

Andrew Marvell and the Lord Wharton

Two uncollected letters by Andrew Marvell (9 May 1668, 10 March 1673/4) and a draft of a parliamentary address in his hand may be found in the Wharton papers at the Bodleian Library, Oxford.¹ The letters are addressed to Marvell's friend in the House of Lords, Philip, fourth Baron Wharton (1613–96). They reflect the length and closeness of their association, which in turn informs some of Marvell's Restoration publications. They also point to the winter of 1667/8 as the season when Marvell began to hope for more from Charles II as an ally against the Cavalier House of Commons.

Although the very model of a parliamentary Puritan, and despite his intimacy with Cromwell, Wharton had survived the Restoration with his circumstances not much reduced to become a major aristocratic supporter of nonconformity. Marvell's eagerness to serve him is consistent with the pattern in his life of seeking to consolidate his connections with the great, not least with a series of great northern lords. Wharton came from Yorkshire and had substantial interests there. Marvell had already developed ties with the Lord General Fairfax, the Duke of Buckingham, and the Earl of Carlisle, and would later befriend the Earl of Anglesey and perhaps William Lord Cavendish (spendthrift son of the third Earl of Devonshire and himself the future Duke of Devonshire). His service to Wharton also reflects Marvell's commitment to Comprehension in the English Church – he may have embraced toleration, or at least indulgence, only more belatedly² – and exemplifies the low-church sympathies that seem the most consistent feature of Marvell's politics.

Of Marvell and Wharton's personal association there was already evidence in a set of letters from Dr Benjamin Worsley to Marvell, in the Christmas season 1671/2, addressed to him at Wharton's house in Winchendon, Bucks.³ Marvell had approached Worsley (a former army surgeon, millenarian, and the long-serving secretary of the Council for Trade) about a West-Country heiress who might make a good match for Wharton's oldest surviving son Thomas (1648–1715). He read Worsley's letters in reply, added brief comment, and

ANDREW MARVELL AND THE LORD WHARTON

forwarded them 'to be broke open by my lord Wharton' (presumably at his preferred country house at Wooburn, Buckinghamshire, where Marvell was soon to visit en route to London).⁴ Marvell also wrote back to Worsley on this business, which letters have not yet surfaced. Wharton had long been engaged in a concerted search for an appropriate daughter-in-law.⁵ In the event the present arrangement proved unsuccessful, owing in part to concerns in the family of the intended that Thomas Wharton was likely to become a courtier and a rake. Although far from a courtier under the Stuarts, he was soon a great rake and eventually an even greater Whig.⁶ There are signs too of Marvell advising Wharton on other business. When Worsley writes to Wharton directly a few weeks later, he urges Wharton to ignore Marvell's counsel discouraging efforts on behalf of an unnamed prisoner (presumably one arrested for conventicling since mention is made of an impending 'generall Release of all, that are in Custody or Confinement of this kinde', 23 January 1671/2, Bodleian MS Rawl. letters 50, fols 132–3).

On the parliamentary side, there has been further evidence of connections between Marvell and Wharton, of which rather more deserves to be made. He is named as a supporter in Wharton's parliamentary lists at the beginning of the 1660s, and in a letter of 2 April 1667 from Marvell (London) to Wharton (presumably at Wooburn) he professes 'that I perfectly honour and therefore desire faithfully to serve you.'⁷ This is a fuller submission than usual in his frequent professions of service, and seems to reflect more than just the Lenten highmindedness characteristic of this letter to his Puritan patron. Some closer association also shows in his apology here that he has 'not yet anything mature enough in the businesse we used to discourse of, which might be worthy your notice.' The business may have been personal or perhaps some writing for publication, since he trusts that he will have something done 'by the Terme' and it was customary to prepare works for the press in time for the legal Terms of the year – that is, in about three weeks time since in 1667 the Easter Term began on 24 April. We may speculate that of Marvell's known writings this might best be the 'Short Historical Essay', which was later joined to *Mr. Smirke* (1676) as if 'this following Essay of mine own' were ready to hand, and incorporated in a work otherwise very rapidly written. The essay may be more likely to have been generated by such discussion than satires in the vein of 'Last Instructions', although if Marvell was indeed involved in Elizabeth Calvert's printing of the latest edition of *The Directions to a Painter* (1667)⁸ that or related work may be the publication in question. With the later *Mr. Smirke*, there may be cause to suspect Wharton of involvement with the publication when '15 non conformists took off the whole Impression to disperse'⁹ since, a year later, a government informer emphasized that Wharton lay behind the printing by Presbyterian private presses of controversial works that were distributed by 'one Eglinton, or some such name, and Cooper with some other Presbyterian ministers [who] were confederate with [Francis] Smith in the dispersing of the said libels.' These libels

seem now to have included Marvell's *Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* (1677).¹⁰ In the *Account*, Marvell names Wharton with Shaftesbury, Buckingham, and Salisbury in acclaiming those four Lords as 'Confessors' of 'the English Liberties and the Protestant Religion'¹¹ – they had in 1677 been imprisoned in the Tower for insisting too much that Parliament had been dissolved *de facto* after its prorogation for over a year. Marvell's association with Wharton may also lie behind Marvell's last-known prose work, *Remarks Upon a Late Disingenuous Discourse, Writ by one T.D.* (better known as his 'Defence of John Howe', 1678). This defends the nonconformist minister Howe, who remained a friend and associate of the Lord Wharton from Cromwellian times through to their going together into exile in Holland in 1685, and on into the 1690s.¹²

