

# Introduction: remapping early modern literature

This book is about the relation between political instability and imaginative writing in seventeenth-century England. It centres on the fifty years between the armed invasion of England by Scots forces in 1639 and by the Dutch in 1688–89, clashes that may be seen as tipping points in the history of what contemporaries referred to as ‘England’s troubles’.<sup>1</sup> More broadly, these decades are situated in the context of a ‘long’ seventeenth century, characterised by a fluid set of continuities and discontinuities between the earlier and later Stuart eras, which is to say, between the Renaissance and what we have come to think of as ‘modernity’. My study thus dispenses with the notion of 1660 as historical watershed, in consequence of which the Stuart Restoration and its cultural regimes have been co-opted, under the pressure of teleology, as the opening act of a ‘long eighteenth century’.

A further aim of the book is to loosen the grip of adversary politics on the study of seventeenth-century writing. The genealogy of this literature’s adversarial image is distinguished indeed: it was none other than John Dryden who observed, addressing readers of *Absalom and Achitophel* (1681), that ‘*he who draws his Pen for one Party, must expect to make Enemies of the other. For Wit and Fool, are Consequents of Whig and Tory: And every man is a Knave or an Ass to the contrary side*’ (*Works*, 2:3). What Dryden’s own career amply illustrates, however, is how labile were the terms of personal identity and allegiance in the face of unstable cultural and political orders. Dryden’s brief service to Oliver Cromwell and the Protectoral government was no unfit apprenticeship, as it turned out, for the role of Stuart laureate; and we do well to remember that only five years before Dryden

sang hosanna to James II and the Roman faith in *The Hind and the Panther* (1687), he obligingly celebrated the ‘*Supernatural Light*’ gracing Charles II’s church.

Notwithstanding the self-contradiction and provisionality patent in such shape-shifting – and Dryden was hardly singular in this regard, as the examples of that ‘chameleon’ Andrew Marvell, that ‘serial turncoat’ Marchamont Nedham, or the suave opportunist Edmund Waller readily suggest – accounts of seventeenth-century literature continue to be hung (one might say hung up) on oppositional frameworks.<sup>2</sup> It is true that whereas our histories once baldly juxtaposed ‘Puritan and Cavalier’, we now possess more modulated studies, for instance, of ‘the writing of the English republic’ and ‘the writing of royalism’.<sup>3</sup> Drawing their evidence from broadsides, newsbooks, diaries, and correspondence as well as from more traditional literary sources, such projects clearly entail a radically revised notion of ‘literature’ than was current a generation or two ago. We may wonder though how far they entail a re-conceived notion of politics or partisanship, to say nothing of literary period.

*Aesthetics of Contingency* thus argues the need for a greater responsiveness to what Lori Anne Ferrell terms ‘seventeenth-century England’s culture of “inexactness”’, in other words, to accident, to unevenness, to contradiction and uncertainty.<sup>4</sup> I am also concerned with the relation between aesthetic production and the material circumstances of writing and publishing, of reading and reception. Movement between and across borders is at the centre of my story: eschewing umbrella terms and convenient binaries, this study is drawn instead to the vexed interstices of political formations, spiritual identities, and literary networks.

In pursuing its argument, the book moves through a series of case studies, largely focused on major writers of the period: from John Milton and Thomas Browne, who saw their writings of the 1620s and 1630s published amidst the turmoil of civil war; to Andrew Marvell, Lord Rochester, and John Dryden, whose works and careers were variously in dialogue with one another – and with Milton – from the late 1640s down to the turn of the century. The advantage of this approach is that it permits a robust dialectic between sustained attention to literary form on the one hand and to historical and material context on the other. Thus close reading puts pressure on unduly determinist contextual frameworks, while the effort of

contextualising anew illuminates previously ignored or underexplored aspects of writing and reception. Because I am interested in how the history of seventeenth-century literature has been written, that is, in questions of literary historiography that date to the seventeenth century itself, this constellation of writers also has the benefit of allowing me to unravel that history over the *longue durée*. As a result, however, voices which have more recently, and rightly, garnered the attention of early modern scholars are not represented here to the extent they deserve. To be sure, the aesthetics of contingency comprise aspects of gender, of race, and of geography – both British and trans-Atlantic – which the present study perforce can only glance at: the best success the book can hope for is to set a course for future work that will encompass even more of the century's heterogeneous richness.

My point of departure in these pages is the revolution that has taken place in seventeenth-century historiography over the last several decades. 'Revisionism', as it came to be called, took shape in the early 1970s as 'a series of negative propositions' aimed at prevailing assumptions about the nature and causes of the English civil war.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps chief among these was the supposition that there were two sides to every division and that change necessarily took place through the clash of opposites.<sup>6</sup> In demolishing the familiar polarities of Whig and Marxist historiography, Revisionists suggested a jarringly new conception of the seventeenth century. Rather than assuming the inevitability of conflict between king and Parliament, the new generation of historians 'stressed the consensual rather than conflictual nature of early modern society, pointing to the contingent rather than determined nature of serial events'.<sup>7</sup> The clash of principles and ideals unleashed in the wake of 1642, moreover, could no longer be plotted along the twin axes of conservatives and radicals, as Revisionists showed that political actors both individual and collective behaved in ways far more unpredictable than previously assumed.

In the years since its initial assault on traditional historiography, the Revisionist programme has been widely extended and critiqued. If the 'post-Revisionist' landscape – itself a fluid and contested construct<sup>8</sup> – does not quite amount to the whitewashing of the old canvas anticipated by Kevin Sharpe in 1978, nevertheless much that we once thought we knew about the English past has been called into doubt and considered anew.<sup>9</sup> Master narratives of constitutional conflict and class struggle have shattered into a 'multiplicity of such narratives, the

relations between which are held to be contingent and not ordered in some pre-ordained way', which amounts to nothing less than a full-scale reimagining of early modern political culture, and of the panoply of acts, affects, and discourses that culture comprised.<sup>10</sup> Nor is it merely the civil war decades that have come in for re-examination, as historians have begun to recognise that any 'adequate account' of what the causes of the English civil war *caused*, 'of where they went or led, must ... encompass the long seventeenth century'. Just where the goalposts of this 'long' seventeenth century are to be set depends on the specific changes over time we wish to measure: from Agincourt to Blenheim, as the editorial team of Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake suggests, if we are interested in the 'functional breakdown of Stuart government' and the 'military revolution'; from Lollardy to Toleration, or from the Reformation to the Convocation Controversy, if we mean to 'trace the impact of religious pluralism and confessional conflict on a religio-political culture obsessed with the need for unity and consensus'.<sup>11</sup> Post-Revisionist historiography thus challenges students of the early modern period to view the seventeenth century no longer in terms of ineluctable, dialectical struggle, but rather as an interlocking series of complex, uneven, and open-ended historical processes.

This is not to forget that the Restoration was brought about in part by Charles's proclamation from Breda of indemnity and oblivion 'for all our subjects, how faulty soever', or celebrated by its poets and propagandists as a new age, a new order.<sup>12</sup> Such histories of course served a purpose – to erase the past and present a clean slate, to assuage the anxiety and insecurity latent in memories of the New Model Army or the king's bleeding head. As post-Freudian subjects, it is easy enough to argue that such systematic efforts to shape public memory only confirm the past's uncomfortable endurance. But we hardly need Freud to understand this. Marvell seems to have grasped perfectly well the return of the repressed in imagining Charles II haunted by the ghosts 'Of grandsire *Harry* and of *Charles* his sire':

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

(*The Last Instructions to a Painter*, lines 870–4)

To take a different kind of example, we might recall that – with the public theatres closed by order of Parliament throughout the civil wars and Interregnum – Restoration theatre impresarios had to rely initially on pre-war material to stage productions. Indeed, two seasons in, records still show ‘only 4 new plays being performed, as opposed to 54 written before the Interregnum’.<sup>13</sup> From the 1667–68 season, according to Michael Dobson, the ratio of premieres and productions of post-Restoration drama relative to revivals of pre-war plays stabilises at roughly one to one. It is perhaps little wonder then that Restoration subjects tended to greet crisis and calamity with cries of ‘Forty-One is come again’: for theatre-goers at least, the experience of *déjà vu* was a deeply familiar one.

Such circumstances have prompted Jonathan Scott to comment, ‘It appears to be only historians who remain dramatically separated by the interregnum; and only this can account for the remarkable persistence in Restoration histories of claims to uniqueness for events, structures, and issues which are almost xerox copies of events, structures, and issues of the early Stuart period’.<sup>14</sup> In the two decades since Scott was writing, however, a raft of new historical work on the Restoration, and more broadly on the Stuart century, has done much to bridge the previously stark historiographical borders of 1642, 1660, and 1688. Indeed, at the farthest edge of Revisionism, J. C. D. Clark has argued for the persistence of an ‘ancien regime’ in England all the way up to the Reform Act of 1832.<sup>15</sup> The historiographical boundaries of Renaissance literature, and indeed of English studies as a whole, by contrast, look much as they did a century or more ago. As Ted Underwood’s recent book underscores:

Periodization has endured in a discipline where almost nothing does, and has endured not just in broad outline but in detail ... Of course, the content of [English] courses was transformed whenever one methodology gave way to another. Different theoretical schools have defined the purpose of literary study in fundamentally different ways. But this is just what seems remarkable: the persistence of an organizing grid that is able to survive repeated, sweeping transformations of its content.<sup>16</sup>

This Introduction thus has several connected aims. First, I survey the writing of English cultural and political history from

the Victorians down to the 1960s. My concern here is to map the overlapping and mutually reinforcing disciplinary orthodoxies that long combined to produce an image of the seventeenth century saturated by high-definition contrasts: between the earlier and later Stuart periods, but also between factions and ideologies. I then consider more recent manifestations of historicist criticism within the field of Renaissance studies, asking why such criticism should have done so little to alter the received literary historical narrative – especially at a time when political historiography was being transformed by energies deeply suspicious of tradition. I am especially interested here in the Revisionist challenge to modernisation motifs, to teleological narrative, and, in the words of Sharpe and Lake, ‘what one might term a principle-centred account of the politics of the period, in which political ideas and groupings fell more or less tidily into various bi-polar categories’.<sup>17</sup> Accordingly, I bring the Introduction to a close by suggesting how the insights of Revisionism might reorient us to the politics and poetics of seventeenth-century literature, and so allow us to write the history of that literature anew.

