

## Was Marvell a Republican?

### I

Hardly anyone who has written about seventeenth- and eighteenth-century republicanism agrees as to exactly what the term means. Blair Worden has argued that republicanism was inconceivable in England before the execution of Charles I in 1649 and extremely rare even in the 1650s: the regicides, in this view, ‘were concerned to remove a particular king, not kingship. They cut off King Charles’ head and wondered what to do next.’<sup>1</sup> David Norbrook, in contrast, finds evidence of a flourishing ‘republican literary culture’ as early as the 1620s, and gives Marvell a prominent role in his account of post-1650 English republicanism.<sup>2</sup> Quentin Skinner, uneasy at the imprecision of the term, has moved from a liberal and inclusive definition of republicanism to rejecting the term altogether, substituting ‘the neo-roman theory of free states’, and in *Liberty before Liberalism* reserves the category ‘republican’ for those writers who reject monarchy altogether.<sup>3</sup>

A copy of *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* in the Folger Library, discovered by Annabel Patterson, contains manuscript annotations by two seventeenth-century readers: one comments ‘it is supposed to be written, by Mr. Marvell, A Countrey Gentleman, & a Great Republican’, while the other responds, ‘To say he is a great Republican you are very much mistaken for he is of this parliament and a conformist’.<sup>4</sup> By the strictest definition of the term, Marvell, if we take his words literally, would appear to disqualify himself from consideration as republican theorist. If a republican is a resolute, unyielding opponent of monarchy as an institution – someone who, as David Wootton has put it, applauded the execution of Charles I and regarded Brutus, Caesar’s assassin, as a role model – then the author of the ‘Horatian Ode’ and ‘Tom May’s Death’ is no republican.<sup>5</sup> Even in *An Account of the Growth of Popery* (1677), which, as J. G. A. Pocock and others have shown, became something of a sacred text to later republicans, Marvell speaks respectfully of the institution of monarchy, and in particular of ‘the Lawfull Government of England’ as limited monarchy:

## WARREN CHERNAIK

Nothing is left to the Kings will, but all is subjected to his Authority . . . and a King of England, keeping to these measures, may without arrogance be said to remain the onely Intelligent Ruler over a Rational People . . . So that the Kings of England are in nothing inferiour to other Princes, save in being more abridged from injuring their own subjects . . . In short, there is nothing that comes nearer in Government to the Divine Perfection, then where the Monarch, as with us, injoys a capacity of doing all the good imaginable to mankind, under a disability to all that is evil.<sup>6</sup>

Yet, as many commentators have noted, the strict definition of republicanism raises any number of problems, since many seventeenth-century writers who considered themselves republicans were willing under certain circumstances to countenance monarchy with limited powers, a constitutional arrangement which would guarantee that ‘nothing is left to the Kings will’. David Wootton points out that ‘there was an extensive public literature which appealed to republican principles and republican values, claiming that they were perfectly compatible with constitutional monarchy’ (p. 4). The republicans Algernon Sidney, James Harrington, Sir Henry Vane, and Henry Neville all opposed the trial and execution of Charles I, as did John Lilburne and other Levellers.

Edmund Ludlow, Sidney, and Vane were prominent among the radical republican opponents of the Cromwellian Protectorate, on the grounds that the new regime was monarchy under another name, a betrayal of the principles on which the English revolution had been fought. Some scholars have therefore limited the category of republicans in the 1650s to those who supported the Commonwealth government but, after 1653, refused to accept the legitimacy of the Protectorate. But, as Norbrook has shown, Marchamont Nedham, Milton, and Marvell all defend the Cromwellian government during this period by appealing to republican principles.<sup>7</sup> Was Milton a republican when he wrote the *First Defence* (1651), ceasing to be a republican when he wrote the *Second Defence* (1654), and again becoming a republican in writing *The Readie and Easie Way* (1660)? Nedham, the editor of the newsbook *Mercurius Politicus*, published *The Case of the Commonwealth of England, Stated* in 1650, urging *de facto* submission to any government in power, and afterwards published *A True State of the Case of the Commonwealth*, in 1654, defending the Protectorate. Two years later, in 1656, Nedham published *The Excellencie of a Free-State*, arguing that all kings are potential tyrants and that ‘not onely the Name of King, but the Thing King (whether in the hands of one or many)’ should be ‘pluck’d up root and branch’.<sup>8</sup> Was he a republican in some of these tracts and not in others?

In *The Machiavellian Moment*, Pocock has shown in detail how, in the circumstances of the 1670s and 1680s, anti-monarchical arguments advanced in the 1650s by Harrington and Nedham were adapted by Neville (Harrington’s close friend), Sidney, and the political allies of the Earl of

WAS MARVELL A REPUBLICAN?

Shaftesbury, including Marvell, to criticize abuses of power, without overtly attacking monarchy as an institution.<sup>9</sup> Even Sidney, executed for treason in 1683 on a charge of ‘compassing and imagining the death of the king’ in unpublished writings, distinguished between good kings and tyrants, claiming that ‘absolute monarchy’ is ‘all that I dispute against, professing much veneration for that which is mixed, regulated by law, and directed to the common good’.<sup>10</sup> If anyone in the seventeenth century deserves the title of republican, it is Sidney: he held that ‘Monarchy is the worst evill that can befall a Nation’, and as Worden points out, he detested both Cromwell and Charles II:

He hated Cromwell’s protectorate. For most of Charles II’s reign he longed for the king’s overthrow. For much of it he plotted to achieve it.

But Sidney’s republicanism, like Milton’s, allows for a distinction between those monarchs who are content to serve the public interest, ruling by consent, and tyrants who claim that ‘they may do what they list’, with no restrictions on their unbounded will.<sup>11</sup>

Marvell in his post-Restoration political writings similarly emphasizes accountability, the need to restrain the immoderate desire of kings and their favourites for power, arguing, like Nedham, that ‘Freedom is to be preserved no other way in a Commonwealth, but by keeping Officers and Governours in an accountable state’.<sup>12</sup> Ambitious, intriguing courtiers tempt a ruler with a vision of absolute power, a ‘brutal magistracy’ in which kings and their favourites would be ‘row’d in state over the Ocean of Publick Tranquility by the publick Slavery’:

There never have been wanting among them such as would set the Magistrate upon the Pinnacle of the Temple, and showing them all the Power, Wealth, and Glory of the Kingdoms of the Earth, have proffer’d the Prince all so he would be tempted to fall down & worship them.<sup>13</sup>