The first of the 'new' letters is of particular interest since it shows Marvell the MP working closely with Wharton at a critical time in 1668. It is bound out of sequence in the Wharton papers (MS Carte 81, fol. 37). Written in Marvell's conspicuous hand and signed with his monogram – the M skilfully superimposed on the A – it is a communication from a Member of Parliament to a Lord at the end of a very long sitting of the Commons, the day and night of 8–9 May 1668. That was on the eve of an adjournment, when the tensions between the Lords and the Commons had reached a peak over their competing claims in Skinner's Case. (Thomas Skinner, a London merchant, had successfully petitioned the House of Lords for damages from the East India Company; the East India Company went to the Commons who voted Skinner's complaint and the Lords' ruling illegal, which vote the Lords then ruled illegal in turn.¹³) An exhausted Marvell reports on the votes of the lower house in time to inform Wharton of events in preparation for the day of 9 May. This was the more necessary because there had pointedly been no order to communicate these votes to the Lords. Marvell writes:

My Lord

We sat till five in the morning. We voted first that the East India Companys Petition was no ways scandalous. 2^{ly}. A vote directly contrary to your first viz: our proceedings were no way a breach of your privileges &c: 3^{ly} We haue voted a message to you that taking notice of your desire of union & unsatisfyd with your reasons we conceiue the best way to union is for you to surcease all proceedings & dismisse in liberty our Petitioners. 4^{ly} at 10 a clock to resume a question that whoeuer executes your sense is a betrayer of the libertys of the Commons This is is [sic] in reserve in case you do nothing on our Message. Our Votes are not orderd to be Communicated to you. My eys are scarce open. Pardon

Your humble Serv^t AM: [monogram]
(MS Carte 81, fol. 37r)

The note is endorsed in another hand 'Heads of the voates of the Commons house 8. & 9th. of May 1668.' The votes it lists are described more fully in a letter by Marvell to the Hull Corporation the next day (9 May).¹⁴ Here he also mentions another pressing issue that helped sharpen the contest over

ANDREW MARVELL AND THE LORD WHARTON

Skinner's Case: the bill for continuing the Act of Conventicles that had easily passed in the House of Commons (28 April) but now 'had not time to passe' in the Lords. He lists those who represented the Lords' position to the Commons for 'almost five hours', and they include familiar names to the student of Marvell's later career: the Duke of Buckingham, the Lord Lucas, the Earl of Essex (later a Whig martyr), the Earl of Anglesey, Denzil Lord Holles.

By the delay of an adjournment, which became a series of adjournments and then a prorogation (1 March 1668/9), was prevented any continuation of the Conventicles Act, which was not renewed until 1670, when Marvell famously characterized it as 'the Quintessence of arbitrary Malice'.¹⁵ The session of 1667 had begun in October with high hopes for Comprehension on the part of Presbyterians – this after the seasons of the Plague, the Fire, and the failures of the Second Anglo-Dutch War had revealed the depth of the nonconformists' loyalty¹⁶ – but the Commons proved unwelcoming of such legislation and, after a Christmas adjournment, reaction was setting in by the time parliament met again in February 1667/8. Now complaints were voiced about the excesses of nonconformity, disruptive to the Church, and legislation followed instead to renew the Conventicles Act. Marvell is recorded as having spoken twice in the Commons against the renewal of the Act; he did so, however, in a House now overwhelmingly in favour of it.¹⁷ His first intervention was at its introduction (13 March 1667/8), where he was one of a number of speakers against it; his next was at its first reading (30 March 1668), when Marvell 'single fights forsaken Vertues cause' and seems alone to have opposed 'the current of their fury,' with no second 'as out of season judg'd'. But this Abdiel's communication with Wharton shows that he did not 'change his constant mind'. During the Cavalier Parliament, those in the lower house who were opposed to High Church measures needed to cooperate with the much more effective opposition to them in the upper house.¹⁸ In 1660, when the Comprehension afforded by the Worcester House Declaration had been fought over in the House of Commons, Marvell had been the teller for the unsuccessful Yeas in the first of the climactic votes. He comments darkly on that failure in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* (1672).¹⁹ In 1667, although he was author of bitter lampoons against the Lord Chancellor and 'the troop of Clarendon' ('Last Instructions', 177–80), he spoke three times in parliament during the impeachment of Clarendon in ways calculated to support the falling minister. This has baffled students of Marvell, who have supposed Marvell inept or thought this a cunning plan to outfox those who might suspect him of having written the satires impugning Clarendon (of which suspicions no other record has surfaced from this date).²⁰ But in doing so he was following the lead of figures like Wharton, Anglesey and Hollis, who were either conspicuously neutral or even supportive of Clarendon at this hour, in part because they understood that Clarendon was ready now to support Comprehension.²¹ Only later did Marvell again join in the convenient scapegoating of Clarendon as a means of distinguishing Charles II's

better 'Consideration of tender Consciencēs'.²² Moreover, any impeachment by the Commons of a lord gave too much power to a House of Commons that Marvell plainly distrusted. Again in 1670–71, his commitment to religious reform shows when he speaks in the Commons on behalf of some prominent victims of the renewed Conventicles Act and is a teller, now for the successful Noes, on a vote seeking to limit the punishments following from it.²³

