DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

'A barbarous nook of Ireland' : representations of the Irish Rebellion in Milton and some contemporaries.

Daems, James William

Award date:
2001

Awarding institution:
Bangor University

'A barbarous nook of Ireland': Representations of the Irish Rebellion in Milton and Some Contemporaries

by

James William Daems

M.A., Simon Fraser University; B.A., University College of the Fraser Valley

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of PhD

in the Department of English

University of Wales, Bangor April, 2001

Abstract

The Irish Rebellion profoundly affected the literary and political imagination of John Milton and his contemporaries. This work examines some of the textual strategies employed in representing the Irish Rebellion. These include analogies to the 1605 Gunpowder Plot, the Old Testament, and paternity. Each of these analogies works in conjunction with the familiar, barbaric Irish stereotype in order to discredit the political objectives of the rebels. In addition, many of these political analogies prompt accusations of sexual depravity. This association of the political and the sexual is essential in how Milton, in particular, genders the godly commonwealth as masculine. Representing the Irish, however, also betrays domestic political anxieties. The binary opposition of civility and barbarism prompts an active struggle against barbarism on both a national and individual level. Paradoxically, the more the Irish stereotype is used in an attempt to differentiate and distance the Irish from the godly commonwealth, the closer the poles of the binary opposition come together.

Dedication

To my parents, for all their support.

Perhaps I just make out

Edmund Spenser,

dreaming sunlight,

encroached upon by

geniuses who creep

'out of every corner

of the woods and glennes'

towards watercress and carrion.

--Seamus Heaney, "Bog Oak"

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank my supervisor, Professor Thomas N. Corns, for his suggestions, time, and patience. His knowledge was instrumental while working on Milton's prose. Linda Jones, the research assistant for the English Department at the University of Wales, Bangor, provided much assistance during the later stages of completing my dissertation. Michelle Harrison and her sister Denise for giving me a place to stay for the first few days following my arrival in Bangor. Thanks also to Oran Barrett for providing top competition on the BV pool table. Mike Malloch for the friendly and familiar bluenose accent at the BV pool table, and those other regulars at the BV pool table (you know who you are!). Kevin Stansfield lent me some of his books, *tried* to convince me of the superiority of Shakespeare over Marlowe, and frequently made sure that I got out of bed at 9 am on Sunday mornings to put the kettle on for a "northern cup of tea" (while he ran across the street to Kwiks to do his shopping). Laura Massey...bloody hell, she was even in Canada. Stu and Tara--a couple with fine musical taste (when they put on Jane's Addiction). And Carl Peters and Paul deMontigny for three years of email reports from back home (okay, the last few months Paul's been in Taiwan).

Abbreviations

CPW *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton*. Ed. Don M. Wolfe, et al. New Haven: Yale UP, 1953-1982.

OED *Oxford English Dictionary*

Introduction

Those inhumane Rebels and Papists of *Ireland*.[1]

John Milton and his "sage and serious Spenser" share two interesting Irish connections: both wrote tracts on Ireland and both had a literary interest in King Arthur. Milton had, of course, intended to write an epic around the figure of King Arthur, a central character of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. Arthur also makes an appearance in Spenser's *View*, implicating the legendary king with the conquest of Ireland. In Spenser's writing, Arthur plays a role both in the subjection of Ireland as well as in the legitimisation of later colonial activity in the country. The stories of King Arthur that Spenser's historical sources provided him with serve as a foundational narrative for English rights in Ireland in *A View*.[2] Tudor writers found these justifications for the English presence in Ireland in the writings of Giraldus Cambrensis: "The most obvious early modern influence of...[Giraldus's] writings about Ireland was on geographic and choreographic perceptions of the country."[3] The first "conspicuous appearance" of Giraldus's writings in a strictly political context justifying English rights in

---

[1]John Milton, *CPW* 3: 301.

[2]For a more extensive discussion of the links between the Arthur of *A View* and that of *The Faerie Queene* see Jim Daems and Carl Lynden Peters, "King Arthur and Ireland: The Discursive Landscape of Edmund Spenser's *View*," *Foundational Narratives: Proceedings from the Foundational Narratives Interdisciplinary Graduate Student Conference, Simon Fraser University, February 1998*, ed. Stephen Collis and Sharon-Ruth Alker (Burnaby, B.C.: SFSS Printers, 1998) 116-23.

[3]Hiram Morgan, "Giraldus Cambrensis and the Tudor Conquest of Ireland," *Political Ideology in Ireland, 1541-1641*, ed. Hiram Morgan (Dublin: Four Courts, 1999) 28. On Giraldus's influence, see also Andrew Hadfield, "Briton and Scythian: Tudor Representations of Irish Origins," *Irish Historical Studies* 28 (1993): 390-408.

Ireland occurred in 1569.[4]

These are the very justifications that appear in Spenser's Irish tract and can be traced through his allusion to King Arthur. The Arthur allusion in *A View* occurs relatively early in the dialogue after a rather questionable genealogy of "how all that realm of Ireland was first peopled, and by what nations."[5] Irenius states, "Finally, it appeareth by good record yet extant, that King Arthur, and before him Gurgunt, had all that island in his allegiance and subjection."[6] The "good record yet extant" of *A View* must be the "mens former workes" of A Letter of the Authors that provide the Arthur material for *The Faerie Queene.*[7] These sources originate in Geoffrey of Monmouth's *The Kings of Britain* and Giraldus's *The History and Topography of Ireland*, material which, in turn, was incorporated into Holinshed's *Chronicles.* Andrew Hadfield states that Tudor writers were not averse to using "dubious historical precedents" to support their narratives.[8] This is clearly evident in Spenser's Irish writings. But history does more than justify the present, as Ciaran Brady argues, Spenser's method involved turning "to the past...for material which would sustain and make intelligible his prophetic vision of the future."[9] The prophetic colonial vision that we find in *The Faerie Queene* and *A View* is, however, also entwined in both a national and an individual future, as,

---

[4]Morgan 30.

[5]Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, ed. W. L. Renwick (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970) 47.

[6]Spenser, *A View* 46.

[7]*The Faerie Queene*, ed. Thomas P. Roche Jr. and C. Patrick O'Donnell Jr. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987) 15.

[8]"Spenser, Ireland, and Sixteenth-Century Political Theory," *The Modern Language Review* 89 (1994): 11.

[9]"Spenser's Irish Crisis: Humanism and Experience in the 1590s," *Past and Present* 111: 44.

in a sense, Arthur is also the exemplar of the ideal values of civility against which Irish cultural values stand as antithesis, barring the progress of civility's narrative and the poet's epic.

Geoffrey's narrative, for example, is clearly expansionist. Arthur's military campaigns violently subdue the Celtic periphery. Once these areas are secured, Arthur turns his attention to continental Europe until, as he prepares to besiege Rome, his campaign is broken off by Irish treachery and Mordred. Arthur's Irish campaign, however, is already a reaffirmation of an English presence in the country, for, as Irenius states, Gurgunt had the island in subjection prior to Arthur. In Giraldus's narrative, Gurgunt gives Ireland to Basclenses: "granted them the island, now called Ireland, which was then almost deserted, or thinly peopled, that they might settle there." This, for Giraldus, is one of the justifications for the claims of the English kings to Ireland, "although it [the right] be ancient."[10] The violence of the original conquest, as Hadfield notes, is effaced--the narrative simply states that Gurgunt has Ireland in his control.[11] Violence only enters the narrative sources with Arthur. But Giraldus's discussion of English rights includes a second significant justification, from his point of view, that is effaced in Spenser and other Tudor writers. Giraldus presented his work on Ireland to Henry II. In 1159, Henry had his rights in Ireland confirmed in the Bull Laudabiliter issued by Pope Adrian IV. Within the Reformation context of *A View*, Irenius and Eudoxus obviously deny papal authority and, instead, appeal to the earlier Arthurian narrative in order to return to a moment constructed as historically prior to the Bull, making

---

[10]*The Topography of Ireland, and the History of the Conquest of Ireland, The Historical Works of Giraldus Cambrensis*, trans. Thomas Forester (New York: AMS Press, 1968) 121.

[11]Hadfield, "Spenser, Ireland" 11.

that document superfluous. Milton, of course, never wrote his Arthurian epic. But, considering Milton's appreciation of Spenser as well as the textual sources these works would have shared, the subjection of Ireland would most likely have been included once again as a foundational narrative of these colonial activities.

Milton read Spenser's *A View*, either in manuscript or in James Ware's first publication of Spenser's text in 1633. Milton copied lessons gleaned from Spenser's text, regarding the policies of lord deputies in Ireland and the settlement of soldiers after the wars, into his Commonplace Book.[12] Apart from these references to the practical issues faced in colonising Ireland, Milton and Spenser also shared a belief in the civilizing force of poetry. While never having experienced Ireland first hand as Spenser had as a planter in Munster, Milton's literary mentality shares in the violence of rebellion dealt with in *A View* and *The Faerie Queene*. In *Milton and the Culture of Violence*, Michael Lieb discusses the centrality of regenerative violence in Milton's work.[13] Lieb's focus on the significance of the dismemberment of the archetypal poet Orpheus on Milton's poetic adds a fascinating element shared by Milton and Spenser in regards to Ireland. As several readers have observed, Spenser's *Epithalamion*, written to celebrate his marriage to Elizabeth Boyle, is haunted by the allusion to Orpheus in its opening stanza: "So Orpheus did for his own bride, / So I unto my self alone will sing, / The woods shall to me answer and my Eccho ring."[14] There are, of course, some positive

---

[12]See Willy Maley, "How Milton and Some Contemporaries Read Spenser's *View*," *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660*, ed. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993) 191-208; revised and reprinted in Willy Maley, *Salvaging Spenser: Colonialism, Culture and Identity* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997) 118-36.

[13]Lieb, *Milton and the Culture of Violence* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994).

[14]*The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*, ed. William A. Oram, et al. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1989) 16-18. On the allusion, see Joseph Loewenstein, "Echo's Ring: Orpheus and Spenser's Career," *ELR* 16:2 (1986): 287-302; Celeste Marguerite Schenck, "'Sacred Ceremonies': Spenser's *Epithalamion*

implications of the allusion by developing the contrast between the Thracian bard's loss of Eurydice and the poet-groom's "triumph...of victory."[15] However, even in some of these positive readings, critics have recognized an unsettling aspect in the allusion to Orpheus. Celeste Marguerite Schenk writes, "Invoking the archetypal bard at the outset of a marriage poem, Spenser claims competitively that he will accomplish what Orpheus failed to do: he will reverse that poet's unsuccess."[16] Yet, recognizing the possibility of "unsuccess" reveals that the bardic competition implied is fraught with the dangers of failure and dismemberment encapsulated within the Orphic narrative. This unsettling danger provides a gateway into the troubled colonial context of Spenser's wedding poem. In doing so, *Epithalamion* imagines Ireland as an arena of colonial spectacle.

We should not be surprised to meet with an appropriation of Orpheus in this early-modern Irish context, particularly if we recall that Horace "speaks of Orpheus as a civilizer, a harmonist of culture, in the *Ars Poetica*."[17] Orpheus is an apt figure to invoke in what is, for the English in Ireland, represented as a struggle of civility versus barbarism. This is certainly the significance of the Orpheus that Fynes Moryson, principal secretary to Mountjoy, Lord Deputy of Ireland from 1600 to 1603, invokes when discussing the faults of Irish bardic culture: "Alas, how unlike unto Orpheus, who, with his sweet harp and wholesome precepts of poetry, labored to reduce the rude and barbarous people from living in woods, to dwell

---

and *Prothalamion*," in her *Mourning and Panegyric: the Poetics of Pastoral Ceremony* (Pennsylvania State UP, 1988) 55-71.

[15]Spenser, *Epithalamion* 243.

[16]"'Sacred Ceremonies'" 62.

[17]Loewenstein, "Echo's Ring" 290.

civilly in towns and cities, and from wild riot to moral conversation."[18] James P. Myers, Jr. notes that the analogy was a favourite of Elizabethan writers on Ireland "because of the implied contrast Orpheus's harp made with the Irish harp."[19] Sir John Davies also makes use of the analogy: "The strings of the Irish harp, which the civil magistrate doth finger, are all in tune...and make a good harmony in this commonweal."[20] For these writers, however, even in the case of the more optimistic representation of Ireland in Davies's work, the unsettling conclusion of the Orpheus narrative, though unacknowledged, haunts their appropriation of this civilizing force. These invocations are destabilized by the context in which their words are recorded. If we take this displacement of the colonial struggle in sixteenth-century Ireland into a classical allusion seriously, and understand that in the use of Orpheus what is really at stake is civility, then the appropriation of Orpheus on the colonial periphery reveals the resistance that works against the extension of English colonial power. A profound anxiety is clearly evident, although any particular writer may attempt to efface the inherent dangers of colonial entrenchment and its possible failure: Orpheus loses his bride; he is dismembered.

The contrast between Spenser's poem and prose tract is striking. The Ireland of *A View* is chaotic, caught in the flux of time. *Epithalamion* tenuously attempts to transcend and efface this context. The flux of time is frozen in celebration, in what Joseph Loewenstein sees as the poem's "over-determined structure."[21] Yet, this celebration is on the verge of collapse:

---

[18]*An Itinerary, Elizabethan Ireland: A Selection of Writings by Elizabethan Writers on Ireland,* ed. James P. Myers, Jr. (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1983) 202.

[19]*Elizabethan Ireland* 238.

[20]*A Discovery of the True Causes Why Ireland was Never Entirely Subdued, nor Brought Under Obedience of the Crown of England, Until the Beginning of His Majesty's Happy Reign,* in *Elizabethan Ireland,* 179.

[21]"Echo's Ring" 300.

Orpheus, the English bard in Ireland, faces a very real threat, "every day we perceive the troubles growing more upon us."[22] In this context, there is no distance from the troubles, no master of ceremonies who is "so central to his civilization that he can command echoes from every corner of his world."[23] The proliferating threat cannot, ironically, be taken in in a view.

The contrast between the poetic and the prosaic politics of representation in *Epithalamion* and *A View* can be further developed in relation to colonialism. In *Marvellous Possessions*, Stephen J. Greenblatt discusses the European dream of possession in the New World and argues that one of the important ways that possession is gained is through language. The coloniser is reliant on metonymy. The place in which he is physically located allows for the imaginative expansion of his dominion:

> Everything in the European dream of possession rests on witnessing, witnessing understood as a form of significant and representative seeing. To see is to secure the truth of what might otherwise be deemed incredible.... The discoverer sees only a fragment and then imagines the rest in the act of appropriation. The supplement that imagination brings to vision expands the perceptual field, encompassing the distant hills and valleys or the whole of an island or an entire continent, and the bit that has actually been seen becomes by metonymy a representation of the whole.[24]

The marriage celebrated in *Epithalamion* is a metonym for a colonial vision in which imaginative projection incorporates the whole colonial and cosmic order. The poet-groom

---

[22]Spenser, *A View* 94.

[23]Schenck 60.

[24]*Marvellous Possessions: the Wonder of the New World* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991) 122.

establishes an imaginative, stable anchoring point for the colonial project of plantation in Ireland. This poetological view of Ireland, and the poet-groom's request for fruitful progeny, is clearly "dependent upon the perceived character and destiny of a particular geography."[25] *Epithalamion*'s complex structure works to expand and reinforce the imaginative vision of the colonial project.

A View, however, is unable to do this, unable to provide the imaginative anchoring point--the Pale is not sufficient, nor, apparently, is the monarch. The flux of the historical process calls for the exercise of the sword to trim back its proliferation. The sword of "justice" must be put in motion and enter into a world recognized as heraclitan, a world in need of a state power capable of managing the flux. The text can only align itself with a power structure and hope to accelerate the historical process because the bard is not a sufficient agent capable of advancing civility through the creative act. That act, much like Orpheus's when he is confronted by the Maenads, is in danger of being drowned out by the Irish "hubbub."

Most of Spenser's literary production occurs within a colonial arena of spectacle, an arena of flux and violence. In *Epithalamion*, he creates a spectacle of harmony, an imaginative anchoring point for a colonial vision. However, in *A View* cultural violence is enacted in its regenerative horror: whether it be the "anatomies of death" crawling out of the woods on their hands and knees, or the execution of Murrogh O'Brien at which,

> an old woman which was his foster mother took up his head whilst he was quartered and sucked up all the blood running there out, saying that the earth

---

[25]Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage, 1994) 78.

> was not worthy to drink it, and therewith also steeped her face and her breast, and tore her hair, crying and shrieking out most terribly.[26]

The spectacle of the scaffold becomes a metonym of colonialism, yet one which does not allow for imaginative projection because the writer's words alone cannot efface resistance. The quartering of O'Brien does not crop the proliferation; indeed, it essentially fails to be a symbol of order restored because of the woman's disruption of the display of sovereign power. Only the horrific, complete eradication of Irish culture by a worthy, heroic agent who will immerse himself in the flow of the historical process can allow the bard to turn these events into poetry. Only by removing the threat of dismemberment facing the bard can he stand back from the proliferation of the troubles and transcend them, give them the form that they lack. For the time being, Spenser must engage the present state of Ireland in its unruly, heraclitan form. He must take the prosaic world as is, threatening and indeterminate.

In what follows, we shall see how Milton and some contemporaries attempt to deal with that heraclitan world of threat and indeterminacy, and how, as it had for other writers throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, this attempt reflects the political situation in England. Chapter one focuses on three pamphlets that describe an Irish gunpowder plot in October, 1641. These pamphlets allow us to examine the initial reaction to the outbreak of the Irish Rebellion in the wider contexts of the events leading to civil war and anti-Catholicism. The appropriation of an annually celebrated event marking the defeat of a Catholic conspiracy that threatened the English polity places these accounts of Irish treachery in a wider Reformation context. In addition, they attempt to delineate an Irish identity and the threat it

---

[26]Spenser, *A View* 62.

poses.

In the second chapter, I focus on letters--specifically, the letters published in Milton's *Observations*, Lazarus Haward's *A Few Collections for Irelands Souldiers* (1647), and *The Kings Cabinet Opened* (1645). Milton's anti-monarchical tracts and *Observations* often explore the links between words and deeds. If words and deeds are commensurate, they can support the construction of a civil identity against the Irish stereotype. If they are not, they demonstrate the alienation of a civil identity and reveal political dissimulation. The revelation of the self in published letters demonstrates the theatrical performativity of identity which Milton uses to challenge and displace Charles I's central political subjectivity as well as critique the aristocratic ethos.

Chapters 3 and 4 examine representations of atrocity in contemporary accounts of the rebellion from its outbreak to Cromwell's reconquest of the Celtic periphery. Representations of atrocities prompt an affective response in their readership which is intended to unify individual reactions to the rebellion within a broader ideological program. Throughout the rebellion, a set of stock images of the barbarous Irish emerged which helped to justify Cromwell's reconquest. These operate within an apocalyptic framework of militant protestantism. The desire to avenge the events of 1641 leads to the enactment of a regenerative violence in order to reconstitute the shattering of the body politic. Chapter 4 looks more specifically at Milton's use of a biblical atrocity narrative in an Irish context--the dismemberment of the concubine in Judges 19. Milton makes frequent allusions to the concubine in both his poetry and prose. I approach these allusions through both queer theory and Stephanie Jed's analysis of the humanists' use of the rape of Lucrece as a narrative of

political liberation. Milton's polemical appropriations of Judges 19, as we shall see, function as narratives of liberation. What results is an exploration of the colonial implications of Milton's reexposure of the concubine to the social forces of chaos which makes the female body the site of identity and difference. In both Milton's allusions and his Old Testament source preventing the rape of a male preserves the masculinity of the political nation.

In Chapter 5, I continue to focus on the female body in political and colonial discourse. I examine the issue of gender in power relations, arguing for the centrality of "natural" attitudes to sex as key to the construction of political order in *Paradise Lost*. The common representation of a colony as a female body imposes the colonisers' analogy between gender and politics on the colonised. As a result, the Genesis story serves as a foundational narrative for colonialism, as is evident when one reads *Paradise Lost* in relation to sixteenth-and seventeenth-century colonial discourse.

In the last chapter, I turn to the wider political context of Milton's writing from the Caroline period through to the Restoration. Picking up on issues that occur throughout the previous five chapters, Milton's political ideals and representations of the court and monarch are read against Cavalier and Restoration writers, including, Suckling, Carew, Herrick, and Rochester. Concerns with the sexual mores of the monarch and the court, as well as the court's purported Catholicism, tie these central political concerns in England to many of the fears dealt with in relation to the Irish Rebellion as the three kingdoms move from the personal rule of Charles I, through the constitutional experiments of the Interregnum and the eventual restoration of Charles II. What follows, then, reveals that varied attempts to construct the Irish as radically different are entwined with attempts to define the British

polity. The difference, however, cannot be entirely or consistently maintained. As Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley have argued, English representations of Ireland are, in fact, reflexive. They are representations of England negotiated in the colonial space of a discursive geo-political construction called "Ireland."[27] Milton's *Observations* is no exception.

---

[27]"Introduction: Irish Representations and English Alternatives," *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660*, ed. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993) 1-2.

1. A 1641 Gunpowder Plot: English Reactions to the Irish Rebellion

> And because these new-carriers did by their false intelligence many times raise troubles and rebellions in this realm, the Statute of Kilkenny doth punish news-tellers (by the name of *skelaghs*) with fire and ransom.[1]

Joad Raymond begins his analysis of Civil War newsbooks by stating that "What news was probably one of the most frequently asked questions in early-modern Britain."[2] News is a social currency. It prompts opinions and interpretations of events and creates divisions between those who are informed and those who are not, usually in politically partisan terms. The pamphlet war intended to win converts to a cause, be it royalist or parliamentarian, as well as to rally one's own side--the news demanded political action and highlighted political inactivity.[3] As Sharon Achinstein persuasively argues in *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader*, the pamphlet debates, more so than the grander works of political theory, worked towards the creation of a politicised, revolutionary public sphere.[4] The

---

[1]Sir John Davies, *A Discovery of the True Causes Why Ireland was Never Entirely Subdued, nor Brought Under Obedience of the Crown of England, Until the Beginning of His Majesty's Happy Reign, Elizabethan Ireland: A Selection of Writings by Elizabethan Writers on Ireland*, ed. James P. Myers, Jr. (Hamden, Conn.: Archon, 1983) 182.

[2]*The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) 1.

[3]Raymond 118.

[4]Achinstein argues this point throughout her book while demonstrating how Milton, and other writers, attempted to align their reader's responses to their own political cause: *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994). A great deal of the work done on the outburst of pamphleteering in the 1640s has focussed on the issue of censorship, an issue which lies outside the focus of this chapter. See Achinstein, cited above, particularly her Introduction; and both Christopher Hill, in *Milton and the English Revolution* (London: Faber and Faber, 1977), and Thomas N. Corns, in *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature,*

ongoing political struggle between the king and parliament coincided with the outbreak of rebellion in Ireland in 1641, an event which further exacerbated that struggle:

> The opposition group in Parliament refused to trust a royal nominee with command of an army to reconquer Ireland. So the question of ultimate power in the state was raised. In the panic caused by news of the Irish rebellion the Grand Remonstrance was adopted, a comprehensive indictment of royal policy.[5]

With the failure of the attempt to arrest the Five Members, Charles I left the capital and made his way north.

From the very beginning, then, the Irish Rebellion was intimately entwined with the larger political struggle which would eventually engulf the three kingdoms in civil war. Even a quick glance through the pages of the catalogue of the Thomason tracts gives some hint of the amount of publications devoted either wholly or in part to covering events in Ireland. The Irish Rebellion was clearly seen as a significant component of the wider political climate of the 1640s. In this chapter, I want to focus on three early accounts of the rebellion that relate a rumoured Irish Gunpowder Plot in order to highlight the politics of representation during a time of profound crisis in Great Britain and Ireland. This necessarily involves an examination of the affect of news on its readership, and these three pamphlets provide fascinating examples of how, by analogy with a popularly celebrated event, Irish events from 1641 to 1649 were located within a wider socio-political context. Increasingly through the seventeenth

---

1640-1660 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992) make perceptive comments on the censorship debate.

[5]Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*, 2nd ed. (London: Sphere Books, 1972) 103.

century, the 1605 Gunpowder Plot came to stand for something other than the celebration of monarchical authority; "it celebrated institutions of English government, as the plot was aimed against the government as a whole, against its central institution of parliament."[6]

As the Irish Rebellion erupted in late October, 1641, a plot "as great as the Gun-powder Treason," which was supposedly planned to coincide with a more widespread uprising, was discovered in Dublin.[7] Three accounts of this plot, which make use of the Gunpowder Plot analogy, exist in the Thomason pamphlet collection. The first, *A Copy of a Letter Concerning the Traiterous Conspiracy of the Rebellious Papists in Ireland*, was written in Chester, following the writer's escape from Dublin with his wife and servants. "I protest," he writes, "we escaped with the cloathes on our backs."[8] The writer does not provide a great amount of the details of the plot:

> The Intelligence I received since I came away is thus written. viz. The newes certaine is that there hath beene a designe for the blowing up of Christ Church in Dublin, but by the mercie of God defeated, and certaine barrels of Gunpowder found under the Church.[9]

Rather, while thanking God for his and his wife's escape, he is concerned more with his lost

---

[6]Achinstein, "Milton and King Charles," *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I,* ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999) 145.

[7]*The Last Newes from Ireland. Being a Relation of the Hostile and Bloody Proceedings of the Rebels. Related in a letter and dated at Dublin, October 27, 1641. And read in Parliament here, November 5, 1641* (London: 1641) A2r. A fourth pamphlet, *An Exact and true Relation of the Late Plots which were contrived and hatched in Ireland* (London: 1641), contains information that occurs in the other three, but never specifically mentions a gunpowder plot.

[8]*A Copy of a Letter Concerning the Traiterous Conspiracy of the Rebellious Papists in Ireland: Being a true Relation, written by a Gentleman of good worth, who hath suffered by them much dammage and losse in his estate, and hardly escaped with his life* (London: 1641) 3.

property, which is quite carefully itemised:

> thirteen hundred faire English sheepe, two hundred Milch Cowes, young and old, some worth five pounds, and most worth foure pounds a peece, some twenty or two and twenty horses...twenty Swine, and as much houshold stuffe, plate and Jewels, Linnen and such like goods, as was not so little worth within doores as Six hundred pounds. And thus in two houres space I was made two thousand pounds the worse in my estate...and of 500 pounds rents now due at all Saints; I feare me the Kingdome now stands in such condition, as not a penny will be gotten of it.[10]

A second pamphlet provides more information. *The Last Newes from Ireland*, publishes a letter from Dublin which, considering the Gunpowder Plot analogy, was appropriately read in parliament on November 5, 1641. *The Last Newes* provides only the barest outline of a plot "to surprise the Castle of *Dublin* on Sunday last in the evening Prayer times and to have killed the Warders and possessed themselves of the Kings store, and then to have mastered the *English*, but God prevented their bloody intentions."[11] The letter writer lists the rebels purported pretences and intentions: Ireland is not a conquered nation and should not be dependent on the crown of England, Irish law should be reestablished, and the Irish should be free to exercise their Catholicism. "[T]hese Papists or *Rebels*," writes the correspondent, "call it a Religious Warre, Ruine and Desolation they threaten to the poore

---

[9]*A Copy of a Letter* 4.

[10]*A Copy of a Letter* 2-3.

[11]*The Last Newes* A3r.

Protestants...unlesse the King and Parliament helpe and relieve us, we shall utterly be destroyed and rooted out of the Land."[12] While the Dublin plot was discovered, the account is interspersed with more successful rebel actions throughout Ireland: the burning of Armagh, Lougnall, Neuery, and Dundalk along with the taking of "two Castles in the North parts of this Kingdome, besides two other Towns of great strength with much munition in it, and it is thought they still increase in great Multitudes."[13] And finally of note, the pamphlet rehearses what will become familiar in the literature of the rebellion--images of Irish barbarity, massacre and destruction. The rebels are,

> plundering all places they come into, the Murders and out-rages daily committed by them, is great and intolerable, the Tyrannical power they exercise upon the poore *Protestants*, not to be parrallel'd, amongst Pagans or Infidels, so farre doe these bloody Miscreants degenerate from the name of Christians.[14]

However, other than the passing analogy with the 1605 Gunpowder Plot, the comparison is not developed at length by the letter writer.

A third pamphlet provides more details of the plot and makes the analogy with the 1605 Gunpowder Plot more explicit. *A Gun-Powder-Plot in Ireland* includes a letter written by the Lords Chief Justices of Ireland,

> Declaring that the Papists and Popish Priests had undermined the chiefest

---

[12]*The Last Newes* A3r.

[13]*The Last Newes* A3r.

[14]*The Last Newes* A3v.

Church in *Dublin*, and there placed great store of Faggots and Barrels of Gunpowder, intending when the Lords and Privy Counsell in *Ireland* had beene at Church to have blowne them al [sic.] up at once, and at that time to have set upon all the rest of the Protestants in *Dublin*, and to have massacred them, had they not been miraculously prevented.[15]

The analogy between this reported Irish plot and the 1605 Gunpowder Plot is curious. I have found no account of an Irish gunpowder plot in the work of historians of the period. Certainly, attempts to seize Dublin Castle were made in the autumn of 1641, as in any conflict of the time, control of such a stronghold and its magazine would be essential for either side. This is evident from an intercepted letter from the Earl of Traquere to Father Philips:

> we have made many private assaults to take *Dublin* Castle, but as yet cannot prevaile, had we but once that strong house, our sole intents are to put all the Hereticks to fire and sword, But our beginning shall be with the Lord Justices, and the Privie Councell.[16]

Was there, in fact, an Irish Gunpowder Plot that bore such a close relation to the intentions of the 1605 Gunpowder Plot? Stella Revard reminds us that the Gunpowder Plot was conveniently "called to mind whenever a crisis in politics or religion warranted

---

[15] *A Gun-Powder-Plot in IRELAND For the blowing up of the chiefest Church in* Dublin, *when the Lords and others were at Sermon, on* Sunday, October, *31. 1641. Which Conspiracie was plotted to be done by the Papists and Priests in* Dublin. *With a further Discovery of their bloody intention for the Massacring of the* English *Protestants in* Ireland. *By the Information of* Thomas Creamor *of* Grayes-Inne *Gentleman, taken before the Mayor of* Chester, November *5. 1641. And Related in a Letter sent from two chiefe Justices in* Ireland *to the Parliament* (London: 1641) A2v.

[16] *The Coppy of a letter sen* [sic.] *from the Earle of* Traquere *in* Ireland *the third of* October *1641. To Old Father* Philips, *heere in* England, *and now prisone* [sic.] *in the* Tower. *Which letter was intercepted, at a certaine time by Sir* Robert Richardson, *kept private but now disclosed. Upon which old Father* Philips *was committed to the* Tower. *With a true relation how the number of Rebels dayly increase in the woods at* Ireland (London: 1641) 5.

comparison."[17] An Irish catholic conspiracy to destroy the fabric of the protestant kingdom would certainly provoke a strong reaction from English readers, particularly when accounts of the outbreak of rebellion in October were read in parliament, as were those of *The Last Newes from Ireland*, on November 5th. We might also recall that both royalists and parliamentarians made political use of the 1605 Gunpowder Plot. For example, shortly after the execution of Charles I, the royalist newsbook *Mercurius Pragmaticus* commented,

> Tuesday, *Jan.* 30. a day more ominous and fatall to all true Protestants then *November* the Fift, for what was then but intended, is now Acted, and indeed never two such horrible *Acts* were committed in *England* as came forth this day, to the abundant joy of the *Saints*, The one ACT was for murdering the King, the other for the prohibiting the Proclaiming of his Highness the Prince of *Wales*, or any other Person to be King of *England*, or *Ireland*, or the Dominions thereof.[18]

Both Revard and David Quint have argued that the 1605 Gunpowder Plot profoundly haunted Milton's poetic imagination, from the royalist sentiments of the early "In Quintum Novembris" and the Latin epigrams on the Gunpowder Plot and the inventor of gunpowder, through to Satan's diabolical invention of gunpowder in Book 6 of *Paradise Lost*.[19] Milton's "In Quintum Novembris" and his epigrams on gunpowder were most likely written for the

---

[17]*The War in Heaven:* Paradise Lost *and the Tradition of Satan's Rebellion* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1980) 87-8.

[18]Quoted in Joad Raymond, ed., *Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England 1641-1660* (Moreton-in-Marsh: Windrush Press, 1993) 250.

[19]See Revard, *The War in Heaven*, and Quint, *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Forms from Virgil to Milton* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993).

annual celebrations that marked the nation's deliverance from the Gunpowder Plot. These poems share in the allegorical and pyrotechnical aspects of November 5th festivities, such as sermons and fireworks displays. The allegorical mode of representation is expressive in asserting the very form of the social totality saved by the discovery of the plot which, if successful, would have fragmented the socio-political fabric of the kingdom. The allegorization of the plot makes use of familiar Catholic stereotypes and conspiracy theories--the demonic nature of Catholicism, the pope as antichrist, and Rome as Babylon--in order to construct a narrative of Catholic duplicity in contrast to a narrative of England as a chosen nation. Gunpowder plots against the protestant nation become implicated in the wider European context of the Reformation which is both a religious and political struggle. "Anti-Catholic propaganda," writes John Miller, "was concerned to show, not only the ridiculousness, impiety, and superstition of Popery, but also its dreadfulness as a *political* phenomenon as evidenced by English Protestants' past struggles with Catholicism."[20]

As a widespread papist conspiracy, however, the threat manifested by the Gunpowder Plot, while clearly endangering the body politic, is also something that each individual must be on guard against. The fireworks display in London on November 5, 1647, cleverly allegorizes the Plot, and a broadsheet describes the significance of each part of the display. Fireballs on the water and rockets shooting out of the water represent the papist alliance with the underworld and the infernal spirits. Runners on a line represent the attempt to unite plotters against England's peace. Various firewheels, rockets, balloons streaming fire,

---

[20]*Popery and Politics in England, 1660-1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1973) 71.

and a great bumber-ball,[21] all significantly exploding in the air as opposed to the earlier fireworks emerging from the water, symbolize England's divine blessing and the defeat of the Plot. The display finally ends with fire-boxes that had been set amongst the crowd of spectators. These are meant to warn them of their enemies, which, it seems, are suspected to be ever present.[22] The celebration, then, is not only one of a triumph over a past threat to the nation, but also a warning that the threat still exists and is, in some sense, faced on an individual level.

The sermon, along with fireworks displays and Gunpowder Plot poems, was another genre which insisted on a continuing Catholic threat, often associating the Plot with a number of other Catholic plots against England as well as other, at times curious, transgressions. The Armada, the reign of Mary Tudor, and a variety of plagues, for example, are coupled with the Plot in order to demonstrate God's continued blessings which have saved England from, in William Barlow's 1605 sermon on the Gunpowder Plot, a "cruell Execution, an inhumane crueltie, a brutish immaintie, a develishe brutishness, & an Hyberbolicall, yea an hyperdiabolicall divelishness."[23] Sermons to mark England's delivery from the Gunpowder Plot share in the more widespread anti-Catholic sentiments frequently espoused from the pulpit. In a 1609 sermon, for example, Lancelot Dawes continues to view the English Catholics as a danger to the kingdom. They and their mysterious fellow conspirators are "the

---

[21]A "bumber-ball," it would appear from the *OED*, is a loudly exploding ball of some sort: *bum*, 1. *intr.* to boom.

[22]George Browne, *A Modell of the Fire-workes to be presented in* Lincolnes-Inne *Fields on the 5th of* Novemb. *1647 Before the Lords and Commons of Parliament, and the Militia of* London (London: 1647).

[23]Quoted in Millar Maclure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534-1642* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1958) 226-7.

very scumme and excrements of this land" and must be purged from the body politic.[24] And, in 1616, Sampson Price expresses similar views while linking English Catholics to a number of other socially undesirable types --if England "permits roarers, Jezebels, usurers, atheists, blood-thirsty papists to dwell within her gates, then surely God's judgement will come upon her."[25] These examples share in the belief in a Catholic threat existing within the nation, a threat made all the more dangerous with the possibility that discontent amongst the English Catholic community may be taken advantage of by foreign conspirators. The political tensions during Charles I's reign only served, in the minds of many, to highlight these dangers: Charles's marriage to the Catholic Henrietta Maria, the queen's open practice of her religion, Laud's ecclesiastical policies, and the commonplace association between popery and arbitrary government that the years of personal rule only served to make all too real for some.

These same troubling notions occur in Milton's "In Quintum Novembris." Satan inspires the Pope to break the Britons's "vaunting spirits, their insolent pride."[26] While the mention of pride here may well be ironic coming from Satan's lips, a similar note is often sounded in sermons of the period. A sermon delivered to the Lords and Commons on November 5, 1642, taking Nehemiah 4.11 as its text, also raises this concern after discussing the Gunpowder Plot and the "*butcheries of Ireland*:"

> for though I hope it is not in the *purposes of God* to destroy *England*, nor to destroy *London*, yet I have thought sometimes: *The purpose and intent of God*

---

[24]Quoted in Maclure 231.

[25]Quoted in Maclure 237.

[26]*Milton: Complete Shorter Poems*, ed. John Carey, 2nd ed. (London and New York: Longman, 1997) 48.

> *hath been* to *humble*, and *attenuate London* and *England.* For *Englands* long *continued peace*, had *abundantly increased* Englands *wealth*, and the *abundant increase* of Englands *wealth*, had proportionately *increased* Englands *pride*.[27]

The social currency of these fanciful representations of stock Catholic conspiracy theories would make the reported Irish Gunpowder Plot plausible to a 1641 readership: the threat to sovereignty, religion, and property that would follow upon the destruction of the Protestant nation. "The Gunpowder Plot," writes Miller, "was the last and greatest influence in the formation of Protestant belief in Popish disloyalty and treason."[28]

The Gunpowder Plot is problematically linked to England's peace and wealth, which have resulted in a sinfulness and sense of complacency that has negative repercussions on the national as well as the colonial reformation: though the 1605 plot was discovered, a Catholic threat still remains and may well take advantage of the kingdom's complacency and indifferent attempts at stamping popery out. Yet, of course, the internal turmoil of civil war also has a negative effect on the three kingdoms and, in particular, with attempts to deal with the rebellious Irish. Edmund Spenser had pointed this out almost half a century prior to the outbreak of the 1641 Irish Rebellion and the raising of the king's standard in the summer of 1642. In Spenser's *View*, Irenius comments that English political struggles are at least partly to blame for the Irish situation. They have added "fatall mischief[s]" to the colonial troubles; for example, at

> the time that the division between the two houses of Lancaster and York arose

---

[27]*The Craft and Cruelty of the Churches Adversaries: a Sermon Preached on Nov.5, 1642 at St Margaret's in Westminster, before the House of Commons* (London: 1642) 66.

[28]*Popery and Politics* 80.