In these verse and prose satires, *Last Instructions to a Painter*, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d*, and *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*, Marvell warns princes (and in particular, Charles II, to whom all these writings are explicitly or implicitly addressed) that those who pursue ‘the sanguinary course’ often bring retribution upon themselves. In a dream vision near the end of *Last Instructions to a Painter*, Charles II is reminded of the fate of his father and his grandfather, as their ‘pale ghosts’ appear before him:

Harry sits down, and in his open side  
The grisly wound reveals of which he died,  
And ghastly Charles, turning his collar low,  
The purple thread about his neck does show.<sup>14</sup>

## II

Thomas Corns in *Uncloistered Virtue* has warned against the dangers of 'reading backwards from the reassuringly liberal voice' of *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* and Marvell's other late prose works, imposing an 'internal coherence' upon writings which can be read as 'disconcertingly unstable' in the way they respond to changing political circumstances. In Corns's view, 'Marvell does not hold together'. The most striking example of apparently 'incompatible utterances' in poems by Marvell can be found in two poems of 1650, the 'Horatian Ode'; and 'Tom May's Death'. It might therefore be useful to examine these two poems and 'The First Anniversary', written five years later, to see if any consistent pattern can be discerned or whether the 'discontinuities' raise problems which 'defy any certain or straightforward resolution'.<sup>15</sup>

During the Civil War, Marvell was a non-combatant, absent on the continent (in Holland, France, Spain, and Italy) between 1642 and 1646. Some critics have argued for an early royalist phase in Marvell's writing, on the evidence of three poems of 1648–9, none included in his *Miscellaneous Poems* (1681) and one of doubtful authorship. Marvell's 'To his Noble Friend Mr Richard Lovelace, upon his Poems' is one of seventeen commendatory poems in *Lucasta* (1649), a volume which is in itself a royalist utterance, testifying to Lovelace's devotion to the royalist cause. Several of the other commendatory poems refer to the author as Colonel Richard Lovelace, poet-warrior.<sup>16</sup>

Marvell's poem in its opening lines resembles his account of the lost garden paradise in 'Upon Appleton House', written three years later, presenting the present times as 'tainted' and 'degenerate' from a departed 'candid age' of peace which allowed the 'sweet Muse' of Lovelace to flourish:

These virtues now are banished out of town,  
Our civil wars have lost the civic crown.  
He highest builds, who with most art destroys,  
And against others' fame his own employs. (1–2, 5, 11–14, 17)

But there is no direct statement of royalist allegiance, no mention of the King and his cause in Marvell's poem, differentiating it from much of the royalist verse circulating at the time (including Lovelace's own poems).<sup>17</sup> A series of witty topical allusions to sequestration, the Presbyterian ministry, the Kentish petition, and the licensing of books suggest a certain coolness toward those currently in power. Yet war is seen here not as glorious (one of the other commendatory poems speaks of Lovelace as motivated by 'a Hero's spirit', a 'desire of Glory') but as destructive; Marvell enlists himself in the company of Lovelace's fellow poets, not his fellow soldiers.

An elegy 'Upon the Death of Lord Hastings', published in *Lachrymae Musarum* (1649), is even less the poem of a committed royalist. Though other poems in the collection link the death of young Hastings with the execution

## WAS MARVELL A REPUBLICAN?

of Charles I several months earlier and with the 'sick lapsed desp'rate state' of the kingdom (one poet even says there is 'in Heaven both Monarch, and an House of Peers'), none of this enters into Marvell's poem. Like Milton on Edward King and Dryden on John Oldham, Marvell emphasizes his subject's early death and unfulfilled promise, holding out some hope of consolation for the mourners:

Hastings is dead; and we, disconsolate,  
With early tears must mourn his early fate (7–8)<sup>18</sup>

A third poem, 'An Elegy upon the Death of my Lord Francis Villiers', is unequivocally royalist and violently partisan, but, as I have argued in *The Poet's Time*, it is probably not by Marvell. The poem, of which only two printed copies are extant, was attributed to Marvell by George Clarke at least forty years after its anonymous publication. Its bellicose quality and its total identification with not only the royalist cause but the King's army – indeed, it purports to be by one of Villiers' fellow soldiers and its opening lines pour scorn on noncombatants like Marvell, those who, 'far from the dust and battle's sulph'ry heat', were 'not in the fight nor durst thou charge' (4, 10) – differentiate it from all other poems by Marvell.<sup>19</sup> The poem ends with a call to the army to avenge Villiers's death by slaughtering as many 'vulgar bodies' as possible among the enemy:

And we hereafter to his honour will  
Not write so many, but so many kill. (117, 125–6)

Certainly the vituperative treatment of Cromwell and Fairfax in this poem is wildly at variance with the 'Horatian Ode' and 'Upon Appleton House', written shortly afterwards, and projects a world of black villainy and unblemished heroism:

Much rather thou I know expect'st to tell  
How heavy Cromwell gnashed the earth and fell,  
Or how slow Death far from the sight of day  
The long-deceived Fairfax bore away. (13–16)

Whether or not the Villiers elegy is by Marvell, all these early poems express several characteristic Marvellian themes, in common with such poems as 'Upon Appleton House' and 'The Nymph Complaining for the Death of her Fawn'. These include an acute awareness of loss in a universe where 'man (alas) is but the Heavens' sport', a sensitivity to perishable beauty, 'Forced to live in storms and wars', and a recognition that the 'arts of peace', the pleasures of the contemplative life, may be inaccessible in time of war. The 'wanton troopers riding by', who kill the nymph's fawn, can perhaps be associated with the New Model Army, but a political reading of this dramatic monologue is hard to sustain. As Marvell says in an eloquent passage in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, the dream of living in a state of 'perpetual Peace' and prelapsarian tranquillity is futile:

## WARREN CHERNAIK

And ever since the first Brother Sacrificed the other to Revenge, because his Offering was better accepted, Slaughter and War has made up half the business in the World, and often upon the same quarrel, and with like success.<sup>20</sup>

But one poem of 1650, ‘Tom May’s Death’, is strongly royalist, and attacks some of the central assumptions of English republicanism. Not only does the poem express unmitigated regret at ‘great Charles his death’, but it explicitly presents the Civil War, in standard royalist fashion, as unjustified rebellion, with Brutus and Cassius, heroes in the republican tradition, as patterns of villainy. Ben Jonson, the poet’s spokesman, acts as guardian of standards, political and aesthetic:

