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Commencing from a recognition of the ways in which the didactic ends attributed to satire in the later seventeenth-century were frustrated by the association of the genre with motives of malice and spite, this thesis examines the means employed by satirists to evade responsibility for their invectives. The obtrusiveness of satiric voice characteristic of the genre focused attention upon the unpleasantly censorious character of the satirist, thereby accentuating the subjectivity of satire and obstructing its polemical message. Making reference to a broad range of texts from print and manuscript sources, I argue that poets of the period 1640-1700 responded to this dilemma by employing a variety of rhetorical and literary devices to conceal the satirist's voice, and generate an illusion of objectivity that enhanced the credibility of the satiric attack.

My Introduction examines the inadequacy of modern responses to the theoretical problems posed by satiric topicality. Chapter 1 surveys didactic theories of satire in the seventeenth-century, and the ways in which the prominence of satiric voice undermines the genre's polemical intent; it concludes with a discussion of theories of satire that minimized the satirist's responsibility for his or her invective. Chapter 2 features a discussion of the use of prosopopæia to conceal the satirist's voice. Chapter 3 sketches out the operations of rhetorical ethos, with particular reference to Horace, and to its use by Cowley and Dryden. Chapter 4 explores the uses of pathos in Juvenalian satire, and focuses upon John Cleveland. In Chapter 5, the use of burlesque forms as a means of projecting the voice of the satiric victim is discussed. Chapter 6
examines how allusion to the satires of the past is employed to authorize topical satire; the chapter concludes with an examination of translation as a means of satiric concealment. My Conclusion looks ahead to eighteenth-century developments in satire that tended to foreground aesthetic rather than didactic considerations.
One may observe a sort of Natural Rhetorick, even among the Common Professors of the Art of Railling . . . . Besides the use of their admirable Art of Canting, they have a cunning way of Jeering, accusing others by justifying themselves, and saying, I never did --- or by asking the Question general, Who did so and so? Why who did you Whore cries 'tother? did I? and so the Game begins; but by this evasive way of Abuse they will be sure to keep wide off the Law's Tenterhooks.

*Raillerie a la Mode Consider'd: Or the Supercilious Detractor* (London, 1673) 40-42.
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Preface

When citing from both printed and manuscript sources, I have endeavoured to reproduce to as exact a degree as was practical the text as it appears in the original. For this reason, I have retained original spelling, punctuation, and italics, modernizing only the long "s." I have employed modern critical editions of primary sources wherever a trustworthy original spelling edition existed; otherwise, I have quoted from an original printed or manuscript source. This has meant that I have generally been unable to cite from the two most readily accessible modern-spelling editions of seventeenth-century satiric verse, the Yale Poems on Affairs of State and John Harold Wilson's Court Satires of the Restoration: where possible, citations of poems include reference to the pages on which the work in question appears in these two anthologies.

Manuscript conventions and abbreviations have been retained (excepting only the long "s"): text reproduced here in bold appears as such in the original manuscript source. Capitalization has been normalized in citing all titles, and I have used the the standard form of authors' names. Titles of individual poems frequently vary, and I have employed that given in the source from which the work is cited. In footnotes, I have frequently employed short titles: full titles can be found in my bibliography. Translations are given whenever possible from seventeenth- or eighteenth-century translations. I have generally used the translation most popular in the period (as for example Alexander Brome's 1666 Horace), except on rare occasions when the seventeenth-century tendency towards "paraphrastical" translation or imitation has obscured or distorted the meaning of the original. All of the manuscripts and many of the printed sources cited in this thesis were examined from microfilm copies.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Title and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP Venetian</td>
<td>Public Record Office. <em>Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts Relating to English Affairs Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy.</em> Ed. Allan B. Hinds. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office. 1939.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNB</td>
<td><em>The Dictionary of National Biography.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Collection</td>
<td><em>A New Collection of Poems Relating to State Affairs. From Oliver Cromwel to this Present Time.</em> London, 1705.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED</td>
<td><em>Oxford English Dictionary.</em> (2nd ed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rump Songs</td>
<td>Rump: Or An Exact Collection of the Choycest Poems and Songs Relating to the Late Times. By the Most Eminent Wits. From Anno 1639 to Anno 1661. 2 Vols. London. 1662.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Anthony à Wood. Athenæ Oxonienses: An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops Who Have Had Their Education in the Most Antient and Famous University of Oxford. 2nd ed. 2 Vols. London. 1721.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Abbreviated Periodical Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AHR</th>
<th>American Historical Review</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Études Anglaises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIHR</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research</td>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>Early American Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>Brno Studies in English</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Essays in Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNYPL</td>
<td>Bulletin of the New York Public Library</td>
<td>ECent</td>
<td>The Eighteenth-Century: Theory and Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CahiersE</td>
<td>Cahiers Elisabéthains</td>
<td>ECL</td>
<td>Eighteenth Century Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCrit</td>
<td>Comparative Criticism</td>
<td>ECS</td>
<td>Eighteenth-Century Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>College English</td>
<td>EHR</td>
<td>English Historical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CentR</td>
<td>Centennial Review</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Essays in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHJ</td>
<td>Cambridge Historical Journal</td>
<td>ELH</td>
<td>English Literary History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>Cambridge Quarterly</td>
<td>ELR</td>
<td>English Literary Renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>Comparative Literature Studies</td>
<td>EngS</td>
<td>Englische Studien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CML</td>
<td>Classical and Modern Literature</td>
<td>ERC</td>
<td>Explorations in Renaissance Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CollG</td>
<td>Colloquia Germanica</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>English Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ContR</td>
<td>Contemporary Review</td>
<td>E&amp;S</td>
<td>Essays and Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Classical Philology</td>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>English Studies in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CritQ</td>
<td>Critical Quarterly</td>
<td>FSB</td>
<td>French Studies Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Dalhousie Review</td>
<td>HLB</td>
<td>Harvard Library Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUJ</td>
<td>Durham University Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Journal Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLQ</td>
<td>Huntington Library Quarterly</td>
<td>NLH</td>
<td>New Literary History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Hispanic Review</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Neuphilologische Mitteilungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>History and Theory</td>
<td>NMQ</td>
<td>New Mexico Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HudR</td>
<td>Hudson Review</td>
<td>N&amp;Q</td>
<td>Notes and Queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJCT</td>
<td>International Journal of the Classical Tradition</td>
<td>NRRSL</td>
<td>Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBS</td>
<td>Journal of British Studies</td>
<td>OBSPP</td>
<td>Oxford Bibliographical Society Proceedings and Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHI</td>
<td>Journal of the History of Ideas</td>
<td>PBSA</td>
<td>Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMRS</td>
<td>Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies</td>
<td>PFSCL</td>
<td>Papers on French Seventeenth Century Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWCI</td>
<td>Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute</td>
<td>PLL</td>
<td>Papers on Language and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang&amp;S</td>
<td>Language and Style</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Past and Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Library Chronicle (University of Pennsylvania)</td>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>Philological Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiltonQ</td>
<td>Milton Quarterly</td>
<td>PSf</td>
<td>Prose Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MiltonS</td>
<td>Milton Studies</td>
<td>PQ</td>
<td>Philological Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ</td>
<td>Modern Language Quarterly</td>
<td>PULC</td>
<td>The Princeton University Chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLR</td>
<td>Modern Language Review</td>
<td>QQ</td>
<td>Queen's Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Modern Philology</td>
<td>QR</td>
<td>Quarterly Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQR</td>
<td>Michigan Quarterly Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECTR</td>
<td>Restoration and 18th Century Theatre Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RenP</td>
<td>Renaissance Papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RenSt</td>
<td>Renaissance Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Review of English Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>Renaissance and Modern Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPLit</td>
<td>Res Publica Litterarum: Studies in the Classical Tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatN</td>
<td>Satire Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Studies in Bibliography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCB</td>
<td>South Central Bulletin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCent</td>
<td>The Seventeenth Century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCFS</td>
<td>Seventeenth-Century French Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRev</td>
<td>South Central Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECC</td>
<td>Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>Studies in English Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoR</td>
<td>Southern Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Studies in Philology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPWVSRA</td>
<td>Selected Papers from the West Virginia Shakespeare and Renaissance Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ</td>
<td>Shakespeare Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Sewanee Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SStud</td>
<td>Swift Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVEC</td>
<td>Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCBS</td>
<td>Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRHS</td>
<td>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSLL</td>
<td>Texas Studies in Language and Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSiL</td>
<td>Tennessee Studies in Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSwL</td>
<td>Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCPE</td>
<td>University of California Publications in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULR</td>
<td>University of Leeds Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTQ</td>
<td>University of Toronto Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMQ</td>
<td>William and Mary Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUS</td>
<td>Washington University Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Yearbook of English Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YFS</td>
<td>Yale French Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YR</td>
<td>Yale Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

In 1687, Henry Higden published *A Modern Essay on the Tenth Satyr of Juvenal*, an experimental translation of the most popular of the Roman satirist's poems into tetrameter couplets. Pursuing the method he had employed the year previous in *A Modern Essay on the Thirteenth Satyr of Juvenal*, Higden "aimed to abate" Juvenal's "serious Rigour."¹ The results seem, on occasion, curiously burlesque:²

Since the rude Thracian in his City  
Ne'er saw procession half so pretty.  
As modern Pageantry and State  
Does on our City-Triumphs wait;  
Than which no Interlude is gayer.  
Whilst Sword and Cap usher the Mayor;  
A Cap that does with Heads dispense  
Without regard of Brains or Sense:  
And whose mysterious Power translates  
Mechanick Furs to Potentates,  
From weighing Plumbs, to ballance States. (9)

In Higden's translation, Juvenal's depiction of a triumph through Rome becomes the Lord Mayor's Procession: Higden's greatest challenge lay not in the translation of Juvenal's Latin, but in finding modern equivalents for the Roman poet's topical references. He has generally remained faithful to his source, he writes, because of his conviction that "all Satyr" has "a strong taste of the Humour

---

¹ *A Modern Essay on the Thirteenth Satyr of Juvenal* (London, 1686) sig. [b2']. Dryden praises the translator for having "temper'd" Juvenal with Horatian rallery, and having joined "the Vertues of Two Stiles in One." "To My Ingenious Friend, Mr. Henry Higden, Esq.," *A Modern Essay on the Tenth Satyr of Juvenal* (London, 1687) sig. [A4'].

and particular Hints of the Times wherein they were writ, which is indeed the Life and Beauty of Satyr" (sig. [a4']).

Higden is more willing to rob Juvenal of his "lofty Rhimes" (as Aphra Behn phrased it in her commendatory poem) than to eliminate reference to the satire's historical context. And yet, as Elkanah Settle, another of Higden's admirers, points out, the characteristic topicality of the genre is its greatest liability: "whilst the warm Intrigue is just found out," scandalous satire is applauded, but once the occasion is past, satire "lies Neglected, and Forgot as soon." The translation of ancient satire is difficult because "Commentators" must "groap without a Clue" to resurrect long-forgotten scandals. The "strong taste of the Humour and particular Hints of the Times wherein they were writ" is both the "the Life and Beauty of Satyr." and the greatest threat to its endurance.

To critics accustomed to the satire of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-centuries, the dilemma posed by Settle seems familiar. If, as George Test has written, "satire tends to go out of date very quickly and become as dead as last month's news," it is because last month's -- or last century's -- news is precisely its most common subject. As John Barnard has written of

---

3 "To Henry Higden, Esq.; On his Translation of the Tenth Satyr of Juvenal" sig. [a1'].

4 "To H. Higden, Esq.; On his Modern Way of Translating Juvenal's Tenth Satyr" sig. [a3']. Joseph Trapp remarked that "Modern Satires will always appear with an Advantage, which the Ancients want, viz. we are better acquainted with the Characters." Lectures on Poetry, 1742, trans. William Bowyer and William Clarke ([Menston]: Scolar P, 1973) 236n. See also Swift's comments in The Examiner 18 (December 7, 1710) on topical writing: "although the present Age may understand well enough the little Hints we give, the Parallels we draw, and the Characters we describe: yet this will all be lost to the next" (3: 32).

5 Satire: Spirit and Art (Tampa: U of South Florida UP, 1991) 2. Ralph. W. Rader defines satire as "a work whose intelligibility and value is determined by a formally embodied intention to ridicule an object understood to exist outside the work," but adds that its continued
occasional poems, "any grasp of them as poetic structures, as wholes, depends upon a working
knowledge of their historical context -- the context and function implied by and embodied in their
original form." Despite the footnotes of modern editions, even the most casual reader of poems
like Absalom and Achitophel often feels like one of Settle's groping "Commentators."

Satire has, since Restoration and eighteenth-century literature was "rescued" from neglect
in the early twentieth-century, re-achieved a legitimacy that it had lost in the nineteenth. Even
so, partisans of the genre frequently exhibit embarrassment when attempting to vindicate the ways
of Dryden and Pope. A. G. Barnes, who compiled one of the first modern anthologies to take
satire as its subject, adroitly avoids giving judgment on whether "satire can ever be really great
poetry" and begs the question when he blames the neglect of English verse satire on the
"misfortune" of satirists' choice of genre; Hugh Walker, writing of Butler, similarly suggested in

value depends upon "the degree to which a knowledge of the external object adequate to a full
response is internally inferable from the work itself." "The Concept of Genre and Eighteenth-
Century Studies," *New Approaches to Eighteenth-Century Literature*, ed. Phillip Harth (New


A good thumb-nail history of twentieth-century attitudes to the genre can be found in

also C. W. Previté-Orton, *Political Satire in English Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1910)
5-6, Edward Lucie-Smith, *The Penguin Book of Satirical Verse* (Harmondsworth: Penguin,
1925 that "Satire at its best is a second-rate kind of literature." Embarrassment is similarly a feature of the two most important anthologies of late seventeenth-century satire, the mammoth Yale edition of Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714 (1963-75), presided over George deForest Lord, and John Harold Wilson's more modest, but equally important, Court Satires of the Restoration (1976).

It would be difficult to overstate the value of the Yale Poems on Affairs of State: the sheer bulk and variety of materials that it includes provides an invaluable insight into the context of the satire and state poems of the period. Yet, even here, in a collection professedly devoted to the ephemeral, the topical, and the political, we find Lord writing of his subject with that perennial sense of embarrassment and admitting, reluctantly, that "satire directed at ephemeral issues and persons seems above all to lack the autonomy or universality of true poetry" (POAS Yale 1: xlix-l). Lord's response to this fallacy is characteristic of the New Criticism: "The richest satire," he confidently asserts, "is that which transmutes concrete historical realities into universals. Its fictions include but transcend historical fact" (li). A successful satire achieves an "autonomous poetic life" (lv) precisely because it leaves topical reference behind. But if Lord is anxious to prove that Restoration satire does exhibit the "autonomy or universality of true poetry," he finds his thesis undercut at every turn by the materials he has chosen. Reading and understanding seventeenth-century satire is hard work: Stephen College could assume that the reader of his A Satyr against In-Justice: Or, Sc--gs upon Sc--gs (1679) would know who the subject of his attack, Lord Chief Justice Sir William Scroggs, was, and what he had done. The voluminous

---

notes available to the modern reader of this poem in the Yale edition can only begin to redress our initial disadvantage in this regard. And these note are voluminous: quantitatively, there is probably more "history" in the Yale collection than poetry. Lord's own editorial practice perforce must undermine our faith in the "autonomy" of his material.

John Harold Wilson's Court Satires of the Restoration differs from the Yale Poems on Affairs of State in that its materials are coterie satires attacking "Court personalities, literary and theatrical figures" rather than state affairs (Wilson xi). "Court satires," Wilson writes, are in some ways "more interesting and useful than the political poems because they tell us a great deal about the lives and manners of Restoration high society. Partisan political satire is ephemeral; personal satire is more likely to be universal" (xi). We note again the preference for the "universal": Wilson's thesis, however, implies that the reader of a satire attacking the Duchess of Portsmouth as a French whore ignores the historical identification, and fixes instead upon the generalized "character." It is difficult to imagine anyone reading Wilson's collection in quite this way. These are not abstracted images of vice: court satire was expressly written (to quote a lampoon that appears in Court Satires) to "tell you who focks who." The reader is swept up in a

---

10 This is even truer of "definitive" editions of such satires: the California Dryden provides 77 pages of commentary to explain Absalom and Achitophel, more than twice the length of the poem itself. In Paul Hammond's edition, context literally overwhelms poetry: the explanatory footnotes entirely push Dryden's text from the page on a number of occasions.

11 The distinction is, in some ways, artificial: as Lord notes, "affairs of state" are "as likely to be the love affairs of kings and courtiers" as "matters of public policy" (POAS Yale 1: xxvi). See also Basil Greenslade, "Affairs of State," Spirit of Wit: Reconsiderations of Rochester, ed. Jeremy Treglown (Hamden, CT: Archon, 1982) 92-110.

12 "Satyr," BL MS Harl. 6913 f.132; Wilson 81-85. See also Alastair Bellany, "Rayling Rymes and Vaunting Verse": Libellous Politics in Early Stuart England, 1603-1628," Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England, eds. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, (Houndmills and London:
whirlwind of scandalous gossip that is unyieldingly topical and particular. More honest is Wilson's comment that such poems "tell us a great deal about the lives and manners of Restoration high society": here, he concedes as lost the "autonomy" that Lord insisted upon. From this perspective, the anthology is a collection of historical documents: social and political context, far from merely informing the poetry, becomes its *raison d'être*.

Modern editors are, relative to their seventeenth-century counterparts, at a disadvantage. Henry Higden could make relevant to a contemporary audience the satire of another age by means of modernization; indeed, translation from Latin is, by definition, a "modernization," a radical transformation of a text that opens it up to other possibilities. It is a relatively small step from translating the *corone* of Juvenal's triumphant general as "crown," to rendering it as the Lord Mayor's "Cap" of office. Such modernizations help obviate the need for explanatory footnotes, an important facet of the success of seventeenth-century resurrections of ancient satire: as Dudley Fitts has rightly pointed out, "Topicality, the recondite allusion, special jargon -- these are matters that can not be handled even in a Nabokovian footnote without inviting the embrace of death."13 A modernized text, one that renders the topical in contemporary terms, has a much better chance of success with a modern audience. As Dryden explained to the readers of his 1693 collaborative edition of Juvenal and Persius:

> If sometimes any of us (and 'tis but seldom) make him [Juvenal] express the Customs and Manners of our Native Country, rather than of *Rome*: 'tis, either when there was some kind of Analogy, betwixt their Customes and ours; or when, to make him more easy to Vulgar Understandings, we gave him those Manners

---


which are familiar to us. ("Discourse," 89)\textsuperscript{14}

It is an index of the obduracy of satiric topicality that, despite modernization, seventeenth-century translators were still invariably forced to use notes. Barten Holyday attempted to make his 1673 translation of Juvenal and Persius "as free from Annotations, as the Argument would permit" (Holyday sig. [b l?]), but was, as William Kupersmith has pointed out, "very unsuccessful" (39).\textsuperscript{15} Higden's Essay on Juvenal's Satire 10 similarly includes both Latin commentary in the margins, and 9 pages of "Annotations" in English. And yet, notes could aid the translator by providing modern parallels for ancient references. Holyday's notes frequently draw such parallels: "Suburra," he tells us in his notes to Juvenal's Satire 3, "was the Cheapside of Rome" (44). John Harvey, in his The Tenth Satyr of Juvenal Done into English Verse, used notes to score political points, identifying Mark Antony as "a bloody Roman Tory."\textsuperscript{16} "Good translation," writes Paul Hammond, "is occasional," necessitating the introduction of "a whole new nexus of


\textsuperscript{15} Holyday's notes are lengthy: Juvenal's Satire I, which runs to less than 6 pages, is accompanied by some 12 pages of "Notes" and "Illustrations," rendered in cramped type.

\textsuperscript{16} The Tenth Satyr of Juvenal Done into English Verse (London, 1693?) 21 (mispaginated as 9); see Kupersmith 140. See also Harvey's note on Ulubraë in Satire 10: "not to complement this Town; it was a sad poor one . . . a little better than Castle-Rising, and not quite so good as Higham Ferrars in Northamptonshire" (20).
circumstances, associations and values."  

Higden's assertion that "the Life and Beauty of Satyr" resides in its topical particularity rests upon a faith in the usefulness of history. Settle praises Higden because he has made the past relevant: "Great Juvenal's Wit, who in an English Scene, / By Time's long Rust at best had pointless been, / Thou grind' st to a New Edge, to cut more keen" (sig. [a3v]). The modernized Juvenal has been translated through time and space as well as through language, and his polemical significance revived by demonstrating that his critique of Roman society applied to seventeenth-century England. Fundamental to this method was the period's conception of history. History "instructed" in much the way that satire (and, indeed, most other genres) did: indeed, as Edward Young was to write in the preface to The Love of Fame: "Historians themselves may be consider'd as Satirists, and Satirists most severe; since such are most human Actions, that to relate, is to expose them."  

History's patterns are recurrent: the task of the historian, like that

\[
\text{\textbf{17}} \quad \text{John Oldham and the Renewal of Classical Culture (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983) 2, 64. Restoration translation, as Hardin Craig asserted, "put a local and temporary stamp on all that it did, marked it for almost the sole use of its own age, and took pride in so doing." "Dryden's Lucian." CP 16 (1921): 150.}
\]

\[
\text{\textbf{18}} \quad \text{The Love of Fame. 2nd ed. (London, 1728) sig. [a2v]. See also Dryden's assertion in Absalom and Achitophel that he is "only the Historian" of the events he recounts (4).}
\]

\[
\]
of the poetic imitator, was to make precedents, examples, and parallels clear. From such parallels, the thoughtful reader could predict the future. As Sir William Temple opined, "whilst Human Nature continues what it is, The same Orders in State, The same Discipline in Armies, The same Reverence for things Sacred, And Respect of Civil Institutions, The same Virtues and Dispositions of Princes and Magistrates . . . Will ever have the same effects."

As Temple's remarks suggest, this faith in history was predicated upon the conception of a general and consistent human nature. As Thomas Hearne commented in 1704, "Mankind being


22 Observations upon the United Provinces (London, 1673) sigs. [A6"].

23 The influence of this idea upon literary theory was immense. See Dryden's "A Parallel, of Poetry and Painting" (1695): "Nature is still the same in all Ages, and can never be contrary to her self. Thus from the practice of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, Aristotle drew his Rules for Tragedy; and Philostratus for Painting" (De Arte Graphica 57). The quarrel of the ancients and the moderns represents a battle between stable and progressive views of history, and correspondingly different ideas about human nature; A. H. de Quehen notes that Sir William Temple "saw Phalaris as some ancient contemporary." "Richard Bentley's Spider-Web," IJCT 1 (1994): 95. See also Joseph M. Levine, Humanism and History (Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1987) 155-77, and his more recent The Battle of the Books, 1991 (Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1994) esp. 267-90.
the same in all Ages . . . nothing can come to pass, but some Precedent of the like Nature has already happen'd."  

History is "a Prospect-Glass" revealing analogical images of ourselves: "It informs the Understanding by the Memory, and helps us to judge of what will happen by shewing us the like Revolutions in former Times" (1: 113). Similarly, Pierre Le Moyne noted that "since, as the Wise Man says, nothing is new under the Sun, a Learned and Judicious Reader may learn to foretell the future by the past; and regulate what he has to do, by what has been done" (45).

The exemplary approach to history sounds, as Dustin Griffin notes, "remarkably like the theory of satire advanced at the same time by Dryden and his followers"; however, this view of a cyclical, recurrent pattern to human events informs all seventeenth-century writing. Annabel Patterson's discussion of Marvell's method of "defining that transitional moment of history" in his poems on Cromwell applies: "It depends on presenting both the old and the new, the 'ancient rights' and the necessary revolution . . . . it is also implied that history has seen such contrasts

---


25 Hearne's image suggests a parallel with conventional descriptions of satire as a mirror. See also Le Moyne 41-42. Hearne is quoting Dryden's "Life of Plutarch."

26 This cyclical theory of history competed with both older eschatological approaches and progressivist views of history, but these could be reconciled: see Tuveson 116 and passim. For a discussion of theories of progress, see R. S. Crane, "Anglican Apologetics and the Idea of Progress, 1699-1745," MP 31 (1934): 273-306, 349-82

History was not the property only of conservatives: tradition could, paradoxically, be used to justify a break from the past. If Tories used historical constitutionalism to support their views, Whigs could counter with their own historical myth, the "Norman Yoke," which claimed that the natural processes of history had already been distorted by the suppression of Saxon liberty. If Royalists looked to the court of Augustus for models, radicals adored the republicanism of Cicero, Cato, and Brutus. The publication of an important Tory history like that of Clarendon in 1702-04 was for this reason a political event as well as a historiographical one: every new reading of the past had potential implications for the present and

28 "Against Polarization: Literature and Politics in Marvell's Cromwell Poems." *ELR* 5 (1975): 254. Historical interpretation was, of course, ideological: as A. H. de Quehen notes of theological scholarship, "most seventeenth-century antiquarians were looking to the past for some sort of doctrinal support" (94). Whig reaction to Dryden's *The Duke of Guise*, which paralleled the French Catholic League with the Exclusionists, demonstrated that historical precedents could fit opposing ideologies: Thomas Shadwell, in his *Some Reflections upon the Pretended Parallel in the Play called The Duke of Guise* (London, 1683) reported that the play had originally been intended "to expose that unparallel'd Villany of the Papists in the most horrid Parisian Massacre," but that Dryden "poisons and perverts" the play's original "good Intentions" (2).


It is, in part, the fact that we today have lost this sense of a recurrent, eternally significant history that makes it so difficult for us to reclaim the satires of the past: however successful an aesthetic creation we may find Dryden's representation of Shaftesbury in *Absalom and Achitophel*, the portrait does not have the same *kind* of significance for us that Juvenal's *Sejanus* did for the seventeenth-century. The impact upon satire of such a loss is dramatic, for, regardless of whether its intent is to provoke revolution or reaction, satire's moral attitude to the present is almost invariably conservative. Its normative values -- whether the cautious sobriety of the Norman conquerors, or the quasi-republican liberty of the Saxons -- are to be found largely in a lost past. One major modern historical school does, however, retain something of this lost sense of cyclical history, of patterns with a direct application to the present: it is hardly a coincidence that it is Marxist critics who have been at the forefront of recent historicist approaches to literary criticism. Marxist analysis is predicated upon a faith in the recurring mechanisms of history, an economic dialectic at work, in different guises, through all ages: Marxists (and their kin, the New Historicists and Cultural Materialists) have kept faith with the idea that the study of the literature


of the past is immediately relevant and useful. "The most important work" in literary studies, write the editors of the 1987 collection *The New Eighteenth-Century*, "always insists on the relations between ideology, gender, race, and class, and on the functions of the oppressed and excluded in texts and cultural formations." Why? Because these are the most pressing issues of our own day: this is modernization applied as an interpretive strategy. An interesting case in point is Laura Brown's recent study of ideology, gender, and mercantile capitalism, *Ends of Empire: Women and Ideology in Early Eighteenth-Century English Literature* (1993): its intent, Brown writes, is to "uncover the operations of imperialism in the eighteenth century and to help put a stop to empire in the twentieth." Brown's employment of an anachronistic term like "imperialism" -- and indeed, of a nineteenth-century historical/economic theory like Marxism -- in the service of an analysis of the England of Behn, Addison, Swift, and Pope reflects a very seventeenth-century faith in the unchanging patterns of history. Dryden would doubtless quarrel with her interpretations of these patterns, but he would have no difficulty with her perspective on

---

33 This faith can lead to a point where "literature," as a distinct discourse, no longer exists: "literary studies" becomes ideological or historical analysis. See for example Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, 1983 (Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1986) 206.

34 Felicity Nussbaum and Laura Brown, "Revising Critical Practices: An Introductory Essay," *The New Eighteenth-Century* (New York and London: Methuen, 1987) 20. It is interesting to note the absence of religion from this triad of contextual concerns: Phillip Harth makes an important point when he notes that, while "politics and religion were more closely intertwined in the seventeenth century than in most other periods," the "movement of influence was usually from religion to politics, and seldom in the opposite direction." *Contexts of Dryden's Thought* (Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1968) 228. James Harrington's *The Commonwealth of Oceana* (1656) provides an obvious seventeenth-century analogue to Marxism: Harrington's economic analysis of the causes of the Great Rebellion has made him a central figure in the Marxist approach of Christopher Hill: see *Puritanism and Revolution* 289-302.

history -- or with her polemical intent.

Marxism, however, has abandoned the individual, for only classes, races, and genders react predictably enough to be of use to economic determinism. This unwillingness to account for the individual voice is a liability in the study of satire, which presents itself always as an expressive genre, as the individual enunciation of complaint. We apprehend satire as we would a murder mystery, for, whatever our attitude to the victim, the fact of the death is not, in itself, enough: we want to know who pulled the trigger. Agency seems vitally important: satire provokes biographical speculations because it is about perspective: the satiric insight, the attitude of the speaker, is the result of looking at a particular subject from a particular angle. In this sense, the satirist who defines the satiric object is simultaneously defining him or herself. We follow the sight lines backward, tracing them to the point of origin: reading a satire upon the Whigs, we register the information that the satirist is a Tory. In a broad sense, satire is metonymic (for metaphor represents precisely the kind of "disguise" that satire is designed to penetrate): it insists upon connections, between cause and effect, art and life, creation and creator.

Satire allows us to "see" ourselves and others from an unfamiliar perspective. It offers a

---

36 Modern Marxist readings of seventeenth-century texts tend also to ignore generic bounds: see for example Steven N. Zwicker's Lines of Authority (Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1993) 9-12. Satire has been particularly ill-served by Marxist criticism: it is perhaps significant that in Michael McKeon's "Historicizing Absalom and Achiropeth" (New Eighteenth Century 23-40), the word "satire" appears just twice (24. 39).

clarified vision, wherein shades of grey dissolve to reveal the sharp outlines of vice and virtue.

"All this," Maynard Mack has written, "results from a slant of the glass, a fictional perspective on the real world." But if satire allows us to "see," it does so by refraction or distortion. Satire is frequently described as a mirror, but it is more truthfully a medium through, rather than in which we perceive the objects of reality. The distinction underlines the importance of the satirist, who is the source of the satiric perspective. In this sense, the personal and topical qualities of satire imply each other, for the satirist's vision enhances ethical insight by limiting us to a single subjective perspective. Satire is topical and occasional precisely because it operates through the subjective distortions of a particular person in a particular place writing from a unique perspective with a specific ideological or polemical purpose. In fact, satire's point of origin is frequently unknowable: the majority of seventeenth-century satires are, and will likely remain, anonymous or of doubtful attribution. Others are the products of collective composition: because so many


41 See Mirth Diverts All Care (London, 1708) sig. [A2*], and Paul Hammond's "Anonymity in Restoration Poetry," ScEnt 8 (1993): 123-42. Personal lampoons were particularly likely to be anonymous: see however "Advice Or an Heroic Epistle to M
d Fra: Villiers," which daringly concludes, "And so I end / Your faithful friend / And Servant -- / Roger
Satires were distributed in manuscript, new hands frequently added stanzas to ballad lampoons, or new lines to formal verse satires. Nonetheless, the satires themselves encourage us to construct an image of the satirist. Such was precisely the method of nineteenth- and early twentieth-centuries critics of satire, with frequently disastrous consequences: had Pope not been "crippled," wrote Humbert Wolfe in 1929, he had not written satire. Reading character from the satires, critics constructed monstrous versions of satirists: Lytton Strachey's characterization in 1925 of Martin, BL MS Harl. 7319 f.141r; Wilson 117-20. Martin was a notorious libeller: see "To Julian," BL MS Harl. 6913 f.151r, and "Letter to Julian." BL MS Harl. 7319 f.172v; Wilson 131-37.

See Harold Love, Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993) esp. 231-83 and Jean de La Bruyère. The Character, or the Manners of the Age (London, 1699) 7. Rochester's "Signior Dildo" exists in numerous states, with a wide variety of possible stanzas that were probably added by others; see Love's "A Restoration Lampoon in Transmission and Revision: Rochester's(?)'Signior Dildo." SB 46 (1993): 250-62. Self-censorship by scribes also created variants: see Paul Hammond. "Censorship in the Manuscript Transmission of Restoration Poetry." E&S 46 (1993): 39-62. See also "An Essay of Scandal" (1681), which switches from heroic couplets to hodiebrastics midway through the poem. This, like so many other lampoons, is an unstructured satirical catalogue to which new names, and new scandals, may be added ad infinitum by later satirists. BL MS Harl. 7319, f.68r-70r; Wilson 63-67.

See for example John Aubrey's association of Samuel Butler's satirical wit with his personality 1: 138. Charles A. Knight notes that the "satiric speakers of Horace and Juvenal may be in part a fiction . . . but we tend to use those speakers as authorial images onto which we can project what we take to be the author's intentions." "Satire, Speech and Genre," CL 44 (1992): 24. Seventeenth-century readers tended to attribute anonymous satires to well-known satirists: it is difficult to establish reliable canons for Cleveland, Butler, Marvell, Rochester, Buckingham, Dorset and others because much that was spurious works was published under their names. See the debate over the Second and Third Advice to a Painter in George deForest Lord, "Two New Poems by Marvell?" BNYPL 62 (1958): 551-70. Ephim G. Fogel's response in "Salmons in Both, or Some Caveats for Canonical Scholars," BNYPL 63 (1959): 223-36, and Lord, "Comments on the Canonical Caveat," BNYPL 63 (1959): 355-66. See also ARP 3-56 and A. H. de Quehen. "An Account of Works Attributed to Samuel Butler," RES N.S. 33 (1982): 262-77.

Pope as the "little monster of Twit'nam." and of his satires as "spoonsful of boiling oil, ladled out by a fiendish monkey at an upstairs window upon such of the passers-by whom the wretch had a grudge against" is characteristic.\footnote{Pope (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1925) 1-2. For a more sympathetic biographical reading of satire, see Gilbert Cannan, \textit{Satire} (New York: George H. Doran, 1914).}

New Criticism seems, in hindsight, an unlikely champion for satire. Its literary values are frequently profoundly opposed to those of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century: even its formalism, with its emphasis upon ambiguity, was of a sort alien to the earlier period.\footnote{See for example Cleanth Brooks' complaint that neoclassical poets "segregated" the "satiric impulse" from "other impulses," making "neoclassical satire, too narrowly satiric." \textit{Modern Poetry and the Tradition} (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1939) 230. See also Wallace Cable Brown, "Dramatic Tension in Neoclassic Satire." \textit{CE} 6 (1944-45): 263-69.} Perhaps, as Phillip Harth has suggested, the New Critics "showed particular zeal in applying the impersonal theory of poetry" to apparently personal poems like satires "because the more intractable the material, the greater the triumph in bringing it to bay."\footnote{"The New Criticism and Eighteenth-Century Poetry," \textit{CI} 7 (1981): 531.} Bruce King's remarks on \textit{Absalom and Achitophel} are typical: "our knowledge of the poem's political occasion misdirects our response away from its imaginative patterns."\footnote{"Absalom and Achitophel: A Revaluation." \textit{Dryden's Mind and Art}, ed. Bruce King (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1969) 65.} King does not deny the poem's topicality: he merely renders it irrelevant. Topicality embarrassed the New Critics because it denies that any given poem can "mean" the same things in different historical contexts.\footnote{See Reuben A. Brower's influential article, "An Allusion to Europe: Dryden and Tradition" \textit{ELH} 19 (1952): 38-48, which praises \textit{Absalom and Achitophel} as an occasional piece that is nonetheless "poetry of a high order" (40); "Minor Augustan poetry is dead for modern readers not because it was too 'general,' but because it was too local" (47).} R. S. Crane's perceptive
comment that New Criticism reduced all poetry to "one qualitatively homogenous thing, however variously it may manifest itself in the different poetic genres" is precisely to the point. While genre was reduced in this way to a single poetic "kind," so too did New Criticism dismiss historical context and difference:

Cleanth Brooks' influential *The Well Wrought Urn* (1947) employs the same method in its analysis of poetry from Shakespeare to Yeats: "what must be sought is an instrument which will allow for some critical precision, and yet one which may be used in the service, not of Romantic poetry or of metaphysical poetry, but of poetry." Topicality posed a double threat to such an "instrument": on a synchronic level, topical poetry insists upon a distinction between polemical genres and more obviously fictive ones, while it also asserts the importance of diachronic distinctions, and of historical context.

New Criticism's insistence upon the autonomy of the literary artifact rested upon its perception of the impersonality of art. As W. K. Wimsatt Jr. and M. C. Beardsley expressed it in the immensely influential article, "The Intentional Fallacy" (1946), "We ought to impute the thoughts and attitudes of the poem immediately to the dramatic speaker, and if to the author at


51 There is, as Roland Barthes noted, a vital connection between genre and history: "the more a system is specifically defined in its forms, the more amenable it is to historical criticism. . . I shall say that a little formalism turns one away from History, but that a lot brings one back to it." *Mythologies*. 1957, trans. Annette Lavers (London: Palladin Grafton Books. 1988) 112.

all, only by an act of biographical inference." For satire, the most important manifestation of this credo was the notion of the persona, which initially developed as a response to biographical analyses of satire. This is not the place for a lengthy examination of the history of this concept: indeed, such a history has already been written, by Robert C. Elliott in The Literary Persona, published posthumously in 1982. However, a brief outline of its development is appropriate. It was Maynard Mack, in his influential article "The Muse of Satire," published in the Yale Review in 1951, who first introduced a type of systematic persona criticism to the study of satire. Mack's article is, primarily, a defence of Pope against nineteenth-century biographical criticism: his thesis is that "good satire . . . exhibits an appreciable degree of fictionality" (84), and that one of its aspects is "the ethos of the satirist" (86), a rhetorical term signifying the writer's public self-presentation. This ethos -- which Mack next anachronistically terms a "persona" -- has too often been confused with the historical writer: "We may call this speaker Pope, if we wish, but only if we remember that he always reveals himself as a character in a drama, not as a man confiding in us" (88). Mack's essay was extraordinarily successful, and was soon adapted for studies of other satirists, most influentially in Alvin Kerman's The Cankered Muse (1959), which introduced into its discussion of Elizabethan and Jacobean satire the idea of the "satyr-satirist," the ironic persona


55 Similar in its thesis, and also focused upon Pope, is Elder Olson's "Rhetoric and the Appreciation of Pope." MP 37 (1939): 13-35: Olson also evokes the idea of ethos (23-24).
who both "speaks" the satire and is one of its main targets. By the 1960s, however, the programme had provoked a counter-reaction, which was articulated most effectually in Irvin Ehrenpreis' 1963 article "Personae." Ehrenpreis argued that, insofar as any use of language involves a fictionalization of the self, the idea of the persona is, at best, meaningless: "To the degree that the speaker in the Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot does not stand for Alexander Pope, no man, in a single speech, can be wholly himself" (28). "Surely," Ehrenpreis writes, "we read the Modest Proposal as a wildly sarcastic fantasy delivered by the true author" (36). Ehrenpreis' article created a stir, provoking a lengthy symposium on the subject in 1966 in Satire Newsletter that featured 18 participants: it was clear that a strong reaction to persona criticism had set in.

The New Criticism no longer dominates, as it once did, the field of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century studies. It has been succeeded, in turn, by Structuralism and Poststructuralism, each, however, as insistent upon the impersonal, and ahistorical, nature of texts as the older "rhetorical criticism". characteristic is Rose A. Zimbardo's argument, in an analysis

56 See The Cankered Muse (New Haven: Yale UP. 1959) 54-63 and passim.


60 As Jonathan Culler has written, "once meaning is explained in terms of conventional systems which may escape the grasp of the conscious subject -- the self can no longer be identified
of the Restoration episteme, that there "is no comforting, reassuring 'I' at the heart of a Restoration satire, no good man of common sense speaking to us and assuring us of our community in the empire of reason." Generally, however, neither Structuralism or its successor seems to have had much of a lasting impact upon the study of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century satire, while the concept of the persona has survived: there are still many occasions when (to quote Claude Rawson on Rochester) "the now slightly faded stand-by of the critic, the persona" is "wheeled in." The controversy aroused by Ehrenpreis has not so much been resolved as driven underground. An interesting example is Leon Guilhemet's *Satire and the Transformation of Genre* (1987), which notes that the "issue of the persona is one where the battle lines have been clearly drawn." and which "remains an issue of the utmost importance for


those concerned with the aesthetics of satire.\textsuperscript{64} Guilhamet, however, seems to have felt it sufficient to acknowledge the "importance" of the debate, for he makes no attempt to resolve it: his own position on "the battle lines" only becomes evident some 10 pages later, when he describes the persona as a characteristic fictive technique of satire (12).

Similar is Stephanie Barbé Hammer's \textit{Satirizing the Satirist} (1990), which is greatly indebted to Kerman's persona-based approach in \textit{The Canpered Muse}. She never employs the term "persona" -- it as though the word is now a little embarrassing -- but prefers instead, as in her discussion of "Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift," to designate the poem's shifting identities by means of ambiguous phrases like "the Swift of part three" (34). More reactionary is George Test's \textit{Satire: Spirit and Art}, published in 1991. Test defends the concept of the persona late in his book (222), but his sympathies are evident throughout: "Students of satire since World War II have argued that literary satire is art and ought to be treated as an aesthetic object and not a biographical or sociological document. or worse, a Rorschach test revealing its creator as sadistic, malicious, or mad" (14-15).

There is much that is valid in the notion of the persona, particularly as it was first articulated by Mack, who associated it with rhetorical \textit{ethos}.\textsuperscript{65} It is difficult to dispute that language fashions "images" of ourselves; it is also evident that dramatized "characters" who are obviously not to be identified with the author, are frequently the "speakers" of satire. Alexander


\textsuperscript{65} See however Phillip Harth's comment that "the ethos Aristotle describes in his \textit{Rhetoric} -- one's own character as it is presented effectively to an audience -- had become, for the New Critics, indistinguishable from the ethos he discusses in his \textit{Poetics} -- a fictional character as the agent of an imitation" ("New Criticism" 533).
Brome, in his comments prefixed to his 1661 Songs and Other Poems, makes reference to just such a concept:

But as to the men of a severer brow, who may be scandaliz'd at this free way of writing. I desire them to conceive those Odes which may seem wild and extravagant, not to be Ideas of my own mind, but characters of divers humours set out in their own persons. And what reflected on the Times, to be but expressions of what was thought and designed by the persons represented . . .”

Clearly, the period had a concept somewhat analogous to this aspect of persona: this, as I will suggest later in this study, is more usefully and accurately termed prosopopeia.

The real problem with the concept of the persona is two-fold. First, it lacks precision, and remains an "elusive idea, rarely defined" (Ehrenpreis, "Personae" 26); even Elliott, in the Preface to The Literary Persona, concedes parenthetically that the term "has, in truth, been abused to the point where its usefulness is in question" (ix). A term flexible enough to be applied both to


69 A cursory glance at dictionaries of literary terms reveals not only the continued currency of the term, but also the prevalent confusion about its meaning. See for example M. H. Abrams' A Glossary of Literary Terms, 5th ed. (Fort Worth: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1988) 135-37, which distinguishes between historical author and "persona," and Gareth Griffith's article in A Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms, ed. Roger Fowler, rev. ed. (London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987) 176-77, which adds a third term, the "narrator," which Griffith distinguishes from both author and "persona."
obviously ironic narrators like Swift's "Modest Proposal," and to ambiguous figures like that of Rochester's "A Ramble in St. James's Park." is unlikely to be of much value in critical analysis and description. The greatest liability of persona criticism is, however, not that it implies a disjunction between the historical author and the "voice" that we experience when we read satires, but rather that it encourages us to ignore the questions that this disjunction raises. In most discussions employing persona, the historical Rochester, Swift, or Pope simply disappear. Yet, satire insists upon the issue of authorial responsibility: it asserts that a real person with a real axe to grind has produced what we are reading. No one with any extensive experience of satire will deny that satirists frequently use a variety of rhetorical, structural, and poetic devices to create an effective and credible voice with which to persuade the reader. Indeed, this is precisely the point. Persona criticism buys into the poet's fiction without a murmur of dissent: it asks us to accept, at his word, Pope's contention that he acts without personal animus. Persona criticism relieves the critic of the onus of analyzing the means by which this fiction is maintained. It is, as Ehrenpreis recognized, "a device to screen the author from his meaning" ("Personae" 29) or, more properly, from responsibility for that meaning.

It is, in this connection, interesting to note that persona critics like Kernan refer to the persona as the "satirist," as though to shield the historical author from association with the genre itself: Rochester was thus not a satirist, but rather a poet who has created a fictive satirist.

Indeed, the genre itself disappears: satire becomes a fiction produced, not by the poet, but by the "satirist" within the poem.70 A satire, according to this view, is really a fictive representation of a

satire. The tendencies of this process reached a depressing nadir with Kernan's *The Plot of Satire* (1965), in which it was asserted that "the authors of satire have insisted that their works are literature, symbolic worlds and plots constructed to reveal the nature and workings of dullness, not complexes of devices aimed at disabling particular men or practices by ridicule." Satire, contrary to all expectations, does not satirize. Ehrenpreis' remark that persona critics "believe that if the structure of a poem involves a persona, the work deserves special praise on that account" ("Personae" 26) sums up the situation: a satire is valued only if it can be made to seem unsatirical.

And yet, persona criticism should not be dismissed out of hand: on the contrary, it should be recognized that such criticism mirrors or replicates the evasive strategies of the satirists themselves. What is required is some insight into the purpose of such strategies, and an examination into the characteristic means by which evasion is effected. We should question Rochester's motivations, not for attacking Dryden in *An Allusion to Horace*, but for his attempt to conceal behind a genial Horatian voice his responsibility for having done so. Satire produces paradoxical effects. Saint-Evremond's response to Juvenal is not singular:

"Here [in "A Satyr upon the Imperfection and Abuse of Human Learning"]], Butler's *Satirist* uses what becomes a common device" (163: my italics).

71 *The Plot of Satire* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1965) 5. Cf. T. S. Eliot's judgement of the value and effectiveness of Ben Jonson's satire, which achieves greatness "not by hitting off its object, but by creating it; the satire is merely the means which leads to the aesthetic result, the impulse which projects a new world into a new orbit." "Ben Jonson." *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*, 1920 (London: Methuen, 1972) 120.

In vain doth an Author so abominably licentious and impudent persuade me to hate the excesses of Messalina. I hate him even more than I do her; and the lewdnesses of his wit that are sufficiently discovered in the boldness of his Stile, scandalize me infinitely more than those of the most abandon'd Women, who are blindly transported by the fury of their Passions.\footnote{Miscellaneous Essays, 2 vols. (London, 1692-94) 2: 108-09.}

As Saint-Evremond intimates, our response to the character of the satirist can undermine the polemical purpose of the genre. While we enjoy the message, we tend to dislike and, more crucially, distrust the messenger.\footnote{A good discussion of the ambivalence of social responses to satire is to be found in Elliott's "The Satirist and Society." ELH 21 (1954): 237-48, expanded for inclusion in The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1960) 257-75. See also Louis I. Bredvold's remarks in "A Note in Defence of Satire," ELH 7 (1940): 253-64, and Feinberg 5-8.} Satirists recognized this dual effect, and sought to alleviate it by engaging in what the anonymous author of Raillerie a la Mode Consider'd (1673) termed an "evasive way of Abuse":\footnote{Raillerie a la Mode Consider'd: Or the Supercilious Detractor (London, 1673) 42.} as Michael Seidel has noted, satire involves a "simultaneous line of attack and retreat" designed to direct the reader's attentions away from the unattractive figure of the railing satirist, and toward the unpleasant but vital truths that he or she is articulating.\footnote{Satiric Inheritance, Rabelais to Sterne (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1979) 10: Seidel is citing Freud's comments on the psychology of satire in The Interpretation of Dreams.} This conflict between satire's means and its putative end produces a paradox that is inherent to the genre: at no historical time, however, are the contours of satire's fault lines more evident than in the period from 1640-1700.

Examining the dynamics of the satirist's response to the pressures exerted upon the genre by its topicality and subjective voice requires of the critic a good sense of balance. Crudely biographical criticism is frequently blind to the artistic and polemical purposes of satire.
Historicist approaches neglect the role of the artist, treating satire as an impersonal expression of ideology, with the result that the subjective quality of satiric insight, and the problems this creates for the satirist, are overlooked. Formalist criticism devotes little attention to the historical context that shapes both the satirist's rhetorical strategies and the audience's responses, and tends, as a result, to treat satire as though it were something else. This study therefore seeks to mediate between biographical, formalist and historicist approaches to satire. My approach is founded, first, upon a recognition of the putative polemical function of satire, and, second, upon an acknowledgment of the apparently personal quality of the satiric utterance as a characteristic effect of the genre. The first of these necessitates an engagement with historicist criticism, and the second, with the effect of personal (i.e. "biographical") voice; at the same time, my interest in both of these areas is formalist, insofar as both topicality and personal voice are a function of the genre itself. The greatest part of what follows, however, is an analysis of the evasive rhetorical strategies that satirists employ as a response to the stresses upon the genre. Evasion can necessitate creative strategies: as the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury noted in his Characteristicks, "Tis the persecuting Spirit has rais'd the bantering one" (72). So too did the satirist's rhetorical evasions produce innovative forms that enriched, and indeed, helped define the genre.

A few words need to be said about my choice of historical period. Periodicization produces arbitrary distinctions that are as clumsy the word itself, and I do not by my choice of this sixty-year time span aim to replace older categories such as "Restoration," with a new, equally arbitrary one. The years from 1640 to 1700 do, however, represent a significant epoch in the history of satire, for it was with the advent of civil war that topicality became the dominant mode
of literary satire; equally, with the development of a more structured, theoretically coherent
"neoclassicism" in the early decades of the eighteenth-century, topicality, while never
disappearing, was increasingly viewed as a liability, an undesirable element in a genre that was
seeking recognition as a legitimate poetic form in its own right. Because satire was at its most
topical in the period that I have chosen, the satires of this era reveal more clearly than in any other
period the stresses between the particular and the general, the topical and the universal, the
personal and the impersonal. For this reason, my approach is both synchronic and diachronic. I
am particularly interested in the features that the satires of this 60 year period hold in common;
moreover, because satire is always to some extent topical and didactic, much of what I have to
say about the genre in the later seventeenth-century applies to all satire. At the same time, no
study of satire that is concerned with its relationship to external events can avoid an
acknowledgement of the ways in which historical change impacted upon the genre: the outbreak
of civil war, the execution of Charles I, the Restoration, the Dutch Wars, and the Glorious
Revolution had a vital effect upon the way in which satire was written within the period that I
discuss, and the effects of these historical developments are treated in some detail in the chapters
that follow. As benchmarks, 1640 and 1700 are themselves entirely arbitrary, and I have felt free
to touch upon the satire of both earlier and later periods whenever it seemed useful to do so.

My decision to concentrate upon verse satire is similarly motivated. Poetry in the
seventeenth-century was a serious business, and was credited as the most effective medium of
literary communication: it was not by accident that Milton, seeking to justify the ways of God to
men, chose to do so in an epic poem. Again, however, I have not hesitated to discuss prose or
dramatic satire where it seemed informative to do so. Neither have I restricted myself to "formal
verse satire," in large part because I do not believe that such a category truly existed until Dryden invented it in his seminal "Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire" in 1693. This lack of a strict definition for the genre through much of the later seventeenth-century means that a great deal of the most important satire of the period is modal rather than generic, and occurs within narrative poems like Absalom and Achitophel: I am more interested in exploring the characteristic features of the satiric impulse than in creating largely artificial and anachronistic distinctions. As well, the generic verse satire of the period is immensely varied, and there is a great deal of overlap between forms. Ballad satires, so immensely important from the 1640s on, are a case in point, and encompass a broad range of thematic structures, the satiric song, the mock-litany, the ironic prosopopæia and the "Sessions" poem being but a few. Some forms defy classification, as, for example, "A Bill on St. Paul's Church Door" (1642?), an attack on Isaac

77 See Dryden's "Discourse" for his discussion of "how a Modern Satire shou'd be made" (78-84), and his classification of Mac Flecknoe and Absalom and Achitophel as "Varronian" satire (48). Employing a definition derived from Dryden's, Mary Claire Randolph, in "The Structural Design of the Formal Verse Satire," PQ 21 (1942), was able to identify only three English practitioners of the genre: Donne, Young, and Pope (383).


Penington printed in the important 1662 collection of Royalist satire. *Rump Songs*: 80

This House is to be let.
It is both wide, and fair;
If you would know the price of it.
Pray ask of Mr. Maior.

*Isaack Pennington* (Rump Songs 1: 145)

My approach has been deliberately eclectic, and I have tried to examine as broad a range of satiric modes as possible. These forms do imply important distinctions, but I am most interested in those features that these forms hold in common. For this reason, as well, I make some use of printed and manuscript miscellanies from the period: 81 a comprehensive view of the thousands of satires produced in this period would require a far longer study than mine, but I have attempted to deal with a representative sampling of the variety of forms in order to demonstrate that the issues that I examine are endemic to the genre itself, and not just to the better-known works of figures like Cleveland, Marvell, Dryden, Rochester, and Oldham. While these satirists constitute an important part of my study, a broader examination of the less well known verse satire of the period places their achievements in context, reminding us, as Higden remarked, that "the Humour and particular Hints of the Times" wherein it was written "is indeed the Life and Beauty of Satyr."

---

80 See however M. C. Randolph, "'Hide-and-Seek' Satires of the Restoration and XVIII-Century," *N&Q* 183 (1942): 213-16. Penington was twice Lord Mayor (in 1642 and 1643); he was a frequent target of satirists, the "wicked, debauched Shagamuffins," of the King's party. See *A Complaint to the House of Commons* (Oxford, 1642) sig. [B2'].

Chapter 1

"Criminal Delight": Satiric Polemic and Voice

When the anti-Papist, anti-Irish mock ballad *Lilli burlero* (probably penned by Thomas Wharton and sung to a tune associated with Henry Purcell)\(^1\) first appeared in late October of 1688, it achieved instant popularity. The ballad, written in mock-brogue, detailed a planned uprising by the Irish troops serving James in England, to be led by the unpopular Richard Talbot, the Catholic Earl of Tyrconnel, and Viceroy of Ireland:

Ho by my Shoul it is a T----t,
Lilli Burlero, [Bullen a-la;]
And he will Cut all de English Troat.
Lilli [Burlero Bullen a-la].
Lero, Laro, [Laro Lero, Lilli Burlero Bullen a la].
Lero, Laro, [Laro Lero, Lilli Burlero Bullen a la].\(^2\)

As the tune disseminated throughout the country, William of Orange's fleet was already sailing towards Tor Bay: for James, *Lilli burlero* could not have appeared at a worse time. According to Gilbert Burnet, the tune "made an impression on the Army, that cannot be well imagined by those who saw it not. The whole Army, and at last all people both in city and country, were singing it perpetually. And perhaps never had so slight a thing so great an effect" (Burnet 1:


\(^{2}\) *A New Song* ([London]. [1688]): *POAS Yale* 4: 311-12. Words in square brackets replace "&c." in the original, and have been transcribed from the first verse.
792). Clearly the tune did have a remarkable impact, galvanizing support for William, and inflaming the always-present hatred and fear of Irish Papists: Lilli burlero did not cause James' downfall, but it did provide his opponents with a powerful symbol, a popular means of articulating fears of Papist tyranny.

There is a marked reluctance on the part of twentieth-century critics to accede that satire has the power to effect reform. "For poetry makes nothing happen," wrote W. H. Auden, one of our own century's most prominent verse satirists. The reasons for this pessimistic evaluation are as various as the critical approaches of the critics who express it: J. W. Nichols, noting the lack of evidence for satire's effectiveness as a tool of reform, argues that its "essential aims and effects" must therefore be found elsewhere (31): similar is Paul Elkin's uniformitarian contention that satire fails "because neither human nature nor society is capable of human change." Formalist approaches ignore utility in their pursuit of structure and device, or view the satirist's depictions of evil as archetypal; psychological criticism, on the other hand, takes a darker view of the

---

3 Wharton himself boasted that it "sung a deluded Prince out of Three Kingdoms." See [Delarivière Manley?], A True Relation of the Several Facts and Circumstances of the Intended Riot and Tumult of Queen Elizabeth's Birth-day (London, 1711) 5. Thomas Percy wrote that the ballad "had once a more powerful effect than either the Philopics of Demosthenes, or Cicero: and contributed not a little towards the great revolution in 1688." Reliques of Ancient English Poetry, 3 vols. (London. 1765) 2: 358.


6 See for example Jewel Spears Brooker's comment that Northrop Frye's definition of satire as "wit or humour" with "an object of attack" is built upon satiric technique, and omits any mention of satiric purpose; see "Satire and Dualism," Thalia 5 (1983): 7, and Anatomy of Criticism, 1957 (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971) 224. Employing a vaguely archetypal approach, Philip Pinkus opines that "reform" is not "the purpose of any satire, insofar as the target is eternal.
satirist's motivation, which it relates to deeply-buried atavistic impulses." David Nokes has even suggested that satire acts as a verbal substitute for moral and political action.  

If it is difficult to find examples of satire's direct impact upon historical events, it is easier to demonstrate that personal satire did wound its victims, even if it failed to reform them. As Addison wrote in *Spectator* 23 (March 27, 1711), the fact that "the Wounds" satire gives "are only Imaginary," does little to alleviate the pain if the damage is accepted as real: "how many are there that would not rather lose a considerable Sum of Mony, or even Life it self, than be set up as a Mark of Infamy and Derision?" Buckingham's well-known lament for the damage done to his reputation by the portrait of Zimri in *Absalom and Achitophel* provides rare insight into the personal effects of lampoon:

As witches images of wax invent  
To torture those theyr bid to Represent.  
And as the true live substance do's decay  
Whilst that slight Idoll melts in flames away  
Such. & no lesser witchcraft wounds my name  
So thy ill made Resemblance wasts my fame.

---


So as the charmed brand consum'd ith' fire
So did Meleagers vitall heat expire.
Poor name! w't medicine for thee can I finde
But thus with stronger charms, thy charme t'unbinde? (Buckingham 168)

Buckingham's comments belie Dryden's suggestion that he "was too witty to resent it as an injury" ("Discourse" 71). Indeed, if satire is to reform, it must be treated by the victim. if not as an "injury," then at least as a friendly warning. Buckingham, however, recognized little truth in the satiric portrait, and determined upon poetic revenge rather than reform.  

If the attack on Buckingham was intended to instruct its victim, it was scarcely a success.

Nor, indeed, did Absalom and Achitophel bring about dramatic political change: the hope expressed in Absolon's IX Worthies (1682) that "Thy Lines will make young Absolon relent, / And though 'tis hard Achitophel repent," remained unrealized. Its major impact was instead to blacken the reputation of its victims permanently. In this, satire frequently succeeds: Dryden was called Bayes for decades after he was pilloried in The Rehearsal: Mulgrave. mocked as "Bajazet"

---


by Etherege and Rochester. was still associated with this name almost 30 years later.\textsuperscript{12} Dryden's caricature of Shadwell in \textit{Mac Flecknoe} is another example.\textsuperscript{13} But if our own responses to such as Shadwell are inevitably conditioned by the damage inflicted by Dryden, there is, at best, slight evidence that the victims themselves changed their conduct, or that others took example from them, and reformed. Any determination of the effectiveness of satire thus depends, to a great extent, on how we define "effective"; it is particularly important to identify the intended audience of the satire. We are not surprised that Buckingham did not "learn" anything about himself from Dryden's Zimri, yet seventeenth-century satirists, as we shall see, routinely claimed that their satiric attacks were intended to persuade the wicked to reform.\textsuperscript{14} As Dryden remarks in the prefatory "To the Reader" of \textit{Absalom and Achitophel}, "The true end of Satyre. is the amendment of Vices by correction" (5), and it is his expressed hope that Shaftesbury, and indeed, "the Devil


\textsuperscript{14} Cf. "Satyr" (1680): satire is "charity to Foes kindness to's Friend. / The more wee love the more we wish they'd Mend." BL MS Harl. 6913 f.69; Wilson 36-40. See also Swift's comments in \textit{Examiner} 38 (26 April, 1711), in Swift 3: 141.
himself may, at last, be sav'd" (5). Buckingham, Monmouth, and Shaftesbury together constitute one of Dryden's intended audiences; another is the "Body Politique" (5) and, in particular, "the more Moderate sort" (3) to whom he directly appeals in his prefatory remarks. The ends of persuasion are, in each of these two cases, distinct. Shaftesbury and his fellow victims are to reform themselves; the "Body Politique," on the other hand, are asked to abandon the cause of the Whigs.

Satire that accentuates the first audience, the satiric victim, makes pretence to reform, but more truly resembles what Edward Rosenheim has usefully called "punitive" satire. Such satire, as Rosenheim notes, is preaching to a public that is "already thoroughly convinced" of the victim's culpability (13); it achieves its effect upon the victim by giving public expression to such a belief. Satire that addresses itself to a broader audience resembles, as Rosenheim suggests, "polemic rhetoric" in that it apparently seeks to persuade the reader to adopt some particular viewpoint. Satire that addresses this second audience is frequently bald propaganda, and is the approach outlined in the remarks of Nathaniel Thompson, Tory publisher and propagandist, in the preface to his A Choice Collection of 180 Loyal Songs (1684, 1685):

Amongst the several means that have been of late years to reduce the deluded Multitude to their just Allegiance, this of BALLADS and LOYAL SONGS has not been of the least influence. . . . The mis-informed Rabble began to listen; they began to hear to[sic] Truth in a SONG, in time found their Errours, and were charm'd into Obedience. Those that despise the Reverend Prelate in the Pulpit, and the Grave Judge on the Bench: that will neither submit to the Laws of God or Man, will yet lend an itching Ear to a Loyal Song, nay, and often become a

---

15 Rosenheim actually pays little attention to the role of the victim, emphasizing instead the broader public's enjoyment of the satire's aggressive ridicule. See also W. O. S. Sutherland, Jr., The Art of the Satirist (Austin: U of Texas P, 1965) 17-18.
Convert by It, when all other means prove ineffectual.\textsuperscript{16}

Appreciating that such categories are not inviolable, Rosenheim posits a "satiric spectrum" that ranges between "persuasive" and "punitive" satire (16): much satire addresses both audiences, and employs punitive and persuasive elements as complements, using public opinion to "punish" the victim, and the portrait of the victim to influence opinion. \textit{Absalom and Achitophel}'s audience is double, for it addresses itself both to the vicious and to a general readership. Clearly, however, its main persuasive thrust is in the direction of the "Body Politique."\textsuperscript{17} Ironically, however, the poem's greatest impact has been a reflection of punitive intent: while \textit{Absalom and Achitophel}'s persuasive influence upon contemporary readers is doubtful and difficult to gauge, its effect upon the reputations of Buckingham and Shaftesbury is unquestionable.

Significantly, most seventeenth- and eighteenth-century critics who acknowledged the utility of satire as an instrument of reform accentuated its punitive effects upon the victim: its role as propaganda is rarely explicitly conceded, although René Rapin, in his influential \textit{Reflections on Aristotle's Treatise of Poetry}, opined that "It may . . . be of great advantage in a State, when taught to keep within its bounds."\textsuperscript{18} More typically, Obadiah Walker, writing in 1673, claimed that satire "makes men stand better upon their guard, when they know that they are likely to hear

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{A Choice Collection of 180 Loyal Songs}, 3rd ed. (London, 1685) sigs. [a2v]. See also William Meston, \textit{The Knight} ([London], 1723) sig. [*2'].

\textsuperscript{17} For Dryden's participation in the paper scuffle sparked by the Popish Plot, see Frank H. Ellis, "'Legends No Histories' Part the Second: The Ending of \textit{Absalom and Achitophel}."] MP 85 (1988): 405-06 and Phillip Harth, \textit{Pen for a Party} (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993).

again of their actions; besides, it inureth them to bear harsh words, and bridle their passions."¹⁹

As the Earl of Mulgrave expressed it in An Essay upon Poetry (1682), satire can "mend the Age" precisely because it can "mortify Mankind."²⁰ Nor did the victim alone "benefit": portraits of vice dissuaded others by example. "Satyr," John Phillips wrote in A Reflection on Our Modern Poesy (1695), "was a wholesome Remedy. / Prescrib'd to cure a People's Malady,"²¹ while Rapin believed that "The principal end of Satyr. is to instruct the People by discrediting Vice" (137).

André Dacier, in his Essay on Satire (1687, translated by Tom Brown in 1695), criticized those who tended to "Halt at the out-side" of Horace's satires:²² it was the task of the scholar, therefore, "to shew the Rise, the Reason, and the Proof of his Precepts" (sig. [A6']).

The Earl of Mulgrave expressed a commonplace when he opined that "Satyr well writ has most successful prov'd. / And cures. because the remedy is lov'd" (9); nonetheless, the difficulty of proving the effectiveness of satire was a useful tool in the derogation of the form. Charles Gildon (who seems to have held contradictory opinions about the genre) employs just such a means to discredit satire in his Epistle Dedicatory to Tom Brown's translation of Dacier's Essay:

_The greatest Patrons of Satyr. I am sure. cannot prove that it answers the End. they pretend. 'twas design'd for. viz. the Reformation of Vice. especially that Satyr. which names Men. and tends to a personal abuse. For instead of_


Reforning Vice it only gratifies the ill-nature of most, and that Criminal delight they have in hearing an other abus'd, without any influence on the Manners of those it aims to Correct. (sig. [A4⁴])

That such accusations were to a great extent justified, even some satirists were inclined to admit:

In vain the fulsom errors of the Ages  
We strive to mend in Satyr, or on Stage;  
Fools will be Fools, Cullies will be undone.  
Tho we still Rail, & Nokes & Lee show on.  
Satyr may please, of wholesome Counsel boast.  
Harden'd in Vice their Sense of Feeling's lost.

The lament here is strategic, a means of satirizing the impenitence of the guilty, as too is that of Sir Charles Sedley in "The Doctor and His Patients": "The Wise may preach, and Satyrists rail, / Custom and Nature will prevail." Some, like Richard Blackmore, in his Essays upon Several Subjects (1716), more seriously challenged the instructive value of satire. Taking particular aim at the author of the Tatler and Spectator, he wrote "that all his fine Raillery and Satire, tho admirable in their kind, never reclaim'd one vicious Man, or made one Fool depart from his Folly." Addison, replying to this attack, in The Free-holder 45 (May 25, 1716), was compelled to admit that Blackmore's "is a Position very hard to be contradicted," although he asserted that, at the least, the Horatian satire of the Tatler and Spectator "have made some Proselytes to the

---

23 "Satyr on both Whigs and Tories" (1682), BL MS Harl. 7319 f.120r; Wilson 121-30. Words in bold in this and future citations appear as such in the original. Cf. William Cowper's The Task, a Poem, in Six Books (London, 1785) 61-62: Bk. II [ll. 315-25].


25 Essays upon Several Subjects (London, 1716) xlviii.
Interests, if not to the Practice, of Wisdom and Virtue."

Much of Addison's argument in The Freeholder rests upon a specific defence of his own practice in the Tatler and Spectator papers: he makes little real attempt to justify the genre itself. On one point, however, he is unequivocal: particular satire is to be avoided.

Should a Writer single out particular Persons, or point his Raillery at any Order of Men, who by their Profession ought to be exempt from it: should he slander the Innocent, or satyrize the Miserable... he might be sure of pleasing a great Part of his Readers, but must be a very ill Man, if by such a Proceeding he could please himself. (237)

Addison's comments demonstrate the importance of the controversy over the relative merits of particular and general satire to the overall defence of satire. At issue was the extent to which particular satire could be said to reform, and whether such an aim justified an attack upon an individual's reputation. Gildon argued in "To his Ingenious Friend Mr. George Isaacson, in defence of Personal Reflections" (1693) that particular satire is more effective than general satire. "For if Men must not be told their Faults," he explains, "they'll never mend 'em: and general Reflections will never do the Business, because the Devilish good Opinion ev'ry Man has of himself, furnishes him with an Evasion from the lash of general Characters." Because personal satire exposes its victim to "Publick Jest," it also discouraged others from the same vice (6).

In An Essay upon Publick Spirit (1711), John Dennis condemned "particular Satyrs"

---


27 Miscellaneous Letters and Essays on Several Subjects (London, 1694) 4.
because they sacrificed truth. More importantly, however, general satire was a more effective instrument of reform: "the Pleasure which we find that the Generality of Mankind takes in particular Satyr, is a certain Sign that the Publick reaps little Benefit from it; for few are willing to apply those Faults to themselves, for which they see any particular Person expos'd to Contempt and Infamy" (27). But while many expressed misgivings about the morality of personal satire, most conceded that it was more effective. Swift, subverting the sort of argument later used by Dennis, suggests in the preface to A Tale of a Tub (1704) that "Satyr being levelled at all, is never resented for an offence by any, since every individual Person makes bold to understand it of others, and very wisely removes his particular Part of the Burthen upon the shoulders of the World, which is broad enough, and able to bear it." The debate about the moral validity and relative efficacy of particular satire highlights the paradox that confronted the satirist: while particular satire was defended as the most polemically effective mode of invective (and the more so because satirists emphasized their wish to reform the satiric victim), it was also the least morally defensible, a fact which actually reduced its effectiveness: it was all too easy to dismiss

28 An Essay upon Publick Spirit (London, 1711) 27.


30 Tale of a Tub, 1704, eds. A. C. Guthkelch and D. Nichol Smith, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958) 51. See also Pope's comment that "General Satire in Times of General Vice has no force, & is no Punishment." The Correspondence of Alexander Pope, ed. George Sherburn (Oxford: Clarendon, 1956) 3: 423. Cf. "Utile Dulce" (1681): "For who about this spacious Town can hear / A Knave's, a Fop's, a Cuckold's Character, / But strait he thinks within his guilty mind / One (if not all of these) for him design'd?" BL MS Harl. 7319 f.65'; Wilson 49-55.
 satire by claiming that, in the words of Addison, the satirist was simply a "very ill Man."

Didactic effectiveness was the one criterion of excellence upon which nearly all literary critics of the seventeenth-century agreed. The authority of Horace in this matter, who insisted that poetry communicate both utile et dulce, was absolute. "A Poet should inform us, or divert," he wrote in the Ars Poetica (here quoted from Oldham's translation), "But joyning both he shews his chiefest Art" (ll. 535-36). Rapin could assert without fear of contradiction that, while "delight is the end Poetry aims at," it was not "the principal end" (9). It was, to a great extent, the instructive nature of epic that gave that genre, and epic experiments like Sir William Davenant's Gondibert (1651) or Cowley's Davideis (1656), their prestige: these last two works were much admired and widely read in their own day because their attempts to reform the epic so as to make it more instructive to a modern audience were seen as so vitally important. That neither poem has fared well with twentieth-century readers is (in part) an index of how low a priority we now assign to didacticism: as Alfred Harbage drily noted in 1935, "Gondibert is not so frequently read

31 This is, of course, a commonplace: for other examples, see Gildon's Miscellaneous Letters and Essays sig. [A3'], Collier 1. and Dennis' The Grounds of Criticism in Poetry (London, 1704) 9-10. In old age, Waller, according to Samuel Johnson, expressed a desire to "blot from his works any line that did not contain some motive to virtue." Lives of the English Poets, ed. George Birkbeck Hill, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1905) 1: 283.

in these days." Davenant's epic, tapping into a venerable tradition of neo-platonic criticism, employed ideal forms to communicate truths that transcend the accidental forms of physical reality: his ultimate goal, as he expresses it in his influential "Preface" to his epic, is, like that articulated by Sir Philip Sidney, to deliver a "golden" world where nature's is but "brazen." Davenant's style, themes, and narrative are the direct consequence of his attempt to produce a work that will operate "for the honor and benefit" of his nation (43).