Just how far Marvell was engaged in this quarter appears from a related attempt to escape the stranglehold that the House of Commons had kept on ecclesiastical legislation. He had a more particular reason to keep Wharton informed at just this point in 1668. To make the most of the impasse over Skinner's Case, they had prepared an 'Adresse from the House of Peeres to the King to make use of his prerogative in Ecclesiasticall affayres for the better composure and union of the mindes of his protestant subjects in the intervall of the present adjournment'. A draft of this address in Marvell's hand is in the Wharton papers.²⁴ Also dated 9 May 1668 (in the endorsement), the draft shows Marvell and Wharton's purpose in framing an appeal to the Crown. The troubles over Skinner's Case become an excuse to plead that the King use his prerogative to produce a religious settlement. Whether author or secretary, Marvell seems to have been directly involved in its composition:

We your Majestyes loyall Subjects the Lords Spirituall and Temporall in Parliament assembled do return all humble & hearty thanks for Your M^{tyes} gracious speech to both Houses of the 10th of February last, wherein in Your Princely wisdom You did then recommend it to them to thinke of some course to beget a better union & composure in the minds of Your Protestant Subjects in matters of Religion. And We do further humbly show that hauing been interrupted in our Counsell by the unexpected Violation of our Privileges by the House of Commons it is thereby & by reason of the approaching Recess become impossible for us to weigh & debate the considerations which are requisite in so important an affaire And therefore We do humbly beseech Your Mty that You will be graciously pleasd in the intervall of this instant adjournment to take such course therein as to Your M^{ty} shall seem fit according to the Power inherent in You in Ecclesiasticall affairs by the Prerogatiue annex to Your Imperiall Crown.
(MS Carte 77, fol. 597r)

In the event, Wharton records in a later endorsement that this was 'nott read in the Howse' (fol. 598v). But remarkable though Marvell's part be in such an address, it is consistent with his work in that session of parliament, when he was more demonstrative as an MP than otherwise in his career. In preparation for the session, a Comprehension Bill had been draughted anew and royal support for it engaged.²⁵ In the King's Speech (10 February 1667/8), Charles II then invited 'the setling a firm Peace as well at Home as Abroad' by some 'better Union and Composure in the Minds of My Protestant Subjects in Matters of Religion; whereby they may be induced not only to submit quietly to the Government, but also chearfully give their Assistance to the Support of it.'²⁶ When the House of Commons then instead persisted with

ANDREW MARVELL AND THE LORD WHARTON

inquiries into miscarriages in the Second Anglo-Dutch War, it was Marvell who, despite his animus against the king's minister Arlington, was ready to move that the House take up the King's Speech.²⁷ The Commons responded to the king's request in a most divisive way, however, as far as proponents of Comprehension were concerned. Now at the end of the session, the Marvell-Wharton address from the House of Lords urges Charles to do what the 'Last Instructions' had not yet contemplated: to supersede parliament and exert his dispensing power to heal the nation.

Marvell, whom later Whigs would prize as an MP's MP and a most loyal defender of the privileges of the House of Commons,²⁸ is here working hand in glove with the Lords instead to circumvent the Commons. As with his kindness for the Declaration of Indulgence in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, Marvell might sacrifice his constitutionalist regard for parliamentary privilege to the pressing need to recover that 'better Union and Composure in the Minds of . . . Protestant Subjects in Matters of Religion'. Already at this date, well before the 1670s, royal prerogative might have its merits in the eyes of those seeking comprehension from the Cavalier Parliament.²⁹ The Erastian solution recalls Marvell's Hobbesian encouragement of royal powers in *The Rehearsall Transpros'd: The Second Part* (1673) and related prescriptions from other hands in 1668 and after.³⁰ Where the attempt to legislate the Worcester House Declaration in 1660 had perhaps fallen afoul of royal resentment at 'the apparent slight to the prerogative',³¹ the Marvell-Wharton address invites the king to exercise his dispensing power to achieve some comparable Comprehension.

