seductive woman who robs men of reason (G1r), reason being associated with masculine objectivity and the senses with feminine inconstancy. The Bishops of the English church are traders in the Whore's market, peddling "the reliques of this Romish idolatry", such as episcopal government, a set liturgy, holy-days, chapels, baptised bells, and hallowed fonts (F7v). The verse from I John 5, "Children keep yourselves from Idolls", quoted at the conclusion of *An Arrow Against Idolatry* (G4r), consequently assumes a sexual connotation that associates Puritan ecclesiastical plainness, asceticism almost, with male chastity, cleanness, and sexual fidelity.

The approach of writers supporting the Laudian use of religious imagery was to provide a rational, objective explanation of "idolatry" through linguistic analysis. Dr. Henry Hammond, for instance, responds to separatist interpretations of the second commandment with a treatise on idols and images in 1646, in which he employs the rhetorical technique, *notatio* (defining the name of a term from its etymology), to examine Old and New Testament usages of "idol" and "image".⁹ The analysis remains strictly philological throughout, with Hammond citing Tertullian and other ancient commentators, expressly to avoid contemporising the implications of the issue in terms of Laudian practices. In fact, Hammond concludes

⁹ *Of Idolatry* (Oxford, 1646).

the treatise with a sharp attack on writers (such as Ainsworth) who inordinantly extend the Biblical meaning of "idolatry" in applying it to the English liturgy. "As for the *East, or altar, or syllables of the name Jesus*", Hammond writes, "he that must think them *worshipt...* must either be of a very *short discourse...* or else of a very *pettish spleene*" (F3r). To demonstrate the folly of extending "idolatry" to the Laudian liturgy, Hammond suggests extending the terms even further:

I should not I conceive be thought in earnest, if I should go about to vindicate the use of the *Liturgy*, and of all *set formes* of prayer from this charge of *Idolatry*; 'Tis true it hath been printed, that *words in a book are images, and consequently that to pray before a book, or use a booke in prayer, is Idolatry, or Image worship*. But till this argument be extended to all *words spoken, as well as written*, and so all vocall (though it be *extemporary*) *prayer*, condemned for *Idolatry* also, I shall not conceive the *disputer* to have believed himselfe, nor consequently give him or my reader the trouble of an *answer*. (F3v)

Hammond here describes the essential divergence between the two sides, for the Laudian defence restricts the debate to a literal interpretation of "idol" and "image", and focusses on the *object* of worship (e.g. the person, not the name, of Jesus); the anti-prelatical writers extend the debate to the words and actions with which God is worshipped.

Paradoxically, the Parliamentary forces pursued their iconoclastic activities during the Civil War in a literalistic fashion, being unwilling (perhaps unable) to understand that ecclesiastical furniture is intended to transport the believer beyond the material to the spiritual realm. The tables were turned after 1643 when the strident anti-Laudian, Presbyterian leaders, such as Prynne, were accused, by Richard Overton and others, of the spiritual

idolatry of "will-worship". The controversy turns repeatedly to the non-literal interpretation of idolatry, in dealing not with images or representations of God, but with forms of worship. Thus, despite the physical manifestation of iconoclasm, the whole issue is more concerned with semantics, and it would be legitimate to take up Hammond's suggestion, for, as the representational function of language itself demonstrates, words indeed are images, meaning-bearing symbols that, on one level, simply produce a mental picture of the thing encoded in the word, and, on another level, affect and manipulate the faculties of comprehension and apprehension.

3.1.2. Iconoclastic Satire.

Since language is a metaphorical system, all linguistic activity, ranging from forensic, ecclesiastical and political rhetoric to fictional representation and allegorisation in literature, is in this broad sense imagistic. Satirical literature is involved with imaging in a particular way in that it systematically destroys idealised images of people, and deconstructs a person's public version along fissures of vulnerability until the figure collapses into a heap of rubble. The satirist penetrates the superficial exterior, the surface of the statue (they are invariably *static* figures), breaks the false image, and explodes the public adoration the insubstantial idol received. An awareness of the pre-occupation with imaging in the early seventeenth century makes more significant the iconoclastic impulse of much Civil War satire and clarifies such aspects as the satirical *persona*, satirical

stereotyping and caricature, and the vicarious mutilation of the object of attack in effigy. In a genre implicitly iconoclastic, the issues of imaging that dominate seventeenth-century thought become additionally pertinent in satirical pamphlets explicitly attacking the use of images.

The single most influential forebear of the Civil War satirical pamphlet is the Marprelate tract of the 1580s, two of which were reprinted in 1642 and 1643. The Marprelate tract not only brought religious issues sharply into the arena of popular ridicule, it also established a satirical idiom that outlived the Bishops' Ban of 1599 to reappear to express the frustrations of the late 1630s and the 1640s. Martin Marpriest, for instance, the pseudonymous "author" of Richard Overton's anti-Presbyterian satires in 1645-6, associates himself with the Elizabethan critic of episcopacy in the most direct way possible, declaring on the title-page advertisements that he is the "Sonne, and Heire to Old Martin the Metropolitane".¹⁰ Overton assumes the mantle from Marprelate and develops a satirical *persona* appropriate to the new generation's problems and ideals.¹¹ The mark that perhaps most clearly distinguishes Marprelate from his contemporaries is the conscious iconoclastic impetus which gives the tracts their power and menace, and which imbues the satirical pamphlet of the 1640s with its immense affective capabilities.

The first indicator of Marprelate's iconoclastic nature is his

¹⁰ Richard Overton, *The arraignment of Mr. Persecution* (1645), t.p.

¹¹ Nigel Smith, "Richard Overton's Marpriest Tracts: Towards a History of Leveller Style", 45, in *Prose Studies* 9 (2), ed. Thomas N. Corns, *The Literature of Controversy: Polemical Strategy from Milton to Junius* (London: Frank Cass, 1986).

name, and indeed the tracts were unprecedented in the specific allegations they made against particular members of the higher clergy, such as Bishops Thomas Cooper and John Bridges. Although the *Oxford English Dictionary* has no record of "mar" being used in a specifically iconoclastic context, the word nevertheless forms the prefix in several sixteenth- and seventeenth-century nonce-words (such as "mar-text", "mar-all") connected with the verbal form of "mar", denoted as impairing, ruining, or destroying a material object (q.v. "mar", 2a). Thomas Cooper responds to Marprelate's aspersions with *An Admonition to the People of England* (1589), where he comments ironically on the appropriateness of Martin's name:

The Author of them calleth himselfe by a feigned name, *Martin Marprelate*: a very fit name vndoubtedly. But if this outrageous spirit of boldnesse be not stopped speedily, I feare he wil proue himselfe to bee, not onely *Mar-prelate*, but *Mar-prince*, *Mar-state*, *Mar-lawe*, *Mar-magistrate*, and all together, vntil he bring it to an Anabaptisticall equalitie and communitie. (Fiiv)

The "marring" envisaged by Cooper amounts to the complete overthrow of established forms of ecclesiastical and political authority and a levelling of social distinctions in "an Anabaptisticall equalitie and communitie" such as that of John of Leiden's Münster in 1535.

George Cranmer's *Concerning the New Church Discipline* (1598), written in the aftermath of the Admonition Crisis, laments that the "modest" writing of godly men like Cooper soon "brake forth into open outrage" like a plague:

That whereas *T.C.* and others his great Masters had alwaies before set out the discipline [*Religio*] as a Queen, and as the daughter of God, he [*Martin Marprelate*] contrariwise to make her more acceptable to the people, brought her forth as a vice upon the stage... that by open railing (which to the vulgar is commonly most plausible) the state Ecclesiasticall might have been drawn into such contempt and hatred, as the overthrow thereof should have been most gratefull to all men, and in a

manner desired of the common people.¹²

Cranmer here presents two versions of religion: the iconic version "set out" by godly men "as a Queen", whose majesty demands universal respect, and the desecrated image which Marprelate trundled onto the stage of popular ridicule in order to encourage the overthrow of the church. The theatrical allusion to the Vice draws on the visually signifying quality of archetypal figures, iconic characters whose very appearance conveys meaning. In the iconoclastic process of the Marprelate tracts, the accepted image of religion is defaced to reveal another image --the true one, according to the satirist-- which bears a significance and an affective force entirely different, moving the viewer to revulsion rather than reverence. The publication in 1642 of Cranmer's criticism of Marprelate is not anachronistic, for the satirical pamphlets published against Laud and the bishops in 1640-41 recall the personal attacks by Marprelate against Cooper and Bridges.

Like Cranmer, Francis Bacon also employs theatrical terms to condemn Martinist satire for defacing religion in *An Advertisement Touching the Controversies of the Church of England* (1598; publ. 1641), and, like Cranmer's treatise, Bacon's tract relates as much to the situation in 1641 as it does to the 1590s. For Bacon, to handle religion "in the stile of the stage" and "to turne religion into a Comedy or Satyr" is to deform the majesty of religion, to render her form literally unrecognizable. Bacon contrasts religion and satire in terms of their outward carriage and their affective powers to compel reverence and revulsion respectively, as when he writes of the

¹² *Concerning the New Church Discipline* (publ. 1642), B1r.

"majestie of religion, and the contempt and deformity of things ridiculous" (B4v). The notion of the comeliness of majesty and the formlessness of ridiculous things reappears in a political context in Bacon's essay "Of Seditious and Troubles", where "Libels and licentious discourses against the state" offend the majesty of the prince's government.¹³ The images which Bacon uses in *An Advertisement Touching the Controversies of the Church of England* to characterize religious satire ("this unmodest and deformed kinde of writing") are frequently of physical deformation, as in the expression "to search and rip up wounds with a laughing countenance" (B4r).

Along with the others, Bacon understands that Marprelate seeks "to deface the government of the Church in the persons of the Bishops and Prelates" (C2r). Marprelate's deliberate deconstruction of the bishops' public *personæ* indeed "de-faces" the church of its leaders, and, in "the stile of the stage", reveals their secret vices and follies to a readership otherwise excluded from assessing the bishops. Recognizing this, Cooper, Cranmer, Bacon, and others (including Richard Hooker) criticize the works first as *libels*, offences indictable under civil law, and then as breaches of the moral code and the propriety of decorum.

In the advertisement to *An Admonition to the People*, Thomas Cooper describes Marprelate as "Martin the Libeller" and "his broode" as slanderers who "deface and discredite the present state of the Church" (t.p.), "this Libeller being as a Botch in the body, whereunto all bad humors comonly resort, & fewe good" (Hiiiv).

¹³ *The Essays*, 101-3.

Eventually, when Penry and Udall were sentenced for their involvement in the Marprelate tracts, Penry was executed and Udall imprisoned, with Job Throkmorton, now believed to be the actual author, escaping judgement. If nothing else, the Marprelate example demonstrates that the iconoclastic satirist is indistinguishable from the libeller, a synonymy exploited by the defenders of the status quo in order to place legal constraints on satirical expression. Indeed, the explicitly iconoclastic project (to deface the bishops) and the subsequent fate of the Martinists begin the pattern that, in the 1630s, develops into the Star Chamber mechanism for controlling orthodoxy and that recommences to protect a different orthodoxy under Parliament in the licensing regulations of 1643.

3.2. Libel, Satire and Magic.

The iconoclastic intent of particular satire written against the bishops merges with committing the crime of libel, which can be distinguished from unwittingly defaming a person through ignorance or error by determining malicious intent. Martin Parker wrote *The Poet's Blind mans bough* in reaction to the prodigious amount of anti-episcopal pamphlets published in the first half of 1641:

The Presse is overprest, and (justly) grones
Vnder the burthen of those heavie tones
Of Scritch-oule musick, threatening death and hell,
One striving all in malice to excell. (A4v)

The malicious intent of the pamphlets defaming the bishops' characters, particularly the person and reputation of Archbishop William Laud, calls for more rage than Parker's "demy Satir" displays:

Should I but give them their deserved due,
Whom though I know not that most shamelesse crew
Of namelesse Authers, Authors all of lies,
Of slanderous Pasquills rayling falicies,
I might my pen dip in that learnean Sinke,
Which the infernall furies use for ink,
Or with Iambean rimes Ironicall,
Makes lines should serve for ropes to hang them all. (A3r)

That a pamphlet circulating in the popular book market, presumably among the public of Parker's broadside ballads, can make esoteric references ("learnean Sinke", "Iambean rimes Ironicall") without further elucidation suggests that the receivers of such pamphlets may have been familiar with the vocabulary of classical notions of satire; "Pasquill" is less surprising due to the popular familiarity

with the works of Thomas Nashe. "Learnean Sinke" refers to Lerna, a marsh in Argolis, the home of a Hydra and the symbolic source of hell-infecting writing. Parker's threat is clear: should the pamphlets against William Laud not cease, he will invoke the power of Archilochean curse.

The anti-Laudian pamphlets that Parker decries, from the dissolution of the Short Parliament in April 1640 until after his imprisonment in the Tower in March 1641, are distinctly iambic in character: they are fierce, frequently crude, attacks on the Archbishop's person, publicly posted, like Pasquils, in such prominent places as the gates of Lambeth Palace. The illocutionary force of Greek *iamboi* to cause harm had acquired another facet in the late Roman satirical form *pasquillus* or "pasquil", a personal satirical attack posted on or over Pasquinus, a mutilated statue disinterred in 1501 in the centre of Rome. The anonymous lampoons were frequently signed "Pasquin", making the maledictory effigy the symbolical spokesman of the verse and ascribing to Pasquin's iconic presence the affective power of the written images of the pasquil. Parker seems to acknowledge the magical effect of the pasquils' "Scritch-oule musick", and he echoes the fear expressed by Laud in his diary that the harsh-sounding invectives presage real evil, "threatening death and hell". For Milton, an anonymous libeller is a "nameless hangman", casting into public despightful contumely on

persons deserving respect.¹⁴

Laud's modern biographer notes that the Archbishop had difficulty dissociating himself completely from the figure portrayed in the pasquils, and that he needed to reassure himself repeatedly, as he did in his diary:

Libels and ballads against me were frequently spread through the city and sung up and down the streets: and (I thank God for it) they were as full of falsehood as gall. Besides, they made base pictures of me, putting me into a cage, and fastening me to a post by a chain at my shoulder, and the like.... Against which my only comfort was that I was fallen, but into the same case with the prophet David.¹⁵

Laud tries to rise above the aspersions by identifying with the beleaguered psalmist, escaping into the divine fiction in order to assert a godly version of himself to counteract the *iamboi*. The anti-Laud playlet *Canterburie His Change of Diot* (1641) is one of the pamphlets involving a graphic representation of Laud in a woodcut to illustrate the text, depicting the Archbishop enacting the events described in the playlet.¹⁶ The pamphlet's form as a play, with stage directions and act divisions, strengthens the visual aspect of the satire, and it invokes the *performative* aspect of *iambos*. The controlling image of John Donne's "Witchcraft by a Picture" is the

¹⁴ *Colasterion*, II.753: "you [the Licenser] suffer'd this nameless hangman to cast into public such a despightfull contumely upon a name and person deserving of the Church and State equally to yourself.... But as to this brute Libel, so much the more impudent and lawless for the abus'd authority which it bears, I say again, that I abominat the censure of Rascalls and their Licensers".

¹⁵ Quoted in H.R. Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud, 1573-1645* (London: Macmillan, 1940), 412.

¹⁶ Martin Butler, *Theatre and Crisis: 1632-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 238-42, discusses the rôle this pamphlet played in dramatic representation after the closing of the theatres.

enthralment of the lover by means of an effigy in the power of the witch/beloved, and it serves to illustrate the understanding in the Renaissance that the graphic representation of a person involves a surrender to the power of the maker of the representation.¹⁷ The Archbishop's nemesis, William Prynne, in his *A Breviate of the Life of William Laud* (1644), notes Laud's superstitious fear of satirical woodcuts and concludes smugly concerning Laud "That he tooke speciall notice of sundry Dreames, Presages and Omens of his owne downfall" (Elr-v). However, just as a person's actions cannot be attributed to the stars that predicted them, so Laud's demise and the collapse of the episcopal edifice are not the effects of *iamboi*, but the inevitable consequence of the bishops' actions, as a contemporary pamphlet "prophesies":

And though we be called Libellers by them all,
And factious persons, yet *they'l have the fall*.¹⁸

Laud's distinction between "lampoon" and "libel" is a crucial one, not only because the former is legitimate and the latter illegal, but also because it implies the Archilochean notion of satire as formal malediction, a point which Roman satire acknowledges. Catullus alludes to the Archilochean model in calling his lampoons *iambi* even though they do not stand in the Greek iambographic tradition.¹⁹ Horace, on the other hand, invokes a particularly Roman model when he uses *carmina mala* to describe

¹⁷ See Ernest Gilman, *Iconoclasm and Poetry*, Ch. 5, "Pictures Made and Mard".

¹⁸ *The Prentises Prophecie, of the certainty of the Bishops destruction* (1642), A4r; emphasis added.

¹⁹ West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, 22.

"lampoons" (*Sermones*, II.i).²⁰ Despite his lawyer's opinion concerning personal satire, Horace admires the courage and brilliance of Lucilius ("the first man who dared compose this kind of poem"), and he praises the vigour with which Lucilius "stripped off the skin wherein everyone flaunts his good looks in his neighbour's eyes while inwardly ugly"; "Lucilius laid hands on the leaders and on the people themselves" (102). According to Cicero the basis of Roman libel legislation was the Twelve Tables, which allowed redress to the victim of *carmina mala* ("evil songs"). The phrase almost certainly referred originally to incantations, curses and the casting of evil spells, and later to slander and libel.²¹ The *carmina mala* exemplified by Lucilius, like Archilochean *iamboi*, combine the characteristic features of "lampoon": the violent assault on the person and the incantatory force of invective, with the legal implications of libel.

In *Areopagitica* (1644), Milton insists that there were in the classical age "only two sorts of writings which the Magistrate car'd to take notice of; those either blasphemous and Atheisticall, or Libellous", and Milton reminds his audience that in Roman times, "Nor was the Satyricall sharpnesse, or naked plainnes of *Lucilius*, or

²⁰ *Satires and Epistles of Horace*, S.P. Bovie, trans. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), 103. Horace emphasises the advantage of "rank and genius", which provide political immunity and universal approval. See Frederick Ahl, "The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome", *American Journal of Philology*, 105 (1984), 174-207.

²¹ *The Classical Dictionary*, q.v. "Libel and Slander in Rome", 606.

Catullus, or Flaccus, by any order prohibited".²² Although Lucilius, Catullus and Persius were not punished for their public censure of prominent members of Roman society, Naevius (2nd-century, B.C.) was imprisoned and later forced to leave Rome after he lampooned a prominent consular family, the Metelli. How would Milton distinguish between "libel" and "lampoon" or "pasquil" in his republic of ideas? Milton's "free press" would not permit books which the magistrate determines unjustly mar persons represented in the text ("libel"), a decision which entails a *post factum* examination of printed texts in a court of law which, presumably after litigation, would determine the truth of the offensive allegations made in the libel. The judgement is ultimately a socio-political one, for the enforcement of the libel law, as in the Roman examples, depends on the social position of the offender relative to the offended.²³ In the Elizabethan case of Martin Marprelate, the offended party controlled the print medium, the tribunals where the case would be tried, and the sentencing. In the Stuart period, the offence of anti-prelatical literature continued to be considered in terms of libel, as Jonson indicates in *The Alchemist* (1610), where the con-man Subtle mocks the "zeal" of the Amsterdam separatists and describes their financial prospects:

Nor shall you need to libel 'gainst the prelates,
And shorten so your ears against the hearing
Of the next wire-drawn grace.... (III.ii.86)

²² *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, II.494 and 498-90. Concerning Aristophanes, Milton calls him "the malicious libeller of his chief friends" (523).

²³ *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, E.J. Kenney, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), II.1: "It was Lucilius' privileged position in society that made it possible for him to mount and to sustain such attacks" (163).

Precisely how effective the libel laws and the Stationers' Company were in discouraging personal satire in both newsbooks or pamphlets (whether anti-prelatical or -presbyterian, anti-royalist or -parliamentarian), is difficult to gauge. The sheer number of books and pamphlets published in the 1640s suggests that the mechanism for control, the ecclesiastical licensers and the Stationers' agents, would probably be unable to cope with the volume.²⁴ The Licensing Act of 1643 may have succeeded in regulating the press somewhat, but Cromwell was still issuing Orders in 1655 for "the timely preventing and suppressing of all Seditious, Blasphemous, and other Libellous Pamphlets, Books, and Papers whatsoever" (Ee2v).

The stigma of sedition and illegality remained with unlicensed books and pamphlets produced by the clandestine press, and, without the hallmark of official authorisation, the unlicensed pamphlet continued to be read as an act of opposition to the authority of the King and his ecclesiastical censors and, later, of Parliament and its Committee for Printing. To borrow the vocabulary of modern descriptions of "ideology" (such as that by Catherine Belsey or Jonathan Dollimore, for instance), the connotation of "libel" expanded from being a punishable offence to an abstract concept of morally objectionable publication, is the evolution of the external, physical constraint of the laws governing the printing press, into an

²⁴ F.S. Siebert, *Freedom of the Press in England, 1476-1776* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1952), notes the deterioration of the coöperation in the Stuart period between ecclesiastical licensers and the Stationers' Company, which "had become an autocratic oligarchy principally engaged in pursuing the pecuniary advantage of its officers", 141.

internalised, ideologically restrictive force.²⁵ Just as the high profile which three victims of libel legislation, William Prynne, Henry Burton and John Bastwick, enjoyed throughout the late 1630s assured the constant reminder of the threat of the law under Laud, so the idea of "libel" continued to effect the production of satirical texts after the dissolution of the Star Chamber in a less material way, becoming the chief critical term in the contemporary interpretation of literature attacking persons of authority and position. That the term "libel", with its array of legal implications, came to be employed against anti-prelatical literature in the late 1630s and early 40s indicates not only that the satirical pamphlet was taken seriously enough to invoke criminal law to suppress it, but suggests also that the satirical pamphlet was read in *iambic* terms primarily. The nexus of *iambos*, lampoon and libel also becomes the focus of deliberately iconoclastic satire, examined below (3.3 and 3.4).

The iambic/iconoclastic project --to deface the bishops-- of the Elizabethan pamphleteer, Martin Marprelate, with its subsequent fate begin the pattern that, in the 1630s, develops into the Star Chamber mechanism for controlling orthodoxy and that recommences to protect a different orthodoxy under Parliament in the licensing regulations of 1643. In 1637, when anti-prelatical literature attracted the displeasure of the Star Chamber, the term "libel" was applied with great effect against William Prynne, Henry Burton, and John Bastwick whose punishment (cropping of the ears, as anticipated

25 In *Critical Practice* (London: Methuen, 1981) and in *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries* (Brighton: Harvester, 1984), respectively.

by Jonson's *Subtle*) seems to correspond with their crime: the libeller defaces the image of the victim and is disfigured in turn. Prynne, a repeat offender, had the letters "S.L." (for "Seditious Libeller") branded on his cheeks, marks which he interpreted as "*Stigmata Laudae*" to encourage the analogy with Marian torture and to create a contemporary anti-episcopal martyrology. In fact the physical disfigurement of the three Presbyterians became a political tool, developing into a symbol of the Laudian tyranny which maimed the Body of Christ, deprived the people of hearing the Word preached, and which caused much of the disfiguring satire of the early 1640s.

Nevertheless, despite the Stationers' Company and the licensing acts, unwanted material could not be prevented from reaching the book market under either regime. When "Laud", the speaker in the anti-episcopal *The Recantation of the Archbishop of Canterbury* (1644), boasts about his success as "the muzzle of the press", the pamphlet itself attests to the falseness of the claim, and the satirical verses which "Laud" quotes verbatim ironically highlight his own self-delusion as the strangler of the printing press. After the Restoration, however, the flood of pamphlets, mostly particular satires and lampoons ("libels"), released after a lapse in the Licensing Act in April 1679 attests to the fact that licensing yet served as a restraint.²⁶

After the trial of Burton, Bastwick and Prynne in 1637, Charles I asked Laud to publish his Star Chamber speech, apparently to accentuate the gravity of the crimes committed and to encourage the

²⁶ See John Oldham, "Prologue", *Satyrs Upon the Jesuits*, 1-9, in *The Poems of John Oldham*, Harold F. Brooks and Raman Selden, edd. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

sense of responsibility among those (in Francis Bacon's words) "that have understanding and conscience".²⁷ The reverence due to both prince and religion, so crucial to Bacon's concept of the suppression of "Libels and licentious discourses" ("Of Seditious and Troubles", 102), is explicitly combined in the *Canons* of 1640. The *Canons*, composed by the Archbishops and approved by the various provincial synods, respond to puritan attempts to reform the church by making decrees such as the Etcetera Oath ("for the preventing of all Innovations in Doctrine and Government"). The first decree "Concerning the Regall power", which had to be "treatably, and audibly read" "upon one Sunday in every quarter of the yeer", states that religious non-conformity is essentially atheistical: "treasonable against God, as well as against the King".²⁸ In his Star Chamber speech, Laud characterises the offence as "libel" not only to empower the court to administer a severe penalty according to well-established legal precedent, but also to invoke the moral connotations of "libel", especially its slanderous intent:

I Shall not need to speake of the infamous course of *Libelling* in any kind: Nor of the *punishment* of it, which in some cases was *Capitall* by the *Imperiall Lawes*.... But of all *Libels*, they are most *odious* which pretend *Religion*: As if that of al things did desire to be defended by a *Mouth that is like an open Sepulchre*, or by a Pen that is made of a sick and a loathsome Quill.²⁹

The reference to Psalm 5:9 ("their throat is an open sepulchre") briefly summons the Psalmist's situation and implies a correlation

²⁷ Francis Bacon, *A Wise and Moderate Discourse* (1598, publ. 1641), C2v.

²⁸ The *Canons* are reprinted in *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, Appendix D, I.986-987.

²⁹ *A Speech Delivered in the Starr Chamber* (1637), B1r-B1v.

between the malicious attacks upon David and the libels against Laud and the bishops.³⁰ In these opening words, Laud sweeps aside the need even to elaborate on what must be universally accepted, namely, the severe punishment ("in some cases... *Capital*") of perpetrators of libel. For Laud and the Star Chamber, "libel" gave a legal force to their judgements that "satire" never carried.³¹

Already from the mid-sixteenth century, the defenders of the established, episcopal church government had appropriated the term "libel" to describe any published work that criticized directly or indirectly any person in a position of authority. The term was no longer true to its root, *libellus* or "little scroll", since Prynne's massive *Histriomastix* came within its bounds. In the 1630s and later, "libel" connoted the legal sense of "any published statement

³⁰ Also quoted in Romans 3: 13, "Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips."

³¹ J.F. Stephens, *A History of the Criminal Law of England* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1883), devotes considerable attention to libel and makes the following comment on the period in question:
 there is no reason to doubt that practically libels attracted comparatively little attention till the Court of Star Chamber was at the height of its power, by which time the invention of printing, and the great intellectual movement of which it was one symptom, had given importance to political writings which they did not possess before. It must, however, be remembered that for a long time the offences which were afterwards treated as seditious libels were dealt with much greater severity, for though words were not regarded as an overt act of treason by themselves, writings were, if they were considered to display a treasonable intention, so that what would now be regarded at most as libels may in earlier times have been punished as treason. (I.302)

Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick were punished not for treason, but for libel (a misdemeanour). The *Calendar of State Papers Domestic* (1637, 49) nevertheless casts the case in terms of treasonous behaviour, reporting the judgement of the three "for the publication of various libellous books with the intent to move the people to discontent against the King's ecclesiastical government".

damaging the reputation of a person" as in the second definition offered by John Cowell, legal lexographer and "sometime the Kings Majesties Professour of the Civill Law in the Universitie of Cambridge":

Libell (*Libellus*) literally signifieth a little booke, but by use it is the original declaration of any action in the civill law.... It signifieth also a criminous report of any man cast abroad, or otherwise unlawfully published in writing, but then for difference sake, it is called an infamous libell, *famosus libellus*.³²

It also had the more popular sense of "any writing of a treasonable, seditious, or immoral kind" (*OED* "libel", 5a). Milton uses "libel" in *Areopagitica* strictly in the legal sense,³³ and Bacon's "Libels and licentious discourses" is in the political sense. The *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic* for these years provides ample evidence of its use as "any false or defamatory statement in conversation or otherwise" (*OED* "libel", 5b). The swathe of the term is wide, and the arbiters of the definition were in effect the controllers of printing licenses and the thirteen members of the Star Chamber, and, after its abolition, the Company of Stationers under the Parliamentary Committee. In other words, the definition of "libel" was determined by those who controlled its meaning as treasonable, seditious, or immoral.

But "libel" also gained a widespread definition as a generic term, roughly synonymous with "pamphlet" and "satyr". The following three entries in Joshua Poole's *The English Parnassus* (1657),

³² *The Interpreter: or Booke, Containing the Signification of Words* (1607), quoted from the 1637 edition, q.v. "Libell".

³³ *Complete Prose*, II.494. Milton calls Aristophanes "the malicious libeller of his chief friends", II.523.

described in 'The Preface' as "not unlike that of *Thesaurus Poeticus*, in Latine" (a8r), reflect the growth of the conception of "libel" in more than its strictly legal sense:

Libell. v. Pamphlet. Scandalous, seditious, rayling, calumnious, reviling, abusive, injurious, licentious, lawles, loose, dissolute, regardless, saucy, audacious.

Pamphlet. Loose, wanton, seditious, libellous, saucie, scurrilous, calumnious, railing, reviling, abusive, licentious, lawlesse, audacious, injurious.

Satyre. Girding, biting, snarling, scourging, jerking, lashing, smarting, sharp, tart, rough, invective, censorious, currish, snappish, captious, barking, brawling, carping, fanged, sharp-tooth'd, quipping, jeering, flouting, sullen, impartial, whipping, thorny, pricking, stinging, sharp-fanged, injurious, reproachful, libellous, harsh, rough-hewne, odious, opprobrious, contumelious, defaming, calumnious.³⁴

In the fifth edition of Cockeram's *The English Dictionary, Or, An Interpreter of hard English Words* (1637), "libel" was still defined economically and strictly as "A defamatory scrole", and "Satyricall" is interpreted as "sharpe, biting".

In 1637, the four effectual licensing agents (the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and the Chancellors or Vice-Chancellors of either of the two universities) determined the interpretation of the term "libel" over all books "of Divinity, Phisicke, Philosophie, Poetry, or whatsoever."³⁵ In practice, any satire attacking any aspect or person of the established authority could earn the description of "libel" and be liable for prosecution. This fact explains in part the widespread anonymity of many

³⁴ *The English Parnassus: Or, A Helpe to English Poesie* (1657), q.v. "libell", "pamphlet", and "satyre".

³⁵ The Star Chamber Decree of 1637, in *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, Appendix A, II.794. Since he was Archbishop of Canterbury and Chancellor of Oxford, and his protegé William Juxon the Bishop of London, Laud was effectually the sole arbiter.

subversive satires, an aspect that their conservative respondents claim is proof of their falsity and evidence of moral cowardice. The Star Chamber Decree of 1637, lamenting in its preamble that "*divers libellous, seditious, and mutinous bookes have beene unduly printed, and other bookes and papers without licence, to the disturbance of the peace of the Church and State*", leaves a wide scope:

no person or persons whatsoever shall presume to print, or cause to bee printed, either in the parts beyond the Seas, or in this Realme, or other of his Majesties Dominions, any seditious, scismaticall, or offensive Bookes or Pamphlets, to the scandall of Religion, or the Church, or the Government, or Governours of the Church or State, or Commonwealth, or of any Corporation, or particular person or persons whatsoever.... (II.793)

Laud's is the discourse of conservative ideology, affirming the position of established authority, so he does not hesitate to deploy the term in the trial of the "libellers" of 1637.

Another sign of the growing value of the currency of "libel" as synonymous for "satire" is John Bond's *The Poets Knavery Discouered, in all their lying Pamphlets* (1642), in which he claims to "lay open the Names of every lying Lybel that was printed last yeare, and the Authors who made them, being above three Hundred Lyes".³⁶ As a preface to the damning list of "libels", Bond refers to "An Order from the House of Commons for the suppressing of Pamphlets" to remind

36 The complete title page reads as follows: "THE / POETS Knavery Discouered, in / all their lying PAMPHLETS: / Wittily and very Ingeniously Compo- / sed, laying open the Names of every lying / Lybel that was Printed last yeare, and the / Authors who made them, being above / three Hundred Lyes / Shewing how impudently the Poets have not / onely presumed to make extream and incredible / Lyes, but dare also feign false Orders and / Proceedings from the Parliament, with / many fictitious Speeches. / Well worth the Reading and knowing of every / one, that hey may learn how to distin- / guish betwixt the Lyes, and / reall Books. / Written by J.B. / LONDON, / Printed for T.H."

the reader of the serious nature of the crime. Bond's list of "every lying Lybel" --the orthography of "Lybel", the lazy alliteration of the liquid "l's", and the incessant repetition of "lye" emphasise the untruthfulness of the pamphlets-- mentions satirical works published in 1641, particularly those against Strafford and Laud, but also allegedly true accounts of speeches and events. All these serve as evidence to substantiate the statement that "lying and Non-sense were the two coincident twins, that alway distilled from the nasty dregs of their Satyricall quills" (A2r). A similar conceit on the tainted, physical materials of seditious pamphleteering appears in an anonymous work describing "the abuses of Printing, in publishing every Pamphlet that comes to their Presse":

A / PRESSE / FULL OF / PAMPHLETS: / WHEREIN, / Are set
 Diversity of Prints, containing defor- / med and misfigured
 Letters: Composed into / Books fraught with Libellous and
 Scandalous / Sentences. / *In the Year of their Uncasing*, / 1642
 / [ornament] / LONDON, Printed for R.W. / 1642.

The image in the title page refers both to a press that cannot but produce literally crooked sentences, as well as crooked thoughts (*sententiae*) published in unlicensed texts; it also refers to the penalty imposed by the Stationers' Company on printers who published unlicensed works. The standard action taken against renegade printers took the form of seizing ("Uncasing") and defacing the letter types, thus making the press inoperable and destroying the illegal printer's source of livelihood.³⁷

³⁷ *An Order of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament. For the Regulating of Printing* (14 June 1643) authorised the Stationers' Company to search "for all unlicensed Printing Presses, and all Presses any way employed in the printing of scandalous or unlicensed papers, Pamphlets, Books..., and to seize and carry away such printing Presses Letters, together with the Nut, Spindle, and other materialls of every such irregular Printer, which they find so misemployed, unto the Common Hall of the said Company, there to be

The material aspect of satirical writing ("Satyricall quills" and "deformed and misfigured Letters") in the 1640s not only is a metonym of corruption and untruthfulness, but also, as in Lichfield and typographical satire (2.2), suggests an active participation in what satire is. The extra-significant rôle of typography and orthology, by which physical shapes are manipulated to create maledictory satire, coincides with the Roman notion of lampoons as *carmina mala*. Lampoons are caricatures which re-present persons as objects of ridicule, set up in effigy in the satirical portrait in order to subject it to punishment. The notion of libel, designed to protect persons from false representation, seeks to limit the extent to which the satirical images become icons for satirical-magical manipulation precisely in the same way as the Roman libel laws associate lampoons with evil spells. The association between satire and magic is made by John Taylor in the phrase "callumnious Art and mystery of Libelling".³⁸ The underlying idea of libel is that it has the effectual power of a spell and that it can cause harm; William Laud's terror at the lampoons posted on the gates of Lambeth Palace, like his observation of the zodiac and his notation of ominous dreams, suggests that he believed in the magical power of the libels.

The concern about libels and lampoons must be seen concurrently with the iconological debate in the ecclesiastical context. The affective power of sensual objects and religious images takes on meaning beyond the mere representation of a saint or a Biblical

defaced and made unserviceable according to Ancient Custom" (A3r-A3v).

³⁸ *The Whole Life and Progress of Henry Walker the Ironmonger* (1641), A2v.

narrative. The misreading of images by those opposing the Laudian church is mocked in nearly every anti-puritan satire, and the demolition of Cheapside Cross in May 1643 produced a series of satirical pamphlets. More intrinsically and subtly, the making and marring of images as a satirical strategy occurs in Parliamentary, Royalist, and anti-Presbyterian lampoons and satires of the 1640s in ways which involve the notion of libel as *carmina mala*.

The rôle of the libel laws in the attempted suppression of satirical literature challenging the legitimacy of episcopal church government in the early 1640s and the authority of presbyterianism after 1645 can be dealt with most profitably in the context of iconoclasm. For iconoclastic satire is not always the verbal assault on a religious object, as in the case of the Cheapside Cross pamphlets, but can be the attack on a person as well, as in the political satires attacking figures such as Thomas Wentworth the Earl of Strafford, Philip Herbert the Earl of Pembroke, Oliver Cromwell, and others; in the case of the pamphlets published to debunk the myth of Charles the Martyr after January 1649, the iconoclasm is simultaneously religious and personal. I will argue that the central thread in the web associating iconoclasm with satire is "libel", both as it was strictly defined in legal terms and as it became used as a synonym for particular satire, since libel is verbal iconoclasm that parallels (and occasionally accompanies) the act of breaking a material object, religious or otherwise. Perhaps the supreme example of the kinship of image-breaking and libel (considered in 3.4), are the anti-Charles pamphlets, such as *Eikon Alethine* and *Eikonoklastes* (1649) and *The true Portraiture of the Kings of England* by Henry

Parker (1650), which followed the publication of *Eikon Basilike*. The satirical assault on the "king's image" in *Eikon Alethine* and *Eikonoklastes* were implicitly exonerated by a Parliamentary Ordinance passed on 9 April 1650:

That the Arms of the late King be taken down in all Ships of and belonging to the Commonwealth; as also of all Merchants or others inhabiting within the same; and that the Generals at Sea be required to see the same done accordingly. . . .

That all Justices of the Peace in the respective Counties, and all other publique Magistrates and Officers, Church-wardens, and VVardens of Companies, be authorized and required to cause the Arms of the late King to be taken down and defaced, in all Churches, Chappels, and all other publique places within *England and Wales*, and the Towne of *Berwick*.³⁹

When the iconoclastic satirist becomes indistinguishable from the libeller, defenders of the status quo can place legal constraints on satirical expression. The explicitly iconoclastic project of Martin Marprelate (to deface the bishops) and his subsequent fate begin the pattern that, in the 1630s, develops into the Star Chamber mechanism for controlling orthodoxy and that recommences to protect a different orthodoxy under Parliament in the licensing regulations of 1643. The physical disfigurement in 1637 of the three Presbyterians became a political tool, developing into a symbol of the Laudian tyranny which maimed the Body of Christ and deprived the people of hearing the Word preached. In 1642, in the context of the Cheapside Cross debates on the nature of religious imagery, pamphlets such as *The Crosses Case in Cheapside* will recall, within a satirical context, the punishment of Burton, Bastwick and Prynne in whom the living Image of God was pilloried, defaced, and defiled (11).

Several pamphlets, such as the anti-Laud playlet *Canterburie*

³⁹ Published as a broadsheet, Thomason 669 f 15 (25).