Sounding of ancient heroes, such as were  
The subject’s safety, and the rebel’s fear.  
But how a double-headed vulture eats  
Brutus and Cassius, the people’s cheats. (15–18, 76)

May, as Norbrook has shown, is a key figure in the development of English republicanism, author of an influential translation of Lucan’s *Pharsalia* (1627), *A Continuation of Lucan’s Historical Poem* (1630), *The History of the Parliament* (1647), and *A Breviary of the History of the Parliament* (1650), as well as other works in English and Latin.<sup>21</sup> Marvell presents May as an unprincipled apostate, wholly motivated by ‘mercenary’ considerations both as poet and as historian – a ‘most servile’ wit who would truckle to anyone in power and has made unworthy use of any gifts he may have had:

But thou, base man, first prostituted hast  
Our spotless knowledge and the studies chaste,  
Apostacizing from our arts and us  
To turn the chronicler to Spartacus. (40, 71–4)

What is particularly awkward and problematical about ‘Tom May’s Death’, written four or five months after the ‘Horatian Ode’, is that Marvell accuses May of doing what, as chronicler of the rise of Cromwell and the establishment of the Commonwealth government, he himself might be accused of doing. In any number of ways, then, the ‘Horatian Ode’ and ‘Tom May’s Death’ seem incompatible.

Parallels between England and Rome are central to classical republican discourse. In such writers as Harrington and Nedham, as in Machiavelli’s *Discourses on Livy*, the Roman republic is seen as a viable model for a modern state to follow, and, in Roman and later history, the transition from republic to rule by king or emperor is characterized as a loss of freedom, a descent into servitude. But in ‘Tom May’s Death’, the arguments of classical republicanism are presented as fraudulent:

Go seek the novice statesmen, and obtrude  
Of them some Roman-cast similitude,  
Tell them of liberty, the stories fine,  
Until you all grow consuls in your wine. (43–6)

## WAS MARVELL A REPUBLICAN?

To apply 'Rome's example' to wholly different English circumstances, 'transferring old Rome hither', Marvell claims in these lines, is illegitimate, revealing May to be a 'foul architect that had not eye to see/ How ill the measures of these states agree' (41–4, 49, 51–3). And yet Marvell himself used the same metaphor of architecture as applied to statecraft in the 'Horatian Ode', giving his own version of 'Rome's example' in describing the violent birth of the English republic:

This was that memorable hour,  
Which first assured the forced pow'r.  
So when they did design  
The Capitol's first line,  
A bleeding head where they begun,  
Did fright the architects to run:  
And yet in that the State  
Foresaw its happy fate. (65–72)

This is of course a complicated and enigmatic passage, in which virtually every detail is charged with an ambivalence which would be out of place in a satire like 'Tom May's Death'. Portents are shown to be open to different interpretations, positive or sinister, depending on the perspective of the observer. Rewriting Roman history, Marvell superimposes the decapitated monarch's bleeding head upon a human skull which, according to legend, was discovered in the foundations of Rome's Capitol, and invents the detail of frightened architects – probably an allusion to the presbyterians who, after initially supporting the parliamentary cause, balked at the execution of the king.

In *The Poet's Time*, I argued that the 'Horatian Ode' and 'Tom May's Death', two poems which respond to a similar time of disorder and uncertainty, can be read as engaging in an internal debate, each commenting on and challenging some basic assumptions of the other (as in Marvell's 'Dialogue between the Soul and Body').<sup>22</sup> The best-known passage in 'Tom May's Death' represents an example of this kind of dialogue:

When the sword glitters o'er the judge's head,  
And fear has cowed churchmen silenced,  
Then is the poet's time, 'tis then he draws,  
And single fights forsaken Virtue's cause.  
He, when the wheel of empire whirleth back,  
And though the world's disjointed axle crack,  
Sings still of ancient rights and better times,  
Seeks wretched good, arraigns successful crimes. (63–70)

These lines are a ringing defence of a poet's responsibility to remain true to his principles even in the most adverse circumstances, and state the fundamental ethical principle on which those falling short of this ideal are judged. As such, it is compatible with the posthumous image of Marvell as incorruptible patriot-poet. 'this island's watchful sentinel', memorialized on his

## WARREN CHERNAIK

tombstone as ‘a strenuous asserter of the constitution, laws & liberties of England’.<sup>23</sup> Yet, as Corns has pointed out, the details of the passage, ‘in the context of the events of 1649–50’, are royalist and anti-republican: the threatening sword recalls the trial of Charles I, the earth forcibly wrenched from its axle (a metaphor Marvell used in *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* and ‘The Definition of Love’) alludes to the King’s execution, successful crimes are the acts of the victorious Cromwell and the regicides.<sup>24</sup> The ‘ancient rights’, which Charles I claimed to be upholding at his trial, are in the ‘Horatian Ode’, in contrast, presented as ‘helpless’, rendered ineffectual by the facts of power, the iron laws that determine human success or failure:

Though Justice against Fate complain,  
 And plead the ancient rights in vain,  
     But these do hold or break,  
     As men are strong or weak.  
 Nature that hateth emptiness,  
 Admits of penetration less,  
     And therefore must make room  
     Where greater spirits come.      (‘Horatian Ode’, 37–44.62)

The immediate context of ‘An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell’s Return from Ireland’ is the return of the victorious general from his Irish campaign in May 1650, and the political issue central to the poem is where, after the death of the King, the allegiance of the King’s former subjects was due. As Michael Wilding has pointed out, there are a number of strategic silences in Marvell’s poem: there is no mention, for example, of the fact that Cromwell’s Irish campaign was opposed by Levellers and other radicals within the army (‘Will you go on stil to kill, slay and murther men, to make them as absolute Lords and Masters over Ireland as you have made them over England?’), no mention of the suspicion and hostility with which Cromwell was frequently treated at this time, no mention of Charles II, heir to the throne, as a possible rival claimant to power.<sup>25</sup> And of course, there is the extraordinary act of appropriation in which the defeated Irish, denied their own voice (howls of protest at the massacres at Drogheda and Wexford) are made, out of their dead mouths, to praise their conqueror:

And now the Irish are ashamed  
 To see themselves in one year tamed:  
     So much one man can do,  
     That does both act and know.  
 They can affirm his praises best,  
 And have, though overcome, confessed  
     How good he is, how just,  
     And fit for highest trust.      (73–80)

Blair Worden has commented on the close resemblances between these lines and Nedham’s praise of Cromwell in *Mercurius Politicus* of 13 June:

## WAS MARVELL A REPUBLICAN?

His most famous services in Ireland, which being added to the garland of his English victories, have crowned him in the opinion of all the world, for one of the wisest and most accomplished *Leaders*, amongst the present and past Generations . . . It is the wonder of our Neighbour Nations, that so much should be done in so little time.<sup>26</sup>

If Marvell's praise, unlike Nedham's, appears double-edged, hinting at ironic reservations, it is because, though decisive military victories may provide evidence of competence and strength of character as well as political acumen (the ability to 'act and know'), they in no way show Cromwell to be either 'good' or 'just'. Cromwell is represented throughout the poem as a destructive force and as an agent of historical change, without any concession, at least in the first part of the poem, that such change is beneficial or that the ruthless exercise of power, 'burning', 'breaking', blasting (14, 21, 24), is tempered by forbearance or moderation. Milton's sonnet to Cromwell, while praising his 'matchless fortitude', argues that 'Peace hath her victories / No less renowned than War', and Milton's sonnet to Fairfax, urging him to turn his 'firm unshaken virtue' to a 'nobler task', warns 'For what can war but endless war still breed?'<sup>27</sup> The 'Horatian Ode', on the other hand, projects no future other than 'endless war', with the destructive power of the New Model Army turned from domestic to foreign enemies. Cromwell is shown as no less ruthless in dealing with rivals within the Army or Parliament than in destroying the 'palaces and temples' of the former regime:

For 'tis all one to courage high,  
The emulous or enemy;  
And with such to inclose  
Is more than to oppose. (17–20,22)

His skills, as Marvell presents them, include the 'wiser art' of politics, complementing his physical courage, as he applies his 'industrious valour' to eliminate potential threats to his power (33, 48).

The 'Horatian Ode' is a notoriously problematical poem. Is it, as David Norbrook argues, a poem which embodies the spirit of republicanism, as it presents the events of 1649–50 as 'a decisive historical break, the transition from monarchy to freedom', combining in its approach an 'unillusioned realism with an activist republicanism'?<sup>28</sup> Does the poem, as John Wallace and others have argued, urge *de facto* acceptance of the legitimacy of the Commonwealth government, on the pragmatic grounds that (to quote Nedham in *The Case of the Commonwealth, Stated*) 'the Power of the Sword Is, and ever hath been, the Foundation of All Titles to Government'?<sup>29</sup> Is the poem persuasive in intent or, as other critics have claimed, finely balanced in its sympathies, elusive, full of complex ironies, a poem which 'resists any partisan reading'?<sup>30</sup> How does one reconcile the sympathetic treatment of the doomed King in the poem's most celebrated lines with the praise, however

## WARREN CHERNAIK

qualified and hedged round with conditions, of the victorious Cromwell, 'the War's and Fortune's son' (113)?

Though the agency of Cromwell frames the scene on the 'tragic scaffold', this is the one episode in the poem from which Cromwell is absent, withdrawn offstage, as his defeated adversary is permitted to hold the stage alone. Charles, conscious of the gravity of the occasion, plays his allotted role with a grace and dignity befitting his lineage and training: 'He nothing common did, or mean, / Upon that memorable scene' (53–4, 57–8). As in the deposition scene in *Richard II*, what is being enacted in this public spectacle is the visible transfer of power:

*Bolingbroke.* Fetch hither Richard, that in common view  
He may surrender: so we shall proceed  
Without suspicion. (*Richard II*, IV.i.135–7)

Where Richard II, earlier in that play, tries to convince himself that God will send an army of glorious angels to punish his enemies (III.ii.59–62), Charles, as represented here, is more of a realist, recognizing that the only choice left him is how to face death:

Nor called the Gods with vulgar spite  
To vindicate his helpless right,  
But bowed his comely head,  
Down, as upon a bed. (61–4)

This is yet another of the strategic silences by Marvell, since at the King's trial Charles had challenged the authority of the court, claiming that the 'ancient rights' had not been abrogated but retained their validity.<sup>31</sup>

It has often been noted that the comparison of Cromwell with a falcon differs from the earlier thunderbolt simile by representing power voluntarily brought under control. Cromwell is characterized here not as an embodiment of amoral force, filling a political space momentarily left vacant, but the servant of the republic:

Nor yet grown stiffer with command,  
But still in the Republic's hand:  
How fit he is to sway  
That can so well obey.  
He to the Commons' feet presents  
A kingdom, for his first year's rents.  
And, what he may, forbears  
His fame, to make it theirs.  
And has his sword and spoils ungirt  
To lay them at the public's skirt. (81–90)

As Norbrook has said, the terms 'Republic', 'public', and 'Commons' bring out the 'radical constitutional change' in the establishment of the Commonwealth of England. In another instance of 'Roman . . . similitude', Marvell

## WAS MARVELL A REPUBLICAN?

suggests the parallel of Octavius Caesar, offering up his ‘power and Commission’ to the Roman Senate, who then immediately granted him even ‘more triumphant dignities’ as the Emperor Augustus – in this case, not the birth of a republic but its death-throes.<sup>32</sup> The ominous qualifications ‘nor yet’, ‘still’, and ‘what he may’ all suggest a very uneasy equilibrium, capable of sudden reversal. To quote my earlier commentary in *Marvell and Liberty*:

In constitutional terms, the voluntary forbearance projected in these lines, enacting a renunciation of the power of the sword as . . . constitutive of political power, was deeply problematical since it relied entirely on the good will of the person or persons bearing the sword or carrying off the spoils.<sup>33</sup>

As Worden has pointed out, Marvell’s prophecies of imperial triumphs awaiting ‘our isle’ under Cromwell closely resemble a passage in *Mercurius Politicus* of 3 October 1650, written after Cromwell’s Scottish campaign and announcing ‘the total routing of the Scots’:

This brave *Scipio*, my Lord Generall *Cromwell*, after he hath wholly subdued *Ireland*, and *Scotland*, to the Common-wealth of *England*, ought to do the like elsewhere; that so our domineering and insolent neighbours may be brought under.<sup>34</sup>

First Ireland, then Scotland, then the Roman Catholic powers of continental Europe: the praise of Cromwell in this part of the ‘Horatian Ode’, like similar passages in ‘The First Anniversary’ five years later, presents him as ‘one man’ able to perform extraordinary feats:

What may not others fear  
If thus he crown each year?  
A Caesar he ere long to Gaul,  
To Italy an Hannibal,  
And to all states not free  
Shall climacteric be. (99–104)