> for the Crown of England: at which time all the great English lords and gentlemen which had great possessions in Ireland repaired over hither into England...to strengthen their party for to obtain the Crown.[29]

The Wars of the Roses allowed the Irish to overrun the Pale and reclaim their lands. English political conflicts enhance the difficulty of continuity for the colonial project, and the Irish troubles are entwined with the "troubles of England."[30] In much the same way, the debate between the king and parliament over control of the army to quell the Irish in the early stages of the rebellion only adds to the confusion in Ireland and the rebels's initial successes. Just prior to Cromwell's 1649 expedition to Ireland, Colonel Jones's response to Ormond's attempt to lure him away from the parliamentary cause asserts as much:

> Most certain it is, and former ages have approved it, that the intermeddling of Governors and parties in this Kingdom, with sidings and parties in *England*, have been the very betraying of this kingdom to the Irish, while the Brittish forces here had bin thereupon called off, and the place given up to the common enemie.[31]

Jones's concerns regarding the "betraying of this kingdom to the Irish" shares in the anti-Catholic and anti-Irish concerns of the fireworks display, pamphlets, poems, and sermons: has God preserved Ireland in an "unquiet state...for some secret scourge which shall by her

---

[29]Spenser, *View* 14.

[30]Spenser, *View* 14.

[31]Milton, *CPW* 3: 294.

come unto England" and punish it for its sins?[32] Jones's letter implies that the unity of a developing British identity is reliant on the political situation in Ireland and the Irish as the "common enimie" of the Scots and the English. Ireland's standing within the three kingdoms is, moreso than Scotland's and England's, dependent upon a joint Scottish / English presence and alliance. When internal Scottish or English upheavals arise, that British identity fragments into "sidings and parties" that can take advantage of Ireland, as is evident in the developing conflict between the king and parliament and, later, between the Independents and Presbyterians.

Political fragmentation within the three kingdoms had already begun when the Irish rebelled, and, regardless of whether the Irish Gunpowder Plot actually existed, reports of it appeared in print and most certainly coloured their readers's reactions to the outbreak of rebellion by drawing upon a particular cultural response. An Irish event is made understandable through the appropriation of a popularly celebrated English event, making a sudden uprising knowable to an audience by representing it as the recurrence of Catholic conspiracy. The iterability of the plot is precisely what gives the analogy its cultural value, and it also makes the outbreak of rebellion in Ireland a plot which, once again, attacks the fundamental socio-political foundation of England. The analogy is an historical fragment appropriated for a contemporary political use, serving as an interpretive key to the rebellion by locating it within a larger narrative framework of a very plausible Catholic conspiracy. In addition, the analogy draws the more immediate colonial causes for the rebellion into the larger fears of "popery and arbitrary government" during the 1640s as well as the wider European

---

[32]Spenser, *View* 1.

reformation context.

The textual strategies used to represent this all too threatening crisis are important. While Raymond's analysis of the development of the newsbook reveals the fits and starts in the gradual evolution of the format and genre of news reporting, he does not particularly discuss this in terms of political fragmentation. Raymond writes,

> The style of the early newsbooks can be characterized as the absence of "style." The horizons of the newsbook were outwardly, not inwardly defined: they were anthologies of other modes of speech and writing, loosely bound in a small quarto. It was the formal, typographical elements, the title and the daily heads, which defined it as a newsbook, while the text was essentially heterogeneous.[33]

The textual strategy used in pamphlets and newsbooks appropriates fragments with which a picture of Ireland is constructed for readers who often have little or no first-hand knowledge of the country. Of the three pamphlets making use of the gunpowder analogy, all but one contextualize this fragment amongst other fragments of news from Ireland in order to construct some sense of a social totality that demonstrates a "will to reconciliation of object and spirit," in terms of political ideology and social relations.[34]

The frequent reprinting of material also serves the purpose of constructing a social totality by grounding the latest events within an unfolding political context. For example, *A Gun-Powder-Plot in Ireland* also includes an account of the rumours preceding the rebellion

---

[33]*The Invention of the Newspaper* 135-6.

[34]Fredric Jameson, *Marxism and Form: Twentieth-Century Dialectical Theories of Literature* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972) 72.

along with a report of a skirmish; *The Last Newes* provides lists of the rebels' reasons for taking up arms, as well as an opinion of their possible intentions; *A Copy of a Letter* incorporates information from the Lord Justices' letter relating the gunpowder plot, reprinted in its entirety in *A Gun-Powder-Plot in Ireland*, as well as the rebels' reasons for taking up arms which are given in *The Last Newes* and are frequently reprinted in other pamphlets reporting on the outbreak of the rebellion. These three pamphlets, then, serve as a gateway into analysing the genre of news in terms of montage, a mode of representation which Peter Burger argues is closely related to allegory. Essentially, many of these publications are montage--they pull selected elements out of the rebellion and contextualize them in print. Milton's *Observations* is, of course, another example which reproduces letters, a proclamation, a treaty, and a representation which Milton then proceeds to refute in the furtherance of a particular political agenda. Montage, like allegory, "combines two production-aesthetic concepts, one of which relates to the treatment of material (removing elements from a context), the other to the construction of the work (the joining of fragments and the positing of meaning)."[35] These fragments are joined together with the intention of creating "a living picture of the totality;" however, "Montage presupposes the fragmentation of reality."[36] Meaning, then, is reliant on the juxtaposition of the selected fragments. "What are decisive," writes Burger, "are not the events in their distinctiveness but the construction principle that underlies the sequence of events."[37]

---

[35]Peter Burger, *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, trans. Michael Shaw (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984) 70.

[36]Burger 70, 73.

[37]Burger 80.

Letters, orders, proclamations, depositions, treaties, etc. presented as news: the variety of genres reveals a textual inability to represent Ireland fully. It is an attempt to incorporate the colonial periphery, both materially and ideologically, into the state's narrative of reformation. This textual process shares a revealing trope with the later military subjugation of Ireland--the rebels' words and actions are to be "reduced" into writing and, finally, they are to be "reduced" by force. *A New Remonstrance from Ireland* orders appointed commissioners to record,

> what trayterous or disloyall words, speeches or actions were then or at any other time uttered or committed...and what unfitting words or speeches concerning the present Rebellion, or by occasion therof were spoken at any time by any person or persons whatever.... [The commissioners] are to reduce to writing, all the examinations you shall take...And the same returne unto the Councell Board of this our realme of *Ireland*.[38]

The reduction of Ireland to text in the early years of the rebellion is a means of making the country knowable, and including accounts of this process in the news situates the debate regarding the quelling of the rebellion in the public sphere. In addition, colonial recordation finds its correlative in the familiar military strategy of the Irish wars, wasting the country, reducing it to ruins and antiquities: "In the ruin history has physically merged into the setting. And in this guise history does not assume the form of the process of an eternal life so much

---

[38]Thomas Emitie, *A New Remonstrance from Ireland: Declaring the barberous cruelty and inhumanity of the Irish Rebels against the Protestants there. Also an Exact Discoverie of the manners and behaviour of the Irish Renegadoes here in* England, *with infallible Notes whereby they may be knowne and distinguished, together with the places they usually frequent and many other things remarkable* (London: 1642) A2v.

as that of irresistible decay.... Allegories are, in the realm of thoughts, what ruins are in the realm of things."[39] This is evident in the treatment of Irish antiquities and ruins in both Spenser's *Faerie Queene* and *View*. As Carl Lynden Peters and I have argued, Spenser's existence within the chaotic Irish space seriously challenges any attempt to give the shape of events meaning.[40] Only Irenius's proposed violent subjection, the wasting of Ireland, and its subsequent reformation can restore meaning. The void of history, the centuries of English colonial failure in the face of Irish resistance, must be filled by transforming Irish culture, reducing it to antiquities and ruins so that the allegorist can set to work and pick up a higher meaning from the fragments: "the present demands a coherent and accountable past from history; history demands that the present take it into account, to settle the accounts of the past."[41] The violent subjection of Ireland, then, is the material correlative of Catholic conspiracy theories: "Popish-plot thinking involves a retrospective gaze, one through which events from the past rise in significance in light of those of the present."[42]

For Milton, too, the Irish Rebellion highlights a process of decay: "their Cruelty hath dispeopl'd and lay'd wast" colonial structures.[43] The spatial separation of documents in *Observations* demonstrates the results of that decay, the political fragmentation of the kingdom and the alienation of civil identity. In his analysis of these documents, Milton

---

[39]Walter Benjamin, *The Origins of German Tragic Drama*, trans. John Osborne (London: New Left Books, 1977) 177-8.

[40]"King Arthur and Ireland" 120-21.

[41]Scott Wilson, *Culture and Materialism: Theory and Practice* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995) 155.

[42]Achinstein, "Milton and Charles I" 155.

[43]*Observations*, *CPW* 3: 305.

appears quite confident in his ability to incorporate this fragmentation into a single political perspective. No "true" Englishman can read the Articles of Peace without "indignation and disdaine."[44] In regards to the Belfast Presbytery, Milton upholds his earlier distinction from his discussion of royalist presbyterians in the *Tenure*:

> Nor is it distance of place that makes enmitie, but enmity that makes distance. He therfore that keeps peace with me, neer or remote, of whatsoever Nation, is to mee as farr as all civil and human offices an Englishman and a neighbour: but if an Englishman forgetting all Laws, human, civil and religious, offend against life and liberty, to him offended and to the Law in his behalf, though born in the same womb, he is no better then a Turk, a Sarasin, a Heathen.[45]

In joining forces with the rebels and the royalists, the Belfast Presbytery is no better than the barbaric Irish.

The role of the Irish in this reduction is very similar to that of the condemned in Michel Foucault's analysis of crime and punishment:

> The role of the criminal in punishment was to reintroduce, in the face of crime and the criminal code, the real presence of the signified--that is to say, of the penalty which, according to the terms of the code, must be infallibly associated with the offence. By producing this signified abundantly and visibly, and therefore reactivating the signifying system of the code, the idea of crime functioning as a sign of punishment, it is with this coin that the offender pays

---

[44]*Observations*, *CPW* 3: 301.

[45]*CPW* 3: 215.

his debt to society.[46]

Once the signifying system is reactivated, the allegorist can then set to work on the repristination of the social body from the dismembered body of the condemned as fragment and ruin. Yet, ambivalence is at the very core of this signifying code of subjection, be it criminal or colonial. The code's very existence always admits the possibility of its own subversion yet claims it is capable of containment. This code must be internalized by the subject who remains an object of surveillance:

> A whole corpus of individualizing knowledge was being organinsed that took as its field of reference not so much the crime committed (at least in isolation) but the potentiality of danger that lies hidden in an individual and which is manifested in his observed everyday conduct.[47]

To reproduce, for a moment, Foucault's paradigm, we can juxtapose two very different responses to the Irish Rebellion. First, we can return to one of the pamphlets that mentions the gunpowder plot--*A Copy of a Letter Concerning the Traiterous Conspiracy of the Rebellious Papists in Ireland.* This letter ends by relating the immediate response of the Dublin authorities: "Divers Rogues have endeavoured to fire the Suburbs, but are taken and two Gibbets set up for their sudden execution."[48] This reaction aims at immediately reestablishing the subject's relationship to authority by "reactivating," in Foucault's words, "the signifying system of the code" that has been so suddenly disturbed. The response on the

---

[46]*Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan, 2nd ed. (New York: Vintage Books, 1995) 128.

[47]Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 126.

[48]*A Copy of a Letter* 4.

part of the authorities represents the relationship between crime and punishment as fixed. The crime is "a sign of punishment." The quite different response to rebellion in *A New Remonstrance from Ireland* provides a fascinating contrast. This is a more individualized response which accounts for a distinct, observable pattern of behaviour that reveals a person's Irishness and can be put into practice even by readers. In doing so, *A New Remonstrance* attempts to forestall the need to resort to corporal punishment by preventing the victimisation of English protestants. The pamphlet relates a number of abuses committed by the Irish in England, including theiving, robbing, housebreaking, and the forging of papers, before providing a means of distinguishing the Irish:

> Many of the Irish that are lately come over into England, and have robbed and undone many good English men, deny themselves to be Irish, and say that they are Scots: that ye may the better discover them, observe these distinctions following. 1. Cause them to pronounce any word which hath the letter H in it, as Smith, faith, &c. Which they cannot do, not one among an hundred, but pronounce Smith, Smit; and Faith, Fait. 2. To know their Religion, cause them to say their prayers, as the Pater Noster and the Creed, in English, which they cannot well do. 3. Uncover their bosomes, most of them weare Crucifixes, especially the women. 4. Concerning their false papers, separate them asunder, and so examine them.[49]

A New Remonstrance provides those in the public sphere with a knowledge that *A Copy of a Letter* does not convey: in the latter, the key relationship is between the transgressive subject

---

[49]Emitie, *Remonstrance* 5-6.

and authority rather than, in the former, between subjects who share a common interest as property owners and citizens and those who pose a threat to them. *A New Remonstrance* recognizes the need for a new form of knowledge.

The four tests of *A New Remonstrance* imply that identity and difference can be discerned. The pronounciation test has its Old Testament precedent in Judges 12. In that narrative, Gilead defeats Ephraim and seizes the fords of the Jordan. If any Ephraimites attempt to cross the Jordan, they are asked to say "shibboleth," and, if they cannot properly prononce the word, they are killed. Emitie sees the shibboleth as almost completely effective in weeding out the Irish in England. The second test, again, is represented as watertight, but the possibility does exist that some Irish may be able to say prayers in English. Test three claims to work especially well on women, without providing the circumstances whereby one could conduct such a test--perhaps a magistrate would be involved in a physical search. But, some men, as well as women, may slip through such a superficial test. The final test is probably the most difficult, as a good set of counterfeit papers may not be distinguishable and would not necessarily be carried only by Irish renegadoes in England. Of course, the other curious element of these tests is that they are not ostensibly directed at distinguishing English from Irish (apparently, that must be relatively straight forward), but Scots from Irish who impersonate them. Other than the fourth test, the focus is on establishing the religious identity of the subject, as this appears to be the most effective way of distinguishing Irish and Scots.

One of the first problems that arose with the rebellion was identifying just who the enemy was. On November 4, 1641, amidst the difficulty of distinguishing friend from foe, *A*

Proclamation made by the Lords, Justices, and Councel in the Castle of Dublin attempted to define the term "Irish Papist." At first, they used a rather broad definition which included the Old English in the term:

> We do therefore, to give them [the Old English] full satisfaction, hereby declare and publish, to all his Majesties good Subjects in this kingdome, that by the words Irish Papists, we intended onely such of the old meere Irish, in the Province of *Ulster*, as have plotted, and continued, and beene Actors in this Conspiracy, and others who adhere to them, and that wee did not in any way intend, or meane thereby any of the Old *English* of the Pale, nor of any other parts of this Kingdome, we being well assured of their fidelities to the Crowne, and having experience of the good affection and service of their Ancestors in former times of danger and Rebellion, and we further require all his Majesties loving Subjects, whether Protestants, or Papists, to forbeare upbraiding matter of Religion, one against the other, and that upon paine of his Majesties indignation.[50]

The problem of identification was further exacerbated by defining a civil, protestant identity against its antithetical blood-thirsty other. The inhuman stereotypical representation of Irish, papist rebels created such a distancing effect that misidentification could result: "at midnight there was an allarum given, as if the Rebels had beene come to Kells, but it was my owne neighbours of Kells, that were the Rebels indeed."[51] Identity cannot be pinned down--

---

[50] *A Late and True Relation from Ireland* (London: 1641) A3v.

[51] *A Copy of a Letter* 2.

something always escapes the attempt at categorisation.

Between any constructed civil identity and its antithetical other, then, a problematized gap exists. This is a space in which panic circulates, fears and rumours, a hybrid space "beyond the knowledge of ethnic or cultural binarisms."[52] Catholic conspiracy theories are one ever present example. Nor is the circulation of panic in a more specific Irish context a new problem for the English in the 1640s. In Spenser's *View*, for example, it is characterized by the Irish mantle. The mantle is a powerful symbol of cultural difference, a symbol that conflates a variety of transgressions. Irenius associates the mantle with outlaws, thieves, and rebels, to those "wandering in waste places far from danger of law...[far] from the sight of men."[53] The mantle sustains these unruly activities, as the thief can conceal his stolen goods under his mantle and, like the outlaw and the rebel, use it as a "house" to lay in wait for his victims: "Besides all this he or any man else that is disposed to mischief or villainy may, under his mantle, go privily, armed without suspicion of any."[54] In terms of gender specific transgressions, the mantle is a convenient cover for the "lewd exercise" of questionable women; they can hide their "bastards" under their mantles. The mantle even transforms "good" women into lazy women. Both Irenius and Eudoxus agree that the mantle should be abolished.

> The mantle, then, is a symbol of,
>
> a protean, masculine and warlike, yet feminine and seductive, intimate, veiling,

---

[52]Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994) 204.

[53]Spenser, *A View* 51.

[54]Spenser, *A View* 52.

> nurturing, protective space.... As a fluid, changeable and property-less place, the space facilitated by the mantle represents everything that is alien and threatening to Spenser and the English forces.[55]

The mantle is also a symbol of both the degeneration of the Old English and of English colonial frustrations. Its space must be colonised; its secrets must be revealed. This protean space is fundamentally different from that of "sedentary state-forming cultures."[56] It is a private, self-enclosed space, allowing a certain degree of troubling autonomy to the Irish within a terrain contested as colonised. Power must be brought to bear on this space. Scott Wilson states that sedentary space is a clearly demarcated, enclosed space in contrast to the space inhabited by nomads. Adapting the concept of "nomadology" from the work of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, Wilson writes, "nomad space is smooth, marked only by 'traits' that are effaced and displaced along the nomadic trajectory. The latter, smooth space is exterior to the enclosed, striated space of the State."[57] The exteriority of this space, paradoxically, allows the state to demarcate its own interior space. The exterior, nomad space is "waste" against which the civil space is demarcated.

As Lord Deputy Sidney's 1576 trek around Ireland in pursuit of rebels that had attacked Athenry demonstrates, the nomadic space is really nowhere, unlocatable within the colonial structure. Ireland seems to turn England itself inside out. The space symbolized by the mantle dissolves the colonial power structures (laws, boundaries, etc.) of the striated

---

[55]Wilson, *Cultural Materialism* 81.

[56]Wilson, *Cultural Materialism* 79.

[57]Wilson, *Cultural Materialism* 79-80.

space of the state and encloses it within its own shifting, protean space where things are hidden, transgressions committed, and rebellious conspiracies plotted. If the nomadic trajectory cuts across what has been established as a demarcated, civil space, it leaves in its wake a spectacle of traces--waste. Sidney describes the traces he encountered in a letter to the Privy Council: a "horrible and lamentable Spectacle there are to beholde, as the Burninge of Villages, the Ruyn of Churches, the Wasting of such as have ben good Townes and Castells: Yea, the view of the Bones and Sculles of the ded Subjectes."[58] As David J. Baker states, Sidney is faced with "a jumble of relics, what is left after random insurrection has exploded the realm into spatial chaos."[59] Colonial discourse is complicit with the military strategy of subjection in its attempt to impose form onto spatial chaos. In the example of the mantle, the English project their panic and anxiety onto an ethnic particularity in order to attempt "to contain and 'objectify' their anxiety, finding a ready 'native' reference for the undecidable event that afflicted them."[60]

Panic is also evident in another important way. In Spenser's *View*, Irenius states,

> for every day we perceive the troubles growing more upon us, and one evil growing upon another, insomuch that there is no part sound nor ascertained, but all have their ears upright, waiting when the watchword shall come that they should all rise generally into rebellion and cast away the English subjection to which there now little wanteth, for I think the word be already

---

[58]Quoted in David J. Baker, "Off the Map: Charting Uncertainty in Renaissance Ireland," *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660*, ed. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993) 84.

[59]Baker 84.

[60]Bhabha 204.

given, and there wanteth nothing but opportunity.[61]

Irenius relates an odd mode of anxious suspension, a temporal lag: the word may well already have been given, either the opportunity is lacking or the precise moment has not arrived. While Irenius has no knowledge of what the watchword is, he is certain that it is already in circulation. He can only associate it with the troubling symbol of the mantle. Though the political context of the 1641 rebellion is different, the colonisers' reactions are similar. In 1641, we meet with another account of a watchword: "And on Monday upon the watchword (Skeaner) a dangerous weapon which they use, they were to cut all the English throats."[62] It is unclear from the context of this statement whether the watchword or the *scian* ("skeaner" is an anglicisation of the Irish word for a long knife) is the more dangerous weapon.[63] The watchword circulates freely and easily amongst the rebels and possesses a use and exchange value that disrupts the signifying system of the colonisers.

The watchword creates a threatening sense of collective agency. In this way, it functions much like the chapati (a small, unleavened bread) during the Indian Mutiny two centuries later. Homi K. Bhabha's analysis of the symbolic significance of the chapati's circulation among Indian villages to the complete astonishment and mystification of the British reveals the profound anxiety that native, conspiratorial codes prompt in the colonisers. The chapati was passed from village to village, being presented to the head of each

---

[61]Spenser, *A View* 94.

[62]*A Brief Declaration of the Barbarous And inhumane dealings of the Northerne* Irish *Rebels. Written to Excite the* English *Nation. By G. S. Minister of Gods word in Ireland* (London: 1641) 2-3.

[63]Patricia Coughlan provides the definition of *scian* (Irish for "long knife"), a common weapon attributed to the stereotypical Irish rebel, in "'Cheap and Common Animals': the English Anatomy of Ireland in the Seventeenth Century," *Literature and the English Civil War*, ed. Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990) 210.

village in turn, creating excitement among the populace and anxious interpretations as to its significance among the British. The chapati in nineteenth-century India, like the Irish watchword in seventeenth-century Ireland, betrays the "semiotic condition of uncertainty and panic...generated when an old and familiar symbol...develops an unfamiliar social significance as sign through a transformation of the temporality of its representation."[64] Precisely because they employ "old and familiar symbols," the potentially disruptive social significance of a commonplace chapati or word prompts all the more temporal anxiety in the colonisers--a disruptive suspension in the time between the symbolic appearance of an object or word and the rebellious consequences.

The desire to record the traitorous words and actions of rebels is an attempt to restabilise the signifying system. Many pamphlets aim at making events understandable, and, in order to do so, writers must engage with a world in a state of flux that challenges their intentions of fixing meaning. Wlad Godzich and Jeffrey Kittay contrast poetry and prose in terms of their relation to historical process and argue that "Prose is much more heraclitan, it begins with change and seeks to find ways of managing it. We have seen that in the social sphere it is the function of the state to be the manager of change, the holder of conflicts, the definer of limits."[65] The need to manage what is an essentially formless, prosaic world is trapped in the process of events which continually outrun their textuality and the anxiety of what may next occur. In the context of rebellion, events occur with a potentially frightening immediacy. Composed from a position within the flux, prose can only suggest possible

---

[64]Bhabha 202.

[65]*The Emergence of Prose: An Essay in Prosaics* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1987) 177.

avenues of participation in events with the hope of giving them some sort of desired direction by pointing outside of the text to potential power alignments. Proliferating transgression requires a force to trim it back, to give it form. If, for a moment, we consider the contrast between pamphlets and broadsheets, particularly broadsheets which publish orders or proclamations, we see that the broadsheets are brief statements which attempt to channel change summarily; they are direct, official responses to events which attempt to stop the process of decay and give a desired form to the social world. Yet, reproduced within a pamphlet, they are resituated within the flux that they are trying to affect, often pointing to their inadequacy as a definitive imperative. Recontextualized in this way, the broadsheet statements are often judged against events either favourably or critically in a way that may well suggest further political action from within the public sphere. Milton's own appeal to read the actions of the Belfast Presbytery against their *Representation* in light of the latest news from Ulster, "that the *Scottish* Inhabitants of that Province are actually revolted,"[66] does as much:

> [prose readers] are the observers--participants who can block, accelerate, redirect, invert, or even abort processes. Thus they do have at their disposal a form of agency commensurate with their powers; they do not transform the world through heroic deeds, but they see the potential directions and can channel change that will occur anyway.[67]

For Godzich and Kittay, prose is aligned with matter and poetry with form. Poetry

---

[66]*Observations*, *CPW* 3: 322.

[67]Godzich and Kittay 199.

requires a distance from events in order to give them the form that they lack in the present, often through an heroic agent. Even in poetry, however, this attempt may be unsuccessful, as it certainly is in Book 5 of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. It is a rather odd moment, therefore, when Milton writes,

> If there were a man of iron, such as *Talus*, by our poet *Spencer*, is fain'd to be the page of Justice, who with his iron flaile could doe all this, and expeditiously, without those deceitfull formes and circumstances of Law, worse then ceremonies in Religion; I say God send it don, whether by one *Talus*, or by a thousand.[68]

The poetic representation of Justice, figured in Artegall and Talus, of course, fails in Spenser's poem due to both the proliferating, rebellious vice of the age and court intrigues, yet the violent form of Justice portrayed by Spenser clearly appeals to Milton. If we contrast Milton's praise of Artegall and Talus with C. S. Lewis's disgust at Book 5, we can further elucidate the issue of distance and engagement with events in relation to poetry and prose. For Lewis, "the violent excesses of Artegall and of the 'iron man,' Talus, are an indication of the gradual corruption of Spenser's imagination and a direct by-product of his allegiance to a 'detestable policy in Ireland.'"[69] Lewis believes that where Spenser's engagement with a colonial ideology and current events obtrudes and breaks the surface of his epic, there his poetry falters, and the only recourse for the reader is to reject such writing out of hand.[70]

---

[68]*Eikonoklastes, CPW* 3: 390.

[69]Anne Fogarty, "The Colonization of Language: Narrative Strategy in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* and *The Faerie Queene*, Book VI," *Spenser and Ireland: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*, ed. Patricia Coughlan (Cork: Cork UP, 1989) 76.

[70]Fogarty 76.

Furthermore, Foucault's analysis of punishment and discipline may well enhance our understanding of the relationship of poetry and prose to their political context. Foucault's account of public punishment as a display of sovereign power is, in this light, a poetics of power, one which attempts to reinstate form to a social order following a transgression that has disrupted the signifying system. Its response to transgression is to crop it when it appears and before it proliferates. The modes of discipline, on the other hand, are essentially a prosaic of power, an attempt to direct ongoing change as it occurs. The poetic of power is aligned with form; the prosaic with matter. As Walter Benjamin writes, "Just as earthly mournfulness is of a piece with allegorical interpretation, so is devilish mirth with its frustration in the triumph of matter."[71] The problem here is one of meaning persistently clinging, in a more materialist sense, to the sign, preventing it from transcending its context as a stable emblem or ideal.

Annabel Patterson states that societies invoke allegorical "symbols more frequently when experiencing painful transitions"; yet,

> the strains within justice as a theory are exhibited as strains on the allegorical system itself, an internal critique of the way allegory, by setting static emblems in narrative motion, is bound to reveal their inherent failures of logic and truthfulness.[72]

The complicity of the barbarous stereotype in colonial discourse goes some way in mystifying the logic of the emblem. However, the transcendent icon of justice descends into

---

[71]*The Origins of German Tragic Drama* 227.

[72]"The Egalitarian Giant: Representations of Justice in History / Literature," *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992): 106, 112.

the prosaic world, where possession of the emblem is contested between king, parliament, and Irish rebels. Unchallenged possession of the sword will reinstate the signifying system and reassert the emblem's transcendence of the prosaic world. Yet, as Andrew Marvell's "An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland" points out, possession of the sword is not unproblematic. Following the execution of the king, the defeat of the Irish rebels, and the impending Scottish invasion, the "sword erect" is an ambiguous icon when contrasted to "ancient" and "helpless" rights. Cromwell is represented as having swept away the old order by the sword, and "The same *Arts* that did *gain* / A *Power*, must it *maintain*."[73]

The proliferating transgression of the Irish Rebellion causes the sword, the emblem of the poetics of punishment, to collapse in the flux of the prosaic world and the triumph of matter. Many pamphlets and broadsheets betray an anxiety in relation to the events they attempt to communicate to their audiences. For example, Charles I's declaration that those in arms in Ireland are rebellious traitors, ordering them to lay down their arms, carries with it the threat of force--words themselves are simply not enough. Either the rebels lay down their arms or they will be prosecuted by "fire and sword," having made themselves unworthy of "mercy or favour." The proclamation is related in a letter from the Lord Chief Justices of Ireland:

> The proclamation from the Kings Majesty, requiring the Rebels immediately to lay downe their armes, and in case they faile so to doe, then requiring the Lords Justices to prosecute them with fire and Sword...yet no effect at all is found thereof further than to confirme this beleefe, that they are universally so

---

[73]*The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, ed. H. M. Margoliouth, 2 vols. 3rd ed. (Oxford:

hardened in their wickednesse...and to take the Kings authority wholly into their owne hands, that there is no way of honour and firme securitie left to his Majestie, and the Kingdome of England but by the Sword, and that with speed.[74]

The incorporation of the terms of the king's proclamation, while not serving as a criticism of the king in the prosecution of the rebellion, reveals its failure in practice. Yet, the Justices' letter demonstrates the essential aspect of the ambivalence of the colonial stereotype. The barbarous stereotype is complicit with colonial violence, as the Irish refusal to respond positively to the king's proclamation only serves to reinforce their barbarism.

The rebellious Irish are one frightening manifestation of the arch-rebel Satan and his infernal plots. Following the episode in which Satan invents gunpowder, that frightening tool of Popish plotters, Raphael tells Adam,

> ...yet haply of thy race
>
> In future days, if malice should abound,
>
> Someone intent on mischief, or inspired
>
> With devilish machination might devise
>
> Like instrument to plague the sons of men
>
> For sin, on war and mutual slaughter bent.[75]

Clarendon Press, 1971) 1: 50-52.

[74]*A Relation Touching the present state and condition of Ireland. Collected by a Committee of the house of Commons, out of severall letters, lately come from the Lords Justices of Ireland and others, and Printed by order of the said House. And also the Examination of* Hubert Petit, *taken the 19. of* February, *1641 by direction of the Lords Justices, and Counsell of* Ireland (London: 1642), 3.

[75]*Paradise Lost*, ed. Alastair Fowler, 2nd ed. (London and New York: Longman, 1998) 6. 501-6.

The key word here is "inspired." This Satanic inspiration and its simulation in later gunpowder plots underlies Catholic conspiracy theories and their threat not only to the reformed religion but also to English political institutions. As a November 5, 1642 sermon states,

> Never any Treason before this so *destructive*. Others were but *petty* Treasons compared with this. *This* was the *master-piece* of all the *pollicy* of *Rome* and *Hell*. Unlesse it were the *Treason* of *Satan* against the *state* of *Man* in *Paradise*, to blow up all *Man-kind* in *Adam, the representative of it at once.*[76]

The secret planning and guile of Satan's originary plots--the war in heaven and the temptation in Eden--is reenacted by the 1605 plotters: the political targets of that plot "shall not seie who hurts them."[77] Or, in the words of the November fifth sermon quoted above, the plotters' intentions are to "*come upon them, and they shall neither know nor see, till we are in the midst of them and slay them, and cause the worke to cease.*"[78] It is interesting to note, however, that when discussing the Irish Rebellion, though claiming that the rebellion had been secretly plotted for many years, the clergyman states, "*our adversaries* [in Ireland] *have said* (varying the words of the Text a little) *Wee will come upon them, though they know and see it, and slay them, and cause the worke to cease.*"[79] There is, unlike the pamphlets discussed earlier in this chapter, no specifically Irish Gunpowder Plot tied to the rebellion. Although a

---

[76]*The Craft and Cruelty of the Churches Adversaries* 24.

[77]This quotation occurs in the anonymous warning note given to Lord Monteagle shortly before the 1605 plot. The letter, along with a discussion of its probable author, is in Antonia Fraser, *The Gunpowder Plot: Terror & Faith in 1605* (London: Orion Publishing, 1996) 150-57.

[78]*The Craft and Cruelty of the Churches Adversaries* 1.

[79]*The Craft and Cruelty of the Churches Adversaries* 49.

rebellious, secret conspiracy existed which accords with demonic papists stereotypes, the Irish *openly* rebelled. The familiar elements of Catholic and Irish stereotypes are conveniently flexible.

It is interesting, in closing, to recall Milton's allusion to the 1605 Gunpowder Plot in his discussion of the Irish Rebellion in *Eikonoklastes*. In 1649, Milton asks his readers to reread critically the 1605 plot in relation to current events:

> Although if the Common-wealth should be afraid to suppress op'n Idolatry, lest the Papists thereupon should grow desperat, this were to let them grow and become our persecuters, while we neglected what we might have done Evangelically, to be their Reformers. Or to doe as his Father James did, who in stead of taking heart and putting confidence in God by such a deliverance as from the Powder Plot, though it went not off, yet with the meer conceit of it, as some observe, was hitt into such a Hectic shivering between Protestant and Papist all his life after, that he never durst from that time doe otherwise then equivocat or colloque with the Pope and his adherents.[80]

There is no revelling in the plot's failure here, other than in terms of a missed opportunity to take advantage of God's blessing in the discovery of the plot. Due to the misgovernance of James I and Charles I, in fact, the allusion becomes particularly critical of monarchy. The failure of the 1605 plot was an opportunity to quash the potential of Catholic conspiracies, yet, because both James and Charles chose rather to "equivocat or colloque with the Pope and his adherents," a Popish threat continues to endanger the English polity. Invoking the

---

[80] *CPW* 3: 479-80.

Gunpowder Plot was, throughout the seventeenth century,

> a rational and highly effective means of political analysis.... Since it drew upon a mode of interpretation vital to English history since the Reformation, the Popish Plot worked to fire revolutionary action not only because it could explain the present; it also reawakened memories of past events, fears and self-perceptions deeply rooted in collective memory so as to seem naturally woven into the fabric of English identity.[81]

This is precisely the political function of an alleged Irish Gunpowder Plot that appeared in three pamphlets late in 1641. The Irish Rebellion is thereby immediately open to a readily familiar mode of political interpretation.

Increasingly, as the Irish Rebellion continued and civil war occurred, and by the time of the execution of Charles I and that event's political aftermath, the Gunpowder Plot clearly gained significant, contemporary political resonances. As we shall see in the next chapter, the 1605 plot and its associations with the arch-rebel Satan would come to be used as an interpretive key to the political machinations of not only the Irish rebels but also, by association, those of Charles I and the Prebyterians: In *Observations*,

> Milton's polemical engagement with Presbyterian plotting and with the treacherous politics of the Irish Rebellion, associated with the shifty conduct of the king, sharpened his sense of *Realpolitik*; as a result, he perceived more keenly the genesis and nature of ambiguous rebellion in his age and its

[81]Achinstein, "Milton and King Charles" 142-3.

connection with secretive political discourse and behavior.[82]

In a fascinating way, Milton's pen, and those of writers of similar political persuasion, is analogous to Ithuriel's spear in *Paradise Lost*. While crouched at Eve's ear in the shape of a toad, Satan's concealment is destroyed when touched by Ithuriel's spear:

> ...up he starts
>
> Discovered and surprised. As when a spark
>
> Lights on a heap of nitrous powder, laid
>
> Fit for the tun of some magazine to store
>
> Against a rumoured war, the smutty grain
>
> With sudden blaze diffused, inflames the air.[83]

When touched by the polemicist's pen, the dubious political intentions of the Irish rebels, Charles I and the Presbyterians would cause them all to inflame the air.

---

[82]David Loewenstein, "Representing the Irish Revolt: Militant Protestantism and the English Republic" (presented at the British Milton Seminar, March, 1999) 11.

[83]*Paradise Lost* 4: 813-18.

2. Cabinet Drama: the Civil Self, Politics, and the Colonial Encounter

> It is a trew old saying, That a King is as one set
> on a stage, whose smallest actions and gestures,
> all the people gazingly doe behold. -- James I[1]

In the previous chapter, I suggested that we read the pamphlets dealing with the Irish Rebellion as montage, a form which attempts dialectically to shape political fragmentation. Montage remains, however, a paradoxical mode of representation, as its constructed totality affirms an essentially fragmented reality. The struggle for political authority between royalists and parliamentarians, and increasingly between Independents and Presbyterians, becomes entwined with representations of Ireland throughout the rebellion and the civil war. By 1649, this struggle would be largely between the Independents and the Presbyterians, following the events surrounding the execution of Charles I. In addition, representations of the self are implicated in this wider political struggle. We see this in the frequent publication of letters which attempt to negotiate identity within the complexities of this socio-political context. Ireland is a site where political authority and identity are seriously challenged. In Ireland, a variety of armies of the three kingdoms confront each other in a conflict for political supremacy that significantly blurs the already existing rifts between nationalities--Irish, English, and Scottish--political ideologies, and religion. This is also evident in the fact that political as well as religious categories cut across these distinctions. Milton's *Observations*

---

[1]*King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge UP,

implies a particular English hegemony in Ireland, and this, in turn, has significant political and religious implications for the whole commonwealth. Pamphlets, such as *Observations*, attempt to fashion individual responses to events in order to incorporate these into a broader ideological program.

My primary focus in this chapter is letters, and the letters that I will discuss tell us much about a "civil" identity and its relationship to the state and historical processes, one which results in a prioritized English, republican identity within a broader British / Irish context of civil war and rebellion. For Milton, the Irish Rebellion not only confirmed the barbarity of the Irish; it also highlighted the political dissimulation of both Charles I and the Presbyterians: "If any political or religious crisis confirmed Milton's sense of monstrousness and devilishness interwoven with the politics of verbal and artful equivocation, it was the Irish revolt."[2] In addition, the political manoeuvring witnessed in these letters often demonstrates the performativity, or theatricality, of identity. I will begin by discussing the iterability and constraints of performativity in relation to political issues before turning to address the question of aesthetic representation. As we shall see, Irish events prompt significant revelations: the colonial encounter propels the inner, often secret self, towards the public sphere, either willingly or, as in the case of the frequent publication of intercepted letters, unwillingly, and incorporates it into a political narrative. In effect, both Irish and Scottish activities in Ireland are factors that impale an English identity through a process of reiteration and constraint.

1995) 49.

[2]David Loewenstein, "Representing the Irish Revolt" 1.

While a letter writer states his own standing in relation to events in order to demonstrate his loyalties, the reader of these letters is continually required, and often explicitly asked in pamphlets, to compare the contents of a letter with the relations of events against which they are juxtaposed--words with roughly simultaneous or subsequent actions. Milton, working with *Eikon Basilike* and the documents that precede *Observations*, both of which include substantial sections dealing with letters, employs a similar strategy of comparison / contrast. He establishes this criterion immediately in *Observations*, stating that "sincere and upright intentions can certainly with as much ease deliver themselves into words as into deeds."[3] This is the basis on which the reader is critically to evaluate the words and deeds of Charles I and the royalists, the Belfast Presbytery, and the Irish rebels. Similarly, when dealing with the king, Milton writes,

> But if these his fair spok'n words shall be heer fairly confronted and laid parallel to his own farr differing deeds, manifest and visible to the whole Nation, then surely we may look on them who notwithstanding shall persist to give to bare words more credit then to op'n deeds, as men whose judgement was not rationally evinc'd and perswaded, but fatally stupifi'd and bewitch'd, into such a blinde and obstinate beleef.[4]

Thus, Milton's reading of the king's letters presented in *Eikonoklastes*, as well as a letter writer's relation to events, is an attempt to position oneself in respect to power alignments in the political fragmentation of the Irish Rebellion and the Civil War. The king's "manifest and

---

[3]*Observations, CPW* 3: 300.