His Change of Diot, involve a graphic marring of the victim by illustrating the narrative of the pamphlet with dramatic woodcuts depicting the Archbishop enacting the events described in the playlet. The pamphlet's form as a play, with stage directions and act divisions, strengthens the *visual* aspect of the satire: the reader is encouraged to picture forth the actions assigned to Laud in the performance. The woodcuts constitute a de-figuring of the object of ridicule parallel to the defiguring process of the text illustrated by them. Satirical pamphlets, lampoons and pasquils are the chief participants in the project heralded by William Prynne in *Canterburies Doome* (1646) that "will soon *Un-Martyr, Un-Saint, Uncrown this Arch-Imposter....* stript of his *Disguises*" (a2r).

3.3. Royalist Iconoclasm: Richard Corbett (1582-1635).

In "On Christ-Church Play at Woodstock", Richard Corbett describes the Puritan objections to the stained-glass windows of Christ Church cathedral as "libel".⁴⁰ "On Christ-Church Play at Woodstock" deals with what can be described as the Puritan reaction to the notorious performance of Barten Holyday's *Technogamia or the Marriage of the Arts* before an unimpressed James I on 26 August 1621. Corbett makes no apology for offending "those, / Whose clamorous Iudgments" (1-2) drowned out the applause at the performance, and ends the poem with a reminder that "*Number never conquer'd Merit*" (22). Those who denigrated Christ Church College for the débâcle at Woodstock are incapable of sound judgement, being bound to concur in all things with the Heads and Senior members of their colleges. But it is especially to the Cambridge colleges, guilty of a servile conformity to Puritan opinion, that Corbett fiercely refuses to apologise:

Wee are not sorry; for such witts as these
Libell our *Windowes* oft'ner, then our *Playes*. (5-6)

That Corbett does not conceive of libel in a strictly legal sense is clear: the law of libel does not include the malicious slander of inanimate objects, such as the pre-Reformation stained-glass windows of Christ Church Cathedral; Corbett uses the word in this expression in the sense of a malicious, unjustified verbal assault with the

⁴⁰ *The Poems of Richard Corbett*, J.A.W. Bennett and H.R. Trevor-Roper, edd. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).

intent to deform. The association of anti-episcopal sentiment with the zeal to purify the furniture, liturgy and vestments of the church is one aspect of Corbett's use of "libel". Verbal attacks on ecclesiastical objects and rituals, such as stained glass, altar rails, and bowing at the name of Jesus, are acts of iconoclasm similar to the personal attacks upon the bishops, allowing Corbett to connect with ease the act of verbal iconoclasm with the concept of libel, both being attempts to pull down, in the first instance a religious object and, in the latter, a person's character and reputation. Royalist satirists such as Corbett, of course, are as busy as their anti-prelatical rivals in pulling down images of their opponents. Corbett returns repeatedly to the iconoclasm of Puritans, most notably in "Upon Faireford Windowes", "The Distracted Puritane", "Iter Boreale", and "An Exhortation to Mr. John Hammon", in order to demonstrate that the literalism of the Puritans, which gives vitality to mere objects, is idolatrous, not the proper, spiritual use of ecclesiastical images to God's glory.

It is necessary first to qualify Corbett's use of the term "Puritan", particularly since we are dealing here with satirical texts written in the 1620s but only published in the 1640s. As Professor Patrick Collinson demonstrates, the term "Puritan" does not describe a constant, homogeneous theological position, but covers a sweep of epithets that assume significance only when read in context; most frequently, it is used by supporters of the established episcopal government as a convenient way to describe "*the other*".⁴¹

41 See *The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture* (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, University of California, 1989), 17-18.

When Corbett mocks the ignorance of the "clamorous Iudgments" (1-2) in "On Christ-Church Play at Woodstock", he is dealing with the Cambridge colleges, the port of entry into England for radical theology, mindlessly following that of Calvinist Geneva. Corbett's conception of the Puritan "Brethren" in "Upon Faireford Windowes", "Iter Boreale", and "An Exhortation to Mr. John Hammon", however, derives more from those who practise the theoretical radicalism of Cambridge Puritans, who go beyond the Genevan model in eliminating all remnants of prelaticism; in Calvin's Geneva at least, the ministers of local congregations retained some degree of headship and remained the most influential members of the consistories by which churches were governed. The more radical implementation of the notion of equality within the church, combined with a literalistic approach to the concept of the priesthood of all believers, produced the two phenomena of lay (or "mechanick") preachers and independent congregations, both of which encouraged the sectarianism that Separatists or Brownists espoused.

The "Puritans" of "Iter Boreale", "The Distracted Puritane", and "An Exhortation", therefore, are more akin to the congregational independence advocated by Robert Browne in the early 1580s which became the model for the Independent congregations as well as the radical "conventicles" gathering in London in the 1640s and 50s. Corbett's use of the term "Puritan", even though the behaviour he describes in "Iter Boreale" and "The Distracted Puritane" is more Brownist than "Puritan", indicates that the opponents of the original Puritanism extended it in association with the more extreme forms of church reformation in England. Corbett's main argument in "On

Christ-Church Play" is against the Cambridge Puritans, although their "clamorous Iudgments" already anticipate the discordant clamour of their spiritual sons, the "Zealous Brethren". The caricature of the Puritan position exaggerated in "Iter Boreale" and the later anti-Puritan satires allows Corbett to attack the hypocrisy and basic irreligion of Puritanism as a *system of theology*, connecting the practical manifestation with its theoretical basis and obliquely blaming the originators at Cambridge (and on the continent) for the excesses of the "Zealous Brethren" of the radical Blackfriars conventicle, for instance. To retain the contiguity between "zealous" and peaceable Puritans which informs Corbett's conception of Puritanism in the satires, I deliberately use the ambiguous generic term "Puritan" throughout this discussion; even though the position and persons attacked by Corbett could be described more objectively, precisely, and dispassionately in other terms, the readers of Corbett's satires in the 1640s would themselves impose a contemporary image of Puritanism upon Corbett's use of the term.

In "Upon Faireford Windowes", Corbett engages an imaginary audience of Puritans in order to solve the riddle as to how the stained-glass windows of Fairford church in Gloucestershire escaped their iconoclastic rage:

Tell mee, you Anti-Saintes, why glasse
With you is longer liv'd then brasse?
And why the Saintes haue scap't their falls
Better from Windowes, then from Walles? (1-4)

Corbett considers two answers, both compatible and equally likely, from material and figurative perspectives. The first likelihood is that the Brethren "Maintaine a Glass-house at Blackfryars" (6) and have a business interest to protect, a notion reversed in a 1642

pamphlet, *The Arraignment of Superstition; or, a Discourse betweene a Protestant, a Glazier and a Separatist* (1642), where the glazier encourages the pulling down of church windows to provide him with more business.⁴² The second possibility is more complex:

Or is't because such painted ware
 Resembles something what you are,
 Soe py'de, soe seeming, soe unsound
 In manners, and in doctrine found,
 That, out of Emblematick witt,
 You spare your selves in sparing it? (9-14)

The conceit of a sympathy between cosmic correspondences or resemblances, which Corbett here refers to as "Emblematick wit", provides the philosophical basis for the irony that the hypocrisy of the Puritans proves the windows' safety.⁴³ Corbett named the Puritans "Anti-Saintes" in the opening line of the poem, ironically combining the Puritans' tendency to describe themselves as "saints" with their zealous opposition to that popish remnant in the church of honouring beatified heroes of faith. The use of the word "saints" in the poem's opening lines anticipates the sympathetic correspondence of the Puritans with the figures depicted in the glass, and forms the basis of that resemblance or correspondence which preserves the windows and which provides Corbett with the satirical conceit. The Anti-Saint/Saint paradox is taken up again in the closing lines of the poem where the incongruity of appearance and reality, which is the basis of the illusion of the representations painted on the Fairford glass, is simultaneously an apt description of a Puritan, "Whose life is colour'd in thy paint, / The Inside drosse, the

⁴² In *A Satyre Against Separatists*, "Glasius" pays drunks to smash windows; reprinted in *Ad Populum* "by A.C. Generosus" (1660), B1v.

⁴³ On correspondence and sympathy, see above (2.2., pages 41f).

Outside Saint" (19-20).

"Iter Boreale" elaborates on this concluding image in "Upon Faireford Windowes" of Puritan hypocrisy by combining the notions of *imago Dei* and *imitatio Christi*: the Puritan obsession with external, material images hides a broken image of Christ in their hearts. Although many apologists of the Elizabethan settlement and, later, of the Laudian church, seem uncomfortable with the subject of ecclesiastical images, Corbett confidently introduces it in a satirical context in order to reverse the charge of idolatry against the Puritans. For instance, Corbett scores some minor satirical points from the statue of the giant Guy of Warwick with the comment:

And let this answere all the Popes complaints,
Wee sett up Gyants though wee pull downe Saintes, (375-6)

where the easy jocularly of the sweeping identification with the iconoclasm of the Henrician reformation ("Wee... wee") deliberately understates the absurdity of Puritan reformist behaviour in the first two decades of the 1600s. Banbury, the last stopping place of "Iter Boreale", provokes the lengthy anti-Puritan passage (445-508) which confronts Puritan iconoclasm directly with the concept of spiritual idolatry and brings the poem to a heated conclusion.

In Banbury, a town notorious for its Puritan zeal, the distinction between church and inn, like the distinction between spiritual and material later in the lines on idolatry, is blurred, with the furniture of the ancient church being put to fustian use. Remnants of the ancient chapel in the inn, such as the altar stone and memorials, make it difficult for travellers (as well as the reader) to make out whether the building is actually a place of worship or an inn:

Wee lodged in a Chappell by the signe,
 But in a banquerupt Taverne by the Wine:
 Besides, our horses usage made us thinke
 Twas still a *Church*, but they in *Coffins* drinke,
 As if twere congruous that the Ancients lye
 Close by those Alters in whose faith they dye....
 Instead of Saints in Windowes and on Walls,
 Here Bucketts hang, and there a Cobweb falls. (449-60)

"Congruous", the key word in these lines, identifies the essential problem which the travellers instinctively feel about the place: the prophane use of sacred objects offends the doctrine of decorum, in both aesthetic and moral terms, and further suggests a complete erasure of the separateness of holy things.⁴⁴ Contrary to the rigorous laws of the Old Testament demanding the scrupulous separateness of holy from prophane, clean from unclean, here the consecrated objects of worship are contaminated by objects legitimate in themselves but desecrative in the sacred context, as well as by the human filth for which Banbury was notorious:

Would you not sweare they loue Antiquity,
 Who rush the Quire for perpetuity?
 Whilst all the other pauement and the floore
 Are supplicants to the Surveyors power
 Of the high wayes, that he would gravell keepe,
 For else in Winter sure it will be deepe. (461-66)

The doctrinal impurity of desecrating a church and of putting ordinary buildings to religious use is indicated by the physical uncleanness, and marks the incongruity of the spiritual and material that lies at the heart of the error of Puritan iconoclasm.

More serious than the external desecration of the chapel is the marring of the image of God in the hearts of literalist and hypocritical Puritans, a form of spiritual iconoclasm far more

⁴⁴ Perhaps the Puritans have the prophecy of Zechariah 14: 20 in mind: "In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD."

damning than the smashing of statues or stained-glass windows. It is paradoxical, of course, that the Puritans are simultaneously idolators and iconoclasts: their literalist perception of images grants the objects an idolatrous significance and prominence --which is the impetus for their iconoclastic acts-- at the same time as their hypocritical and unChrist-like practices mar the *imago Dei* in them. Corbett interprets the zealous iconoclasm as spiritual blindness which, rather than seeing the true object of worship *beyond* the fictional images, makes the images, through an unholy ("unchristian") animating power, to assume independent realities dissociated from their symbolical or metaphorical function:

And say, Beloved, what unchristian charme
 Is this? you have not left a Legg or Arme
 Of an Apostle: think you, were they whole
 That they would rise at last t'assume a Soule?
 Ist not? tis plaine; all the Idolatry
 Lyes in your folly, not th'Imagery. (473-8)⁴⁵

This adroit reversal of the accusation of idolatry brings Corbett to the Calvinist doctrine, taken up by a variety of English Puritans, Presbyterians, and Independents, that the expression of the Apostles' Creed, "He descended into hell", refers to Christ's descent to "Sheol", the realm of the dead, rather than to a literal hell, the place of eternal torment, which was the accepted interpretation.

They which tell
 That *Christ* hath nere descended into Hell,
 But to the Graue, his Picture buried haue
 In a far deeper dungeon then a Graue:
 That is descended to endure what paines
 The Divell can think, or such Disciples braines. (489-94)

⁴⁵ Ann Kibbey, *The Interpretation of Material Shapes in Puritanism*, 42, remarks that "in their own way the iconoclasts believed very deeply in the power of icons. Simultaneously adoring and destroying, they both rejected visual shapes and endowed them with sacred meaning".

Beside the incidental humour --the defiance of "all Rithmes", the ironical reverence of the versifiers Sternhold and Hopkins, the hint of sexual innuendo of "My Spirit" shall "Gird up her Loynes", the pun on Satanic prosody ("furiously run... feet")-- the poetic ecstasy which transports the Zealous Brother beyond himself introduces some of the concerns which later arise. Religious ecstasy caused by the meditation upon the person and work of Christ was the legitimate inspiration of the devotional poetry for such as Henry Vaughan ("the Silurist") and Richard Crashaw who associated his *Steps to the Temple* (1646) with George Herbert's chaste *The Temple* (1633).⁴⁷ The Zealous Brother's ecstasy, however, produces devotional verse to Mr. John Hammond, "minister in the parish of Bewdly". The zeal that inspires the Zealous Brother is excessive and extravagant, taking him beyond himself and beyond the bound of God's law, for the worship of any object or person other than God is, of course, classic idolatry.

The self-incrimination of idolatry at the outset of a poem satirising the iconoclastic attitude of the Puritans toward such innocuous things as the Maypole and Whitsun Ales is a master stroke of *accusatio concertativa* (also known as *anticategoria*), the countercharge against the accuser which is one of the twenty-eight valid topics in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*.⁴⁸ Typical of the incoherent and incohesive exhortations of zealous brethren (recall the "clamorous Iudgments" of "On Christ-Church Play") the address in this poem

⁴⁷ See "On Mr. G. Herberts booke intituled the Temple of Sacred Poems, sent to a Gentlewoman"; *The Flaming Heart* was added to the 2nd edition, 1648.

⁴⁸ Richard A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms: A Guide for Students of English Literature* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1968), 110.

focuses only briefly on the theme stated in the title, "the Vanities of the Gentiles, which are comprehended in a Maypole". Contemporary theological treatises on the second commandment frequently turn to two Hebrew words for "idol", *aven* and *elil*, which signify "vanity" and "nought, a thing of nought", respectively.⁴⁹ But rather than expound the Scriptural connection between idolatry and vanity as suggested in the satire's title, the Zealous Brother dwells predominantly on the lascivious response by "the righteous" to the maypole, confirming what "Iter Boreale" and "Faireford Windowes" revealed, that the source of irreligion is not the object (the maypole) but the impure hearts of the self-styled Puritans.

The incitation to lasciviousness lures the sincere Brother from his prayer and contemplation to "the Nimphes" (40) dancing around the Maypole. Likewise the Sister:

...grownded in the truth,
Seeing the iolly carriage of the youth,
Bin tempted to the way that's *broad* and bad. (41-3)

The Zealous Brother's attempt to determine the difference between the wicked lewdness of the pagan rite and the lawful lust of the holy brothers and sisters fails because the lewdness of the former is merely *perceived* by the Zealous Brother, a case of "evil in the eye of the beholder":

The simple wretches say they meane no harme,
They doe not, surely; but their actions warme
Our purer blouds the more: for Sathan thus
Tempts us the more, that are more Righteous. (33-6)

Lust among the righteous, presumably because it abides by the Pauline command "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers" (II

49 *Young's Analytical Concordance to the Bible*, q.v. "idol".

Cor. 6:14), is legitimised in terms of zeal, nature, and "Liberty":

Wee must not *moue our selves*, but, if w'are mov'd,
 Man is but man; and therefore those that lov'd
 Still to seeme *good*, would evermore dispence
 With their *owne* faults, so they gaue no *offence*.
 If the times sweete enticing, and the blood
 That now begins to boyle, haue thought it good
 To challenge Liberty and Recreation,
 Let it be done in *Holy contemplation*. (59-66)

The double standard applied to "wicked" and "holy" lust interprets the divine law on fornication in the Antinomian manner associated with extreme Anabaptists, who erase the literal meaning of the law and take obedience into the realm of the mind alone. The Antinomian heresy draws a distinction between literal and spiritual, parallel to the Puritan misapprehension of the physical and metaphorical dimensions of religious imagery, the chief error motivating their iconoclasm. The sin of idolatry is not in the innocent pastimes, but in the hearts of "Brothers and Sisters" who:

in the fields may walke,
 Beginning of the *holy worde* to talke,
 Of *David* and *Vriahs* Lovely wife,
 Of *Thamar*, and her lustful Brothers strife;
 Then, underneath the hedge that woes them next,
 They may *sitt downe*, and there *Act out the Text*. (67-72)

Textual perversion and the misuse of Scripture by the Puritans in ecclesiastical debate is here pictured as a grotesque literalisation of the Word, where the participants enact narrative portions of the Old Testament, and "Text" becomes "Act". "The Character of a Roundhead" (1641; *Rump*, i.42-3), makes a similar connection between sexual licence and "zealous" Scriptural hermeneutics:

What's he that met a holy Sister,
 And in an Hay-cock gently kist her,
 Oh! then his zeal abounded,
 Close underneath a shady willow,
 Her Bible serv'd her for her pillow,
 And there they got a Roundhead.

The locus of idolatry in Corbett's "An Exhortation to Mr. John Hammon" shifts from the rural celebrations around the Maypole to the literal enactment of Scripture "underneath the hedge", where "*Baalls* worship't in the *Groves* againe" (30). The "groves of Baal" is a classic description of the mixture of false religion and sexual immorality, where the idolatrous worship of the Canaanite gods is coupled with "temple prostitution"; the association also empowers the image throughout Old Testament prophecies, such as in the Book of Hosea, which describe Israel's spiritual unfaithfulness to God as the sexual infidelity of His spouse. The New Testament continues the marital image of God's chosen people in the description of the church as the Bride of Christ. Throughout this satire, the context of idolatry and the iconological debate informs the inferred relation between the sexual fornication of "the Righteous" and their unfaithfulness to the Word of God.

Corbett's use of images has developed from the initial connection between the performance of Barten Holyday's play at Woodstock, the windows of Christ Church Cathedral, and libel into an association of various forms of representation in the satires (painted on Faireford glass, imaged in Banbury, and, finally, enacted by the "holy" couple) which consistently deconstruct the Puritan iconoclastic constitution, destroying the image of the Puritan. The earlier discussion of Corbett's use of the term "Puritan" highlighted a deliberate ambiguity in linking the theoretical Puritanism of the Cambridge colleges with the applied zealotry of the "Brethren" typified by the radical Blackfriars assembly in "Upon Faireford Windowes" and "An Exhortation to Mr Hammon". The development in the

satires moves to the conclusion that the quiet, "theoretical" Puritans of the Cambridge colleges are guilty on account of their association with and inspiration of the zealous iconoclasts. Richard Hooker, not only in the anti-Genevan portions of the "Preface" but throughout *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Policy*, repeatedly warned that the doctrines of the Puritan position would enflame the less soberminded among the people into irrational behaviour against figures of authority in church and state. The advice on Puritanism given by James I to Prince Henry in *Basilikon Doron* (1599) resurfaces in *A Puritane Set forth In his Lively Colours* (1642), a pamphlet attempting to demonstrate James's description of Puritans as "the very pests (or plagues) in the Church & Commonwealth" (A2v). James I shared Hooker's fear of the democratisation of the church by Genevan theology, and, through Corbett and his Royalist successors in the 1640s, perpetuated the stereotype of the Puritan as a revolutionist, smashing the images and destroying the liturgy, both acts pulling down the symbols of authority that maintained the church in England.

[Page left unintentionally blank.]

3.4. The *Eikon* Pamphlets (1649-51).

The greatest iconological encounter of the seventeenth century in England began with the publication of *Eikon Basilike* immediately after the execution of King Charles I. In his demise Charles had gained a transcendental significance and influence greater than that during his reign, and the iconography of the martyr-king became a focal point of Royalist propaganda. It is worth noting the exceptional nature of the execution and of the uniqueness of the situation in which the monarch --the divinely-instituted representative of God's authority, the head of the body politic, the keystone of the arch of authority-- was deliberately tried and sentenced to death by representatives of the subjects: the circumstances encourage the mystical dimension of the death of the monarch that consequently endows the images of Charles with such vitality and force. The formation of the image of Charles the martyr began immediately after his death with sermons such as *The Teares of Sion upon the Death of Josiah* (30 Jan 1649) and *The Subjects Sorrow*, subtitled "Lamentations upon the Death of Brittaines Josiah, King Charles, unjustly put to Death by His owne people" (12 Mar 1649); without a doubt, unpublished sermons on this theme and in this tenor are numerous.

But it is when Charles's execution is interpreted as an analogy of the undeserved death of Jesus Christ at the hands of His own people guided by self-seeking leaders that the martyrology of Charles

becomes more graphically engraved on the people's imagination than Rubens's apotheosis of James I in the Banqueting Hall. Within four days of the execution, the following sermon was published:

The Devilish Conspiracy and Damnable Murder committed by the Jews against the Anointed of the Lord, Christ their King. And the just judgement of God severely executed upon these Traytors.

On 3 June 1649, *The Martyrdome of King Charles, or his conformity with Christ in his sufferings* was published in London, being a sermon preached by Henry Leslie, the Bishop of Down, before Charles II at Breda on I Cor 2:8 ("Which none of the Princes of this world knew: for had they knowne it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory"). The image of Charles as Christ coalesces with images of theocratic, Davidic kingship in *Eikon Basilike*, where the prayers and meditations are styled after and frequently quote from the psalms of David, a feature developed by Thomas Stanley in *Psalterium Carolinum* (1657), a versification of *Eikon Basilike*. *Eikon Alethine* and John Milton's *Eikonoklastes* respond to *Eikon Basilike* by exposing and dismantling the specious rhetoric with which the King's book portrays the saintly Charles I.

(i) *Eikon Alethine*.

The anonymous *Eikon Alethine: The Povrtraitvre of Truths most sacred Majesty* (1649) immediately takes *Eikon Basilike* into the wider context of the antithetical systems of representation exemplified by the opposing sides in the image debate and, more generally, in the ecclesiastical, political and military confrontations of the 1640s.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ I use Philip A. Knachel's edition of *Eikon Basilike* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press for The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1966).

Eikon Basilike, as its title ("image of the prince") and subtitle ("The Pourtraiture of his Sacred Majestie") suggest, is conceived in aesthetic terms: it is a portrait, painted in words. The advertisement of *Eikon Alethine* indicates that it likewise is a representation of the subject of *Eikon Basilike*, but one in which "the false colours are washed off, where-with the Painter-steiner had bedawbed Truth, the late King and the Parliament, in his counterfeit Piece" (t.p.). The "Epistle Dedicatory" aims "to present to your [Parliament's] view the Authour" of *Eikon Basilike* (A1r), and, in the words of "The Epistle to the Reader", "to pull the vizer from the Whiffler, and shew you the counterfeit in his proper person" (A4r) in an act of disclosure parallel to the visual revelation depicted in the engraving facing the titlepage:

The Curtain's drawne; All may perceiue the plot,
 And him who truely the blacke Babe begot:
 Whose sable mantle makes me bold to say
 A Phaeton Sol's charriot rulde that day.
 Presumptuous Preist to skip into the throne,
 And make his King his Bastard Issue owne.
 The Authour therefore hath conceiu'd it meet,
 The Doctor should doe pennance in this sheet.

The "plot", which the drawn curtain reveals to public view, is both the drama of deceit played out in *Eikon Basilike* and the conspiracy behind John Gauden's usurpation of the monarch's name. The ideas of usurpation, illegitimate birth, and forgery, which recur throughout *Eikon Alethine*, concern the nature of perception and the apprehension of "the image of truth".

Eikon Alethine casts the notions of usurpation, illegitimacy and forgery in the satirical mode which characterizes the pamphlet as animadversion, a form of direct, at times verbally violent, confrontation. The ridicule which is a vital component in

animadversion, plays a significant rôle in the re-presentation of the "Prelaticall Levite" (A3r) who wrote *Eikon Basilike* as a mad dog: "he shewes his teeth, his will to bite; and barks at the Moon, whose brightnesse is never the more obscured for the bawling of a Curre" (B4r). The "Epistle to Parliament" portrays the author as one who "dared to rob the Tombes" (A1r), an Archimago who assumed "an Angels shape" (A1v), a Judas who sold "his Masters fame for base lucre", "enslaved to his own devillish mallice" (A2r). The epistle to "the Seduced People of England" adds to this composite picture further characteristics: the imposter is a Gorgon, a "Terræ fillius", a "mushrome" (A3r), an Achitophel, a Comet, and a "Mime" (A4v). The prefatory verse, "The Authour to the Doctor", continues the notion of the author of *Eikon Basilike* being the compendium of evil:

I'm halfe a *Pythagorean*, Thou by this
 Hast almost prov'd a *Metempsuchosis*.
 For when I read thy Book, in every line
 Appear'd the genius of curst *Catiline*;
 Thy actions did perswade me his bold sprite
 Had re-informed thy Body;
 What malice, fury, treason, did possesse
 Bold *Lucius* breast? But thou dost in't expresse
 Trebled against the State; as if there were
Cethegus, Cimber, Manlius centred there. (a1r)

Consequently, *Eikon Alethine* takes on aspects of another satirical form, the character: "Now to give you the Character of this forger: He is a thing in whose composition Knavery and Folly are chiefe ingredients" (B3v).

The pamphlet's stated aim of revealing the true identity of the author of *Eikon Basilike* and, consequently, of vindicating Charles I (B1r), governs the metaphors and similes of false representation and authorship, as in the analogy in the opening epistle to Parliament:

But if he that counterfeites the Stamp, or debases the Coin be
 accounted a Traytor amongst most if not all Nations? What

better Tittle is due to this counterfeiter of the Person of a Prince, and debaser of the reputation of a Parliament, to cheat the world? (A1r)

Eikon Basilike purports to be written by Charles and is "stamped with his effigies" (A1v) but "her armour discovers the counterfeit Palas, and her weapons forg'd in Hell" (A2v). The "Seduced People of England" have been "bewitched with gilded leaves" (A1v) and their discernment obscured by "a froath of words" (A3v): "Shall the wals of your reason fall at the noyse of Rammes hornes, and shall painted Grapes allure you?" (A3v). *Eikon Alethine* earlier referred to Spenser's Archimago as a metaphor for the protean character of John Gauden in assuming the person of Charles and his conjuring the late king to appear before the people (A1v). The "painted Grapes" here alludes to the artificial grapes embossed on the gate leading to the "Bower of Bliss" (*The Færie Queene*, II.xii.54) where Guyon overcomes the temptation to succumb to the world of illusion, to lose his reason and to be transformed into a beast.⁵¹ The people have been captivated by the appearance of real authority in *Eikon Basilike*:

Can the counterfeit be more reall then the substance? and must the dimensions of the mind bee taken by the shadow of the body? Will you judge of a mans Phisiognomy by his Pourtracture rather then by his owne Face? Have you perfectly read the late King in his actions, and shall experimentall knowledge bee confuted by this forgers bare assertions? will you be frighted by his Image, whose Person could neither frown nor flatter you from

⁵¹ This allusion is loaded with iconoclastic nuances:

But all those pleasant bowres and Pallace braue,
 Guyon broke downe, with rigour pittillesse;
 Ne ought their goodly workmanship might saue
 Them from the tempest of his wrathfulnesse,
 But that their blisse he turn'd to balefulnesse:
 Their groues he feld, their gardins did deface,
 Their arbers spoyle, their Cabinets suppressse,
 Their banket houses burne, their buildings race,
 And of the fairest late, now made the fowlest place.

Edmund Spenser, *The Færie Queene*, ed. A.C. Hamilton (London/New York: Longman, 1977), II.xii.83.

your fidelitty to your Country, nay and his fals Image, which may be some *Malignant Priests*...? (A3r)

The phrase "experimentall knowledge" catches the tenor of the response to assertions in *Eikon Basilike* which fly in the face of empirical evidence; the right reading of Charles's actions resulted in his execution, but the superficial reading of the words of *Eikon Basilike* causes England's infidelity and idolatry. The rhetorical appeal of *Eikon Basilike*, however invincible it seems, is as vulnerable as the seemingly invincible Goliath:

Though this *Goliah* struts in a giganticke garbe of pace and language, and seeme to defile the whole Host of Israel, yet a Pebble, an unpolish'd truth from a youths arme slung, will overthrow the Boaster. (A3v)

The picture here of the author of *Eikon Alethine* as David is integral to the notion of the people of England, represented by Parliament, as the legitimate people of God who array themselves against the false worship of the Philistines and Canaanites. "The Epistle Dedicatory" ends with a prayer for Parliament in terms of the providential history of the English Commonwealth:

The Lord of Hoasts, the God of Councel still goe on, to protect, and direct you; That you may be honoured as *Joshua's* in our *Israel*, the settlers of us in the *Canaan* of liberty, after so long *Ægyptian* bondage and slavery, and so sharpe a traveil through the wildernesse.... (A2v)

The "Epistle to the Reader" ends with an injunction that, like the prayer for Parliament, casts the history of Parliament in terms of the liberation of God's people, and alludes to the birth of the "Manchilde" to the "Woman" who represents the church in Rev. 12: 2-6:

O yee sonnes of my Mother, you Legitimate off-spring of *England*, I beseech you by the wombe that bare you, and the paps that gave you sucke, not to betray your Parent, your Country now travailing with Liberty, and ready to bring forth a Manchilde; suffer not Tyrants to rip her up that they may destroy the Sonne of so much hope: Bee not cheated out of your innocency by this subtill Serpent with an Apple of *Sodom*, which

at the touch of truth will fall to ashes: Be not affraid to enter Paradice for this painted Cherubim armed with a seeming Sword of Sophistry flashing with Rhetoricke: Sell not your birth-right, our freedomes for a messe of Pottage.... (A4v)

The other Biblical references --to the serpent in Eden, the exclusion from paradise, the cosenage of Esau by Jacob-- combine in the notion of England's Parliament as representing the faithful people of God who steadfastly resist the temptation to false worship and idolatry. The concept of the new Commonwealth being the fulfillment of the providential history of God's chosen people is essential to the iconoclastic project of Parliamentary supporters, particularly for Milton, surnamed "Iconoclastes".⁵²

Unlike "the other bastard progeny" (A2r), the "good People of *England*... have undazeled beheld" the noon-day of revealed truth. Truth is depicted by medieval and Renaissance iconographers as naked and carrying a sun-beam to expose things covered by deceit and falsehood. *Eikon Alethine*, "unpolish'd" and uneloquent in contrast to the dressed-up rhetoric of *Eikon Basilike*, is "the Sun of reason and truth, which will easily expell this night of falshood spangled with twinckling pretences" (A3v). Like Guyon, readers are "creatures endued with reason": "therefore manly logick must prevaile against the allurements of effeminate Rhetorick" (A3v). In this respect, the history of the Earl of Strafford complements the narrative of rhetorical excess told by *Eikon Basilike*: Strafford exchanged the substance of virtue for the shadow of ambition, "him that stripped himselfe of the glorious raiment of *Vertue*, for a gawdy garment

⁵² There is more to the relationship between *Eikon Alethine* and *Eikonoklastes* than is hinted at in the brief discussion by Merritt Y. Hughes, *Complete Prose*, III.147-50.

spangled with counterfeit honour, cloathed with shame and everlasting infamy" (C2r). In a paraphrase of the quotation from Pliny on the titlepage, it is not the "elaborate elegancy" of the prayers in *Eikon Basilike* which "dazle our eyes", not "Rhetoricall flourishes, nor smooth running Sentences flowing from a *Ciceronian* tongue; but ejaculations abruptly broken with sobs, and prayers ending in unartificiall sighes fetched from the heart truly contrite, are the most prevalent Oratory with the Almighty" (B4v).

The irony of the forged authority of *Eikon Basilike* is that its author is "murdering the very memory of his dread Sovereign":

when the royallists, as they will be stiled, have found how he hath wounded their Sovereigne, and murdered their late King in his repute with posterity, who will be judges without exception, of the impartiall relations of the cause of the difference; will they not curse the Forger? (A2r)

These efficacious curses are the forger's punishment, "and perhaps the *Achitophell* will hang himselfe when hee sees that he is rejected of all Parties" (A4v). Instead of the self-portrait which *Eikon Basilike* pretends to be, the "Pourtraiture of his Sacred Majestie" is revealed by the light of *Eikon Alethine* to be a forgery, as one of the commendatory verses suggests:

Each eye
Shall in thy light the Painters cheat espy,
And say (though none durst speak it out before)
This is not *Venus*, but the Painters whore. (a2r)

The iconoclastic purpose of *Eikon Alethine* is concerned with stripping away the false appearance of *Eikon Basilike*, not with destroying the image and memory of Charles I. References to idolatry pertain to prelatical innovations, such as "their golden Calfe, the *High Commission*" (O1v), which Parliament pulled down; consequently, Parliament is "bitterly inveighed against by this Babylonish Doctor,

for taking away *Bell, the Liturgie*, destroying the *Dragon Episcopacy*, and casting out their Priests" (O2r). The iconoclastic intent of *Eikon Alethine* goes beyond these explicit references to idolatry, and directs its energy to marring the sensual appearance of *Eikon Basilike* in order "to undeceive the World" (t.p.).

The confrontation between *Eikon Basilike* and *Eikon Alethine* is the confrontation between falsehood and truth, darkness and light, shadow and substance, appearance and reality, words and deeds that is at the heart of the image debate between the Laudian and the "Puritan" conception of the apprehension and re-presentation of truth, whether transcendent religious realities or historical events. The form which the *Eikon* pamphlets take is animadversive, being a direct engagement with and systematic deconstruction of the opponent's conception of imaging and representation, simultaneous with the deliberate deconstruction of the person and reputation of the opponent. In other words, the use of satirical tropes in these animadversive pamphlets is consonant with the nature of making and marring images occurring on the pages of the *Eikon* pamphlets. Because *Eikon Alethine* is careful not to damage the image of Charles I in exposing the forgery of *Eikon Basilike*, the ridicule is restrained and directed precisely against John Gauden. Whereas the object of *Eikon Alethine* is to wash off the false colours "where-with the Painter-steiner had bedawbed Truth" (t.p.), Milton's *Eikonoklastes* goes beyond its forebear to destroy both *Eikon Basilike* and the image of the king. Consequently, the rôle of ridicule and sarcasm is far more dominant in Milton's pamphlet than in *Eikon Alethine*, and the iconoclastic energy more radically focussed.

(ii) *Eikonoklastes*.

Milton's response to *Eikon Basilike* is *Eikonoklastes* (1649).⁵³ The image of the king which *Eikon Basilike* presents, in both the text and William Marshall's engraving, is perhaps the most powerfully-charged iconic point in the seventeenth century, and one which had a remarkable political impact through its immense success, appearing in approximately twenty English editions within a month and a half of Charles's death, and thirty-five by the end of 1649.⁵⁴ But Milton has little hope of reaching the mass of *Eikon Basilike*'s audience, "the blockish vulgar... the Common sort" (339), "exorbitant and excessive in all thir motions" (343), who are not "the People" (388) Milton is defending, as he makes plain in his response to the depiction of peaceable petitioners to Parliament as "the tumults" in *Eikon Basilike*. Milton seems to acknowledge that the greatest difficulty he faces in answering *Eikon Basilike* is its popular hold; he despairs at reaching the vulgar crowds who are enthralled by the King's Book, and he deliberately isolates himself as one of the few selected by God, "the sole remainder... to stand upright and stedfast in his [God's] cause" in "a graceless age" when "ignorance and perverseness will needs be national and universal" (348).

It is precisely the notion of enthrallment to the words of *Eikon Basilike* that associates the book in Milton's mind with the

⁵³ See Lana Cable, "Milton's Iconoclastic Truth", 135-152. Cf. David Loewenstein, *Milton and the Drama of History: Historical Vision, Iconoclasm and the Literary Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), Ch.3.

⁵⁴ "Introduction", *Eikon Basilike*, xiv-xv.

debilitating, irrational effect of ecclesiastical and civil images, the two components of Caroline idolatry which Milton describes in *Eikonoklastes* as "the bondage of Tyranny and superstition" (438), or "tyranny and popery" (339), and as a yoke with two burdens, "the one of prelatical superstition, the other of civil tyrannie" (446). The object of freeing the people from enthrallment informs Milton's deconstruction of the "King's image", an attack that incorporates the essential tenets of rhetoric, the notion of the deceptiveness of sensory perception, and the interrelation of image-worship, tyranny and false religion. A quotation from "The Preface" introduces the basic iconoclastic method of *Eikonoklastes* and demonstrates that the three elements of Milton's concerns --rhetorical principle, "Puritan" scepticism, and idolatry-- collaborate closely in the attack:

But if these his fair spok'n words shall be heer fairly confronted and laid parallel to his own farr differing deeds, manifest and visible to the whole Nation, then surely we may look on them who notwithstanding shall persist to give to bare words more credit then to op'n deeds, as men whose judgement was not rationally evinc'd and perswaded, but fatally stupifi'd and bewitch'd, into such a blinde and obstinate beleef. For whose cure it may be doubted, not whether any charm, though never so wisely murmur'd, but whether any prayer can be available. (346-7)

In the Ramist interpretation of classical rhetoric, which Milton later endorses in *The Art of Logic* (1672), the phrase *res et verba* suggests not only a general harmony of content and form, but also the proper signification of things or "right naming". "Thus", Milton concludes after noting that never was there a time in England "men of truest Religion were not counted Sectaries", "in a graceless age things of highest praise and imitation under a right name, to make them infamous and hatefull to the people, are miscall'd" (348). Similarly, the removal of logic from rhetoric in *Eikon Basilike* is

indicated by sentences (both in the sense of *sententiae* as well as in a grammatical sense) which are "faire in seeming, but fallacious" (418), "specious rather than solid" (388), amounting to "the artificialest peece of fineness to perswade men into slavery" (392). The stated intention of *Eikonoklastes* ("not to ripp up and relate the misdoings of his whole life, but to answer only, and refute the missayings of his book", 342) indicates that the misalignment of *res et verba* is Milton's chief concern: Charles's words portray him as a king, but his deeds reveal him for a tyrant. The distance between Charles's "fair spok'n words" and his "farr differing deeds", thus described in rhetorical terms, is also characterised in ethical terms as the disparity between alleged piety and a godly walk. Charles's "verbal Devotion", "the lip-work of every Prelatical Liturgist", is "without the pledge and earnest of sutable deeds" (360); "the pietie of his prelatic modell, glister'd more upon the posts and pillars which thir Zeale and fervencie guilded over, then in the true workes of spiritual edification" (431).