The fear of rival princes, suddenly insecure on their thrones, is also prominent in ‘The First Anniversary’, as is the association of imperial expansion with the Protestant cause, vigorously pursuing the Popish beast to ‘her Roman den impure’. One of these rival princes is imagined speaking:

That one man still, although but named, alarms  
More then all men, all navies, and all arms.  
Him, all the day, him, in late night I dread,  
And still his sword seems hanging o’er my head.  
(‘The First Anniversary’, 126–30, 375–8)

In the phrase ‘all states not free’, the aggressive pursuit of empire is equated with republican values, as the triumphant English are depicted as bestowing the gift of freedom on those they have conquered. This is a recurrent motif in Harrington and Nedham, a vision of ‘an armed people who should be democrats at home and conquerors abroad’ (as Pocock puts it).<sup>35</sup>

## WARREN CHERNAIK

But there are problems with adducing lines praising Cromwell as warrior and leader as evidence for Marvell's republicanism. Even leaving aside the casual abuse of anyone not fortunate to be English – an element also present in Marvell's 'The Character of Holland' (1652) – the lines on 'the English hunter' and his trembling prey describe the amoral application of physical force, a victory of the 'strong' over the 'weak' (40, 109–12). Roman example, with one Caesar after a certain amount of bloodshed succeeding another, might suggest that the pursuit of greatness would eventually lead to a loss of liberty among the conquerors as well as among the conquered. Marvell's presentation of recent history as single combat between two powerful and charismatic individuals, one destined for victory and the other doomed to defeat, can equally be read as reaffirming monarchical government in a new guise: as Wilding says, Cromwell is shown to 'step into the gap created by the removal of Charles'.<sup>36</sup>

The 'Horatian Ode' ends not in triumph but in uncertainty. Cromwell, 'the War's and Fortune's son' (113), is warned of the instability of fortune and the problems inherent in an unremitting state of war. Like Richard III in his uneasy dreams before Bosworth Field, he may need to fend off 'the spirits of the shady night' (118), his old victims coming back to haunt him, as well as new, unforeseen enemies. As Marvell says in the celebrated, enigmatic closing lines of the poem:

The same arts that did gain  
A pow'r must it maintain. (119–20)

These lines, as I said in *The Poet's Time*, are 'not so much a warning to Cromwell to use his power well, as a warning to him to realize how tenuous his hold on power, or any man's, in fact is'.<sup>37</sup> Perhaps the advice offered here is not very different from the apparition of 'ghastly Charles' toward the end of *Last Instructions*, reminding his son of the fate awaiting occupants of 'th' uneasy throne' (890, 921–2).

In many ways, 'The First Anniversary' fits easily into the standard discourse of republicanism. The poem begins and ends with attacks on the institution of monarchy, presenting the kings of the earth as both oppressive and ineffectual, 'only . . . against their subjects strong' (28). In an extended architectural conceit, Marvell praises Cromwell's skill and foresight as republican legislator, 'Founding a firm state by proportions true' (248) in framing a constitution for the Protectorate. In its reconciliation of order and liberty, the Protectorate settlement, Marvell claims, finds a place even for the most 'stubborn men', the 'crossest spirits' among the populace:

And they whose nature leads them to divide,  
Uphold, this one, and that the other side . . .  
While the resistance of opposed minds,  
The fabric as with arches stronger binds. (78,89,91–6)<sup>38</sup>

## WAS MARVELL A REPUBLICAN?

One major difference between ‘The First Anniversary’ and the ‘Horatian Ode’ is that the dominant pattern of imagery in the later poem is Biblical rather than classical, with recurrent allusions to the history of Israel and to ‘the path where holy oracles do lead’ (108), as set forth in the prophetic books of the Bible. Cromwell’s victories are presented here as the promised fulfillment of millennial prophecy:

How might they under such a captain raise  
The great designs kept for the latter days! (109–10)

The apocalyptic imagery, as Margarita Stocker has shown, is partly a polemical strategy, by which ‘mainstream chialism answers its revolutionary critics’ at a time when Fifth Monarchists and other religious radicals – preachers like Vavasor Powell, who ended a sermon ‘Lord, wilt thou have Oliver Cromwell or Jesus Christ to reign over you?’ – were active in their opposition to the regime.<sup>39</sup>

Yet the violence of Marvell’s satiric attack on sectaries and dissident republicans seems out of keeping with the poem’s emphasis on healing, inclusiveness, *discordia concors*. Just as Milton, using a similar metaphor, had spoken in *Areopagitica* of how ‘out of many moderat varieties and brotherly dissimilitudes . . . arises the goodly and graceful symmetry that commends the whole pile and structure’, Marvell praises the Protectorate constitution for the way it accommodates ‘opposed minds’, even those who unreasonably demand ‘the highest place’ for themselves.<sup>40</sup> But the extended passage of savage polemic branding religious radicals unsympathetic to the regime as ‘the shame and plague both of the land and age’ leaves no room for toleration of ‘brotherly dissimilitudes’, accusing dissidents of ‘brutish fury’, wilfulness, blind and selfish ambition. Fifth Monarchists and other radicals are anathematized as servants of Satan, who proclaim an absolute liberty of the unbounded will, in defiance of law and reason:

Accursed locusts, whom your king does spit  
Out of the centre of th’unbottom’d pit:  
Wand’rers, adult’rers, liars, Münser’s rest,  
Sorc’rers, atheists, Jesuits, possessed;  
You who the scriptures and the laws deface  
With the same liberty as points and lace.<sup>41</sup>

The aim of such passages, as of the attacks on Levellers and diehard republicans as ‘ambitious shrubs’ seeking power for themselves (261–4), is to discredit the motives of Cromwell’s opponents. Nedham in *A True State of the Case of the Commonwealth* and Cromwell himself in addressing the Protectorate Parliament in September 1654 had similarly accused Fifth Monarchists of aiming at ‘the perverting of all Order among Men’, promoting ‘meer Anarchy and Confusion’: ‘by turning the stream of Government out of its proper channel, it would have utterly confounded the whole course of Natural and

## WARREN CHERNAIK

Civil Right, which is the only Basis or foundation of Government in this world'.<sup>42</sup>