Wharton in endorsing this document also notes that this draft is 'in the hand writing of a friend deceased' (fol. 598v).³² Wharton's regard for his 'friend' is striking and it seems like tenderness that he should thus belatedly remark on Marvell's distinctive handwriting. The draft of the address and the first of the two new Marvell letters show him in the heat of the political action in the winter of 1667/8. They and the other Marvell materials in the Wharton collection also begin to show the depth of the friendship between Marvell, the poor minister's son from Hull who had risen to the House of Commons, and Wharton, the northern magnate, godson of Philip III of Spain³³ and friend of Cromwell, one of the protesting lords in 1675, one of the four lords sent to the Tower in 1676/7, and a parent of the Revolution of 1688/9. It is no wonder that Marvell, as Worsley has it, 'putt so great a vallew . . . upon his Lordship'³⁴ nor, we may think, that Wharton should set such store by Marvell.

The second new letter arises from Marvell's involvement in the marriage negotiations for the Lord Wharton's sons, but is written two years after the triangular correspondence with Worsley and Wharton of 1671/2. The unsigned document is bound out of sequence in Bodleian MS Rawl. letters 51, fol. 218. Unmistakably in Marvell's hand,³⁵ it is endorsed as written from Westminster with the date '10 March. 1673.'³⁶ This was soon after the wedding of Thomas

NICHOLAS von MALTZAHN

Wharton the previous September, announced publicly in January 1673/4.³⁷ Marvell now reports on a bride in prospect for Goodwin Wharton (1653–1704):

Your L^{ps} most humble
Servant. Mar: 10.

My Lord,
I spoke this day again with the person who repeats all that he had said to me with more assurance. He saith that the Company who spoke of it were all great persons & one of them neare of Kinne to the Ladyes and who principally negotiates the businesse. He himselfe onely helpd on the discours by seeming pleasd with it and w[ha]^t a prity sport it would be to see one that had all his life been coop'd up at Prayers & Conventicles should dispose of himselfe to such advantage This further he affirms to me that the yong man has not bin wanting to himselfe but for this six or eight weeks has daily hanted the Ladyes company. Concerning their vertue he informd me more particulars which at fitter time I shall acquaint You. He saith Your L[ordshi]^p has done very wisely in taking this journey and that you will do well not to be credulous w[ha]^tsoever may be affird to the contrary He can not conveniently begin the discourse afresh with them but if by rencounter they say any thing more of it he will give me account.
(MS Rawl. letters 51, fol. 218r)

Endorsed verso ‘10th March: 1673 [= 1674] From Westminster’, the letter shows Marvell again working for the Lord Wharton, and apparently more current than other of Wharton’s correspondents about his absence from London at this date.³⁸ We are lucky in having Goodwin Wharton’s massive autobiography of his life with its rich documentation of his spiritual encounters;³⁹ unlucky in that it describes eight of the likeliest candidates for his hand without naming them or making clear which of them Marvell’s letter might concern. (We are unlucky too in that he claims to have destroyed what may have been a more specific autobiography of his twenties, before his eccentricities took fuller hold.) Marvell’s letter may concern the third in Goodwin’s list, who is

a very pretty young woman and a very good fortune whose consent I was not wanting of, but her father being a lingring covetuous old beast he made such a stirr and such delays about artikles & setlements with my father that I grew quite tired and desisted, and she afterwards in I know not what kind of humor ran away with a young cuntrey foole.⁴⁰

This candidate seems best to fulfil Marvell’s references to the woman’s fortune or birth (‘to such advantage’), to the involvement of Wharton *père*, and to the length of Goodwin’s emotional involvement – he was easily put off and even (or especially) when in love he could end a courtship upon the least suspicion, being quick to feel ‘disappointments’.

Marvell’s politics and his associations with the great find illustration in these documents. But a deeper familiarity with Wharton again appears where Marvell reports in the later letter that his source ‘onely helpd on the discours

ANDREW MARVELL AND THE LORD WHARTON

by seeming pleas'd with it and w[ha]t a prity sport it would be to see one that had all his life been coop'd up at Prayers & Conventicles should dispose of himselfe to such advantage'. The note recalls that of Macaulay characterizing the same household with its 'Geneva bands, heads of lank hair, upturned eyes, nasal psalmody, and sermons three hours long.'⁴¹ Wharton was a powerful man and could be a forbidding presence. Did he accept Marvell's report as a tolerable bit of deprecation? Or does the note imply their shared distaste for such misrepresentations of faithful devotion? I incline to the former. But the rapport between them is not in doubt. They plainly understood each other and shared even more than their hopes of a broader, more inclusive Church of England than the Cavalier Parliament would ever accept.