Although the gilded pillars seem to support the edifice, their appearance is deceptive. The people's enthrallment by "fair spok'n words", like that of the followers of Comus in Milton's mask, is brought about by the suspension of reason and understanding (416) that accompanies an uncritical dependence on sensory perception. Consequently, images of blindness and sight are scattered throughout *Eikonoklastes*, as in the passage cited concerning those who "give to bare words more credit then to op'n deeds": they are "men whose judgement was not rationally evinc'd and perswaded, but fatally stupifi'd and bewitch'd, into such a blinde and obstinate beleef"

(347). The phrases "fatally stupifi'd and bewitch'd" and "blinde and obstinate beleef" participate in the tradition of treatises on idolatry which draw the analogy between the idolator and the victim of feminine allurement. Henry Ainsworth's *An Arrow Against Idolatry* (1640), for instance, personified Idolatry as the seductress who robs men of reason (Glr) and incites them to spiritual infidelity.⁵⁵

In *Eikonoklastes*, Milton compounds the rhetorical deception of *Eikon Basilike* with the false religion of image-worship, both civil and ecclesiastical, in which a seductive femininity supplants the faculty of reason. The misogynistic, Knoxian comment on Henrietta Maria also applies metaphorically to the relationship of reason and sensory perception in Milton:

Examples are not farr to seek, how great mischeif and dishonour hath befall'n to Nations under the Government of effeminate and Uxorious Magistrates. Who being themselves govern'd and overswaid at home under a Feminine usurpation, cannot but be farr short of spirit and authority without dores, to govern a whole Nation. (421)

Just as the "Feminine usurpation" of the queen has dethroned the monarch, so alluring images emasculate sovereign reason; Milton's insistence on the supremacy of reason in a regicide tract is only partially monarchical, for the notion is used in a democratic image later in the tract to defend the liberties of the people's reason.⁵⁶ In any case, the idea of the seductress (both Henrietta Maria and popish superstition) as usurper of reason is misogynistic, if not

⁵⁵ See above, 3.1.1., 92.

⁵⁶ Elsewhere, in commenting on Charles's remorse at giving his consent to the execution of Strafford, Milton comments: "it was a strange Tyranny which his conscience had got over him, to vex him like an evil spirit for doing one act of Justice" (373); the picture of kingliness unseated by an evil spirit suggests Saul, whose demon was exorcised by the young David playing the harp.

gynæphobic. Milton had earlier associated a king's subjection to female supremacy and idol-worship in his notes for possible Biblical dramas: the portion of Scripture dealing with Solomon's polygamy is characteristically entitled "Salomon Gynæcocratumenus or Idolomargus", translated as "Solomon Women-governed or Idol-mad" (VIII.556).

The effeminacy of *Eikon Basilike* is evident throughout: "I begun to think", Milton writes sarcastically, "that the whole Book might perhaps be intended a peece of Poetrie" (406), noting that its "garb" is indecorous, being "somewhat more Poetical then for a Statist". *Eikon Basilike* contains "little els but the common grounds of tyranny and popery, drest up, the better to deceiv, in a new Protestant guise, and trimmly garnished over" (339). Kings "have not more change of Rayment in thir Wardrobes, then variety of Shifts and *palliations* in thir solemn actings and pretences to the People" (577), and, like an ancient whore, Charles "washes over with a Court-focus the worst and foulest of his actions" (347) with "fiction smooth and cleanly" (406) which *Eikonoklastes* reveals as "wither'd arguments and reasons" (347):

That they who from the first beginning, or but now of late, by what unhappines I know not, are so affatuated, not with his person onely, but with his palpable faults, and dote upon his deformities, may have none to blame but thir own folly, if they live and dye in such a strook'n blindness, as next to that of *Sodom* hath not happ'nd to any sort of men more gross, or more misleading. (341-2)

Milton includes the Presbyterians with the early supporters of Charles I as people "affatuated", that is, besotted with the idea of Charles's monarchy as well as his faults, which are tangible, irrefutable ("palpable") as opposed to his imaginary, pretended

qualities. The willing suspension of disbelief that eradicates the distinction between fact and fiction (*res et verba*) causes blindness, so that the prayer in *Eikon Basilike* taken from Sidney's *Arcadia*, is read credulously and not as an ignoble shift "to seem holy and to get a Saintship among the ignorant and wretched people; to draw them by this deception... to go a whooring after him" (367). More significantly, perhaps, the erstwhile agents of change, the Presbyterians, accept Charles's revision of recent history.⁵⁷

Throughout *Eikonoklastes*, Milton draws antitheses between word and deed, passion and reason (356), allegations and reasons (346), probable and actual (440), false and true (426, 447), and blindness and sight (342, 416), and compounds these dichotomies into irrefragable proof which, as it did for Richard III in Shakespeare's play, "delivers him [Charles] a deep dissembler, not of his affections onely, but of Religion" (362): "For hee seemes not one, but double" (371). Those who are taken by the twin deceits of the king's "counterfet" religion (361) and "ill-acted regality" (356), whether life-long Royalists or their more recent Presbyterian allies, are "men whose judgement was not rationally evinc'd and perswaded, but fatally stupifi'd and bewitch'd, into such a blinde and obstinate beleef" (347).

Earlier in the pamphlet, Milton takes as axiomatic that "the People... are prone oftentimes not to a religious onely, but to a civil kinde of Idolatry in idolizing thir Kings" (343), conceiving of image-worship and tyranny as interrelated. The responsibility for

⁵⁷ David Loewenstein, *Milton and the Drama of History*, suggests that the iconoclasm of *Eikonoklastes* is "an essential expression of Milton's dynamic sense of history" (51).

the people's idolatry, however, lies with the Presbyterian divines who earlier had disaffected the people of prelatical idolatry, but who are now the "wizzards" of the people, even encouraging the double idolatry of "tyranny and popery". The image debate in the mid-seventeenth century had moved from a conception of idolatry as the worship of a material idol to worship through un- or supra-scriptural means, and classified such "will-worship" as sin against the second commandment. The task of the seventeenth-century "*Iconoclastes*" (343), therefore, beside the eradication of material idolatrous objects, is the extirpation of "will worship". By enforcing ordinances not prescribed by the regulative principles of the New Testament, the Presbyterian divines assume authority above Scripture, the classic definition of "will worship". This form of idolatry among the Presbyterians is compounded when they assent to and promote the civil idolatry of the monarch who, as Milton repeatedly points out, rules according to his individual conscience and own opinion, the classic definition of "tyranny". Tyranny is, then, a civil kind of idolatry equivalent to religious "will worship".

Consonant with the references to Israel's infidelity and the small remnant of the faithful in the Old Testament, Milton describes the effect of ecclesiastical and civil idolatry of Charles's reign, made manifest in the people's response to *Eikon Basilike*, as an adulteration of Englishness:

But now, with a besotted and degenerate baseness of spirit, except some few, who yet retain in them the old English fortitude and love of Freedom, and have testifi'd it by thir matchless deeds, the rest, imbastardiz'd from the ancient nobleness of thir Ancestors, are ready to fall flatt and give adoration to the Image and Memory of this Man, who hath offer'd more cunning fetches to undermine our Liberties, and putt Tyranny into an Art, then any British King before him. (344)

The prostration before and adoration of "the Image and Memory of this Man" is associated here with the civil counterpart to religious "will-worship", tyranny, the subjection of fundamental laws and liberties to the "sole voice and predominant will" of one man. Elsewhere in *Eikonoklastes*, Milton contrasts the imposition of Charles's "own private reason" with "public reason, the enacted reason of a Parliament" (360), which is the law. But, as Milton ruefully observes, kings are "accustom'd from the Cradle to use thir will onely as thir right hand, thir reason alwayes as thir left" (337-8). Thus, although Charles in *Eikon Basilike* "confesses a rational sovrantie of soule, and freedom of will in every man", he "would have his reason the sovran of that sovranty, and would captivate and make useless that natural freedom of will in all other men but himself" (412). Just as false religion, whether the adoration of idols or will-worship, must be forcibly cast down, so "force is well us'd... to acquitt and rescue our own reason, our own consciences from the force and prohibition laid by his usurping error upon our Liberties & understandings" (416-7).

The rhetorical force used in *Eikonoklastes* takes the form of ridicule and satirical irony, which Milton describes in the preface to *Animadversions* (1641) as essential to the casting down of specious arguments: ridicule aptly wields the hammer of argumentation and logic.⁵⁸ The mode which *Eikon Basilike* adopts in its representation of events is self-consciously tragic, but Milton forcibly reads the king's book as anti-masque and farce; David Loewenstein characterises Milton's emplotment of events and his iconoclastic treatment of

⁵⁸ See 1.4. above.

history in *Eikon Basilike* in terms of satiric drama.⁵⁹ Charles's execution, for example, can hardly "be thought upon... without some kind of laughter at the manner, and solemn transaction of so gross cousenage: that he who had traml'd over us so stately and tragically should leave the world at last so ridiculously in his exit, as to bequeath among his Deifying friends... such a pretious peece of mockery" (364). The anonymous *Eikon Aklastos, The Image Vnbroaken* (1651), responding to this theatrical metaphor and to Milton's transformation of tragedy into farce, reverses the scornful charge that the emblematic engraving for *Eikon Basilike* was "begg'd from the old Pageantry of some Twelf-nights entertainment at *Whitehall*" (343): "instead of harmles Pageantry they erected the Theatre, of their Barbarous villanie at white hall" (D4v).

Milton had argued in the preface to *Animadversions* and demonstrated in the polemical tracts of the early 1640s that ridicule serves a legitimate rhetorical function, and he recognizes that *Eikonoklastes* is essentially satirical. The sarcasm directed against Charles is supplemented in the second edition of *Eikonoklastes* with a satirical attack on the critics of the first edition:

And since there be a crew of lurking raylers, who in thir Libels, and thir fitts of rayling up and down, as I hear from others, take it so currishly that I should dare to tell abroad the secrets of thir *Egyptian Apis*, to gratify thir gall in some measure yet more, which to them will be a kinde of almes (for it is the weekly vomit of thir gall which to most of them is the sole meanes of thir feeding) that they may not starv for me, I shall gorge them once more with this digression somewhat larger than before: nothing troubl'd or offended at the working upward of thir Sale-vevon thereupon, though it happ'n to asperse me; beeing, it seemes, thir best livelyhood and the only use or good digestion that thir sick and perishing mindes can make of truth charitably told them. (363)

⁵⁹ Milton and the Drama of History, 57-61.

The interwoven image of libel, gall, and feeding on vomit ironically recalls the characterisation of books as food in *Areopagitica* ("For books are as meats and viands are; some of good, some of evill substance", II.512), which becomes here an image of disease and putrefaction. *Eikon Alethine* also turned the idol-maker into the beneficiary and consumer of his own creation:

Daring Idolator! What made thee take,
His name on thee, thou didst an Idoll make?
What did thy belly wonted offerings want,
And as thy Credit, so thy Coyne grow scant?...
Impious Egyptian, in thy hungry mood,
To kill thy Apis, make thy God thy food. (A4r-v)

Milton's criticism of *Eikon Basilike* is an act of charity which provides material for the weekly newsletters to digest with bitterness, increasing their sales and feeding their readers with their regurgitated gall. The charter in *Areopagitica* of the ideal community of Miltonic intellectual toleration does not grant a right to life to the "Libels" of the "lurking raylers" (II.494). The clear distinction between libel and his own form of legitimate censure, implied in his satirical digression on "the crew of lurking raylers", is compromised by the vituperative iconoclasm of *Eikonoklastes*: although he intends "not to ripp up and relate the misdoings of his whole life, but to answer only, and refute the missayings of his book" (342), Milton still addresses Charles "as in his Book alive" (341), marring with his sarcasm the "lively portraicture" of the king.

The iconoclastic ridicule attacks not only the person of the king, but also the Presbyterians who, after the execution of Charles, are among the most loyal to him; for Milton, not the Cavaliers, but the Presbyterians are the obstructors of truth and justice, and they

are the intended readers of *Eikonoklastes* and *The Tenure*:

They who seem'd of late to stand up hottest for the Cov'nant,
can now sit mute and much pleas'd to hear all those opprobrious
things utter'd against thir faith, thir freedom, and themselves
in thir own doings made traitors to boot: The Divines also,
thir wizzards, can be so braz'n as to cry *Hosanna* to that his
book, which cries louder against them for no disciples of
Christ, but of *Iscariot*. (347)

Overturning the explicit Christological associations of *Eikon Basilike* and the Royalist martyrologists, Milton here pictures the Presbyterian divines in an expression of worship ("cry *Hosanna*") explicitly recalling Jerusalem's welcome of the Messiah (Mark 11: 9-10), and identifies the worship of a material object ("his book") with the betrayal of Judas. The sexual dimension of idolatry consists of the seduction of reason by the senses as well as spiritual infidelity, and the characterisation of the divines as "wizzards" further associates the idolatry of the Presbyterians with Israelite integration with ancient pagan rites, such as "secrets of... *Egyptian Apis*" (363), which recalls two passages from the Old Testament:

And the spirit of Egypt shall fall in the midst thereof; and I will destroy the counsel thereof: and they shall seek to the idols, and to the charmors, and to them that have familiar spirits, and to wizzards. (Isaiah 8:19)

And the soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits, and after wizzards, to go a whoring after them, I will set my face against that soul, and will cut him off from among his people. (Lev 20:6)⁶⁰

Again Milton is "the sole remainder" (348) chosen by God to remain steadfast to the truth, and his sarcasm against the Presbyterians is the laughter of isolated superiority, of a "judgement unenthralled" which finds both the King's life and book "ridiculous" (348). Milton

⁶⁰ The Geneva Bible renders "wizzards" as "south saiers" in these texts.

consciously assumes the mantle of Elijah, and to a certain extent Gideon, against the Presbyterian "priests", as the divines were derisively called in the 1640s:

let them who now mourn for him as for *Tamuz*, them who howle in thir Pulpits, and by thir howling declare themselves right Wolves, remember and consider in the midst of thir hideous faces, when they doe onely not cutt thir flesh for him like those ruefull Priests whom *Eliah* mock'd; that he who was once thir *Ahab*, now thir *Josiah*. (365)⁶¹

The burden of guilt lies not so much with "the people", but with the wizards, themselves charmed and bewitched by the deception of *Eikon Basilike*: the ridicule that empowers much of the iconoclastic satire of *Eikonoklastes* falls heavily on the Presbyterian divines.

(iii) *Eikon Aklastos*.

Eikon Aklastos, *The Image Vnbroaken* (1651) repeatedly draws attention to the hypocritical irrationality of Milton's dependence on pathetic proof and ridicule in *Eikonoklastes*, and significantly refers to "Iconoclastes" or "the Image Breaker" as "*libeller*".⁶² To the author of *Eikon Aklastos*, Parliament's protestation that it took up arms against the king in order to protect him, one of the "strong Charmes to delude the people" (Dlv), is contradictory, void of

⁶¹ Milton considered "Gideon Idoloclastes" as a possible Biblical drama (*Complete Prose*, VIII.556).

⁶² Commentators use expressions such as "pathetic proof" to defend Milton's reliance on artificial proof in the tyrannicide tracts, such as *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* which has to counter the emotional excess caused by the trial and execution (see *Complete Prose*, III.136). The object of *The Tenure* is not only to perform the deliberative function of justifying the ways of the court of Parliament to the world, but is also a polemic against the Presbyterian party and a satirical treatment of their eleventh-hour, hypocritical conversion to royalism.

reason, and, like the serpent's seduction in Eden, Satanic: "As the Arts of those seedes-men of sathan were jnspired by their Master to the ruine of mankinde: so how farr they have effected it in his majest: three kingdomes by this logicke of the Devill" (B1r). Consequently, the polarities of true and false, deed and word, passion and reason, and order and chaos, which Milton repeatedly highlighted in *Eikonoklastes*, turn against him in *Eikon Aklastos*. If *Eikon Basilike* was indeed "stuft with nought els, but the Common grounds of Tyranny, and Poperie" (B3v) as *Eikonoklastes* alleges, then a reasoned presentation of the facts by Milton would be sufficient proof:

he would have vsed lesse rayling, and more reason, heate, & fowle language proceede from impotencie of defence, and thence is a great noyse of words, and insignificant matter of Iconoclastes. Common angers disorder reason, but vnnaturall furious distempers destroy it. (B4r)

Thus, in Milton's unnatural furor, "staid and well-principl'd men" (339) are in fact those who excell in rebellion, confusion and usurpation, men "to whome a rayling libell is more convincing, then a Logicall Argument" (B3v).

The opening of *Eikonoklastes* ("To descant on the misfortunes of a person fall'n from so high a dignity", 337) is evidence to the author of *Eikon Aklastos* that "this libeller of the late king is the Compendium of all vnworthynes, and vnnaturall insolence" (A3r). Not only are the pathetic and logical proofs grotesquely imbalanced in *Eikonoklastes*, the third essential element of artistic proof in rhetoric, *ethos* or the ability to convince the audience of the

speaker's moral character, is entirely inverted.⁶³ Rather than chosen by God "to stand upright and stedfast in his cause" (348), Milton is abandoned by Him to the devil's party:

There are some, whome God hath given over to delusion, and of that the libeller appears to have a great measure, who not only beleives lies, but is the Author of them, making the names of Religion, and conscience, and the feare of God baites to deceive, and venom to reproach. (L2r)

The strategy of *Eikon Aklastos*, therefore, is primarily *ad hominem* and vituperative in order to undermine the credibility of the author of *Eikonoklastes* and his masters, who "know not a man els, whose credit they could more easily prostitute, nor any man more of so base ane imployment" (B4v).

Furthermore, *Eikon Aklastos* offers an astute reading of the iconoclasm of Milton and his regicide paymasters by suggesting that their true object is not to destroy the image of the late king but to "deface the Memory of their owne vile Actions against him" (A2r). *Eikon Aklastos* clearly conceives of *Eikonoklastes* as an iconoclastic treatment of history, though not as farcical revisionism, but one which assails the very façade of "Memoria", represented in medieval and Renaissance iconology as a building. In fact, Milton's iconology is entirely misconceived. The author of *Eikon Aklastos* points out that Milton is making a grave iconological error when he suggests that "the Picture sett in Front would Martyr him and Saint him" (343), for "It is not the picture but the crueltie exercised vpon him, that made him a Martir", adding that "these miscreants are enraged to see their owne Actions in picture, which they shamed not

⁶³ For the three elements of artistic proof in rhetoric, see Vickers, *Classical Rhetoric*, 62-3.

to commit in the face of the world" (D4r). Milton's iconoclastic rage is rendered even more impotent by its being autoclastic: *Eikonoklastes* rends its own flesh by pulling down a portrait of its hideous self. The strategy of *Eikon Aklastos*, therefore, is to turn the vocabulary of iconoclasm against Milton who will "will breake downe the united reason of mankinde" but "regarde not the alseeing eye of God" (A2v), perhaps anticipating an allusion later in the pamphlet to the Parliament's protestation "in the presence of the all-seeing Deitie" that the prosperity of the king is one of its chief ends (L1r). *Eikon Aklastos* takes Milton's figurative use of blindness and divine punishment, such as the depiction of the Presbyterians' infatuation with the king as "such a strook'n blindness, as next to that of *Sodom* hath not happ'nd" (341-2), and suggests that Milton's deteriorating eyesight is a tangible sign of God's displeasure and portends further divine retribution: "this prodigious blindnes is a beginning of his punishment" (C4v). By means of repeated *ad hominem*, or ethical, attacks, such as the lengthy passage on Milton's blindness, the author of *Eikon Aklastos* figuratively gauges out Milton's eyes, and strips away the moral fibres and the seeming cloak of reason, religion and loyalty in an act of iconoclastic anger.

It is significant that the author of *Eikon Aklastos* consistently treats *Eikonoklastes* as *libel*, and suggests that Milton adopts the persona of "Iconoclastes" to disguise his malice as a divine commission from God. Thus Milton's posturing as an iconoclastic prophet, whether Gideon or Elijah, is portrayed as a transparent attempt to make the libel legitimate, Milton's true

kinship being with Satan for he "not only beleives lies, but is the Author of them, making the names of Religion, and conscience, and the feare of God baites to deceive, and venom to reproach" (L2r). The metaphor of venom for the lying libeller's malice ("todes that thus swell wil breake with their owne venom", B1v) develops into an image of malicious falsehood and perverted pagan idolatry:

There were a people, that Idolized Todes, and vipers and all venomous creatures, and these men have resumed that Idolatry, that will have the most cruell, and destructive impieties to make men saints. (E3r)

(The "Todes, and vipers and all venomous creatures" are, of course, Milton and the regicides who are the object of their own worship.) Milton's malice is self-evident and his deceptive revision of Caroline history is exposed by a presentation of truth; the examination of Milton's Preface concludes with the statement that "His Majest: enduring afflictions with admired patience, his suffering death with Christian fortitude, his vertuous life, & holy Martyrdome, cannot be blasted by an Atheists scorne, nor a Rebels malice" (L2r).

The strategy of *Eikon Aklastos* follows the two main ingredients in the definition of "libel", malice and falsehood: to reveal "the taunting scurrilitie of this Author" (C4v) and re-present Caroline history in vindication of *Eikon Basilike*. Thus, according to *Eikon Aklastos* Milton has recast Caroline events, not as a satirical drama or a farce, but as a malicious libel:

The laughter, which he conceives is caused by the thought of this, *that he, which acted so Tragically should have such a ridiculous exit*, might rather strike horreur in the libeller, for his malitious opposition to truth, that will so contrary to his owne knowledge charge him to act tragically, that had governed so mildly, and to have a ridiculous exit, that left the world with so great pietie, and such vniversall grieffe of the people for his sufferings, but desperate wretches laugh at

the wickednes they act. (L2r)

The desperation is particularly evident to the author of *Eikon Aklastos* in Milton's satirical cursing:

A Dumbe childe gott speech at the apprehension of an Injury to the father, and its a dead Loyaltie, that stands vnmoved at the cursing of a shimei, and those curses of shimei recorded in Scripture were lesse virulent, and more excusable, then this Authors language of his late Majest:; through his whole treatise, which is a Treason against God, and Man, Religion, Truth, and Iustice. (A2v)

Consequently, Milton's attempt to destroy the image of truth is marred by "the impotencie of his malice, and disorder in his vnderstanding" (D3v).

PART IV: LUCIANIC SATIRE

- 4.1.** Heaven and Hell
 - 4.1.1. Introduction: The Two Kingdoms
 - 4.1.2. The Classical Models: Lucian and Seneca

- 4.2.** The Exclusus and Divine Sessions Motifs
 - (i) Andrew Marvell, "Tom May's Death"
 - (ii) The Great Assises Holden in Parnassus

- 4.3.** Infernal Authorship and Legitimacy

4.1. Heaven and Hell

4.1.1. Introduction: The Two Kingdoms.

The treatises on idolatry, the pamphlets alleging will-worship, and the iconoclastic satires of the 1640s arise from a context of controversy between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism; the response to ecclesiastical and civic images in England in the mid-seventeenth century to a certain extent reflects the attitude taken toward the status of the church of Rome. The association drawn between idolatry, Roman Catholicism and Antichrist was readily assumed by opponents of the Laudian church, and, coupled with a perceived political threat posed by international Roman Catholicism and English recusants, the Romish character of ecclesiastical practices in England during the Caroline reign was accentuated in order to use the bipolarisation of Protestant and Roman Catholic for anti-prelatical, propagandistic purposes. The more the Laudians seem to accept the legitimacy of the Roman church and the more the Royalists promote the notion of the martyr-king as saint, the easier they become "the other", the alien, and the anti-English; the more they appeared to adopt "Romish" practices and modes of thought, the easier it was for their opponents to construe the conflicts of the period in terms of the old antithesis between God and Satan, the divine and the diabolical. Consequently, heaven and hell play prominent rôles in the satirical texts of the 1640s.

The notion of heaven and hell as places of eternal bliss and

torment in the afterlife is a specifically Christian idea, but one which in the Renaissance was not completely distinguished from the Greek and Roman conception of Elysium and Tartarus. Classical writers such as Homer, Virgil, and Cicero (particularly in *Somnium Scipionis*) greatly influence the portrayal of heaven and hell, especially in pre-Reformation literature, such as Dante's *Divine Comedy*. Informed as it is by the Ptolemaic universe, the church's doctrine concerning divine judgment and the afterlife, and classical lore, *The Divine Comedy* takes a prominent place among literature that elaborates on the physicality of heaven and hell conveyed in the spatial terminology of the Bible.¹ Dante's Hell has a very real existence, and can be precisely located on an extended diagram of the Ptolemaic universe, with the concentric spheres of hell corresponding to the planetary spheres, contained within the round of earth.

The literal or physical reality of hell is inseparably linked with the allegorical and anagogical conceptions of hell. The physical design of Dante's Hell is determined by moral reality, and gradations of guilt determine the divisions of the circles, as well as the degree and nature of the torment. Thus, the City of Dis, the abode of Satan and the worst offenders, is located at the epicentre of sublunary earth, at the greatest possible distance from God:

the deepest, darkest place of all,
And furthest from high Heaven's all-moving gyre.²

Dante is led through a literal hell, but the journey is also an

¹ The tradition begins with the Apostles' Creed, which echoes the Biblical spatial imagery of heaven and hell in stating that Christ "descended into hell, ... ascended into heaven".

² Alighieri Dante, *The Divine Comedy: Hell*, Dorothy L. Sayers, trans. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1949), Canto IX, 28-9.

allegorical one; likewise, Christ's descent into hell was not a local but a spiritual descent, as Thomas Aquinas, already following a tradition, argued.³ In *Paradise Lost*, heaven and hell are first physical places in space and then moral and psychological realms: Lucifer and his angels literally fall from heaven into hell, yet Satan's "infinite despair" itself is hell ("Which way I fly is Hell; myself am Hell", IV.75). Despite the figurative use of the spatial dimension of the afterlife in the Bible, classical literature and medieval theology, the existence of a physical heaven and hell is represented in the cosmography of the Renaissance as specific *loci*.

Indeed, few people in the seventeenth century would have believed, for example, in the literal stellification of Elizabeth I or the actual apotheosis of James I. Nevertheless, the success of Rubens's *trompe-l'oeil* painting of the apotheosis of James on the ceiling of the Banqueting Hall depends on the fundamental premise, established in the Biblical account of Christ's ascension into heaven, that heaven is a physical locality above the clouds. The location of the main action in Thomas Carew's *Coelum Britannicum* (1634) is literally the stage in the Banqueting Hall, even though the subject is the Olympian gods and the scene depicts the firmament. The conceit of the masque depends on the belief in both a physical "heaven" and a moral, ethical "heaven"; the discrepancy between the physical "heaven" (the residence of the gods) and the moral "heaven" (the royal court) results in the eventual stellification of England into the "coelum Britannicum". In order for the figurative use of

³ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Richard T.A. Murphy, O.P., ed. (London: Blackfriars, 1965), Vol. 54, "The Descent into Hell", 214.

heaven and hell in an anagogical manner to be convincing, it must be grounded on the reality of a literal heaven and a physical hell.

True, the number of heterodox, sceptics and radical sectarians, who denied the very existence of heaven and hell grew during the Interregnum; the Ranters, for instance, regarded as blasphemous notions of a physical heaven and the bodily resurrection, and Richard Overton's *Mans Mortallitie* (Amsterdam, 1644) reflects the crisis in the orthodox conception of eternal life.⁴ Keith Thomas suggests that "the actual volume of disbelief [in a literal hell] may have been much greater than that which the surviving evidence indicates".⁵ Christopher Hill has noted that the orthodox belief in hell was rejected by people like Gerrard Winstanley because it was one of the church's most effective forms of social control, and adds that "many of the educated who were themselves doubtful about hell thought it a necessary fiction to keep the lower orders in due subordination".⁶ Sir Thomas Browne "was never afraid of hell, nor never grew pale at the description of that place", and, verging on the heretical, conceives of hell and its torments in spiritual rather than physical terms:

Surely, though we place hell under earth, the Devil's walk and purlieu is about it: men speak too popularly who place it in

⁴ See, for instance, Jacob Bauthumley's *The Light and Dark sides of GOD* (1650) in N. Smith, ed., *A Collection of Ranter Writings from the 17th century* (London: Junction, 1983), 246f.

⁵ Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971), 168-9.

⁶ Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (London: Temple Smith, 1972), 142. See also his discussion of heretical beliefs, "Irreligion in the 'Puritan' Revolution" in J.F. McGregor and B. Reay, edd., *Radical Religion in the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984).

those flaming mountains which to grosser apprehensions represent hell. The heart of man is the place the Devil dwells in....⁷

In the popular imagination at least, hell is located "under earth" in "flaming mountains", a literalness denied and affirmed in several debates throughout the 1640s on the article of the Apostles' Creed concerning Christ's descent into hell.⁸ Even though he expresses doubt about a physical hell, Browne is aware of the widespread conception of heaven and hell as simultaneously literal and symbolic, as places on the cosmic map, physically opposite, as well as ethical states, morally antithetical; the moral geography, not only of *The Divine Comedy* or *Paradise Lost*, but of popular works such as the Lucianic satires of the 1640s or John Bunyan's *The Pilgrims Progress*, depends on a model of the other world that is both material and transcendent, physical and spatial. Despite what has been called "the decline of hell" in this period, heaven and hell are seen both literally and figuratively as places of blessing and torment, providing the schema for satirical attack in the popular pamphlets arising from the religious hysteria of the early 1640s.

Throughout the first two years of the Long Parliament, England was held in constant dread of a Roman Catholic conspiracy. John Pym spoke incessantly in the Commons of popish plots, eventually convincing Members of Parliament to engage a close committee to investigate the conspiracies; the necessity of the committee alone

⁷ Sir Thomas Browne, *Religio Medici*, R.H.R. Robbins, ed., 54-55.

⁸ See, for instance, Thomas Hayne, *Of the Article of Ovr Creed: Christ descended to Hades* (1642). The Westminster Assembly concurred with arguments for removing the article concerning Christ's descent into hell from the Apostles' Creed (*The Collected Works of Abraham Cowley* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989), I.346-7).

indicated to MPs and people throughout England alike the real threat of conspiracy, and the secrecy surrounding the committee intensified speculation. Alexander Brome's "A new Diurnal" (1643) mocks the plot-paranoia of Members, perhaps recalling the occasion in the House of Commons in May 1641 when the floor of the gallery cracked loudly; one member had called out that he smelled gunpowder:

This Day a great fart in the house they did hear,
Which made all the members make buttons for fear;
And one makes nine speeches while the business was hot,
And spake through the nose that he smelt out the plot.
(109-12)⁹

In *The Character of a London Diurnal* (1644), John Cleveland ridicules the "plots" fabricated by pro-Parliamentary diurnals to fuel public opinion against the Laudian influence at court:

Thus the *Quixotes* of this Age fight with the Windmills of their
owne heads; quell Monsters of their owne creation, make plots,
and then discover them; (A3r)

The effect and extent of the anti-papist sentiment whipped up by the newsbooks and Parliamentary rumours became evident during the trial of Thomas Wentworth, the Earl of Strafford, when massive crowds gathered at Westminster on 21 April 1641 to present the citizens' petition for Strafford's execution, a petition condemning Strafford's handling of the Catholics in Ireland.¹⁰ The hysteria also developed into an intense hatred of Archbishop Laud, who was not only a proponent of Arminianism and "Romish" liturgical innovations, but who also strongly supported Strafford and defended anti-Puritan bishops

⁹ Alexander Brome: *Poems*, Roman R. Dubinski, ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), I.188.

¹⁰ Anthony Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London: Edward Arnold, 1981), 15. The religious fears which set the political agenda (according to Fletcher, "Introduction") also produce the outburst of satirical pamphlets in the early 1640s.

and ministers, such as Matthew Wren, the Bishop of Ely, and Sir Francis Windebanke, the recusant Secretary of State. At this point in the history of the Long Parliament, the antagonism against Strafford, Laud and his "superstitious innovations" proceeded less from Puritan principles than from a nationalistic fear of Roman Catholicism, which, in the words of the Protestation of May 3, 1641, was active "to the undermining and danger of the true reformed Protestant religion in His Majesty's dominions" and endeavouring "to subvert the fundamental laws of England and Ireland".¹¹ Speaking to the Lords about the Irish rebellion, Pym stressed the papal influence over the King's evil counsellors:

These ill counsels have proceeded from a spirit and inclination to popery and have a dependence in popery and all of them tend unto it.... the principles of popery are destructive to all states and persons that oppose it, with the progress of these mischievous counsels.¹²

Through Pym's effective tactics in the Commons and the politically expedient release of suggestive hints of papist plots, the complex web of religious and political issues was simplified into a single confrontation between Protestant and Catholic.

The expression of the anti-Catholic paranoia in the early 1640s combines the moral bipolarisation of good and evil with the physical opposition of heaven and hell: reformed Protestantism (*de jure divino*) comes from heaven; Catholicism (*de jure diabolico*) comes from

¹¹ S.R. Gardiner, ed., *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660* (3rd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), 155.

¹² John Pym, 8 November 1641, quoted in Fletcher, *Outbreak*, 138.

hell.¹³ But the political situation was far from the simplistic opposition of the post-Marian period, and the monolithic consensus among English Protestants against Catholicism was fragmenting in the wake of growing criticism of the prelatical episcopacy. Nevertheless, the simplistic model --the true and the false, the loyal and the traitorous, the godly and the evil-- still had its uses. John Lilburne, for example, in *A Christian Mans Triall* (2nd ed., 1641) exploits anti-Catholic sentiment in a dramatic denunciation of episcopacy when he attributes episcopal authority to the Pope:

the *Popes* authoritie comes from the devill, and the *Prelates*, and their Creatures in their printed Bookes, doe challenge their authoritie, jurisdiction and power, (that they exercise over all sorts of people) is from *Rome*.¹⁴

Lilburne's tracing the lineage of episcopacy through the Pope to the Devil reflects the tendency in seventeenth-century thought to construe genealogies of authority vertically, either ascending or descending to their moral origins in a literally conceived heaven or hell; it is essentially an ironical inversion of the emphasis on tradition ("handing on") which was used to legitimate episcopal authority. The norms of patrilinear descent and legitimate birth underpin the conception of society still affirmed in the first half of the seventeenth century, and are the basis for the orderly succession of property and for the retention of power by people elected to authority by birth.

¹³ As an extension of this habit of reducing reality to basic contrasts, character writing and woodcuts solidify stereotypes of good and evil in fixed images in the cultural lexicon.

¹⁴ John Lilburne, *The Christian Mans Trial* (1641), Dlv.

These norms are employed ironically in the satirical genealogies which trace the origin of the object, often through Biblical villains such as Cain, to "your father the devil" (John 8:44). The pattern and rhythm of genealogy is suited to satirical ballads such as the Royalist song, "The Parliaments Pedigree":

The *Devil* he a *Monster* got,
Which was both strong and stout,
This many-headed *Monster*
Did strait beget a *Rout*:
This *Rout* begat a *Parliament*,
As *Charles* he well remembers,
The *Parliament* got *Monsters* too,
The which begot *Five Members*.¹⁵

The matter of pedigree was particularly significant for Royalists whose position rested on the prerogatives of noble birth and property, and the repudiation of these facts of social order had monstrous results. Likewise, *Mistris Parliament Presented in her Bed... in the Birth of her Monstrous Off-spring, the Childe of Deformation* (1648) presents an "Etimologie" of Parliament (A3v) and suggests that the two monsters Sediton and Schism are of "one progenitor, the Devill" (A2r). *A Strange and Lamentable Accident* (1642) describes the birth of a headless boy to one "Mary Wilmore of Mears-Ashby" (t.p.) who objected to the sign of the cross at baptism, and provides other examples of monstrous births as a result of disobedience to established authority and social discord. The fact that the monstrous child had "a firme crosse on the brest"

15 Collected in *Rump Songs* (i.24). Charles I, accompanied by over three hundred armed men, rode to the Houses of Parliament on 4 January 1642 to arrest John Pym, John Hampden, Denzil Holles, Sir Arthur Haslerigg and William Strode, the leading Parliamentary figures known collectively as the "*Five Members*". The attempted use of force proved to be a tactical error costing Charles much support and hastening the military confrontation of civil war.

demonstrated that the deformity was significant, carrying meaning: it affirmed the authority of the church as established by God (*de iure divino*). The interest in monsters and unusual births in the mid-seventeenth century appears to be related to unease about the instability of society, and the number of teratological pamphlets and treatises published in England increased in the mid-1600s.¹⁶ The birth of a human monster, in whom the image of God is so spectacularly deformed, suggested infernal parentage, and several anti-sectarian satires picture the devil begetting Brownists and Roundheads, reversing the Puritan description of saints as children of God.

The anti-Catholic broadsheet *The Lineage of Locusts, or, The Popes Pedegre* (1641) traces the genealogy of Antichrist through the Pope to the Devil in three sets of fourteen generations, satirically inverting the genealogy of Christ outlined in Matthew 1 which consists of three series of fourteen generations to indicate a fullness of time; the image of the conception and birth of sin comes from James 1:15 ("when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death"):

1. And the Pope begat the mysterie of iniquity.
2. And the mystery of iniquity begat divine sophistrie.
3. And divine sophistrie begat rejection of the Scripture.
4. And rejection of the Scripture begat tyranny.
5. And tyranny begat murder of the Saints.
6. And murder of the Saints begat the despising of God.
7. And the despising of God begat dispensation.
8. And dispensation begat licence to sinne.
9. And licence to sinne begat abomination.
10. And abomination begat confusion.
11. And confusion begat travell in the spirit.
12. And travell in the spirit begat disputation.
13. And disputation begat matter to write of:

16 Ronald E. McFarland, "Teratology in Late Renaissance English Popular Literature", *English Miscellany* XXIX (1980), 103-23.

*By which writing the sonne of perdition Antichrist specified
in so many places of Scriptures was revealed.*

John Cleveland's *The Character of a London Diurnall* (1644) uses the same conceit to ridicule the picture of Cromwell as England's saviour, mocking the Puritan penchant for Biblical names *en passant*:

the *Diurnall*... now begins an *Hosanna to Cromwell*, one that hath beat up his Drums clean through the Old Testament: you may learne the Genealogy of our Saviour, by the names in his Regiment: The Muster-Master uses no other List, then the first Chapter of *Matthew*. (A4r)

The Right Picture of King Oliure (1649) contains a mock-genealogy of Cromwell, "descending from his first parents ZIMRI and CORBY" (A2v), the Israelite man and "Midianitish woman", whose iniquitous union was the sole remaining cause of a plague in the Israelite camp and whose death was the requirement for its cessation. The analogy with England is obvious: Cromwell's death is the requirement for ending the plague of war in England.¹⁷

In Lilburne's *A Christian Mans Triall*, as in other anti-prelatical tracts, the Pope is an intermediary between Laudian episcopacy and its origin, the devil; the argument boils down to assertions of divine against infernal origin (*de iure divino* or *de iure diabolico*). The reduction of the satirical victim to infernal origins in *The Lineage of Locusts* is the Protestant response to claims of papal authority:

Forsaken by the Quire supernall,
Hee's taken by the fiends infernall,
For let false Catholicks say what they can
Hee's neither God nor angell, nor a man,
But a prodigious beast or monster fell
With all his brood hatch'd or begot in hell,
And so I leave him.

¹⁷ Numbers 25:6-15, where the woman's name correctly is "Cozbi".

Arising from the anti-papist paranoia that developed the identification of the Pope with Antichrist or the Devil, the satire of the 1640s extends the rigid Protestant/Catholic distinction and traces the origins of a person, faction or movement dangerous to the health and harmony of the nation or church to the Devil by representing that person, faction or movement in a local, material hell. The literalness of the opposition of heaven and hell, expressing the moral opposition of the divine and the diabolical, provides an essential structure for the satirical representation of good and evil during the Civil War.