### **English politics and culture: from Macaulay to Eliot**

The natural starting point for a discussion of seventeenth-century historiography is surely Lord Macaulay, Whig politician, historian, and litterateur, and common ancestor of modern English political and cultural history. Macaulay’s *History of England from the Accession of James II* (1849–61), in the words of Hugh Trevor-Roper, ‘won an instant and seemingly effortless success’, and so became the standard history of England for the nineteenth century.<sup>18</sup> What is more, it installed a triumphalist faith in progress and constitutionalism – what Herbert Butterfield identified as ‘the Whig interpretation of history’<sup>19</sup> – at the centre of English historical writing for at least a century to come. Macaulay’s judgements of cultural phenomena were equally shaped by his Whig stance, and received and repeated with equal conviction. Indeed, it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that Macaulay’s picture of seventeenth-century literature and culture persisted more or less intact until the 1960s, and continues to influence our thinking.

Macaulay hails 1660 as a new dawn, bringing with it ‘the restoration of the old constitution’, and emancipating ‘thousands of minds

from a yoke which had become insupportable'.<sup>20</sup> The 'revenge' of wit upon Puritan austerity and censoriousness, however, Macaulay finds to have been intolerably extreme, giving rise to a polite culture he deems 'profoundly immoral':

The hostility excited by a grotesque caricature of virtue did not spare virtue herself. Whatever the canting Roundhead had regarded with reverence was insulted. Whatever he had proscribed was favoured. Because he had been scrupulous about trifles, all scruples were treated with derision. Because he had covered his failings with the mask of devotion, men were encouraged to obtrude with Cynic impudence all their most scandalous vices on the public eye. Because he had punished illicit love with barbarous severity, virgin purity and conjugal fidelity were made a jest. To that sanctimonious jargon which was his Shibboleth, was opposed another jargon not less absurd and much more odious. As he never opened his mouth except in scriptural phrase, the new breed of wits and fine gentlemen never opened their mouths without uttering ribaldry of which a porter would now be ashamed, and without calling on their Maker to curse them, sink them, confound them, blast them, and damn them.<sup>21</sup>

Against the heat and viciousness of poetry and the theatre, Macaulay counterposes the cool element of prose, and the rise of the 'new philosophy', destined, under the auspices of the Royal Society, 'to be a chief agent in a long series of glorious and salutary reforms'.<sup>22</sup> With the benefit of Macaulay's early *Edinburgh Review* essay on Milton (1825), we can view this set of transactions between the arts and sciences as the inevitable cost of progress: 'We think', Macaulay posits, 'that as civilisation advances, poetry almost necessarily declines', for language, 'the machine of the poet, is best fitted for him in its rudest state'. The 'most wonderful and splendid proof of' Milton's genius is thus, in a pleasing paradox, that he produced his great poem 'in a civilised age'.<sup>23</sup> These, then, are the signs of Victorian and early twentieth-century historiography: an insistence on 1660 as cultural turning point; a clash of opposites as the mechanism of change; the reprobation of Cavalier license and licentiousness; and the embrace of those elements of the Restoration implicated in the rise of science, rationality, and, broadly speaking, modernity.

Thus for Edmund Gosse, the Restoration stands out for the singular sharpness of its division of one age from another: 'when Monk went down to Dover to welcome the agitated and astonished Charles',

we read in his *Short History of Modern English Literature* (1897), 'it was not monarchy only that he received into England, but a fresh era in literature and the arts'.<sup>24</sup> W. V. Moody and R. M. Lovett's popular textbook *A History of English Literature* (1902) tells much the same story. For them, too, 'The date of 1660 is one of the most significant in English literature, as it is in the history of English politics'. Like Macaulay, they see Restoration literature and culture as a direct reaction – indeed overreaction – to what they call the Puritans' 'absorption in otherworldliness'.<sup>25</sup> R. H. Fletcher's 1916 *A History of English Literature*, to take one last example, displays with especial ferocity Macaulay's moral repugnance for the manners of the restored court, calling the reign of Charles II 'in almost all respects the most disgraceful period of English history and life'.<sup>26</sup> Fletcher reads Restoration literature accordingly, as a direct flight not only from 'the moral severity of the ... Puritan regime', but indeed from any 'imaginative treatment of the spiritual life'.<sup>27</sup> In this desert of psychological inwardness and cultural elevation, 'the rationalistic and practical spirit showed itself in the enthroning above everything else of the principles of utility and common sense in substance and straightforward directness in style'.<sup>28</sup> What goes missing in this curiously antagonistic survey of the later Stuart period is the compensatory discovery, found in otherwise similar accounts, of signs of modern 'progress'. Rather, the English Renaissance is, to Fletcher's mind, something like a paradise lost, and modernity – notwithstanding the railroad or the Victorian sonnet – merely the condition of life after the fall.

If this sounds reminiscent of the nostalgia for an 'organic society' found in the likes of T. S. Eliot and his disciple F. R. Leavis, it is no coincidence. In 1956 the eminent literary historian Rene Wellek called Eliot 'by far the most important critic of the twentieth century in the English-speaking world',<sup>29</sup> and it is surely Eliot's theory of the 'dissociation of sensibility', more than anything else, that has determined the shape of seventeenth-century literary history – indeed of English literary history *tout court* – in the modern era. At the same time, as Eliot's commentators have observed, one of Eliot's major talents was the ability to give received prejudices an oracular turn, to infuse the commonplace with an aura of vatic insight.<sup>30</sup> Indeed, Christopher Benfey, reviewing a volume of Eliot's letters, teases out a suggestive parallel between a stray remark of Eliot's about Donne and Eliot's

own habit of repurposing what lay near to hand: 'It seemed as if, at that time, the world was filled with broken fragments of systems', writes Eliot, 'and that a man like Donne merely picked up, like a magpie, various shining fragments of ideas as they struck his eye, and stuck them about here and there in his verse'.<sup>31</sup> So while it may be the case, as Frank Kermode reflected, that the post-Eliot generation grew up 'believing in a pattern, applicable not only to poetry but to intellectual history, formed and codified by the expression "dissociation of sensibility"', it is nonetheless possible to see Eliot's version of literary history as in effect a polemical reinscription of Victorian historiography: it is Whig history produced in the grip of modernist disenchantment.<sup>32</sup>

The dissociation of sensibility, Eliot wrote, was 'something which happened to the mind of England'.<sup>33</sup> While Eliot is guardedly coy, in 'The Metaphysical Poets' (1921), about the historical forces precipitating this traumatic cleavage of thought and feeling in English poetry, he would later be brought to admit 'that it had something to do with the Civil War', or if it were 'unwise to say it was caused by the Civil War', then 'it is a consequence of the same causes which brought about the Civil War'.<sup>34</sup> By looking to Eliot's social and political writings, however, we can discover the name of that rough beast slouching to be born in seventeenth-century England: it is Liberalism, the religion of 'progress', whose slogans of constitutionalism, economic freedom, and toleration are deflated in *The Idea of a Christian Society* (1939) into a formula for 'inevitable doom'.<sup>35</sup>

'We have been accustomed to regard "progress" as always integral', Eliot writes, 'and have yet to learn that it is only by an effort and a discipline, greater than society has yet seen the need of imposing upon itself, that material knowledge and power is gained without loss of spiritual knowledge and power'.<sup>36</sup> Such thinking goes some way toward contextualising Eliot's wider conservatism – 'classicist in literature, royalist in politics, and anglo-catholic in religion' – as well as the particular idealisation of late medieval Christendom within his literary historical vision.<sup>37</sup> Since, to Eliot's way of thinking, 'the culture of a people' may be regarded 'as an *incarnation* of its religion',<sup>38</sup> the supposed homogeneity of Christian society before the schisms of Reformation and Revolution thus provided a perfectly unified interpretive community, as that concept would later be theorised by Stanley Fish: 'a structure of interests and understood goals, a structure

whose categories so filled ... individual consciousnesses that they were rendered as one, immediately investing phenomena with the significance they must have'.<sup>39</sup>

Eliot's myth of cultural decline is a powerful one, all the more so in that it leaves very much intact the basic plot of the story Eliot means to dislodge, the myth of Whig-Liberal progress: both draw a red line in the mid seventeenth century, and both centre on a dialectic between 'tradition' and 'dissent', though the passions and implicit teleologies are reversed. Even Macaulay, though, seems doubtful about the fate of literature along the advancing curve of civilisation, for, he supposed, the changing nature of 'intellectual operations' in an 'enlightened society' is a 'change by which science wins and poetry loses'.<sup>40</sup> In the 1920s and 1930s, Eliot's views were disseminated in the extraordinarily influential work of Leavis and his *Scrutiny* circle.<sup>41</sup> As Bernard Bergonzi has argued, *Revaluation* (1936), together with *New Bearings in English Poetry* (1932), 'contain a firm redrawing of the map of English poetry along Eliotic lines'.<sup>42</sup> Despite Eliot's ambivalence toward what he called 'the lemon-squeezer school of criticism', he was also seen as a prime mover among the New Critics, whose tastes defined the English curriculum for several generations of American college teachers and their students.<sup>43</sup> By mid-century, the 'dissociation of sensibility' had been subject to sufficient scrutiny that Kermode could pronounce it 'absolutely useless historically'.<sup>44</sup> But it had already done its work, insinuating itself into the central nervous system of the emergent literary profession. Indeed, while Eliot's formula may have assumed the status of a fossil in the history of criticism, its logic is nonetheless pervasive, and may still be detected in the practice and organisation of literary scholarship at every level, from the Norton Anthology to the divisions of the Modern Language Association.<sup>45</sup>