Macaulay's characterization of the Lord Wharton's household does not allow for that aristocrat's passions for architecture, for painting, for gardens, and for poetry. At Wooburn especially he built anew, adding a gallery 120 feet long for his unparalleled collection of portraits by Van Dyck and Lely.⁴² His energy in improving his estates was inherited by his son Thomas, of whose estate at Winchendon it was claimed that 'the Gardens are the finest in this County, and for the Orange-Trees, perhaps the finest in England'.⁴³ In particular, the Lord Wharton was a keen gardener and capable of attention to minute detail in such improvements.⁴⁴ At Winchendon but especially at Wooburn he afforded his friends opportunity to enjoy with him 'so sweet a Retirement from the Business of the Court and Town, that both himself and his Lady were extremely delighted with it'.⁴⁵ But what of Marvell's poetry? Wharton had a taste for verse and for Restoration satire. Other of Wharton's correspondents sent him such materials⁴⁶ and Marvell's letter to him of 2 April 1667 shows the poet eager to satisfy that interest: 'I have herewith sent your Lordship something of others, having nothing of mine own to deserve your acceptance.'⁴⁷ The Marvell of 'The Last Instructions' would have found an appreciative audience in this quarter, especially with its final commendation of those 'born to Virtue and to Wealth . . . Whose gen'rous Conscience and whose Courage high / Does with clear Counsels their large Souls supply'.⁴⁸ 'The Loyall Scot' too would have been welcome to Wharton, as well as other work in this vein. His son Thomas later triumphed as the author of 'Lilli burlero', and a cherished youngest son, William, also came to show a fatal inclination for satire.⁴⁹ The Lord Wharton had given his share of instructions to painters and may be thought the most likely patron to have commissioned the portrait of Marvell by Lely (if Vertue's report of such is to be believed).⁵⁰ But the Wharton friendship may also help us with dating some of Marvell's lyrics.

There has for twenty years been some uncertainty about a possible Restoration dimension to Marvell's lyric poetry, ever since Allan Pritchard described the echoes in 'The Garden' of Restoration publications by Katherine Phillips (1667) and Abraham Cowley (1668).⁵¹ Little has been made of Pritchard's claim⁵² because, presumably, of scholarly unease owing to biographical and

contextual assumptions that the poem must nonetheless issue from his 'Fairfax' period. These issue in significant interpretive and editorial choices. Elizabeth Story Donno prints 'The Garden' right after 'Upon Appleton House' in her edition of Marvell's *Complete Poems*, since as 'an example of the poetry of solitude, *The Garden* very probably dates from the period of Marvell's sojourn with General Fairfax'.⁵³ In Marvell's *Miscellaneous Poems* (London, 1681), by contrast, the arrangement of the *silva* presents the lyrics without personal association before turning to those more specifically addressed, and 'The Garden' is separated from the Fairfax poems proper.

Marvell's 'The Garden' does seem very much a garden of the mind. Critics have shown how much it is one based on literary tradition. But at Wharton's country houses, and perhaps at others he visited in the Restoration, Marvell had much occasion – should such specific occasion have been needed – to return to his hortulan note of yesteryear. This of all his poems seems the most likely to be such a revisiting of earlier materials and themes. Marvell's remarkable capacity for compression in rewriting others' looser materials has been noted, not least by Pritchard.⁵⁴ In 'The Garden' we seem to find him thus compressing himself. The very artifice of the poem may be a tribute to the higher level of artifice (and expense) in Wharton's than in Fairfax's gardens, and its neoclassicism and response to literary tradition celebrate features that seem at a remove from the northern world of 'Upon Appleton House'.⁵⁵ Certainly Marvell had by the late 1660s, after his years of service to the House of Cromwell, and in Whitehall and in parliament, much more reason than before to complain of having sought innocence in vain '*per Templa, per urbes / . . . Regum perque alta Palatia*'.⁵⁶ He had reason too to share the thought with his friend Philip, Lord Wharton.

University of Ottawa

NICHOLAS von MALTZAHN

Notes

- 1 Preliminary report of the letters appeared in the *Times Literary Supplement*, no. 5177 (21 June 2002), pp. 14–15. Transcriptions of these documents are published with the kind permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.
- 2 Evidence of Marvell's commitment to toleration is hard to discover at any early date, even if the composition of 'A Short Historical Essay' included in *Mr. Smirke* (London, 1676) can be brought forward (see below); for his preferring even at a late date the position of Richard Baxter over that of John Owen, see William Lamont, 'The Religion of Andrew Marvell: Locating the "Bloody Horse"', in Conal Condren and A. D. Cousins (eds), *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell* (Aldershot, 1990), pp. 135–56.
- 3 This had by now become the residence of Wharton's son Thomas upon his coming of age. John Carswell, *The Old Cause: Three Biographical Studies in Whiggism* (London, 1954), p. 41; J. Kent Clark, *Goodwin Wharton* (Oxford, 1984), pp. 3–4.
- 4 The Lord Wharton had come to prefer his Wooburn to his Winchendon house