Like satire, epic had two potential audiences, the most important being those in power (in the normal scheme of things, a king or prince) to whom the example provided by his princely hero would prove most apposite. Davenant, however, stresses the uses of literature in educating (or propagandizing) the general population: while "the Minde can never be constrain'd, ... it may be gain'd by Persuasion" (38). Epic achieved this "Persuasion" by way of a subtle infusion of virtuous ideas: Davenant suggests the use of "Images of Vertue so amiable that her beholders

---


36 The dedication of the poem's critical preface to Hobbes is thus entirely appropriate: it has even been suggested that Hobbes followed Davenant's lead in his understanding of the importance of the moral and political education of the aristocracy. See Mary Edmond, Rare Sir William Davenant (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1986) 108.

37 Davenant's choice of heroic poetry is also predicated upon his faith in "the particular strength of the Heroick: which hath a force that overmatches the infancy of such mindes as are not enabled by degrees of Education" (38).
should not be able to looke off (rather gently, and delightfully infusing, then inculcating Precepts)." Only "when the minde is conquer'd" by delightful images of virtue should the state bend its populace, now as pliant as "a willing Bride," to the gentle rule of law (39). Two vital elements of the poet's art, working through the narrative, combined to impress upon the reader the precepts of virtue: the fable provided vividly realized examples of the blessings visited upon the virtuous (and, of course, the miseries endured by the vicious), while a judicious employment of hyperbole, idealization, and imaginative reconstruction worked to transform even the most quotidian subjects into unambiguous representations of vice or virtue.

One of the period's clearest statements of the function of instruction through example appears in Rapin's influential Reflections on Aristotle's Treatise of Poesie. Working from the assumption that "all Poetry, when 'tis perfect, ought of necessity to be a publick Lesson of good Manners for the instruction of the world," Rapin explains that "Heroick Poesie proposes the example of great Virtues, and great Vices, to excite men to abhor these, and to be in love with the other: it gives us an esteem for Achilles in Homer, and contempt for Thersites: it begets in us a veneration for the piety of Aeneas in Virgil, and horror for the profaness of Mezentius" (13). Tragedy inculcates a love of virtue because "it lets men see that Vice never escapes unpunish'd": comedy emphasizes to an even greater extent the negative example, and by this means "corrects the publick Vices, by letting us see how ridiculous they are in particulars" (13-14). The central premise here is that the poet shows rather than tells the reader what is or is not virtuous, an approach reminiscent of Horace's advice in the Ars Poetica:

Some things are best to act, others to tell;  
Those by the ear convey'd, do not so well.  
Nor half so movingly affect the mind.
As what we are to our eyes presented find. (Oldham ll. 302-05)

While Horace is largely concerned with aesthetic response, his advice, with its concern for affective psychology, is applicable to Davenant's theory of poetic instruction as well, as is most clear from a document published in 1653, and now known to have been the work of Davenant.38 A Proposition for Advancement of Moralitie, By a new way of Entertainment of the People was probably part of a pragmatic campaign by Davenant to pave the way for the kind of quasi-operatic performances that he wished to stage. To this end he sought to demonstrate drama's potential uses as propaganda: "if the peoples senses were charm'd and entertain'd with things familiar to them, they would easily follow the voices of their shepherds; especially if there were set up some Entertainment, where their Eyes might be subdu'd with Heroicall Pictures and changes of Scenes" (244-45). Davenant's basic premise -- that representations of virtue (communicated, in this case, through performance) succeed because they require of the audience little conscious engagement with the ideas put forth by the text -- is predicated upon the common assumption that literature can catch the audience unawares. It is an idea that Davenant had already expressed in his Preface: the poet succeeds by "rather gently, and delightfully infusing, then inculcating Precepts."

Dulce becomes, in fact, a kind of blind that masks the operations of utile.

To a degree, satire shared with other forms of literature this modus operandi. Vice was to be made as unattractive as possible, and the vicious were to be shown suffering for their transgressions so as to instill a horror of both the sin and the sinner. Sir Carr Scroope's In Defence of Satyr (1676?) characterizes invective as the most powerful tool in the poet's arsenal.

38 See James R. Jacob and Timothy Raylor, "Opera and Obedience: Thomas Hobbes and A Proposition for Advancement of Moralitie by Sir William Davenant," SCent 6 (1991): 205-50; the piece is dated 1654. Jacob and Raylor reprint the text, and it is from this that I quote.
because the negative examples that it provides are so vivid:

And (without doubt) though some it may offend, Nothing helps more than Satyr, to amend Ill Manners, or is trulier Virtues Friend, Princes, may Laws ordain, Priests gravely Preach, But Poets, most successfully will teach, For as a passing Bell, frights from his Meat, The greedy Sick man, that too much wou'd Eat: So when a Vice, ridiculous is made, Our Neighbors shame, keeps us from growing Bad. 39

Unlike other forms of literature, satire can render its negative examples as "ridiculous": it does not merely present vice, but actually redefines it, for our laughter may force us to revise our judgment of the thing ridiculed. 40 The key to Scroope's account of satiric ridicule, however, is Hobbes' conception of laughter, "the apprehension of some deformed thing in another, by comparison whereof they suddenly applaud themselves. And it is incident most to them, that are conscious of the fewest abilities in themselves: who are forced to keep themselves in their own favour, by observing the imperfections of other men." 41

While this description reflects in obvious ways upon the character of the satirist, 42 it also describes the persuasive effect of satire upon the reader: our laughter results from the

39 Printed in Appendix II of Walker's edition of Rochester, 136; ll. 5-13.

40 The extent to which satires employ ridicule can vary widely: as Joseph Trapp says of Juvenal, "tho' he may sometimes laugh, he is, for the Generality, serious: and shews the Lash much more than his Teeth" (228). See however Guillamet, Satire 7-11.


"apprehension" of deformity (i.e. vice), but is prompted, ultimately, by the existence of deformities within ourselves, our perception of which inclines us to an assertion of our superiority by ridicule. Satiric exempla, then, do not gently insinuate their images of vice and virtue, but act directly upon our conscious thought, forcing us to apply their lessons directly to ourselves. As Paul Fussell has noted of the genre, it inculcates "self-distrust": "the acute reader is moved to consider his own fallen state as well as that of the ostensible target" (82-83). At the same time, the punitive agency of the satirist also discourages us from vice, lest we, like our unfortunate "Neighbors," be exposed to public shame. Scroope's knaves and villains

Hate Poets all, because they Poets fear.  
Take heed (they cry) younder Mad Dog will bite.  
He cares not whom he falls on in his fit;  
Come but in's way, and strait a new Lampoone  
Shall spread your mangled Fame about the Town. (Rochester II. 41-45)

Satire's direct application to the reader is underlined by the tendency in the period to characterize the genre as a kind of mirror, within which we may glimpse the reflection of our own grotesque vices, even where the ostensible victim is someone else:43

Send forth dear Julian, all thy Books  
Of Scandal, large & wide,  
That every Knave that in 'em looks  
May see himself describ'd;  
Let all the Ladies read their own,  
The Men their failings see . . .44

---

43 See The Muses Farewel (sig. [A2']): "Among the Ancients, Satyr was in much esteem, being as a Faithful Looking-Glass of Humane Nature and Things, wherein the Vices, Ignorance, and Follies of all sort of Persons were fairly represented, which either Self-Love would not suffer them to see, or the Interest and Flattery of others might endeavour to disguise." The tradition of such works as A Mirror for Magistrates was still very much alive, as the title of the Tory ballad satire, Loyalty Triumphant: Or, A Looking Glass for Deceivers (London. 1682) indicates.

44 "Directions to Secretary Julian" (1682). BL MS Harl. 7319 f.92. Wilson 86-91.
This belief is the source of the central paradox, and humour, of that argument of Swift's in the Preface to *The Battle of the Books* that "*Satyr is a sort of Glass, wherein Beholders do generally discover every body's Face but their Own*" (215): it is only a perverse blindness that allows so many readers to overlook the reflection of their own face figured therein. Where mimetic forms conventionally reflect the essential identity of their subjects, the satiric mirror effects reform, less by its delineation of its putative victim, than by the way it forces the reader to confront his or her own distorted visage.¹⁵

In this sense, satire is not truly mimetic, but rather corresponds more closely to what M. H. Abrams has called the "pragmatic theory" of literature; this he defines, in terms that recall the polemical function of satire, as an approach that "looks at the work of art chiefly as a means to an end, an instrument for getting something done."¹⁶ Seventeenth-century critics frequently excluded satire from the category of mimetic literature. Francis Bacon, in his *De Augmentis Scientarum* (1623), calls poesy "an imitation of history at pleasure," and notes that he will for this reason dismiss "from the present discourse Satires, Elegies, Epigrams, Odes, and the like: and refer them to philosophy and the arts of speech. Under the name of Poesy I treat only of feigned history."¹⁷ Some seventy years later, Sir William Temple makes the same distinction in his essay "Of Poetry"

---

¹⁵ Patricia Meyer Spacks, in "Some Reflections on Satire," *Genre* 1 (1968): 13-30, argues that "true satire" operates by creating a sense of uneasiness within the audience; the limitations of this definition are evident in the fact that she is therefore forced to exclude *Mac Flecknoe*, which "works entirely through the response [sic] of complacency" (28).


(1690): "When I speak of Poetry, I mean not an Ode or an Elegy, a Song, or a Satyr, nor by a Poet the Composer of any of these, but of a just Poem."  

Temple's exclusion of this collection of literary forms from his discussion is based on his perception that they are not mimetic. Satire's proper subject is "Reproach" (309): it imitates an emotional response rather than an object, and is therefore really an expressive form. Temple and Bacon may, however, mean something else as well by their distinction: satire differs from "feigned history" because it eschews the use of fictions; indeed, declarations of absolute veracity are a characteristic of the genre. "But sure we fain"? Juvenal asks in Satire 6, in the midst of a catalogue of female vices: his answer impressively reflects his own horror at the events that he has witnessed, and is now describing: "Would we did Fable now" (Holyday 104). Juvenal's employment of realistic detail, as well as his tendency to avoid narrative, reinforce this impression of veracity: he seems a chronicler or historian rather than a fabulist. The English satirists of the mid to late seventeenth-century likewise claimed that their satire provided unmediated access to the real world. Rochester's attack on Sir Carr Scroope in "On the suppos'd Author of a Late Poem in defence of Satyr" (1676?) exemplifies this fiction of absolutely faithful representation:

To rack, and torture thy unmeaning Brain.  
In Satyrs praise, to a low untun'd strain,  
In thee was most impertinent and vain.  
When in thy Person, we more clearly see.


49 Fictions were a primary characteristic of poetry; Sidney made it a cornerstone of his defence of literature, while Ben Jonson called the poet "a Maker, or a Fainer: his Art, an imitation or faining," a definition that Temple repeats (Miscellanea 282). See Discoveries; or, Timber. Works, 11 vols., eds. C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925-52) 8: 135. See also Jean Le Clerc, Parrhasiana: Or, Thoughts upon Several Subjects (London, 1700) 1-2.
That Satyr's of Divine Authority.
For God. made one on Man, when he made thee. (ll. 1-6.)

Here, the figure of the satirist disappears almost completely: God is the satirist.

Dryden's The Medall (1682) is arguably his most topical and direct verse satire: while undeniably the most scurrilous and hyperbolic of his satires, the fact that it refrains from the narrative fictions that characterize both Mac Flecknoe and Absalom and Achitophel allows Dryden to assume a posture of utter probity. In the "Epistle to the Whigs" that prefaces The Medall, Dryden ironically accentuates his own verisimilitude, and faithfulness to the commemorative medal struck to celebrate Shaftesbury's acquittal by a London jury: "'Tis the representation of your own Heroe; 'tis the Picture drawn at length, which you admire and prize so much in little" (38). Despite the facetious tone here, Dryden is making a serious claim to veracity. While the medal appears to be a celebratory portrait of the Whig leader, its actual meaning, interpreted properly, is otherwise. Dryden poses as a painter of historical portraits, who has taken great pains to ensure that the likeness is exact:

50 Similar is Rochester's "Tunbridge Wells. A Satyr." ll. 27-28: "Nature. has done the Bus'nesse of Lampooone. / And in their lookes, their Characters has shouwne": see also the attack upon James Douglas, Lord Arran in "An Heroick Poem," BL MS Harl. 6913 f.100'; Wilson 68-75.

51 Cf. Jeremy Collier's assertion that "THE Lines of Virtue and Vice are Struck out by Nature in very Legible Distinctions . . . and in the greater Instances the Space between them is easily perceiv'd. Nothing can be more unlike than the Original Forms of these Qualities" (140).

52 Dryden suggests ironically that the medal is an exact likeness of Shaftesbury: "So like the Man; so golden to the sight, / So base within, so counterfeit and light" (ll. 8-9).

53 The advantage of association with history painting -- that of appearing to "show" (objective) rather than "tell" (subjective) the reader about vice -- is the primary conceit of the "Advice to a Painter" poems. See A. E. Wallace Maurer, "The Design of Dryden's The Medall," PLL 2 (1966): 293-304. Dryden's comment that "I am no great Artist: but Sign-post painting
Yet for your codon the lineaments are true; and though he sate not five times to me, as he did to B. yet I have consulted History: as the Italian Painters doe, when they wou'd draw a Nero or a Caligula: though they have not seen the Man, they can help their Imagination by a Statue of him, and find out the Colouring from Suetonius and Tacitus. (38)\textsuperscript{54}

Dryden's comparison of his own task with that of a history painter, and his allusion to "Suetonius and Tacitus," allow him to reconfirm his affinity with the historian. In fact, Dryden's theme here is another version of Davenant's neoplatonic ideal, reconfigured for the purposes of satire: the satirist paints not the outside, but rather the real, essential truth as revealed by a man's actions.\textsuperscript{55}

As Edward Bysshe conceded, the normal standards of literary truth did not apply to satire, which "may be fine, and true Satire, tho' it be not directly and according to the Letter, true. 'Tis enough that it carry with it a probability or semblance of Truth."\textsuperscript{56} Bysshe's comments concede more than

\footnotesize

will serve the turn to remember a Friend by; especially when better is not to be had" (38) is reminiscent of Marvell's question posed to the "painter of Last Instructions: "canst thou dawb a Sign-post, and that ill? / 'Twill suit our great debauch and little skill" (ll. 7-8). The meanness of the subject requires little more than a sign-post painter: as Michael Gearin-Tosh notes, "seventeenth-century painters were as concerned with decorum as the poets." "The Structure of Marvell's 'Last Instructions to a Painter,'" \textit{EC} 12 (1972): 50; see also James A. Winn, "When Beauty Fires the Blood": \textit{Love and the Arts in the Age of Dryden} (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1992) 338-39. For a reading that accentuates the indeterminacy of visual polemic, see K. M. Quinsey, "Sign-Post Painting: Poetry and Polemic in Dryden's \textit{The Medall}," \textit{Restoration} 16 (1992): 97-109.

\textsuperscript{54} Cf. Shadwell's parody of this passage in \textit{The Medal of John Bayes} (London, 1682) sig. [A1]; \textit{POAS} Yale 3: 75-95, and in Samuel Pordage's \textit{The Medal Revers'd} (London, 1682) 1-3; \textit{POAS} Yale 3: 60-74.

\textsuperscript{55} See Dryden's "Parallel, of Poetry and Painting" (1695): "In the character of an Hero, as well as in an inferior Figure, there is a better or worse likeness to be taken; the better is a Panegyrick if it be not false, and the worse is a Libel" (\textit{De Arte Graphica} 70).

\textsuperscript{56} "Preface" to "A Collection of the Most Natural, Agreeable, & Noble Thoughts," \textit{The Art of English Poetry} (London, 1702) sig. [*3*].
most satirists would. Nonetheless, "tho' it be not directly and according to the Letter." there is another kind of truth in satire that is, paradoxically, produced by the satirist's falsehoods and hyperbole.

One index of the period's faith in satire's supposed correspondence with the objective and verifiable "fact" was the tendency of readers to identify actual persons with disguised portraits of malefactors: many original copies of satires contain contemporary marginalia expressly identifying such characters. This process of identification seduces readers, making them complicit in the transformation of satiric distortions into "truth." as Addison, speaking of disguised fables (and citing Absalom and Achitophel as a particular instance) in Spectator 512 (October 17, 1712), astutely realized: "in Writings of this Kind, the Reader comes in for half of the Performance: Every thing appears to him like a Discovery of his own: he is busied all the while in applying Characters and Circumstances, and is in this respect both a Reader and a Composer" (4: 318). The veracity of a satiric portrait was "proven" when the reader recognized the original from the caricature: acquiescence to the satirist's fictions became verification of their truth. It is entirely characteristic of the genre that its truthfulness should be established by sleight of hand.

Satire, then, sought to establish for itself a distinct rationale, predicated upon an accurate correspondence with the external world that was, nonetheless, "not directly and according to the

57 See however T. Adams' "To the Unknown Author of the Following Poem," published in 1691 with The Medall: "Y' insinuate Loyalty with kind deceit. / And into sense th' unthinking Many cheat." The Medall, The Works of Mr. John Dryden (London, 1691) sig. [a2'].

Letter, true”; it pursued moral reform by morally questionable means of public exposure: it allowed the reader to laugh with the satirist while simultaneously threatening the reader with the same punishment. Satiric persuasion in the interests of morality seems laudable, but its efficacy doubtful. What, then, was the reader to make of the satirist’s motives? What if the punitive elements of the genre were more than a means to an end? In Quevedo’s first “Vision,” a devil in possession of a tax-collector provides the attendant priest and spectators with a description of Hell that is, in fact, a transparent satire upon human society: as the attending priest notes, “Thou art the Father of Lyes, and yet deliver’st truths, able to mollify and convert a Heart of stone.”59 The priest himself is convinced that “he that well weighs what has bin said, may doubtless reap some benefit by the Discourse. Wherefore without considering whence it came: Remember, that Saul (although a wicked Prince) Prophesied; and that Honey has been drawn out of the Mouth of a Lyon” (26). Doubtless satire could benefit “he that well weighs what has been said.” but is it really possible to avoid “considering whence it came”? Because the satirist’s motives and methods remained, like the devil’s, suspect, practitioners of the genre found themselves the target of critics who would not, or could not, accept truths from the “Father of Lyes.”

"A Kinde of Madness": Satire and Malignant Wit

Midway through Horace’s fourth satire of the first book, an interesting exchange develops between the poet and an adversarius: “Thou sayest I love to jeer and study it, / To gratifie my own ill-natur’d wit” (Brome 209). Horace’s reply is a masterpiece of evasion: “Where didst thou pick up this Report? or who / Of my acquaintence e’re reposites me so?” (209). Horace

distinguishes between self as person and self as writer: he does not, however, pursue this line further, embarking instead upon a new course, contrasting his role as a legitimate satirist with the secretive backbiters who betray their friends:

If in thy presence any person does
Report Petillus Sacriligious.
Thou (as thy custome is) wilt him defend.

... But yet thou canst not but admire how he
Himself could from that Judgement so well free. (209-10)

The false friends and poisonous wits that Horace describes are both like and unlike the satirist: they share a method of attack, but Horace insists that he himself at least does so publicly and honestly: "this vice... thou shalt never find / In all my writings, no nor in my mind" (210).

Horace justifies his satire on two grounds: on the one hand, the impression of Horace's character gained from reading his satires is not representative of his actual personality, while on the other, he at least is honest and forthright in his criticisms. Neither response adequately addresses the accusation that his satires are motivated by malice; more significantly, both rest on fundamentally contradictory assumptions. His initial response suggests the employment of a poetic mask that shields the real Horace from too close an association with his own poetry, but his second defence rests upon a denial of any sort of dissembling: he is honest precisely because he does not attempt to evade responsibility for what he has written. The poet's equivocations are all the more surprising given that Horace talks in his satires so much about himself; yet, so laced with ambiguity are Horace's satiric poems that, as Raman Selden remarks, he "undermines with irony all pretensions and assertions of self, including those of the satirist himself."60

---

Seventeenth-century critics frequently viewed Horace as a chameleon. Isaac Casaubon, in the "Prolegomena" to his edition of Persius (1605), noted that Horace frequently speaks in different voices, and articulates contradictory philosophies: "Nor should it be doubted that such inconstancy as we see in his writings is also found in his life. For he wrote as he lived." André Dacier similarly commented that "as Horace is a true Proteus, that takes a thousand different Forms," critics "have often lost him, and not knowing where to find him, have grasped him as well as they could" (Essay on Satire sig. [B6']). Horace's ambiguous poetic identity is a mask that the intelligent reader or critic must penetrate to discover the poet's true meaning: "In the manner that Horace presents himself to us in his Satyrs, we discover nothing of him at first, that deserves our Attachment." But, once we remove "that, which hides him from our Eyes, and view him even to the Bottom, we find in him all the Gods together; that is to say, all those Vertues, which ought to be the continual Practice of such as seriously endeavour to forsake their Vices" (sig. [B5']).

Dacier remains certain, where Casaubon was not, that there is an essential, unified and ultimately apprehendable personality behind Horace's varied satiric voices, a personality that actually exemplifies his text and "all those Vertues." Paradoxically, Horace's subtly hidden personality becomes the core of the satires' meaning. The language of Horace's text actually "hides him from our Eyes": the reader need only peel away the words of the poem to discover, not merely the poet's meaning, but the all-important figure of the poet himself.

Both Casaubon and Dacier recognize the ambiguity of Horace's poetic identity. yet each seeks, in different ways, to locate the meaning and moral significance of the poet's satire within the character of the satirist himself. As Ann Cline Kelly has noted, "Since classical times, the idea that a man's speech reveals his character has been axiomatic."62 "good" oratory was thus an index of a "good" man. Cicero, articulating a commonplace that dated back to Isocrates, claimed in Brutus that "no man can be an eloquent speaker, who has not a clear and ready conception."63 This faith remained a commonplace of the seventeenth-century, receiving its most famous articulation in Ben Jonson's Discoveries: "Language most shewes a man: speake that I may see thee. It springs out of the most retired, and inmost parts of us, and is the Image of the Parent of it, the mind. No glasse renders a mans forme, or likenesse, so true as his speech" (8: 625). In 1650, Sir Balthazar Gerbier, in A Publique Lecture on All the Languages, Arts, Sciences and Noble Exercises, citing Jonson's remark, suggested that "Language, [was] to be as the Soule of the Soule, at least its interpreter".64 in his Art of Well-Speaking, published that same year.

---


64 A Publique Lecture on All the Languages, Arts, Sciences and Noble Exercises (London, 1650) 4. It is ironic to find Gerbier articulating his faith in language as an index of character: he himself was a consummate con man. See Hugh Ross Williamson, Four Stuart Portraits, (London: Evans Brothers, 1949) 26-60, and The Last Will and Testament of the Earl
Gerbier opined that "the voyce ... discovereth the disposition and composition of man. both in his Physicall humours, and in his Morall actions."65

Not even the challenges to the conventional notion of language as an index of the mind which came from the new scientific empiricists overturned the older rhetorical conception. Thomas Sprat thought the idiosyncracies of a personal style a dangerous distraction, and condemned "the easie vanity of fine speaking": "I cannot with-hold my self. from betraying the shallowness of all these seeming Mysteries; upon which, we Writers. and Speakers. look so bigg."66 The emphasis upon the employment of rhetoric to inflate reputations betrays Sprat's distrust: literary identity as expressed through style is cheat. Yet rhetorical habits of thought remained ingrained;67 even language reformers like Bernard Lamy evinced some old-fashioned notions about the relationship between language and character.68 In De L'Art de Parler (1675), translated as The Art of Speaking in 1676, Lamy makes clear his faith that "Discourse is the Image of the Mind; we shew our Humours and Inclinations in our Words before we think of it. The Minds then being different. what wonder if the Style of every Author has a character that

---

of Pembroke, 1650 ([London, 1679]) 4, a satirical pamphlet probably by Sir John Berkenhead.

65 Art of VVell-Speaking (London, 1650) 23.

66 The History of the Royal Society (London, 1667) 112.


68 Lamy was not a Port Royalist as the 1676 title page indicates, but he was a Cartesian, and a "Modern" in the "Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes." See Wilbur Samuel Howell, Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700 (New York: Russell and Russell, 1961) 381-82.
distinguishes it from all others, though all use the same Terms and Expressions in the same Language." In fact, developments in the last decade of the century brought linguistic theory full-circle: Locke's argument in An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (1690) that words referred to ideas linked language, once again, to the mind.

The period's faith in style as a kind of window to the soul of the writer encouraged critics into speculations of a psychological or biographical nature. Not atypical are Dryden's conjectures upon the personalities of Virgil and Horace in his "Preface" to the Fables Ancient and Modern (1700): "In the Works of the two Authors we may read their Manners, and natural Inclinations, which are wholly different. Virgil was of a quiet, sedate temper; Homer was violent, impetuous, and full of Fire." This kind of analysis was applied to many authors writing in a variety of genres, but the attention focused upon the character of the poet by critics of satire was both more intense, and of a different kind. Dryden, for all his interest in the creative genesis of the Iliad, never questioned Homer's motives for writing it, yet it was precisely this kind of inquiry that

---

69 The Art of Speaking, in The Rhetorics of Thomas Hobbes and Bernard Lamy 305.

70 See An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, 1690, ed. Peter H. Nidditch, cor. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985) esp. 402-04. As Murray Cohen has noted, "By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the idea of language study had shifted from the taxonomic representation of words and things to the establishment of the relationship between speech and thought. . . . in the early eighteenth century, linguists assumed that language reflects the structure of the mind." Sensible Words (Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1977) xxiv. As early as 1679, Samuel Shaw held that "every individual man is a system" of rhetoric; see his eccentric and humorous Words Made Visible, 1679, ed. R. C. Alston, English Linguistics 1500-1800 317 (Menston: Scolar P, 1972) 98.

dominated the period's critical response to satire. The issue of intention and, more importantly, motivation, lies at the heart of the satirical genre. Casaubon condemned Horace precisely because it was difficult to gauge the satirist's exact intentions: on the other hand, Persius' sincerity was an important element of his excellence as a satirist: "You know indeed when you read Persius, that he felt what he said, and that, as the Greeks say, 'he wrote completely from within and from his beliefs, not just from his lips'" (290).

The morality of the satirist was of particular interest to critics. In his *A Dissertation upon the Most Celebrated Roman Poets* (translated by Christopher Hayes in 1719; originally published in 1692 as *Dissertatio De Insignioribus Romanorum Poenis*) Addison chose, significantly, to begin his discussion of the relative merits of Horace and Juvenal with a discussion of their moral characters: "Horace bears to this Day, an ill Character for the Looseness of his Conduct in Life. Juvenal was a rigid Practiser of Virtue." Juvenal can attack "the grossest Crimes" and employ "the highest Resentment of Soul. Ardency of Expression, and Sharpness of Speech" (48-49) precisely because the satirist was himself so strictly virtuous. The more blameable Horace is

---

72 See Raymond Anselment's comments on the critique of satire in William Falkner's *Concerning Reproach & Censure* (1684): "intent determines the acceptable censure of personal shortcomings. When the cause is just and a greater good is its end, reproof which derives no secret satisfaction, eschews distorting language, and avoids personal prejudice or harm is charitable." "*Betwixt Jest and Earnest*: Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift, and the Decorum of Religious Ridicule" (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1979) 24.


74 Through much of the seventeenth-century Juvenal was viewed as a wild figure made nearly irrational by the force of his own rage. But by the end of the century, he was as frequently characterized as a stern righteous defender of morality. Some distinction must also be made between the character of his early works, and that of his later satires, which are more self-aware.
reduced, by virtue of his own culpability, to jeering at "the ridiculous Fopperies of some particular Courtiers" (48).

Significantly, most seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century definitions of satire take the character of the satirist as a starting point. Joshua Poole's *The English Parnassus* (1657) defines the genre by means of a catalogue of unpleasant traits that are as much a part of the character of the satirist as of the genre:

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

Poole's colourful adjectives personify satire: a literary kind is imaginatively transformed into a snarling beast. Much the same process is at work in definitions that more explicitly relate literary satire to the Greek satyr, "that mixt kind of Animal... made up betwixt a Man and a Goat" as Dryden described it ("Discourse," 28). The false etymology that derived the name of the genre from this fanciful woodland creature dominated considerations of the nature of literary satire through most of the seventeenth-century. Despite the demolition of this fallacy by Casaubon in his 1605 study, *De Satyrica Graecorum Poesi & Romanorum Satira*, and the attempts of Dacier and Dryden to popularize his derivation of the word from the Roman word *satura* or *satira*.


meaning "full" or "varied," critics continued to associate satire with the mythological creature.\textsuperscript{77}

Most seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century dictionaries and glossaries defined "satyr" and "satire" together.\textsuperscript{78} Elisha Coles' \textit{An English Dictionary} (1676) is typical: "Satyre, an hairy Monster, like a horned man with Goats feet; also an invective poem."\textsuperscript{79} Edward Cocker's \textit{English Dictionary} (1704) gives the entries for the words satyr and satire in such a way as to suggest that the one naturally follows from the other: "Satyr, a feigned Monster with the face of a Man. Ears of an Ass. Leg. and Feet like a Goat .... Any thing written sharp or severe, is called a Satyr. and so Satyrical poems, are such as have biting reflections, or abusive wit in them."\textsuperscript{80}

The seventeenth-century acceptance of the derivation of satire from satyr profoundly influenced style. John Cleveland, in an oft-quoted passage from his "The Rebell Scot" (1644), exemplifies this satirical model of half-animal savagery:

\begin{quote}
Come keen \textit{Iambicks}, with your Badgers feet.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{77} The "Epistle" to John Biddle's \textit{Virgil's Bvcolicks, Engished. VVhereunto is Added the Translation of the Two First Satyrs of Juvenal} (London, 1634), calls his translations of the satirist a "Homely (though holesome) dish of Satyrical stuffe," and characterizes Satire 1 as a meal of "hard and sower-Meat" (sig. [C4	extdegree]), an image that, as Kupersmith points out, may derive from his awareness of the derivation of "satire" from \textit{satura} (56-57). Possibly, Henry Fielding's description of \textit{Tom Jones} as a "Dish" of "prodigious Variety" derives from the same source. \textit{The History of Tom Jones}, eds. Martin C. Battestin and Fredson Bowers. 2 vols. ([Middletown, CT]: Wesleyan UP, 1975) 1: 32; see Edward A. and Lillian D. Bloom, "The Satiric Mode of Feeling: A Theory of Intention," \textit{Criticism} 11 (1969): 131-32. See also Meston, \textit{The Knight} sig. [*1	extdegree].

\textsuperscript{78} Thomas Blount's \textit{Glossographia} (London, 1656) is an interesting exception, and shows that Casaubon's work was not entirely unknown: Blount's attempt to distinguish the derivation of satyr (from \textit{satyrus}) from that of satire (from \textit{satyra}) suggests that he is aware of satire's true etymology (s.v. "Satyre"). See also Edward Phillips. \textit{The New World of English Words} (London, 1658), which derives its etymology for "satire" and "satyr" from Blount.

\textsuperscript{79} \textit{An English Dictionary}, 1676 (Menston: Scolar P. 1971) s.v. "Satyre."

\textsuperscript{80} \textit{English Dictionary}, (London, 1704) s.v. "Satyr" and "Satyrical poem."
And Badger-like, bite till your teeth do meet.
Help ye tart Satyrists, to imp my rage.
With all the Scorpions that should whip this age. (ll. 27-30)

Forty years later, attitudes had changed little: the rationale offered by the anonymous "H. P." for the roughness of his verse in A Satyr against Common-Wealths (1684) draws an explicit connection between his chosen style, and the figure of the mythological satyr:

_I could never imagine that smoothness should be so absolutely necessary in the dressing up of a Satyr: it always seeming to me as disagreeable to see a Satyr Cloath'd in soft and effeminate Language, as to see a Woman scold and vent her self in Billings-gate Rhetorick in a gentle and advantageous Garb._

"Satire" becomes, literally, a "Satyr," an image of the genre personified that underlines the extent to which satire was identified with a characteristic kind of personality; as Marvell noted in the second part of The Rehearsal Transpros'd. "whereas those that treat of innocent and benign argument are represented by the Muses, they that make it their business to set out others ill-favouredly do pass for Satyres, and themselves are sure to be personated with prick-ears, wrinkled horns, and cloven feet." Even Dryden, who was to become so important in redefining the genre, reveals in his "To the Memory of Mr. Oldham" (1684) an adherence to these associations: while chiding Oldham for disregarding "the numbers of thy native Tongue," Dryden

---


concedes that "Satyr needs not those" (ll. 14-15).

Harold Love, describing the lampoon tradition in English satire, notes that such poems were "conceived of as a series of virtually independent satiric epigrams"; indeed, John Peter has usefully suggested the influence of Martial's epigrammatic form on the development of English satire. The effect created by this kind of loose structure is very like that of stream-of-consciousness: we are treated to a barrage of apparently disconnected ideas, images, and characterizations, all presumably produced by associations within the mind of the author, that communicate a sense of the writer's state of excited and uncontrollable outrage. The anonymous court lampoon "Satyr on both Whigs and Tories" (1683?) is a representative example:

Name we the Whigs. we must the num'rous Troop.
Like Faggots, four for Sixpence, bind 'em up.
Fools by the Dozen, Rascals by the Gross.
Knaves, Fops, & pardon'd Rebels, which are worse.
Show me the Man. & lay the Traitor by.
We cannot charge with Knave or Foppery.

---

83 Anna Battigelli has suggested that Dryden viewed Oldham's achievement as an intermediate stage in the "progress" of satiric form: see "Nature, Time, and Translation: Dryden's 'To the Memory of Mr. Oldham' and the Poetic Tradition," Restoration 14 (1990): 28.

84 "Rochester and the Traditions of Satire." Restoration Literature (London: Methuen, 1972) 147. A. Alvarez has suggested that Cleveland was, fundamentally, "a writer of epigrams." The School of Donne (London: Chatto and Windus, 1961) 125.

85 Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature (Oxford: Clarendon, 1956) 160-67. See an epigram written by John Owen, and translated by Thomas Pecke in Parnassi Puerperium (London, 1659): "AN Epigram may aptly stiled be. / The long-ledg'd Satyrs, brief Epitomie. / A Satyr bears equal Respect; and is / An Epigram, with a Periphrasis" (72).

86 See Kernan, Cankered Muse 35: satire's "rapid transitions reflect the character of the satirist and suggest his sense of urgency, his zeal." Alvarez suggests that Cleveland's method involves "joining up as many ideas and images as possible, heterogeneous or not, by their accidents of sound and sight." This is he suggests, "more a game of word-association than a formal method" (128); Alvarez, however, is mistaking the effect of Cleveland's poetry with its cause.
Kent slavers. Wital Stamford is a Tool, Armstrong a Rogue, Monmouth both Knave & Fool, Lovelace a Sot, Brandon a gaping Traytor, And lately marry'd quondam Footman's Daughter, Who by the King inrich'd from scarce a Groat, Gives it to him who'd gladly cut his Throat: To Exercise wifth Talent he begins With murd'ring Boys, to end with murd'ring Kings. 87

There is no particular order to this succession of images and characterizations: it is as though the poem's structure is dictated by the whimsical associations of these figures within the satirist's mind. Our perception of the satirist's (or satyr's) emotional state becomes, therefore, the argument of the poem. The satirist becomes a "satyr," in both senses of the word: herein lies one of the more important aspects of the false satire-saty r etymology, for the derivation tends to shift attention away from formal elements, and instead associates the defining features of the genre with the supposed nature of its creator.

The Romans did not associate their satira with the mythical Greek satyr. nor did they see any connection between Greek satyr plays and a genre that, in the well-known words of Quintilian, was tota nostra. 88 But while the Romans did not associate the satirist with satyrs, the poetic identities of Horace, Juvenal, and Persius are nonetheless closely bound to their chosen

87 BL MS Harl. 7319 f.120v: Wilson 121-30. For Charles Gerard, Lord Brandon, a dissolute young spark who struck, and killed, a footboy in 1676, see Hatton 1: 127.

form of literary expression. Urged by his friend Trebatius to try his hand at some safer genre. Horace intimates that genre is determined by the personality of the writer: "Father, that being it / I'de fain be at, my will exceeds my wit. / Not every Pen can paint in horrid Field / Thick Groves of Pikes" (Brome 238; page misnumbered 239). Chided, like Horace, by a friend, Persius similarly maintains that he writes satire because he must: "I'me of a Scoffing spleen. I Love to Flout / At Hypocrites: therefore it now must out" (Holyday 293-94). Significantly, there is the suggestion that he does delight in "giving pain;" Most importantly, however, it is in Persius' nature to attack. Even the normally mild Horace employs this rationale:

That every one doth awe
   Them whom he fears, with that where his strength is.
And that by Natures Law appear in this:
  Wolves smite with teeth, Bulls with the horn (this must
  Be taught them from within.) (239)

Particularly significant is the theme of compulsion that these passages suggest. The provocaton of external events triggers in the satirist an irresistible urge to respond. Persius' satire "now must out," while Horace is not more culpable for his satire than the wolf or bear who employ their natural armaments. The element of human will is absent from these accounts: when


90 Cf. Whig and Tory, Or the Scribling Duellists (London. 1681), in which satirists are described as "domestick Curs" who clash with "Ivory weapons till they grate" (1).

91 A related issue is that of the cathartic effect of satire upon the satirist: satire is a purgative which relieves the satirist of pent-up "bile." See Randolph, "Medical Concept" 125-57, and Arnold Stein's discussion of melancholy in "Donne and the Satiric Spirit," ELH 11 (1944): 266-82.
Trebatius suggests that Horace simply cease to write, the poet acknowledges the wisdom of the advice, but confesses that he is unable to follow it: "Let me never stir. / If 'twere not better. But I cannot sleep" (238). He "must write Verses: that's my play" (239). Compulsion is similarly an important component of seventeenth-century satire: as Cleveland expressed his rage in "The Rebell Scot." "I am all on fire. / Not all the buckets in a Countrey Quire / Shall quench my rage" (ll. 5-7). Less colourful, but equally characteristic is Dryden's apology in "To Sir Godfrey Kneller" (1694) for an anti-feminist aside: "Satire will have room, where e're I write" (ll. 94).92

The *locus classicus* for the idea is the opening passage of Juvenal's first satire:

Shall I be still an Auditor? And ne're Repay, that have so often mine eare Vext with hoarse *Codrus Theseads?* Shall one sweat Whiles his gown'd *Comique* Scene he does repeat? Another, whiles his Elegies soft strain He reads? and shall not I vex them again? Shall mighty *Telephus* be unrequited, That spends a Day in being All recited? Or *Volume-swolne Orestes*, that does fill The Margin of an ample Book, yet still (As if the Book were mad too) is extended Upon the very back. nor yet is ended? (Holyday 1)

Echoes of these lines appear in Restoration verse satire with a frequency that attests to their influence. The most outstanding of these is undoubtedly the opening passage of the "Prologue" to John Oldham's *Satyrs upon the Jesuits* (1681):

For who can longer hold? when every Press, The Bar and Pulpit too has broke the peace? When every scribling Fool at the alarms Has drawn his Pen, and rises up in Arms? And not a dull Pretender of the Town.

---

92 See also Dryden's *Eleonora: A Panegyrical Poem* (1692) ll. 359-70.
But vents his gall in pamphlet up and down. (ll. 1-6)¹³

The most important facet of Juvenal's passage is that it converts subjective tone and perspective into a strength. We are enticed into acquiescence less by the justice of the satire's arguments than by our respect for the satirist's impressive display of righteous indignation. The strength of the satirical assault that follows is derived from the satirist's powerful identity. The most graphic and powerful expression of this idea occurs a little later in Juvenal's first satire: "Si natura negat, facit indignatio versum / qualecumque potest: quales, ego vel Cluvienus:" "If Nature wont command / Verse, Indignation shall at least indite / Such lines, as I or Cluvienus write" (3). Juvenal's addition to the theme of compulsion is the agency of indignatio, a concept that relocates the source of the satiric impulse outside of art, and within the involuntary passions of the poet.⁴ We are reminded of Plato's image of the creative process as a kind of impersonal divine frenzy -- keeping in mind, of course, that this poetry is derived not from the gods but from within, powered by indignation and malice.⁵

Seventeenth-century critics adapted Juvenalian indignatio to current psychological and physiological theory: Obadiah Walker's Of Education speculated that various passions produce distinctive species of wit. Speaking of anger, he cites Juvenal:

\[ Si natura negat, facit indignatio, versum. Archilochus and Hipponax two very \]

¹³ See also H. P.'s A Saryr against Common-Wealths 1 and Samuel Wesley's parody of satiric indignation in "On a Discourteous Damsel that Call'd the Right Worshipful Author -- (an't Please Ye!) Sawcy Puppy," in Maggots (London, 1685) 98-99.


⁵ Wither employs this Juvenalian motif, but introduces a more explicitly Platonic element: see Abuses Stript and Whipt 9, and Campo-Muse (London, 1643) 1. See also the title of one his latter works, Furor-Poeticus (i.e.) Propheticus. A Poetic Phrensie (London, 1659).
bad Poets, yet for spite and rabbia, to be revenged of two persons that injured them, invented those doggrel sorts of Verses, Iambicks and Scazons, whose force they so well applied, that their Adversaries made away themselves. (124-25)

Archilochus and Hipponax were traditionally cited to exemplify the power of satire to inflict harm. Walker here makes more explicit an idea only hinted at in Juvenal: verse produced through indignation is more powerful than the products of wit nurtured in less heat. Similar in its implications are Samuel Butler’s remarks in his manuscript notes on “Wit and Folly”: “There is nothing that provokes and sharpens wit like Malice, and Anger si Natura negat facit Indignatio &c And hence perhaps came the first occasion of calling those Raptures Poetical Fury. For Malice is a kinde of Madnes.” Malice has power "above all other Passions. to heighten Wit and Fancy": "And therefore Satyrs that are only provok’d with the Madnes and Folly of the world. are found to conteine more wit. and Ingenuity then all other writings whatsoever." Satire’s powerful potential derives from its intimate relationship with the mind and soul of the satirist, as it is expressed in the anonymous "An Answer to the Satyr on the Court Ladies" (1680). “those the Bays shall bear / Not that write best. but most malicious are.”

96 Archilochus was associated with a related genre, "Iambics": Michael Coffey notes that Horace and Quintilian viewed Iambics as a genre entirely distinct from satire (7-8): see also Ulrich Knoche. Roman Satire. trans. E. S. Ramage (Bloomington and London: Indiana UP. 1975) 74-75.


98 See however, Butler’s description of “A Satyr” as “a kinde of Knight Errant”: “though his meaning be very honest, yet some believe he is no wiser then those wandring Heros used to be” (215). See also Earl Miner, “The Restoration: Age of Faith. Age of Satire,” Poetry and Drama 1570-1700. eds. Antony Coleman and Antony Hammond (London and New York: Methuen, 1981) 92.

99 BL MS Harl. 7319 f.48”; Wilson 41-46.
Juvenalian *indignatio* and quasi-psychological theories that closely associated satire with the passions of the satirist were, however, double-edged swords, for they led to charges of subjectivity and malice that undercut the credibility of the form. The necessity of maintaining the appearance of compliance with standards of Christian morality further complicated matters. While some claimed that there were in the satires of Juvenal elements compatible with Christian morality, many moralists associated satire with libertinism, free-thinking, and blasphemous attacks upon religion. Clement Ellis' *The Vanity of Scoffing* (1674) associated all forms of ridicule with atheism and "that malignant and heaving humour of pride and self-conceit." More moderate is the author of *Poems on Several Occasions* (1684): satire can make vice appear "what really She is, ugly and ridiculous," but "so impious is the Age, and so deprav'd are the Wits thereof, that the most happy Book of *Morals* in the World is become the Subject of *Satyr.

*Burlesque. Jocularity. and Contempl.*

---


101 Collier opined that "That which might pass for Raillery, and Entertainment in Heathenism, is detestable in Christianity" (14), while Jean de La Bruyère opined that "A Man born a Christian and a Frenchman, is confin'd in Satire" (32). See also Milburn 275-83. A notable exception was Gilbert Burnet, who commended "Horace, Juvenal, and Persius" as a means of inculcating into those entering orders a "Detestation of Vice, and a Contempt of the common Methods of mankind." *Discourse of the Pastoral Care* (London. 1692) 162. See also Marvell's self-justification in *The Rehearsal Transpos'd. The Second Part* 163-69. and Dryden's defence of Chaucer's anti-clerical satire in *Fables* sig. [*C1*].

102 *The Vanity of Scoffing* (London, 1674) 5. For a similar view, see John Sergeant's *Raillery Defeated by Calm Reason* (London, 1699) 2.

Satirists frequently had to accommodate such attitudes. John Caryll, in *Naboth's Vinyard*, an allegorical satire protesting the persecution of Catholics in the wake of the Popish Plot, reigns in his indignation when it seems to transgress against Christian charity:

> Hold, Muse! Thy Zeal now grows to Mutiny:
> Thou dost ignobly from thy Colours fly:
> Under the Standard, of the Cross we serve.
> And from our Leaders ways we must not swerve.

More radical in its interpretation of Christian strictures against ridicule is Elizabeth Tipper's poem "A Satyr," published in 1698 in her *The Pilgrim's Vitiacum*. The poem begins with a conventional characterization of "Satyr's Lash dipt. poison'd in Disgrace" as "fit to Scourge the Vice of Human Race," suddenly. Tipper remembers God's "Golden Rule": "First cast away the Beam that hides the Light / Of thine own Eye, deluded Hypocrite" (71). Satirists should pray to God to "Make me true Christian, tho' no Satyrist" (72).

John Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury, expressed his disapproval of satire in a sermon entitled "The Folly of Scoffing at Religion": "Satyr and invective are the easiest kind of wit. Almost any degree of it will serve to abuse and find fault. For wit is a keen instrument, and every

---


one can cut and gash with it." Tillotson's account of the genesis of satire is a new and subversive variant of Juvenal's claim that satire requires merely indignation, rather than art: "A little wit, and a great deal of ill nature will furnish a man for Satyr" (41). This too was the opinion of Sir William Temple, expressed in "Of Poetry": "Tis a very poor, tho' common Pretence to merit, to make it appear by the Faults of other Men" (330). Such subtle reworkings of Juvenalian indignatio made it easy for critics of the genre to identify malice and jealousy, rather than righteous indignation, as the origin of the satiric impulse. Walter Charleton's *A Brief Discourse Concerning the Different Wits of Men* (1669) includes a portrait of "Malignant" wits, "Satyrists and Comical Poets." who "like Beetles, seem hatch'd in dung, or Vermine bred out of Ulcers: perpetually feeding upon the frailties and imperfections of Human nature." This image of spontaneous generation functions as a brilliant, if unconscious, parody of Juvenal's indignatio facit motif. Similarly, *Raillerie a la Mode Consider'd* describes the satirist as a creature akin to the fabled spider, spinning invective out of himself "out of pure spight" (52-53).

For Charleton, on the other hand, satire's origins in envy means that, logically, scoffers are inferior to those that they attack. "it being an Aphorism of daily Experience: that the more imperfect men are in themselves, the more prone they are to defame and scoff at others" (131).

---

107 Works . . . Containing Fifty Four Sermons and Discourses (London. 1696) 41.

108 See also Isaac Barrow, *Several Sermons against Evil-Speaking* (London. 1678) 73. and Anselment, *Betwixt Jest and Earnest* esp. 8-32.


110 Cf. the characterization of Mercurius Britannicus in *Mercurius Anti-Britannicus* [2] (11 August, 1645) 12: "like Spiders, he spinnes foure leaves of Rancor from his own Bowells."
Indeed, detractors see in others vices that are, in fact, their own: "Thus drawing suspicions from the crooked rule of their own insincere Mind and depraved inclinations: they labour to persuade themselves and others, that there is among Men no such thing as true Virtue, but only a Shadow or artificial representation of it" (131).111 As John Spencer warned his friend Oldham, "no one can in earnest rayle at ills. / Unlesse within himself their stings he feels." "In kenning vice," he continues, "those most Quicksighted are, / Who in their brests its counterpart do wear."112 When not castigated as rogues, satirists were characterized as clowns: Obadiah Walker, in Of Education, describes "Drolls" as "those who spare neither their Souls nor reputation, to prove themselves Buffoons; and shew their abilities in ingenious folly" (245). Such men "become themselves really, what others are in their imagination" (246).113

The persistent identification of the vehemence of satire with the personality of the satirist meant that, more frequently than not, the satirist's motives were impugned and his or her satire dismissed as hopelessly subjective: "Who knows the Vice to Envy does belong. / Wou'd loathe the Slanders of a Railing Tongue," as John Tutchin observed.114 Horace, we have seen, answered

111 See Dryden's Epilogue to The Unhappy Favourite (1682) ll. 26-27, and Richard Blackmore. A Satyr against Wit. 2nd ed. (London. 1700) 14.

112 Bodley MS R 198-204, reprinted in Oldham 540.

113 Lucian is described by Rapin as "a pleasant Buffoon" (139), while Ferrand Spence commented in his 1684 translation that "should I have drawn Lucian to the Life, all bespotted with his Paederastic Humour, and tainted with the other Vices and Misfortunes of his Age. I must grant he would then have proved the greatest Satyr upon Himself and instead of being an Instrument towards the promoting of Virtue, his very Pretences to't, would have turn'd to its Scandal." Lucian's Works, 5 vols. (London, 1684-85) 1: sig. [A4']. See Craig 144-47.

114 A Congratulatory Poem to the Reverend Dr. John Tillotson (London. 1691) 5. Tutchin is responding to the flurry of Jacobite and Tory satirical attacks that greeted Tillotson's nomination to a see made vacant by the deprivation of the nonjurors: see for example "The
accusations of personal malice by a policy of indirection and subterfuge, while Juvenal poses as the righteous defender of virtue provoked beyond endurance by the spectacle of pervasive evil: the creation of effective satire was, in the age of the Caesars no less than in that of Charles II, one that required a not unsubstantial degree of proficiency in the arts of evasion and subterfuge.

"This Evasive Way of Abuse": Criticism and Evasion

The detractor, according to the anonymous Raillerie a la Mode Consider'd. is "a kind of Camelion, that lives upon the worst sort of Air," a "Proteus in Conversation upon every turn" (51, 56). So effective are the detractor's efforts to escape detection, and hence liability, that it is frequently impossible to locate the source of the slander: "He sometimes whispers like one that discourses through the Speaking-Trumpet, you shall hear the sound, but not know who utters it, nor whence it proceeds" (55). Such evasions are, however, less a reflection of the naturally duplicitous character of detraction, than of the rhetorical strain that expressive approaches to the genre place upon the poet: as Thomas Lockwood has noted, the audience that becomes interested in the satirist's own personality "may now want to isolate (and possibly punish) him while he continues to try to call their attention to his victim."115

Even the genial Horace is obliged, as we have seen, to evade an accusation of malice: Juvenal is also careful to employ subtle evasions within his first satire: his resolution to attack only the dead represents one very practical way of avoiding retribution and accusations of self-

interest and envy. A similar function is performed by Juvenalian indignatio, which is treated as an almost autonomous entity: in the lampoon "Utile Dulce" (1681), the satirist is almost uninvolved:

But when I do rail, from off Parnassus top.  
Th' officious Sisters hast to help me up. 
Words of themselves do into order drop  
And smoothly say that St. John is a Fop.  
Or wou'd I of a famous Cuckold tell.  
My hand inspir'd strait writes down Arundell.\(^{116}\)

Alternatively, it was possible to disarm a potentially critical audience with shows of modesty: anticipating objections to his own sharp invective, the Earl of Mulgrave's "Essay on Satyr" concludes with a disingenuous tone of self-mockery:

I who so course and humble seem to be 
Now my own Pride and Vanity can see  
While the Worlds Nonsense is so sharply shown 
Wee pull down others to sett up our own  
That we may Angells seem we paint 'em Elves  
And are but Satyrs to sett up our Selves.\(^{117}\)

Many of the themes employed in attacks on satire appear in these lines: the satirist admits to "Pride and Vanity," and his assault upon the vices of others is revealed even to himself as an attempt to raise his own stature by the ruin of the reputations of others. This theme is to be found in a more explicit and pervasive form in the "satirist-satirized" poems of Elizabethan writers like Hall and Marston, as Alvin Kernan notes: these authors draw attention to the "imperfections of the satirist himself, and may purposely complicate . . . satire by including such elements" (Cankered Muse 244-45). The Elizabethans, Ronald Paulson has suggested, "were interested in the satirist as a man, a consciousness, and individualist posed against stock types": later

\(^{116}\) BL MS Harl. 7319 ff.65'-66'; Wilson 49-55.  
\(^{117}\) BL MS Harl. 6913 f.17'; POAS Yale 396-413.
seventeenth-century critics tended, for this reason, to regard Elizabethan satire "as an academic exercise rather than a practical tool for reform." Mulgrave's self-portrait, however, lacks the complexity and candour to challenge our perceptions of the satirist: the passage functions instead as an apologia, a strategic attempt to soften our response to the poem's willful nastiness, and deflect our attention away from the satirist by anticipating and ameliorating potentially hostile reactions. It is rhetorical rather than aesthetic, an attempt to evade rather than invite scrutiny.

Hostility to a satire could, and did, take many forms, some of them violent:

Believe me, tis an evil Trade to rail,
The angry Poets hopes do often fail.
While the Ambitious to ye Skyes do climb.
Instead of Baes, a Cudgel o'th does find:
Some Lines, for being prais'd when they were read
Were once a Cause of Dryden's broken head. ("Utile Dulce" l.64)

Mulgrave's carefully phrased apologia did little to assuage the outrage of at least one of the victims of "Essay on Satire," for it has long been believed that it was for his supposed role in writing this poem that Dryden was cudgelled in Rose Alley. Anthony à Wood, describing the circulation of the satire in manuscript around London in "Nov. (or before) an. 1679," wrote that the poem's "many gross Reflections . . . on Ludovisa Dutchess of Portsmouth and John Wilmot E.

---


of Rochester" prompted "one or both" of these to hire "three Men to cudgel" Dryden: 120 "they
effected their business in the said Coffee-House at 8 of the Clock at Night on the 16th of Dec.
1679" (Wood 2: 804-05). The threat of violence was a very real one. 121

Another hazard faced by satirists was the potential for political and legal retaliation. 122

When the satirist himself was unknown, action was frequently taken against the publisher: 123

---

120 See James A. Winn, John Dryden and His World (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1987) 325-29. Luttrell wrote that "tis thought to be done by order of the duchesse of Portsmouth" (1: 30). In the 1680 "Satyr," BL MS Harl. 6913 f.69": Wilson 36-40, the satirist defies Portsmouth's "strong Ruffians" whom "shee can trust / As well to serve her Malice as her Lust." For other theories, see David Haley, "John Dryden: Protestant in Masquerade?" Cithara 30.2 (1991): 10-25 and POAS Yale 1: 396-401.

121 John Tutchin was said (incorrectly) to have died as a result of injuries inflicted by the hirelings of one of his satiric victims in 1707: for this and a general discussion of the threats faced by satirists, see the Review for 13 July, 1708, in Defoe's Review, 22 bks. (New York: Columbia UP, 1938) 5: 181, and Giles Jacob's The Poetical Register, 2 vols. (London, 1719-20) 2: 309.


indeed, even the distributors of manuscript lampoons were persecuted. At the best times, as Matthew Prior pointed out, satire, "however agreeable for the present to the Writers and Incouragers of it does in time do neither of them good, considering the uncertainty of Fortune, and the various changes of Ministry, where every Man as he resents may punish in his turn of Greatness." Libel laws and the Licensing Act of 1662 made the producers of lampoons and satires, especially those in opposition to the government, vulnerable to legal action: Samuel Butler's notebooks include the observation that "our modern Satyr has enough to do, to secure himself against the Penalty of Scandalum Magnatum, and Libells." The age provided many examples of the dangers of involvement with seditious or libelous satire. Most ominous was the fate of the Whig satirist Stephen College, tried and executed in 1681 for, in part, his authorship of


124 Robert Julian, who ran a scriptorium, was charged with, and convicted for, writing and publishing "Old Rowley the King" in 1684. See Luttrell 1: 309 and 319-20, and "Julian's Farwell to y' Muses" (1685). BL MS Harl. 7319 f.196'-97'; Wilson 138-40. In "To Cap! Warcup" (1686), Lenthal Warcup, Julian's rival as "Secretary to the Muses," is warned "of Julian's fate beware. / More Secret be, or you may loose an Ear." BL MS Harl. 7319 f.197*: Wilson 159-65. See also Hammond, "Censorship in Manuscript Transmission" 39-62. For Julian, see Mary Claire Randolph, "Mr. Julian, Secretary of the Muses: Pasquil in London." N&Q 184 (1943): 2-6. Brice Harris, "Captain Robert Julian, Secretary to the Muses." ELH 10 (1943): 294-309, and Judith Slater, "The Early Career of Captain Robert Julian, Secretary to the Muses." N&Q N.S.13 (1966): 260-62. For Warcup, see Brice Harris, "Letter to C----- W." MLN 49 (1934): 46-47.

125 "Heads for a Treatise upon Learning." The Literary Works of Matthew Prior, eds. H. Bunder Wright and Monroe K. Spears. 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1959) 1: 583. See also Dryden's account, in a letter to Rochester (1667?), of an imitation of Boileau by Etherege, who, "changing the French names for English, read it so often that it came to their cares who were concerned; and forc'd him to leave off the design e're it was half finish'd" (Ward 10).

126 Prose Observations 216; according to Siebert, "No single method of restricting the press was as effective as the law of seditious libel" (269).
the anonymous satire *A Rare Show*.\(^{127}\) College persisted to the day of his execution in denying any role in the authorship of the pamphlet, but his protestations availed him nothing;\(^{128}\) despite a return of *Ignoramus* by a London jury, College’s trial was moved to Oxford in July, where he was speedily condemned by a packed jury, and executed on August 31, 1681.\(^{129}\) Equally disturbing was the fate of the republican political theorist Algernon Sidney, who was condemned to death in 1683: his trial demonstrated that the government was willing to proceed even where the work in question had not been disseminated to the public.\(^{130}\) Sidney’s crime was to have been found in possession of some private notes on the subject of Filmer’s *Patriarcha*: he was condemned under a law dating from the reign of Edward III which made “the compassing or imagining the death of

---

\(^{127}\) He was also accused of plotting to assassinate the King, a charge Shadwell mocked in *Some Reflections* 18. See *The Speech and Carriage of Stephen Colledge* (London, 1681) 3.

\(^{128}\) *A True Copy of the Dying Words of Mr. Stephen College* (London, 1681) 1. The trial and execution of “the protestant joiner” spawned a flurry of pamphlets and satires: see also *A Letter from Mr. Stephen Colledge* (London, 1681), *A Letter Written from Oxford By Mr. Stephen Colledge* (London, 1681), *A Letter Written from the Tower by Mr. Stephen Colledge* (London, 1681), *The Trial of Stephen College* (London, 1681) and POAS Yale 2: 448-52.


\(^{130}\) Sir Roger L’Estrange attempted to overcome the problems posed by anonymously published seditious works (including those in manuscript) by prosecuting the possessor of any such works: “whoever shall receive, and Conceale any such Libell, without giving notice thereof, to some of his Matyes Justices, within a certain space of time after the receipt of it: let him suffer as an Abettour of it, & if he shall not produce y’ person of whom he had it, let him suffer as y’ Authour of it.” Quoted from Harold Love, "Scribal Texts and Literary Communities: The Rochester Circle and Osborn b. 105." *SB* 42 (1989): 230.
the king" high treason. A poem entitled "A New Song for the Times" underlined the threat that this precedent set for satirists:

Algeron Sidney,
Of Commonwealth kidney,
Compos'd a damn'd libel (ay, marry, was it!)
Writ to occasion
III blood in the nation.
And therefore dispers'd it all over his closet.

The faith of the anonymous author of "Letter to Julian" (1681), that "Twas never known in any time / That one was hang'd for writing Rhime." seems sadly misplaced. Anonymity was one evasive response to such threats (although this usually provoked curiosity and speculation); it could, as well, shield the satirist from the ill reputation that association with satire could generate. Charles Sackville, the sixth Earl of Dorset, was the author of a variety of particularly savage and libellous lampoons. His attack upon Edward Howard, in "On the Same Author upon his New Ut----" (1671), was characteristically vicious:


133 BL MS Harl. 7319 f.171v: Wilson 131-37. See also *Rabshakeh Vapulans* (London, 1691): "But sure a Poem is excepted still: / No Laws touch that: where, like a Chancery Bill. / Invention, Truth, and Reason both supplies: / Nor must we answer for Abuse and Lyes" (10).

134 See Hammond. "Anonymity in Restoration Poetry," 137, and the comments of the author of *The Second, Fourth, and Seventh Satyrs of Monsieur Boileau Imitated* (London, 1696): "There are a thousand People perhaps . . . will be so inquisitive as to ask who is the Author, I presume, not out of any particular Curiosity they have to be acquainted with the Person, but purely out of custom" (sig. [A3']); A related strategy was pseudonymous publication, which was not, however, always intended to obscure authorship: see Margaret J. M. Ezell. "Reading Pseudonyms in Seventeenth-Century English Coterie Literature," *EL* 21 (1994): 14-25.
Thou damn'd Antipodes to common sense.
Thou Foyle to Fluence! prithee tell from whence
Does all this mighty Rock of dullness spring.
Which in such Loads thou to the Stage dost bring? (Rochester 1680 90)

Yet Dorset had a reputation for good-nature and reticence: Gilbert Burnet described him as "a generous good natured Man" (1: 264). Dorset circulated his lampoons privately in manuscript, and took some care to dissociate his name from them: as Brice Harris notes, "Had any large number of readers associated him with these poems between 1680 and 1700, his contemporary reputation for gentleness and good nature might have suffered." Sometimes the social consequences of association with one's own libels could be more serious: Rochester was banished from the court in late 1673 for accidentally delivering into Charles' hands his infamous "Sceptre" lampoon. On occasions, satiric skirmishes could even result in fatalities: a lampoon skirmish between Robert Wolseley and William Wharton led, on December 9, 1687, to a duel in which the latter was killed. As Princess Mary wrote of the incident some months later, "'tis a
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Yet Dorset had a reputation for good-nature and reticence: Gilbert Burnet described him as "a generous good natured Man" (1: 264). Dorset circulated his lampoons privately in manuscript, and took some care to dissociate his name from them: as Brice Harris notes, "Had any large number of readers associated him with these poems between 1680 and 1700, his contemporary reputation for gentleness and good nature might have suffered." Sometimes the social consequences of association with one's own libels could be more serious: Rochester was banished from the court in late 1673 for accidentally delivering into Charles' hands his infamous "Sceptre" lampoon. On occasions, satiric skirmishes could even result in fatalities: a lampoon skirmish between Robert Wolseley and William Wharton led, on December 9, 1687, to a duel in which the latter was killed. As Princess Mary wrote of the incident some months later, "'tis a

---

135 See also Joseph Browne's *St. James's Park: A Satyr*, in *State Tracts*, 2 vols. (London, 1715), which celebrates "Dorset's gentle Nature, / His Wit and Humour" (2: 246); Pope similarly opined that Dorset was "a good-humoured, good man." (Spence 1: 200, 202). Burnet noted that "Never was so much ill nature in a pen as in his, joined with so much good nature as was in himself" (1: 264), while Rochester more famously described him as the "best good Man. with the worst Natur'd Muse" ("An Allusion to Horace" 1. 60).


cruel thing to hazard both body and soul for a jest."\textsuperscript{139} In a very real sense, this is precisely what many satirists did every time they put pen to paper.

The satirist's evasions were not, however, prompted only by fear of legal action or the cudgels of hired thugs: there were also aesthetic and polemic reasons for avoiding responsibility. A satire dismissed as intemperate and malicious gossip was unlikely to effect reform, or change reader's attitudes towards the persons satirized. Satirists and sympathetic critics therefore employed sweeping strategies that attempted nothing less than a redefinition of the genre. These new definitions tend, in almost every case, to shift attention away from the figure of the satirist, focusing attention upon formal qualities of the genre, or upon the relationship between satire and objective standards of truth and morality.

Thomas Creech, in the prefatory remarks to his translation of Horace, remarked that "ill Nature" is "commonly thought a necessary ingredient" of satire (sigs. [A6'']), an assumption he immediately challenges: "As for ill Nature, Horace requires none, nay disclaims it in a Satyrist: his sharpest touches, if we believe both himself, and those that best understood him, are innocent Waggery" (sig. [A7']). Horace is the model of just and objective satire: against him, and those who apply his methods, are ranged those Creech accuses of "dirting one Man's Face, and bespattering another." Such, he says are "like Mad-Dags" (sig. [A7']). The true satirist reacted with impartial severity to objectively verifiable instances of vice: the role of personal animus, and indeed of agency, is carefully repudiated. John Phillips, in \textit{A Reflection on our Modern Poetry}, characterizes the development of scurrilous satire as a function of historical change, a decay of a legitimate genre:

\textsuperscript{139} 13 February, 1688 to Lady Forester: quoted from Harris, \textit{Earl of Dorset} 112.
Significantly, Phillips' only mention of the agency of the satirist is a negative one: when wielded by one who is motivated to "black Malicious ends" by "Gall" and "Spite," the genre is corrupted.

Both Creech and Phillips appropriate the language habitually employed by critics of invective verse in order to legitimate a certain kind of satire: they concede much in order to protect the genre. The distinction between malicious satire and that which is just and objectively true manifests itself in many ways: one of the most frequent appears in the formalized distinction between satire and lampoon. Edward Phillips' The New World of English Words (1658) defines lampoon as "a kinde of Drolling Poem, or Pamphlet, wherein any person of the present age, is mentioned with reproach, or scurrility" (S.v. "Lampoon"). As Phillips' definition, with its mention of "scurrility," hints, lampoon is more malicious than satire. It is, as Elisha Coles' An English Dictionary makes clear, "a libel in verse." Lampoon is particular, but particularity in satire also had, as we have seen, its champions. Charles Gildon's defence of particularity in satire rests upon an unspoken distinction between satires that use particular reflections as a means to an end, and those that, "perverted by Passion or Int'rest," are solely intended to humiliate the

---

140 See Richard Flecknoe's Character "Of Raillerie": "There is as much difference betwixt Raillerie and Satyrs, Jesting and Jeering, &c. as betwixt gallantry and Clownishnesse: or betwixt a gentle Accost and rude Assaults" (30).

141 S.v. "Lampoon." Libel was employed synonymously with lampoon: Coles defines it as "an invective or slanderous Writing." See also Poetical Reflections on a Late Poem 4.
intended target (*Miscellaneous Letters 4*); lampoon, then, is distinguished from satire not by virtue of their respective targets, but by their differing intents. Richard Blackmore, smarting from Samuel Garth's attack upon himself and his fellow "Apothecaries Physicians" in *The Dispensary* (1699), draws this same line in *A Satyr against Wit* (1699) when he discriminates between Dorset's just satire and that of "lampooners" like Garth, whose business is "to Rail" at innocent victims: "Let 'em proceed and make your Names a Sport / In Lead Lampoons, they've Time and Leisure for't. / Despise their Spite" (8).142

The word lampoon was itself a relatively recent addition to the English language: the earliest date furnished for the noun in the *OED* is 1645. The date of the term's first recorded appearance in English is significant, coinciding as it does with an historic shift away from both the academic satires characteristic of the Elizabethans and the older tradition of medieval complaint, and towards the more occasional and particular verse form that Kirk Combe has called "politicalized neoclassical satire."143 Cleveland was the most influential and important pioneer of this new trend.144 Particular satire was not entirely new: the 1st Duke of Buckingham had been

142 See also Dennis' *Essay upon Publick Spirit*: "particular Satyrs, if they are just Satyrs, [are] preferable by much to Lampoons or Libels: That only can be call'd a just Satyr, whose Censures are always true; but that which endeavours to decry true Merit, out of Malice, or Passion, or Interest, is in spite of popular Applause a Lampoon, and an infamous Libel" (27). For the background to Blackmore's *poetomachia* with Garth, see Harry M. Solomon, *Sir Richard Blackmore*, Twayne's English Authors Series 289 (Boston: Twayne, 1980) 65-73 and *passim.* Despite his personal animus against Garth, Blackmore's sentiments in *A Satyr against Wit* are consistent with those expressed elsewhere, especially in *Essays upon Several Subjects*: see above.


144 A. D. Cousins, consciously endorsing a "commonplace," suggests that "there is no innovative formal verse satire between Marston and Cleveland." "The Cavalier World and John Cleveland," *SP* 78 (1981): 61. See also Brian R. Morris, "Satire from Donne to Marvell."
the target of a great deal of invective poetry in the 1620s, and ballad satires, usually the product of a popular rather than "literary" milieu, frequently attacked named individuals. Doubtless the crisis of the late 1630s and 40s encouraged an increase in the incidence of particular satire: David Underwood, writing of popular culture in Dorset, Wiltshire, and Somerset, has suggested that it was the "early years of Charles I's reign" which were "the crucial period of politicization": "By 1627 the circulation of subversive writings had become ominously common." At the same time, the growing efficiency with which news was disseminated made particular and topical reference more viable, as the potential audience for such satire became better informed.

---


The appearance of satires like "The Rebell Scot" created for defenders of satire an immediate crisis of image.\(^\text{149}\) The fiercely partisan and highly particular nature of the satires generated by the Civil War meant that the genre was now, as never before, vulnerable to accusations of malice, self-interest, and fraudulence. The development of the distinction between lampoon and satire came at exactly the opportune moment to provide a temporary defence against such accusations: it was expedient to concede the potential for abuse, while maintaining that particularity could be employed as a legitimate satiric tool.\(^\text{150}\) The invention of the idea of lampoon was a tale of a tub, which provided critics of satire with an easy target while simultaneously deflecting attacks upon "legitimate" satire. It is this process that we find at work in Dryden's discussion of lampoon in his "Discourse" (1693). His initial attitude to it is one of condemnation: that "sort of Satire, which is known in England by the Name of Lampoon, is a dangerous sort of Weapon, and for the most part Unlawful. We have no Moral right on the Reputation of other Men. 'Tis taking from them, what we cannot restore to them" (59). Dryden's opening comments virtually equate particularity with moral wrong; there are, however, at least

---

\(^{149}\) See for example the comments in *Mercurius Anti-Britannicus* [3] (18 August, 1645), which distinguishes between the satire of *Mercurius Britannicus* and "tuner Invectives" by characterizing the former as "a kind of boysterous Gall. which makes them venemous. not sharpe. . . . There is as much difference, between his Invectives, and a true Satyre, as between the prick of a Needle, and the biting of a Mad-Dogge, the one is all poynit, the other all Rage" (25).

\(^{150}\) See the distinction made in *Tatler* 242, which seems to espouse generality, but actually relies upon an apprehension of the satirist's intent: "when the Sentence appears to arise from Personal Hatred or Passion, it is not then made the Cause of Mankind, but a Misunderstanding between Two Persons" (3: 244).

