The Historical Journal, 44, 3 (2001), pp. 703–726 © 2001 Cambridge University Press
DOI: 10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Printed in the United Kingdom

MARVELL AND THE EARL OF ANGLESEY: A CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF READING*

ANNABEL PATTERSON AND MARTIN DZELZAINIS
Yale University and *Royal Holloway, University of London*

ABSTRACT. *Andrew Marvell's famous polemical pamphlets against Samuel Parker, the two parts of* The rehearsal transpros'd, *are packed with references and allusions to other books, some very esoteric. We think we have discovered where Marvell did his reading – in the library of Arthur Annesley, first earl of Anglesey, who also protected Marvell and his bookseller from the licenser and the Stationers' Company. In this, he collaborated with the earl of Shaftesbury, the then Lord Chancellor. The implications of these discoveries go well beyond even the new bibliography, suggesting that Marvell wrote his responses to Parker under the patronage of Anglesey, and that his connections with Shaftesbury began earlier than supposed; but they also show us how one efficient and intelligent reader responded to the task of detailed controversy, by doing focused and rapid research. Would that our own had equally witty results!*

I

The early 1670s were the culmination of the 'first Restoration crisis', a period of intense conflict over competing imperatives of strictly enforced religious conformity and the Nonconformists' desire for freedom of worship.[1] The crisis was generated by the Cavalier Parliament's decision in 1670 to renew the 1664 Conventicle Act, and its most dramatic moments were the publication of Charles II's Declaration of Indulgence on 15 March 1672 and its withdrawal, under pressure, on 8 March 1673. Its most enduring monuments, however, were Andrew Marvell's *The rehearsal transpros'd* (1672) and *The rehearsall transpros'd: the second part* (1673), remarkable achievements for a private citizen, even if he happened to be, as Marvell was, a member of the very parliament whose coercive measures he deplored. In the first place, these books were greatly more readable and amusing than most of the other contributions to this debate. As a result, not only were far greater numbers of copies sold than was typical of controversial tracts,[2] but also the first part was protected from the Stationers' Company and Sir Roger L'Estrange, the Surveyor of the Press, by

* Part of the research for this article by Martin Dzelzainis was done during a one-year Leverhulme Research fellowship in 1999.

[1] See Gary S. de Krey, 'The first restoration crisis: conscience and coercion in London, 1667–1673', *Albion*, 25 (1993), pp. 565–80.

[2] The first edition of the *Rehearsal transpros'd* was followed by 'The second impression with additions and amendments' (in fact, a second edition), plus two pirated editions in 1672 and 1673. There were two editions of the *Second part*, both in 1673.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

no less a person than Charles II himself, while Marvell succeeded in humiliating and silencing his opponent, Archdeacon Samuel Parker, an inveterate and voluble scourge of the Nonconformists. In the second place, both parts of *The rehearsal transpros'd* were – and this of course contributed to their readability – packed full of literary quotations and 'historical' anecdotes, often about disreputable conduct by figures in the past who could be seen as analogies for Parker, although the increased seriousness with which Marvell viewed his task in the *Second part* led him to reduce the anecdotal and literary ammunition in favour of unimpeachable theological or historical authorities. But the scholarship and wide, if scattershot, reading that he demonstrated in both tracts puts great strains on a modern editor. When D. I. B. Smith embarked on this task in the 1960s, producing the Clarendon edition in 1971,[3] Marvell had largely met his match. Smith's edition was a feat of retrieval of Marvell's sources. Some of these Marvell had himself specified with precision, including page references, others he either assumed a well-read audience would recognize, or pulled them out of his memory without any longer having the reference. Some, evidently, he had merely heard second-hand, probably in the coffee houses. Some he concealed.

What was missing from Smith's edition, however, was any analysis of the data he had assembled.Were there any patterns to Marvell's reading? Was it possible to tell if he had done research specific to the task of answering Parker (that is, beyond his microscopic scrutiny of Parker's works); or did he largely draw on books he had read in the past? Were there any differences between the patterns of allusion and reference in the two parts, and between them and his later pamphlets, *Mr. Smirke* (1676), the *Remarks* in defence of John Howe (1678), and the famous *Account of the growth of popery and arbitrary government*, printed surreptitiously in the winter of 1677 to 1678? And, perhaps most importantly if one is interested in the history of reading, where did Marvell, a man of modest means, get access to the many, diverse, and often quite esoteric books he consulted? This question has never been asked, so accustomed are we to a culture of libraries, but attempting to answer it has opened up a very exciting hypothesis, one that has broader ramifications for understanding Marvell's role in the politics of the 1670s.

The problem of access to books brings up the question of time, as well as money, the two in Marvell's case being inversely related. Marvell did not have time for research while parliament was in session. The writing of the *Rehearsal transpros'd* took place during a long break between sessions. On 22 April 1671, Marvell reported to his Hull constituents that the parliament was prorogued until 16 April of the following year. In fact, it did not meet again until 4 February 1673, so that he had nearly two years with time on his hands (but no salary) to write the *Rehearsal transpros'd*, completed in September 1672. He was

[3] Andrew Marvell, *The rehearsal transpros'd and the rehearsal transpros'd: the second part*, ed. D. I. B. Smith (Oxford, 1971). The works, as edited by Smith, are cited separately in the text and notes as *RT* and *RT2*; Smith's edition is cited as *RT/RT2*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

presumably in the Commons for both the short sessions of 1673, and we know he was paid for his services for the one that ended 29 March. On 23 May, he wrote his famous letter to Sir Robert Harley, announcing his plans for the recess. He had read part of Parker's *Reproof to the rehearsal transpros'd* in the print shop, and was preparing to respond with what eventually became the *Second part*:

> I will for mine own private satisfaction forthwith draw up an answer that shall haue as much of spirit and solidity in it as my ability will afford & the age we live in will indure. I am (if I may say it with reverence) drawn in, I hope by a good Providence, to intermeddle in a noble and high argument w^{ch} therefore by how much it is above my capacity I shall use the more industry not to disparage it.[4]

Marvell also mentions his plan to 'betake' himself some five miles out of London, to enjoy the spring and his privacy; but we should not imagine that his cottage at Highgate contained a substantial private library.

We have no evidence, in fact, that Marvell, who in the past had made his living as a private tutor or, for about two years, as a public servant, had any means of subsistence other than his parliamentary wages from Hull (six shillings and eightpence for each day's presence in parliament). The legend of Marvell's poverty has come down to us from both admirers and enemies. It was first made public by Thomas Cooke in his 1726 edition of Marvell's works (minus the pamphlets in question), as part of a claim that Marvell was impervious to bribery by the earl of Danby. But Samuel Parker, Marvell's original adversary, had harped on Marvell's impecuniousness in his *History of his own time*, written in Latin about the time of the Popish Plot, published by his son in 1726, and republished in a translation by Thomas Newlin the following year. It was, however, republished by Edmund Curll (the publisher of Cooke's edition) in 1730, with the invidious title of *Bishop Parker's history: or, the Tories chronicle*, and the stated intention of undermining Parker's reputation. Parker himself sneered at Marvell for taking his parliamentary salary; 'Gentlemen despising so vile a stipend, that was given like alms to the poor yet he requir'd it for the sake of a bare subsistence.'[5] Evidently, there was an historiographical and political battle going on in the late 1720s for which Marvell's poverty served as a symbol. The legend has its modern sceptics, but they have so far been unable to produce any counter-evidence; it seems rather confirmed than unsettled by his landlady's notions of Marvell's wealth and her disappointed rage after she had obtained the administration of his estate. Her legal protests reveal that all she found in his lodgings were '*but a few Bookes* & papers of a small value' (italics added). Although he owned the Highgate cottage, he lived in lodgings in 'Mr. James Shawes house in Maiden Lane', Covent Garden.[6] All

[4] Andrew Marvell, *Poems and letters*, ed. H. M. Margoliouth, rev. Pierre Legouis (2 vols., Oxford, 1971), II, p. 328.

[5] Samuel Parker, *History of his own time*, trans. Thomas Newlin (London, 1727), p. 334.

[6] See Hilton Kelliher, *Andrew Marvell: poet & politician, 1628–1678* (London, 1978), pp. 90, 120, 124; in 'The severall answeare of Mary Marvell widdow', Mary Palmer claimed that Marvell

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of this suggests that, for the research project posed by the need to answer Parker in 1672, Marvell would have needed a library much greater than he could possibly have owned; preferably one within walking distance.