[4]*Eikonoklastes, CPW* 3: 346-7.

visible...op'n deeds" provide an interpretive key to his words, allowing access to his dubious intentions. In addition, prompting readers to engage critically with "bare words" forces them to consider their own relationship to possible power alignments by entering into the political debate of the public sphere. The vantage points created by the juxtapositioning of documents enable the reader's choice of political alliance.

The stress which Milton puts on comparing royalist words and royalist actions in texts such as *Eikonoklastes* and *Observations* is linked to the frequent use of theatrical tropes in pamphlets. Recent work has addressed the Civil War theatre which revises earlier views that claim that the period was a void between the Renaissance and the Restoration theatres. Susan Wiseman writes,

> The order which banned the theatre inevitably simultaneously foregrounded the role of theatre and drama as participating in constructing popular political debate.... [T]he closure of the theatres served to intensify the politicised status of dramatic discourse: Civil War drama was sharply aware of its politicisation as a genre and of a political readership.[5]

Both Wiseman and Nigel Smith agree that the closure of the theatres in 1642 "did not mean the extinction of drama."[6] In this light, the accusations of *The Character of a London Diurnall* become particularly apt in pointing out the politicisation of dramatic resources:

> The next Ingredient of a Diurnall is Plots, horrible plots; which with wonderfull Sagacity it hunts dry-foot, while they are yet in their Causes,

---

[5]*Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998) 4-5.

[6]Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1994) 70.

before Materia prima can put on her smock. How many such fits of the Mother have troubled the Kingdome...and not yet delivered of so much, as a Cushion: But Actors must have their Properties; And, since the Stages were voted down, the only Play-house is at Westminster.[7]

From a royalist perspective, John Cleveland attacks the theatricality of Westminster and newsbooks in one fell swoop: both manufacture essentially fictional plots that trouble the kingdoms' peace but never materialise. Having commented on the fictional aspect of these theatrical plots, however, Cleveland falls back on a curious literary allusion of his own: "Thus the Quixotes of this Age fight with the Wind-mills of their owne heads; quell Monsters of their owne creation, make plots, and then discover them, as who fitter to unkennel the Fox, then the Tarryer, that is a part of him."[8] Plots emerge from within a fictional framework and are then quixotically pursued for political purposes.

The theatrical model employed by Cleveland, and others, is interesting because the theatre developed clever ways to demarcate secret places in its productions and made letters, as do newsbooks and pamphlets, into important plot devices. In the theatre, secrecy "required elaborate strategies for blocking out theatrical space and for defining vantage points that excluded certain audiences from certain knowledge at certain moments."[9] Montage, similarly, allows pamphlets to demarcate vantage points and secret places by reproducing material that is private (i.e. letters) in the public sphere, moving the reader into the subject's

---

[7]John Cleveland, *The Character of a London-Diurnall: With Several Selected Poems By the Same Author* (London: 1647) A2v.

[8]Cleveland A3r.

[9]William Slights, *Ben Jonson and the Art of Secrecy* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1994) 31.

inner thoughts and out to actions as the rebellion unfolds. This provides the reader with a somewhat privileged perspective on events through the revelation provided by publication. Published letters, then, blur the distinctions between public and private. As Lois Potter points out,

> members of the Long Parliament at first felt a certain delicacy about opening private letters. On capturing a packet of royalist correspondence early in 1642, they carefully forwarded one writer's letter to his parents unopened, while opening those written by two men to their brothers.... They had difficulty, too, in deciding what was and was not private. Letters to women usually came into the former category, but it was at first difficult to decide whether the Queen should be treated as an ordinary woman. In February 1642, the House of Commons was faced with a packet of intercepted letters from a man whom nobody trusted, Lord George Digby. They first decided to open all the letters except the one to Henrietta Maria, but then, after hearing a report on the others, voted to open that one too.[10]

Increasingly, of course, parliament realised the propaganda potential of publishing such correspondence, and I will turn to discuss Charles I's captured correspondence following the battle of Naseby later. Much as Potter argues that the boundaries between private and public are blurred by the political treatment of correspondence, Wiseman sees this in her analysis of Civil War drama: "The dialogic and rhetorical nature of the [pamphlet dialogue and playlet] form located even the private, individuated, purchaser and reader as participating in public

---

[10]*Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989)

events and ideas."[11] Published letters complicate this further by bringing the private individual's inner thoughts or intentions into the public sphere. These pamphlets bridge the gap between the private and the public with text in an attempt to affirm a political identity, or, in the case of Ireland, a civil identity fashioned against the barbaric stereotype that it is reliant on, in the flux of events which draw their readership into a political debate.

While Wiseman focuses on published playlets and dialogues, I want to explore the "migration of dramatic resources to the arena of the pamphlet" in a much broader sense.[12] The juxtaposition of letters and events is quite similar to the rhythm of the Renaissance theatre. In a discussion of Renaissance theatre, William Slights states that "Scenes of public show alternate with scenes of private conference, both romantic and political, in a reassuring rhythm of concealment and revelation."[13] Tension is created when this rhythm collapses in revelation, and I believe that we can read pamphlets as creating just such a rhythm by situating correspondence within an account of public events. This strategy is an attempt to give the impression of some sort of underlying structure to chaos--something discoverable that can be found to explain rebellion as well as the intentions underlying one's actions. But the rhythm of private conference and public events--what basically becomes a plotting of rebellion in pamphlets--places an incredible strain on both the discursive subject and the Irish stereotype. As we shall see, the revelation of the self that letters provide, whether negative or positive in light of events, leads to the subject's collapse, a co-optation into the state

---

39-40.

[11]Wiseman 4-5.

[12]Wiseman 70.

apparatuses.

The Irish stereotype plays an important role: "Stereotyping involves a reduction of images and ideas to a simple and manageable form; rather than simple ignorance or lack of 'real' knowledge, it is a method of processing information."[14] The information that the stereotype provides is an empowering knowledge of the self and a foil for the creation of a national identity by delineating everything that the civil subject is not. Norah Carlin argues this more specifically in the political context of seventeenth-century Ireland. She claims that more than hypocrisy is evident in the Independents' plans for Ireland and its justifications: the difficulty involves "reconciling an ideology of individual rights and liberty with the degradation and exploitation of a particular section of humanity. In 1649 the Independents sought to resolve this dilemma by reaching for the idea of Irish barbarism."[15] The stereotyping of the Irish as barbaric clearly has a long history, but Carlin's point calls attention to the shift in political strategies that the Independents' use of the stereotype is involved in. In Milton's *Observations*, the Irish stereotype becomes increasingly useful in the political battle between the Independents and the Presbyterians following the trial and execution of the king. Milton uses the Irish stereotype to discredit both the royalists and the Presbyterians by associating their political intentions with those of the Irish rebels. There is a move in *Observations*, as in Milton's other tracts of 1649, "to discredit Presbyterian leaders while retaining at least the

---

[13]Slights 25.

[14]Ania Loomba, *Colonialism-Postcolonialism* (New York: Routledge, 1998) 59-60.

[15]Norah Carlin, "Extreme or Mainstream?: the English Independents and the Cromwellian Reconquest of Ireland, 1649-1651," *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660*, ed. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993) 214.

acquiescence of the rank-and-file supporters of Presbyterian persuasion."[16] Through the useful lever of the Irish stereotype, the civil subject gradually emerges on the politically charged stage of the public sphere. Comparing written protestations to Irish events provides the reader with an important interpretive perspective.

The most important of these vantage points are those which take the reader into an inner space--the cabinet, or the closet--an often troubling private site. The pertinent *OED* definitions of these words are: *cabinet*, "a case for the safe custody of jewels, or other valuables, letters, documents, etc.," or a "secret receptacle." *Closet* is defined as "a private room;" "That which affords retirement like a private chamber, or which encloses like a cabinet; a hidden or secret place, retreat, recess," and, more specifically political, as the "private room in which the confidential advisers of the sovereign or chief ministers of a country meet." From out of this safe, secret, private site, the civil subject tentatively emerges through political and colonial encounters in a particularly theatrical way. What we shall see as this chapter develops is that the conflicting viewpoints of what is contained within this secret place, that which provides the reiterative and constraining elements of performativity, are implicated in a critique of Royalist aesthetics and the production of a new republican identity. The deployment of secrecy, in light of these *OED* definitions, becomes important for both royalists and parliamentarians. Potter's work calls attention to the importance of arcane symbolism and the coding of Royalist texts. Potter writes,

> the relation between ornament and secrecy is interesting because it indicates

---

[16]Thomas N. Corns, "Milton's *Observations Upon the Articles of Peace*: Ireland Under English Eyes," *Politics, Poetics, and Hermeneutics in Milton's Prose*, ed. David Loewenstein and James Grantham Turner (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990) 125.

how literary evaluation can depend on the sense that one is reading a coded text. Secrecy...may be an added ornament to rhetoric...if it enables a moral point to be made more effectively under the guise of a story. Where the moral is too effectively concealed, however, a story can appear merely grotesque.[17]

By conjoining Royalists and Presbyterians, Milton reads Ormond's rhetoric, as well as that of the Representation, as hiding a "close purpose"[18] which becomes evident through their actions in Ireland. As David Loewenstein comments, "In Milton's mind, the horrid conspiracy of the Irish rebels--both Catholics as well as Ulster Presbyterians--is linked to the king's 'tyrannicall designes in *England*.'"[19] Conjoining with the Irish cause is, not surprisingly from Milton's point of view, seen as a form of anarchic motion, a turning away from republican and civil ideals which threatens the sought for fixity of identity. One of Milton's key ingredients in his attack on Ormond and the Presbytery in regards to this is rhetoric. The unrestrained rhetoric of Ormond's letter to Jones and *A Necessary Representation* is analogous to the Irish rebels breaking the bounds of civility, and it becomes a demonstration of Royalist and Presbyterian complicity with the Irish. Ormond's letter to Jones "roves into long digression[s],"[20] and "he contains not himself, but contrary to what a Gentleman should know of Civility."[21] Ormond's "lavish pen" is "let loose" and the Articles of Peace threaten

---

[17]Potter 51.

[18]*Observations*, *CPW* 3: 322.

[19]David Loewenstein, "Representing the Irish Revolt" 8.

[20]*CPW* 3: 308.

[21]*CPW* 3: 312.

"anarchy" and "confusion;"[22] the Presbytery is "illeterat" and their malice is "highth'n'd to a blind rage."[23] Their *Representation* concludes "in frenzie; throwing out a sudden rapsody of Proverbs quite from the purpose."[24] If we recall Potter's discussion of Wilkin's view of the role of rhetoric in Royalist texts, both Ormond and the Belfast Presbytery are hiding their political intentions in the rhetoric of their written protestations. Their texts become merely grotesque attempts at concealment. In contrast, Colonel Jones's letter demonstrates the "discretion and true worth of that Gentleman."[25] Tempted by the "evill" words of Ormond to join forces with the Royalists, Jones remains unmoved in his political cause, in opposition to Ormond's anarchic motion in both words and deeds.

Milton deals with the king's letters in a similar way in *Eikonoklastes*, as do the annotations to *The Kings Cabinet Opened*. In both *Eikonoklastes* and *Observations*, Milton critiques a Royalist aesthetic--secrecy as a grotesque, ornamental aspect of rhetoric aimed at superficially hiding intentions and thereby duping susceptible readers. In terms of Ireland, Milton deploys secrecy in order to critique it and contrasts it to his own controlled rhetoric and anti-imaginative writing of Ireland, in very straightforward prose, in an "unaffected style."[26] As I suggested in the previous chapter, when discussing the work of Jeffrey Kittay and Wlad Godzich on the emergence of prose, this style is commensurate with a bureaucratic rewriting of Ireland, one which strips away the Royalist and Presbyterian rhetorical veneer.

---

[22]*CPW* 3: 308.

[23]*CPW* 3: 328-9.

[24]*CPW* 3: 332.

[25]*CPW* 3: 308.

[26]*Paradise Regained, Milton: Complete Shorter Poems*, 4. 359.

The bare framework of their questionable political goals is revealed. In its place, a republican style of openness emerges, a supposed political transparency. Yet, this remains an illusory openness of political communication within the public sphere, a deployment of parliamentary secrecy. If we see Ireland as a place of secrets, tied to Royalist and Presbyterian doings, as a cabinet that holds the key to troubling English political problems, then *Observations*, like *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, reveals the secret designs of those parties. Opening the Irish cabinet in order to reveal its secrets also demonstrates the sincere intentions and openness of parliament by entrusting this material to the public sphere.[27]

We realise, then, when reading the Irish pamphlets how both the notions of barbarism and civility are reliant on textual affirmation--civility is clearly something actively written in a struggle for political hegemony, and barbarism is something written of, a foil that often denies any Irish voice. Pushed by events into the public sphere, this revelation of self may have either positive or negative consequences, depending on whether one was royalist or parliamentarian in sentiment. The revelation of the civil self also involves the redefinition of concepts such as virtue and honour within a wider context of the politics of privacy and publicity. What is involved is "a wider remapping of social and body space, which enabled the rejection of traditional patterns of social subjection and the emergence of a public interest in men's privacy."[28] For Thomas A. King, privacy takes on a public utility and takes its place in a discourse of political resistance. No longer is political power associated with proximity to

---

[27]For a discussion of the spatial division of Ireland and England that is reproduced by the structural layout of *Observations*, see my "Dividing Conjunctions: Milton's *Observations Upon the Articles of Peace*," *Milton Quarterly* 33:2 (1999): 51-5.

[28]Thomas A. King, "Displacing Masculinity: Edward Kynaston and the Politics of Effeminacy," *The Image of Manhood in Early Modern Literature: Viewing the Male*, ed. Andrew P. Williams (Westport, Conn. & London: Greenwood Press Inc., 1999) 120.

the king's body, particularly after Charles I vacated the capital. Private individuals, in the public institution of parliament, come to occupy that void. The private and the public individual become key during the Civil Wars, and the Irish Rebellion is an important aspect of these emergent distinctions in political terms.

Lazarus Haward's *A Few Collections for Irelands Souldiers* provides us with an interesting example of the link between private and public in this political context. He begins with a dedicatory epistle to Lord Lieutenant General Lisle which justifies Haward's military profession:

> The profession of a Souldier is necessary, his ends glorious, and his quality honourable; But when I come to thinke of a minde befitting a Souldier, I can only say this: that how curious, costly, plaine, or deformed the Cabinet be, yet must it necessarily bee filled with all manner of vertues.[29]

"A Souldier," Haward continues, "must bee valiant (for his proper vertue) valiant to conquer his Countreys foes; and valiant to overthrow his owne passions."[30] Haward's comments clearly distinguish the private man from the public man of action while at the same time pointing to the fact that these distinctions are intimately entwined: his valiant actions, observable by others, and his inner virtues, which may not be particularly observable, and may, in fact, be concealed within a "deformed" cabinet. If we recall the *OED* definitions of *cabinet* and *closet*, the valuables stored safely within are the currency drawn upon by the virtuous individual in his public actions--inner virtue has a public utility in contrast to the

---

[29]Haward, *A Few Collections for Irelands Souldiers* (London: 1647) A2r.

[30]Haward A2v.

ostentatious spectacle of the aristocracy which may be seen as an entirely superficial display of social status and virtue, a point I will return to when discussing the king's correspondence. Yet, within, as without, a war rages; the enemy must be conquered, both on the national as well as on the personal level. The virtues residing within the cabinet impel the individual to write, in a sort of ethical imperative that requires the subject to relate the experiences of the inner conflict, to display them on paper to his superior and to a public readership.

The contents of the cabinet are important in terms of individuation, a process which Homi K. Bhabha sees as constituting a "form of address that is personalized by its own discursive activity.... And this creation of historical agency produces the subject from out of the temporality of the contingent."[31] While Bhabha's comment deals primarily with the discursive activity of the colonised, the colonial encounter prompts a similar process of individuation in the coloniser. Haward's *Collections*, a long series of biblical parallels which provide a metanarrative, a knowable plot, for Irish events, attempts to make the contingent understandable through his personal account. Located within the very real and chaotic rebellion, the colonial encounter becomes for Haward, in much the same way as Virginia does for John Rolfe,

> the site of the affirmation of psychic, social and cosmic order. The encounter with the savage other serves to confirm the civil subject in that self-knowledge which ensures self-mastery.... The letter, then, rehearses the power of the civil subject to maintain self-control and to bring the other into his service.[32]

---

[31]Bhabha 199.

[32]Paul Brown, "'This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine': *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism," *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, ed. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan

We might develop these insights further by drawing on the similarities between Bhabha's individuation and Louis Althusser's interpellation, the ideological hailing of the subject. Both Rolfe and Haward must reproduce the conditions of their own personal subjection in order to affirm the state's repressive and ideological apparatuses which produce the civil subject. Reinscribing ideology in their material practices is most certainly a contributing factor of the subject's inner battle with his "passions." Althusser writes,

> Throughout this schema we observe that the ideological representation of ideology is itself forced to recognize that every "subject" endowed with a "consciousness" and believing in the "ideas" that his "consciousness" inspires in him and freely accepts, must "act according to his ideas," must therefore inscribe his own ideas as a free subject in the actions of his material practice.[33]

This internalisation of discipline in Haward's letter is important, as the publication, and even interpretation, of letters may well demonstrate the beginnings of a more insidious inscription of methods of discipline in the subject (as opposed to inscribing in terms of the display of punishment) that Francis Barker has written of, particularly in his essays on *Areopagitica*. This movement in terms of techniques of discipline is,

> characterized by a remarkable degree of that self-discipline which, along with other qualities associated with it, is to become the linchpin of a move articulated by the text from the unmediated and overt violence of the older settlement to a more indirectly ideological control implanted in the new

---

Sinfield, 2nd ed. (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994) 50.

[33]"Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)," *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, trans. Ben Brewster (London: New Left Books, 1971) 157.

subjectivity.[34]

The self-discipline of the civil subject in writing these colonial texts is, in fact, an aspect of larger patterns of domination and submission betrayed by the writers' concerns with property, sovereignty, religion, and status, as Carlin's comment on the importance of "individual rights" in colonial discourse affirms. Discourse "is an essential link between the inner being of the subject, that interiority for which the pre-bourgeois polity had no role, and the outer dimension of the state."[35]

The pressures of the state apparatuses, in effect, contribute to the impaling of an English identity by allowing it no room to adapt to Irish conditions--it must remain stable in a foreign context, under very different material conditions. The problem, however, is the need to fix the Irish other and negotiate the quagmire of political and religious interests in both Britain and Ireland in order to interpellate the civil subject. Paul Brown argues that colonial discourse voices demands for both order and disorder, producing a disruptive other in order to assert the superiority of the coloniser. But once the disruptive other is produced, the text must continually struggle with restricting that disruptiveness. The colonial text does not simply affirm the triumph of civility, it is forced, by continually struggling with the other, to produce civility.[36] This, as we see in Haward's *Collections*, is both an internal and an external battle, within the coloniser as civil subject and between the coloniser and the colonised. We see this process in evidence in the active development of the Irish stereotype, as, during the

---

[34]"*Areopagitica*: Subjectivity and the Moment of Censorship," *John Milton*, ed. Annabel Patterson (London: Longman, 1992) 69.

[35]Barker 73.

[36]Brown 50.

1640s, the Irish stereotype created in earlier Elizabethan and Jacobean writings was not simply passively received.[37] This is, in some ways, a distancing effect that demonstrates the civil subject's superiority by extending the barbarism of the Irish but remains an anxious assertion, revealing the fact that the identity boundaries during the rebellion and the Civil War are blurring: the loyalty of the Old English and of the Scots, the fall of the Scots from sharing in a "joint posture of Arms" to "ingratefull and treacherous guests,"[38] the alliance between Monck and Owen Roe O'Neill, and the switching of sides by Ormond and Inchiquin, to cite but a few examples. Colonel Jones's claim that the Irish are a common enemy on which a developing British identity depends, therefore, is problematic.

As the Civil War began, the Covenant implies an equality, though obviously, from the English standpoint, a pragmatic one in military terms. The ordinance appointing the committee of both kingdoms stresses this unity but presents the common enemy in much broader terms:

> Whereas, by the covenant and treaty ratified and established between the two kingdoms, both nations are engaged in one common cause against the enemies of their religion and liberties, and, by the late entrance of the Scottish forces into this kingdom in pursuance hereof, are firmly united in a joint posture of arms for their own necessary defence, and for the attaining of the ends expressed in the covenant and treaty.[39]

---

[37]Carlin 218.

[38]*Observations*, *CPW* 3: 334.

[39]*The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660*, ed. Samuel Rawson Gardiner, 3rd ed., rpt. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951) 271.

The situation changed as the Scottish military force was no longer needed, and the differences, rather than the unity, were further exacerbated by the events leading to the trial and execution of the king. The causes of this division are summed up in *A Necessary Representation*:

> These, and many other their detestable insolencies, may abundantly convince every unbyassed Judgement, that the present practise of the Sectaries, and their Abettors, doe directly over-turne the Lawes and Liberties of the Kingdomes, roote out lawful, and supreme Magistracy (the just priviledges whereof we have sworne to maintaine) and introduce a fearfull confusion, and lawlesse Anarchie.[40]

In terms of the Irish dimension of the Anglo-Scottish front, the reconquest plans that began with Lisle's lieutenancy, which were finally realized by Cromwell's Irish campaign, also challenge a sense of Britishness. While the English parliament and the Royalists fought out their political differences in the Irish theatre, the Scots became involved in Ulster in order to prevent an Irish Catholic victory which would have freed military resources to be turned against them and in order to provide them "with the leverage to claim a role in the territorial redistribution following the rebels' defeat...[that] would legitimize Scottish involvement in a previously English-dominated part of the three kingdoms."[41] Under these conditions, any monolithic concept of us-them collapses in the negotiation of alliances. Milton deals with the various conjunctions proposed by Ormond and the Belfast Presbytery in a way that

---

[40]*Observations, CPW* 3: 298.

[41]John Kenyon with Jane Ohlmeyer, "The Background to the Civil Wars in the Stuart Kingdoms," *The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland 1638-1660*, ed. John Kenyon and Jane Ohlmeyer (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998) 31.

highlights the political problems of identity. In *Observations*, he repeatedly calls attention to the attempt by Royalists and Presbyterians to "sever" and "divide" Ireland from England.

The attempt at alienating Ireland from England demonstrates the political dissimulation of parliament's enemies. In the case of the king, this is nowhere more damaging than in the publication of his papers seized at Naseby and their publication as *The Kings Cabinet Opened.* If we read Haward's letter as bringing the other into service both textually and militarily--as Haward ends his letter, "Your Honours devoted Souldier, by word and deede, to the hazard of his life"[42]--in its production of civility, Charles's letters reveal a far more threatening use of the other's disruptive potential, highlighting Charles's alienation of civil identity as well as a whole "Feudary Kingdome from the ancient Dominion of *England.*"[43] The opening of the king's cabinet reveals the secret intentions of the king in regards to Ireland, as well as other political issues; it also becomes a key for reading Charles's dealings with his earlier parliaments. The preface to *The Kings Cabinet Opened* treats the documents as a revelation of the king's secret self as private in contradistinction to the king's public role. Charles I is seen as not acting within the constraints of the polity; he is not enacting the ritualised reiteration of his political role. Unlike Haward, who draws upon his inner virtues and manifests them in his actions, Charles keeps his intentions locked away and attempts to colour favourably his actions. The preface states, "It were a great sin against the mercies of God, to conceale those evidences of truth, which he so graciously...hath put into our hands;" in arguing against charges of forgery or that they are producing an extremely

---

[42]Haward A2v.

[43]*Observations, CPW* 3: 307.

partisan reading of the king's letters, the preface claims "we affirm nothing necessary to be beleeved, but what the printed papers will themselves utter in their own language."[44] The secret self speaks out and, in so doing, empties out the aristocratic individual only, however, to reincorporate him within the parliamentarian view of events.

As in theatre, the king's private self is co-opted through a process of progressive fragmentation brought about by the struggle for political authority during the Civil Wars:

> The secret or hidden other self as it is represented in Renaissance drama is at best a temporary stay against co-optation, at worst the progressive fragmentation of a Volpone or the malicious reinvention of an Iago. Any sense of self that relies heavily on secrecy suggests unresolved anxieties in the culture which produces that self.[45]

As tensions build in any society, "the individual proves incapable of containing him- or herself. The force behind the scenes...is impelled into the public arena by a powerful sense of self that requires, in theatrical terms, an audience."[46] In *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, Charles emerges into the public in very theatrical terms. The voice that speaks this secret script is described thus:

> but now by Gods good providence the traverse Curtain is drawn, and the King writing to Ormond, and the Queen, what they must not disclose, is presented upon the stage. God grant that the drawing of this Curtain may bee as fatall to

---

[44]Henry Parker, *The Kings Cabinet Opened: or, Certain Packets of Secret Letters & Papers, Written with the Kings own Hand, and Taken in His Cabinet at Nasby-Field, June 14, 1645. Together with Some Annotations* (London: 1645) A2.

[45]Slights 30.

[46]Slights 57.

> Popery, and all Antichristian heresie here now, as the rending of the vaile was to the Jewish Ceremonies in Judea, at the extirpation of our Saviour.[47]

We are invited to witness the conspiracies of a Catiline or a Faustus. Drawing the curtain takes readers into an inner, secret recess.

The king is co-opted, and in terms of Barker's comments on the new subjectivity, the spatial trope is fascinating if we remember Milton's statement in the *Tenure*:

> If men within themselves would be govern'd by reason, and not generally give up thir understanding to a double tyrannie, of Custom from without, and blind affections within, they would discerne better what it is to favour and uphold the Tyrant of a Nation. But being slaves within doors, no wonder that they strive so much to have the public State conformably govern'd to the inward vitious rule, by which they govern themselves. For indeed none can love freedom heartilie but good men; the rest love not freedom, but licence; which never hath more scope or more indulgence then under Tyrants.[48]

The civil state is analogous to the subject's inner state, to what resides within the cabinet or within doors. In a republic, privacy has public utility. Only when we realize this can we see that the comforting rhythm of private conference and public actions has collapsed in order to be politically reconfigured.

Putting the king on stage is a frequent trope. Marvell, for example, does so in the "Horation Ode" and Milton does it repeatedly in *Eikonoklastes*. For Milton, the issue of

---

[47]*The Kings Cabinet Opened* A3v.

[48]*CPW* 3: 190.

theatricality is associated with the king in terms set down in a rhetorical question in the *Tenure*: "Who knows not that the King is a name of dignity and office, not of person?"[49] The king acts out a carefully plotted, constitutional part in the nation, one which, if he fails to follow the script, as in not hearing grievances in return for subsidies, leads to another interesting theatrical analogy in *Eikonoklastes*--"the general voice of the people almost hissing him and his ill-acted regality off the Stage."[50] The theatrical constraints of performativity are disrupted. Milton makes essentially the same distinction here as in the *Tenure*, seeing the king as divided between the person and the office, between the actor and the role.

Yet, we cannot lose track of the fact that Charles is represented as a tragic figure in *Eikon Basilike*. Milton, on the other hand, sees Charles as a tragic villain and often attempts to turn that theatrical presentation into a courtly form of the masque, as ornate entertainment, all artifice. Walter Benjamin's work on the *Trauerspiel* is insightful in regards to the theatrical role of the king.[51] Benjamin argues that "the confirmation of princely virtues, the depiction of princely vices, the insight into diplomacy and the manipulation of all the political schemes...[make] the monarch the main character in the *Trauerspiel*."[52] Opening the curtain onto the king's cabinet provides the vantage point from which a public readership can gain insight into the king's diplomacy and political scheming. These readers become both

---

[49]*CPW* 3: 233.

[50]*CPW* 3: 355.

[51]See Herman Rapaport's discussion of the relationship between Milton's early plans for "Adam Unparadized" and the *Trauerspiel* in chapter two of *Milton and the Postmodern* (Lincoln and London: Nebraska UP, 1983).

[52]*The Origin of German Tragic Drama*, trans. John Osborne (London: New Left Books, 1977) 62.

"Spectators and Judges" of the king's dealings.[53] This vantage point permits the delineation of princely virtues and vices, primarily, of course, the vices contained in the annotations to the thirty-nine letters of *The Kings Cabinet Opened* and Milton's own project to reconfigure political virtue. Readers are, in effect, asked both to judge the king's doings and to police their own reading by comparing words and deeds and taking part in the public debate. The annotations of *The Kings Cabinet Opened* tell Royalist readers and sympathisers that,

> It concerns you to look both forward and backward, and having now taken the dimension of the Kings minde by his secret Letters, turne about awhile and looke upon the same in his publike Declarations. See if you can reconcile his former promises to his present designes.[54]

The call to look both forward and backward is an interesting request in terms of Benjamin's assertion of the Janus face of the baroque monarch: "the tyrant and the martyr are but the two faces of the monarch. They are the necessarily extreme incarnations of the princely essence."[55] This is clearly in evidence in the period immediately following the king's execution.[56] Contemporary responses support Benjamin's insight. In 1647, Jasper Mayne writes,

---

[53]*The Kings Cabinet Opened* 49.

[54]*The Kings Cabinet Opened* 49.

[55]Benjamin 69.

[56]On the issue of Charles as tyrant, see John Morrill, "Charles I, Tyranny and the English Civil War," *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London and New York: Longman, 1993) 285-306; and Martin Dzelzainis, "'Incindiaries of the State': Charles I and Tyranny," *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999) 74-95. In terms of Charles as martyr, it is interesting to note that the hagiographic *Eikon Basilike* ran through thirty-five editions in London and another twenty-five in Ireland and abroad, with forty-seven different variations of William Marshall's originial frontispiece (*CPW* 3: 150).

I have in my time seen certain *Pictures* with two *faces*. Beheld one way, they have presented the *shape* and *figure* of a *Man*. Beheld another, they have presented the *shape* and *figure* of a *Serpent*. Me thinks, Sir, for some years, whatever *Letters* the *King* wrote either to the *Queene*, or his *friends*, or what ever *Declarations* he publisht in the defence of his *Rights* and *Cause*, had the ill fortune to undergoe the fate of such a *Picture*.[57]

In the political fragmentation of rebellion and civil war, the king's words and actions become increasingly open to interpretation. And we might also attribute the ambiguity of Marvell's representation of Charles on the scaffold to the Janus face of the monarch:

That thence the *Royal Actor* born

The *Tragic Scaffold* might adorn:

While round the armed Bands

Did clap their bloody hands.

He nothing common did or mean

Upon that memorable Scene:

But with his keener Eye

The Axes edge did try:

Nor call'd the *Gods* with vulgar spight

To vindicate his helpless Right,

But bow'd his comely Head,

Down as upon a Bed.

---

[57]Quoted in Joad Raymond, "Popular Representations of Charles I," *The Royal Image:*

> This was that memorable Hour
>
> Which first assur'd the forced pow'r.[58]

Charles's physical and mental composure on the scaffold embodies the Janus-face of the monarch; indeed, in so meeting his fate, he almost manages to transcend it.

Milton, too, is working within the paradigm of the Janus-faced monarch. He was called upon to play the devil's advocate, to destroy the "artifice" of *Eikon Basilike*'s representation of the martyr-king in order to smash the civil idolatry it prompted: "it being the proper scope of this work in hand, not to ripp up and relate the misdoings of his whole life, but to answer only, and refute the missayings of this book."[59] Milton must swing opinion back from the incarnation of the martyr to that of the tyrant:

> The most violent element of Milton's tract is its title. But it is the image of the king-- the hagiographer's image--that he destroys, not the king himself. No sympathetic magic obtains. Though he breaks that image, there is little that hints at the breaking of the king's own body. Just as Cromwell's cavalry drove witnesses from the place of execution, Milton too forbids his readers' gaze to rest for long on the severed head.[60]

The poles of martyr and tyrant, then, are not all that far apart, as Benjamin notes. The cavalry's actions and Milton's reticence to attack or display the king's body reveal an awareness of just how easily a tyrant can become a martyr. Milton may see Charles's

---

Representations of Charles I, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999) 47.

[58]"An Horation Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland" 53-66.

[59]*Eikonoklastes, CPW* 3: 342.

unkinged body as "the meere useless bulke of his person,"[61] but he must concentrate his critique on the role of kingship. Against *Eikon Basilike*'s representation of "saint-like constancy and stability in the face of historical mutability and turbulence," an image of the martyr-king which "challenges the perception of history as a dynamic and unsettling process of change,"[62] Milton situates Charles within the dynamic flow of events in order to rewrite the martyr as tyrant. The unreconcilable aspects of Charles's words and deeds, as well as the evidence provided by *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, shatters the image of passive suffering represented in *Eikon Basilike*:

> Though every true Christian will be a *Martyr* when he is called to it; not presently does it follow that every one suffering for Religion, is without exception. Saint *Paul* writes, that *A man may give his Body to be burnt*, (meaning for Religion) *and yet not have Charitie*: He is not therefore above all possibility of erring, because he burnes for some Points of Truth.[63]

Another important point regarding Benjamin's analysis of the *Trauerspiel* needs to be made. Discussing Benjamin's work, Herman Rapaport argues that the *Trauerspiel* is an "attempt to present a Protestant rewriting of the miracle play tradition, a rewriting that preserves allegorical representations on stage while at the same time attempting to secularize

---

[60]Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue* 208.

[61]*CPW* 3: 197.

[62]David Loewenstein, *Milton and the Drama of History: Historical Vision, Iconoclasm, and the Literary Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990) 52, 54.

[63]Milton, *Of Reformation CPW* 1: 533.

or humanize them."[64] The civil subject's wholeness, then, is fragmented and reflected in a divided self of character attributes, and the centre, the king, as in the masque, is no longer present to unify the self politically. In chapter twenty one of *Eikonoklastes* Milton writes,

> It were a Nation miserable indeed, not worth the name of a Nation, but a race of Idiots, whose happiness and welfare depended upon one Man. The happiness of a Nation consists in true Religion, Piety, Justice, Prudence, Temperance, Fortitude, and the contempt of Avarice and Ambition. They in whomsoever these vertues dwell eminently, need not Kings to make them happy, but are the architects of thir own happiness; and whether to themselves or others are not less then Kings. But in him, which of these vertues were to be found, that might extend to the making happy, or the well-governing of somuch as his own houshold, which was the most licentious and ill-govern'd in the whole land.[65]

The list of the virtues recalls the medieval morality plays (but the drama, as in Haward's letter and *The Character of a London Diurnall*, is now interior), and those who can balance their virtues "are not less then Kings."

The drama of princely virtue and vice, or the subject's virtues and passions, locate the subject within an all too human postlapsarian economy of allegorized character attributes. The quotation from *Eikonoklastes*, above, points to the shift of political representation and serves as a critique of the aristocratic ethos. The revelation of the king's secrets, and his own

---

[64]Rapaport 50.

[65]*CPW* 3: 542.

inability to demonstrate these virtues, highlights an important issue in regards to Ireland. Deborah Shuger has argued that both Elizabethan and Jacobean tracts on Ireland are, in fact, developing a bourgeois critique of the aristocratic ethos. While Shuger oversimplifies Spenser's and Davies' Irish writings by claiming that what is meant by "barbarism" in their tracts is the "aristocratic warrior society,"[66] a claim which almost effaces the Irish from her article, or at best quietly suggests that the English bourgeois civilizing process is of benefit to them, the notion that Ireland is a space on which troubling English political problems are negotiated and written is important. Milton, too, critiques an aristocratic ethos of privilege and aggression while writing Ireland, most notably, perhaps, in the Tutbury horse passage of *Eikonoklastes* and his defence of Cromwell in *Observations*. Of the later *Readie and Easie Way*, Corns writes,

> Milton concludes both editions of *The Readie and Easie Way* with the assertion, "What I have spoken, is the language of that which is not call'd amiss the good Old Cause." The phrase is appropriate for, in a sense, that cause, the cause of English republicanism, is a language. It is an idiom in which a value system and an aesthetic are inscribed, and it is an undeferential posture which utterly subverts the assumptions of Stuart monarchism.[67]

The developing republican subject is clearly implicated in a new aesthetic, perhaps most evident in Milton's insistence on using the artifice of the masque form against the king in *Eikonoklastes*. But in so doing, new patterns of discipline result:

---

[66]"Irishmen, Aristocrats, and Other White Barbarians," *Renaissance Quarterly* 50 (1997) 513.

[67]"Milton and the Characteristics of a Free Commonwealth," *Milton and Republicanism*, ed. David Armitage, Armand Himy, and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995) 42.

Against the notion of freedom as the liberty of the strong man to do as he pleases, the Irish tracts claim that juridical subjection creates liberty, since a free person differs from a serf or slave in that the former is governed not by the arbitrary will of a master, but by law.[68]

Shuger's comment reveals the importance of the internalisation of bourgeois subjectivity--the tyrant king rules through his will, not through the law that all subjects must submit to preserve their liberties.

This is implicated in both a developing bourgeois ethos and its critique of aristocracy, as well as in the need to reincorporate Ireland within a new political configuration. The issue involves the legitimacy of political and aesthetic representation. As Sean Kelsey notes,

> After the revolution, the Rump declared an end to the days of courtly excess, bringing to a rhetorical climax the antipathy towards the court which had been mounting throughout the seventeenth century.[69]

Stripped of its Stuart artifice and excess, the reformed Cromwellian court is to become the model of a new, godly republican polity. Milton's writings take part in this reevaluation of political representation. He, too, puts "an end to the days" of the Stuart court by dismantling the rhetorical artifice of the commonwealth's enemies, destroying the old icons: "pulling down the image was tantamount to pulling down the past."[70] The iconoclastic impulse separates the symbols from the "truths" of the political signs unified by the king. This separation, begun in

---

[68]Shuger 512.

[69]*Inventing a Republic: the Political Culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649-1653* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1997) 27.

[70]David Loewenstein, *Milton and the Drama of History* 63.

the *Tenure* and enacted in the execution of Charles I, is followed up in *Eikonoklastes*, the *Defences*, and *Observations*, but this literary project remains one prompted by the king's transgressions and those of the Irish. Both have resisted co-optation and that resistance leads to writing.

Rapaport's discussion of Milton and the state points to the intersection of ideology and writing. In exploring Milton's political mindset, Rapaport hits certain extremes in his polemic, particularly in arguing against Christopher Hill's attempt to situate Milton within a radical tradition by stressing "the opposite line of thought...not Milton's resistance, but his complicity with the most repellent aspects of fascism."[71] Rapaport's portrayal of a cold and cruel Milton does gain a small bit of support from William Riley Parker's biography. Commenting on Charles I's execution, Parker writes, "The crowd that had gathered outside Whitehall, eyes focussed on the black-draped scaffold, greeted the falling axe with a universal and involuntary groan.... If Milton shuddered, he could remind himself, walking briskly back to High Holborn, that it was a raw January day."[72] Rapaport does, however, raise many provocative insights regarding Milton's state employment. In terms of Milton's relation to historical process, Rapaport writes, "For Milton it is a matter of preventing history from turning into theatre, for opening the curtains, not onto a stage, but onto a scaffold on which the practitioners of the popish and absolutist state are mercilessly executed without qualm, without guilt."[73] Rapaport, however, separates the theatre from the scaffold, but both remain

---

[71]Rapaport 172.