---
two allowable situations that can admit of lampoon, although these, he cautiously adds, cannot "always justify us" (59). The first of these is when revenge is intended because "we have been affronted in the same Nature, or have been any ways notoriously abus'd, and can make our selves no other Reparation." Dryden, however, is uncomfortable with this concession, and adds immediately that "in Christian Charity, all Offences are to be forgiven" (59). Dryden's second exception relates to attacks on one who "is become a Publick Nuisance":

'Tis an Action of Virtue to make Examples of vicious Men. They may and ought to be upbraided with their Crimes and Follies: Both for their own amendment, if they are not yet incorrigible; and for the Terour of others, to hinder them from falling into those Enormities, which they see are so severely punish'd, in the Persons of others. The first Reason was only an Excuse for Revenge; But this second is absolutely of a Poet's Office to perform (60).

A subtle shift, encapsulated in this last sentence, has occurred in the argument, for our subject has now turned almost imperceptibly to that of formal verse satire itself. The particular attack upon "vicious Men" is now treated, not merely as a justification for a descent to lampoon, but rather as a positive duty of the "Poet." Lampoons upon such men are, in effect, not lampoons at all, but rather a legitimate employment of the genre. The essence of the distinction between lampoon and satire, then, resides in the role of the satirist.\(^{152}\) In theory, the lampoon derives its genesis.

---


\(^{152}\) As William Frost notes, "lampoons are distinguished from true satire on extra-literary grounds. To distinguish the true satirist from the falsely seeming one, the reader must make a judgment of the character of the producer." "Dryden's Theory and Practice of Satire." *Dryden's Mind and Art*, ed. Bruce King (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1969) 196.
impetus, and end from the personal dislike of the satirist for his or her target, while satire is the expression of an detached and impassive dislike of vice itself. In practice, of course, one reader's satire was another's lampoon: yet, even if the differences between lampoon and satire were more apparent than real, it was a convenient tool to denigrate opposing satirists while deflecting criticism away from "legitimate" (i.e. allied or friendly) invective attacks.

An equally important, if less immediately effective, means of redirecting the attention of critics of the genre away from the person of the satirist was the attempt to re-establish the etymology of the term. As already noted, the older and widely-held idea that "satire" derived from the mythical "satyr" or from the Greek satyr plays had an important influence upon the way that the genre was written and received. It was only after 1687, with the publication of Dacier's "Préface" to the Œuvres d'Horace that the "satyrus" derivation for the term was gradually supplanted.\(^\text{153}\) Dacier's insistence upon the correct etymology for "satire" was more than an academic exercise. The new etymology, as he saw, necessitated a revised understanding of the genre as well: Dacier pointed out that satura could also be applied to forms of praise, "whereas we have had respect only to the first, and general Use, which has been made of it in the beginning to mock, and deride" (sig. [B5']). His argument had two important corollaries: satire need not be rough and unmannerly in the manner of Greek woodland satyrs: what was more, it might even

---

contain praise. This was to have important implications for the structure of formal verse satire, which, as Mary Claire Randolph and, more recently, Howard Weinbrot have noted, increasingly took on a bipartite form, with a balance of both praise and blame. It was also to affect satiric tone, which was to become smoother and more genial in its critique of vice.

While English satire had long featured sporadic passages of praise, the suggestion that praise was a formal component of satire justified a radical revision of satiric tone, and provided satirists with a saving fiction, a link with a more sympathetic and attractive genre. The gradual and subtle redefinition of satire that followed on the heels of the establishment of the correct etymology of the word made it more feasible to argue that satire reinforced positive virtues, thereby improving the image of the satirist and blunting the arguments of those who attacked satire as the venomous spewings of a malicious and spiteful mind. Another important facet of this change is the fact that the derivation of "satire" had shifted from one that identified the genre, and

154 Dryden, in the "Discourse," asserts that "The Poet is bound, and that ex Officio, to give his Reader some one Precept of Moral Virtue" (81). See also Sprat's comments that "true Raillery should be a defence for Good and Virtuous Works" (History 419). For Dryden's indebtedness to Dacier, see Amanda M. Ellis, "Horace's Influence on Dryden," PQ 4 (1925): 57-59.


its practitioners, with a personified attitude, to one that was essentially formalistic. Increasingly, the satirist was no longer a "satyr." 157

One other development in satire theory in the later decades of the seventeenth-century contributed towards the formalization of the genre. As the two most influential models for verse satire were Horace and Juvenal, it was natural that throughout the seventeenth-century critics should define contemporary satire by perceived affinities to one or other of the two Roman satirists. The characteristics of two poets tended to be arranged in a series of binary oppositions, as is the prevalent pattern of Joseph Trapp's description of the two in his Lectures on Poetry (Latin 1711-19; English 1742): satire "is twofold: either the jocose, as that of Horace: or the serious, like that of Juvenal. The former hidden, the latter open. That generally makes Sport with Vice, and exposes it to Ridicule: This probes it to the Bottom, and puts it to Torture" (227).

One set of opposing qualities that was gradually accepted as a means of conveniently classifying the distinctive styles of the Horace and Juvenal was that of comic versus tragic satire. The distinction was a relatively common one in the seventeenth-century. Daniel Heinsius, following Scaliger, had suggested the classifications in 1612: 158 Dryden, in his "Discourse," had

---

157 See however the letter "From a Lady at the Bath" in A Pacquet from Will's (1701): "modern Satyrists" are "not like those of old, whom Painters represent with Asses Ears, and Goats Legs"; instead, they have "a Snake's Head and a Wasp's Breech." The Second Volume of the Works of Monsieur Voltaire. 2nd ed. (London, 1705) 200.

158 In De Satyra Horatiana Liber (1612), Heinsius claimed that "Horace amuses himself in the manner of comedy; Juvenal often strikes out in the manner of tragedy. The former excites laughter, with the greatest pleasure; the latter arouses horror and indignation in equal parts." Quoted from California Dryden 3: 573.
argued that "Juvenal Excels in the Tragical Satyre, as Horace does in the Comical" (74). The most influential statement of the idea was, however, that of John Dennis, in his "To Matthew Prior, Esq.: Upon the Roman Satrist" (1721), in which it was argued that "the true Roman Satire is of the Comick kind, and was an Imitation of the old Athenian Comedys, in which Lucilius first signaliz'd himself, and which was afterwards perfected by Horace," while "Juvenal afterwards started a new Satire which was of the Tragick kind." Dennis' characterization associates tragic satire with Juvenal's high style and virulent attacks upon great vices. Comic satire, on the other hand, is exemplified by Horace's plain style, and his concentration upon private foibles and follies: tragic and comic satire therefore correspond very neatly with neoclassical views on the distinctions between comic and tragic drama. Dennis fixed satire in relation to two well-established genres, providing his two types with stable characteristics that, in the context of neoclassical theories of genre, make sense.

What distinguishes the tragic/comic distinction from such oppositions as snarling versus smiling satire, and railing versus rallying is that the older categories referred to the tone of the satirist's voice: descriptive rather than taxonomical, they focused attention upon the agency of the

---

159 Dryden quotes Heinsius, who, he says, "urges in praise of Horace, that according to the Ancient Art and Law of Satire, it shou'd be nearer to Comedy, than to Tragedy: Not declaiming against Vice, but only laughing at it" (69). See also Trapp 228-30 and 307-08.

160 Original Letters (London, 1721) 2: 432. In his sixth satire, Juvenal adopts the analogy with tragedy: "Our Satyre has put on / The lofty Buskin, And Old bounds out-gone / Our Sophoclean throat yawnes out a Crime" (Holyday 104). Juvenal insists, however, that his satires are unlike stage tragedy because the latter are fictional. For a modern analysis of the tragic/comic distinction, see Harold Weber's "The Jester and the Orator: A Re-examination of the Comic and the Tragic Satrist," Genre 13 (1980): 171-85. and his "Comic Humour and Tragic Spirit: The Augustan Distinction between Horace and Juvenal." CML 1 (1981): esp. 280-89, which argues, from a different perspective from my own, that the distinction was part of the "public evasions and hypocrisies which disguised the personal aspect" of satire (289).
saturist. The distinction between tragic and comic satire accentuated instead matters of style and subject matter. As a result, this descriptive method reduces the prominence of the characteristics of the satirist’s voice, and thereby isolates the genre more effectively from any association with the putative poet. Significantly, however, attempts to describe satire in this way generally break down. Dennis’ description is typical in this regard. The categories of tragic and comic satire are, in the final analysis, most useful as descriptions of the distinctive approaches of the two most important Roman satirists: where Horace “endeavours to correct the Follies and Errors, and epidemick Vices of his Reader, which is the Business of Comedy,” Juvenal “attacks the pernicious outrageous Passions and the abominable monstrous Crimes of several of his Contemporaries, or of those who liv’d in the Age before him, which is the Business of Tragedy” (432). What Dennis concludes with is not an account of two distinct subgenres of satire, but rather a descriptive sketch of the distinctive characteristics of the satire of Horace and Juvenal: it is as though attempts to banish the voice and character of the satirist from descriptions of the genre are doomed to failure. Everywhere and always, the voice of the satirist resurfaces to establish its dominance over our experience and perceptions of the genre. It was, finally, the task of the individual satirist, rather than the critic, to address this dangerous tendency, and devise evasive strategies to counter the reader’s tendency to read through the satire to the forceful and often unattractive personality that seemed to lie behind it.
Chapter 2

"For Stones Doe Speake": Satiric Prosopopeia

On September 11, 1656, Edward Hyde sent a letter to his colleague the Duke of Ormonde that included an account of the reception of a recently-published prose pamphlet entitled A Letter from a True and Lawfull Member of Parliament (1656). This piece contained a carefully argued criticism of Cromwell's Declaration of October 31, 1655, which enacted further punitive measures against Royalist sympathizers. Because it purported to be written by a man who had fought with Parliament to curtail arbitrary government, its arguments against the wisdom, legality, and justice of Cromwell's harsh declaration must have carried a certain weight with moderate supporters of the Protectorate. The pamphlet's comparison of the Lord Protector's methods of rule with those of the overthrown monarchy were particularly calculated to appeal to the more moderate sort:

if after so much blood spilt and calamities undergone by the people, to free them from Monarchique Government, it should be now found most agreeable to the Nature and temper of the Nation, to return to the same forme of subjection, there could be little doubt, it would be much better to restore it to the Royall Person, to whom by the line of succession the unquestioned Right was derived . . . than by continuing it in the hands of an Usurper.  

Hyde informed Ormonde that "there is a letter come out to one of the Protector's Council which makes Cromwell mad, who swears that it is by Hollis & that he will destroy him for it; Hollis is generally believed to be the author." Hyde was disingenuous, for it was actually he, and not

---

1 A Letter from a True and Lawfull Member of Parliament (n.p., 1656) 59-60.

Denzil Holles, who was the author of the piece. Hyde was one of the Royalist party's chief propaganda writers both during and after the war, and produced a wide variety of pamphlets, speeches, and letters arguing the King’s case. Perhaps his most interesting contribution to the cause, however, was his use of forgeries and anonymous works like A Letter to sow dissension among the King’s enemies. Hyde took pride in his abilities as a forger and mimic of style: in his Life, he recounts with obvious relish a wager made by Charles I that he could recognize Hyde’s style regardless of the subject matter. The King lost: Hyde forged a speech ascribed to Pembroke which fooled Charles so completely that he declared that “every word [Pembroke] said was so much his own, that nobody else could make it.”

Graham Roebuck has written of Hyde’s efforts in this vein that he “may properly be considered the innovator of these new types of polemic in the period.” Hyde, however, can hardly claim credit for the invention of the literary forgery: nor was he the first propagandist of

---


7 The prevalence of such forgeries allowed polemicists to undercut the enemy’s use of captured documents: see John Taylor’s accusation that Parliament had ”contrived Letters” or ”new moulded them” to damn the King, in his The Generall Complaint of the Most Oppressed, Distressed Commons of England ([Oxford], 1645) 7-8. See also Martin Llewellyn’s ”A Satyr. Occasioned by the Author’s Survey of a Scandalous Pamphlet Intituled, The King’s Cabinet
the Civil War period to employ such mimicry in the service of his cause. Hyde's pamphlet, of course, relied upon the reader's acceptance of its authenticity to succeed, but mimicry could also be employed as a self-conscious literary device designed not to fool readers but to persuade and entertain them: as Margaret Doody has noted, "Civil War poetry sees a surge of poems and verses rendered as if in the enemy's voice." Doody is not the only critic to notice this development: in fact, the modern notion of the satiric persona has developed in part from the growing awareness of this kind of ventriloquism in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century satire. More seldom noted is the fact that this "innovation" had, in fact, venerable precedents: rhetoricians would have recognized in such mimicry an example of *prosopopaia*.

This figure was certainly a well-known one in the seventeenth-century: one of the fuller definitions of it is found in John Smith's *The Mysterie of Rhetorique Unvail'd (1657):*

*Prosopopeia* is the feigning of a person to speak, or the attributing of a person to the inanimate creatures; as, when we bring in persons that are dead, or the inanimate creatures speaking or hearing, &c.

A figurative Exomation, when in our speech, what thing soever, which is is [sic] not a person, is Metaphorically brought and represented as a person; or when the properties of man are for similitude and agreeableness sake attributed unto other things; whence it is said that this form of speech animates and makes dead men speak; or it is.

When in our speech we feign another person speaking."

Something of the variety of uses to which *prosopopaia* can be put is apparent in this description:

---


it includes, for example, a type of personification ("the inanimate creatures speaking or hearing"). and is closely related by Smith and others to *apostrophe* (Smith groups these together as examples of *legismo*, 8-9). By this means, the orator can represent the speech of his opponents of a dead authority, of inanimate objects, or of personified abstract ideas. As well, new and unfamiliar perspectives on the satiric subject can be offered. The figure of an injured nation may be conjured up to denounce a political opponent, and Justice personified can cry out for vengeance against a malefactor.

Seventeenth-century employments of *prosopopœia* reflect this wide variety of possibilities. One not uncommon form of satiric *prosopopœia* features talking inanimate objects, usually closely associated with the satiric subject. On occasion, the object in question may be a literary work which speaks to its readers: in such cases, the point of the *prosopopœia* is to interpret what the work *actually* says. In *A Satyrick Poem against Those Mercenary Wretches, and Troublers of Englands Tranquility, the Authors of Heraclitus and Observator* (1682), the Tory periodical *Heraclitus Ridens* is characterized as a Papist "Monster . . . late made in Hell," and now in league with Roger L'Estrange: its true sympathies, masked by its wit, are revealed in its speech:

Pray blind the Eyes of Hereticks.
That they may not discern our Tricks:

---


And that we may delude them all
Into our fatal Snare to fall:
Or that we may at last divide 'em,
And then both ruine and deride 'em. (9)

Much *prosopopeia* employs fable, adapting *Æsopian* forms to topical satire: 12 "The Story of the Pot, and the Kettle: As it was told by Colonel T[itus], the Night before he Kist the K[ing]'s Hand" (1688) is a good example of such poems. 13 Dealing with the attempt by James II to forge an alliance, by means of his Declaration of Indulgence, between Protestant dissenters and Catholics, the satire features a brief dialogue between a brass kettle and a clay pot. Both find themselves inundated in the "Torrent of an angry Flood," and the kettle proposes an alliance. The pot, however, wisely concludes that it has more to fear from the "hardned side" of the kettle than from the stream, and so declines (*Second Collection* 18). The point of the dialogue is nicely, if rather unnecessarily, summed up in the poem's final passage:

Learn hence you *Whigs*, and act no more like Fools.
Nor trust their Friendship, who would make you Tools.
While empty Praises, and smooth Flatteries serve.
Pay with feign'd Thanks, what their feign'd Smiles deserve.
But let not this alliance further pass.
For know that you are Clay, and they are Brass. (28)

12 See Leyburn 57-70. An early example is Spenser's "Prosopopoia: Or, Mother Hubberd's Tale" (1591), which glances at Lord Burghley in its fable of the Fox and the Ape. See Kent T. Van Den Berg, "The Counterfeit in Personation: Spenser's *Prosopopoia, or Mother Hubberds Tale,*" *The Author in His Work,* eds. Louis L. Martz and Aubrey Williams (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1978) 85-102. There are a number of such poems in *POAS* 1697 2: 47-104. See also Richard Flecknoe's *The Diarium, or Journal* (London, 1656) 61-63. *POAS Part III* 124-26, and John Dean's *The Badger in the Fox-Trap* ([London, 1681]).

13 Ascribed to Charles Montagu in *POAS* *Yale* 4: 233, and first printed in *A Second Collection* and *The Muses Farewell to Popery and Slavery* (London, 1689). Silas Titus was a Whig MP who, despite being invited to join the Privy Council by James in July of 1688, declared for William; see *DNB* and Buckingham's "Advice to a Painter, to Draw the Delineaments of a Statesman, and his Underlings" (1674?). Buckingham II. 23-25.
Poems of this sort employ prosopopeia in a largely allegorical fashion, but the majority of satires using the figure are more straightforward. An early prose example is the anonymous Prosopopeia. Or, The Complaint of the Pyramis, or Pillar (1606), which features the lament of a Paris monument about to be pulled down by an ungrateful nation. It had been erected to commemorate the expulsion of the Jesuits from France after the attempt by the young scholar Châtel, a former student of the Jesuits, upon the life of Henri IV in December of 1594. In 1603, however, Henri recalled the Jesuits and the monument was pulled down. The pamphlet begins with the Pyramis making reference to the strange fact of its own speech. "for Stones doe speake": "Is it not strange that (a thing which was and is not) A Pyramis, should speake? a senseless Stone desires audience: A Pillar that can neither heare nor feele. will make you doe both." Following a short lamentation by the monument upon its own mortality, the piece proceeds, predictably, in an anti-Jesuitical strain, accusing these of having "not onely corrupted the men, but even the

---

14 Prosopopeia and allegory are frequently difficult to distinguish. A personified speaker of Britannia is prosopopeia because it does not merely represent, but rather *is* Britain. It speaks *in propria persona*. The dominant mode of James Howell's Δενδρολογία. Dodona's Grove. Or. The Vocal Forest (London, 1640), in which talking trees are stand-ins for actual persons and factions in pre-Civil War England, is allegory. Here, when the "royall Oke" (5) speaks, it is as a representation of Charles I. See J. Whitman. *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique* (Oxford: Oxford UP. 1987) 271 and Leyburn 3-4.


17 Prosopopeia. Or. The Complaint of the Pyramis (London, 1606) sig. [A3'].
children also of France" (sig. [A4']). Henri’s Jesuit confessor, the pro-Spanish Père Pierre Coton, is the particular target, but the Pyramis also takes aim at the Duc D’Orleans and the Spanish.¹⁸

Prosopopeia. Or, The Complaint of the Pyramis retains always the sense of dramatic monologue: the Pyramis, in a strange and paradoxical sense, speaks "in character" throughout, and its sorrow and anger are almost moving. At the same time, there is more than a small element of humour in the situation the pamphlet presents to us. Its criticisms of the Jesuits are quite serious, but our amused reaction to the speaker undercuts the severity of our judgment of these villains. The Pyramis is not, after all, an entirely disinterested party. In the final analysis, Prosopopeia. Or, The Complaint of the Pyramis remains, like much Elizabethan satire, a work that sacrifices didactic intent and satiric sharpness in the interests of wit and humour. Similar in this regard is John Taylor’s A Shilling, or The Trauailles of Twelue-pence (1621), in which the coin narrates its own adventures and satirizes the various persons into whose hands it falls:

Imagine Reader (to his griefe and glory,)  
Twelue-pence himselfe declares his wand’ring story:  
Relating how he first was borne and bred,  
And how about the world he Trauailed.¹⁹

There is satire in what follows, but it is the novelty of the joke and humour of the situation that is the real point of the exercise.²⁰

---

¹⁸ James I had been attempting to separate Henri IV from Coton and the Jesuits since 1603: see Maurice Lee, Jr., James I and Henri IV (Urbana, Chicago, and London: U of Illinois P, 1970) 32-34, 51. Probably, this satire was written with reference to these diplomatic efforts.

¹⁹ A Shilling, or The Trauailles of Twelue-pence ([London, 1621]) sig. [A5'].

²⁰ This particular conceit was long a popular one: for a late seventeenth-century example, see Richard Ames’ The Circulation of Money Demonstrated ([London], 1691?). A better known.
A poem that is in many ways similar in form to, but rather different in effect from,

Prosopopeia. Or, The Complaint of the Pyramids is an anonymous broadside satire, dating from May 1643, entitled A Vindication of Cheapside-Crosse against the Roundheads. Like the earlier prose piece, this poem features the lamentations of a monument facing imminent destruction. Iconoclasm and attacks upon "Popish" ornament and idolatry were rampant in London in early 1643: Cheapside Cross, that "Monument of their Superstition" and "great inducement . . . unto Idolatry" as one contemporary pamphlet described it, was accordingly ordered destroyed by Parliament.  

A horrified Evelyn described the resulting scene in his "De Vita Propria":

May 2d being at Lond: I saw the furious & rabid Mobile throw down, & breake to pieces. the Crosse in Cheape-side, though of Gotique Invention. with statues. Carving. & Gilding surpassing any that I had ever scene. or was I belive in Europe: To that ungoverned Exorbitance were things come. thro' the malice. & mistaken Zeale of the fanatic Magistrats. dipt in the Rebellion. (1: 55. See also 2: 81)

The poem begins with the monument's complaint, not only that it is to be destroyed, but also that it has been identified with Papist idolatry:

Must I then downe? is an eternall doome
Past out against me? must I needs to Rome?
And why? it is contrary to the Lawes
To judge th' offender c're they heare the cause.  

The hint for this device may have been provided by a prose pamphlet published, according to Thomason, on the very day of the Cross' destruction: The Downfall of Dagon, or the Taking

and later, instance is Charles Johnstone's prose Chrysal, or The Adventures of a Guinea (1760-65).


22 A Vindication of Cheapside-Crosse against the Roundheads (London, 1643).
Downe of Cheap-side Crosse this Second of May, 1643 similarly gives voice to the monument's complaints, but contains nonetheless a rationalization for the actions of Parliament. A Vindication, on the other hand, is a compelling satire on the iconoclasm of Parliament. It is a piece of pseudo-forensic oratory that allows the Cross to develop two interconnecting themes. The first of these is an attack upon the "zealous rabble" that has gathered to watch the demolition:

When such a Prick-eare troope upon me gaz'd.
Crying (no Crosse) good faith I stood amaz'd:
I was stroke dumb with wonder, and which worse,
Because I'de gold about me, fear'd my purse.

This satiric attack upon the fanatical rabble quickly, however, merges with a second theme, the dangers inherent in such undiscriminating exercise of iconoclasm:

Wisedome they cal'd Apocryphall, threw durt on
All Fathers faces, but Saint Prin and Burton.
Was God ith' middle of this congregation?
Or were they led by instinct or revelation?
Kings doft their Crowns, and Cardinais their cope.
All must be bare unto a crew of Crops.
But do's Religion such a hatred bring.
To hate the very picture of a King?

By giving voice to the Cross itself, the poet is able to reveal the true and inherent nature of the personified object. The Laudian sentiments of the poem further permit the poet to elaborate upon the theme of symbol and intrinsic significance by allusion to crucifixion and sacrament: "They will divide my coat, my flesh, my bones," the Cross complains. Spirit and meaning are inseparable from physical embodiment, a theme reinforced by the device of personification itself. Employed in this way, prosopopeia becomes a demonstration of the real significance of the Cross.

23 The Downfall of Dagon, or the Taking Downe of Cheap-side Crosse ([London], 1643).

24 See also "The Downfall of Cheapside-Crosse, May 2, 3, 4. 1643." Rump 1: 138.
Prosopopeia can also be employed to reveal that symbols and icons are empty, hollow, or false: this is the method of the Restoration satire A Dialogue between the Two Horses (1676). In form, it employs dialogismus, a variation upon prosopopeia, which, as John Smith describes it, differs from the former figure "only in this . . . when the speaker answers now and then to the question, or objection, which the feigned person makes unto him, it is called Dialogismus" (255). A Dialogue between the Two Horses recounts a conversation between the bronze horse at Charing Cross upon which was mounted the figure of Charles I, and the marble horse that carried the figure of Charles II, erected in the Stocks Market by Sir Robert Viner in 1672. Interestingly, A Dialogue Between the Two Horses begins, like Prosopopeia. Or, The Complaint of the Pyramis, with an explanation and justification of its technique:

Wee read in profane and Sacred records
Of Beasts that have uttered Articulate words:
When Magpyes and Parratts cry "walke knave walk."
It is a clear proofe that birds too may talke:
Nay Statues without either windpipe or Lungs
Have spoken as plainly as men doe with Tongues (Marvell II. 1-6)

25 Margoliouth says that it "is probably Marvell's" (Marvell 317) but Lord suggests John Ayloffe as a possibility: see POAS Yale 1: 274. Annabel Patterson speculates that it may have been produced through collaborative authorship. Marvell and the Civic Crown (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978) 43. Marvell's political allegiances, which have an obvious bearing upon attributions, have been a much discussed: see John M. Wallace, Destiny His Choice: The Loyalism of Andrew Marvell, 1968 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980), Christopher Hill, Puritanism and Revolution and Donal Smith, "The Political Beliefs of Andrew Marvell." UTQ 36 (1966): 55-67.

26 See also Richard Ames' A Dialogue between Claret & Darby-Ale (London, 1692), and Aphra Behn's(?) Rebellions Antidote: Or a Dialogue Between Coffee and Tea (1685), in which the two beverages lament the "Rage and Madness of the Nation." The Works of Aphra Behn, ed. Janet Todd, 7 vols. (Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1992-) 1: 164; 1, 21.

27 See The Statue in Stocks-Market (1675?) and The Statue at Charing Cross (1675), ascribed to Marvell by both Margoliouth and Lord.
The poem proceeds in this vein for nearly 25 lines, citing examples of speaking animals and objects, including the brass head of "Fryar Bacon." Balaam's ass, the oracular "Stocks and Stones" of Rome and Delphi, and, with a predictable dig at the Roman Church, the speaking "Idolls" of the Papists. By means of this mixed group of antecedents the poet underlines the facetious nature of his poem, while establishing some kind of authority for his strange narrative. The emphasis upon the supernatural aspect of the tale also aids in reinforcing the poem's prophetic element.

Given the historical precedents, the speaker sees no reason why we should "not credit the publique discourses / Of a Dialogue lately between the two Horses" (ll. 23-24). Despite their status as royal mounts, the two horses prove less than loyal to their masters: the dialogue portion of the poem commences with a catalogue, recited by each horse in alternate turns, of the sins and vices that have overtaken the nation, most of which are blamed on Charles II:28

W[oolchurch]. That Bondage and Begery should be brought on the Nation
By a Curst houes of Commons and a blest Restauracion:
Ch[aring Cross]. To see a white staffe make a Beggar a Lord
And scarce a wise man at a long Councell board;
W. That the bank should be seiz'd yet the Chequer so poor:
Lord a mercy and a Cross might be set on the doore:
Ch. That a Million and half should be his revenue.
Yet the King of his debts pay no man a penny (ll. 51-58)

The poem continues on in this vein for another 32 lines, only to proceed to a direct, and even more scathing critique of the Stuarts. The royal father is criticized by Charles II's horse as "Priest-ridden" (l. 117), and the son castigated for lechery. Both kings, although differing in their respective vices, are equally contemptible:

28 Charles himself seems not to have taken exception to the satire: Defoe wrote that "tho' it was the bitterest Satyr, upon him and his father, that ever was made, the king would often repeat them with a great deal of Pleasure." *Review*. 28 March. 1713. Bk. 22: vol. [IX]: 151.
W. The Goat and the Lyon I Equally hate.
   And Free men alike value life and Estate.
   Tho Father and Sonne are different Rods.
   Between the two Scourges wee find little odds.
   Both Infamous Stand in three Kingdoms votes.
   This for picking our Pockets, that for cutting our Throats. (ll. 125-30)

The Woolchurch horse proves, as this speech suggests, to be something of a radical. Indeed, the two statues proceed to outline what is in essence a republican programme of political revolution:

   Ch. But can'st thou Divine when things shall be mended?
   W. When the Reign of the Line of the Stuarts is ended.
   Ch. Then England, Rejoyce, thy Redemption draws nigh:
     Thy oppression togethre with Kingship shall dye.
   W. A Commonwealthe a Common-wealth wee proclaim to the Nacion:
     The Gods have repented the Kings Restoration. (ll. 157-62)

The poem does not merely recount the signs of the degeneracy of the Stuarts, but actively seeks to subvert Royal symbols. The speaking statues are themselves emblems of this order.

When the Woolchurch statue of Charles II was unveiled on the anniversary of his Restoration on May 29, 1672, the London Gazette provided a full account of the "solemnity" of the celebrations, and noted that the figure had been erected "for the Honour of His Majesties Royal Person and Government."²⁹ Ruth Nevo has noted that the use of the statues as speakers underlines that it is not merely the Charles II and his office that are being assaulted, but the sacred images themselves that are being subverted: "In these can be seen again the impulse to contradict the ceremonial monuments to greatness which the baroque heroic had erected."³⁰ Annabel Patterson, who has

²⁹ The London Gazette 681 (27 May to 30 May, 1672) n.p.

³⁰ The Dial of Virtue (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1963) 165. She compares the "Statue" poems to the mock "Advice-to-a-painter" poems: "It is not an opposition faction which is being abused, but a sacred image which is being revengefully defiled" (166). See also Patterson, "Fables of Power." Politics of Discourse, eds. Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: U of California P, 1987) 290-91.
similarly seen the poem as an exploration of "political iconography." cites it as an example of "calculated indecorum" (Marvell 173). Prosopopæia provides the poet with the perfect means of exposing the gap between what such symbols are said to mean, and what they actually represent: the monuments insist upon speaking for themselves, asserting for themselves, in the process, a radical new signification.

Prosopopæia thus allows the satirist to make his point without entering the body of the poem in his own person. Indeed, A Dialogue is intended in part to address the issue of satiric responsibility and censorship: in the Conclusion to the poem, the satirist again speaks directly, addressing Charles' Proclamation of 29 December 1675 suppressing the operation of coffee-houses with a view to stifling public dissent:32

Tho' Tyrants make Laws which they strictly proclaim
To conceal their own crimes and cover their shame.
Yet the beasts of the field or the stones in the wall
Will publish their faults and prophesy their fall.
When they take from the people the freedom of words.

31 See also the Earl of Dorset's "The Whim," POAS Part III 279, inspired by the erection of a statue of James in ancient Roman garb. A. B. Chambers suggests that Statius' panegyric on "The Great Equestrian Statue of the Emperor Domitian" (Sylva i. 2) may lie behind the three satires on the equestrian statues: Domitian was the type of a tyrant. Andrew Marvell and Edmund Waller (University Park and London: Pennsylvania State UP, 1991) 167-80.

32 Coffee-houses were meeting-places for political discussion groups, such as the republican Rota Club; see Stephen B. Dobranski, "Where Men of Differing Judgments Croud': Milton and the Culture of the Coffee Houses." SCent 9 (1994): 35-56. That they were also distribution centres for manuscript libels and lampoons had long been a source of irritation for the government: in 1671 Joseph Williamson wrote "Pull down... coffee houses, and nothing can be more to the establishment of the government" (CSPD Charles II 11: 581), while Thomas Player commented in 1673 that "These sober clubbs produce nothing but scandalous and censorious discourses." W. D. Christie, ed.. Letters Addressed from London to Sir Joseph Williamson, Camden Society N.S. 8 and 9. 2 vols. (London: Camden Society, 1874) 2: 68. See also Harold Love, "Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England." TCBS 9 (1987): 142-43 and 152n56.
They teach them the Sooner to fall to their Swords. (ll. 175-80)

The truth about this tyrant King, like the revelation of Midas' ears, must out, even if it is the inanimate world that gives it articulation.33

A significant parallel to the talking statues of A Dialogue between the Two Horses is the Roman Catholic fondness for "idols." The poet of A Dialogue makes this connection himself, commenting, as already noted, upon the precedent that such religious artifacts provide:

All Popish believers think something divine,
When Images speak, possesses the shrine:
But they that faith Catholick ne're understood.
When Shrines give Answers, say a knave 's in the Roode;
Those Idolls ne're speak, but the miracle 's done
By the Devill, a Priest, a Fryar, or Nun. (ll. 15-20)

Here we come full circle from the theme of A Vindication of Cheapside-Crosse, which employed prosopopeia to defend and demonstrate the essence and real spiritual value of the divine image of the cross. The attack on such images in A Dialogue between the Two Horses anticipates by a few years the most famous satiric elaboration upon this theme, Oldham's "Satyr IV" from his Satyrs upon the Jesuits (1681). Entitled "S. Ignatius his Image Brought In. Discovering the Rogueries of the Jesuits, and Ridiculous Superstition of the Church of Rome," this satiric prosopopeia is a monologue by a wooden statue of Loyola:

Once I was common Wood, a shapeless Log.
Thrown out a Pissing-post for every Dog:

33 Clear precedents for the poem's satirical statues are the statues of Pasquino and Marforio in Rome, to which were affixed satires reflecting upon the Pope and others. See Pierre Legouis, Andrew Marvell, 2nd. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 167, and the Review for 13 May, 1712 for a discussion of the "Statue of Pasquin": "under this Figure were always Posted Libels and Satyrs, Papers of Personal Scandal, and all manner of Sarcasms ... from hence, a Lampoon in a Modern Dialect, is new-Christen'd, and now call'd Pasquinade." Bk. 21: vol. [VIII]: 714. See also Pasquin to the Queen's Statue at St. Paul's ([London? 1715]); POAS Yale 7: 617-25.
The Workman yet in doubt what course to take.
Whether I'd best a Saint or Hog-trough make.
After debate resolv'd me for a Saint.
And thus fam'd Loyola I represent:
And well I may resemble him, for he
As stupid was, as much a Block as I. (ll. 1-8.)

Oldham's model for his poem was, as he points out in his "Advertisement" (3). Horace's Satire I. 8, in which a Priapic statue relates its impressions of the rituals performed in a cemetery by a coven of witches. Oldham's opening lines are a very close echo of Horace's:

OF an old Fig-tree once the trunk was I,
And as a useless piece of wood laid by,
Till an ingenuous Carpenter who found
Me lying so neglected on the ground.
Took me in hand to form me with his tool,
But whether he should make of me a stool,
Or a Priapus, was a thing that did
Long time perplex this politick work-man's head;
Till after a long deliberation, he
For weighty reasons made a God of me. (Brome 225)

Horace uses *prosopopoeia* here for a number of reasons: it provides his readers with a first-hand perspective on the scene, and it serves, at the same time, to establish a tone of gentle mockery. There is also an element of iconoclasm provided by the revelation that this "Deity" very nearly became a stool, a mocking element that foreshadows his ridicule of the witches' ridiculous and meaningless ceremonies. Oldham departs subtly from Horace in the way that he establishes the relationship of image to the reality represented: whereas the humour in Horace's characterization

---


35 See Rudd's comments on this theme in *Satires of Horace* 72-74.
relies upon the contrast between the log's humble origins and its current status as god. Oldham insists that, fraud though Loyola's image may be, it is for that very reason an apt representation of the founder of the Jesuits.

Like A Dialogue, "Satyr IV" turns out to be a poem about the significance of images. about the connection between res and verba, representation and represented. Not only is the image of Loyola able to furnish first-hand evidence of the frauds of the Popish religion and wicked conspiracies of the Jesuits, but it is also itself a speaking testament to the ridiculousness of Popish idolatry. Where Horace's Priapus is merely a witness to the events that it describes, Loyola's image is itself complicit in the deception being practised upon the ignorant.36

Oft I by crafty Jesuit am taught
Wonders to do, and many a juggling Feat.
Sometimes with Chaffing Dish behind me put,
I sweat like Clapt Debauch in Hot House shut.
And drip like any Spitchcock'd Huguenot,
Sometimes by secret Springs I learn to stir.
As Paste-Board Saints dance by miraculous Wire:

The Church I vindicate, Luther confute.
And cause Amazement in the gaping Rout. (ll. 53-59, 65-66).

The statue of Loyola is a confessedly false image, an emblem of the deceits that it describes. The catalogue of such "holy Cheats" (l. 67) swells, from the relatively innocent exploitation of Loyola's relics, to the doctrine of transubstantiation itself:

36 A. D. Cousins suggests that the image's speech betrays "a droll, knowing contempt born of familiarity with that world's grotesque and predictable variety." This seems to me to overstate the case: his contempt is not that of the satirist, but rather that of the knavish swindler. See "Oldham in Defence of the Restoration: Satires upon the Jesuits," NM 87 (1986): 150. Horace's statue even represents a kind of parodic version of the satirist: satiric ire is displaced by the statue's fear of the witches, and satiric power reduced to the fart that it emits. Anderson says that while he would "not go so far as to call Priapus a comic version of Horace," he "would not reject such a suggestion" ("Horace's Satire 1. 8" 82).
Hey Jingo, Sirs! What's this? 'tis Bread you see:
Presto be gone! 'tis now a Deity.
Two grains of Dough, with Cross and stamp of Priest.
And five small words pronounc'd, make up their Christ.
To this they all fall down, this they all adore.
And strait devour what they ador'd before:
Down goes the tiny Saviour at a bit.
To be digested, and at length beshit:
From Altar to Close Stool or Jakes preferr'd.
First Wafer, next a God, and then a ----.
(Il. 263-72)

Oldham's speaking image serves as the thin edge of wedge employed to pry open the darkest secrets and most important fallacies of the Catholic church. The language employed by Loyola's image is cynical: most of his ridicule is reserved for the dupes who fall for such tricks rather than for the scoundrels who perpetrate them. The diction is, for that reason, mockingly elevated, as though to accentuate the distance between the sanctity of what is represented and the reality of the means by which that representation is accomplished.

Another very popular mode of satiric personification involved abstract representations. George Wither was fond of this device, employing it most frequently in a prophetic dream-vision. Wither took his role as prophet seriously, as apparently did others: Aubrey commented that "he was a good *vates*. He had a strange sagacity and foresight into mundane affaires" (2: 306). By the time of his 1628 *Britain's Remembrancer*, Wither viewed the role of the poet as

primarily vatic: \(^{38}\) "Most Poets future things declare; / And Prophets (true or false) they are." \(^{39}\) His use of prosopopæia is best viewed as an aspect of inspired religious "enthusiasm." \(^{40}\) In Wither's *Prosopopoeia Britannica: Britains Genius, Or, Good-Angel, Personated* (1648), a "reverend Person" carrying "A threefold, but a broken Diadem" appears miraculously, and in a long verse reflection upon the times, urges moderation upon Parliament, and that mercy be applied to the King. \(^{41}\) Wither's recourse to a personified speaker deflects attention away from the poet, depersonalizing the criticisms of Parliament and objectifying his argument. The poet merely reports what the spirit has said to him:

*Hear, O ye Islands! harken and belceve*
Your *Genius*, who, doth see your waies, and greeve.
If you shall act, much longer, as ye do.
Your *City, Army, Priest, and People* too:
Your *King*, your chosen *Commons*, and your *Peers*.
Your *Independents*, and your *Presbyters*.
The worst disposed, and the best affected:
The *faithfull*, and the *man of fraud detected*:
The *Friend, the Foe, the Foole*, and he that's wise:
The *Rich*, and he who at his *threshold* lies:
*English, Scot, Welsh, Kerne*, shall all together

---


\(^{39}\) "Hymn LX. For a Poet." *Halelviah. Or Britans Second Remembrancer* (London. 1641) 478. See also sigs. [A2*-5*].

\(^{40}\) Pritchard (221-22) notes that most of Wither's Civil War poems and pamphlets contain accounts of "the poet's raptures, which suddenly seized him, and of voices which broke into his contemplations to bring him divine messages." *Prosopopoeia* was associated with states of high emotional excitement: Bernard Lamy notes that "When a passion is violent, it render them mad in some measure that are possess'd with it. In that case, we entertain our selves with Rocks, and with dead Men, as if they were living, and make them speak as if they had Souls" (234).

\(^{41}\) *Prosopopoeia Britannica* (London. 1648) 2.
So jumbled be, so juggle with each other.
So stagger from their Principles, and Friends.
Through foolish hopes, false fears, or private ends;
That most shall be deceived, and, undone . . . (6)

Wither's figure does not, of course, demand that the poet display any real genius at mimicry: little more is required than that "Britons Genius" speak in a language consonant with the sorrows and dignities of the nation. His use of this kind of personified abstract ideal has its classical antecedents, but few of these are found in satire. Horace, Juvenal, and Persius use this form of prosopopeia sparingly, and usually self-consciously. The best example is Juvenal's Fortuna, who appears at the conclusion of Satire 10 as the embodiment of humanity's willingness to trust in fate rather than the exercise of virtue: "The Gods are All Ours, if we're wise: but we, / O Fortune, 'mongst the Pow'rs Divine place Thee!" (Holyday 192). Because Fortuna is a false god, Juvenal accentuates the artifice of his prosopopeia: Fortune is personified, but only so as to highlight the fallacy of attributing personal qualities to the abstracted idea. Similar in this regard is Lucretius, who spends some time in Book II of the De Rerum Natura describing a personified figure of nature, the Magna Mater, only to conclude the passage with a mocking dismissal of those who believe in personal gods that intervene in human affairs: "Such men may call, and strength of fancy show, / The Earth the Mother of the Gods below, / And those above, altho she is not so." Wither, however, employs no irony in his "Britans Genius." She laments

42 Robert Stapylton's translation makes this paradox more explicit: "And yet to thee vain Fortune we have given / The name of Goddesse, and plac'd thee in heaven." Juvenal's Sixteen Satyrs (London, 1647) 192. Witke suggests that Juvenal used objectifying personifications seldom because he is "entirely too subjective a poet to rely upon personification" (142).

43 T. Lucretius Carus the Epicurean Philosopher, His Six Books De Natura Rerum, trans. Thomas Creech (Oxford, 1682) 53. Dryden, who translated part of Book II for Sylve, calls this figure "the Prosopopeia of Nature" in the Preface to that collection (12). Monica Gale notes that
because the state of the nation is lamentable, but retains all the while an air of dignified reproach because, it is implied, the evils now overrunning the nation are accidental, rectifiable because not intrinsic to Britain itself.44 In this sense, Wither's personified figure is eminently qualified for the role of surrogate satirist, embodying within itself victim, normative values, and righteously indignant censor. These three qualities lend to "Britanns Genius" an authority and objectivity that Wither, the actual satirist, cannot hope to achieve speaking in his own voice.

This use of prosopopœia to achieve a literalized vision of the essential nature of the satiric victim was a popular device throughout the century. John Dennis' short poem in ballad metre, "The Prosopœia of Ostend," published in Miscellanies in Verse and Prose (1693), has the city, under siege, lamenting that it has become a great sepulchre: "Th' impartial Plague sweeps either side, / One Monument I am grown."45 Ostend re-defines itself as a symbol of the vanity of warlike endeavour. Marvell employs a prosopopœia of another kind of victim in a rather different way, and with an effect that is at once funny and horrifying, at the conclusion of Last Instructions to a Painter. Charles is pictured alone late at night, musing on his "uneasie Throne":

Raise up a sudden Shape with Virgins Face.


Though ill agree her Posture, Hour, or Place:
Naked as born, and her round Arms behind.
With her own Tresses interwove and twin'd:
Her mouth lockt up, a blind before her Eyes.
Yet from beneath the Veil her blushes rise:
And silent tears her secret anguish speak.
Her heart throbs, and with very shame would break.
The Object strange in him no Terrou mov'd:
He wonder'd first, then pity'd, then he lov'd:
And with a kind hand does the coy Vision press.
Whose Beauty greater seem'd by her distress;
But soon shrunk back, chill'd with her touch so cold
And th' airy Picture vanisht from his hold. (ll. 891-904)

While Marvell's personified Britain does not speak, she is recognizably of the same type as
Wither's prophetic figure.\(^46\) Her role in the poem is to make concrete, and so apparently
objective, the essential truth that England has been fettered (or, as Barbara Richling suggests,
raped) by the corruption of those who rule it.\(^47\) Appearing in an "Advice to a Painter" poem, this
literalized figure is particularly apt, for it employs, using prosopopœia, demonstration, rather than
discourse. Marvell's image gains much of its humour from the translation of his mode from verbal
to visual: it is, in fact, a concretely realized form of the venerable joke that politicians are doing
to the nation that which they do with their mistresses.\(^48\)

\(^{46}\) Cf. the "dreadful and most monstrous Vision" that appears to Shaftesbury, as he muses
upon his assumption of the monarchy of Poland, in the prose satire \textit{A Modest Vindication of the
Earl of Stu} \textit{dy} (London, 1681) 4: it appears in succession as a "Whore of Babylon," the
murdered Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, a mob of Whiggish ruffians, and finally as "a Doctor of
Salamancha" (i.e. Titus Oates). The vision encapsulates Shaftesbury's seditious past. Similar is \textit{A Dialogue,
between Toney, and the Ghost of the Late Lord Viscount Stafford} (London, 1682).

\(^{47}\) "England Deflowered and Unmanned: The Sexual Image of Politics in Marvell's 'Last

\(^{48}\) See Steven N. Zwicker, "Virgins and Whores: The Politics of Sexual Misconduct in
the 1660s," \textit{The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell}, eds. Conal Condren and A. D. Cousins
(Aldershot: Scolar P, 1990) esp. 102-04. Zwicker identifies the allegorical maid with Frances
The image of the Royal rape is a popular one in the period, and undoubtedly owes much to Charles' reputation as a womanizer: Dryden may have been attempting to subvert such images when he makes Achitophel counsel Absalom to "Commit a pleasing Rape upon the Crown" (l. 474). Another version of this sexual motif occurs in Britannia and Rawleigh (1675?), in which a figure representing the corruptions of Stuart rule urges upon Charles a rape of his three kingdoms.

Tast the delicious sweets of sovereign power.
Tis Royall Game whole Kingdomes to deflower.
Three spotless virgins to your bed I bring,
A sacrafice to you, their God and King. (Marvell ll. 98-101)

Britannia and Rawleigh is probably the work of John Ayloffe, although it has been attributed to Marvell.49 A fanatical republican, Ayloffe remains something of a shadowy figure: distantly related to the Hydes (and thus to the first Duchess of York), he was nonetheless associated politically with Marvell, the Green Ribbon Club, and the followers of James Harrington. He was exiled in 1673 for his opposition to the Third Dutch War, and executed in 1685 for his participation in the Rye House Plot and Monmouth's Rebellion.50 Britannia and Rawleigh is


49 See Marvell 1: 305, and POAS Yale 1: 228; it is ascribed to "M' Aylot" in Bodleian MS Eng. Poet. d.49, the main authority for attributions to Marvell. Paul Hammond suggests that anonymity "helped to promote the use of authoritativc personae, so that the criticism of the King and his ministers is voiced not by an individual but by a representative of the nation" like "Britannia": "the anonymous voice of the poet is easily represented as being the collective voice of the nation, authorized and enabled to speak through a patriotic community of copyists and readers." "Anonymity" 138.

typical of his satiric method: it is an example of prosopopœia employed in dialogismus.

featuring an encounter between the resurrected Raleigh and Britannia. In this sense, it actually employs prosopopœia in two distinctly different ways: personification and (recalling Smith's definition of the figure) the introduction of "persons that are dead." Britannia, disgusted by the degeneracy of the court, has fled her native land in disguise; despite the urgings of the Elizabethan courtier, she has abandoned all hope of reforming the Stuarts:

Rawleigh, noe more; too long in vain I've try'd
The Stuart from the Tyrant to devide.
As easily learn'd Virtuoso's may
With the Doggs bloud his gentle kind convey
Into the Wolf and make him Guardian Turn
To the Bleating Flock by him so lately torn.
If this Imperiall oyl once taint the Blood,
It's by noe Potent Antidote withstood. (ll. 141-48)

Britannia, like Wither's "Britans Genius," is a dignified but disenfranchised embodiment of the true essence of Britain, while Raleigh appears, as Margoliouth has suggested, "as an opponent of the succession of James I" (Marvell 306): Britannia laments that she did not, like Raleigh, resign her charge at the accession of the first Stuart. Raleigh adds an historical dimension to those values represented by the personified genius of the nation: he is, in a sense, the last Elizabethan, the last Englishman uncorrupted by the taint of the Stuarts. His appearance reflects a spirit of Protestant chauvinism and xenophobia: as C. V. Wedgwood reminds us, Raleigh "was popularly remembered as the most illustrious victim of the Spanish policy of King James I." Charles II, on the other hand, is criticized for his pro-French foreign policy, and patronage of French styles in

51 See also Ocean a nd Britannia (1681?), also attributed to Ayloff e by Lord and others, in which Harrington's England (Oceana) laments the injustices of Stuart tyranny with Britannia.

the arts: Britannia complains that a "Colony of French Possess the Court: / Pimps. Priests. Buffoones i'th privy chamber sport" (ll. 25-26).

One of the most interesting features of the poem, however, is the appearance of a third figure of prosopopæia, an allegorized figure of Stuart tyranny, described by Britannia:

Entred a Dame bedeckt with spotted pride;
Faire flower-deluces in an Azure field
Her left Arm bears, the Antient Gallick shield
(By her usurpt), her right a bloody sword
Inscrib'd Leviathan the sovereign Lord.
Her Towry front a fiery Meteor bears
From Exhalation bred of blood and tears.
Around her Joves lou'd ravenous Currs complain;
Pale death, lusts. Horrour fill her pompous train. (ll. 60-68)

We are approaching something like Spenserian allegory here: the "Dame"'s essential nature is embodied in the physical details of her appearance. This represents a rather brazen attempt to manipulate the reader: she is given a voice that dams her the more effectively because she is herself seemingly unaware of the horrific moral implications of her speech:

Are thread-bare Virtues Ornaments for Kings?
Such poor pedantick toys teach underlings.
Doe Monarchs rise by vertues or the sword?
Who e're grew great by keeping of his word?
Virtues a faint-green-sickness of the souls,
Dastards the hearts and active heat controules. (ll. 72-77)

Ayloffe's use of the self-incriminating speech here is striking, but ultimately ineffective, because of his chosen quasi-allegorical form: prosopopæia is most effective when it depicts the speech of a "real" person, rather than an abstraction like "Stuart tyranny." It depends for its effect upon an acceptance of the idea that speech is an index of character: Ayloffe's figure reveals through her

speech the essential nature of what she represents, but because she remains an abstraction, the poet's role as artificer is highlighted. When "real" persons are represented, however, the obtrusive figure of the poet, who is now merely an amanuensis, recedes into the background. There is a voyeuristic appeal to works featuring such figures, which also provides a more concrete focus for our hate and revulsion than do personified abstractions. It is easier to fear and despise the duplicitous Arlington, overheard advocating arbitrary government at the council table, than it is to become outraged by the generalized evil mouthed by an abstract personification of Stuart tyranny.

The appeal of this voyeuristic form of prosopopeia can be gauged by the popularity of what might be characterized as a satiric subgenre, the "secret conference" poem. The nature of the clandestine meetings represented in this way vary: they can be seditious gatherings of traitors plotting the overthrow of the government, meetings of government leaders of the highest level who discuss means of crushing the liberty of the free-born Englishman, or even a conference in Hell. In Prosopopeia. Or, A Conference held at Angelo Castle, between the Pope, the Emperor, and the King of Spain (ca. 1620), we witness the meeting of the three most important leaders of the Catholic Europe. The recently-erupted Thirty Years War is revealed as the fruit of their efforts; the poem ends with a invocation by the Pope to the Furies:

54 A related form is the "Sessions" poem, of which two types predominate, the first being the popular "Sessions of the Poets" form. A second is the "Session of the Ladies," featuring amorous contests between women: this form, as is suggested by the title of "The Lovers Sessions. In Imitation of Sir John Suckling's Session of Poets" (1687; BL MS Add. 34362 f.154'; Wilson 175-98, derives from the first. See "Colon" (1679; BL MS Harl. 6913 ff.40r-43v; Wilson 23-31 ) and "The Session of the Ladies" (1688; BL MS Harl. 7319 ff.280'-85'; Wilson 204-16).

55 See for example John Taylor's The Hellish Parliament ([London], 1642). A further variant form is the account of the "secret" drinking society: see Charles Darby's Bacchanalia: Or a Description of a Drunken Club (London, 1680), a mildly Tory prosopopeia in pindarics.
Help me to store of pistols, poysan, knives. 
to fyre and powder, manacles and gives. 
Bid Ravilliack and Clement hye them hither. 
Let Gerard, Faux, and Garnet come toghter: 
Come ye Ignatiants bring Assasinates, 
left handed Ehuds, that doe rule the fates, 
and cut the threads of Princes lives a sunder; 
these Romane Scavola's shall make men wonder 
to see the upstart King with his partakers, 
in euery nation slauthred by massacres. 56

*Prosopopoiea. Or, A Conference* includes no framing or narrative device: it is simply a dramatic exchange between these three conspirators. It pretends, therefore, to be an unmediated transcription of an actual meeting. While the verse-form of the work means that it cannot be accepted as a *verbatim* report of an actual meeting, many of its readers undoubtedly accepted that such a conspiracy existed: the work need not be accepted as literally true to impart a thrilling sense of privileged insight into the causes of great historical events. Two influential Restoration satires operate in a similar manner, and address similar concerns: although both Oldham's *Satyrs upon the Jesuits* I and III feature monologues in verse, rather than exchanges between all participants, "Garnet's Ghost, addressing to the Jesuits. Met in Private Cabal" and "Loyola's Will" seek to instill this same sense of dangerous discovery. 57

An important Restoration example of the "secret conference" poem is the opposition satire "The Dream of the Cabal, A Prophetick Satyr" (1672), first published in 1689: this poem, framed

56 *Prosopopoiea. Or, A Conference* ([London], ca. 1620) sig. [A3'].

57 "Loyola's Will" derived from Buchanan's *Fransiscanus*, a Latin satire in which a monk provides novices with immoral advice; Chester H. Cable. "Oldham's Borrowing from Buchanan," *MLN* 66 (1951): 523-27. It belongs as well to another tradition of satiric *prosopopoiea*, the satiric will. See *The Last Will and Testament of Anthony, King of Poland* ([London], 1682); *POAS* Yale 3: 396-402 and *The Last Will and Testament of the Earl of Pembroke* (1650).
as a dream-vision, concerns a meeting of the Cabal ministry, with Charles and the Duke of Ormonde also present: the discussion centres on methods of strengthening the royal prerogative, imposing religious conformity (of a Papist order), and dispensing with Parliament: 

Methought there met the Grand Cabal of Seven,  
(Odd numbers, some men say, do best please Heaven)  
When sat they were and Doors were all fast shut,  
I secret was behind the Hangings put:  
Both hear and see I could; but he that there  
Had placed me bad me have as great a care  
Of stirring, as my life: and ere that out  
From thence I came, resolv'd shou'd be my Doubt.  
What would become of this Mad World, unless  
Present Designs were cross'd with ill success? (A Second Collection 5) 

As the meeting proceeds, the Cabal ministers unfold their various projects to circumvent the authority of Parliament; only Ormonde opposes their schemes. Charles himself remains ominously quiet throughout: possibly the satirist thought it safer to avoid implicating the King directly. In any case, Charles' silence communicates more than his speech might have done. The satire instills a sense of privileged access without requiring a complete suspension of disbelief: we need not accept the poem as a genuine transcript to feel that we have somehow overheard something momentously relevant and significant.

The Restoration was replete with plots and rumours of conspiracy, real and imagined, loyal and treasonous, and such "secret conference" poems were perfectly contrived to exploit the

---

58 In 1672, England entered into war, in alliance with the Catholic French, against the Protestant Dutch, a fact that created much dissent: it is in this context that satires like the "The Dream of the Cabal" were produced. For a discussion of the political context of the early 1670s, with particular reference to the issue of religious conscience, see Gary S. De Krey, "The First Restoration Crisis: Conscience and Coercion in London, 1667-73." Albion 25 (1993): 565-80.
rampant paranoia of the age. Conspirators were to be found literally everywhere: in "The Fancy: Or, The D. of York's Last Farewel" (1680), the anonymous poet recounts a sinister harangue overheard by chance during an evening ramble through St. James's Park. Concealed in the lengthening shadows of the park, the poet is privy to an attempt by the Duke of York to suborn his brother the King into the commission of crimes against the liberty of his subjects:

But he that's mounted on a Sov'raign Throne,
Ne'er had nor can have other ways than one
To curb the sawey Vulgar, and pull down
Their Cobweb Rights, that circumscribe the Crown;
Take off their Shackles, let the Bumkins know,
No other Almighty is than you below. (POAS 1697 3: 197)

The clandestine meeting of royal brothers in the park is at last broken up by the unexpected arrival of the Earl of Shaftesbury, a conspirator in "A Dream of the Cabal," but here a spokesman for English liberties. Possibly the Duke of York should have known better than to conduct such a seditious interview in a public place, but in late seventeenth-century London, it would seem, conspirators could be found muttering treason anywhere: in a poem by Richard Ames, entitled The Jacobite Conventicle (1692), the poet, innocently "in Temple-Cloysters walking," overhears a man talking to himself in terms that mark him as a Jacobite. His curiosity prompts him to follow the malcontent to Whitechapel, where he is admitted into a secret conventicle:

He stopt at Door, which stood at jar.
And whisp'ring softly in the Ear,
Of one whose looks declar'd Suspicion.
Receiv'd into the House Admission.

---


60 This poem exists, as E. F. Mengel, Jr. notes, in two forms and with two titles: it is also found as "Popish Politics Unmasked. See the textual notes to the poem in POAS Yale 2: 540.
I seeing this, with Confidence.
What'e might be the consequence.
Went boldly up. and gave the Sign.
(The Word I mean) and so got in.⁶¹

Once within, the poet treats the reader to snippets of the seditious talk he overhears there: the conventicle concludes with the satirical transcription of a Popish church service, disrupted at last by the entrance of a constable.⁶² This feature places the poem within the tradition of earlier "conventicle" poems satirizing Puritan sermons, here ironically recast as a Catholic service.

Poems employing prosopopœia to represent the speech of people, real or invented, require that some attention be paid to the principle of decorum personæ, a concept most famously enunciated by Horace in the Ars Poetica. Nature "tells the various Passions with the Tongue," and the poet must therefore employ language consonant with the emotions of the speaker: at the same time, the poet must account for the social status, age, and nationality of the speaker: "You must take care, and use quite different words. / When Servants speak, or their commanding Lords, / When grave old Men, or head-strong Youths discourse . . ." (553). Ralph Johnson's school rhetoric, The Scholar's Guide from the Accidence to the University (1665), which gives complete "RULES for making" prosopopœia, highlights the importance of decorum personæ:

1. Consider the case and condition of the person you represent, and imagine your self in such a place, so qualified.
2. Observe what passions the person is most affected with, as. love, joy, sorrow, fear, hatred, anger, despair: also what vertues or vices he is inclined to, and by the Rules of moving passions, make use of those figures and arguments which best suit


⁶² "Mr. Sh---," the preacher satirized by Ames, was probably a minister identified by Luttrell as Shales or Shield: see 2: 386-87, 389, and 3: 20.
the purpose.

3. Consider the time, place, condition, age, sex, religion, and former estate of the person, that all things may be done *ad decorum*, not unsuitably in any circumstance.

4. Consider the endowments, and office of the person, let an old Patriot speak gravely, a King majestically, a Souldier resolutely, a young novice headily . . .

Johnson's "Prosopopæia" is the type of rhetorical exercise that would have been very common in seventeenth-century schools, and is closely related to such academic exercises as contending in favour of paradoxes, or delineating the arguments on both sides of a question. Johnson's emphasis upon *decorum personæ* is marked: verisimilitude is achieved by an imaginative empathy, an immersion into the represented character rather like that required for "method acting." Where "Prosopopæia" is a spoken oration, the orator becomes, in essence, an actor, submitting the self to the character whose speech is represented. Principles like those articulated in Johnson's treatise can be seen at work in a wide variety of poems, Pope's "Eloisa to Abelard"

---


64 See for example the set-pieces laid out in William Richards' *The English Orator* (London. 1680) and in Saint-Evremond's *Miscellaneous Essays* 1: 197-208. As Benjamin Boyce notes, *prosopopæia* is related to the satirical Character "because the ubiquitous classical doctrine of *decorum*" tended "to encourage the presenting of types" (*Theophrastan Character* 28).

65 The relation of this concept to theatre is underlined by Charles Hoole's suggestion that students reading Terence pay attention to "the true *decorum* of both things and words, and how fitting they are for such persons to do or speak, as are there represented, and upon such occasions as they did, and spake them." *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole*. 1660, ed. R. C. Alston. English Linguistics 1500-1800 133 (Menston: Scolar P. 1969) 139-40.

66 See Robert Boyle's description of his method for making dialogues: "I sometimes took Pleasure to imagine two or three of my Friends to be present with me at the Occasion, that set my thoughts on work, and to make them Discourse as I fancy'd Persons, of their Breeding and tempers, would talk to one another on such an Occasion." *Occasional Reflections upon Several Subjects* (London. 1665) sig. [B2'] (mislettered: actually sig. [a2']).
The failure to conform to *decorum personae* could have disastrous effects. One example of such a failure is the 1650 prose pamphlet *Prosopopeia, Or, The States and the Steward, or Their King, as Called: Personated and Presented in their True Stations & Postures* (1650). Written, as the title page notes, “just at the very time” when *Eikon Basilike* entered into circulation, it was published, in part, as an answer to it: here again we see *prosopopeia* employed as a means of polemic iconoclasm. It targets the royalist “image of the King” in four prose monologues, two of which are spoken by Charles Stuart, and two by an abstract embodiment of the “State” representing both the Parliament and people of England. Commencing with an assertion of the importance of *decorum personae* to his method, the author makes no

---

67 Pope’s appropriation of a woman’s voice had numerous precedents in the seventeenth-century. Surprisingly, these most frequently side with women in the battle of the sexes: see for example John Taylor’s *The Womens Sharpe Revenge* (London, 1640). Etherege’s *Ephelia to Bajazet*, and Richard Ames’ *Syliva* poems: a probable model for these is Juvenal’s *Laronia* (Satire 2). More ambiguous examples are “The Lady Freschevile’s Song of y′ Wives” (1682). BL MS Harl. 7319 ff.98′-99′; Wilson 112-16. the Duchess of Albemarle in *Third Advice to a Painter* (1666). many of Rochester’s lyrics (as for example “A Song of a Young Lady. To Her Ancient Lover”), and Artemiza in his *A Letter from Artemiza in the Towne to Chloes in the Country* (1674?). For a very select bibliography of examples. see P. Crawford’s Appendix to *Women in English Society 1500-1800*, ed. Mary Prior (London and New York: Methuen, 1985) 262-63.

apologies for the occasional "dark" or obscure passage, arguing that this is the price of writing in character: "Tragedians. so all Writers and Personaters. do. and ought to present the Presented. as becomes such. and not to the obtuse capacities of the Auditory. or every fancy." In fact, Charles' speeches are direct confessions rather than unselfconscious harangues that require commentary or ironic interpretation (the marginal notes are from the original):

(a) By not consenting.

I could, and ought to have prevented Tumults by a fair and just Compliance. but then should I have wanted a pretext for my fright and flight: so I purposely and Politically necessitated those Tumults. (a) that so I might plead a necessity of flight, by this Arte put my Adversaries to flight: for I know well that the foulest of things, well-coloured, seem fair. with the foolish and factious: and as for the seeing and wise. I as well know that the multitudes of the (b) Headly, and the "Head less multitudes will surprize and suppress them. and so save me a labour. (2)

This is prosopopeia as wish-fulfilment, a quasi-dramatic presentation of the contrite confession that Charles refused to give at his trial: he speaks as his enemies would have wished him to speak, rather than as he conceivably might have spoken. The author's clear divergence from decorum personae renders this propaganda piece transparent and ineffective: even an outrageously exaggerated portrait of Charles as the epitome of tyrannic evil would have been more credible; it certainly would have been more interesting.

69 Prosopopeia, Or, The States and the Steward (London. 1650) sig. [A47].

70 Similarly, much of the literature concerning Stephen College's trial and execution in 1681 are forgeries that have College "admitting" to the guilt that he had denied. See for example The Last Speech and Confession of Mr. Stephen Colledge (London. 1681). A Letter Written from the Tower by Mr. Stephen Colledge, and A Letter Written from Oxford By Mr. Stephen Colledge, possibly by Nathaniel Thompson. See also Satyr to His Muse (London. 1682: sometimes attributed to Shadwell).a prosopopeia in which Dryden abuses himself freely: two other such forgeries are discussed in Hugh Macdonald, "The Attacks on Dryden." Essential Articles for the Study of John Dryden. ed. H. T. Swedenberg, Jr. (Hamden. CT: Archon. 1966) 45. For an earlier example of this tactic. see "Prosopopeia. On the D," by one "Jo. Heape." Fairholt 51-52.
The most important advantage of the ironic self-condemning speech is that it allows the satirist to maintain the fiction of objectivity and distance: far from mediating our experience of the satirical object, the satirist need do no more than report the words of the satirical victim. Here, Rochester's suggestion that "Savoy's of Divine Authority" is realized in quasi-dramatic form, enacted before us in the language of villainy. At the same time, this satirical method reinforces our impressions of the stability of satirical language. *Prosopopeia* relies for its effect upon our unquestioning acceptance of the agreement between signifier and signified. A direct correlation is established between the personified object and what it literally "says": language becomes the concrete embodiment of the speaker's true significance. Whether our reaction to that language is approval or horror, the efficacy of the figure rests upon our faith in language as an index of innate character. At the same time, while *prosopopeia* is frequently employed with iconoclastic intent, it nevertheless assumes that there is both a right and a wrong way to read signs and symbols: the talking statues of *A Dialogue between the Two Horses* are both apt, and at the same time, terribly inappropriate symbols of Stuart monarchy. This doubleness of meaning, an inherent quality of ironic discourse, is a reflection of satire's binary arrangement of right and wrong, good and evil. The task of the satirist is to teach the reader to read moral significance accurately, to perceive the vital correspondence of outward sign and inner meaning. *Prosopopeia's* usefulness to the satirist derives precisely from the fact that it literalizes this correspondence, representing it by means of the very rhetorical form through which it is communicated.

In fact, *prosopopeia* is, literally, a form of forgery, not merely because it is a fiction, but
because it attempts to pass off the satirist's language as another's.\footnote{The link between \textit{prosopopoeia} and forgery is strongest when the fiction is purportedly written by that writer: see for example the satire upon Davenant in "The Author upon Himself," \textit{The Incomparable Poem Gondibert, Vindicated} ([London], 1655) 14-15, and the satire \textit{An Address of John Dryden, Laureat to His Highness the Prince of Orange} (London, 1689).} If language is an index of character, a signature of a person's inner qualities, \textit{prosopopoeia} is an attempt to counterfeit that signature, and affix to the assumed name the false qualities of character implied by the false autograph. Paradoxically, then, \textit{prosopopoeia}, which relies upon our faith in the motivation of language for its effects, is in fact produced by a violation of the stability of discourse. Even more strangely, satiric \textit{prosopopoeia} must declare its own fraudulence to succeed. \textit{Prosopocoeia} in this sense differs from outright forgery: it is a self-confessed lie that nonetheless asks that we accept the inviolability of the truth that it purports to represent. Our awareness of satiric intention provides the signposts that guide our interpretation of the work: without this, the danger exists that the \textit{prosopopoeia} will be taken seriously. This is one reason why satiric \textit{prosopopoeia} tends towards exaggeration: satiric violence and hyperbole guides our reading.\footnote{See for example John Taylor's \textit{Oxford Besieged, Surprised, Taken, and Pitefully Entred} ([Oxford], 1645) a mock account of a failed attempt to take the city in June of 1645 which employs extravagant exaggeration to belie its own report of Parliamentary victory.}

The age affords many instances of the misinterpretation of \textit{prosopopoeia}. Richard Head's \textit{The English Rogue Described, in the Life of Meriton Latroon, a Witty Extravagant} (1665), a highly-derivative prose narrative posing as the autobiography of a cheat, is a case in point. The work was published anonymously, but Head included a preface, written as though by the work's editor, in which he revealed his didactic purpose, and made clear his satiric intent: "herein you may see Vice pourtrayed in her own proper shape, the ugliness whereof (her \textit{Vizard-Mask} being
removed) cannot but cause in her (quondam) Adorers, a loathing, in stead of loving." It is hard to believe that anyone could have taken this extended prose *prosopopæia* seriously, yet this is precisely what happened, provoking Head to lament in the dedicatory epistle of *Proteus Redivivus: Or the Art of Wheedling* (1675) that readers had censured "the Author of the English Rogue, concluding him to be the Actor too":

> how irrational that Opinion is, I shall leave to any indifferent Person to judge, without Suggesting this: that as it is impossible for any one man to act all these Villainies contained in that Book, so if any one committed but the tith of them, certainly Justice, though Blind, would soon find him out . . .

Head's complaint is not merely that readers had accepted his fiction as fact: indeed, he makes some effort in *The English Rogue* to pass it off as a true story. He is more concerned that his critics have misunderstood his intentions: "for my design was not to propagat Vice, but so to detect it, that at the sight of its ugly Loathsomeness, men should shun it worse then the greatest Contagion" (sig. [A2']).

The *English Rogue* failed as satire because it failed as *prosopopæia*: the work was accepted as genuine, with the result that its satirical point was blunted. Head's case was not singular: a more famous example of failed *prosopopæia* is Defoe's *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters* (1702). Defoe's pseudo-autobiographical narratives make him one of the most important practitioners of prose *prosopopæia* of his age. For the most part, however, "hoaxes" like *The Journal of the Plague Year* were not purely satiric, and did not require that they be

---

73 *The English Rogue Described* (London. 1665) sig. [A2'].

74 *Proteus Redivivus: Or the Art of Wheedling* (London. 1675) sigs. [A2'].

75 See *Proteus Redivivus* sig. [A4']. Head lost all control of his own creation when four separate spurious continuations were published between 1668 and 1681; see DNB.
exposed in order that they should succeed. Paradoxically, Defoe's mock High-Church pamphlet succeeded all the more because it was initially accepted as genuine: nonetheless, had it not been revealed as a satiric prosopopoeia, Defoe might have found himself in the uncomfortable position of having actually lent support to his enemies. For this reason, *The Shortest Way* relied for its final effect upon the revelation that it was, in fact, a forgery. In fact, as Defoe himself admitted in 1705, "the Piece, in its Outward Figure, look'd so Natural, and was as like a Brat of their own begetting, that like two Apples, they could not know them asunder." As a result, those who had eagerly defended the extreme hard line that the pamphlet took against Dissenters found themselves embarrassed by the revelation that their own views could accommodate those generated by Defoe's satiric hyperbole. Defoe's pamphlet is, in this sense, an unintentional literary hoax. Like all hoaxes it needed to be penetrated before its effects could be felt.

John Dunton, in his *Life and Errors*, suggests that Defoe's near-failure lay precisely in his unwillingness to stretch his irony too far:

76 Leon Guilhamet points out that it "relies too heavily on a single exaggerated proposal," and that once "this proposal is countenanced as plausible, there are no significant disruptions in the text to signal the existence of satire" (*Satire* 47). Satire is not effective until its intention is perceived: see however William E. Haas, "Some Characteristics of Satire," *SatN* 3 (1965): 1-3.