Parker himself, as Marvell pointed out rather meanly in the *Second part*, once he became chaplain to Gilbert Sheldon, archbishop of Canterbury, would have had access to his patron's library in Lambeth Palace, but his scholarship fails to reflect that privilege.[7] Marvell, we have hitherto assumed, had had no such bookish patron since he had left the employ of Sir Thomas Fairfax, whose own reading may be reflected in *Upon Appleton House*. Of course, Marvell had long been a close friend of John Milton, and could certainly have borrowed books and anecdotes from him; but Milton had been blind since the mid-1650s, and we may assume that his subsequent book purchases had been few. In 1670, Milton appears to have sold part of his library through Edward Millington.[8] Besides, Marvell stated emphatically in the *Second part* that there had been a two to three year break in their acquaintance before and during his work on the *Rehearsal transpros'd*.[9] Unless this was a bare-faced lie, which Marvell usually avoids by irony or circumlocution, this excludes his borrowing from Milton during the writing of the first part. It would not, perhaps, rule out some collaboration during work on the *Second part*, especially since Milton was then at work on a tolerationist tract of his own.[10]

Another source of access to books was the London booksellers, who evidently allowed their customers to thumb through stock. They were also sometimes willing to lend copies to individual customers, such as Robert Hooke, whose *Diary* records regular borrowings.[11] The bookseller Francis Kirkman even set up a sort of commercial circulating library of lighter materials, advertising in 1661 and again in 1669 'all the plays that were ever yet Printed, and all sorts

---

'dyed intestate … possessed of a considerable personall Estate in money Jewells bonds bills & otherwise to a good value … and in particular at the time of his death left in his study & att his Lodgings in Mayden Lane many trunks & Hampers wherein were great Summes of money in Gold & Silver besides bonds bills books Jewells and other goods of value … and this defendant going afterwards to look for her husbands Estate and shee finding no Estate … but a few Bookes & papers of a small value was dissatisffyed therein'.

[7] *RT2*, p. 319: 'You say you find none of the *Non-Conformists dirty Thumb Nails in your Patrons Library*. But have not you … liberty to peruse the Volumes? Or is there a peculiar Reverence due to the Books in that place that no man does or may touch them?'

[8] See Barbara K. Lewalski, *The life of John Milton: a critical biography* (Oxford, 2000), p. 490.

[9] *RT2*, pp. 311–12: 'you resolved to suspect that he had an hand in my former book, wherein … you deceive others extreamly. For by chance I had not seen him of two years before; but after I undertook writing, I did more carefully avoid either visiting him or sending to him, least I should in any way involve him in my consequences.'

[10] John Milton, *Of true religion, haeresie, schism, toleration, and what best means may be us'd against the growth of popery* (London, 1673). According to Milton's editors, he wrote it during the parliamentary session beginning 4 February 1673, during which the king withdrew the Declaration of Indulgence: see *Complete prose works of John Milton*, gen. ed., Don M. Wolfe et al. (8 vols., New Haven, 1953–82), VIII, pp. 411–12.

[11] See Adrian Johns, *The nature of the book* (Chicago and London, 1998), pp. 98, 117–18.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of Histories and Romances, which you may buy or have lent to you on reasonable considerations'.[12] Marvell tells us a little more of his own and others' habits as a haunter of bookshops and stalls, thereby adding to the data noted by Adrian Johns. This was how he rediscovered an important source for the *Rehearsal transpros'd*, the tolerationist arguments of John Hales of Eton: 'That which I speak of is his little *Treatise of schism*, which though I had read many years ago, was quite out of my mind, till I occasionally light upon't at a Book-seller's stall' (*RT*, p. 79). At eight pages, it would have been an inexpensive purchase; though, as we shall see, he may not have had to buy even this item. Marvell also implies, by insulting Parker, a more extensive reliance on the bookshops. Before Parker's appointment as Sheldon's chaplain, he remarks, 'you were then a meer Shop divine, and did so nibble all his [John Sherley's] Library, and dirty them with your Thumbs, that the poor man had not one new Book left, but was fain to Sell them all at second hand' (*RT2*, pp. 259–60). It takes one to know one.

II

There were of course a few 'public' libraries, which for various reasons it appears that Marvell did not or could not use. We will return to this point at the end of the argument. But there was one remarkable source of books near at hand, that may, if we can show that Marvell used it, give us new information, not only about the history of reading in seventeenth-century England, but also about Marvell's contacts in the struggle over toleration. That source was the patronage of Arthur Annesley, earl of Anglesey, described by the old *Dictionary of national biography* as 'the first peer who devoted time and money to the formation of a great library'. Douglas Greene, Anglesey's modern biographer, states that it was 'the largest private library of the period – some 30,000 volumes'.[13] When Sir Peter Pett dedicated his edition of Anglesey's *Memoirs* to Anglesey's son, he told him: 'His Lordship used often to quote occasionally that saying of my Lord Bacon's, *Actio est Conversatio cum Stultis, lectio autem cum Sapientibus*: the thought whereof induced him to spend so much of his time in his Library.'[14]

That Anglesey was to some extent a patron and protector of Marvell and his bookseller, Nathaniel Ponder, we already know from the record of how Anglesey intervened on their behalf over the printing of the *Rehearsal transpros'd*.

[12] Strickland Gibson, 'A bibliography of Francis Kirkman', *Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications*, n.s., 1, fascicule ii (1947), p. 144.

[13] Douglas Greene, 'Arthur Annesley, first earl of Anglesey, 1614–1686' (PhD diss., Chicago, 1972), p. 98.

[14] Sir Peter Pett, *Memoirs of the right honourable Arthur earl of Anglesey* (London, 1693), sig. A3r–v. This peculiar memoir was really a pedantic reply by Anglesey to Pett's *Happy future state of England*, which Pett had begun to write in January 1681, partly to defend Anglesey from the charge of having papist sympathies. See Mark Goldie, 'Sir Peter Pett, sceptical toryism and the science of toleration in the early 1680s', in W. J. Sheils, ed. , *Persecution and toleration*, Studies in Church History 21 (Oxford, 1984), pp. 247–73.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sir Roger L'Estrange deposed that 'he did not know or hear of the book until the first impression was distributed', but, 'Enquiring of one Brome, a Bookseller, about it', was told 'that it was printed for Ponder, who own'd the thing, and sayd that if the Book were Questioned, there were those would Justify it, and bring him off'.[15] When Samuel Mearne, one of the wardens of the Stationers' Company, seized part of the second edition (the self-styled 'second impression'), Ponder told L'Estrange that the earl of Anglesey wished to see him. He

> took Ponder along with him Immediately to his Lord.^{spp} at his house in Drury Lane: where the Earle was pleased to speak to the Examinate (in the presence, and (as he beleeves,) in the hearing of M^{r} Ponder) in these or the like words. Look you M^{r} L'Estrange there is a Book come out, (the Rehearsall Transpros'd) I presume you have seen it.)I have spoken to his Ma:^{ty} about it, and the King says he will not have it it suppresst, for Parker has done him wrong, and this man has done him Right: and I desired to speak with you to tell you this. And since the King will have the Book to passe, Pray give M^{r} Ponder your License to it, that it may not bee printed from him.[16]

That is to say, Anglesey demanded that L'Estrange now license this illicit publication, giving Ponder the rights over it that would prevent piracy. This initiated a complex sequence of events whereby, after the licence was granted, revoked, and regranted, printing of the 'second impression' resumed, with the changes required by L'Estrange. L'Estrange's testimony to Sir Henry Coventry includes details about how Anglesey negotiated with L'Estrange what did and did not require censorship in the book, details suggestive both of Anglesey's level of involvement and his personal style of diplomacy. And even more remarkably – a fact overlooked by D. I. B. Smith – the deposition of Ponder on 25 January 1673 shows that, being asked who was protecting him, 'he named the Lord Chancellor & Earle Anglesey; and gaue this reason for it, because (as he said) they liked the Book'.[17] This shows that Anglesey was, in this matter, collaborating with Shaftesbury.

It is odd that nobody has previously extended the inquiry into the nature of Anglesey's patronage of Marvell and his bookseller. Ponder had earlier published two works by Sir Charles Wolseley, *The unreasonablenesse of atheism* (1669) and *The reasonablenes of scripture-belief* (1672), the first in the form of a letter to Anglesey and the second dedicated to him.[18] For his part, Anglesey was

[15] Leicestershire Record Office (LRO), Finch MSS, DG7, Box 4985, Bundle IX, p. 9/2. There is a partial transcript in Kelliher, *Andrew Marvell*, p. 108. See also Historical Manuscripts Commission (HMC), *Report on the manuscripts of the late Allan George Finch*, II, pp. 9–10; HMC, *Appendix to seventh report*, cols. 517b–18a.

[16] LRO, Finch MSS, DG7, Box 4985, Bundle IX, p. 9/2.

[17] LRO, Finch MSS, DG7, HMC, vol. 2, p. 10/1. See also HMC, *Report on the manuscripts of the late Allan George Finch*, II, p. 10.