### **From Renaissance to early modern**

The field of literary studies has of course hardly stood still since the middle of the last century. In North America, New Critical formalism eventually gave way to – or found radical new expression in – the 'linguistic turn' of the 1960s, or what Gabrielle Spiegel referred to as the 'literary phase in the reception of French theory'.<sup>46</sup> This emphasis on semiotics was partly deflected and partly absorbed by the succeeding

'historical turn' of the early 1980s.<sup>47</sup> Since then, historicism has remained the dominant paradigm within much of the literary profession, and certainly the Renaissance period, though as Ann Baynes Coiro and Thomas Fulton note, 'the term "historicism" is capacious, and many varieties of historicist work are now flourishing'.<sup>48</sup>

At the root of this 'turn', however, are American New Historicism and its British cognate Cultural Materialism, which sought to challenge both 'the dominant historical scholarship of the past (in Renaissance Studies) and the formalist criticism that partially displaced this scholarship after World War Two'.<sup>49</sup> Whereas formalist critics had, it was said, insisted that literary works of art were essentially 'verbal icons', transcendent of historical contingency, New Historicism, Louis Montrose explained, asserts 'the cultural specificity, the social embedment, of all modes of writing'.<sup>50</sup> And whereas old historicists had construed history as a monological and homogeneous 'background' against which literature could be securely read, New Historicism suspected such practices of misrecognising 'political commonplaces' as 'a stable, coherent, and collective ... world picture, a picture discovered to be lucidly reproduced in works of the age'.<sup>51</sup> The New Historicism would seem to have been ideally positioned, in that case, to rethink the mythopoeic framework underlying Eliot's literary history, insofar as we can regard Eliot as a formalist and an old historicist both. In fact, as Aranye Fradenburg argues, 'it did nothing to disturb the conventional periodization of English history'.<sup>52</sup> It is worth trying to understand why this is so, as it may help us take a step 'beyond' New Historicism, and toward a reconciliation with Revisionist hypotheses about the shape of the past and in particular the seventeenth century.

To be sure, 'redrawing the boundaries' of English and American studies, to recall the title of a volume co-edited by Stephen Greenblatt, was absolutely thematic to the New Historicism's disciplinary insurgency.<sup>53</sup> Indeed, one of the key battles within the New Historicism's sphere of origin, Renaissance studies, concerned the very nomenclature and conceptual parameters of that field: in place of a 'Renaissance' period, trailing the baggage of a hierarchical agenda and an overt triumphalism, New Historicists urged the use of 'early modern', a term whose entailments were arguably more democratic and more wary.<sup>54</sup> And with respect to the *textual* boundaries that had for so long defined Renaissance scholarship, it must be said that the

New Historicist intervention was a remarkable success. Together with other critical approaches concerned with relations of social power – notably feminism and post-colonialism – New Historicism helped achieve a lasting change of focus, opening criticism ‘to different kinds of voices and different kinds of texts from those traditionally considered the objects of literary analysis’.<sup>55</sup> Reconfiguring the canon in this way drastically transformed what we think of as Renaissance or early modern literature and indeed Renaissance or early modern literary studies.<sup>56</sup>

But what did New Historicism do for the notion of *when* we think of as early modern literature? In what has been called the ‘*locus classicus*’ for use of the term ‘early modern’,<sup>57</sup> Leah Marcus suggests that ‘Both *Renaissance* and *early modern* are chronologically shifty’.<sup>58</sup> ‘While the boundaries of the Renaissance tend to push toward earlier and earlier chronological beginnings’, she writes, ‘early modern tends to creep up on the present’:

In the field of history ... [early modernity] ends with the close of the eighteenth century; modern history begins roughly with the start of the nineteenth. When adopted by literary scholars, however, the term *early modern* designates a time period that usually ends in the late seventeenth century or the first half of the eighteenth – more than a century before the beginnings of literary modernism, in the twentieth century.<sup>59</sup>

Granted, Marcus is here making a broad, theoretical generalisation. But surely there is a discrepancy between the period Marcus claims ‘early modern’ *designates* and that defined by the frames of reference in signal works of New Historicism. Surveying the titles published by an informal nucleus of critics associated with the New Historicism and Cultural Materialism between c. 1980 and the turn of the millennium, what we find is that the Interregnum is no less an impassable Rubicon for these scholars than it was for earlier Renaissancists.<sup>60</sup> Marcus’s ‘new’ historicists are, first and foremost, Shakespeareans, with interests that widen out into non-Shakespearean drama, early seventeenth-century poetry, and the Jacobean masque, subjects that would not be out of place in *The Sacred Wood* (1920). While the synchronic richness of these books – their ranging across the strata of high and low culture, the literary and the non-literary – is genuinely pathbreaking, their

diachronic range seems altogether conventional. The new 'early modern' period looks rather like the old 'Renaissance'.

There are several reasons we could give for why the New Historicism ultimately reproduces the calendar and divisions of old literary history. For one, it seems clear that New Historicism, as a practice, chimed more strongly with certain authors, and with certain cultural moments, than with others. In Shakespeare, New Historicism found its ideal object of cathexis; as has often been observed, it achieved little purchase with Milton. New Historicism's Foucauldian understanding of discursive formations as effects of the circulation of social power melded productively with an author like Shakespeare, about whose intentions we know vanishingly little: in place of the familiar image of the Bard as supreme imitator of nature, New Historicists were able to fashion Shakespeare as the avatar of a 'poetics of culture'.<sup>61</sup> Milton, however – such an outsize and ineradicable presence in his texts, so biographically ample – proved a different story. Indeed, in the essay that follows Leah Marcus's in *Redrawing the Boundaries*, William Kerrigan flatly denies New Historical innovation any lasting significance, characterising the movement's 'advances' from the position of the disinterested Miltonist, loftily above the fray of critical fad and fashion. 'That new historicism enjoys its greatest prestige in Shakespeare studies, and can claim scant impact on Milton studies', Kerrigan writes, 'may reflect longstanding differences between the two disciplines':

Every intellectual fashion of the last 250 years has left its mark on Shakespeare studies. New historicism has been able to absorb some of the more congenial achievements of thriving traditions of psychoanalytic, Marxist, Christian, and feminist interpretation. Yet during my professional lifetime, and no doubt before, the study of Shakespeare has seemed gloriously out of control. The deep and irresolvable uncertainties that beset both the author and his texts turn out to inspire rather than restrain the critical imagination ... Milton studies, by contrast, is more disciplined, more unanimous, just as Milton himself, unlike Shakespeare, was so careful to correct his texts and so abidingly conscious of recording his own development.<sup>62</sup>

Only a few years before, Stanley Fish had said much the same thing, casting Milton as a figure bound to embarrass both 'high theory' and 'the New or Newer Historicism'.<sup>63</sup>

But there is more to this story than the outsize effect of the Shakespeare and Milton industries on the literary historical landscape, though that effect is real enough. We can also observe, more generally, a telescoping of historical perspective entailed by the conceptual shift from 'Renaissance' to 'early modern'. As Marcus explains:

What is termed *early modern* seems almost inevitably to take on some of the aura of twentieth-century modernism to the eclipse of temporal and intellectual categories in between (the Age of Enlightenment, the Romantics, and, in England, the Victorians). To look at the Renaissance through a lens called early modern is to see the concerns of modernism and postmodernism in embryo – alienation, a disjunction from origins, profound skepticism about the possibility for objectivity (in literary studies or anywhere else), an emphasis on textual indeterminacy as opposed to textual closure and stability, and an interest in intertextuality instead of filiation.<sup>64</sup>

This passage disarmingly confesses to the implicitly teleological basis of the New Historicism's vision of history, in acknowledging how the thrust of 'early modern' lends itself to marginalising or downplaying those elements of the past which are not conducive to the present. And with this orientation toward the future comes a tendentious apprehension of the 'temporal and intellectual categories' constituting the past – categories which savour of Lyotard as much as they do Shakespeare or Montaigne.

Much as Eliot had connected his own modernism to metaphysical poetry, in other words, Marcus's anatomy of 'early modern' connects the postmodern condition of Reagan-era New Historicists to Renaissance 'alienation', 'disjunction from origins', and epistemological scepticism. The Restoration and eighteenth century are thus 'eclipsed', in this account of New Historicism's relation to literary period, presumably because the resettling of the monarchy in 1660 represents a counter to the open question of Elizabeth's succession and the political experiments of mid-century; the rise of the Royal Society a squaring of the epistemological accounts thrown into disorder by the Reformation and Renaissance; the closed couplets of Dryden and Pope a turning away from Shakespeare's vertiginous blank verse. We may be struck by the ingenuity of New Historicism's cracking of the 'Elizabethan world picture': but what perhaps astonishes more is the extent to which its 'counter-history' of

the English Renaissance appears to depend on recirculating other – monological, homogenising – historical clichés. This is too bad, for in the Restoration, Greenblatt & co. might have found much to interest them, might, indeed, have made some ‘new’ history.<sup>65</sup> For as much as the problems of Charles II – insufficient revenues, divisions within the church, a less than compliant Parliament – in many ways recapitulated those faced by his father, the central crisis of restored Stuart rule, a monarch without heritable issue, surely hewed most closely to an Elizabethan script. And was there ever an age more obsessed by images and representations than the Restoration? Or a cultural moment more illustrative of their potency than that of the ‘horrid Popish plot’?<sup>66</sup>

Of course, even at the zenith of its disciplinary cachet in the 1980s, New Historicism was not without its challengers; indeed, it was not even the only ‘new’ historicism to be galvanised in that decade. As I have written elsewhere at greater length, rather than taking Foucault and the poststructuralists as their leading lights, a rival network of British and American scholars interested in forging connections between literature and history looked instead to the Cambridge historians John Pocock and Quentin Skinner.<sup>67</sup> Themselves much influenced by the speech-act theory of J. L. Austin – especially Skinner – the ‘Cambridge School’ revolutionised the study of intellectual history by emphasising the primacy of contemporary discursive contexts in giving shape and force to political thought.<sup>68</sup> More positivist and intentionalist in orientation than Foucauldian discourse analysis, Cambridge historicism provided a powerful methodological tool to critics who were more interested in the ‘efficacy of words’, to borrow a Miltonic phrase, than in the endlessly recursive play of subversion and containment. And indeed it is with Milton studies rather than Shakespeare that this version of historical scholarship has come to be perhaps most powerfully and prestigiously associated, in the work, for instance, of figures like Sharon Achinstein, Thomas Corns, Martin Dzelzainis, David Norbrook, Annabel Patterson, Nigel Smith, and the historian Blair Worden.