4.1.2. The Classical Models: Lucian and Seneca.

However important the rôle of *de iure divino/diabolico* in the ecclesiastical debates of the early seventeenth-century in the popular perception of truth and error, the chief influence for the use of heaven and hell in the satirical literature of the 1640s is the satires of Lucian of Samosata. The influence of Lucian on Renaissance literature especially via Erasmus, More and Rabelais needs no further elaboration, and the cursory survey of satirical communications with the underworld by Benjamin Boyce suffices as a general introduction to Lucian in English literature.¹⁸ The appeal of

¹⁸ See Christopher Robinson, *Lucian and His Influence in Europe* (London: Duckworth, 1979); Douglas Duncan, *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Benjamin Boyce, "News From Hell: Satiric Communications with the Nether World in English Writing of the 17th and 18th Centuries", *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 58 (1943), 402-37.

Lucian to the Christian humanists, in spite of his mocking treatment of Christians, guaranteed him a place in the history of English literature, especially as a source for political and religious satire. The Lucianic influence is due in part to Ben Jonson through whom satire acquired not only the *lusus* (the lighthearted playing on traditional materials) of Lucian's satire, but also its dramatic dialogue. Lucian's *Dialogues* were available in various forms, including an English translation by Thomas Hickes, *Certaine Select Dialogues of Lucian* (1635) and the Lucianic comic dialogue became a familiar medium in which material is satirically conveyed, especially in popular urban culture after the closure of the theatres.

Lucian's style is described as "Menippean", not in the formal sense that the term has acquired of satire that mixes prose and verse, but in uniting the serious connotations of philosophical dialectic with the wit and fantasy of Aristophanic comedy.¹⁹ Philosophical dialectic translates on the stage into a dialectic of characters in dynamic opposition, of protagonist and antagonist striving toward a resolution of the dramatic problem. The joco-serious combination in non-dramatic satirical dialogues of the 1640s, when questions of religion and the state were resolved by means of ridicule, involves a similar dynamic interaction of speakers presenting antithetical propositions.

Lucian would not primarily be remembered in the seventeenth century for his dual "Menippean" achievement of comic dialogue and

¹⁹ Duncan, *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition*, 10. See also F. Anne Payne, *Chaucer and Menippean Satire* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1981), 3-54; Joel C. Relihan, "On the Origin of 'Menippean Satire' as the Name of a Literary Genre", *Classical Philology* 79.3 (1984), 226-9.

joco-serium dialectics, but for the Olympian trials and the infernal subjects of some key dialogues. With a conception of the world as divided into the godly and ungodly, the divine and the diabolical, the heavenly and the infernal --the "two kingdoms" worldview-- Lucian's underworld material needed only to be marginally Christianised to provide the anti-papist hysteria of the early 1640s with a model for the satirical representation of good and evil. Both the Christian conception of hell and the classical notion of Tartarus as places of retributive justice, despite their allegorisation into ethical states, retain very literal existence as physical locales. When Laud in his Star Chamber speech in 1637 calls religious satire "a Mouth that is like an open Sepulchre", he suggests that satire is like a mouth that reveals the heart of the speaker ("things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart", Matth. 15:18); furthermore, the image suggests the gaping mouth of hell itself. Already in the Middle Ages, satirical prints portraying the victim of the satire entering the mouth of hell derive very much from the classical geography of Hades. "Embleme I" of *A Rot Amongst the Bishops* (1641) by Thomas Sterry, for instance, depicting the devil steering the ship of High Commission into a ferocious, gaping mouth marked "hell", owes much to such classical works as *The Odyssey*.²⁰ The journey to Hades in Book XI of *The Odyssey* is significantly a sea voyage across the river Ocean, to the place where the infernal rivers (Acheron, Phlegethon, and Cocytus) converge. In his *An Apology for Poetry*, Sir Philip Sidney notes that the poet has "all, from Dante's

²⁰ The hell-mouth image also appears in *Hell's Hurlie-Burlie. Or, A Fierce Contention betwixt the Pope and the Devil* (1644), t.p.

heaven to his hell, under the authority of his pen."²¹

Several aspects of popular satirical pamphlets derive from Lucian. John Taylor frequently employs Lucianic motifs, such as the "Acts" of the hellish parliament in Taylor's *Hellish Parliament* (1642; see 4.3 below). The resolutions of the "hellish Councill" in the anonymous *Pope's Proclamation* (1644) also derive from Lucian's "Council of the Gods" and "Icaromenippus", both of which conclude with the formal passing of "acts"; Thomas Carew's masque, *Coelum Britannicum* (1634) borrows directly from Lucian in this respect.²² Less particularly, however, Lucian's use of parody to display, for example, the shallowness of the Sophists or the errancy of historians is matched with mock sermons and speeches in popular satires that reveal a similar consideration of the idioms of discourse and their moral implication as Lucian. Thus Henry Walker, in *Taylor's Physicke* (1642), focusses on John Taylor's "wicked, unsanctified, disorderly, ungodly life and conversation". Then, too, Lucian's concern with hypocrisy, especially that of professors of philosophy, is mirrored in popular satire of all sorts, whether critical of the Bishops, the Brownists, or Sectaries, where hypocrisy is repeatedly the central vice; Thomas Herbert concludes *An Answer to the most Envious... Mercuries Message* (1641) with an acrostic on "Beware Of Hypocrisy It Is The Way To Hell".

The combination produced the self-consciously Lucianic

²¹ Sir Philip Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry*, in Hazard Adams, ed., *Critical Theory Since Plato* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1971), 162.

²² It should be noted here already that other classical "Menippean" satires, such as Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, also recount sessions of the gods and the passing of resolutions.

anonymous satirical pamphlet *The Passage of Thomas Strafford* (1641). In this short satire, mainly of prose dialogue but also containing two speeches by Strafford in heroic verse, Charon brings the freshly-executed Earl of Strafford across Styx and leaves him with other recent English residents of Hades to discuss the state of England and of the English in hell. The satirical dialogue, the characterisation of surly Charon, the wry ridicule cast on practices in England in comparison with practices in the underworld, even the "Menippean" mixture of prose with heroic verse, distinctly echo Lucian's "Charon, or the Tyrant" and "Charon, and the Surveyors".

The pamphlet from the outset bears the hallmarks of Lucian's influence, but withholds explicit acknowledgement until the closing lines of the satire. A discussion between Strafford and Noy about the wares of "mercuries", the sellers of newsbooks, pamphlets, ballads, and pasquils finally introduces Lucian into a patently Lucianic satire:

Noy. They may doe well to read *Lucian*, he will teach their pamphlets wit and innocence.

Straff. The Divell he will: excuse me, Mr Noy, not too much innocence I beseech you; but let them write even what they will, the dead bite not, and if they bite not the dead I care not. (A4v)

Strafford's metafictional reflection on his own appearance in a Lucianic pamphlet and his lack of concern for his posthumous treatment further question Strafford's status as the archetype of English villainy held in the early 1640s. Then, too, the commendation of Lucianic "wit and innocence" provides *The Passage of Thomas Strafford* with its own internal criteria by which its reader can only judge it favourably. The development of characterisation through comic dialogue, another hallmark of Lucian's satire and the

key to Ben Jonson's success, is also vital to the success of *The Passage of Thomas Strafford*. Lucianic satire has also been noted for its *lusus* and its jocular treatment of questions of a serious philosophical nature: the self-referential play with tradition in the Lucianic comment and the sensitivity with which the satire presents complex facets of Strafford's character and of developments in English politics demonstrate both Lucianic characteristics. These ingredients are directly attributed to the influence of Lucian; the conscious appeal to literary tradition lends authority to the representation of truth in a satire which casts --and forecasts-- contemporary events in the form of an infernal dialogue.

The influence of the infernal and Olympian satires of antiquity also includes the pseudo-Senecan satire, *Apocolocyntosis*, which saw several editions on the continent in the sixteenth century, most notably in the editions of Seneca by Erasmus; the Dutch scholar Justus Lipsius alone produced four editions between 1602 and 1652.²³ In this Menippean satire, the Emperor Claudius presumes to take a place among the gods but is instead arraigned by the Senate of Olympus and is found wanting. The accusers and witnesses present their case before the gods just as in the Roman *curia* or Senate, and the satire takes the form of a reported trial, complete with the forensic rhetoric of prosecution and defense (albeit parodied with little respect for the contemporary legal process) together with evidence, counsel for the defense, and verdict. Claudius is deemed

²³ See the bibliography compiled by Allan Perley Ball, *The Satire of Seneca on the Apotheosis of Claudius* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1902), as well as the Introduction to *Seneca: Apocolocyntosis*, P.T. Eden, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 21-22.

unfit for apotheosis and is sent down to Hades, a precipitous fall which takes him ignominiously through Rome to hell, where he is tried again and sentenced to be the eternal infernal slave of Gaius Caligula. Two 1640s trial satires greatly influenced by the Olympian settings and method of Lucian and Seneca, *Great Assises Holden in Parnassus*, attributed to George Wither, and Andrew Marvell's "Tom May's Death" --as well as the latter's "The Loyal Scot" in answer to John Cleveland's "The Rebell Scot"-- will receive detailed examination below (4.2). The satirical use in classical literature of heaven and hell as arbiters of ethical judgement merges with the seventeenth-century "two-kingdom" worldview.

.

4.2. The *Exclusus* and *Divine Sessions* Motifs.

(i) Marvell's "Tom May's Death"

One of the difficulties posed by "Tom May's Death" is the apparent inconsistency of Jonson's attitude toward Brutus and Cassius whom he seems to favour in *Sejanus* (III.i.411-13) but castigates in Marvell's satire.²⁴ Recent articles attempt to solve the problem by trying to describe Jonson's political affinity with May in terms of the degree of Marvell's republicanism at the time of writing "Tom May's Death", an approach that is hampered by several real problems, not the least of which is determining the precise date of the poem. Gerard Reedy, S.J., for instance, arguing that Marvell's dislike of May dates back to the pro-Essex *History of the Parliament of England* (1647), suggests that Jonson could endorse the earlier May (the 1627 translator of Lucan's *Pharsalia*) but not the author of either *The History of the Parliament of England* or *A Breviary of the History of the Parliament of England* (1650).²⁵ Christine Rees thinks that Jonson's ghost retracts his own pro-republican sentiment of *Sejanus* in order to prepare for "the parallel recantation" of Jonson's earlier approval of May.²⁶ Despite certain benefits, such as

²⁴ Andrew Marvell, *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell* (3rd ed.), H.M. Margoliouth, ed., revised by P. Legouis and Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), I.94-7.

²⁵ Gerard Reedy, S.J., "'An Horatian Ode' and 'Tom May's Death'", *SEL*, 20 (1980), 148-50.

²⁶ Christine Rees, "'Tom May's Death' and Ben Jonson's Ghost: A Study of Marvell's Satiric Method", *MLR*, 71 (July 1976), 484. That *Sejanus* is "pro-republican" is debatable.

explaining historically the subtle political nuances of the poetry, the emphasis on Marvell's politics has in this case created the problem of Jonson's ghost, relying as it does heavily on conjecture to articulate what Marvell may have thought at the time of writing "Tom May's Death".²⁷ As a result, torturous readings of "An Horatian Ode" based on comparisons with the politics of "Tom May's Death" tend to be centrifugal, seeking meaning outside the poetry with little reference to the generic modes of the two poems. The solution to the "problem" of Ben Jonson's double recantation lies simply in the tradition of underworld literature in which "Tom May's Death" participates.

Marvell's "The Loyall Scot" offers the most substantial clue to the status of Jonson's ghost and his recantation, for in "The Loyall Scot" another deceased poet reverses a published opinion in similar circumstances. The lines in *The Last Instructions* (ll.649-96) in praise of Captain Archibald Douglas, who died heroically defending the doomed vessel the *Royal Oak*, were augmented in 1669-70 with a frame which placed the praise in the mouth of John Cleveland, author of "The Rebell Scot" (?1643). The complete poem was published in 1694 as "The Loyal Scot, by Cleveland's Ghost, being a Recantation of his former Satyr: Intituled, The Rebel Scot."²⁸ "The Loyall Scot" opens with a group of ancient heroes deliberating which of the poets should sing Douglas's welcome, and they give the task Cleveland, "as

²⁷ The dating of the poem proves problematic: Father Reedy plausibly suggests that Marvell began this poem as a response to May's *The History of the Parliament of England* in 1647 and completed it shortly after May's death in November 1650; "'An Horatian Ode' and 'Tom May's Death'", 148.

²⁸ See "Headnote" in Margoliouth, I.384.

a favourable Pennance":

Hee understood and Willingly Addrest
 His ready muse to Court the Warlike Guest.
 Much had hee Cur'd the Humor of his vein:
 Hee Judg'd more Clearly now and saw more plain.
 For those soft Airs had temper'd every thought,
 And of wise Lethe hee had took a draught.
 Abruptly he began disguising art,
 As of his Satyr this had been a part. (7-14)

The environment of Hades and the water of "wise Lethe" correct earth-bound delusions and grant Cleveland a clairvoyance which transcends the politically-biased judgement he had while alive. The setting of the poem provides the explanation of Cleveland's dramatic reversal.

The point of the comparison is not to suggest that Marvell considers Jonson guilty of the same degree of misjudgement as Cleveland, but that, in Marvell's vision, the underworld is free of the errors of judgement that those yet alive are prone to make; it is an ethically cleansed place where formerly clouded judgements are purified. In classical literature, the inhabitants of the underworld, especially the blessed in Elysium, have the prophetic power to discern the true nature of things and are given the prescience to predict future events. The heroes of classical epics traditionally visit the underworld for this very reason, Odysseus to inquire of the seer Tiresias (*Odyssey*, XI) and Aeneas of his father Anchises (*Aeneid*, VI.756f). Just as the tone of "The Loyall Scot" refrains from retrospective glee and recrimination at Cleveland's error, the double "recantation" of Jonson's ghost in "Tom May's Death" is not an indictment of Ben Jonson's ethics or politics. Instead, in keeping with the very nature of the shades dwelling in Elysium, Jonson has simply observed the events of the years since his death in 1638 and, from the retrospective angle of 1650, must

conclude that the treatment in May's Roman analogy of Essex as Brutus in *The History of the English Parliament* is mistaken: "seeing May he varied streight his Song, / Gently to signifie that he was wrong" (19-20).

But there are two stages to Jonson's reaction to May's presence: first, still lying "in the dusky Laurel shade" (13), Jonson mocks May's translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia* (21-4) with relatively mild sarcasm, and, after May "Prest for his place among the Learned throng" (28), explodes into a dramatic denunciation to expell May. May's presumption ("he crowds in", 37) is an act of hubris intolerable to Jonson, and the gentleness of the rebuke turns into dreadful action:

But *Ben*, who knew not neither foe or friend,
Sworn Enemy to all that do pretend,
Rose more then ever he was seen severe,
Shook his gray locks, and his own Bayes did tear
At this intrusion. Then with Laurel wand,
The awful Sign of his supream command.
At whose dread Whisk *Virgil* himself does quake,
And *Horace* patiently its stroke does take,
As he crowds in he whipt him ore the pate
Like *Pembroke* at the Masque, and then did rate. (29-38)

Not only was May mistaken in his application of Roman history to the English Civil War, he also failed to learn the lesson of political honesty and moral courage from "the ancient Heroes" and the great Roman historians. In the face of hostility and official oppression the poet-historian must be an active force in society, precisely what May was not:

When the Sword glitters ore the Judges head,
And fear has Coward Churchmen silenced,
Then is the Poets time, 'tis then he drawes,

And single fights forsaken Vertues cause. (63-7)²⁹

The power of the pen that draws --delineates as well as unsheathes like a sword-- embodies the political role of the poet which Cordus in *Sejanus* champions before the Senate (III.i.407-60). Not only is Cordus's speech taken verbatim from Tacitus's *Annales*, the favorite of the "Machiavellian" school of politics during the 1590s, the criticism of Tiberius indirectly touched James I and his favorite, the Duke of Buckingham. Thus *Sejanus* and its exponent of free criticism of the state, Cordus, attest to Jonson's integrity to speak in "Tom May's Death" as a poet who "single fights forsaken Vertues cause". If Jonson's judgement was perceptive in *Sejanus*, he has obtained even greater perspicuity in death: "Hee Judg'd more Clearly now and saw more plain" ("The Loyall Scot").

Additional to the function and significance of the underworld setting in the unequivocal delineation of truth and falsehood, "Tom May's Death" partakes in a tradition of *exclusus* satire in which the victim, presuming to merit deification or glorification, is physically expelled from heaven. The prime classical text of the *exclusus* motif is Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, written in A.D. 54 probably as a Saturnalian skit celebrating the end of Emperor Claudius's life and the beginning of Nero's reign.³⁰ The resonances

²⁹ Marvell was not the first and certainly not the only "political" poet in the Renaissance. Spenser, Shakespeare, and scores of other non-satirical writers serve as examples of the active political engagement of the poet in society. The "Mutabilitie Cantos" of Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*, for instance, exemplify the bitter obverse side of praise, blame.

³⁰ *Seneca: Apocolocyntosis*, ed. P.T. Eden (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984). Seneca's satire saw several sixteenth-century editions, and was frequently reissued. There were several seventeenth-century editions as well, such as J.F. Gronov's Leiden

of Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* in "Tom May's Death" are stronger than simply in the general terms of the *exclusus* motif, for Marvell chooses physical characteristics of his victim that distinctly resemble Emperor Claudius in Seneca's satire. In describing Claudius's physical deformities in *De Vita Cæsorum*, Suetonius emphasises his unintelligible stammer and pronounced limp, two prominent features of the characterisation of the Emperor in the *Apocolocyntosis*.³¹ Claudius, scarcely able to make himself audible, prevails upon Hercules to introduce him to the Senate of the Olympian gods, a senate organised on the principles and procedures of the Roman *curia*. Claudius is deemed unfit for apotheosis and is sent down to Hades, a precipitous fall which takes him ignominiously through Rome to be sentenced to hellish punishment as an eternal slave. In Marvell's *exclusus* satire, Thomas May tries to take his place among the poets in a similarly undignified manner:

Yet then with foot as stumbling as his tongue
Prest for his place among the Learned throng. (27-8)

Clarendon corroborates the fact of May's speech impediment, reporting that he suffered from "an imperfection in his speech, which was a great mortification to him".³² Claudius came to join the gods in Olympus upon the presumption that he was already divine; the session

edition of 1649. See also Emrys Jones, "Byron's Visions of Judgment", *Modern Language Review*, 76.1 (Jan 1981), 3-5, for a synopsis of Seneca's satire and an introduction to Erasmus's *Julius Exclusus* (1517), 6-7.

³¹ Suetonius was translated by Philemon Holland in 1606. Marvell refers to Suetonius and mentions Claudius in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*; see *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, D.I.B. Smith ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 198.

³² Quoted in Margoliouth, I.305.

determined that the emperor had no right to be among their august midst, not only because of his far-from-divine physical appearance but also on account of his lack of principle. Similarly, May's presumption borders on *hubris* in "pressing" for his place he was not worthy to possess. And like Claudius in the *Apocolocyntosis*, May is dispatched without delay to Tartarus:

Thus by irrevocable Sentence cast,
 May only Master of these Revels past.
 And streight he vanisht in a Cloud of pitch,
 Such as unto the Sabbath bears the Witch. (97-100)³³

The *Apocolocyntosis* is unique among *divine-sessions* satire in containing two trials: the *curia* of the Olympian gods and the court in Tartarus. In "Tom May's Death", of course, the single judgement by Elysium's poet laureat involves only the *exclusus* element of the *Apocolocyntosis*, and the satire ends with May's expulsion. Furthermore, Jonson's judgement in Elysium does not involve the pagan gods nor does it mock their particular vices and foibles, although the jokes about Jonson's corpulence and inn-keeper appearance are equivalent to the disrespectful attitude toward the gods in the *Apocolocyntosis*, and in Lucian, for that matter. Erasmus of Rotterdam was interested in both Seneca and Lucian, and he included the *Apocolocyntosis* in his 1515 edition of the two Senecas, even contributing to the *exclusus* tradition with his satire on Pope Julius II, *Julius Exclusus* (1517). Erasmus translated Lucian at several

³³ May's sudden disappearance from the scene is echoed in Dryden's *MacFlecknoe* (211-3):

He said, but his last words were scarcely heard,
 For *Bruce* and *Longvil* had a *Trap* prepar'd,
 And down they sent the yet declaiming Bard.

Emrys Jones notes that a rapid *dénouement* is a characteristic of the *Apocolocyntosis* and *exclusus* satire, 4-5.

stages of his life, and the influence of Lucian on Erasmus is undisputed.³⁴ Martin Luther noted the Lucianic character of the *Colloquies*, adding that Erasmus "is much worse than Lucian, mocking all things under the guise of holiness".³⁵ Among the later humanists, Daniel Heinsius approved of the Lucianic strain in Erasmus, remarking particularly that "Dialogue can be devoted to the service of spiritual truth".³⁶

Erasmus not only ensured the availability of Lucianic texts throughout the Renaissance in his editions and translations, but his *Colloquies*, *Moriæ Encomium* ("Praise of Folly"), and *Julius Exclusus* embody the successful translation of Lucianic forms into the Christian humanistic mode of joco-serious writing that validated the satirical treatment of religious subjects, as in the Marprelate tracts. Despite the criticism Lucian received from the defenders of the ecclesiastical and literary status quo during the lifetime of Erasmus and More and throughout the seventeenth century, Lucian looms large in the satire of the mid-seventeenth century.³⁷

³⁴ Christopher Robinson, *Lucian and His Influence in Europe* (London: Duckworth, 1979): "No creative writer has left more evidence for his knowledge of Lucian and for the way in which he interpreted him than has Erasmus", 165. See also Douglas Duncan, *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition*, 26-51. Although there is no direct exclusus theme in Lucian, his chief "divine sessions" satire, *Deorum Concilium* or *The Parliament of the Gods*, includes the resolution of the gods to expell all spurious deities into Tartarus.

³⁵ Quoted in *Lucian: Selections*, Keith Sidwell, ed. (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1986), 118, where he also refers to Thomas Elyot, *The Boke named the Governour* (1531) which recommends Lucian's "quicke and mery dialogues" for schoolboys.

³⁶ "Preface" to the *Colloquies* (1636), quoted in Duncan, *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition*, 45.

³⁷ The idea of exclusus is not peculiar to classical literature alone. At the last judgement, Christ will say to those on the left hand, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire" (Matt. 25:

(ii) *The Great Assises Holden in Parnassus*

The Great Assises Holden in Parnassus by Apollo and His Assessors (1645), attributed to George Wither, is essentially a Lucianic satire.³⁸ The satire consists of three parts, "The Proem" (v-vi), the inquiry into the abuse of printing (1-5), and the trial of the "Mercuries" (6-35). In fact, the satire begins earlier, with the *dramatis personæ*, a list of the participants and their respective functions in the Assises, the high officers under Apollo being Francis Bacon (Chancellor), Philip Sidney (High Constable), Guillaume Budé (High Treasurer), and Pico della Mirandola (High Chamberlain). Already here the business of judgement, with which satire is chiefly concerned, begins because the reader is faced with four men who are truly great people, but not without spot or blemish: Budé was mocked in Erasmus's circle, and Bacon can hardly be impartial, having been indicted for bribery. The satirical irony of incongruity is more evident in the list of the twelve judges headed by Julius Cæsar Scaliger (the extremely ungenerous critic, particularly harsh against Homer and Erasmus) and followed by "Erasmus Roterodam" himself (whose *Ciceronianus* piqued Budé and other Parisian humanists in 1528), as

41), and, conversely, "him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out" (John 6:37). Several seventeenth-century Dutch texts treat the expulsion from Eden: Hugo Grotius, Dutch ambassador to England in 1613, wrote *Adam Exsul* (1601); Vondel wrote *Adam in Ballingschap* ("Adam in Exile", 1664). See George Edmundson, *Milton and Vondel: A Curiosity of Literature* (London: Trübner, 1885), 13.

³⁸ *The Great Assises Holden in Parnassus by Apollo and His Assessors*, Hugh MacDonal, ed. (Oxford: Luttrell Society by Basil Blackwell, 1958).

well as John Barclay (author of the anti-Jesuit satire, *Euphormionis Satyricon*, ?1603-7), Justus Lipsius (Dutch classicist and editor of Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*), John Selden and Hugo Grotius, who clashed over the international law of the seas with *Mare Clausum* and *Mare Liberum* respectively, and several continental classical scholars.³⁹ The list of jurors, likewise politically and religiously divided, promises not the unanimity required of a jury, but a lack of consensus that undermines the trial from the outset. Although even the "Malefactours", newsbooks of various political persuasions, are also uneasily joined (*Aulicus* stands condemned with *Britanicus*), they are a homogeneous group of equally guilty perverters of truth and literary decorum, as the trial intends to prove. The unsatisfactory process to that end, however, makes *The Great Assises* a complex, unstable satire that constantly demands a critical appraisal of the dispensing of literary justice with parallel references to justice in England. *The Great Assises* is a relevant, contemporary adaptation of the Lucianic form which eschews simplistic political categories and forces the reader to experience the erosion of standards in the dispensing of justice.

In Lucian's best known "divine sessions" satire *The Parliament of the Gods* or *Deorum Concilium*, Momus introduces a bill in the divine senate which results in a commission to examine the legitimacy

39 The form "Erasmus Roterodam" is common in sixteenth-century translations, such as Thomas Chaloner's *The Praise of Folly* (1549). The Dutch scholar Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577-1649) is here incorrectly named "Conradus Vossius", perhaps a conflation of Vossius and Conrad Vorstius, who was appointed to replace Arminius as Professor of Theology at Leiden in 1611; James I was among many who objected to honouring Vorstius, a Socinian, with the chair at Leiden. It is curious that six of the twelve judges are Dutch.

of the Olympian gods, many of whom, Momus argues, do not warrant divine status on account of ancestry or behaviour. Joseph Scaliger, somewhat ironically praised as "*Grave Censour*" in "*Learnings Commonwealth*", opens *The Great Assises Holden in Parnassus* with an inquiry into the scandalous use of printing, the "engine of the *Muses*":

Learn'd Scaliger, the second of the twaine,
Second to none in Arts, did late complaine
To wise *Apollo*, of some strange abuses,
Committed against him and the *Nine Muses*.... (1)

Then follows Scaliger's criticism of the abuse of "*Typographie*" "by Paper-wasters, / By mercenary soules, and Poëtasters" (2) who threaten the inhabitants of Parnassus and disturb *Apollo's* rule (3).⁴⁰ Parnassus is an analogy of contemporary England, and Scaliger's description of the liberty of the press in terms of a civil rebellion against the "Great Prince" sets the equation between the two that continues throughout the satire. It is particularly interesting, therefore, to note the satirist's attitude toward *Apollo*, the figure analogous to Charles I in *The Great Assises*.

Compared to the outrage of Jonson's ghost in "*Tom May's Death*", *Apollo's* reaction seems merely perfunctory:

...then *Apollo* shook
His harnish'd lockes, and with a frowning look,
Declar'd his discontent. (3)

Like the Duke in *Measure for Measure* (I.ii.19-54), *Apollo* proposes to rein in the liberties taken with his leniency, and he sends Tasso to scour Parnassus and Helicon:

to bring in alive, or dead, each one
That had discovered been, or to defile
The Presse with Pamphlets scarrilous, and vile,

⁴⁰ Cf. John Denham's "*Progress of Learning*", 145ff.

Or to have traduc'd with malignant spirits,
Persons of honorable worth, and merits. (4)

Tasso's search for traitors of Apollo and the rules of Parnassus (those who have dishonoured the press or libelled great persons) is successful, and Apollo rewards him with a promotion to "Lieutenant General" (5) much to the envious discontent of senior Italian poets:

This reward
Made elder *Dante*, and *Petrarch* to regard
His dignitie with ill affected eyes:
And *Ariosto* discontent likewise:
But *Phoebus* did brave *Tasso's* merit weigh
By reason, but in scales of passion they (5)

Although the first part of the satire, and especially the passage relating to Tasso's promotion, appears to have a bearing on the situation in England, the lines on Apollo's criteria for promotion do not allow direct application to the court of Charles I, nor can Dante, Petrarch and Ariosto be positively identified as disgruntled lords overlooked by Charles. Nevertheless, the vindication of Apollo as a meritocratic ruler contains a clue to its relevance to the English situation, for Dante, Petrarch and Ariosto regard Tasso's new honours with "ill affected eyes", an epithet synonymous with "malignant" used in Parliamentary circles to describe what is later termed as "Royalist" (*i.e.*, loyal to the Stuart monarchy); those loyal to Parliament were "well-affected".⁴¹ If

⁴¹ O.E.D., "affected" (II.1b) does not note the political significance of the word, except to cite Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion* (II.vi.90): "The Major part... being cordially Affected to the Government". For the use of "ill-affected", see, for instance, *The Cavaliers Catechism: or, The Reformed Protestant catechising the Antichristian Papists, Malignants, Incendaries, and other ill-affected Persons under the Name of Cavaliers* (1643), Dr. John Bastwick on *Malignants and Ill-Affecteds all against King and Parliament* (1643), and *The City-Dames Petition in the behalfe of the long afflicted but well-affected Cavaliers* (1647).

Dante, Petrarch and Ariosto are old-guard Royalists ("ill affected"), then Tasso must represent a recent entry into the Stuart court. Both William Laud and Thomas Wentworth could possibly be intended in Tasso, since the Archbishop as chief licenser of printing would normally be the agent to bring the offenders to book in the Star Chamber. The strategies by which Tasso apprehends the offenders and his promotion to "Lieutenant General", however, seem to suggest a military person rather than the ineffectual ecclesiastical licenser, and Wentworth, who was made first Earl of Strafford after subduing the Irish as the Lord Deputy of Ireland, seems more likely to be figured by Tasso. Charles is here, then, defended for promoting men (whether it is Laud or Strafford) on the basis of merit, thus meeting the accusation at the heart of anti-Stuart discontent of his being manipulated by "evil counsellors". As Apollo's chief characteristics at this point of the satire are reasonableness, leniency and clemency, the reference to Charles I's character as it was praised in the last royal masque, Davenant's *Salmacida Spolia* (1641), seems unmistakable.

When the arraignment of the delinquent Mercuries begins, the Lucianic scepticism of the regard in which classical gods are held is applied to the literary establishment of the seventeenth century. To a certain extent, the envy of Dante, Petrarch and Ariosto at Tasso's promotion already sends up the very literary establishment required to assess the crimes of the newsbooks. Lucian's *Deorum Concilium* begins with Zeus asking the Olympian gods to stop murmuring about their places around the table, and in one of the *Dialogues of the Gods* Zeus decides the quarrel over precedence between Æsculapius and

Hercules. When the judges take their places, the jostling is undeniably hostile:

The elder *Scaliger* his place then tooke
 Before *Erasmus*, who shew'd in his looke
 Distaste, for hee (like *Pompey*) tooke displeasure
 To see himselfe put downe by *Julius Cesar*. (6)

The next judge, Justus Lipsius, despite his association with Lucian and the pseudo-Senecan *Apocolocyntosis* presents dubious political credentials ("a *Turnecoate*"), and John Barclay sits "somewhat discontented".

Then, once the judges are seated, an interloper appears and an *exclusus* note is suddenly struck:

But when old *Camden* thought to take his place,
Apollo him repuls'd with some disgrace:
 For hee of late receiv'd had a complaint
 From hands of credit, which did him attaint
 Of misdemeanours, acted in a story,
 That did detract from a *Great Ladies* glory,
 Wherein he was accus'd to have reveal'd
 Some things, which better might have been conceal'd
 Had they been truths: What madnesse him misled,
 T'asperse the ashes of that *Phoenix* dead,
 With notes of infamy, whose fun'rall flame
 Ravish'd the world with th'odour of her fame?
 Doubtlesse the living hee to flatter knew,
 Much better then to give the dead her due. (7)

William Camden, whose antiquarian work in *Britannia* (1586) and his *Annales* of the reign of Elizabeth I (1615, 1629) received much praise, was thought to have given to the French historian DeThou unfavorable information about Elizabeth and Mary Queen of Scots which he suppressed in the *Annales* in order to avoid embarrassing James I.⁴² Camden's story is not recounted here because the repeating of a libel is itself libellous and because the weight of emphasis should fall on the motivation (flattery) for its telling. The whole notion of

⁴² The *Annales* were translated in 1625, 1629 and 1635 (*D.N.B.*).

revering a monarch's secrets became politically volatile a few months after *The Great Assises* appeared, when Charles's private letters, taken at Naseby, were published in June 1645 as *The Kings Cabinet opened*. Camden appears unexpectedly at this stage of the proceedings (immediately prior to the entry of the "Malefactours") in order that Apollo can actively assert the gravity of the crimes which Joseph Scaliger had outlined initially:

to defile
The Presse with Pamphlets scarrilous, and vile,
Or to have traduc'd with malignant spirits,
Persons of honorable worth, and merits. (4)

The person Camden traduced was the late "Great Lady", and to libel a monarch is treasonous.⁴³ In repulsing Camden, Apollo now appears determined and able to execute the justice required, and his promise to address the corruption of Parnassus is given some bite. Furthermore, Apollo's decisive action sets the moral standard for the arraignment of men who lied and slandered for mercenary purposes.

The crimes committed by the twelve "Malefactours" all relate to the perversion of truth for personal ends, whether concerning events or persons, and little separates them from their common guiltiness. The startling aspect of *The Great Assises* is not in the arraignment of the newsbooks, but in the counter-charges made by the defendants against judges and jurors. Like the lesser gods in Lucian's *Deorum Concilium*, the poets elevated to high standing in Parnassus are vulnerable, as is Apollo himself who must repeatedly defend the men

⁴³ Camden received another posthumous attack when "cavaliers or independents who broke into the abbey [Westminster] to deface the hearse of the Earl of Essex (1646) 'used the like uncivil deportment towards the effigies of old learned Camden, cut in pieces the book held in his hand, broke off his nose, and otherwise defaced his visiognomy'" (*D.N.B.* quoting *Perfect Diurnal*, 23-30 Nov. 1646).

he has honoured in his court. The critical assessment of the court's credibility in *The Great Assises* has serious implications for the success of purging Parnassus, and, as the weakness of the court becomes more evident, the satire grows increasingly bleak and gradually loses the lightness of other contemporary "Sessions" poems, such as Sir John Suckling's "The Wits" (1637), which is concerned with choosing the best among a number of worthy poets. That *The Great Assises* owes specific debts to "The Wits" is undeniable. Ben Jonson's position as "the old Hoste of a *New Inne*" in Parnassus (7), for instance, echoes his appointment as Apollo's inn-keeper: "Apollo call'd him back agen, / And made him mine host of his own new Inne" (ll.31-2). Apollo's remarks on merit, discussed above, also echo "The Wits":

Apollo stopt him there, and bid him not go on,
'Twas merit, he said, and not presumption
Must carry it.... (ll.25-7) ⁴⁴

But the resemblances are superficial. The struggle for position among the poets in the Elizian session described in *The Copie Of A Letter Sent From The Roaring Boyes* (1641) is similarly ancillary to the object of the satire, which is to mock the wine patent held by Aldermen Abel and Kilvert:

First came the Poets, of each land, and tooke
Their place in order, learned *Virgill* struck
In for the first, *Ben Iohnson* cast a glout,
And swore a mighty oath hee'd pluck him out,
And wallowing towards him, with a cup of Wine,
He did so rattle him with *Catiline*,
That had not *Horace* him appeas'd, 'tis said
He had throwne great *Sejanus* at his head. (Alv)

The issue at stake in *The Great Assises Holden in Parnassus* is much

⁴⁴ *The Works of Sir John Suckling: The Non-Dramatic Works*, Thomas Clayton, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 72.

more serious than the jokey treatment of the poet laureatship in "The Wits" or the price of wine and beer in *The Copie Of A Letter Sent From The Roaring Boyes*. In *The Great Assises*, there is an urgent sense of the need for purification and purgation, which Apollo takes so seriously that even his chosen judges and jurors must face scrutiny.

When Britanicus challenges the right of translators to stand as jurors, calling their work "asinine endeavours", his remarks on the nature of translation require a fuller response than Apollo's defense that Sands and Sylvester have done the valiant service of discouraging "the infirmer sex" from having "more tongues than one" (11); consequently, Apollo's other argument in their defense, the fact that monarchs renowned for majesty and arts had rewarded the translators, is of very little value. When Aulicus accuses Thomas May with the capital offence of "ingratitude" (13), referring to his change from pro-Royalist to pro-Parliamentary writer, rather than clear May's name, Apollo abruptly cuts him off:

Apollo then darts forth an awfull ray
From his impiercing eye, which silenc'd May.
So Kings (if they bee just) may rule like Gods,
And be observed by their lookes, and nods. (14)

Apollo's response to the defence May begins to make, much fiercer than the "frowne" that pacified Withers (9), recalls both Apollo's initial meeting of the Malefactours ("Apollo with his radiant looke / The Pris'ners had into amazement strooke", 5) and his angry reaction to Camden's presumption (7). The accusation of lasciviousness directed against Thomas Carew unsettles Apollo, and he refers the matter to Scaliger who admits that, because of the "corruption" of human nature, "some luxuriant witt, will often vent / Lascivious

Poëms" against his consent (21). Carew's mournful recantation of *The Rapture* elicits an immediate edict from Apollo absolving Carew's former error and condemning the reading or reciting of the poem. When the Intelligencer objects to the presence of dramatists on the jury, rather than defending them, Apollo commissions another inquiry:

if our *Censour*, shall hereafter find,
They have deserved ill, we have design'd
That they likewise shall be to judgement brought,
To suffer for those crimes, which they have wrought.... (26)

The double arraignment of *The Great Assises*, then, subjects the less obvious offenders of Parnassus's integrity to the same process as the newsbooks. More than simply sending up the literary establishment, the satire questions the very possibility of impartial judgement when all parties, judges and judged, fall short of the high moral standard set at the outset of the satire. The satirist throughout does not promote either Parliamentary or Royalist ideals, being constant only in the condemnation of the lamentable abuse of printing. The satire is not an allegory primarily concerned with contemporary politics, and an interpretation along political lines runs into difficulty when confronting a question such as why Camden is repulsed and May remains when both offended their monarch.

The political implications of Apollo's character, however, cannot be ignored especially at those points in the satire when divinity and monarchy are explicitly linked, as in the seemingly slight reference to justice as the principal condition of effective government:

So *Kings* (if they bee just) may rule like Gods,
And be observed by their lookes, and nods. (14)

At the conclusion of the satire, the reader must wonder not only

whether Apollo, the "Great Prince" of Parnassus, has been just, but also whether the "Great Prince" of England, the analogue of Parnassus, is a just king. The cynicism with which Lucian regards Zeus and the Olympian gods in *Deorum Concilium* is applied to Apollo/Charles and his ability to restore the moral integrity of the commonwealth. In the first lines of "The Proeme", the author had already rejected the possibility of a solution to the civil strife in England through human agency:

Iust teares commix'd with streames of guiltless blood
 May shew our woes, but not their period;
 For this Heaven onely can affixe: Why then,
 Trust wee to armes or strategems of men?
 Expecting peace, or any faire accord,
 From Counsels wise, or the victorious Sword.... (v)

The solution lies not in the "Oracle of Delphos, but of Sion", and, as far as the author is concerned, the project of *The Great Assises* to purge the commonwealth was doomed from the outset. In *Deorum Concilium*, Zeus ends the session peremptorily in order to save face; in *The Great Assises*, Apollo ends the sessions without analysing thoroughly the nature of the threat to Parnassus which the initial inquiry by Scaliger seemed to warrant. The bottom line quite literally ("Then all the Court commended / Apollo's mercy: Thus th'Assises ended", 35) accommodates Apollo's initial resolve to redress his leniency and to purge the contamination corrupting his Commonwealth. The satire was an exercise in the futility of a political solution to the deadlock between Charles and Parliament at the beginning of 1645.