[18] For Wolseley, see Blair Worden, 'Toleration and the Cromwellian protectorate', in Sheils, *Persecution and toleration*, pp. 229–33, and Gary S. de Krey, 'Rethinking the Restoration: dissenting cases for conscience, 1667–1672', *Historical Journal*, 38 (1995), pp. 53–83.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

still trying to protect Ponder and Marvell in 1676. On 10 May, Secretary of State Joseph Williamson recorded the indictment of Ponder 'for printing Marvells book', that is, *Mr. Smirke* and its attached *Short historical essay on general councils*. Ponder

> Owned to have had those papers from Mr. Marvell with directions from him to print them. That he, Ponder, gave them out to be printed, that he had no license for the book. Ordered to be committed. Lord Privy Seal opposed it, because the cause is bailable by statute. Lord Chancellor. That for contempt of the order of the Board made against printing without license, for the seditiousness of the matter of it &c he may be committed for it.[19]

Lord Privy Seal was Anglesey, who had succeeded to the office in February 1673. In this instance, Anglesey was overruled by Shaftesbury's successor as Lord Chancellor, Sir Heneage Finch. In November 1675, Anglesey had been rebuked for being too lenient over the publication of the anonymous *Letter from a person of quality*,[20] believed today to have been the work of Shaftesbury (by 1675 in overt opposition to the crown), assisted therein by John Locke (see below). These facts suggest that, despite Anglesey's considerable intimacy with the king, his moderating influence was limited, especially, perhaps, now that Shaftesbury was *persona non grata* and the balance of power in the council had shifted.

Greene, whose biography focuses on the last eight years of Anglesey's career, makes no mention of these significant episodes. But in determining Anglesey's positions, beliefs, and influence during the Popish Plot and its aftermath, he does much to erase Gilbert Burnet's double-edged assessment, which was probably responsible for Anglesey's having remained a somewhat shadowy figure. 'He understood our government well', wrote Burnet in the 1690s,

> and had examined far into the original of our constitution. He was capable of great application … but stuck at nothing, and was ashamed of nothing. He was neither loved nor trusted by any man on any side … but sold every thing that was in his power: and sold himself so often, that at last the price fell so low, that he grew useless.[21]

It would be more true to say that Anglesey was a moderate, a conforming Anglican who usually hated Catholics and sympathized with the Non-conformists,[22] and a strong parliamentarian whose loyalties nevertheless stayed with Charles II on most occasions.

[19] Calendar of State Papers Domestic (CSPD), 1676, pp. 106–7.

[20] On 9 Nov., Alfred Morrison wrote: 'the Lords have been again very angry about the [*Letter*] which they yesterday condemned to be burned, and quarrelled with the Lord Privy Seal, who was the Chairman to the Committee appointed to examine it, for not being severe enough upon it' (*Catalogue of the collection of autograph letters and historical documents*, 2nd ser. (Bulstrode papers, 1667–75, vol. 1), 1897, p. 323; cited by Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary politics and Locke's 'Two treatises of government'* (Princeton, 1986), p. 123).

[21] Gilbert Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's history of his own time* (6 vols., Oxford, 1833), 1, p. 177; quoted by Greene, 'Anglesey', p. ii.

[22] For Anglesey as 'Friend' of the Baptist bookseller Francis Smith, see the letter to Smith from his wife Elizabeth, 10 Oct. 1661, Public Record Office, SP29/43/42, cited by John Hetet, 'A

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This did not prevent him from occasionally taking positions in the Lords or in council that ran athwart Charles's intentions. We possess two volumes of a manuscript diary that Anglesey kept from early 1671 to June 1684, shortly before his death at seventy-one.[23] While the diary is usually brief, elliptical (including sections in shorthand cypher), and silent on such possibly incriminating events as his dealings with L'Estrange, it does tell us that Anglesey had some anxieties about the implications of Charles II's Declaration of Indulgence in 1672.[24] The degree of ideological convergence between Anglesey and Marvell, who was prepared to support indulgence in the first part of the *Rehearsal transpros'd* despite whatever reservations *he* may have had, explains why they joined forces in 1672. Anglesey also vigorously opposed Danby's Non-Resisting Test in 1674,[25] an attempt to weed out resistance to his policies that Marvell would later excoriate in his *Account of the growth of popery and arbitrary government*; and Anglesey also attempted to prevent the long prorogation of 1675,[26] another of Marvell's targets in the *Account*.

But despite what now seems his obvious longstanding sympathy for the Nonconformists,[27] Anglesey was accused during the Popish Plot crisis of being a papist sympathizer, on the grounds that he had tried to prevent the execution of Jesuits; and in 1683, after Shaftesbury's death, he was attacked in a

---

literary underground in Restoration England: printers and dissenters in the context of constraints, 1660–1689' (PhD diss., Cambridge, 1987), p. 27.

[23] The first volume of this diary, British Library (BL), Additional MS 40860, has been printed in HMC, *Thirteenth report*, Appendix 6; the second volume remains only in BL, Additional MS 18730.

[24] BL, Additional MS 40860, fo. 25v (15 Mar. 1672): 'I was at Councell where I spoke my mind freely to the Declaration offered by the King for indulgence observing the papists are put thereby into a better and less jealoused state then the dissenting Protestants.' Anglesey is sometimes thought to be the author of *The king's right of indulgence in spiritual matters* (1688), edited and published anonymously in support of James II's first Declaration of Indulgence (April 1687) by Henry Care. Care's preface (dated 26 Oct. 1687) reveals only that the work was 'Composed divers years ago, by the Dictates of a *NOBLE PERSON* … an Eminent *Minister of State*, a known *Protestant*, and one of the most Studious Gentlemen of our Age' (sig. A2). The actual author was Bulstrode Whitelocke, who drafted the work (BL, Additional MS 21099) at the king's request in 1663; see Ruth Spalding, *The improbable puritan: a life of Bulstrode Whitelocke, 1605–1675* (London, 1975), p. 237. Lambeth Palace Library, MS Lambeth 1496, is an unsigned fair copy of the work, dated 1665, fo. iv.

[25] BL, Additional MS 40860, fo. 86 (19 Apr. 1674): 'I urged many arguments against the test or new oath.' Greene, however, notes ('Anglesey', pp. 91–2) that Anglesey's name appears on a list of supporters of the Test drawn up for Danby, and concludes that he must have succumbed to pressure, while Douglas R. Lacey points out (*Dissent and parliamentary politics in England, 1661–1689* (New Brunswick, 1969), p. 458) that it was only during the 'Danby's ascendancy' from 1674 to 1677 that Anglesey did not maintain a Nonconformist chaplain for private services.

[26] BL, Additional MS 18730, fo. 5 (20 Nov. 1675): 'Spent all day till neer 9 at night in parliament to prevent the dissolution.'

[27] On 7 Mar. 1673, when Charles was forced by the Commons to cancel the Declaration, Anglesey drafted a bill to exempt Protestant Dissenters from the legal penalties applied by Clarendon Code. See HMC, *Ninth report*, Appendix 2 (House of Lords MSS), p. 25; cited by Greene, 'Anglesey', p. 87. Anglesey's bill lapsed upon prorogation.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

broadside as someone who had plotted with Shaftesbury, and carried toleration to anarchic extremes, while his wife Elizabeth was accused of maintaining conventicles.[28] The best explanation one can give for these discrepancies is that Anglesey's toleration was of a kind that required him to protect *any* group who were being persecuted for their religion – a toleration closer to our own liberal conceptions than that of Marvell or Milton.

Perhaps most interesting is the diary's record of Anglesey's ambitions as a writer. In the opening folios of the second instalment, which contain a list of projects, Anglesey resolved on 13 July 1680, 'To make a collection of the workes of all nonconformists and see whether they could be spared though the wickedness of the times by a just judgment of God hath driven them out of the Church.'[29] In November 1683, following the trials of Russell, Essex, and Algernon Sidney, Anglesey made the following commitment: 'November 25 resolved of writing the summe of our Lawes and liberties and against the oppression of the times in causes of life, members and liberties. see 1.2 of Philip and Mary cap. 3 mag[na] charta Right of parliament freedome of members the kings legal title and prerogatives.'[30] And on 14 June 1684, shortly before his death, he wrote, with some pathos:

> resolving if God give life to write a compleat History of England out of all Records memorialls journals the bravery of the English monarks and people how tenacious they were allwayes of their liberties even in popist times opposing the Romish Tyranny … and shew the miserable end of those that have opposed or betrayed their country or its well settled government or endeavoured to inslave them. That the clergy have been the worst in that kind in all times.[31]

These ambitions, though never fulfilled, help to explain the principles behind his book-collecting. It is highly likely, therefore, that he would have wanted to assist Marvell in *his* writing. Moreover, Marvell was not only connected to Anglesey by patronage, but also by geographical convenience, since they lived within walking distance of each other on opposite sides of Covent Garden.[32]

[28] See *Great news from Poland: being an impartial account of the election of a new king, in the room of Anthony, by the grace of god lately deceased* (London, 1683): 'To reckon up all the Pretenders would be too tedious; therefore, in short, the choice fell upon Arthur E. of A – -y, adjudg'd by the most prudent part of the Dyet the fittest Person to succeed Anthony [Ashley, earl of Shaftesbury]; and that, for his Religion, his Principles of Honor and Modesty, there needed no more, than that there have been entertain'd *Men of all perswasions* at this *King Arthur's Round Table* … There [in Poland] shalt thou glut thy self, O king Arthur! Thou admired Patron of Toleration; There you may pay the respects you owe to the Romanists, to the Calvinists, to the Arrians, Anabaptists, Anti-Trinitarians, &c. and thy Royal Consort Queen Bess, may, to her heart's desire, sit in state in a conventicle every day.'