Important books by these and other critics working in the same milieu not only deploy a highly sophisticated historiographical awareness but seek an audience more or less equally among historians and students of literature. In the Afterword to the 2002 reissue of his *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (1984),

Norbrook somewhat ruefully remarks that ‘Some literary scholars, indeed, have assumed that I actually am a historian by training’, a perception ‘not always taken as a positive feature’.<sup>69</sup> Norbrook’s two major studies, *Poetry and Politics* and *Writing the English Republic*, are tours de force of contextual reading, superbly attuned to the ambivalence and multivocality of seventeenth-century political discourse. Yet his investments as a critic are unmistakably republican and Whiggish, and notwithstanding his celebration in *Poetry and Politics* of ‘the immense imaginative and political openness of the period’s poetic texts’, Norbrook’s analytic is locked into an agon with Eliot’s royalist version of seventeenth-century literary history, setting Norbrook’s canon of Spenserian saints against the traditional cast of Donne, Jonson, and Herbert. Smith’s ground-breaking *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660* (1994) reinvigorated our sense of civil war literature and went beyond Norbrook in giving ‘a cross-cultural perspective’ of the period.<sup>70</sup> At the same time that it countenanced some of the historical claims of Revisionism, however, *Literature and Revolution* reinstalled the cataclysm of civil war within what Smith called ‘the world of words, which is where’, he argued, ‘the impact of the crisis was most strongly registered’.<sup>71</sup> The political historian’s loss was to be the cultural historian’s gain. Indeed, despite giving the appearance at times of being a reviser herself, by the turn of the millennium Annabel Patterson was proclaiming what she called ‘a new Whig interpretation of history’.<sup>72</sup>

The marginalisation of Revisionism in the context of early modern literary studies – from the New Historicism to ‘post’-New-Historicism – has thus had the effect, I would argue, of decoupling literary scholarship from sweeping transformations within the historiography of the very period with which it is concerned. It is to the nature and implications of those transformations for the study of writing, politics, and culture that we now turn.

### **From Whig history to Revisionism and beyond**

Taking as his lodestones the ‘tendency toward perfection’ observable ‘in every experimental science’, and moreover the wish ‘in every human being to ameliorate his condition’, even ‘great public calamities’ and ‘bad institutions’, Macaulay thought, could little prevent civilisation from being carried rapidly forward.<sup>73</sup> What civilisation – English

civilisation, anyway – was rushing toward was, of course, the liberty and prosperity of Macaulay's own age. Ostensibly more impartial, more dedicated to archival history, more scientific and empirical than Macaulay, S. R. Gardiner was if not the most widely read then surely the most scrupulous of the great Whig historians. Indeed, it was Gardiner who famously said, no doubt with Macaulay in mind, that 'He who studies the history of the past will be of greater service to the present in proportion as he leaves [the present] out of account'.<sup>74</sup> Gardiner was nevertheless unabashed to hold that 'the Parliament of England was the noblest monument ever reared by mortal man',<sup>75</sup> and he opened his *History of the Great Civil War* by underlining 'the inadequacy of the intellectual methods of the day to effect a reconciliation between opposing moral and social forces, which derived their strength from the past development of the nation'.<sup>76</sup> For Gardiner little less than for Macaulay, then, both the civil war and its ultimate outcome in favour of 'free people and free markets' – to borrow the parlance of the neoliberal 1980s – were equally part of early modern English destiny.

In the early twentieth century, the Whig interpretation of the English revolution was gradually displaced and absorbed by histories grounded in German sociological and economic thought, namely the theories of Weber and Marx.<sup>77</sup> R. H. Tawney's classic 1926 study *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, for instance, sought to elucidate the connection between Puritan spirituality and what Tawney called 'the triumph of the economic virtues', that indispensable step toward 'political freedom and social progress'.<sup>78</sup> Whereas for the Marxist historian Christopher Hill, 'The Civil War was a class war, in which the despotism of Charles I was defended by the reactionary forces of the established Church and feudal landlords. Parliament beat the King because it could appeal to the enthusiastic support of the trading and industrial classes in town and countryside, to the yeomen and progressive gentry, and to wider masses of the population whenever they were able by free discussion to understand what the struggle was really about'.<sup>79</sup>

Without supposing Whiggery and Marxism to be the same thing, then, we may say that the dominant perspective in historiography from the 1850s down to the 1960s was one that emphasised the inevitable triumph of liberal modernity over a traditional feudal-agrarian worldview. The civil war was bound to happen, for Whig and Marxist

alike, almost as if according to a law of physics, the king's raising of his banner at Nottingham in August 1642 the direct result of long-term friction between king and Parliament; between 'Court' and 'Country'; between the established Church and Puritan zeal; between a declining aristocracy and an ascendant bourgeoisie. Moreover, the deterministic underpinnings of this interpretive model entailed the interrelation of a whole strand of identitary commitments: show me a prosperous bourgeois merchant, Whig-Marxist thinking tells us, and I'll show you a Puritan supporter of Parliament; a substantial landowner, and I'll show you a High Church royalist; the younger son of a master in Chancery, a Cavalier poet.

It is perhaps not surprising that with postmodern scepticism toward master narratives should have come an impulse to question and ultimately to explode these totalising constructs of English history. And while no doubt it was in part the intellectual atmosphere created by postmodernism that allowed Revisionism to assert itself as peremptorily as it did, in fact it was the most parochial and conventional sort of English historical research that provided the initial spark. Originally seeking to extend the theoretical Whig-Marxist view of early Stuart England to granular scale, a clutch of historians in the 1950s and 1960s began closely to examine the phenomenon of civil war allegiance in English county communities. Again and again, however, the expected linkages between socioeconomic status and partisanship eluded these county historians, making 'nonsense' of the long-standing assumption that the English revolution – if that is still the right word – necessarily arose through long-term ideological struggle.<sup>80</sup>

What emerged most significantly from the study of provincial social groupings was the extent to which local interests overrode the incipient divisions at Westminster and the claims of national politics. As Alan Everitt was among the first to argue, 'the Civil War was not simply a struggle between gallant Cavaliers and psalm-singing Roundheads. If one studies the history of any particular county community in this period, particularly if one is fortunate enough to find an extensive *corpus* of family correspondence, one finds that only a small minority of provincial gentry can be exactly classified in either of these conventional categories'. 'This does not mean', he goes on to say, 'that most English people were indifferent to the political problems of the time, but that their loyalties were polarised around

different ideals. For them bounded as they so often were by local horizons, a more urgent problem was the conflict between loyalty to nation and loyalty to the county community. This division cuts across the conventional divisions, like a geological fault'.<sup>81</sup>

If the study of county communities provided a Revisionist challenge from below, as it were, from the contingency of local social bonds, C. S. R. Russell would open the assault on historical orthodoxy from above, focusing his attention on the nature of Parliaments in early Stuart England. Russell's 1976 essay, 'Parliamentary history in perspective, 1604–1629',<sup>82</sup> Kevin Sharpe commented retrospectively, 'exploded a bomb under the edifice of the English past'. 'Seventeenth century parliaments were not', as Russell saw it, 'seeking more power at the expense of the Crown, the Civil War was not the inevitable outcome of a long constitutional struggle, and the story of English history is not that of the inexorable development of parliamentary sovereignty'.<sup>83</sup> Deliberately stressing the point that Parliament in early modern England was not an institution but an event, that it met at the pleasure of the king in order to conduct the king's business, Russell zeroed in on parliamentary attempts to force its will on the crown by withholding supply, virtually Parliament's only means of exerting leverage. Rather than a seizing of the initiative, what Russell found in his study of Stuart Parliaments was that the Commons in fact used this power little, and when they did, did so ineffectively. Indeed, far from demonstrating an ability 'to sustain a constitutional struggle with the Crown, the frustrated efforts of parliamentary leaders to limit the king's prerogative seemed to contemporaries to cast doubt on Parliament's very survival'.<sup>84</sup>

Nor is it accurate, Russell maintained, to see such efforts in ideological terms, that is, as symbolising a unified opposition in Parliament to governmental policy. While there were, of course, disagreements over policy, those disagreements cut across Parliament and Privy Council alike. 'On none of the great questions of the day', Russell surmised, 'did Parliamentary leaders hold any opinions not shared by members of the Council'.<sup>85</sup> Moreover, MPs were often caught between their duty to the crown and duty to their provincial constituencies, which would bear the burden of any extraordinary tax or supply voted by Parliament. The Commons' sporadic intransigence toward the king's fiscal demands – and both James and Charles were beset with budgetary shortfalls as a result of inflation, inefficient

levies, and the rising cost of early modern warfare<sup>86</sup> – likely reflects, above all, considerations of local politics, as opposed to principled resistance to Stuart monarchy. Thus we hear Sir Humphrey May imploring his fellow members in 1628 with respect to supply for the Spanish war: ‘you cannot resolve too soone for ye kinge neyther can you indeede give enough. But lett our harts joyne. Let forrane states knowe wee are united. Wee have here in towne six embassadors and they every day aske after us.’<sup>87</sup> Such appeals inform Russell’s contention that consensus politics was the order of the day in early Stuart England, certainly in the 1620s, perhaps even to the brink of civil war. Indeed, ‘the bulk of the evidence’, Russell asserted in introducing an early collection of Revisionist essays, ‘suggests that we are dealing [in 1642] with ... an accidental war, growing out of the panic and confusion which followed the failure of the Parliamentary leaders’ plans for a bloodless coup’. ‘If this is so’, he declared, ‘we must be looking, not for explanations of a desire for revolution, but for explanations of a state of chronic misunderstanding, terror and distrust’.<sup>88</sup>