[72]Parker, *Milton: A Biography*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968) 1: 345.

[73]Rapaport 177.

public spectacles and share in strategies of representation. The past is pulled down in the spectacle of the scaffold and collapses into a political void. The scene on the scaffold is the literal enactment of the rhetorical process whereby the magical artifice of kingship is stripped away.

The monarch is progressively decentred by the myth of the bourgeois individual subject and its reconfiguration of space and public utility, a process which culminates in his execution. No longer is political ideology founded on the monarch's ritualized presence and its ability to draw even the periphery into its empowering self-representation. As the Bard steps forward in Ben Jonson's *Irish Masque at Court*, for example, the Masquers let fall their mantles and discover their masquing apparel:

> So breaks the sun earth's rugged chains
> Wherein rude winter bound her veins;
> So grows both stream and source of price
> That lately fettered were with ice;
> So naked trees get crispèd heads,
> And colored coats the roughest meads,
> And all get vigor, youth and sprite,
> That are but looked on by his light.[74]

The king's own presence, that of the sun, prompts the revelation of civility in the rude Irish through the artifice of their masquing apparel. Charles himself, however, is implicated in breaking this awesome form of revelation throughout the 1640s. This is clear in the debate

---

[74]*Ben Jonson: the Complete Masques*, ed. Stephen Orgel (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1969)

concerning the king's evil counsellors. *Eikon Basilike* states,

> Although I know they are very unwilling I should enjoy the liberty of my own Thoughts, or follow the light of my own Conscience, which they labour to bring into an absolute captivity to themselves; not allowing Me to think their Counsels to be other then good for Me, which has so long maintained a War against Me.[75]

Milton's response in *Eikonoklastes*, in regards to the king's reference to Strafford in *Eikon Basilike*, is particularly adept:

> no marvel though in stead of blaming and detesting his ambition, his evil Counsel, his violence and oppression of the people, he fall to praise his great Abilities; and with Scolastic flourishes beneath the decencie of a King, compares him to the Sun, which in all figurative use, and significance bears allusion to a King, not to a Subject.[76]

Charles in fact usurps himself, enacts his own aesthetic fall from the omniscient seat of the masque. His masquing apparel is removed to reveal political dissimulation.

The issue here, again, is one of political representation, or signification. Rapaport comments on the two processes of name-giving which Benjamin distinguishes: "the empirical name-giving of man (signification) and the sacred name-giving of God (revelation). It is the fall from revelation to signification that Benjamin uses as his starting point for his analysis of

---

170-77.

[75]Charles I (attr. John Gauden), *Eikon Basilike. The porctraicture of His Sacred Majestie in his solitudes and sufferings. With a perfect copie of prayers used by His Majesty in the time of his sufferings. Delivered to Doctor Juxon, bishop of London, immediately before his death* (London: 1649) 180.

[76]*Eikonoklastes, CPW* 3: 372.

allegory in the seventeenth century."[77] This is the commonwealth's fall, also, into signification that follows from the breaking of the hierarchy of signs anchored in the divine right of the monarch, although it attempts to create a godly justification for the establishment of a new form of political signification without the centrality of the court. Jean Baudrillard writes,

> In caste societies, feudal or archaic, cruel societies the signs are limited in number, and are not widely diffused, each one functions with its full value as interdiction, each is a reciprocal obligation between castes, clans or persons. The signs therefore are anything but arbitrary.[78]

The interdiction of the sign controls the value of the signs as well as their possession. In addition, Charles's reference to Strafford as the "sun" breaks the reciprocal obligation inherent in sign values. We are seeing, then, "the emergence of open competition on the level of the distinctive signs."[79] This is the result of political fragmentation which must be gathered into a new social totality--into the state. Milton's separation of the man from the office is an attempt to control political signs and revalue them in the service of the commonwealth.

Milton's writings clearly destroy the artifice of the icon to show the dissimulation underlying the king's doings. The comments on the rhetoric of Ormond and the Belfast Presbytery in *Observations* achieve a similar aim of shattering a royalist, or royalized-presbyterian aesthetic. We move, though, from a critique of an aristocratic aesthetic of secrecy, one which establishes the court as a separate enclave within society, to a far different

---

[77]Rapaport 52.

[78]*Simulations*, trans. Paul Foss, Paul Patton, and Philip Beitchman (New York: Semiotext(e), 1983) 84-5.

[79]Baudrillard 84.

deployment of secrecy which envelops all of society--where the secret dimensions of the subject's mind are to be commensurate with the state. But Milton's own conservative aesthetic in *Observations*, by insisting on the textual fixity of the Irish stereotype, creates an odd tension in relation to the desire of the iconoclastic impulse to unmask publicly the king's party. Lana Cable suggests that "all icons, verbal or otherwise, are themselves no more than finite mortal instruments--instruments to be used in the continuing search for immortal, and therefore inexpressible truths."[80] As in Haward's letter relating his internal and external struggles with the foe, Milton's writings demonstrate that the nation's foes are also inner foes, but the Irish tract reveals the troubling metaphysical issue of iconoclasm. By conjoining enemies that he wishes to shatter textually with those he wishes to textually fix, Milton may well realise that there is nothing behind the icon, that identity and immortal truth may only reside with those who have a monopoly of violence, the horrific mortal instruments of truth and the authority to speak, the state: "And for the last effect / Still keep thy Sword erect: / ... / The same *Arts* that did *gain* / A *Pow'r*, must it *maintain*."[81] Aligning oneself with this power legitimizes both the subject and the state, and "the dubious centre of their power is their integrity," at the heart of both are secrets.[82]

---

[80]*Carnal Rhetoric: Iconoclasm and the Poetics of Desire* (Durham and London: Duke UP, 1995) 169.

[81]Marvell, "An Horation Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland" 115-20.

[82]Slights 57.

3. Atrocity and the Commonwealth

Avenge O Lord thy slaughtered saints.[1]

For the majority of Milton's readers, "On the Late Massacre in Piedmont" is very likely to be the most familiar response to atrocities in Milton's work. The sonnet, written in 1655, memorializes the slaughter of the Waldensians on April 24th of that year by the troops of the Duke of Savoy. This protestant sect had previously been granted certain limited rights by the Catholic duke, but they were massacred by his troops on the dubious pretence of a territorial settlement claim. For many protestants in Europe, the Waldensians were seen as embodying a primitive Christianity untainted by centuries of Catholic dominance in Europe. Milton shared this opinion, referring to the Waldensians as those "who kept thy truth so pure of old / When all our fathers worshipped stocks and stones."[2] Not only did Milton write a sonnet in response to this event, but, as Latin Secretary to the Council of State, he also had a hand in composing the official reactions to news of the massacre which had prompted "the severest grief and commiseration...[for] the great misfortune of these afflicted people:"[3]

> From Lucerne, Aargan, and other valleys in the dominion of the Duke of Savoy are brought to us the groans of the very wretched men living there who profess the reformed religion and upon whom the most cruel slaughters have recently

---

[1]John Milton, "On the Late Massacre in Piedmont" 1.

[2]"On the Late Massacre in Piedmont" 3-4. Within a few months, the remaining Waldensian forces won a military victory which secured the rights that had been granted them previous to the massacre.

[3]"State Papers, 73. *Redditae Sunt Nobis*, Oliver Cromwell to the Duke of Savoy, May 25, 1655," *CPW* 5: 686.

> been done and the very sad and frequent messages concerning the plunder and exile of others.[4]

In addition to condemning "the very cruel massacre of both sexes and of every age,"[5] letters appealing to various continental governments to intercede on behalf of the surviving Waldensians were sent by the Commonwealth. A letter to the Evangelical Swiss Cantons, for example, implores them to carry out their Christian duty to avenge the slaughtered and protect the survivors:

> You who are so close not only to the fury of the enemies, but also to the torments of our brethren and can almost hear their cries, by the immortal God take care now of what your duty may be and do it speedily.... Next to divine help, it seems to be in your hands alone to prevent the tearing away of that most ancient root of a purer religion in these remnants of primitive believers.[6]

The immediate necessity for intervention is provided in a letter to the King of France:

> [The remaining Waldensians] are placed under the yoke of a new fortress from which soldiers frequently sally forth either to ravage or cruelly slay those whom they meet. In addition, new forces are being secretly prepared against them, and those who practice the Romish religion are ordered to depart at an appointed time, so that now all things seem to point to the slaughter of those

---

[4]"State Papers, 78. *Perlati ad Nos*, Oliver Cromwell to the King of France, May 25, 1655," *CPW* 5: 698-9.

[5]"State Papers, 151. *Meminisse Potest*, Oliver Cromwell to the King of France, May 26, 1655," *CPW* 5: 833.

[6]"State Papers, 152. *De Convallensibus*, Oliver Cromwell to the Protestant Swiss Cantons, May 26, 1658," *CPW* 5: 837. In addition to the Swiss Cantons and the King of France, letters were sent to the King of Sweden, the States General of the United Provinces, and the King of Denmark.

wretches whom that former butchery left surviving.[7]

These diplomatic responses to the massacre and the continued threat faced by the Waldensians reveal both religious and political concerns within a wider European context of Reformation. Milton's sonnet accords with these concerns, and his poem clearly echoes statements made in the above quoted letters:

...in thy book record their groans

Who were thy sheep and in their ancient fold

Slain by the bloody Piedmontese that rolled

Mother with infant down the rocks. Their moans

The vales redoubled to the hills, and they

To heaven. Their martyred blood and ashes sow

O'er all the Italian fields where still doth sway

The triple tyrant: that from these may grow

A hundredfold, who having learnt thy way

Early may fly the Babylonian woe.[8]

The "groans" and "moans" of the wretched that were heard in England are echoed off the hills of Piedmont and up to heaven. Once heard in heaven, God is implored to record them in the book of eternal life. The indiscriminate slaughter "of both sexes and every age" is recalled in the image of a mother and child being rolled down the rocks. In "suffering for truth's sake"[9],

---

[7]"State Papers, 151," *CPW* 5: 834.

[8]"On the Late Massacre in Piedmont" 5-14.

[9]*Paradise Lost* 12. 569.

the upholders of a primitive Christianity are truly martyrs. Also, from the sowing of their "blood and ashes," like the dragon's teeth sown by Cadmus, armed men will rise to avenge this slaughter and break the "sway" of "The triple tyrant," papal Rome. Milton, here, recalls Tertullian's dictum--"'The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church."[10] This Christian notion of the seminal blood of the martyrs is important. It reveals the significance of violence within this religious worldview. Martyrs, to a certain degree, reenact Christ's self-sacrifice. From out of the destruction and chaos of the violence inflicted on the martyr, a purified collective body is regenerated in order to turn the forces of destructive violence back on its perpetrators.

Michael Lieb's discussion of Milton's sonnet on the massacre of the Waldensians focuses on the centrality of sparagmos in Milton's work. Sparagmos is the dialectic of violence and the sacred which transforms destructive violence into regenerative violence and reconstitutes a strengthened body, either individual or politic. Lieb writes,

> The extent to which bodily mutilation is fundamental to the Miltonic point of view may be seen in an analysis of its enactment in both his poetry and prose. There, one discovers the emergence of what might be called a "sparagmatic mentality" so pervasive that its presence underlies every aspect of his thinking and personality. Sparagmos is at the heart not only of Milton's conduct as a writer but of the way he views himself in relation to the world. Its impact, in short, is inescapable.[11]

---

[10]Stephen Orgel and Jonathan Goldberg, ed., *John Milton: A Critical Edition of the Major Works* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991) 782.

[11]Lieb 16.

"On the Late Massacre in Piedmont" memorializes "bodily mutilation and dismemberment in poetic form...[causing] the destructive elements of sparagmos to resolve themselves generatively. Such a resolution occurs within a distinctly apocalyptic framework."[12] The diabolical slaughter of the Waldensians is of importance to all protestants in an ongoing battle between the forces of God and those of the Antichrist. Within this context, the dialectic of sparagmos moves from a material to a transcendent, spiritual level; however, this transcendence from victim to martyr or saint remains carnally grounded in the mutilated or dismembered bodies of the massacred. Somewhat paradoxically, the regeneration of the body spiritual or politic first requires its destruction.

Readers of Milton may be less familiar with his reaction to the Irish Rebellion and the massacres of 1641, but it shares in the mindset of "On the Late Massacre in Piedmont." Indeed, the experience of the Irish Rebellion may well influence Milton's response to the later massacre. In both instances, the perpetrators of the massacre are identified with commonplace notions of the antichristian Roman Catholic church. The letter to the King of France, quoted earlier, claims that the Catholic forces continue to secretly plot the destruction of the survivors of the original onslaught and that the Catholics of the area are privy to these designs. In chapter one, I discussed the associations between the Irish Rebellion and diabolical Catholic conspiracies which set the rebellion, as such claims regarding the massacre of the Waldensians do, within the wider European context of the Reformation. In addition, both the Irish Rebellion and the massacre of the Waldensians lead to calls for divine retribution--the enactment of a regenerative violence on the antichristian perpetrators of atrocity. And, finally,

---

[12]Lieb 33.

in both incidents, the affective response for this divine retribution depends upon representations of murdered, mutilated, and dismembered protestant bodies.[13]

Representations of Irish atrocities comprise one of the primary components of accounts of the Irish Rebellion. Chris Morash's examination of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Irish Famine texts results in the argument that images of atrocity are iconic and fragmentary; because of this, they are free-floating and easily appropriated by any number of discourses. Morash writes, "We must begin by recognising that even before the Famine was acknowledged as a complete event, it was in the process of being textually encoded in a limited number of clearly defined images."[14] These images come together to form a textual,

> collectively maintained "memory"...[and] create the impression of a unified collective history, in which the memories of the individual and memories shared by the literate members of society as a whole are the same. If we think of textually generated memories in this manner, it becomes apparent that they have an ideological function--indeed, they are almost pure ideology, insofar as they create an illusion of complete identity between the individual and society.[15]

Clearly, a similar process occurred in the textualization, from the outbreak of the rebellion late in 1641 and beyond the time of Cromwell's return to England, of the Irish Rebellion. In addition, many of these images drew upon earlier representations of Irish barbarity for added

---

[13]For a particularly horrendous account of the mutilation and sexual violence of the Piedmont massacre see *Mercurius Politicus* No. 262.

[14]"Literature Memory Atrocity," *Fearful Realities: New Perspectives on the Famine*, ed. Chris Morash and Richard Hayes (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1996) 113.

[15]Morash 113-4.

force. Atrocity images prompt an affective response aimed at unifying individual reactions within a broader ideological program. This is accomplished in an interesting way. "Because atrocity images upset our sense of cause and effect," writes Morash, "it hampers our ability to construct sequential narratives which follow the conventions of mimetic representation."[16] What we are confronted with when reading accounts of Irish atrocities is more a continuous repetition of violence rather than a coherent, sequential narrative. The randomness and unpredictability of Irish atrocities is textually incorporated by constructing a metanarrative employing biblical analogies and Catholic conspiracy, such as the Gunpowder Plot.[17] In this way, Cromwell's atrocities in Ireland are justified and seen as the logical outcome of the rebellion. The repetition of Irish violence is broken, and a more sequential narrative can be constructed once divine retribution has been enacted and the body politic regenerated. In addition, along with the political resolution of the rebellion in Cromwell's reconquest, the event marks one more victory against the forces of the Antichrist. Thomas N. Corns writes,

> Atrocities, which are the common matter of all partisan accounts of wars, are potently linked with Catholicism and with the taking of plunder. There is a strong suggestion of a continuity between the struggle in England and the assaults on the Reformation taking place on the European mainland, and more especially with the current revolt in Ireland.[18]

While atrocity images are a partisan representation of past and present events, they

---

[16]Morash 117.

[17]In chapter four, I look more closely at Milton's use of one such biblical narrative in the context of the Irish Rebellion--Judges 19-21.

[18]Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue* 7.

also imply a threatening potentiality and a certain degree of paranoia. Parliamentary troops, royalist troops, Scottish troops, and the Irish were all accused of committing atrocities. Corns notes that Royalist troops may well have been more restrained than their opponents, that "royalist cruelty scarcely matched the New Model Army's wanton mistreatment of captured camp-followers after Naseby."[19] This event, however, also calls attention to the affective power of representations of Irish atrocities:

> mercy was denied to the common camp followers...many of whom the soldiers killed. Afterwards, shame-faced at this massacre of women, they said that they were "Irish women of cruel countenance," armed with long knives; it seems more likely that they were Welsh, crying out in a strange language, and defending themselves with the cutlery they carried to dress and cook meat for their menfolk.[20]

In the previous year, fuelled by atrocity stories, parliament had ordered that no quarter be given to the Irish.[21] Ormond's Royalists, Scots, and parliamentary troops put this into practice. For example,

> early in 1644 one parliamentary commander in Ulster allegedly killed 1,000 Irish soldiers and camp-followers in a single raid and later boasted that "the reason why our prisoners were so few was because...[we] had no stomach to

---

[19]Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue* 6.

[20]C. V. Wedgwood, *The King's War, 1641-1647: the Great Rebellion* (London: Collins Fontana, 1970) 428.

[21]*Two Ordinances of Parliament; one commanding no Quarter to any Irishman taken in armes against the Parliament, the other for the better observation of the Monethly Fast* (London: 1644).

give such perfidious rogues any quarter."[22]

While the troops at Naseby had mistaken Welsh for Irish, once that misidentification was made their fate was sealed. Contemporary accounts of Naseby attempt to explain this incident by either claiming that the women were papists or whores.[23] Either explanation invokes Irish stereotypes. The claim that the women were papists is quite straightforward in this respect. The women's use of long knives in an attempt to defend themselves recalls Irish rebels armed with scians and the frequently repeated image of throat cutting. That the women were whores is linked to Irish fashion: "Since Irish women often went bare-headed, a fashion used at home by prostitutes, English troops assumed they were whores beyond the chivalric pale."[24] Both the king and parliament had issued rules of conduct for their armies. The existence of such rules does not necessarily imply that they were always respected by commanders or individual soldiers. In the case of the Irish, however, the order of no quarter put them beyond such consideration.

The Irish rebels also produced a purported code of conduct, to be administered under oath, which consisted of eighteen items dealing with the persons and property of protestants. Initially, the oath was sent by the Confederacy to the kings of France and Spain, but, published in England, the oath is juxtaposed against instances of Irish cruelty in order to discredit the intentions of the Irish as represented in the declaration. In addition, the author of

---

[22]Jane Ohlmeyer, "The Civil Wars in Ireland," *The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1638-1660* , ed. John Kenyon and Jane Ohlmeyer (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998) 78.

[23]See, for example, *A more exact Relation of the great Victory obtained by the Parliaments Forces in Naisby Field* (London: 1645) and *A more particular and exact Relation of the Victory* [at Naseby]. *With the true coppy of a Letter of the regaining of Leicester* (London: 1645).

[24]Charles Carlton, *Going to the Wars: the Experience of the British Civil Wars, 1638-1651* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994) 37.

the tract discredits the Irish by prefacing the oath with a brief "Historie" of Ireland which justifies the English presence in the country. But the oath itself is quite interesting, as it is more concerned with religious rather than national distinctions, as the first item demonstrates:

> It shall not bee lawfull for any under paine of death to take away the Catholicks goods, or to doe any damage to them, whither they be *Irish, English,* or *Scotts*, or any other Nation whatsoever inhabiting within this Realme, those onely excepted who shall be declared enemies to the common cause.[25]

Even Catholics who do not support the common cause are excepted from the guarantees of the oath, while protestants who convert to catholicism, after providing a six month bond of surety, are included in their protection. In addition to the first item, items eight, ten, twelve, and eighteen are the most significant in relation to accounts of Irish atrocities. Item eight insists on respecting property: "It is forbidden to all on the forfeit of their lives, either under pretext of warre or under any other pretence to invade any house whatsoever it bee, no not of those who make open profession of the protestant religion."[26] Sexual violence and stripping are forbidden in item ten: "None on the paine of Death shall ravish or offer violence to any married woman, widdow, or Catholicke maide or Protestant, or shall goe about to take away any habit from the body of any man, maide, or woman of whatsoever Religion they are."[27]

---

[25]R. C., *A Declaration Sent to the King of France and Spayne, From the Catholiques or Rebells in Ireland: With a manifesto of the Covenant or Oath they have made and taken for the defence of the Catholique League against the Protestants in that Kingdome. Wherein is discovered their treacherous practizes under the pretence of Religion, and their bloody Actions full of Cruelty and Barbarisme. Published in Paris, April the 24. 1642. And translated out of French by R. C. Gent* (London: 1642) 3.

[26]R. C. 5.

[27]R. C. 6.

Item twelve deals with plundering: "No Souldier or any other shall be so bold, as to steale, pillage, burne the fruits or the houses of the Enemies themselves, or to commit any prejudicialle offence without the expresse commandment of the Directors."[28] And item eighteen deals with collaboration: "Lastly, it is forbidden under paine of death to carry or cause to bee carried any provision or ammunition into places where the enemy doth quarter, or to have any intelligence or commerce either by word or pen with any Captaine or Souldiers of theirs to the prejudice of the cause."[29] Of course, it was conventional not to trust any oath made by a prevaricating papist, but the oath shares in the common concerns of the propertied subjects of the three kingdoms in a state of war. In all cases, such rules of conduct attempt to address "anxieties...about the release of ill-disciplined forces which thereafter may become uncontrollable."[30]

The Irish stereotype, then, clearly influenced how the Irish were treated. As the Irish Rebellion was occuring, a store of stock images of cruelty and barbarism was rapidly developed and employed. The catalogue ranges from standard adjectives, such as "blood-thirsty," to repeated accounts of throat cutting, stripping, mutilation, and rape. Patricia Coughlan notes the "alarming simplicity" of English accounts of the rebellion and the fact that "Throughout the 1640s, any mention of the Irish seems to require an epithet such as 'bloody,' 'cruel,' or 'inhuman' to be communicatively effective."[31] Milton is able to appropriate atrocity accounts commonly in circulation in English culture: those from both contemporary

---

[28]R. C. 6.

[29]R. C. 7.

[30]Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue* 10.

pamphlets and newsbooks on the rebellion and from earlier Elizabethan and Jacobean works on Ireland. As Corns argues, the use of such familiar cultural images of the rebellious Irish works in Milton's favour by exploiting his readers' familiarity with representations of the situation in Ireland.[32] And, indeed, Charles would also make use of these stereotypes in defending himself against the charge of being in league with the Irish rebels. Though Charles sees the Irish as provoked, the Irish are "a people prone enough to break out to all exhorbitant violence."[33] All such comments regarding the Irish "helped to perpetuate the legend of the 1641 massacre--both in England and abroad--at a time when appearances were indeed often more potent than reality."[34]

If, as Morash argues, atrocity images are fragmentary, they are so in both a figurative and, quite often, a literal sense. Many of the familiar images of Irish atrocities that we find in contemporary accounts are repetitive images of mutilation and dismemberment. The mutilation and dismemberment of Protestant bodies is analogous to the destruction of the body politic and the threat to the reformed religion which are endangered by the rebellion. As in "On the Late Massacre in Piedmont," "where still doth sway / The triple tyrant," Ireland continues to pose a threat to both the reformed religion and the nascent republic. And, like the later call to God that the Waldensians' "martyred blood and ashes sow / O'er all the Italian fields... / ...that from these may grow / A hundredfold," the "dreadful providential victories at

---

[31]Coughlan 210.

[32]Corns, "Milton's *Observations*" 125.

[33]*Eikon Basilike* 84.

[34]David Loewenstein, "Representing the Irish Revolt" 5.

Drogheda and Wexford...[by] Cromwell, the regime's instrument of divine retribution,"[35] enacts a similar process of renewal that links violence and the sacred in regenerative slaughter.

As the instrument of God, Cromwell's army in Ireland transforms the destructive violence of the Irish into a regenerative, transcendent violence which is particularly evident in the massacres at Drogheda and Wexford. The barbaric Irish stereotype plays a striking role in these events. While the stereotype is a means of differentiating the barbaric Irish from the civil English, it also prompts a sense of identification between the coloniser and the colonised. Writing on American colonial discourse, Neil L. Whitehead states that,

> the projection of wild and savage qualities and characteristics onto the colonised leads to the mimetic reflection of that projection in the acts of the brutality of the colonisers. Indian "savagery" or Caribbean "cannibalism" thus justify Spanish massacres and punitive raids.... In the socio-political confusions and radical change of the tribal zone the establishment of cultural order may require a mimetic savagery of the civilisers towards those that the colonisers construct as savage.[36]

Irish atrocities prompt the same mimetic savagery from the English. In turn, these English atrocities are the culmination of the textualized memories of 1641: "It may be that when we encounter these shattered fragments of the past, we wish to complete them; and the only way in which we can do so is by internalising them, making them part of the narrative of our own

---

[35]David Loewenstein, "Representing the Irish Revolt" 3.

[36]"Introduction," Sir Walter Ralegh, *The Discoverie of the Large, Rich and Bewtiful Empyre of Guiana*, ed. Neil L. Whitehead (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1997) 38.

memories."[37] Internalising atrocity stories links the individual to the collective through his or her self-identification as English and protestant. Once that identification has been accomplished, the individual becomes one of the godly and the barbaric, antichristian enemy must be destroyed.

Though commenting on American colonial activity, Lim's point is applicable to Ireland: the religious underpinnings of colonialism result in,

> the development of a worldview structured on the contestation between competing icons: the elect "who are the true *figurae* of Protestant religion" and the reprobate, who is the living image of opposition to God's living image of grace (in this case, the Puritan). Viewing themselves as living icons, the Puritans perpetrated sacred violence against the body of the Amerindian, whose destruction is the logical outcome of a habit of mind that literalizes figurative language.[38]

The perception of the other as somehow inhuman still occurs in modern history--the Holocaust, ethnic cleansing in the Balkans, and the civil war in Rwanda to cite a few of the more extensive examples. Such actions rely on their perpetrators to take literally the figurative dehumanisation of their intended victims as well as the figurative elevation of themselves as godly. Cromwell's language, and Milton's, along with other supporters of the Irish campaign, is a denial of agency in perpetrating atrocities; one is simply carrying out divine retribution on a barbaric, antichristian race. Writing on the Holocaust and the Nuremburg Trials, Lawrence L.

---

[37]Morash 118.

[38]Lim, *The Arts of Empire: the Poetics of Colonialism from Ralegh to Milton* (Newark: U of Delaware P, 1998) 100.

Langer states that the defence war criminals provided for their actions,

> concerns the blurring and decay in Nazi Germany of what we might call the phenomenon of *agency*. It involved the development of a psychology of detachment whereby the perpetrator of a violent act separated himself inwardly from its effect upon the victim, especially (though not exclusively) when the victim was Jewish.[39]

That inward detachment is evident in the treatment of the Irish in all of the active theatres of the civil wars. The ability of the godly to detach themselves from the violence committed on an Irish victim is clear in a response to Prince Rupert's order to hang thirteen parliamentary prisoners in retaliation for the hanging of thirteen Irish prisoners early in 1645: "Essex was instructed to remind Rupert that 'there was a very great difference between Englishmen and Irishmen.'"[40] Once in collective memory, the conditioned response to the Irish which is prompted by the stereotype makes such distinctions appear to be self-evident. The Irish are, quite simply, different, and their barbarism legitimizes a mimetic savagery on the part of the parliamentary troops. Indeed, Charles Carlton argues that "a visceral hatred of Irish papists" was perhaps a stronger ideological commitment than any political ideals during the civil wars.[41]

One of the most shocking denials of agency in Irish colonial discourse occurs in Spenser's *View*. When discussing his policy for the military subjection of the rebels, described

---

[39]*Admitting the Holocaust: Collected Essays* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995) 67-8.

[40]Joyce Lee Malcolm, *Caesar's Due: Loyalty and King Charles, 1642-1646* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1983) 121.

[41]*Going to the Wars* 254-5.

as "such desperate persons as wilfully follow the course of their own folly,"[42] Irenius relates the desired end result of famine. It is a long passage, but deserves our attention:

> The end I assure me will be very short and much sooner than can be in so great a trouble (as it seemeth) hoped for. Although there should none of them fall by the sword, nor be slain by the soldier, yet thus being kept from manurance, and their cattle from running abroad by this hard restraint, they would quickly consume themselves and devour one another. The proof whereof I saw sufficiently ensampled in those late wars in Munster, for notwithstanding that the same was a most rich and plentiful country, full of corn and cattle, that you would have thought they would have been able to stand long, yet ere one year and a half they were brought to such wretchedness, as that any stony heart would have rued the same. Out of every corner of the woods and glens they came creeping forth upon their hands, for their legs could not bear them. They looked anatomies of death, they spake like ghosts crying out of their graves, they did eat of the dead carrions, happy were they could find them, yea and one another soon after in so much as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape out of their graves, and if they found a plot of water cress or shamrocks, there they flocked as to a feast for the time, yet not able long to continue therewithal, that in short space there were none almost left and a most populous and plentiful country suddenly left void of man or beast. Yet sure in all that war there perished not many by the sword, but all by the

[42]Spenser, *A View* 104.

extremity of famine, which they themselves had wrought.[43]

This is seen as the just dessert of those "desperate persons" that "wilfully follow the course of their own folly." Again, the logical outcome of rebellion is annihilation. Though the familiar religious justification of seventeenth-century responses to the Irish is not explicit in Irenius's comments, it still plays a role in the Reformation context of Spenser's tract. Agency in perpetrating atrocities is denied by the godly--none of them, or very few of them, have to actually bloody their hands. The willful, rebellious course of the Irish need only be contained and allowed to consume itself. As Andrew Hadfield argues, the "devoured and devouring bodies [of the Irish] form a pointed contrast to the continued existence of the body politic, something strengthened, almost nourished, by their self-consumption."[44] Famine regenerates the English body politic. This detachment from such horrific acts is reliant on a profound ideological engagement with the political cause, and this is precisely why it is no longer an individual act--internalizing the textual memories of 1641 makes military atrocities in Ireland a communal act. It reaffirms the legitimacy of the body politic.

One of the primary texts that helped shape how the Commonwealth's troops, as well as the reading public, responded to the Irish was published in 1646, Sir John Temple's *The Irish Rebellion: or An History of the Beginnings and first Progresse of the Generall Rebellion raised within the Kingdom of Ireland, upon the three and twentieth day of October, in the Year, 1641. Together With the Barbarous Cruelties and Bloody Massacres which ensued thereupon.* Temple's text combines a number of sources: the official depositions collected from refugees

---

[43]Spenser, *A View* 104.

[44]"Spenser, Ireland, and Sixteenth-Century Political Theory" 9.

shortly following the outbreak of the rebellion, letters, and parliamentary orders. *The Irish Rebellion* has the appearance of a scholarly, legalistic work which clearly adds weight to Temple's narrative. The legalistic framework of the text seems to reassure the reader of the believability of the atrocities it describes. Temple essentially summarises depositions into a sequential narrative, providing references to actual depositions which are included as marginalia. This can best be demonstrated in a long passage which includes many of the most common atrocities described:

> If these be not sufficient, let us over-looke the particular ends of some particular persons, and we shall yet in them behold more horrid cruelties then these before mentioned. What (39)[45] shall we say to a child boyled to death in a cauldron, a (40) woman hanged on a tree, and in the haire of her head her owne daughter hanged up with her; a woman (41) miserably rent and torne to pieces, (42) some taken by the Rebels, their eyes plucked out, their hands cut off, and so turned out to wander up and down; (43) others stoned to death; (44) a man wounded and set upright in a hole digged in the earth, and so covered up to the very chin there left in that miserable manner to perish: a (45) mans feet held in the fire till he was burnt to death, his wife hanged at his doore: (46) a Minister stripped stark naked, and so driven like a beast through the Town of *Cashell*, the rebels following and pricking him forward with darts and rapiers: (47) a company of men women and children put into a house, and as they were burning, some children that made an escape out of the flames

[45]These numbers key the reader to the actual depositions Temple includes in his text.

> were taken by some of the Rebels who stood by, cut them in pieces with sithes, and so cast them into the fire again.[46]

The numbers in parentheses key the reader to the margins of Temple's narrative, where we find basically the same story in a deponent's own words. Indeed, the marginalia, at times, almost overwhelms Temple's narrative. Upon reading Temple's account of the rebellion, one comes to share in David Masson's reaction:

> Enough of these quotations! The mind refuses to believe in more than a fraction of their horrible details as by any possibility authentic. But such were the stories that every post brought over to England and Scotland, and that represented too truly in the main, with whatever exaggeration in particulars, what was actually passing in the dreadful island so near.[47]

The official sanction of the depositions that Temple includes is meant precisely to add to the truth and believability of the events described. While atrocities were certainly committed by the Irish, without this support, the relentless accounts of stripping, rape, mutilation, and murder move beyond the realms of believability.

The Irish Rebellion sanctions the suffering of English protestants in a Christian way. As in Milton's sonnet on the massacre in Piedmont, this is essential to the regeneration of the body politic. Cromwell, as we shall shortly see, expresses similar sentiments. Temple writes,

> with what indignation and reproach, did they teare, trample under their feet the

---

[46]Temple, *The Irish Rebellion: or An History of the Beginnings and first Progresse of the Generall Rebellion raised within the Kingdom of Ireland, upon the three and twentieth day of October, in the Year. 1641. Together With the Barbarous Cruelties and Bloody Massacres which ensued thereupon* (London: 1646) 97-8.

[47]*The Life of John Milton*, 7 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1859-94) 2: 313.

sacred Word of God? How despightfully did they upbraid the profession of the truth to those blessed soules, whom neither by threats nor terrours, paines nor torments, they could draw to forsake their Religion. But I shall not here touch any further upon those who dyed thus gloriously; this will be a worthy work for some more able pen to undertake, and indeed fit for a Martyrology.[48]

While claiming that he has not written a martyrology, Temple in fact has. His text is a catalogue of the individual suffering of English protestants at the hands of the antichristian Irish papists. Temple's text clearly gains its emotive impact from the ever popular protestant martyrology of John Foxe. In both Temple and Foxe, the cataloguing of bodily afflictions provides

> a tangible, compelling way of validating the suffering and magnifying the heroism of the martyrs. The more abuses of the flesh they endured without disavowing their faith, the greater their spiritual triumphs would seem. What should have been marks of shame, physical humiliations reserved for the lowest order of criminals, became badges of the highest spiritual dignity in the eyes of Christians.[49]

The transcendent, spiritual righteousness of the protestants in Ireland is affirmed through the ability to withstand whatever bodily tortures they endure. This goes some way to explaining the exaggerated nature of Irish atrocity accounts--the more horribly exquisite the torture, the greater the proof of godliness. Divine retribution must be enacted. *The Irish Rebellion* is most

---

[48]Temple 108-9.

[49]John R. Knott, *Discourses of Martyrdom in English Literature, 1563-1694* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993) 37.

definitely a call for vengeance on a par with Milton's sonnet: "Avenge O Lord thy slaughtered saints."

Before turning to Cromwell's enactment of regenerative violence in Ireland, one more aspect of Temple's text is noteworthy in terms of how *The Irish Rebellion* prompts an affective response from its readers, integrating the individual with the communal. In chapter one I discussed Thomas Emitie's *A New Remonstrance From Ireland* (1642) and his four tests to discover Irishness. In *The Irish Rebellion,* Temple includes strange and horrible accounts of how the Irish rebels dealt with Englishness. "*The* Irish," writes Temple, "*in many places killed* English *Cowes and Sheep meerly because they were* English; *in some places they cut off their legges, or tooke out a peece out of their buttocks, and so let them remain still alive.*"[50] Strictly speaking, of course, this is a property issue that becomes entangled with nationality. But, killing or mutilating cows and sheep because they are "English" is linked to seeing the English themselves as beastly. This is, once again, the familiar dehumanisation of the victim: the minister driven through Cashell like a beast, for example. This bestial nature may also explain the repeated degradation of stripping. Atrocities, once the victims are identified as "English" or "Irish", know no bounds of age, sex, or even species. In a vicious test of national characteristics, "Others were hanged up by the Armes, and with many slashes and cuts they made the experiment with their swords how many blowes an *Englishman* would endure before he died."[51] Such tests suggest that there is some mysterious, quantifiable essence to national identity.

---

[50]Temple 84.

[51]Temple 91.

The horror that atrocity accounts such as Temple's *The Irish Rebellion* evoked most certainly motivated the ferocity of Cromwell's reconquest of Ireland. Cromwell's speeches and writings frequently invoke notions of Irish blood guilt and divine retribution. The body politic must be regenerated, and Cromwell's apocalyptic framework establishes the grounds through which it will be accomplished. This is evident in Cromwell's response to two declarations by Irish Catholic prelates published in December 1649. The Roman Catholic clergy warned

> their people that Cromwell intended to extirpate Catholicism from Ireland, which would necessarily involve the extermination or banishment of the Irish people, the confiscation of the property of those who were spared, the colonizing of the island from England, and a policy of transportation such as had already taken place to "the Tobacco Islands."[52]

Following upon the massacres at Drogheda and Wexford, their fears seem well founded. Cromwell responded to the prelates with the ominous *A Declaration of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, For the Undeceiving of deluded and seduced People.* Cromwell writes,

> You are a part of Antichrist, whose Kingdom the Scripture so expressly speaks should be laid in blood; yea in the blood of the Saints. You have shed great store of it already, and ere it be long, you must all of you have blood to drink; even the dregs of the cup of the fury and the wrath of God, which will be poured out onto you![53]

---

[52]Wilbur Cortez Abbot, ed. *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: with an Introduction, Notes and an Account of His Life*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1939) 2: 199.

[53]*A Declaration of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, For the Undeceiving of deluded and seduced*

Cromwell literalizes the figurative language of Scripture, deflecting the agency of atrocity as well as raising the colonial struggle to a transcendent plain, as a battle against the Antichrist. The spilt blood of the saints will be justly avenged.

This deflection of agency by calling upon scripture is quite interesting in a colonial context. Paul Stevens argues that "the secular discourse of civility is...interpenetrated by a biblical rhetoric of exclusion."[54] When the "argument of civility" fails in colonial discourse the biblical rhetoric of exclusion comes to take on a greater significance:

> the biblical rhetoric of exclusion allows them to transform the destruction of the natives into a sin offering, a sacrifice of atonement, a mark of their own holiness. What this paradox suggests is that often when early modern colonizers commit atrocities, imbrue their hands in blood, they don't necessarily conceive of themselves as having abandoned civility...they don't conceive themselves as having gone native so much as having become biblical.[55]

Stevens's comment supports much of what I have argued in the previous pages. The biblical rhetoric of exclusion establishes the distinction between the godly and the antichristian. It literalizes the figurative language of scripture in order to justify the coloniser's mimetic savagery and detach them from the acts of violence they commit. And, finally, the biblical rhetoric of exclusion allows the colonisers not only to retain but also to affirm their humanity

---

People: which may be satisfactory to all that doe not wilfully shut their eyes against the light. In answer to certaine late Declarations and Acts, framed by the Irish Popish Prelates and Clergy, in a Conventicle at Clonmacnoise, in *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: with an Introduction and Notes and an Account of His Life*, ed. Wilbur Cortez Abbot, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1939) 2: 199.