ANDREW MARVELL AND THE LORD WHARTON

- after his second wife's death in 1658, but through the 1660s still spent time at both.
- 4 Marvell expects his messenger to reach Wharton and to return to Winchendon the same day, Andrew Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, 3rd ed., H. M. Margoliouth and P. Legouis with E. E. Duncan-Jones, 2 vols (Oxford, 1971), II, 326–7.
 - 5 Anne Wharton, *Surviving Works*, ed. G. Greer and S. Hastings (Guildford, 1997), pp. 23–4; one of the forms he sent out for reports on such candidates may be found in Bodleian MS Rawl. letters 50, fol. 12.
 - 6 Thomas Wharton's sensational horsemanship, duelling and affairs soon gained him fame of a kind after his marriage to another heiress (and poet), Anne Lee, which proved miserable and childless (Wharton, *Surviving Works*, ed. Greer and Hastings, pp. 34–106); Anne Wharton's life, letters, and works yield no evident connection with Marvell, unless there be something in her mockery that 'Romantick Heros may their Fancy please / In telling of their Griefs to senceless Trees' ('To Melpomene against Complaint', lines 3–4, Wharton, *Surviving Works*, ed. Greer and Hastings, p. 129). For Thomas Wharton's career as a Whig and his importance at the Revolution of 1688/9 and after, see Macaulay's compelling portrait in his *History of England*, chapter 20, in *The Complete Works of Lord Macaulay*, 12 vols (London, 1898), V, 480–4; Carswell, *Old Cause*, 25–127, and B. D. Henning, *The Commons 1660–1690*, 3 vols (London, 1983), III, 697–700; D. W. Hayton, *The House of Commons 1690–1715*, 5 vols (London, 2002), V, 838–43.
 - 7 Parliamentary lists: Bodleian MS Carte 81, fols 77r ('1660'), 80r (1661), 82r ('Names of friends' 1661); newsletter: MS Carte 103, fol. 258–9, printed in Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, II, 309–10. For the Lord Wharton's country residence being Wooburn by this date, see MS Carte 228, fol. 23r (1 February 1667/8).
 - 8 Qv. Nigel Smith and Maureen Bell, 'Andrew Marvell and the "femina periculosa"', *Times Literary Supplement*, 5104 (26 January 2001), pp. 14–15; headnote for 'The Advice-to-a-Painter Poems' in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. Nigel Smith, Longman Annotated English Poets (London, 2003), pp. 322–3. Marvell also hopes the business will show 'at least mine industry, if not my good fortune', however, which seems less like such an edition (*Poems and Letters*, II, 309.)
 - 9 Thomas Blount to Anthony Wood, 6 June 1676 (Bodleian, MS Wood F40, fol. 214).
 - 10 Public Record Office, SP 29/401/321, on 9 August 1677 L'Estrange reports to Williamson the information of Anthony Lawrence, received ca. 28 July 1677: the works cited as prepared or preparing for the press are the related 'Amsterdam' imprint *A Narrative of the Cause and Manner of the Imprisonment of the Lords*, also 'Two Speeches in the Lords house on their behalf: [and] an other Treatise to prove this Parliament dissolv'd', and a 'discourse reflecting upon the Duke of York, and the Lord Treasurer concerning a design to bring in Popery' – this last may well be the *Account*.
 - 11 Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* ('Amsterdam' [= London], 1677a), pp. 72, 152.
 - 12 Wharton, *Surviving Works*, ed. Greer and Hastings, p. 4, citing two dedications by Howe of 1681; see also Bodleian MS Carte 228, fol. 167 (Howe to the Lord Wharton, 2 August 1680) and MS Rawl. letters 51, fol. 298 (Howe to William Wharton, 20 October 1682); Bryan Dale, *The Good Lord Wharton*, 2nd ed.

- (London, 1906), pp. 83–4; N. H. Keeble, *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity* (Leicester, 1987), p. 40. Marvell should already have known Howe from fellow service in Whitehall in 1658, N. H. Keeble and Geoffrey Nuttall, ed., *Calendar of the Correspondence of Richard Baxter*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1991), I, 294, 302, 308, 309, 310, 390.
- 13 [William Cobbett and John Wright,] *The Parliamentary History of England, from the Earliest Period to the Year 1803*, 36 vols (London, 1806–20), IV, 422–6; a letter from Arlington to the Duke of Ormond (2 May 1668) shows how with the money bill passed, the dispute over privilege doomed the session (2 May 1668, MS Carte 46, fol. 627r–v).
 - 14 Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, II, 75–6 – the Corporation also had separate notice of these events from its other chief correspondent, Robert Stockdale (Hull Archive, BRL 1194/114–16, 5–9 May 1668).
 - 15 Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, II, 314 (21 Mar. 1670/1).
 - 16 Steven Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and the Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650–1668* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 430. In this connection, Marvell may well have recalled his own father’s loyal service to a plague-ridden Hull in the late 1630s.
 - 17 *The Diary of John Milward*, ed. Caroline Robbins (Cambridge, 1938), pp. 225, 238. For the progress of the bill see *Commons Journal*, IX, 58, 60, 66, 71, 72, 74, 78, 87, 90, 93; and Marvell’s constituency letters, *Poems and Letters*, II, 70 (14 March 1668), 71 (19 March 1668), 74 (25 April 1668).
 - 18 For the latter see Richard Davis, ‘The “Presbyterian” opposition and the emergence of party in the house of Lords in the reign of Charles II’, in Clyde Jones (ed.), *Party and Management in Parliament, 1660–1784* (Leicester, 1984), pp. 1–35. Here Wharton played a significant role and his papers show his interest (one is a set of headings addressing the impact on trade and the loss to foreign interests of the nonconformists’ wealth should the legislature succeed, MS Carte 81, fol. 305).
 - 19 *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, ed. D. I. B. Smith (Oxford, 1971), p. 18.
 - 20 Henning, *The Commons 1660–1690*, 3:25; John Dixon Hunt, *Andrew Marvell: His Life and Writings* (London, 1978), p. 163; Annabel Patterson, *Marvell: The Writer in Public Life* (Harlow, 2000), pp. 21–22.
 - 21 Davis, ‘The “Presbyterian” opposition and the emergence of party’, p. 9; Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661–1667* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 318–9: ‘When parliament did meet, Sir Robert Atkins and Colonel Birch were the sponsors of a bill for comprehension – and both men were among Clarendon’s strongest defenders in the proceedings against him in October and November.’
 - 22 *Rehearsal Transpros’d*, ed. D. I. B. Smith, p. 44.
 - 23 *Commons Journal*, VIII, 191, IX, 223; Douglas R. Lacey, *Dissent and Parliamentary Politics in England, 1661–1689* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1969), p. 13; *Poems and Letters*, II, 117–8, 317–8, 364–5: for John Jekyll, see Elizabeth Clarke, ‘Elizabeth Jekyll’s Spiritual Diary: Private Manuscript or Political Document?’ *English Manuscript Studies*, 9 (2000), 230.
 - 24 So styled in the endorsement: this is bound with other Wharton papers in MS Carte 77, fols 597–8.
 - 25 See Bodleian, B. 14.15. Linc. (Thomas Barlow’s account of the matter); Walter G.