The gauntlet of Revisionism was thus cast, and scholars on either side of the Atlantic were quick to join the fray. By the early 1980s a number of key arguments had emerged: that the revolutionaries in the first civil war were not the Puritans but in fact the Arminians, the supposedly right-wing element of the established Church (Tyacke); that adversary politics and religious and social radicalism were products of an unlooked-for clash between king and Parliament in 1642, not its antecedent cause (Kishlansky); that the crisis of Stuart government was a crisis of counsel and as such the crisis of Parliaments (Sharpe).<sup>89</sup> While, like New Historicism, more a stance than a methodological creed, ‘all versions of revisionism’, Russell lightly joked, ‘like all brands of whisky, enjoyed certain broad similarities’.<sup>90</sup> Chief among these was ‘a rejection of a dialectical framework for history’ and of historical determinism, and a corresponding commitment to viewing the seventeenth century through the eyes of contemporaries, without the distorting bias of hindsight. Revisionist narratives of the origins of the civil war thus tended to privilege short-term and contingent factors over more long-term explanations. Revisionists also restored to view and to significance the so-called ‘losers’ of the civil war – the royalist absolutists, the High Church Laudians, the Cavalier elites – doomed to obsolescence in Whig-Marxist teleologies.

If the initial phase of Revisionism was essentially sceptical and negative, more concerned with knocking down Whig-Marxist analytics than with what to put in their place, its second phase ('post-Revisionism', for lack of a better term) has been more constructive. For as Derek Hirst early observed, in a sympathetic critique of first-wave Revisionist work, 'historians who ignore what comes before and after can fall victim to a myopia as damaging as that suffered by the most teleological Whigs'.<sup>91</sup> Subsequent research has thus been more committed to developing new long-term explanatory frameworks for the problem of the civil wars, while continuing to militate against reductive dichotomies and oppositions. For the later Russell, these long-term causes included 'the problem of multiple kingdoms', that is, the tendency for political remedies in one of the Stuart kingdoms to create unrest in another; 'the problem of religious division', which of course also had a 'British' dimension; and the breakdown of a financial and political system in the face of inflation and the rising cost of war'.<sup>92</sup> In the same article cited above, Hirst also re-emphasised the 'place of principle' in the troubles of the early Stuarts, a corrective that has been widely heeded in the ongoing Revisionist debate.<sup>93</sup>

Moreover, as the scholarship of recent decades has made clear, the Restoration settlement did little to heal the conflicts made manifest by civil war. Constitutionally, the Restoration erased the parliamentary reforms forced on the king or imposed after the civil war had begun, thus resetting the institutions of government to the conditions of 1641. Through a series of bills passed by the Cavalier Parliament in the early 1660s, the Anglican Church was re-established on a footing deeply antagonistic toward Presbyterians and non-conformists, ensuring the perpetuation of religious strife. If Jonathan Scott perhaps overstates the case in seeing the Restoration's crises as 'xerox copies of events, structures, and issues of the early Stuart period', surely the fears over popery and arbitrary government that fuelled the Exclusion Crisis may remind us of the disastrous last years of Charles I's rule.<sup>94</sup> Thus to the question – 'What did the Restoration settle?' – as Tim Harris wrote in reviewing a tranche of new work at the turn of the millennium, we may answer: 'not very much'.<sup>95</sup> From a previously cloistered narrowness, the perspective of civil war historiography has in this way expanded to take in the sweep of the Stuart century. Indeed, it has become possible to imagine the causes and consequences of the civil wars as occupying an historical frame

stretching from the Reformation to the Reform Bill – a long seventeenth century to be sure!

Contingency however has retained its place in most post-Revisionist paradigms.<sup>96</sup> While long-term structural issues may account for the Stuart crisis of government, 'it can only be regarded as a coincidence', as Russell put it, 'that the crisis took the form that it did'. 'The history of the 1650's and of 1688', he observed, 'show that High Anglicanism, as well as Puritanism, was capable of becoming a revolutionary force when the weight of authority was turned against it. [Nor could one foresee] ... Charles I [choosing] to make a personal commitment to the doctrines of Arminianism', and in so doing binding himself to cast out 'most of the people in the Church of England who had done anything to capture the popular imagination'.<sup>97</sup> In other words, the arrow of history was not necessarily on the side of one or another faction or party; the putative struggle between 'conservatives' and 'radicals' belies the lability of principle and interest in revolutionary England. We are reminded as well of the uncertain and frequently unpredictable interaction between private conscience and the public sphere, and of the violent contradictions that often organise both subjectivity and the social imaginary. Thus do we discover, for instance, that scourge of Stuart absolutism, John Milton, to have been a secret sharer in Charles I's conversion to Arminianism. Thus indeed do we find that most notorious of republicans implacably sceptical of 'the people', whom he called 'an inconstant, irrational, and Image-doting rabble', 'a credulous and hapless herd, begott'n to servility'.

### **Toward a Revisionist approach to literary history**

What, then, are the implications of Revisionism for studying the literature and culture of seventeenth-century England? First, surely, is the need to situate the Restoration within a broader Stuart and civil war matrix, what I have called, following Scott, 'England's troubles'. While 1639 and 1689 are themselves arbitrary and indeterminate boundaries, the invasion of England by Scots forces at the start of the Bishops' Wars may be seen as inaugurating a period of political and cultural instability that only begins to abate with the Glorious Revolution and the establishment of a new constitution. By removing the artificial barrier of the Interregnum, by discarding the notion of a magical start date for modernity, we better position ourselves to

discern the genuine continuities and discontinuities between earlier and later Stuart England; to assess the impact of the civil wars on literary discourse and aesthetic production; and to judge accurately the course of seventeenth-century literary careers. 'Aesthetics of contingency' thus takes on a dual sense in this book. It signals at once a detuning of hindsight and determinism in the construing of seventeenth-century texts and the responsiveness of those texts to conditions of political lability and uncertainty.

The figure of Andrew Marvell brings several of these issues sharply into focus. Aptly termed 'the chameleon', Marvell seems at once to fit everywhere and nowhere in taxonomies of seventeenth-century literature, by turns a Cavalier poet, one of the sons of Ben, a belated metaphysical, and a proto-Augustan. Indeed, the problematic of labels makes itself felt in the very texture of Marvell's lyrics – lyrics which tease with topical hints and innuendoes. In poems like *The Nymph Complaining* and *The Unfortunate Lover*, critics have pulled at such threads in hopes of uncovering a coherent political allegory, of harmonising the text's floating chain of signifiers into a story of identity and allegiance. A number of critics, for instance, have tried to read *The Nymph Complaining* as a coded statement about the fate of the church and its titular head, King Charles, in the context of the English civil wars. Thus Douglas Bush, following the suggestion of Muriel Bradbrook and M. G. Lloyd Thomas, thought the poem most likely expressed 'an Anglican's grief for the stricken Church'.<sup>98</sup> As Edward Le Comte was to argue, however, 'there is much, too much, in the poem that mocks any attempt at a theological reading', or at any such through-interpretation.<sup>99</sup> Indeed, the hallmark of Marvell's politically resonant lyrics is rather their refusal of closure, their resistance to narrativisation. If there is any allegory to be uncovered in these poems, it seems to be one about the difficulty of making meaning out of these late 'storms and wars'.<sup>100</sup>

Following the Restoration, as we know, Marvell turned his talent for verse writing to the purposes of satire and abuse, a continuation of politics by other means for the poet, now a backbench MP, and something of a segue to his late turn as prose controversialist. Few contemporary students of Marvell would agree with Patrick Cruttwell, writing in 1954, that 'No poet's career provides a more striking, or more depressing, contrast than ... his real poetry and the *Satires* which were apparently his only work in verse written after the

Restoration', and yet the problem of the 'two Marvells', the lyric poet and the Restoration politician, continues to define Marvell scholarship.<sup>101</sup> Which is to say that the upsurge of interest in Marvell's politics and political writings – which began with John Wallace in the late 1960s and came into its own with the publication of the Yale prose in 2003 – has increasingly cast in the shade that body of lyric verse for which Marvell is justly celebrated. Our understanding of Marvell and of how he adapted as a writer in the face of revolution and restoration predictably suffers from this zero-sum logic, whereby sustained attention to those self-encircling verses written during the Nun Appleton period so often entails the neglect of Marvell's Restoration poetry and prose, and vice versa. For surely it is a mistake to imagine the Restoration as a kind of literary historical razor, dividing not just one period from another but indeed bisecting the poet's subjectivity, such that the author of *The Last Instructions* can be discussed almost as if philosophically distinct from the intelligence and sensibility that created, say, *The Nymph Complaining*.

'Authorial wholeness and integrity of imagination may be Enlightenment idealisms',<sup>102</sup> yet if we are able to set aside assumptions of opposition and division – between the early poet and the late, between Caroline innocence and Restoration experience – we can see that Marvell's preoccupation with external encroachments on 'the ethical subject' animates the lyrics *Eyes and Tears* and *On a Drop of Dew* no less than it does the pamphlets he wrote in the 1670s in support of religious toleration. Nor should we suppose that the sublime 'metaphysical' Marvell disappears in the context of his allegedly 'coarse', 'virulent' satires.<sup>103</sup> Rather, we find the whole moral and aesthetic plan of *The Last Instructions* to be held together by a scene of incandescent pastoral intruded amidst the poem's catalogue of vice and folly. As the slack and unprepared English fleet is being set ablaze by 'the ravisher De Ruyter', the youthful captain Archibald Douglas stoically refuses to abandon his post:

Like a glad lover, the fierce flames he meets,  
 And tries his first embraces in their sheets.  
 His shape exact, which the bright flame enfold,  
 Like the sun's statue stands of burnished gold.  
 Round the transparent fire about him flows,  
 As the clear amber on the bee does close,

And, as on angels' heads their glories shine,  
His burning locks adorn his face divine.