In comparison, Samuel Sheppard's *The Socratick Session, or The Parliament of Poets* (1651) lacks the involvement with contemporary events that distinguishes *The Great Assises*. The occasion for

Sheppard's Parliament of Poets is the arraignment of Julius Scaliger for harshly criticising Homer, as Apollo tells the gathered poets:

To castigate a Critick Elfe,
Who Censured all men but himselfe,
Who hath blasphem'd the three times three,
Taxing the Master of all Poesie. (192)

After Apollo places Homer in the throne of honour, Mercury calls the poets to the session, and virtually all classical writers enter and are seated each according to "his degree" (186). In keeping with what appears to be a hallmark of the "divine sessions" genre, Virgil is miffed by being placed after Juvenal and a "Scuffle for Superioritie" ensues when Seneca enters (189). The classical greats continue to arrive in twos and threes, and when Claudian (the last pagan writer of the classical age, some of whose work was translated by Cowley) is given special preference, Tibullus, Propertius, Catullus and others demur. Mercury explains that merit has precedence over seniority, a refrain heard in the *Deorum Concilium*, *The Great Assises*, and "The Wits":

Though elder in degree,
Y'are lesser farre then hee. (191)

After being whipped into submitting to Apollo's authority at the bar, Scaliger confesses to being a "Traytor to [the] Fundamental Lawes" of Parnassus (193), and explains why he attacked Homer:

Yet by Ambition lead,
I rashly censured
His most incomparable works; as low
That by eclipsing him, I great may grow. (194)

In terms of the criteria established in *The Great Assises*, Scaliger "tradic'd with malignant spirits, / Persons of honorable worth, and merits" (GA, 4). Unlike *The Great Assises*, however, in *The Socratick Session* Apollo remains committed to the cause of punishing the

subversion of the "Fundamental Lawes" of Parnassus, and judges that a confession of guilt cannot mitigate the sentence for treason. When the assembled poets propose various tortures for Scaliger in Tartarus, Boethius suggests a taste of Scaliger's own medicine:

With Homers Momus (*Lucian*) seat him,
And let his Fancy ever cheat him. (198)

Lucian himself makes sport of Homer on several occasions, as in his interview with Homer in *The True History* or Charon's account of Homer's seasickness on the passage across Styx in *Charon, or The Surveyors*.⁴⁵ But with Momus, the unrelenting critic who with his fault-finding strikes fear into the heart of even Zeus in *Deorum Concilium*, Scaliger would receive an ironically Lucianic punishment in a patently Lucianic satire.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ *Lucian: Satirical Sketches*, P. Turner, trans. (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1990), 280-1 and 84.

⁴⁶ Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing*, passes over The Socratick Session when discussing Sheppard, nor does Hyder E. Rollins devote more than a short paragraph to the work in "Samuel Sheppard & His Praise of Poets", *Studies in Philology* XXIV (1927), 532. They do not mention Lucian's *Deorum Concilium*.

4.3. Infernal Authorship and Legitimacy.

The anagram "KNAVE REVILER HELL" in the fifth "Act" passed in *The Hellish Parliament* (1642), which identified Henry Walker with the hellish empire was a salvo fired in a paper war between John Taylor and Henry Walker which returns repeatedly to infernal allegations. The verse couplet on the title page of Taylor's *A Reply as true as Steele* (1641), a response to Henry Walker's answer to Taylor's *A Swarme of Sectaries and Schismatiques*, is typical:

The Divell is hard bound and did hardly straine,
To shit a Libeller a knave in graine.

The title page of Walker's reply, *Taylor's Physicke* (1641), answers in kind:

TAYLORS Physicke has purged the DIVEL. OR, The Divell has got a squirt, and the simple, seame-rent, thredbare *Taylor* translates it into railing Poetrie, and is now soundly cudgelled for it....

The titlepage woodcuts of both pamphlets combine the infernal and the scatological: *A Reply as true as Steele* depicts the Devil with a man emerging from his anus; *Taylor's Physicke* shows Taylor, the Thames boatman and self-styled "Water Poet", reclining in a boat, the Devil defecating in his mouth, with the caption:

Such is the language of a beastly railor,
The Devils privi-house most fit for *Taylor*.

Combining as they do the scatological and the infernal, the two graphic images illustrate precisely the fundamental issue in the satirical conflict: both Taylor and Walker identify the devil as the author of the other's words and works.

John Bond's *The Poets Knavery Discovered* (1642), states that "lying and Non-sense were the two coincident twins, that alway distilled from the nasty dregs of their Satyricall quills" (A2r). Bond writes of the actual writing-instrument as being tainted, and William Laud referred to the "Pen that is made of a sick and loathsome Quill" in his 1637 Star Chamber speech, images of physical deformity like that of deformed and misfigured letters in the anonymous *A Presse Full of Pamphlets* (1642). Bond and Laud condemn satirical writers critical of the church and state for the source or authority of the "libellous" thoughts that flow through their pens; as in Laud's quotation from Psalm 5:9, the thoughts of those who speak unholy things pass through "a Mouth that is like an open Sepulchre". Similarly, *A Presse Full of Pamphlets* reveals the source of sedition and scandal as the printing house in Hell:

they dive into the nethermost parts of the Earth, and from *Lucifer, Pluto*, and infernall spirits, they bring good sheets of written paper, ... having wasted the Devils Store-house....
(A3v)

In so doing the author of this conservative counter-satire, like Laud and Bond, reasserts the antithesis between things that come from above and things that come from below. Implicit in the antithesis is the claim to divine authority while condemning their opponents as being of their father, the devil:

Ye are of your father the devil, ... [who] abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. (John 8:44)

Metaphors to describe the act of writing often involve an external or supernatural source, intermediary agent and autonomous product: the author is midwife to the birth of words conceived by a

Muse. John Cleveland's *The Character of a London diurnall* (1644), undoubtedly conscious of the convention of epideictic rhetoric which requires the encomiast to commence with the subject's origins, begins with a satirical account of the birth of the English newsbook: "A *Diurnall* is a puny Chronicle" (A2r).⁴⁷ It is "puny" in the sense of being a small version of a chronicle, which is a substantial historical account of a particular period. But the reader is encouraged, by means of the repeated references to conception and birth throughout the pamphlet, to understand "puny" in its etymological sense, "*puisné*" (literally "born after"), which suggests immature, under-sized, and weakly. The pedigree which follows suggests that the contemporary newsbook is an unborn descendant from an Adamic precursor ("The *originall sinner* in this kind was Dutch; *Galliobelgicus* the *Protoplast*; and the *moderne Mercuries* but *Hans-en Kelders*", A2r). Other images of conception and birth in *The Character*, such as the characterisation of the Parliamentary "Ordinance" as "a Law stil-borne, dropt, before quickned by the Royall assent", are metaphors of Parliament's impotence, whose militia "is the issue onely of the Mother, without the concourse of Royall *Jupiter*" (A2v).

Besides being the spawn of Parliament, the London Diurnal also serves as its chamber pot:

The Countrey-Carrier, when he buyes it for their Vicar,
miscalls it the *Urinall*: yet properly enough; For it casts the
water of the State, ever since it staled bloud. (A2v)

The scatological pun leads by association to a picture of the Diurnal examining Britain's urine; this further suggests the arresting image

⁴⁷ Quoted from the 1647 edition.

of intestine war as an internal hemorrhage.⁴⁸ But Parliament and the Diurnal can offer no cure to heal the body, for its imaginations are swollen with pus:

The Victories of the Rebels are like the magicall combate of *Apuleius*; who, thinking he had slaine three of his Enemies, found them at last, but a Triumvirate of Bladders. Such, and so empty, are the Triumphs of a *Diurnall*: but so many impostumated Fancies, so many Bladders of their own blowing.
(Blv)

The wineskins which Lucius mistakes for enemies in Apuleius's *The Golden Ass* (also known as *Metamorphoses*) are transformed by Cleveland's satirical magic into "Fancies" bloated with impostume, which, like the hungry sheep of Milton's *Lycidas* ("swoll'n with wind", 125-26), spread foul contagion.

The notion of "the body politic", implicit in Cleveland's image of "the water of the State", suggests scatological images in Royalist satire even prior to the "Rump", the remnant of the Long Parliament left after the purge in December 1648 by Colonel Pride of members unsympathetic to the Army. "A Madrigall on Justice", versions of which circulated in manuscript as early as 1641, comments on the fact that England no longer acknowledged "the head", Charles I:

Most men do now the Buttocks lick
Of their great body Politick;
For not the head, but breach, is it

⁴⁸ *stale* (v.2): "to pass (blood) in the urine"; *cast* (v.40), "*To cast water*: to diagnose a disease by the inspection of urine". The *OED* cites *Macbeth*:

If thou couldst, doctor, cast
The water of my land, find her disease,
And purge it to a sound and pristine health,
I would applaud thee to the very echo,
That should applaud thee again. (V.iii.50-54)

Samuel Sheppard associates the profession with casting water in the name of a character in *The Second Part of the Committee-man Curried* (1647): "Urinall, a Physician".

By which the Kingdom now doth sit....⁴⁹

When Parliament is perceived as the anus of the body politic, scatological anti-Parliamentary satire cannot be far behind. When Henry Rich, the Earl of Holland, was suspected of wanting to defect from Parliament and return to his position as Charles I's "Groom to the Stole", Abraham Cowley exploits the connection between Holland's membership of the Committee of Safety (Parliament's "close committee") and his former office:

*One Groome for the close stoole againe would bee,
Rather than still Groome of the close Committee. (235-6)*

Rather than "gratuitously obscene", as Cowley's modern editors suggest, the added adjective "close" in Holland's title is entirely appropriate: the *Oxford English Dictionary* indicates that the title refers to the "stole chamber", the room containing the king's close-stool.⁵⁰ Cowley's comparing Parliament's close committee to the king's lavatory implies not only that the committee is the receptacle of Parliament's fæces, but also that tending to the evacuation of the royal bowels is an honour greater than attending the Committee of Safety.

Scatological humour, in western civilisation generally and in the satires considered above, arises from notions of the excremental which are closely connected to ideas of the divine and diabolical. The eighth circle of Dante's Hell contains a lake of human ordure

⁴⁹ *Rump*, i.35. See Harold F. Brooks, "Rump Songs With Notes", *Oxford Bibliographic Society*, Vol. V (1939), 300.

⁵⁰ *stole*, sb.: "the word is properly a variant of STOOL".

reserved for flatterers and malicious frauds.⁵¹ The stench of hell is compared to excrement by Erasmus in his colloquy "The Apotheosis of That Incomparable Worthy, John Reuchlin". Evil spirits in the form of immense black birds tried to attack Reuchlin as he crossed the bridge to heaven, but he repulsed them by making the sign of the cross:

those foulest of birds flew away, but leaving behind them a stench that would make dung seem sweet marjoram or spikenard by comparison. He swore he'd sooner go to hell than bear the blast of such perfume again.⁵²

The odour of hell carried by Reuchlin's evil spirits reminds him of excrement, suggesting that excrement, if not a concretisation of evil, is an emblem of sin. Rabelais develops this notion into a picture of monks as coprophagists:

they [monks] eat the ordure and excrements of the world, that is to say, the sins of the people, and, like dung-chewers and excrementitious eaters, they are cast into the privies and secessive places, that is, the convents and abbeys, separated from political conversation, as the jakes and retreats of a house are.⁵³

The image of monasteries as society's outhouses, aside from being a condemnation of the moral filth found in contemporary religious orders/ordures, suggests that sin, like excrement, must be disposed of to prevent society from becoming a living hell. The separation and sanitisation of excrement are metaphors for the sanctification of

⁵¹ Martin Pops, "The Metamorphosis of Shit", *Salmagundi* 56 (Spring 1982), 53 and 29-31, on Luther's theological breakthrough "Auff diss Cl." ("on the privy?").

⁵² Desiderius Erasmus, *The Colloquies of Erasmus*, Craig R. Thompson, trans. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 83.

⁵³ Francis Rabelais, *Five Books of the Lives, Heroic Deeds and Sayings of Gargantua and His Son Pantagruel* (1653), Sir Thomas Urquhart and Peter Antony Motteux, trans. (London: A.H. Bullen, 1904), 110-111.

life from sin: cleanliness *is* godliness.⁵⁴

Universal to the popular cultures of Europe from the fourteenth century on is the cucking-stool, a chair in which an offender of social norms --disorderly women, scolds, dishonest tradespeople-- was bound and carried at the head of a jeering procession through the village or town to be ducked in a pond or river.⁵⁵ As the name "cucking-stool" suggests, the chair was meant to represent the close-stool, an implement associated with the shame and filth of excrement. The ritual of the cucking-stool exposes the offender to the universal view in the most shameful posture of evacuating filth from the body; the shame produced by the excremental connotation of the cucking-stool is the effective punishment. At the same time, the ducking in the town pond is a symbolical purification of the social body of moral filth as personified in the victim of the ritual; the corporate act exposes and cleanses the moral filth from the community, just as the removal of ordure to the abbeys and convents in Rabelais signifies spiritual sanitation. Filth, whether physical or spiritual, personal or corporate, must be expelled from a body purged of unclean, toxic substances.

If the expulsion of excreta from the body is analogous to spiritual rebirth, then there is a positive rôle for excremental

⁵⁴ See Piero Camporesi, *The Incorruptible Flesh: Bodily mutation and mortification in religion and folklore*, trans. Tania Croft-Murray (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 115, on images of man as a latrine.

⁵⁵ David Underdown, "The Taming of the Scold: The Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England" in Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson, edd., *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), Ch. 4.

imagery.⁵⁶ In *Rare Physick for the Chvrch Sick of an Ague* (1642), the Members of Parliament are styled "Admirable physicians of the Church and State" (t.p.), who have cast the water of the church and have purged her of papistical adherents (A3v); the fever returns in the form of Brownists and a new purge is required. *British Lightning* (1643) also casts Parliament in the rôle of "Physician of the land" (Aij^r). *The French Mountebank, or An Operator* (1642) is the sales pitch of a "mountebank", or quack, who claims to be able to cure the diseases of the Body Politic which have plagued England even though "a Parliament... be *salus Populi*, the best meanes conducing to the health of this Nation" (A3v-4r). *A Purge for Pluralities* (1642) completes a dialogue about purgation between Dr. Lazie and Dr. Symonie with an attack of contemporary Laudian practices. *The Open Movth of Balaams Asse* (1642), a title rich with scatological potential, suggests that the Physician-Parliament may have to prescribe an abortive rather than a purge in order that the destructive Sectaries "in the womb of this Kingdom,... in good time may be cleansed by authority" (A3r). Samuel Sheppard, in *The Weepers: Or, The bed of Snakes broken. Wit Vitiated, and made a Pander to Wickednesse* (1652), goes yet one step further; he condemns the abusers of Parliamentary positions and appointments, "who committing a Rape upon the body Politique, seem to put out the Lawes, as others upon a like occasion, put out the Lights" (A3v).

The recipe of a purge in a satirical pamphlet functions in a way similar to a magical spell, with the recipe effectively performing the required purge; thus the satire can display the

⁵⁶ Martin Pops, "Metamorphosis of Shit", 27-29.

malignant filth cast up as a result of the purge. Not only does such a pamphlet describe a fictional doctor prescribing the purge or describe the patient vomiting, but the satire is itself a purge: the satirical pamphlet brings itself to throw up the unwholesome toxins which prevent the writing of a healthy, salutary discourse. *The Bishops Potion* (1641) describes Archbishop Laud speaking with his physician about his health and "to preserve him from being let blood in the neck, when the signe is in *Taurus*" (t.p.), obviously a premonition of his death by decollation. Aside from the observation that Laud's "respect to the Constellations" can be construed as superstitious (A2r), the pamphlet describes the objects that Laud vomits, all objects associated with Laud's primacy: the tobacco patent, Dr. John Pocklington's controversial *Sunday no Sabbath*, the Star Chamber Order against Prynne, Burton and Bastwick, a bundle of ecclesiastical Orders, and the Canons of 1640. The Doctor concludes, "the Divell is not far off, farewell good my Lord" (A3v), suggesting that the increasingly ungodly character of the vomited objects indicate that they proceed from the devil. The satirist/doctor is also the exorcist whose satire/spell/purge causes the vomit of evil.

Thus the voiding of excrement is simultaneously a salutary image and a signifier of moral degeneracy. In Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, the last words of Emperor Claudius, "after he had let out a louder sound from that part by which he found it easier to communicate", are "*concacui me*" ("I have shit myself").⁵⁷ The "Parliamentary fart" reported in Alexander Brome's parody "A new Diurnal of passages" (1643) becomes in the Royalist "Upon the

⁵⁷ Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis*, 34-35.

Parliament Fart" an extended metaphor of the noise typically produced by the Members of Parliament. The parody of the debate in "Upon the Parliament Fart" manages a scatological pun in most of the thirty-eight couplets of the poem which insistently maintains the equation between the metaphorical flatulence of Parliamentary debate and the actual passing of wind (*Rump*, i.61-63). Like Seneca's Claudius, Parliament can only communicate anally in a grotesque response to the voice of reason that resides in Charles, the head ("For not the head, but breach, is it / By which the Kingdom now doth sit", "A Madgrigall on Justice"). And, like the "impostumated Fancies" of Cleveland's *London diurnall*, the foulness emitted at the breech breeds infernal contagion.

Rather than merely a facetious satirical invention to amuse an increasingly disheartened Cavalier army, the "Parliamentary fart" arises from the entirely serious notions of defilement and the body politic. The spontaneous and involuntary defecation as a manifestation of terror --such as Claudius's upon dying-- plays a similar part in Royalist scatological satire. In "The Earl of Essex his Speech to the Parliament after Keinton Battle", the ignominious retreat before a superior Cavalier army is a recurrent theme:

Happy were all the Round-heads that did flee;
 They scapt a scowering, which through very fear
 Took me and all my Regiment *in th' Rear*,
 At the first Charge; for that when we should fight,
 We sneakt away, and had more mind to ----.

(*Rump*, i.120; italics added)

"Upon Alderman Atkins bewraying his Slops on the great Training day" recounts in mock-heroic terms how the alderman became the shameful image of the New Militia:

I sing the strange adventures and sad Fate,
 That did befall a Collonel of late,

A portly Squire; a Warlike hardy wight,
 And pity 'tis, we cannot call him Knight,
 A stout man at Custard, and Son of Mars,
 But oh the foul disaster of his -----
 Before the *Worthies*, and the rest beside,
 Who saw how he his Courser did bestride,
 Weilding his *Truncheon*, like a *Weavers* beam,
 And yet ----- his hose in every seam; ... (*Rump*, i.136-7)

The picture of Alderman Atkins seems designed to raise the spirits of the Royalist forces, similar in intent as the morale-boosting "The Cavaliers Prayer":

The Devil take *Pym* and all his Peers,
 God blesse Prince *Rupert* and his Cavaliers,
 For if they come hither *Pym* will stink with fears;
 Which no body can deny.
 (*Rump*, i.111)

Aside from the function of providing some relief to the tension of increasingly hopeless military campaigns, the scatological humour collected among the *Rump Songs* expresses the fundamental polarisation of the divine and diabolical with excremental images.

John Milton's use of excremental imagery involves the notion of the diseased body as morally corrupt, as in *Eikonoklastes* where the emphasis falls "upon disease and distortion rather than remedy"; Merritt Y. Hughes further suggests that "there is also a link between Milton's grasp of truth and the plain language of his comparisons involving so many bodily processes".⁵⁸ But it is in *Colasterion* (1645) that Milton's satirical vein expresses itself with scatological language, where Milton combines images of over-indulgence (suggestive of moral decadence) with the voiding of human filth. Milton compares the task of replying to critics of his tracts on divorce to Hercules's sixth labour ("Yet *Hercules* had the labour

⁵⁸ Kester Svendsen, *Milton and Science* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 214, is quoted in *Complete Prose*, III.146.

once impos'd upon him to carry dung out *Augean* stable", II.757); after a digression Milton returns to the pamphlet in question:

With difficulty I return to what remains of this ignoble task, for the disdain I have to change a period more with the filth and venom of this gourmand, swell'd into a confuter. Yet for the satisfaction of others, I endure all this. (753)

The "odious fool" cannot digest the idea of the thoughts of others being above his, and "leavs the noysom stench of his rude *slot* behind him" (751). Milton advises his critics to reconcile their differences, ironically using the phrase "contrariety of mind" from his own divorce tracts: "I send them by his advice to sit upon the stool and strain, till their cross dispositions and contrarities of minde shall change to a better correspondence, and to a quicker apprehension of common sense, and thir own good" (738). In *Animadversions*, Milton characterises his opponent's work as a filthy sewer ("you doe well to be the Sewer of your owne messe", I.667); in *Colasterion*, his opponent is seen to "disgorge his vileness" (747) openly. If he is a Herculean muck-raker, Milton is also an analyst of the moral and verbal filth voided into his world, threatening him with its contagion.

The process of writing can also be described as the vomiting or excreting of words. In *Mercurius Britanicus His Vision* (1647), Homer and Orpheus judge *Britanicus His Welcome*, the pamphlet to which *Mercurius Britanicus* responds, "The very excrement of Verse to bee" (A3v). The notion of vomiting words has its origin in classical rhetoric, and finds its way into satire, as in Lucian's "Charon", where Charon describes Homer and his stormy passage across Styx:

the good poet fell sea-sick, and so violently that he brought up almost all his rhapsodies, and at last even Scylla and

Charybdis and the huge Cyclops....⁵⁹

Arising from the New Testament notion of defilement ("the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man", Mark 7: 15), the conceit of scurrilous poetry as vomit and excrement features in much popular literature of the 1640s. John Booker, for instance, offering a pro-Parliamentary response to John Taylor in *A Rope trebel-twisted for John Taylor* (1644), seems to recall Spenser's Blatant Beast in describing Taylor's pamphlets:

pernicious Papers, the very vomit and filth of Malignant
Presses, throwne at the very faces of the most High and Sacred
Senate in *Christendome*.... (A2r)

To cure the sickness of the "Malignant Presses", Booker prescribes a "purge" (A4v), a scatological image connected to that of "voiding" excrementa. So, too, Walker's *Taylor's Physicke has purged the Divel*, concludes with this medicinal advice:

After this preparative, expect a * bitter pill if thou beest
not well. [margin: * A furious Zoilus quill mixt with Pluto's
excrement.] (B2r)

The object of Walker's response to Taylor in *Taylor's Physicke* is to reveal the Devil as the true author of Taylor's words and works. The Renaissance notion of the poet as the passive intermediary of the Muses is adapted to the satirical context of *Taylor's Physicke*, and John Taylor becomes the mouthpiece of the Devil-inspired word. The title page of *Taylor's Physicke* adds a twist to image, and combines the scatological metaphor of poetry as excrement with the metaphor of the poet as medium: "The Divell has

⁵⁹ "Charon, or the Surveyors" in *The Dialogues of Lucian*, William Tooke, trans. (London: Navarre Society, n.d.), 172. (Loeb Vol.II, 411) On vomiting as a commonplace, see Jennifer Hall, *Lucian's Satire* (New York: Arno Press, 1981), 82.

got a squirt, and... *Taylor* translates it into railing *Poetrie*". The remainder of the satire is concerned mainly with decoding the infernal meaning of the "translation" and with the nature of "hellish language" (A3v).

The satire begins with a fantastic vision ("Am I sleeping, or am I waking?") of the transformation of *Taylor*, "a Poet of Bacchus", into a poet of the Devil, the metamorphosis taking place in the very act of writing ("by his distemper'd quill", A2r):

Oh! how may I call him, and recall him to view his Anagram,
justly drawne from his owne name? (ART THOU IN HEL, O
POET?).... But why dwell I so long on such discourse? let him
(and such who like it) have recourse to these infernall furies;
raising up such mishapen, diobolical inventions, which I
defie, yet I pity him. (A2r-v)

In Walker's mind, the anagram is "justly" drawn in two senses: the anagram is a true and correct transliteration of "John Talour the Poet", and the question "ART THOU IN HEL, O POET?" is warranted. *Taylor*, on the other hand, has abused the power of the anagram in a display of ignorance and deceit:

he had need to goe to Schoole againe, to learne to spell; he
writes an Anagram of my name, but hee puts in LIE, and leaves
out y. and so makes a simple compound of his owne nature: if he
will see a true Anagram of my name, he may finde it [v.r.
heavenly K.R.] the last line of my book, which is a riddle to
him and his infernall study.... (A4v)

Walker turns *Taylor*'s flawed anagram of his name to illustrate *Taylor*'s want of learning, but also to expose *Taylor*'s true essence as a liar ("a simple compound of his owne nature"). The act of naming was conceived as an exercise of power over the object named, and the anagram was of great significance in this respect. Not only could an anagram lay bare the essential nature or "character" of a person in his name, the satirist's power, too, was unlimited in

controlling the very essence of his victim through re-naming by means of an anagram. Taylor responded to Walker's challenge in *The Hellish Parliament* with another anagram of "Henrie VWalker": "KNAVE REVILER HELL".

It is not enough for Walker simply to condemn the opponent on the basis of his association with hell, and he follows up his heated denunciation of Taylor with a pious statement of his own loyalty to the divine cause:

My allegiance to my royall King; my sincerity and reall submission to that honourable Assembly, to the godly Lawes of this land, and my love to the Church and State, is well knowne to those that know me; (I pray God make me faithfull in his service and worship.) Do not those severall books presented to the members of that Honourable Assembly expresse the same, whose favors I have tasted of; and the God of heaven look upon them and blesse them. (Blr)

Although Walker's authority in *The Hellish Parliament* is demonstrated to be directly from the Devil and the devillish Brownists, Taylor's own claim to legitimate authority is made by inference. In a very real sense, both *The Hellish Parliament* and *Taylor's Physicke* deal with legitimate sources of authorship: the first reveals the devil with his "Hellish Parliament" as the true source (or author, origin) of Henry Walker's work, and the second displays Taylor's transformation into the devil's amanuensis. In *Taylor's Physicke*, Walker makes his self-legitimation explicitly by vaunting his pedigree as being far above that of Taylor's "dunghill-parentage" (A2v), almost as if to prove that he is literally not descendant from the devil.⁶⁰ To complete the godly lineage, Henry Walker construes

⁶⁰ *Mercuries Message Defended* (1641) also accuses the opponent of being derivative of a dung-heap: "I tooke him rather to be some dung-hill ralar's page, than a lackey to the Muses" (A3r).

the true anagram of his name as "V.R. heavenly K.R." (B2r).

Once the essence of John Taylor has been demonstrated as a poet-turned-devil and Walker's own godly authorisation shown, *Taylor's Physicke* displays the true character of the "divellish anointed", "infernall", and "hellish" language (A3v) into which Taylor translates "all the abominable, hellish lyes, and Ethnicall inventions of his noddle" (B1r). Taylor formerly wrote bawdy poetry and was "more expert then any scould or fishwoman in Billingsgate" (A3v) in blasphemy, but now his hellishness derives truly from the devil, just as in Thomas Herbert's description of a satirist in *An Answer to the most Envious... Mercuries Message* (1641):

Surely no wise man, and yet you rail'd well,
Your tongue's not fit for Bilingsgate, but hell. (A3r)

Since Taylor's "message was from Satan" (A3v), Walker feels justified to apply "the whip, without the balme" and to respond in kind to Taylor's "Zoilous language" (A4r). He is careful to differentiate between the "Ethnicall and diabolicall language" (A3v), which derives from the Devil, and his own satirical language which aims to bring Taylor to repentance in the cause of truth. Just as the author of *J Marry Sir* (1642) demonstrated the Devil's unfamiliarity with the language of the godly, so Walker describes the idiom of Taylor's language as "Ethnicall and diabolicall", being a translation of the Devil's "squirt" into "railing poetry": Taylor's language bears the signature of Satan, whose mouthpiece he has become. In giving corroborative evidence of this, Walker illustrates the difference with an example of what "the godly" would call "the sanctified language of Canaan".

Nevertheless, should Taylor refuse to amend (or, "sanctify")

his language, Walker will not refrain from righteous anger and threatens further medical treatment of a "furious Zoilus quill mixt with Pluto's excrement" (B2r). In *The Poet's Blind mans bough* (1641), the Royalist balladeer and satirist Martin Parker employs a similar physical conceit in promising harsher treatment:

I might my pen dip in that learnean Sinke,
Which the infernall furies use for ink,
Or with Iambean rimes Ironicall,
Make lines should serve for ropes to hang them all....
(A3r)

Earlier in *Taylor's Physicke*, Walker used the two related metonymic images of venom and ink to characterise the whole of Taylor's poetry:

How many are those ecchoing voyces, crying shame with me
against him and his Zoilous language, who Hidra like, hath
doubled his hellish venome, in raising of horrid monsters....
as if hell were mingled with his inke. (A4r)

Since most people still made their own by mixing the various ingredients according to preference, ink was a highly individual substance in the seventeenth century. To indicate the reality of the infernal origin of Taylor's words, the image of "hell... mingled with his inke" is appropriately physical and material. William Laud, in his Star Chamber speech at the trial of Prynne, Burton and Bastwick for libel in 1637, described religious libels as products of "a Pen that is made of a sick and loathsome Quill".⁶¹ In a pamphlet entitled *The Poets Knavery Discovered* (1642), John Bond describes chronic libellers as writing only "lying and Non-sense..., that alway distilled from the nasty dregs of their Satyricall quills" (A2r). The metonymy of the image --the diseased and nasty quill epitomises the libeller-- depends on conveying successfully a vivid sense of the

⁶¹ William Laud, *A Speech Delivered in the Starr Chamber* (1637), Blv.

physical, material reality of a (literally) rotten pen. Likewise in *A Presse Full of Pamphlets* (1642), the author uses the substantial, physical images of the "Devils Store-house" and of a katabasis, or descent, of pamphleteers into a literally-conceived hell:

they dive into the nethermost parts of the Earth, and from *Lucifer, Pluto*, and infernall spirits, they bring good sheets of written paper, and having wasted the Devils Store-house....
(A4r)

The Popes Proclamation (1641), an anonymous anti-papist satire, concludes, like Taylor's *Hellish Parliament*, with the passing of resolutions, one of which conceives of a literal hellish origin of pro-episcopal satire:

We appoynt *John Taylor, Martin Parker, Herbert*, and all three English Poeticall, Papisticall, Atheisticall Ballad makers, to put in print rime doggery from the river Styx against the true Protestants in railing lines.... (A3r)

As in the other infernal satires, the effectiveness of the image depends on a simultaneous understanding of hell as a physical locality and as an ethical, spiritual state. The pamphlets between John Taylor and Henry Walker combine the physical and moral connotations of hell in revealing the true "author" of the other's work; conversely, of course, they legitimate their own authority by associating themselves with the moral good.

PART V: A POETICS OF SUBVERSION AND CONSERVATISM

5.1. Order and Disorder

5.1.1. Introduction: Configurations of Order

5.1.2. Religious Satire and Decorum

5.1.3. Order in the Court: Masques

5.2. Parody and Subversion

5.3. Conclusion

5.1. Order and Disorder

5.1.1. Introduction: Configurations of Order.

The reaction in the 1580s and 1640s to the expression of popular dissatisfaction with the church and state was similar in both periods: the episcopal and Royalist defence of the established order attempted to preserve the status quo by cultural and physical means. Censorship, in the form of licensing and press regulation, was the physical means of suppressing the literature that threatened political and religious stability. Various cultural modes --such as public spectacle and masque, theatrical performance, idealized portraits of the monarch, philosophical and moral treatises, printed sermons, even architecture-- reinforced and reaffirmed the established forms of political and religious authority.

The period between 1590 and 1640 which formed the preconditions of fragmentation in the years after 1640, holds vital clues to the evolution of dissent and the expression of opposition. In order to facilitate an understanding of the contents and rôle of satire in the 1640s, when political instability and the inversion of social givens rendered earlier models of authority obsolete, it is necessary to examine the cultural representations of authority and collective social order in the preceding years. The most pervasive cultural paradigm of authority and social order in the seventeenth century is the sphere model of society. Derived from Aristotelean-Ptolemaic cosmology, the Renaissance model of society as a perfectly ordered

planetarium precisely mirrors notions of order, hierarchy and "degree" in the social and political realms.¹ The representation of order in the period preceding 1640 provides the framework for the forms of representing order in the years of turmoil, 1640-1649.

In 5.2 below, I will focus on the inversion of literary genres by which Civil War satire reflects the "world-turned-upside-down" in various satirical forms, such as parody. It is necessary first, however, to be fully aware of the extent to which models of order and decorum were entrenched in the social consciousness, and I will provide evidence of it here. I will examine Francis Bacon's assertion of models of order and decorum in reacting to popular satire in *An Advertisement Touching the Controversies of the Church of England* (1598, publ. 1641) and *The Essays* (final ed. 1625), and I will briefly discuss the use of sphere imagery in Ben Jonson's *Sejanus His Fall* (1603) as corroborating Bacon's anxieties and fears of disorder. I will then analyse the rôle of the court masque as both example of the cultural significance of the sphere model and its ultimate inability to be an effective conserving force. The anxiety caused by threats to order is expressed in these representations of order and continues to unsettle the minds of people from the early 1600s until the return of a stable monarchy in William III and Mary in 1689.

¹ E.M.W. Tillyard, *The Elizabethan World Picture* (New York: Vintage, 1964) and C.S. Lewis, *The Discarded Image* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964) are still good introductions to Renaissance cosmology. Isabel Rivers, *Classical and Christian Ideas in English Renaissance Poetry* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1979), Ch 9, offers a concise treatment of the origins, sources and development of classical cosmology in England.

5.1.2. Religious Satire and Decorum.

Francis Bacon's *An Advertisement Touching the Controversies of the Church of England*, written in 1598, seemed "to have some reference" forty-three years later when it was published in 1641 as *A Wise and Moderate Discourse Concerning Church-Affairs*. Bacon almost certainly had Martin Marprelate in mind when he advised wisdom and moderation in the reception of satirical pamphlets and lampoons, particularly those with religious subjects. But Bacon goes beyond the immediate concern of the Marprelate controversy and endorses the suppression of religious satire of any kind. He realistically accepts the impossibility of complete and total suppression by licensing laws (such as the Star Chamber decree of 1586 or, later, the Bishops' Ban of 1599), and places the moral burden and responsibility for successful censorship with the discerning reader:

As it were to bee wished that these writings had been abortive, and never seene the Sunne; so the next is, that seeing they be common abroad, that they bee censured of all that have understanding and conscience, as the untemperate extravagants of some light person: yea further, they may beware (except they meane to deprive themselves of all sense of religion, and to pave their owne hearts, and to make them as the high way) how they bee conversant in them, and much more how they delight themselves in that veine, but rather to turn their laughing into blushing, and to bee amazed as at a short madnesse, that they have in matters of religion, taken their disport and solace.... (C2v-C3r)

Bacon, like other anti-Martinist writers, does not distinguish between subversive (presbyterian) and conservative (episcopal) satire but advocates the control of the genre *per se*, identifying religious satire in the popular mode as a distinct discourse offensive to all who love true religion. For Bacon, therefore, the real danger of religious satire is not primarily its theological heterodoxy, but its

language and manner:

it is more then time that an end were made of this unmodest and deformed kinde of writing lately entertained, whereby matters of religion are handled in the stile of the stage.... to leave all reverend and religious compassions toward evils, or indignation toward faults, to turne religion into a Comedy or Satyr, to search and rip up wounds with a laughing countenance, to intermix Scripture and Scurrility sometimes in one sentence, is a thing farre from the devout reverence of a Christian, and scant beseeming the honest regard of a sober man. *Non est major confusio quam serii & joci*: there is no greater confusion then the confounding of jest and earnest. The majestie of religion, and the contempt and deformity of things ridiculous, are things as distant as things may be. (B4r-B4v)

The first heresy of religious satire is an aesthetic one: it denies the laws of artistic decorum and propriety, a denial which carries implications of moral indecorum and impropriety. The words Bacon chooses clearly reveal his formal and artistic interests: "unmodest" ("not in due measure"), "deformed" ("misshapen"), "kinde", "stile", and "beseeming" ("proper"). The gnomic "*Non est major confusio quam serii & joci*" echoes the Horatian dicta of decorum. The phrase "to intermix Scripture and Scurrility", with its powerful alliteration, not only juxtaposes the divine and godless ("what concord hath Christ with Belial?", II Cor. 6:15), but also reflects the current debates about the validity of the "mixed" dramatic form, tragi-comedy. By its derivation from "*satura*", satire is etymologically a mixed genre; the improper blending of incompatible ingredients in religious satire, however, is a rejection of moral principles that, taken to its logical extension, is akin to atheism.

The publication history of Bacon's *A Wise and Moderate Discourse*, written in 1589 and published in 1641, is paralleled in two other reactions to the Admonition Crisis and the Marprelate tracts. "A Discovery of the Causes of the Continuance of these

Contentions concerning Church Government, out of the Fragments of Richard Hooker" is one in a collection of essays in support of episcopal government by various hands printed in 1641 under the title *Certain brief Treatises*.² Hooker appears to have written this "fragment" around 1598 while completing *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, a work that revolves around the central principle of order and degree, no less in church and state than in the universe. Book VIII deals explicitly with this fundamental law:

Without order there is no living in public society, because the want thereof is the mother of confusion, whereupon division of necessity followeth, and out of division, inevitable destruction.... The whole world consisting of parts so many, so different, is by this only thing upheld; he which framed them hath set them in order. (III.341-2)

In the "fragment" in *Certain brief Treatises*, Hooker argues for peaceful, objective discussions in the church, as opposed to the manner of the "common adversary", the Roman Catholics, who are gorged with "virulent, slanderous, and immodest speeches":

"Will you speak wickedly for God's defence?" saith Job. Will you dip your tongues in gall and your pens in blood, when you write and speak in his cause?... Is it likely that Invectives, Epigrams, Dialogues, Epistles, Libels, laden with contumelies and criminations, should be the means to procure peace? (Vol.III, 464)

The means cannot be dissociated from the end, nor can the manner be divorced from the matter. Thus orderliness and literary propriety carry the same moral implication as in Bacon's *A Wise and Moderate Discourse*, as this essay too strives to separate Scripture from

² Richard Hooker, *Works*, arr. J. Keble (7th ed., rev. by R.W. Church and F. Paget; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888), III.460-5. Whether this essay is Hooker's or not is irrelevant: like Bacon's *A Wise and Moderate Discourse*, it is vitally concerned with the destabilising effect of popular religious satire on the vulgus; and, like Bacon's *A Wise and Moderate Discourse*, Hooker's "A Discovery" is as much a text of the 1640s as the 1580s.

scurrility, God's cause from wicked and satirical discourse.