Like Nedham in *A True State*, Marvell directs his arguments toward 'the godly People of this Nation (whose satisfaction we principally intend)', those who are 'Well-affected' to the Commonwealth, seeking to prove that the Protectorate has not betrayed the principles of the revolution.<sup>43</sup> The task he sets himself, as I argued in *The Poet's Time*, is not unlike that in Milton's *Second Defence*: to show that 'the rule of the man most fit to rule', the Protector Cromwell, is compatible with, even necessary to, the preservation of liberty. In urging those of republican principles to support the Protectorate, Marvell needed to refute the argument that the Lord Protector was simply an arbitrary monarch under another name – the 'divers Doubts', as Nedham puts it, which 'may be seen to arise in the minds of some sober Men concerning the present Change . . . as if we had turned our backs upon our former Principles, and introduced that very Thing, which was the great Bone of contention'<sup>44</sup>

The poem's pervasive religious imagery, appropriate to its intended audience, subserves this persuasive end. Where the perspective of the 'Horatian Ode' is essentially secular, 'The First Anniversary' presents Cromwell's rise to power as divinely ordained:

What since he did, an higher force him pushed  
Still from behind, and it before him rushed,  
Though undiscerned among the tumult blind,  
Who think those high decrees by man designed. (239–42)

In a series of Old Testament analogies, Cromwell is compared to Elijah calling forth rain on 'the thirsty land' (which 'o'ertook and wet the king'), to Jotham's parable of the olive refusing to reign and 'be promoted over' its brethren, and to Gideon who 'on the peace extends a warlike power', punishing those who had refused to support him. Each of these analogies has republican resonance, presenting the overthrow of the monarchy as both just and inevitable, and praising Cromwell because, like the Biblical Gideon, he refuses to be a king:

No king might ever such a force have done;  
Yet would not he be Lord, or else his son. (233–8, 249–58)<sup>45</sup>

Marvell's contrast of 'that sober liberty which men may have' with drunken license (288–9) is fully compatible with republican theory: Milton, invoking 'the known rules of ancient liberty', uses similar terms in criticizing those who, unable to distinguish liberty from license, 'bawl for freedom in their senseless mood'.<sup>46</sup> Yet, for all the emphasis on a constitutional settlement which avoids the extremes of tyranny and anarchical license – 'Tis not a freedom, that where all command, / Nor tyranny, where one does them withstand' (179–80) – the republicanism of 'The First Anniversary' is decidedly odd in

## WAS MARVELL A REPUBLICAN?

the extraordinary weight it places on the presumed virtue and forbearance of a single dominant figure, 'one man' whose 'one soul / Moves the great bulk, and animates the whole' (375, 379–80). Far from being sovereign, free-born, possessed of inalienable rights, the people are presented in 'The First Anniversary' as an unregenerate lump, 'all unconcerned, or unprepared' (150), needing to be beaten or cajoled into obedience.

As the writings of Milton illustrate, a degree of scorn for 'the inconsiderate multitude', always likely to choose wrongly, is characteristic of classical republicanism.<sup>47</sup> This element is pronounced in one of the poem's most Miltonic passages, juxtaposing millennial fervour and the awareness that the future is impossible to predict:

Hence oft I think, if in some happy hour  
High grace should meet in one with highest power,  
And then a seasonable people still  
Should bend to his, as he to heaven's will,  
What we might hope, what wonderful effect  
From such a wished conjuncture might reflect. (131–6)

Theologically, the passage is orthodox, giving priority to God's 'high grace' and to acceptance of God's will, whatever that may be ('that same lot, however mean or high, / Toward which time leads me, and the will of heaven').<sup>48</sup> In 'Upon Appleton House', Fairfax's decision, prompted by 'Conscience', to withdraw from public affairs, is presented in similar conditional terms: 'had it pleased him and God' ('Upon Appleton House', 346, 353). Marvell's consistent position is that expressed in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*: in a fallen world, we cannot anticipate the ways of providence or control the impersonal forces of history:

For men may spare their pains where Nature is at work, and the world will not go the faster for our driving . . . All things . . . happen in their best and proper time, without any need of our officiousness. (RT, I, *Prose Works*, I. 192)

The poet's emphasis on the 'thick cloud' which obscures the workings of divine providence from mortals able only to see through a glass darkly is, then, entirely characteristic of Marvell in juxtaposing great hopes against the human limitations which make their fulfilment doubtful:<sup>49</sup>

But a thick cloud about that morning lyes,  
And intercepts the Beams of Mortal eyes. (141–2)

But the role of the populace, the 'seasonable People', seen in the earlier extended architectural conceit in 'The First Anniversary' as an essential participant in the mixed state favoured by classical republican theorists, is here simply to 'be ruled' (77), bending to the will of the leader, submitting to a quasi-military hierarchical discipline.

The problem Cromwell faced in 1654 was that the Protectorate government, for all its constitutional trappings, lacked consent. As Edward Sexby wrote three years later, with bitter irony:

## WARREN CHERNAIK

Who made thee a Prince and a Judge over us? If God made thee, make it manifest to us. If the people? where did we meet to doe it? Who took our Subscriptions? To whom deputed we our authority? And when or where did those Deputies make the choice?<sup>50</sup>

However much Marvell may seek in 'The First Anniversary' to demonstrate that Cromwell neither is nor wishes to be King – 'Abroad a king he seems, and something more, /At home a subject on the equal floor' (389–90) – much of the poem's rhetoric seems incompatible with the central assumptions of republicanism. The long passage on the coaching accident in which Cromwell was injured presents him as semi-divine, as the principle of order holding the state together, the only bulwark against chaos. As Norbrook says, this is the kind of hyperbole one would expect to find in an elegy for the martyred Charles I:

It seemed the earth did from the centre tear;  
It seemed the sun was fallen out of the sphere:  
Justice obstructed lay, and Reason fooled;  
Courage disheartened, and Religion cooled.  
A dismal silence through the palace went,  
And then loud shrieks the vaulted marbles rent. (205–10)<sup>51</sup>

In this part of the poem, Marvell goes so far as to attribute the cause of the accident to 'our sins' (174), endangering a sinless Cromwell. In the earlier passage, the introduction of the distinction between elect and reprobate further complicates matters, in blaming the benighted, sin-ridden multitude for any possible failure:

For the great justice that did first suspend  
The world by sin, does by the same extend.  
Hence that blest day still counterpoised wastes,  
The ill delaying, what th'elected hastes;  
Hence landing Nature to new seas is tossed,  
And good designs still with their authors lost. (153–8)

My tentative answer to the question 'Is Marvell a Republican?', based on the limited evidence of these three poems, then, echoes the closing lines of Forster's *A Passage to India*: no, not yet; no, not there. Republican discourse is central to all three poems, but none of them can quite be called the work of a republican.