ANDREW MARVELL AND THE LORD WHARTON

- Simon, *The Restoration Episcopate* (New York, 1965), pp. 164–7; and more generally Roger Thomas, ‘Comprehension and Indulgence’, in Geoffrey Nuttall and Owen Chadwick (eds), *From Uniformity to Unity, 1662–1962* (London, 1962), pp. 189–253.
- 26 *Lords Journals*, XII, 181.
- 27 Marvell had inveighed against Arlington on February 14 or 15 (Anchitell Grey, *Debates of the House of Commons*, 10 vols (London, 1763), I, 70–71 gives the 14th, whereas it is the 15th in Milward, *Diary*, 184 and in *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. R. C. Latham and W. Matthews, 11 vols (London, 1973–1983), IX, 74 [17 Feb. 1668]), but Arlington was ready ‘to forgive him’ when Marvell then invited consideration of the King’s Speech (*The Right Honourable the Earl of Arlington’s Letters to Sir W. Temple, Bar.*, ed. Thomas Bebington (London, 1702), p. 226).
- 28 The phenomenon is described in more detail in my ‘Andrew Marvell and the Pre-history of Whiggism’, in *The Cultures of Whiggism*, ed. Abigail Williams and David Womersley (Newark, Delaware University Press, forthcoming).
- 29 N. von Maltzahn, ‘Marvell’s Ghost’, in Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (eds), *Marvell and Liberty* (Basingstoke, 1999), p. 51; and see earlier Martin Dzelzainis, ‘Marvell Transpos’d’, *English*, 33 (1984), 139–45.
- 30 Jon Parkin, ‘Liberty Transpos’d: Andrew Marvell and Samuel Parker’, in Chernaik and Dzelzainis (eds), *Marvell and Liberty*, pp. 269–89 (esp. pp. 275–83).
- 31 Anne Whiteman, ‘The Restoration of the Church of England’, in Nuttall and Chadwick (eds), *From Uniformity to Unity, 1662–1962*, p. 71.
- 32 This seems contemporary with some cataloguing of these materials (probably in connection with religious legislation attempted late in 1680, during the Exclusion Crisis) under the heading ‘Draught of Acts of Par[liament] in church matters not passed 1675 &c.’ (fol. 597a^r): these later notes are in the same hand as the first part of the endorsement but in a different pen.
- 33 Arthur Raistrick, *The Wharton Mines in Swaledale in the Seventeenth Century*, North Yorkshire County Record Office Publications, 31 (1982), p. 3.
- 34 Bodleian MS Rawl. letters 50, fol. 126v (1 Jan. 1671/2).
- 35 It also features a form of the lower case letter ‘y’ to which he was partial at this date, for which compare his letter to Sir Edward Harley of 3 May 1673, readily available in facsimile in Hilton Kelliher, *Andrew Marvell, Poet and Politician, 1621–78* (London, 1978), p. 109.
- 36 In Wharton’s usual way in dating these endorsements this is 1673/4; compare in the same volume fols 47r–48v, 50r–v, 207r–v (also MS Rawl. letters 50, fols 61r–62v, 99r–v) where Wharton uses the old year on letters dated from both years by his correspondents.
- 37 Wharton, *Surviving Works*, ed. Greer and Hastings, p. 41.
- 38 Other letters to Wharton from this date are addressed to him at his house near the church of St Giles in the Fields, but after the end of the parliamentary session he may well have returned to his country house at Wooburn or also to some place unknown (since Marvell refers to him as being on ‘this journey’); hence the point of Marvell writing to him from Westminster. The letter disproves the claim that after Thomas Wharton, ‘Lord Wharton was to make no attempt to find wives for any of his other three sons’ (Wharton, *Surviving Works*, ed. Greer and Hastings, p. 40); the scouting of prospects for Goodwin is also cited in Clark, *Goodwin Wharton*, pp. 9, 331.