[29] BL, Additional MS 18730, fo. 2.

[30] BL, Additional MS 18730, fo. 108v.

[31] BL, Additional MS 18730, fo. 110v.

[32] Anglesey had a family residence in Kensington, but he did business, read, and wrote primarily out of his mansion in Drury Lane.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

III

We also know exactly what was in Anglesey's collection, at least by the time he died in 1686, when, starting on 25 October, his library was sold by auction in the cemetery of St Paul's Cathedral. The sale catalogue, *Bibliotheca Angleseiana, sive catalogus variorum librorum*, is a remarkable document. It begins by telling us (despite Pett's emphasis on Anglesey's love of erudite solitude) that the library was not (unlike that of Sir Robert Cotton at this period)[33] jealously guarded but generously made available to others: '*The whole Library being really considerable for Number, as well as Scarcity, that many Persons of Honour*, &c. (*tho possessed of very great Libraries of their own*) *had frequent recourse to this for the perusal of many out of the ordinary Road of Learning, not elsewhere to be found*' (sig. A2). Even more remarkable is the fact that the Lambeth Palace Library copy of the catalogue, a large paper version, is the actual sale catalogue recording purchasers and prices. It also shows strong signs of political and/or ecclesiastical intervention involving Marvell's old enemy, Sir Roger L'Estrange.[34] The nature of the items or bundles left unsold, and the physical striking-out of certain items, reveal that the government of James II had no intention of letting this archive of dissenting and oppositional thought be recirculated as it stood.[35]

The catalogue originally included 6,505 books and 178 bundles of pamphlets, several of which contained between 80 to 100 items. Organized by language, by

[33] See *Catalogue of the manuscripts in the Cottonian Library 1696* (*Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Cottonianae*), ed. C. G. C. Tite (Woodbridge, 1984), p. 7.

[34] Lambeth Palace Library, shelfmark Z999. On the verso of the last of the interleaved sheets which record buyers and lots in alphabetical order, the auctioneer records 'A p^{cell} of Bookes Return'd fro L'estrange sold to M^{r} Bell.' Another copy of *Bibiliotheca Angleseiana* in the Bodleian Library (shelfmark Broxb. 110.10.) has a note on p. 7[8] (second pagination): 'My Frend gave me this sth yt they have sold to P. 60 in ye Lattine and yet severall Pamphletts are forbid sale by Sr. R: Le Strange & above 3oood never brought into ye Catolouge.' Our thanks to Sharon Achinstein and David Norbrook for this reference. The fullest contemporary account is by Roger Morrice: 'When M.^{r} Millington that managed the Auction of the sale of the Earle of Angleseys bookes first printed the Catalogue, he carryed the first Coppy to the Secretary of State, and the next to S.^{r} Roger Le Strange and speak to this purpose. That the Earle of Anglesey by his place as a Privy Counsellor might read such bookes as others might not, and therefore he had submitted the Catalogue to them & c. S.^{r} Roger did prohibit the Sale of many Manuscripts, and severall Bookes (but seized upon or tooke more away) as all M.^{r} Baxters Workes Miltons Iconoclastes in ffrench, and in that very booke the Earle of Anglesey had writ thus Ex dono Rogeri Le Strang Armigeri' (Dr Williams's Library, Morrice MSS, Entring Book Q, fos. 14–15; see also Entring Book P, fos. 567, 646).

[35] While the unsold items include those for whom no buyers appeared, the fact that they feature the works of Buchanan, Robert Ferguson, John Goodwin, Harrington, Hobbes (*Leviathan*, but not *De cive*), Thomas May, Milton, Nedham, Prynne, and Marvell himself, indicates that censorship, though inconsistent, was at work. Bundles were sold after offending items had been deleted. Thus Lord Falkland could buy bundle no. 102 (p. 67) after Milton's *Ready and easy way to establish a free commonwealth* had been struck out. Martin Dzelzainis is preparing a full account of the sale in a study of print and censorship, 1662–95.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

size, and by category, and only partially alphabetized, it is not easy for a modern reader to sort, especially since the books in English (where the pagination begins again) are much less precisely defined than those in Latin, and often referred to by rough paraphrases of their titles or contents. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that *almost* every book or pamphlet that Marvell specifically cites, or that Smith proposed as the source of an allusion, is to be found somewhere in Anglesey's library.

We can begin by noting that Anglesey owned most of the works of Samuel Parker that were included in Marvell's attacks: the Latin *Tentamina physico-theologico de deo* of 1665 (p. 8, no. 178); *A free and impartial censure of the Platonick philosophie* (p. 13, no. 100), listed in the catalogue as 1664 but actually 1666; and the *Reproof to the rehearsal transpros'd*, listed in the catalogue as 1675, but actually 1673 (p. 36, no. 95, just under the *Rehearsal transpros'd* itself, '2 parts compleat'). Anglesey also owned two copies of John Owen's *Truth and innocence vindicated* (1669), the first answer to Parker's *Discourse of ecclesiastical politie* (1669), which appears in the catalogue as anonymous (pp. 13, no. 114, 23, no. 603). He also owned two of the other answers to Marvell's first part, *Animadversions on the rehearsal transpros'd* (p. 37, no. 157), which can be recognized as Henry Stubbes's *Rosemary and bayes: or animadversions*, followed by 'Another with Observations, with the Humour of writing the Rehears. 2 vol.' (no. 158), which is identifiable as *S'too him bayes or some observations upon the humour of writing the rehearsal transprosed*, sometimes attributed to John Dryden,[36] though the reference to two volumes may imply that yet another answer was included. Anglesey seems not to have owned a copy of Parker's *Ecclesiastical politie*, but it is reasonable to assume that this at least Marvell would have purchased as a working copy; nor did he own Edmund Hickeringill's *Gregory, father-greybeard*, which Marvell frequently cites in the *Second part*, unless it was one of many unidentified pamphlets in the bundles.

We should deal first only with works from which Marvell actually quotes, as distinct from merely mentioning them. In the first part, these are relatively few, as compared to glancing allusions to *Don Quixote*, Aesop's fables, the plays of Shakespeare, or the romances of de Scudery and de la Calprenede. The work most frequently quoted in the first part is, unsurprisingly, Buckingham's *Rehearsal*, which appears in the Anglesey catalogue in a bundle of six modern plays (p. 71, no. 132). But apart from this parodic underpinning (to which Buckingham himself must have consented) the first of Marvell's belletristic moves is a quotation from Guarini's *Il pastor fido* of three lines in Italian designed to make Samuel Parker feel linguistically challenged. 'I perceive', wrote Marvell, 'the Gentleman hath travelled by his remembring *Chi lava la testa al asino perde il sapone* [Who washes the ass's head wastes soap], and therefore hope I may without Pedantry quote the words in her own *whining* Italian' (*RT*, p. 1). That 'without Pedantry' establishes the project of outdoing

[36] Marvell thought it was 'writ by one Hodges', *Poems and letters*, II, p. 328.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

his opponent in education, which is then nailed down by Marvell's providing a comic translation of Amaryllis's dilemma in Guarini's tragicomedy, Act 3, Scene 4, lines 19–24. Marvell again quotes this text at *RT*, p. 54. Anglesey's library contained the 1602 edition (p. 96, no. 140). Shortly afterwards Marvell refers his readers to 'the History of the Mogul' as the source for a mockingly quoted passage about oriental grandstanding (*RT*, p. 12). Smith identified this quotation as from Francois Bernier's *Continuation of the memories of monsieur Bernier concerning the empire of the great Mogol*, translated by H[enry]. O[ldenburg] (1672), p. 46; and Anglesey owned it (p. 36, no. 102).

The first really extensive quotation that Marvell deploys in the first part is from John Hales's *Treatise of schism* (*RT*, pp. 79–82), and we already know where he found that – on a bookstall. Had he wished to transcribe it at leisure, however, Anglesey owned no fewer than three copies (p. 45, bundle no. 5; p. 47, bundle no. 31; p. 48, bundle no. 35). The second such quotation, as Marvell tells us, is from Archbishop Matthew Parker's *De antiquitatibus ecclesiae Britannicae*. This long Latin passage deals with a *cause célèbre* in ecclesiastical history, the massacre of the monks of Bangor in the early seventh century. Some authorities attributed the massacre to the intolerance of St Augustine, who 'stirred up Ethilbert King of Kent against them, because they would not receive the Romish Ceremonies' (*RT*, pp. 114–15). Putting it like this shows why Marvell went in search of this passage, and then proceeded to translate it; though the fact that its author was another Parker no doubt directed his search. Marvell even provides a page number, from which Smith identified the source as the 1605 Hanover edition, which appears in Anglesey's catalogue (p. 4, no. 139) as one of his theological works in folio, and again (p. 26, no. 247) under the heading 'Libri Geographici & Historici, in Folio'.