George Cranmer's *Concerning the New Church Discipline* (1642) is even more remarkably similar to Bacon's *A Wise and Moderate Discourse*. Also writing in 1598, in the aftermath of the Admonition Crisis, Cranmer notes that the "modest" writing of men like Thomas Cooper, the Bishop of Winchester, soon "brake forth into open outrage" like a plague:

That whereas *T.C.* and others his great Masters had alwaies before set out the discipline as a Queen, and as the daughter of God, he [Martin Marprelate] contrariwise to make her more acceptable to the people, brought her forth as a vice upon the stage.... (Blr)

To Cranmer's mind, Martin Marprelate is the mouthpiece of the Puritan conspiracy, ultimately associated with atheism and popery, to reduce the church in England to anarchy and chaos:

it was imagined that by open railing (which to the vulgar is commonly most plausible) the state Ecclesiastical might have been drawn into such contempt and hatred, as the overthrow thereof should have been gratefull to all men, and in a manner desired of the common people. (Blr)

As might be expected of someone who believes strongly in the principle of order and degree, this appeal "unto the common people" failed, at the same time conclusively revealing "their intent and purpose to be rather destructive than corrective" (Dlr).

Furthermore, the destructive impetus of treating church discipline "as a vice upon the stage" is doubly sinister for Cranmer, as indeed it was for Hooker: by catering to popular taste, it arouses populist desires. Cranmer associates such populism in religion with democracy in the state, and concludes that the most important lesson of the controversies is ultimately political: "when they strike at the state ecclesiastical, they secretly wound the civil state" (Dlr). Both

religious populism and political democracy destroy the divine order defined by Hooker as essential to the survival of human society.

For Bacon, Hooker and Cranmer, the artistic heresy of yoking the highest with the lowest by the satirical pamphleteers contravenes the sacred doctrine of order in generic hierarchy: the supreme science, *theologia*, with a base rhetorical mode, *vituperatio*; the highest human activity, the worship of God, with the lowest literary form, *satura*: "things as distant as things may be". The order of genres reflected the divine order of the cosmos, the planets in their orbits, the levels of social and political order, and the hierarchy in the church. Bacon's fear of the threat of pamphlet satire is the converse of his fear of the disruption of order: those who disrupt literary decorum while disrupting ecclesiastical order, will (in Hooker's terms) produce confusion, division and inevitable destruction, reducing the cosmos to chaos.

The warning not to "intermix Scripture and Scurrility" in *A Wise and Moderate Discourse* is not the only place where Bacon levels trenchant criticism at the mixture of sacred and profane. In *The Essays*, Bacon argues that one of the causes of superstition is "the taking an aim at divine matters by human, which cannot but breed mixture of imaginations" ("Of Superstition").³ In *The Advancement of Learning*, after warning against the tendency to submit divine mysteries to human reason, Bacon justifies his digression on the mongrel breed of religious philosophy:

the extreme prejudice which both religion and philosophy have received and may receive, by being commixed together; as that which undoubtedly will make an heretical religion, and an

³ *The Essays*, John Pitcher, ed. (London: Penguin, 1985), 112.

imaginary and fabulous philosophy. (II.vi.2; 89)

In "Of Discourse", Bacon acknowledges the need "to vary and intermingle speech" in the art of speaking, but only when the jest is fitting to the discourse. In an echo from *A Wise and Moderate Discourse* ("*Non est major confusio quam serii & joci*: there is no greater confusion than the confounding of jest and earnest"), Bacon sets the bounds:

As for jest, there be certain things which ought to be priveleged from it; namely, religion, matters of state, great persons, any man's present business of importance, and any case that deserveth pity. ("Of Discourse", 160)

For instance, Bacon refers to Rabelais ("a master of scoffing") to express "the deformity" of "so many discordant and contrary opinions of religion". But before quoting the title of a book from Pantagruel's library, *The morris dance of heretics*, Bacon first justifies using such a "light thing... in so serious a matter" ("Of Unity in Religion", 68). Just as superstition next to religion increases the deformity of the former ("as it addeth deformity to an ape to be so like a man"; "Of Superstition", 112), so the "light" illustration from Rabelais "expresseth well the deformity" of religious disunity. Jest and superstition in relation to religion have in common the power to confound, confuse and deform.

In the political arena, "Libels and licentious discourses against the state" entail similar destabilising effects as sacrilegious satire in the church (*Essays*, 1625: "Of Seditious and Troubles", 101). The monstrosity of seditious "Libels and licentious discourses" is of a cosmic scale, upsetting the perfect order and

motion of the spheres:⁴

when discords and quarrels and factions are carried openly and audaciously, it is a sign the reverence of government is lost.... it is a sign the orbs are out of frame. For reverence is that wherewith princes are girt from God.... (102-3)

In "Of Seditious and Troubles", "Libels and licentious discourses against the state" offend "the reverence of government" and the divinely-granted reverence of the prince. On the grand stage of state spectacle, "discords and quarrels and factions are carried openly and audaciously" in place of the order visually displayed to be as harmonious as the spheres in masques, for instance, where nobles radiate from the king at the focal point in an elaborate arrangement by degree.⁵ Deforming religion and disrupting social order are forms of *lèse-majesté*, the *crimen maiestatis* of high treason.

Thus Bacon's concern about seditious literature, whether religious or political, is inseparable from what amounts to an obsession with artistic as well as social order, decorum, reverence and majesty. Order, propriety, reverence and majesty are all crucial attributes of the divine nature of the universe and society. Man as

⁴ 102. Throughout *The Essays*, Bacon is obsessed with the catastrophic results of upsetting the social order and untuning the harmony of the spheres, as the recurrence of the image in "Of Wisdom for a Man's Self" (130) and "Of Vicissitude of Things" (230) testifies.

⁵ Stephen Orgel, *The Illusion of Power: Political Theatre in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1975), 39. Even Lady Macbeth's precipitate dismissal of the Scottish nobles in the Banquo ghost scene considers the significance of the placing of nobles, "Stand not upon the order of your going" (III.iv.118). The placing of ambassadors at court entertainments carried vital significance as well, often with international ramifications. See Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham, 1592-1628* (London: Longman, 1981), 172, on the Spanish ambassador in London who turned down an invitation to a feast with James I rather than risk losing face in a quarrel over precedence.

microcosm mirrors the perfect harmony of the universe, the various organs functioning each in its proper location and in its relative dependence on each other. The bodies ecclesiastical and politic mirror the human anatomy, with certain members subordinate to but vitally dependent on others, and all under the government of the head.⁶ In such a conception of the wholeness of the body, Bacon envisages subversive tendencies as mutilation and dismemberment. Discontentments "are in the politic body like to humours in the natural, which are apt to gather a preternatural heat and to inflame" ("Of Troubles and Seditious", 103). Treating matters of religion in a satirical manner is "to search and rip up wounds with a laughing countenance" (*A Wise and Moderate Discourse*, B4v). Bacon's classifications of and distinctions between religion and philosophy, serious and jesting, and even masque and antimasque (in "Of Masques and Triumphs", 176), indicate how fundamental the notion of order is to his thought. Bacon's prose style, with its precise parallels, symmetry, equipoised dialectic, is a ramification of the psychological urge to keep imbalance, disorder, and asymmetry at bay.

5.1.3. Order in the Court: Masques.

In the discussion of Bacon's fear of the "common people", the necessity of ensuring the loyalty of "the greater sort" was paramount to the security of the prince. As a result, factions in court are of

⁶ The notion of the church as the body of Christ derives from I Cor. 12:12-27, and the image of the monarch as head of the body politic is its analogue.

great consequence to the prince, and kings must be seen to remain beyond the quarrels:

The motions of factions under kings ought to be like the motions (as astronomers speak) of the inferior orbs, which may have their proper motions, but yet still are quietly carried by the higher motion of *primum mobile*. ("Of Faction", 212)

The king must always be at once the centre of the court and a higher sphere above the lesser lights, and he must visibly appear as such. Bacon uses the Ptolemaic myth simply as a model of social order and not to expound the scientific theory of a geocentric universe, for he even considers the theory "that all celestial bodies move in perfect circles" a "fiction".⁷ For the prince the Ptolemaic myth is a necessary fiction for the retention of majesty and power, and royal appearances in court settings consequently become important occasions to enact the monarch's control of order.

Although the opening and concluding sentences of the essay "Of Masques and Triumphs" seem dismissive of the whole subject of public entertainment, this essay, too, involves the sacred doctrine of decorum, particularly in urging the distinct separation of antimasque and masque proper, a distinction necessary for the maintenance of social and political order (176). Antimasque must not dominate over masque (it must "not be long") and the separation between masque and antimasque, order and disorder, must be complete:

As for angels, it is not comical enough to put them in antimasques; and anything that is hideous, as devils, giants, is on the other side as unfit. (176)

The "antic" music of the anti-masque jars with the elegant music of the masque proper, and the presence of anti-masquers among masquers

⁷ "Idols of the Mind", 279.

would strike a literally discordant note. Beside the artistic aspect, it is possible that Bacon also had a social consideration in mind: the anti-masquers were professional actors, hired to perform the speaking parts and to dance the anti-masque, whereas the masquers were the ladies and gentlemen of the court.⁸ It has been argued that Elizabethan and Jacobean drama radically subverts the assertion of order, especially in the ascendance of the antimasque over the masque.⁹ Bacon asserts the preëminence of masque over antimasque as a political necessity for the very reason that even the symbolical disruption of order in court entertainment can lead to disorder in the state. The masque, in its particularly emblematic reassertion of the sphere-myth, upholds the providential hierarchy in society.

It is not surprising that Ben Jonson's *Sejanus His Fall*, an almost perfect illustration of the consequences of letting the sphere-myth of providential order disappear, turns repeatedly to cosmic imagery. Already in the play's opening exchange, Silius, an exemplar of "the old virtue" of Germanicus, simply and significantly says of the court of flatterers, "this place is not our sphere" (I.i.3).¹⁰ The image of displaced planets and stars is central in the

⁸ Stephen Orgel, *The Illusion of Power*, 39-40. Orgel makes this point after noting that "Masquers are not actors" in that they do not adopt a persona, but remain themselves throughout the masque.

⁹ For instance, by Jonathan Dollimore, *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Brighton: Harvester, 1984), 26-8. For a more sensitive reading of the masque in Renaissance drama, see David Lindley, "Music, masque and meaning in *The Tempest*", in D. Lindley, ed., *The Court Masque*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), 47-59.

¹⁰ Ben Jonson, *Sejanus His Fall*, W.F. Bolton, ed. (London: Ernest Benn, 1966). First performed in 1603, *Sejanus* was published in the 1616 Folio. Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984), discusses the relation

description of Sejanus's engineered ascent from "serving boy" (I.i.212) to effectual ruler of Rome. The model of spheres in *Sejanus* serves as both metaphor and moral commentary on the rise and fall of the protagonist, as in the wooing of Livia when Sejanus elevates her above her station, declaring that she is destined to rise with him,

to shine
 Bright, as the moon, among the lesser lights,
 And share the sovereignty of all the world.
 Then Livia triumphs in her proper sphere,
 When she, and her Sejanus shall divide
 The name of Caesar; and Augusta's star
 Be dimmed with glory of a brighter beam:
 When Agrippina's fires are quite extinct,
 And the scarce-seen Tiberius borrows all
 His little light from us, whose folded arms
 Shall make one perfect orb. (II.i.35-45)

Sejanus, "whose high name doth strike the stars" (II.i.98), in a moment of *hubris*, sees himself at his zenith, exalted:

My roof receives me not; 'tis air I tread:
 And, at each step, I feel my advanced head
 Knock out a star in heav'n! (V.i.7-9).

The "star" Sejanus thinks he knocks from heaven is Tiberius, and Sejanus takes to himself the divinity ascribed to the emperor and figured in the heavens. A usurper of a sphere not his, Sejanus sets himself above both deity (Fortune) and authority (Tiberius): "Jove, but my equal: Caesar, but my second" (V.iii.264). The irreverence for the ruler of the gods and disrespect for the prince of the people mark the beginning of Sejanus his fall. The necessity of publicly demonstrating the relevance of providential models of history in order to preclude such "policy" and popular disorder is the

of *Sejanus* to the political situation of 1626, suggesting that Tiberius and Sejanus are analogues of James I and Buckingham (57).

conclusion that Bacon draws and Jonson demonstrates. That Jonson's politics of order remained relevant to the 1640s is evident from the posthumous rôle Jonson plays in several satires, such as Andrew Marvell's "Tom May's Death" and Sir John Suckling's "The Wits"; *The Copie Of A Letter Sent From The Roaring Boyes in Elizium* refers specifically to Jonson's *Catiline* and *Sejanus* (Alv).

Bacon's comments on masques in relation to political necessity are remarkably prescient. "Of Masques and Triumphs" was written in 1625, the year that the increasingly beleaguered monarchy passed to Charles, and the developments in the royal masque comment on the decline and fall of the Stuart monarchy. The growing gulf between the mythology of the divine monarch and political reality is especially evident in two Caroline masques, *The Triumph of Peace* (1634) by James Shirley and *Salmacida Spolia* (1640) by William Davenant and Inigo Jones.¹¹

Shirley's *Triumph of Peace* is usually taken to affirm the position of Charles and Henrietta Maria, as well as an expression of the loyalty of the Inns of Court after one of their sons, William Brynne, had so dishonoured their majesties with his *Histriomastix* (1633). The excessive claims made by the masque, for instance, that the King and Queen are easily mistaken with Jove and Themis, are conventionally preposterous; the *dei ex machina* in this masque are Charles and Henrietta-Maria themselves, explicitly identifying monarchy with divinity. Rather than dispell the echoes of an earlier chaotic antimasque, however, the presence of the divine monarch and

¹¹ Quotations from *The Triumph of Peace* and *Salmacida Spolia* are taken from T.J.B. Spencer, ed., *A Book of Masques: In Honour of Allardyce Nicoll*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967).

his queen instead invites what has been called the "sudden incursion of the common people".¹² The Carpenter, Painter, Guards, Tailor, Tailor's Wife, Embroiderer's Wife, Feather-maker's Wife, and Property-man's Wife force their way onto the stage and demand to take part in the courtly action. Plain-speaking, brash and disrespectful of the honourable audience, this contingent of common people recognizes itself as a disruptive force in the masque, and they dupe the masquers into believing them to be anti-masquers, turning their actual rebellion into an artistic metaphor ("a piece of plot", 707) acceptable to their superiors:

Tailor. Let's put a trick upon 'em in revenge, 'twill seem a new device too.... and somebody will think this was meant for an Anti-masque. (708-9, 714-5)

Besides being a masque for the court, *The Triumph of Peace* was also a triumphal procession, with the participants travelling *in persona* through the city from the Inns of Court to the venue at which the masque was held. The exclusive, court-coterie nature of masques on this occasion becomes also a public display or spectacle, "in the nature of a triumph", according to Sir Henry Herbert, making *The Triumph of Peace* an instance of the public interaction of the popular and the courtly.¹³ Whatever the intended effect on the people, the

¹² By Clifford Leech in his introduction to *The Triumph of Peace*, in *A Book of Masques*, 280.

¹³ Herbert is quoted in G.E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), V.1157. Bentley thinks the popularity of *The Triumph of Peace* was mostly "due to the dazzling parade through the streets of London" (1161). The Privy Council would take no chances with the common people and instructed the Lord Mayor "to prevent all disorders and disturbanc[es], wch in the like cases, vsually happen by the Concourse of vnruly people" (1156). For a discussion of political interpretations of the procession, see David Norbrook, "The reformation of the masque", in D. Lindley, ed., *The Court Masque*, 94-5, 104.

impression of viewers along the route would be mixed between that of the anti-masquers and the Grand Masquers, with the balance favouring the anti-masquers, who, though less in number, are more arresting in appearance than, for instance, the hundred "gloriously furnished" gentlemen (79). Significantly, it provided the common people an image of themselves in a cultural form they understood impinging uninvited and unrestrainable upon the ordered realm of power and authority.

Popular disruption is also the threat to national stability in *Salmacida Spolia*, presented in 1640, at the brink of Charles's troubles. As the allusion to the civilising powers of the spring at Salmacia in the title suggests, the entire masque sets out to address directly the threat of popular discord, personified as Fury:

The allusion is that his Majesty, out of his mercy and clemency..., seeks by all means to reduce tempestuous and turbulent natures into a sweet calm of civil concord. (89-91)

The hope expressed in the masque is a lame one, as it, too, "seeks" without success to reduce the tempestuous and turbulent anti-masque into the sweet calm of the masque. "Tempestuous and turbulent natures" are revealed the first scene: "a dark wrought sea, with rolling billows breaking against the rocks" (96-7). Seas and billows are associated with the numberless mass of people (*turba*), as in Isaiah 57:20 ("the wicked are like the troubled sea, which cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt").¹⁴ Then, too, *Salmacida*

¹⁴ Cf. *A Glimpse of Sion's Glory* (1641) on Rev. 19:6: "By waters we are to understand people: the voice of many waters, of many people"; in A.S.P. Woodhouse, *Puritanism and Liberty* (London: Dent and Sons, 1974), 234.

Spolia is brimming with premonitions of England's disaster and decadence, as in the Fury's opening speech:

Thou over-lucky, too-much-happy isle
 For thy long health can never alter'd be
 But by thy surfeits on felicity. (115, 117-8)

The sense of transience and inevitability of Concord's words ("I shall be valued when I'm gone", 159) is echoed in the song to the Queen's Mother by the "Chorus of the beloved people":

Our blessings that descend so fast...,
 We grieve they are too great to last. (292, 294)

More specific than the traditional *sic transit gloria mundi*, these words suggest that England's fate is inherent in her very greatness and abundance, her surfeit of felicity. Earlier Concord voiced ominous words about Charles:

...though the best
 Of kingly science harbours in his breast,
 Yet 'tis his fate to rule in adverse times,
 When wisdom must awhile give place to crimes. (168-71)

The concluding songs of *Salmacida Spolia* celebrate the King as having gained the Throne of Honour by "strength of virtues" (361) and hail the Queen and their attendants as heavenly lights. The final apparition is a cloud "in which were eight persons richly attired representing the spheres", praising the king and queen as perfect Platonic lovers:

So musical as to all ears
 Doth seem the music of the spheres,
 Are you unto each other still,
 Tuning your thoughts to either's will. (451-54)

Although typical of the cult of Platonic love celebrated in the Caroline masque, the conclusion of *Salmacida Spolia* fails to bring assurances of national harmony by failing to make the royal couple the prime mover of the nation's spheres. Compared to the national

optimism of *The Triumph of Peace*, the resigned fatality of *Salmacida Spolia* indicates that it has all but forgotten the idealism the masque was meant to represent.¹⁵ The shift takes place concurrently with the upsetting of the significant balance between masque and anti-masque that Bacon conceived as crucial to the symbolic function of the masque and vital to the position and authority of the prince.¹⁶ Ben Jonson argued fiercely against Inigo Jones that the dominance of spectacle (things "objected to sense") over the "more removed mysteries" figured in the masque ("things subjected to understanding") debases the genre, and, in terms of the *imprese*, presents a body without its soul.¹⁷

¹⁵ C.V. Wedgwood's description of "The Last Masque" in *Truth and Opinion: Historical Essays* (London: Collins, 1960), captures some of the latent irony in the royal performance of *Salmacida Spolia*, especially in the necessary disorder among masquers and machines: "The accidental disorders on the stage added their unintentional, tacit note of satire to the last masque ever to be danced by King Charles" (155). D.J. Gordon, in *The Renaissance Imagination: Essays and Lectures*, collected and edited by Stephen Orgel (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), after describing the ceiling of the Banqueting House as "the apotheosis of the rule of Charles I and the Stuart dynasty", sums up Charles's reign as follows: "As Rubens' ceiling expresses the triumph of Charles's autocracy, *Salmacida Spolia* expresses its tragedy" (3).

¹⁶ Roy Strong, *Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals 1450-1650* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1984), connects the Jacobean and Caroline masque with "the advent of the Stuarts and the official enunciation of the Divine Right of Kings":

The rise and fall of the masque is indeed exactly coincidental with the rise and fall of extreme claims to monarchical divinity. . . . The thought-tenets of the masque world were beginning to wear thin [by 1638]. By 1640, the year of the last of the masques, Sir William Davenant's *Salmacida Spolia*, they were almost threadbare. (154, 169-70)

¹⁷ Ben Jonson, *Works*, C.H. Herford, P. Simpson, and E. Simpson, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), VII.209-10. See D.J. Gordon, "Poet and Architect: The Intellectual Setting of the Quarrel between Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones" in *The Renaissance Imagination*, 78-101.

5.2. Parody and Subversion.

During the first years of the reign of James I, unlike the second and third decades of the seventeenth century with the gradual deterioration of the monarchy, political reality still kept the Elizabethan models of order credible. This is manifested in an extraordinary work entitled *The Philosopher's Satyrs* (1616) by Robert Anton, in which are combined Ptolemaic cosmology, Elizabethan genre theory and social order. The seven satires of *The Philosopher's Satyrs*, with separate dedicatees ranging from the Earl of Pembroke to Prince Charles, are closely related to the visual representation, engraved on the title page, of the four major planets, elements, winds, seasons, ages of man, and humours, arranged in concentric circles; as a constant reminder of the connection between the satires and cosmology, the same engraving is placed at the beginning of the each satire. Reminiscent of the consciously cosmic approach of Elizabethan texts like *The Shepherdes Calendar*, the general dedication is full of the correspondences between the interrelated levels of the universe:

the sects of vice are more then in Amsterdam, to whose errors I oppose my booke, as an eager disputant. The motions of this planetarie satire are regular and presented in a maske of a seuenfold uniformity. Appeare Philosopher in thy undaunted humor of grauity, & spit defiance in the face of scurrile satirrisme: lend heauenly whipcord, and borrow correction from the Sunne: fetch blood from the whole body of Nature, and the sixe planets lay on load on the stigmaticke shoulders of vice. This book was conceiued in dog-daies, and must bite, the sign is in Scorpio, and the planets in their most criticall mansion.... A satire is musicke worthie of Pithagoras his opinion, especially, when the planets dance a heauenly lauloto, they are nimble spirited and actiue.... (A2v)

Within this cosmic satirical dance, the political connotations of order and degree are evident. For instance, the first satire, the "Satyre of the Sunne", is an allegory in which the sun is an emblem of the life- and light-giving monarch. After a brief apostrophe to the sun ("Great heart, of this great world"), Anton addresses James:

Thou, that bestow'st a *pension* of thy *light*,
 (Like a true noble *master*, to whose might
 An active *will* concurs) to euery *groome*,
 That serues in *office* of a *Planets* roome:
 Thou, whose *attendants*, are fixt radiant *stars*,
 Well qualified; not enuious *followers*
 Of thy great *fortunes*, more then they admire
 The *vertues*, not the *greatnesse* of thy *fire*....
 Giue *light* and *motion* vnto each *degree*,
 Onely retaine thy influence *vprightly*. (D1r, D2r)

A satirical "Musicall maske of the Spheares" (B1r), *The Philosopher's Satyrs* verbally and visually affirms the cosmic orderliness of human society and generic propriety, just as masques (such as Thomas Carew's *Coelum Britanicum*, 1634) were meant to do:

And had the Musicke silent beene,
 The eye a moving tune had seene. (E3r)

Although shared by all but the Levellers in the late 1640s and 1650s, the cultural givens of order, hierarchy and degree were variously put to use in ways that can roughly be distinguished as conservative and subversive. The conservative use of the sphere model seeks to legitimate existing authority structures by ostensibly "reflecting" their reality in society, while the oppositional applications of the model, particularly in satirical literature, deployed the model to criticise certain forms of authority; the opponents of established forms of authority re-apply rather than discard the existing models and images of order, reworking the pieces of the old cultural matrix. It is not surprising that *parody*, a form

of ridicule which takes a model, reverses its values, subverts its style, and mocks its author, is a form that Parliamentary and Royalist, as well as Independent and Presbyterian, satirists have in common. Not only are particular authors or preachers mocked by a ridiculous mimicry of their writing or preaching, but established literary models are re-deployed in reversed guise as vehicles of ridicule and abuse. Sermons, wills, parliaments, and trials --all significant elements of a just and ordered society-- are parodied and inverted in many satirical texts in the 1640s. *A Seasonable Lecture* (1643) is a parody of a sermon of Henry Walker, ironmonger-turned-preacher, by John Taylor (under the pseudonym "Thorny Ailo", an anagram of his name) on Tobias 5:16: "So they went forth both and departed, and the dog of the young man with them."¹⁸ Taylor caricatures the sectarian preaching style, exaggerating its salient features, such as the excessive repetition and tautology: "it is correspondent, meet, necessarie and convenient, that I do unveile, lay open, describe, discover, and manifest unto you, some reasons why, wherefore, upon what causes, grounds, or reasons this Dog is mentioned in my Text" (Alv). Another aspect of separatist sermons, treatises, and anti-episcopal tracts ridiculed by Taylor by means of parody is the citation of "authorities": "Quabo the American in his third Book, fol. 900 of his *Dogmatistes*; and *Nimpshag* the Gymnosophist" (A4r). The titlepage referred to the habit of the auditors of separatist sermons to take comprehensive notes by

¹⁸ This Henry Walker --whose life is chronicled by Taylor in *The Whole Life and Progress of Henry Walker the Ironmonger* (1641)-- is not to be confused with Henry Walker, M.A., who put it on record in *The Modest Vindication of Henry Walker* (1642) that he has no connection with the other Henry Walker or his *Toby's Dog* sermon.

translating the sermon into the esoteric system of shorthand symbols ("Taken in short writing...; and now printed in words at length, and not in figures"), and the sermon takes transcendental hermeneutics to a ridiculous extreme by purporting to decipher the words of the text in "a mysticall sense":

This word *and* standing betwixt *forth* and *departed*, hath a mysticall sense, that a man may goe forth and not depart, that he may also depart and not goe forth, *And* that hee may both goe forth and depart, and likewise he may neither depart or goe forth. (A3r)

The mystical significance of language and grammatical systems is ridiculed in another parody of a separatist sermon, *Love one another: A Tvb Lectvre* (1642):

Away with all Learning, away with all immodesty, and all trumpery of the Arts: the very Grammar is prophane, and instructs our children in the obscenenesse of Conjunctions copulative, and what a smell thinke you are they like to have when they come to *Tullies* offices.... (A3v)

Beside the parody of ecclesiastical forms such as the published sermon, parliamentary and legal procedures also are easily adapted for parody. There are several "last will and testament" pamphlets around the death of Philip Herbert, the Earl of Pembroke, whose ignominious defection to the Parliamentary side in 1643 became one of the chief subjects of ridicule in the Royalist camp. The Earl of Pembroke broke a serious rule of social orderliness by voluntarily exchanging his place in the House of Lords for a seat in the Commons; upward movement within the Great Chain of Being is the natural tendency, and any retrograde motion goes against the divine creation ordinance. His damning error, his *hamartia*, was consenting to the death of Charles I, whom he swore to defend when he was made a knight of the realm. The Earl of Pembroke had several libertine vices,

including a mistress, and he punctuated his speech with frequent imprecations. A peculiar trait in speaking, of course, makes a prime target for parody, and at several points in his career, such as his appointment as Visitor of the University of Oxford, pamphlets appeared which purported to be speeches delivered at Oxford and in the House of Commons. When he died in January 1650, satirical pamphlets such as *The Last Will and Testament of Philip Herbert* (1650) appeared in which the Earl's manner of speaking was combined in the parody of a last will and testament. At this point, the mock "last will and testament" genre was firmly established, with satires throughout the 1640s in this form against persons (William Laud in *Canterbury's Will*, 1641), institutions (*The Last Will and Testament of the Doctors Commons*, 1641), objects (*The Downe-fall of Dagon*, 1642; *Articles of High Treason Exhibited against Cheap-side Crosse*, 1642; *The Last VWill and Testament of Charjng Crosse*, 1642; *The last Will and Testament of Superstition, eldest daughter to Anti-Christ*, 1642), and fictional representations of classical Presbyterianism (*The last Will and Testament, of Sir Iohn Presbyter*, 1647). In *The Life and Death of Philip Herbert* (1650), Pembroke is arraigned before the infernal judges Eacus, Minos and Rhadamanthus in a mock trial.

In a similar parody of English legal procedure, *Mercurius Britanicus, Or The English Intelligencer* (1641) indicts the Ship-Money judges who had granted Charles's controversial extra-Parliamentary monetary policy legal legitimacy. The pamphlet takes the form of a play ("A Tragic-Comedy, At *Paris*") in which the Chorus is the common people of England, the true champions of peace, and in which the injustice served by the judges in John Hampden's trial is

overturned: the condemned judges are sent to the boat of Charon. Like the parodic adaptation of last will and testament, the mock trials and speeches invert forms which ordinarily reflect social justice and orderliness, making them ironical representations of the extent to which justice has degenerated from former times. The last will and testament ensures the succession of goods and rights through the generations in order to maintain social and economic stability; the court of law ensures the equality of all citizens before the fundamental laws of the realm. The sermon, the courts of law, and the succession of goods can no longer perform the stabilising function in society which they once had, and the inversion of these forms in the print culture, like that in certain rituals in popular culture, signifies the inability of traditional agents of order to be socially viable. The parodic subversion of these essential ingredients in society, even of the grammatical basis of language, is the literary expression of a world turned upside-down.

An important feature of some of the parodies of Parliamentary procedure is the extension of the idea of reversal to the relation between the sexes (*A Parliament of Ladies: With Their Lawes Newly Enacted* and *The Ladies Second time Assembled*, 1647; *An Exact Diurnall of the parliament of Ladyes*, 1647; *Newes from the New Exchange, or the Commonwealth of Ladies*, 1649; *Now or Never: or, a New Parliament of Women*, 1656; *The Ladies Remonstrance*, 1656), a vehicle for satirical social comment legitimised by Aristophanes's *Ecclessiazusæ*. The Royalist satires on the petition or resolution to Parliament ridicule the lobbying of Members of Parliament by counties, guilds, and individuals through published petitions and resolutions. While

The Resolution of the Women of London to the Parliament (1642) seems to suggest that the Civil War is responsible for the deterioration in traditional rôles for men and women, the text develops a titillating semi-pornographic theme --sexual licence for women remaining in London while their husbands are at the wars-- into a sexual metaphor for the infidelity of Charles I with the "evil counsellors" who have seduced and drawn him from his faithful spouse, Parliament. The *Parliament of Ladies* and *New Exchange* pamphlets, however, treat the reversal of male/female rôles and the increased sexual promiscuity among the wives of Parliamentarians with sensational relish. Nevertheless, the later pamphlets parodying Parliamentary forms, particularly *The Ladies Remonstrance* (1656), develop the idea of the emasculation of Parliament and the imbalance of power between man and woman. The inversions of Parliamentary forms (resolutions, acts, proceedings) in these pamphlets are literary analogues of the social and political reversals produced in the Civil Wars. Ultimately, the beheading of Charles I in 1649, the emblematic rejection of the social order represented in the monarch, marks the moment of truly radical repudiation of social, political, and cultural norms.

Until that juncture, however, the dissociation between past and present was unimaginable, and the notions of order enshrined in images such as the Ptolemaic cosmology belonged to the common cultural matrix. Nevertheless, the 1640s were not the 1590s, when the Marprelate outbreak was controlled and localised without great difficulty, and such works as Anton's *The Philosopher's Satyrs* were credible representations of contemporary social and political order, not merely idealistic or utopian; the destabilisation of Caroline

order, reflected in the degeneration of the masque, could not be halted by printing Bacon's *A Wise and Moderate Discourse*.

The Recantation of the Prelate of Canterbury (1641) is representative of how a cultural given --represented in the sphere model of social order-- functions in satire critical of the established order, in this case of the abuses of Archbishop Laud and the bishops.¹⁹ The satirical process of inverting a conservative application of a cultural given works particularly well in this "recantation" since it purports to be spoken by Laud himself, the great champion of the established order. The parody of Laud's at times expansive style inverts the conservative rhetoric of, for instance, his Star Chamber Speech against the "libellers" Prynne, Burton and Bastwick in 1637. The form of *The Recantation*, both palinody and parody, allows the satirist to rehearse the crimes of which Laud stood accused, the form of a confession and admission of guilt making it doubly effective.

The mock-commendatory poem to the "ever much esteemed, and most deserving Friend, the Authour of this *Palinodia*", signed "P.A.", extols the "grace" with which the author wounds his Grace the Archbishop and his fellow prelates:

Whilst thou un-mytr'st Prelats, lo! we bow
To gather gracious Garlands for thy brow.
And 'cause thou wound'st them with so sweet a grace,

¹⁹ The *Recantation* reworks most of the Articles Exhibited In Parliament Against William Archbishop of Canterbury (1640) such as the following:

- 6. He assumed capitall power over his Majesties Subjects, and denied his power to be from the king.
- 7. By Doctrine and otherwise he went about to subvert Religion, and to set up Papists and superstition.
- 14. ...brought in many superstitions and innovations, as in the Church of Scotland, and procured the King to breake the pacification, and to bring in a bloody Warre.

They cannot grudge, but smiling on thy face,
 Must humbly kiss the Rod: So, make thy way
 Through glories aire, untill the vulgar eie
 Forget thee, and aethereall thou appeare
 Vnto the sons of wisdom, like a cleere
 And select Star, which cannot deigne to bow,
 And court the empty vapours here below. (¶v)

The tone is heavily ironic in introducing themes and images that will condemn Laud later in *The Recantation*, for the object of the commendation is both the author of the satire and Laud, "Authour of this *Palinodia*". The images in these commendatory verses of exaltation, apotheosis, and courting vanities refer ironically to the actual author of *The Recantation* and satirically to "Laud", the fictional author of the recantation. The images anticipate those in the satire proper, where Laud emerges as the type of Sejanus, corrupting political and ecclesiastical power for his own ends in the great scheme to destroy the church in England and raise a Romish Babel on the ruins.

The opening of *The Recantation*, in an ecclesiastical style fitting to the person and occasion, acknowledges the dispensing power of God even in matters of "policy" and politic ambition:

Though the wicked hath settled his habitation with the
 Eagle among the Starres, and say in his minde, I shall not
 be changed, I shall not taste of affliction, neither shall
 the dayes of Adversity lay hold on me, yet there is an
 appointed time for all things. (A1r)

In particular, "Laud" spells it out for the remaining prelates:

I have embraced that Shaddow which ye so hotly court; I
 have been lift up to the Pinacle of the Temple, where all
 ye so zealously aspire, and was gazed upon as a starre,
 which gave life, and motion to you all. (A2r)

This passage refers back to the commendatory verses where the apotheosised "Authour of this *Palinodia*" appears:

like a cleere
 And select Star, which cannot deigne to bow,

And court the empty vapours here below.

Courting shadows and "empty vapours" echoes the "all is vanity" refrain of Ecclesiastes. The passage also alludes to Christ's third temptation to hurl Himself from the pinnacle of the temple (Luke 4: 9-12), suggesting that Satan brought Laud to the apex of the hierarchical pyramid of the church, here figuratively "the Pinnacle of the Temple". But the Archbishop, directly contradicting his Exemplar for life and office, welcomes the temptation and falls to his ruin. Then there is the double pun in "zealously aspire": "zealous", usually taken derisively from the Puritan lexicon by their mockers, here applies ironically to the prelatical party, and "aspire" both expresses earnest desire ("hotly court") and echoes "the Pinnacle of the Temple", the scene of temptation and fall. Finally, Laud usurps the position of *primum mobile*, ascribed to God --and to monarchs in poetry of praise and in Jacobean and Caroline masques-- as the intelligence of the spheres, the disposer of all things ("For in him we live, and move, and have our being", Acts 17:28). *The Recantation* re-casts in a satirical mould, in the context of evil ambition and still loaded with moral implication, the sphere imagery of Jonson's *Sejanus* and Bacon's *Essays*. It makes ironic use of conservative ideology, yet without dismantling the sphere model of society.

The theme of majesty offended (*crimen maiestatis*), so vital to Bacon's conception of religion and monarchy, also plays a role in *The Recantation*. Speaking of his failed attempt to force a new Service Book on Scotland ("poyson... imperiously presented to them"), "Laud" acknowledges that his motives were far from pure:

as if Supreame Majesty had been violated, Monarchy
affronted, and a Royal Prerogative many wayes injured, I
armed Authority against them, and made such strange

pretences, dissembling a Zeale to the honour of the Crowne
(which meane while I was trampling under-foote)... (B3r)

To consolidate the political power of the bishops, and presumably still under the false pretense of preserving the "Supreme Majesty" of the monarch, "Laud":

had so cunningly interlaced the Image of the Beast, with His Majesties Pourtrait, that none durst invey against the one, but presently behoved to injure the other (thus caught within the compasse of Treason,) by a strange Divinty, assuring the world, that the Crowne could not flourish on the Kings head, without the Fellowship of a Miter. (A4r)

The identification of Charles I with the church-devouring Beast (Revelation 13ff) promoted by "Laud's" propaganda in his Sejanus-like policy, implicates "Laud" of the double *crimen maiestatis*, destroying both religion and the monarchy. In January 1645, Archbishop William Laud was executed for high treason.

The political power of Laud's "Inquisition" (A4r), a reference to the High Commission and church courts empowered by the "Ex Officio" Oath, was further manifested in the Archbishop's control of the press, what "Laud" calls in *The Recantation* his power "to muzzell the times" (C3v):

because the Printers Presse did often speake the times,
and tell the world the mystery of my Episcopising,
therefore did I arrogate to my selfe the keys thereof, and
making the power of Printing dependent on me, did shut and
open the same at my pleasure. (B1r)

Not only does "Laud" indict himself, the notion that the press speaks "the times" echoes Bacon's backhanded compliment, recalled by Milton in *Areopagitica*, that there is "a certaine sparke of truth" in forbidden writing.²⁰ The very appearance of *The Recantation* testifies

²⁰ Francis Bacon, *A Wise and Moderate Discourse* (1641), C2r.

to the failure of censorship and to the victory of "the bolder pens" (C3v) that "Laud", by his own admission, could not suppress. In "Laud's" last will and testament, "the bolder pens" sound their triumph over suppression from Laud's own mouth. Unlike the speeches of villains on the scaffold, the last will and testament to a specific, close audience (like the death-bed address of a venerable man) has the status of prophecy. By making "Laud" voluntarily admit guilt to all accusations in this form, the satire offers its own, internal authorisation, allowing "Laud" to authorise even the pasquils and verse satires against him.

In *The Recantation*, "Laud" pleads guilty to the charges of his accusers, reproducing in full several satires and pasquils against him. These satires-within-the-satire are in fact new verse satires, autonomous but curiously fitting to the work that surrounds and foregrounds them. They are presented to his followers as evidence of "the world's estimation" (C2v), what "Laud" sees as verses to be strewn on his hearse, the inversion of the traditional respect for the dead, as in the verses that immortalized Edward King ("Lycidas", 1637).