- 39 These find sympathetic exploration in Clark, *Goodwin Wharton*, which supplies valuable guidance through Goodwin Wharton's very long manuscript.
- 40 British Library, Add. MS 20006, fol. 6r.
- 41 *Complete Works of Lord Macaulay*, 12 vols (London, 1898), V, 480.
- 42 These included the remarkable Van Dyck portrait of the Lord Wharton aged 19, now in the National Gallery in Washington.
- 43 Thomas Cox, *Magna Britannia*, 6 vols (London, 1720–31), I, 208. The grand scale of the house and gardens at Winchendon by the turn of the century is recorded in a painting by Peter Tillemans, now in the Buckinghamshire County Museum (a reproduction may be found in Elizabeth Berry 'A Household Account Book of Thomas Wharton 5th Baron Wharton (1648–1715)', *Records of Buckinghamshire*, 36 (1994), 87).
- 44 His application to just such detail appears in other of his correspondence from the 1680s: M. Y. Ashcroft, ed., *Documents Relating to the Swaledale Estates of Lord Wharton in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, North Yorkshire County Record Office Publications, 36 (1984), pp. 211–2, 230, 243–4.
- 45 Cox, *Magna Britannia*, I, 205.
- 46 See especially G. T. to the Lord Wharton (28 May 1666), Bodleian MS Rawl letters 53, fol. 233, enclosing a satire 'on the new Oath' in 'the style of The Loyal Non-Conformist': G. T. claims that any advantage that the Presbyterians enjoy in preaching is met by that of the 'Episcopal Men' in poetry (Dr Robert South especially finds admiring notice as 'our Noble Austrian Satyrist'), with some mockery of the recent 'Presbyterian Pretender to Poetry'.
- 47 *Poems and Letters*, II, 310. He encloses a Stillingfleet sermon reproving the king, which is 'so polish't as indeed suited with the delicacy of his auditory rather than the notoriousnesse of the Evill', and Simon Ford's newly printed *The Conflagration of London*, and gives Wharton some guidance on what to think of the latter, not least its Latin text.
- 48 *Poems and Letters*, I, 172 ('Last Instructions', lines 983–9).
- 49 George Lord (gen. ed.), *Poems on Affairs of State*, 7 vols (New Haven, 1963–75), III, 505–10, IV, 309–12; *Poems on Affairs of State . . . Part III* (London, 1698), sig. A3r, pp. 5–9, 13, 16–17, 19–21 ff. (the latter presents William Wharton's 'poetical quarrel' with Seymour Walseley, which led to a duel in 1687 in which William was killed, Folger Library MS L.c.1894, 1895 [13 and 15 Dec. 1687] and Bodleian Thorn Drury d. 28, pp. 1, 22), and pp. 194, 221.
- 50 Later recorded in the hands of one of Shaftesbury's relations, *Poems and Letters*, I, 286; perhaps the portrait of Marvell by Gaspar Smith (Smitz) cited in C. H. Collins-Baker, *Lely and the Stuart Portrait Painters*, 2 vols (London, 1912), II, 217.
- 51 Allan Pritchard, 'Marvell's "The Garden": A Restoration Poem?', *Studies in English Literature*, 23 (1983), 371–88.
- 52 See, for example, Andrew Marvell, *Pastoral and Lyric Poems 1681*, ed. David Ormerod and Christopher Wortham (Nedlands, Western Australia, 2000), p. 166; or the claim that Marvell 'was done with lyric poetry by the Restoration, and putting aside one of his favorite topics [the garden] may have been an inevitable consequence', Curtis Whitaker, 'Andrew Marvell's Garden-Variety Debates', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 62 (2001), 311.
- 53 Andrew Marvell, *The Complete Poems*, ed. E. S. Donno (Harmondsworth, 1972, 1996), pp. 75–102, 255.

ANDREW MARVELL AND THE LORD WHARTON

- 54 For another very specific instance, see Marvell, *Complete Poems*, ed. Donno, p. 273.
- 55 See also L.N. Wall, 'Some Notes on Marvell's Sources,' *Notes and Queries*, 202 (April 1957), 173. By the late 1660s the Wooburn gardens must have been well-established, since already in 1650 Wharton was planting there: Oliver Miller, 'Philip Lord Wharton, and his Collection of Portraits', *Burlington Magazine*, 136 (August 1994), p. 521.
- 56 '*Hortus*', lines 8–9: Pritchard, 'Marvell's "The Garden"', p. 380, cites Elsie Duncan-Jones as first having observed as much, 'Marvell: A Great Master of Words', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 61 (1975), 275n, where she suggests the poem's connection to Wharton and Winchendon.

Address for Correspondence

Dr Nicholas von Maltzahn, Department of English, University of Ottawa, 70 Laurier Avenue East, PO Box 450, Stn. A, Ottawa, Ontario K1N 6N5, Canada, e-mail: maltzahn@uottawa.ca