(lines 677–84)

Even in the apparently remote element of ecclesiastical controversy, some of Marvell's most memorable passages prove to be nothing other than the metaphysical conceit 'transpos'd'. Comparing the cottage industry of libels written against him by anti-tolerationist divines to the manufacture of glass, Marvell writes, 'The Furnace was so hot of it self, that there needed no coals, much less anyone to blow them. One burnt the Weed, another calcined the Flint, and a third melted down that mixture; but he himself [Marvell's adversary, Samuel Parker] fashion'd all with his breath, and polished with his stile, till out of a meer jelly of Sand and Ashes, he had furnish'd a whole Cupboard of things so brittle and incoherent, that the least touch would break them again in pieces, so transparent that every man might see thorow them' (*PW*, 1:249–50). One would be hard pressed to think of an argument by images more worthy of Dr Donne.

Marvell's is of course far from the only career better grasped within the arc of a long seventeenth century. A number of leading Caroline poets – Davenant, Waller, and Cowley spring chiefly to mind – survived into the Restoration and remained influential. Waller, like Marvell, was pliable enough to turn Protectoral servant and Cromwellian panegyrist, and like Marvell and Dryden he was canny enough to shrug off such dalliances as mere expedients following the return of Stuart rule. In answer to the king's surmise that Waller's verses in praise of Cromwell were superior to his own panegyric, Waller is said to have replied, 'Sir, we poets never succeed so well in writing truth as in fiction'.<sup>104</sup> Cowley's *The Mistress* (1647, 1656) was one of the most popular books of the age, and 'he received the tributes of both imitation and avowed admiration from such important poets as the earl of Rochester, John Oldham, and John Dryden, to say nothing of minor period figures whose verse is permeated by Cowley's influence'.<sup>105</sup> While Davenant's experiments of the 1650s – his incomplete epic *Gondibert* (1651), his opera *The Siege of Rhodes* (1656) – prefigured the heroic drama that would conquer the stage in the 1660s and early 1670s, to say nothing of Davenant's contribution to the development of Restoration drama as theatre manager.

But it is perhaps Milton's writings and reputation that stand to be revised most suggestively in light of changing perspectives on seventeenth-century England. It was Milton himself, of course, who first tutored us to read his early verse prophetically, through paratextual interventions like the headnote to the poet's paraphrase of Psalm 114, 'This and the following *Psalm* were don by the Author at fifteen years old', or that which prefaces *Lycidas*, indicating that the poem 'by occasion fortels the ruine of our corrupted Clergy then in their height'. Tempering the habit of Miltonists to take their poet at face value, however, a less certain revolutionary trajectory for Milton's poetics emerges. Recent scholars have paused, for instance, over Milton's eagerness to tout his connections to the court on the very title page of *Poems of Mr. John Milton*. 'At the very least', Steven Zwicker argues, the 1645 *Poems* 'must have seemed a collection of verse suspended between or among contradictory gestures – some pointing towards spiritual orthodoxy, others touched by a more militant spirit'.<sup>106</sup>

Study of the great poetry, in particular *Paradise Lost*, is equally subject to the distortions of teleology and hindsight. From one perspective, Milton's epic stands as the apotheosis of both Renaissance humanism and Milton's radical politics; from another, as the opening move of Romanticism.<sup>107</sup> What *Paradise Lost* has until recently seemed least to be is an artefact of the Restoration, despite Aubrey's testimony that Milton 'began about 2 yeares before the K. came in, and finished about 3 yeares after the K's Restauracion', the indelible fact of the poem's publication in 1667, and Milton's evident engagement with contemporary politics and poetry in explaining 'why the poem rhymes not' and indeed throughout *Paradise Lost*.<sup>108</sup> There are signs that this is changing. Peter Herman, ringleader of the 'New Milton Criticism', has urged that 'in the aftermath of the Revolution Milton engaged in a wholesale questioning of just about everything he had argued for in his prose works'. It is thus 'out of the turmoil of not knowing what to affirm in the wake of the Revolution's failure', Herman believes, 'that Milton creates his finest poetry'.<sup>109</sup> Working within the more orthodox camp of Miltonists, scholars like Nicholas von Maltzahn have done much to improve our understanding of the immediate contexts in which *Paradise Lost* was first published and read, uncovering correspondence between John Beale, FRS, and the diarist John Evelyn,

royalists both, concerning whether Milton might be gotten to write some pindarics in praise of the Royal Society – not exactly evidence of Milton's 'internal exile', wholly beyond the pale of Restoration letters or sociability.<sup>110</sup> The protocols and assumptions of more than three centuries of scholarship, however, are not lightly reversed, and much work remains to be done resituating Milton and his works within the indeterminate horizons of his own lived history.

As has been variously suggested in the course of this Introduction, revising our picture of the causes and consequences of the English civil wars also means complicating received narratives about the onset of Enlightenment and modernity. Under the influence of Elizabeth Eisenstein, we have long viewed the seventeenth century as the triumphal scene in the history of the printing press and the printed book as agents of change.<sup>111</sup> More recently, however, scholars have emphasised the influence and endurance of scribal culture throughout the Stuart era, and revealed the ways in which ideas and information flowed back and forth between print and manuscript, as well as between a literate and official discursive sphere and the vernacular margin.<sup>112</sup> In the work of Adrian Johns, the institution of print itself has been drawn into the realm of instability and incertitude, forcefully reminding us of the social and material contingencies to which early modern printing was subject, and of the fact that printed texts were by no means universally regarded as trustworthy or transparent.<sup>113</sup>

Lord Rochester – a figure of almost ubiquitous fascination in the Restoration and early eighteenth century – embodies the force of both these corrective arguments. '[T]he last poet in English whose natural medium of publication was manuscript', his canon presents a morass of attribution problems and of irresolvable textual complexity and multiplicity.<sup>114</sup> Rochester's commodification by eighteenth-century print culture if anything only ramified the fundamental uncertainty that has historically attended reading this poet: amidst a crowded field of spurious and expurgated editions, a surreptitiously printed 1761 edition of Rochester's *Poetical Works* stands out for the audacity of its fraudulence, offering for the reader's pleasure some one hundred poems, ninety-nine of which are not by Rochester.<sup>115</sup>

Johns's work follows on from that of historians of science like Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer who have questioned, in Shapin's words, whether 'there was any single coherent cultural entity called

“science” in the seventeenth century’, and thus the idea ‘that there was any singular and discrete event, localized in time and space, that can be pointed to as “the” Scientific Revolution’.<sup>116</sup> Rather, Shapin suggests, ‘There was ... a diverse array of cultural practices aimed at understanding, explaining, and controlling the natural world, each with different characteristics and each experiencing different modes of change’.<sup>117</sup> As a result, scholars have been forced to grapple with suppositions like Boyle’s – though it could just as well be Thomas Browne’s – ‘that by being addicted to experimental philosophy a man is rather assisted than indisposed to be a good Christian’,<sup>118</sup> to give just due to the apparently anti-modernising, anti-secularising elements in Enlightenment thought, to Boyle’s obsession with the philosopher’s stone, to Newton’s occultism, and so on.<sup>119</sup>

As in the proverbial arcade game, however, Whiggish myths of sudden modernity seem to pop up just as quickly as they are knocked down. The new historians of affect, for instance, have suggested 1660 as the climactic dividing medieval and Renaissance subjectivities conditioned by ‘psychological materialism’ – the theory of the humours – from those of modern Cartesian dualists.<sup>120</sup> Charles II was often suspected of collusion with Louis XIV, of sharing a taste for popery and arbitrary government; but how many English subjects could have thought that he meant to replace their blood, bile, and phlegm with a pineal gland. It is the argument of this book that the seventeenth-century body politic, and with it the republic of letters, can be more comprehensively understood in terms of the same vital spirits, and indeed the same diseases.

## Notes

- 1 See J. Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), esp. pp. 20–7.
- 2 Marvell was deliberately figured in amphibious terms by contemporary polemicists, a facet of his identity given new currency by his latest biographer; see N. Smith, *Andrew Marvell: The Chameleon* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010). ‘Serial turncoat’ is Blair Worden’s phrase for Nedham in *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). I am indebted to Timothy Raylor for this characterisation of Waller.