Lo here another monument of my fame, for I thought good to
shew you with what honourable Elegies they resolve to
attend my Herse, that yee may be acquainted with your
Panegyricks before they be engraven on your Tombe....
(C3r)

"Laud" significantly urges his followers to take seriously the "little flourishes" or satirical pamphlets since "in them as in a mirrour, yee may discover the minde of the people" (C4r). Many images in the verse satires quoted by "Laud", such as the tall cedar troubled by lightning or the Romish whore, appear in the satire

proper, but none as significantly as that of now-familiar disordered planets:

Like to a blazing Comet in the North
 Drowning the Neighbour Stars, and casting forth
 A floud of fire, that poyson'd all the aire,
 And darkn'd the light, thou didst ere-while appeare,
Sulphureous Meteor, dangling in the skie,
 Thou thoughtst thou couldst the Sun with beauty die,
 And Soveraignly presumedst to dispence
 On everything thy usurped influence
 Base, putrid vapour, which some gentle rayes,
 When *Phoebus* smiling on the Centre plays,
 Hath lately but exhal'd, and with his beams
 Hath so so deeply gilded, that it seems
 Thou art a Star indeed, 'Cause thou didst mock
 The Moon and heavenly bodies and provoke,
 Climbing with jealousie as thy crown,
 Like *Lucifer* thou dyest, and are thrown down. (C3r)

The two similes that frame this verse description of Laud offer a double account of the rise and fall of the "Sulphureous Meteor". The naturalistic image of a "blazing Comet" introduces the astronomic allegory of Phoebus and the Meteor, and describes the sudden appearance of Laud among the heavenly bodies. The human attributes of the Meteor (thinking, presuming, mocking) add moral qualities to the idea of a comet as usurper, a notion culminating in the comparison with Lucifer, the fallen light-bearer. A meteor has no place in the heavens simply by its definition as "A luminous body seen temporarily in the sky, and supposed to belong to a lower region than that of the heavenly bodies" (*OED*, sb.2a). The epithet "Sulphureous" specifies how low the region of its origin is, "sulphur" having associations with hell, an association reinforced by the comparison with Lucifer. Phoebus in this moral allegory not surprisingly represents Charles I, whose "gentle rayes" gild the Sulphureous Meteor to seem like a star indeed. Elsewhere in *The Recantation*, sun imagery denotes abstractly "the Spirit of truth"

(A4r), traditionally depicted with a sun in her right hand;²¹

concretely it describes Parliament, in related but significantly political terms:

If we dare not for the illegality of these Canons, appeare before that powerfull Sun-beame (the Estates of Parliament) which doth melt us like Snow, and make us ashamed like Bats and Owls, where shall we stand for their impietie in the great day of our reckoning. (C1r)

But Parliament in *The Recantation* does not replace the monarch as sun to the other planets in the traditional image of cosmic hierarchy. Parliament represents the extension or emanation, rather than the essence, of "the Spirit of truth" that discloses all things for judgement: a "Sun-beame" rather than the sun itself. In the "Sulphureous Meteor" verses, Phoebus is not criminally guilty in gilding a meteor while passively "smiling" indiscriminately on earth, "the Centre" of the universe; by analogy, Charles cannot be accused of being more than misguided in bestowing favour. The crime is presumption and usurpation, and the guilty party is "Laud" who earlier in *The Recantation* admits that "All my pretentions were deeply gilded with the Beams of Authority" (A4r).

Robert Anton's *The Philosophers Satyrs* had made no mention of a rôle for parliament in the notion of monarch as sun. The Catholic threat to England ("*Sulphureous practice, hatcht in hell*", D2v) vanished with James I's ascension to the throne:

So, when our *Brittish Sunne*, rose from his *East*,
His *Kingly beames*, with *triple honours* blest,
Burnisht our *mufled darknesse*, with such *rayes*,
As gaue a *spritefull length*, to our *blacke dayes*:
The *troubled ayre*, ingrost with *Icie-feares*,
Daun'st at the *musick*, of the *iocund Spheares*:
That then, if er'e *Pythagoras* did not lie,

²¹ For example, Bernini's *Truth* or Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia*. See D.J. Gordon, *The Renaissance Imagination*, 51-4.

In *Diapasons*, kept true *harmonie*.... (D2v)

The translators of the Authorised Version are more restrained than Anton in their use of the sun-image for James. They mention the threat of "some thick and palpable clouds of darkness" in the period after "the setting of that bright *Occidental Star*, *Queen Elizabeth*" and before the ascension of James:

the appearance of Your Majesty, as of the *Sun* in his strength, instantly dispelled those supposed and surmised mists.

The image of the king as the light of truth in dispelling error is not unusual in the Tudor and Jacobean periods. But the replacement in *The Recantation* of the king by parliament as agent of truth, if not actively revising the sphere model of political supremacy, at least reflects the expectations that many people had from the Long Parliament.²² The unpublished diary of Robert Woodford (at New College, Oxford) provides a good example:

thou [God] seest how the wicked Bps limbs of him [the Antichrist of Rome] here in this Kingdome have even darkened the sunne in the heavens thereof, and brought up a fog over the whole nacon, Lord cast them off roote and branch.... Strengthen the Parliamt to that end.²³

The "Sulphurous Meteor" image is taken up further in *The Recantation*. "Laud" elsewhere characterises prelacy's attendant baggage --impediments to the light of true religion-- as the "tail of the comet":

How many Rites, and Orders and Ceremonies, and Comick follies, & novations... doe attend that Antichristian Prelacie, as a tail of the Comet doth follow the

²² On the national euphoria at the beginning of the Long Parliament and the hopes for settlement, see Anthony Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London: Arnold Edward, 1981), 1-2.

²³ John Fielding, "Opposition to the Personal Rule of Charles I: the diary of Robert Woodford, 1637-1641", *Historical Journal*, 31, 4 (1988), 787.

imperfect mistion of the vanishing body, which must all be drowned in the clouds of shame, when the Sun comes forth in Majesty like a valiant Champion, to chase ungracious darknesse from the face of heaven and earth? (E3r)²⁴

The "horrid preheminance" of prelacy is unnatural and contravenes divinely created order and discipline:

No wonder wee have so long troubled the calme of Church and Common-wealth, because being lift up to the unnatural places of preferment, we are out of our Element, and so cannot give rest to our selves, nor the world. (E3r)

"Element" can have a double significance in this context, generally as "ordinary range of activity; the appropriate sphere of operation of any agency" (*OED*, 12) or precisely as "One of the 'heavens' or celestial spheres" (*OED*, 10b). Then, too, the elements formed the basis of the material diapason in God's stringed instrument the universe, fixed by God in their natural places in the great chain of being. When men are raised to "unnatural places" out of their "Element" or a "Sulphureous Meteor" exerts its "usurped influence" on celestial bodies, degree is taken away, the string untuned, and all hell breaks loose.

The Recantation of the Prelate of Canterbury is "opposition" satire in that it criticises more than gross episcopal abuses, which is a central concern of much English complaint literature and satire. Like many satires launched against Laud in the early 1640s, it condemns the very basis of church government by bishops. But paradoxically, whilst satirically attacking an institution of authority so closely connected with the hierarchy emblemized in the Ptolemaic cosmology, it also affirms this model of providential

²⁴ The image of the sun coming forth "in Majesty like a valiant Champion" comes from Psalm 19: 4-6.

social order. The Machiavellian policy that projects Sejanus and "Laud" into forbidden spheres of control is condemned, but the sphere-model of society is maintained by both Jonson and the author of *The Recantation*. Rather than negate the ideals of social harmony and order which Bacon and the court masque present, *The Recantation* paradoxically affirms them.

5.3. Conclusion.

The 1640s witnessed the development of the formal satire of the late Elizabethan period to the rough-hewn satire produced during the Civil War. The recognition by writers across the political spectrum of the possibilities of satire written in the popular idiom as a socially effective medium produced the flood of pamphlets recorded in Thomason and Wing; more than one satirist refers to Juvenal's motto concerning the times:

Then what one say'd, I now avow,
Tis not hard to write Satyrs now.²⁵

Raman Selden, discussing the notion of "roughness" in formal satire, concludes that the "fine raillery" of Restoration satire, eschewing the virulence associated with Juvenal and Persius, is a synthesis of two kinds of roughness:

In respect of tone, the Horatian tradition tries to temper roughness rather than displace it entirely:... the vituperative element in satire is never totally abnegated. In respect of versification, the more 'romantic' satirists regard roughness as a stylistic property of the genre, but the classicists consider it primitive and unpolished, accepting, however, in plain style genres, a 'negligent' prosody which is without abruptness or inelegance.²⁶

Aside from John Cleveland, Civil War satirists do not feature in Selden's otherwise excellent book on English verse satire, nor are they considered in the article on "roughness".²⁷ On the other hand,

²⁵ *Times Whirligig* (1646), A4r.

²⁶ "Roughness in Satire from Horace to Dryden", *Modern Language Review*, 66 (1971), 272. See also P.K. Elkin, *The Augustan Defence of Satire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 146-166.

²⁷ *English Verse Satire, 1590-1750* (London: Unwin, 1978).

Margaret Anne Doody illustrates the influence of Civil War verse on Augustan practice, but without describing the poetics of 1640s satire.²⁸ Dryden, in repudiating rough satire, is reacting to the predominantly Juvenalian character of satire in the mid-seventeenth century, as well as to its Archilochean intentions; Cleveland and Oldham, both of whom Dryden chides for "strong" lines, refer explicitly to the effective force of *iambic* satire. The urbanity and elegance of Horatian satire in the Restoration responds to the harshness of satire in the 1640s and 50s, the apparent lawlessness of which is the corollary of social, political and ecclesiastical discord; the classicism of the latter decades of the seventeenth century re-defines literary theory and practice, imposing an orderliness perceived as being absent from the years of upheaval.

The "roughness" of tone and versification is a conscious feature of the poetics of 1640s satire, as Milton's threat in *Colasterion* (1645) demonstrates:

I may bee driv'n to curle up this gliding prose into a rough
Sotadic, that shall rime him into such a condition, as instead
of judging good Books to bee burnt by the executioner, hee
shall be readier to be his own hangman. (II.757)

Rather than abandoning notions of decorum and propriety, Milton and other satirical writers in the 1640s redeploy them, embracing the conventions of the *iambos* of Archilochus rather than the *sermo* of Horace. Seen in the context of the rituals of ridicule practised in the popular cultures of England and Europe, the popular idiom of Civil War satire assumes the effective power of iambic curse. Certainly, the book market is a significant factor in forming the

²⁸ Margaret Anne Doody, *The Daring Muse: Augustan Poetry Reconsidered* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

popular mode: the single-sheet quarto pamphlets could be produced very quickly and inexpensively, and be distributed immediately throughout London and into the counties. In situations of political and social instability, the consumption of news-related printed items dramatically increases, and those with interests to protect or arguments to advance seized upon the marketability of popular pamphlets. The physical factor works in tandem with the idea that the printed word can effect material change. The three significant aspects of 1640s satire which this thesis has explored --infernal or divine, iconoclastic, and typographical satire-- are associated in the notion that the printed word performs what it represents: the poet is welcomed into hell, the bishop is defaced, and the presbyterian is reduced to a mere typographical mark *by means of the representation*. The contention between heaven and hell, the incapacitation of the senses, and the necessity of cosmic order --three central factors in the seventeenth-century ethos-- are the motivating fears which produce the virulent words of abuse and vituperation in the satirical pamphlets of the Civil War years.

Thus, although he concentrates upon "formal" verse satire at the exclusion of "popular" and prose satire, Raman Selden has identified in the concept of "roughness" a key to the satire of the 1640s. The terms "subversion" and "conservatism" describe the antithetical projects of polarised groupings: the former seeks to undermine the established structures of authority which the latter aims to retain. As revisionist historians of the English Civil War have demonstrated repeatedly, the continual movement within what were formerly described as homogeneous ideological positions renders Whig

and Marxist historiography unrealistic, even misleading. The opposition to Charles I at the beginning of the Long Parliament, like the opposition to Charles II grouped around Shaftesbury in the 1680s, consisted of various elements which became progressively less cohesive; although pairings of adjectives such as "Parliamentary" and "Royalist", "Puritan" and "Cavalier", provide shorthand descriptions in general terms, they do little justice to the political and ecclesiastical circumstances or to the individuals the terms are meant to describe.

What unites the satirists of the various ideological positions is the adoption of the popular idiom and its correlative "roughness". The stylistic features of satire in the 1640s, both prose and verse, are in direct contrast to the requirements of the Restoration satirists such as Dryden; the prose satires of post-Restoration Marvell, on the other hand, retain both the plainness and directness of the preceding decades. The satire of the Civil War adopts the popular idiom as the means of effecting political change, and the rhetorical strategies of 1640s satire set aside the Elizabethan scruples regarding particular satire, by which the Bishops in 1599 banned texts that were "rough" in both manner and matter.²⁹

However, the strategies used in the 1590s to contain the expression of anti-prelatical sentiment in satirical texts were ineffectual in the 1640s; the political climate had changed so dramatically by 1641 that the publication of Francis Bacon's *A Wise and Moderate Discourse* (1598) was almost irrelevant. The satirical

²⁹ See Richard A. McCabe, "Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599", *Yearbook of English Studies* 11 (1981), 188-193.

attacks on the bishops in 1640-41, especially those against Archbishop Laud, could not be restrained by the means traditionally employed by the Star Chamber. Instead, the defense of episcopacy had to be made through satirical counter-attacks against separatists and sectarians using the medium with which the bishops were assaulted. This medium, the quarto pamphlet, together with the "rough" popular idiom in which it spoke, became the vehicle of criticism and defense, of subversion and conservatism, in the 1640s.

APPENDIX

A Satyr Against Hypocrites: Milton and Popular Satire

- (i) Introduction
- (ii) The Structure of *A Satyr Against Hypocrites*
- (iii) Education
- (iv) Ramism: The conjugacy of thing/word and word/deed
- (v) "*Exempla domestica*"
- (vi) Reason
- (vii) Music
- (viii) Milton's "popular" influence

APPENDIX: A Satyr Against Hypocrites: Milton and Popular Satire

(i) Introduction.

Whereas most critical attention has dealt with John Phillips only in connection with the life of Milton, an examination of his nephew's *A Satyr Against Hypocrites* (1655) suggests that Milton's influence was substantial.¹ W.R. Parker, Milton's biographer, remarks sympathetically on the burden Phillips had to bear throughout his physical and artistic life of being John Milton's nephew, burdened by the anxiety of influence.² Parker's fair-minded appraisal of Phillips's literary achievement does not descend into the moralizing conclusion of, for instance, the entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, that Phillips "soon chafed against his uncle's strict discipline and principles, and abandoned all pretence of acquiescence."³ However natural --and gratifying perhaps-- it is to focus on the apparent failure of Milton's utopian curriculum in the case of his own nephew, such an approach is inappropriate when

¹ I have used the *Augustan Reprint Society* (No. 38) facsimile of the first edition, introduced by Leon Howard (Los Angeles: University of California, 1953), as well as the manuscript copy with the dedicatory letter to John Churchill (Bodleian Library MS.Rawl.Poet. 30).

² W.R. Parker, *Milton: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), II. 1169n96: "It must have been difficult being a writer known as the nephew and former amanuensis of a really great writer!"

³ q.v. "Phillips, John (1631-1706)".

analyzing John Phillips's work. The relationship eschews such a simplistic interpretation. The rhetorical analysis of *A Satyr Against Hypocrites* in this essay will demonstrate that Phillips's moral vision in *A Satyr* is close to Milton's in many ways.

(ii) The Structure of *A Satyr Against Hypocrites*.

The opening twenty lines of *A Satyr Against Hypocrites* form the first half of a traditional satirical frame: the satirist has observed something amiss in society and ventures forth to discover the cause. The speaker has the air of an innocent, naïve seeker after truth, a *simplicius simplicissimus*, intending no harm and unsuspecting as to what he might uncover. In Peter Hausted's *A Satyre Against Separatists* (1642), to which Phillips is indebted, the speaker has pre-judged his subject prior to the satire and states his intention to expose the errors of Separatism:

As't haps its Sunday too,
And the chiefe *Rabbies* preach. To church i'le goe.... (A1v)

The reader of *A Satyr Against Hypocrites*, however, is much more subtly induced to accept the satirist's persona of an objective reporter, to see with his eyes, and to assent to the picture that will unfold: the reader becomes one with the speaking voice in the rôle of passive observer, and is disingenuously seduced into trusting the speaker from the outset. Although the suspicious reader is aware that he is being led ("Ile lead ye round the Church from pew to pew, / And shew you what doth most deserve your view", A3r), he is forcibly controlled by the satirist's point of view and selective vision.

The speaker states that the satire is *epideictic* in the etymological sense of the word, that is, with the intent "to display" hypocrisy. In this way, satire as a genre subverts the traditional function of epideictic speech which serves to praise the object of attention, as in a sonneteer's praise of his beloved or the description of Belphoebe in *The Faerie Queene* (II.iii.22f.). The description of the "Chamber-maid" (A3v) is an example of the subversion of rhetorical praise, turning epideictic display into mock-blazon:

O what a glosse her forehead smooth adorns!
 Excelling *Phoebe* with her silver horns.
 It tempts a man at first, yet strange to utter,
 When one comes neere, fogh gudds, it stinks of butter. (A3v)

The description of the "Chamber-maid" comes to a grating halt with the appropriately inelegant "fogh gudds" (121) with which the speaker's intended praise turns, involuntarily almost, into blame.⁴ The rhetorical mode of satire conforms to Aphthonius's definition of *vituperatio* as:

A speech which exposes the bad.... We can castigate those things we can praise - people, things, times, places, animals, plants and so on.⁵

A pattern emerges in *A Satyr* no matter what comes to the speaker's attention, whether it is the righteous zeal to worship God or the exercise of Christian liberty: what is traditionally praiseworthy inevitably deserves blame. In part, the reversal of the natural order of things reflects the carnivalesque quality of the satire,

⁴ "fogh", obs. var. of "faugh": "an exclamation of abhorrence or disgust"; "gudds" a "deformation of GOD" (O.E.D.).

⁵ L. Sonnino, *A Handbook to Sixteenth-Century Rhetoric* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968), 232.

when the sacred becomes absurdly secular, the spiritual becomes carnal, and the godly becomes ungodly.

(iii) Education.

As epideictic and vituperative verse, *A Satyr Against Hypocrites* follows the notion that satire is didactic: it ridicules vice and folly with the intent to correct and instruct. But the matter of education is of more specific and greater importance to Phillips in his conception of satire generally and in *A Satyr Against Hypocrites* in specific. For Milton, the purpose of education, similar to that expressed in Sidney's *Apology for Poetry*, is to teach virtuous knowledge and action:

The end then of learning is to repair the ruins of our first parents by regaining to know God aright, and out of that knowledge to love him, to imitate him, to be like him, as we may the neerest by possessing our souls of true vertue, which being united to the heavenly grace of faith makes up the highest perfection. (*Of Education*, II.366-7)⁶

The Biblical inseparability of ethical knowledge and action (as in James 1:22) not only informs the concept of the end of education in Milton and Sidney, it also provides the Biblical definition of hypocrisy. The unpublished dedication of *A Satyr Against Hypocrites* makes explicit Phillips's condemnation of

the worst of hypocrites, who taking on them to be Rabby's and Instructors of others, who pretending to know the Laws of the Almighty, and dissembling thir mission from him, yet neither keep those Laws themselves, nor teach them aright to others. So that while they hold forth thir false lights, thir Ignis Fatuos, men are lead, or rather gulld by them into thir

⁶ Cf. *Paradise Regained*, II.473-80 and III.7-11.

destruction.⁷

Phillips is well aware of the Biblical precedents for such vatic rage against "priests" of lawlessness and deception, as the reference to Elijah (that "holy Israelite") and the Baal priests on Mount Carmel (749-53) evinces. The epigraph to the satire could fittingly have been Hosea 4:6:

My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children.

The attack, made in the parody of a sermon and in the priests' behaviour, is further made explicit in the concluding section of the satire.

But while they doe their strict injunctions preach,
Deny in actions what their words doe teach....
Yet if they can no better teach than thus,
Would they would onely teach themselves, not us:
So while they still on empty out-sides dwell,
They may perhaps be choakt with husk and shell:
While those, who can their follies well refute,
By a true knowledge, doe obtaine the fruit. (C4r-v)

(iv) Ramism: The conjugacy of thing/word and word/deed.

The image of the husk and kernel ("empty out-sides" and "the fruit") aptly caps the theme of sensual gluttony prominent throughout the satire. The image also connects Phillips with the Renaissance

⁷ It is not clear why the dedication was never published; F.L. Beaty, "The Life and Works of John Phillips (1631-1706)", Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1950, 40, speculates how the satire came to be attributed to Edward Phillips, but does not consider why John Phillips did not include the dedication in later editions, of which there were eight in his lifetime.

rhetorical tradition of *res et verba* and of the notion of language as the medium of the moral message. Milton believed that language must be used for acquiring knowledge already from the earliest stages of education, for "language is but the instrument conveying to us things usefull to be known"; the sign and its significance (the *signifiant* and its *signifié*) are inseparable, as are the word and its meaning or sense ("the solid things in them [languages] as well as the words and lexicons", *Of Education*, II.369). With the added Protestant emphasis on the Word (*sola scriptura*), it is not surprising, therefore, that Phillips aims the brunt of his attack primarily against the preachers who do not expound Scripture for the edification of the flock and that he does so by parodying a separatist sermon. Milton lashes out in "Lycidas" against the prelates who fail to provide the divine food for the flock ("The hungry Sheep look up, and are not fed," 125); Phillips applies the image to the "priests" of the separatist clergy. He elaborates it further by turning the spiritual hunger and thirsting after righteousness (Matthew 5:6) into the carnal gluttony of the preacher and well-to-do members, giving sensuous descriptions of food (C1r) to a nauseating degree, with an effect similar to that generated by the banquet-scene temptation in *Paradise Regained* (II.337-65). The answer which Jesus explicitly gives and which Phillips implies, is, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God" (Luke 4:4). References to food pervade the *Satyr*, from the

poore Matrons stuck with Lice like Cloves,
Devoutly come to worship their white loaves (A2r),

to "the good flock-Feeder" (A3r), who in fact serves his own belly and whose "his first mover" (C1v) is food. The spiritual starvation

is captured in the figure of "old Robin", the epitome of Biblical malnutrition, enslaved to the Word "chained to his waste" (A2r) which he cannot read; as such he is an absurd version of the conceit of man as a library of one.

It was noted earlier that Sidney and Milton considered knowledge and action as inseparable, and that Milton conceived of language as a means of conveying matter. Both concepts, the double conjugacy of thing/word and word/deed, entwine in a Christian rhetoric that evolves naturally from Ramism where language is the means by which the poet (or orator) brings the reader (or auditor) to the thing signified in the word. Gabriel Harvey's instructions to students of rhetoric in *Ciceronianus* (1577) are typical of this: "Remember that words are called by Homer *pteroenta*, that is, winged, since they easily fly away, unless they are kept in equilibrium by the weightiness of the subject matter.... be not only speakers of words, but also doers of deeds."⁸ Milton himself received a Ramist training at Cambridge, and his *Art of Logic* provides further evidence of Ramist influence. That Milton passed his interest in Ramus on to his nephew pupils is clear from the treatise on logic and dialectic in Edward Phillips's *Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* (1658), which clearly betrays Milton's influence.⁹ Milton also alludes to the related ideas of *res et verba* and word/deed in *Of Education* when he attacks the "ragged notions and babblements" (II.375) of the clergy. Of course, Phillips is not proposing a Ramist system of rhetoric in

⁸ Gabriel Harvey, *Ciceronianus*, C.A. Forbes, trans. (Lincoln, Na: University of Nebraska, 1945), 83.

⁹ See J. Milton French, "Milton, Ramus, and Edward Phillips", *Modern Philology* 47 (1949), 82-7.

the kernel and husk image at the conclusion to the *Satyr*;
nevertheless, the hypocrite's inability to conjoin deed with word,
literally vital to Sidney and Milton, is the target of Phillips's
attack.

The parody of the sermon provides Phillips with the opportunity
to display the "rhetoric" of sectarian preaching and supplies further
evidence that Phillips knew enough about Ramist logic and rhetoric to
pinpoint its essential hypocrisy. The text which the priest takes is
not a passage from Scripture, but proceeds from the fancy of the
preacher, presumably with divine inspiration.

*Make haste and doe not tarry,
But unto Babylon thy dinner carry,
There doth young Daniel want in the Den,
Thrown among Lyons by hard-hearted men. (B2v-B3r)*

The subsequent division and exposition of the text --a salient
feature of the nonconformist sermon-- deviates excessively from the
Ramist emphasis on coherence in structure.¹⁰ The first division of
the text ("*make haste and doe not tarry*") is no more than a
tautological exercise in vacuity. The essential question, "Why? my
Beloved", is indeed a pertinent and profound one --Ramus considered
cause as vital-- but the preacher meets the challenge with empty
tautologies:

...these words great force doe carry.
Au! 'tis a waundrous emphaticall speech,
Some men Beloved, as if th' had lead i' their breech,
Doe walk, and some (as snails) doe creep as fast:
Truly, my Brethren, these men doe not make haste. (B3r)¹¹

¹⁰ W.F. Mitchell, *English Pulpit Oratory* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1932), discusses the rhetorical method of the Puritan sermon, 112-3.

¹¹ Sonnino, *Handbook*, 6, on Ramus.

The "Use" or practical application of the doctrine of these words ("But be ye quick, dear Sisters, be ye quick", B3r) is bathetically banal and pregnant with sexual innuendo. The second division ("*To Babylon*") also has the potential of a Scriptural explanation; the preacher instead castigates in unveiled invective against the fashionable seventeenth-century dupe, the Pope. The third division ("*Thy dinner carry*") is a ludicrously inappropriate topic for a Fast sermon, and the preacher launches into mouth-watering depiction of imagined dinners, but by rhetorical negation, verbally pulls the food from before the auditors. The "use" derived from this division paradoxically undermines the entire purpose for the mid-week service and promotes the promiscuous, indiscriminate eating ("Better eat any thing than not at all", B3v) to which the parson later gives rein. The preacher alleges to give the "reason" for his conclusion; rather he engages in word-association (not the "matter-association" of pure rhetoric) and disabuses both church and state.

Although one of the first, Richard Hooker was not alone in warning against the politically subversive nature of the nonconformist rash; Thomas Edwards's *Gangraena* (1646) is representative of the growing fear among Presbyterians of radical sects, and the anti-Brownist satires of John Taylor reflect a stance similar to that of Phillips's in *A Satyr Against Hypocrites*. The parodied sermon soon turns into a tirade against monarchy and episcopacy, and into a call for separatist withdrawal from society. In quasi-Biblical language, the preacher enters upon the facile interpretation (such as that offered in the marginal notes to the Bible published in 1642 by John Canne, the notorious Fifth

Monarchist) that:

By Lyons are meant Monarchs, Kings of Nations...
 Truly dear friends, these Kings and Governours,
 These Byshops too, nay all superiour powers,
 Why they are Lyons, Locusts, Whales, I Whales, beloved,
 Off goes our ears if once their wrath be moved;
 But woe unto you Kings! woe to you Princes! (B3v-B4r)

The preacher implicates himself doubly by echoing Christ's solemn warnings against hypocrisy ("But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites", Matthew 23:13, 16) in predicting the downfall of "all superiour powers".¹² Even the sermon provides Phillips an opportunity to attack the ubiquitous sensuality of the sectaries in the ribald pun on "Habacuck" (B4r), a learned double *double entendre* since the name means "love's embrace" in Hebrew.

That Phillips exaggerates the charge of lasciviousness and gluttony is not an issue; exaggeration of salient features plays a vital rôle in satirical portrayal and provides the rhetorical means to bring ridicule upon the victim. Nor is the militant millenarianism of the "sermon" a gross exaggeration of the prophecies of Fifth Monarchists even in the 1650s.¹³ The more extreme forms of nonconformity did indeed develop a liberation theology which not only freed believers from the authority of the state and church, such as the Ranters, but also freed believers from a literal interpretation

¹² The marginal note to these lines, "And hey then up goe we", alludes to the refrain of "The Roundhead's Race", found in *Rump Songs*, i.66. (From *The Distraction of Our Times* (1642) quoted by W.P. Holden, *Anti-Puritan Satire, 1572-1640* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), 64 n6).

¹³ See, for example, Bernard Capp, "Popular Millenerianism" in J.F. McGregor and B. Reay, edd., *Radical Religion in the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 165-89. M.R. Watts, *The Dissenters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), I.148f, discusses among others John Canne and his Fifth Monarchy predictions.

of the law, such as extreme antinomians, Mortalists and others who denied the physical existence of heaven and hell, and who considered sins of the flesh as inconsequential. In portraying the lawlessness of some, by synecdoche Phillips attacks the lawlessness of all, as in the blatant sensuousness of the parson (C3r). Phillips seizes on the antinomian aspect of nonconformity, not only because it engages the political subversiveness of separatism. The fundamental aspect of antinomianism is an antagonism to the rule of the law, frequently expressed in the superficial contradiction between "spirit" and "letter". The antinomian heresy, then, is essentially a rhetorical heresy for the nexus of *res et verba* is transcended to such a degree that the word of the law no longer retains any ethical significance. Physical lasciviousness in *A Satyr Against Hypocrites* functions as a metaphor for spiritual impurity; an analogous interrelatedness occurs in the twin perversions of rhetoric (*res et verba*) and ethics (word and deed).

(v) "*Exempla domestica*".

Phillips's rhetorical education undoubtedly also included the classical conception of the orator as *vir bonus*, and Milton's notion of the teacher as *exemplum bonum* is a third educational principle that is central to Phillips's anti-clerical attack. Milton outlines the effective means of instruction; a good teacher uses:

Art, and proper eloquence to catch them with, what with mild and effectually persuasions, and what with the intimation of some fear, if need be, *but chiefly by his own example*, might in a short space gain them to an incredible diligence and courage: infusing into their young breasts such an ingenuous and noble

ardor, as would not fail to make many of them renowned and matchless men. (*Of Education*, II.385; italics mine)

This picture of the efficacious method of the teacher can be applied, point for point, to the ideal preacher. The stress on the example of the instructor is not unusual; Chaucer's Parson provides the English model ("Wel oughte a preest ensample for to yive / By his clenness how that his sheep sholde live").¹⁴ The Roman satirical model is Juvenal's Fourteenth Satire, from which Phillips quotes an essential idea on the title page of the first edition of the *Satyr*:

----Velocius & citius nos----
Corrumpunt vitiorum exempla domestica, magnis
Cum subeant animos autoribus.¹⁵

Phillips quotes Juvenal not merely to lend his satire credence, as became the fashion after Joseph Hall's *Virgidemiarum* (1598) and John Marston's *The Scovrge of Villainie* (1599), nor simply "as evidence of the author's classical education" as F.L. Beaty has suggested.¹⁶ Rather, the moral responsibility of figures of authority as rôle models is the central concern of the *Satyr Against Hypocrites*, and Phillips transfers the domestic example of the parents appropriately to the leaders in "house of God". The "Vaine foolish people" (C4r) are not entirely guiltless, as Phillips makes clear in the "Dedication" and as the attack on the outward religiosity of the lay people in the satire demonstrates; the satire is against all hypocrites, but especially those who assume divine authority.

¹⁴ "Prologue", 507-8, in E.T. Donaldson, *Chaucer's Poetry: An Anthology For the Modern Reader* (New York: Ronald Press, 1958).

¹⁵ "Evil examples at home corrupt us all the more quickly since they subvert our minds with the sanction of loftier warrant."

¹⁶ "Three Versions of John Phillips' Satyr against Hypocrites", *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 6 (1952), 381.

(vi) Reason.

Grievous though the sensual immorality is, the gravest error of the hypocrites in the *Satyr* is arguably their loss of their God-given reason. Richard Hooker's *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1593) elaborated a model by which human reason acts as the supreme interpreter of the divine will on earth, as in the matter of church discipline. Milton, in *Areopagitica* and elsewhere, considers reason as the road back to paradise; mankind has been given reason (the "freedom to choose", *Areopagitica* II.527) to enable him to discern the divine will and to obey it. In *A Satyr Against Hypocrites*, Phillips makes a similar, if indirect, appeal to human reason in divine matters; differently phrased, his greatest objection to the hypocrites concerns their abandonment of human reason.

For all the Puritan zeal to bring the church back to the Bible, the Word of God is strikingly absent from the church of the *Satyr*. The first mention of Scripture comes in the description of "old Robin":

Who although write or reade he neither doe,
Yet hath his Testament chain'd to his waste. (A2r)

Old Robin, described above as a figure of scriptural starvation, serves also as emblem of the irrationality of the hypocrites' religiosity ("blind zeale", A2r) which does not free them (John 8:32) but chains them to their ruin. At this point in *A Satyr*, the stress is on the Pharisaical legalism --as in the rules concerning the Sabbath (A3r)-- which manacles the hypocrite to the law, whereas later, the hypocrisy is displayed as an outward legalism but inner

and actual lawlessness. The sisters in the pew-altercation scene lose their pretense to human reason and flaring tempers extinguish all traces of humanity. One sister,

mad beyond all law,
Unsheaths her talons, and prepares to claw. (A2v)

The expression "mad beyond all law" is significant: the intemperate anger of the sisters has no Biblical sanction, and consequently, they transgress (or "go beyond") "all law", divine and human, to become animals. In the Sunday service itself, a series of speakers ascend the pulpit, when,

with count'nance sad,
Up steps a man, stark revelation mad,...
and by and by
He tears his throat for the *fift monarchy*. (B1r)

Again, one significant expression ("stark revelation mad") destroys the credibility of the speaker and his extempore prophecy, and condemns the irrational basis of belief. Not only is the disregard for the Pauline injunction that "all things be done decently and in order" (I Corinthians 14:40) striking, the exercise of human reason in spiritual matters, so important for Milton, is unmistakably absent. The "vulgar frie", admiring the "pious sentences, as all inspiring" (B1r), sigh and groan at the preacher's words:

Though he speak sometimes sense, and sometimes none:
Their zeal doth never let them minde that matter,
It is enough to hear the Magpye chatter. (B1r)

Milton's rational view of ironical laughter and the decorum of religious satire (1.4) naturally melds with that of Phillips, whose unpublished "Dedication" of *A Satyr Against Hypocrites* to John Churchill is an apology for religious satire that assumes the premises Milton had established in the "Preface" to *Animadversions*.

Phillips here describes the *Satyr* as "a kind of Cromatick Descant upon the badd actions of men" which, by definition almost, demands "a full apology for the harshnes of its Expressions", and which, he subtly adds, his dedicatee will no doubt understand. In his epistle of dedication in *Maronides, or Virgil Travestie* (1672), Phillips writes about the measures he took to make that work more "a serious Satyr then a jocular story."¹⁷ In both cases, Phillips refers to the notion, made legitimate by the endorsement by Milton and others in the polemical satires of the 1640s, that religious satire is a legitimate, serious form in which the "lowness" of the subject and its treatment is a necessary ingredient. An anonymous answer to an attack on the Protestation in 1641 defends its acerbic manner in this way:

If the Reader complaine of Vinegar in the Inke, let him remember that the bite of the Viper (and such they are that rend the bowels of their mother the Church) is best helped by the antidote of Vipers.¹⁸

Milton's defence of "grim laughter" in the "Preface" to *Animadversions* and his "Upon the New Forcers of the Conscience" (?1646) challenges a tradition of disapprobation which produced the response to the Marprelate tracts in 1598, to the anti-Laudian pamphlets in 1641 and 1642, and to the anti-Presbyterian satires (including those by Richard Overton as Martin Marpriest) which continued well after the Licensing Act of 1643. Both Milton and Phillips counter the rhetoric of indignation with a reasoned defence

¹⁷ *Maronides, or Virgil Travestie: Being a New Paraphrase Upon the Fifth Book of Virgils Aeneids in Burlesque Verse* (1672), A2v.

¹⁸ *A Survay of that Foolish, Seditious, Scandalous, Prophane Libell, The Protestation Protested* (1641), B2r.

of religious satire that answers directly the accusation of impropriety.

(vii) Music.

The musical image in the "Dedication" of satire as a "Cromatick Descant" precisely describes Phillips's jarring or inharmonious use of language. Phillips follows Milton's use of "descant" (as an "improvisation on a set theme") in both form and content.¹⁹ One of the main themes of *A Satyr Against Hypocrites* is the disunity of a superficially whole church community. The infernal noise of clearing throats and noses forms the prelude to the discordant singing of the congregation:

While these cough up their morning flegme, and those
Doe trumpet forth the snivel of their nose;
Straight then the Clerk began with potsheard voice
To grope a tune, singing with wofull noise,
Like a crackt Sans-bell jarring in the Steeple,
Tom Sternholds wretched Prick-song to the people. (A4r)

For Phillips, as it definitely was for Milton, music is a remnant of divinity in fallen human nature. Milton's "At a Solemn Music" treats this subject with great religious and philosophical intensity:

That we on earth with undiscording voice
May rightly answer that melodious noise;
By leaving out those harsh chromatic jars
Of sin that all our music mars
And in our lives and in our song
Broke the fair music that all our creatures made

¹⁹ Sigmund G. Spaeth, *Milton's Knowledge of Music: Its Sources and Significance in His Works* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1913), 116n1; recall also the opening words of *Eikonoklastes*: "To descant on the misfortunes of a person fall'n from so high a dignity...".

To their great Lord....²⁰

Music carries a similar moral significance in *A Satyr Against Hypocrites* and the "harsh chromatic jars" is evidence of its paucity as true religion. The discordant note is struck early when "'gan the Bells to jangle in the Steeple" (A2r). The broken music of the "communal" singing is a strong indictment of the disunity of the church, and the "crackt Sans-bell" (A4r) image underscores this. The place on earth where the divine music of the spheres is most likely to be heard is in the midst of a congregation sincerely seeking to worship God. Instead, here are only "*Tom Sternholds* wretched Prick-song" and "Such Notes that *Gamut* never yet did know" (A4r). For Milton, music contains essential humanising qualities necessary to repair "the ruins of our first parents" and he writes in *Of Education* about "the solemn and divine harmonies of musick" (II.409):

which if wise men & prophets be not extreamly out, have a great power over dispositions and manners, to smooth and make them gentle from rustick harshnesse and distemper'd passions. (410-11)

Diametrically opposed to this model, the church in *A Satyr* is filled with *discordia discors*: "Discords and Concords O how thick they jumble!" (A4r). Phillips's description of the satire as a discordant discourse ("Cromatick Descant") is appropriate to the moral function of music in *A Satyr Against Hypocrites*, and further allies Phillips with Milton and classical notions of decorum, when sound and sense are truly one and the medium and the message are inseparable.

20 "At a Solemn Music", 17-22, Trinity Manuscript version (see John Carey, ed., *Milton: Complete Shorter Poems* (New York: Longman, 1968), 164).

(viii) Milton's "popular" influence.

The opening device of the *naif inconnu* comes full circle and the frame is completed with the satire's conclusion, when the initial question (about the presence of evil in a city of such obvious religiosity) is answered. As the speaker spells out for the reader what was implied throughout, the "open" or "dialectical" mode of discourse gives way to the "closed" or "rhetorical", as Umberto Eco and Stanley Fish would describe it. Possible external motives for the conclusion --to preclude the charge of irreligion from his detractors-- do not require further speculation, since the internal structure sanctions a patently didactic conclusion, both rhetorically and theologically. The satire has inveighed against the failure of the self-styled "Rabby's and Instructors of others" ("Dedication") to teach moral virtue such as Sidney and Milton prescribe. Likewise, lest the speaker himself fail to make the lesson clear, he must spell out the moral of the story in rhetorical peroration, and homiletically "apply" it for the reader. Satire, as a form of the art of persuasion, is eristic by definition, a view that Milton clearly shares:

toothlesse Satirs... as improper as a toothed Sleekstone....
For if it bite neither the persons nor the vices, how is it a
Satyr, and if it bite either, how is it toothlesse, so that
toothlesse Satyrs are as much as if he had said toothlesse
teeth.²¹

Furthermore, Milton's "On the New Forcers of Conscience" indicates that scruples did not prevent him from fanged religious satire,

²¹ *An Apology* etc. (1642), III.327 and 329.

despite the censorious comments of offended scholars. Perhaps Douglas Bush's statement cannot be proven that Milton's religious tenets did not reflect or directly influence popular thought in the seventeenth century as much as Phillips's *A Satyr Against Hypocrites*.²² Nevertheless, despite being "popular" in both senses as employing the idiom of the popular print culture and as being widely read, Phillips's satire inhabits a religious, moral and literary world clearly influenced by Milton. William Godwin, the nephews' nineteenth-century biographer, exaggerates more than a little when he takes John Phillips's refusal to be moulded by his uncle as a powerful example of "the antagonistic powers of nature and education".²³ If indeed irreconcilable differences arose between Milton and Phillips, as the nephews' biographer suggests, the apparently un-Miltonic *A Satyr Against Hypocrites* was not the cause.