[54]"Spenser and Milton on Ireland: Civility, Exclusion, and the Politics of Wisdom," *Ariel* 26 (1995) 156.

[55]Stevens 156-7.

in perpetrating acts of violence which are equally as horrific as those committed by the colonised.

Just how broadly these distinctions were applied is clear in the events that occurred at Drogheda and Wexford. In terms of Drogheda, Cromwell's actions demonstrate,

> a startling doctrine which held a town that had at no time been in the hands of the Confederate Catholics responsible for the massacre which they had unleashed in 1641. Among Drogheda's defenders, moreover, were many English officers, one of whom (Colonel Byrne) commanded a whole regiment of protestants.[56]

An account of the massacre at Wexford illustrates the curious apocalyptic element of the reconquest:

> Some [priests] came holding forth crucifixes before them, and conjuring our soldiers (for his sake that saved us all) to save their lives; yet our soldiers would not own their dead images for our living saviour; but struck them dead with their idols; many of their priests (being got together in a church of the town, where 'tis said many poor protestants were kept and killed together in the beginning of the Rebellion) were slain together by our soldiers about their altar.[57]

The slaughter at Drogheda and Wexford may not be particularly surprising in terms of seventeenth-century rights of war, which permitted such actions against a position that was

---

[56]I. J. Gentles, *The New Model Army in England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1645-1653* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992) 361-2.

[57]Quoted in Gentles 367.

seen as indefensible but continued to fight on:

> Everyone knows, too, what the right of war is, and that it extends not only to those who are responsible, but to everyone who is in the enemy's power, women, for example, and even children, and people who have done nothing towards the war nor intended to.[58]

This definition cuts a very fine line between innocence and guilt by a poet who lamented the sad spectacle of "bloody Piedmontese" rolling "Mother with infant down the rocks." Though the rights of war may, to a certain extent, explain the massacres at Drogheda and Wexford, it does not excuse them:

> it was...[Cromwell's] bitterness at the losses of his army in the storm of Drogheda that provoked him into sanctioning indiscriminate massacre...and undoubtedly the fact that his enemy was "Irish", representing a people whose blood guilt was regarded as putting them almost beyond the bound of humanity, contributed to his readiness to sanction the deed.[59]

Even if the massacre at Wexford was not at first sanctioned by Cromwell, Drogheda had set an example for his men. Cromwell would soon view the slaughter at Wexford as God's "righteous justice...a just judgment."[60]

The apocalyptic terms that justify such atrocities are disturbing. The sacred violence of the Wexford account of the killing of priests occurs on two levels: first, there is the obvious

---

[58]Milton, *The Christian Doctrine CPW* 6: 388.

[59]David Stevenson, "Cromwell, Scotland and Ireland," *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*, ed. John Morrill (London and New York: Longman, 1990) 157.

[60]Cromwell, "For the Honourable William Lenthall, Esquire, Speaker of the Parliament of England" 2: 142.

iconoclastic response to Catholic idols, and, second, the wish to avenge 1641. The two motives join together in this sacrifice "about their altar." We also see Lim's contrast of those in opposition to God and protestants who view themselves as living images of grace--the shift from the figurative "dead images" of Catholic idols to the literal enactment of violence. The priests are "struck...dead with their idols." And this occurs in a place "where 'tis said" a massacre of protestants was committed in 1641, calling attention to the fact that this knowledge has entered into communal memory. In addition, focussing on altars and idols broadens the context of this communal memory beyond the strictly Irish issue to include the affective power of puritan attacks on the Anglican church in the previous decades.

Atrocity and the divine are clearly entwined in this account of Wexford's iconoclastic slaughter. Jean Baudrillard writes,

> [The iconoclasts'] rage to destroy images rose precisely because they sensed this omnipotence of simulacra, this facility they have of effacing God from the consciousness of men, and the overwhelming, destructive truth which they suggest: that ultimately there has never been any God, that only the simulacra exists, indeed that God himself has only ever been his own simulacrum...their metaphysical despair came from the idea that the images concealed nothing at all.[61]

The priests' images are "dead," not the "living saviour." Only by breaking the image, both the idols and these figuratively, faithlessly dead individuals, is He kept alive, or asserts His presence, through these soldiers' actions. The link between this metaphysical despair and

---

[61]Baudrillard 8.

atrocity is striking:

> atrocity is a characteristic of some of the great crimes: it refers to the number of natural or positive, divine or human laws that they attack, to the scandalous openness or, on the contrary, to the secret cunning with which they have been committed, to the rank and status of those who are their authors and victims, to the disorder that they presuppose or bring with them, to the horror they arouse.... Atrocity is that part of the crime that the punishment turns back as torture in order to display it in the full light of day: it is a figure inherent in the mechanism that produces the visible truth of the crime at the very heart of the punishment itself.[62]

The rebellion attacks both divine and human laws, issues related to rank and status: for example, Catholic / Protestant (or, more broadly, antichristian / godly) and coloniser / colonised. It is associated with the secret cunning of Catholic conspiracies, prompting disorder and horror. The Irish military reconquest is linked to divine vengeance for the 1641 massacre and popery. Both these "crimes" are turned back on the supposed perpetrators, and the annhilated Irish bodies become the "visible truth" of their crimes as well as evidence of God's favour for the English cause. In *A Declaration of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, For the Undeceiving of deluded and seduced People*, Cromwell writes,

> England hath had experience of the blessing of God in prosecuting just and righteous causes, whatever the cost and hazard be.... We are come to ask an account of the innocent blood that hath been shed.... We come to break the

---

[62]Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* 56.

power of a company of lawless rebels, who having cast off the authority of England, live as enemies of human society.... We come...to hold forth and maintain the lustre and glory of English liberty in a nation where we have an undoubted right to do it.[63]

The realization that idols are simulacra, that there is only a void behind them, that only habit and besotted reason for Milton and "senseless orders and traditions" for Cromwell give them their power, leads to atrocities. Turning the crime back on itself, the atrocity destroys those who accept the simulacra as divine and those who have prompted rebellion through appeals to these "dead images." The atrocity executes justice and literalizes what is seen as a spiritual death, as "Justice...is the Sword of God, superior to all mortal things, in whose hand soever by apparent signes his testified will is to put it."[64] English liberty and the protestant godhead are violently reasserted upon a nation "that lives as enemies to human society."

The ferocity of Cromwell's Irish campaign is in stark contrast to the Scottish campaign which followed. While atrocities occurred in the treatment of Scottish prisoners and, particularly, in the aftermath of the battle of Worcester, there was nothing on the scale of repeated Irish atrocities. The issues of religion and blood guilt take on very different aspects in regards to Scotland, and if we turn now to consider this later campaign some of the issues regarding atrocities can be further developed. Both Ireland and Scotland were key to Charles II's efforts to regain the throne. Ireland was the preferable alternative because of Charles I's experiences in dealing with the Scots and their insistence on a presbyterian church settlement.

---

[63]Cromwell, "Declaration for the Undeceiving of Deluded and Seduced People" 2: 204-5.

[64]*Tenure*, *CPW* 3: 193.

With the defeat of the Irish Rebellion, however, Charles II was forced to turn to the Scots and accept the terms of the Kirk party. While Scotland had posed periodical threats to the Commonwealth since Charles I had surrendered to the Scots in 1646, with their declaration of Charles II as king not only of Scotland but also of England and Ireland the threat was exacerbated. Cromwell's attitude to the Scots changed a couple of times through the 1640s, but with their proclamation of Charles II, "Cromwell at last admitted that his policy of leniency towards the Scots had failed."[65] This latest change in attitude did not, however, lead to tarring the Scottish nation with blood guilt as the actions of the Irish rebels had. Cromwell had already stated his position towards the Irish and the Scots shortly before accepting the post of commander-in-chief of the Irish expedition:

> I had rather be overrun with a Cavalierish interest than a Scotch interest; I had rather be overrun with a Scotch interest, than an Irish interest; and I think of all this is most dangerous. If they shall be able to carry on their work, they will make this the most miserable people in the earth, for all the world knows their barbarism.[66]

Ruthlessly reconquering Ireland, in effect, served only to combine the Scots and Cavalier interests in the person of Charles II. Yet, bloodshed, it was hoped, could still be avoided, and a careful propaganda campaign was launched in conjunction with military action in Scotland.

From the outset, then, the Scottish campaign included an important component that was never extended to the Irish--the possibility of a negotiated settlement. The contrasting

---

[65]Stevenson 155.

[66]"General Council of Whitehall, March 23, 1649" 2: 38.

attitudes of Cromwell towards the Irish and the Scots is evident in a declaration of 1650 in which he explains why the Commonwealth is undertaking military action against Scotland:

> out of our tenderness towards you, whom we look upon as our brethren, and our desire to make a distinction and separation of you from the rest, as who, through the cunning practices of some wicked and designing men, biased by particular interests, or for want of a true and right information and representation of the great and wonderful transactions wrought amongst us, and brought to pass by the mere finger of our God, may possibly be scandalized at some late actions in England.[67]

Rather than being outside the pale of human society, the Scots are "brethren," the majority of which have simply been deceived by their leaders. Bloodshed can be avoided if the people only realise this and reject the political views of their leaders. The Commonwealth's quarrel is only with those who put forward the "particular interests" of the Kirk party and meddle in the affairs of England. Nor, at least according to Cromwell, is the invasion an attempt to meddle in Scottish affairs:

> if it shall please God to make Scotland sensible of the wrongs done to us, and to give to the Commonwealth of England a satisfying security against future injuries, we shall rejoice; but if that may not be obtained, we shall desire such as fear God not to join or have to do with those who are the authors and actors of so much evil and mischief against their neighbours.[68]

---

[67]"A Declaration of the Army of England upon their March into Scotland to all that are Saints, and Partakers of the Faith of God's Elect, in Scotland" 2: 283.

[68]Cromwell, "A Declaration of the Army of England" 2: 287.

The declarations and proclamations of the English army continually make this distinction while reassuring the godly of Scotland, contrary to the Scottish authorities claims that the sectarian English army would behave towards the Scots as they had to the Irish, that their lives and property were safe. This had been a familiar strategy in dealing with the Presbyterians since the trial and execution of Charles I, and it is clearly evident in Milton's tracts of 1649. In these tracts, as well as in the addresses to the Scottish nation, Milton's polemical "tactics are to hive off the leadership of 'turbulent spirit' while leaving an avenue of reconciliation open to their followers."[69]

No blood guilt accrues to the majority of godly Scots, pointing out the error of their leaders' opinions should win them over to, at the very least, a tolerance of the Commonwealth. In order to do so, Milton associates Presbyterian leaders with the dubious intentions of the Irish rebels and Charles I. In regards to the Belfast Presbytery, Milton points out

> the Sympathy, good Intelligence, and joynt pace which they goe in the North of *Ireland*, with their Copartning Rebels in the South, driving on the same Interest to loose us that Kingdome, that they may gaine it themselves, or at least share in the spoile: though the other be op'n enemies, these pretended Brethren.[70]

The Belfast Presbytery is seen as meddling in the affairs of an English possession. Ireland is England's by right of conquest. The same charge is made against Charles I's Irish policies in

---

[69]Corns, "Milton's *Observations*" 130.

[70]*Observations*, *CPW* 3: 317.

order to discredit the Presbyterians' insistence on the terms of the Covenant:

> But this I dare owne as part of my faith, that if such a one [Charles I] there be, by whose Commission whole massachers have been committed on his faithful Subjects, his Provinces offerd to pawn or alienation, as the hire of those whom he had sollicited to come in and destroy whole Citties and Countries; be he King, or Tyrant, or Emperour, the Sword of Justice is above him; in whose hand soever is found sufficient power to avenge the effusion, and so great a deluge of innocent blood.[71]

The Scots must be convinced that their interests do not lie with those who are responsible for shedding innocent, protestant blood in Ireland. The propaganda campaign attempts to take advantage of Scottish political disunity, and the Covenant figures significantly in the attempt to point out the disparity of Scottish intentions. *A Declaration of the Army of England upon their March into Scotland* makes this clear:

> The Covenant tied us to preserve religion and liberty, as the ends of it, even when these were inconsistent with the preservation of the king's interest and the frame of parliament; because when the means and the end cannot be enjoyed both together, the end is to be preferred before the means.[72]

While Scottish factional interests were divided as much as the various Irish interests, no similar concerted propaganda effort was undertaken in Ireland.

The different status of Ireland and Scotland within the three kingdoms is key to the

---

[71]*Tenure*, *CPW* 3: 197.

[72]Cromwell 2: 284.

issue. Treating Ireland as an English dependency is important in terms of Anglo-Scottish relations. From the outbreak of the Irish Rebellion, plans for a strictly English reconquest of the island flew in the face of the Covenant. By the end of 1646, those influencing Irish policy at Westminster "advocated an entirely English campaign to subjugate Ireland--to the exclusion of the Scots from any part in the expected victory over the rebels."[73]

The Irish Rebellion had, of course, posed a threat to Scotland--both in terms of the dangers faced by the Ulster presbyterian population as well as Irish raids on the west coast of Scotland which were intended to draw Scottish forces out of Ireland. For Milton, the Scottish presence in Ireland is "but by the courtesie of *England.*"[74] They should not, therefore, side with the declared enemies of the Commonwealth. Ireland's status as a dependency, in contrast to Scotland's more independent status, helps to explain the different treatment these countries experienced at the hands of the parliament's army. The universal blood guilt of the Irish, that barbarous and antichristian race, contributed to a horrendous policy of reconquest, confiscation, and transportation. While the Kilkenny Confederacy had worked at turning back English colonial policies, it was, in effect, Cromwell's campaign which destroyed the country's political infrastructure. Violently purged of its rebellious resistance, Ireland could be remade in the appropriate godly image. As Stevenson writes,

> The opportunity to build a new godly society, and a legal system and government guaranteeing liberty and equality before the law, should not be

---

[73]John Adamson, "Strafford's Ghost: the British Context of Viscount Lisle's Lieutenancy of Ireland," *Ireland from Independence to Occupation, 1641-1660,* ed. Jane H. Ohlmeyer (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995) 134.

[74]*Observations, CPW* 3: 333-4.

> missed. Thus the Cromwellians, like Wentworth back in the 1630s, saw Ireland as a test site for policies ultimately to be introduced in England.[75]

The apocalyptic context of Cromwell's reconquest, the dialectic of violence and the sacred, establishes the key groundwork for the regeneration of the godly Commonwealth. The "slaughtered saints" are avenged and the political foundations of the Commonwealth are strengthened. These had been the goals from the outset of the Irish Rebellion.

In terms of Scotland, however, the aim was simply to remove the threat posed by the alliance with Charles II. Only gradually, as the propaganda campaign failed to have the desired result, did the conquest of Scotland become the objective. Scots prisoners were certainly mistreated after the Battle of Worcester--many died of dysentery while in confinement and others were transported to the West Indies and New England--but a more moderate treatment of the nation ensued than what had occurred in Ireland:

> Expediency suggested that generosity to the defeated would help to reconcile them to the new order.... In Cromwell's mind the Scots were already basically godly: treating them justly and removing the forces which had led them astray (king, feudal landlords and bigoted ministers) would convert them into active supporters of the commonwealth.[76]

The ensuing incorporation of Scotland into the Commonwealth may well have been a political farce, as "the English were making an offer that could not be refused,"[77] but even the

---

[75]Stevenson 162.

[76]Stevenson 163-4.

[77]Stevenson 165.

possibility of a stage-managed resolution was not offered to the Irish. The treatment experienced by the Irish was always averted in Scotland by the presence of an essentially godly, but deluded element, and the possibility of a negotiated settlement. This does not, of course, deny the fact that both Ireland and Scotland became conquered nations incorporated into the Commonwealth. Abbott comments that "Though the English congratulated themselves on their generosity, the feeling of the Scots was expressed by the Reverend Blair, when he declared, 'it will be as when the poor bird is embodied into the hawk that hath eaten it up.'"[78]

Once again, as in writings on the Irish Rebellion, we meet with an image of the Commonwealth being nourished by the colonial periphery. This movement outward contrasts to the collapse of royal power which began with the periphery--Scotland in 1638 and Ireland in 1641. It resolves the political and religious threats faced by the Commonwealth, but it was this joint threat that Ireland embodied which drew the most brutal response. While "Cromwell saw the confrontation with the Irish (and the Scots) as a means of uniting the majority of Englishmen against 'barbarous races' which were the enemies of the nation rather then merely the Rump,"[79] the Irish stereotype clearly conditioned the far more violent response of the state and individual troops. The Scottish nation can potentially redeem itself and accept the Commonwealth as its political master. The Irish are beyond redemption. Milton makes this quite clear in his use of a biblical rape narrative when discussing the Irish Rebellion, and this analogy is the focus of the next chapter.

---

[78]Cromwell, 2: 534.

[79]Corns, "Milton's *Observations*" 130.

4. The Dismembered Concubine: Rebellion and Judges 19-21

...the humanistic tradition...has celebrated Lucretia's

rape as a prologue to republican freedom.[1]

In *Chaste Thinking: the Rape of Lucretia and the Birth of Humanism*, Stephanie Jed examines the Florentine appropriation of the Roman republican tradition of humanist philological practices which she sees as commensurate with the political ideals of Florence. Central to this appropriation is the rape of Lucretia by Tarquin which results in the establishment of a republic purged of monarchical tyranny. The rape operates metaphorically within textual editing practices that aim at recovering, or repurifying key texts in the republican tradition. The text, then, like Lucretia's body following her suicide, becomes a purified symbol of a transcendent political ideal. In undertaking her project, Jed is aware that the contemporary reader, in retelling the story of Lucretia's rape, enters into,

> some sort of binding relationship with all of those readers and writers who somehow found the narrative of this rape to be edifying, pleasurable, or even titillating, and to be bound by the vision of those readers and writers to look at the rape as they did (and do)--as a paradigmatic component of all narratives of liberation.[2]

Jed's book resists reproducing the violation of Lucretia, a violation which points to both an

---

[1]Stephanie Jed, *Chaste Thinking: the Rape of Lucretia and the Birth of Humanism* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1989) 51.

[2]Jed 49.

ideological competition and a textual homosocial bond in regards to a set of desired political aims. The male struggle over, and possession of, Lucretia's body is a political one which aids in the construction of a republican masculinity which is metaphorically linked to female sexual purity. There are similarities between Jed's analysis of a rape narrative as a paradigm of political liberation and Milton's use of the rape narrative in Judges 19-21. I will begin by exploring the issue of textual homosocial bonds, and their violation, before turning to the use of rape narratives in political and colonial contexts.

In his writings, Milton put himself on the line for the individual, political, and religious liberties of the people: "The people of England know that I am not sorry to be either the defender of their rights or the hunter of their beasts."[3] In a fascinating way, through the written word, Milton's body became intimately entwined with the body politic. In defending the revolutionary regime, Milton responds to published attacks on himself as if they are attacks on the nation. In one of the most frequently quoted passages of *Areopagitica*, Milton explicitly draws an analogy between the book and the author's body which is clearly linked to the bodily violation of unruly authors by the state in early modern England--punishments which included branding, flogging, pillorying, the cropping of ears, and the amputation of hands:

> For Books are not absolutely dead things, but doe contain a potencie of life in them to be as active as that soule was whose progeny they are; nay they do preserve as in a violl the purest efficacie and extraction of that living intellect that bred them.... And yet on the other hand unlesse warinesse be us'd, as good

[3]*Pro Se Defensio*, *CPW* 4: 746.

almost kill a Man as kill a good Book; who kills a Man kills a reasonable creature, Gods Image; but hee who destroyes a good Booke, kills reason it selfe, kills the Image of God, as it were in the eye. Many a man lives a burden to the Earth; but a good Booke is the pretious life-blood of a masterspirit, imbalm'd and treasur'd up on purpose to a life beyond life.[4]

Sandra Sherman writes, "Milton uses language of intense physical implication to invest the text with a corporeality that derives from the author as he is merged into the printed text."[5] Milton, then, must attempt to preserve his book / body from the "violence"[6] of the licencer while recognising that the book / body is entering into a polemical war of truth that threatens potential textual mutilation or dismemberment at the hands of his adversaries. In *Milton and the Culture of Violence*, Michael Lieb discusses the pamphlet war that Milton entered as a "theatre of assault," one in which Milton exposes himself to the violence of his adversaries and, indeed, violently attacks them in order to repristinate his book / body in an ideal purity and wholeness.[7] This textual body is symbolic of the social order--the book's margins are those of the body for Milton, and "all margins," writes Mary Douglas, "are dangerous. If they are pulled this way or that the shape of fundamental experience is altered. Any structure of ideas is vulnerable at its margins. We should expect the orifices of the body to symbolise its

---

[4]*CPW* 2: 492-3.

[5]"Printing the Mind: the Economics of Authorship in *Aeropagitica*," *ELH* 60 (1993): 324.

[6]*Areopagitica*, *CPW* 2: 534.

[7]See Lieb's chapters on Milton's prose in *Milton and the Culture of Violence* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994) 159-225.

specially vulnerable points."[8] The political appropriation of rape narratives, as we shall shortly see, highlights Douglas's point.

Lieb develops the social forces of violence that threaten Milton's identity as an author, both poet and polemicist; in terms of his poetry, Lieb configures Milton's career in the archetypal dismemberment of Orpheus. In the prose there is no archetype to fall back on, the threat of violence is more definite, the adversary more apparent (though at times anonymous)--it is either the state censor or his polemical adversaries. If we see Milton's idealized view of literary production as intimately entwined in the homosocial bonds of the state, which result from searching, meditating, and consulting "with his judicious friends,"[9] these forms of violence endanger and devalue those bonds. In addition, we see that these homosocial bonds are solidified by aggression towards women. The censor's stamp violates the book / body as much as polemical attacks do, and both of these violations take a misogynistic and, what may be anachronistically termed, a homophobic turn. I will begin with a brief discussion of the homoerotics of Milton's work, as this is essential in exploring the homosocial bond, before turning to the violation of this relationship.

In his book on early modern theatre, Mario Digangi writes,

> Early modern representations of male intimacy reveal a multiplicity of possible social configurations, erotic investments, and sexual acts: this multiplicity cannot be reduced to a uniform system of behavior.... It is pointless to claim that all male friendships in early modern England were

---

[8] *Purity and Danger: an Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966) 121.

[9] *Areopagitica, CPW* 2: 532.

> homoerotic, let alone actively sexual. It is nevertheless the case that early modern gender ideology integrated orderly homoeroticism into friendship more seamlessly than modern ideological formations.[10]

Digangi makes an essential early modern distinction between "orderly" and "disorderly" homoeroticism--the latter being the category of sodomy that has drawn so much recent critical attention. Sodomy became relevant only "in tandem with, or as an effect of, other socially disorderly behavior."[11] Alan Bray's work demonstrates the early modern linking of social disorder, witches, heretics, and Papists, in the category of the sodomite, a category within which homosexuality, in terms of sexual acts, was only a small part:

> Mediated as homosexuality then was by social relationships that did not take their form from homosexuality and were not exclusive to it, the barrier between heterosexual and homosexual behaviour (despite the impression contemporaries gave to the contrary) was in practice vague and imprecise. There was little or no reason for homosexual relations to influence people's lives outside the strictly sexual sphere.[12]

Neither the individuals engaged in homosexual relations nor society would view these relationships as sodomitical if they were expressed within established social institutions such as the household, the educational system, or prostitution.[13] Representations of the sodomite

---

[10]*The Homoerotics of Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge UP, 1997) 12.

[11]Digangi 5.

[12]Alan Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*, 2nd ed. (London: Gay Men's Press, 1988) 69.

[13]Bray 74.

were almost totally divorced from "the social forms that homosexuality actually took."[14] Hence, what occurred within friendship and patronage relationships, etc., if sexual acts were performed at all, would not be visible, for, rather than disturb the social order, these relationships and their interaction supported the patriarchal social order. We can interrogate the classifications of orderly and disorderly homoeroticism by focusing on Milton's comments on homosocial bonds and on the sodomite, particularly in regards to Milton's allusions to the Judges narrative, as well as by looking at polemical attacks on Milton. What will result is an analysis of sexual politics, one in which "male homosexual contact serves metaphorically for other sorts of unequal male-male power relations. Sexual penetration signifies social submission."[15]

Areopagitica demonstrates the importance of the homosocial bond in the production of texts, yet, for a more openly homoerotic version of this bonding, we must turn for a moment to Milton's correspondence with Charles Diodati and his poems touching on that relationship. Working from the name given Milton at university, "the Lady of Christs," John Shawcross discusses the homoeroticism of Milton and Diodati's relationship, holding out the possibility of sexual acts. Shawcross's argument is, however, rather problematic in its gender binarism, asserting an active "masculine" role for Diodati and a passive "feminine" role for Milton. Shawcross writes, "This is definitely not to say that Milton was overtly effeminate

---

[14]Bray 77.

[15]Ken Stone, "Gender and Homosexuality in Judges 19: Subject-Honour, Object-Shame?" *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 67 (1995): 97. The issue is still relevant today, as Stone quite rightly points out that a "distinction between socially approved subject and object positions still determines the dominant attitude toward male homosexuality" (98).

in attitude or had sexually exercised such personality traits."[16] Milton may well be the "Lady of Christs" for his moral uprightness and not fitting in as one of the boys (issues which are, of course, tangled up in views of gender), but the issue of sexually exercising one's effeminacy is a rather contentious debate in current early modern studies.

Michael B. Young cogently summarizes this debate in *James VI and I and the History of Homosexuality*.[17] The debate centres around whether the meaning of *effeminacy* was distinctly different from our own use of the word and whether it was linked to male homosexuality. The *OED* defines *effeminate* as unmanly, or womanish in behaviour and as obsessed with women. The latter sense is evident in John Donne's epigram, "The Jughler:"

> Thou call'st me effeminate, for I love women's joys;
>
> I call thee not manly, though thou follow boys.[18]

The implication here, of course, is that the effeminate male is an oversexed heterosexual, but Donne also neatly implies the unmanly meaning of effeminate. While the definition of effeminate as womanish does not implicitly encapsulate homosexuality, Young argues against critics, such as Jonathan Goldberg and Alan Bray, who attempt strictly to separate representations of the effeminate male from issues of homosexuality until the appearance, in the early eighteenth century, of the molly.[19] Throughout the first half of the seventeenth

---

[16]*John Milton: the Self and the World* (Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1993) 42.

[17]Young, *James VI and I and the History of Homosexuality* (London: Macmillan, 2000).

[18]*Complete English Poems*, ed. C. A. Patrides (London: J. M. Dent, 1994) 78.

[19]On the term "molly," Bray writes, "'Molly' in the homosexual sense of the molly houses, etc. was taken over from Molly, a form of the female name Mary: it was part of the effeminate conventions of the homosexual subculture" (137). His discussion of the trials following raids of these establishments clearly demonstrate a link between effeminacy and homosexuality. The *OED*, however, gives the earliest example of molly as "an effeminate man or boy" as 1754.

century, "men were often accused of becoming effeminate, and that did not necessarily mean they were suspected of becoming sodomitical. Effeminacy did not always imply sodomy. But sodomy did imply effeminacy."[20]

Effeminacy, then, clearly involves issues of hierarchy and the usurpation of masculine prerogatives, implying in the political uses of the term a switching of sexual subject / object positions in either male-female or male-male relationships. This is how Milton uses the charge against Charles in *Eikonoklastes*. Charles's doting on Henrietta Maria makes him effeminate:

> Examples are not farr to seek, how great mischief and dishonour hath befall'n to Nations under the Government of effeminate and Uxorious Magistrates. Who being themselves govern'd and overswaid at home under a Feminine usurpation, cannot but be farr short of spirit and authority without dores, to govern a whole Nation.[21]

Milton clearly views effeminacy as threatening the social order. In addition, Charles's doting submission to Henrietta Maria upsets the relationship between himself and his subjects precisely because the queen has usurped his masculine prerogatives. The dangers resulting are both political and religious in this case, as Lucy Hutchinson points out, with an added dose of xenophobia:

> but wherever male princes are so effeminate as to suffer women of foreign birth and different religions to intermeddle with the affairs of state, it is always found to produce sad desolations; and it hath been observd that a French queen

---

[20]Young, *James VI and I* 70.

[21]*CPW* 3: 421.

never brought any happiness to England.[22]

Within orderly homoeroticism, Milton and Diodati's relationship carries none of these threatening possibilities. Nor, of course, does it imply sodomy. Milton himself, however, was not free of explicit accusations of sodomy that carry with them charges of disturbing the social order. The first such accusation is linked to Milton's trip to Italy in 1638-39. Italy was, of course, frequently represented as the den of all vice. During the Italian trip, Salmasius alleges that Milton became a male prostitute, "'selling his buttocks for a few pence.'"[23] Nicholas Heinsius denies the accusation in a letter of 1653: "He [Salmasius] sometimes calls Milton a catamite, and says that he was the vilest prostitute in Italy, and that he prostituted his buttocks for a few pennies."[24] Salmasius's allegation,

> may throw light on the enigmatic accusation of John Bramhall in May 1654 that Milton was sent down from Cambridge and banished from the society of men because of actions so shameful that if they were revealed Milton would hang himself, but both records have been set aside because they do not accord with the image of Milton that his champions wish to create. Such records raise a specific problem about the evidential value of hostile reports, in this case uncorroborated slurs by known enemies, but also point to the general problem of tendentiousness in allusions; indeed, all descriptive records embody the

---

[22]*Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, ed. N. H. Keeble (London: J. M. Dent, 1995) 70.

[23]Quoted in Gordon Campbell, "The Life Records," *A Companion to Milton*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Oxford: Blackwell, forthcoming).

[24]In J. Milton French, *The Life Records of John Milton* 6 vols. (New York: Gordian Press, 1966) 3: 316.

perspective of their authors, and to that extent cannot be taken at face value.[25]

Gordon Campbell is quite right to claim that such accusations cannot be taken at face value without further evidence--and where sexual relations are concerned, such evidence rarely exists. The debate between Milton, Salmasius, and More is rife with a whole variety of sexual transgressions.

The charge is, however, repeated in *The Transproser Rehears'd*, an attack on Marvell's response to a tract by Bishop Bramhall. The social transgression implied here in the attack on Marvell that touches upon Milton, is linked to political views and, in Milton's case, the divorce tracts:

> Certainly, to see a *Stallion* leap a *Gelding*, (and this *leap't* fair, for he *leapt* over the *Geldings* head) was a more preposterous sight, or at least more *Italian*, then what you fancy of *Father Patrick's bestriding Doctor Patrick.* Neither is it unlikely but some may say in defence of these Verses, that *Nol's Latin Clerks* were somewhat *Italianiz'd* in point of Art as well as Language, and for the proof of this refer those that are curious to a late Book call'd the *Rehearsal Transpros'd*, where p. 77. the Author or some body for him asks his Antagonist if the *Non-conformists must down with their Breeches as oft as he wants the prospect of a more pleasing* Nudity. And for his fellow Journey-man, they may direct the *Leaf-turners* to one of his books of *Divorce....* Such was the Liberty of Unlicenc'd Printing, that the more modest *Aretine* were he alive in this Age, might be set to School again, to learn in his own Art of *Blind*

[25]Campbell, "The Life Records."

*School-maste*r.[26]

As in other instances in the early modern period, the accusation of sodomy, here, only emerges in association with other forms of social transgression, political and religious. Unlike his relationship with Diodati, Milton's relationship with Marvell, their shared opinions, are seen as threatening the social order.

But, while discussing the effeminacy of the "Lady of Christs," and the implications that the epitaph potentially encapsulates, Shawcross wishes to preserve the virginal body of his author, holding out the suggestion of possible sexual acts between Milton and Diodati while asserting that Milton was, at that point, "surely virginal."[27] Shawcross writes,

> The view of Diodati which the foregoing yields is of one who represented a dominant counterpart to Milton, one whose sexual life cannot be described but whose personality outlines--his excesses, his fickleness in friendship, his sensual nature, his drifting life--would not deny a rather promiscuous homosexuality. On the other hand, Milton would seem to be somewhere on the fringes of homosexuality through religious and ideological repression of "natural" attitudes toward sex, high-mindedness, and "female" qualities of appearance, interests, and abilities. That there may have been homosexual experiences with Diodati does not demand a label of "homosexual" for Milton but rather a latent homosexualism that on occasion might possibly have emerged and a homoerotic personality that would seem to fit the total evidence

---

[26]In French, *The Life Records* 5: 55.

[27]Shawcross 52.

of Milton's life.[28]

Clearly, Shawcross is correct in calling attention to ideological implantations in the subject that produce "natural" attitudes toward sexuality. However, he attaches the label, a promiscuous homosexuality, onto Diodati (though, certainly, the attributes Shawcross provides could just as easily describe a promiscuous bi- or heterosexuality). Milton, if, as Shawcross repeatedly states, there was any sexual relationship at all, was guilt-ridden and experienced self-hate for his homoerotic desires, while Diodati remains the "'stud,' whose attitude was blasé."[29] Shawcross implies that the relationship that Milton sought with Diodati could not occur within the homoerotic economy that he identifies. In fact, Shawcross generally produces a trajectory of maturity for Milton--a trajectory not unrelated to "natural" attitudes toward sexuality--which works through homoeroticism in order to arrive at an adult sexuality configured as heterosexual.

This is reinforced by Shawcross's analysis of Sonnets 1 to 6. But, do these sonnets, as Shawcross argues, propose a different sort of relationship than the writings to Diodati? Clearly, the language of Sonnets 1 to 6 express similar sentiments as those of letters and poems written to and about Diodati. Both the sonnets concerning an Italian lady and the writings regarding Diodati express love, but this suggests no real difference in terms of a language of desire and demonstrates how seamlessly orderly homoeroticism fit into early modern gender ideology, establishing and reinforcing homosocial bonds. Neither, of course, does the language of desire, be it homo- or heteroerotic, imply sexual acts. Such language

---

[28]Shawcross 55.

[29]Shawcross 58.

occurs even in letters between men of very brief acquaintance. On February 23, 1652, Mylius, a diplomat in the service of the Count of Oldenburg, writes to Milton:

> so that I may finally sail hence from your embrace with a tranquil brow and heart to the lawful joys of my own roof and bed, and that I may restore with naval interest the loss which the sharer of my toil and mistress of my inmost privacy has suffered in my absence.[30]

We can never know what "unlawful" joys Myleus experienced in England, nor can we know whether these involved Milton in any way. Yet, much like Shawcross's reading of Sonnets 1-6 in relation to Milton's writings which deal with his relationship with Diodati, the presence of the "mistress" and the "lawful joys" in Mylius's letter to Milton, and the presence of the Italian lady in the Sonnet 4, addressed to Diodati, serves "to guarantee that only...[on a female body can any] such desires become sexual ones. The homoerotic can thus be read as if within the heteroerotic."[31]

Shawcross's project is perhaps best explained by another critic's comment on memorializing Milton. Lieb analyses both Milton's desire to keep his body, physical and textual, whole and the attempts of others to monumentalize the author. Discussing the poem to Manso, Lieb writes,

> It is a fantasy, we might say, that deliberately eliminates any possibility of potential violation by refusing to acknowledge the presence of such destructiveness in the universe it envisions, wholeness, safety, and soundness,

---

[30]*CPW* 6: 850-1.

[31]Jonathan Goldberg, *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1992) 158-9.

> accompanied by the rites of veneration, are the distinguishing characteristics of the fantasy of death and burial which culminates in Milton's poem to Manso.[32]

Lieb demonstrates how this struggle is carried out in Milton's work through an examination of Milton's "sparagmatic mentality," a mentality which prioritizes violence in the service of regeneration. Shawcross, however, in his reading of the Diodati material, enacts the fantasy of keeping the Miltonic body sexually inviolable, a body which is now only a corpus of text.

Yet, both books, when invested with a corporeal quality, and bodies remain the potential targets of violent sexual attack--either literally or metaphorically. If the body can be violated, so, of course, can the book that marks out its margins. There are two particularly interesting examples of this--the state censor and Vlacq's pirated editions of *Defensio Secunda.* Discussing the relationship between authority and the author in *Areopagitica,* Abbé Blum writes,

> The "manual stamp," the pressure of another hand, marks, signs and annuls the force or impression of the author, defacing him in the process.... The hand / signature of the licenser not only erases and thus undoes the singularity represented by the author's signature-hand, but also places the author in a symbolic position of disgrace, dependence, debt and immaturity.[33]

The book / body becomes an object in the hands of the licencer. On the sexual-political level,

---

[32]Lieb 2.

[33]"The Author's Authority: *Areopagitica* and the Labour of Licensing," *Re-membering Milton: Essays on the Texts and Traditions*, ed. Mary Nyquist and Margaret W. Ferguson (New York and London: Methuen, 1988) 86.

one may suggest that the pressure of the hand is on the back, challenging the author's position as a sexual subject within metaphorical structures which represent political submission in sexual terms. The hand of the censor challenges the author's masculine subjectivity by placing him in a dependent position by feminizing him or by treating him as a boy. There is another curious analogy in *Pro Se Defensio* between Milton's use of Salmasius's purported comment that, "If More was wanton with Pontia, I am a pander and my wife a bawd"[34] and pirated editions of Milton's work. Milton complains of Vlacq's editions of *Defensio Secunda* which include *The Public Faith of Alexander More.* This, as well as the purchasing of all available copies of Milton's book, is a violation of "the ethics of business."[35] This cuts the circuit of communication between author and audience that plays an important part in Milton's argument against pre-publication censorship in *Areopagitica.* In addition, Milton complains that Vlacq's pirated edition mutilates, opens, his text, "sometimes with whole words omitted, and not without either the destruction or the distortion of the whole structure and sense."[36] These textual gaps are important in terms of the book as body--the distortion of the "structure." Milton continues, "Thus I find those whom I thought to have been banished and removed farthest from me to be most closely joined with me, against my will, even under the very same covers."[37] Milton finds himself, his book / body, against his will, under the covers with More. That the two authors are "joined," combined with the textual gaps created by Vlacq, suggests that this forced union is a sodomitical rape. Vlacq, here, acts as pander and

---

[34]*CPW* 6: 728.

[35]*CPW* 6: 720.

[36]*CPW* 6: 718.

bawd to the More that Milton represents in all his lasciviousness.[38] These textual gaps mark out the body's vulnerable points, challenging the very political order that is justified in *Defensio Secunda.*

The strategy to deal with these attacks on his texts is, however, best demonstrated in *Areopagitica.* Milton's apocalyptic fable of the dismemberment of Truth provides his most explicit view of the violation of textual homosocial bonds, but it is, in fact, a tale designed to draw attention, and the hands of the censor, away from the male body:

> when the male body is threatened with penetration and fragmentation (words taken from the rhetoric of menaced female virginity), a feminine and feminized body takes its place within the narrative frame. Nor is substitution the only strategy activated to protect the male body: we can also discern a pattern of transformation of the masculine into the feminine for precisely the same reason.[39]

The inclusion of a female body in the narrative acts in two ways: first, it makes a female body the site of ideological struggle, and that body, like the chaste Lucretia, is sexually pure, a "virgin." This leads to the second important point: the search for Truth is thereby sexualized; she is a desirable object. Milton writes,

> Truth indeed came once into the world with her divine Master, and was a

---

[37]*CPW* 6: 719.