- 3 These are of course the titles of important studies by David Norbrook and Robert Wilcher, respectively: *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric, and Politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); *The Writing of Royalism 1628–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- 4 L. A. Ferrell, 'Introduction: revisiting Revisionism', *HLQ* special issue, 78:4 (2015), p. 573.
- 5 C. S. R. Russell, *Unrevolutionary England, 1603–1642* (London: Hambledon Press, 1990), p. ix. The capitalisation of 'Revisionism' is meant to distinguish the historiographical movement in Stuart history from revision in its more generic forms. It should be remembered nonetheless that Revisionism and its legacies are notoriously plural and contested.
- 6 Closely paraphrasing T. Cogswell, R. Cust, and P. Lake, 'Revisionism and its legacies: the work of Conrad Russell', in Cogswell, Cust and Lake (eds), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain: Essays in Honour of Conrad Russell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 1.
- 7 Ferrell, 'Revisiting Revisionism', p. 572.
- 8 Derek Hirst (in 'Revisiting Revisionism') warns how the term 'post-Revisionist' tends to blur 'the situational and the substantive'. What would an 'age' of '*post-Revisionism*' be like, he asks. '[E]ternal dialogue with some shapeless predecessor?', p. 596.
- 9 K. Sharpe (ed.), *Faction and Parliament: Essays on Early Stuart History* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), p. v.
- 10 P. Lake, 'Retrospective: Wentworth's political world in revisionist and post-revisionist perspective', in J. F. Merritt (ed.), *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621–41* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 278. For the idea of political culture within seventeenth-century historiography, see K. Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- 11 Cogswell *et al.*, 'Revisionism and its legacies', pp. 14–15.
- 12 *King Charls II. His Declaration To all his Loving Subjects of the Kingdome of England. Dated from his Court at Breda in Holland* (London, 1660), p. 4.
- 13 M. Dobson, 'Adaptations and revivals', in D. P. Fiske (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 41.
- 14 J. Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677–1683* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 6.
- 15 See J. C. D. Clark, *English Society 1688–1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge

- University Press, 1985); together with his *Revolution and Rebellion: State and Society in England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
- 16 T. Underwood, *Why Literary Periods Mattered: Historical Contrast and the Prestige of English Studies* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013), p. 2.
  - 17 K. Sharpe and P. Lake (eds), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London: Macmillan, 1994), p. 1. Discussions of Revisionism's origins and impact are of course legion. To the studies and syntheses cited elsewhere in this Introduction, we might add: G. Burgess, 'On revisionism: an analysis of early Stuart historiography in the 1970s and 1980s', *HJ*, 33 (1990), pp. 609–27; T. Cogswell, 'Coping with revisionism in early Stuart history', *JMH*, 62 (1990), pp. 538–51; J. P. Kenyon, 'Revisionism and post-revisionism in early Stuart history', *JMH*, 64 (1991), pp. 689–99; P. Lake, review of *The Causes of the English Civil War, The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–1642, and Unrevolutionary England*, by C. S. R. Russell, *HLQ*, 57 (1994), pp. 167–97.
  - 18 See H. R. Trevor-Roper, 'Lord Macaulay: introduction', in Trevor-Roper (ed.), *The History of England* (London: Penguin Classics, 1979), p. 7.
  - 19 H. Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (London: Bell, 1931). In a brief preface, Butterfield writes, trenchantly, 'What is discussed is the tendency in many historians to write on the side of Protestants and Whigs, to praise revolutions provided they have been successful, to emphasise certain principles of progress in the past and to produce a story which is the ratification if not the glorification of the present. This whig version of the course of history is associated with certain methods of historical organisation and inference – certain fallacies to which all history is liable, unless it be historical research. The examination of these raises problems concerning the relations between historical research and what is known as general history; concerning the nature of a historical transition and of what might be called the historical process; and also concerning the limits of history as a study, and particularly the attempt of the whig writers to gain from it a finality that it cannot give', pp. v–vi.
  - 20 Macaulay's *History* is quoted here and throughout from the edition prepared by C. H. Firth, 6 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1913–15), 1:398, 388.
  - 21 Macaulay, *History*, p. 390.
  - 22 Macaulay, *History*, p. 388.
  - 23 [T. B. Macaulay], 'Milton', *Edinburgh Review*, 42:84 (1825), p. 306.
  - 24 E. Gosse, *A Short History of Modern English Literature* (New York: D. Appleman, 1897), p. 161. The 'dissociative' thrust of these histories is

- compassed in S. N. Zwicker, 'Is there such a thing as Restoration literature?', *HLQ*, 69:3 (2006), pp. 425–50.
- 25 W. V. Moody and R. M. Lovett, *A History of English Literature* (New York: Scribner's, 1902), pp. 174–5. A popular textbook, the Moody and Lovett *History* was reprinted some fifteen times between 1906 and 1964.
- 26 R. H. Fletcher, *A History of English Literature* (Boston: R. G. Badger, new and rev. edn, 1919), p. 217.
- 27 Fletcher, *A History*, pp. 216, 218.
- 28 Fletcher, *A History*, p. 218.
- 29 R. Wellek, 'The criticism of T. S. Eliot', *Sewanee Review*, 64:3 (1956), p. 398.
- 30 On Eliot's literary criticism, see L. Menand, 'T. S. Eliot', in A. W. Litz, L. Menand, and L. Rainey (eds), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism Volume VII: Modernism and the New Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 15–56.
- 31 C. Benfey, 'Becoming T. S. Eliot, for better and for worse', *New Republic*, 4 March 2013, Web.
- 32 F. Kermode, 'Dissociation of sensibility', *Kenyon Review*, 19 (1957), p. 169.
- 33 T. S. Eliot, 'The metaphysical poets', in *The Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot*, ed. F. Kermode (New York: Harcourt, 1975), p. 64.
- 34 Eliot, 'Milton II', in *Selected Prose*, p. 266.
- 35 Eliot, 'from *The Idea of a Christian Society*', in *Selected Prose*, p. 290.
- 36 Eliot, 'from *The Idea of a Christian Society*', p. 291.
- 37 Eliot, *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on Style and Order* (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1928), p. 11.
- 38 Eliot, 'Idea of a Christian Society', p. 299.
- 39 S. Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretative Communities* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), p. 333. Donne and the metaphysicals stand, for Eliot, at the last brink of this 'undissociated' Christian culture, just before the 'new philosophy', in Donne's familiar phrase, 'calls all in doubt'.
- 40 [Macaulay], 'Milton', p. 307.
- 41 See, e.g., F. R. Leavis, 'English poetry in the seventeenth century', *Scrutiny* 4:4 (1935), pp. 236–55, republished as the opening chapter of *Revaluation: Tradition & Development in English Poetry* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1936).
- 42 B. Bergonzi, 'Leavis and Eliot: the long road to rejection', *Critical Quarterly*, 26:1–2 (1984), p. 22.
- 43 T. S. Eliot, 'The frontiers of criticism', *Sewanee Review*, 64:4 (1956), p. 537. For nuanced discussion, see Menand, 'T. S. Eliot', in the *Cambridge History*

- of *Literary Criticism*. For the influence of the ‘dissociation of sensibility’ in particular, see e.g. J. Bennett, *Four Metaphysical Poets: Donne, Herbert, Vaughan, Crashaw* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934).
- 44 Kermode, ‘Dissociation of sensibility’, p. 185.
- 45 For the purposes of both study and marketing, Norton, ‘the world’s most widely used anthology of English literature’, divides the Restoration and eighteenth century into a separate volume from the sixteenth and early seventeenth century. The MLA likewise amalgamates the Restoration into an eighteenth century distinct from the division of Renaissance and early modern literature.
- 46 G. Spiegel (ed.), *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn* (New York: Routledge, 2005), p. 4.
- 47 On the relation of New Historicism to literary theory, see S. J. Greenblatt, ‘Towards a poetics of culture’, in H. A. Veeger (ed.), *The New Historicism* (New York: Routledge, 1989), pp. 1–14. More wide-rangingly, see S. Lotringer and S. Cohen (eds), *French Theory in America* (New York: Routledge, 2001).
- 48 A. B. Coiro and T. Fulton, ‘Introduction: old, new, now’, in Coiro and Fulton (eds), *Rethinking Historicism from Shakespeare to Milton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 1.
- 49 S. J. Greenblatt, ‘Introduction’ to *The Forms of Power and the Power of Forms in the Renaissance*, special issue *Genre*, 15 (1982), pp. 1–2.
- 50 L. Montrose, ‘Professing the Renaissance: the poetics and politics of culture’, in Veeger, *The New Historicism*, p. 20.
- 51 Montrose, ‘Professing the Renaissance’, p. 18.
- 52 A. Fradenburg, ‘(Dis)Continuity: a history of dreaming’, in E. Scala and S. Federico (eds), *The Post-Historical Middle Ages* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), p. 88.
- 53 S. J. Greenblatt and G. B. Gunn (eds), *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Studies* (New York: Modern Language Association, 1992).
- 54 See L. S. Marcus, ‘Renaissance/early modern studies’, in Greenblatt and Gunn, *Redrawing the Boundaries*, pp. 41–63.
- 55 E. Pollak, ‘Feminism and the New Historicism: a tale of difference or the same old story?’, *Eighteenth Century*, 29:3 (1988), p. 282.
- 56 Thus Edward Said (1991): ‘the ferment in minority, subaltern, feminist, and postcolonial consciousness has resulted in so many salutary achievements in the curricular and theoretical approach to the study of the humanities as quite literally to have produced a Copernican revolution in all traditional fields of inquiry.’ See his ‘The politics of knowledge’, *Raritan*, 11:1 (1991), p. 25. At the same time, it must be said, New Historicism only reinforced Shakespeare’s status as the unquestioned centre of English literature.