Matthew Parker's diatribe against ceremonialism is followed by the testimony of another archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbott, to whose narrative of his struggles with the Arminians under Charles I Marvell devoted several pages (*RT*, pp. 125–30). His source, as Smith determined, was the *Historical collections 1618–1629* of John Rushworth, the strong commonwealth man whom Marvell had known since they both sat in Richard Cromwell's parliament. Rushworth published this first part of his political history of the Stuarts in 1659, with a dedication to Richard Cromwell, deleted from subsequent editions. Marvell could perhaps have consulted Rushworth's own copy, but Anglesey's library contained the work, in three volumes, with gold lettering, and the interesting rider, 'the first volume not castrated' (p. 26, no. 83).

Appropriately, the first part ends with a sardonic quotation from William Davenant's would-be epic poem, *Gondibert*, first published in 1651, its literariness matching the opening via Guarini. For this there is no obvious equivalent in Anglesey's library, unless it were in one of the bundles of poetry.

In the *Second part*, partly for reasons of self-defence, Marvell decided to play down literary allusions and focus instead on theological and political

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

arguments, buttressed by impeccable authorities.[37] He had certainly noticed the sneers of Edmund Hickeringill, in *Gregory, father-greybeard*, to the effect that the *Rehearsal transpros'd* was inchoate and unlearned: 'for him to do all this', Hickeringill observed, 'with Politick-scraps gathered up when let fall at a Club in the Tavern or Coffee-house, bound up with patches out of Diurnals, old Parliament & Army Declarations, Mr. Hales of Eaton his account of Schism, and Rushworth's orts, is intolerable presumption'.[38] Stung, too, by Parker's complaints in the *Reproof* about his unscholarly citations, Marvell responded by building into his tract not only continual marginal references to Parker's works but also bibliographical specifications of the editions he used. Even some of the glancing attacks have this bibliographical flavour. Marvell begins with an apparently casual reference to the Dutch historian Aytzema, deployed as an analogue to Parker's unseemly public statements about his own health. Aytzema, we are told, was 'so punctual in the late Prince of Oranges malady, as even to Chronicle in Folio what days he did *exurnere Dura*, when *Foetida*, and when *Faeces laudabiles*' (*RT2*, p. 150). Smith cites a work in Dutch, but it is more likely that Marvell made use of *Notable revolutions: beeing a true relation of what hap'ned in the United Provinces in the years MDCL and MDCLI somewhat before and after the death of the late prince of Orange*, published in London in folio in 1653, where the account of these symptoms occurs on pp. 110–11 and 114–15. This work featured in Anglesey's library (p. 25, no. 39), where, significantly, it formed part of a large collection of works on Dutch history and politics.

Consistent with the emphasis on Anglo-Dutch relations is Marvell's deployment of Hugo Grotius. Towards the end of the *Second part*, Marvell refers Parker to Grotius, 'whom I chuse always to ply you with above all other Authors' (p. 315). At this point Marvell is citing Grotius's *De rebus Belgicis*, which Anglesey owned in a gold-backed Amsterdam edition of 1657 (p. 23, no. 124).[39] Alerted to Grotius by Parker's dismissals of him (*RT*, pp. 20, 49, 50, 106), in the *Second part* Marvell begins to cite extensively from Grotius's theological works: *Annotationes in novum testamentum* (*RT2*, pp. 218–19, 266), and the *Annotationes in libros evangeliorum* (pp. 294–5). On the first page of Anglesey's catalogue (no. 25) appears 'Hug. Grotii Comment. Omnia in Vetus & Novum Test. In 3 vols., 1644', published in Paris and Amsterdam in folio. While this does not exactly match any known edition of Grotius's commentaries, it is possible that Anglesey had the first two sets of annotations bound together with the *Annotationes ad vetus testamentum*, which was published in Paris in 1644.[40]

[37] The one striking exception is Marvell's set of thirty quotations from Donne's satirical poem, *The progress of the soul* (*RT2*, pp. 175–7). If Marvell owned any books, it is likely that an edition of Donne's poems would be one, given his close imitation of Donne in his early satire, *Fleckno, an English priest at Rome*. Anglesey owned copies of the 1633 (first) edition (p. 31, no. 97), and the 1635 edition (p. 40, no. 320). The latter contains the reading 'kindle' at line 150 that Marvell registers.

[38] Edmund Hickeringill, *Gregory, father-greybeard, with his vizard off* (London, 1673), p. 182.

[39] Smith (*RT/RT2*, p. 400) refers to the translation by T. M., *De rebus Belgicis: or, the annals and history of the low country warrs* (London, 1655), but Marvell is clearly translating from the Latin.

[40] Despite being produced in different cities, the two other commentaries were already

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Of similar stature to Grotius in the *Second part* was Richard Hooker's *Of the laws of ecclesiastical polity*. This authority, vital for someone refuting Parker's *Discourse of ecclesiastical politie*, is first mentioned by Marvell at *RT*, pp. 79 and 97, but, like Grotius, only because Parker has mentioned him; Hooker becomes a major rebarbative weapon in the *Second part*. On p. 286, he calls in, as witness for the prosecution of Parker's negligent understanding of the doctrine of justification by faith, 'Mr. Hooker's Life, p. 17. Or his Sermon of Justification, p. 520'. Smith traced these page numbers to the 1666 edition of Hooker's *Works*, edited by Gauden, with a Life by Isaac Walton. Anglesey owned two editions of *Ecclesiastical polity* 'in 8 books' (p. 3, nos. 97 and 130), undated in the English catalogue but very likely the important 1666 edition.

At the opposite end of the ecclesiastical spectrum, in Marvell's opinion, is Peter Heylyn. At *RT2*, pp. 306–7, Marvell cites extensively from Heylyn's *Aerius redivivus or the history of the presbyterians*, which had been published in Oxford in 1670 by Heylyn's son, with a dedication to parliament, urging it to severity towards the Nonconformists, and congratulating it on its legislation to that end. Anglesey owned the 1670 edition (p. 26, no. 112).

A still more precise reference is given by Marvell during his discussion of the Emperor Julian, whom Parker had made the mistake of defending. Marvell tells that he went on a hunt for a precedent for Parker's mock declaration 'For the Tolerating of Debauchery', a move itself intended as a satirical rebuff to Marvell's charge that Parker was more tolerant of immorality than principled Nonconformity. This was definitely a form of research for the occasion. Marvell eventually found what he needed in the *Caesares Juliani*, a parodic decree by the emperor in support of vice, and nailed down the reference as to 'the 99*th*. Page of that Book, Printed at *Paris* 1583'. Though defensive in motive, this precision makes possible the identification of just that edition in Anglesey's library: 'Juliani Imperatoris Opera Grae. Lat … Paris 1583' (p. 45, no. 32).

But the second half of this strategy is still to come. Parker had complained that Marvell had misled his readers by citing a fifth epistle of St Augustine to Marcellinus, whereas he could only discover four. Marvell's riposte is magnificent:

> Take the Edition *Lugduni*. Anno 1561 … you will find there p. 1080, a 222d Epistle, which is a fifth to the same person … But this proceeds from your bragging of Books … which you have not the patience to read over, no more then your own; or having cast your eye on the Index you imagine you have read the Author; for indeed here the *Index* points but at four Epistles, but the Pollex would have made them five. (*RT2*, pp. 318–19)

It is magnificent in its proof that Parker was the pot calling the kettle black; in its ingenious play with an index as both scholarly tool and digit, versus the

---

considered as parts of the same work; volume I, the *Annotationes in libros evangelium*, was published in Amsterdam in 1641; volume II, the *Annotationes in novum testamentum*, was published in Paris in 1646.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pollex, or thumb, the tool with which one actually turns over the pages when reading; and in its helpfulness to our purpose. For in Anglesey's library there was the multi-volume edition 'X. Tomis in 16. Vol. Lugduni 1563' of Augustine's *Opera* (p. 10, no. 1). The edition in question was actually dated 1561–3.

Thanks, then, to Marvell's new concern with bibliographical detail, we have precise data by which to compare his reading with Anglesey's holdings, and a dozen such matches is remarkable. But even when Marvell deliberately concealed his source, as he did with his extensive quotations from a Latin text relating to the rituals of 'the Jewish Zelotes' for the incorporation of proselytes at *RT2*, p. 310('I will tell you hereupon a Story out of one of them, that shall as yours be nameless'), the work turns up in Anglesey's catalogue. This allusion was untraced by Smith, but has recently been solved by Jason Rosenblatt, who discovered that Marvell was using John Selden's *De synedriis et praefecturis juridicis veterum Ebraeorum*, published in London in three separate volumes from 1650 to 1655. On p. 66, no. 47, of the Anglesey catalogue appears 'de Synedriis & Praefecturis … Tomi. 3 in 2 vol. *Lond.*'.