77 *Review*, 11 August, 1705. Bk. 4; Vol [II]: 277; in the discussion which follows, Defoe makes much of the willingness with which the High Churchmen "immediately fell in with the Project." See however "A Brief Explanation of a Late Pamphlet, Entitul'd, 'The Shortest Way with the Dissenters,'" in *The Shortest Way with the Dissenters* (London, [1703]) 17-20.

78 For the relation of the literary hoax to satire, see Highet, *Anatomy of Satire* 92-103, and Test 179-83. For a recent example, see Dale Spender's *The Diary of Elizabeth Pepys* (London: Grafton, 1991), which, as J. R. Philip notes, has fooled some librarians: see "An Innumerate President of the Royal Society?" *NRRSL* 48 (1994): 1. 8n2.

79 See Fielding's comments in *The Jacobite's Journal* for 26 March, 1748: growing "weary of personating a Character for which I have so solemn a Contempt," he notes that "tho'
had his Prudence only weigh'd a few Grains more, he'd certainly have writ his 
shortest way, a little more at length. There have been some men in all ages, who 
have taken that of Juvenal for their motto:

\[ \text{Aude aliquid brevibus Gyaris et carcere dignum} \]
\[ \text{Si vis esse aliquis}^{80} \]

Dunton's comment suggests an important point: Defoe's pamphlet was accepted as genuine 
because it did not adequately highlight its artificiality through hyperbole: it was, as Ian Watt has 
noted, "a masterpiece not of irony but of impersonation."^{81} His fictive High Church polemicist 
does not, like Juvenal's hypothetical villain, "'Something dare / Worthy the narrow Gyarus, or th' 
aire / Of a loath'd Jaile" (Holyday 3). On the contrary, the views expressed by the putative author 
of The Shortest Way were all too similar to those espoused by an important and influential faction 
in the Church: as David Ogg notes, many Tories "regarded the book as comparable with the 
bible; others thought that its author should be made a bishop; many earnest-minded churchmen 
welcomed this expression of their heart-felt convictions."^{82} This last phrase hints at the source of 
Defoe's difficulties: he had given voice to sentiments actually felt by his opponents. It is as 
though he had followed Ralph Johnson's directions for the construction of prosopopeia too 
carefully: he has sounded his subject's thoughts and feelings thoroughly, and expressed them with

---

Irony is capable of furnishing the most exquisite Ridculc: yet as there is no kind of Humour so 
liable to be mistaken, it is, of all others, the most dangerous to the Writer." The Jacobite's 


a misleading accuracy. While an unironic *prosopopæia* derives its authority from the plausibility of the representation, an ironic *prosopopæia* relies upon hyperbole and a calculated violation of *decorum personæ*. Decorum restricts irony because it denies the possibility of doubleness of meaning: a monarch, even a tyrannic and malignant Tamerlane, must speak "majestically." An ironic *prosopopæia*, however, involves an inversion of expectations: a poem satirizing the Duke of York must make him speak despicably, *despite* the rules of decorum: in effect, the cause and effect relationship of character and language are reversed, and our understanding of the speaker's qualities is forcibly made to conform with our impressions of the language that he or she employs.

In this context, Juvenal's ironic suggestion that the villain who desires notoriety should dare to do something truly despicable provides a useful model for the satirist. Not coincidentally, this theme is frequently mouthed by the ironically-conceived speakers of satiric *prosopopæia*. A number of Oldham's self-incriminating speakers, for example, reiterate Juvenal's satirical admonition in different words; the first and third *Satyrs upon the Jesuits*, as well as "Sardanapalus" (1681), are in a sense extended verse essays upon the theme.  

In the last named, a libertine lauds the Persian prince's unstinting pursuit of carnal love:

---

83 For an earlier example, see "The Copie of His Grace's Most Excellent Rotomontados. Sent by His Servant the Lord Grimes, in Answere to the Lower House of Parliament, 1628." in Fairholt 28-31. a *prosopopæia* describing Buckingham's arrogant defiance of the Commons.

Fates, do your worst, said'st thou.
Our Pr--k shall Reign in spite of you:
Not all your Heav'n shall bribe me from Delight.
Nor all your Thunder from my Pleasure fright.
Sink Nations. Kingdoms perish. Empire fall.
One thrust in Charming C--t shall over ballance all.
If I must dye, Clasping my Joys I'll go.
And boldly Swive my Passage to the Shades below:
And through all Ages. all Posterity,
This my sole Glory shall Recorded be;
No Monarch ever F--kd. or Dy'd like Me. (ll. 110-20)

More explicit in its indebtedness to Juvenal's *aude aliquid* is Oldham's "Ode. Suppos'd to be spoken by a Court-Hector at Breaking of the Dial in Privy-Garden" (1679): more popularly known as *A Satyr against Vertue*, the title under which it was first printed (in a pirated edition). Juvenal's lines appear as the prefatory tag to the poem. The poem, as the author's title indicates, is a verse *prosopopæia* in ironic support of vicious living. The unnamed "Court-Hector" whom we overhear espousing an Epicurean variety of libertinism is, as was commonly known. Rochester: he employs the occasion to give expression to a profoundly sceptical philosophy that values, above all else, extremes of action, thought, and experience:

---


85 For Rochester's assault upon the dial in the Privy Garden at Whitehall on June 25, 1675, see Aubrey 2: 34 and Marvell's "The Statue at Charing Cross" ll. 9-12.

86 Oldham knew Rochester: Wood says that he was befriended by the Earl while serving as usher at Croydon School (2: 751). One intriguing account subjoined to an ms. copy of the poem suggests that the theme "aude aliquid" was actually proposed to Oldham by "severall off the witts att court" who wished to test his skill at composition and invention. although this, as David M. Vieth has pointed out, seems unlikely. "John Oldham, the Wits, and *A Satyr against Vertue*," *PQ* 32 (1953): 91. The extract from the ms is quoted from Vieth's article. See also Raman Selden, "Rochester and Oldham: 'High Rants in Profaness,'" *SCent* 6 (1991): esp. 89-90.
Now curses on you all! ye vertuous Fools,
Who think to fetter free-born Souls.
And ty 'em up to dull Morality and Rules:
The Stagyrite be damn'd, and all the Crew
Of learned Ideots, who his Steps pursue.
And those more silly Proselytes, whom his fond Precepts drew (ll. 1-6)

Aristotle is decried as a thinker who reduced experience to measurable and immutable qualities, and (with the Ethics particularly in mind) human action to the observance of precepts of reason and morality. Our "Court-Hector," however, glories more in the transgression of laws and codes of conduct than in the exercise of true freedom. His exemplars of human greatness are those who have most spectacularly broken taboos. Herostratus, Fawkes, and Nero are his paradigms, but the great prototype is Cain, who is chided, ironically, for not having dared enough:

Had the just Fates design'd me in his stead.
I'd done some great and unexampled Deed;
    A Deed, which should decry
    The Stoicks dull Equality.
    And shew that Sin admits Transcendency:
    A Deed, wherein the Tempter should not share.
Above what Heav'n could punish, and above what he could dare:
    For greater Crimes then his I would have fell.
    And acted somewhat, which might merit more then Hell. (ll. 286-94)

Curiously, although the rhetoric employed here by "Rochester" is virtually identical to that of Garnet and Loyola in Satyrs upon the Jesuits. A Satyr against Vertue was misinterpreted by some contemporary readers. At least one work, entitled A Pindarique Ode, Describing the Excellency of True Virtue, with Reflexions on the Satyr against Virtue (1679), was published as a "reply" to the pirated edition of the poem, and sought to refute its pernicious and vicious arguments. The publisher of the piracy appears to have been aware of the potential for

87 A Pindarique Ode (London, 1679). The poem is a close refutation of Oldham's satire, and includes notes referring the reader to particular passages. See also Robert Bell's note in The
misinterpretation, prefacing the edition with a note "To the Reader" that suggests that it could not "do much hurt, for that there are but few will understand it: and for the more ingenious. I hope. they will make better use of it." Oldham himself seems to have felt it necessary to correct the impression that the poem was a straight-forward attack upon virtue, and appended to his poem "An Apology for the Foregoing Ode. by Way of Epilogue" in which he protests that his Muse "only acted here in Masquerade" (l. 4); this was actually published along with the pirated edition of A Satyr against Vertue. When the authorized version of the poem was printed with Satyrs upon the Jesuits, he added to the volume's "Advertisement" a further gloss on the poem:

\[
\text{though the World has given it the Name of the Satyr against Vertue, he [the author] declares 'twas never design'd to that intent, how apt soever some may be to wrest it. And this appears by what is said after it, and is discernable enough to all, that have the sense to understand it. 'Twas meant to abuse those, who valued themselves upon their Wit and Parts in praising Vice . . . (3-4)}
\]

There is no record of anyone having misread the intention of Satyrs upon the Jesuits, and yet these do not feature less violent or hyperbolic rhetoric than A Satyr against Vertue. Ironically, Oldham's mistake lay in his choice of speaker: Rochester's reputation, established in part by his own violent and extreme satires, was such that it was easy to attribute to him even the most exaggerated opinions and language. As was the case with Defoe's The Shortest Way, Oldham's poem confused some of its readers because it maintained too strict a degree of decorum personae.

---


88 A Satyr against Vertue (London, 1679) sig. [A1']

89 As though to prove his contrition for the poem, Oldham later published still another apologetic, entitled "Counterpart to the Satyr against Vertue (1683), explicitly spoken "In Person of the Author," an interesting and suggestive touch. See Hammond, "Anonymity" 128-29.
Oldham's portraits of Rochester in *A Satyr against Vertue* is but one of the more notable, and more successful, attempts to draw a verse portrait through *prosopopeia* of the foremost libertine and court poet of the age.\(^9^0\) Most interesting of all of these, however, is Rochester's own self-portrait in "To the Post Boy" (1676). Rochester is often praised for his ability to recreate the rhythms and language of idiomatic speech.\(^9^1\) Robert Wolseley, in his Preface to Rochester's adaptation of *Valentinian*, attested to the "strang facility he had to talk to all Capacities in their own Dialect."\(^9^2\) He achieves by means of this talent more than a merely natural and conversational quality of verse, for he is able to reproduce an individualized discourse that evokes different speakers and divergent perspectives.\(^9^3\) At the same time, he displayed a penchant for disguise and self-dramatization: his best fictional creations are, like his Artemiza, always extremely self-aware, conscious of the roles which they adopt and then discard. "To the Post

---

\(^9^0\) See also his "A Dithyrambique on Drinking: Suppos'd to be Spoken by Rochester at the Guinny-Club" (1683).

\(^9^1\) Jeremy Treglown claims that Rochester was the first to make satires which "sound like someone talking." "He Knew My Style He Swore." in Treglown, ed., *Spirit of Wit* 84. James Sutherland lauds Rochester's "ability to reproduce contemporary dialogue" (English Literature 172), while William Bowman Piper calls Rochester's couplets more conversational than oratorical: see *The Heroic Couplet* (Cleveland: The P of Case Western Reserve U. 1969) 318.

\(^9^2\) *Valentinian: A Tragedy* (London. 1685) sig. [A4'].

Boy" begins in mid-rant, the poet exulting in his own viciousness:

Son of A whore God dam you can you tell
A Peerless Peer the Readiest way to Hell?
Ive out swilld Baccus sworn of my own make
Oaths wod fright furies and make Pluto quake.
Ive swived more whores more ways than Sodoms walls
Ere knew or the College of Romes Cardinalls.
Witnes Heroick scars, look here nere go
Sear cloaths and ulcers from the top to toe. (ll. 1-8)

The last lines of the passage quoted present a mock-heroic portrait of the speaker similar to that of "The Disabled Debauchee" (probably roughly contemporary with "To the Post Boy"). while also anticipating Oldham's "Sardanapalus": indeed, Rochester's speech here might have been lifted straight out of this or A Satyr against Vertue. That the lines are spoken by Rochester in propria persona (something not necessarily true of "The Disabled Debauchee" or Rochester's other vaguely autobiographical pieces) is proven by explicit reference to the "Downs Affair" at Epsom where, on the 17 June, 1675, a drinking companion of Rochester was killed by the watch while attempting to prevent a fight between the young lord and a constable:

Frighted at my own mischeifs I have fled
And bravely left my lifes defender dead.
Broke houses to break chastity and died
That floor with murder which my lust denied. (ll. 9-12)

Rochester speaks of his disgraceful exploits with something like pride: yet, the effect upon the reader here is surely one of disapproval if not of disgust. It quickly becomes clear that Rochester has here created an ironic, self-condemning speaker, deliberately identified as himself.

94 According to Charles Hatton, the incident was the conclusion to an extended debauch by Rochester, Etherege, and others: after Downs had been struck "with a sprittle staff" which "cleft his scull," Rochester "and the rest run away, and Downs, having noe sword, snatched up a sticke and striking at them, they run him into the side with a halfe pike" (1: 133-34).
whose language operates in a manner exactly analogous to that of Oldham's versions of "Rochester." Rochester is, in fact, using *prosopopœdia* to generate a complex self-portrait: he is mimicking himself, and creating in the process an ironic distance between a poet and a speaker who are, nonetheless, one and the same person. The whole effect reaches a climax with a final crescendo of self-accusation that seems composed of equal parts pride and self-loathing:

```
Pox on it why do I speak of these poor things?
I have blasphemed my god and libelled Kings;
The readiest way to Hell come quick --
```

Boy nere stir
The readiest way my Lords by Rochester. (ll. 13-16)

That the poem is by Rochester himself complicates our response, and our reactions to what the poet says are in conflict with our awareness that this is a self-portrait: we are perplexed by Rochester's eagerness to damn himself. Modern readers, with expectations shaped by the Romantic tradition, are particularly liable to feel confused about Rochester's intentions.

"To the Post Boy" is not, however, a lyric or confessional poem. The sudden and unexpected interruption of the poet's monologue by the "Boy" to whom the poem is addressed creates a new context and perspective, as the apparently direct and unmediated address of the poet to the reader is abruptly transformed into a dialogue. The effect is to produce a sudden distance between us and the poet's furious bluster that accentuates both our critique of what he is saying and our understanding of the means by which he has chosen to say it. We are thrust backwards from a direct apprehension of the poet's words to one newly framed within a quasi-dramatic context, our own responses echoed, not by the poet, but by the "Boy": it is as though

---

Rochester is now dramatizing the reader. This represents a startling inversion of the technique employed by Oldham and others: the more traditional form of ironic prosopopœia masks the author's meaning behind an appropriated voice. Here, the author's own voice is the mask, and the true "meaning" of the poem finds direct and unironic expression instead through the personated voice of another. In "To the Post Boy," then, it is not merely a conventionalized "satirist" who is satirized, but rather the author himself. Prosopopœia is employed to dramatize a disjunction between poet's voice, and the poet's meaning.

Satire is a genre that, paradoxically, employs an often brazen dishonesty (critics with discretion call this "hyperbole") in the service of morality: arguably, satiric prosopopœia, with its close kinship to outright forgery, is the most dishonest satiric mode of all. But if a bare-faced forgery like Clarendon's A Letter from a True and Lawfull Member of Parliament represents one possible extreme to which the genre may be taken, Rochester's "To the Post Boy" represents the opposite, for it was clearly intended to explore, rather than merely exploit, the complexities of the relationship between voice and character, expression and meaning. For the most part, the satirist who employed prosopopœia preferred to leave such issues unexamined. While it is true that ironic prosopopœia requires that the artifice of the form be to some degree laid bare, ensuring that the reader is aware of the intended doubleness of meaning, polemic and didactic satire generally fails in its effect when too much light is cast upon the means by which the satirist accomplishes his or her ends. Too much honesty, and too much attention to form, divert attention away from the

---

96 The addition of this new perspective is a characteristic strategy. Rochester seems to have required the intercession of other voices to provide him with alternate perspectives. We see Rochester's apparent need for dialogue in his correspondence with Charles Blount and in his summoning of Burnet before his death. See Burnet, Some Passages of the Life and Death of John Earl of Rochester (London, 1680) esp. 30-34.
satire's instructive purpose; more significantly, they also introduce the embarrassing issues of the satirist's personal responsibility, perspective, and character into our understanding of the poem.

Indeed, *prosopopoeia*’s appeal as a satiric tool derives precisely from the way in which it distances the satire from the agency of the satirist, permitting other voices to give expression to unpleasant "truths." Rochester's "To the Post Boy" is a fascinating miniature masterpiece precisely because it employs *prosopopoeia* to bridge that distance, and to re-establish the responsibility of the satirist for the creation of his or her invective attack.
Chapter 3

"The Pleasant Reproofs of a Gentleman": Horace and Ethos

Many who championed the didactic and aesthetic values of poetry were anxious to distance "legitimate" verse from the sometimes disreputable art of invective. Joshua Poole was one such: his verse Proem to The English Parnassus contrasts satire and "true" poetry:

And though you may perchance meet some of those
That in a Satyr of their dough-bak'd Prose,
Not able to reach further, lash the horse
They cannot sit, and whilst they rudely force
Their waspish language to disgrace the fount.
The horse-hoof-made, scorning the sacred Mount,
Too high for them to climb, turn horse themselves,
And kick in vain . . .

Poole focuses his assault upon the aesthetic worth of the genre: satirists lack the wit to reach truly poetic heights, while satire is barely poetry at all and more akin to "dough-bak'd Prose." Invective by its very nature is unpoetic: "They never understood, which can dispraise" (sig. [A7]). There was a rhetorical tendency, born of the Ciceronian discussion of content and style, res and verba, to believe that satire's malicious intent, and its "waspish language" were inextricably related. Peter E. Medine, citing Polydore Vergil's suggestion that satire is "very railing," has noted that "such a view of satire implies that it is esthetically -- and perhaps even morally -- suspect." Surprisingly, satirists themselves frequently seem to accede to this

---

1 The English Parnassus (London, 1677) sigs. [A6'-7'].

2 In Casaubon, Prolegomena 271. See also Casaubon's De Satyrica 344-56.
contention, and granted that satire was more truly like prose than verse.¹ For authority, satirists could look to Horace, who frequently belittles his own invective verse.² Thus, in the fourth satire of his first book, he modestly admits that "I'me no Poet" because "my numerous feet enclose / Such plain familiar Talk, and almost Prose" (Creech 390).³ Horace's stylistic technique does frequently seem like prose: as Thomas Sprat noted of Horace's verse technique, "the Verse seems to be loose, and near to the plainness of common Discourse."⁴

In the tenth satire of the first book, a sequel or elaboration upon his fourth satire, Horace claims that satire need not be good poetry. While Lucilius' "Muse / Is incorrect, his way of Writing loose." "His Wit" is nonetheless "as sharp as ever lash't the Town" (Creech 415). Lucilius was a better satirist than himself: "I would not strive to blast his just renown. / He wears and best deserves to wear the crown" (417). Horace's defence of Lucilius' uneven verse technique rests, in

³ See Kernan. Cankered Muse 2-4, 16-18, and the characterization of the verse lampoons of Hugh, 3rd Viscount Cholmondeley, in "To Cap' Warcop" (1686) as written, not "in smooth Verse, but rough ill natur'd Prose." BL MS Harl. 7319 f.197: Wilson 159-65. Samuel Wesley opined that in satire "Prosaic Lines are Pardonable" (Epistle to a Friend 27. ll. 1034-35).

⁴ See Witke 57-59. Philip Francis argued that Horace believed that "a Satirist and a Poet were extremely different characters: and that the Language of Poetry was as unnatural to the Morality of a Satire, as a low, familiar Style to the Majesty of an Epic Poem." The Satires of Horace (London, 1746) xii. H. W. Garrod did not wish "to intrude" Horace's satires into his Oxford Book of Latin Verse (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912), "where Horace himself would have known them to be out of place" (v-vi). Cited in Richard Jenkyns. Three Classical Poets (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard UP, 1982) 151.

⁵ See also Persius' "Prologue": Persius denies that he is "A Poet by Infused art," and is embarrassed to bring "this my rude line. / Vnto Apollo's sacred shrine" (Holyday 292).

part, on the familiar contention that satire neither requires, nor indeed, allows, the employment of smoother verse: Lucilius' "Subject won't permit. / More even Verse" (417). Horace's Satire I. 10 can be profitably compared, as was surely intended, with Dryden's lines on John Oldham:

What could advancing Age have added more?
It might (what Nature never gives the young)
Have taught the numbers of thy native Tongue.
But Satyr needs not those, and Wit will shine
Through the dull cadence of a rugged line.
A noble Error, and but seldom made,
When Poets are by too much force betray'd. (ll. 12-18)

Like Lucilius, Oldham chose a verse technique that harmonized with his subject matter: the roughness of his verse is involuntary, the result of having been "betray'd" by the "force" demanded by his chosen genre. There is, however, in both poems a complexity of tone and an element of condescension, that suggests that both Horace and Dryden are being generous to a fault.⁷ Horace's protestations of respect for Lucilius are deliberately weak, and tend paradoxically to highlight his criticisms of the earlier poet;⁸ Dryden, for his part, leaves the impression that, while satire "needs not" a polished poetic finish, it would nevertheless be greatly improved by its addition. Both poets implicitly reject the notion that satire must, of necessity, employ rough or crude language: satire, too, should display artfulness.

A fair proportion of Horace's argument in Satire I. 10 is devoted to an explication of his


understanding of the form that artfulness should take. The satirist should adopt the plain style (his advice here echoes his Ars Poetica). 9 "He must be short, nor must He clog his sense / With useless words, or make his Periods long. / They must be smooth, and so glide o're the Tongue" (415). A recurrent theme concerns the reduction of unnecessary ornament. While the word "Sense" that appears in Creech's translation is not in the original Latin, it is certainly a value implied throughout Horace's poem: ornate poetic qualities, the "useless words" and long "Periods," are to be sacrificed in the interests of ensuring that the satirist's sense is clearly understood. Horace's style is actually much less ornate than Juvenal's, a fact that, as William Kupersmith has pointed out, escaped those seventeenth-century critics who confused a rough satirical attitude with rough style (Roman Satirists 132). 10 As Mulgrave remarked in An Essay upon Poetry of satire that was "as the Subject rough": "This great work must be more exactly made. / And sharpest thoughts in smoothest words convey'd" (Essay upon Poetry 9).

The theory of stylistic decorum, which underwrites Horace's argument, is founded upon the identification of three levels of style, generally attributed to Theophrastus, but, as Renato Barilli has noted, already implicit in Aristotle's contention that style should be appropriate to subject matter. 11 As Aristotle describes the concept in the third book of his Rhetoric, "Decorum in Elocution is, if it be moving, if Moral and Sententious, if accommodated and proportionable to

9 "An honest Judg will blame each idle line. / And tell you, you must make the Cloudy shine; / Show you what Words are harsh, blot out the rough" (Creech 568).


the business. For it will not be proportionable, if it neither speak *ex tempore* and slightly of great things; nor loftily of mean things, nor bestow too much Trimming upon an ordinary word*

(*Aristotle's Rhetoric* 180-01; III.vii.1-2). Because Horatian satire ridicules follies, not great vices, a plain style is preferable. As Heinsius asserted, "Those who love full and sonorous verse and who play the orator in their argument when their subject-matter is mundane and prosaic, are the most troublesome fools." John Dennis made a similar point: "in Satyr the thoughts ought to be more simple, and the expressions less magnificent" (*Miscellanies* sig. [A8r]).

Horace's plain style was appropriate to his subject matter and avoided the obscurity that a more ornate poetic diction and syntax could confer. Dacier, for one, seems to have thought of Horace as an extremely simple writer to comprehend: "To make us understand the Terms he uses, to explain the Figures he employs, and to conduct the Reader safely through the Labyrinth of a difficult Expression, or obscure *Parenthesis*, is no great matter to perform" (sig. [B6r]). This aspect of Horace's satires was particularly admired throughout the seventeenth-century. In 1608, Lævinus Torrentius accentuated the lucidity of Horace's arguments, and their didactic value, over their poetic worth: "you will not find subtle disputations or cunning syllogisms, but almost all the rules that enable profane man to progress towards living a right, holy, peaceful, and blessed

---

12 Horace borrowed the association of satire with plain style from Lucilius, who developed it as part of his Stoic programme: see George Converse Fiske. *Lucilius and Horace: A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation* (Madison: U of Wisconsin P. 1920) 76ff. However, Horace's repudiation of invective was the source of one difference between the two satirists, for Lucilian invective is related to the grand, rather than plain, style; see Fiske 114-16. See also Witke 8-9.

13 Quoted from Selden, *English Verse Satire* 43.
manner disclosed and arranged"\textsuperscript{14} Dacier complained that commentators on Horace had spent too much time examining the poetic qualities of his verse, and not exerted enough effort explicating his moral themes. "as if Horace had writ meerly to have his Language understood, and rather to divert, than to instruct us... when it produces no Action, 'tis only a vain amusement, which idly tickles the Ear, without ever reaching the Heart" (sigs. [B5'-6']).

"Juvenal was the greater Poet." Dryden asserted, but "The Meat of Horace is more nourishing" ("Discourse" 65): the plain style was better calculated to instruct than to please.

Dryden's remarks in the Preface to Religio Laici (1682) make the distinctions clear:

The Expressions of a Poem, design'd purely for Instruction, ought to be Plain and Natural, and yet Majestick: for here the Poet is presum'd to be a kind of Law-giver, and those three qualities I have nam'd are proper to the Legislative style. The Florid, Elevated and Figurative way is for the Passions: for Love and Hatred, Fear and Anger, are begotten in the Soul by shewing their Objects out of their true proportion: either greater than the Life, or less: but Instruction is to be given by shewing them what they naturally are. A Man is to be cheated into Passion, but to be reason'd into Truth. (243).

While Dryden's Horatian model for Religio Laici was the Epistles rather than the Sermones, this description of the "Legislative style" applies to Horace's satires, for these too show things as "what they naturally are."\textsuperscript{15} The employment of such a style for satire legitimized the genre by implying that the poet was speaking the unalloyed truth without recourse to rhetorical tricks or

\textsuperscript{14} Lævinus Torrentius. "De Q. Horatii Vita ac Scriptis." Q. Horatius Flaccus, cum erudito Lævini Torrentii Commentario (Antwerp, 1608) sig. [***2']. Quoted from Thomas E. Maresca, Pope's Horatian Poems ([Columbus]: Ohio State UP, 1966) 33n.19.

\textsuperscript{15} The Horatian epistle is closely related to the sermo. As Leon Guilhamet notes, "Conventional wisdom held that satires were chiefly to attack vice and drive it out: epistles, on the other hand, had the function of inculcating virtue" (Satire 44). See also Knoche 89-90, and Howard D. Weinbrot, Alexander Pope and the Traditions of Formal Verse Satire (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1982) 170-200.
poetic ornament: readers, the Horatian satirist promised, would be "reason'd into Truth." rather than "cheated into Passion." This is the pretence of more than one lampoon:

This way of writing I observe by some
Is introduced with an Exordium
But I will leave to make all that adoe
And in plain English tell you who sucks who.\(^{16}\)

Satiric verse that posed as "plain English" was able to exploit the reputation that prose was developing as a more truthful or scientifically objective medium. As K. G. Hamilton has pointed out, the "association of prose with the new emphasis on an exact, scientific correspondence between words and actual concrete objects or forces might be seen as placing prose in clearer opposition to poetry with its 'fictional' basis."\(^{17}\) Satire that adopted the guise of prose was better able to generate the all-important illusion of veracity and objectivity.

At the same time, Horace's plain style lent to his verse a conversational ease which put the reader at ease and enhanced his credibility. One of the reasons that Horace gives for disclaiming the title of poetry is his colloquial, conversational style: to write only "as we / Do naturally speak" is not "Poetry" (Brome 207). Horace, it should be remembered, chose to entitle his satiric poems *Sermones* or conversations, rather than satires, and the rhythms of his verse frequently seem to approximate those of genteel conversation.\(^{18}\) The satirist's attacks on folly are not, this conversational ease implied, the manifestations of malicious spite, but instead, in Sprat's words.

\(^{16}\) BL MS Harl. 6913 f.132v; Wilson 81-85.


\(^{18}\) See Knoche 78, 80, and Coffey 68-69. An excellent discussion of the eighteenth-century ideal of the conversational style (which was particularly associated with Horace) can be found in Peter Dixon, *The World of Pope's Satires* (London: Methuen, 1968) 14-39 and passim.
the "pleasant reproofs of a Gentleman" (sig. "c2")], whose gentility, geniality, and urbanity make him one whose word can be trusted.

The Horatian plain style was attractive because it permitted the satirist to maintain the character of one who speaks out of rational concern and with objective insight. As Raman Selden notes, it features an "adherence to classical norms of 'rational' discourse (that is, appealing to 'clarity,' 'common sense', 'moderation,' and 'sincerity')" (English Verse Satire 27). Horace's plain style, then, represents something more than a concern with decorum: it is a sign of a distinctive rhetorical strategy. Cicero, in Orator, suggests that each of the three styles can be employed by the rhetorician to sway the audience in different ways: "as the duties of an Orator, so the kinds of Elocution are three. The neat and accurate is used in proving; the moderately florid in delighting; and the vehement and impetuous in forcing the passions" (283-84: xxi.69). This description of the grand or "vehement" style implies the use of highly rhetorical stratagems aimed to incite the passions of the auditor: such a style, to repeat Dryden's phrase, "cheated" the reader "into Passion." Horace's plain style, on the contrary, repudiates an appeal to emotion, and works instead, in Cicero's words, by "proving" (in probando). This is, of course, a polite fiction: the plain style is in some ways more duplicitous than the grand, for it uses art, in Horace's own famous formulation, to hide art. It recognizes the great truth that Quintilian was later to articulate: "a curious choice of Periods makes a Speaker's Sincerity suspected, and the more Art he discovers, the less Credit he obtains" (298; IX.iii.102).

As terms like "Sincerity," and "Credit" might suggest, the most important resource made

---

19 See also Aristotle's Rhetoric: we should "not seem to speak fictitiously but naturally. For the one gains credit, the other the contrary" (170; III.ii.4).
available by the plain style is the personality of the poet. The plain style allows Horace to adopt the pose of the honest and reasonable man who relies upon the soundness of his case rather than upon the force of his eloquence. He is, above all else, reasonable, for his dialogical method gives at least the illusion that his argument is being reasoned out by means of something akin to the Socratic method. More important even than this, however, the Horace of the satires seems an attractive and likable character: Howard Weinbrot has characterized the Horatian satirist as "the reasonable man accommodating himself, but not normally lowering himself, to a fallible and treacherous world, with dignity and pride" (Pope xiii-xiv). Horace maintained this impression even while apparently refusing to take himself too seriously: in satire I. 10, he playfully suggests that "I sport my self with writing Lines, which ne're / Are spoken in Apollo's Temple . . ." (Brome 234). Such shows of jesting self-deprecation merely enhanced his attractiveness. Rapin argued that Horace's good nature enhanced his credibility and effectiveness: "the sporting of wit, hath more effect than the strongest reasons, and the most sententious discourse, to render Vice ridiculous": Juvenal "scarce persuades at all; because he is always in choler, and never speaks in cold blood" (138). Juvenal's outraged indignation damages his credibility because it leaves him vulnerable to charges of subjectivity or even malice, while Horace approaches his subject coolly, and attracts us to his opinions by means of his reasonableness and good humour. In 1728, Edward Young, echoing Rapin, argued that Horace "appears in good humour while he censures: and therefore his censure has the more weight, as supposed to proceed from Judgment, not from Passion" (Love of Fame sig. [A4r]).

Such views are founded upon the perception of Horace's

---

20 See also Richard Steele's comments in Spectator 422 (for July 4, 1712) 3: 182.
employment of rhetorical *ethos*.

The *locus classicus* for the discussion of the role of *ethos* in oratory is Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. Here, Aristotle discusses rhetorical proofs. Artificial proofs, which derive from the excellence of the oration, are of three kinds: *ethos* resides "in the Manners of the Speaker." *pathos* is "in the disposition of the Hearer," and logical proof is "in the Oration itself, by virtue of its Demonstration or Probability of Demonstration." *Ethos, pathos, and logos* are necessary components of all orations, and are employed in varying degrees according to the specific needs of the case; *ethos*, or "Manners," was, however, the most effective of the three:

Convincement by manner is when the Oration is so pronounced that the Orator may be thought a person worthy to be credited. For we believe the Vertuous more easily and sooner, and barely in all things; but absolutely in these things where there is not that Certainty, but a suspense of Judgment, and difficulty of Determination, in regard of the various opinions of Men. (8: I.ii.3-4)

The orator, Aristotle insisted, must appear to be endowed with "Prudence, Vertue, Benevolence": "Therefore if they be but thought to be endow'd with all these Vertues, of necessity he must be thought a Person of Credit by his Hearers" (85-86; II.i.5-7).

In Roman rhetorical works, Aristotle's tripartite division of artificial proofs was adjusted somewhat; in Quintilian's account, *pathos*, "Affections or Passions," is paired with *ethos*. "MANNERS," and both characterized as kinds of emotion, "the former the violent and warm, the latter, the mild and gentle": "The former give us Emotion, the latter Composure; the one

---


22 See George Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton: Princeton UP. 1963) 90-91 and passim. Kennedy points out (91, 94) that *ethos* and *pathos* had been traditionally associated only with the *prooemium* and *peroration* respectively: Aristotle's promotion of both to essential elements of proof is an index of their importance.
overpowers, the other persuades us: the one hurries us into Disorder, the other attracts us into Benevolence” (2: 28; VI.i.9-10). Quintilian comes much closer to Aristotle’s conception of ethos, however, when he begins to discuss the specific effect of ethical proof upon the audience:

it is distinguished by GOODNESS, not only of the mild and gentle, but of the cheerful, benevolent, Kind: such as pleases and charms the Attention: And the great Property of its Expression consists in its seeming to flow from the Nature of Men and Things, that the Manners of an Orator shine through, and are characterised by. his Discourse. (2: 29; VI.ii.13)

The observation that “the great Property” of ethos “consists in its seeming to flow from the Nature of Men and Things” suggests the extent to which the character of the speaker, orator, or poet, can create a (possibly specious) illusion of objectivity and reasonableness. This is precisely the effect achieved by Horace in his satires.

It is perhaps a little surprising to find the notion of ethos so little discussed in the rhetorical manuals of the seventeenth-century. While it is probable that many seventeenth-century rhetoricians felt it unnecessary to discuss ethos in any depth, given the wealth of material on it available in classical sources, another reason may be found in the lingering influence of Ramist doctrines. Ramism was no longer the dominant force in rhetoric by the time of the Restoration: nevertheless, Ramus’ division of inventio, including artificial proofs such as ethos and pathos, from elocutio, and his delegation of the former to the study of logic, undoubtedly had an effect on

---

23 Quintilian also blurs ethos with mores, implying that the former means, in effect, virtue, an idea that dovetails with his view of the orator as the vir bonus, but that undermines the importance of ethical proof as a persuasive strategy: see 2: 28; VI.ii, and 2: 30; VI.ii.

24 See also Tatler 242: “There is a certain Impartiality necessary to make what a Man says bear any Weight, with those he speaks to. This Quality... is never seen but in Good-natured Men” (3: 243).
the way in which rhetorical treatises of the period dealt with the subject of ethical proof. One corollary was the prevalence of formulary rhetorics in the period, which dealt with the nuts and bolts of tropes and figures by providing elaborate examples; such an approach was ill-suited to the explication of the more subtle aspects of artificial proof. Another corollary was, as W. S. Howell has suggested, a tendency towards "a growing recognition of the inadequacy of artistic proof as a means of persuasion, and . . . the development of a belief in non-artistic proof as a better way to that goal" (375). In this sense, Ramism was abetted by developments in linguistics being elaborated by proponents of the New Science.

The apparent lack of interest in the notion of *ethos* displayed in the rhetorical handbooks of the late seventeenth-century is probably misleading: the prevalent view expressed throughout the period and into the eighteenth-century in less technical studies of speech, rhetoric, and poetics was that character was a vitally important weapon in the arsenal of the orator or poet. The comments of the Earl of Shaftesbury in his *Soliloquy: or Advice to an Author* (1710; reprinted in *Characteristicks* in 1711) are typical: the poet "must at least be speciously honest, and in all

25 See Alexander Richardson's *The Logicians School-Master* (London, 1657) "Preface," 11-12, and "Grammatical Notes," 2. Brian Vickers asserts that "one of the major features of rhetoric over its first fifteen hundred years . . . was an ever-increasing interest in elocutio or style, until medieval and Renaissance rhetoric was essentially stylistic." *Classical Rhetoric in English Poetry*, 2nd ed. rev. (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 1989) 41.

26 Walter J. Ong suggests that "formulary rhetorics" had no place in Ramist method because "all organization or structuring was purportedly dialectical or logical by its very nature." *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue*, 1958 (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard UP, 1983) 285. However, rhetoric having been stripped of all those component parts not related solely to style, diction, and other facets of "eloquence," the formulary rhetoric was a logical form through which to teach what remained of the art.

appearance a Friend to Virtue, throughout his Poem" (1: 278). One of the fullest discussions of this highly traditional concept is to be found, paradoxically, in the revisionist rhetoric of Bernard Lamy. That most of his remarks upon the subject are to be found within the shorter work subjoined to *The Art of Speaking*, entitled "A Discourse, in which is given an Idea of the Art of Perswasion." underlines the nature of *ethos* as a persuasive strategy, rather than as a mere adjunct of the orator as "good man." Lamy argues that when "Reason is too weak," but the auditors "not fond of the truth" or "perverse in their inclinations, and prepossess'd by their Passions." we may then lawfully "infuse such Motions into them as may bring them to our side: Wherefore the Masters in that Art have owned three ways of Perswading: Arguments, Manners, and Passion" (343-44). These have, of course, been lifted directly from Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, and correspond respectively to *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos*. His faith in the efficacy of *ethos* is evident throughout this work: because "It is of importance that an Auditory has an esteem for the person who speaks," the orator must "pretend it is pure zeal to their Interest that prompts him to speak" (353: see also 370). Lamy is not entirely comfortable with the use of *ethos* as subterfuge: like Cicero and Quintilian, he believed that *ethos* was most effective if an accurate reflection of the speaker's true character. As his modern editor John T. Harwood notes, Lamy actually "stresses the dangers of false eloquence and the pre-eminence of the speaker's own virtue" (147): he knows that "very ill use may be made of this Art.": "One may pretend love for his Hearers, to conceal some ill design that his hatred has prompted him to meditate against them: One may put on the face of an Honest man, only to delude those who have a reverence for the least appearance of truth" (359). The dilemma is a familiar one: the notion of the rhetorician as *vir bonus* is not really consistent
with the existence of an art of rhetoric, which teaches rhetorical subterfuge.  

Ironically, it is the satirists themselves who most clearly articulate these dangers. Milton's Satan is a particularly adept master at the use of ethical proof: his assumption of animal disguises in Eden is a literalized image of his rhetorical strategy. Dryden's portrayal of Achitophel's oratory in *Absalom and Achitophel* owes much to Milton, and similarly incorporates a critique of *ethos*.  

Achitophel is a master orator, and his use of "studied Arts" (l. 228) to corrupt Absalom provides the reader with a demonstration of the effectiveness of ethical proof. In particular, our attention is drawn to Achitophel's manner and presentation of self by virtue of the fact that we have just been given the poet's "objective" portrait of him in the preceding lines, which undercuts the effectiveness of Achitophel's *ethos* even while impressing upon us its effectiveness. Almost as impressive is the display of Absalom's own rhetorical powers, and he proves himself an

---

28 Peter Dixon writes of Cato's formulation of the orator as *vir bonus dicendi peritus* that "The classical champions of rhetoric were unshaken in their adherence to this definition, in their conviction that goodness is a prerequisite of the true orator. But their firmness is an attempt to disguise an underlying anxiety; it obliquely testifies to the existence of a counter-definition -- that the orator is quite as likely to be a wicked man, manipulating his hearers for evil purposes." *Rhetoric, The Critical Idiom* 19 (London and New York: Methuen, 1971) 16.


30 Shaftesbury had a reputation as an effective speaker: John Dean's *The Wine Cooper's Delight* (London, 1681), portraying Shaftesbury, by way of a pun upon Ashley Cooper, as a Wine Cooper, likens the effectiveness of his rhetoric to the intoxication of a "heavenly Liquor."

accomplished student of Achitophel's methods when he successfully sways the people to his cause. Here, the employment of *ethos* is even more marked, as Absalom exploits all his rhetorical powers to project an attractive personality:  

> Th'admiring Crowd are dazled with surprize,  
> And on his goodly person feed their eyes:  
> His Joy conceal'd, he sets himself to show:  
> On each side bowing popularly low:  
> His looks, his gestures, and his words he frames,  
> And with familiar ease repeats their Names.  
> Thus, form'd by Nature, furnish'd out with Arts.  
> He glides unfelt into their secret hearts:  
> Then, with a kind compassionate look,  
> And sighs, bespeaking pity ere he spok.  
> Few words he said; but easy those and fit:  
> More slow than *Hybla* drops, and far more sweet. (ll. 686-97)

The falseness of Absalom's rhetoric is suggested by its every circumstance within the poem: his ability to glide "unfelt into their secret hearts." with its parodic allusion to the love of Christ, suggests the extent to which Absalom is exploiting *ethos* to evil ends. The speech which follows contains very little material content: Absalom's task here is not to persuade the mob to any particular action or decision, but rather to attach their affections to his own person, to set "himself  

---

32 Cf. the description of Absalom's popular arts in *Absalom's Conspiracy* (London, 1680) and Schilling's discussion (156) of this theme as prefigured in Nathaniel Carpenter's *Achitophel or the Wicked Politician* (1627); see also Harth, *Pen for a Party* 38-40. For a Whig description of the success of Monmouth's public-relations tour through the West Counties, see *A True Narrative of the Duke of Monmouth's Late Journey into the West* ([London], 1681).

to show." It is appropriate that his first word is the first person pronoun singular:

I mourn, my Countrymen, your lost Estate;
Tho far unable to prevent your fate:
Behold a Banished man, for your dear cause
Expos'd a prey to Arbitrary laws!
Cut off from Empire, and no more a Son!

The real subject of this speech is Absalom himself: its purpose is nothing more than to establish for its speaker an attractive ethos. The result is predictable: an ignorant mob is turned against their lawful king, and the seeds of rebellion are sown. As harmless as ethical proof might seem in the politically complacent satires of Horace, its ambivalent nature, and its potential for abuse, was obvious to the seventeenth-century student of poetry and rhetoric.

"Unbloody Conquests": Ethical Proof in Seventeenth-Century Satire

I Have been (Sir) where so many Puritans dwell.
That there are only more of them in Hell:
Where silence'd Ministers even were met
To make a Synod, and may make one yet. (Cowley II. I-4)

Abraham Cowley's attack on Nonconformist preachers and parishioners in The Puritans Lecture (1642) commences on a reassuringly Horatian note of moderation: the poem, an epistle to a sympathetic friend, is to be polite, restrained, and decorous. As Thomas O. Calhoun has suggested, "The narrator and the unnamed 'Sir' to whom the letter is addressed implicitly share a

---

34 Weinbrot notes that Absalom's extensive use of "I," "me," and "my" in the speech to Achitophel represents a breaking of community and filial ties. "'Natures Holy Bands' in Absalom and Achitophel: Fathers and Sons, Satire and Change" (Eighteenth-Century Satire 87).

point of view which is reasonable, learned, conservative, and patriotic." As such, the narrator may have seemed something of an anomaly, for of the two major classical models available to satirists in the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century, Juvenal was by far the most popular: the hallmark of contemporary verse invective was, accordingly, a tone of unrelenting violence and vituperation that grew more marked with the advent of the struggle between Parliament and King.

Horatian satire had its admirers among the Elizabethans. Hugh Walker notes that Horace provided Thomas Wyatt with his model (60-61). Thomas Lodge's *A Fig for Momus* (1595) experiments with the Juvenalian satirical mode by adding touches of Horace: his "Satyre. 4." for example, features a casual autobiographical voice reminiscent of the Horatian epistle:

I Heare of late (but hould it verie strange)  
(That such vaine newes is common in the change)  
How being old, and drawing to the graue.  
Thou waxest greedie, and desir'st to saue:  
As if thy life of sorrowes had no store.  
But thou in policie shouldst purchase more?  
Alas for thee, that at thy iournies end  
Art growne so neere and carefull what to spend.  


39 See also Alden 55-59: Bernard Harris notes that Drant was another early Horatian (177).

40 *A Fig for Momus* (London, 1595) sig. [E4*]: an inverted "n" has been corrected.
As Raman Selden suggests, even Lodge's renderings of passages lifted directly from Juvenal "give us a re-creation of Juvenal in the image of a native Horace" (English Verse Satire 57-58). Another satirist who chose to dabble with Horatian satire was Joseph Hall: Virgidemiae, containing as it did three books of "tooth-less Satyrs" (i.e. "Horatian" satire) and three of "byting satyres" (modeled on Juvenal) represents an early recognition that models other than Juvenal were available, although his "tooth-less Satyrs" were not, in any real sense, Horatian.  

A more important model for those who were attracted to Horatian satire was Ben Jonson, whose classicism was, as Wesley Trimpi has demonstrated, essentially Horatian. Jonson cultivated the plain style and employed as a favourite model Horace's Epistles, which he, following the lead of Casaubon, tended to conflate with the Sermones. Despite Jonson's extensive employment of Horatian language, forms, and ethos, vituperation remained an important element of his satire, only slightly obscured by the plain style personal voice favoured by Horace. Jonson was skilful enough to make a success of this strange melange of conflicting features: even "An Expostulation w'h Inigo Jones" (1631), possibly his most vituperative and "Juvenalian" attack.

---

41 See however Ejner J. Jensen, esp. 80-83. The extent to which Juvenalian conceptions of satire dominated the genre is suggested by Milton's attack upon Hall, in the course of the Smectymnuus controversy, for his "toothless satires," which Milton claimed, were a logical absurdity. See "Apology for Smectymnuus," Complete Prose 1: 916.

42 See Trimpi's Ben Jonson's Poems: A Study of the Plain Style (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1962) 159-67. In Jonson's The Poetaster (1601; pub. 1602), Horace represents the norm against which the abusive satire of Crispinus and Demetrius is measured: the play is an attack upon Marston and Dekker, both primarily Juvenalian satirists.

43 However, George Wither, in Abuses Stript and Whipt describes Jonson's as an elaborate satiric style: "Do not look for... the deepe conceits of now flourishing Johnson, no: say, tis honest plaine matter, and there's as much as I look for" (sig. [A7]).

upon the architect, artist, and masque-maker, exhibits, despite its impassioned tone, a very Horatian sense of self: "I am too fat to enuy him. He too leane / To be worth Enuy. Henceforth I doe meane / To pity him . . ." (8: 405; ll. 69-71).

Among those influenced by Jonson's successful blend of Horatian *ethos* and Juvenalian vigour was Cowley. The opening lines of *The Puritans Lecture* signal the poet's pursuit of the Horatian ideal, for the epistolary form permits a self-presentation that accentuates casual goodwill, genteel if informal manners, and an easy style. At the same time, fictional letters to unidentified friends cast the reader in the role of correspondent, with the result that we are seduced into an acceptance of the values articulated by the poet: the illusion of familiarity breeds acquiescence. Our sense of personal connection with the poet is also strengthened by the alien society into which the poem introduces us: in contrast to the easy Horatian moderation of the poet, those whom we now meet are characterized by images of extremism. The congregation is composed of an unsightly collection of "reverend Sophes of no degree," "walleyed Sisters," and "scaldheaded children," but the physical appearance of these is but an external sign of their distorting lack of balance and reason. The women in the church immediately distinguish

---


46 The "visit" to a Nonconformist service is a standard invective form: see Flecknoe's *Diarium* 13-18, and John Taylor's "Relation of the Most Famous Preaching Cobler Samuel Howe," in *A Swarne of Sectaries, and Schismatiques* ([London], 1641) 8-13.
themselves by the extremity of their response to the sermon:

. . . How he drawes his *Humme*
And quarters *Haw*, talkes Poppy and Opium!
No feaver a mans eyes could open keepe
All *Argus* body hee'd have preach'd a sleepe
In halfe an houre. The *Waud O Lawd* he cries
*Lukewarmenesse*: and this melts the Womens eyes.
They sob aloud . . . (ll. 21-27)

The preacher's assault on "_Lukewarmenesse_" is, significantly, the cue for a response from the auditors that itself serves as a model of excessive warmth: extremes of thought and feeling are indulged almost exclusively for their own sake. The preacher's own immoderation is mirrored in his bombastic language. Ironically, the preacher's sermon is a model of decorum, for both his message and his medium are violent:

And now the Christian *Bajaset* begins:
The suffering Pulpit groanes for Israels sinnes.
Sinnes which in number many though they be.
And crying ones, are yet lesse loud than he:
His stretch'd-out voyce sedition spreds a farre.
Nor does he only teach but act a warre:
He sweats against the state, Church, learning, sence.
And resolves to get hell by Violence. (ll. 85-92)

The poet is literally as well as figuratively an outsider amid this assembly of monstrous extremists.

As the congregation begins to rail against prelacy and the King himself, the poet vainly undertakes to defend the status quo with logic and reasoned argument:

*But against the Bishops they all raile, and I*
Say bouldly I'le defend the Hierarchy.
To Hierarchy they meant no harm at all.
*But roote, and branch, 'bout Bishops too't wee fall.*
I like a foole with reason, and those men
*With wrested Scripture . . .* (ll. 85-92)

We find ourselves drawn to the poet's values of moderation and reasoned objectivity. so much at
variance with that of the society into which the poem plunges us.

All is not, however, what it at first seems, for as the poem progresses, the poet begins to reveal his own prejudices. Particularly telling is his joke that William Prynne, Henry Burton, and John Bastwick, all of whom had lost their ears in 1637 after being found guilty of libel by the Star Chamber, "nere were perfect Round-heads untill then" (l. 48). 47 This is witty enough, but derives its humour from the assumption that the reader is predisposed to scorn these victims of royal jurisprudence. The conceit does little to establish a bond of trust between reader and writer: it is assumed that they are already of one mind on this matter of the punishment accorded the "three worthies." For the briefest moment, witty scorn replaces reasoned argument. The mask of Horatian objectivity does not fully drop however until line 139 when the narrative of the service ends: from this point, the poem undertakes a direct assault upon the beliefs and values of Nonconformists. This shift from narrative to direct invective is of some importance: while the poem provides us with both description and interpretation, we are able to confirm the justice of the narrator's comments by reference to the description of the scene that has evoked them. In the second half of the poem, however, we are impelled to rely upon the speaker's unsupported and unproven assertions. We are told, not shown, that the Nonconformists subscribe to a "pretty slight religion, cheape, and free" (l. 141), and that their social revolution is the work of bullies who, to display their Godly righteousness, "Beat an old Baud, or fright poore whores" (l. 151).

Significantly, it is at this point that the poem's language takes on a more intemperate tone. This escalating employment of a severe approach culminates at last in the straight declamation of

the poem's last section, in which all attempt at humour and moderation gives way to an impassioned rhetorical rant, whose high seriousness is signalled by Cicero's familiar phrase:

    OH times, oh manners! when the Church is made
    A prey, nay worse a scorne to ev'ry Cade
    And ev'ry Tyler: when the popular rage
    (The Ages greatest Curse) reformes the Age.
    When reason is for Popery suppress'd
    And learning counted Jesuitisme at least.
    When without bookes Divines must studious be.
    And without meat keep hospitality . . . (ll. 219-26)

This seems almost from another, quite different poem. The poet's use of anaphora emphasizes his passionate response to the events he has witnessed: gone is any pretence of moderation, along with the fiction that his is an informal epistolary poem to a friend. The highly stylized and rhetorical nature of this passage signals that we have left the plain-style Horace behind, and are now moving steadily in the direction of Juvenal. A moral stance determined by a reasoned appeal to common sense and empirical evidence is displaced, at last, by an ethical attitude founded upon first principles. The sense that Cowley has unmasked and revealed himself as one who, like the zealots he attacks, speaks from an entrenched ideological perspective, is unintentionally reinforced by the very last lines of the poem: "Hereafter more, for since we now begin, I You'le find wee've Muses too as well as Prinn" (ll. 243-44). Ironically, the efforts of our royalist poet are equated with those of the William Prynne, who, as the poem has already reminded us, has had his ears lopped for libel. Our poet seems unwittingly to concede that there is, in fact, no middle ground to occupy: extremism must be met by extremism.

Cowley's attitude in his preface to the 1656 Poems towards the verse written during the "late troubles" suggests an embarrassment that is only partially attributable to his desire to make
his peace with the new regime, for his decision to suppress such works rather than raise the ghosts of past conflict with "any relation to the differences that caused them" continued also into the Restoration.\(^48\) As Cowley seems to have understood, his work from this period is frequently fiercely partisan and subjective. During the period in which \textit{The Puritan's Lecture} was written Cowley was, as Arthur Nethercot has pointed out, "with the possible exception of John Denham, the chief poet of the Cavalier party at Oxford."\(^49\) He was expected to produce verse that glorified, rather than examined, the Royalist cause; his function was probably not so much that of a propagandist writing to sway the undecided, as that of a coterie poet, producing partisan poems for committed audience.

As unbalanced and, in some ways, un-Horatian as \textit{The Puritan's Lecture} is, it betrays in Cowley the desire to reproduce in his satirical poems something of the moderate pose of the Roman satirist. Cowley unquestionably felt affinities for Horace, and in later life, he was to translate and imitate much of the Roman author's work, including the tale of the country mouse and the city mouse taken from Horace's \textit{Satire} II.6.\(^50\) Contemporaries noted the presence of an


\(^{50}\) This fragment, with the remainder of the satire as imitated by Sprat, was to be published in Brome's edition of Horace in 1666. Kupersmith has suggested that Cowley's contribution to the imitation of \textit{Satire} II.6 was influential in the establishment of a more Horatian voice in satire (95). See also Selden, \textit{English Verse Satire} 89.
Horatian quality in Cowley's work: Sprat praises Cowley's facility with the Horatian plain-style in his "Life," while Congreve's Sharper, in The Old Batchelour (1693), calls Cowley "our English Horace."

Having abandoned satire with the Restoration, the Horatian theme of retirement was to become particularly important in Cowley's work after the Restoration, and pervades his Several Discourses, By Way of Essays, in Verse and Prose (1668). At the same time, Cowley was the master of many styles and voices and put his hand to a wide variety of genres: Sprat entitled a eulogistic ode to the poet "Upon the Poems of the English Ovid, Anacreon, Pindar, and Virgil, Abraham Cowley" (1657?), naming, it seems, nearly every possible classical model available except Horace, and suggesting the variety of Cowley's poetic voices.

Cowley's experiments in style suggest an enduring interest in poetic voice, and his verse technique frequently relies upon a kind of ventriloquism that implies a strong awareness of the role of ethos in poetry: indeed, his development of the "imitation" is founded upon just such an impulse. From this perspective, The Puritans Lecture seems an ultimately unsuccessful attempt to apply the principles of ethos to partisan satire: Cowley loses control of his medium as he progresses from a pose of detachment

---


53 The First[-Sixth] Part of Miscellany Poems. 5th ed., 6 vols. (London. 1727) 4: 288. See also Sprat's "Life of Cowley": "there can scarce any Author be found, that has handled so many different Matters in such various sorts of Style" (sig. [A1']).
to one of fierce engagement.

Interestingly, this same movement is evident in his other poems of the period as well. *The Civil War* is a salient example: here, the intended *ethos* and tone of detachment is that of the historian (Lucan being the obvious model) or epic poet rather than that of the Horatian satirist.\(^{54}\) Again, however, Cowley proves unable to sustain an attitude of dispassionate distance, and lapses with increasing frequency, as the editors of the modern *Collected Works* note, into satire and elegy (361).\(^{55}\) Cowley's initial ethical posture is, again, one of moderation:

To what with Worship the fond Papist falls,
That the fond Zealot a curst Idol calls.
So twixt their double madness heres the odds,
One makes false Devills, t'other makes false Gods. (Bk. I. ll. 33-36)

David Trotter has noted of these lines that "Cowley's own attitude at this point seems to be one of disquiet rather than militancy, of bewilderment at a factionalism which has cut away the middle ground leaving only hostile extremes."\(^{56}\) It is an attitude that is admirably suited to the ideal of the historian, the dispassionate chronicler for whom the appearance of objectifying distance is so vital.

And yet, the collapse of this pose ensues rapidly: in his account of Edgehill (23 October, 1642), the first major battle of the war, Cowley is already allowing a satiric note to creep into his

\(^{54}\) Tom May, who translated *Pharsalia*, argued that "against the unexpected stroke of partiall History the ward is not so ready, as against that Polemicke writing, where Hostility is professed with open face." *The History of the Parliament of England* (London, 1647) sig. [A3'].

\(^{55}\) Allan Pritchard suggests that Cowley's shift of voice in this poem was due to the increasing misfortunes suffered by the Royalist cause in the period in which it was written (Cowley 1: 361). See also Raymond A. Anselment's discussion of the poem. *Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War* (Newark: U of Delaware P; London and Toronto: Associated UP, 1988) 160-65.

"Cowley's rhetoric," Trotter says, "has taken him closer to one pole of the 'double madness,' than perhaps he had intended" (11-12). By the middle of Book III, and the account of the first battle of Newbury (20 September, 1643), Cowley is giving full reign to his satiric muse in his description of the Parliamentary dead:

What should I here their Great ones Names rehearse?  
Low, wretched Names, unfit for noble Verse?  
There Swart, a drunken, banisht Dutchman fell;  
At home a Sailour, here a Colonell.  
In his bold draughts the Villaine slew his freind;  
And fled from Justice there, worse here t'offend  
Noe part of him was left to curse the place;  
His very Death the Canon did deface. (Bk III, ll. 383-90)

Two mutually incompatible replies can be made to the rhetorical question with which the poet begins this passage. First, the impartial historian is obliged, whatever his personal feelings, to list the prominent dead on both sides: Cowley's insinuation that the Parliamentary dead are unworthy of the chronicler's notice is a useful rhetorical pose, but only accentuates the extent to which he here abandons the mantle of historian. The second response relates to the increasing prominence of satiric voice in the poem: such a catalogue allows the poet to expose the baseness of those on the opposing side. Significantly, it is the second rather than the first of these impulses that drives on Cowley's description, and the voice that describes the death of "Swart" and others is that of the satirist, rather than historian. In effect, his description of the dead becomes not an historical memorial to those who have perished, but rather a satiric eradication of their significance: all vestiges of "Swart" are literally, blown away by roundshot. The violence of the

---

battlefield finds an analogue in the satiric posture of the poet, who evokes the names of the dead merely to mutilate them further and consign them to oblivion:

   Fifty more such, men whom they Worthies call,
   In that black feild did ripe for vengeance fall.
   But with them let their Names forever dy:
   Too vile, and base for well-writ Infamy.  (Bk. III. ll. 451-54)

The emergence of the satiric voice in The Civil War parallels the collapse of Horatian distance in The Puritans Lecture: in each case, Cowley is unwilling or unable to mask his personal engagement with his subject. The figure of the satirist intrudes into the narrative, damaging in the process the tone of dispassionate objectivity that the poet has laboured to establish. The epic poet and the historian speak for their entire age and culture: Cowley in The Civil War and The Puritans Lecture comes instead to exemplify the fragmentation and division of the age. The presence of the satiric voice annihilates the middle ground: as Trotter notes, Cowley has created "a language for 'them' and for 'us'" (21). The reader's response is, inevitably, determined by party allegiances rather than by analysis and reasoned interpretation. Cowley's later suggestion, expressed during the relative calm of the Commonwealth, that "A warlike, various, and a tragical age is best to write of, but worst to write in" (Poems sig. [a1']) may owe something to his awareness of the difficulty of disengaging from events. Topical satire necessarily precludes such a disengagement, but it must, if it is to be effective as propaganda and persuasive polemic, convey at least the illusion of veracity uncontaminated by party allegiance: it is to this end that ethos is most profitably employed. It is only with his The Puritan and the Papist that Cowley succeeded in combining topical satire with a consistently persuasive ethos.

Published in 1643, The Puritan and the Papist takes for its central conceit a standard
thesis of Anglican apologists, who conventionally characterized the Church of England as a via media lying between two extremes: Nonconformists are, by virtue of the excessiveness of their views, little different from the Papists that they attack.\(^{58}\) Cowley touched upon this same theme in *The Civil War*, in a passage from the beginning of Book I that has already been cited, but the idea was a commonplace of the mid-seventeenth-century: it was, moreover, to be adapted by Tories to their Whig opponents in the Exclusion Crisis.\(^{59}\) The accusation had many merits, for it allowed Anglicans to distance themselves from Catholicism (a strategy necessitated by the charges levelled by Prynne and, in Parliament, John Pym, that popish fanatics were manipulating the king)\(^{60}\) while simultaneously tarring the Nonconformists with their own brush. Viewed from the perspective of persuasive polemic, moreover, this theme allowed the writer to delimit and occupy a supposed middle ground between two fanatical positions. Milton employed precisely this strategy in his


\(^{59}\) See *The Loyal Letany, The Character of a Protestant Jesuite* (London, 1682), and *A Loyal Satire against Whiggism* (London, 1682) 2; *POAS Yale* 3: 358-65. *Dolus an Virtus?* (London, 1668) explains the enmity between sects as a corollary of their similarity: "it is no wonder, that Cocks of the Game, bred up in the same Principles, should sometimes fight with one another" (3).

attack on the Westminster Assembly in *On the New Forcers of Conscience Under the Long Parliament* (1646?), in which Presbyterianism is equated with Popery, and the middle ground assumed by the Independents: "New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ Large."61

Cowley commences his poem with a conceit that at once stigmatizes his target while establishing his own essential moderation:62

SO two rude waves, by stormes together throwne.
Roare at each other, fight, and then grow one.
Religion is a Circle; men contend.
And runne the round in dispute without end.
Now in a Circle who goe contrary.
Must at the last meet of necessity. (ll. 1-6)

Cowley initially avoids mention of Catholicism or Nonconformity and begins instead by establishing what is apparently his broader theme, that contrary extremes meet: the "Catholicke cause" and that of the "Puritan," when they are introduced in the passage that follows, thus appear as exempla of his larger theme, rather than as his primary concern. The effect of this deferral is to mislead the reader into believing that this is a general satire: Nevo accordingly places *The Puritan and the Papist* within an emerging tradition of generalized satire, written, she suggests, largely by moderates, and "less partisan than philosophical and reflective" (18). Nevo, however, has confused means with intent: the poem's generalized beginning is strategic, and its function is to mask an intensely partisan satire in the guise of reasoned moderation. Nevertheless,


62 Calhoun (204n13) suggests Cowley may have lifted the idea for these lines, and part of his general argument, from Marston's "Reactio" in *Pigmalions Image*: "So haue I scene the fuming waues to fret. / And in the end, naught but white foame beget . . ." (59). Marston's image, however, is merely employed to characterize the inefficacy of Joseph Hall's satire.
Nevo's comments are suggestive: we are encouraged to believe that that attack, when made, is motivated not by party principles, but by the consideration of a more extensive intellectual framework.

The poem begins, then, with a conceit that at once distances the poet from his subject while at the same time apparently legitimizing his motivations. In this context, the fact that the poet in these first lines makes no direct attempt to establish his own perspective or identity is highly significant. In fact, the speaker remains for much of the poem an impersonal presence, a voice whose origin is implied rather than stated, and whose perspective and beliefs are more a function of his opposition to extremes than of a positive system of values: his attack consists of a series of propositions, tightly contained within the bounds of end-stopped couplets, that compare the follies of Catholicism ("they") with the hypocritical knavery of the Puritans ("you"):  

They keepe the Bible from Lay-men, but ye
Avoid this, for ye have no Laytie.
They in a forraigne, and unknowne tongue pray.
You in an unknowne sense your prayers say:
So that this difference 'twixt ye does ensue,
Fooles understand not them, nor Wise-men you. (ll. 57-62)

Nevo says of Cowley's wit in this poem that it "projects itself with the clarity of the rational proposition" (62). Indeed, much of Cowley's poem reads like a series of rhymed syllogisms, the two apparently opposing propositions coming together in an implicit third term that equates the two, and identifies them with the absurdity of extremism. Cowley manages in this way to generate a convincing illusion of rational and logical thought that does much to establish the poem's credibility as an objective, reasoned, and clarified vision of its subject.

The absence from this poem of any vision of the satirist himself represents a departure
from the quasi-Horatian method that Cowley pursued in *The Puritan's Lecture*. for he has abandoned the epistolary form and self-revelatory mode that characterizes true Horatian satire. In fact, Cowley comes close to perfecting a remarkably subtle type of *ethos*, one which avoids the direct self-dramatization of the Horatian satire, and embodies itself as little more than an attitude of reason and moderation: as the editors of the *Collected Works* note, "Cowley is less defending than occupying a moderate position, from which he views immodesty and voices his criticism" (341). While Cowley's technique exploits the advantages of a quasi-Horatian *ethos*, it also represents a recognition of the fact that the self-revelatory method is, in the context of intensely topical and political satire, a liability. As Cowley seems to have discovered in *The Puritans Lecture*, it is difficult to sustain both a personal voice and a sense of distance when the target is as immediate, topical, and important as the one with which he is grappling. It is a question of decorum: Horatian detachment seems an inappropriate response to great evil, with a result that the satirist seems morally weak, or the satiric target less of a threat than is implied. On the other hand, adoption of a more appropriately Juvenalian outrage introduces a subjective element to the satire that undermines the attitude of reasoned moderation that the poet wishes to project.

Cowley's solution to this dilemma is simple, elegant, and highly effective: he banishes the figure of the satirist from the poem, and employs *ethos* purely at a stylistic level. Moderation is invoked by language, left implicit rather than dramatized. Because the figure of the satirist remains shadowy and undeveloped, the reader's attention is focused instead upon the hypocrisy of the Puritans, whose actual perfidy is worse than the vices with which they charge the Papists:

They hold *free-will* (that nought their soules may bind)  
As the great *Priviledge* of all *mankind*.  
You're here more *moderate*, for 'tis your intent.
To make't a *Priv'ledge* but of *Parliament*. (ll. 81-84)

In this passage, the ironic suggestion that the Nonconformists are more "*moderate*" than the Papists indirectly accentuates the poet's own moderation: tolerance is offered, if for the briefest moment, as the norm against which the opposing factions are to be evaluated. Puritan "moderation," on the other hand, is revealed as an assault upon free-will, and as a rationale for the usurpation of political power. Our distaste for the Puritans is balanced by an almost subconscious apprehension of the poet's own attractive values, as well as of his wit. We identify with the satirist without even being consciously aware of his presence.

The passage cited above highlights a further important point: Cowley's satire is not really about "the Papist" at all. Catholicism is employed by Cowley as a foil against which the poet's observations on Puritanism are played off. On numerous occasions, as in this passage, the Catholic religion actually looks somewhat attractive: Cowley exposes anti-Papist sentiments of Nonconformist writers as hysterical scare-mongering, while simultaneously suggesting that it is, in fact, the Puritans who pose the real threat to society. In effect, Cowley's tripartite division of parties serves merely as a vehicle, a mode of expression that allows Cowley to disguise his own partisan allegiances behind a veil of moderation. Arthur Nethercot's otherwise inexplicable description of the "savageness" of this "satire on the two extreme religious parties" (82) is therefore correct at least in one regard: there is nothing moderate about the poem's actual theme. On the contrary, it is as bitter an attack as that launched in *The Puritans Lecture*, but the more dangerous because effectively cloaked in the language of moderation.

Cowley's true polemic intention is unmasked somewhat as the poem proceeds, and the three opposing terms that shape the poem's initial structure give way to a clearer two-part
opposition of Anglican moderate versus Puritan extremist. This development becomes most
marked after line 257, when the poet begins a direct assault upon Puritanism:

Ye boundless Tyrants, how doe you outvy
Th'Athenian Thirty, Romes Decemviri?
In Rage, Injustice. Cruelty as farre
Above those men, as you in number are. (ll. 257-60)

There is, of course, the danger that Cowley will go too far, and will, as in The Puritans Lecture,
allow the poem to degenerate into an immoderate attack that stigmatizes the poet as much as it
does his target, but Cowley dexterously manages to avoid this by structuring his more direct
attacks in a manner that replicates the three-part pattern of his earlier argument. In place of the
opposition between Puritan and Papist is one that opposes hypocritical Puritan cant to reality:
unstated, but still present, is the third term of the equation, representing the poet’s plain-speaking
moderation and truth:

What Mysteries of Iniquity doe we see’?
New Prisons made to defend Libertie.

... Ship-money was unjustly ta’ne, ye say:
Unjustlier farre you take the Ships away.
The High-Commission you calld Tyrannie.
Ye did: Good God! what is the High-Committee? (ll. 261-62, 267-70)

Cowley’s method entails one last shift in the final ten lines of the poem: he addresses the
Puritans even more directly, giving ironic thanks to the Puritans for their extremism:

We thanke ye for the wounds which we endure.
Whil’st scratches and slight tricks ye seek to cure.
We thanke ye for true real feares at last.
Which free us from so many false ones past.
We thanke ye for the Bloud which fats our Coast.
(That fatall debt paid to great Straffords Ghost.)
We thanke ye for the ills receiv’d, and all
Which by your diligence in good time we shall.
We thanke ye, and our gratitude's as great
As yours, when you thank'd God for being beat. (ll. 293-302)

The poet has never, to this point, used the plural of the first person: he has, in fact, barely employed the first person pronoun at all. Thomas Calhoun has suggested that the "you" of the poem represents "the readers he addresses in the second person" (205), an assumption that leads him to characterize the poem as a failed polemic because the direct attack upon the (Puritan) reader in the final passage is unlikely to convert the opposition. Calhoun, however, misses the point: the implied reader is not the opposition, but the unaligned moderate. Cowley's employment of the plural is significant: "We," in this passage, refers both to the poet and the reader, while the second person pronoun is used in direct address to the Puritans, who are by means of this pronoun shift excluded from the reasonable and moderate community the poet has forged with his readers. In this way, the poem's final passage articulates in concrete form the poet's subtle ethos. Our sympathetic identification with the poet's values and character, so carefully nurtured to this point, at last makes possible our own placement within the poem: we, in a sense, become the poet, speaking collectively with his voice.

There is no evidence that The Puritan and the Papist had any influence on the satiric verse of its own age, or that of the Restoration: it received only one seventeenth-century printing after the end of the first Civil War, and Sprat, in compliance with Cowley's wishes, did not reprint it in his 1668 edition of the Works, so that the text long remained on the margins of the accepted canon of Cowley's verse. The one Restoration reprint of the poem is, however, of some interest:

63 See lines 16, 95, and 120: it occurs always as a parenthetical aside, isolated from the main clause of the poet's statement: "Lies have possest the Press so, as their due. / 'Twill scarcely, 'I feare, henceforth print Bibles true" (ll. 15-16).
The Puritan and the Papist was included (with an attribution to Cowley) in a 1682 collection entitled Wit and Loyalty Reviv'd. The date is significant, for 1682 marked the beginning of the "Tory revenge": The Puritan and the Papist, with its attack on Nonconformity and its comparison of Puritanism and Catholicism, had an obvious applicability to attempts to exclude from the English throne an avowedly Catholic heir. The poem's technique of carefully controlled ethos prevents it from seeming outdated in the way that other satires frequently did: in fact, Cowley's handling of tone and style in The Puritan and the Papist anticipates the technique of some Restoration satirists. Absalom and Achitophel is a case in point.