[38]Lieb provides a list of the official indictments against More which include "the frequenting of brothels, imposture, and sodomy with one Herman Hendric de Doesburg of Amsterdam in 1656. A repetition of this last offence with another boy in Middelburg in September, 1658, occasioned his arrest by the bailiff's deputy and his furitive withdrawal from Middelburg" (*Milton and the Culture of Violence* 209).

[39]Kathleen Coyne Kelly, "Menaced Masculinity and Imperiled Virginity in Malory's *Morte Darthur*," *Menacing Virgins: Representing Virginity in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. Kathleen Coyne Kelly

perfect shape most glorious to look on: but when he ascended, and his Apostles after him were laid asleep, then strait arose a wicked race of deceivers, who as that story goes of the *AEgyptian Typhon* with his conspirators, how they dealt with the good *Osiris*, took the virgin Truth, hewd her lovely form into a thousand peeces and scatter'd them to the four winds. From that time ever since, the sad friends of Truth, such as durst appear, imitating the carefull search that *Isis* made for the mangl'd body of *Osiris*, went up and down gathering up limb by limb still as they could find them. We have not yet found them all, Lords and Commons, nor ever shall doe, till her Masters second comming; he shall bring together every joynt and member, and shall mould them into an immortall feature of lovelines and perfection.[40]

The searchers for Truth can only find scattered fragments. But the gendering involved is interesting on a couple of counts: the myth of Osiris and the nature of the search for "every joint and member" of Truth. If we recall the Osiris myth, Typhon dismembers Osiris into fourteen pieces and scatters the parts. Isis makes a search for them and either buried them where she found them or,

> buried an image of him in every city, pretending it was his body, in order that Osiris might be worshipped in many places, and that if Typhon searched for the real grave he might not be able to find it. However, the genital member of

---

and Marina Leslie (London: Associated University Presses, 1999) 99.

[40]*CPW* 2: 549.

Osiris had been eaten by the fishes, so Isis made an image of it instead.[41]

Milton substitutes a female Truth for the male Osiris, bypassing a search that would focus on a missing male genital member while eroticizing the search for Truth.[42]

Eroticizing the object of masculine enquiry is an early modern commonplace. For example, writing on Francis Bacon's work, Mark Breitenberg comments on the significant problems that arise from Bacon's gendering of nature as feminine:

> Since knowledge is figured in Baconian science as process and pursuit rather than as consummation, nature must in turn be constructed as at least partially resistant to the scientist's interrogation and manipulation. This construction of external reality as never fully knowable in turn produces a masculine subject position marked by perpetual desire and, consequently, by the instability and anxiety that derives from the perceived need to control what is always elusive. Once again, the deep irony of this model is that the deferral of masculine satisfaction is the necessary result of a masculinist construction of nature and scientific method in the first place.[43]

The male search for scientific knowledge, or truth, constructs the masculine subject as a desiring subject with only a far off possibility for consummation with his object of desire.

Francis Barker also sees this metaphorical connection in *Areopagitica*--the scientist's

---

[41]Sir James George Frazer, *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion. Part IV Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, 3rd ed. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1936) 10.

[42]Milton's allegorical use of the Isis and Osiris myth is in accord with his probable source, Plutarch's "On Isis and Osiris." Plutarch "repeatedly insists that it must be understood as an allegory" (Sirluck, ed., *CPW* 2: 549).

[43]*Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996) 88.

attempt to discover the mysteries of a feminized nature is similar to Milton's depiction of the search for the scattered body of Truth. Milton's use of this metaphor makes Truth "a sexually available woman opening herself to male entry."[44] While Barker sees "no hint of rape"[45] in the dismemberment of Truth, the violence of the metaphor is quite fascinating in regards to Jed's analysis of the Lucretia rape narrative. *Areopagitica* presents a definite "association of discourse and violence."[46] This is evident in both the initial dismemberment as well as in the militant search to gather scattered fragments of Truth. Barker writes,

> Counter to traditionally liberal versions of the relative value of violence on the one hand, and literature on the other, here the material preparation for battle and the forging of the ideological weapons of the approaching Reformation, the coming revolution, run parallel to each other.[47]

In Barker's argument, this link between violence and discourse in *Areopagitica* is figured in the duality of Truth as both a warrior and a victim of violence. Through Truth, the female body is subjected to a violent discursive struggle between males. But, as Breitenberg notes above, this constructs the brothers who diligently search for the scattered fragments of Truth as desiring subjects whose satisfaction can not be attained, "nor ever shall...till her master's second coming." Much like the Neoplatonism of the conventional Petrarchan sonneteer, consummation is raised from the unattainable carnal level to a transcendent level. Yet, unlike

---

[44]Francis Barker, "In the Wars of Truth: Violence, True Knowledge, and Power in Milton and Hobbes," *Literature and the English Civil War*, ed. Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (Cambridge: CUP, 1990) 99.

[45]Barker, "In the Wars" 98.

[46]Barker, "In the Wars" 95.

[47]Barker, "In the Wars" 95.

the sonneteer, who dissects the object of desire in the blazon in order to assert a degree of control over the unattainable woman, Milton's concept of the book as analogous to the author's body is itself also a fragment subsumed into the body of Truth, contributing a vital part for the far off, eventual total consummation with the desired object at the Second Coming.

The "violence" of the censor, then, makes the act of censorship complicit with the "wicked race of deceivers," though this remains an essential part of the searcher's pursuit of the desired object. But the violence is deflected from the desiring masculine subject by representing Truth as female, even though this occurs in an ambiguous way. As Barker points out, Milton represents Truth as both a "warrior" / "militant activist" in the wars of truth as well as the "object victim of a definite violence."[48] Animated by the body of Truth, of which it is a part, the book must fight for its life in the public sphere. Pre-publication censorship prevents this struggle. The warriors must confront each other in open conflict, and, for the losers, "the fire and the executioner will be the timeliest and the most effectuall remedy that mans prevention can use."[49]

As noted above, Milton often explicitly exposes himself to polemical attack, and this occurs through the book. The most disturbing result is the textual rape of Vlacq's pirated editions which clearly violates property relations, the circulation of texts in the public sphere, and Milton's notion of the autonomous author. Milton's body is analogous to the nation, even in the most obvious way in the relationship between *Defensio Secunda* and *Pro Se Defensio.*

---

[48]Barker, "In the Wars" 96-7.

[49]*Areopagitica*, *CPW* 2: 569.

To examine how the charge of sodomy functions in Milton's texts, I want to turn now to Judges 19-21 and Milton's allusions to that text in his discussion of the Irish Rebellion in *Eikonoklastes* and *Defensio Prima* and compare these to the larger Irish context provided in *Observations.* The wider social repercussions that the early modern period feared in the act of sodomy (or even its accusation) are evident in Milton's allusions to Judges 19-21 in *Eikonoklastes* and *Defensio Prima.* In these texts, sodomy carries the weight of the transgression of rebellion. As in the Baines and Kyd accusations against Marlowe, sodomy is "placed in a context in which official government positions and their accompanying malaise both speak."[50]

Briefly summarized, Judges 19-21 tells the story of a Levite's journey to retrieve his concubine who has returned to her father's home. On the return journey, the Levite, his concubine, and a servant stop for the evening in the town of Gibeah, where, eventually, a man of his own tribe offers them lodging for the evening. A group of men gather around the house, and ask the host to send out the Levite so that they may "know" him. The host offers the men his virgin daughter, which they reject. The Levite then thrusts his concubine out the door, and the men of Gibeah rape her. In the morning, the Levite collects his concubine from the doorstep (and it is unclear in the narrative whether she is alive), takes her home and dismembers her, sending a part of her body to each of the tribes of Israel, who unite to avenge what the men of Gibeah have done. Following that attack, the united force massacres the men of Jabesh-Gilead for not taking part in the vengeance taken on Gibeah.

---

[50]Goldberg, "Sodomy and Society: the Case of Christopher Marlowe," *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*, ed. David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass (New York: Routledge, 1991) 79.

Milton made use of the concubine in *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. In that tract, Milton wrestles with the definition of fornication, clearing the concubine of the charge of adultery: "Fornication then in this place of the *Judges*, is understood for stubborn disobedience against the husband, and not for adultery."[51] Milton makes the same point in *De Doctrina Christiana* when discussing Christ's response to the Pharisees in regards to divorce:

> So the word *fornication* must be interpreted here in a much broader sense than that of adultery. The best text to demonstrate this, and there are many, is Judg. xix. 2: *she fornicated against him*. This was not by committing adultery, because then she would not have dared to run home to her father, but by behaving in an obstinate way towards her husband.[52]

Curiously, however, "stubborn disobedience" and "behaving in an obstinate way" remain coupled with terms of sexual transgression, "Fornication," and "whore." While the distinction that Milton makes is essential to his argument for the legitimacy of divorce on grounds of incompatability, in both cases he argues that the commentators of Judges have misread, violated the biblical texts touching on divorce, but, in so doing, he appeals to a rape narrative. By extension, Milton seems to be connecting this interpretive textual violation by commentators that read the concubine's actions as adultery, playing the "harlot," to her bodily violation by the men of Gibeah. Yet, as Stanley Fish claims, Milton's own reading of scripture, and in particular of Matthew 7:19, is a violation of the text: "In the *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, the scripture is the object not only of direct scrutiny, but of an

---

[51]*CPW* 2: 336.

[52]*CPW* 6: 378.

interpretation so strenuous that even the word 'manipulation' is too mild to describe it."[53] Milton's defence of the concubine's sexual purity and his castigation of previous interpretations of her conduct makes her into a key example of a narrative of personal liberation for the unhappily married Milton. Politically, it would also prepare the way for a more significant, republican narrative of liberation in the spirit of the Florentine appropriation of Lucretia. And, finally, Lucretia's rape recurs in Milton's last appeal to the "Good Old Cause" just weeks before the Restoration of the Tarquin / Stuart, Charles II.[54]

Critics have read the treatment of the concubine in Judges as a microcosmic representation of the larger social malaise expressed in the text. Susan Niditch, for example, writes,

> The man's insensitivity towards his concubine, his non-communication with her, his selfishness are, in fact, a microcosm of larger community-relationships in Israel. He does not take care of her, the townspeople of Gibeah do not take care of him, men of the town are openly hostile in an exemplary anti-social, uncivilized way.[55]

The men of Gibeah transgress homosocial bonds (issues of property relations, sovereignty, and gender hierarchy), figured in the narrative as hospitality, a bond which other critics discuss at length in their readings of Judges. These are important issues in Milton's Irish

---

[53]"Wanting a Supplement: the Question of Interpretation in Milton's Early Prose," *Politics, Poetics, and Hermeneutics in Milton's Prose*, ed. David Loewenstein and James Grantham Turner (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990) 54.

[54]In Prolusion VI, Milton favourably compares himself with Lucius Junius Brutus, "that second founder of Rome and great avenger of the lusts of kings" (*CPW* 1: 267).

[55]"The 'Sodomite' Theme in Judges 19-20," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 371.

allusions to Judges. In Milton's writings, the rape and dismemberment of the concubine is a narrative of liberation. This narrative plays two roles in relation to Ireland's ambiguous status as kingdom and colony, an ambiguity which resulted following the power vacuum created by the displacement of the Old English through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Old English stressed Ireland's links to the crown that were founded upon the Act of Kingship during Henry VIII's reign, as opposed to the New English colonial outlook. Hence, first, regarding the substitution of the concubine for the Levite, and, as we shall shortly see, the substitution of the concubine for Dinah in countering Charles's use of another biblical rape narrative in *Eikonoklastes*, what happens to the concubine is a prelude to the establishment of the commonwealth from the tyranny of the monarch, as well as the purging of the rebellious Irish from the body politic. This is in keeping with the Florentine appropriations of Lucretia in order to represent a political ideal. Ireland, in this case, is clearly part of the kingdom, a microcosmic representation of the larger British conflict, a mirror image. Yet, secondly, the charge of sodomy that lurks behind the rape of the concubine functions as a colonial narrative similar to the accusations of sodomy in the Americas that Jonathan Goldberg discusses in *Sodometries*--it differentiates, distances the English from the Irish. Milton's earlier defence of the concubine in the divorce tract clears the way for his later use of her to reconstruct and repurify the commonwealth. The violated body of the concubine bridges Ireland's status as kingdom and colony--as a site of sameness and difference.

In *Eikonoklastes*, Milton uses Judges 19-21 in order to refute Charles's use of Genesis 34 and 49:7, another tale of rape and its consequences,

> in which Charles blamed the desperate resistance of the Irish rebels on the

severity of the measures with which they had been threatened by Parliament.... Milton denies this parallel because he represents the seduction as an offence which was fully atoned for by honorable love and offers of a most generous marriage settlement.[56]

The Bible, however, is more explicit with its description of what the editor of the *Complete Prose Works* terms the "seduction" of Dinah by Shechem--"And when Schechem the sonne of Hamor the Hivite prince of the countrey saw her, he took her, and lay with her, and defiled her."[57] Dinah functions solely as an object of patriarchal exchange that strengthens homosocial bonds. The only atonement here applies to the establishment of an alliance between males through intermarriage:

> And Hamor communed with them, saying, The soul of my sonne Schechem longeth for your daughter: I pray you give her him to wife. And make ye marriages with us, *and* give your daughters unto us, and take our daughters unto you. And ye shall dwell with us, and the land shall be before you: dwell and trade you therein, and get you possessions therein.[58]

Jacob's sons, making circumcision, an insistence that clearly implies the outsider status of the other group, a condition of the alliance, receive the curse of their father in far stronger terms when they destroy this alliance than any reaction to the initial rape in the text. Milton's refutation of Charles's allusion accords with this reading--the problem is the breaking of

---

[56]Merritt J. Hughes, ed., *CPW* 3: 481.

[57]King James Version (1611), Genesis 34: 2.

[58]Genesis 34: 8-10.

established bonds of alliance between groups of men. This is in keeping with the injunction of Deuteronomy 22.28-30 that anyone who "humbles" a daughter of Israel must pay a fine to her father and marry her. Jacob's sons, then, are the culprits, not the rapist Shechem, whose violent act, in a very disturbing way, brings two groups of men together to share land, property, and women.

In place of Charles's use of Genesis 34 as a fit analogy for the Irish Rebellion, Milton substitutes a "just Warr" reading of the slaughter of Judges:

> Did not all Israel doe as much against the Benjamits for one Rape committed by a few, and defended by the whole Tribe? and did they not the same to Jabesh Gilead for not assisting them in that revenge? I speak not this that such measure should be meted rigorously to all the Irish, or as remembering that the Parlement ever so Decreed, but to shew that this his Homily hath more of craft and affectation to it, then of sound Doctrin.[59]

Yet, in this exchange of rape stories, women remain as a token of exchange between men, much as the offer of the daughter and the concubine in exchange for the Levite does in Judges. Milton's preferred narrative also highlights the issue of property in a far different way than the Genesis story. In Genesis, property leads to atonement of the rape, while in Judges the concubine is violated strictly as the property of the Levite. The political analogy here is that Ireland is a part of England; it is colonial property and subordinate to England.

Clearly, some important political issues are being negotiated through these rape narratives--the very narratives that Charles and Milton select to support their arguments

---

[59]*CPW* 3: 481-2.

reveal their political ideals. The Dinah rape highlights the role of the father which is appropriate in regards to the conventional Royalist analogy of the king as father to his people. James I, for example, in *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* writes that a king is "to fore-see and preuent all dangers, that are likely to fall vpon [his subjects], and to maintaine concord, wealth, and ciuilitie among them, as a louing Father."[60] James continues by stating that, "By the Law of Nature the King becomes a naturall Father to all his Lieges at his Coronation: And as the Father of his fatherly duty is bound to care for the nourishing, education, and vertuous gouernment of his children; euen so is the king bound to care for all his subjects."[61] In a 1609 parliamentary address, James further elaborated on this paternal analogy:

> As for the Father of a familie, they had of olde under the Law of Nature *Patriam potestatem*, which was *Potestatem vitae et necis*, over their children or familie.... Now a Father may dispose of his Inheritance to his children, at his pleasure: yea, even disinherite the eldest upon iust occasions, and preferre the youngest, according to his liking; make them beggers, or rich at his pleasure: restraine, or banish out of his presence, as hee finds them give cause of offence, or restore them in favour againe with the penitent sinner: So may the King deale with his Subjects.[62]

The analogy continues in Royalist political theorists in the Caroline period. Sir Robert

---

[60]*King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994) 65.

[61]*King James VI and I* 65.

[62]Quoted in Bruce Boehrer, "Elementary Structures of Kingship: Milton, Regicide, and the Family," *Milton Studies* 23 (1987): 99.

Filmer finds the origin of monarchy in the Old Testament patriarchs. Filmer succinctly states his views in *Patriarcha*:

> If we compare the natural duties of a father with those of a king, we find them to be all one, without any difference at all but only in the latitude and extent of them. As the father over the family, so the king, as father over many families, extends his care to preserve, feed, clothe, instruct and defend the whole commonwealth. His wars, his peace, his courts of justice and all his acts of sovereignty tend only to preserve and distribute to every subordinate and inferior father, and to their children, their rights and privileges, so that all the duties of a king are summed up in an universal fatherly care of his people.[63]

The patriarchal family comes to serve as one of the essential anchoring points of monarchical discourse. It seamlessly joins the theory of the king's two bodies, politic and natural--as is evident in the advice on policy and deportment given to Henry in *Basilikon Doron* and, later, to the future Charles II in *Eikon Basilike*. The king begets heirs and begets laws which ensure the continuance and order of the body politic--an order based on a patriarchal structure which subordinates wives to husbands, and children to parents. Through his right of succession as head of the body politic, the king becomes, upon his coronation, the head of the national family, the political father of his subjects. These patriarchal prerogatives are, in effect, what Hamor and Jacob enact in the aftermath of Dinah's rape. For Charles I, then, parliament takes the place of the unruly sons, usurping his patriarchal authority and plunging Ireland into rebellion and prompting civil war at home.

---

[63]*Patriarcha and Other Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991) 12.

The analogy ultimately rests "upon the *sexual* character of patriarchy, for it is the act of *begetting* that finally unites fatherhood and kingship."[64] It remains central in *Eikon Basilike*. In *Eikon Basilike*, Charles claims, "But...I cannot allow...[parliament's] wisdom...to exclude...myself...without whose reason concurrent with theirs (as the sun's influence is necessary in all nature's productions), they cannot beget or bring forth any one complete and authoritative act of public wisdom."[65] Milton engages with this passage in *Eikonoklastes*, challenging Charles's gendering of parliament as feminine and requiring the king's "masculine coition" to beget "*any authoritative Act.*" Milton writes,

> Yet so farr doth self opinion or fals principles delude and transport him, as to think *the concurrence of his reason* to the Votes of Parlament, not onely Political, but Natural, *and as necessary to the begetting*, or bringing forth of any one *compleat act of public wisdom as the Suns influence is necessary to all natures productions*. So that the Parlament, it seems, is but a Female, and without his procreative reason, the Laws which they can produce are but wind-eggs.[66]

A few things are of note here. First, the king's sexuality is taken for granted. The king's analogy suggest the standard sexual / gender roles of the early modern period, making parliament female and passive. But Milton, apparently, is not quite convinced of this possibility: "Parlament, *it seems*, is but a Female." Milton initially resists the position of the

---

[64]Boehrer 107.

[65]*Eikon Basilike* 69.

[66]*Eikonoklastes*, *CPW* 3: 467.

submissive partner that Charles casts parliament in. But, "Milton's own rhetoric," writes Bruce Boehrer, "is predetermined...for in his role of respondent to the royalist arguments he has no choice but to neutralize whatever patterns of representation the royalists find useful."[67]

Curiously, as the passage continues, Milton apparently accepts Charles's view of parliament as female in order to neutralize the royalist symbolism, as, because laws make kings, and parliament begets laws,

> [Charles] ought then to have so thought of a Parlament, if he count it not Male, as of his Mother, which, to civil being, created both him, and the Royalty he wore. And if it hath bin anciently interpreted the presaging signe of a future Tyrant, but to dream of copulation with his Mother, what can it be less then actual Tyrrany to affirme waking, that the Parlament, which is his Mother, can neither conceive or bring forth *any autoritative Act* without his masculine coition.[68]

Milton remains within Charles's gendered notion, hoping to neutralize it by making Parliament generatively prior to the king. Yet, the comment, "if he count it not Male" lurks behind this rhetorical move. Boehrer finds this passage "ludicrous."[69] To a certain degree, it is: "the king, after all, could act reasonably like a father to his people, but who could believe for a moment that the gentlemen of the Rump might be anyone's mother?... The result is this

---

[67]Boehrer 105.

[68]*Eikonoklastes, CPW* 3: 467.

[69]Boehrer 113.

bemusing vision of incest-by-committee, with King Charles committing his rape upon the Rump."[70] Milton attempts to discredit the familiar analogy by invoking a tyrannical, incestuous fantasy, but this prompts something of a contradiction. He is, indeed, trapped in the Royalist family analogy's view of patriarchal prerogative. If Charles I is subject to a feminized parliament, be it as a political wife bringing forth laws through his masculine coition or as a mother that begot him, then he is effeminized by it.

Milton, again, alludes to the Judges narrative in *Defensio Prima*:

> All Israel saw that without much shedding of blood she could not avenge the outrage and murder of the Levite's wife; did they think that for this reason they must hold their peace, avoid civil war however fierce, or allow the death of a single poor woman to go unpunished?[71]

Milton, here, touches on an odd gender aspect of the Judges narrative. Contra Judges, he genders the nation feminine, making the margins and orifices of the concubine's body those of Israel. Judges, itself, does some interesting twists and turns with gender: "The men of Gibeah do not speak to him [the Levite], even by command, but rather speak about him to the host, who is implicitly given control over the disposal of the Levite's sexuality--exactly as men are often given control over sexual access to women."[72] The men of Israel see the affront as having happened to the Levite and the nation, and in both cases the actions of the men of Gibeah challenge notions of sexual purity.

---

[70]Boehrer 113.

[71]*CPW* 4: 431.

[72]Stone 99.

The dismemberment of the concubine leads to the regeneration of the body politic (and its boundaries in some sense, as the twelve pieces circulate widely geographically). The body politic, however, remains gendered masculine: "Then all the children of Israel went out, and the congregation was gathered together, as one man."[73] In addition, "So all the men of Israel were gathered against the citie, knit together as one man."[74] Through the female body, the nation somehow preexists its unity, in a nostalgia for what is seen as a lost wholeness in her dismemberment. This notion seems similar to Milton's representation of parliament as generatively prior to the king. Here, the substitution of the concubine for the Levite preserves the sexual purity of the male, both reconstructing and repurifying the masculinity of the body politic.

Commenting on Milton's reading of the historical books of the Old Testament, Mary Ann Radzinowicz writes, "In those days *either* justice spoke to 'the bettering of nations,' *or* its silencing indicated kingship, whether in Israel or England."[75] While critics such as Trible and Robert O'Connell argue that Judges is rhetorically structured in order to persuade its readers of the benefits of kingship, Milton clearly reads Judges against the grain.The contrast with Filmer's political beliefs in relation to Judges is, again, instructive. In arguing for kingship and against rule by the people, Filmer writes,

> At the time when the Scripture saith "There was no king in Israel, but that every man did that which was right in his own eyes" [Judges xxi, 25], even

---

[73]Judges 20: 1.

[74]Judges 20: 11.

[75]"'In Those Days There Was No King in Israel': Milton's Politics and Biblical Narrative," *Yearbook of English Studies*, 21 (1991): 242.

then, the Israelites were under the kingly government of the fathers of particular families. For in the consultation after the Benjamitical war for providing wives for the Benjamites, we find the elders of the congregation bear only sway, Judges xxi, 16. To them also were complaints to be made, as appears by verse 22. And though mention be made of "all the children of Israel", "all the congregation", and "all the people", yet by that term of "*all*" the Scripture means only all the fathers, and not all the whole multitude.[76]

For Milton, however, as in Samuel, kingship is a rejection by the people of God as king. Justice, then, is not reliant on a figurehead, earthly king: "If men within themselves would be governed by reason, and not generally give up their understanding to a double tyranny of custom from without and blind affectation within, they would discern better what it is to favour and uphold a tyrant of a nation."[77] Justice is silenced in an act of self-alienation--an argument which closely approaches Milton's view that Catholicism abrogates reason. The consequences of this act of alienation plunges the three kingdoms into anarchy, as the king, "whose office is to execute Law and Justice upon all others, should sit himselfe like a demigod in lawlesse and unbounded anarchy."[78]

In terms of Ireland, that anarchy is clearly seen by Milton as commensurate with the Judges narrative; not only is this evident in Milton's repeated allusions to the concubine, but it is also apparent in many of the concerns he expresses regarding the Articles of Peace and *A*

---

[76]Filmer, *Patriarcha* 23.

[77]*Tenure*, *CPW* 3: 190.

[78]*Observations*, *CPW* 3: 307.

Necessary Representation. The Scots, for example, like the men of Jabesh-Gilead, do not aid their "best friends;"[79] they do not assist the English "in that revenge."[80] The Irish are clearly represented as being inhospitable, and the English, who have been hospitable to the Scots, have been, in Milton's opinion, betrayed.

In *Observations*, Milton views the Irish as "justly made our vassals."[81] This hierarchical relationship is, of course, of central importance both to how Milton sees the Irish and how we read the tract. The Articles of Peace disturb this relationship: the Irish,

> after the mercilesse and barbarous Massacre of so many thousand *English*, (who had us'd their right and title to that Countrey with such tendernesse and moderation, and might otherwise have secur'd themselvs with ease against their Treachery) should be now grac'd and rewarded with such freedomes and enlargements...to be infranchiz'd with full liberty equall to their Conquerors.[82]

"[T]endernesse:" Milton stresses a curious view of the bond between coloniser and colonised that is broken by the Articles of Peace. The *OED* definition includes many of the terms that one might expect in the early modern discourse of friendship, of closeness between men. Bray, discussing the Elizabethans, writes,

> If someone had acquired a place in society to which he was not entitled by nature and could then perhaps even lord it over those who were naturally his betters, the specter likely to be conjured up in the mind of an Elizabethan was

---

[79]*CPW* 3: 334.

[80]*Eikonoklastes*, *CPW* 3: 481-2.

[81]*CPW* 3: 302.

> not the orderly relationship of friendship between men but rather the profoundly disturbing image of the sodomite, that enemy not only of nature but of the order of society and the proper kinds and divisions within it.[83]

The "natural" order is violated. In terms of the sexual politics of the colonised body, the sexual subject-object hierarchy is violated. The relationship is no longer one of "tendernesse," but one which leads to the specter of sodomy through Milton's allusions to Judges.

Milton's reexposure of the concubine to the social forces of chaos in the colonial context makes the female body the site of identity and difference. Yet, preventing the rape of a male through this substitution in Judges demonstrates the homosocial bond and what threatens its patriarchal-sexual economy. The Levite is treated as a sexual object, and it is this objectification that even Milton struggles with in his allusions. Lieb argues that "like the sacrificial animals of which she is a type, the concubine becomes less than human, a commodity, the sole purpose of which is to satisfy the needs of those (whether of the men of Gibeah or the Levite) who would impose their will upon her."[84] Yet, Lieb neglects to see Milton "using" the concubine. Lieb prefers to see Milton as her defender. It is important to remember that the men of Gibeah are offered two women--the host's virgin daughter and the concubine. They take the concubine because "they are not interested in attacking the host, but rather his guest."[85] It is a direct attack on the Levite by imposing their will on the concubine

---

[82]*Observations*, *CPW* 3: 301.

[83]Bray, "Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship in Elizabethan England," *Queering the Renaissance*, ed. Jonathan Goldberg (Durham and London: Duke UP, 1994) 51.

[84]Lieb 130.

[85]Stone 100.

and, by analogy, the body politic.

The body, again, clearly represents the vulnerable points of the social system. The substitution of the concubine for the Levite demonstrates that far more is socially at stake in the rape of a male in the gender ideology of Judges and the seventeenth century. Masculinity and national identity are kept intact through the substitution. Sacrificing the woman, be it the concubine, Dinah, or Truth, to these social dangers preserves the masculinity of the political subject and the nation. The anxieties prompted by the potential rape of the Levite remain precisely because the nation is configured as masculine, "one man." The homoerotic is situated within the heteroerotic in which the concubine's body stands in for the possibility of sexual desire between men that could be legitimately expressed within certain partriarchal institutions. Through her, and the bodies of hundreds of other women in Judges, identity, sexual and national, is brutally reaffirmed.

In closing, an insightful comparison can be drawn here between English colonial practices in Ireland, and Spanish colonial practices in America, particularly in regards to charges of sodomy. Goldberg writes,

> For if the accusation of sodomy is meant to signal how unlike the Spaniards the Indians are, how repugnant their practices and very being must be, how much their relations to each other and to their own bodies fail to communicate with Spanish practices, they also offer an uncanny mirror of Spanish desires, above all the desire to violate.[86]

The allusions to Judges in an Irish context perform a similar distancing of English from Irish--

[86]Goldberg, *Sodometries* 196-7.

civil and barbaric--even though Milton never explicitly calls the Irish sodomites. The accusation need only be implied, drawing some of its force from common accounts of the rebellion that include accounts of sexual violence and mutilation. Milton, by focussing on the heterosexual rape and its aftermath (which reasserts heterosexuality in the face of a potential male rape), reveals a certain anxiety: both the penetration-submission issue and desire. In other than the "worse rape" comment in *Paradise Lost*, Milton is reticent in seeing the events of Judges as homosexual--he attempts to resist, as in the passage discussing the king's relationship with parliament in *Eikonoklastes*, objectification. Commenting on the host's actions in Judges, Stone writes,

> The host introduces two women into what has been, up to now, an exclusively male transaction. The offer expresses a certain opinion not only about the intended rape of the Levite but also about the rape of the women. Better to hand over my daughter, who is at any rate a proper sexual object, than my Levite guest, who is properly a sexual subject.... [T]his is not to say that the rape of the woman that follows was not in itself considered offensive.[87]

If power is seen as flowing from the top down, the subject-object position is effectively maintained by a social hierarchy. "What determined the shared and recurring features of homosexual relations," writes Bray, "was the prevailing distribution of power, economic power and social power, not the fact of homosexuality itself."[88] Anything that attempts to invert this view of hierarchy challenges the sexual politics of the social order. Within this

---

[87]Stone 100.

[88]Bray, *Homosexuality* 56.

power structure, orderly homoeroticism could exist almost invisibly. The exposure of the concubine attempts, in the face of social disturbance, to keep the sexual political register intact--to preserve the vulnerable points of the masculine nation.

5. Colonialism, Sexuality, and *Paradise Lost*

> Thus sung they, in the *English* boat,
>
> An holy and a chearful Note,
>
> And all the way, to guide their Chime,
>
> With falling Oars they kept the time.[1]

Recent critical work has examined the influence of the colonisation of the Americas on Milton's *Paradise Lost*. David Quint argues that *Paradise Lost* signals the demise of the epic which had aligned itself with empire and aristocratic, martial values.[2] Indeed, in what Quint sees as a generic split in Milton's text of epic and romance, he argues that Milton's poem rejects both imperialism and the Virgilian epic of empire by displacing these issues onto Satan's quest.[3] Quint reads *Paradise Lost* as a spiritual tale of the fall of the Commonwealth by making the private world of Eden continuous with the public, political world: "*Paradise Lost* suggests...that individual choices of conscience, themselves the product of complicated psychological processes, can have far-reaching, indeed world historical consequences."[4] David Armitage arrives at a similar conclusion by focussing on Milton's reading of Sallust, Juvenal, and Machiavelli. Armitage reads Milton's epic poem in terms of Machiavelli's distinction of republican aims in the *Discorsi*:

---

[1]Marvell, "Bermudas" 37-40.

[2]Quint 248.

[3]Quint 255.

Machiavelli laid bare the collision at the heart of republican politics between two overwhelmingly desirable but utlimately irreconcilable goals: liberty, which distinguished the internal constitution of the republic by allowing the human potential of its citizens to be realized through active participation in political life, and *grandezza*, the aggressive but potentially destructive pursuit of glory in external affairs.[5]

Milton believed that both internal and external affairs had to be pursued prudently and that the pursuit of external glory caused the downfall of the republic.[6] For Armitage, this makes Milton a "poet against empire."

Both Quint and Armitage, then, read the poem in terms of expressing an internal and an external constitution, whether of the individual or the republic, and both critics see the movement inward as rejecting colonial expansion. The separation of internal and external political cultivation is not, in the end, entirely tenable. Cultivating the attributes of citizenship in the republican subject can, as Armitage points out, develop a platform for sustainable external expansion that can bring further glory to the godly English republic. Satan, of course, provides a negative example of aggressive expansionism, an expression of his disturbed inner state which leads to a dangerous pursuit of empire. "*Paradise Lost*," writes Armitage, "is built around only two narratives--the biblical narrative of the Fall, and the story of Satan's

---

[4]Quint 283.

[5]"John Milton: Poet Against Empire," *Milton and Republicanism*, ed. David Armitage, Armand Hiny, and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995) 208.

[6]Armitage 207.

colonization of the New World."[7] Yet both the internal and external, in relation to colonialism, are commensurate through God.

Milton makes this connection. In "To the Lord General Cromwell," Milton conflates the public realm and the individual conscience: the three kingdoms have passed through war,

> ...yet much remains
>
> To conquer still; peace hath her victories
>
> No less renowned than war, new foes arise
>
> Threatening to bind our souls with secular chains:
>
> Help us to save free conscience from the paw
>
> Of hireling wolves whose gospel is their maw.[8]

Here, the external battle is explicitly linked to the cultivation of an internal peace, a freedom of conscience and obeying the inner dictates of God, which is equally important in terms of what has been achieved by Cromwell's martial prowess. Only by being victorious in both realms can the revolution truly succeed: by cultivating the internal, the political gains of the Civil War can be shored up and, indeed, expanded upon. And we should also remember that Cromwellian iconography was essentially martial throughout the 1650s.[9] Cromwell has conquered both his inner and outer foes, a dual conflict that was discussed in relation to Lazarus Haward's letter in chapter two. Laura Lunger Knoppers, discussing the use of the Roman Triumph through the 1650s and 1660s, calls attention to Milton's comments on

---

[7]Armitage 216.

[8]"To the Lord General Cromwell" 9-14.

[9]Laura Lunger Knoppers, *Historicizing Milton: Spectacle, Power, and Poetry in Restoration England* (Athens and London: U of Georgia P, 1994). Knoppers argues that this was due to the fact that Cromwell "did not take the crown and could not be represented on the throne" (117).

Cromwell in the *Second Defense*: "Milton further qualifies the figure of the Roman conqueror, commending Cromwell in that 'Commander first over himself, victor over himself, he had learned to achieve over himself the most effective triumph, and so, on the very first day that he took service against an external foe, he entered camp a veteran.'"[10] The internal must be conquered before it, either the leader or the republic, can achieve victory in external expansion without threatening the stability of the republic. This is an important political point that recurs in *Paradise Lost*. Terry Eagleton writes of Christopher Hill's reading of Milton's epic,

> Thus Hill reads *Paradise Lost* not as an expression of political defeatism, but as the urging of a new political phase: 'the foundations must be dug deeper, into the hearts of individual believers, in order to build more securely.' Today, perhaps, after Gramsci, we would say such a project involves the question of hegemony.[11]

In its post-Restoration context, *Paradise Lost* reiterates the internal and external so as to legitimate, contra Quint's and Armitage's readings, the colonial project. This is to be accomplished through the reanimation of the internal virtues lost in the moral failings "Of man's first disobedience," and, by analogy, those of the commonwealth, in order to reestablish the groundwork for expansion.

If we read Milton's epic in this way, we can find it supporting a colonial agenda. Both Paul Stevens and J. Martin Evans argue that *Paradise Lost* does legitimate the colonial project. Stevens explicitly sets out to "challenge Quint's reading in order to suggest how

---

[10]Knoppers 120.

[11]"The God that Failed," *Re-membering Milton: Essays on the Texts and Traditions*, ed. Mary Nyquist and Margaret W. Ferguson (New York and London: Methuen, 1988) 345.

exactly and to what extent *Paradise Lost* authorizes colonial activity even while it satirizes the abuses of early modern colonialism."[12] For Stevens, this debate in the epic is played out in terms of a dialectic of English representations of Spanish colonial abuses which were redeployed between 1655 and 1658 in order to justify Cromwell's Western Design.[13] Evans has written the most comprehensive study of *Paradise Lost* within the context of seventeenth-century colonialist discourse.[14] Both Stevens and Evans provide a more nuanced reading of the various colonial relationships in the poem--arguing that Satan, God, Adam and Eve, and the narrator are all implicated in the colonial quest.

Yet, all of these studies focus on English colonial efforts in the Americas. It is important to examine the influence of English attempts to colonise Ireland on the later colonisation of the Americas, for, as Nicholas Canny writes, "the experience gained in Ireland throughout the trial-and-error period of the sixteenth century proved useful to those who went to America and vice versa."[15] Canny continues,

> almost every promoter of English settlement in Ireland, whether in state-sponsored plantations or private colonization, compared their work to that of those contemporaries who were attempting to settle among the North American Indians. Both efforts, it was alleged, were concerned primarily with the advancement of true religion among a heathen or heathenish people; both

---

[12]"*Paradise Lost* and the Colonial Imperative," *Milton Studies* 34 (1996): 3.

[13]Stevens, "Spenser and Milton on Ireland" 9.

[14]*Milton's Imperial Epic:*Paradise Lost *and the Discourse of Colonialism* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996).

[15]*Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World 1560-1800* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1988) 17.

were concerned with the substitution of civil standards for barbarous customs; and both were intended to promote the enrichment of England through the cultivation of crops or the exploitation of resources that were not available at home.[16]

The links between English colonial aspirations in the Americas and the centuries of English colonial presence in Ireland are worth pursuing. As Walter S. H. Lim comments, "Any commentary on the relationship of Milton's thought to the discourse of colonialism and imperialism must take into account his treatment of the subject of Ireland."[17] There is a complex interchange, an intertextuality in colonial discourse concerning both the Americas and Ireland. Karl S. Bottigheimer points out that the analogy between the native Americans and the Irish is accurate only up to a point. The native Americans lacked the centuries of ties to England and Scotland that are important to Irish affairs, yet, "What Ireland and America shared was a vulnerability to conquest, though this occurred for different and varied reasons."[18]

Approaching Milton's epic through the parameters of early modern colonial discourse will reveal some of the similarities between colonialism in Ireland and the Americas and the profound influence of those contemporary debates on his poem. This chapter continues the focus of the previous on sexuality and the female body in order to further elucidate the relationship between coloniser and colonised as it is portrayed in the patriarchal relations of

---

[16]Canny 2.

[17]Lim 195.

[18]"Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Western Enterprise, 1536-1660," *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and America, 1480-1650*, ed. K. R. Andrews, N. P. Canny, and P. E. H. Hair (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1978) 61.