The evidence grows stronger still if we now go back and compare those remarkable holdings with Marvell's more glancing allusions. Listed here, in the order in which they appear in Marvell, rather than in order of importance, are the more striking 'coincidences':

1. *The legend of captain Jones* (*RT*, pp. 12–13); Anglesey, p. 51, no. 70 (1671).
2. Simon Patrick, *A friendly debate between a conformist and a nonconformist* (*RT*, p. 13); Anglesey, p. 15, no. 188 (4 vols., 1669).
3. Strabo, *Geography*, for the allusion to Deinocrates, Alexander's architect (*RT*, p. 15); Anglesey, p. 37, no. 4 (Paris, 1620).
4. Montaigne, *Essais* (*RT*, pp. 18, 24, 107, 118); Anglesey (p. 27, no. 120) owned '*Mountaigns* Essays, Moral, Politick, and Military, with an *Index* 1632', that is, the third edition of Florio's translation.
5. Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his pilgrimage*, source of allusions in *RT*, pp. 22, 60, and *RT2*, p. 247; Anglesey, p. 27, no. 155 (1625).
6. James Howell, *Dodona's grove, or the vocall forest*, first published in 1640 (*RT*, p. 24); Anglesey, p. 35, no. 74 (1650).
7. John Ray, *Collection of English proverbs* (1670); Anglesey, p. 35, no. 84. Smith detected an allusion at *RT*, p. 36, but Ray was in fact a source that Marvell returned to several times, both in *RT2* and *Mr. Smirke*.
8. Pliny, *Natural history*. Possibly the source of allusions at *RT*, p. 37 (the Arcadian sow) and p. 99 ('insana laurus') and *RT2*, p. 189 (the bird 'Icterus'), probably in Philemon Holland's translation; Anglesey, p. 25, no. 53 (1634).
9. William Rastell, *A collection of statutes*. The source for Marvell's citation of the *Jejunium Cecilianum* (Cecil's Fast) of 1562 at *RT*, p. 48 and *RT2*, p. 253; Anglesey, p. 69 (first pagination), nos. 5, 6 (1618, 1621).
10. Aesop's Fables. Smith proposed John Ogilby, *The fables of Aesop*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

paraphrased in verse (1651), for Marvell's allusion to the 'Ass in the Fable', *RT*, p. 49; Anglesey, p. 24, no. 8 (1665).

11. Sleidan (Joannes Philippson), *A famouse cronicle of oure time, called Sleidanes commentaries, concerning the raigne of the emperour Charles the fifth*. Translated J. Daus (1560). Proposed by Smith as the source of a detail about Charles V's coronation, *RT*, p. 51. Matches Anglesey, p. 27, no. 138, but see also George Sabinus, *Historia de electione & coronatione Caroli V imperatoris*, Anglesey, p. 28, no. 76.
12. Peter Heylyn, *Cosmographie: containing the chorographie and historie of the whole world*. Probably the source of anecdotes at RT, pp. 59, 109, and RT2 pp. 260, 290, 292; see Anglesey, p. 25, no. 51: 'History of the World, with all the Principal Kingdoms, Provinces, &c. 1657'.
13. Tertullian. As the source of a question whether the Christians were not yet tired of suffering (*RT*, p. 59), Smith proposed 'Ad Scapulam', 5, *Opera*, edited Rigalti (Paris, 1664); Anglesey, p. 2, no. 44, owned the 1634 Rigault edition.
14. Marvell refers to 'Cardinalism, Nepotism, Putanism', at *RT*, p. 83. Smith identified the allusion to Gregorio Leti's three works, published anonymously; *Il putanismo Romano* (1668), owned by Anglesey, p. 95, no. 115; *Il nipotismo di Roma*, translated W. A. (1669); *Il cardinalismo* (1667), translated G. H. (1670). The last, which Anglesey did not own, became a source for an anecdote about Cardinal Barberini at *RT2*, p. 195. Marvell could have read it in John Starkey's bookshop, where it was advertised for sale in February 1673.
15. J. Pits, *Relationum historicarum de rebus Anglicis* (Paris, 1619), identified by Smith as the source of Marvell's anecdote about Henry Parker, the Carmelite friar made to recant his sermons against clerical decadence, at *RT2*, p. 78. See Anglesey, p. 30, no. 169, and p. 36, no. 44, under the running title of the second and major part, *Relationes historicae de illustribus Britanniae scriptores*.
16. *Mercurius Politicus*, no. 204, 4–11 May 1654, identified by Smith as the source of Marvell's anecdote about the literary cause of the war between Poland and the duke of Muscovy at *RT2*, p. 179. This issue was presumably contained in Anglesey's set of *Mercurius*, p. 74, bundle no. 158, though the run was incomplete.
17. *Holinshed's Chronicles*; the source of an anecdote about William the Conqueror at *RT2*, p. 187. See Anglesey, p. 25, no. 63.
18. Sebastian Munster, *Cosmographia universalis* (Basle, 1559); the source of Marvell's allusion to throwing a whale barrels to divert him, at *RT2*, p. 198; Anglesey, p. 25, no. 192.
19. Thomas Fuller, *Worthies of England*; the source of Marvell's reference to the 'great eater of Kent', at *RT2*, p. 212; Anglesey, p. 26, no. 88 (1662).
20. Paolo Sarpi, *History of the council of Trent*. Deployed by Marvell at *RT2*, pp. 238–41 and 253, to undermine the authority of church councils.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Smith cited the translation by Nathaniel Brent (1620); Anglesey, p. 1, no. 39 (1640).

21. Peter Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus: or, the history of … Laud* (*RT2*, p. 295); Anglesey, p. 26, no. 113.
22. *Tre grandi impostori*. Mentioned by Marvell at *RT2*, p. 302. Smith recorded this as 'an apparently suppositious work' (p. 395), but Anglesey's library contained two copies: a 'History of the late three famous impostors, *viz*. *Paidre Ottomanno* … 1669' (p. 35, no. 70) and 'The 3 late famous Impostors with an Account of the War betwixt *Venet: & Turks* 1669' (p. 36, no. 110).
23. *De pacis ecclesiasticae rationibus inter evangelicos usurpandis*; Smith determined that Marvell was citing bishops Morton, Davenant, and Hall from the Amsterdam edition of 1636. This 'little Tract', as Marvell describes it (*RT2*, p. 304), may well be the 'Treatise touching peace of the Church' bundled with 'L. Bacon about Church Affairs', in Anglesey, p. 60, bundle no. 48.

This brings up Marvell's use of Bacon as the *coup de grace* against Parker, with the very long quotation (*RT2*, pp. 323–4) from Bacon's *Advertisement touching the controversies of the church of England*, written in 1589, first printed in 1640, and subsequently reprinted in William Rawley's *Resuscitatio*. From the page numbers so carefully cited by Marvell, Smith deduced he must have been using the third edition of the *Resuscitatio* (1671), which does not appear in Anglesey, although he had more than one copy of the 1640 pamphlet version. Marvell could have consulted the 1671 *Resuscitatio* in William Lee's bookshop and might have chosen to do so because of its newness.

IV

We must now ask the question: what else did Marvell evidently read or quote that he could *not* have found in Anglesey's library. The answer is, not very much. One is an edition of Davenant's *Gondibert*; another is Samuel Butler's *Hudibras*, of which Anglesey only owned the second part. The letters of Synesius, supposing that Marvell did not quote the list of tortures (*RT*, p. 60) from some other source, do not appear in the catalogue. We are not considering brief quotations from the classics, though if Marvell could not cite them from memory (unlikely) he could have found what he needed in Anglesey's extensive collection of Horace, Juvenal, Cicero, and others.

One item of some significance that at first seemed to be missing was Philemon Holland's translation of Livy, ushered in by Marvell with much specificity: 'I will give you honest Philemon Holland for an interpreter' (*RT2*, p. 307). However, in the Lambeth Palace copy, at the end of the relevant category (p. 29) a manuscript note records the sale of the latest edition of this translation (1659), which must simply have been omitted originally. Another puzzle is the Roman history of Ammianus Marcellinus. Anglesey owned Philemon

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Holland's 1609 translation of Ammianus (p. 25, no. 16), but not the Latin edition, *Rerum gestarum* (Hamburg, 1609), that Marvell's marginal notes indicate he used. A second puzzle is an unlikely work for the purpose, Del Rio, *Disquisitionum magicarum*, a compendium of stories about magic and conjurers to which Marvell gives the distinction of citations in the margins of the *Second part* – the only work other than Parker's own, the various other 'answers' to the *Rehearsal transpros'd*, or 'Reh. Com', that is, Buckingham's *Rehearsal*, given that typographical prominence.[41]

But there was another library to which Marvell could have had access in 1672–3. That library belonged to John Locke. From 1667, Locke had been residing in London in the house of *his* patron, the earl of Shaftesbury, and employed as his private physician.[42] Locke scholars now believe that he was in the early 1670s engaged also as Shaftesbury's secretary in work on the whig agenda. John Marshall and Richard Ashcraft have analysed the notes Locke wrote on Samuel Parker's *Discourse of ecclesiastical politie* in 1669 or early in 1670, though he never published a response.[43] It seems clear that this exercise was undertaken in the context of rethinking the issue of toleration, and bringing his views closer to Shaftesbury's. More importantly, Cranston, Marshall, and Ashcraft agree, with different degrees of emphasis as to how much creative responsibility Locke was given, that the notorious *Letter from a person of quality* published in November 1675 was the work of Shaftesbury and Locke. On 8 November 1675, the House of Lords ordered the *Letter* burned by the common hangman. The following day, Marvell wrote to his constituents in Hull, 'There being a late printed book containing a narrative of the Test carryed on in the Lords last session, they yesterday voted it a Libell: and to be burnt by the hands of the Hangman & to inquire out the Printer and Author.'[44] Locke hurriedly left for France on 12 November, and Cranston cites a letter written in 1704 by Shaftesbury's grandson, which may allude to the *Letter* by way of explanation:

> When my grandfather quitted the Court and began to be in danger from it, Mr. Locke, now shared with him in dangers as before in honours and advantages. He entrusted him with his secretest negotiations, and made us of his assistant pen in matters that nearly concerned the State and were fit to be made public to raise that spirit in the nation which was necessary against the prevailing Popish Party. It was for something of that kind that got air and out of tenderness to Mr Locke, that my grandfather in the year 167[5] sent him abroad to travel.[45]

If Locke had been working for Shaftesbury on whig and anti-Parker arguments

[41] Presumably because of the marginal notes, Elsie Duncan-Jones assumed that Marvell owned a copy of Del Rio. See Smith, *RT/RT2*, p. 337, who cites the 1633 edition.