While Dryden's attack on Shaftesbury and Monmouth features, as has already been noted, a vivid and forceful critique of the moral ambiguities inherent in ethical proof, Dryden did not hesitate to exploit ethos himself to good effect in the poem. Dryden's initial approach to ethos differs somewhat from Cowley's, however, in that he chooses to establish and validate his appealing satirical voice first in his prefatory "To the Reader." Here, he begins by carefully situating himself within the context of faction. While unable to deny his own party allegiances.

---

64 Similar is the unauthorized reprinting of The Puritans Lecture, as A Satyre against Separatists (1680), in a volume with another Civil War satire entitled An Essay upon Satyr, or, A Poem on the Times, a reissue of a 1675 edition. This last work, originally published in 1648 as The Foure Ages of England: Or, The Iron Age, was (falsely) ascribed to Cowley in both earlier editions; Cowley himself disowned it in the "Preface" to the 1656 Poems (sig. [a1']). See Noyes and Mead, "An Essay upon Satyr" 136-55 and Zwicker's Lines of Authority 26-27.

65 The question of party coherence in this period remains controversial: Jonathan Scott, in Sidney and the Restoration Crisis has gone so far as to suggest that the rhetoric of propaganda of both sides in the Exclusion Crisis was similar because, "with the important exception of some hardliners on both sides, 1678's 'whigs' were 1681's 'tories'" (47). See also Scott's "Restoration Process. Or, If This Isn't a Party. We're Not Having a Good Time." Albion 25 (1993): 619-37, and the responses by Richard L. Greaves, Gary S. De Krey, and James Rosenheim in the same volume. Tim Harris, in "Party Turns? Or, Whigs and Tories Get off Scott Free," Albion 25 (1993): 581-90, argues that "Tories did use similar rhetoric to the Whigs," because they wished
his tone of forthrightness and reasoned moderation, signalled by a slightly mocking attitude toward political division, immediately puts the unaligned reader at ease: 66

Tis not my intention to make an Apology for my Poem: Some will think it needs no Excuse: and others will receive none. The Design, I am sure, is honest: but he who draws his Pen for one Party, must expect to make Enemies of the other. For, Wit and Fool, are Consequences of Whig and Tory: And every man is a Knave or an Ass to the contrary side. (3)

Dryden was not afraid to identify himself explicitly as a member of party because he could do so in a manner that situated him outside of faction, thereby establishing his own credentials as an honest and objective observer of events: as Steven N. Zwicker notes, he "admits vulnerability where it can do least damage and by such frankness aims to establish greater credibility" (Politics and Language 42). 67 Even more explicitly, he identifies himself with the moderates of each party by targeting them as his audience: 68

If I happen to please the more Moderate sort, I shall be sure of an honest Party: and, in all probability, of the best of Judges: for, the least Concern'd, are commonly the least Corrupt: And, I confess, I have laid in for those, by rebating "to recapture the middle ground from the Whigs" (585. 583), a strategy that corresponds with Dryden's own.


67 Zwicker has argued elsewhere that the literary polemics of the period helped form and define party politics: see "Lines of Authority: Politics and Literary Culture in the Restoration." in Sharpe and Zwicker, eds., Politics of Discourse 230-70.

What is perhaps most interesting about this passage is the suggestion that a more severe satire must, by its very nature, relinquish all claim to objectivity and impartiality. Moderate readers are repelled by satire that displays "too sharp an Edge": because the reader who reacts with disgust or abhorrence to a sharp satire is unlikely to be swayed, satiric sharpness is a rhetorical liability. Here, then, Dryden is engaged in a strategic withdrawal, apparently catering to those critics who viewed satire as the unjust and partisan attacks of the malicious, but his retreat is only partial, made to better secure his own self-appointed role as good-natured Horatian satirist: a defence of Juvenalian satire is abandoned not because it is untenable, but because concession strengthens the poet's rhetorical position as a man of reason.69 Despite his assurances to the contrary, Absalom and Achitophel does, in fact, contain much Juvenalian satire: Dryden's later assertion that "'Tis not bloody" ("Discourse" 71) notwithstanding, it is difficult to imagine a more effectively brutal satiric assault than that launched against Buckingham (as Zimri).70

69 James A. Winn sees in the poem a reconciliation of "the Christian ideal of moderation and the political necessity for revenge" (Dryden 345). As McKeon points out, however, with reference to Dryden's rhetorical stance in Annum Mirabilis, "the assertion of moderation does not prove moderation . . . . what Dryden manifestly adopts is not a 'moderate political position,' but the name and language of moderation, and he does so in order to argue for a position which may or may not be moderate" (18). George deForest Lord similarly suggests that "'Dryden's 'moderation' turns out to be more manner than substance." "'Absalom and Achitophel' and Dryden's Political Cosmos," in Miner, ed., Dryden 185. See also Steven N. Zwicker and Derek Hirst, Rhetoric and Disguise: Political Language and Political Argument in Absalom and Achitophel, JBS 21 (1981): 39-55 and Zwicker's Politics and Language 25-28.

70 Raman Selden suggests that the portrait of Zimri "in respect of verbal wit is closer to Juvenal" than Horace because it is scornful and directly judgemental (English Verse Satire 37).
Interestingly, Dryden's tactic is evocative of that used in a satire by a court poet whose allegiances lay on the other side of the Exclusion controversy. The Earl of Dorset, while a moderate Whig, despised Monmouth as much as he hated the Duke of York: in "The Right Honourable the E. of D-rs-t's Opinion of the Whigs and Tories" (1682?) Dorset, like Dryden, situates himself between the two factions:

After thinking this fortnight of Whig & of Tory.  
This to me is the long & y' short of y' Story)  
They are all Fools. & Knaves & they keep up this pother.  
On both sides, designing to cheat one another.\(^71\)

Having established his own impartiality, Dorset proceeds to savage both Monmouth and York. Like Dryden, he does not allow his own ethical posture to interfere with his uncompromising criticism of his two satiric victims: York is an ugly, ill-natured "Bigot," and Monmouth a moronic "Fop." The conclusion damns both although, like Dryden, Dorset is perhaps a little harsher to the opposing party:

Had I this soft Son. & this dangerous Brother.  
I'd hang up the one. then I'd piss upon t'other.  
I'd Make this the long & y' Short of the Story;  
The Fools might be Whigs. none but Knaves should be Tories. (f.104')

In the final analysis, Dorset's vehemence subverts his attempt to position himself in the middle. The sharp invective displayed by Dryden in his characterizations notwithstanding.

\(^71\) BL MS Harl. 7319 f.103\textsuperscript{v}; POAS Yale 2: 391-92. In Harl. 7319, it is entitled "My Opinion," and dated 1682.
however, Dryden does sustain throughout much of *Absalom and Achitophel* a tone of Horatian moderation. Dryden's mode of voice is similar to that of Cowley in *The Puritan and the Papist*: here, however, the poet's efforts to remain unobtrusive are aided by the poem's narrative structure, which allows him to disguise personal commentary as story-telling, filtered through an apparently objective and impersonal medium of communication. At the same time, however, the effect of the personal, almost conversational, revelations of Dryden's prefatory note "To the Reader" linger in the mind as the reader progresses to the poem proper. His miniature prose essay serves as a framing device, eliciting sympathy and affection for the poet even while obviating the need for a more intrusive satiric presence within the poem itself. He gives us, at one and the same time, both the chatty Horatian gentleman and the impassive historian.72

A close reading of both Dryden's prefatory remarks and the body of his poem reveals, however, that a straight-forward distinction of the two into Horatian and Juvenalian camps is simplistic.73 While it is undeniably true that "To the Reader" is more personal, and more Horatian, than the poem itself, Juvenalian elements creep into the former as well, for Dryden consistently plays Horatian *ethos* off against an implied, or threatened, Juvenalian mode. We observe the technique at work when Dryden expresses hope that matters are not yet so far out of hand as to be unremediable: "Things were not brought to an Extremity where I left the Story: There seems,

---


73 Although it is Dryden's ambiguous handling of the moral authority of David that he has in mind, Michael Seidel comment that "Dryden wants the best of Horatian and Juvenalian satiric worlds" is a valid characterization of the poem as a whole (*Satiric Inheritance* 144).
yet, to be room left for a Composure: hereafter there may only be for pity" (4). This seems like an appeal for reason and moderation, and a perfect reflection of Dryden's Horatian ethos: Edward and Lillian Bloom, for example, have cited this passage as an example of Dryden's "compassion" (Satire's Persuasive Voice 73). And yet, it is difficult not to read in the suggestion that "pity" may soon replace hope the presence of a veiled threat. Dryden's apparently compassionate hope that Monmouth will not go so far astray as to endanger himself contains, on closer examination, elements not only of condescension, but also the hint that there may yet be bloody work done. There is even the slight suggestion that satirist himself is potentially an instrument of the prophesied retribution. Similar is Dryden's ambiguous display of magnanimity towards Shaftesbury in the passage that immediately follows. "I have not, so much as an uncharitable Wish against Achitophel," Dryden assures us. "but, am content to be Accus'd of a good natur'd Errour; and, to hope with Origen, that the Devil himself may, at last, be sav'd" (4-5). Dryden's willingness to admit to a "good natur'd Errour" is more than a little disingenuous, establishing as it does his own good humour even as he is in the process of damning Achitophel. The identification of Shaftesbury with "the Devil himself," an image that will be developed in the poem through Miltonic allusion, is a Juvenalian touch: we may agree with Raman Selden when he notes that "Dryden is probably the first English satirist to call a man Satan without raising his voice in anger"

74 See Poetical Reflections, which says of the attack on Shaftesbury that "the more prudent deserts of that Peer were to be so impeach'd before hand by his impious Poem, as that he might be granted more emphatically condign of the Hangman's Ax: And which his Muse does in effect take upon her to hasten" (sig. [B1']). Zwicker and Hirst point out that the "Preface" moves "from an elaborate show of moderation and impar[ti]ality to an advocacy of the block" (45-46).

Just as the "Horatian" prose preface exploits Juvenalian touches to devastating effect, so too do we find in the body of the poem itself evidence of Dryden's Horatian ethos at work, playing off against the stern Juvenalian morality of the poem's political polemic. The poet's oblique intrusion into the initial account of Absalom's character provides one example:

What faults he had (for who from faults is free?)
His Father cou'd not, or he woud not see.
Some warm excesses, which the Law forbore,
Were constru'd Youth that purg'd by boyling o'r:
And Amnon's Murther, by a specious Name,
Was call'd a Just Revenge for injur'd Fame. (ll. 35-40)

The admission that Absalom does, indeed, possess faults is almost balanced and offset by the reminder that we are all flawed. Paradoxically, the parenthetical aside redounds more to the poet's credit than to Absalom's, for Dryden has shown himself to be both candid and painstakingly fair, while the effectiveness of this apparent attempt to mitigate Absalom's flaws is severely undercut as the passage proceeds. His father's inability or unwillingness to concede that his son possesses faults has a similar effect: David is made to look benevolent (if unwise) in such a way as to leave unblunted the increasingly sharp criticism of Absalom.\(^76\) The next four lines gradually produce in the reader an even more damaging impression of Absalom: the poet, as Dryden intends, appears to be struggling, unsuccessfully, to maintain the illusion that Absalom is guilty, at

\(^76\) As Harth points out, David's willingness to overlook Absalom's past parallels -- and is ultimately as unwise as -- his employment of "Pardon'd Rebels" (l. 147). Pen for a Party 114. To some extent, David's tone of tolerant moderation throughout the poem parallels Dryden's own, although the magisterial style of his final speech is too impersonal and detached to encourage a sympathetic identification on the part of the reader. As Ferry notes, the "echoes of the divine Maker's voice are audible in the King's tones as he assumes authority" (109): David's rhetoric lacks the human qualities associated with ethos.
most of youthful exuberance. When we at last learn that his “excesses,” have led to murder we are shocked. At this point, the reader recalls Dryden’s gentle reminder that no one “is from faults . . . free”: possibly so, but few of us number a predilection for homicide among our personal failings. At the same time, Dryden damns Absalom without suffering repercussions himself. Although he avoids using the first person pronoun in these six lines, the passage is, in a sense, nearly as much about the poet as about Absalom. Throughout the poem, he appears scrupulously fair. His deliberately flawed attempt to mitigate Absalom’s crime is paralleled, more famously, by his acknowledgement of Achitophel’s excellence as a judge: his concessions enhance his own pose as impartial moderate without materially benefitting either Absalom or Achitophel.

Dryden’s ability to employ a Horatian ethos in the service of a rather nasty invective poem was both striking and effective enough to evoke comment from contemporaries. The poem’s detractors, of course, suggested that this combination of Horatian and Juvenalian satire was forced and unnatural. Written in response to The Medall, Shadwell’s The Medal of John Baves (1682) attacks Dryden’s satiric mode, arguing that his malicious invectives are too crude to sustain the pose of Horatian satirist:

Methinks the Ghost of Horace there I see,  
Lashing this Cherry-cheek’d Dunce of Fifty three:  
Who, at that age, so boldly durst profane.  
With base hir’d Libel, the free Satyr’s Vein.  
Thou stil’st it Satyr to call Names, Rogue, Whore.  
Traytor, and Rebel, and a thousand more.  
An Oyster-wench is sure thy Muse of late.  
And all thy Helicon’s at Billingsgate. (2: POAS Yale 75-95)

Most attacks upon Absalom and Achitophel feature accusations of malice and viciousness. See for example Samuel Pordage’s Azeria and Hushai, a Poem (London, 1682) 29, and Settle’s Absalom Senior (London, 1682). Henry Care’s Towsor the Second. A Bull-Dog (London, 1681) imagined Dryden as a mad dog biting everyone, including his own sovereign.
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The forces of chaos and vice are in control, and so they exclude the deviant satirist, the maintainer of old values" (Fictions of Satire 25). After 1688, Dryden himself would find this potentially subversive aspect of Juvenal highly congenial to his changed circumstances, but in 1681, when, as Historiographer Royal, he functioned in an official capacity as the regime's propagandist, such an identification was more embarrassing. For his immediate purposes, the political quietism of Horace provided a more convenient and appropriate model.

Juvenalian and Horatian satire are not so much different in degree as in kind. Juvenal focuses attention upon the satirical object; Horace, on the other hand, accentuates the voice of the satirist, which becomes a more significant influence upon our reactions than the portrait of folly that is the putative subject of the satire. Juvenal attempts by force of language to win the auditor over to his own way of thinking; Horace, on the contrary, accommodates himself to his projected audience, assuming a pleasing pose that will seduce it into acquiescence.

Accommodation is vital to ethos, and is the reason why so many rhetorical manuals, from Aristotle on, take time to discuss the nature and expectations of different audiences.


80 Dryden is able to employ a more explicitly Juvenalian mode of satire in The Medall because the acquittal of Shaftesbury, and the subsequent celebrations in the City, enabled him to pose as an opposition poet attacking the dominant political order. See however Phillip Harth's contention that the satire assumes that the Whigs have been defeated, and that Dryden "raised the pitch of his voice" in The Medall because he was adopting the new "rhetoric of outrage" characteristic of the Tory satire that followed the acquittal (Pen for a Party 169, 161). See Harold Weber's excellent discussion in "Jester and the Orator" 171-85.

82 Aristotle for this reason discusses the different kinds of "Commonwealths" in which an orator might be required to speak: "And because convicemcnt is not only that which demonstrates by oration, but by Ethical discourse, for we believe the speaker because we take him
Introduction to the Art of Rhetorick thus advises the orator to "bespeake the favour of the Auditors, in respect of himself, if his gesture and deportment be suitable unto theirs that are his Auditors, and express himself modestly" (68). Dryden's "Auditors" are the "the more Moderate sort," and it is therefore no surprise to find him assuming in the preface, and more subtly throughout the poem, the guise of the reasonable and dispassionate everyman. Dryden must, in essence, become the audience for which he is writing: this kind of sympathetic transformation is the very essence of ethos.83

Dryden, in Absalom and Achitophel, is dealing with a serious subject: his satirical objects are not the trivial bores, fawning courtiers, or execrable poestasters of Horatian satire, but rather those who directly threaten the very fabric of the social and political order.84 Even Absalom, who seems to fulfil the role of Horatian fool to Achitophel's Juvenalian knave, becomes himself more an active agent than a victim of evil, for his speech to the people mirrors that of his deceiver, and suggests the extent to which he himself has become Satanic.85 Indeed, as Howard Weinbrot

to be an honest Man: or a man of understanding, or both, therefore it behoves us to understand the customs of every sort of Public-weal" (44; I.viii.6).

83 Schilling comments that "gains enormously as well from his air of supporting a view which is of course held by his audience, as indeed it must be held by anyone able to reason at all" (292). Far from merely tapping into a pre-existing set of communal values, Dryden employs ethos, with its characteristic strategies of accommodation and seduction, to create a community of values where none before existed.

84 Guilhamet notes that "Zimri, Sporus, and Mac Flecknoe are completely ridiculous, but they are also harmful and dangerous. Satire, thus, depends upon the reader's ability to take a comic and serious view of an object at the same time" (Satire 9).

85 This aspect of the poem relates to the recurrent theme of fathers and sons: if Absalom begins the poem as David's bastard son, he has, by its conclusion, marked himself through his adoption of Achitophel's language as the spiritual progeny of the latter, replacing the "shapeless Lump" that Achitophel has sired. See Weinbrot, "'Natures Holy Bands' in Absalom and
suggests, Absalom's acceptance of Achitophel's arguments means that "Absalom not Achitophel becomes associated with the devil or with others who soared too high against paternal advice" ("Natures Holy Bands" 92.). In a sense, then, Absalom comes to represent not merely a false Messiah, but Antichrist.86

Much of the impressive effect that Absalom and Achitophel generates is a result of Dryden's successful blend of Juvenalian subject with the Horatian technique of ethos.87 Paradoxically, Dryden effects this, like Cowley before him, by avoiding the overt self-dramatization characteristic of Horace's satires and epistles: the figure of the satirist remains, in both The Puritan and the Papist and Absalom and Achitophel, a shadowy figure in the background. Horace's self-revelatory mode notwithstanding, ethos can actually help to mask the figure of the satirist. Even when applied to topical invectives that deal with great vices, ethos can render the figure of the satirist almost invisible by accommodating the satirist's putative (but not necessarily true) perspective to our own. Where Juvenalian satire offers the voice of an indignant individual whose strident tone and rigid moral certainties frequently alienate the unaligned reader, ethos submerges the voice of the individual within a community of moderation, conciliation, and

---

86 See also Korshin, Typologies 284-86 and Steven N. Zwicker, Dryden's Political Poetry (Providence: Brown UP, 1972) 84. As Ronald Paulson has pointed out, however, Juvenal's satirical subjects, while preeminent for their knavery, are also, in the final analysis, fools who are undone by their own evil. Fictions of Satire 27.

87 David Farley-Hills argues that Absalom and Achitophel is "a non-comic poem which makes use of comic devices." Benevolence of Laughter (London: Macmillan, 1974) 114.
accommodation. Paradoxically, *ethos*, while itself a form of rhetorical self-dramatization, enabled the satirist to sustain the illusion that satire might generate a vision that transcended the limited perspective of its human agency.

---

88 See Thomas Lockwood's "The Augustan Author-Audience Relationship: Satiric vs. Comic Forms," *ELH* 36 (1969): 648-58. Lockwood characterizes the comic (i.e. Horatian) mode as one involving "reassurance" that the writer is "fundamentally just like most of his readers" (654).
Chapter 4

"The Pleasure of Concernment": Juvenal and Pathos

Horace and Juvenal had each their champions among seventeenth-century critics: indeed, the history of satire criticism in the period is, to a large extent, the history of the feud between pro-Juvenalian forces, led by Scaliger, and those who favoured Horace, including most notably Heinsius and, later, Dacier.¹ (Persius had his own influential sponsor in Casaubon²). Increasingly, it was to Horace that the bays were awarded, but for eighteenth-century critics like Addison, Young, and Trapp, the choice was still one of Horatian (or comic) versus Juvenalian (or tragic) satire. One of the most significant aspects of this debate is the disjunction between critics and satirists: Juvenal remained throughout the seventeenth-century the most widely-imitated model for practising satirists.³ The comments of John Oldham on Juvenal's language in the "Advertisement" of his Some New Pieces (1681) reminds us that the ideal of Juvenalian roughness was still prevalent: "certainly no one that pretends to distinguish the several Colours of Poetry, would expect that Juvenal, when he is lashing of Vice and Villany, should flow so smoothly as Ovid, or Tibullus" (89).

¹ See Harold Weber, "'Comic Humour and Tragic Spirit" 275-77, and Weinbrot, Augustus Caesar 150-52. See also Dryden's "Discourse" 49.

² As Dustin Griffin has pointed out, Dryden lifted his model for satiric unity from the practice of Persius. (Satire 20-22). Nor was Persius neglected by English translators: see William Frost, "English Persius: The Golden Age," ECS 2 (1968-9): 77-101.

³ Juvenal's satires were more frequently translated than those of Horace. Trapp remarked that "the Horatian Satire is but little affected among us" (236). Paul Elkin points out that Juvenal's satire "was too serious and scathing to comply" with later "neo-classical principles" (34).
Like Horace (and Persius), but for different reasons, Juvenal denied that his satire was great poetry: "If Nature wont command / Verse, Indignation shall at least indite / Such lines, as I or Cluvienus write" (Holyday 3). In some ways, the key to this expression of Juvenalian passion lies in the second, rather than in the more famous first, line. Richard Jenkyns, commenting on this passage, notes that they "seem to express not exuberant anger but a self-contemptuous pessimism: the sort of verse that 'indignatio' produces is mean stuff" (158-59). Seventeenth-century evaluations of Juvenal frequently echoed this observation. Attitudes to Juvenal were slowly changing, however, and the century's most sophisticated and effective defence of Juvenalian satire, Dryden's "Discourse," was also its most revisionist. Dryden undertook to prove, in an argument that owed much to Boileau, that Juvenalian satire was compatible with standards of correctness and decorum. Seeking to undercut its associations with the rough invective of the preceding century, Dryden accentuated the sublime and heroic aspects of Juvenalian style.

Dryden follows Boileau's lead in classifying satire as a form of heroic poetry: it is for this reason that so much of his "Discourse" is expended discussing, not satire, but epic. The two forms, Dryden insists, require the same kind of language, and employ the same style. In this context, his musings on Virgil's satiric potentialities are highly significant: the author of the

4 Boileau anticipates Dryden, but his approach is more broadly Horatian than that of the English poet. Boileau combined Horatian and Juvenalian elements in his satire more thoroughly than Dryden, earning him Dryden's encomium in the "Discourse" as the "living Horace and Juvenal" (12). See John M. Aden, "Dryden and Boileau: The Question of Critical Influence." SP 50 (1953): 491-509.

5 As William Frost notes, the decision to link the discussion of satire with that of epic and verse tragedy also lends legitimacy to invective verse. "Dryden and Satire," SEL 11 (1971): 416.

6 Reuben A. Brower has even suggested that "it was in satire that Dryden made the most apt use of his epic manner." "Dryden's Epic Manner and Virgil." PMLA 55 (1940): 131.
Æneid "cou'd have written sharper Satires, than either Horace or Juvenal, if he would have employ'd his Talent, that way" (64). Dryden's views are most apparent, however, in his comments on Boileau's *Le Lutrin*. The French poet, Dryden explains, wrote his satire "in the French Heroique Verse, and calls it an Heroique Poem: His Subject is Trivial, but his Verse is Noble. I doubt not but he had Virgil in his Eye." (83). It is not coincidental that Dryden proceeds to recommend heroic couplets as the most appropriate medium for satire: "This, I think, my Lord, to be the most Beautiful, and most Noble kind of Satire. Here is the Majesty of the Heroique, finely mix'd with the Venom of the other; and raising the Delight which otherwise wou'd be flat and vulgar, by the Sublimity of the Expression." (84)

Dryden's admiration for this mixture of "Venom" and "Sublimity" marks a subtle shift in his argument. *Le Lutrin* is a mock-heroic which mixes, as Dryden comments, "Noble" expression with a "Trivial" subject matter. This is not what Dryden now advocates: the "finely mix'd" form of "Venom" and "Sublimity" suggests not mock-heroic, but rather a high-style Juvenalian rant. This last mode, in contrast to the first, assumes a stylistic decorum, an appropriateness of medium and message, and a personal engagement with the subject (*indignatio*), that is diametrically opposed to the operations of mock-heroic. Both modes were undoubtedly suggested to Dryden

---

7 See Trapp's comments on Virgil (91-92) and Jenkyns 157. Dryden undoubtedly had in mind Virgil's many passages of mock-heroic.

8 Cf. his comparison of "the adequate delights of heroick Poesie" which "beget admiration," with "the images of the Burlesque," in the "Account of the Ensuing Poem," prefixed to *Annis Mirabilis* (56).

9 Juvenal maintains decorum even when describing low subjects: as Witke notes, "Sufficient seriousness is present to obviate such tension, for Juvenal's vivid pictures are used to illustrate that which produces his *seva indignatio*. There is no room for laughter" (114).
by Boileau's practice, but A. F. B. Clark notes, "what impresses Dryden is not so much the comic effect of Le Lutrin -- not so much the mock-heroic tone proper -- as the blending of the dignity of epic style with the sharpness of satire." Dryden's "Discourse" defines and defends Juvenal's heroic mode by means of a stealthy distortion of conventional attitudes and critical terminology. Horace's plain-style becomes, in Dryden's new formulation, "low," and his reasoned rhetoric of moderation "generally groveling" (64), while Juvenal's intertemperate and violent rhetoric is transformed into a language of "sublimity" which is not to be "circumscrib'd. with the meanness of Words and vulgarity of Expression" (78) demanded by those (Dryden's specific target here is Heinsius) who subscribe to Horatian definitions of the genre. Dryden has turned conventional attitudes on their head: Horace's genteel urbanity becomes something low and even a little coarse, while Juvenal's vehement roughness has been elevated to the estate of heroic poetry. This revisionist approach allows Dryden to assert that "we cannot deny, that Juvenal was the greater Poet, I mean in Satire" (65).

Dryden was above all else interested in demonstrating the effect of the two diverse styles upon the reader. He begins by describing his own responses to the two satirists:

I must confess, that the Delight which Horace gives me, is but languishing. Be pleas'd still to understand, that I speak of my own Taste only: He may Ravish other Men; but I am too stupid and insensible, to be tickl'd. Where he barely grins himself, and, as Scaliger says, only shews his white Teeth, he cannot provoke me to any Laughter. His Urbanity, that is, his Good Manners, are to be commended, but his Wit is faint; and his Salt, if I may dare to say so, almost insipid. (63)

---


Dryden has conceded that Horace is more "instructive." but this proves to be a hollow victory because his effect is "languishing." Dryden has turned Horace's strengths against him: Horace's *sermo pedestris* restricted his satiric tone, and is the "chief Reason, why he minded only the clearness of his Satire, and the clearness of Expression, without ascending to those heights, to which his own vigour might have carri'd him." Horace, Dryden continues generously, "cou'd not give an equal pleasure to his Reader, because he us'd not equal Instruments. The fault was in the Tools, and not in the Workman" (64). In Dryden's re-evaluation of satiric method, credibility, rationality, and objective engagement cease to be the touchstones of excellence. Instead, Dryden highlights delight and emotional response.

This concern with the reader's pleasure lies at the heart of Dryden's argument: "They who will not grant me, that Pleasure is one of the Ends of Poetry, but that it is only a means of compassing the only end, which is Instruction: must yet allow that without the means of Pleasure, the Instruction is but a bare and dry Philosophy, a crude preparation of Morals" (88). Juvenal is superior, not merely because he is more delightful, but because he is therefore also more effective:

*Juvenal* is of a more vigorous and Masculine Wit, he gives me as much Pleasure as I can bear: He fully satisfies my Expectation, he Treats his Subject home: His Spleen is rais'd, and he raises mine: I have the Pleasure of Concernment in all he says; He drives his Reader along with him. (63)

While Horatian moderation is a fatal flaw, Juvenal is lauded for his extremism, which is actually the source of the greater pleasure that he imparts: he is "sometimes too luxuriant, too redundant: says more than he needs . . . but never more than pleases." Juvenal "goes with more impetuousity

---

than *Horace*; but as securely: and the swiftness adds a more lively agitation to the Spirits" (63-64). As a result, Juvenal, Dryden argues, "always intends to move your Indignation: and he always brings about his purpose." while Horace, "amongst the Moderns . . . is not so Successfull" (72). Dryden's defence of Juvenal rests in his faith in the ability of heroic verse, employed in the service of satire, to move the reader to heights of indignation. Poetic pleasure is more than a sugar pill to make polemic and morality more palatable: an elevated style is a conduit through which the poet's indignation is apprehended, and by means of which is generated in the reader an analogous state of emotional excitement. Indignation becomes, in this way, a kind of communicable disease: "His Spleen is rais'd. and he raises mine." Dryden says, "I have the Pleasure of Concernment in all he says." "Concernment," as H. James Jensen has pointed out, means for Dryden the "emotional involvement (of an audience) effected by great art. especially high tragedy." The term's association with tragedy is significant, for what Dryden is proposing in relation to his defence of Juvenal is a theory of *pathos*.

Aristotle, it will be recalled, speaks of *pathos* and *ethos* as two of the "three sorts" of

---

13 Trapp similarly commented that "the genteel Jokes of *Horace*, how ingenious soever, are less affecting than the poetic Rage. and commendable Zeal of *Juvenal*" (227).

14 See for example Alexander Richardson's *Logicians School-Master*: "Rhetorick is a honey to a bitter Potion. or lace to a garment" ("Rhetorical Notes" 29).

15 *A Glossary of John Dryden's Critical Terms* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P. 1969) 32. See also Oldham's translation of *Ars Poetica* in Oldham Il. 170-73.

16 See also Quintilian: *pathos* "resembles Tragedy, as the other Manner [*ethos*] does Comedy" (2: 31; VI.ii.20). Jensen (84) lists only one instance of the word *pathos* in Dryden, and glosses it as "That which moves a pleasant pity or sadness in an audience." but Monk notes that "in all eighteenth-century critical writings the term *pathetic* is used in its generic sense of 'producing an effect upon the emotions.' not necessarily the tender emotions" (13n11).
artificial proof: "Some in the Manners of the Speaker: some in the disposition of the Hearer. some in the Oration it self: by vertue of its Demonstration or Probability of Demonstration" (8: I.ii.3).\textsuperscript{17} Aristotle identifies these three proofs with speaker, text, and audience: \textit{pathos} is associated with the responses of the audience, and concerns the affective qualities of a work. As Aristotle comments, "the Auditors believe in respect of themselves, when they find the Impulse of some affection rais'd in their Minds. For we do not give the same Judgments, when we grieve as when we are glad: when we love as when we hate" (8-9: I.ii.4-5). The proof of the orator's argument is generated within the minds of the audience, by means of an appropriately affecting style: "Pathetic consists in this, that the Injury be recited in the Language of the angry Person. When things impious or ignominious are to be repeated to speak with a modest detestation . . . For this proportional Language renders the thing Probable." As a result, "the Hearer is affected with him that speaks passionately, tho' he speak nothing to the purpose" (181: III.vii.3-6).\textsuperscript{18}

Cicero, as we have seen, remarks in \textit{Orator} that the "vehement and impetuous" style (\textit{vehemens}) is to be used for persuasion (284: xxi. 69).\textsuperscript{19} Cicero's account has the virtue of making explicit what is only implied in Aristotle: that passions are most effectively aroused by a grand or vigorous language, that \textit{pathos} is, in effect, the product of heroic style. The most important classical treatise on the operations and effects of \textit{pathos} was, however, the anonymous

\textsuperscript{17} See Kennedy 93-95.

\textsuperscript{18} See Rapin's \textit{Reflections upon the Eloquence of These Times} (London, 1672): "The Orator ought to make the chief end of his Study to move the Souls of his Auditors by the movement of his Affections, which are the true resorts of this Machine, which is so difficult to enflame, when we bestow no time in the study of them" (9).

\textsuperscript{19} See also \textit{Orator} 249-51 and 303-04.
Peri Hypsous, long attributed to Longinus, and first translated into English by John Hall in 1652 as Περὶ Ὑψος. Or Dionysius Longinus of the Height of Eloquence. In Peri Hypsous, as Renato Barilli has noted, "everything is centered on pathos": "First of all the orator must manifest his own pathos, in order to convey it to the audience . . . . To show one is inspired by strong passions is in itself a persuasive argument" (21). As "Longinus" expresses it, "our souls are so enflamed by true heights that they generally elevate themselves, and in a transport of joy and wonder own and father those great things that are presented to them, as if they themselves had produced them" (xi: vii.2). It is the function of pathos to reproduce in our own breasts and minds the sensation that we are ourselves experiencing everything that the orator is describing, and reacting to it as he or she has. We are transported unknowingly inside the perspective of the speaker, producing a near to total identification of auditor with orator. Significantly, "Longinus" emphasizes the importance of pseudo-visual illusions. "Phantasies," that allow us to "see" through the speaker's eyes and leave us "so agitated with fury and passion as to think thou really seest them and so make them visible even to the hearers" (xxxi-xxxii: xv.1-2). "Phantasies" convert mere accordance into utter belief: "they do not only persuade the Hearer but conquer him" (xxxv: xv.9).


Edward Pechter (119) notes that Dryden cites this passage in "The Author's Apology for Heroic Poetry and Poetic License." when he describes "Imaging," "which by a kind of enthusiasm, or extraordinary emotion of the soul, makes it seem to us that we behold those things which the poet paints, so as to be pleased with them, and to admire them." The State of Innocence (London. 1677) sig. [b4']. See also Van Doren 40-42.

21 Images of oratorical emotion overpowering the auditor are frequent in Peri Hypsous: see also xxvi-xxvii. Seventeenth-century commentators on the sublime retain this habit: see for example Gilbert Burnet's comments on the sublime style of a cleric he has heard, in Some Letters.
"Longinus" identifies many modes of the sublime: paradoxically, both simplicity of style and elevated language can produce sublimity.23 As Samuel Monk notes of the latter, "from its inception the grand style had as its purpose the awakening of emotion in the audience ... this is the point of departure for the earliest eighteenth-century discussions of sublimity” (11). And, one might add, for seventeenth-century discussions as well: in the title of Hall’s translation, “sublime” is rendered as the Height of Eloquence. Similarly, J. Pulteney’s translation, published in 1680, termed itself A Treatise of the Loftiness or Elegancy of Speech.24 Bernard Lamy couples three kinds of "matter for Writing," "Sublime, Mean, or Indifferent," with three appropriate styles. "the Lofty, the Plain, and the Moderate" (312). Joseph Addison in The Guardian 117 (1713) similarly emphasizes the importance of elevated style for the sublime, citing Boileau’s 1694 Réflexions Critiques sur Quelques Passages du Rheteur Longin XII: "the Sublime in Writing arises either from the Nobleness of the Thought, the Magnificence of the Words, or the harmonious and lively Turn of the Phrase, and that the perfect Sublime arises from all these three in Conjunction together.”25 The entry for the sublime in Ephraim Chambers’ Cyclopaedia (1728), lifted, as A. F.

Containing, An Account of What Seemed Most Remarkable in Switzerland, Italy, etc (Rotterdam, 1686): "he not only convinces his hearers, but subdues them and triumphs over them” (260).

Theodore Wood notes of the views of many critics ca. 1700 that "their espousal of the affective power of plain, natural discourse is probably not 'pre-romantic,' but rather a neo-classical insistence on the simplicity to be found in the Ancients.” The Word "Sublime" and Its Context, 1650-1760 (The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1972) 76. See also Dryden’s comments on the sublimity and affective power of silence in the "Dedication" to Amboyna (London, 1673) sig. [A2].


B. Clark notes, directly from Boileau, opines that "The sublime style necessarily requires big and magnificent Words." 26

One of the reasons that the lofty style was thought to be so affecting was because it made an extensive use of rhetorical figures and tropes: 27 both are unusual employments of language, involving the deliberate violation of rules of logic or grammar in order to express certain emotional states. 28 An example will serve to clarify their mode of operation: Hyperbaton, defined in John Smith's The Mysterie of Rhetorique Unvail'd as a "Figura dictionis" (i.e. "Figure of a word," involving "repetition of sounds or words in a sentence") involves the separation of two words (or ideas) that are normally connected (5, 7). The Longinian explanation of its effects accentuates the connection between rhetorical artifice and the natural disorder of language produced by emotion: hyperbaton is a troubled and disorderly placing of words or notions, and indeed the truest character of a struggling and contending passion: as those who are really angered or afraid or provoked, or possessed with jealousie, or any other passion... falling from their first thoughts straggle into others, and speak things clean different, interrupting the series of the discourse with some new and improper things, yet at last winding into what they had formerly propos'd: And this through vexation of mind, being drawn aside and ross'd up and down by a giddy and unruly spirit, disordering and entangling both their words and notions a thousand wayes contrary to the conduct and order of reason. So even the most excellent writers

---


27 See Vickers, Classical Rhetoric 85. A "figure" is an arrangement of words, while a "trope" involves the transference of meaning on a conceptual level. Because individual rhetorics classify such devices differently I shall use "figure" as a convenient tag by which to refer to both.

28 See Lamy's definition of figures, which are "Characters drawn by our Passions in our Discourse." He defines them as "Manners of Speaking, different and remote from the ways that are ordinary and natural" (224). See also 201. Dryden's comments that Ovid's "thoughts [i.e. figurative language] which are the Pictures and results of those Passions, are generally such as naturally rise from those disorderly Motions of our Spirits" ("Preface" to Ovid's Epistles 111-12).
have taken occasion to *imitate* this work of *nature*. (xliv-xlv)

Figures like *hyperbaton* thus function as a descriptive analysis of the specific effects of actual emotions on language, while providing the orator with the tools to simulate the linguistic effects of emotional states, to "*imitate* this work of *nature". As Bernard Lamy expresses it in *The Art of Speaking*, figures "are Instruments used to shake and agitate the Minds of those to whom we speak" (247). Through figures, the orator can infect the audience with an analogous emotion: "we must animate our selves, and (if I may say so) kindle a flame in our hearts, that it may be like a hot Furnace from whence our words may proceed full of that fire which we would kindle in the hearts of other people" (364).

The fact that figures provided the orator or poet with a means of simulating an emotion that may not actually be felt left some rhetoricians, like Lamy, uncomfortable. The idea that rhetoric could produce the appearance of passion where none was felt posed a particular threat to the legitimacy of Juvenalian modes of satire because it made satiric *indignatio* look too much like a weapon that could be wielded capriciously and irresponsibly. Rapin's criticism of Juvenal has already been cited: Juvenal's "violent manner of declamation" has "but very little effect" precisely because "he is always in *choler*, and never speaks in *cold blood*" (138). In fact, however, Juvenal's extensive employment of rhetorical figures to manipulate his audience could seem all too cold-blooded to some. It likewise could seem dishonest: Dryden, it will be recalled, remarked in

---

29 Dryden, in the "Apology for Heroic Poetry," explains that figures and tropes developed as poets conventionalized emotional responses: "From hence have sprung the tropes and figures for which they wanted a name who first practised them, and succeeded in them" (sig. [b3^v]).

30 See Shaw's *Words Made Visible*, in which "Irony" argues that "there can be no Oratory without dissimulation. The lively representations with either *Orators* or *Poets* do make, whereby they so wonderfully affect the minds of men; what are they but purely *Ironical*?" (117).
the Preface to Religio Laici that "A Man is to be cheated into Passion" (243). Paradoxically, if the idea that satiric fury was an accurate index of the satirist's deformed soul could be employed by critics of the genre, so too could charges of artifice and insincerity.

Rapin's slighting characterization of Juvenal's style as a "violent manner of declamation" hints at the nature of such charges: Juvenal's employment of pathos, his use of elaborate tropes and figures, seemed overtly artificial and too like a highly stylized rhetorical declamation.31 Adding fuel to such criticisms was the belief that Juvenal had begun his career as a professional orator: indeed, Quintilian was thought to have been his tutor.32 Scaliger thought that Juvenal's rhetorical training gave his satires a bite and force missing from those of Horace: "Juvenal's are easily the most eminent of satires, for his verses are better by far than those of Horace, with bitterer judgements, and a clearer way of speaking."33 Saint-Evremond thought that "the tone of Declame" was "the true Character of Juvenal" (2: 109), while Barten Holyday suggested that Juvenal used rhetoric to modify the genre, "declaming against Vice" rather than "jeering at it," and reshaping satire to make it "not so much like a Flount, as a Declamation" (sig. [al']).34


34 Casaubon similarly suggested that Juvenal's rhetorical training was the origin of "those sharp expressions and, as they say, those sententiae which Julius Scaliger admired so much in the admirable work De Poetica" ("Prolegomena" 289).
Earlier in the century, Sir Robert Stapylton had commenced his "Life of Juvenal" by noting that the satirist had "left the pleasing, but unprofitable fictions of the Orator Quintilian, to prosecute the bitter but wholesome truths of the Satyrist Lucilius" (sigs. [A7⁺]). Stapylton's remarks are interesting because they reveal an anti-rhetorical bias characteristic of much seventeenth-century criticism of Juvenal. Far from citing Juvenal's background in rhetoric as a strength, Stapylton lauds him for abandoning its "unprofitable fictions." Even Juvenal's partisans conceded that Juvenal's employment of rhetoric was sometimes a liability: Dryden, in his "Preface" to Sylvaē (1685), concedes that Horace's satires "are incomparably beyond Juvenals if to laugh and rally, is to be preferr'd to railing and declaiming" (16). Similarly, in the "Discourse." Dryden praises Persius because he does not "declaim like Juvenal against Vices, more like an Orator, than a Philosopher" (56).³⁵

Thomas Wood, in his Juvenalis Redivivus, Or, The First Satyr of Juvenal Taught to Speak Plain English (1683), modified Juvenal's language in an attempt to restore "that Naturalness, which Juvenal (in the judgment of Rapin) has seem'd wholly to have forgot." He does so, he admits, because he finds Juvenal's poetry too artificial: "a sporting and merriment of Wit doth render Vice more ridiculous, than the strongest reasons, or most sententious discourse."³⁶ Juvenal can seem insincere because his overwrought and elaborate rhetoric sometimes appears to underscore the artificiality of his discourse. Dryden concedes this point, suggesting that Horace is instructive precisely because his art is so well concealed: "he had found

---


³⁶ Juvenalis Redivivus ([London], 1683) sig. [A3⁺].
out the Skill of *Virgil* to hide his Sentences: To give you the Virtue of them, without shewing them in their full extent: Which is the Ostentation of a Poet, and not his Art" (61-62). Juvenal's declamatory method is highly conspicuous, drawing attention to itself in a way that distracts the reader from the instructive morality. Rhetorical expression overwhelms satiric meaning, with the result that it is Juvenal himself, and not his moral instruction, that most attracts our attention.

Attitudes towards Juvenal's extensive employment of rhetorical figures, however, varied greatly according to the individual critic's perception of the value of rhetoric. Rhetorical figures are designed to be transparent: they are intended to provide apparently unmediated access to the speaker's emotional state, and to produce in the unsuspecting auditor an analogous passion. Yet, by the very virtue of the fact that figures are rhetorical, they can seem like self-conscious artifice: the negative modern connotations of "rhetorical" were already becoming current, especially among those subscribing to the language theories promulgated by the Royal Society. Those who distrusted rhetoric were least likely to find Juvenalian *pathos* attractive or effective. Yet rhetoricians themselves could and did argue that figures were only effective if they reflected the speaker's actual feelings. In its treatment of *pathos*, Smith's *The Mysterie of Rhetorique Unvail'd* exhibits just such an attitude:

*Pathopæia* is a form of speech whereby the Speaker moves the mind of his hearers to some vehemency of affection, as of love, hatred, gladness, sorrow, &c. It is when the speaker himself (being inwardly moved with any of those deep and vehement affections), doth by evident demonstration, passionate pronunciation and suitable gestures make a lively expression thereof. (266)

Smith's account implies that the speaker truly feels the emotion that is communicated: although *pathos* is employed to move the auditors "to some vehemency of affection," the speaker must be "inwardly moved" by the emotions expressed. A similar point is made by the author of *The Polite
Grntlemcn: a poet must "be touch'd first himself. and mov'd by the very Passion he wou'd excite. Passions are commonly mov'd by Passions, and Motions caus'd by the like Motions."

The notion that the orator must experience those emotions communicated by pathos is highly conventional one: its most famous expression is Horace's advice in Ars Poetica: "Would'st have me weep? thy self must first begin" (Oldham l. 176). Quintilian similarly notes that "the great Secret of moving the Passions consists in our being moved ourselves": he urges, therefore, that we, "when we want to persuade others of the Truth of what we urge ourselves, be impressed with the real Passion we endeavour to excite, and let us talk to the Judge with the Feeling of the very Sentiments we want to inspire." Quintilian makes explicit what is only implied in Horace's recommendation: the orator must actively and deliberately induce in himself the emotions that are to be communicated. Pathos is employed to beguile both audience and speaker. In this context, it is worthwhile citing the comments of Rochester, who frequently displayed Juvenalian indignatio. Upbraided by Gilbert Burnet for being one of those who "mixed Lies with Truth, sparing nothing that might adorn their Poems or gratifie their Revenge," Rochester replied that

A man could not write with life, unless he were heated by Revenge: For to make a Satyre without Resentments, upon the cold Notions of Phylosophy, was as if a man would in cold blood, cut men's throats who had never offended him: And he said, the lies in these Libels came often in as Ornaments that could not be spared without spoiling the beauty of the Poem. (Some Passages 22)

Rochester seems to be saying many things here: he begins by suggesting, like Horace, that he cannot "write with life" unless he himself sincerely feels the emotions that he is trying to

[Henry Barker], trans. The Polite Gentleman (London, 1700) 83.

Quintilian 2: 33-34; VI.i.26-27: Significantly, this discussion leads into one on the subject of φαντασίας, the "Phantasies" of "Longinus," as a means of inducing emotion in the self. See also 2: 36; VI.i.34 and 461 (XI.i.62). Aristotle expresses a similar idea in Poetics 17.
communicate. To this expression of the importance of sincerity he adds an overtly moral dimension by suggesting that satire written dispassionately is like cold-blooded murder.⁹⁹ Rochester's concern, however, is not truly with standards of probity, sincerity, or truth, but rather with the aesthetics of what he is writing, with "the beauty of the Poem." Beauty is not a neutral term, for beauty creates pleasure and poetic pleasure is always, in a seventeenth-century context, related in some manner to polemical or didactic effect: the "cold Notions of Phylosophy" are not in themselves enough to generate an effective poem, but require the assistance of an affecting element of beauty. Rochester's faith in the efficacy of his own emotive communication is testimony to his faith in pathos. To move others as he would wish, he must first be moved himself. Something of this same idea is apparent in Dryden's Prologue to Amphitryon (1690):

The lab'ring Bee, when his sharp Sting is gone,
Forgets his Golden Work, and turns a Drone:
Such is a Satyr, when you take away
That Rage, in which his Noble Vigour lay.
What gain you, by not suffering him to teize ye?
He neither can offend you, now, nor please ye.
The Honey-bag, and Venome, lay so near.
That both, together, you resolv'd to tear:
And lost your Pleasure, to secure your Fear. (ll. 1-9)

Rochester's remarks are founded upon a paradox: the lies that serve as "Ornaments" (a common seventeenth-century term for figures) are the means by which Rochester gives expression to his sincere thirst for revenge. The truth of pathos resides not in the subject-matter, but in the honest origin of the satiric expression. Figures, then, are falsehoods, because they are both "artifice" and, literally, scurrilous lies, but they are simultaneously truthful because they accurately

⁹⁹ Rochester's description of being "heated by Revenge" implies, as Ronald Paulson points out, a conventional correlation between the satiric impulse and bodily function. "Rochester: The Body Politic and the Body Private," in Martz and Williams, eds., The Author in His Work 103.
reflect the satirist's emotional state, and reproduce that state in the audience. Indeed, so far is Rochester from being insincere, that his marks betray a rather frightening element of self-preoccupation: it is his personal enemies, the objects of his "Revenge," rather than more general vices that he chooses to target.40

This emphasis upon "Revenge" highlights an important aspect of pathos: it is, by definition, intensely personal and subjective. If Horatian satire, with its employment of ethos, presupposes the existence of a community of values, Juvenalian satire posits a community where values have gone mad, and only one moral perspective, that of the satirist himself, applies.41 That an objective examination of Rochester's "Ornaments" exposes them as "lies" is irrelevant, because the truth of pathos is subjective, a function of what is felt rather than of what can be proven. The very fact that the Juvenalian satirist must employ pathos to reproduce in the audience an analogous emotional state underlines the singularity of the satirist's perspective: where ethos obliges the satirist to accommodate himself to his audience, pathos forces the audience to adopt the perspective of the satirist. Jean Le Clerc, in his Parrhasiana: Or, Thoughts upon Several Subjects (1700) describes the effects of the sublime in a way that is most relevant in this context:


41 Peter Green (230) suggests that "Juvenal writes from a very limited viewpoint, and the traverse of his attack is correspondingly narrow," while S. H. Braund notes that the Juvenal of Books I and II (Satires 1-6) is "the angry man with his simple, blinkered, narrow-minded viewpoint." Beyond Anger: A Study of Juvenal's Third Book of Satires (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988) 23. See also Anderson. Roman Satire 294-95.
"The irregular Imagination of the Poet expresses itself in so noble and sublime a manner, that it easily overpowers ours, and gives it the same Movements, by which itself is agitated" (16).

Juvenal attempts in some sense to possess his readers, to limit our perspective to his own, to make his values our values and, in fact, to construct a new community centred around the figure of the satirist and the values that he espouses. *Pathos*, then, insists upon a single perspective: under its influence, our emotional and moral vision becomes that of the speaker. It is for just this reason the perfect vehicle for the kind of rigid, unyielding and superbly self-confident moral outlook that Juvenal and his imitators adopt. Just as Horace's moral relativism is a function of his adherence to a perceived community of values, Juvenal's self-confident morality is an expression of the subjective nature of *pathos*. The Juvenalian satirist refuses to acknowledge the validity of any perspective but his or her own, and endeavours to shift us towards it.\(^{42}\)

There is thus a kind of violence implicit in the Juvenalian mode of satire that extends beyond its characteristic employment of vehement or brutal language. As one anonymous lampoon expressed it,

> The Men of Witt and judgment doe admire  
> In usefull Satyr a resistless Fire  
> The Heav'ly Lightning Church and Throne destroys  
> While the dimm Candle onely singes flies\(^{43}\)

As seventeenth-century England found the illusion of a single community of values increasingly untenable, perspectives on the function and operations of Juvenalian *pathos* shifted. Elizabethan and Jacobean satirists valued the Juvenalian mode because *pathos* focused upon the figure of the

\(^{42}\) See Weber "Jester and the Orator" 175-77, and Knoche 150.

\(^{43}\) "Satyr." BL MS Harl. 6913 f.69'; Wilson 36-40.
satirist, and provided the opportunity for witty and self-reflexive explorations of the relationship between poet and poem. For topical satirists in the increasingly fragmented age that followed the 1630s, Juvenalian satire provided a model that accommodated increasingly narrow party perspectives, while simultaneously providing a tool for the conversion of the uncommitted. Joseph Trapp wrote of the opening lines of Juvenal's Satire 1 that "At the first Onset, he declares open War" (233): critics and moralists might disapprove of the methods employed by Juvenal, if not of his actual values, but for the polemical satirist of the late seventeenth-century, the tools of Juvenalian pathos offered a technique for the continuation of war by other means.

_**Cleveland and the "War of the Pen"**_

Explaining his decision to "cast away all such pieces as I wrote during the time of the late troubles" in the "Preface" to his 1656 Poems, Cowley defended his act of self-censorship by accentuating the differences between the roles of the poet in peace and in war. The Civil Wars having ended, the task of the poet was to reunite a fragmented nation: "The Names of Party, and Titles of Division, which are sometimes in effect the whole quarrel, should be extinguished and forbidden in peace under the notion of Acts of Hostility" (sig. [a4v]). In war, the duty of the poet was different: "in all Civil Dissentions, when they break into open hostilities, the War of the Pen is allowed to accompany that of the Sword, and every one is in a manner obliged with his Tongue, as well as Hand, to serve and assist the side which he engages in" (sig. [a4]). Cowley's analogy of soldier and poet is far from merely fanciful: it would be difficult to underestimate the ferocity with which the poets of the 1640s and 1650s engaged in this "War of the Pen."

Royalist and Roundhead writers alike viewed their role as that of capturing the hearts and
minds of the English people: even those poets who, like John Taylor, had determined before the war to "curbe" their muses "from medling with the State." found themselves drawn in. Charles brought printing-presses with him into the north Midlands and the Welsh Borders. Parliament demonstrated its respect for the impact of the written word when it reimposed strict censorship over areas under its control in June of 1643. Parliament had, of course, its own poet-soldiers, engaged in what Clarendon was to call "paper skirmishes" (5: 30); one of these, Thomas Walker, was accused by a Royalist pamphleteer of having "done more mischief in the kingdome then ever all my Lord of Essex's, or Sir Thomas Fairefaxes whole traine of Artillery ever did." Milton served the cause. So too did George Wither: in his The Great Assises Holden in Parnassus by Apollo and His Assessours (1645) he censures the publishers of diurnals on both sides of the

---

44 Wither, in Campo-Musae, argues that "The Sword hath had his turne. and now the Pen / Advanced is to play her part ajen" (2). A commendatory poem to Martin Llewellyn's Men-Miracles praises the poet for having "taken Pen. and Sword unsheath'd / When Mars with Hermes have thy Lawrell wreath'd" (sig. [A4]).

45 Bull, Beare, and Horse, Cut, Curtaile, and Longtaile (London. 1638) sig. [E2].

46 P. W. Thomas 28; see also Potter 12-26 and passim, and Donald Williams Bruce "Oxford Garrison" 250-56.


48 A Fresh Whip for All Scandalous Lyers (London, 1647) 6. Mercurius Britannicus 4 (12-19 September, 1643) reported the capture of a shipment of Mercurius Aulicus, and facetiously remarked that it was "as great a losse as befell his Majestic since the late losse at Gloucester" (25). See also the account of the "Prodigious service Aulicus did" in Mercurius Britannicus 39 (10 June to 17 June, 1644) 303-04, and 101 (13 October to 20 October, 1645) 897.

conflict. Party satirists are arraigned by the *manes* of Scaliger, who is particularly agitated by the work of the Royalist *Mercurius Aulicus* (i.e. John Berkenhead):

```plaintext
hee for wicked ends
Had the *Castalian Spring* defil'd with gall:
And chang'd by witchcraft, most Satyrical.
The bayes of *Helicon*, and myrtles mild.
To pricking hauthornes, and to hollyes wild.51
```

The "wicked ends" of *Mercurius Aulicus* are, as the event proves, nothing less than having "added fewell to the direfull flame / Of civill discord, and domesticke blows" (14-15).

The most famous, and probably most effective, writer serving the Royalist cause was only incidentally the writer of a diurnal: it was with verse satire that John Cleveland made his name.52

Even his enemies conceded his impact: the Parliamentary pamphlet *Mercurius Anti-Mercurius* described him in 1648 as "the wittiest knave of the whole crew: (give the Devil his due.) he is the Court-jester, the Cavaliers fool, the chief squib-crack, arch pamphlet-puppy: if his Brethren (in iniquity) get him, the fools hug him, as the Papists doe a Dispensation, to eat flesh Fridayes."53

To Royalists, Cleveland was a poetic Prince Rupert, waging the paper war with an unprecedented ferocity and effectiveness. David Lloyd, writing after the Restoration, asserted that his satires

---


52 Cleveland wrote some issues of *Mercurius Pragmaticus*: see Frank 139 and 194. See also Samuel Vogt Gapp's speculations in "Notes on John Cleveland." *PMLA* 46 (1931): 1082-84.

53 *Mercurius Anti-Mercurius* ([London. 1648]) sig. [A2"]. Cited in Cleveland lxviii.
were "blows that shaked triumphing Rebellion, reaching the soul of those not to be reached by Law or Power, striking each Traitor to a Paleness beyond that of any Loyal Corps that bled by them; the Poet killing at as much distance, as some Philosophers, beat scars lasting as time, indelible as guilt-stabs beyond death."  

Cleveland's undoubted effectiveness as the voice of Royalist outrage is in large measure the result of what was, in some ways, a revolutionary approach to topical polemical satire. Where Cowley chose as his weapon a variety of Horatian ethos, Cleveland employed a bitter and violent Juvenalian invective. Juvenal, it has been noted, was thought to have studied rhetoric: it is not insignificant that Cleveland too had a well-established reputation as an orator at Cambridge before his involvement in the war. Contemporary accounts of Cleveland's life and character seldom fail to mention his oratorical accomplishments: Thomas Fuller, in the biographical sketch contained in The History of the Worthies of England (1662), calls him an "Exquisite Orator," while Aubrey tells us that Cleveland at Cambridge was "more taken notice of for his being an eminent disputant, then a good poet" (1: 174). His rhetorical powers were called upon in a more serious context when, imprisoned at Yarmouth in late 1655, he appealed in writing to Cromwell: ironically, while he had been imprisoned because of his literary accomplishments, his eloquent plea to Cromwell

---

54 Memoires of the Lives, Actions, Sufferings, and Deaths of Those Noble, Reverend, and Excellent Personages (London, 1668) 618.

55 For Cleveland's academic career, see John M. Berdan's biography (still the best life of Cleveland available) in The Poems of John Cleveland (New Haven: Yale UP, 1911) 15-27.

succeeded in securing his release. 57

While a rhetorical training was hardly an unusual accomplishment of the age, Cleveland was thought to excel in the practical aspects of oratorical persuasion: an anonymous commendatory Pindaric prefatory to the 1677 edition of Cleveland's poems praises him as the inheritor of both "Cicero's tongue, and Virgil's spirit." 58 If Juvenal's satiric metier was founded upon his own skilful handling of rhetorical figures and the operations of pathos, so too was Cleveland's. As Lee Jacobus has put it, "Cleveland's genius was a rhetorical genius": "much of his technique of persuasion is calculated in terms of its ability to produce a specific response from the listener." 59 As Jacobus notes, modern antipathy towards Cleveland is the result, in part, of the rhetorical nature of his poetry. Pathos relies upon figures, and figures, it should be remembered, are deliberate violations of grammar or logic. 60 Many of Cleveland's "faults" are, in fact, deliberate rhetorical ploys: Jacobus sees "great care in [Cleveland's] apparent disorganization and in his efforts to produce extreme effects in the mind of the reader." One of Cleveland's favourite figures, catachresis, means literally "misuse" or "misapplication": it is defined in John Newton's rhetoric as "a harsh and unpleasant change of a word: as namely when one word or name is put for another, not by any proper relation, but by a kind of force" (95). Cataphresis was, by the time

57 The last of the "reasons of judgment" against Cleveland was that "Mr. Cleveland is a person of great abilities, and so able to do the greater disservice"; see Berdan 39-40.

58 "L. T.," "Hail venerable Reliques . . .," Clieidlandi Vindiciae sig. [a1'].


60 Cf. Dryden's complaint, in "The Apology for Heroique Poetry," that the grand style is misinterpreted: "Are all the flights of Heroique Poetry, to be concluded bombast, unnatural, and meer madness, because they are not affected with their Excellencies?" (sigs. [b2'-b3']).
of the Restoration, already associated with Cleveland, as Dryden's discussion of its employment by an unnamed poet (probably Cleveland's friend and Royalist colleague, Robert Wild) in *An Essay of Dramatick Poesie* (1668) suggests:61 "I ask you if one of them does not perpetually pay us with clenches upon words and a certain clownish kind of raillery? if now and then he does not offer at a *Catachresis* or *Clevelandism*, wrestling and torturing a word into another meaning" (10). *Catachresis* was coming into disfavour by the mid-seventeenth-century, a victim of changing tastes, emerging Neoclassical values, and new theories of language. It is not surprising to find Smith's *The Mysterie of Rhetorique Unvail'd* describing *catachresis* as "an improper kind of speech," or "the abuse of a Trope, when words are too far wrested from their native signification" (49). And yet *catachresis* was a legitimate trope. As described by Dryden in "The Authors Apology for Heroique Poetry; and Poetique Licence," it was not "to be avoided, but to be us'd judiciously, and plac'd in Poetry, as heightenings and shadows, to make the Figure bolder, and cause it to stand off to sight" (sig. [b4']). One example of *catachresis* chosen from many in Cleveland's œuvre will suffice to demonstrate its function.

On April 27, 1646, Charles I slipped out of Oxford: one contemporary reported that "he went out disguised in a montero and a hat upon it: that sir Thomas Glemham [the Governor of Oxford] at his parting bid him 'Farewell Harry,' by which name it seems he goes."62 On the 5th of

---


May Charles surrendered himself to the Scots at Southwell. Cleveland's response to these events was *The Kings Disguise* (1647), which opens with a surprising *catachresis*: "AND why so coffin'd in this vile disguise. / Which who but sees blasphemes thee with his eyes?" (ll. 1-2). The employment of "coffin'd" here is a *catachresis*: it is, technically, an abuse of the verb "to coffin" to use it with reference to a disguise. Its appearance is sudden and unexpected, and its effect upon the reader unquestionably jarring or even unpleasant. It is also, in the context, entirely appropriate. On one level, the characterization of Charles I as "coffin'd" in his disguise communicates Cleveland's sense that, in the course of the king's ignoble escape from Oxford, something of his majesty and glory has died: "This Privie-chamber of thy shape would be / But the Close mourner to thy Royaltie" (ll. 23-24). At the same time, the sudden and violent appearance of this unexpected verb communicates not merely the poet's attitude but also something of his apparent mental state: it is as though, searching for the proper word, his excited and outraged feelings have led him to fasten, almost unconsciously, upon this one.

---

63 Southwell was near Newark, where Cleveland served as the King's Judge Advocate. Charles' action had an immediate impact upon Cleveland, who was, on May 6, ordered by Charles to surrender Newark to the Scots. Berdan 37, and Wedgwood, *King's War* 556.


65 Cf. the reply to Cleveland's poem in *Upon His Majesties Comming to Holmby* ([London, 1647]): the monarch is assured that he "canst not loose thy selfe, unlessse thou yeeld."

66 M. L. Donnelly, noting that "real emotional distress and psychological confusion" shapes Cleveland's poem, locates the source of this response in the decay of Royalist ideology and language, an argument that has some validity, but that ignores Cleveland's employment of this verbal strategy elsewhere. "Caroline Royalist Panegyrical and the Disintegration of a Symbolic Mode." "The Muses Common-Weale," eds. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, Essays
catachresis, then, communicates the poet's emotions on two levels, both directly through the meaning of the verb he has employed and indirectly by the very fact of his unusual mode of expression. This involves a kind of paradoxical decorum: in a world turned upside down, when Charles himself seems guilty "of high Treason 'gainst my Soveraigne" (l. 6), such "wresting and torturing" of language is entirely decorous. Cleveland shows, rather than describes, his sense of bitter outrage. The reader is encouraged to react, not merely to the events described, but to the poet's own reaction.

Modern readers are, perhaps, more inclined to see Cleveland's catachresis as clever wordplay than as a highly affecting and emotional outburst. Lines like these on Charles' self-betrayal now, perhaps, appear merely self-consciously artificial. "metaphysical":

The Sun hath mew'd his beames from off his lamp.
And Majesty defac'd the Royall stamp.
Is't not enough thy Dignity's in thrall.
But thou 'lt transcripte it in thy shape and all? (ll. 11-14)

Here, the paradoxes may now seem witty, but hardly affecting: and yet, to his own generation, Cleveland's mode was most commonly characterized as "lofty" or even, to use a term just becoming current, sublime. As John Leigh's commendatory poem prefixed to William Cartwright's Comedies, Tragi-Comedies, with Other Poems (1651) expresses it, "Give us all

______________________________


67 Paul Korshin, speaking of "The Mixt Assembly" (ca. 1643-47; ll. 67-90), notes "an analogy between the cacophony of Cleveland's style and the discord in church and state, for Cleveland's concept of poetic mimesis includes the idea of congruity of style with external events." "The Evolution of Neoclassical Poetics." ECS 2 (1968): 111. See also Potter 62-65.
Cleveland, *all his gallant lines, / Whose Phansie still in strong Expressions shines.* Cleveland's "strong Expressions" are not likely to seem sublime to modern readers, nor indeed did they to Dryden. Eugenius, in *An Essay of Dramatick Poesie* comments that "we cannot read a verse of Cleveland's without making a face at it, as if every word were a Pill to swallow: he gives us many times a hard Nut to break our Teeth, without a Kernel for our pains": Cleveland "gives us common thoughts in abstruse words" (30). In 1668, however, Dryden's view represented the exception rather than the rule. Edward Phillips called Cleveland "a Notable High soaring Witty Loyalist" (104), while Thomas Fuller praises "His lofty Fancy" which "may seem to stride from the top of one Mountain to the top of another, so making to it self a constant Level and *Champion of continued Elevations*" (135). William Winstanley similarly characterizes "the very vein and strain of Mr. Cleveland's Writing" as "walking from one height to another, in a constant Level of continued Elevation" (174).

A variation on this theme appears in a poem prefacing *J. Cleaveland Revived: Poems.*

68 "To the Stationer (Mr. Moseley) on his Printing Mr Cartwright's Poems," in *Comedies, Tragi-Comedies, With Other Poems* (London, 1651) sig. [*1*]. Cited in Cleveland lvi.


70 Eugenius does praise the lines in "The Rebell Scot" that compare the Scots with Cain: this is "wit in all languages" because it "is independent of his words"(30). Significantly, Dryden does not even here abate his censure of Cleveland expression. Korshin points out that Dryden's "fruitless nut -- broken tooth image . . . is representative of scholastic obscurantism and futility" ("Evolution" 106). A. Alvarez has criticized Cleveland's verse for just this quality (129-36).

71 Winstanley's *Lives* provides some indication of the continuing popularity of Cleveland as late as 1687: this work contains an entry on the poet some eight pages long.
Orations, Epistles, and Other of His Genuine Incomparable Pieces (1659):

Great storm of Wit, whose fierce sharp wounding rods,
Did awe the Pow'rs, and discipline Gods,
Whose singeing lightning falls on all he meets,
Granado's, Satyrs, Balls of wilde fire greets
The Kirk, the zeal o' th' Scottish Nation.72

Here, Cleveland's loftiness is heroic, and derives from the impression of the force and strength of his language:73 he himself becomes an epic hero, a warrior-satirist who fights on the printed page the same battle being waged by Prince Rupert on the field. Fuller, we have seen, employs the image of Cleveland's personified Fancy striding hugely "from the top of one Mountain to the top of another." It is a short step from this kind of image to one that figures forth a colossal Cleveland, employing, like Achilles, Odysseus, or Æneas, mighty weapons: a manuscript poem by Mildmay Fane, 2nd Earl of Westmoreland, calls him "Of all great Arts Leviathan."74

Even more dramatic in its evocation of Cleveland's loftiness is the humorously effusive (and premature) funeral elegy for the poet in 1655 by "S. H." Cleveland is a "Colbrand of Castalia, he whose strength, / Takes up nine Acres at the least in length," and he is compared to "Titius," one of Augustus' court poets: "every line of his might well, / Serve Faustus, or Agrippa

72 "Verses that came too late, intended for Mr. J. Cleaveland, pictured with his Laurell." J. Cleaveland Revived, ed. E. Williamson (London, 1659) sig. [A8']: The piece is signed "E. W.," presumably the E. Williamson who edited the volume and signed the prefatory "To the Reader."

73 Cf. Robert Boyle's description of sublimity: "it far'd with Similitudes as with Bows, which though they may be bent so forcibly as to be thereby broken or spoil'd, yet by being strain'd somewhat more than ordinarily, they acquire a greater strength, and enable the Arrow to Pierce farther, and to make a smarter Impression." (Occasional Reflections sig. [a3']).

for a Spell." An impression of Cleveland's "loftiness" is conveyed by means of a mock imitation (approaching parody) of his style:

Thou great Gargantuan, huge Collossian Bard,
Who shall dare sing thy worth unless prepar'd
With Sack and Sulphure, every word should pierce
Like Thunder through the wond'ring Universe;
Although thou art inhum'd (to fancy Fate)
Yet still to us thou dost tonitruate.
Thy words want each an Arlium: we can Rant.
'Tis true, but not like thee (our Termagant)
Whose every syllable a sentence is.
Each word an Axiome, thou hast searcht Abysse,
(The Muses Hercules) and shown to us.
That triple-headed bandog Cerberus (sig [A4'])

This evocation of a "Gargantuan" Cleveland is a witty Clevelandesque pun. for Aubrey tells us that Cleveland "was a comely plump man" (1: 175). "S. H.'s mock-elegy deliberately plays off contemporary characterizations of Cleveland as poet-hero and royalist champion. Critics less sympathetic than "S. H." attempted to subvert this myth: in such accounts, his "lofty" verse is denigrated as rhetorical noise, while Cleveland himself becomes a bloated bully, who can frighten but not kill. A poem by Sir John Cotton, for example, derides the poet as a "Poet in bumbaste.

---

75 "On the Death of the High-priz'd Poet John Cleaveland, Esq. . . . Funerall Elegies. Or the Sad Muses in Sables (London. 1655) sig. [A4']. The reference is probably to Titius Septimius, mocked by Horace in his Epistle 1. 3 as "He that so bravely dares transfer the flame / Unto us Romans, which from Pindar came." "Titius" is also a punning reference Tityos, the giant who "covered nine acres when stretched on the ground." John Lemprière. Lemprière's Classical Dictionary. 1788. 1792 (London: Bracken Books. 1984) s.v. "Titius."

76 The poem later compares Cleveland with Ben Jonson, jesting upon his "face and belly . . . as big as Bens" and calling him a "Gyant of Wit as well as Bulk" (sig. [A4']).

77 An element of this appears in the poem of "S. H." : the image of Cleveland as "our Termagent" is double-edged, suggesting both the violent and overbearing quasi-deity of medieval Mystery plays, and the more recent meanings of bully, blusterer, and even shrew (OED). The word was frequently associated with satire: see John Taylor's A Most Horrible, Terrible.
whose conceptions bee / But Witts-impostumes, and a timpanie":

    Thy verses rumble like the Cataracts of Nile
    Disturbly rumble, and are heard a Mile
    Before a man come at them, they write
    Thus, doe not please or profit, but affright. 78

Cotton's attack upon Cleveland's meaningless thunder suggests the extent to which definitions of elevation and loftiness were undergoing a transformation in the period: the definition of elevation as "strength" and "forcefulness" of language was becoming displaced by the belief that it was the product of a loftiness of thought or sentiment expressed in consonant language. Hobbes, in his "Answer" to Davenant's "Preface before Gondibert," addresses the issue of heroic expression in just these terms, attacking "wordes in use at this day in the English tongue, that, though of magnifique sound, yet (like the windy blisters of a troubled water) have no sense at all":

    To this palpable darknesse, I may also adde the ambitious obscurity of expressing more then is perfectly conceived: or perfect conceiption in fewer words then it requires. Which Expressions, though they have had the honor to be called strong lines, are in deed no better than Riddles, and not onely to the Reader, but also (after a little time) to the Writer himselfe dark and troublesome. (52)

Hobbes' disparagement of "magnifique sound" that has "no sense at all" and attack on "strong lines" of impenetrable meaning is evocative of much hostile criticism of Cleveland. 79

These are common themes in the critiques of pre-Restoration poetry that appeared in the 1650s

Tollerable, Termagant Saryre (1639).