*King's College, London*

WARREN CHERNAIK

## Notes

- 1 Blair Worden, 'Milton's republicanism and the tyranny of heaven', in *Machiavelli and Republicanism*, Gisela Bock, Quentin Skinner and Maurizio Viroli (eds), (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 226. This view is strongly

## WAS MARVELL A REPUBLICAN?

- contested by Richard Tuck in *Philosophy and Government 1572–1651* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993), who argues that in seventeenth-century England ‘a willingness to contemplate some kind of republican government is present from an early date and among a surprisingly wide range of people’ (p. 222).
- 2 David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999). Worden’s review of *Writing the English Republic* in *TLS*, 29 January 1999, argues that ‘no one in Norbrook’s period considered himself a republican’ and that Norbrook’s ‘republican literary tradition’ is too ‘capacious’ (pp. 5–6).
  - 3 Quentin Skinner, *Liberty Before Liberalism* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998), esp. pp. 22–4, 53–7. Skinner’s earlier essays on the subject are reprinted, in revised form, in his *Visions of Politics, Vol. 2: Renaissance Virtues* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002).
  - 4 Folger Library, Washington, D. C., M 878B, copy 1, quoted in *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N. H. Keeble, and Nicolas von Maltzahn (eds), 2 vols (New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 2003), I, xi. Patterson dates the two notes February or March 1673, before Parliament was prorogued.
  - 5 David Wootton (ed.), *Republicanism, Liberty, and Commercial Society, 1649–1776* (Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1994), p. 2.
  - 6 Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government in England*, *Prose Works*, II, 225–7. On the importance of *Growth of Popery* as a ‘key text’ of the Neo-Harringtonian republicans in the 1670s and later, see J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1975), pp. 406–9; and M. M. Goldsmith, ‘Liberty, Virtue, and the Rule of Law’, in Wootton, p. 201.
  - 7 Norbrook, pp. 299–378; see also Joad Raymond, ‘Framing Liberty: Marvell’s “First Anniversary” and the Instrument of Government’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 62 (1999), 347–9.
  - 8 *The Excellencie of a Free-State* (London, 1656), p. 13. To further complicate matters, *The Excellencie of a Free-State* is largely based on articles from *Mercurius Politicus* of 1651–2, updated to fit changing circumstances. Moreover, the final chapter of *The Case of the Commonwealth, Stated* is ‘A discourse of the excellency of a Free-State, above a Kingly Government’, which includes several paragraphs (pp. 83–5) recycled, virtually unchanged, in Nedham’s 1656 pamphlet (*Excellencie*, pp. 18–20). See J. Milton French, ‘Milton, Nedham, and *Mercurius Politicus*’, *Studies in Philology*, 33 (1936), 238–44.
  - 9 Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment*, pp. 406–22.
  - 10 Worden, ‘Republicanism and the Restoration’, in Wootton, pp. 161–3.
  - 11 Blair Worden, *Roundhead Reputations: The English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (London, Penguin, 2002), p. 124. On this distinction, see *ibid.*, pp. 138–9. Sidney’s characterization of monarchy as the worst of evils can be found in his *Court Maxims*, written in exile in the 1660s: see Jonathan Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the English Republic, 1623–1677* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 187.
  - 12 Nedham, *Excellencie of a Free-State*, p. 79.
  - 13 Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* and *The Rehearsal Transpros’d, The Second Part*, *Prose Works*, I, 166, 324, 330–1; subsequent references to RT.

## WARREN CHERNAIK

- 14 'Last Instructions to a Painter', 917, 919–22, in *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. Nigel Smith (London, Longman, 2003). Except as noted, all quotations from Marvell's poems are from this edition.
- 15 Thomas N. Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640–1660* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992), pp. 235, 310. Norbrook similarly argues that 'we need to be wary about constructing an unproblematical grand narrative of Marvell's career' because of 'major discontinuities': see David Norbrook, 'Marvell's "Horatian Ode" and the Politics of Genre', in *Literature and the English Civil War*, ed. Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 150.
- 16 See my discussion of the volume in 'Books as Memorials: The Politics of Consolation', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 21 (1991), 214–15; and Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, pp. 69–71, 115–16.
- 17 On this aspect of Marvell's poem, see James Loxley, 'Prepared at last to strike in with the tyde? Andrew Marvell and Royalist Verse', *The Seventeenth Century*, 10 (1995), 35–62.
- 18 *Lachrymae Musarum* (2nd ed., London, 1650), pp. 28 (J. Joynes), 34 (S. Bold). Cf. Loxley, pp. 50–54.
- 19 Nigel Smith, in his recent *Poems of Andrew Marvell*, pp. 11–17, makes a strong case for Marvell's authorship, arguing that lines 55–8 ('I know how well he did'), praising Villiers' skill in swordsmanship, 'are based on Marvell's personal acquaintance of Lord Francis', when they both were in Rome during the 1640s. Smith cites close verbal parallels with 'The First Anniversary' and 'Upon Appleton House' (see lines 31–6 and 81–2). But I still consider the poem doubtful: see my earlier discussion in *The Poet's Time: Politics and Religion in the work of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 236–7.
- 20 'Nymph Complaining', 1; 'Upon the Death of Lord Hastings', 59; 'The Unfortunate Lover', 60; 'Horatian Ode', 60; *RT*, II, *Prose Works*, I, 323. Recent political readings of 'The Nymph Complaining', which see the poem as 'conceived in aftermath of regicide', a 'veiled memorial to the death of King Charles', with the Civil War as implicit 'background to the whole poem', include Graham Parry, 'What is Marvell's nymph complaining about', *Critical Survey*, 5 (1993), 244–54; and Chris Fitter, 'The Slain Deer and Political *Imperium: As You Like It* and Andrew Marvell's 'Nymph Complaining for the Death of her Fawn', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 98 (1999), 208–18.
- 21 Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, pp. 43–50, 65–70, 80–92, 186–7. For an excellent discussion of 'Tom May's Death' and the problems it raises, see *ibid.*, pp. 271–80. On May's and Marvell's contrasting treatment of Brutus and Cassius, see *The Poet's Time*, pp. 178–9, 237.
- 22 *The Poet's Time*, pp. 176–182. For similar arguments, see Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, pp. 231–5.
- 23 On Marvell's posthumous reputation, see Hilton Kelliher, *Andrew Marvell Poet & Politician* (London, British Library, 1978), pp. 119–35; and Nicholas von Maltzahn, 'Marvell's Ghost', in *Marvell and Liberty*, ed. Warren Chernaik and Martin Dzelzainis (Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1999), pp. 50–79.
- 24 Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, pp. 233–4.
- 25 Michael Wilding, *Dragons Teeth: Literature in the English Revolution* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1987), pp. 118–37; *The English Soldiers Standard* (1649), quoted in Wilding, p. 118. According to Corns, 'Marvell's poem excludes from