[42] For Locke's service as Shaftesbury's doctor, including his supervision of a life-saving operation, see Maurice Cranston, *John Locke: a biography* (London and New York, 1957), pp. 108, 113.

[43] Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary politics*, pp. 105–8; John Marshall, *John Locke: resistance, religion and responsibility* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 74–6. For a full text of the notes on Parker, see now Mark Goldie, ed., *Locke: political essays* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 211–15.

[44] Marvell, *Poems and Letters*, II, p. 172.

[45] Cranston, *John Locke*, pp. 158–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

since 1669 or 1670, and if Marvell began work on a similar project under Anglesey's auspices in early 1672, and since we know that Shaftesbury and Anglesey combined to protect the *Rehearsal transpros'd*, the likelihood is that Marvell and Locke had some communication.

Thanks to John Harrison and Peter Laslett, we have access to the contents of Locke's library, whose catalogues they edited, testifying in their preface to Locke as a man completely 'enslaved to the bibliophile's passion', and enjoying 'one important prerequisite for the collector of books, money to spend as he pleased'.[46] The premise that Marvell and Locke knew each other at this time begins with the fact that Locke owned all of Marvell's contributions to the tolerationist debates, and three of the six attacks on Marvell generated by the first part of the *Rehearsal transpros'd*. He owned both a pirated copy of the first edition, 'The Rehersal [sic] transprosed'(no. 1931) and the second edition with Marvell's alterations, 'The Rehearsal transpros'd ... 2nd impr.' (no. 1932), along with 'The Rehearsall transpros'd the second part' (no. 1933). The last two items were in his library at Oates at his death. Locke also owned Parker's 1673 'A Reproof to y^{e} Rehearsal Transprosd' (no. 2199) but, significantly, had not purchased Parker's previous tracts that led to Marvell's ripostes. He owned 'S'TOO him Bays or some observations upon the humour of writing Rehersals Transprosed' (no. 2792), and 'Hickeringil, Edm. Reflections upon the Rehersal Transprosed' (no. 1447) both published in 1673, and responded to in Marvell's *Second part*. This collection was untypical of his library. He did not begin to invest substantially in ecclesiastical and theological polemic until the 1680s, when his own *Letter concerning toleration* was being developed. Locke also owned two of Marvell's later tracts. One was *Mr. Smirke*, published in 1676 (no. 1934), although he purchased no other contributions to that controversy. It was occasioned by Bishop Herbert Croft's *The naked truth* and involved Francis Turner (whom Marvell answered), Gilbert Burnet, and the anonymous *Lex talionis*; yet Locke did not even own Croft's pamphlet, the cause of a major scandal. And, finally, Locke owned one of the two 1677 editions of Marvell's 'Account of y^{e} Growth of Popery & Arbitrary Goverm^{t}' (no. 1935), both of which, we should note, were published while Locke was in France from late 1675 to early 1679. These bibliographical facts alone suggest a relationship between Marvell and Locke, who might even have acquired his copies of Marvell's tracts from their author.

Although this part of our argument is more speculative than that concerning Anglesey's library and is unnecessary to the larger thesis, it is striking to discover that precisely those books we could not find in Anglesey's collection were owned by Locke.[47]

[46] *The library of John Locke*, ed. John Harrison and Peter Laslett (Oxford, 1965), pp. v, 1.

[47] Locke had in effect two libraries in 1672–3, one in London, and another, earlier, collection in his rooms at Christ Church, Oxford. The earlier collection was primarily medical and scientific. There is no way of knowing what was contained in the London library, or whether any of the books recorded as being there in 1681 (*Library*, Appendix 1) had spent any time in London.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1. Sir William Davenant, *Gondibert* (1651). Cited in *RT* at pp. 8 and 143, the second time disapprovingly; mentioned p. 47; Locke, *Library*, no. 924[a].
2. Samuel Butler, *Hudibras* (1663–4). Marvell pays a tribute to Butler at *RT*, p. 22, and, at p. 119, cites the first part of the poem, which Locke owned (no. 1530).
3. The copy of Edmund Hickeringill's *Gregory, father-greybeard*, mentioned above.
4. Richard Hooker, *Laws of ecclesiastical polity*. Locke owned three copies, including that published in 1666 (no. 1491); we cannot be sure that Anglesey possessed the 1666 edition.
5. Del Rio, *Disquisitionum magicarum*. Locke owned the three-volume edition of 1600 (no. 943).
6. Ammianus Marcellinus. Locke owned precisely that edition of Ammianus's *Rerum gestarum* published in Hamburg in 1609 (no. 1896) that Marvell used.

One obvious question, however, is whether Marvell could just as well have produced this extraordinary and eclectic list of references *without* access to Anglesey's library. It is true that, on 30 September 1665, just before the short session of parliament held in Oxford to avoid the plague, Marvell signed the register of admission to the Bodleian, and that, according to Anthony à Wood, he 'became a sojourner in Oxford for the sake of the public Library and continued there, I presume, some months'.[48] But this anecdote only underlines the point that taking up residence in Oxford was almost a practical necessity for making effective use of the Bodleian, which was closed on 239 mornings and 185 afternoons in the year (excluding Sundays).[49] Moreover, there was, inter alia, no copy there in the 1670s of Matthew Parker's *De antiquitatibus*, and, even more significantly, no 1561 Lyons edition of St Augustine's works. Nor, for that matter, did the Bodleian possess a copy of Philemon Holland's translation of Livy.[50] Marvell may have used the Bodleian at other times, but there is no evidence of his having done so while writing the two parts of *The rehearsal transpros'd*.

London libraries would have been much more convenient. The city had several ecclesiastical libraries, but Marvell would certainly have been unwelcome at Lambeth Palace and the Dean and Chapter Library at Westminster Abbey by the time he came to write the *Second part*, which was when he most needed access to scholarly texts. The 'most important' public library in London in the later seventeenth century was at Sion College, which

[48] Marvell, *Poems and letters*, II, p. 362; Pierre Legouis, *André Marvell: poète, puritain, patriote* (Paris and London, 1928), p. 258 n. 138 (citing Wood, *Fasti*). Our thanks to Paul Mathole for drawing our attention to Legouis's remarks.

[49] The secondary literature on early modern libraries is sparse, though the situation will be transformed by the *History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland* in preparation for the Cambridge University Press. For the Bodleian, see John Butt, 'The facilities for antiquarian study in the seventeenth century', *Essays and Studies*, 34 (1938), pp. 64–5, 69n.

[50] See *Catalogus impressorum bibliothecae Bodleianae* (Oxford, 1674).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

required only the recommendation of a London minister for admission and was open from 8.00 a. m. until 5.00 p. m., with a two-hour break at midday.[51] It also boasted a comprehensive catalogue, complete with shelfmarks, published in 1650 and kept up-to-date by the librarian, John Spencer.[52] However, a third of Sion's books were destroyed by fire in 1666, and, until 1670, the collection was stored at the Charterhouse.[53] Among the books that survived were Parker's *De antiquitatibus* in the 1605 Hanover edition, Selden's *De synedriis*, and the works of Synesius (though not the separate volume of his *Epistolae* listed in 1650).[54] As against this, Sion did not hold many of the works or specific editions cited by Marvell, including the 1561 edition of Augustine's works, the 1609 Ammianus Marcellinus and Del Rio's *Disquisitionum*. Moreover, while readers were being admitted again from 1671 onwards, Marvell's name is nowhere in the register, either before or after that date.[55]

In short, the other sources of scholarly texts seem unlikely, even in combination, to have provided Marvell with the books we know he used and that were close at hand, all together, in the London house of his patron. We now know, we believe, how Marvell assembled his ammunition for *The rehearsal transpros'd*, and especially the *Second part*. His methods of research were much like ours. He evidently went up to Highgate, as he told Harley, to work through Parker's *Reproof* and identify the new sources (or second passes at ones used before) that were needed for refutation. Having drawn up a list – including Grotius, Hooker, Bacon, Heylyn, Selden, and the crucial edition of Augustine – he could return to Drury Lane and read only and exactly what he needed.