78 "Upon Mr. J. C. a Famous Poet of our time," quoted from Cleveland lxix.

79 See for example "Upon Mr. Cl. Who Made a Song against Ddrs." a manuscript verse attack upon Cleveland printed in Gapp (1078-79): "Are thy strong lines, & mighty cartrope things / Now spunne soe small, they'l twist on fiddle strings?" For a discussion of "strong lines," and the Restoration reaction against this concept, see George Williamson's essay on the subject in Seventeenth Century Contexts (London: Faber and Faber, 1960) 120-31, and Alvarez 123-25.
and after. Samuel Drake and John Lake, the editors of *Clievelandi Vindiciæ* (1677), are responding to this new approach in their attack upon modish Restoration satire: Cleveland's "touring Fancy soareth so high a pitch that they fly like shades below him. The Torrent thereof (which riseth far above their high water mark) drowneth their Levels" (sigs. [A4"]*). His loftiness, then, resides less in his use of elevated diction than in his profuseness, the idea that his every word is packed with meaning waiting to explode. We recall that "S. H." commented that Cleveland's words "want each an Atlas," and that his "every syllable a sentence is. / Each word an Axiome." Lake and Drake compare Cleveland's wit with the meagre propriety of Restoration poets, and ask "how many of their slight productions may be gigged out of one of his pregnant Words? There perhaps you may find some leaf-gold, here massie wedges: there some scattered rays, here a Galaxy: there some loose fancy frisking in the Ayr. here Wit's Zodiak" (sig. [A4]'). In the same edition, we find a poem entitled "On Mr. Clievcland and his Poems" that berates modern wits who "beat their Wit too thin to make it spread," and praises Cleveland for the fact that each of his words "swells pregnant with a Page" (*Clievelandi Vindiciæ* sig. [a4']). David Lloyd similarly remarks that Cleveland sums "whole books into a Metaphor. and whole Metaphors into an Epithete" (618).

Profuseness of meaning is, as Dryden was to note in his "Discourse," sublime:

*Barten Holiday*, who Translated both *Juvenal* and *Persius*: has made this distinction betwixt them, which is no less true than Witty: that in *Persius* the

---

80 *Ironically, Dryden's heroic plays were ridiculed for the bombastic faults that he found in Cleveland. See for example The Censure of the Rota: On Mr. Driden's Conquest of Granada* (London, 1673), possibly by Richard Leigh, which attacks "His blustering Metaphors" (13).

81 See also E. Williamson, who asserted that "a few of our deceased Poets pages" are "worth cart-loads of the Scriblers of these times" (sig. [A3']).
difficulty is to find a Meaning: in Juvenal, to choose a Meaning: So Crabbed is Persius, and so Copious is Juvenal: so much the Understanding is employ'd in one; and so much the Judgment in the other. So difficult it is, to find any Sense in the former, and the best Sense of the latter. (73)

To many, however, Cleveland's style was merely obscure: he was frequently associated with Persius. Casaubon excused Persius' obscurity by suggesting, on the authority of Longinus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, that daring and obscure figurative language was sublime: "with such great geniuses excessive and even 'hazardous' expressions of this sort are common" (297):

Dryden replied that obscurity generated only a false sublime ("Discourse" 54). The increasing currency of this last view in the latter half of the seventeenth-century undoubtedly impacted upon Cleveland's reputation: Samuel Werentels' criticism of those "who think every thing sublime, which is obscure" might well have been applied to Cleveland. Cleveland's language was un fashionably "metaphysical," but not therefore merely clever, intricate, or "witty." Cleveland's employment of highly figurative language derived from his

---

82 See Holyday sig. [B17].

83 Paul J. Korshin suggests that Cleveland's obscurity was a parody of the mysticism of his opponents. Typologies in England 1650-1820 (Princeton: Princeton UP. 1982) 45. 275-77.

84 An older tradition associated satire with obscurity. See Arnold Stein, "Donne's Obscurity and the Elizabethan Tradition." ELH 13 (1946): esp. 104-08. Kerman, Cankered Muse 60 and passim, and Joseph Hall, "Prologue" to Book III. Viridemiarum. Collected Poems, ed. Arnold Davenport (Liverpool: Liverpool UP. 1949) 33: ll. 4-6: Hall contrasts his own "plaine vittering" with "the Roman ancients, I Whose wordes were short, & darkesome was their sence."

85 A Discourse of Logomachys (London, 1711) 206.

perception that it was an appropriate and effective means of expressing his own engagement with the subject. In this sense, Cleveland's satires, like those of Juvenal, assume the characteristics of expressive poetry. Significantly, defenses of Cleveland's poetry invariably suggest an inextricable identity of poet and poem. It is not merely his verses that are sublime, but the man himself who is gigantic. His poetic loftiness derives from the character of the poet himself:

Hail Reverend Bard! whose name in British story
Shall raise new Monuments of glory.
Whereon thou sublim'd shalt sit
    The Genius of wit.
The winged Pegasus mounts so high.
As if the wind the Gennet ow'd his Progeny.
The lofty Pindar stops his flight.
And only gazeth at, not emulates thy height.
    Whom at that distance plac'd we see.
    There's no parallel for thy Degree.
    But thine own Climax, or Hyperbole.
Which out soars Dedalus his pitch, without his destiny.

Cleveland's is a personal sublime. In the accounts of commentators and eulogists like Lake and Drake, it is Cleveland himself who strides like an epic hero across the landscape. His language is decorous because appropriate to the man who utters it: there is an inviolable connection of signifier to the human origin of the utterance.

The sublimity of Cleveland's satiric style is very like that of Juvenal in that it focuses attention more upon the reactions of the poet than upon the vices that have elicited these

---

87 Ironically it is Milton, in his An Apology against a Pamphlet, who offers the best defence for such language: "indignation against men and their actions notoriously bad, hath leave and authority oft times to utter such words and phrases, as in common talke were not so mannerly to use" (Complete Prose 1: 904). Milton's opinion is founded upon the close association of satire to tragedy. See Irene Samuel, "Milton on Comedy and Satire." HLQ 35 (1972): 107-30.

88 "L. T.," "Hail venerable Reliques . . ." Clevelandi Vindiciæ sig. [a2'].
responses. Indeed, in many ways, many of the criticisms levelled by Restoration commentators against Cleveland, namely those of obscurity and artificiality, are variations on those that were being applied to Juvenal: like the Roman satirist, Cleveland can appear too overtly "rhetorical." on the one hand, and too personally engaged and subjective on the other. Cleveland's satire relied upon the affective power of figurative language, upon pathos, to do its work of persuasion. In this regard, again, the comments of Drake and Lake, who ironically refer to "the exuberance of his Fancy" as "Another blemish in this monster of perfection." are particularly insightful: "When he should only fan, he with Hurricanoes of wit stormeth the sense and doth not so much delight his Reader, as oppress and overwhelm him" (sigs. [A4*-5*]). This rhetoric of violence is one that we have heard before, used by "Longinus" to characterize the working of figures and tropes.

Cleveland's poetic of violent indignation is encapsulated in a manuscript poem that may have been written by him as an early school exercise.89 The opening argument of "On the Poudre Plot" is interesting enough to quote at some length:

I NEEDE not call thee from thy mitred Hill
Apollo, anger will inspire my quill.
If nature should deny, rage would infuse
Virtue as much as could supply a muse.
Satyres run best when Classhing tearms do meet.
And Indignation makes them knock their feet.
To bee methodicall in Verse, & rhime
In such inuectiues is the highest crime.
Who Euer saw a fiery passion breake
But in abruptness? thus my pen must speak
Make at Each word a period, which may show
As Cornes of poudre, & then fire the row
With sharp articulate blasts, which breathing on
Those lines, may inflame each hot expression.

89 Morris and Withington list this poem as "probably by Cleveland": see Cleveland xl. and Withington, "The Canon of John Cleveland's Poetry, Part II," BNYPL 67 (1963): 381-82. 385.
This Annual subject (which now calls the nine)  
Must be shot through the quills of porcupine. (II. 1-16)

Cleveland commences with an introspective discussion of his emotions, and their relationship to his means of expression: it is, in fact, an elaborated paraphrase of the facit indignatio motif, employed to the particular purpose of justifying his language with reference to an idea of satiric decorum. His determination to "Make at Each word a period" anticipates the praise of those who admired his ability to pack profuse significance into each word. "Granado's" as E. Williamson was to call them. His reliance upon the operations of pathos is made explicit in the image of his lines as a blazing trail of gunpowder: it alludes directly to his subject matter, the Gunpowder Plot, but it is also a marvellously apt description of the operations of pathos, which employs strong and sublime language to ignite the passions of the auditor.

The intensity of Cleveland's language and the apparent immediacy of his emotional responses make this poem on Fawkes' Gunpowder Plot seem almost topical. Other poets and prose satirists of the period are as quick to exploit the day's news in their satire, but few are as adept at reproducing the impression of an almost instantaneous explosion of rage. Less evident in this poem, but increasingly marked in his later satires, is the related Juvenalian tendency to sound like a lone voice of outrage howling against the iniquity of society itself. As Morris and Withington have put it, "He begins as the notable defender of authority and due order, and ends as the snarling critic of mob-rule" (Cleveland lxi). Juvenalian satire characteristically combines a rage for order with a solipsistic attitude to the external world: authority and control no longer reside in societal norms, but are rather embodied in the person of the poet himself. It is this sense of personal authority that in turn empowers the satirist with the right to snarl. In this context,
aspects of the opening lines to "The Rebell Scot" take on a new significance:

How? Providence? and yet a Scottish crew?
Then Madam Nature wears black patches too:
What? shall our Nation be in bondage thus
Unto a Land that truckles under us?
Ring the bells backward: I am all on fire.
Not all the buckets in a Countrey Quire
Shall quench my rage. A Poet should be fear'd
When angry, like a Comets flaming beard.
And where's the Stoick can his wrath appease
To see his Countrey sicke of Pym's disease;
By Scotch Invasion to be made a prey
To such Pig-wiggin Myrmidons as they?
But that there's charm in verse, I would not quote
The name of Scot, without an Antidote:
Unless my head were red, that I might brew
Invention there that might be poysom too. (ll. 1-16)

It is truly remarkable how little actual information these initial sixteen lines provide about the object of the poet's ire. The true subject of these lines is, in fact, the satirist himself: again and again, his lines gesture back towards the poem's personal origin. Cleveland characteristically breaks in upon his subject without warning, signifying the strength of his passionate engagement with his subject. The questions within which much of his commentary is framed accentuate the consciousness behind this stream of invective: it is as though we are overhearing a heated monologue. Less subtle are the repeated self-references: the first person pronoun appears, in various forms, no less that seven times in these sixteen lines.

Cleveland's lines are a miniature soliloquy dramatizing, not the invasion of England, but rather the effects of his own rage. He makes no attempt to establish the justice of his cause:

90 Cleveland seldom engages with the issues at hand. What Nevo says of "Smectymnuus, or The Club-Divines" is true of most of his satire: "The obliquity is instructive. There is no attempt to deal with content or an actual issue. Fastening upon the oddity of the name implies that no other attribute of the Club-Divines is worthy of a moment's consideration" (53).
instead, the accent is upon his emotions, revealed both directly through reference to his "fire," "rage," and "wrath," and indirectly through the disordered rhythms of his lines, which are complicated by the frequency of accented caesurae and enjambment. In the ten lines that follow this initial exposition of his anger, he addresses directly the issue of poetic voice:

Were I a drowzie Judge, whose dismall Note
Disgorgeth halters, as a Juglers throat
Doth ribbands: could I (in Sir Emp'ricks tone)
Speak Pills in phrase, and quack destruction:
Or roare like Marshall, that Genevah-Bull,
Hell and damnation a pulpit full:
Yet to expresse a Scot, to play that prize.
Not all those mouth-Granadoes can suffice.
Before a Scot can properly be curst,
I must (like Hocus) swallow daggers first. (ll. 17-26)

Cleveland here examines the destructive potential of language. The judge "Disgorgeth halters, as a Juglers throat / Doth ribbands." "Sir Emp'rick" can "quack destruction," while Marshall is a roaring "Genevah-Bull." In each case, violence is reduced to a trick of language: the fires of Hell may be real enough, but it is not Marshall who will send us there. It is the rope and the pill that are deadly, not the vocalizations of those that dispense them; Cleveland is subtly mocking the power of performative language. This is not an insignificant point: Cleveland's curse-driven poem relies upon such performative language to an immense degree: from his faith in the supposed "charm in verse" (l. 13), to his invocation of the aid of "keen iambics." "The Rebell Scot" derives much of its power from the near magical qualities of verse to make things happen.

In this context, the fact that Cleveland imagines himself swallowing daggers "like Hocus," a common juggler or conjuror, is significant. The association of the raider with the fool is an
ancient and, as Robert C. Elliott has noted, a convenient one, for the fool has had a "licence in speech throughout history. He has always had prerogative to say what other men dare not say" (Power of Satire 137). Cleveland does not require such licence, for his rage is his warrant. Cleveland is instead foregrounding his own linguistic trickery: the violence that he inflicts is, after all, like that of "Hocus," a kind of illusion. The passage provides a covert exposition of the workings of pathos, of how, in Dryden's phrase, "A Man is to be cheated into Passion."

Interestingly, these self-revelatory images lead into his famous invocation of the satirist's power:

Come keen lambics, with your Badgers feet.
And Badger-like, bite till your teeth do meet.
Help ye tart Satyrist, to imp my rage.
With all the Scorpions that should whip this age. (ll. 27-30)

Read in isolation, this evocation of Archilochus seems a serious testament to the satirist's faith in his own powers, but it is also possible to agree with Raman Selden that the extremism of his rhetoric is such as to suggest that "the traditional Juvenalian stance . . . is almost burlesqued" (English Verse Satire 82). When these lines are read in association with his image of the dagger-swallowing satirist-conjuror, the element of burlesque is greatly reinforced. Given that his art is illusion, a conjuring-trick, the effectiveness of his "Badger-like" biting and scorpion-inspired whipping seems questionable, a point reinforced by his later admission that "'tis steel must tame / The stubborn Scor" (ll. 91-92). His assertion that the Scots can, like witches rendered harmless by the drawing of their blood, be reduced to impotence by the "Scratch" of a "pen" (ll. 31-32) is absurd enough in real terms, but is disputable, given Cleveland's apparent attitude towards performative language, even within the metaphorical context of the poem. The key to Cleveland's invocation of violent satire is his desire to "imp" his "rage": it is the articulation of his indignation
that is itself the point of the poem. At the same time, Cleveland’s covert admission that his
iambics are, in real terms, ineffective weapons does not preclude an intention to effect real change
through the medium of his poem: if his words are indeed “granadoes” exploding with
significance, the target against which they are hurled is not the Scots, but the reader. Cleveland’s
role is that of the judge, disgorging “halters, as a Juglers throat / Doth ribbands” with his words:
the power of his language resides in his ability to enjoin others to assume the role of executioner.
His language is performative, and deadly, only in this sense. Cleveland’s mental state is revealed
in large measure by his rapid transitions from one grotesque image to another. The Scots are
transformed by means of pervasive animal imagery into “Wolves” (l. 40) and Soland geese (l. 124),
while their land is a barren “wildernesse” which in itself is punishment almost sufficient for
their transgressions. More boldly still, Cleveland describes the Scots as a “Nation Epidemicall” (l. 70).
They are themselves a disease, the plague of war that is the main export of the Scottish
nation: “No: the Scots-Errant fight, and fight to ear; / Their Estrich-stomacks make their swords
their meat” (ll. 79-80). Reverting swiftly back to his image of sickness, Cleveland next employs
what is perhaps the poem’s most grotesque and striking image:

Sure England hath the Hemerods, and these
On the North Posterne of the patient seize.
Like Leeches: thus they physically thirst
After our blood, but in the cure shall burst. (ll. 83-86).

This an image of the world turned upside down in a comically literalized manner.91 The strongly

---

91 The image of a world stood on its head was popular amongst Royalists, and was
appropriated, as Gerald Hammond points out, from Puritan allusions to Acts 17: 6 (246). See
Marchamont Nedham’s ballad-satire on the prohibition of Christmas celebrations, The World is
Turned Upside Down ([London], [1646]), and John Taylor’s Mad Fashions, Old Fashions, All
Out of Fashion (London, 1642) (reissued in 1647 as The World Turn’d Upside Down, often
erroneously attributed to Thomas Jordan).
visual effect of these lines approaches in effect the concrete dramatic illusion of Longinian "Phantasie" or "imaging."

The lightning-fast transitions of images in this and other passages function as evidence of the speaker's excited state of mind. Harry Levin has claimed that Cleveland's satires "consist merely or assortments of epigrams on a general theme, rather than any carefully integrated onslaughts." Logic is, however, the province of ethos, not pathos, and Cleveland's employment of epitrochusmus -- moving swiftly from one statement to another -- sacrifices integration in order to better communicate the impression of angry excitement, of a mind and a tongue racing so quickly in impassioned response that logical progression becomes impossible. C. V. Wedgwood has argued that Cleveland "was clearly a man of fluent and excitable invention: one imagines him arguing well by bounding from point to point and making his opponent dizzy." As Hobbes said of pathos, "as the minde of the speaker, so the mind of the Hearer alwayes" (Briefe 108): the reader too is swept along, overwhelmed by both the speed of the images and the impression of emotion that they convey. The real "magic" of Cleveland's satiric verse lies in its ability to make us see through his eyes, to present a new and grotesque angle on the subject that is his own subjective perspective, but becomes, by means of pathos, our own.

Cleveland's ability to focus a single, overwhelming perspective upon a given historical moment is, perhaps, nowhere more evident than in The Scots Apostasie (1647). Cleveland's


poem details his reactions to the printed text of the speech made by the Earl of Loudoun to the King in July of 1646. Charles had been in the custody of the Scots since his surrender at Southwell, but he refused any accommodation with his captors, and his presence was fast, with the conclusion of the Civil War apparently in sight, becoming a liability. When Commissioners from Parliament arrived at Newcastle on July 30 with terms to offer the King, the Scots were greatly dismayed to find the King obdurate: Loudoun (whose relationship with the King had been a rocky one) addressed him in an attempt to force him to reconsider. Charles, however, remained steadfast, and on January 30, 1647, the Scots marched out of Newcastle leaving Charles behind in the custody of the English: the townspeople, according to Jean de Montereul, the French Ambassador, demonstrated their feelings by "throwing stones" at the Scots, "making reproaches," and calling them "nothing but Jews.--people who had sold their king and their honour." The belief that the Scots had betrayed their king for money became pervasive throughout England: Loudoun's address to the King, as ineffective as it had proved, at least


96 Loudoun was active in the First Bishop's War (Clarendon called him "the principle manager of the rebellion": see 1: 188 and 414); imprisoned in 1640, he later fought at Newburn and became, after the pacification, Lord Chancellor. Loudoun was to assist at the coronation of Charles II at Scone in 1650, and was present at Dunbar: see *DNB* and Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second, King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989) 59-61 and 137.

97 Letter to Mazarin, February 12, 1647. *The Diplomatic Correspondence of Jean de Montereul and the Brothers de Bellièvre*, ed. J. G. Fotheringham (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1898-99) 1: 445. Charles himself is said to have commented that the Scots had sold him "at too cheap a price" (Carlton 313); see also Nedham's mock "Epitaph upon James Duke of Hamilton," *Digitus Dei: Or, God's Justice upon Treachery and Treason* (London, 1649) 30-31.
demonstrated that the Scots thought "nothing more precious than the safety" of the King and had done their best to persuade an obstinate and foolish monarch; it was accordingly republished in early November of 1646 in Severall Speeches, Spoken by the Right Honourable The Earle of Loudoun, in an attempt to counter wide-spread anti-Scot and anti-Presbyterian sentiments.

It is in the context of this propaganda campaign that Cleveland's The Scot's Apostasie should be read. Although it was probably written sometime after the re-issue of Severall Speeches on November 9, 1646 (see Cleveland 156), it was first published as a broadside in March of 1647. By March, the King's "betrayal" by the Scots was already an accomplished fact: Charles was at this time lodged in Holdenby House in Northamptonshire, and Loudoun's speech to the King was already old news. As the initial lines of Cleveland's poem seem to suggest, however, The Scots Apostasie was written less in reaction to Loudoun's speech, than to its republication by Bostock: "Ist come to this? what? shal the cheeks of Fame. / Streteht with the breath of learned Lowdons name. / Be flag'd again?" (I. 1-3). Loudoun's speech is the occasion of the poem, but its title anticipates the surrender of the king and the cry of the brickbat-wielding Newcastle women: Loudoun is the modern type of Judas. Cleveland's attack interweaves two themes, the false eloquence of Loudoun, and the betrayal of the King to the English, and employs both to discredit recent attempts to justify the actions of the Scots.

---

98 "The Lord Chancellour of Scotland his Speech, to the Kings Majesty . . ." Severall Speeches, Spoken by the Right Honourable The Earle of Loudoun (Edinburgh. 1646) 48.

99 Paul J. Korshin, commenting on the importance of such pamphlet skirmishes to Cleveland's poetic output, has noted that he was "irrevocably affected by the tide of attack and reprisal which advances and recedes throughout his career." ("Evolution" 109).

100 See Cleveland 156. Thomason's copy is dated March 10. It was reissued a week or two later in the fifth edition of The Character of a London-Diurnall.
Robert Bostock, the publisher of *Severall Speeches*, evidently believed that *The Scots Apostasie* was a direct reply to his pamphlet.¹⁰¹ a week after the appearance of the poem. Bostock responded with *The Scots Constancy. Or, An Answer to Cleveland's Scots Apostacy* (1647). Bostock's charges against Cleveland cover familiar ground: the Royalist poet writes for his own glory, and his rhetoric of lofty outrage consists of empty noise. "bum-basted raptures, to abuse / The poor compounders."¹⁰² More interesting, however, is his characterization of Cleveland's poem as "Poore Crums of Comfort to a dying cause / Of his malignant party" (1). Bostock undoubtedly touched upon a sensitive point here: by March 1647, the King's defeat seemed irrevocable. Nigel Smith has described the quandary facing Royalists poets in this twilight of the King's cause: "in defeat, satire had no function of providing an overcoming of powerlessness because for most Royalists the culture of loyalism had drifted away. Absence typifies this verse" (314). In an important sense, by 1647 the Royalist propaganda campaign was like the pitiful remnants of King's military effort, already lost.

Cleveland's model was, however, Juvenal, and Juvenal is, to a great extent, the patron satirist of lost causes: his Rome is already corrupted and all but beyond redemption, and his normative values, like those of the increasingly isolated and desperate Royalists of the late 1640s and 1650s, are those of an all but dead past. As the Royalist cause slid towards total defeat, the

¹⁰¹ Bostock was a fervent defender of the Scots and of Presbyterian interests: he had already been a victim of Parliamentary censorship for his publication of David Buchanan's aggressively pro-Covenant *A Short and True Relation of Some Main Passages of Things* (1645). His most important contribution to the Parliamentary effort was his publication of *The King's Cabinet Opened* (1645). See Henry R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers... from 1641 to 1667* (Oxford: Bibliographical Society, 1968) 28, CSPD Charles I 19: 15, 144, 330, and 343, and CSPD Commonwealth 2: 178 and 516.

¹⁰² *The Scots Constancy* (London, 1647) 1.
bitterness of Juvenalian indignation, and the sense of isolation amidst a world of vice that is such an important element of Juvenalian pathos, came to seem a very appropriate vehicle. The Scots Apostasie thus offers little in the way of normative values: it is almost exclusively a poem of attack. It is part of Cleveland's intention to exploit the new tensions that were arising between Scots and English, between Independent and Presbyterian, but the Royalist position is at best merely implied in his poem. The King, in fact, had no viable party left, and the Royalist norms that had furnished sympathetic satirists with a foundation for earlier verse attacks had disappeared: Cleveland's is therefore the lone howl of execration.

\begin{verse}
Ist come to this? what? shal the cheeks of Fame,
Stretcht with the breath of learned Lowdons name,
Be flag'd again? and that great piece of Sence,
As rich in Loyalty, as Eloquence,
Brought to the Test, be found a trick of State?
Like Chymists tinctures, prov'd adulterate? \ (ll. 1-6)
\end{verse}

Rhetorically, Loudoun's speech is an example of the parrhesia, or candid speech. John Smith defines this figure as a "liberty or boldnesse of speaking" and notes that it is employed when "in any case we shew our confidence for the present, our fearfulnesse for the future" (225-26).

Parrhesia is superb vehicle for the display of ethos, for it relies for its effect upon an impression of the speaker's fearless forthrightness and honesty, or "Truth and plain dealing" as the prefatory

\begin{flushright}
103 Cf. Thomas Lockwood's description of later Augustan satire: the "chosen satiric object is so vast that he [i.e. the satirist] and not it appears in isolation. A large enough change in the size and power of what the satirist attacks results in a radically new convention illustrating his relationship to it: cut off from the old source of support that came from his audience or 'public,' he is now threatening to become a victim himself, overwhelmed from all directions by a force he cannot even isolate much less destroy" (653).
\end{flushright}
remarks to *Severall Speeches* express it. Loudoun balances of strong avowals of loyalty with frank assertions of the King’s weakness: Loudoun’s candid if unpleasant précis of Charles’ predicament is, it is implied, itself an index of his love for his King, while that loyalty serves simultaneously to suggest that the Chancellor is not exaggerating the severity of the situation. Because it relies so much upon this portrait of the speaker’s honesty and loyalty, Loudoun’s speech was the ideal instrument to counter the growing revulsion at the Scottish Parliament’s surrender of the King.

Cleveland commences with an assault upon Loudoun’s false rhetoric: his *ethos* of moderation is a lie and, by implication, the community that underwrites his views an illusion, a “trick of State.” Cleveland feigns surprise at this discovery: Loudoun has not merely betrayed the King, but also the poet who has, it is mockingly suggested, hitherto held this “great piece of Sense” in some regard. Differently employed, this kind of stratagem might have led to something like a Horatian tone, or one more of sorrow than of anger. Cleveland, however, exploits another effect, that of bleak and bitter despair, as this one last prop of the King’s cause is revealed, finally, as counterfeit. The rapid succession of broken and unanswered questions, a favourite device of Cleveland, conveys surprise, but also a turmoil of emotion and the inability to articulate his intense feelings. The isolated “What?” is particularly effective: this is *aposiopesis*, a sudden silence, as John Smith explains, “*when through vehemency, the course of the sentence begun is so stayed, as thereby some part of the sentence not being uttered, may be understood.*” It serves as an index of “*some affection, as either of sorrow, bashfulness, fear, anger, or vehemency*” (sig. 

---

Clarendon, who evidently had access to a copy of Loudoun’s speech, and gives a summary of it, says that the Scots “used all the rude importunity and threats to his majesty to persuade him freely to consent to all” (4: 210).
[A1']. We respond to the questions that the poet seems, initially at least, emotionally unable to answer. The result, as so often in figures conducive to pathos, is the reproduction within the reader's mind of something analogous to the thoughts and feelings expressed by the poet.

The fact that Cleveland is in the process of manipulating the reader through rhetorical figures does not prevent him from launching a full assault upon Loudoun's slick rhetoric:

The Devill sure such language did atchieve,
To cheat our un-fore-warned Grandam Eve,
As this Impostor found out, to besot
Th' experienc'd English, to believe a Scot. (ll. 7-10)

The real meat of the poem, however, resides in the employment of curse, which dominates the poem from line 27:

Oh were you so ingag'd, that we might see
Heavens angry lightning 'bout your eares to flee,
Till you were shrivel'd to dust: and you cold Land
Parcht to a drought, beyond the Lybian sand!
But 'tis reserv'd: and till heaven plague you worse.
Be Objects of an Epidemick curse. (ll. 27-32)

In an act of hubris that is entirely typical of the supremely self-confident and egocentric Juvenalian mode, Cleveland takes it upon himself to invoke the retribution that heaven has "reserv'd" for the future. The lengthy and involved curse that follows is a virtuoso performance:

First, may your Brethren, to whose viler ends
Your pow'r hath bawded, cease to count you friends;
And prompted by the dictate of their reason,
Reproach the Traytors, though they hug the treason.
And may their Jealousies increase and breed,
Till they confine your steps beyond the Tweed. (ll. 33-38)

---

105 These are also epiplexis, or the framing of questions for purpose of reproach, and of anacoenosis, or an asking of the auditor's opinion: both figures compel the readers to formulate the response for themselves, thus, in some sense, making us complicit in their production.
The first thing that the observant reader begins to realize has he or she works through the subsequent catalogue is how closely Cleveland’s curse corresponds to the actual state of the affairs of the Scottish nation. The Scot’s English "Brethren" were already exhibiting a discomfort with their Presbyterian allies; what is more, the Scots had already, by the time of the publication of Cleveland’s poem in early March of 1647, been confined "beyond the Tweed," their army having departed northern England for Scotland in early February. Cleveland’s curse is in this sense a fulfilled prophecy. He asks that "In forraigne Nations may your loath’d name he / A stigmatizing brand of Infamie" (ll. 39-40), but this is, if the poet is to be believed, already true: indeed, he has, earlier in the poem, conjectured that the Scot’s betrayal of the King represented a desire to "tell the world you know the sins you act" (ll. 17-18).

Similar in effect is his final curse: "To summe up all --- let your Religion be, / As your Allegiance, mask’d hypocrisie" (ll. 61-62). There can be little doubt that Cleveland already believed -- and expected his readers to concur -- that the Presbyterianism of the Covenanters represented precisely this. The performative language of the curse shades almost imperceptibly in the descriptive language of invective:

Till forc’d by generall hate, you cease to rome
The world, and for a plague go live at home:
Till you resume your poverty, and be
Reduc’d to beg, where none can be so free
To grant; and may your scabbie Land be all
Translated to a generall Hospitatall.
Let not the Sun afford one gentle Ray,
To give you comfort of a Summers day.
But, as a Guerdon for your traiterous War,
Live cherisht onely by the Northern Star. (ll. 41-50)

The echo of "The Rebell Scot" that occurs in the first couplet of this passage hints at the complex
interrelationship of perspectives involved: the damning characterizations of "The Rebell Scot," published some three years earlier, serve as proof that the poet's wishes have, in fact, already come to pass.\(^{106}\) The past becomes the fulfilment of the present, and the realization of the future. This is, of course, witty stuff: the poet, as events prove, can construct no worse a fate for the Scots than that they should be themselves. At the same time, however, Cleveland proves himself an Archilochus, a satirist capable of inflicting destruction with the language of invective. That all of this is accomplished through a rhetorical sleight of hand is hardly the point: the poet's vehemence, and the speed with which we fly through this rapid catalogue of punishments creates something like the illusion that we are witnessing performative language in action. The satirist, in the process, manages to place himself at the centre of this world of crime and punishment: he is witness, judge and executioner, truly vomiting forth "halters, as a Juglers throat / Doth ribbands."

He has, in the process, drawn us subtly into his own sphere, compelling us to view the satiric subject from his own individual perspective.

But if our identification of ourselves with the satirist represents a compression of diverse spacial perspectives into a single point of view, he has, with an equally effective rhetorical cheat, managed to compress temporal perspectives. We are granted a vision of a supposedly hypothetical future of retribution that proves, ultimately, to be identical to both the past and the present. Vice and punishment exist simultaneously in a Dantesque vision of a Hell where the punishment is an eternal parodic re-enactment of the crime. This kind of temporal trick puts a radically new spin on the commonplace characterization of Cleveland's satire as "topical." It is

---

\(^{106}\) Readers could easily compare the two poems, both of which were included in the 1647 (5th) edition of *The Character of a London-Diurnall, with Severall Select Poems by the Same Author*, published within weeks of the first appearance of *The Scots Apostasie*. 
not merely that this kind of occasional satire engages directly with a given historical moment: more than this, Cleveland's satire creates for itself, and exists within, a single isolated moment of perception that overpowers past, present, and future. It was common to justify Juvenal's bitter tone by reference to the historical circumstances within which his satires were written: the reader who wishes to understand Juvenal's powerful invectives must first engage sympathetically with the political and social context of Rome under the tyranny of Domitian. We must, in other words, submit ourselves to the sense of the single moment in time that generated the outraged tirades that we are reading. Cleveland's compression of historical perspectives forces us to do just this.

Pathos, then, seeks not merely to overwhelm the reader's perspective with the poet's own, but also relies for its effects upon an erasure of our sense of history. The poet, and by extension, the reader, is unable to see beyond the horror of the current moment: Pathos represents the immediate, visceral, subjective, and unconsidered emotional response of the speaker. Such satires are not to be read, digested, and judged upon a careful consideration of all the facts: the immediacy of our experience of reading, and reacting, is all important. This is a function of topicality gone mad, a short-sightedness that is both the greatest flaw and greatest strength of satires of this kind. Historical fact is the occasion, rather than the subject of such satire: Cleveland's poems are rarely topical in the sense that they address a single historical moment. The various, overlapping "occasions" of The Scots Apostasie -- Loudoun's speech to the King, the publication of the text of that speech, the betrayal of Charles to the English -- slip by in the opening lines of the poem almost unnoticed, displaced entirely by the dramatization of the fictionalized moment of exploding outrage that is the poem's true subject and occasion. Pathos personalizes, and in the process, effectively displaces history.
From the perspective of Cleveland and others of the Cavalier school of satire, this aspect of pathos must have seemed attractive. As the King's party slid irrevocably towards defeat, time itself became the enemy. The past was a catalogue of mistakes and missed opportunities, the present bleak, and the future ominous and frightening. Desperation and bitterness are states of mind that imply both regret for the past and a lack of hope for the future: both are qualities increasingly sounded in the Royalist satires of the mid-1640s and after. Reform or amendment seemed impossible. In John Phillips' *A Satyr against Hypocrites* (1655), which takes its Juvenalian cue from Cleveland, the poet's despair at effecting reform, a reflection of a perspective that sees only a future of darkness and vice, is evident from the early lines of the poem:

The sins of Parliament have long been bawl'd at.
The vices of the City have been yawl'd at.
Yet no amendment: Certainly, thought I.
This is a Paradox beyond all cry.107

Phillips' poem is reminiscent of Cowley's *The Puritans Lecture*: puzzled by the prevalence of vice when the rulers of the country are now so godly, the speaker makes his way to church to judge the matter for himself. The satirist soon finds himself a solitary voice of reason lost amidst a swelling crowd of hypocrites.108 But where Cowley was able at last to leave the church and return to a society that did still embody normative values worth upholding, Phillips is unable to escape

107 *A Satyr against Hypocrites* (London, 1655) 1.

these fools and knaves who now, in fact, represent the norm both within and without: 109

Oh what will men not dare, if thus they dare
Be impudent to Heaven, and play with Prayer!
Play with that fear, with that religious awe
Which keeps men free, and yet is man's great law. (23)

Juvenal's response to overwhelming evil had been to answer extremism with extremism, and this to some extent is the recourse of Phillips as well: his anger is as immoderate as that of Cleveland, even if his language sometime is more measured. His expression of outrage captures through its employment of tenses his situation exactly: if men can currently act thus shamefully, how much more vicious will they be in the future? This satiric myth of decay is a vital feature of Juvenalian satire, but it is made more poignant in Phillips' poem by the sense conveyed that the normative values of the past have not merely degenerated but are actually dead. What is more, it is within that past that the seeds of present and future misery were sown, and Phillips's poem therefore gives little evidence that the norms that should rule society are to be discovered there. All that remains for the individual is to pursue a solitary path of virtue:

O what will men not dare, if thus they dare
Be impudent to Heaven, and play with Prayer!
Yet if they can no better teach than thus,
Would they only teach themselves, not us:
So while they still on empty outsides dwell,
They may perhaps be choaked with husk and shell.
While those who can their follies well refute,
By a true knowledge do obtain the fruit. (25)

David Lloyd suggested that Cleveland's satire was motivated by a didactic impulse, a desire "to shame the ill from Vice" (618), a conventional justification of invective that rings

109 Nigel Smith comments that Phillips "seems to accept the new order . . . and locates it at the centre of the social order" (Literature and Revolution 315). This "centre," however, is overwhelmingly dark, and fatalistic acceptance does not, in Juvenalian satire, imply integration.
somewhat hollow in the face of the bitter despair that characterizes Cleveland's later satire and that of his fellow Royalist poets. Phillips' poem is an elegiac lament, a denial of the possibility of reform, while Cleveland gives no indication that he expects the Scots to see the errors of their ways. Cleveland's "The General Eclipse" (1646?) best expresses the sense of loss, and of an unredeemable future. The last stanza of the poem epitomizes the sense of a timelessness that is not that of art, but of death:

Thus 'tis a General Eclipse,
And the whole World is al-a-mort;
Only the House of Commons trips
The Stage in a Triumphant sort.
Now e'n John Lilburn take 'em for't. (ll. 31-35)

Cowley chose at this point in history to turn his art towards other, different ends: defeat offers few opportunities for the employment of an Horatian ethos. But while the "War of the Pen" had already been lost, Juvenalian pathos offered to the Royalist poet of these lean and desperate years a means of wreaking destruction, if not of effecting change.

Although Juvenal remained a dominant model for satire long after 1660, the new age did not offer the same opportunities for satiric pathos for the simple reason that the times were not as desperate, nor the "War of the Pen" so fierce. Robert Gould's Presbytery Rough-Drawn (1683), written in the aftermath of the Rye House Plot, attacks rebels past and present with an admirable Juvenalian zeal that is, nonetheless, simply not as credible as that of Cleveland:

ROuze, Rouze, my Muse: why dost thou silent lie
When Truth's oppress'd, and Mischief soars so high?
ROuze, then, and lash with thy severest Rage

110 If the poem is in fact Cleveland's: Withington remarks that "I would not give up Cleveland's claim to at least partial authorship, but in a new edition I would label it one of his dubia." "Canon of Cleveland's Poetry. Part I." 314.
Th' ingratitude of a Rebellious Age.\textsuperscript{111}

Gould could mimic Juvenal's tone, but he could not hide the fact that the knaves of his own "Rebellious Age" neither posed the threat, nor possessed the stature, of a Pym or a Cromwell.

Written in 1683, when the Tories had already taken firm control of the political stage and the king's enemies were dead, exiled, or on trial for their lives, Gould's denunciations demanded that the reader pretend that the situation was more desperate than it truly was. In such a context, it is hardly surprising that Gould's "severest Rage" should seem tepid in comparison with that of the "Colossian" Cleveland.

\textsuperscript{111} *Presbytery Rough-Drawn* (London, 1683) 1. Gould was one of the more consistently Juvenalian satirists of the last quarter of the seventeenth-century: see for example the broad-ranging satire of *The Corruption of the Times by Money* (London, 1693), and his numerous anti-feminist invectives, most of which are derived from Juvenal's Satire 6. As E. H. Sloane noted, "Gould belonged to the Oldham school of satirists, who believed that in satire rough vigour was more important than smoothness." *Robert Gould: Seventeenth-Century Satirist* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1940) 4: see also 48-98. Gould's verses to Oldham in *Remains of Mr. John Oldham* (London, 1684) make his debt clear.
Chapter 5

Living Dissections: Burlesque Satire

Cleveland was not always comfortable with a straight-faced employment of Juvenalian indignation. His language frequently shifts from direct invective to an ironic detachment that approaches mock-heroic in effect. "To P. Rupert" (1642) features many such instances, most notably in his treatment of "Boy," the dog that accompanied the prince into battle:

He that devoures the scraps, which Lundsford makes.
Whose picture feeds upon a child in stakes:
Who name but Charles, hee comes aloft for him.
But holds up his Malignant leg at Pym. (ll. 121-26.)

Scatological imagery is used to mock the fears and suspicions of those on the Parliamentary side who thought Boy a "familiar" or demonic ally to Rupert, with the result that attention is directed away from the "four-legg'd Cavalier" and back to the exploits of the Cavalier general: at the same time, Rupert's opponents are belittled for their absurd fear of a dog.¹ Ruth Nevo sees in Cleveland's handling of his satiric victims evidence of a tension between the "desire to express contempt in burlesque or farcical images" and the "need to present the enemy in terms larger than life": his response "verges towards the exaggeration of invective which raises the object to heroic proportions, though of a monstrous, not virtuous kind" (55).² But Cleveland's employment of

¹ See Observations upon Prince Rupert's White Dog, Called Boy (London, 1643) and The Parliaments Unspotted-Bitch: In Answer to Prince Roberts Dog Called Boy (London, 1643). The image of a demonic Rupert was encouraged by Royalist writers: see "The Earl of Essex his Speech to the Parliament after Keinton Battle" (1642?) in Rump Songs 1: 120.

² Noting that "the rhetoric of disparity comes into increasing prominence" during the Interregnum, George Williamson asserts that Cleveland demonstrated how "to set seriousness and levity at odds -- as in the mock-heroic -- by a deliberate impropriety of words and thoughts: how
mock-heroic is consistent with a Juvenalian mode of satire. As Raman Selden has noted, Juvenal's is essentially a mixed style, in which satiric effects "are derived from the clash of styles and from the resulting incongruity" (English Verse Satire 39); his blending of the grand and the vulgar often produces mock-heroic. The fall of Sejanus in Satire 10 is heralded by the destruction of his statue, melted down into the most commonplace of items: "Of the world's second Face are form'd strange matters. / Water-pots. Basons. Frying-pans and Platters!" (Holyday 185). Like Cleveland, Juvenal employs mocking ridicule, a "harsh belittling sarcasm or contemptuous animus" that frequently weakens the forceful effect of his indignation.1

But while Cleveland had Juvenalian precedents for his mock-heroic, his own poetry sometimes demonstrates an uneasiness with his classical sources. While at Cambridge, Cleveland made an oration on the occasion of his elevation to the role of "Father" in a burlesque academic celebration: his remarks on classical antiquity on this occasion should be treated cautiously, but are nonetheless highly suggestive:

I am not addicted to that vulgar error, of those that esteem nothing of any moment unless what is ancient, such loath the present time, and in favour of yesterday feed upon course bread; Nature so sooth must grow old. to our ancestors she gave acres of Soul. to us but spans. they were Gyants. we but Dwarfs: how degenerous. and truely little Souls have they that persist in this
to deflate by inflation." The Proper Wit of Poetry (London: Faber and Faber, 1961) 63. 75. Guilhamet observes that satire "reveals its objects as both contemptible and terrifying" (Satire 8).


opinion.º

But Cleveland's irreverence towards antiquity and its idolaters was, in practice, matched by an equal contempt for his own immediate predecessors and contemporaries. Indeed, if "The Song of Marke Anthony" is, like the parodic "Mock-Song," by him, Cleveland was even capable of parodying himself.⁶ In this context, Cleveland's attitude towards both the ancients and moderns appears to be one of unrelieved scepticism. His mock-epic moments do not, contrary to the traditional formula, merely contrast a decayed present with an idealized past: rather, they epitomize a radical instability of perspective that exhibits little faith in anything except his own perceptions. What Edward A. Richards says of Samuel Butler may, in this respect, be applied with equal force to Butler's friend, Cleveland: "he chooses as a center, or norm, not England as a whole, nor the Anglican Church, nor the Court... he chooses above all else his own mind and his own sense of the fitness of things."⁷

Cleveland was among the first to employ burlesque in the service of sharp and topical satire: in this, he anticipated the preoccupations of the age that was to follow.⁸ Burlesque became enormously popular in the years of the Intercrhem and Restoration: its influence has been plausibly detected even in Paradise Lost.⁹ Much to the irritation of modern critics, however.

---

⁵ "An Oration Spoken... in the Publicke Schools." Cleaveland Revived 124.

⁶ See Cleveland xxxv, Withington, "Canon of Cleveland's Poetry" 313. and Woodward 517.


⁸ For Cleveland's influence upon later burlesque, see Kimmey 419-23.

the period was by no means precise in its use of the term, and, despite recent attempts to impose their rigid categories, there exist real problems of nomenclature. Contemporary confusion is reflected in a passage from Davenant's *The Play-house to Be Lett* (1663):

> the Travesti,
> I mean Burlesque, or more t'explain my self,
> Would say, the Mock-heroique must be it
> Which draws the pleasant hither i'th Vacation.
> Men of no malice who will pay for laughter.\(^\text{11}\)

The term "parody" appears early, yet seems to have been relatively rare in the seventeenth-century: None of the seventeenth-century English dictionaries that I have consulted include it before 1681, when a revised edition of Thomas Blount's *Glossographia* defines it as "to change the signification of a Verse, by altering some words."\(^\text{12}\) "Burlesque" appears frequently in the period, but, as Timothy Raylor has noted, the early seventeenth-century used it to describe not a specifically imitative genre, but rather a comic tone or mode.\(^\text{13}\) Randle Cotgrave's *A French and

---


\(^\text{11}\) *The Works of Sr William Davenant* (London, 1673) 76.

\(^\text{12}\) Ben Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour* (pub. 1616) employs it to signify plagiarism "with a kind of miraculous gift, to make it [the original] absurder then it was" (3: 400; V.v.26-27).

\(^\text{13}\) *Glossographia, Or a Dictionary*, 5th ed. (London, 1681), s.v. "Parody." John Kersey's edition of Edward Phillip's *New World of English Words* (London, 1706) introduces parody as a literary kind, "a Poetcick Sport, which consists in putting some serious Pieces into Burlesk, and affecting as much as is possible, the same Words, Rhimes and Cadences" (s.v. "Parody").

English Dictionary (1650) defines the French "Burlesque" as "Jeasting, or in jeast, not serious: also, mocking, flouting." Its earliest recorded appearance as an English word (OED) is Blount's 1656 edition of the Glossographia. where it is defined as "drolish, merry, pleasant": the 1681 edition adds specific reference to the term's literary signification, noting that it means "also merry or drolish Poesie," but it is not until the 1707 Glossographia Anglicana Nova that the idea of burlesque as "mock Poetry" is added. In practice, the term is frequently used broadly to indicate a form of denigration or criticism by means of ridicule. Raylor suggests that "Burlesque" came to signify "incongruous imitations of specific texts" only after the influence of Scarron was felt (114). Richard Flecknoe's Diarium, or Journal (1656) suggests that this development was slow to occur: Flecknoe's "Entrance into Style" provides a list of models for burlesque verse, including Scarron and Tassoni, but also mentions writers not primarily known for imitative verse, such as Plautus, Cervantes, James Smith, and Sir John Mennes (sig. [A4']). Similar is Sir William

15 A French and English Dictionary (London, 1650) s.v. "Burlesque." Cotgrave does not include the word in the English portion of his dictionary. Guy Miege's Dictionary of Barbarous French (London, 1679), while derived from Cotgrave, does not have an entry for "burlesque."


17 See Dryden's "The Authors Apology for Heroique Poetry." State of Innocence sig. [c1'], where he complains against the critique of one droll by noting that "He might have Burlesqu'd Virgil too, from whom I took the image."

18 For a definition that makes specific the idea of burlesque as imitation, we must look to Elisha Coles' A Dictionary, English-Latin, and Latin-English. s.v. "Burlesque," which gives as a translation Poesis Jocularis Imitatoria. Dryden's critique in the "Discourse" of the "sort of Verse which is call'd Burlesque" is based upon his dislike of the tone of the associated metrical form rather than its imitative nature (81); see Barbara M. H. Strang. "Dryden's Innovations in Critical Vocabulary." DUJ 51 (1959): 120. See also Samuel Wesley. Epistle to a Friend 16, ll. 575-78.
Temple's later account of the rise of ridicule:

It began first in Verse with an Italian Poem called *La Secchia Rapita*. was pursued by Scarron in French with his Virgil Travesty, and in English by Sir John Mince, *Hudibras*, and Cotton, and with greater height of Burlesque in the English, than I think in any other Language. But let the Execution be what it will, the Design, the Custom, and Example are very pernicious to Poetry, and indeed, to all Virtue and Good Qualities among Men, which must be disheartened: by finding how unjustly and indistinguish't they fall under the lash of Raillery, and this Vein of Ridiculing the Good as well as the ill, the Guilty and the Innocent together.  

(*Miscellanea. The Second Part* 329-30)\(^9\)

Temple's discussion of the rise of ridicule is notable because it implicitly identifies burlesque with satire: in so doing, it applies to the form a criticism that is representative of the predominant attitude of the age towards ridicule, articulated most famously in Hobbes' characterization of laughter as an assertion of superiority by those insecure in their own abilities.\(^{20}\)

Writers of burlesque verse naturally begged to differ from this analysis of their motives, and the idea that burlesque functioned as satire became more acceptable as the form became more common: Alexander Radcliffe uses burlesque as a virtual synonym for satire in "The Epistle Dedicatory" to his Works: "I remember you once told a grave affected Advocate, That he Burlesqu'd God's Image, for God had made him after his own Likeness, but he made himself look like an Ass."\(^{21}\) By 1723, William Meston was able to assert the didactic role of the mode with confidence, implicitly identifying it with Horatian raillery: "And since the Follies of Mankind are to be encountred, as well as the grosser Vices; they have not been deficient nor unsuccessful in

\(^9\) Spence says that Dryden acknowledged Tassoni as a source for *Mac Flecknoe* (1: 274).


this, but have shewed themselves both wise and lucky, in combating these with the proper
Weapons of Burlesque and Ridicule" (sig. [*2*]).

A slightly different view was that of Samuel Butler, who wrote that

Heroicall Poetry handle's the slightest, and most Impertinent Follys in the world in
a formall Serious and unnaturall way: And Comedy and Burlesque the most
Serious in a Frolique. and Gay humor, which has always been found the more apt
to instruct, and instill those Truths with Delight into men, which they would not
indure, to hear of any other way. (Prose Observations 13)

Butler's view of burlesque as a medium of instruction is founded upon the traditional Horatian
formula of utile dulce: more interesting is his denigration of heroic poetry, which is
representative of an increasing tendency to mock or ridicule the ancients as, in Cleveland's words.
"course bread." By the end of the century, divergent valuations of the ancients were to collide in
the "Battle of the Ancients and the Moderns": long before this, however, the tendency to
denigrate the classics was manifested in the ascendancy of travesty, a word that first enters into
English by way of Scarron's Virgile Travesti (1648-52): Blount defines it as "disguised or shifted
in apparel: And Metaphorically it may be applied to any thing that is translated out of one
language into another."22 Travesty "disguises" a given poem by retaining the subject matter while
distorting the style.23 Charles Cotton explains the method of his Burlesque upon Burlesque: Or,
The Scoffer Scoft (1675), a travesty of a number of Lucian's dialogues, in just this way: "Gentles

22 Glossographia, 1656, s.v. "Travestied." See also Coles, Dictionary s.v. "Travestied,"
where it is defined as "drest in another mans cloathes," and Cotgrave, French and English
Dictionary, s.v. "se Travestir": "To disguise, or shift, his apparell: to mask it, or take on him
another mans habit: to play the counterfeit."

23 See for example the title of The Poet Banter'd: Or, Ovid in a Vizor. 2nd ed. (London,
1702). Travesty was not limited to poetry: Thomas Percival's The Rye-House Travestie
(London, 1696) is a close but straight-faced parody of Thomas Sprat's history of the Rye House
behold a Rural Muse / In home-spun Robes, and clowed shoos." Cotton will tell Lucian's story in a voice that has been radically translated.

Another telling element of Cotton's travesty is evident from its title: while Lucian is himself an author of burlesque, he is himself the target of Cotton's "Scoff." Cotton's burlesque poem provides a good example of the complexity of the relationship that can exist between burlesque poet and original author. This same kind of complexity is evident also in the most important burlesque poem of the period, Butler's Hudibras. Hudibras has puzzled critics because it resists generic demarcation: as R. P. Bond puts it, the Butler's poem "is so complex in its origin and purpose and method that it defies final classification" (5). It employs allusions to the elevated subject matter of epic in order to denigrate and ridicule Hudibras and his squire Ralph, and in this regard possesses clear affinities to mock-heroic (as for example, in the account of Hudibras' battle with the butcher Talgol in Part I, Canto ii.). At the same time, Butler's

---


25 Edward Ames Richards characterizes this complexity by reference to the various generic affinities that the poem displays: thus, while Hudibras "is a romance, it is many things besides. For one thing it is a travesty; for another, it is a satire; for a third, it is burlesque" (25). Ellen. Douglass Leyburn's treatment of the poem as allegory is useful, but limited (34-52). The recent interest in the Bakhtinian carnivalesque and Menippean satire have provided critics with one possible response to the poem, albeit one which tends to impose upon the work modern conceptions of the form: Dryden calls Hudibras a Varroonian satire ("Discourse" 81), but his definition of the genre accords with Bakhtin's only in incidentals. See David J. Rothman's "Hudibras and Menippean Satire," ECent 34 (1993): 23-44 and his "Hudibras in the Doggerel Tradition," Restoration 17 (1993): 15-29.
characteristic doggerel verse-form seldom mimics heroic style and operates, in fact, a great deal like travesty, disguising its "Muse," as did Cotton, in "home-spun Robes, and clown'd shoos." Like Hobbes, Davenant, and Cowley, Butler employs a revisionist approach to epic: unlike these three contemporaries, his poem does not so much attempt to reform the epic genre as to damn it. This said, Butler has it both ways: his use of a romance or epic framework provides a set of normative values against which his ludicrous heroes are to be measured even as he effectively undermines the legitimacy of those values.

In theory, we may distinguish between "mock" forms of burlesque which use an elevated style to denigrate a low subject, and travesty, which "disguises" the original style, degrading it while retaining an elevated subject matter. At the same time, this neat distinction is frequently difficult to apply in practice. Hudibras is only the most famous instance: another good example of the way in which "mock" poetry and travesty can be combined in a single work is David

26 Bond points out (6) that "true mock-heroic uses a more heroic verse form than the double rhyming octosyllabics Butler perfected." For a discussion of the confused seventeenth- and eighteenth-century responses to the poem, see Richard Terry, "Hudibras amongst the Augustans," SP 90 (1993): 426-41.


28 See John Crowne's The History of the Famous and Passionate Love (London. 1692), a mock-heroic based on Virgil's Dido and Æneas: it is "a kind of Burlesque, directly contrary to that of Virgil Travestie, for that makes a Hero and Heroine talk like Higlers or Costardmongers, and this represents Priests, Chanters, and Vergers, like Gods and Heroes" (sig. [A2']).
Lloyd's enormously popular burlesque, *The Legend of Captaine Iones* (1631). Although it has been identified as a parody of John Smith's published adventures, *Captaine Iones* is primarily a broad spoof in doggerel verse. Its style is difficult to pin down: it frequently adopts a remarkably straight-faced attitude towards its hero's unbelievable exploits:

Now for a verse
To speake *great Iones* his deeds, who headlong goes
Amongst the thickest rancks, cuts, kils, and throwes.
Some by the legs, some by the wast he makes
Shorter, another by the lock he takes.
Reapes off his head, wherewith he braines another.
Then at one stroke kills father, sonne, and brother;
Few scap'd with life, but strangely happy those
Which scap'd with losse of halfe a face or nose.

The language and versification here are certainly low, but there is little obvious irony. Passages like this obtain their satirical edge indirectly from the author's frequent winking asides about Jones' mendacity; yet, Lloyd includes in his poem many traditional epic gestures, such as a relatively unironic epic invocation. His attitude towards his hero is ambiguous, and the poem's relationship to the heroic tradition correspondingly difficult to ascertain.

Travesties of classical authors proliferated from the mid-century on: deriving in part from the drollery poems of Sir John Mennes and James Smith, and influenced by Scarron and Tassoni, the travesties of the Restoration period also owed a great deal to both Cotton's *Scarronides* (an

29 It achieved at least 5 editions in his own lifetime, and was reprinted regularly well into the eighteenth-century. In 1648 a second part was added. See *Naps upon Parnassus* (London, 1658), a collection of "learned" parodies and mock-encomiums upon Samuel Austin, "dedicated . . . by Captain Jones": "*Vide Jones* his Legend. Drink Sack and Gunpowder, and so fall to't."


31 *The Legend of Captaine Iones* (London, 1631) 5-6.
imitation rather than translation of Scarron's *Virgile Travestis*) and *Hudibras.* At its most radical, travesty represents an attack upon the literary values, conventions, and genres of the ancient world. The act of reducing Achilles to a blood-thirsty and "ill-bred Clown," as does James Scudamore's *Homer Alamode,* inevitably undermines, through its denigration of one of the most important heroic models, the legitimacy of the epic mode. The other great exemplar of heroic poetry, Virgil's *Æneid,* was the target of both Scarron and Cotton: the latter subverts the genre and its values by its suggestion that *Æneas* is a liar. A dedicatory poem to Cotton's travesty of Virgil's Fourth Book compares *Æneas* to Lloyd's untrustworthy hero Captain Jones:

Tell us how he [*Æneas*] by her command
Told stories which should be *infand.*
Which neither *Faith nor Troth* would hold.

---


34 The modern editor of *Scarronides* has glossed this reference to Jones as an allusion to "another burlesque of the *Æneid*" which he has been unable to identify. See Charles Cotton's *Works,* ed. A. I. Dust (New York and London: Garland, 1992) 319. The assault upon *Æneas' veracity, as well as reference to exploits "by the arm of flesh" in the subsequent lines (Lloyd's hero kills a bear with his hands) makes it clear that Cotton is referring to Lloyd's poem.
If not by Jones or him been told.  

The poem further criticizes Virgil for libelling Dido, and for writing inaccurate history (sig. [A1']): the Roman poet's account of events is no more to be trusted than that of Æneas.  

The overall effect of such travesties is to subvert the moral and literary value of the epic. Timothy Raylor and Ken Robinson have both minimized the subversive intent of burlesque and travesty poetry of the period, pointing out that much of it is actually conservative in nature.  

But while travesty appealed to those already well-versed in classical literature, the overall effect is one that contributes, if indirectly, to the cause of the moderns in the developing debate about the relative value of the ancients.  

Many seventeenth-century critics and commentators viewed travesty as an

---


36 Commonwealth satires frequently contrast the mendacity of epic or romance with the satirist's narrative which is, we are assured, fantastic but absolutely true. See for example stanza 1 of Alexander Brome's satire on Col. Thomas Pride. "The New Knight Errant" (1658?). Rump Songs 1: 299 and Brome's Poems 1: 202.


38 Howard D. Weinbrot has for some time insisted upon the ambivalence of the attitude of the English "Augustan" age to its classical model, a thesis he pursues most vigorously in Augustus Caesar in "Augustan" England and more recently in Britannia's Issue esp. 30-77, which accentuates the importance of a developing myth of a "native" tradition in English literature. See
outright attack upon classical literary kinds, for travesty attacks the genre itself. Epic need not always be treated with solemn reverence, as the Latin tag. *Non semper seria*, affixed to the title page of an anonymous continuation of *Scarronides* suggests.39

John Dennis, himself a composer of burlesque, spends some time in the "Preface" to his *Miscellanies in Verse and Prose* (1693) defending the form against the criticisms of Dryden and Boileau. Boileau’s criticisms (here cited from the Soames-Dryden translation) are a defence of neoclassical standards of reasoned reverence for antiquity:

The dull Burlesque appear’d with impudence.
And pleas’d by Novelty, in Spite of Sense.
All, except trivial points, grew out of date:
Parnassus spoke the Cant of Belingsgate:
Boundless and Mad, disorder’d Rhyme was seen:
Disguis’d Apollo chang’d to Harlequin. (ll. 81-86)

Dennis admits that Boileau’s remarks apply to Scarron and French burlesque, which "has nothing of a Gentleman in it, little of good Sense, and consequently little of true Wit." He is, however, chauvinistic enough to defend Butler against these same charges, noting that "Butlers Burlesque was certainly writ with a just design, which was to expose Hypocrisie" (*Miscellanies* sig. [A4']).40


Scarron, on the other hand, wrote "either with no design, or but with a very scurvy one. For the only design that can be imagin'd of his Virgil Travesty, was to ridicule Heroick Poetry, which is the noblest invention of human Wit" (sig. [a5']). Burlesque is properly a form of satire, and laudable only when it ridicules contemporary vices, a judgment that exalts mock-heroic at the expense of travesty.

As a general rule, travesty attacks the form rather than the author of the burlesqued work: Scarron, according to a commendatory poem attached to John Wright's 1674 translation of Seneca's Thyestes, "made / Virgil himself smile at the Masquerade."^{41} Wright's Thyestes included a Mock-Thyestes, in Burlesque: it is left to the reader to choose which he or she prefers:

Which Diet likes ye best, as 'tis before ye?
Or which of these you think the truest Story?
Whether Heroique Fustian drest in Meeter.
Or Mimmick fare in Jingling Rhime sounds sweeter? (141)

Wright himself seems to prefer the burlesque version of the play: he dislikes Seneca's "Heroique Fustian" and denigrates "the No-Plot of these old Tragedy's." The attached commendatory verses go so far as to suggest that it is no fault of the translator that the "Tragedy's unfit to Act" (sig. [A5']). Seneca may be an admirable writer, but his chosen form and style are outmoded.

In fact, travesty shields the burlesqued author by "disguising" the style beyond all recognition, thereby effacing the distinctive stylistic signature of the original author.^42 In Cotton's

---


^{42} In _Ovid in Masquerade_ (London, 1719). Joseph Gay admits that "I have made old OVID tell divers Things, which probably never once enter'd into his Thoughts" (sig. A3'). See also George Duckett's facetious comparison of his travesty of Homer with Pope's translation, in _Homerides. Or, Homer's First Book Moderniz'd_ (London, 1716) iv-v.
**Scarronides**, the parody is directed against Virgil's characters, rather than at Virgil himself. The voice of the original author is replaced by that of a playful or mocking version of the burlesquing poet. James Smith's "The Innovation of Penelope and Ulysses. A Mock-Poem" (1658), a generalized burlesque upon the heroique form, includes two commendatory poems tellingly written by Smith to himself that suggest the conscious adoption of a role or disguise by the burlesquer. Mock-footnotes explain the "author's" meaning or demonstrate how his character is revealed through his writing: one note remarks that "the Author shewes himselfe to be well versed in the Almanack." while the next suggests that the poem "argues an elegant fancy in the Poet" (Wit Restor'd 149n4 and 5). Smith directs our attention not to the classical authors that he is burlesquing, but rather to their chosen form, and to his own playful act of ventriloquism.

In contrast to travesty, the "mock-poem" is frequently employed to ridicule a given author directly. In such poems, the strategy of the burlesque poet more closely resembles that of the satirist: the intention of the parodist is to highlight the voice of the satirized poet, while concealing his or her own. As so often in satire, the victim is manifestly a satire upon himself: the satirist need do little more than present a slightly distorted version of the victim's language to reveal his or her incompetence. This process can be seen at work in Rochester's burlesque of Sir

---

43 See Francis Hutcheson, *Reflections upon Laughter* (Glasgow, 1750): "Virgil Travesty may often come into an ingenious man's head. when he reads the original, and make him uneasy with impertinent interruptions, but will never diminish his admiration of Virgili" (28). See also *A Journal from Parnassus* 21. and *Ovidius Exulans or Ovid Travestie* (London, 1673) sgs. [A3"]. "Henry Fitzcotton." on the other hand, in the travesty *A New, and Accurate Translation of the First Book, of Homer's Iliad* (Dublin, 1749), burlesques pedantry and the ancients (vi-x).

44 Charles Martindale, noting the paradox that "parodies often tell the reader more about the style of an author than translations," points out that the "parodist seeks not to soften the idiosyncracies and mannerisms that help to make an author's style what it is, but to highlight them." "Unlocking the Word-Hoard: In Praise of Metaphrase." *CCrit* 6 (1984): 60.
Car Scroope's song "I cannot change as others do" (1676-77?). Scroope's poem is a surprisingly pretty, if rather conventional, complaint to his mistress:

I cannot change as others do
Though you unjustly scorn
Since that poor Swayne that sighs for you
For you alone was born.
No Phillis, no, your Heart to move.
A surer way I'll try
And to revenge my slighted love
Will still love on, will still love on, and dye.

This lament of a love-sick gallant is replete with the commonplaces of the genre: the purpose of such songs was to paint a flattering portrait of the would-be lover. Scroope's poem communicates little sense of individuality: the poet deliberately assumes a recognized role, dramatizing or "personating" himself in order to evoke a sympathetic response from both the object of his desire and his general readers. Songs such as these are more truly intended to

---


48 See "The Lovers Sessions. In Imitation of Sir John Suckling's Session of Poets" (1687), where the "sect of songsters" admits to using "the Muses but as bawds do intrigus . . . And that but for their frantick amorous fits / They had n'ere took upon 'em y' buisness of witts." BL MS Add. 34362 f.157'; Wilson 175-98. See also Robert Gould's Satyr against Wooling 5-6.

49 Peltz, analyzing Ambrose Philips' discussion of the lyric form in The Guardian (no. 16, March 30, 1713), notes that Philips' theory of the lyric ignores "the spontaneous expression of a mood, whether of the group or individual . . . . It seeks above all the flawless expression of conventionalized thoughts, reactions, attitudes concerning love making" (96).
establish the identity of the speaker than to extol the virtues of the woman they address. The very first word of the poem is "I." and its initial lines assert the stability of the speaker's identity.

For this reason, a parodic appropriation of the speaker's voice becomes, inevitably, an assault upon the stability of that identity. David Vieth suggests that the poem is addressed to Cary Frazier, whom Scroope was wooing, which, if true, makes Rochester's appropriation of Scroope's voice a much more personal attack (ARP 235-37):

I swive as well as others do,  
I'm young, not yet deform'd,  
My tender Heart, sincere, and true,  
Deserves not to be scorn'd.  
Why Phillis then, why will you swive,  
With Forty Lovers more?  
Can I (said she) with Nature strive.  
Alas I am, alas I am a Whore. (ll. 1-8)

Upon first reading, it may appear that Rochester's target here is less the speaker than the self-confessed "Whore" he loves. If, however, Scroope defines the cohesion of his own character by reference to his pure regard for his mistress, so too is Rochester's speaker defined by his attitude towards the object of his desires. The whore's promiscuousness reflects upon the speaker's individuality: he is, after all merely one of a large crowd of lovers. What is more, the speaker's

---

50 See also "A Familiar Epistle to Mr. Julian, Secretary to the Muses" (1677), where Scroope is described as a notorious producer of "billet-doux" (Buckingham ll. 46-62). Scroope's pursuit of Frazier was featured in a great many court satires: see DNB s.v. "Scrope." Rochester's appropriation of Scroope's voice is ironic in that, until Vieth's study of the poem, the "Song" itself was attributed to Rochester, and the "Mock Song" dismissed as spurious: see ARP 231-32.

motives are impugned, as Rochester reduces Scroope's sentimentality to the rudiments of fornication. Scroope's assertion of immutable identity becomes here nothing more than a defence of his unextraordinary sexual prowess: "I swive as well as others do." Rochester cuts through the language of the song to reveal both the inanity of the form's conventions, and the true motives and character of its author. The burlesque functions both as literary parody and as a personal satire upon the author.

Rochester's parody belongs in the tradition of other travesties of love songs like Dorset's mock-song, first printed in 1673.\footnote{Parodies of love songs were very popular: see Mock Songs and Joking Poems (London, 1675), and George Kitchin, A Study of Burlesque and Parody in English (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1931) 66-87. Treglown's "Scepticism and Parody in the Restoration," cited above, includes a useful "Index of Verse Parodies in Printed Miscellanies 1660-1680."}

Methinks the poor Town has been troubled too long.
with \textit{Phillis} and \textit{Cloris} in every Song:
By Fools, who at once can both Love and despair.
And will never leave calling them Cruel and Fair.
Which justly provokes me in Rhime to express.
The truth that I know of bonny Black Bess.\footnote{\textit{Choice Songs and Ayres For One Vouce} (London, 1673) 50. For a discussion of this poem and its date, see Brice Harris, \textit{Dorset} 49. Cf. Mulgrave's \textit{Essay upon Poetry}: songs "now so much abound. / Without his Song no Fop is to be found" (5).}

Dorset's attack on the genre is, because of the putatively personal nature of the love lyric, an attack on the "Fools, who can both love and despair." Dorset, however, critiques the genre by transforming the speaker in a way that is not in itself parodic. The speaker is "honest," and good-naturedly exposes the "Truth" about his lover, who becomes less physically or spiritually perfect, but not necessarily less desirable. While Dorset's poem employs a form of \textit{ethos} to drive its
literary satire, foregrounding the figure of the poet in an appeal to common sense. Rochester conceals his own voice and foregrounds that of his victim.

The parodic mock-poem is an effective means of personal satire because it seems to dispense with the mediating perspective of the satirist, forcing the victims to reveal their ridiculousness through their own words, and compelling them to take responsibility for their own language. That parody distorts the victim's language is of tactical rather than strategic importance: parody succeeds only when it draws our attention back to the inadequacies of the original text. It is particularly useful when directed against a dramatist: the playwright is insulated from his or her own language, because it is always someone else who is actually speaking it. While the dramatist remains concealed behind the voices of the actors and the characters that they portray, parody re-establishes the connection of author with language. The most famous and successful example of this sort of parodic operation is The Rehearsal, first performed 7 December, 1671 at the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane. Largely the work of the Duke of Buckingham, it targets a wide range of popular heroic dramas, and in its earliest pre-performance forms may have taken particular aim at Sir Robert Howard and Sir William Davenant. By 1671, however, Dryden was its main target, and a revised text published in 1675 added more detail

54 Recognizing this, one of Jeremy Collier's characteristic strategies in A Short View is to hear the voice of the "Author . . . in his Characters" (66), making the playwright responsible for words spoken on stage. See Charles O. McDonald, "Restoration Comedy as Drama of Satire: An Investigation into Seventeenth Century Aesthetics," SP 61 (1964): 524-25 and passim.

directly implicating Dryden.\footnote{Buckingham may have coached Lacy, who played Bayes, in Dryden's mannerisms (Spence 1: 276). Bayes is also a satire upon Arlington: see George McFadden's "Political Satire in The Rehearsal," YES 4 (1974): 120-28, Staves 70-72, and Margarita Stocker, "Political Allusion in The Rehearsal," PQ 67 (1988): 11-35. Dryden himself, in his "Discourse" (8), affected to believe that "my Betters were more concern'd than I was in that Satire."} John Lacy's Bayes, in the Prologue to the play, hints at the method that the play will employ to demolish its target: Lacy will "not only shew the feats" of the dramatists that the play satirizes, but also "give you all their reasons for 'em too."\footnote{The Rehearsal, ed. D. E. L. Crane (Durham: U of Durham Publications, 1973) ll. 21-22.} As promised, 

\textit{The Rehearsal} makes explicit Bayes' responsibility for his play: the playwright is dragged from his place of concealment and placed centre stage where we can witness, first hand, his culpability for the dramatic nonsense that he has produced.\footnote{See Pordage's Azeria and Hushai: Shime (Dryden). Pordage explains, resents Zimri (Buckingham) because the latter "brought his Follies on the publick Stage" (29).} In this way, \textit{The Rehearsal} makes literal the technique of foregrounding the victim-author employed by Rochester in his "Mock-Song."