Paradise Lost. The construction of the female body as a readable body is evident in the Lucretia story, as it is in the dismemberment of the concubine in Judges. It is also apparent in *Paradise Lost*. Kathleen Coyne Kelly writes,

> Patriarchy, in which assured paternity and secured lineage and property are so crucial, depends upon maintaining *female*, not *male*, virginity and marital fidelity. Thus the female body has been constructed as a *readable* body, subjected to endless explication, while the male body has been figured as exempt from interpretation.[19]

A number of wider social concerns intersect with the readability of the female body and its perceived threatening potential to masculine identity. As Catherine Belsey points out, "patriarchy, which locates the defining difference as sexual, constructs sex itself as a place of instability, of threat."[20] This is clearly evident in a suspiciously autobiographical passage of *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* in which the misreading of "the bashful muteness of a virgin" leads to marital discord. The possibility of misreading the bashfulness of a virgin curiously leads to an indictment of patriarchal sexual mores:

> nor is there that freedom of accesse granted or presum'd, as may suffice to a perfect discerning till too late: and where any indisposition is suspected, what more usuall then the perswasion of friends, that acquaintance, as it encreases, will amend all. And lastly, it is not strange though many who have spent their youth chastly, are in some things not so quick-sighted, while they hast too

---

[19]Kelly 99.

[20]*John Milton: Language, Gender, Power* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988) 64.

> eagerly to light the nuptiall torch; nor is it therefore that for a modest error a man should forfeit so great a happines, and no charitable means to release him. Since they who have liv'd most loosely by reason of their bold accustoming, prove most successfull in their matches, because their wild affections unsetling at will, have been as so many divorces to teach them experience. When as the sober man honouring the appearance of modestie, and hoping well of every sociall vertue under that veile, may easily chance to meet, if not with a body impenetrable, yet often with a minde to all other due conversation inaccessible.[21]

The "veil" of fetishized female virginity may be "impenetrable" to the chaste youth's interpretation. This is due to the fact that the male reader expects the female body to conform to the established social text written on that body. When what is veiled is revealed to expose that which is "impenetrable" and "inaccessible" masculine subjectivity is threatened, but the fault is displaced from the patriarchal reading of the female body onto the woman herself. I will return to the issue of the veil later when discussing the colonial implications of Milton's rewriting of Spenser's Bower of Bliss. For now, it is important to explore some of the problems created for masculine identity in the reading and explication of virginity and married chastity.

Mark Breitenberg argues that reading and explicating the female body prompts an anxious masculinity. Discussing Shakespeare's "Rape of Lucrece," Breitenberg writes,

> In the initial 'publication' of Lucrece, her inviolable body was advertised in

---

[21] *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, *CPW* 2: 249-50.

order to confer masculine honor and fame; now, her 'bleeding,' *violated* body and the purity of her soul have become the fetishized objects. Indeed, the poem can only end with yet another publication of Lucrece's body, for it is a body inevitably written among men in order to confer masculine honor.[22]

The possession and control of a wife's fetishized chastity contributes to a male's honour. But, in order to demonstrate this particular aspect of his honour, it is necessary for Collatine to advertise his wife's chastity, paradoxically representing her as a desirable object in Tarquin's eyes. A vicious cycle of control, sexual purity, and desire is involved, leading to a competitive struggle between males:

> ... why is Collatine the publisher
>
> Of that rich jewel he should keep unknown
>
> From thievish ears, because it is his own?[23]

The paradox here is that Collatine must publish the jewel in order to confer honour upon himself. Lucrece is frequently described as a treasure, but more importantly, she also takes on the commonplace attributes of a newly discovered colony. The issue here of publication and rumour--Collatine's extolling Lucrece's virtue and the men's trial of their wives--is important in relation to voyages of discovery. During the first council of the fallen angels in *Paradise Lost*, Satan relates the rumour of the creation of a new world:

> Space may produce new worlds; whereof so rife
>
> There went a fame in heaven that he ere long

---

[22]Breitenberg 115.

[23]William Shakespeare, "The Rape of Lucrece," *The Poems*, ed. F. T. Prince (London: Methuen, 1960) 33-5.

> Intended to create, and therein plant
>
> A generation, whom his choice regard
>
> Should favour equal to the sons of heaven.[24]

This rumour spurs Satan's desire to set off on his own voyage of discovery. Lim writes,

> Interestingly and significantly, the 'ancient and prophetic fame'...concerning this other world refers to rumors circulating about the existence of new lands. Such rumors form an intrinsic feature of colonialist discourse. Many colonial ventures were undertaken to ratify the validity of rumors circulating about land and treasures.[25]

It is, precisely, Collatine's publication of Lucrece's chaste virtue that functions in a similar way in that text. The story of such a treasure, picked up by Tarquin's "thievish ears," leads to desires of conquest. When Tarquin enters Lucrece's bed chamber, the moment is described in just such terms:

> Her breasts like ivory globes circled with blue,
>
> A pair of maiden worlds unconquered;
>
> Save of their lord, no bearing yoke they knew,
>
> And him by oath they truly honoured.
>
> These worlds in Tarquin new ambition bred;
>
> Who like a foul usurper went about,

---

[24]*Paradise Lost* 1. 650-54.

[25]Lim 205.

From this fair throne to heave the owner out.[26]

There are clearly analogies to be had here between Tarquin's impression of Lucrece and Satan's initial response to Eve, and I shall shortly return to this issue, as both figures are represented as rapacious colonisers and tyrants. Of course, Tarquin loses his honour in raping Lucrece, but Collatine's honour, and Rome's, is preserved through Lucrece's suicide and the subsequent republication of her body.

The female body is a central focus of colonial texts. This is, perhaps, considering the analysis of rape narratives in the previous chapter where the sexual purity of the female body is analogous to political ideals, not surprising. The colonial encounter, from the initial contact and its textualisation, or more broadly, artistic representation, is linked to sex and the policing of gender roles. The colonisers often view political relations in sexual terms. Michel Foucault argues that sexuality is "an especially dense transfer point for relations of power...[it is] endowed with the greatest instrumentality: useful for the greatest number of manuevers and capable of serving as a point of support, as a linchpin, for the most varied strategies."[27] Clearly, sexuality served as one such transfer point in the colonial relationship as it was envisioned by the colonisers. In addition, it intersects with issues of religion and social status. As Alan Bray has shown, threats to the social order in early modern England, be they political or religious, were often topped off by accusations of sexual transgression, i.e. sodomy. The progression of these accusations, from religious / political to sexual, is important. Citing Bray's work, Paul Hammond argues that,

---

[26]Shakespeare, "The Rape of Lucrece" 407-13.

[27]*The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1990) 103.

it would be anachronistic to expect a Renaissance reader to seek his sense of identity primarily through his sexual behaviour. Ultimately, what gave the Renaissance world its sense of coherence was religion, and this shaped a man's self-understanding; secondarily, the hierarchical social order provided the roles for everyday living.[28]

While sexuality was not a primary determinant in identity, the metaphorical structure of sexual / gender identity does underlie political identity in a patriarchal society, and this, in turn, was policed in early modern society through biblical injunctions regarding sexuality.

Colonial discourse is not exempt from the political ramifications this creates. For example, Edmund Spenser's allegory entwines religion, social hierarchy, and sexuality in *The Faerie Queene* as well as in *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, as does Milton in *Paradise Lost*. Accusations of sexual transgression only follow from religious and / or political transgressions. Foucault's model of power relations is important in this regard, as there is "no power without potential refusal or revolt."[29] As in all power relations, then, various types of resistance, religious or political, are placed within particular discursive categories, and often result in accusations of sexual transgression. This, for example, is evident in *Paradise Lost*. Possessing free will, Adam and Eve are subjected to God through the only injunction He gives them--not to eat of the Tree of Knowledge. This injunction allows for power to operate by permitting the potential for revolt. In Milton's epic, subjection must be willingly yielded--Adam and Eve to God, and Eve to Adam--not forced:

---

[28]*Love Between Men in English Literature* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996) 7.

[29]Michel Foucault, "Politics and Reason," *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984*, ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman, trans. Alan Sheridan, et al. (New York: Routledge, 1990) 84.

Freely they stood who stood, and fell who fell.

Not free, what proof could they have given sincere

Of true allegiance, constant faith or love?

Where only what they needs must do, appeared,

Not what they would, what praise could they receive?

What pleasure I from such obedience paid,

When will and reason (reason also is choice)

Useless and vain, of freedom both despoiled,

Made passive both, had served necessity,

Not me.[30]

The political model of subjection provided here is important in terms of the gender hierarchy proposed in *Paradise Lost*. Achsah Guibbory points out that the "ease with which Charles, and James before him, used the language of love to express political and economic relations suggests the deep interconnection between domestic, amatory relations and public, political ones."[31] In turn, these domestic, political interconnections could be applied to the relation between England and its colonies. Once again, we see the complex negotiation of identity in colonial discourse. If we consider, for a moment, "that colonialism begins at home, and that relationships which later characterized European rule in much of the overseas world were but extensions and adaptations of habits and institutions already well-established on

---

[30]*Paradise Lost* 3. 102-11.

[31]"Sexual Politics / Political Sex," *Renaissance Discourses of Desire*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: U of Missouri P, 1993) 213. Kevin Sharpe discusses these links in regards to the Platonic ideal in the Caroline Court in *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies* (London and New York: Pinter Publishers, 1989) 230-58. I will return to this issue in more detail in the following chapter.

European soil,"[32] then we can explore this issue through Homi Bhabha's notion of mimicry. Bhabha writes,

> Mimicry *repeats* rather than *re-presents*.... [Colonial writers] are the parodists of history. Despite their intentions and invocations they inscribe the colonial text erratically, eccentrically across a body politic that refuses to be representative, in a narrative that refuses to be representational. The desire to emerge as "authentic" through mimicry--through a process of writing and repetition--is the final irony of partial representation.[33]

Mimicry, for Bhabha, leads colonial discourse into producing "authorized versions of otherness," as well as a drive to formally "normalize" the other in order to attempt to stabilize the disruption of colonial authority prompted through the ambivalence of mimicry.[34] The attempt to textually fix the identity of the other in colonial discourse "connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and daemonic repetition."[35] The very fixity and iterability, repetition rather than representation, of the stereotype admits the possibility of subversion. Resistance to colonial power, an essential component of power relations in Foucault's model, prompts repetition, an "authorized version of otherness," the ambivalent stereotype. In a wider sense, the colonial project itself, moving from internal

---

[32]Karl S. Bottigheimer, "Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Western Enterprise, 1536-1660," *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and America, 1480-1650*, ed. K. R. Andrews, N. P. Canny, and P. E. H. Hair (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1978) 60. Bottigheimer, here, is discussing Hechter's thesis of "internal colonialism" in an effort to reconcile seeing Ireland as kingdom and colony.

[33]Bhabha 88.

[34]Bhabha 88, 91.

[35]Bhabha 66.

colonisation to external expansion is always already a repetition, and, in some ways, a supplement to a national, political identity.

The gender dynamic of domestic power relations, then, require the representation of the colonial site as a readable female body. We might recall illustrations of America as a rather nubile, semi-nude young female receiving her fully clothed, male European lover. Sir Walter Ralegh, for example, writes of Guiana as a virgin:

> *Guiana* is a Countrey that hath yet her Maydenhead, never sackt, turned, nor wrought, the face of the earth hath not beene torne, nor the vertue and salt of the soyle spent by manurance, the graves have not beene opened for gold, the mines not broken with sledges, nor their Images puld down out of their temples. It hath never been entered by any armie of strength, and never conquered or possessed by any Christian Prince. It is besides so defensible.[36]

Much like the scientific pursuit of the secrets of a feminized nature, or Milton's fable of Truth in *Areopagitica*, Ralegh represents Guiana as a desirable object, one which can be possessed and controlled. Ironically, however, Guiana's purity, its fetishized virginity, is precisely what the English colonial enterprise intends to spoil. And it is the rumoured treasure of El Dorado that drives Ralegh's conquest to possess the jewel of Guiana's maidenhead. This is precisely the chain of events leading to Tarquin's rape of Lucrece and Satan's voyage to Eden.

The relationship of the virgin land to her male conquerer may also be described in terms of marriage, a legal bond that legitimizes the possession and control of the feminized

---

[36]*The Discoverie of the Large, Rich and Bewtiful Empyre of Guiana*, ed. Neil L. Whitehead

colony. On the image of America as a female virgin receiving her male, European lover, J. Martin Evans writes,

> The image was most highly developed in the writings of Samuel Purchas, who addressed himself to Virginia as if he were proposing marriage: 'Whether shall I warble sweete Carols in prayse of thy lovely Face, thou fairest of Virgins, which from our other Britaine World, hath wonne thee Wooers and Suters...to make thee of a ruder Virgin, not a wanton Minion, but an honest and Christian Wife?' Only the English, he asserted, were deserving of her favors, for the 'savage inhabitants' were 'unworthie to embrace with their rustike armes so sweet a bosome.'[37]

Colonial power relations impose these ideological structures as a way of gaining and maintaining control by gendering the relationship between England and Virginia in the familiar terms of dominance and submission. Purchas's comment touches on social status, sexuality, and religion, all important elements for both the maintenance of the coloniser's masculine identity as well as the subjugation of the colonised. Much like Ralegh's desire for the maidenhead of Guiana, Purchas's comments demonstrate the dependence of colonial discourse on repetition rather than representation--reading the colony is explicating the established social text of the virgin.

We can find some similarities in representations of Ireland which already had established legal bonds with England. In Spenser's allegorical, imperialist epic representation

---

(Manchester: Manchester UP, 1997) 196.

[37]Evans 66.

of Ireland the country is a distressed woman appealing to the Fairy Queen for redress, highlighting the bond between the countries:

> Wherefore the Lady, which *Eirena* hight,
>
> Did to the Faery Queene her way addresse,
>
> To whom complayning her afflicted plight,
>
> She her besought of gratious redresse.
>
> That soueraine Queene, that mightie Empresse,
>
> Whose glorie is to aide all suppliants pore,
>
> And of weake Princes to be Patronesse,
>
> Chose *Artegall* to right her to restore;
>
> For that to her he seem'd best skild in righteous lore.[38]

While the "mightie Empresse" and Eirena demonstrate a female bond, a bond we see in several other instances in the poem, male agency is still the central fact of the epic's martial and imperial values (this is evident even in the transvestism of Britomart). Only male heroism can confront the rapacious, colonising masculinity of Grantorto. Like Ralegh and the supporters of the later Western Design, Spenser plays on anti-Spanish sentiments and the threat that Spain poses to the English colonial enterprise. That threat would be reconfigured in *Paradise Lost* through the confrontation of a Christian, rather than martial heroism and the rapacious conquistador, Satan. Such representations are clearly part of sixteenth and seventeenth century views of gender hierarchy--of sexually passive and active roles. The plight of the helpless Eirena, however, is left unresolved, leaving the door open to further English colonial

---

[38]*The Faerie Queene*, ed. Thomas P. Roche, Jr. and C. Patrick O'Donnell, Jr. (Harmondsworth:

"reforms" in the country. Spenser's allegorical representation of a colonial conflict between Spanish and English interests in Ireland shares in an English colonial discourse which portrayed Spanish intentions as brutally exploitative in contrast to gentler and more just English intentions.

Yet, as the narrative of Book 5 develops, gender roles are clearly an important part of the religious and political "reformation" that Artegal undertakes. We cannot forget the narrator's opening lament "with the state of present time."[39] Sexual relations are, indeed, "quite out of square;" men are "(...backward bred)."[40] The parentheses here are rather curious. The phrase "(so backward bred)" reiterates the previous "behind their backs." The parentheses graphically enclose the sexual act--a transgressive sex that can be read in the context of the Proem as either bestial, in terms of lust, or sodomitical, and, of course, among other transgressions, bestiality and anal sex were encompassed by the category of sodomy. The closing lines of the stanza are also odd: "And if then those may any worse be red, / They into that ere long will be degendered." The three rhymes act as a gloss of the parenthetical phrase--bred, red, degendered. The reading of "backward bred" leads to the conclusion of degeneration. And what of the "that" in the last line? Ostensibly, it appears to refer back to the notion of men regressing and transforming into the "hardest stone," yet "that" can also be read as the sexual transgression "behind their backs (so backward bred)." The reformation that ensues in Book 5 ensures that the sexual act will not be performed from behind. Civility,

---

Penguin, 1987) 5.1.4.

[39]*The Faerie Queene*, Book 5 Proem.

[40]*The Faerie Queene*, Book 5 Proem.

colonialism, and sexuality will be reinstated in a proper conjuncture that finds its social and cosmic analogies in the narrator's lament of a "world...runne quite out of square."

Such sexual / political analogies are clearly evident in *Paradise Lost*. The story of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah essentially frames Milton's epic "Of man's first disobedience." It is not long before the fallen angels are linked to that narrative, as well as its retelling in the concubine's rape in Judges:

> ...and when night
>
> Darkens the streets, then wander forth the sons
>
> Of Belial, flown with insolence and wine.
>
> Witness the streets of Sodom, and that night
>
> In Gibeah, when the hospitable door
>
> Exposed a matron to avoid worse rape.[41]

In Hell, there are trees with "fruitage fair to sight, like that which grew / Near that bituminous lake where Sodom flamed."[42] In this passage, Paradise is analogous to Sodom, and that analogy is made explicit in the expulsion scene in Book 12 as Adam and Eve descend to the plain, though they are allowed to look back.[43] With conspiracy and the onset of rebellion, familiar concerns for the coloniser, follows the accusation of sodomy, the return of chaos--"It is here that homosexuality had its place in the myth, altogether outside the ordered world of

---

[41]*Paradise Lost* 1. 500-5.

[42]*Paradise Lost* 10. 561-2.

[43]See Lieb's discussion of this association in *Milton and the Culture of Violence* 114-34; also, Alastair Fowler's notes on the expulsion in his edition of *Paradise Lost*.

Creation."[44] In a rather disturbing way, even a modern editor makes this connection between rebellion and homosexuality. In Book 5 of *Paradise Lost*, Satan turns to Beelzebub and asks,

> Sleepst thou companion dear, what sleep can close
>
> Thy eyelids? And rememberst what decree
>
> Of yesterday, so late hath passed the lips
>
> Of heaven's almighty? Thou to me thy thoughts
>
> Wast wont, I mine to thee was wont to impart;
>
> Both waking we were one; how then can now
>
> Thy sleep dissent?[45]

Alastair Fowler glosses "dear" as suggestive of "perverse intimacy." Fowler can only be implying that homosexuality, like rebellion, overturns the established order. I will shortly return to the implications of Fowler's comment in regards to Raphael's account of celestial sex. But, for the moment, it is curious to examine another passage which does not draw Fowler's condemnation--Eve's account of her own creation.

Eve recounts when she first awoke and gazed into a pool of water:

> As I bent down to look, just opposite,
>
> A shape within the watery gleam appeared
>
> Bending to look on me, I started back,
>
> It started back, but pleased I soon returned,
>
> Pleased it returned as soon with answering looks

---

[44]Bray, *Homosexuality* 24.

[45]*Paradise Lost* 5. 673-9.

> Of sympathy and love; there I had fixed
>
> My eyes till now, and pined with vain desire.[46]

Eve's naive narcissism can be described as same-sex desire. "[W]arned" by the voice of God, she is informed of a heterosexual imperative that she shall be "Mother of human race"[47] and led to Adam, though Eve initially turns away from him to return to the "watery image." As Lillian Faderman and Valerie Traub have argued, lesbianism caused little anxiety unless it was linked to challenges to patriarchal prerogative.[48] Discussing Shakespeare's female characters, Traub writes,

> Significantly, the homoerotic desires of these female characters existed comfortably within the patriarchal order until the onset of marriage; it is only within the cementing of male bonds through the exchange of women...that the independent desires of female bodies become a focus of male anxiety and heterosexual retribution.[49]

There is no masculine anxiety evident in the response to Eve's narrative. In fact, the story is treated almost comically in regards to Eve's pre-lapsarian innocence. She yields to the voice of God and to Adam, cementing a male bond and fulfilling her reproductive function:

> Women's social role within a system of reproduction relies not only on her

---

[46]*Paradise Lost* 4. 460-6.

[47]*Paradise Lost* 4. 475.

[48]Lillian Faderman, *Surpassing the Love of Men: Friendship and Love Between Women from the Renaissance to the Present* (London: Women's Press, 1991) 21-143. This point is made throughout Faderman's discussion of female same-sex relationships from the sixteenth through to the eighteenth century.

[49]"The (In)Significance of 'Lesbian' Desire in Early Modern England," *Queering the Renaissance*, ed. Jonathan Goldberg (Durham and London: Duke UP, 1994) 73.

biological capacity to give birth, but her willingness to perform that labor. It is only when women's erotic relations with one another threaten exclusivity, and thus endanger their reproductive 'performance,' that cultural injunctions are levied against them.[50]

This brief episode, however, curiously ties the pre-lapsarian Eve with the fallen Satan. Immediately following Eve's creation narrative in which she "pined with vain desire" for a female image, Satan comments on seeing the couple together:

> Sight hateful, sight tormenting! Thus these two
>
> Imparadised in one another's arms
>
> The happier Eden, shall enjoy their fill
>
> Of bliss on bliss, while I to hell am thrust,
>
> Where neither joy nor love, but fierce desire,
>
> Among our other torments not the least,
>
> Still unfulfilled with pain of longing pines.[51]

All desire which is not commensurate with the "happier Eden" of male and female through God results in one's pining away with vain desires. The gendered model of power relations are key to masculine subjectivity in religious, political, and colonial contexts.

These relations, in all their political and colonial implications, are clearly played out in Milton's epic. But who are the colonised in *Paradise Lost*? This is an important issue in regards to how Quint, Armitage, Evans, and Stevens interpret the colonial stance of the poem.

---

[50]Traub 78.

[51]*Paradise Lost* 4. 505-11.

For Quint and Armitage, Satan is a perverse conquistador who represents the folly of colonial expansion; Stevens sees a colonial dialectic that negatively colours Spanish colonial ambitions in the Americas in order to legitimate English intentions; Evans sees a multivalenced legitimation of the colonial enterprise.

Adam and Eve are planted in Eden; they "by sovereign gift possess / This spacious ground."[52] Theirs is a godly plantation which narratively follows and echoes, repeats, the plantation of the fallen angels in Hell. Both colonial sites reflect contemporary debates regarding the "two most influential English rationales for settling North America."[53] The fallen angels fit the purgative model of colonialism, one which involves the transportation of criminals to plant colonies; Adam and Eve fit the expansive model of empire building. These sites, however, ironically invert, with Satan attempting to use Hell as the base of an expansive empire recoiling back on the heavenly imperial centre. Adam and Eve are expelled from Eden still under the injunction to increase and multiply on "the subjected plain": "The world was all before them, where to choose / Their place of rest, and providence their guide."[54] Only in Eden, however, does a conflict occur between colonial powers--the internal cultivation that is to lead to the expansion of the godly plantation and the aggressive conquest of the Satanic quest for external aggrandizement.

The confrontation in Eden represents the conflict of the republican model proposed by Machiavelli, and both are set in motion by God. While Satan and the fallen angels are

---

[52]*Paradise Lost* 5. 366-7.

[53]On the debate regarding purgative and expansive colonies, see Evans 42-3.

[54]*Paradise Lost* 12. 646-7.

transplanted in Hell, he clearly acts as a rapacious conquistador figure on a voyage of discovery to oust those who have been advanced "Into our room of bliss."[55] Misguided by his internal constitution, Satan fails to see the consequences of his actions. Yet, Satan's reaction to Eden is a familiar one from colonial writings. Satan's initial prospect of Eden, and later of Eve, is that of a discoverer's wonder: "Wonder, the experience of witnessing new, exotic, fascinating, and marvelous things and spectacles can be a spontaneous and sincere response, just as it can also function as a strategic reaction, carefully fashioned to legitimate and enact the politics of empire."[56] Satan shows this sense of wonder in both ways, but opts for the latter. When he first enters upon the "sylvan scene,"

> ...Satan still in gaze, as first he stood,
>
> Scarce thus at length failed speech recovered sad.
>
> O hell! What do mine eyes with grief behold,
>
> Into our room of bliss thus high advanced
>
> Creatures of other mould, earth-born perhaps,
>
> Not spirits, yet to heavenly spirits bright
>
> Little inferior; whom my thoughts pursue
>
> With wonder, and could love, so lively shines
>
> In them divine resemblance, and such grace
>
> The hand that formed them on their shape hath poured.[57]

---

[55]*Paradise Lost* 4. 359.

[56]Lim 206.

[57]*Paradise Lost* 4. 356-65.

Once recovering his "failed speech" at this scene of wonder, Satan continues,

> And should I at your harmless innocence
>
> Melt, as I do, yet public reason just,
>
> Honour and empire with revenge enlarged,
>
> By conquering this new world, compels me now
>
> To do what else though damned I should abhor.
>
> So spake the fiend, and with necessity,
>
> The tyrant's plea, excused his devilish deeds.[58]

Though melting at the scene of innocence, and later, before his temptation of Eve, being struck "Stupidly good,"[59] Satan makes his complaint of reasons of state in order "to legitimate and enact the politics of empire." Without the proper, godly internal constitution, however, Satan's quest is doomed to failure. As for Adam and Eve, only through contrite repentance for their actions can they attempt to regain, or recolonise Paradise.

The sexual consequences of the fall, however, remain rather curious, and I want to turn now to examine an interesting exchange on the "exposed / ...utmost border of...[God's] kingdom"[60] in order to discuss the implications of Milton's accusations of sodomy in a colonial context. As we have seen, the Sodom and Gomorrah narrative is present throughout *Paradise Lost*, and it makes its most surprising appearance in Book 8 when Adam discusses

---

[58]*Paradise Lost* 4. 388-94.

[59]*Paradise Lost* 9. 465.

[60]*Paradise Lost* 2. 360-1.

sex with Raphael, who is a colonial envoy sent by "the sovereign planter."[61] Adam asks, "Love not the heavenly spirits?" Raphael answers,

> Whatever pure thou in body enjoyst
>
> (And pure thou wert created) we enjoy
>
> In eminence, and obstacle find none
>
> Of membrane, joint, or limb, exclusive bars:
>
> Easier than air with air, if spirits embrace,
>
> Total they mix, union of pure with pure
>
> Desiring.[62]

Evans, reading this exchange, reminds us of the interest that the native Americans expressed in the reproductive capacity of the Europeans:

> According to Thomas Hariot, for instance, the native inhabitants of Virginia, noting that 'we had no women amongst us,' concluded that the English 'were not born of women, and therefor not mortal.' Adam, too, is fascinated by his visitor's sexuality, or lack of it.... The brief account of celestial intercourse which Raphael offers in reply apparently leads Adam to the same conclusion as the Virginian Indians: the world from which his heavenly guest has voyaged, he believes, is peopled exclusively by 'Spirits Masculine.'[63]

What else can Adam, or, indeed the reader, conclude? While "spirits when they please / Can

---

[61]*Paradise Lost* 4. 691.

[62]*Paradise Lost* 8. 622-8.

[63]Evans 74.

either sex assume, or both,"[64] suggesting androgyny, Raphael's description of celestial sex, his choice of words, all point to what might pose an obstacle to pleasure in terms of obstacles to penetration. In addition, in the broader sense of the term sodomy, the angels have no procreative intercourse--their sex is sodomitical, as it is the "multiplication of man...[which is] to fill up the number of fallen angels."[65] At one point, Satan does take the form of a "stripling cherub,"[66] but the text does not clarify whether this is the result of reproduction and maturation or whether lower ranks of angels are marked off by this physical distinction. Also, when Satan first sees Eve, he comments that her form is "Angelic, but more soft, and feminine."[67] We are again left with the impression that the angels are all male.

This account of celestial intercourse is implicated in the misogynistic elements of the poem. The post-lapsarian Adam laments,

> ...Oh why did God,
>
> Creator wise, that peopled highest heaven
>
> With spirits masculine, create at last
>
> This novelty on earth, this fair defect
>
> Of nature, and not fill the world at once
>
> With men as angels without feminine,
>
> Or find some other way to generate

---

[64]*Paradise Lost* 1. 423-4.

[65]James Grantham Turner, *One Flesh: Paradisal Marriage and Sexual Relations in the Age of Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987) 160.

[66]*Paradise Lost* 3. 636.

[67]*Paradise Lost* 9. 458.

Mankind?[68]

Certainly, other means of reproduction are not incomprehensible--the possibilities of asexual reproduction, hermaphrodism, and even bestiality are discussed throughout James Grantham Turner's *One Flesh.* But none of these, other than the birth of Sin from Satan's head, appear in Milton's epic.

The issue also makes a notable appearance in Milton's divorce tracts. The anonymous *Answer* to the *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, though it tends to misread Milton's arguments regarding procreation and marriage, upholds the marital role of women as that of procreation:

> But that solace and peice which is contrary to discord and variance (in which sense you seem to take it) is not the main end of mariage or conjugall society, is very plain and apparent: nor yet the solace and content in the gifts of minde of one another only, for then would it have been every wayes as much, yea more content and solace to *Adam*; and so consequently to every man, to have had another man made to him of his Rib instead of *Eve*: this is apparent by experience, which shews, that man ordinarily exceeds woman in naturall gifts of minde, and in delectableness of converse...a solace and a meetnesse made up chiefly as of different Sexes, consisting of Male and Female.[69]

The *Answer* makes use of a dichotomy between marriage (a male-female relationship for

---

[68]*Paradise Lost* 10. 888-95.

[69]*An Answer to a Book, Intituled, the Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, or, A Plea for Ladies and Gentlewomen, and all other Maried Women against Divorce. Wherein, Both Sexes are vindicated from all bonadge* [sic.] *of Canon Law, and other mistakes whatsoever: And the unfound Principles of the Author are examined and fully confuted by authority of Holy Scripture, the Laws of this Land, and sound Reason* (London: 1644) 12. The tract is published in facsimile in Parker.

reproductive purposes) and friendship (a male-male relationship, which, of course, does not deny the possibility of sexual relations). Now, Milton twice deals with the issue of whether it was best for Adam to be provided with a male or female partner in Eden, and essentially demolishes the twisted logic of the above passage in arguing that there is more than sex to conjugal society: "hee [the author of the *Answer*] denies *that the solace, and peace, which is contrary to discord and variance, is the main end of mariage.* What then? Hee will have it *the solace of male, and female.*"[70]

The analogy used in the second edition of *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* to describe the marriage bond is also curious. Milton draws upon the Eros / Anteros myth: "And of matrimoniall love no doubt but that was chiefly meant, which by the ancient Sages was thus parabl'd, That Love, if he be not twin-born, yet hath a brother wondrous like him, call'd *Anteros.*"[71] Searching for his brother, Eros is deceived by others who resemble Anteros. Eros,

> imbraces and consorts...with these obvious and suborned striplings, as if they were his Mothers own Sons.... For strait his arrows loose their golden heads, and shed their purple feathers, his silk'n breades untwine, and slip their knots and that original and firie vertue giv'n him by Fate, all on a sudden goes out and leaves him undeifi'd, and despoil'd of all his force: till finding *Anteros* at last, he kindles and repairs the almost faded ammunition of his Diety by the reflection of a coequal and *homogeneal* fire.[72]

---

[70]*Colasterion, CPW* 2: 739. Milton responds to the question of whether it was best to create a male or female companion for Adam in *Colasterion* (*CPW* 2: 739-40) and in *Tetrachordon* (*CPW* 2: 596).

[71]*CPW* 2: 254.

[72]*CPW* 2: 255.

Why is an incestuous relationship between males, complete with a hint of narcissism, the ideal of conjugal society? As Annabel Patterson points out in her reading of both editions of *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, the passage suggests that "Without the 'novelty' of the female, there could be, need be, no 'amatorious novel.'"[73] Patterson comments on Milton's self-consciousness of the presence of narrative fiction in his pamphlet in terms of the developing genre of the novel and its focus on domestic issues. What is important to note here, however, is that the novelty of the female leads to the need to explicate the female body in text: the bashful virgin in *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* and Eve in *Paradise Lost*, for example. Through this explication, we are thrown back onto the question of whether it had been better for God to create a male or female partner for Adam.

In both Satan and Adam's case, the feminine, be it Sin or Eve, is linked to downfall, though we can commend Adam for choosing not to abandon Eve. Adam, prior to Michael's visitation in Books 11 and 12, fails to understand the importance of the role of Eve within homosocial bonds:

> To misunderstand the kind of property women are or the kind of transaction in which alone their value is realizable means, for a man, to endanger his own position as a subject in the relationship of exchange: to be permanently feminized or objectified in relation to other men.[74]

In siding with Eve, Adam devalues the bond between himself and God of which Eve is a

---

[73]"No Mere Amatorious Novel?" *Politics, Poetics, and Hermeneutics in Milton's Prose*, ed. David Loewenstein and James Grantham Turner (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990) 97.

[74]Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia UP, 1985) 50-1.

token. Misogyny still underlies this understanding and Adam's decision to stick it out with Eve, as is evident in Michael's response to Adam's assertion that "man's woe" begins with woman--Michael corrects Adam, "From man's effeminate slackness it begins."[75] The charge of effeminacy is rooted in misogyny, the denigration of "feminine" traits.

In this context, we might also recall the great colonial fear of "going native," an option which Adam enacts by breaking the homosocial bond with God and forgoing Paradise. This problem, in both America and Ireland, is linked, often, to the feminine: intermarriage, and, more widely, to the colony as a feminine space. This is a reality created by the colonial enterprise remaining a largely masculine project. Intermarriage moves males outside of established homosocial bonds. In Ireland, the Statutes of Kilkenny explicitly prohibited intermarriage, though this aim was not particularly successful. Cromwell, too, would forbid intermarriage. The issue clearly caused a great deal of anxiety. For example, John Rolfe's letter explaining his desire to marry a native American,

> becomes the site of the affirmation of psychic, social and cosmic order. The encounter with the savage other serves to confirm the civil subject in that self-knowledge which ensures self-mastery.... The letter, then, rehearses the power of the civil subject to maintain self-control and to bring the other into his service.[76]

Paul Brown focuses on the individual aspects of Rolfe's letter--self-control in relation to the colonial and gendered other--but, more importantly, Rolfe's letter is implicated in wider

---

[75]*Paradise Lost* 11. 634.

[76]Brown 50.

homosocial bonds. Rolfe seems more concerned with his relationship to his governor. Adam and Eve's relationship and Purchas's comments, cited earlier, also demonstrate this point. Women serve as tokens of exchange which cement male bonds. Rolfe argues that his marriage is actually in the service of the civilizing project and, in consequence, his governor's approval of the marriage will strengthen his relationship to colonial authority.

In terms of the wider implications of the colony being gendered as female, the male coloniser must resist its enticements. Milton's Eden shares some similarities to Spenser's Bower of Bliss. In Milton's representation of Eden, Grantham Turner sees the rebuilding of Spenser's Bower of Bliss. In the possibility of a prelapsarian susceptible response by Adam to the enticements of a naked Eve, an issue that Raphael continually warns Adam against in Book 8,

> Milton is apparently fascinated by the paradox of the veil that hides and reveals at once, simultaneously enhancing innocence and desirability. He found this piquant effect in a favourite episode of *The Faerie Queene*, where it is used by the wicked nymphs to inflame Sir Guyon; here it is reappropriated for innocence. Just as Eve is decked and undecked...so she is somehow veiled and not veiled--veiled for the fallen but virtuous Sons of God who read the poem and appreciate the metaphorical allusion to what St. Paul would have to make literal, but unveiled for the angels who meet her in the flesh.[77]

Similar to the problem faced by the chaste youth in interpreting the bashful virgin in *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, this veiling and unveiling of the innocent nudity of Eve

---

[77]Turner 269.

contrasts initially with the wanton behaviour of the nymphs of the Bower of Bliss, who "suddenly both would themselves vnhele, / And th'amarous sweet spoiles to greedy eyes reuele."[78] Stephen Greenblatt draws out the colonial issues of the excessive violence of Guyon's destruction of the Bower of Bliss involved in this episode of *The Faerie Queene*:

> "Excess" is defined not by some inherent imbalance or impropriety, but by the mechanism of control, the exercise of restraining power. And if excess is virtually invented by this power, so too, paradoxically, power is invented by excess: this is why Acrasia cannot be destroyed, why she and what she is made to represent must continue to exist, forever the object of the destructive quest. For were she not to exist as a constant threat, the power Guyon embodies would also cease to exist.[79]

> Power and excess are interdependent, as there can be no exercise of power without the potential of rebellion; both are locked into the ambivalence of the racial and gendered stereotype. The very excess of this violence is regenerative, allowing the colonisers to find "a sense of identity, discipline, and holy faith. In tearing down what both appealed to them and sickened them, they strengthened their power to resist their dangerous longings, to repress antisocial impulses, to conquer the powerful desire for release."[80]

However, in terms of the accusation of sodomy in colonial discourse, and particularly in *Paradise Lost* and Milton's Irish allusions, we see how the boundaries between homosocial

---

[78]*The Faerie Queene* 2. 12. 64.

[79]*Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980) 177.

[80]Greenblatt, *Self-Fashioning* 183.

and homosexual blur--to charge the colonised with sodomy oddly mirrors Raphael's account of celestial intercourse and his comments on the importance of love:

> ...love refines
>
> The thoughts, and heart enlarges, hath his seat
>
> In reason, and is judicious, is the scale
>
> By which to heavenly love thou mayst ascend,
>
> Not sunk in carnal pleasure, for which cause
>
> Among the beasts no mate for thee was found.[81]

Through the female, a higher, homosocial bond is formed in platonic terms whereby Adam's love for Eve, and hers for him, leads to the higher transcendent love of God.

Gender is clearly an important aspect of Milton's views of political and colonial relationships. Submission must be freely yielded to what he sees as godly order--Eve to Adam, Adam and Eve to God, the subject to the political system. This is reiterated in *Paradise Regained* when Jesus expresses the limitations of monarchical tyranny in terms of the imposition of the monarch's will in response to Satan's tempting offer of an earthly empire:

> For therein stands the offence of a king,
>
> His honour, virtue, merit, and chief praise,
>
> That for the public all this weight he bears.
>
> Yet he who reigns within himself, and rules
>
> Passions, desires, and fears, is more a king;

---

[81]*Paradise Lost* 8. 589-94.

Which every wise and virtuous man attains:

And who attains not, ill aspires to rule

Cities of men, or headstrong multitudes,

Subject himself to anarchy within,

Or lawless passions in him which he serves.

But to guide nations in the way of truth

By saving doctrine, and from error lead

To know, and, knowing worship God aright,

Is yet more kingly, this attracts the soul,

Governs the inner man, the nobler part,

That other o'er the body only reigns,

And oft by force, which to a generous mind

So reigning can be no sincere delight.[82]

This point is continually made in Milton's anti-monarchical writings--submitting to an earthly monarch is abrogating the inner reason given human beings by God. In its Restoration context, *Paradise Lost* critiques the political and colonial failures of the commonwealth. As Lim states,

> In this phase of Milton's life, defined by the traumatic experience of defeat, the colonization of the Other that is an aspect of the desire to bring Reformation to the world, no longer proved a viable project.... Now England's enemy is itself: the people who make up the nation; it is not the Indians in the Americas

[82] *Paradise Regained* 2. 463-80.