V

Beyond this practical and reassuring picture of how an active politician could acquire the appearance of great learning at speed – the *Second part* was produced between 3 May and 3 November 1673 – we can draw certain conclusions about the role that those pamphlets were intended to play in the

[51] F. Smith Fussner, *The historical revolution, 1580–1640* (London, 1962), p. 66; Bald, 'Facilities', pp. 69–70.

[52] See *Catalogus universali librorum omnium in bibliotheca collegii Sionii apud Londinenses* (London, 1650); BL, shelfmark C.28e. 13, is an interleaved copy of the 1650 *Catalogus*, with Spencer's notes of accessions until 1663, when it was presented to Robert Porey, a president of Sion College. Thus on the recto of the leaf between pp. 132 and 133, it lists Selden's 'De Synedrijs Hebraoru[m] vol 2 Lond. 1653'.

[53] See E. H. Pearce, *Sion College and its library* (Cambridge, 1913), pp. 122–3, 248–9.

[54] Lambeth Palace Library, Sion College MS, ARC L40.2/E58, consists of two unfoliated volumes, the first of which separately lists books sent to the Charterhouse and those destroyed by fire in 1666.

[55] Lambeth Palace Library, Sion College MS, ARC L40.2/E29, lists over 900 admissions between 1632 and 1677. Most supply institutional affiliations (thus Robert Ferguson ('the Plotter') was admitted in 1664 'è Coll Aberdonensi apud Scotos', fo. 42v) or foreign places of origin (thus Roger Williams was admitted in 1652 'ex Vico, Providentia dicto in Nova Anglia', fo. 18v); but there are many entries which simply add 'Londinensis'. The note about resuming admissions is at fo. 45v.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tolerationist programme as it developed between 1671 and 1673, a period when Shaftesbury, Buckingham, Anglesey, and Marvell himself hoped that they could work with Charles's own instincts for a religious programme of non-interference, but discovered to their embarrassment that the ground kept shifting under them. If the *Second part* was intended to speak indirectly both to the king's forced withdrawal of the Declaration of Indulgence and Anglesey's attempts to replace it with a bill exempting Protestant dissenters from penalties, no sooner had it been published than Shaftesbury was dismissed from the council on 9 November 1673, and the strategies of the group began to move towards overt opposition. In February or March 1675, Marvell wrote a famous and widely circulated parody of the king's speech delivered at the opening of the previous session of parliament, in which he agreed to table the Declaration of Indulgence and requested more money. The next phase was that of the *Letter from a person of quality*, and of another scandalous text, Bishop Herbert Croft's The *naked truth*, which Marvell sat down to defend in February 1676, requiring in due course the protection of Anglesey for his bookseller.

The question then arises: did Marvell still have the use of Anglesey's library? For whatever reason, Marvell became a great deal more frugal with authorities in his later pamphlets. In *Mr. Smirke*, rather than introducing his own anecdotes, he mocks the learned allusions of Francis Turner (as in the Antiochus/Popilius story from classical history, or the rhetorical battle between Demosthenes and Aeschines, or the 'learned P. Aerodius' who found a precedent for religious compulsion in ancient Roman legislation). His authorities are mainly Scripture, with an occasional gesture to Tertullian or Chrystostom. The one esoteric book he alludes to, in the anecdote about the chocolate addicts of Chiapa, was Thomas Gage's *New survey of the West Indies*, published in 1648 and dedicated to Sir Thomas Fairfax. Anglesey owned this book (p. 27, no. 161), but Marvell could have read it before in Fairfax's library.

This trend continues and intensifies in the *Short historical essay*, where the authorities are, first and foremost, Scripture, the early church historians, Eusebius, Sozomen and Socrates Scholasticus, with occasional tactical recourse to the church Fathers, such as Gregory Nazianzenus or Hilary. For these authorities, the Anglesey library was no help; in particular, it did not contain an edition of the early ecclesiastical historians in the Latin translation Marvell used, that by John Christopherson, which Marvell might have borrowed from Milton.[56] In the *Essay*, the *coup de grace* is delivered by way of Richard Hooker's *Laws of ecclesiastical polity*, but it appears to be via a different edition. The same is true of Marvell's citation of Foxe's *Acts and monuments* from the three-volume edition of 1641, whereas Anglesey only possessed the one-volume edition of 1596 and the two-volume edition of 1610. By the time we reach the *Remarks* of

[56] For Milton's use of *Historiae ecclesiasticae scriptores Graeci*, published in Greek with a Latin translation by John Christopherson (Geneva, 1612), see Constance Nicholas, 'The edition of the early church historians used by Milton', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 51 (1952), pp. 160–2. The Bodleian had a copy.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1678, it is exceedingly hard to discern if Marvell is reading anything other than the text he is attacking and the one he is defending. And as for the *Account of the growth of popery and arbitrary government*, the *only* books it cites, apart from contemporary propaganda pamphlets (like the *Packet of advice to the men of Shaftesbury*) are the *De jure belli et pacis* of Hugo Grotius and the edition of the medieval *Modus tenendi parliamentum* edited by William Hakewill and published by order of the Long Parliament in 1641. Both, however, were briefly mentioned by others in the debates Marvell is summarizing. We could hazard the guess that Anglesey and Marvell decided to cut back on their connection, or, alternatively, conclude that Marvell had simply changed his mode of controversy.

And we cannot quite rule out the possibility that he still had recourse to Anglesey's books when in need. Marvell is, significantly, still quoting John Ray's *Collection of English proverbs* in *Mr. Smirke*. In the *Essay* he alludes to Dr Herbert Spencer's *Discourse of prodigies* (1663, 1665) and this he could have found in its second edition in Anglesey's library (p. 11, no. 33). For the *Remarks*, it appears that Marvell did check Thomas Danson's quotations from William Twisse and John Strangius to see if they were fairly cited. Both Strangius's *De voluntate actionibus dei circa peccatum* (Amsterdam, 1657) and Twisse's *Vindiciae gratiae, potestatis ac providentiae dei* (1632) were in Anglesey's library (p. 9, nos. 214 and 220). And Anglesey possessed the source of Marvell's long, hilarious, if doubly cruel comparison between Danson and a camel, a camel that has been taught to dance by heating the pavement under its feet. The source was Topsell's *History of four-footed beasts*, of which Anglesey possessed the 1607 edition (p. 25, no. 54).[57]

And then, for a conclusion, we should note that Anglesey not only owned both parts of *The rehearsal transpros'd*, but also three copies of *Mr. Smirke* (p. 60, bundle no. 46, and p. 61, bundles nos. 55 and 59). Another interesting bundle of tracts (p. 62, no. 65) contained 'Account of the Growth of Popery both parts, 1677, –82 … Growth of Knavery'; that is to say, Marvell's own pamphlet, its sequel, probably by Robert Ferguson under the pseudonym of Philo-Veritas, and Sir Roger L'Estrange's infuriated and shrewd response to the *Account*. (Of these, Marvell's *Account* and Ferguson's sequel were struck out of the bundle before it was sold to a Mr Squibb for seven shillings.)One cannot draw as much significance from these Marvelliana in Anglesey's huge collection as one can from their appearance in Locke's library; but, taken together with the preceding evidence of what looks like traffic between them, it might be the basis of more research into their relationship. If there was a friendship, it began late. In March 1670, Marvell described both Anglesey and Shaftesbury drily to his nephew William Popple as men 'who study and know their Interests as well as any Gentlemen at Court'.[58] Two years later he must have taken a different

[57] Pending the appearance of the Yale *Prose works of Andrew Marvell*, the details of Marvell's reading in his later tracts can only be described here, without specific references.

[58] Marvell, *Poems and letters*, II, p. 315.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press

view of Anglesey, who by then was protecting him and his bookseller. But their temporary allegiance might have come under stress when Marvell revealed in the *Account of the growth of popery* that his own tolerationist programme did not, as did Anglesey's, extend to protecting Roman Catholics. In his *Memoirs*, Anglesey ironically congratulates Sir Peter Pett for having tried to assist the English Catholics by citing 'the testimony of an adversary, I mean of Marvil, in his growth of Popery' (p. 110).[59] And Marvell did not live to see Anglesey's turn, after his loss of the place of Privy Seal and his experience of the trials and execution of the Rye House conspirators, to something that looks very like oppositional Whig behaviour;[60] or, at least, very like Marvell.

[59] The context was Marvell's ironic admission that the Fire of London had been set, not by any English Catholic, but by two Frenchmen; which 'is not to be attributed to the good Nature or better Principles of that Sect, but to the Wisdom of [the Pope], who observes that we are not of late so dangerous Protestants as to deserve any special Mark of his Indignation'. Cited from Pett's *Future happy state*, p. 180, which seems to be oblivious to the danger of Marvell's way of putting things.

[60] For this phase, see Greene, 'Anglesey', pp. 250–71.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X01001984 Published online by Cambridge University Press