- 57 P. Berry and M. Tudeau-Clayton, 'Introduction', in Berry and Tudeau-Clayton (eds), *Textures of Renaissance Knowledge* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), p. 14, n. 6.
- 58 Marcus, 'Renaissance/early modern studies', p. 42.
- 59 Marcus, 'Renaissance/early modern studies', pp. 42–3.
- 60 Together with Greenblatt, Montrose, and Marcus, I am thinking here of scholars like Catherine Belsey, Jonathan Dollimore, Jonathan Goldberg, Jean Howard, Stephen Orgel, and Alan Sinfield.
- 61 I am indebted here to the observations of J. A. Miller; see his review of Coiro and Fulton, *Rethinking Historicism*, in *MQ*, 49:2 (2015), p. 142.
- 62 W. Kerrigan, 'Seventeenth-century studies', in Greenblatt and Gunn, *Redrawing the Boundaries*, p. 73.
- 63 S. Fish, 'Milton's career and the career of theory', in *There's No Such Thing as Free Speech: And It's a Good Thing, Too* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 264.
- 64 Marcus, 'Renaissance/early modern studies', p. 43.
- 65 New Historicism's claim to being historical was of course famously queried by Greenblatt's Berkeley colleague Carolyn Porter, 'Are we being historical yet?', *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 87 (1988), pp. 743–86. See also C. Porter, 'After the new historicism', *New Literary History*, 21:2 (1990), pp. 253–72; A. Liu, 'The power of formalism: the new historicism', *ELH*, 56:4 (1989), pp. 721–71.
- 66 There is a sense in which the masterpiece of the New Historicism is actually the historian Kevin Sharpe's trilogy of late works: *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009); *Image Wars: Promoting Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603–1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010); and *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660–1714* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).
- 67 See M. C. Augustine, 'Beyond politics: Marvell and the fortunes of context', *Literature Compass*, 11:4 (2014), pp. 235–45.
- 68 See Q. Skinner, *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, ed. J. Tully (Cambridge: Polity, 1988).
- 69 D. Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, rev. edn 2002), p. 270 (originally published by Routledge in 1984).
- 70 N. Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), p. xii.
- 71 Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, p. 362. Cf. S. Achinstein, *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 3: 'The English Revolution was a revolution in reading'.
- 72 For an example of Patterson as reviser, see "'Forced fingers": Milton's early poems and ideological constraint', in C. J. Summers and

- T.-L. Pebworth (eds), *The Muses Commonweale: Poetry and Politics in the Seventeenth Century* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988), pp. 9–22. For her turn to ‘evangelical historicism’, see Patterson, *Early Modern Liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) (from which that phrase derives, p. 2), and *Nobody’s Perfect: A New Whig Interpretation of History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002).
- 73 Macaulay, *History of England*, 1:270.
- 74 S. R. Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603–1642*, 10 vols. (London: Longmans, 1891–93), 1:viii.
- 75 Gardiner, *History of England*, 1:2.
- 76 Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War, 1642–1649*, 3 vols. (London: Longmans, 1886–91), 1:1.
- 77 See J. A. Adamson, ‘Introduction: the civil war and its historiography’, in Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–49* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2008), p. 7.
- 78 R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (New York: Harcourt, rpt. 1954), p. 225. The ‘classic’ status of Tawney’s thesis can be gauged by the numerous reprintings of *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*: since 1926 it has been issued some thirty times by various publishing houses, including Harcourt, Penguin, and the New American Library, most recently by Verso, in 2013.
- 79 C. Hill, *The English Revolution, 1640: Three Essays* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1940), p. 9.
- 80 Adamson, ‘The civil war and its historiography’, p. 18.
- 81 A. Everitt, *The Local Community and the Great Rebellion* (London: Historical Association, 1969), p. 8. To take but one example, in Leicestershire, county loyalties were almost evenly split between two leading Puritan families, the Greys and the Hastings. Both delayed taking sides and sought to keep the shire clear of the war; when push came to shove, however, Lord Hastings broke for the king, Lord Grey for Parliament, with their local partisans following suit. The situation in Leicestershire is discussed in Everitt, *Local Community*, pp. 14–17, and in J. Morrill, *The Revolt of the Provinces: Conservatives and Radicals in the English Civil War, 1630–1650* (London: Longman, rpt. 1980), p. 43.
- 82 C. S. R. Russell, ‘Parliamentary history in perspective, 1604–1629’, *History*, 61:201 (1976), pp. 1–27; rpt. in *Unrevolutionary England*, pp. 31–58, from which I quote below.
- 83 K. Sharpe, review of *Unrevolutionary England, 1603–1642; The Causes of the English Civil War, & The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–42*, by C. S. R. Russell, *History Today* (1991), Web.
- 84 Russell, *Unrevolutionary England*, pp. 33, 42.

- 85 Russell, *Unrevolutionary England*, p. 48.
- 86 See Russell, 'The nature of a Parliament in early Stuart England' (1984), rpt. in *Unrevolutionary England*, pp. 22–3.
- 87 Qtd. in Russell, *Unrevolutionary England*, p. 47.
- 88 C. S. R. Russell (ed.), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (London: Macmillan, 1973), p. 1.
- 89 N. Tyacke, 'Puritanism, Arminianism, and counter-revolution', in Russell, *The Origins of the English Civil War*, pp. 119–43; M. Kishlansky, 'The emergence of adversary politics in the Long Parliament', *JMH*, 49:4 (1977), pp. 617–40, and *The Rise of the New Model Army* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980); K. Sharpe (ed.), *Faction and Parliament: Essays on Early Stuart History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).
- 90 Russell, *Unrevolutionary England*, p. ix, pp. ix–x following.
- 91 D. Hirst, 'Revisionism revised: the place of principle', *P&P*, 92:1 (1981), p. 80.
- 92 C. S. R. Russell, *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 213. See also Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies 1637–1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- 93 Hirst, 'Revisionism revised', p. 99. See also J. P. Sommerville, *Politics and Ideology in England, 1603–1640* (London: Longman, 1986); R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds), *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603–1642* (London: Longman, 1989).
- 94 Scott, *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis*, p. 6; *England's Troubles*, p. 164.
- 95 T. Harris, 'What's new about the Restoration', *Albion*, 29:2 (1997), p. 195. See also T. Harris, 'Introduction: revising the Restoration', in T. Harris, P. Seaward, and M. Goldie (eds), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), pp. 1–28. Harris notes: 'The aim of this introduction is to stress that there was much greater continuity with the previous period than is normally thought, that religion did continue as a dominant theme in Restoration politics, and that in order to understand the tensions of this period we need to look more closely at local politics and at the concerns and aspirations of people below the level of the ruling elite', p. 2.
- 96 On contingency and the problem of narrative in Revisionist historiography, see D. Hirst, 'Of labels and situations: revisionisms and early Stuart studies', *HLQ*, 78:4 (2015), pp. 596–7; also Lake, 'Retrospective', p. 278.
- 97 Russell, *Origins of the English Civil War*, p. 23.
- 98 See D. Bush, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century: 1600–1660* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1946), p. 161; M. C. Bradbrook

- and M. G. Lloyd Thomas, *Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940), pp. 46–50.
- 99 E. Le Comte, ‘Marvell’s “The nymph complaining for the death of her fawn”’, *MP*, 50:2 (1952), p. 100.
- 100 For extended consideration of the poem and its historical reception, see M. C. Augustine, “‘Lillies without, roses within’: Marvell’s poetics of indeterminacy and “‘The nymph complaining’”’, *Criticism*, 50:2 (2008), pp. 255–78.
- 101 P. Cruttwell, *The Shakespearean Moment* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1954), p. 199.
- 102 D. Hirst and S. N. Zwicker, ‘Eros and abuse: imagining Andrew Marvell’, *ELH*, 74:2 (2007), p. 371.
- 103 W. Hazlitt, in E. S. Donno (ed.), *Andrew Marvell: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul), p. 134.
- 104 *The Poems of Edmund Waller*, ed. G. Thorn-Drury, 2 vols. (London: Bullen, 1901), 1:lxii.
- 105 A. Lindsay, ‘Cowley, Abraham (1618–1677), poet’, *ODNB* (2004; online edn 2008), accessed 9 June 2017.
- 106 S. N. Zwicker, ‘The day George Thomason collected his copy of the *Poems of Mr. John Milton, both English and Latin, Compos’d at Several Times*’, *RES*, 64:264 (2013), p. 239.
- 107 For apotheoses of these traditions, see J. H. Hanford, ‘Milton and the return to humanism’, *SP*, 16:2 (1916), pp. 126–47; and D. Loewenstein, ‘The radical religious politics of *Paradise Lost*’, in T. Corns (ed.), *A Companion to Milton* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2001), pp. 348–62. Of Milton and the Romantics, Joseph Wittreich writes: ‘If they did not invent the question, “Why Milton?” the Romantics lent fashion to it, empowering Milton by making him whole again and, simultaneously, giving force to his poetry by reading it as if it were a true history; but also by reading it in the future tense so that poems emerging from one moment of crisis could reflect upon, and explain, another crisis in history when, once again, tyranny and terror ruled’; *Why Milton Matters: A New Preface to His Works* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006), p. 22.
- 108 J. Aubrey, ‘Minutes of the life of Mr. John Milton’, in H. Darbishire (ed.), *Milton’s Early Lives* (London: Constable, 1932), p. 13. Recent treatments of Milton’s materialism have made more of his Restoration milieu: see e.g. J. Rogers, *The Matter of Revolution: Science, Poetry, and Politics in the Age of Milton* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), and J. Picciotto, *Labors of Innocence in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010). Now see as well B. Hoxby and A. B. Coiro (eds), *Milton in the Long Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

- 109 P. C. Herman, 'Paradise Lost, the Miltonic "or," and the poetics of incertitude', *SEL*, 43:1 (2003), p. 183.
- 110 N. von Maltzahn, 'The first reception of *Paradise Lost*', *RES*, 47:188 (1996), pp. 479–99.
- 111 E. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
- 112 See H. Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); *English Clandestine Satire, 1660–1702* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- 113 See A. Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).
- 114 P. Davis, 'From script to print: marketing Rochester', in M. C. Augustine and S. N. Zwicker (eds), *Lord Rochester in the Restoration World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 40.
- 115 See D. N. Vieth, *Attribution in Restoration Poetry: A Study of Rochester's Poems of 1680* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), p. 15.
- 116 See S. Shapin and S. Schaffer, *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985); S. Shapin, *The Scientific Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), p. 4.
- 117 Shapin, *The Scientific Revolution*, p. 4.
- 118 R. Boyle, *The Christian Virtuoso* (London, 1690), t. p.
- 119 See C. Weiss Smith, *Empiricist Devotions: Science, Religion, and Poetry in Early Eighteenth-Century England* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2016).
- 120 G. K. Paster, K. Rowe, and M. Floyd-Wilson (eds) situate the 'Cartesian divide' in historical subjectivity 'about 1660', *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotion* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), p. 2 and *passim*. See also G. K. Paster, *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004). The phrase 'regimes of feeling', commonly used in work on the embodied emotions, thus takes on a suggestively political colouring.