Like Rochester's "Scroope," Bayes is a self-condemning speaker whose responsibility both for his own ludicrous statements and for those which the actors utter under his direction is made manifest. On the stage with Bayes are two representatives of the audience he purports to serve, Johnson and Smith, both relatively undeveloped characters who act as foils to the playwright.\footnote{Brian Corman notes that, despite their relatively passive roles, "Smith and especially Johnson . . . represent a standard of urbane judgment able to encourage and preside over the exposure of Bayes's latest folly." \textit{Genre and Generic Change in English Comedy 1660-1710} (Toronto, Buffalo, and London: U of Toronto P. 1993) 37.} They serve, in fact, a function similar to the "two or three dozen of my friends" whom Bayes has planted in the pit to direct the responses of the audience (11: I.i.296-98). Bayes is held directly
responsible by Johnson and Smith for the absurdities of his play, but an even more intimate link between himself and his language is revealed by his own gloss on his method. Bayes' play is, he boasts, wholly "original," the fruit neither of nature nor literary tradition, but rather the byproduct of his own narrow imagination. As Johnson says, Bayes is one of those "fellows that scorns to imitate Nature" (4: I.i.38), and Bayes himself confesses that he despises "your Johnson and Beaumont, that borrow'd all they writ from Nature: I am for cooking it purely out of my own fancy" (16: II.i.62-64). As he proudly asserts, "I tread upon no mans heels: but make my flight upon my own wings" (27: III.i.6-7).

Even such material as Bayes plagiarizes from ancient and modern authors is made "my own," and "so chang'd that no man can know it" (6: I.i.111-12): "I come into a Coffee-house, or some other place where witty men resort, I make as if I minded nothing; (do you mark?) but as soon as any one speaks, pop I slap it down, and make that, too, my own" (6: I.i.115-18). His language is a physical excretion, as personal, and as worthless, as blood or vomit:61

If I am to write familiar things, as Sonnets to Armida, and the like, I make use of Stew'd Prunes only; but, when I have a grand design in hand, I ever take Phisic, and let blood: for when you would have pure swiftness of thought, and fiery flights of fancy, you must have a care of the pensive part. In fine, you must purge the Belly. (II.i.114-20).62

60 Cf. Flecknoe in Mac Flecknoe: "What share have we in Nature or in Art?" (l. 176).

61 Rochester's "An Epistolary Essay" describes poetic composition as farting or shitting (ll. 30-43). See also "A Familiar Epistle to Mr. Julian, Secretary to the Muses" (Buckingham II. 2-4), "Letter to Julian" (1684), BL MS Harl. 7319 f.171'; Wilson 131-37. and "Julian's Farwell to ye Muses" (1685), BL MS Harl. 7319 f.196'; Wilson 138-40.

62 In The Medal of John Bayes Dryden is described consulting a doctor: "The Dr. merrily asked him Whether 'twas Comedy or Tragedy he designed? he answered, Tragedy: the Dr. replied The Steel Diet was most proper for Tragedy; whereupon the Poet desired to have it prescribed, and did undergo it for six weeks" (sig. [A2']; POAS Yale 3: 77-78). See also Journal
His system for writing operates through the generation of physical reflexes that parody Horace's admonition that the writer must feel that which he seeks to communicate: as Bayes explains in reference to one particularly bathetic speech, "I must confess, when I writ it, I wept my self" (21; II.iii.31-32). Even the play's lack of coherence reveals much about its author, functioning as a symptom of the fragmentation of his character. Not surprisingly, Sheridan Baker has seen in the characterization of Bayes a prefiguring of Swift's egomanical Moderns.

The satiric technique of *The Rehearsal* is echoed in miniature by Bayes' method of appealing to the audience:

my first Prologue is, that I come out in a long black Veil, and a great Huge Hangman behind me, with a Furr'd-cap, and his Sword drawn: and there tell 'm plainly. That if, out of good nature, they will not like my Play, I gad, I'll e'en kneel down. and he shall cut my head off. Whereupon they all clapping --a-- (I.i.268-77)

Bayes' appeal to the audience in the prologue is, like the language of his play, personal. The manner in which he exposes himself to censure is realized upon the stage in the most literal manner: the image of the playwright brought upon the stage to be held immediately and personally responsible for his work is a perfect reproduction in miniature of the operations of *The Rehearsal* itself. In an interesting anticipation of Dryden's image of the satirist as executioner, the Hang-man's sword is, in this play, always falling.

The influence of *The Rehearsal* upon later theatrical travesties was immense, but its technique of conjuring up and exposing the figure of writer/victim to direct ridicule proved

---

*from Parnassus* 33-34.


suggestive to non-dramatic writers as well: it provided satirists with both a satiric form and a magazine of well-established allusions from which to work. In Marvell’s *The Rehearsal Transpro’d* (1672), many of the central images and ideas of the play are appropriated and transformed by a translation of dramatic form into a variety of facetious and satiric prose animadversion that owes much to the example of the earlier Marprelate tracts, as well as to the new fashion of bantering prose polemic exemplified by works like John Eachard’s *Grounds & Occasions of the Contempt of the Clergy and Religion Enquired Into* (1670). Marvell’s target, stigmatized as a new Bayes, is the Erastian theologian Samuel Parker, whose bombastic and ineffective style is damned, in large part, by Marvell’s association of it with heroic drama. The satire employs a complex intertextuality, alluding to Buckingham’s travesty, and through it, to the heroic drama: these allusions are further complicated by the fact that Marvell attacks not merely Parker’s own writings, but his misuse of those of Bishop Bramhall, whose *Vindication of Himself and the Episcopal Clergy from the Presbyterian Charge of Popery* was published by Parker with his own *A Preface Shewing What Grounds There Are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery* in 1672.


66 Bayes becomes Dryden again in Tom Brown’s "Reflections on the Hind & Panther," printed with Martin Clifford’s *Notes upon Mr. Dryden’s Poems in Four Letters* (London, 1687). itself an attack on Dryden’s heroic drama which makes much reference to *The Rehearsal*. Brown’s prose satire is clearly modelled on Marvell’s, and brings the process of allusion full circle by identifying Dryden’s new-found Catholicism with Parker’s Erastianism.
Marvell's purpose in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* was to defend Nonconformists against Parliament's attempts to outlaw Conventicles: Charles' Declaration of Indulgence in 1672 offered him the opportunity to attack Parker's reactionary Anglicanism while simultaneously appearing to support the King.\(^67\) The Declaration failed, but Parker was effectively silenced by Marvell's polemic, which concluded with the publication of *The Second Part* in 1673.\(^68\) Marvell's technique blends a mocking exegesis of Parker's writing with a pose of witty and genteel moderation in order to accentuate Parker's extremism. More often than not, however, Marvell's target is not Parker's argument but his style, and his attack frequently takes the form of a literary critique.\(^69\) Because style reveals character, his analysis becomes a revelatory mode that unmasks Parker's personality: as Jennifer Chibnall observes, it is "the real man behind Parker's text" that "Marvell seeks to uncover" (82). Parker is a dangerous fool who has deluded himself as well as others: "Never Man certainly was so unacquainted with himself. And, indeed, 'tis part of his discretion to avoid his acquaintance and tell him as little of his mind as may be: for he is a dangerous fellow"

---


\(^68\) Anthony à Wood wrote that Parker "laid himself too open to the severe Strokes of his sneering Adversary" and "judged it more prudent rather to lay down the Cudgels, than to enter the Lists again" (2: 818). Rochester dismisses Parker's character in "Tunbridge Wells. A Satyr" (1673?) with the remark that "Marvell has enough, expos'd his Folly" (l. 74); for Rochester and Parker, see also Gillian Manning, "Rochester's Satyr against Reason and Mankind and Contemporary Religious Debates," *SCent* 8 (1993): 113.

(7). It is for this reason "necessary to represent him in his own likeness that it may appear what he is to others, and to himself" (185). Marvell, as Raymond Anselment notes, "personates" his adversary in order to reveal his absurdities (Betwixt Jest and Earnest 106). Having conjured Parker up, Marvell next engages in "a Living Dissection" of this "most noxious Creature" (Part II. 185). The organs through which he picks are Parker's words, signifiers less of his themes than of his dangerous and deluded character.

Marvell isolates his victim, stigmatizing him as a renegade: it can be seen that "his Books come not out under Publick Authority, or recommendation: but only as things of Buffoonery do commonly, they carry with them their own Imprimatur" (22). Like Buckingham's Bayes, Parker is a dangerous innovator whose ideas are a noxious web spun from his own entrails. His language provides more than merely its own "Imprimatur": it carries its own imprint and signature as well. Parker is the more vulnerable to charges of solipsism because of his adoption of a Juvenalian mode for his polemics. His attacks upon Nonconformity are, he writes in A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie (1670), furious because "nothing but Zeal can encounter Zeal." "No Argument in so palpable a Cause." Parker opines two years later, "can be duly urged to its

---

70 This strategy may well have been suggested by Parker himself (see Smith, "Sources of Restoration Satire" 5): in the Defence and Continuation of the Ecclesiastical Politie (London. 1671). Parker discusses the effects of choosing to "personate" one's opponent to "put into his Mouth ridiculous Words of his own unhappy Invention" (173). Richard Terry notes that "personation" implies parody. "Swift's Use of 'Personate' to Indicate Parody." N&Q N.S. 41 (1994): 196-98.

71 A Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie (London. 1670) xi. Ironically, his argument has much in common with that of Milton. See Anselment 95ff. and Patterson, Marvell 186-87.
proper Head, without some Satyr and Invective." But what Parker calls a "Vehemence and Severity" (Ecclesiastical Politie iii) becomes, in Marvell's account, "presumption and arrogance" (142). Marvell's assault upon Parker is virtually a critique of Juvenalian invective:

But the Author's end was only railing. He could never have induc'd himself to praise one man but in order to rail on another. He never oysl his Hone but that he may whet his Razor: and that not to shave, but to cut mens throats. And whoever will take the pains to compare, will find, that as it is his only end: so his best, nay his only talent is railing. (20)

His "Railing." Marvell writes, "is not onely the most material and useful part of his Religion, his Reason, his Oratory, and his Practise: but the ultimate end of this and all his other Books" (72).

Marvell's decision to adopt what Chibnall calls "a specifically conversational tone, with frequent asides, to establish an intimacy with his reader" (84) must be understood in the context of his attack upon Parker's Juvenalian railing. Marvell contrasts his own attitude with that of Parker and adopts a moderate and reasonable pose that identifies him with the broad values of his audience and that therefore protects him from precisely the kind of critique that he is applying to Parker, who is an isolated lunatic, a Quixotic madman (29-32). As Marvell tells him near the conclusion of Part II. "you will believe none but your self. This is that which hath seduced you, and, because you preach'd over your notes of Ecclesiastical Politie in a private Congregation, without being interrupted, you imagined the whole world had been of that mind" (325). Parker's stylistic absurdities mask a vicious intent: Marvell accuses him of "a felonious intention" (28) and asserts that he writes only from "spight against the Non-conformists" (104). The language of the solitary railer becomes the rant of an isolated madman and the signifier of a character submerged

---

72 Bishop Bramhall's Vindication of Himself... Together with a Preface Shewing What Grounds There Are of Fears and Jealousies of Popery (London, 1672) sigs. [b8'-c1'].
in chaos. Parker's prose is "bedawb'd with Rhetorick, and embroder'd so thick that you cannot discern the Ground" (12), and his employment of *pathos* and Juvenalian catachresis are signs of an unstable identity.

As there is "no method at all in his wild rambling talk," Marvell must follow him closely, treading "just on in his footsteps, or else I shall be in a perpetual maze, and never know when I am come to my journeys end" (74). Marvell's choice of the "animadversion" as his polemical form, is for this reason an especially wise one, for his close reading of his adversary's text allows Parker to expose himself through his own writing: "But that I may not involve the thing in generals, but represent undeniably Mr. Bayes his performance in this undertaking. I shall without Art write down his own words and his own *quod Scripsi Scripsi*, as they ly naked to the view of every Reader" (44). Marvell's stylistic lapses are Parker's fault: "I have not committed any fault of stile, nor even this tediousness, but in his imitation" (185). Similarly, the disorder of *The Rehearsal Transpos'd* reflects the chaotic mind with which he is grappling. "I have before so particularly quoted and bound him up with his own Words as fast as such a Proteus could be pinion'd," Marvell confides. "For he is as waxen as the first matter, and no Form come amiss to him" (92). Marvell here makes explicit his central strategy: Parker is "bound up" in his own words and revealed in the end as an alienated, protean figure of chaos.\(^7\) It is this emphasis upon

---

\(^7\) For an analysis of the way in which Marvell's representation of Parker's arguments expose "confusion and inconsistencies" in reasoning, see R. I. V. Hodge. *Foreshortened Time* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, and Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield, 1978) 18-22. See also Sprat's *Observations on Monsieur de Sorbier's Voyage into England* (London, 1665), a refutation of Samuel Sorbiere's *Relation d'un Voyage en Angleterre* (1664): "But that you may the better understand, who this great man is... I intreat you to hear his own description of himself. I will onely repeat in his own words, the praises, which in the compass of a few leaves, he has given his own merits" (14-15). Cited in D. I. B. Smith. "Sources of Restoration Satire" 7.
establishing Parker's responsibility for his own language that makes the theme of *decorum* so important to Marvell's argument. The anonymous author of *Ecclesiastical Politie* was, as Marvell and most of his readers knew, Archdeacon of Canterbury, as Marvell notes, Parker indulges in a "beastly railing unbecoming any man, much more a Divine" (71). Parker's language undermines the dignity of his office, damaging public respect for the clergy. At the same time, Marvell employs *decorum,* and the idea that language is consonant with character, to construct a new identity for his target. Parker becomes the madness that Marvell detects in his language.

In this sense, Marvell's strategy is very much like that of *The Rehearsal:* the author is brought to centre stage where he can be damned for his misuse of language. Unlike Buckingham, however, Marvell foregrounds his own Horatian voice of moderation, seducing the reader into compliance while accentuating by contrast Parker's violence of expression and opinion. Most importantly, Marvell eschews the use of outright travesty: unlike *The Rehearsal,* *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* presents its victim's language undistorted by obvious parody. Instead, Parker's words are transformed through recontextualization: the Parker that we encounter in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* is authentic insofar as the personation of his character is accomplished through direct citation. "I had much rather the Reader would take the pains to examine all

---


75 Shadwell comments in the preface to *The Sullen Lovers* (London, 1668) that heroic drama is self-parody: "they strein Love and Honour to that Ridiculous height, that it becomes Burlesque" (sig. [a2v]). Dryden, commenting upon the burlesque attacks upon *Absalom and Achitophel* in the "Epistle to the Whigs" before *The Medall,* accuses his opponents of turning "my own lines upon me, and in utter despair of you own Satyre, make me Satyrize my self" (41).
himself" (71). Marvell disingenuously writes.

Burlesque masks the intervention of the parodying author, for each victim is, in a sense, allowed to speak for himself. Marvell and Buckingham remain well-hidden, the former behind his chosen Horatian ethos, and the fiction that he is merely transcribing Parker's words, while Buckingham hides in the wings, invisibly directing the action of his dramatic narrative. Ironically, it is precisely this last refuge that is denied to Dryden in The Rehearsal, as he is bodily dragged forth onto the stage. In fact, the kind of parodic satire that we have been examining employs precisely the sort of allusion and distorting citation that is targeted for criticism. Marvell makes much of the manner in which Parker distorts the work of Bishop Bramhall, but does so by means of an almost identical method of recontextualization and distorting exegesis and gloss. Parker's "Talents do peculiarly lie in exposing and personating the Nonconformists" (9-10), but Marvell has himself employed this very tactic. Bayes' plagiarism similarly mirrors the operations of Buckingham's satire: as Kristiaan Aercke notes. Bayes' method of composition involves "the refashioning of pre-existing elements in a process of creative imitation" (35), a description that exactly describes Buckingham's parodic approach to his parent texts. Both plays are pastiches, the one employing citation and imitation, and the other parody: the great difference lies in the fact that Bayes eagerly accepts responsibility for what he has written, while Buckingham manages through irony and strategies of indirection, to deflect responsibility onto his satiric victim.

76 A different device employed to much the same effect appears in the anti-feminist rehearsal play, The Female Wits (pub. 1704): the play begins in a dressing-room, which suggests artificiality and concealment of precisely the sort that the rehearsal format is designed to strip away and expose: the effect is that of Swift's "The Lady's Dressing Room" (1732). The Female Wits, 1697, ed. Lucyle Hook. Augustan Reprint Society 124 (Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1967) 1-13; see also Laurie A. Finke, "The Satire of Women Writers in The Female Wits," Restoration 8 (1984): 66.
Buckingham's methodology epitomizes the strategy of satiric evasion.

Like parody, the mock-heroic relies upon intertextual relationships to establish its meanings. But where the former engages with texts that are negative models, employing citation, allusion, and distortion to denigrate them, mock-heroic founds its satire upon the positive values implied by the heroic literary kind. In fact, the two modes are complementary and congenial strategies and are frequently employed hand in hand. The Rehearsal is an obvious example: Buckingham alludes directly both to the degenerate texts that he parodies, and to the true epics that underwrite his mock-heroic references. Drawcansir is a parody of Dryden's Almanzor, but it is through the implied comparison with more successfully conceived epic heroes that Buckingham damns him most effectively. Marvell too employs the mock-heroic to stigmatize Parker, whom he likens to Don Quixote and Buckingham's Prince Volscius and Drawcansir: "he rallies and rails at the whole Protestancy of Europe. For you are mistaken in our Author . . . if you think he designs to enter the Lists where he hath but one man to combate. Mr. Bayes, ye know, prefers that one quality of fighting single with whole Armies, before all the moral Virtues put together" (21). Marvell's satire contrasts Parker's character with that of epic and mock-epic heroes, while Buckingham measures not Bayes himself, but rather his literary productions, against the epic norm. Parker is no Æneas: Bayes, on the other hand, is no Virgil.

Mock-heroic has generally been thought more characteristic of the eighteenth- than of the seventeenth-century, and it is true that it was not recognized as a distinct subgenre until after the

77 A related form is mock-romance, which employs medieval or renaissance romance forms instead of epic as the stylistic norm. See Don Juan Lamberto: Or, A Comical History of the Late Times (London, 1661), by "Montelion" (sometimes identified as Thomas Flatman, but more probably John Phillips), a pseudo-Spenserian prose satire that pillories John Lambert.
Employed as a satirical strategy, if not as a distinct literary kind, it is, however, an increasingly important element in satire after about 1620. Certainly, it proved a valuable instrument for the satirists of the Civil War. Sir John Denham's "A Western Wonder" (1643), recounting Sir Ralph Hopton's 1643 campaign, uses a ballad stanza but a predominantly mock-epic mode to satirize Parliamentary accounts of the Battle of Sourton Down (25 April):

Do you not know, not a fortnight ago?
How they brag'd of a Western wonder?
When a hundred and ten, slew five thousand men,
With the help of Lightning and Thunder.

There Hopton was slain, again and again,
Or else my Author did lie;
With a new Thanksgiving, for who are living,
To God, and his Servant Chudleigh. (Rump Songs I: 134)

Like the burlesques of Marvell and Buckingham, Denham's poem looks in two directions, satirizing the ecstatic rhetoric of Parliamentary accounts of the battle, while using mock-heroic to reduce the enemy commanders to Falstaffian braggarts.

---

78 Bond (21) opines that the mock-heroic matured only with The Dispensary (1699) and The Rape of the Lock (1714), while James R. Sutherland calls Mac Flecknoe "the first great mock-heroic poem in English." English Satire. 1958 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1962) 55; See also Kitchen 101-02 and Ian Jack. Augustan Satire. 1952 (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1966) 44.

79 See "A Song" (REIOYCE, brave English gallants "), in BL MS Sloane 826, reprinted in Fairholt 14-18, a broadly mock-heroic view of Buckingham's abortive expedition to Rê in 1627, and Davenant's "Jeffereidos, Or the Captivity of Jeffery" (1630), a mock-epic account of the battle between the dwarf Jeffery Hudson, and a turkey. This poem is a satire on Charles I; see Michael P. Parker, "Satire in Sextodecimo: Davenant, the Dwarf, and the Politics of "Jeffereidos," in Summers and Pevworth, eds., Muses Common-Weale 92-106. Mock-heroic elements were, of course, also important in the Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre.

80 A similar strategy is employed by John Taylor's Oxford Besieged, Surprised, Taken, and Pittifuly Entred, an account of a failed attack upon Oxford that parodies both Parliamentary disinformation and such commanders as Philip Skippon. "that Impe of Prowesse, the Magazine and Arcenall of Armes and Military discipline" (2-3).
Denham's mock-heroic is set in a popular, mixed form. and alludes to epic values rather than form. It is far from true, however, that no examples of a sustained mock-heroic can be found before the publication of Le Lutrin. Rump Songs includes a number of short poems that are miniature mock-epics. "Upon Atkins Bewraying his Slops on the Great Training Day" (1647?) is an anonymous satire recounting the sad failure of bowel control that afflicted Thomas Atkins, London alderman and Colonel of the Trained Bands:

I Sing the strang adventures and sad Fate.  
That did befall a Collonet of late.  
A portly Squire: a Warlike hardy wight.  
And pity 'tis, we cannot call him Knight.  
A stout man at Custard, and Son of Mars.  
But oh the foul disaster of his ----.  

(Rump Songs 1: 136)

The results of Atkins' mishap are more fearsome than any conventional weapon: "For feats of

---

81 Similarly, many satires employed mock-heroic frameworks that were quickly abandoned once the initial point had been made: see for example "An Heroick Poem" (1681), which commences with a mock-heroic invocation, but quickly turns to more straight-forward satiric strategies. BL MS Harl. 6913 f.99'; Wilson 68-75.

82 Michael West has additionally suggested the influence of Jean-François Sarasin's Bellum Parasiticum (1644), a Latin satire detailing the defence of Parnassus from the assault of a band of parasites, and his Dulot Vaincu ou la Défaite des Boutes-Rimès (1656), a mock-heroic account of a battle between Apollo's forces and those led by a priestly poetaster. "Some Neglected Continental Analogues for Dryden's Mac Flecknoe," SEL 13 (1973): 444-47.

Armes none could come near him then. / He smelt so strong" (1: 137). The poem concludes with an account of the dressing of the hero's "wound" by a "skilfull Chirurgion" and a kitchen maid: "Then about the Master all the Servants shuffl'd. / He, like old Lockwood in the Counter. scuffl'd, / Shew'd two broad mighty Hanches all bewray'd" (1: 137).

Reference to "Lockwood" in these lines establishes the satire's pedigree by allusion to Robert Speed's immensely popular The Counter Scuffle (1621), which anticipates Boileau's use of a sustained mock-heroic framework to recount a trivial conflict. It is the story of a food fight in a debtor's prison: Lockwood, a turnkey who finds himself, like Atkins, "all be-rai'd." similarly seeks the aid of surgeon and a kitchen maid.85 The poem employs a triplet stanza with final hemistich, a burlesque rather than epic form; however, the poem's opening lines establish Speed's mock-heroic method. Reference to romance (presumably he is thinking of Malory)86 is complemented by allusion to Batrachomyomachia, a mock-epic ascribed in the period to Homer:87

---

84 Cf. the prose prosopopæia Reverend Alderman Atkins (The Shit-Breech) His Speech ([London], 1648) 1: "you know (and the scent of my breeches can yet witnesse it) that I have stank the wicked from my company. so that they have been glad to run away."


87 Batrachomyomachia was translated into English in 1603 by William Fowldes, by Chapman (1624), and by Samuel Parker (not the Bishop) in 1701, as Homer in a Nutshell. See Bond 179-80. It obviously influenced Samuel Wesley's mock-heroic, "A Tame Snake Left in a Box of Bran. Was Devoured by Mice after a Great Battle" (1681), in Maggots (London, 1685) 11-21; Wesley translated Batrachomyomachia in 1726.
Let that Majestick pen that writes
Of brave _K. Arthur_ and his Knights.
And of their noble feats and fights:
And those who tell of Mice and Frogs.
And of the skirmishes of Hogs.
And of fierce _Beares_ and Mastive Dogges.
    Be silent.

And now let each one listen well.
While I the famous Battell tell,
In _Woodstreet Counter_ that befell
    In high Lent. 88

Speed's opening lines set expectations and then, with the unexpected demand for silence, deflate them. The effect of sudden incongruity is not unlike that of Dryden in _Mac Flecknoe_: 89

All humane things are subject to decay.
And, when Fate summons. Monarchs must obey:
This _Flecknoe_ found, who, like _Augustus_, young
Was call'd to Empire, and had govern'd long:
In Prose and Verse, was own'd, without dispute
Through all the Realms of _Non-sense_. absolute (ll. 1-6)

While Speed demonstrates less sophistication, he looks towards Dryden's method in his poem:

And noble _Ellis_ was his name,
Who 'mongst his foes to purchase fame.
Nor cared though the Devill came
    To meet him.
And this brave _Goldsmith_ was the man.
Who first this worthy brawle began,
Which after ended in a Can
    Of milde Beere. (sig. [A3']).

Speed's lines are inferior to Dryden's in large measure because his imitation of heroic verse is less comprehensive. Where Dryden employs heroic couplets to ensure that the contrast between

88 _The Counter Scuffle_ (London, 1648) sig. [A2'].

89 See Dryden's praise of Tassoni in the "Discourse" (82-83): "The first six lines of the Stanza seem Majestical and Severe: but the two last turn them all, into a pleasant Ridicule." The principle of satiric surprise is outlined in Feinberg 143-75 and Nichols 38-48.
expression and subject is marked. Speed retains a burlesque verse form, and depends therefore upon the sporadic use of discordant high style epithets and expressions to elevate his low subject; in this sense, his method anticipates Butler's mixed form.

By the end of the Interregnum, the development of a neoclassical poetics of smoothness and harmony initiated by Waller, Denham, Cowley, and others, provided satirists with a verse form that, if not an accurate facsimile of the Augustan poetics of Virgil and Horace, at least made possible a clearer contrast between high style and low matter. The balanced iambic couplet was increasingly recognized as an heroic form and, indeed, became a signifier of the heroic. It is easy to overstate the significance of the divide that separates Restoration and "Augustan" poetics from that of the earlier seventeenth-century; clearly, however, the development of something like a

---


consensus on the stylistic constituents of an heroic style made possible a more sharply defined mock-heroic style. Dryden's remarks on Boileau's heroic satire are apposite: "Here is the Majesty of the Heroique, finely mix'd with the Venom of the other; and raising the Delight which otherwise wou'd be flat and vulgar, by the Sublimity of the Expression" ("Discourse" 84).

The establishment of stylistic models for heroic verse, along with a concurrent and related focus upon the moral values of epic, made mock-heroic an astonishingly popular mode of satire in the last half of the seventeenth-century. More than just a poetic technique, mock-heroic seems to have become almost a mental habit of the age. Sexuality was a particularly popular vehicle, a phenomenon that owed as much to the "love and honour" themes of Restoration heroic drama as to classical models. George Etherege, writing a congratulatory letter in February of 1688 to Lord Arran upon his marriage, conceives of marital sex in precisely these terms:

you have told me of mighty deeds you have perform'd. I shou'd be glad to be satisfy'd whether you are as great a Heroe now you fight in a good cause as when you drew your Sword in a querelle d'Aleman. The truth is that sorte of courage is a little too violent for the present purpose."


*See Chernai's "Heroic Occasional Poem" 523-35. Butler employs another elevated style that had only recently become available in his mock-elegy To the Memory of the Most Renowned Du-Vall (London, 1671), a straight-faced burlesque that utilizes the sublimity of the Pindaric to mourn the passing of a recently-executed highwayman.

*See John Eachard's mock-heroic critique of preachers who frame their texts in the metaphors of war. in The Grounds & Occasions of the Contempt of the Clergy and Religion Enquired Into (London. 1670) 47-48.

*See Philip Parsons. "Restoration Tragedy as Total Theatre." in Love, ed., Restoration Literature 27-68. The conflict of love and honour is, of course, also central to the *Æneid.*

Male “heroes” of bedroom warfare are most frequently imagined as over-sexed libertines who have mistaken sexual conquest for the real and lasting values represented by true heroic poetry. An anonymous attack on Monmouth entitled “On the Three Dukes Killing the Beadle on Sunday Morning, Feb. the 26th, 1671” makes this point: it is a mock-heroic account of the young Duke’s assault, aided by his companions, Viscount Dunbar and the young Duke of Albermarle, first upon a prostitute, and then upon a member of the local constabulary named Peter Vernel, whom they murdered. Mock-heroic here is wielded in the service of anti-Stuart propaganda, and the young Monmouth employed as an emblem of the misapplication of power:"

Twas there a Glee of Dukes by Fury brought.
With bloody mind a sickly Damsel sought.
And against Law her Castle did invade,
To take from her her instrument of Trade.

(POAS 1697 1: 147; POAS Yale 1: 172)

The assault upon the beadle is similarly an emblem of the false heroic in a passage which alludes also to the Duke’s earlier nose-slitting of Sir John Coventry in December of 1670.

Then fell the Beadle by a Ducal Hand.
For daring to pronounce the sawy Stand.
The way in Blood certain Renown to win.
Is first with bloody Noses to begin. (1: 148)

In a conclusion that anticipates Pope’s Rape of the Lock, the poet details the disappointment of the fine ladies at Whitehall, whose evening entertainments are cancelled as a result of the assault. The splendour of Court ceremony is merely a facade masking the perversion of heroic values: a final grotesque touch contrasts the reality of Court “heroism” with its outward splendour, as the

---

97 Girolamo Alberti, the Venetian Secretary, wrote on April 24, 1671 that outrage over the attacks upon Coventry and Vernel, inflamed by satires like this one, weakened Charles in the Commons and forced him to issue a general pardon for all offenses “chiefly to nullify the force of an act of parliament against those concerned in the Coventry affair.” CSP Venetian 37: 40.
three Dukes "dance all daub'd with Lace and Blood" (1: 148).

Other satires similarly employed mock-heroics to question the values that held sway at Whitehall. Rochester's "A Very Heroicall Epistle in Answer to Ephelia," in which he seizes upon Etherege's characterization of Mulgrave, in "Ephelia to Bajazet" (ca. 1675), as the arrogant and tyrannical Turkish Sultan defeated by Tamerlane, is a particularly fine example." In Rochester's satire, he is characterized by a solipsistic rhetoric that evokes the Satanic language of Milton's anti-hero and Oldham's Jesuits.

In my deare self. I center ev'ry thing.  
My Servants, Friends, my Mistresse and my King.  
Nay Heav'n, and Earth. to that one poyn't I bring:  
Well-Manner'd, Honest. Generous and stout.  
(Names by dull Fooles. to plague Mankind found out)  
Shou'd I reguard. I must my self constraine.  
And 'tis my Maxim. to avoYd all paine. (ll. 7-13)

In this false rhetoric of heroic power, ambition becomes lust and conquest the ability to assert sexual dominion over the "weaker" sex. The same theme underpins many of Rochester's

---

98 All three were pardoned by the King. Albermarle on March 23, and Monmouth and Dunbar on April 11: see CSPD Charles II 11:142 and 183. See also the mock-heroic account in "Upon the Beadle." POAS Yale 1: 174-76. For the attack upon Coventry. see Marvell 2: 321-22. The affair was lampooned in "A Ballad. Call'd the Hay-market Hectors." POAS 1697 3: 68-70; POAS Yale 1: 168-71.

99 For the attribution and date of this poem, see Poems of Etherege 79-82. and Vieth's discussion of the linked group to which this poem and Rochester's belongs (ARP 322-52).

poems in "A Ramble in St. James's Parke" (1673?) a drunken roué intent upon fornication displaces the heroic figure of Charles II in the park painted by Waller in On the Park at St. James's (1661). Rochester's sexualized mock-heroic achieves its most complete statement, however, in "The Disabled Debauchee," written in the stanzaic form of Gondibert, and featuring the self-consciously ironical speech of a veteran of the sexual wars to a young acolyte:

My pains at least some respite shall afford, 
Whilst I behold the Battails you maintain, 
When Fleets of Glasses, sail about the Board. 
From whose Broad-sides Volleys of Wit shall rain. 

Nor let the sight of Honourable Scars, 
Which my too forward Valour did procure, 
Frighten new-listed Soldiers from the Wars, 
Past joys have more than paid what I endure. (ll. 17-28)

Rochester's wry tone is complex, but the element of self-contempt is unmistakable: "safe from Action" the scarred veteran of the sexual wars will "valiantly advise," and "being good for nothing else, be wise" (ll. 45-48). Sexual heroics are signifiers of weakness: in Rochester's "Sceptre

---


102 Dustin Griffin points out that the initial stanza of Rochester's poem parodies stanza 61 of Annum Mirabilis (Satires against Man 50-51). See also Thormählen, Rochester 14.

103 Cf. the "Bacchanalian Solemnity" of the drinkers in Charles Darby's Bacchanalia esp. 2-3, and John Tutchin's "The Tory Catch," in Selected Poems 22-23.

Lampoon." Charles II's "Prick," equal in length (and significance) to his staff of royal authority, actually makes him more vulnerable, for "she may sway the one, who plays with th'other" (l. 12).

Women could also be pseudo-heroic figures. Uncle Toby's Widow Wadman was not the first to apply the arts of war to the arena of sexual politics: *Hudibras* features a widow who, resisting all attempts to reduce her to the status of damsel, is herself a formidable combatant.

Butler also introduces into his poem a less amorous, but the even more warlike "Virago" named Trulla, who "laid about in fight more busily / Then th' Amazonian Dame, Penthesile." Such women were judged by an inversion of the standards applied to men: mock-heroic was used to satirize men who failed to attain the male heroic virtues, while women were damned precisely because they aspired after these. In the anonymous poem "The Argument" (Rochester 1680 35-40), a mock-heroic description of a battle over a dildo, the perversion of nature's order of nature is exemplified by the desire of the three female combatants to possess a "A Dildoe, long, and large, as *Hectors Launce*" (38). Possession of this symbol of masculine sexual power renders the male redundant and equips the women with a new "weapon" in the battle of the sexes.106


105 *Hudibras*, ed. John Wilders (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967) 39; Bk. I. Canto ii. ll. 365, 377-78. See Earl Miner, *The Restoration Mode from Milton to Dryden* (Princeton UP, 1974) 183-96 and Felicity Nussbaum, *The Brink of All We Hate* ([Lexington]: UP of Kentucky, 1984) 48-56. There was, of course, a tradition of genuine warrior-women against whom satiric amazons were measured: Trulla is compared with Virgil's Camilla in Bk. I., Canto ii. ll. 393-95.

Slightly less threatening were those females who applied only the traditional feminine armaments to sexual warfare: such is Aphra Behn's image of the woman-warrior in the prologue to *The Forc'd Marriage* (1671):

> Women, those charming victors, in whose eyes.  
> Lay all their Arts, and their Artilleries;  
> Not being contented with the wounds they made.  
> Would by new Stratagems our Light invade.107

The commonplace characterization of Aphra Behn and other women writers of the period as "Amazons" signals a shift in the paradigm of the female wit from Sappho to Hippolyte that links a sexualized mock-heroic to one satirizing the literary battles of the period.108 This is the kind of image that informs the "Epistle Dedicatory" of *Sylvia's Revenge, or: A Satyr against Man* (1688) a response to Robert Gould's anti-feminist rant, *Love Given O're* (1682): ironically, "Sylvia," the putative author of this piece, was in fact Richard Ames.109 Responding to Gould's satire ("your little Fire-Ship," as he calls it, a euphemism for an infected whore), Ames replies with a mock-

and the anonymous "Dildoides" (1675: BL MS Harl. 7319 ff.7v-11v; sometimes attributed to Butler, but see de Quehen, "Works Attributed to Butler" 264).


109 See Amory 214-15. Gould retaliated with *A Satyrical Epistle to the Female Author of a Poem, Call'd Silvia's Revenge* (London, 1691); see Nussbaum 34-37. Ames was the himself the author of several misogynist satires. See also Sarah Fyge's *The Female Advocate* (1686), and the description of Fyge's poem and the paper scuffle surrounding the publication of Gould's satire in Jeslyn Medoff, "New Light on Sarah Fyge (Field. Egerton)." *TSWL* 1 (1982): 156-63.
heroic joke, that suggests a discomfort with the coupling of femininity and warfare: "we have rigg'd out a Female Man of War (if that been't Nonsense) with 30 Guns of a side, which Egad Gentlemen, (as Mr. Bays has it) wee hope will maul you . . ." 110 A subjoined commendatory poem is less hesitant in its mock-heroic tone, and casts "Sylvia" as a victorious general:

_Th' Invasion first with feirce Assaults began,_
_And scatter'd wild Disorder as it ran,_
_It was a Warr betwixt our Sex and Man._

. . .

_Lord! how aghast appear'd your frightened Foes?_
_At your approach, foil'd and disarm'd they yield,_
_and scatter strange Confusion o're the Field._
_With Numbers sweetly rank't you brought us aid,_
_And shew you can defend us and invade:_
_Submissive at your Feet their General Craves,_
_And you at Pleasure wound the baffl'd Slaves._ (sig. [A2'])

The return at the conclusion of this passage to the image of the amorous combat in the final lines of this poem is telling: ultimately, women conquer by love rather than force.

More often, however, women in mock-heroics are the spoils that go to the victor: an interesting variation on this theme appears in Dorset's "The Duel of the Crabs" (1668), the tale of a battle between armies of lice lodged in the pubic hair of one of the period's more notorious procuresses, Madam Bennet. Here, Bennet is actually the battleground itself, a debased "prize" that is, in a parody of the quarrel of Achilles and Agamemnon, the cause of the conflict. Dorset's real target, however, is Sir Robert Howard, whose heroic poem _The Duell of the Stags_ (1668) recounts the titanic battles between two stags in Windsor Forest. 111 The heroes of Dorset's tale


111 Howard's poem is dedicated to Buckingham, who may have helped in its composition. It is a thinly-veiled allegorical attack upon Clarendon; see George McFadden, _Dryden: The_
are two contending lice emperors. "Two mighty Monsters" (POAS 1697 1: 202), probably suggested, as Brice Harris notes, by Robert Hooke's louse in Micrographia (1665). Their efforts to assert dominion in general combat frustrated, these two heroes meet in single combat:

With small or no advantage they proceed.
Both are much bruised, and their Wounds do bleed:
Both keep their Anger, both do lose their Force:
Both get the better, neither get the worse.
Justice her self might put into each Scale
One of these Princes. and see neither fall. (POAS 1697 1: 203)

"Love" eventually conquers, although in a grotesque manner: the combat ends when the two emperors inadvertently plunge into Bennet's vagina. Conventional associations in seventeenth-century poetry coupled the image of the "stag" with ideas of monarchy; it is difficult not to read Dorset's parody as an attack upon the King, embodying the same satiric message as Rochester's "Sceptre Lampoon."


A more conventional use of mock-heroic to characterize the paper-scuffles of the age is Dorset's "The Duel," recounting a quarrel between William Wharton and Robert Wolseley.\(^\text{115}\) It begins with an allusion to a 1655 edition of mock-eulogies issued for Davenant's *Gondibert*:\(^\text{116}\)

\[
\text{Of Clineas' and Dametas' sharper Fight}
\]
\[
\text{I've neither leisure, nor design to write:}
\]
\[
\text{Of Blood and Wounds, let bolder Poets sing:}
\]
\[
\text{My Muse shall of our Modern Heroes sing.}
\]
\[
\text{In humble Verse I'll only dare to tell}
\]
\[
\text{How brawny Bavius and slim Mevius fell}
\]
\[
\text{At Odds, and in their bloodless Rhyming Strife.}
\]
\[
\text{There was no jeopardy of Limbs and Life.} \quad (POAS \text{ Part III 22})
\]

Dorset's is only a slight squib which, despite the hint of mock-heroic description to come, fails to sustain its burlesque stance, although it does feature some pseudo-epic description: "Bob Bavius swore he'd ne'er be reconcil'd: / In wrath contracts his Forehead with a Frown. / And with his Pen's But-end knocks poor Will down" (24). Dorset's "Modern Heroes" are signifiers of a debased age. "Clineas" and "Dametas" are pseudo-heroes embroiled in an absurd literary debate: there are no longer any fit subjects for heroic verse, and the poet, limited to "humble verse" by his


\(^{115}\) For an account of this quarrel, see Harris, Dorset 110-12, and Chapter 1 above. The six lampoons that resulted from this quarrel were published in *POAS Part III* 1-21.

\(^{116}\) See *The Incomparable Poem Gondibert, Vindicated from the Wit-Combats of Four Esquires, Clinias, Dametas, Sancho, and Jack Pudding*. The four "Wits" of the title are the authors of the satires contained in *Certain Verses . . . To be Re-Printed with the Second Edition of Gondibert* (1653). The poems of the second collection are close parodies of those of the first.
own timidity. is himself an index of that decay.\textsuperscript{117} The condition of Dorset's self-abasing poet points to the effective cause of degraded forms of the epic. The poet of the mock-heroic satire differs from the savagely indignant Juvenal in that he or she has become part of the general malaise. The mock-heroic describes the actions of moral dwarves, but the satirist is also diminished by association, reduced to the status of chronicler of insignificant scuffles and trivial quarrels. Just as the pettiness of the combatants is highlighted by implied comparison with great heroes, so too is the triviality of the mock-heroic poet evident from his or her debasement of Homeric and Virgilian models. The mock-heroic vision of a fallen world is complete, excluding neither subject, poet, nor, by implication, reader, from its indictments. Herein lies part of the attraction of the form for Restoration satirists. Unlike travesty, which denigrates the classical forms themselves, the mock-heroic poem is predicated upon acceptance of the fact that value exists only in a lost past, a time to which the poet can allude but not recreate: it is a gesture of despair and defeat, a concession that inevitably reduces the stature of the satirist.

The polemical poet of the Civil Wars could celebrate real heroes engaged in a real war of vital importance to the nation: mock-heroic poetry before 1660 tends, for this reason, to be a local strategy, a retreat that reinforces by contrast the heroic role of the satirist and those whom he or she celebrates. When Cleveland lapses into mock-heroic, the self-doubt is temporary: always we return to the savage "I," the forceful and reassuring voice of indignant righteousness. For the satirist of the Restoration, however, the context is different: as Butler put it, "No Age ever abounded more with Heroical Poetry then the present, and yet there was never any wherein

\textsuperscript{117} See John R. Clark, "Chafing Dish: Satire's Adulteration of Language and Style," \textit{Thalia} 5 (1983): 14-26. There is a good mock-heroic description of the pamphlet scuffle surrounding the Exclusion Crisis in \textit{Whig and Tory, Or the Scribbling Duellists} (1681).
fewer Heroicall Actions were perfo\r

m" (Prose Observations 175). Historians have sometimes overemphasized the deflation of expectations that followed hard upon the heels of the exuberant welcome accorded Charles II on his return in May of 1660, but the disillusionment that had set in by mid-decade was real. The popular joke that the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion was an act of indemnity for the King's enemies and oblivion for his friends was an early sign of disappointed expectation: as one anonymous royalist lampoon put it, "He that sticks to the Church / Shall be left in the Lurch. / With never a tatter to put on." Given a "Cavalier" Parliament that was continually at odds with the King, and a returning monarch preoccupied with appeasing his father's mortal enemies, it is not surprising that satirists looked to the past for positive models. Such was the new political and social context that even Dryden was obliged in Absalom and Achitophel to concede his monarch's promiscuous exercise of "vigorous warmth" (l. 8).

In this context, the satirists of the Restoration recognized the strategic value of mock-heroic. Because it is a narrative form, mock-heroic allows the satirist to hide behind the

---

118 Cf. Thomas R. Edwards comment that mock-epic is "what happens to epic when it gets too close to real life, the reader's sense of what his world is like and what its values are worth." Imagination and Power (London, Chatto and Windus, 1971) 42. See also Staves 40-42.

119 Charles himself did not believe "that a Nation. so miserably divided for so many Years. is so soon. and entirely United in their Affections and Endeavours as were to be wished." His Majesties Gracious Message . . . June 20, 1660 (London, 1660) 4. See Jose 25-30 and passim.


121 "A Ballad." BL MS Add. 34362 f.18v; Wilson 10-13. See also The Cavaleers Complaint (London, 1661), An Humble Representation of the Sad Condition of Many of the Kings Party ([London], 1661) esp. 2-6, Edmund Dillon, To the Kings Most Excellent Majesty (London, 1664), Brome's "A New Ballad." Poems 214-16, and Pepys 3: 42-43.
impersonality of the historian or epic poet. But mock-heroic satirists are themselves contaminated by the decay that they chronicle: they become a part of the Lilliputian landscape that is their satiric vision, and assume a role of participant in the burlesque drama that is enacted therein. The putative poet of Dorset’s “The Duel” reveals himself so that we can more clearly see him shrink in conformity with the trivial stature of his subject. The mock-epic poet must actually dissemble incompetence. In this sense, the mock-heroic voice is a product of *prosopopeia*, a fictive creation that hides the real satirist behind the squeaky voice of the diminutive would-be epic poet. Mock-heroic succeeds by failing: as Edward Pechter says of Dryden’s most famous mock-heroic, “Reading *Mac Flecknoe* is an experience in frustration. Unsuccess is central not only to its subject but to its strategy, its action upon the reader. Like its anti-hero who promises plays and dwindles into farce, the poem delivers relentlessly less than its apparent commitment” (175). Like the productions of Flecknoe and Shadwell, this poem is ultimately “Pangs without birth, and fruitless Industry” (1.148). The successful author of mock-heroic is one who can hide behind the figure of the execrable epic-poet manqué.

This phenomenon of the hidden poet creates a vacuum in mock-heroic poems, an absence not merely of positive values, but also of authoritative voice. The greatest attraction of the form lies in the fact that this is supplied, in the final analysis, by the most commanding voice of all, that of the true epic poet to whose work the satirist alludes. Behind the tiny and ridiculous figures of Dorset’s Wharton and Wolseley loom the giant shadows of Achilles and Hector or Æneas and

122 K. G. Hamilton opines that *Mac Flecknoe* “succeeds by at once recognizing and ignoring the Augustan ideals of clarity, precision, reason, and order” (*Dryden* 113).

123 Eric Rothstein writes that Dryden generates a kingdom “whose panegyrists might write a poem like this” (23): see also Farley-Hills, *Benevolence of Laughter* 34.
Turnus: it is Virgil and Homer who make Dorset's pygmies ridiculous. Direct comment, the
reasoned voice of a Horace or the impassioned cry of a Juvenal. is unnecessary. For this reason,
the most effective mock-heroic satirists tend to skirt the coastline of real epic closely, maintaining
by means of allusion a constant contact with the models that are being debased. The effectiveness
of Dryden's *Mac Flecknoe* derives from its allusiveness: as Alastair Fowler notes in a recent
article, "virtually every phrase in *Mac Flecknoe* relates to words of Shadwell. Flecknoe, a classic
or the Bible." In contrast to his relatively talkative speakers in *Absalom and Achithophel* and
*The Medall*, Dryden in this poem maintains a very low profile indeed, retaining throughout a
neutral tone. The poem is in this sense highly impersonal: William Myers points out, "there is
little scorn in the poem, and no hatred" (72). Dryden achieves this by allowing others to do his
speaking for him: paradoxically, it is the concealed and yet commanding voice of Virgil (among
other figures of literary authority) who dominates the poem from its first lines:

All humane things are subject to decay.
And, when Fate summons. Monarchs must obey:


125 Joseph War ton, contrasting *Mac Flecknoe* with *The Dunciad*, remarked that the
former is "full of mirth" and that "a vein of pleasantry is uniformly preserved through the whole." *An Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope*. 4th ed. 2 vols. (London. 1782) 2: 383 and n.

126 The voluminous list of such allusions is still growing: see for example Michael
West, "Continental Analogues," and "Dryden's *Mac Flecknoe* and the Example of Duffett's
Flecknoe*." *N&Q N.S.* 34 (1987): 330-31, and the notes in the California Dryden and the

This Flecknoe found, who, like Augustus, young
Was call'd to Empire, and had govern'd long:
In Prose and Verse, was own'd, without dispute
Through all the Realms of Non-sense, absolute. (ll. 1-6)

We should here recall Dryden's praise of Boileau: "His Subject is Trivial, but his Verse is Noble.
I doubt not but he had Virgil in his Eye" ("Discourse " 83). The first four lines of the poem might have been lifted from any heroic poem: while their tone does not derive from specific allusion, the stately authority of this epic voice is founded upon the reader's experience of epics such as the Iliad and the Aeneid. As Reuben Brower noted of the poem's parodic treatment of Shadwell as Ascanius, "Dryden has managed to suggest Virgil's style while producing an entirely different effect." a statement that applies with almost equal force to the rest of the poem ("Dryden's Epic Manner" 135). The sharp note of derision that enters half-way through the last line is supported by the authority of the classical authors whose style is burlesqued and whose epic ideals are here suddenly and brutally betrayed.

While it is epic that most obviously informs the poem's structure, Mac Flecknoe is in fact a tissue of allusions, imitations, and parodies drawn from classical, scriptural, and modern sources. Cowley and Waller are parodied: specific parodies of the Davideis and Waller's "On the Danger His Majesty . . . Escaped in the Road at Saint Andrews" establish these near-contemporaries as types of the diminutive modern epic poet. To this group Flecknoe and Shadwell, both of whose works are also parodied by Dryden, also belong. Jonson, whom Shadwell, to Dryden's disgust.

---


claimed as a literary "father," maintains a ghostly presence throughout the poem, and represents the literary values that Shadwell and others have betrayed. Alongside such contemporary and classical allusions are scriptural ones, for the Old and New Testaments are, like the works of Virgil and Livy, models of heroic endeavour: Flecknoe plays a degraded Elijah, passing on the mantle of the prophet to a sinking Shadwell/Elisha. Shadwell is also a mock-Christ, whose way has been prepared by that diminutive John the Baptist, Flecknoe.

It is tempting to agree with David Hopkins' description of Mac Flecknoe as a poem which "has had a greatness thrust upon it of late to which it never itself aspired." Certainly, as Hopkins notes (67ff), the poem lacks the comprehensive vision of Pope's The Dunciad: Shadwell himself remains the puny monarch of a contemptible world, and poses nothing like the threat that

Dryden 202-03: see also Pechter 171-73.

130 See Ian Donaldson, "Fathers and Sons: Jonson, Dryden, and Mac Flecknoe." SoR 18 (1985): 314-27. The patent awarding Dryden the Laureateship lists his predecessors, reinforcing his contention that it was he, and not Shadwell, who was true heir to "Benjamin Johnson Esquire." Quoted from Eleanore Boswell, "Chaucer, Dryden and the Laureateship: A Seventeenth-Century Tradition." RES 7 (1931): 338. Boswell detects "a serious effort on the part of the Chancery to establish the true pedigree of the poet laureate and of the royal historiographer." The issue of succession is vital: as Pechter points out, "the epic tradition is progressive in spirit, as epitomized by the ritual of succession" (167); in contrast, as Michael McKeon notes, the "premise of mock-heroic is not succession but its impediments." "Historicizing Absalom and Achitophel," in Nussbaum and Brown, eds., New Eighteenth Century 24.


132 See Tanner 220-23 and Korshin, Typologies 283-84.

Pope's "Chaos" does. At the same time, however, the intensely allusive method of Dryden's mock-heroic is representative of the direction in which satire was developing. If the rise of mock-heroic in the later seventeenth-century is an index of a growing awareness of the ways in which the literature of the past can be made to serve the satire of the present. *Mac Flecknoe* represents a fuller recognition of the usefulness of a variety of intertextual relationships to the production of satire that is impersonal and objective, and at the same time authoritative and commanding.

---

134 Michael Wilding notes that "Dryden does not want to stress the seriousness of the threat Shadwell poses to literature: that would be an acknowledgment of the stature of his rival" ("Dryden and Satire" 194).
Chapter 6
"A Just and Secret History": Satiric Occasion and Translation

When Flecknoe, the long-ruling "Augustus" of dullness, contemplates the state of his kingdom, his mind naturally turns to the issue of "the succession of the State" (I. 7). Dryden's theme of succession applies to his topical subject an historical model, but the history that he envisions is a version of the Tory theory of decline: "All humane things are subject to decay," the poem begins, and it is this thesis that Dryden proceeds to demonstrate. Yet, as Dryden's broad-ranging allusions make clear, Mac Flecknoe exists within the contexts of many different "histories." The examples of Hannibal and Ascanius inform Shadwell's ascension to the throne of dullness, while a seedy London is contrasted with the Augustan city that gave birth to the literary models that Flecknoe has betrayed; Mac Flecknoe is in this sense an historical poem, its theme of literary decay informed by the way in which it situates itself in relation to past, present, and future.

1 Leon Guilhamet points out that the poem's opening lines "masquerade as history" (Satire 72). Cf. Dryden's vision of a degenerate age in "To Sir Godfrey Kneller" (1694): "Thy Genius bounded by the Times like mine, / Drudges on petty Draughts" (II. 148-49). See also Pechter 180-84 and Earl Miner, "Dryden and the Issue of Human Progress." PQ 40 (1961): 120-29. For theories of decline, see Godfrey Goodman's The Fall of Man (London, 1616) esp. 348-82, J. Glanvill's Seasonable Reflections 1-2, and Tuveson 70-74.
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Dryden's understanding of the nature and uses of history was conventional. As he explains in his "Life of Plutarch" (1683), history was useful "for instruction, for the regulation of private manners and the management of public affairs":

> It helps us to judge of what will happen, by shewing us the like revolutions of former times. For Mankind being the same in all ages, agitated by the same passions, and mov'd to action by the same interests, nothing can come to pass, but some President of the like nature has already been produc'd, so that having the causes before our eyes, we cannot easily be deceiv'd in the effects, if we have Judgment enough but to draw the parallel. (270-71)

Drawing "the parallel" is Dryden's most characteristic strategy: frequently, he achieves this through stylistic imitation. In *Mac Flecknoe*, the assumption of a Virgilian voice permits him to draw an implicit parallel that damns his subject, while in *Annum Mirabilis* the same epic voice evoked the Roman poet's eulogistic and providential view of history to celebrate a modern triumph. Often, however, his parallels were more direct. In *The Duke of Guise* (1683), written

---


4 Cf. Robert Howard's comments: history is "most effectual, where the Actions of former Ages are made Presidents to our present Times." Howard's "Presidents" were, unlike Dryden's, *Whig (History of the Reigns 2).*

5 See Miner, *Dryden's Poetry* 106-09 and *passim* and William Myers 13 and *passim*. Rachel Trickett notes that Dryden employs a "reflective generalizing tendency" to show "how every event is part of the general pattern of experience...exhibiting the great or tragic event in its true perspective in history." *The Honest Muse* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967) 35. In *Examiner* 17, Swift facetiously describes "looking into History for some Character bearing a Resemblance to the Person we would describe." an "Expedient, frequently practised with great Safety and Success by satirical Writers" (Swift 3: 26).
with Nat Lee, parallels between French Catholic League and English Nonconformists were brought to bear against the Whig Exclusionists. Shadwell, in Some Reflections upon the Pretended Parallel (1683), damned the play as bad history and attacked its attempt to reproduce an historical polemic in dramatic form:

But it appears to me, that Bays did not intend it for a Diversion, but for a Direction and Advice what was to be done: and has more mind to recommend himself as a Counsellor, than a Poet, in this. *Tis a fine Age, when Mercenary Poets shall become Politicians, and their Plays business of State.* (25)

Shadwell's disgust was disingenuous: literature in the seventeenth-century, including his own, was very much a "business of State." The titles of popular collections of satirical verse like the three part *A Collection of Poems on Affairs of State* (1689) are an index of their preoccupation with such themes. Paradoxically, these anthologies are also histories, for they contain verse already out of date: those collections published in the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution, as Paul Hammond has noted, reconstructed the literary context of recent history.

---


8 John Selden remarked of libels that "More solid Things do not shew the Complexion of the times so well, as Ballads and Libels." *Table-Talk*, 2nd ed. (London, 1696) 93. David M. Vieth and Bror Danielsson suggest that one manuscript miscellany of satire, dating from 1680, was acquired by Nils Gyldenstolpe, Swedish ambassador to the Hague, so that he could "familiarize himself with doings at the Court of Charles II." *Collection of English Poetry*, eds. David M. Vieth and Bror Danielsson, Stockholm Studies in English 17 (Stockholm: Almquist and Wiksell, 1967) xxi-xxii.
while creating "a canon of Whiggish poetry" ("Anonymity" 138). The 1697 Poems on Affairs of State relates the anti-Stuart satires of the last 40 years to the struggle for the liberty of the subject. The satirist of earlier, more oppressive times, was a hero: "there is no where a greater Spirit of Liberty to be found, than in those who are Poets." (sig. [A2*]). This thesis was a popular one; Charles Gildon defended satire in 1694 by arguing that "the worst of Princes, and the greatest TYRANTS always persecuted, and hated the Poets, as their known and most dangerous Enemies, for they wou'd spare no Vice in the most powerful Offenders" (Miscellaneous Letters and Essays sig. [A4*]). The preface to the 1697 Poems on Affairs of State maintained that the satire of the past still poses a threat to contemporary tyranny: "no Englishman that is a true lover of his Countries Good, and Glory, can be displeased at the publishing a Collection, the Design of each of which was to remove those pernicious Principles which lead us directly to Slavery" (sig. [A3*]). Poems on Affairs of State served as a monument to past evils, and as an example to those still vigilant in the cause of freedom.¹⁰

Even more significant, however, was the attempt to relate the affairs of the present with the past chronicled by the poems within:

But when all Europe is engag'd to destroy that Tyrannick Power, the mismanagement of those Times, and the selfish evil Designs of a corrupt Court had given Rise to, it cannot be thought unseasonable to publish so just an Account of

---

¹ A Tory version of this phenomenon was the publication by Nathaniel Thompson, during the "Tory revenge" of the mid-1680s, of collections of "Loyal Poems" and "Songs": see A Choice Collection and A Collection of 86 Loyal Poems.

¹⁰ See the justification for the republication of Edward Rawlins' Heraclitus Ridens, 1681-82, 2 vols. (London, 1713): "The Artifices which have of late been thus used to disturb the Peace of these Kingdoms are by no means new, and therefore the same Arguments, by which they have heretofore been so much baffled and exposed, will as effectually do it now" (sig. [A2*]).
the true source of all our present Mischiefs; which will be evident found in the following Poems, for from them we may collect a just and secret History of the former Times. (sig. [A3'])

In 1697, the "Tyrannick Power" absorbing the attentions of Europe was Louis XIV's France, with whom England had been at war since May of 1689. Implicit in this allusion is the parallel between the justness of England's fight in 1697, and the defence of liberty in the 1670s and 1680s against the absolutist aspirations of Charles II. Indeed, the root of the conflict with France, the "true source of all our present Mischiefs," is revealed as Charles' alliance with the French against the Dutch in 1672, and his covenant with Louis XIV formalized in the 1670 Treaty of Dover: the secret provisions of this treaty (first made public in 1682, but rumoured for years before) called for French financial aid, making Charles less dependent upon Parliament for revenue, while the promise of 6,000 French troops to quell possible domestic resistance posed an obvious threat to English liberties. On the other hand, participation with the French in the war with the Dutch in

---


1672 aligned England with a Catholic power against a fellow Protestant nation: herein lay the seeds of French ascendancy. *Poems on Affairs of State* reclaims the satires it contains from irrelevance by establishing a relationship between past and present evils that is one of cause and effect as well as one of parallelism: it is a map of current as well as past political evils.

This new context compelled the reader to re-interpret the collection's poems with reference to recent history. The reader of Dryden's "Heroique Stanzas to the Glorious Memory of Cromwell," the second poem to be found in the volume, would bring to a reading of the poem an awareness of Dryden's subsequent service as Stuart propagandist, as well as his conversion to Catholicism in 1685: in this context, the poem becomes a damning indictment of its writer. Similarly, the reader of the "The Dream of the Cabal. A Prophetic Satyr. 1672" (see Chapter 2, above), found in the same volume, would find particular resonance in the speech of Sir Thomas Clifford, pro-Catholic member of the Cabal ministry, to his King:

You know the Offers we are made from France:
And to have Money and no Parliament.
Must full answer your design'd intent.
And thus without tumultuous noise, or huff
Of Parliaments, you may have Money enough:
Which if neglected now, there's none knows when
Like Opportunities may be had again.

---

13 The war was a turning-point in attitudes towards the crown: see S. C. A. Pinkus. "Republicanism, Absolutism and Universal Monarchy: English Popular Sentiment during the Third Dutch War," in Maclean, ed., *Culture and Society* 241-66. Marvell asserted that "We truckle to France in all things, to the prejudice of our alliance [with the Dutch] and honour" (2: 311), while Pepys wrote that the French alliance would "turn to our ruine" (9: 536).

14 The same intent motivated the republication of Dryden's poem in 1681, 1682, and again in 1687. See also the ironic *A Panegyrick on the Author of "Absalom and Achiuophel," Occasioned by his Former Writing of an Elegy in Praise of Oliver Cromwel. Lately Reprinted* (London, 1681). George Wither's enemies similarly republished parts of *Britain's Remembrancer* (1628) in 1643 to expose his treachery to his monarch: see Norbrook 222.
For all to exirpate, now combin'd be. 
Both civil and religious Liberty. (POAS 1697 1: 143; POAS Yale 1: 191-203)

Clifford's reference to the secret terms of the Treaty of Dover did seem "Prophetick" in 1697, and supplied an insight into the causes of the war in which England was still engaged. Providing a reissued satire with a new context was thus not simply a strategy on the part of booksellers to repackage and profit from old wares: rather, it reflected the way in which topical satire was read.

New satires could, through allusion, also be employed to recontextualize older poems. A salient example already discussed is Marvell's use of The Rehearsal, as also are the allusions by Matthew Prior and Charles Montague to both Buckingham's play and The Rehearsal Transpers'd in his The Hind and the Panther Transvers'd (1687). Dryden's own employment of Protestant millenarian typology and language in Absalom and Achitophel was an allusion to, and reinterpretation of, Puritan satiric attacks upon the Stuarts over the preceding thirty or more years. Dryden employed a similar form of appropriation to answer the anti-Stuart prophesies of Fifth Monarchy Men and others who awaited the onset of cataclysmic change in the year 1666: that year, Dryden's Annus Mirabilis insisted, had indeed been a "year of wonders," but in a way that had redounded to the credit of Charles II's regime. The poem subverts an adversary's version of history, and re-interprets providence through a re-reading of historical portents.15

One obvious way of enlisting the aid of history, and of concealing satire behind other

---


voices, is to conjure up the dead. Harold Brooks, in a cursory catalogue of poems featuring talkative ghosts, lists some 60 of these from 1571 to 1700. Many of these, like Oldham's Garnet's Ghost, are *prosopopæia* in which guilty souls condemn themselves through their own hellish speech. An interesting example is *A Summons from a True-Protestant Conjurer, to Cethegus's Ghost*, which deals with the important London shrieval elections in the autumn of 1682: it features the incantation of a Whig conjuror intent upon calling up the ghost of Cataline's cohort, Cethegus. *A Summons*, like so many other polemics of the Exclusion Crisis, draws the parallel between the current political turmoil, the Civil War, and various historic conspiracies:

Rise then Cethegus. Dear Cethegus, Rise.
*PYM, HAMBDEN, STROUD*. All Brutus dear Allies:
From Holy *MATCHIAVIL*, to more Holy *HOBBS*.
(The Grand *DUUMVIRATE* for *Republic Jobbs*)
Rise *MILTON*, who, to make the Worst-Cause Good.
Did'st dare *Bespatter* a Blest *MARTYR's BLOOD*:
Rise *PETERS*, *NOL*, *SCROOP*, *SCOTT*, Hell's Modern Furics.
Meet *Satan, Fire and Brimstone*. and *WHIGG-JURIES*.

*A Summons* is, in fact, a ghost poem *manqué*, for the poem ends before Cethegus appears; the poem is notable, however, for its attempt to turn the classical Republicanism of the Whigs against


18 See also *Sylla's Ghost: A Satyr against Ambition and the Last Horrid Plot*, by Caleb Calle, who also produced a Tory translation of Sallust's account of the Catalinian conspiracy. For the shrieval election, see Miller 368-71.

19 *A Summons from a True-Protestant Conjurer, to Cethegus's Ghost, To Appear Septemb. 19, 1682* (London, 1682); *POAS* Yale 3: 262-66. The Yale editor, Howard Schless, suggests that Caleb Calle may also be the author of this piece.

20 See the Tory satire *Cethegus's Apology for Non-Appearance upon his Conjurer's Summons* ([London]. [1682]): *POAS* Yale 3: 267-73.
them. Catiline and Cethegus conspired against the Republic in an attempt to institute a tyranny. The Whig conspiracy is identified not as a struggle against arbitrary government, but rather as bloody and mercenary attempt upon the legitimate government. 21

In another prevalent form of ghost poem, the revenants of innocent martyrs return to condemn their murderers. In "Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey's Ghost" (1679), the magistrate whose murder gave Titus Oates credibility appears before Charles to warn and upbraid him:

Behold, Great Sir, I from the Shades am sent.
To shew these Wound that did your Fall prevent.
My panting Ghost, as Envoy, comes to call.
And warn you, lest, like me, y'untimely fall.

(POAS 1689 1: 17; POAS Yale 2: 7-11)

Godfrey's ghost is full of good advice: Charles should abandon his dissolute ways, exile Louise de Kéroualle, confound the treasonous machinations of his Catholic wife and brother, and rid himself of his corrupt ministers. 22 As an immortal shade, Godfrey has a privileged insight into the affairs of men and state, and he speaks throughout the poem with the self-assuredness of a prophet, even comparing himself with Moses: "Think what befell Great Egypt's hardned King / Who scorn'd the Profit of admonishing" (17). 23 Indeed, Godfrey does not sound English at all. His tone is

21 The employment of Cethegus against the Whigs is itself revisionist: in an attack on James entitled Advice to a Painter to Draw the Duke by (1673, ascribed variously to Marvell, Henry Savile, and Ayloffe), "the mad Cethegus of his age" is Thomas Clifford (Marvell I. 59). In Shippen's Moderation Display'd, a Tory satire on "Moderate Men" like Robert Harley. "Cethego" is the Earl of Sunderland, sent from Hell by "Faction" to direct the Whig Junto.

22 Catherine of Braganza appears remarkably seldom in Restoration satire: satirists seem to have felt that she suffered enough. See, however. "A Ballad," POAS Part III 301-02 and "The Advice to the Parliament March 1679," BL MS Harl. 7317 f.47.

23 Ghosts were traditionally associated with prophecy: see for example Æneid Bks. 2 and 6. James Farewell, whose travesty of Book 6, The Irish Hudibras includes a description of the "Succession of the Kings, even to the Late Abdication, and the present Accension of His Majesty,
impersonal and his language replete with scriptural and classical echoes: the French are called "Philistines," the Commons is "the Senate" (17-18), and Charles is compared with Sardanapalus and Tarquin, two favourite exemplars of corrupt monarchy. Godfrey speaks as the embodiment of history itself, and provides a gloss upon historical precedents. Past and present are merged into a single narrative: Godfrey sounds like Moses because Charles is Pharaoh.

Closely related to poems featuring ghostly victims are those that resurrect dead satirists like Stephen College, Rochester, and Robert Wild, lending them a voice with which to comment upon contemporary events. The best known of these is "Marvell's Ghost" (1678) which has

King William the Third," asserts that the English parallel with Virgil's account "is as exact in the Original, as if Virgil had Calculated it for that Meridian" (sig. [A3']).


Poetical Reflections on a Late Poem claims that Dryden's libels "might the Joyner's Ghost provoke to rise" (5), a prophecy fulfilled in Stephen Colledge's Ghost to the Fanatical Cabal ([London], 1681). College's ghost appears also in the Tory prose satires Strange News from Newgate ([London], 1683) and The Strange and Wonderful Apparition (London, 1683), both concerned with the Rye House Plot. See also "Rochester's Ghost, Addressing Himself to the Secretary of the Muses. (1682?); POAS 1697 2: 128-31), "Dr. Wild's Ghost, on his Majesty's Declaration for Liberty of Conscience" (1687; POAS 1697 2: 166-67). "Dryden's Ghost" (1687: POAS Yale 4: 146-50), not a true ghost poem, is a satire on Dryden's conversion.
been attributed to John Ayloffe. Like Godfrey's ghost, Marvell delivers a prophecy of doom:

From the dark Stygian Lake I come,
To acquaint poor England with her Doom:
Which by the Infernal Sisters late,
I copied from the Book of Fate:
And though the sense may seem disguis'd,
Tis in these following Lines compriz'd.

(A Third Collection 5; POAS Yale 1: 284-86)

The Stuart line is corrupt, and Charles II and the Duke of York are singled out for particular opprobrium: contaminated by "Foreign Vices," these two harbour "dark designs" that "have destroyed the Common-weal." There is little in the style of this ghost that suggests the manner of the living Marvell: like Godfrey, Marvell's ghost speaks with the impersonal and authoritative accents of the prophet. The appropriation of his name, however, permits the poet to draw upon the authority of the deceased satirist: when Marvell's ghost berates the Stuart monarchy, the weighty authority of all of his authentic satires lends force to his words.28

An associated technique available to satirists is the account of "News from Hell," an extremely popular form that appeared in verse, prose, and drama:29 it even intrudes into Laurence

27 It is ascribed to Ayloffe in POAS 1697 and A Third Collection of the Newest and Most Ingenious Poems (London, 1689); see also Giles Jacob's The Poetical Register 2: 3.

28 See also "Marvell's Ghost: Being a True Copy of a Letter Sent to the A. Bp. of Cant." (POAS 1697 4: 318-21; POAS Yale 5: 275-80). In this attack upon Sancroft and the nonjuring clergy, the "Ghost" is figurative, representing a revival of the anti-prelatical spirit of Marvell. Similar in this regard are John Taylor's Differing Worships... Or Tom Nashe His Ghost and Tom Durfey's Butler's Ghost: or Hudibras. The Fourth Part (London, 1682), which updates Butler by grafting onto his poem new "Reflections upon these Times."

29 See Benjamin Boyce, "News from Hell: Satiric Communications with the Nether World in English Writing of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." PMLA 58 (1943): 402-37. Dryden's Albion and Albanius (1684) includes a scene set "in a Poetical Hell" (30), where Alecto, "Democracy," and "Zelota" conspire to hatch the Exclusion Crisis; see Paul Hammond, "Dryden's Albion and Albanius: The Apotheosis of Charles II," The Court Masque, ed. David
Echard's *History of England* (1718), which gives an account of an interview between Cromwell and the Devil.\(^5\) Related in obvious ways to Lucianic *Dialogues of the Dead*, such works depicted the illustrious dead in a Hellish or Elysian setting.\(^3\) Frequently, such satire involved little more than placing one's enemies in hell: Phineas Fletcher's anti-Jesuitical satire *The Locusts, or Apollyonists* (1627), which probably influenced Oldham, is a good early example.\(^3\) Oldham himself produced an unpublished fragment entitled "The Vision: A Satyr" in 1678, an anti-Jesuitical poem in which the sleeping poet visits hell.\(^3\) Another variation paralleled the Long Parliament or the Rump with the assembly of Hell. John Taylor's *The Hellish Parliament. Being a Counter-Parliament to this in England* (1642) makes its essential point in its title.