John Phillips and John Milton together personify the paradox of the satire of the mid-seventeenth century which this thesis has implicitly noted. The sharp distinction between "popular" and "learned" or "élite" is blurred in satires which obviously, but never exclusively, appeal to the sector of society described as the uneducated, unclerical, and unpropertied, satires which contain strategies, vocabulary and concepts descendant from classical models by means of the learned circles. The common ground shared by popular

²² Douglas Bush, *English Literature in the Early Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945), 399: "Milton's major poems were less typical of the thought and feeling of a large part of the nation than, say, the popular *Satire Against Hypocrites* (1655) by his nephew John Phillips."

²³ *Lives of Edward and John Phillips, Nephews and Pupils of Milton* (London: Longman, 1815), 314.

and élite, which Peter Burke argues should be the focus of study for cultural historians, is expansive and the influences are bilateral: the self-taught hack learned to write about Lucian and the master of arts learned the popular rituals of abuse.²⁴ John Milton and John Phillips, when seen on the same stage, are not worlds apart. The left hand of Milton --the polemical writer of prose-- is frequently raised in order to strike a blow against an opponent, or, in the case of *Eikonoklastes*, to deface and dismember the image of Charles I. Milton's satirical left hand, seen indirectly in Phillips's *A Satyr Against Hypocrites*, performs what it aims to do: when Milton speaks killingly, the words hurt, maim and rip up.

²⁴ Clive Holmes, "Popular Culture? Witches, Magistrates, and Divines in Early Modern England", in *Understanding Popular Culture* (Berlin and New York: Mouton Publishers. 1984), 94, remarks that the court records used by historians of early modern culture show "the degree to which popular culture was molded by the concerns of the élite. It is also apparent that the traffic was not entirely in one direction."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(i) Primary Sources:

Place of publication is London
unless indicated otherwise.

Ainsworth, Henry. *An Arrow Against Idolatry*, 1640.

All to Westminster: Newes from Elizium, 1641.

Anton, Robert. *The Philosopher's Satyrs*, 1616.

The Arraignment, Conviction, and Imprisoning of Christmas, 1646.

The Arraignment of Superstition; or, a Discourse betweene a Protestant, a Glazier and a Separatist, 1642.

Articles of High Treason Exhibited against Cheap-side Crosse, 1642.

Ashley, Robert. *Of the Interchangeable Covrse, or Variety of Things*, 1594.

Bacon, Francis. *An Advertisement Touching the Controversies of the Church of England*, 1598, published as *A Wise and Moderate Discourse Concerning Church-Affairs*, 1641.

The Beacons Quenched, 1652.

Birkenhead, Sir John. *Paul's Church-Yard*, [?1651].

The Bishops Potion or, A Dialogue betweene the Bishop of Canterbury, and his phisitian, 1641.

Boehme, Jakob. *Signatura Rerum*, translated by Richard Ellistone, 1651.

Bond, John. *The Poets Knavery Discovered, in all their lying Pamphlets*, 1642.

Booker, John. *A Bloody Irish Almanac*, 1646.

----- . *A Rope trebel-twisted for John Taylor*, 1644.

Britanicus His Welcome to Hell, 1647.

British Lightning, 1643.

Butler, Christopher. *The English Grammar, or, The Institution of Letters, Syllables, and Words, in the English tongue*, 1633.

Canterburie His Change of Diot, 1641.

Carew, Thomas. *Coelum Britannicum*, 1634.

Causabon, Meric. *A True & Faithful Relation Of What passed for many Yeers Between Dr. Dee... and Some Spirits*, 1659.

The Caveliers Catechism: or, The Reformed Protestant catechising the Antichristian Papists, Malignants, Incendaries, and other ill-affected Persons under the Name of Caveliers, 1643.

The Character of a Cavaliere, 1647.

The City-Dames Petition in the behalfe of the long afflicted but well-affected Cavaliers, 1647.

Cleveland, John. *The Character of a London Diurnall*, 1644.

----- . *The Character of a Country Committee-Man*, 1649.

Cockeram, Henry. *The English Dictionary, Or, An Interpreter of hard English Words*, 1637.

The Copie Of A Letter Sent From the Roaring Boys in Elizium, 1641.

Corbett, Richard. *Certain Elegant Poems*, 1647.

----- . *Poëtica Stromata*, 1648.

Cowell, John. *The Interpreter: or Booke, Containing the Signification of Words*, 1607 (1637 edition).

Cranmer, George. *Concerning the New Church Discipline*, 1589, published 1642.

The Crosses Case in Cheapside, 1643.

The Decoy Duck: Together with the Discovery of the Knot in the Dragons Tayle called &c., 1642.

A Description Of the Passage of Thomas late Earle of Strafford, over the River of Styx, with the conference betwixt him, Charon, and William Noy, 1641.

A Description of the Round-Head and Rattle-Head, 1642.

A Discoverie or Six woman preachers, 1641.

Dr. John Bastwick on Malignants and Ill-Affecteds all against King and Parliament, 1643.

The Dovvnefall of Temporizing Poets, 1641.

The Downe-fall of Dagon, 1642.

An Exact Diurnall of the parliament of Ladyes, 1647.

Edmundson, Henry. *Lingua Linguarum, The Naturall Language of Languages, 1655.*

Edward, Thomas. *Gangraena, 1646.*

Eikon Aklastos, The Image Vnbroaken, 1651.

Eikon Alethine, The Pourtraicture of Truths most sacred Majesty truly suffering, 1649.

Eikon e Piste. Or, the faithfull Pourtraicture of a Loyall Subject, 1649.

The French Mountebank, or An Operator, 1642.

Gaffarel, James. *Vnheard-of Curiosities: Concerning the Talismanical Sculpture of the Persians, translated by Edmund Chilmead, 1650.*

Granger, Thomas. *Syntagma Logicum, or, The Divine Logike, 1620.*

Hammond, Henry. *Of Idolatry, Oxford, 1646.*

Hausted, Peter. *Ad Populum, or, A Lecture to the People, 1644.*

Hayne, Thomas. *Of the Article of Ovr Creed: Christ descended to Hades, 1642.*

Hell's Hurlie-Burlie. Or, A Fierce Contention betwixt the Pope and the Devill, 1644.

Herbert, Thomas. *An Answer to the most Envious, Scandalous, and Libellous Pamphlet, Entituled, Mercuries Message, 1641.*

Hickes, Thomas. *Certaine Select Dialogues of Lucian, 1635.*

Hoby, Edward. *A Counter-snarle For Ishmael Rabshacheh, 1613.*

The Kings Cabinet opened, 1645.

The Ladies Remonstrance, 1656.

The Ladies Second time Assembled, 1647.

The Last VWill and Testament of Charjng Crosse, 1642.

The last Will and Testament, of Sir Iohn Presbyter, 1647.

The Last Will and Testament of Philip Herbert, 1650.

The Last Will and Testament of the Doctors Commons, 1641.

Laud, William, Archbishop of Canterbury. *A Speech Delivered in the Starr Chamber*, 1637.

Lenton, Francis. *Great Britains Beauties*, 1638.

Leslie, Henry. *The Martyrdome of King Charles, or his conformity with Christ in his sufferings*, 1649.

The Life and Death of Philip Herbert, 1650.

Lilburne, John. *The Christian Mans Trial*, 2nd ed. 1641.

Lilly, William. *Christian Astrology*, 1647.

The Lineage of Locusts, or, The Popes Pedigre, 1641.

Lodwick, Francis. *A Common Writing*, 1647.

"Marprelate, Martin." *Hay any worke for Cooper: Or, A Brief Pistle*, ed. 1642.

----- . *The Character of a Puritan*, ed. 1643.

Mason, Charles. *Irenodia Cantabrigiensis*, Cambridge, 1641.

May, Thomas. *The History of the Parliament of England*, 1647.

----- . *A Breviary of the History of the Parliament of England*, 1650.

Mercuries Message Defended, 1641.

Mercurius Britannicus, Or The English Intelligencer. A Tragic Comedy, At Paris, 1641.

Mistris Parliament Presented in her Bed... in the Birth of her Monstrous Off-spring, the Childe of Deformation, 1648.

Modern Policies, taken from Machiavel, Borgia, and other choice Authors, 1652.

Musarum Oxoniensium, Oxford 1642.

Newes From Avernvs. Being Certaine Propositions and Promises made By Don Belzebub, 1642.

Newes From Rome, or, A Relation of the Pope and his Patentees Pilgrimage into Hell, 1641.

Newes from the New Exchange, or the Commonwealth of Ladies, 1649.

A Notable Touch of the Times, 1642.

Now or Never: or, a New Parliament of Women, 1656.

The Open Movth of Balaams Asse, 1642.

An Order of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament. For the Regulating of Printing, 1643.

The Orders from the House of Commons For the Abolishing of Superstition, and Innovation, 1641.

Overton, Richard. *Lambeth Faire, Wherein you have all the Bishops Trinkets set to Sale*, 1641.

----- . *A Christian Mans Triall*, 2nd ed., 1641.

----- . *Mans Mortallitie*, Amsterdam, 1644.

----- . *The arraignment of Mr. Persecution*, 1645.

Parker, Henry. *The true Portraiture of the Kings of England*, 1650.

Parker, Martin. *The Poet's Blind mans bough*, 1641.

A Parliament of Ladies: With Their Lawes Newly Enacted, 1647.

Phillips, John. *A Satyr Against Hypocrites*, 1655.

----- . *Maronides, or Virgil Travestie: Being a New Paraphrase Upon the Fifth Book of Virgils Aeneids in Burlesque Verse*, 1672.

Poole, Joshua. *The English Parnassus: Or, A Helpe to English Poesie*, 1657.

The Pope's Proclamation: Together With the Lawes and Ordinances established by him and his Shavelings, 1641.

The Prentises Prophecie, of the certainty of the Bishops destruction, 1642.

A Presse Full of Pamphlets, 1642.

A Printed Paper Cald The Lord Digbies Speech to the Bill of Attainder of the Earl of Strafford. Torn to Pieces and Blowne Away, 1641.

Prynne, William. *A Breviate of the Life of William Laud*, 1644.

A Purge for Pluralities, 1642.

Quarles, Francis. *The Shepherds Oracles*, 1645.

Rare Physick for the Chvrch Sick of an Ague, 1642.

The Recantation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, 1644.

A Remonstrance to the People, 1649.

The Resolution of the Women of London to the Parliament, 1642.

The Right Picture of King Oliure, from top to toe, 1650.

Rump: Or An Exact Collection Of the Choycest Poems and Songs Relating to the Late Times, 2 vols., 1662.

Rust, Nicholas. *Roma Ruens. Dagon falling before the Arke, or, The Glory of Christ over-shadowing all other glories*, 1650.

Salteren, George. *A Treatise against Images and Pictures in Churches*. 1641.

A Satyre Against Separatists, reprinted in *Ad Populum*, 1660. [By "A.C. Generosus", Abraham Cowley?]

The Scots Constancy, 1647.

Sheppard, Samuel. *The Second Part of the Committee-man Curried*, 1647.

----- . *The Socratick Session, or The Parliament of Poets*, 1651.

----- . *Epigrams Theological, Philosophical, and Romantick*, 1651.

----- . *The Weepers: Or, The bed of Snakes broken. Wit Vitiated, and made a Pander to Wickednesse*, 1652.

Sions Charity Towards Her Foes in Misery in a Dialogue, 1641.

The Sovndheads Description of the Rovndhead, 1642.

Stirry, Thomas. *A Rot Amongst the Bishops*, 1641.

A Strange and Lamentable Accident that happened lately at Mears-Ashby of one Mary Wilmore, who was delivered of a childe without a head and credibly reported to have a firme crosse on the brest, 1642.

The Subjects Sorrow, 1649.

A Survay of that Foolish, Seditious, Scandalous, Prophane Libell, The Protestation Protested, 1641.

Syms, Christopher. *Great Britans Alarm*, 1647.

Taylor, John. *The Whole Life and Progress of Henry Walker the Ironmonger*, 1641.

----- . *A Seasonable Lecture, or A most learned Oration: Disburthered from Henry Walker*, 1643.

----- . *The Hellish Parliament*, 1642.

----- . *A Delicate, Dainty, Damnable Dialogve, Between the Devill and a Jesuite* , 1642.

----- . *A Reply as true as Steele*, 1641.

----- . *A Swarme of Sectaries and Schismatiques*, 1641.

----- . *The Carriers Cosmography*, 1637.

The Teares of Sion upon the Death of Josiah, 1649.

A Three-fold Discourse betweene three Neighbours, Algate, Bishopsgate, and John Heyden, 1642.

Times Whirligig, or, The Blew-new-made-Gentleman mounted, 1647.

The Trojan Horse of the Presbyteriall Government Vnbovvelled, 1646.
Vox Borealis, 1641.

Walker, Henry. *Taylors Physicke*, 1642.

----- . *Mercurius Britanicus His Vision*, 1647.

----- . *Perfect Occurrences*, 1648-49.

Wharton, George. *Bellum Hybernicae*, 1647.

Wright, Abraham. *Five Sermons, in Five several Styles, or Waies of Preaching*, 1656.

A Zealovs Sermon, Preached at Amsterdam, By a Jew, Whose Name is Not-Rvb, 1642.

(ii) Modern Editions:

Alighieri, Dante. *The Divine Comedy: Hell*. Translated by Dorothy L. Sayers. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1949.

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae*. Edited by Richard T.A. Murphy, O.P. London: Blackfriars, 1965.

Bacon, Francis. *The Essays*. Edited by John Pitcher. London: Penguin, 1985.

----- . *The Advancement of Learning*. Edited by G.W. Kitchin. London: Dent Everyman, 1915.

duBartas, Guillaume de Saluste. *The Divine Weeks and Works of Guillaume de Saluste Sieur du Bartas, translated by Joshua Sylvester*. Edited by Susan Snyder. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Brome, Alexander. *Alexander Brome: Poems*. 2 Vols. Edited by Roman Dubinski. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Browne, Sir Thomas. *Religio Medici, Hydrotaphia, and The Garden of Cyrus*. Edited by R.H.A. Robbins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Bunyan, John. *The Pilgrim's Progress*. Edited by Roger Sharrock. London: Penguin, 1965.

Cary, Patrick. *The Poems of Patrick Cary*. Edited by Sister Veronica Delany. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *Chaucer's Poetry: An Anthology For the Modern Reader*. Edited by E.T. Donaldson. New York: Ronald Press, 1958.

Cleveland, John. *The Poems of John Cleveland*. Edited by Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Colman, Henry. *Divine Meditations (1640)*. Edited by Karen E. Steanson. New Haven: Yale University Press, Published for the Elizabethan Club, 1979.

Corbett, Richard. *The Poems of Richard Corbett*. Edited by J.A.W. Bennett and H.R. Trevor-Roper. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Cowley, Abraham. *The Civil War*. Edited by Allan Pritchard. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.

----- . *The Collected Works of Abraham Cowley*. Volume 1. Edited by Thomas O. Calhoun, Laurence Heyworth, and Allan Pritchard, with Ernest W. Sullivan II, textual consultant. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989.

Davenant, Sir William. *Sir William Davenant's Gondibert*. Edited by David F. Gladish. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Drummond, William, of Hawthornden. *William Drummond of Hawthornden: Poems and Prose*. Edited by Robert H. MacDonald. Edinburgh and London: Scottish Academic Press, 1976.

Eikon Basilike, The Pourtraiture of His Sacred Majesty in His Solitudes and Sufferings. Edited by Philip A. Knachel. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (for the Folger Shakespeare Library), 1966.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Colloquies of Erasmus*. Translated by Craig R. Thompson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

The Great Assises Holden in Parnassus by Apollo and His Assessors. Edited by Hugh MacDonald. Oxford: Luttrell Society by Basil Blackwell, 1958.

Harvey, Gabriel. *Ciceronianus*. Translated by Clarence A. Forbes, introduced by Harold S. Wilson. University of Nebraska Studies in the Humanities, No. 4. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Studies, 1945.

- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited by Herbert W. Schneider. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1958.
- Hooker, Richard. *4 Works*. Arranged by J. Keble. 7th ed., revised by R.W. Church and F. Paget. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888.
- Horace, Flaccus. *Satires and Epistles of Horace*. Translated by S.P. Bovie. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- Jonson, Ben. *Sejanus His Fall*. Edited by W.F. Bolton. London: Ernest Benn, 1966.
- . *Three Comedies*. Edited by Michael Jamieson. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966.
- . *Works*. Edited by C.H. Herford, P. Simpson, and E. Simpson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- King, Henry. *The Poems of Henry King*. Edited by Margaret Crum. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Lucian of Samosata. *The Dialogues of Lucian*. Translated by William Tooke. London: Navarre Society, n.d.
- . *Lucian: Selections*. Edited by Keith Sidwell. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1986.
- . *Lucian: Satirical Sketches*. Translated by P. Turner. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1990.
- Marvell, Andrew. *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, 3rd ed. Edited by H.M. Margoliouth, revised by P. Legouis and Duncan-Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- . *The Rehearsal Transpros'd and The Rehearsal Transpros'd: The Second Part*. Edited by D.I.B. Smith. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Milton, John. *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, I-VIII. Edited by J. Sirluck and others. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959-1982.
- Oldham, John. *The Poems of John Oldham*. Edited by Harold F. Brooks and Raman Selden. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Phillips, John. *A Satyr Against Hypocrites*. Edited by Leon Howard. *Augustan Reprint Society* (No. 38). Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1953.
- Quarles, Francis. *The Complete Works in Prose and Verse*. 3 Vols. Reprint of 1880-1881 edition by Alexander B. Grosart. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1971.
- Seneca. *Seneca: Apocolocyntosis*. Edited by P.T. Eden. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Sidney, Sir Philip. *An Apology for Poetry*. In Hazard Adams, ed. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1971.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. Edited by A.C. Hamilton. London/New York: Longman, 1977.

Stanley, Thomas. *The Poems and Translations of Thomas Stanley*. Edited by G.M. Crump. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Suckling, Sir John. *The Works of Sir John Suckling: The Non-Dramatic Works*. Edited by Thomas Clayton. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Spencer, T.J.B., ed. *A Book of Masques: In Honour of Allardyce Nicoll*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Wilkins, W. Walker. *Political Ballads of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. 2 volumes. London: Longman, 1860.

Wright, Abraham. *Parnassus Biceps, or Severall Choice Pieces of Poetry by Abraham Wright, 1656*. Introduced by Peter Beal. Aldershot, Hants.: Scolar Press, 1990.

(iii) Secondary Sources:

Ahl, Frederick. "The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome", *American Journal of Philology* 105 (1984), 174-207.

----- . *Metaformations: Wordplay and Soundplay in Ovid and other Classical Poets*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

----- . "Ars Est Caelare Artem (Art in Puns and Anagrams Engraved)". In Jonathan Culler (ed.), *On Puns: The Foundation of Letters*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.

Anderson, Graham. *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction*. Leiden: Mnemosyne, Brill, 1976.

----- . *Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic*. Leiden: Mnemosyne, Brill, 1976.

Anselment, Raymond A. *'Betwixt Jest and Earnest': Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift & The Decorum of Religious Ridicule*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.

Ashton, Robert. *The English Civil War: Conservatism and Revolution, 1603-1649*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978.

Austin, J.L. *How To Do Things With Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Translated by Helene Iswolsky. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1968.
- Baldwin, Barry. *Studies in Lucian*. Toronto: Hakkert, 1971.
- Barish, Jonas. *The Antitheatrical Prejudice*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Barton, Anne. *Ben Jonson: Dramatist*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Beaty, F.L. "The Life and Works of John Phillips (1631-1706)". Unpublished Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1950.
- . "Three Versions of John Phillips' *Satyr against Hypocrites*". *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 6 (1952).
- Belsey, Catherine. *Critical Practice*. London: Methuen, 1981.
- . *John Milton: Language, Gender, Power*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.
- Bentley, G.E. *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*. Vol.V. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Bigsby, C.W.E., ed. *Approaches to Popular Culture*. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1976.
- Blagden, Cyprian. *The Stationers' Company: A History, 1403-1959*. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press, 1960.
- Bloom, Harold. *Kabbalah and Criticism*. New York: Seabury Press, 1975.
- Boyce, Benjamin. "News From Hell: Satiric Communications with the Nether World in English Writing of the 17th and 18th Centuries". *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 58 (1943).
- . *The Polemic Character 1640-1661: A Chapter in English Literary History*. Lincoln, Na.: University of Nebraska Press, 1955.
- Branham, R. Bracht. *Unruly Eloquence: Lucian and the Comedy of Traditions*. Cambridge, Mss.: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Briggs, Julia. *This Stage-Play World: English Literature and its Background 1580-1625*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Brooks, Harold F. "Rump Songs With Notes." In *Oxford Bibliographic Society*, V, 1939.
- . "English Verse Satire, 1640-1660: Prolegomena." In *The Seventeenth Century*, III.1 (Spring), 1988.
- Burke, Peter. *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*. London: Temple Smith, 1978.

------. "Oblique Approaches to the History of Popular Culture". In C.W.E. Bigsby, ed., *Approaches to Popular Culture*. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1976.

Burnett, Anne Pippin. *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*. London: Duckworth, 1983.

Bush, Douglas. *English Literature in the Early Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945.

Butler, Martin. *Theatre and Crisis, 1632-1642*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1984.

Cable, Lana. "Milton's Iconoclastic Truth". In David Loewenstein and James Grantham Turner (edd.), *Politics, Poetics, and Hermeneutics in Milton's Prose*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: The Early Republic. Edited by E.J. Kenney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Camporesi, Piero. *The Incorruptible Flesh: Bodily mutation and mortification in religion and folklore*. Translated by Tania Croft-Murray and Helen Elsom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Capp, Bernard S. *Astrology and the Popular Press: English Almanacs 1500-1800*. London: Faber and Faber, 1979.

Chandos, John. *In God's Name: Examples of preaching in England from the Act of Supremacy to the Act of Uniformity 1534-1662*. London: Hutchinson and Co., 1971.

Chartier, Roger. "Culture as Appropriation: Popular Cultural Uses in Early Modern France". In Steven L. Kaplan, ed., *Understanding Popular Culture: Europe from the Middle Ages to the Nineteenth Century*. Berlin & New York: Mouton Publishers, 1984.

------. *The Cultural Uses of Print in Early Modern France*. Translated by Lydia G. Cochrane. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Clark, Sandra. *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers: Popular Moralistic Pamphlets 1580-1640*. London: Athlone Press, 1983.

Cohen, Murray. *Sensible Words: Linguistic Practice in England, 1640-1785*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1977.

Collins, Stephen L. *From Divine Cosmos to Sovereign State: An Intellectual History of Consciousness and the Idea of Order in Renaissance England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Collinson, Patrick. *From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia: the Cultural Impact of the Second English Revolution*. Reading: University of Reading, 1986.

- . *The Puritan Character: Polemics and Polarities in Early Seventeenth-Century English Culture*. Los Angeles: William Clark Memorial Library, University of California, 1987.
- Cook, Elizabeth. *Seeing Through Words: The scope of late Renaissance poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Corns, Thomas N., ed. *The Literature of Controversy: Polemical Strategy from Milton to Junius in Prose Studies* 9 (2). London: Frank Cass, 1986.
- . *The Development of Milton's Prose Style*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Cressy, David. *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and writing in Tudor and Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Culler, Jonathan, ed. *On Puns: The Foundation of Letters*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.
- . *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.
- . *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983.
- . *Framing the Sign: Criticism and its Institutions*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.
- Cust, Richard. "News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England". *Past and Present*, 112 (1986).
- Cust, Richard and Ann Hughes, edd. *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603-1642*. London: Longman, 1989.
- Darbishire, Helen. *The Early Lives of Milton*. London: Constable and Co., 1932.
- Davidson, Clifford. "'The Devil's Guts': Allegations of Superstition and Fraud in Religious Drama and Art during the Reformation." In Clifford Davidson and Ann Eljenholm Nichols, edd. *Iconoclasm vs. Art and Drama*. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, Western Michigan University, 1988.
- . "The Anti-Visual Prejudice." In Clifford Davidson and Ann Eljenholm Nichols, edd. *Iconoclasm vs. Art and Drama*. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, Western Michigan University, 1988.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Society and Culture in Early Modern France: Eight Essays*. London: Duckworth, 1975.
- Dollimore, Jonathan. *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. Brighton: Harvester, 1984.

- Doody, Margaret. *The Daring Muse: Augustan Poetry Reconsidered*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Duncan, Douglas. *Ben Jonson and the Lucianic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Early English Books: from Wing's Short title catalogue of books 1641-1700*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1961- .
- Edmundson, George. *Milton and Vondel: A Curiosity of Literature*. London: Trübner, 1885.
- Eire, Carlos M.N. *War Against the Idols: The Reformation of Worship From Erasmus to Calvin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Elkin, P.K. *The Augustan Defence of Satire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- Elliott, Robert C. *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1960.
- Elsky, Martin. *Authorizing Words: Speech, Writing, and Print in the English Renaissance*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Everett, Barbara. "The Shooting of the Bears: Poetry and Politics in Andrew Marvell". In R.C. Brett (ed.), *Andrew Marvell: Essays on the Tercentenary of His Death*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Fielding, John. "Opposition to the Personal Rule of Charles I: the diary of Robert Woodford, 1637-1641". *Historical Journal*, 31, 4 (1988).
- Fiske, John. *Understanding Popular Culture*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Fletcher, Anthony. *The Outbreak of the English Civil War*. London: Edward Arnold, 1981.
- Fletcher, A.J. and J. Stevenson, edd. *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Fortescue, G.K. *Catalogue of the Thomason Tracts*. 2 volumes. London: British Museum, 1908.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An archeology of the human sciences*. London: Tavistock/Routledge, 1970.
- Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- French, J. Milton. "Milton, Ramus, and Edward Phillips", *Modern Philology* 47 (1949).
- French, Peter J. *John Dee: The World of an Elizabethan Magus*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

- Gardiner, S.R., ed. *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660*. 3rd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906.
- George, Dorothy M. *English Political Caricature to 1792: A Study of Opinion and Propaganda*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.
- Gibbons, Brian. *Jacobean City Comedy: A Study of Satiric Plays by Jonson, Marston, and Middleton*. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1968.
- Gilman, Ernest. *The Curious Perspective: Literary and Pictorial Wit in the Seventeenth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.
- . *Iconoclasm and Poetry in the English Reformation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1986.
- Godwin, William. *Lives of Edward and John Phillips, Nephews and Pupils of Milton*. London: Longman, 1815.
- Gordon, D.J. *The Renaissance Imagination: Essays and Lectures*. Collected and edited by Stephen Orgel. Berkeley: U. of California Press, 1975.
- Greaves, Richard and Robert Zaller, edd. *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century*. 3 volumes. Brighton: Harvester Press, 1982.
- Green, M.A.E. *The Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria (1857)*.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Gross, Kenneth. *Spenserian Poetics: Idolatry, Iconoclasm, and Magic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- Hall, Jennifer. *Lucian's Satire*. New York: Arno Press, 1981.
- Hall, Rupert. *Henry More: Magic, Religion and Experiment*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- Haller, William. *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.
- . *Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution*. 3 volumes. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933-1934.
- Healy, Thomas and Jonathan Sawday, edd. *Literature and the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Heinemann, Margot. *Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama under the Early Stuarts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Hill, Christopher. *The World Turned Upside Down*. London: Temple Smith, 1972.

- . *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*. 2nd edition. Wokingham, Berks.: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1980.
- . "Irreligion in the 'Puritan' Revolution". In J.F. McGregor and B. Reay (edd.), *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- . "Parliament and People in Seventeenth-Century England". *Past and Present*, 92 (1981).
- . *A Turbulent, Seditious, and Factious People: John Bunyan and his Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Hirst, Derek. "Revisionism Revised: The Place of Principle". *Past and Present*, 92 (1981).
- Holden, William P. *Anti-Puritan Satire, 1573-1642*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.
- Howell, Wilbur Samuel. *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms*. New York: Methuen, 1985.
- Idel, Moshe. *Kabbalah: New Perspectives*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Ingoldsby, W.P. "Some Considerations of nonconformist Sermon Style: 1645-1660". Unpublished Oxford B.Litt. thesis, 1973.
- Jones, Emrys. "Byron's Visions of Judgment". *Modern Language Review*, 76.1 (Jan 1981).
- Kantra, Robert A. *All Things Vain: Religious Satirists and Their Art*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1984.
- Kaplan, Steven L., ed. *Understanding Popular Culture: Europe from the Middle Ages to the Nineteenth Century*. Berlin & New York: Mouton Publishers, 1984.
- Katz, David S. *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of Jews to England 1603-1655*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- . "The Language of Adam in Seventeenth-Century England", 132-145. In Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Valerie Pearl, and Blair Worden, edd., *History and Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R. Trevor-Roper*. London: Duckworth, 1981.
- Kibbey, Ann. *The interpretation of material shapes in Puritanism: A study of rhetoric, prejudice, and violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Lake, P.G. "Constitutional Consensus and Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match". *Historical Journal*, 25 (1982).

Lanham, Richard A. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms: A Guide for Students of English Literature*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1968.

Larner, Christina. *Witchcraft and Religion: The Politics of Popular Belief*. Foreword by Alan Macfarlane. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984.

Lewis, C.S. *The Discarded Image*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Lieb, Michael and John T. Shawcross, edd. *Achievements of the Left Hand: Essays on the Prose of John Milton*. Amherst, Mass: University of Massachusetts Press, 1974.

Lindley, David, ed. *The Court Masque*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.

Lloyd, A.L. *Folk Song in England*. St. Albans: Paladin, 1967.

Lloyd-Jones, G. *The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: A Third Language* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983.

Lloyd-Jones, Hugh, V. Pearl, and B. Worden, edd. *History and Imagination: Essays in Honour of Hugh Trevor-Roper*. London: Duckworth, 1981.

Lockyer, Roger. *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham, 1592-1628*. London: Longman, 1981.

Loewenstein, David and James Grantham Turner, edd. *Politics, Poetics, and Hermeneutics in Milton's Prose*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

----- . *Milton and the Drama of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Marcus, Leah S. *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell and the Defence of Old Holiday Pastimes*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

McCabe, Richard. "Elizabethan Satire and the Bishops' Ban of 1599". *Yearbook of English Studies* 11 (1981), 188-193.

----- . *Joseph Hall: A Study in Satire and Meditation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

McFarland, Ronald E. "Teratology in Late Renaissance English Popular Literature". *English Miscellany* 29 (1980), 103-23.

McGregor, J.F. and B. Reay, edd. *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

- Miralles, Carles and Jaume Pòrtulas. *Archilochus and the Iambic Poetry*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1983.
- Mitchell, W. Fraser. *English Pulpit Oratory From Andrewes to Tillotson (A Study of its Literary Aspects)*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1932.
- Nagourney, Peter. "Elite, Popular and Mass Literature: What People Read." *Journal of Popular Culture*, 16.1 (1982), 99-107.
- Neuburg, Victor E. *Popular Literature: A History and Guide*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977.
- Nevo, Ruth. *The Dial of Virtue: A Study of Poems on Affairs of State in the Seventeenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- Norbrook, David. "The reformation of the masque". In D. Lindley (ed.), *The Court Masque*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.
- Ollard, Richard. *The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1979.
- Orgel, Stephen. *The Illusion of Power: Political Theatre in the English Renaissance*. Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 1975.
- Orr, Robert R. *Reason and Authority: The Thought of William Chillingworth*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Ozment, Steven, ed. *Religion and Culture in the Renaissance and Reformation*. Volume XI, Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies.
- Packer, John W. *The Transformation of Anglicanism, 1643-1660, with special reference to Henry Hammond*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969.
- Padley, G.A. *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe, 1500-1700. Trends in Vernacular Grammar I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Pagel, Walter. "The Smiling Spleen". In H. Lloyd-Jones, V. Pearl, B. Worden (edd.), *History and Imagination: Essays in Honour of Hugh Trevor-Roper*. London: Duckworth, 1981.
- Panofsky, Erwin. *Studies in Iconography: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance*. New York: "Icon Editions" Harper and Row, 1972.
- Parfitt, George. *English Poetry of the Seventeenth Century*. London and New York: Longman, 1985.
- Parker, Derek. *Familiar to All: William Lilly and Astrology in the Seventeenth Century*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1975.

- Parker, William Riley. *Milton: A Biography*. 2 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Parry, Graham. *The Golden Age Restor'd: The culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981.
- Patrides, C.A. and Joseph Witteich, edd. *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance thought and literature: patterns, antecedents and repercussions*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.
- Patterson, Annabel. *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*. Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.
- . *Shakespeare and the Popular Voice*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.
- Payne, F. Anne. *Chaucer and Menippean Satire*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1981.
- Pearl, V.L. and M.L. Pearl. "Richard Corbett's 'Against the Opposing of the Duke in Parliament, 1628' and the Anonymous Rejoinder, 'An Answer to the Same, Lyne for Lyne': The Earliest Dated Manuscript Copies". *Review of English Studies* ns 42, 165 (Feb. 1991).
- Pennington, Donald and Keith Thomas, edd. *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Phillips, John. *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1660*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.
- Pocock, J.G.A. *The Politics of Discourse*. London: Methuen, 1972.
- Pops, Martin. "The Metamorphosis of Shit". In *Salmagundi* 56 (Spring 1982), 26-61.
- Potter, Lois. *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Rabb, T.K. "The Role of the Commons". *Past and Present*, 92 (1981).
- Rankin, H.D. *Archilochus of Paros*. Park Ridge, N.J.: Noyes Press, 1977.
- Readings, W.J. "The Restoration and the Fall of Language: The Search for Meaning in the Poetry of Marvell and Milton". Unpublished Oxford D.Phil thesis, 1985.
- Reay, Barry, ed. *Popular Culture In Seventeenth-Century England*. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Reedy, Gerard, S.J. "'An Horatian Ode' and 'Tom May's Death'". *Studies in English Literature*, 20 (1980).

Rees, Christine. "'Tom May's Death' and Ben Jonson's Ghost: A Study of Marvell's Satiric Method". *Modern Language Review*, 71 (July 1976).

Rhodes, Neil. *Elizabethan Grotesque*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980.

Relihan, Joel C. "On the Origin of 'Menippean Satire' as the Name of a Literary Genre", *Classical Philology* 79.3 (1984).

Rivers, Isabel. *The Poetry of Conservatism, 1600-1745. A Study of Poets and Public Affairs from Jonson to Pope*. Cambridge: Rivers Press, 1973.

------. *Classical and Christian Ideas in English Renaissance Poetry*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1979.

Robinson, Christopher. *Lucian and His Influence in Europe*. London: Duckworth, 1979.

Rollins, Hyder E. "Samuel Sheppard & His Praise of Poets". *Studies in Philology*, XXIV (1927).

Rusche, Harry. "Merlini Anglici: Astrology and Propaganda from 1644 to 1651", *The English Historical Review*, lxxx (April 1965), 322-333.

Scholem, Gershom. *Kabbalah*. New York: New American Library, 1974.

------. *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism*. Translated by Ralph Manheim. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.

Searle, J.R. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Selden, Raman. "Roughness in Satire from Horace to Dryden". *Modern Language Review* 66 (1971).

------. *English Verse Satire, 1590-1765*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1978.

Siebert, F.S. *Freedom of the Press in England, 1476-1776*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1952.

Smeed, J.W. *The Theophrastan Character: The history of a literary genre*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Smith, Nigel, ed. *A Collection of Ranter Writings from the 17th century*. London: Junction, 1983.

------. "Richard Overton's Marpriest Tracts: Towards a History of Leveller Style". In Thomas N. Corns (ed.), *The Literature of Controversy: Polemical Strategy from Milton to Junius; Prose Studies* 9 (2). London: Frank Cass, 1986.

------. *Perfection Proclaimed: Language and Literature in English Radical Religion 1640-1660*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

- Sonnino, Lee A. *A Handbook of Sixteenth-Century Rhetoric*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968.
- Spaeth, Sigmund G. *Milton's Knowledge of Music: Its Sources and Significance in His Works*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1913.
- Spufford, Margaret. *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and its Readership in Seventeenth-century England*. London: Methuen, 1981.
- Starobinski, Jean. *Words Upon Words: The Anagrams of Ferdinand de Saussure*. Translated by Olivia Emmet. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Stephens, Frederick George. *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*. Volume 1. Photolitho of 1870 edition. London: British Museum Publications, 1978.
- Stephens, J.F. *A History of the Criminal Law of England*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1883.
- Stephenson, L.C. *Praise and Paradox: Merchants and Craftsmen in Elizabethan Popular Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Thomas, Donald. *A Long Time Burning: The History of Literary Censorship in England*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.
- Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in popular beliefs in 16th and 17th century England*. London: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1971.
- Thomas, P.W. *Sir John Berkenhead, 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.
- Tillyard, E.M.W. *The Elizabethan World Picture*. New York: Vintage, 1964.
- Trevor-Roper, H.R. *Archbishop Laud, 1573-1645*. London: Macmillan, 1940.
- Turner, James Grantham. *One Flesh: Paradisal Marriage and Sexual Relations in the Age of Milton*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Tuve, Rosamond. *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery: Renaissance Poetic and Twentieth-Century Critics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c.1590-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Shoaf, R.A. *Milton, Poet of Duality: A Study of Semiosis in the Poetry and the Prose*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

- Sommerville, J.P. *Politics and Ideology in England, 1603-1640*. London: Longman, 1986.
- Strong, Roy. *The Illusion of Power*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
- . *Art and Power: Renaissance Festivals 1450-1650*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1984.
- Ullman, Ernst. "Reformation and Iconoclasm". *Journal of Popular Culture*, 18.3 (1984), 101-123.
- Underdown, David. *Revel, Riot and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603-1660*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Van Leeuwen, Henry G. *The Problem of Certainty in English Thought, 1630-1690*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1963.
- Vickers, Brian. *Classical Rhetoric in English Poetry*. Repr. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1989.
- Wald, Stephen. *The Doctrine of the Divine Name: An Introduction to Classical Kabbalistic Theology*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Watson, Robert N. *Ben Jonson's Parodic Strategy: Literary Imperialism in the Comedies*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Watts, Michael R. *The Dissenters*. Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Webster, Charles. *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform, 1626-1660*. London: Duckworth, 1975.
- Wedgwood, C.V. *Truth and Opinion: Historical Essays*. London: Collins, 1960.
- . *Poetry and Politics Under the Stuarts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- West, Martin L. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1974.
- Wilding, Michael. *Dragons Teeth: Literature in the English Revolution*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Wilson, F.P. *Some English Prognostications*. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1938.
- Wilson, John F. *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars, 1640-1648*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Woodhouse, A.S.P. *Puritanism and Liberty*. London: Dent and Sons, 1974.

Wrightson, Keith. *English Society, 1580-1680*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1982.