## WAS MARVELL A REPUBLICAN?

- political consideration voices from outside the established ranks of the political nation' and carefully omits any mention of a 'choice between Charles II and Cromwell' (*Uncloistered Virtue*, p. 229).
- 26 Blair Worden, 'Andrew Marvell, Oliver Cromwell, and the Horatian Ode', in *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1987), pp. 147–80, esp. p. 160; quoting *Mercurius Politicus*, 6–13 June 1650.
- 27 Sonnet XV, 5, 9–10, sonnet XVI, 3, 10–11, in John Milton, *Complete English Poems*, ed. Gordon Campbell (London, Everyman, 1990).
- 28 Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, pp. 264, 266.
- 29 John M. Wallace, *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalism of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1968), pp. 69–105; Nedham, *The Case of the Commonwealth, Stated* (London, 1650), p. 6.
- 30 Worden, for example, sees the 'Horatian Ode' as characterized by an 'openness' of approach which represents 'a victory over the narrowing partisanship of most civil war literature' (Worden, *Politics of Discourse*, pp. 172–3). In *The Poet's Time* I argue that 'the greatness of the "Horatian Ode" lies in its ability to rise beyond personal emotion, the natural human need to choose sides, to a level of inevitability where the forces directing choice become visible' (p. 15).
- 31 'For if power (without law) may make law, may alter the fundamental laws of the kingdom – I do not know what subject he is in England can be assured of his life or anything he can call his own . . . I that am your King, that should be an example to all the people of England, to maintain the old laws': J. G. Muddiman, *Trial of King Charles the First* (Edinburgh and London, William Hodge, 1928), pp. 90, 99.
- 32 Norbrook, 'Politics of Genre', p. 157; John S. Coolidge, 'Marvell and Horace', *Modern Philology*, 63 (1965), 115–16, quoting Anthony Norwood, *A Clear Optick* (1654).
- 33 *Marvell and Liberty*, p. 201.
- 34 *Mercurius Politicus* 17, 26 Sept–3 Oct 1650, pp. 282; cited in Worden, *Politics of Discourse*, p. 162.
- 35 Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment*, p. 392; cf. Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, pp. 259–60.
- 36 Wilding, p. 133; cf. David Armitage, 'John Milton: poet against empire', in *Milton and Republicanism*, ed. David Armitage, Armand Himy and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 208–11.
- 37 *The Poet's Time*, p. 22.
- 38 On the architectural conceit and its implications, see my essay in *Marvell and Liberty*, pp. 201–6; Norbrook, *Writing the English Revolution*, pp. 344–6; and David Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution in Milton and his Contemporaries* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 162–7.
- 39 Margarita Stocker, *Apocalyptic Marvell* (Brighton, Harvester Press, 1986), p. 13; cf. Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution*, pp. 144–50.
- 40 'The First Anniversary', 82, 95; *Areopagitica, Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. D. M. Wolfe *et al.*, 8 vols (New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1953–82), II, 555.
- 41 'The First Anniversary', 177, 294, 311–16. For a discussion of 'The First Anniversary' as an attempt 'to negotiate the unresolved tension between political conservatism and religious radicalism', see Loewenstein, *Representing Revolution*, pp. 143–71.

## WARREN CHERNAIK

- 42 *A True State of the Case of the Commonwealth* (London, 1654), pp. 13, 18. Cromwell's speech to the Protectorate Parliament included strong attacks on 'men of Levelling principles', which 'tend to the reducing of all to an equality', and on Fifth Monarchists: 'For men to entitle themselves upon this principle, that they are the only men to rule kingdoms, govern nations, and give laws to people; to determine of property and liberty and everything else upon such a pretence as this is: truly, they had need give clear manifestation of God's presence with them, before wise men would receive or submit to their conclusions': *Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, ed. W. C. Abbott, 4 vols (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1937–47), III, 435, 437.
- 43 *True State*, pp. 3–4.
- 44 *True State*, p. 3; *Second Defence, Complete Prose Works*, IV, i, 672. Cf. *The Poet's Time*, pp. 48–52. For the republican charge that Cromwell was a tyrant, a 'Counterfeit' monarch, 'the Ape of a King', see Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, pp. 319–25. Edward Sexby's *Killing Noe Murder* (1657) is the best-known and most powerful republican attack on Cromwell as tyrant and usurper.
- 45 For a discussion of these biblical analogies, see Annabel Patterson, *Marvell and the Civic Crown* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1978), pp. 79–88; and Laura Lunger Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait and Print, 1645–1661* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 99–100. As Norbrook points out, Anna Trapnel, a Fifth Monarchist, used the analogy with Gideon to warn Cromwell against assuming the throne (*Writing the English Revolution*, p. 321).
- 46 Sonnet XII, 2, 9–11.
- 47 *Complete Prose Works*, VII, 446. On this aspect of Milton's republicanism, see Austin Woolrych's introduction, *ibid.*, VII, 215–18; and Arthur Barker, *Milton and the Puritan Dilemma* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1942), pp. 263–77.
- 48 Sonnet VII, 11–12. On the theology of this passage in 'The First Anniversary', see Stocker, *Apocalyptic Marvell*, pp. 20–23; and my discussion in *The Poet's Time*, pp. 45–7.
- 49 In *The Poet's Time*, p. 46, I compare Milton's *Second Defence*, which similarly warns of the possibility that it may 'seem to posterity that a mighty harvest of glory was at hand, together with the opportunity for doing the greatest deeds, but that to this opportunity men were wanting' (*Complete Prose Works*, IV, i, 685).
- 50 [Edward Sexby,] *Killing Noe Murder. Briefly Discourst in Three Questions* (London, 1657), unpaginated.
- 51 Norbrook, *Writing the English Revolution*, p. 347; cf. Patterson, *Marvell and the Civic Crown*, pp. 79–81.

## Address for Correspondence

Professor Warren Chernaik, 124 Mansfield Road, London, NW3 2JB, email: warren.chernaik@kcl.ac.uk