Marvell produced at least two poems set in Elysium. In "Tom May's Death" (1650), the

\[\text{Lindley (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1984) 174. See also the Tory satire *Poor Robins Dream, or the Visions of Hell* (London, 1681).}\]


\(^3\) It is related to a tradition of hellish visions, including Donne's *Ignatius His Conclave* (1611). See *The Deliquium: Or, The Grievances of the Nation Discovered in a Dream* ([London?], [1681?]), a Tory allegory describing Hell's Parliament. Not all such visions are satiric: see Dennis's vision of Hades in *The Court of Death* (London, 1695), which celebrates the recently-deceased Mary. For a discussion of earlier dream-visions, see Sandra Clark 148-58.
recently deceased poet and historian who lends his name to the poem's title arrives and is severely admonished by the ghost of Ben Jonson. May was the author of a translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia* and of a *History of the Parliament of England* (1647) which paralleled the defence of the Roman Republic with the Parliamentary cause; he was much abused for his betrayal of the King. The poetic authority of Jonson, laureate and producer of masques, encomiums, and satire, is brought to bear against the perfidy of May. Appropriately, he launches into a harangue that begins with a parody of the opening lines of May's translation of *Pharsalia* (1626-27):

Cups more civil of *Emathian* wine.  
I sing (said he) and the *Pharsalian* Sign.  
Where the Historian of the Common-Weal  
In his own Bowels sheath'd the conquering health.  
By this *May* to himself and them was come.  
He found himself translated, and by whom. (ll. 21-26)

May's "translation" is a reference to his Lucan, but also to his recent translation by death. His *Pharsalia* has also been "translated" by Jonson's burlesque, which makes clear the way in

---

34 Given that the poem is nearly contemporary with the "Horatian Ode," its ascription to Marvell remains controversial and problematic. George deForest Lord has expressed doubts in his Modern Library edition of the poems. See also Marvell 1: 303-04, and Annabel Patterson. "Miscellaneous Marvell?" in Condren and Cousins, eds., *Political Identity of Marvell* 201-03. For a summary of the debate over Marvell's political affiliations during the interregnum, see James Loxley, "Prepar'd at Last to Strike in with the Tyde? Andrew Marvell and Royalist Verse," *SCent* 10 (1995): 39-62.


36 Clarendon says that he "prostituted himself to the vile office of celebrating the infamous acts of those who were in rebellion against the king" (*Life* 1: 33); see also Edward Phillips' "Eminent Poets among the Moderns," *Theatrum Poetarum* 179 and William Winstanley's *Lives of the Most Famous English Poets* 164.
which May's misreading of Lucan's portrait of rebellion signifies his larger infidelities. May fails to interpret history correctly. fails, in other words, to translate the topicality of Lucan's work:

Foul Architect that hadst not Eye to see
How ill the measures of these States agree.
And who by Romes example England lay.
Those but to Lucan do continue May. (ll. 51-54)

Jonson demands that May remove himself from the company of the poets: "Go seek the novice Statesman, and obtrude / On them some Romane cast similitude" (ll. 43-44). Marvell's poem is about the ways in which allusion and translation can liberate an historically particular text like *Pharsalia* and transform it into a storehouse of applicable truths. Indeed, May's writings themselves become timeless monuments to literary prostitution and ignorance. Also implicitly present are Jonson's works: their justness gives him the warrant to attack May. The productions of these writers meet in a ghostly, allusive form in Marvell's poem where, like their spirit authors, they transcend the topicality that was the condition of their inception.

In "Tom May's Death," Marvell castigates an historian for his faulty reading of history: in "The Loyall Scot" (1670?) he targets a satirist, reserving for himself the role of historian. The

---

37 See however Jonson's "To My Chosen Friend, The Learned Translator of Lucan, Thomas May" (*Works* 8: 395).

38 See Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle's sneering allusion to May's Roman parallels in *The Life of . . . William Cavendishe* (London, 1667) sig. [d1'].

39 Cherniak notes that Marvell opposes "one traditional interpretation of classical history to another. May follows such classical authors as Tacitus, Juvenal, and Plutarch in seeing Brutus and Cassius, Cato and Cicero, as heroes of liberty; the terms of his eulogy of Brutus and Cassius in Book III of *The History of Parliament* are meant to reflect directly upon the English Civil War" (*Poet's Time* 179). See also David Norbrook, "Lucan, Thomas May, and the Creation of a Republican Literary Culture," in Sharpe and Lake, eds., *Culture and Politics* esp. 57-66, and Corrs 233-35.
poem's immediate occasion is an episode from the final stages of the Second Dutch War: on 13th of June, 1667. a Dutch attack upon the English fleet in the Medway culminated in the destruction of three capital ships.\textsuperscript{40} Panic ensued: according to Clarendon the "distraction and Consternation was so great in Court and City as if the Dutch had been not only Masters of the River, but had really landed an Army of one hundred thousand Men."\textsuperscript{41} In an effort to quell the rising hysteria, the London Gazette issued a deliberately bland account of the action which assured readers that the Dutch "can have but little reason to Brag of their Success, and less encouragements to make any further Attempts on these parts."\textsuperscript{42} In the public post-mortem that followed, however, only one bright light could be discerned amidst the wreckage of British military pride: Archibald Douglas, a captain of a Scotch regiment guarding the Chatham dockyards, had perished alone on the deck of the burning Royal Oak in a futile attempt to save the ship. Sir William Temple, writing in August of 1667, lamented that one of England's most respected poets had not lived to celebrate Douglas' deed:

\begin{quote}
I would have been glad to have seen Mr. Cowley before he died, celebrated \textit{sic}\nCaptain Douglas his death, who stood and burnt in one of our Ships at Chatham when his Soldiers left him, because it should never be said, a Douglas quitted his
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{40} See Philip George Rogers, The Dutch in the Medway (London: Oxford UP, 1970). The destruction of the Loyal London was particularly ironic: an earlier ship of that name had exploded in 1665, and the fiery destruction of the new vessel, launched only three months after the burning of London, seemed providential and significant. See McKeon 165-66; Evelyn 3: 486, \textit{Annus Mirabilis} II. 601-16, and \textit{Last Instructions} II. 697-98.

\textsuperscript{41} Life 2: 418: see also Pepys 8: 262-63, and Evelyn's account: "this alarm was so great, as put both County and Citty in to a panicque feare & consternation . . . for every body were flying" (3: 484).

\textsuperscript{42} The London Gazette 165 (13 June to 17 June, 1667) sig. [7D']. See also the fatuous account in Roger Palmer, Earl of Castlemaine, A Short and True Account of . . . the Late War Between the English and the Dutch (London, 1671) 56-73.
Post without Order: whether it be wise in Men to do such Actions or no, I am sure it is so in States, to honour them\textsuperscript{13}

Cowley had died on July 27th: ironically, however, the panegyric task assigned by Temple to one dead poet was, in a sense, taken up by another, for in 1670 "The Loyall Scot" appeared, being an account of the bravery of Douglas penned, or so the poem suggested, by the shade of John Cleveland.\textsuperscript{44}

The bulk of "The Loyall Scot" was lifted by Marvell from his account of the attack upon the Medway in \textit{Last Instructions to a Painter}. To this description Marvell added a framework featuring Douglas' arrival in Elysium and his greeting by Cleveland: additional material included passages urging the essential unity of England and Scotland, and some very strong anti-prelatical satire.\textsuperscript{45} The occasion prompting the poem's appearance, as the repeated emphasis upon the kinship of Scotland and England makes clear, was the debate in Parliament in 1669 and 1670 over a proposed union of the two kingdoms. Originating with Lauderdale, the Secretary for Scottish Affairs, this idea proved controversial: many saw the proposed union as an attempt to strengthen Charles' control over Scotland with, as Hutton puts it, "a view to using the Scots to impose his will on England" (\textit{Charles II} 268). Even more alarmingly, the Scottish Parliament passed in 1669 a Militia act raising six Scots regiments, as Lauderdale wrote to the King, "ready to march when


\textsuperscript{44} For Cleveland's influence upon Marvell, see Alvarez 104-20, J. B. Leishman, \textit{The Art of Marvell's Poetry}, 1966 (N.p.: Minerva P, 1968) 221-27, and Alden 241; Pierre Legouis calls Cleveland "Marvell's master in political satire" (166). The poem was actually written in at least three different stages, some parts possibly as late as 1672-73: see Marvell 1: 385.

\textsuperscript{45} H. M. Margoliouth finds three different strata: lines 15 to 62 (the death of Douglas), lines 1 to 14 and 274 to 285 (the Cleveland framework, including also the passages on union, lines 63 to 86 and 236 to 273), and lines 87 to 235 (the anti-prelatical harangue).
and whither you please."46 As Lauderdale was later to admit, the act "gives jealousy in England because it is declared you may command them to any of your Dominions" (2: 164): many feared a repetition of the events of 1644, when a Scottish army crossed the Tweed to intervene in English affairs.

Marvell seems an unlikely propagandist for such a scheme: he viewed extensions of the King's prerogative with suspicion, and he disliked Lauderdale who, he suggested in a letter of March 1670, "deserved an halter rather than a Garter" (2: 300). Clearly, however, the intent of "The Loyall Scot" was to whip up support for the unpopular measure, and much space is devoted to asserting the natural kinship of the two kingdoms:

Prick down the point whoever has the Art
Anatomists may Sooner fix the Cells
Where life resides or Understanding dwells:
But this wee know, tho' that Exceed their skill.
That whosoever seperates them doth kill. (Marvell ll. 75-80)

In a final image of a unified kingdom, Charles II is imagined as the "great soul," that informs and unites the two nations: he "Knowes the last secret how to make them one" (l. 265). Marvell's poem unites divided lands, but it also seeks to reconcile different historical moments. As Chernaik points out (196), the poem relates itself to the 1644 of Cleveland's poem, to the Dutch attack on the Medway in 1667, and to the act of union of 1670: only the timeless context of the Elysian Glades where Cleveland's recitation is set reconciles these three distinct time schemes. Marvell heals an historic rift by linking disparate times and spaces in a vision of unity: while "The

Rebell Scot" was a poem about national conflict. Marvell's is about reconciliation. The death of Douglas redresses the sins of the Scottish nation recounted in Cleveland's poem, but it also contributes to the prospect of a unified future, a point Marvell underlines by linking Douglas' heroism to the bonding of the two nations: "Shall not a death see Generous now when told / Unite our distance, fill the breaches old?" (ll. 65-66).

At the same time, "The Loyall Scot" is also a reappraisal of Marvell's own satiric vision, for the context of the proposed Scottish and English union lends to Douglas' death a significance that it had lacked in the earlier Last Instructions. In the earlier satire, Douglas appears an heroic and admirable figure, but his death in the midst of the "Confusion, folly, treach'ry, fear, neglect" (l. 610) of the defence of the Medway modifies our impression of his significance. As the Dutch ships break through the chain guarding the entrance to the estuary, the spectacle unfolds like a scene from a dramatic entertainment: "feather'd Gallants" arrive "To be Spectators safe of the new Play" (ll. 97-98). In this context the death of Douglas does indeed seem, as John Dixon Hunt notes (161), "both magnificent and rather ridiculous or at least sentimental, like the affected Restoration lover."47 He is unable to save the Royal Oak from destruction or impede the Dutch attack in any way. In Last Instructions, his death is significant only as a self-sufficient symbol of heroic action and self-sacrifice.48 In the new context provided by "The Loyall Scot," however.


48 A. B. Chambers, speaking of Last Instructions, stresses the conscious "artfulness" of Douglas' transformation in death, which he suggests is deliberately fragile, as though to imply the incongruity of such heroism with the times (162-64). See also Gearin-Tosh 54 and Seidel, Satiric Inheritance 138-43. A. D. Cousins argues unconvincingly that Douglas is the "emotional centre" of Last Instructions. "The Idea of a 'Restoration' and the Verse Satires of Butler and Marvell." SoR 14 (1981): 140 and 142n20.
Douglas' sacrifice gains an external reference, for his death helps reconcile Scot and Englishman. Paradoxically, Douglas becomes significant only when he is removed from his original historical context, and placed within another.

Marvell's re-appraisal of Douglas' significance is symptomatic of the central theme of this poem, for "The Loyall Scot" is a poem of apologies. While Douglas' death redeems Scotland's betrayal of England in 1644, Marvell's praise represents England's forgiveness. Most striking, however, is the change of heart in that most violent villifier of the Scots, Cleveland, who addresses "His ready muse" to the praise of Douglas (ll. 7-8). Through all but the first fourteen and last four lines of the poem, it is Cleveland who speaks: in a peculiar way, "The Loyall Scot" is about Cleveland's satire, his role as a satirist, and the relation of satire to time and event. Cleveland's speech does not (like Jonson's in "Tom May's Death") merely dominate, but actually is the poem in which it appears. Marvell blurs the distinctions between poet and poem, and Cleveland is permitted to usurp Marvell's role as poet-origin of the poem.49 "The Loyal Scot" is, in fact, a revision of "The Rebell Scot." Cleveland's praise of Douglas does not supersede the invective of the earlier poem, but is rather an appendix recited "As of his Satyr this had been a part" (ll. 9-14). Cleveland (or Marvell) is unwilling to repudiate the original poem, despite the former's courteous counsel to Douglas that he "My former satyr for this verse forget" (l. 276). The original satire, it is intimated, was justified by the events of 1644, but suffered from an incompleteness of vision that Cleveland now attempts to rectify.

The source of this new balanced view of the Scots is both historical and ahistorical.

49 See Charles Gildon's Chorus Poetarum (London, 1694), where the poem is entitled "Cleveland's Ghost: Being a Recantation of his former Satyr Intitled The Rebel Scot" (65).
Cleveland has himself been transformed by Elysium, and, having drunk of "wise Lethe," can now take a more objective view of his subject.  But the times themselves have changed as well, and Cleveland has witnessed an historical event that necessitates a modification of his original perspective. While the mortal satirist experienced events sequentially through time, the immortal shade views history as a simultaneity of experience. His new perspective necessitates an apology:

Pardon, Young Heroe, this soe long Transport:
Thy death more noble did the same Extort.
My former satyr for this verse forget.
The hare's head 'gainst the goose gibletts sett.
I single did against a Nation write.
Against a Nation thou didst singly fight.
My differing Crime doth more thy vertue raise
And such my Rashness best thy valour praise. (ll. 274-81)

The radical transformation of Cleveland's satiric vision is signalled by parodic echoes of passages from "The Rebell Scot." As Diana Treviño Benet has noted, "the figurative flame of Cleveland's 'I am all on fire' (5) in 'The Rebel Scot' becomes literal, underlining the difference between mere, blustering indignation and true, fiery loyalty": similarly, where Cleveland's poem attacks Presbyterians, Marvell's criticizes the Anglican clergy.  Marvell's jest that "had Bishops come, / Pharaoh at first would have sent Israel home" (ll. 108-09) echoes Cleveland's bitter lines on the Scots: "Had Cain been Scot, God would have chang'd his doome. / Not forc'd him wander, but

50 Cf. Mr. Ashtons Ghost to his Late Companion in the Tower (London, 1691) which recounts a visit by the late Jacobite agent to Lord Preston: "I come from a Countrey where Compliments are quite out of Fashion; where we see things as they are in their own Natures, stript from all those odd Disguises, which Prejudice, Interest, or Humour, here dresses 'em in" (2).

confin'd him home" (ll. 63-64).\(^{52}\) Cleveland retains his satirical attitude, but his target has shifted:\(^{53}\) he criticizes his own broad attack, in "The Rebell Scot." upon an entire nation, and admits that "The world in all doth but two Nations bear. / The good, the bad, and those mixt every where" (ll. 236-37). The spectacle of the chauvinistic Cleveland denouncing the distinctions that set off English from Scots is the more apposite given the fears of many that the Scots would be used by Charles to pacify England. The very poet who had most memorably expressed outrage at the Scots invasion of 1644 becomes a means of allaying fears that the same might happen again.

Douglas, Cleveland. "The Rebell Scot." and Marvell's lines from *Last Instructions*, have all, in a sense, been redeemed from time. This is also the process at work in the poem's description of Douglas' translation from mortal hero to immortal soul and heroic symbol:

```
His shape Exact which the bright flames enfold
Like the sun's Statue stands of burnisht Gold:
Round the Transparent fire about him Glowes
As the Clear Amber on the bee doth Close:
And as on Angells head their Glories shine
His burning Locks Adorn his face divine. (ll. 46-51)\(^{54}\)
```

The role of Cleveland in this transformation is underlined in a passage that combines images of time transcended with a faith that the barriers of geography and nationality can be overcome:


\(^{54}\) A further sign of Douglas' transformation is the manner in which he is stripped of gender in this sexualized description: Steven N. Zwicker sees him as an asexual figure whose chasteness contrasts with the sexualized court-pastoral of the preceding scene. "Virgins and Whores: The Politics of Sexual Misconduct in the 1660s," in Condren and Cousins, eds., *Political Identity of Marvell* 98-101. See also Rivers 120 and Riebling 147-49.
Fortunate Boy, if ere my verse may Claim
That Matchless grace to propagate thy fame.
When Oetna and Alcides are forgott,
Our English youth shall sing the valiant Scott. (ll. 59-62)

In this way, Douglas is released, not merely from the limitations of an existence in time, but also from those imposed by space and the artificial bounds dividing nation from nation.

Diana Treviño Benet has written that Douglas is transformed by the poem "into a coherent and unified work of art" (201). Implicit in her celebration of the Loyal Scot's metamorphosis is the assumption that "coherent and unified" works of art are themselves timeless and universal. Yet, this is exactly what Marvell's poem does not suggest. Far from freeing his poem from the bounds of time, Marvell's art builds upon one moment in time to give significance to another. Cleveland's "The Rebell Scot" dominates the form and structure of "The Loyall Scot" in ways that are not always evident, and to read Marvell's poem without reference to the 1644 satire is to read only part of the whole poem that Marvell and Cleveland have together constructed. If Cleveland's poem has been liberated from irrelevance and ephemerality, it is so that it might be put to the service of a new occasion, the proposed Act of Union. Marvell, then, is not creating a timeless work of art: he is reviving Cleveland's poem, much as he resurrects Cleveland himself, in order to make a new topical statement. A poem, Marvell's method seems to imply, cannot be made "universal": it can only be refitted for new historical contexts.

The topicality of satire is a function of its human origin. The Cleveland of "The Loyall Scot" produces a poem that redeems that past only because, as a shade, Cleveland himself has transcended time. It is for this reason that Cleveland appears as putative poet in "The Loyall Scot": to revise the perspective of "The Rebell Scot," it is first necessary to revise the poet who
created it. The thematic heart of the poem, in this context, is the moment of rapprochement between Cleveland and Douglas, for it is at this moment that perspectives are fused and the reconciliation of Scotland and England, past and present, praise and blame effected:

Here Douglas smiling said hee did Intend
After such Frankness shown to be his friend,
Forewarn'd him therefore lest in time he were
Metempsicose to some Scotch Presbyter. (ll. 282-85).

Marvell’s “The Loyall Scot” is an explicit acknowledgment of the subjectivity of satire. Indeed, the poem is a dramatization of the relationship between the artist and the satirical art: like Bayes in *The Rehearsal*, Cleveland is bodily dragged forth -- in this case, from the grave -- and made to acknowledge, and apologize, for his subjective satiric vision. Yet, this candid admission of the satirist’s responsibility for his art is a sham: Marvell has neatly concealed himself behind the contrite Cleveland. Marvell achieves this through a form of *prosopopeia*, appropriating the voice of the dead satirist, and through an integration of his immediate topical occasion with a larger historical pattern of internecine struggle and reconciliation. The fusion of poems, poets, and histories erases the limitations of time, place, and person, and yet does so, paradoxically, so that Marvell may impact upon his own immediate historical context. Edward Young’s suggestion that “*Historians* themselves may be consider’d as Satirists, and Satirists most severe” has already been cited. But historians, as the case of Tom May makes clear, are, like satirists, fallible: in Marvell’s "The Loyall Scot," therefore, history itself is made the satirist.
"In the Persons of the Dead": Satiric Translation

In the final lines of his first satire, Juvenal concludes that it is safer to attack the dead than indict the living. Dryden's translation of this passage makes explicit what is only hinted at in his original, that the satirist will disguise his attack upon the living as an arraignment of the dead:

"Since none the Living-Villains dare implead. / Arraign them in the Persons of the Dead" (ll. 257-58). Dryden's translations of Juvenal and Persius follow this prudent procedure, and his own satiric critique of Williamite policies is masked behind Juvenal's invective assaults upon Nero and Domitian. Dryden's satiric strategy is, however, double-sided, for he arraigns "the Living-Villains" through the resurrection of Juvenal: it is, in fact, the "Persons of the Dead" who arraign the living. Dryden employs Juvenal much as Marvell and others used spectral satirists, exploiting the legitimacy, and subtle concealment, of translation.

Interestingly, both traditions of the satirist redivivus were associated by images of the dead revived through translation.55 An early version is Chapman's quasi-mystical sense of communion with his author: in Euthymic Raptus: or The Teares of Peace (1609), Homer tells him that "thou didst inherit / My true sense (for the time then) in my spirit."56 Similar is Ben

55 Burlesques too raised "ghosts": Alexander Radcliffe, in an attack upon Matthew Stevenson's travesty of Ovid's Epistles, The Wits Paraphras'd (London, 1680), says that Ovid's "Ghost has been lately attempted to be rais'd by an unlucky Pretender to Poetry: who indeed hath not skill enough to disturb his Manes." Ovid Travestie (London, 1680) sig. [*2'']. See also Lucians Dialogues, (Not) From the Greek . . . The Second Part sig. [A2''].

Jonson's praise of Sir Henry Savile: "the soule of TACITVS / In thee, most weighty SAVILE, liu'd to vs" ("Epigramme 95." 8: 61; ll. 2-4.). John Denham, speaking of his translation of Cicero's Cato Major (1669), noted that, in the original, "Cicero did not so much appear to write, as Cato to speak": Cato "who being then rais'd from the dead to speak the language of that Age and Place [i.e. Cicero's], neither the distance of place or time makes it less possible to raise him now to speak ours." Thomas Wood expresses this idea rather well in Juvenalis Redivivus (1683), an imitation of Juvenal's Satire I. Wood radically alters the last passage of Juvenal's poem: "Tis Cruelty to cut and slash the Dead," the revived Juvenal says, "The world shall know, that I the Living dare CORRECT" (29-30). "Juvenal here has thought good to contradict what he said when he was first alive." Wood writes, "and Resolves now to prosecute the Living, as heretofore he did the Dead" (sig. [F1']). It is Juvenal who now satirizes English vices: in such accounts, translation resembles necromancy.

This development derived from the rise of free translation in the period following the Civil

---


58 See "To the Excellent and unknown Author of the ensuing Poem": "once Achitophel / Did please, but now the Ghost of Juvenal." Thomas Wood, sig. [A4']. Creech, however, wrote in his Horace, that he thought it better to "show the Age their whole substance, rather than their thin Ghost imbody'd with some light Air of my own" (sig. [A7']).
War: soon even school texts subscribed to the new theory. Horace's remarks in Ars Poetica were axiomatic: "Be not too nice the Authors words to trace, / But vary all with a fresh air and grace" (Oldham II. 226-31). While really addressed to those dealing with well-trodden themes, these lines were accepted as sanction for free translation. However, it was Denham and Cowley who were most frequently credited with founding the new school of free translation. Arguing, in the preface to The Destruction of Troy (1656), against being "Fidus Interpres." Denham expressed his conviction that a poem is a living thing infused with the spirit of its author:

"Caput mortuam" is a suggestive phrase: all that remains of a work drained of "life and energy" by exact translation is a corpse-like simulacrum of the original. Denham aims at a new kind of


60 See Ralph Johnson's Scholar's Guide 6, 30. and Charles Hoole's A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole 185-87.

61 See Muneharu Kitagaki, Principles and Problems of Translation in Seventeenth-Century England (Kyoto: Yamaguchi, 1981) 42-44. Dryden, quoting the Earl of Roscommon's translation, cites this advice with approval in his "Preface" (115) to Ovid's Epistles (1680), while Brome commented that the contributors to his Horace "all studied to shun a nice Pedantical Translation, which Horace could not abide" (sig. [A5']). See Sir Edward Sherburne's clarification of Horace's meaning in The Tragedies of L. Annaeus Seneca (London, 1702) xxxvi-xxxvii.

62 See Ovid's Epistles (116) and the preface to Anacreon done into English, edited by Thomas Wood and Francis Willis (Oxford, 1683) sig. [a3'].
fidelity founded upon the authorial voice of the original, an idea that pervades his most influential discussion of translation, "To Sir Richard Fanshaw upon his Translation of Pastor Fido" (1648).

Cowley arrived at much the same conclusion by a different route: his task in *Pindarique Odes* (1656) was to make intelligible a voice that time had rendered incomprehensible. Were Cowley "to translate Pindar word for word, it would be thought that one Mad-man had translated another" (*Poems* sig. [Aaa2']); he has therefore "taken, left out, and added what I please: nor make it so much my aim to let the reader know precisely what he spoke, as what was his way and manner of speaking" (sig. [Aaa2']). Like Denham, Cowley concludes that poetic value resides in the character of the poet's voice: peculiarities of idiom and reference are accidentals that obscure the author. Denham makes this same point in *The Destruction of Troy*:

And as speech is the apparel of our thoughts, so are there certain Garbs and Modes of speaking, which vary with the times: the fashion of our clothes being not more subject to alteration, than that of our speech ... and therefore if Virgil must needs speak English, it were fit he should speak not only as a man of this Nation, but as a man of this age. (160)

---

63 See also Dennis' *The Court of Death* sig. [a1'].


65 Cf. Denham's translation of Dominicus Mancinus' *Of Prudence. Of Justice* (1668): "I undertook to redeem it from an obsolete English disguise, wherein an old Monk had cloathed it, and to make as becoming a new Vest for it, as I could" (190). Chapman's advice to "clothe and adorne" the original "with words and such a stile and forme of Oration as are most apt for the language into which they are converted" anticipates Denham's image. *Chapman's Homer*, ed. Allardyce Nicoll, 2nd ed., Bolingen Series 41 (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1967) 17. See also Oldham's comments on his translation of the *Ars Poetica* 87, and Aphra Behn's praise of Henry Higden in "To Henry Higden, Esq." *Tenth Satyr* sig. [a1']. Travesty uses similar images to describe the disguising of the author's style: as Edward Ames Richards notes, "translation, imitation, and burlesque are closely intermingled" in the period (166-67). See also Reuben A. Brower, *Mirror on Mirror: Translation, Imitation, Parody* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard UP.
The "apparel" of language is changed so as to remain faithful, not merely to the sense, but to the spirit of the original writer; that which is "imitated" is not the work so much as the author.⁶⁶

Expressions of this new approach became a commonplace of translation theory for the next century and a half.⁶⁷ Translators, Dryden argues in The Works of Lucian (1711), should communicate "the Author's Spirit and Soul in the Traduction." (226). In his A Modern Essay on the Tenth Satyr of Juvenal, Henry Higden, for example, has chosen a mode of translation "that gives Life and Spirit to his Author, by making him English, in a Modish and Familiar way" (sig. [a4v]), while David Abercromby's A Discourse of Wit (1685) likens translation to "Portraying" and "drawing to life the very Soul it self: I mean, in representing the very Air, Temper, Humour, and Complexion: For a Man is not drawn to Life, unless the most habitual indisposition of his Soul shine in the Piece."⁶⁸ Similar is Dryden's remark in Ovid's Epistles that a good translator maintains the "Character" of his author, "and makes him not unlike himself. Translation is a kind

---

⁶⁶ See Thomas R. Steiner 57. This method does not necessarily imply modernization. Dryden notes that "in the Pindarick Odes, the Customs and Ceremonies of Ancient Greece are still preserv'd" (Ovid's Epistles 117); see however 129.

⁶⁷ See Edward Young's advice, in Conjectures on Original Composition, 1759 (Leeds: Scolar P, 1966): "Imitate; but imitate not the Composition, but the Man" (21); William Cowper, however, opined that this approach "wants nothing but practicability to recommend it." The Letters and Prose Works of William Cowper, eds. James King and Charles Ryskamp. 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979-86) 5: 61. See also Philip Francis' Satires of Horace xi. and "Fitzcotton"'s parody of this concept in A New, and Accurate Translation of . . . Homer's Iliad iii-vi.

⁶⁸ A Discourse of Wit (London. 1685) 229.
of Drawing after the Life."

The passage of time was, like the change of language, a daunting obstacle: Cowley asked that the reader "consider in Pindar the great difference of time betwixt his age and ours." The translator had to deal with "a thousand particularities of place, persons, and manners, which do but confusedly appear to our Eyes at so great a distance" (sig. [Aaa2r]). Denham similarly argued that "change of Times" as well as of "Tongues, or Place" rendered an ancient author obscure to modern readers ("To Sir Richard Fanshaw" 144: 1. 28). It was therefore "fit he should speak not only as a man of this Nation, but as a man of this age" (Destruction of Troy 159). The translator, then, reclaimed the work from history through a sympathetic understanding of the subject author. In fact, the language employed by Denham and Cowley is remarkably similar to that used to describe prosopopœia: Ralph Johnson's rule for writing a prosopopœia, previously cited in Chapter 2, is relevant: "Consider the case and condition of the person you represent, and imagine your self in such a place, so qualified." Free translation and imitation required just such an imaginative reconstruction, as Richard Flecknoe's comments in 1653 suggest:

[The translator] is so to Induere personam authoris, to induc and put on the person of the Author, as to imagine himself him, and that he rather writes the Book then translates it: so he is not to think, nor reflect on the Language he translates out of, but how the Author would best expresse himself in that he translates into."

69 See also the "Preface" to Sylve (1685) 5.


71 See also William King's remarks in The Art of Love xxxviii-xxxix.

72 "Of Translation of Authors." Miscellania (London, 1653) 114.
Imitation produces a creative process that parallels that by which the original work was created.\textsuperscript{73}

That such a process is probably impossible to achieve is irrelevant: it was generally accepted as a precondition for translation. The potential of this innovation was quickly recognized by satirists, who could cloak their satires on the living in translations of ancient satire. But time, as well as language, separates the dead author from his living audience: the next logical step was to modernize the text so that references, as well as language, were such as the ancient author might actually use were he "not only a man of this Nation," but also "a man of this age."

The imitator no longer merely reconstructs the stylistic traits of an imagined English Juvenal: now, sympathetic engagement with the author determines the manifestations of vice that Horace or Juvenal might attack were they living in Restoration England. Two early examples of this technique are Thomas Sprat's imitations of Horace's Satire I. 9 and the first part of Horace's Satire II. 6 (the second part of this was contributed by Cowley), in Brome's 1666 edition of Horace.\textsuperscript{74}

As Harold Brooks puts it, "Horace is reincarnated not simply as a Restoration Englishman, but specifically as Thomas Sprat, writing in the early months of 1662."\textsuperscript{75} While the imitation of Satire I. 9 includes modernizations but little topical satire, Sprat's version of Satire II. 6 contains

\textsuperscript{73} Kitagaki notes that Dryden's emphasis in his Virgil is not "on the imitation of something, but on the imitation like someone. Not the object of imitation, but the manner of imitation matters here" (237). See also Charles Martindale, "Unlocking the Word-Heap" 49.

\textsuperscript{74} Kupersmith calls these "the first full-scale Imitations of a classical satirist" (90). See, however, Griffin, \textit{Satires against Man} 249 and Hammond, \textit{Oldham} 111-12. Brooks' identification of these as Sprat's, in "Contributors to Brome's Horace." \textit{N&Q} 174 (1938): 200-01. is now accepted, but see Harold Whitmore Jones and Adrian Whitworth, \textit{Thomas Sprat, 1635-1713, Bishop of Rochester: Check List of his Works} (London: London University, 1952) item 41.

\textsuperscript{75} "The 'Imitation' in English Poetry. Especially in Formal Satire, before the Age of Pope." \textit{RES} 25 (1949): 129.
references to the arrival of Catherine of Braganza and the acquisition of Tangiers (285). The urban landscape is recognizably that of London:

Sir, my Lord such a one desires that you
Would be at Westminster at two:
There did a Merchant, Sir, for you inquire.
Your aid in some rich project to desire:
I pray Sir get his Graces hand to this.
He knows me, and it reasonable is. (283-84)

Sprat is more interested in reproducing a contemporary tone than in satirizing seventeenth-century London or its denizens. Nonetheless, the example was suggestive, and the second edition of Brome's *Horace* (1671) added thirteen new imitations. The potential for a more topical use of imitation was not, however, fully realized until nearly a decade later, in a poem protesting the 1672 Declaration of Indulgence entitled *Englands Sin. and Shame: In a Parallel Between the Degenerate Estate of Old Rome & Great Britain. Or. Hor. Lib. 3. Ode 6... Occasionally Paraphrased, and Applied for the 30th of January 1672:*

Repost'rously, thou chargest Crimes.
Vain Britain! on thy Grand'sire Times:
Till thou, the ruin'd Church restore:
It's Altars, buried in their Dust, rebuild:
Pays't all those Duties it enjoy'd before.
And all its Sacred Rites reviv'st again..."76

Significantly, the translation is rendered in Cowleian Pindarics. The title says very nearly all that needs to be said: "Occasionally Paraphrased, and applied" makes explicit the new-found link between imitation and historical application. From the early 1670s on, imitation took hold as one of the more vibrant and popular modes of satiric expression.

Dryden's translations employed a conservative variation of this same method, for he was

relatively circumspect in his use of modernization. Nonetheless, his Ovid is a contemporary: as Dryden notes in the "Preface" to Ovid's *Epistles*, each translation "is of a piece with his, and that if he were living, and an *Englishman*, they are such, as he wou'd probably have written" (4). Juvenal is accorded a similar treatment in 1693, for Dryden and his fellow translators have "endeavour'd to make him speak that kind of *English*, which he wou'd have spoken had he liv'd in *England* and Written to this Age" (8). The obscuring veil of history is lifted, and the ancient author permitted to speak directly to modern readers. An example from Juvenal's Satire 10 is representative of Dryden's technique:

```
For this, in *Nero's Arbitrary time*,
When Virtue was a Guilt, and Wealth a Crime,
A Troop of Cut-Throat Guards were sent, to seize
The Rich Mens Goods, and gut their Palaces:
The Mob. Commission'd by the Government.
Are seldom to an Empty Garret, sent.
The Fearful Passenger, who Travels late.
Charg’d with the Carriage of a Paltry Plate.
Shakes at the Moonshine shadow of a Rush:
And sees a Red-Coat rise from every Bush:
The Beggar Sings, ev'n when he sees the place
Beset with Thieves, and never mends his pace. (ll. 23-34).
```

The historical context of these events of "*Nero's Arbitrary time*" initially seems uncomplicated. Yet the term "Arbitrary," not found in Juvenal, hints at a contemporary relevance, for it was a word replete with important political resonances for seventeenth-century readers, and was

---

77 Dryden and his collaborators had "but seldome" made Juvenal "express the Customs and Manners of our Native Country" ("Discourse" 89): Dryden's method, as Kupersmith notes, is more frequently to replace obscure particular references with general ones (145).

78 See also the Preface to *Sylvie* 4, and the Dedication to *Æneis* 330-31. Dennis commented that Virgil "is now, by Mr. Dryden's Translation, to be reckon'd among our own Poets" (*Grounds of Criticism* sig. [A6']).
employed by polemicists of all shades of political opinion: "The very noise of Arbitrary Power." as one pamphlet put it in 1679. "is enough to cramp the Tongues of Scolds, make Teeming Women miscarry, scare Children out of their bawling Cryes, and strike Devils with Ague-fits of Trembling." It is difficult not to read the lines that follow in the context of recent British, as well as Roman, history.

Significantly, Dryden omits many of the particulars of the original passage, and alters others: Nero's victims Longinus and Seneca are not named, nor is the Laterani, the palace of Plautius Lateranus plundered by Nero's troops. At the same time, Dryden's "Mob" translates miles: Juvenal's legionaries are transformed into a plundering rabble like those spawned by London during the Civil War. The robber (latrone) of Juvenal's account becomes in Dryden's lines an English soldier. "Red-Coat." most probably a specific allusion to both Cromwell's hated New Model Army and William III's standing army. Reference to the quasi-official robbery engaged in by the military suggests the Long Parliament's policies of sequestration, and the outrages visited upon citizens by both Parliamentary and Williamite soldiers. Dryden's systematic generalization of Juvenal's historical references, coupled with his politically-charged diction, makes it impossible not to read this passage as a satire upon the Good Old Cause and its

---


80 Cf. Dryden's translation of Satire 16, esp. II. 10-17 and 40-54.
Whiggish successor, the Revolution regime. Juvenal is himself, it seems, a Jacobite.

Read in this way, much of Dryden's translation of Juvenal and Persius becomes, like Poems on Affairs of State, a "just and secret History," not only "of the former Times," but also of contemporary England. Juvenal's Rome does not disappear as a result: on the contrary, Dryden's point is that history repeats itself. Dryden is Juvenal, and then is now: as George Steiner expresses it, this kind of approach to the Ancients "is based on a postulate of timeless..." 

Paradoxically, however, this concept of unchanging human nature disguises an attack upon contemporary evil in a way that implicitly concedes that times have changed: Domitian's Rome is not that of the Republic, and William III's England represents an analogous decay of the standards of the age of Charles II. Nor does Dryden restrict himself to political attacks. His winking protestation in the "Argument" to Juvenal's Satire 6 that "Whatever his Roman Ladies were, the English are free from all his Imputations" (146) disguises a nasty invective against contemporary feminine vice that is generated by his diction, the "kind of

---


"English" that his Juvenal speaks:

Whither wou'dst thou to chuse a Wife resort.  
The Park, the Mall, the Play-house, or the Court?  
Which way soever thy Adventures fall  
Secure alike of Chastity in all. (l. 87-90)

Dryden's translation of "Play-house" for spectacula is literal, and his substitution of the Mall for porticibus an appropriate choice. Yet these, with the addition of the "Park" and "Court," also translate the satire's historical context: the women of London are, like those of Rome, faithless and promiscuous. These lines might almost be in reference to Wycherley's The Country Wife.

Modern critics have become adept at discovering covert satire on William III in Dryden's later works. Drama, which Dryden had employed for the purposes of political polemic during the Exclusion Crisis, provided an obvious avenue for satiric reflections, while many critics have seen in Alexander's Feast a mocking allusion to William's continental campaigns. Dryden had been for too long an energetically political poet to abandon this role merely because he was no longer in sympathy with the prevailing party; indeed, if Dryden's assertions of the duty of the satirist in the "Discourse" are to be taken seriously, we must expect to find him redoubling his efforts to damn those who had become a "Publick Nuisance." At the same time, the dangers associated

---

83 As Hammond notes, Juvenal's Satire 6 "seems to have been one of the points de repère of the subliterature of the Restoration" (Oldham 152); see Nussbaum 77-93 and passim. See also Matthew Hodgart, Satire (New York and Toronto: McGraw Hill, 1969) 79-107.

with open attacks upon the government were real. Dryden assured Mrs. Steward in 1699 that he was willing to adopt an attitude of "acquiescence under the present Government, & forbearing satire upon it" (Ward 123), and in the "Postscript" to Æneis, he disclaimed any satiric intentions. Despite acknowledging that poetasters had opened "a Field of Satire" to him: "But since the Revolution, I have wholly renounc'd that Talent. For who wou'd give Physick to the Great when he is uncalled: To do his Patient no good, and indanger himself for his Prescription?"

... "Tis enough for me, if the Government will let me pass unquestion'd." (808). But translation provided an ideal mode of dissimulating "acquiescence" while practising satire. And while Dryden's translation of Virgil and his Fables, therefore contain much covert satire upon the new Revolution regime, Juvenal and Persius provided even more fruitful satirical parallels.

---

85 See Winn, *Dryden* esp. 436-54. Dryden's plays were vigorously censored after 1688; see Luttrell 2: 413 and Moore 36-42. Rüdiger Ahrens has made the bizarre assertion that William III's Bill of Rights (1689) ensured that "political satire no longer had to clothe itself in allegorical and lyrical forms," a notion disproved by even a cursory examination of the satire of the post-Revolution period. "The Political Pamphlet: 1660-1714. Some Pre- and Post-Revolutionary Aspects." *Anglia* 109 (1991): 21-43.


87 Steven N. Zwicker sees this as a common and characteristic strategy of the post-Revolution period: "Politics and Literary Practice in the Restoration," in Lewalski, ed., *Renaissance Genres* 287-92. David Nokes has pointed out that "pervasive 'Augustan' iconography of the period" provided satirists with "a ready-made system or code of historical parallels that could be used to identify contemporary targets while protecting the satirist from the reach of libel laws" (60).

Dryden himself could not in safety attack William's creation of a standing army, but he could allow Juvenal to undertake it: Satire 16. Dryden's "Argument" informs us, was "intended [as] an Invective against a standing Army." As James Winn points out, "the pose of a translator was a mode of self-protection: Dryden could skew his translation strongly toward criticism of the regime while letting the blame fall on Juvenal or Persius."

The temptation to work through Dryden's translations as though they were allegories is hard to resist: a simple substitution of "William III" for references to Domitian and Nero produces a text that is not, in fact, "about" ancient Rome at all. Dryden himself seems to sanction such an approach, which he attributes to his authors: "wheresoever Juvenal mentions Nero, he means Domitian, whom he dares not attack in his own Person, but scourges him by Proxy" ("Discourse" 69). But to treat such covert satire as allegory is to miss part of the point of the


91 Bottkol notes that the "editors used by Dryden" were "inclined to find hidden personal references in Juvenal and Persius" (250): see also Zwicker, Lines of Authority 4-6.

92 See Dryden's "Argument of the First Satyr" of Persius (257), and the "Argument" of Persius' Satire 4 (311). Casaubon defended Persius' obscurity, arguing that it was motivated "out of fear of that most cruel and bloodthirsty of tyrants against whom they [his satires] were
imitation. Allegory reveals only those meanings built into the form by the author, whereas, in historical writing, as John M. Wallace has pointed out, "the meaning of one set of examples is not exhausted by a single topical context."93 Juvenal's authority does not derive merely from his command of the satiric form: part of his appeal is that he is of another age. Employing Juvenal's attack on Roman women to satirize English females accentuates the unchanging nature of human vice.94 As Sir Robert Stapylton noted, in the preface to his 1647 translation of Juvenal, the Roman satirist's value is not restricted

within the narrow bounds of his owne age, or climate, but communicated and alike usefull to all Ages, to all Nations, for the sad cause which he himselfe fortold. Viz.

Posterity can no new vices frame.
Our Nephewes will but wish and act the same.

And if the same nettles that stung his Latian shepeards, overrun our ground: I see no reason but to him that weeds them out, the same honour should be done by us, which Rome gratefully returned. (sigs. [A.4v])

An anonymous eulogist for Wood's Juvenalis Redivivus praised him for having "but chang'd each name" of his original: "The Matter, Manners, Men were all the same" ("To his Friend the Author," T. Wood sig. [A.4]). Only the names have been changed to scourge the guilty.


93 "Dryden and History" 272. Wallace argues that this multivalence protects the author "from having to own up to his personal opinions" (273). See also Harth, Pen for a Party 11, Roper 1 and passim. George deForest Lord, ""Absalom and Achiophel,"" in Miner, ed., Dryden 162-63, and Zwicker, Dryden's Political Poetry 23-26.

94 Michael Wilding argues in relation to Dryden's Juvenal and Persius that the "very generality of the vices and delusions Juvenal and Persius denounced, the timeless recurrence of their themes, ensured their continuing relevance." "Dryden and Satire," in Miner, ed., Dryden 220. See also Bywaters, Dryden in Revolutionary England 108 and passim.
In the best examples of imitation, the transition from one age to the next, and from ancient voice to modern one, is imperceptible. Oldham became one of the masters of this form of translation. The idea that a translation retains, despite changes in language and topical reference, "Juvenal himself in every line" ("To his Friend the Author," T. Wood sig. [A4']) is vital: in theory, the ideal condition of the translator is invisibility. Translation involves, as Renato Poggioli expresses it, "an exorcism . . . of one's Self." Any intrusion of the voice of the translator is a contamination of the original. As Thomas Shadwell, in an attack upon free translation, asserted in his prefatory remarks to the 1687 The Tenth Satyr of Juvenal, English and Latin, "the thoughts of those Paraphrastical Writers, mixing with those of such noble Authors, look like patches of homely Wollen upon the richest Silk." The advantages of such invisibility are obvious. Henry Vaughan, in the preface to his 1646 translation of Juvenal's Satire 10, hints at parallels awaiting discovery within, but ultimately disclaims any responsibility for applications the reader may draw from the translation:

"Honest (I am sure) it is, and offensive cannot be, except it meet with such Spirits

---


97 The Tenth Satyr of Juvenal (London, 1687) sig. [A3']. See Higden's reply in Modern Essay on the Tenth Satyr sigs. [a3'-4'].

that will quarrell with Antiquitie, or purposely Arraigne themselves: These indeed may thinke, that they have slept out so many Centuries in this Satyr, and are now awaked: which had it still been Latine, perhaps their Nap had been Everlasting.

(2)

Thomas Creech's remarks upon the apparent incompatibility of his own character and that of Horace, his chosen subject, have already been noted: his admission that he himself has "too little ill Nature . . . to be a Satyrist" (sigs. [A6*]) is intended, however, as a subtle assurance to the reader that the translation delivers pure Horace, unadulterated by Creech's own, very different character. More commonly, however, imitators and translators asserted their own invisibility by emphasizing their sense of kinship with their author, or by allowing the original author to "possess" them: John Harvey, who translated Juvenal's Satire 10 in 1693, asserted that while the "same Man who is right set for the Translating of Soft Lays, yet he is not thereby qualify'd to perform the like in Satyr to the best advantage," unless "he has such an absolute command over himself as to subject his own Genius, entirely to that of the Authors before him" (Tenth Satyr of Juvenal sig. [B2*]). The locus classicus for this concept is Longinus, whose notion of "Emulation." although not translation per se, was nonetheless a useful one for translators:

99 See, however, Gilbert Murray's description of Creech's translations as "unreadable; bad verse in themselves, and full of Creech's tiresome personality . . . . But to Creech himself, how different it all was. . . . He did not feel any veil of intervening Creech." Euripides (London: George Allen, 1902) x-xi. Cited in Frost, Dryden 30.

100 His comments echo Horace's self-justification in Satire II. 1: "Not every Pen can paint" an epic canvas (Brome 238). While Harvey cited Oldham as one possessing this "different double Qualification," Dennis criticized Oldham's "The Passion of Byblis" (1681) because "Mr. Oldham's Masculine Temper disdain'd" the "Tenderness of soul" requisite for its successful translation. The Passion of Byblis (London, 1692) sig. [C2*]. Dryden asserted that he had "a Soul congenial" to Chaucer's, and "had been conversant in the same Studies" (Fables sig. [*C2*]).

"Such kind of airs and vapours shoot themselves from the admirable writings of ancient Authors, as it were from some secret cave, which breath upon the souls of their imitators though possibly not made for such high transports, and swell them up into a greatness like their own" (Περὶ Τυρόνες xxix: xiii.2). We are reminded of Chapman's image of Homer's ghostly presence. The process by which this communion is achieved is similar to that employed in both prosopopæia and imitation: we must imagine in ourselves how Homer if there were occasion would have said such a thing, how Plato, how Demosthenes would have rais'd it... for by that means such illustrious shapes appearing to us, and, as it were, conversing with us, whisper unto us expressions to shadow out what we shall conceive: or rather if we can possess our selves with a jealousy, how Homer if he were present, or Demosthenes would judge of such a thing. (xxx-xxxi)

Seventeenth-century critics applied precisely this model to translation. The Earl of Roscommon, a particularly influential authority, recommends that the translator "seek a Poet who your way do's bend. / And chuse an Author as you chuse a Friend":

United by this Sympathetic Bond.
You grow Familiar, Intimate, and Fond;
Your thoughts, your Words, your Stiles, your Souls agree.
No Longer his Interpreter, but He. 103

Translators were responsive to this ideal: Laurence Echard, translating Plautus in 1694, is typical, asserting that "I endeavour'd to be as like my Author as I cou'd." 104 The same theory underlies


102 Thomas R. Steiner writes that Chapman envisioned translation as "an empathic art" in which "the translator attempts to inhabit the consciousness capable of this particular work" (11).


104 "The Preface," Plautus's Comedies (London, 1694) sig. [b2'].
Dryden's discussion of the necessity of submission to the personality of the original author. As he explains in *Ovid's Epistles*, the translator must first "distinguish" and "individuate" the ancient author:¹⁰⁵ "When we are come thus far, 'tis time to look into our selves, to conform our Genius to his" (118). To "conform" is to allow oneself to be possessed or dominated: translating Lucretius for *Sylvae*, Dryden asserted that he "lay'd by my natural Diffidence and Scepticism for a while, to take up that Dogmatical way of his" (11).¹⁰⁶ Failure to "conform" imposes upon the world a forgery: as Wood says of Shadwell's translation of Juvenal's Satire 10, "upon the consideration that I pretend to bring my Author to life again, it would be a mere solecism, if I should not take notice of those verses, which a very wicked Poet and Translator would force upon him, and make the world believe were his own" (sig. [E4']).

Dryden does not merely hide behind Juvenal: because Cowleian imitation permits Dryden to "conform" his spirit to that of his author, it is Juvenal, speaking through his translator, who satirizes William III's martial pretensions and tyrannical rule. Cowleian imitation permits an evasion of responsibility for topical satire while simultaneously lending an authority derived from

---


¹⁰⁶ Shadwell attacked Dryden's presumption: "I will not say as a *Cock Translator* does of *Lucretius* and *Virgil*, that he has added nothing but what he is confident the Authors would themselves were they now Living, by which arrogant saying he would insinuate that his *Genius* is much like theirs, or equal with them" (*Tenth Satyr* sig. [A3']). In fact, translation is frequently characterized as "servility": James Howell remarks that "it must needs be somewhat tedious to one that hath any free-born thoughts within him, and genuin conceptions of his own... to enchain himself to a verbal servitude, and the sense of another." *Epistolæ Ho-Eliane*. 2nd ed. (London. 1650) 3: 33. See however Judith Sloman's unconvincing thesis that Dryden chose translation as a means "of oblique self-expression," a form "through which he could reveal and conceal himself at the same time." *Dryden: The Poetics of Translation* (Toronto: U of Toronto P. 1985) 7.
the oldest and most prestigious practitioners of the genre. Also advantageous is the seeming
objectivity of the historical parallels that are in this way produced, for the reader is presented with
irrefutable historical "fact": even if Dryden lies, his parallels seem valid because they are, in large
measure, generated by the interpretation and application of the readers themselves.

But while Cowleian imitation represents the most subtle and clever means of satiric
evasion, further developments in imitation toward the close of our period herald a new and
radically different use of the past. Dryden's most comprehensive statement on translation appears
in the "Preface" to Ovid's Epistles, in which he reduced translation to "three heads." He first
considers "Metaphrase," or translating "an Author word by word, and Line by Line," and then
"Paraphrase, or Translation with Latitude, where the Author is kept in view by the Translator, so
as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly follow'd as his sense, and that too is admitted
to be ampliyfied, but not alter'd" (114). "The Third way," Dryden continued.

is that of Imitation, where the Translator (if now he has not lost that Name)
assumes the liberty not only to vary from the words and the sense, but to forsake
them both as he sees occasion: and taking only some general hints from the
original, to run division on the ground-work, as he pleases (114-15).

Metaphrase is impractical, it being "almost impossible to Translate verbally, and well, at the same
time" (115), while the "Imitation of an Author is the most advantageous way for a Translator to
shew himself, but the greatest wrong which can be done to the Memory and Reputation of the

---

107 Martindale suggests that "Dryden wishes to create the impression that paraphrase is
dead" (117). Dryden's preferred method, as of 1680, is paraphrase, although his later translations, especially those of the 1690s, reveal an increasing tendency towards imitation. Here, however, Dryden signals a shift in the way that imitation is perceived, for what Dryden terms paraphrase, is, in fact, really a form of Cowleian imitation, used to render accurately the spirit of the original author. What he here calls "Imitation," on the other hand, now appears as something radically different, for it represents, not a means of rendering the voice of the original author, but rather an "advantageous way for a Translator to shew himself." In fact, the imitator is now moving away from translation altogether. Because "imitation," in this new sense of the word, produces a work that displays the artistry of the imitator, it obliges the reader to compare original and imitation, and note the differences between the two: the importance of this facet of imitation is highlighted by the growing tendency to print the original alongside the imitation in

---

108 See Pechter 158, and the comment of "Eumenes" in the "Preface" to Lucian's Charon (London. [1700?):) "Men pervert and corrupt their Authors, either thro' ignorance or design, to serve an Opinion, or shew their Wit, or the like" (13). Sprat admitted that Cowley's Pindaric imitations "may perhaps be thought rather a new sort of Writing, than a restoring of an Ancient" (Cowley, Works sig. [c17]).

109 In the Juvenal, Dryden and his colleagues have taken an approach "which is yet more loose, betwixt a Paraphrase and Imitation" ("Discourse" 87). Kitagaki, detecting a shift in Dryden's approach after Ovid's Epistles, notes that the "problem now is not whether one renders within the scope of paraphrase or not, but whether one presents one's author's spirit or not" (204); see also Corse, Dryden's "Aeneid" 15, Love, "Ovid" 145, and Thomas R. Steiner 29-31.

110 Boileau was an important influence on this development: an anonymous poem prefacing The Second, Fourth, and Seventh Satyrs of Monsieur Boileau Imitated praises him because, "tha' he oft does imitate, I too mean he thinks it to translate" (sig. [A6?]), while Dryden asserted in the "Discourse" that "What he borrows from the Ancients, he repays with Usury of his own: in Coin as good, and almost as Universally valuable" (12). See Stack 19-21.

111 Weinbrot notes the importance of the "recognition of the poem," and that "the focus is on the living (or domestic) rather than the dead (or foreign) author" (Formal Strain 15).
order to facilitate comparison. While the imitator still exploits the authority and example of the original author, the focus has shifted: far from seeking concealment, the imitator is now allied with the imitated author as an equal.

One of the first English satirists to begin experimenting with this new form of imitation was Rochester. In this, he followed the example of Boileau; indeed, as his first efforts in the genre Rochester produced, in *Timon* (1674), and *Satyr [against Mankind]* (1674), very free imitations of Boileau's "Satire 3" (itself based on Horace's Satire II. 8) and "Satire 8" respectively. In neither case does Rochester do more than borrow hints from his original source: in this, he follows Boileau's own practice. More systematic was his imitation of Horace's Satire I. 10, the results of which appeared in manuscript in the winter of 1675-76 as "An Allusion to Horace." Unlike his previous essays in imitation, "An Allusion to Horace" deliberately asserts its relationship with the parent text in its title. At the same time, Rochester radically alters his source in significant ways: in drawing attention to his indebtedness to Horace, he was also

---


113 See Erskine-Hill. "Augustans on Augustanism" 21. There is as well an ideological dimension to this shift, related in part to the ancients-moderns controversy: the creative imitator enters into competition with the original author, and the native English version of the classic supersedes the ancient. Weinbrot explores this idea, frequently described as a kind of literary "warfare," in "Ambition to Excell" 121-39 and *Britannia's Issue* esp. 80-86 and 91-113.

simultaneously highlighting the ways in which he departs from his original. In fact, Rochester is "alluding" to not one but two distinct texts in his Imitation. As David Farley-Hills has noted, Rochester's choice of Horace's Satire I. 10 responds to Dryden's employment of that satire in his "Defence of the Epilogue" (1672), in which Horace's critique of Lucilius is used to buttress Dryden's defence of the moderns against such earlier poets as Shakespeare, a strategy that paradoxically relies upon ancient authority to justify an endorsement of the moderns (Rochester's Poetry 200). In Rochester's imitation, Dryden is substituted for Lucilius:

Well Sir, 'tis granted. I said Dryden's Rhimes.
Were stoln, unequal, nay dull many times:
What foolish Patron, is there found of his.
So blindly partial, to deny me this? (ll. 1-4)

Rochester's poem turns Dryden's employment of Horace, and indeed, his own argument in the "Defence," against himself.

Had Rochester's imitation employed nothing more than this simple substitution to attack Dryden, it would be remembered as little more than an extended and witty joke. Rochester, however, continues throughout the poem to subvert Dryden's argument through the addition of new levels of irony, even where the result is inconsistent with an Horatian ethos. Thus, the charge levelled against Dryden in line 2, that his rhymes were "stoln," becomes particularly important

115 There is disagreement about Rochester's attitude to his source. Samuel Johnson praised the poem's "parallelism" (1: 224). Brooks says that it belongs "to the English line of imitations that were also translations" ("Imitation" 133), while Weinbrot suggests that it is flawed because of its "relatively neutral" attitude to its original. "'The Allusion to Horace': Rochester's Imitative Mode." Eighteenth-Century Satire 78-79. See also Erskine-Hill. "Rochester" 52.

116 Rochester's use of Dryden's own text is, fittingly, authorized by Horace's own practice in Satire I. 10. In lines 64 to 71, Horace usurps Lucilius's voice in order to suggest what Lucilius would do were he now writing. See Weinbrot, "Allusion to Horace" 73, and Combe, "But Loads of Sh------ Almost Choked the Way" 133-34.
when it is recalled that Rochester himself is employing a very free form of imitation. As this imputation does not appear in the parent poem, it is probable that Rochester is taking an ironic swipe at himself. On the other hand, imitation and plagiarism are distinctly different in that the former acknowledges the original source, while plagiarism represents a dishonest imitation, a denial of the voice of the original utterance. Rochester is distinguishing between two employments of the past, one legitimate and the other (Dryden's) dishonest and inappropriate.

Rochester's own poem might seem, in the context of Cowleian imitation and his own attack upon Dryden, an irresponsible use of the past, for in a number of instances, he inverts the values recommended by Horace. In particular, Rochester champions the Ancients over the Moderns, a strategy that justifies his employment of Horace against Dryden even while flying in the face of Horace's own theme. Horace had rationalized his criticisms of the ancients by means of a commonsense appeal to the reader's experience:

```
But prithee tell me? Did thy learned eye
Nothing to be reprov'd in Homer spie?
Did not Lucilius himself think it fit
To alter something of weak Accius wit?
Did he not laugh at Ennius lines, as though
Some things in them were not quite grave enough? (Brome II. 92-96)
```

But where Horace appeals to the authority of Lucilius to support his criticisms of that same poet, Rochester makes Dryden, not an authority, but a negative exemplar:

```
But does not Dryden find ev'n Johnson dull?
Fletcher, and Beaumont, uncorrect, and full
```

---

Lucilius, Horace implies, would have agreed with the later poet's strictures upon the earlier satirist; in contrast, Rochester's Dryden, now disconcertingly characterized as a modern, represents a critical perspective that is the antithesis of all that Rochester advocates.

Rochester's use of Horace is inconsistent because Rochester allowed local effects to dictate his approach to his parent text. Indeed, Rochester's speaker frequently appears as a kind of vengeful or even lewd caricature of Horace: Howard Weinbrot notes that Rochester "lacks Horace's convincing tones of an essentially disinterested, patriotic, personally involved yet ethical and fair poet" ("Allusion to Horace" 78-79). While Rochester's style displays an effortless and genteel wit similar to that of Horace, his satiric rage is far too pointed, his animus too personal, and his language too immoderate to be truly Horatian. The decisive way in which Rochester stamped his own imprint upon Horace's text is characteristic of his parodic art. Most frequently, when he imitated, he all but obliterated the original. The imitation, originally

118 Thorndählen, paradoxically, sees this as one of the few poems in which Rochester speaks "in propria persona without any disguises or reservations" (Rochester 309). Kupersmith, conceding that the "Allusion" is "not at all Horatian," points out that "neither is Horace's original" (98). Rochester's poem initiated a battle over possession of Horace: it was answered by Sir Car Scroope's "In Defence of Satyr," which was itself a very free imitation of Horace's Satire I. 4.


120 Burnet commented that, when Rochester borrowed the thoughts of others "they came to return upon him as his own thoughts: than that he servilely copied from any" (Some Passage 8). Thomas Rymer similarly observed that "Whatsoever he imitated or Translated was Loss to
designed to mimic the distinctive voice of the original poet. becomes in Rochester's hands something very different. for he most frequently suppresses the voice of the parent author. substituting his own stylistic signature for theirs.\(^{121}\) Paradoxically, it is an attack upon precisely this kind of subversion of classical authority that underlies Rochester's critique of Dryden's use of Horace's Satire I. 10. In "An Allusion to Horace," however. Rochester encourages his readers to compare imitation with original, and to admire the ways in which he creates new meanings by distorting Horace's (and Dryden's) text. While the translator aspires to transparency, Rochester's imitation is opaque. for it is upon his artistry that we at last come to dwell.

It is never easy to identify the historical moment at which one literary form comes to subsume another, and, in fact, imitation as translation co-existed throughout the eighteenth-century with that newer form that highlighted the role of the imitator. Nor is it merely a question of determining how greatly any given imitator alters the style or content of the original text: it is, ultimately, the extent to which an imitation draws attention to its departures from its original that matters. Edward Wettenhall's The Wish, Being the Tenth Satyr of Juvenal Periphrastically Rendered (1675) is a case in point.\(^{122}\) Written in irregular Pindaric stanzas, this unexpected union of Roman author and "Greek" style makes the reader's experience of Juvenal's familiar opening

\(^{121}\) Obadiah Walker suggests that, when borrowing material from other writers, the rhetor should "Alter and concoct the matter received from others into your own stile": the existence of personal styles gave sanction to free modes of imitation. Some Instructions Concerning the Art of Oratory (London. 1659) 15.

\(^{122}\) The translation is anonymous. The dedication is, however, signed by Wettenhall: despite his suggestion that the poem is by a friend, it is probably his own. See Kupersmith 95.
lines a rather strange one:

In Court or Crowd shew me, who can.
From Cadiz West
To Ganges East.
That happy, happy man.
Who has a notion of the things are best.
Or things thence distant, as the East from West . . .\textsuperscript{123}

Wetenhall tells us that a friend advised him that Juvenal was "the properest for a Pindarick version, of any Author of that nature" (sig. [B1\textsuperscript{r}]):\textsuperscript{124} as Juvenal is the most sublime of the classical satirists, it was appropriate to render him into an English verse form that had been designed to capture the essence of sublimity. Unquestionably, there is an element of showmanship and self-conscious cleverness in Wetenhall's imitation, yet his decision to employ pindarics was not arbitrary: his radical transformation of the poem is justified because it is the satirist's voice, rather than the form of the poem itself, that he is seeking to translate.\textsuperscript{125}

"An Allusion to Horace," on the other hand, represents what is perhaps the first tentative experiment in what was to become, for all intents, an entirely new genre of satiric poetry. While a far cry from the self-reflexive artistry of the Horatian imitations of Pope, or Johnson's Christianized Juvenal, Rochester's poems signals the beginning of a shift away from the idea of imitation as a form of satiric evasion, and towards an ideal that stresses aesthetic sophistication

\textsuperscript{123} \textit{The Wish} (Dublin, 1675) 1.

\textsuperscript{124} Kupersmith suggests that Wetenhall thought that "the elevated style and morality of the tenth satire required the stylistic and metrical extravagance of the greater ode" (97); Wetenhall's own remarks, however, betray little interest in the satire itself, addressing themselves instead to Juvenal's distinctively sublime voice. See also Weinbrot, \textit{Britannia's Issue} 343.

\textsuperscript{125} At the same time, the final implication of these attempts at emulation denies the existence of an individual voice. Instead, there are only larger stylistic categories: in the final analysis, Pindar and Juvenal are distinctive only in that they are both "sublime" and "elevated."
over functionality and didacticism. It is not that satires achieved through creative imitation of the sort pioneered by Rochester abandon the didactic aims of satire. Rather, satiric artistry is no longer merely a means of achieving a rhetorically effective polemic: it is now an additional end in, and of, itself.

126 Henry Higden's quasi-burlesque adaptations of Juvenal's Satires 13 and 10 in 1686-87 are two early examples of a sea-change, as is Prior's very free Satyr on the Poets: In Imitation of the Seventh Satire of Juvenal (1687). See also Stack's Pope and Horace, especially his useful bibliography of Horatian imitations from 1730-40 (281-83). The origin of creative Imitation has produced a great deal of debate, which is nicely summarized in P. E. Hewison's "Rochester, the 'Imitation,' and 'An Allusion to Horace.'" SCent 2 (1987): esp. 73-76; Hewison's own argument, however, is weakened by a tendency that bedevils much criticism on this subject: namely, a tendency to define seventeenth-century imitations with reference to eighteenth-century critical pronouncements on the form. Hewison thus concludes that "An Allusion" is "not in itself a true Imitation," largely because it does not anticipate the method of Pope's Imitations.
Conclusion

Most of the devices and modes that I have examined operate by means of the manipulation of satiric voice: this process is, of course, most evident in prosopopeia, but it is an equally vital component of the other modes of evasion that I have outlined. Ethos involves the adoption of a verbal tone that attracts the reader to the poet so that it may persuade, while pathos projects through a representation of strong emotion a personality that overwhells the reader. Parody appropriates the voice of its victim by means of distortion or allusion: Rochester's version of "Scroope" speaks with a distorted voice that conceals that of the parodist, while allowing Scroope to condemn himself. Mock-heroic, on the other hand, employs the great epic poets of the past to provide the implied normative values against which the satiric subject is measured, while producing a degraded version of the heroic poet that disguises the satirist. Somewhat similar in operation is the manipulation of the satires of the past by allusion, citation, or republication: recontextualization can force a satirist to condemn himself in his own past words (as with the republished editions of Dryden's "Heroique Stanzas"), or permits a modern satirist to adopt the voice, and hence the authority, of a past master (as in the case of Marvell's appropriations of the satiric voices of Jonson and Cleveland). Finally, translation allows the satirist to assume, by means of a form of sympathetic identification, the guise of an ancient satirist: in this way, Dryden is enabled to articulate his satiric insights through Juvenal's voice.

The obtrusiveness of satiric voice, and the tendency of readers to focus their attention upon the character of the poet rather than upon the satiric object was, as I have suggested, the greatest obstacle to the polemical effectiveness of satire: paradoxically, however, the
manipulation of voice proved to be the satirist's most valuable rhetorical tool. And these are all in some way rhetorical tools: ethos, pathos, and prosopopœia are literally rhetorical, but so too is the satirist's employment of burlesque, allusion, and translation, in the sense that these are primarily persuasive strategies. Certainly, as I have suggested, satirists had reason to fear for their personal safety, but that they were concerned with more than merely this is suggested by the fact that even anonymous satires employ these devices. Satiric evasion is less about avoiding the cudgels of one's victims or prosecution for treason and scandalum magnatum, than about transforming satire into a truly effective polemical instrument. Whether its intent was genuinely to inculcate morality, alert the public to political danger, or simply to besmear the reputation of a hated enemy, the satire of the period 1640 to 1700 is overwhelmingly concerned with persuasion. Even purely punitive satire derives its effect from its persuasive force: had Absalom and Achitophel not been widely read and enjoyed, its punitive effect would have been minimal: had the portrait of Zimri not been so persuasively "just" and recognizable, it is doubtful that Buckingham would have been so stung by it. Herein lies the real importance of satirists' employment of what Raillerie à la Mode Consider'd described as a characteristically "cunning way of Jeering": whatever the "evasive way of Abuse" chosen by the satirist, the intent was to turn satire into a sharper and more effective weapon.

The subtle change in attitude towards satire which develops near the close of the century, and which is manifested most clearly in the emergence of creative imitation, resembles the process that Michael McKeon, with reference to Absalom and Achitophel, has called "aestheticization." the distancing effect created by a belief in the self-sufficiency of the poetic product: this, McKeon says, "is prescient not only of the modern decay of genre, but also of the modern rise of the belief
in aesthetic detachment and autonomy."¹ McKean goes a little far: we are as yet, in 1700, at some distance from Wimsatt and Beardsley. Yet, the willingness of the imitator of Juvenal or Horace to foreground his or her own role in the creation of a new poem, and, indeed, to invite comparison with the classical author in question, implies a new confidence in the legitimacy of the genre. Didacticism, *utile*, remains an important element of the genre, but increasingly, *dulce*, the pleasure produced through the appreciation of beauty and artistry, is brought to the forefront. As Phillip S. McKnight points out, "the nearer satire comes to the production of an aesthetic ideal, the less effective becomes its intended sting and the more attention becomes diverted from the object -- or the victim -- to the artistic technique" (196).

A parallel and related development is the tendency to experiment with voice, especially through the use of an ironic *prosopopeia*: Rochester's self-aware and self-parodying speaker of "To the Post Boy" is an early sign of a growing willingness to highlight and examine the role of the satirist. In "A Letter from Artemiza in the Towne to Chloe in the Countrey," Rochester carries this experiment to a new level, examining, rather than hiding, the complicity of the satirist in the vices satirized.² Artemiza, the "Fine Lady," and Corinna, the three women who lie at the heart of the poem's three successive inset narratives, are all satirists, but of differing degrees and

---

qualities: as the poem's portrait of vice unfolds through each narrative, we perceive in each succeeding satiric voice a diminishing detachment from the satiric subject, and an increasing sense that, as Artemiza herself puts it, "poetry's a snare" (l. 16): the process reaches its inevitable conclusion when it is revealed that Corinna, herself ruined by a rake, poisons the booby she has duped into marriage, enacting in a literal fashion the satiric motif of revenge.

It is the reader's perception of this kind of complicity that makes satiric evasion necessary. So steeped in sin is Corinna herself that her vivid description of the evils she has experienced pales and recedes into the background: our horrified reaction to her conduct overwhelms the rhetorical effect of her satiric insights into our own vices. Rochester's portrait of Corinna dramatizes the quandary that faces all satirists. Artemiza's lament that the poet's task is a thankless one is especially pertinent to the satirist:

Your Muse diverts you, makes the Reader sad:
You Fancy, you're inspir'd, he thinkes, you mad.
Consider too, 'twill be discreetly done,
To make your Selfe the Fiddle of the Towne,
To fynd th' ill-humour'd pleasure att their need.
Curst, if you fayle, and scorn'd, though succeede. (ll. 18-23)

The satirists of the second half of the seventeenth-century attempted, this study has suggested, to

overcome such perceptions by means of evasive rhetorical strategies that directed readers' attentions away from the figure of the satirist, and toward the satiric object. Rochester's "A Letter from Artemiza." on the other hand, signals a new direction for satire, and looks ahead to Swift's even more sophisticated experiments with satiric voice and prosopopeia. Paradoxically, it was only as satire's legitimate place in the hierarchy of literary kinds became secure that such self-reflexive and potentially damaging critiques of the role of the satirist were possible. So long as satire's primary function, and only justification, remained, as Rapin expressed it, "to instruct the People by discrediting Vice" (Reflections 137), evasion remained a strategic necessity for the satirist.

---
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