> or the Irish in Ireland. In *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes*, the biblical rhetoric of exclusivism is turned inward to scrutinize English society and politics itself.[83]

In calling the nation's attention to its inner failures, Milton's epic continues to legitimize the political experiment of the "good old cause," and, in so doing, reestablishes the grounds for its colonial expansion.

---

[83]Lim 241.

6. Milton, Cavaliers, and Rochester: Libertine Pleasures and Politics

All appetites are free, and God will never

damn a man for allowing himself a little pleasure

--Charles II[1]

In chapters four and five, I examined the interconnection of the sexual and political in a colonial context. In the latter, I suggested that the colonisers impose these sexual / political analogies from their home country onto the colony, structuring colonial power relations on their own gendered terms. In this chapter, I will explore this issue in greater depth by focussing on the colonial centre, and, in particular, representations of the Caroline and Restoration courts. This will further our understanding of just how accusations of sexual depravity function politically and how colonial discourse betrays domestic political concerns. Masculinity is privileged as both the primary sexual and political subject, and these subject positions work in tandem--political submission is often conflated with sexual submission. By exploring the family analogy of royalist discourse, the responses to Milton's divorce tracts, and the sexual and political issues raised in the work of Cavalier poets and the Earl of Rochester, we can highlight some of the political concerns prompted by the Irish Rebellion in terms of English domestic problems. In addition, we will see that the interconnection of sex and politics problematizes the very concepts of gender ideology that these various writers attempt to take for granted: distinct gender identities construct particular forms of eroticism

---

[1]Quoted in J. P. Kenyon, *The Stuarts: A Study in English Kingship* (Glasgow: William Collins,

which often lead to fears of transgressive desire, and these have political consequences.[2]

One of the primary notions of monarchy in royalist writings is that of the king as father.[3] The analogy depends "directly upon gender and upon the system of sexual difference upheld within the family unit; and the discourse of royal and divine authority would blend into the discourse of family order."[4] Bruce Boehrer goes on to argue that this ideology of "proper" family order results in accusations of sexual depravity which are intended to discredit any opponent's political ideals and status. This is evident in the charges of uxoriousness levelled at Charles I, the rapacious Cavalier stereotype, the response to Milton's divorce tracts, the sodomitical Irish rebels, and the Restoration court milieu of Rochester. Indeed, Milton is trapped within the rhetoric of royalist authority through this family analogy. He can only hope to reconfigure it to his own political ideals. This is apparent even in the central political role of the patriarchal relations of *Paradise Lost*, and,

> in order for such arguments to work, one must first assume that sexual identity and political authority somehow correspond, that they are in some way equivalent. One is thrown, in other words, back upon family structure as the model for national government, and it is this model that the royalists have been using all along.[5]

1982) 138.

[2]Breitenberg 151.

[3]In chapter four, I briefly discussed the royalist paternal analogy's implications in regards to Charles I's use of Dinah's rape in *Eikon Basilike*.

[4]Boehrer 104.

[5]Boehrer 112.

The patriarchal family serves as an essential anchoring point for a variety of political discourses which results in the gendering of authority and submission. The analogy ultimately rests "upon the *sexual* character of patriarchy, for it is the act of *begetting* that finally unites fatherhood to kingship."[6]

The "sexual character of patriarchy" is central to Sir Robert Filmer's political writings in which fatherhood and kingship are commensurate and traced back to Adam's begetting of children:

> Every man that is born is so far from being free-born that by his very birth he becomes a subject to him that begets him. Under which subjection he is always to live unless by immediate appointment from God or by the grant or death of his father he become possessed of that power to which he was subject.[7]

In his *First Defence*, for example, Milton was forced to directly confront this familiar royalist analogy in response to Salmasius. Milton, at first, denies the analogy:

> you think this metaphor has forced me to apply right off to kings whatever I might admit to fathers. Fathers and kings are very different things: Our fathers begot us, but our kings did not, and it is we, rather, who created the king. It is nature which gave the people fathers, and the people who gave themselves a king; the people therefore do not exist for the king, but the king for the people.[8]

---

[6]Boehrer 107.

[7]Filmer, *Directions for Obedience to Government in Dangerous and Doubtful Times* 282.

[8]*CPW* 4: 326-7.

But even if there are some similarities shared by kings and fathers, Milton writes,

> We endure a father though he be harsh and strict, and we endure such a king too; but we do not endure even a father who is tyrannical. If a father kill his son he shall pay with his life: shall not then a king too be subject to this same most just of laws if he has destroyed the people who are his sons?[9]

Milton asserts that a king does not have the appeal to natural law that a father does over the lives of his children, but, even if a king could appeal to natural law, neither he nor a biological father is above the established laws of the nation. Reasserting the link between fatherhood and kingship, Filmer directly challenges Milton's separation of the two in the above passage from the *First Defence*. Filmer writes,

> father and king are not so diverse. It is confessed that at first they were all one, for there is confessed *paternum imperium et haereditarium* [a paternal and hereditary empire], and this fatherly empire, as it was of itself *hereditary*, so it was *alienable* by the parent, and *seizable* by a usurper as other goods are. And thus every king that now is hath a paternal empire, either by inheritance, or by translation or usurpation. So a father and a king may be all one.[10]

Such notions, of course, underlie the commonplace association between regicide and parricide, but they are also implicated in all political attacks on patriarchal family structures.

In order to further examine the implications of the political uses of the family analogy, I want to turn now to some of the issues involved in Milton's divorce tracts and the reactions

---

[9]*CPW* 4: 327.

[10]Filmer, *Observations Concerning the Original of Government Upon Mr Hobs Leviathan, Mr Milton Against Salmasius, H. Grotius De Jure Belli*, in *Patriarcha and Other Writings* 203.

they prompted. Thomas N. Corns writes,

> If Milton appears as a man who does not much care for coitus, then the charge that he advocates liberalized divorce to facilitate a wider sexual experience is (or should be) pre-empted--though...Milton's new enemies were not thus forestalled. Incidentally, however, Milton does admit the power of at least the male sexual urge. We should recall that the man frustrated with his marriage steps to the stews or his neighbour's bed, not to talk to, but to copulate with, another woman.[11]

Indeed, in arguing for the sanctity of marriage and the necessity of divorce, Milton is upholding what many Protestant reformers believed--that "the bulwark against sexual debauchery...was marriage; that gone and all manner of sodomy and buggery would break forth."[12] Yet, we see this fear in attacks on Milton's views that charge him with libertinism, and these attacks often contain a political significance. In his attack on Milton's views on divorce, James Howell writes,

> But that opinion of a poor shallow-brain'd *puppy*, who upon any cause of disaffection, would have men to have a priviledg to change their Wives or repudiat them, deserves to be hiss'd rather than confuted; for nothing can tend more to usher in all confusion and beggary throughout the world.... In this Republic one man should be contented with one Wife, and he may have work

---

[11]Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue* 45.

[12]Bray, *Homosexuality* 26.

> enough with her.[13]

What is seen as sexual libertinism is given a political tinge: discontent in marriage is linked to discontent with the state. The connection is made far more explicit in Samuel Butler's *The Character of the Rump*:

> But *John Milton* is their Goos-quill Champion, who had need of *A Help meet* to establish any thing, for he has a Ramshead, and is good only at Batteries, an old Heretick both in Religion and Manners, that by his will would shake off his Governours as he doth his Wives, foure in a Fourtnight, the Sun-beams of his scandalous papers against the late Kings book, is the Parent that begot his late new Commonwealth.[14]

Here, Milton's supposed sexual transgressions are seen in relation to political usurpation through the royalist family analogy, the usurpation of political authority through the ability to beget. That political usurpation, in other words, when sexualized, can only bring forth a bastardized, anarchic form of government. The different political opinions expressed in these charges demonstrate the utility of the family analogy. While the attacks on Milton as a libertine are not justified in regards to his views on divorce, they are clearly linked to his political views.

Of course, these were neither the first nor the last attacks on Milton's sexual character by his polemical adversaries in a political context. In *An Apology Against a Pamphlet*, Milton goes to considerable lengths to defend himself against accusations that he frequents brothels,

---

[13]*Epistolae Ho-Elianae* (1655), quoted in William Riley Parker, *Milton's Contemporary Reputation* (New York: Haskell House Publishers, 1971) 92-3.

[14]Quoted in Parker 98-9.

and cleverly turns the accusation against his adversary:

> proceed now to the afternoone; *in playhouses*, he sayes, *and the Bordelloes*. Your intelligence, unfaithfull Spie of Canaan? he gives in his evidence, that *there he hath tracst me*. Take him at his word Readers, but let him bring good sureties, ere ye dismisse him, that while he pretended to dogge others, he did not turne in for his own pleasure; for so much in effect he concludes against himselfe, not contented to be caught in every other gin, but he must be such a novice, as to be still hamper'd in his owne hempe.[15]

Here, in an early text in support of Presbyterianism, Milton's anti-Laudian views are deemed to be as debased as his sexual behaviour. In addition, in chapter four, I discussed accusations of sodomy in regards to Milton's political views--one made by Salmasius in the early 1650s; the other made during the Restoration and included in an attack on Marvell. The latter of these, once again, linking Milton's views on divorce to sexual transgression.

The topic of divorce has a significant political value because of the family analogy. From at least Elizabethan times, when Elizabeth I used the analogy to forestall debate over her marriagability, the notion of the monarch being wedded to the nation became commonplace. James I had made use of the analogy in a speech to parliament in 1603, stating, "What God hath conioyned then, let no man separate. I am the Husband, and all the Whole Isle is my lawfull Wife; I am the Head, and it is my Body; I am the Shepherd, and it is my flocke."[16] James repeated the analogy in a speech of 1624:

---

[15]*CPW* 1: 886.

[16]*King James VI and I: Political Writings* 136.

it is a very fit similitude for a king and his people to be like a husband and wife, for even as Christ, in whose throne I sit...is husband to the Church and the Church is his spouse, so I likewise desire to be your husband and ye should be my spouse; and therefore, as it is the husband's part to cherish his wife, to entreat her kindly, and reconcile himself towards her, and procure her love by all means, so it is my part to do the like to my people.[17]

As noted in chapter four, James's speeches employ the gender hierarchy to subordinate his subjects to his authority in terms readily understood--the wife is to be submissive to her husband; he is the rational head to her body. She is at his service, and the religious element also provides divine sanction for this union. In 1649, Thomas Bayly's *The Royal Charter* reiterates this relationship between king and subjects: "King and Kingdome, are like man and wife, whose marriages are made in heaven and allow of no divorce."[18] The analogy clearly feminizes the king's subjects, prescribing the political relationship along the conventional gender lines of willing submission and passivity in subjects. Through the analogy, unruly, feminized subjects, then, are cast in the role of women who usurp patriarchal prerogatives.

Such rebellious actions take a very literal turn in the work of Royalist writers:

> In *Eikon Basilike*...the king's wife, "eminent for love as a wife and loyalty as a subject," is held up as an example to his errant subjects (victims of an evil "seduction"), whose love he has lost...the loyal, constant wife provides the model for the behavior of subjects who are charged with having spurned the

---

[17]Quoted in Sharpe 60.

[18]Quoted in Guibbory 216.

affection of a devoted husband.[19]

If the rebellious, feminized subjects are enacting a divorce of their king / husband, they are also represented as separating the king from the queen. For example, in "To the King and Queene, upon their unhappy distances," Robert Herrick writes,

Woe, woe to them, who (by a ball of strife)

Doe, and have parted here a Man and Wife:

CHARLS the best Husband, while MARIA strives

To be, and is, the very best of Wives:

Like Streams, you are divorc'd; but 'twill come, when

These eyes of mine shall see you mix agen.

Thus speaks the *Oke*, here; *C.* and *M.* shall meet,

Treading on *Amber*, with their silver-feet:

Nor wil't be long, ere this accomplish'd be;

The words found true, *C.M.* remember me.[20]

Charles is the "best husband;" and Henrietta Maria "the best of wives," and, by analogy, a worthy subject. In addition, the land itself is often represented as a bride receiving her royal husband. In "On New-years day 1640. To the King," Suckling writes,

May every pleasure and delight

That has or does your sence invite

Double this year, save those o'th night:

---

[19]Guibbory 216.

[20]*The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick*, ed. L. C. Martin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956).

For such a Marriage-bed must know no more

Then repetition of what was before.[21]

Much like James I's speech to parliament, Charles I is represented here as having rights to the nation that are analogous to his rights over his wife in the marriage bed, a supposed pleasureable and loving relationship. The king is greeted in similar terms in Herrick's "To the King, Upon His Coming with His Army to the West,"

Welcome, most welcome to our Vowe and us,

Most great, and universall *Genius*!

The Drooping West, which hitherto has stood

As one, in long-lamented-widow-hood;

Looks like a Bride now, or a bed of flowers,

Newly refresh't, both by the Sun, and showers.

War, which before was horrid, now appears

Lovely in you, brave Prince of Cavaliers!

A deale of courage in each bosome springs

By your accesse; (*O you the best of Kings*)

Ride on with all white *Omens*; so, that where

Your Standard's up, we fix a Conquest there.[22]

Herrick makes punning use of the conventions of love poetry in this political context: the delighted bride receives her husband, whose phallic standard makes a conquest. In addition,

---

[21]*The Works of Sir John Suckling: the Non-Dramatic Works*, ed. Thomas Clayton, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971) 1: 41-5.

[22]Herrick, "To the King, Upon His Coming with His Army to the West" 25.

the loving, rightful union of husband and wife challenges parliamentary propaganda's representation of cavaliers as rapacious.

Supporters of parliament were forced to attempt to dismantle such analogies, often by implying sexual transgression. This most notably occurs in Milton's three Latin Defences, where the strategy reaches its lowest, almost puerile level, in *Pro Se Defensio*. However, the strategy was clearly effective in scoring political points if used more moderately. In *Eikonoklastes*, for example, Milton takes issue with Charles I's repeated insistence on his wife's virtues:

> for what concerns it us to hear a Husband divulge his Houshold privacies, extolling to others the vertues of his Wife; an infirmity not seldom incident to those who have least cause. But how good shee was a Wife, was to himself, and be it left to his own fancy; how bad a Subject, is not much disputed.[23]

For Milton, Charles I's extolling of Henrietta Maria's virtues is an attempt to cover sexual scandal--quite possibly picking up on gossip suggesting an affair between Henry Jermyn and Henrietta Maria. Indeed, Milton exposes the royalist use of amatory / political analogies when he writes that Charles I "ascribes *Rudeness and barbarity worse then Indian* to the English Parlament, and *all vertue* to his Wife, in straines that come almost to Sonnetting."[24]

Herrick's poem on the "Unhappy Distances" between the king and queen, however, celebrates the happily married king and queen's future reunion, and the "*C.M.*" recalls Aurelian Townshend's 1632 masque, *Albion's Triumph*, "where the renowned marital unity of

---

[23]*CPW* 3: 419.

[24]*CPW* 3: 420.

the king and queen is symbolised by the 'twin, the Mary-Charles.'"[25] The marriage of Charles and Henrietta Maria was of important significance in court masques and, more broadly speaking, Caroline court culture. This blissful union, following the assassination of Buckingham, was meant to symbolise the supposed harmonious union between the king and his kingdoms. Enacted as it was within the court's platonic code, this removed any taint of sexual impropriety and raised the union of the husbandly king and wifely realm to a transcendent level. These notions are implicated in the wider moral reform instigated by Charles, in contrast to the debauchery of the Jacobean court.[26] With her usual touch of xenophobia, Lucy Hutchinson saw James I's court as "a nursery of lust and intemperance. He had brought in with him a company of hunger-starved poor Scots who, coming into this plentiful kingdom, surfeited with riot and debaucheries and got all the riches of the land only to cast away."[27] But even she noted the change in the moral climate of the court on the ascension of Charles:

> The face of the court was much changed in the change of the king, for King Charles was temperate and chaste and serious, so that the fools and bawds, mimics and catamites of the former court grew out of fashion, and the nobility and courtiers, who did not quite abandon their debaucheries, had yet the reverence to the King to retire into corners to practise them.[28]

---

[25]Douglas Brooks-Davies, ed., *Robert Herrick* 94.

[26]On the changes of the moral atmosphere at the Caroline court, see, for example, Sharpe 147-73; Neil Cuddy, "Reinventing a Monarchy: the Changing Structure and Political Function of the Stuart Court, 1603-88," in *The Stuart Courts*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Thrupp: Sutton Publishing Ltd., 2000) 59-85.

[27]Hutchinson 62.

[28]Hutchinson 67.

While the supposed sexual vices of aristocrats and courtiers did not entirely disappear, but were only practised out of sight, Charles's moral character is upheld.

Charles I "set a personal example of order, comeliness and sobriety at court, so in turn, the court, reflecting his virtues, would become the model for the country."[29] Indeed,

> Charles excluded the openly scandalous from his court, and his personal morality reflected a respectful and monogamous regard for his wife, Henrietta Maria, which found expression in the encouragement of a cult of idealized Platonic love and in the celebration of their reign as an equal partnership.[30]

All aspects of culture--literature, painting, architecture, etc.--were to reflect the courtly virtues centered on the monarch's marriage. This took an idealized, platonic form, and though the platonic forms of courtly self-representation favoured by Charles and Henrietta Maria were hegemonic, they were not without critique, even from within the court circle.[31] These critiques generally took one of two forms. First, Puritan criticism of court entertainments made use of the long traditions of anti-theatricality and anti-Catholicism. Platonic conventions were seen as simply covering for immoral behaviour at court: "Moralists and Puritans assumed that such practices must lead to sexual intrigue, but their attacks may often have been motivated as much by religious as moral interest."[32] Erica Veevers points specifically to

---

[29]Sharpe 171.

[30]Corns, "Thomas Carew, Sir John Suckling, and Richard Lovelace," *The Cambridge Companion to English Poetry: Donne to Marvell*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997) 203.

[31]On the French origins of the Platonic fashions of courtly entertainments see, Erica Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989) passim.

[32]Veevers 90.

Prynne's suspicions that women were using these immoral arts "to seduce men to an 'immoral' religion."[33] It was not a very large step from this stance to arguing that the platonic idealization of women was idolatrous and marked the reemergence of a Catholic cult of the Virgin Mary at court.

The second form of criticism involves the libertine deflation of platonic idealism. One of the most interesting Caroline writers in this respect is Sir John Suckling. Later vilified in parliamentary propaganda and seen as a martyr for the cause by Royalists, "Suckling's literary reputation was established by 1638."[34] While even "Sir John Suckling occasionally prostitutes his muse to affect the Platonicks,"[35] his most notable poems are those that deflate those conventions in favour of a libertine ethos, an ethos that would return with the Restoration wits, most notably Rochester. One of the most explicit contrasts of the platonic ethos and the libertine ethos occurs between Thomas Carew and John Suckling in Suckling's "Upon my Lady Carliles walking in Hampton Court garden." In the poem, Carew takes the platonic line in describing Lady Carlile, while Suckling takes the libertine stance. For T.C., Lady Carlile's passing through the garden "the place inspir'd."[36] He claims to have heard "musick when she talk't / [and]...as she walkt / She threw rare perfumes all about" (5-7). For T.C., she is "a Diety" (19), something to be admired at a distance which leads to a

---

[33]Veevers 90.

[34]Thomas Clayton, introduction, *The Works of Sir John Suckling: the Non-Dramatic Works* lxiv. Clayton includes several lampoons directed at Suckling, see pages 201-209.

[35]M. L. Donnelly, "The Rack of Fancy and the Trade of Love: Conventions of *Précieux* and *Libertin* in Amatory Lyrics by Suckling and Carew," *Renaissance Discourses of Desire*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia and London: U of Missouri P, 1993) 117.

[36]Sir John Suckling, "Upon my Lady Carliles walking in Hampton Court garden," *The Works of Sir John Suckling*, 1. All references to Suckling's poetry are from this edition and will occur parenthetically in the text.

contemplation of a transcendent ideal of beauty. J.S. will have none of this; for him, all the attributes ascribed to Lady Carlile by T.C. take "their birth from" T.C. (13). J.S. links T.C.'s idealisation of Lady Carlile to literary conventions--"I had my Thoughts, but not your way, / All are not born (Sir) to the Bay; / Alas! *Tom*, I am flesh and blood" (22-4). J.S. argues that his response is the more natural reaction to beauty. In contrast to T.C.'s reaction to Lady Carlile which attempts to transcend the carnal through the higher ideals of a courtly fashion of platonic love, whereby love and beauty are to have an affect on the soul and not the body, J.S. undresses Lady Carlile with his eyes:

> I was undoing all she wore,
>
> And had she walkt but one turn more,
>
> *Eve* in her first state had not been
>
> More naked, or more plainly seen. (28-31)

J.S.'s allusion to Eve is implicated in the poem's title which provides us with the setting--a garden. In the poem's post-lapsarian context, however, the "danger" that T.C. identifies in J.S.'s carnal interest in Lady Carlile only inspires lust:

> But had'st thou view'd her legg and thigh,
>
> And upon that discovery
>
> Search't after parts that are more dear,
>
> (As Fancy seldom stops so near)
>
> No time or age had ever seen
>
> So lost a thing as thou hadst been. (34-9)

J.S. cannot gaze upon Lady Carlile's nakedness innocently as Adam had on Eve in Eden. For

the pre-lapsarian Adam, such contemplation leads to God, as Raphael points out:

> What higher in her society thou findst
>
> Attractive, human, rational, love still;
>
> In loving thou dost well, in passion not,
>
> Wherein true love consists not; love refines
>
> The thoughts, and heart enlarges, hath his seat
>
> In reason, and is judicious, is the scale
>
> By which to heavenly love thou mayst ascend,
>
> Not sunk in carnal pleasure, for which cause
>
> Among the beasts no mate for thee was found.[37]

The post-lapsarian separation of "flesh and blood" and reason and will makes this platonic climb toward divine love difficult. The courtly code of love attempts to recapture this possibility. Yet, J.S. sees this as a very conscious set of conventions and implies that it is all an elaborate facade which attempts to cover carnal desire. And T.C.'s mask does, indeed, slip at one point during the debate when he admonishes J.S. as,

> Dull and insensible, could'st see
>
> A thing so near a Diety
>
> Move up and down, and feel no change? (18-20)

The "up and down" movement suddenly, but very briefly, adds a sexual dimension to T.C.'s idealisation of Lady Carlile.

Suckling's contrast of the platonic ethos and the libertine ethos in "Upon my Lady

---

[37]*Paradise Lost* 8: 586-94.

Carlile" presents the reader with a debunking of T.C.'s idealism through J.S.'s revealing of the social conventions of courtly love. This takes perhaps its most poignant form in Suckling's lyric "Loving and Beloved," where "we false fire with art sometimes discover, / And the true fire with the same art do cover" (11-12). The speaker here is tortured by the choice between Love and Honour. M. L. Donnelly argues, quite rightly, that the poem demonstrates "a worldliness that, while demonstrating mastery of the rules of the game, also sees through the social masque and masks and asserts a knowledge of the way things truly are."[38] The lover's need to dissemble his true feelings takes a startling political turn, once again demonstrating an early modern association of sex and politics: "For Kings and Lovers are alike in this / That their chief art in reigne dissembling is" (5-6). This recognition of the arts of love and politics allows the speaker to strip away the social artifice of court conventions, a process which frequently occurs throughout Suckling's poetry. The libertine ethos that the speaker represents,

> refuses the homage of respect to all received ideas and conventional verities, social and political as well as religious.... The gesture is that of a man speaking among men, aware of a shared knowledge of the world that excuses calling a spade a spade.[39]

The speaker's recognition of the dissembling of kings and lovers reveals the artifice of court conventions and reduces the transcendent ideal to its underlying carnal level. In both the world of courtship and politics, self-interest and the satisfaction of appetite reign. As

---

[38]Donnelly 112-13.

[39]Donnelly 113.

Donnelly points out, Suckling's libertine stance,

> sweeps away all posturing, convention, and social constructs in favor of an implicit appeal to "nature." That complex word with all its attendant associations in classical and modern thought usually comes down, for Suckling, to the libertine meaning of self-gratification, the fulfillment of natural appetite.[40]

We see in Suckling's work, then, a challenge from within of the courtly ethos of Platonic love which, to a certain extent, is supportive of parliamentary critiques of court debauchery. Suckling's most clever deflation of that ethos occurs in a short lyric on Thomas Carew--"Upon T. C. having the P." which "smartly associates this Caroline celebrant of married eroticism and Platonic love with a sexually communicated disease in a way which may well carry a critical or reductive force."[41] Suckling's verse clearly lays the groundwork for the best of the Restoration wits, John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester. Corns succinctly sums up what Suckling bequethed his poetic successor:

> His [Suckling's] poetic reputation was advanced by his sensational political manoeuvres of the early 1640s and by his status as royalist martyr. Further, his clearest contributions to the English literary tradition, which rest in the production of a strong and rather loutishly masculinist self-image and in the development of a robust conversationalist poetic mode, while they recommended his work to contemporary readers and to the consciously rakish

---

[40]Donnelly 117.

[41]Corns, "Thomas Carew" 212.

> style of the court of Charles II, seem often charmless now.[42]

Suckling's libertine stance shares many of the problems faced by the libertines in Rochester's work:

> The trouble with this stance is, in pretending to see through the accepted conventions of life and art that blind one's fellows with illusion, in its insistence on being unillusioned, it must perforce be *dis*illusioned. The extreme reach of Suckling's skeptical stance discovers either that there is *really* nothing there at all beneath the manners and fancy dress, or that whatever there is to be found of an unadulterated "nature" beneath art and convention is nothing that can finally satisfy human need. Further complicating Suckling's situation is the fact that his own superior status and reputation are themselves to a certain extent built on conventional and social distinctions, which, however, he and his coterie might insist were, in fact, "natural."[43]

Unlike Rochester, however, Suckling never directly criticises or satirises his king. Donnelly argues that this is due to the fact that "the virtuous image of his king afforded him no immediate concrete ground for the application of theory."[44]

The application of theory did, indeed, occur during the Restoration, and I want now to turn to a comparison of the values that Milton voices in his writings with the values espoused in Rochester's poetry. In so doing, I will continue to focus on the negotiation of cultural

---

[42]Corns, "Thomas Carew" 211.

[43]Donnelly 110.

[44]Donnelly 113.

boundaries through sexual / political analogies. Sexuality remains an important key to political life in the Restoration. Steven Zwicker writes, "It may not be a novel observation that the body politic took on an explicitly sexual life after 1660, but the power of this topic, the danger and vulnerability of its terms, the force of its polemical meaning have not been fully charted."[45] Yet, as I will argue, the sexual nature of the Restoration body politic is a marked continuity through the royalist family analogy and the years of the Commonwealth. The king's sexuality, often seen in terms of excess, is key in regards to the possibility of mobility and constraint. For the revolutionary regime, even though it cut off the king's head, the sexuality of the monarch's body still, paradoxically, remained as the guarantor of the regime's existence as well as the premise for its collapse. For those of the Restoration court, Charles II's sexuality was caught up in the continuance of their own social status: for both republicans and aristocrats, the king's sexuality was an incitement to discourse.

The moral climate of Charles II's reign stood in marked contrast to his father's, much as Charles I's moral reformation differed from the court of James I. Throughout his exile, parliamentary propaganda publicised Charles II's supposed sexual adventures: "the gloating blast of Cromwellian propaganda credited the English 'Tarquin' with the rape of every virtuous matron and the seduction of every helpless virgin within the arrondissements."[46] Even at his coronation, George Morley, Bishop of Worcester's sermon revealed "that Charles's laziness and sexual indiscretions were already arousing the disapproval of many

---

[45]*Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649-1689* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993) 86.

[46]Kenyon 104.

people in and close to the Court within the first year of his restoration."[47] Charles II's coronation reproduced "the order and content of Charles I's coronation,"[48] but, importantly, made use of public festivities which Charles I had cancelled,

> and thereby caused disappointment and resentment among the people who felt they had been cheated of the opportunity to look at, and celebrate with, their king. Charles II made sure he did not repeat his father's mistakes. He was also astute enough to understand that these aspects of the coronation, particularly the procession, gave him the opportunity to display himself directly to his subjects without any interference from the Church regarding the form and content of his presentation.[49]

These changes highlight the importance of the political legitimacy of representation. As Jürgen Habermas writes, courtly "publicity" is not "a sphere of political communication...it indicated social status." The aristocracy gradually lost its "power to represent" and its public character." Aristocratic "Representation was still dependent on the presence of people before whom it was displayed."[50] In contrast to more democratic ideals of political representation, aristocratic publicness demonstrated the natural and divine right of the ruling class and legitimized its status. In the seventeenth century, access and proximity to the monarch was still key in gaining political influence. During Charles I's reign, "the renewed emphasis on

---

[47]Lorraine Madway, "'The Most Conspicuous Solemnity': the Coronation of Charles II," *The Stuart Courts*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Thrupp: Sutton Publishing Ltd., 2000) 146.

[48]Madway 145.

[49]Madway 148.

[50]*The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989) 8-10.

formality, distance and privacy limited access to the king to a select few. James I's easy familiarity was succeeded by Charles I's near obsession with privacy."[51] A shift occured again with the Restoration, as the public festivities occuring at Charles II's coronation implied a greater accessibility and attempted to take advantage of the power of display. However,

> In the abbey Charles encouraged and played on the nation's traditional expectations of kingship only to undermine them afterwards by his tolerationist policies and notorious sexual behaviour. Too often he gave his subjects occasions to feel that his presentation of kingship was not a show of majesty but a spectacle of mockery.[52]

On the eve of the Restoration, Milton, as he had in his attacks on the court of Charles I, clearly continued to see artistocratic publicity as a form of political mockery. *The Readie and Easie Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth* appeared in a second edition less than one month before Charles II's entry into London. While echoing many of Milton's earlier criticisms of monarchy, *The Readie and Easie Way* establishes an interesting dichotomy in terms of these two forms of government in order to point out the political and moral shortcomings of monarchy that would result with Charles II's restoration. When discussing his concept of the free commonwealth, Milton rhetorically asks which government comes closer to the ideals of Christ,

> wherin they who are greatest, are perpetual servants and drudges to the public at thir own cost and charges, neglect thir own affairs; yet are not elevated

---

[51]Sharpe 160.

[52]Madway 154.

above thir brethren; live soberly in thir families, walk the streets as other men, may be spoken to freely, familiarly, friendly, without adoration. Wheras a king must be ador'd like a Demigod, with a dissolute and haughtie court about him, of vast expence and luxurie, masks and revels, to the debaushing of our prime gentry both male and female; not in thir passetimes only, but in earnest, by the loos imploiments of court service, which will be then thought honorable.[53]

Milton clearly establishes the distinctions he sees between a free commonwealth and a monarchy, yet both forms of government remain homosocial bondings which reaffirm a gender ideology based on sexual difference. The commonwealth is comprised of "brethren." As in the debate on relationships in the divorce tracts, these men are friends: equal, free, and familiar because they share interests and privileges as males. Men and women exist as "families"--the conjugal society as a model of political society, and the only term within Milton's commonwealth that recognizes women and gives them a legitimate status in the commonwealth. The bonding of the courtly world is one of "loose employments of court service" and debauchery. Milton's image of the court's sexual freedom and expense is central to his anarchic representation of monarchy. Again, he falls back on the family analogy in arguing for the godliness of a commonwealth.

The issue of free circulation in the public sphere is also of note here. This economy is linked to Milton's concerns for the free circulation of ideas embodied as books and is an important aspect of his argument in *Areopogitica*. Milton's form of literary production for the press and for dissemination in a revolutionary public sphere during the years of the

---

[53]*Readie and Easie Way*, 2nd. ed., *CPW* 7: 425.

commonwealth reflects a more democratic ideal of citizenship and the role of political debate. Investing this cultural capital in the political economy is evident, particularly, throughout Milton's prose works. This view of texts stands in marked contrast to the coterie literary production of the court and the display of status in Rochester's poetry: "Witness heroic scars--Look here, ne'er go! / Cerecloths and ulcers from the top to toe!"[54] Rochester's is a mock heroic display of status, a representation of the aristocratic ethos to a courtly coterie audience. As so often in Rochester, heroic action and social status are no longer martial but linked to sexual conquest. Yet, even though his work emerges from within the court, it, like Suckling's, affirms anti-court accusations of debauchery and economic superfluity:

> In a society in which every outward manifestation of a person has special significance, expenditure on prestige and display is for the upper classes a necessity which they cannot avoid. They are an indispensable instrument in maintaining their social position, especially when...all members of the society are involved in a ceaseless struggle for status and prestige.[55]

While for the speaker of Rochester's "To the Post-Boy" the display of his pox scars confirms his courtly status, the more common means were clothing, residences, carriages, etc. This took an interesting turn in the sexual climate of the Restoration as courtiers jockeyed for favour:

> The mistresses' prominence at court balls and other formal occasions, their attendance at routine events such as riding in the park and going to the theatre, the entertainments they put on for the Court, and their show of wealth in such

---

[54]"To the Postboy," *The Works of the Earl of Rochester*, ed. David M. Vieth (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1968) 7-8.

[55]Norbert Elias, *The Court Society*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983) 63.

> items as jewels and coaches, were all carefully watched by the courtiers as possible signs of the King's favour.[56]

Attempts to fashion and legitimize political authority were negotiated against the excesses of the court. As I suggested earlier, charges of sexual depravity are meant to imply that, whoever they are aimed at, is begetting an illegitimate form of government, and, during the Restoration, the king's sexuality becomes increasingly problematic in this respect. Zwicker writes,

> the public themes of those first months argued the Restoration as a return of the person of the King and the office of kingship, and these were coupled with broader renewal.... At its center were lineage and political continuity; from the promise of the royal line issued a series of topics that bound sexual fertility to those very qualities which the King had pronounced on his return home: liberality, generosity, and forgiveness.[57]

The sexuality of the privileged royal, masculine subject is constraining and enabling in political terms--acting as a foil, in terms of debauchery, for Milton, while for Rochester, the royal body becomes, increasingly, in terms of the developing succession crisis, the problematic guarantor of status. England had not faced such problems since the reign of Elizabeth I: James I was welcomed by many with the implied political stability and continuity of his and Anne's brood of children, and Charles I and Henrietta Maria's fruitful marriage was celebrated with similar sentiments. Charles II's inability to produce a legitimate

---

[56]Sonya Wynne, "The Mistresses of Charles II and Restoration Court Politics," *The Stuart Courts*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Thrupp: Sutton Publishing Ltd., 2000) 172.

[57]Zwicker 87, 89.

heir reveals the "intersection of sexual and political anxieties" in Restoration society.[58] Anti-Catholicism would again play a role in attacks on the court: fears of James's succession, papist officers in the army, the possibility of Irish troops being brought into England, all of which would only be resolved with the Glorious Revolution and the Battle of the Boyne. It is, of course, important to remember that both the revolutionary regime and the court were unable to ensure this political continuity for several decades following the execution of Charles I. Gradually, Charles II becomes not a guarantor of national triumph and political continuity, but, rather, in his sexual failings, the very problem of Restoration society.

For Milton, submitting to the unbridled will of the monarch remains the central political problem, the excesses against which he continues to attempt to construct a masculine, republican identity:

> It may be well wonderd that any Nation styling themselves free, can suffer any man to pretend hereditarie right over them as thir Lord; when as by acknowledging that right, they conclude themselves his servants and his vassals, and so renounce thir own freedom.[59]

Monarchy for Milton is not a willing submission to a loving relationship between king and subjects; it is tyranny. For Rochester, the critique of the monarch's political / sexual excesses occurs in far more explicit terms:

> Peace is his aim, his gentleness is such,
>
> And love he loves, for he loves fucking much.

---

[58]Harold Weber, "'Drudging in Fair Aurelia's Womb': Constructing Homosexual Economies in Rochester's Poetry," *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 33.2 (1992): 109.

[59]*The Readie and Easie Way*, 2nd ed., *CPW* 7: 427-8.

> Nor are his high desires above his strength:
>
> His scepter and his prick are of a length,
>
> And she may sway the one who plays with th' other.[60]

This is, of course, the charge of uxoriousness and effeminacy which was so often levelled against Charles I. The difference here, however, is that Charles I was represented as giving in to the evil influences of his Catholic queen; in Charles II's case, his political prerogatives are usurped by any of the many women who played with his prick. Warren Chernaik argues that Rochester's poetry is a scathing indictment of the institution of monarchy, and so it is:

> The blind battering ram of the penis, ruled by the animal instinct of self-gratification, is equivalent to the insatiable demands of royal power, claiming sovereign sway over private property, freedom of conscience, law, public safety, even life itself. What should restrain this mindless, voracious power--rationality, tradition, law, the public interest--has failed to do so.[61]

Yet, Rochester's social status remains intimately tied to this problematic aristocratic grouping. Chernaik states that Rochester is unable to arrive at a suitable alternative.[62] Rochester's social position, however, is not freely chosen. The aristocratic ethos "grows out of the structure and activity of court society, and is at the same time a precondition for the continuance of this activity."[63]

By focussing on the king's sexuality, both Milton and Rochester call into question

---

[60]"A Satyr on Charles II" 8-12.

[61]*Sexual Freedom in Restoration Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995) 60.

[62]Chernaik 72.

what had been a distinction of the ruling class, the displacement of sexual licence onto the lower classes, as an attribute of aristocratic status: "Rochester is committing a desecration of an image of purity--the purity both of sublimated desire and of honourable social distinction."[64] The moral climate of the Restoration does not allow for the deployment of the platonic code so central to Caroline court culture. In this distinctly post-lapsarian world, heterosexuality and masculinity are called into question and this carries political ramifications. While Milton attempts to distance himself from these problems by locating the "helpmeet" in the domestic sphere of a monogamous union, sex spills out everywhere in Rochester's poetry--it cannot be contained. If we recall Habermas, Rochester's speakers display their status by displaying their sexual conquests; although, often, the speaker's male, aristocratic body fails to function and calls into question the legitimacy of aristocratic representation and political power. But the aristocratic male body remains the guarantor of gender and status, even within the public areas, such as St. James's Park and Tunbridge Wells, that these men enter into from their closed coterie sphere of the court: "When I, who still take care to see / Drunkenness relieved by lechery, / Went out into St. James's Park / To cool my head and fire my heart."[65] Genders and social classes mix in St. James's Park:

> And nightly now beneath their shade
> Are buggeries, rapes, and incests made.
>
> Unto this all-sin-sheltering grove

---

[63]Elias 53.

[64]Robert Holton, "Sexuality and Social Hierarchy in Sidney and Rochester," *Mosaic* 24.1 (1991): 58.

[65]Rochester, "A Ramble in St. James's Park" 5-8.

Whores of the bulk and the alcove,

Great ladies, chambermaids, and drudges,

The ragpicker, and heiress trudges.

Carmen, divines, great lords, and tailors,

Prentices, pimps, poets, and jailers,

Footmen, fine fops do here arrive,

And here promiscuously they swive.[66]

Chernaik argues that "Heterosexual love is seen, with aristocratic scorn, as the province of 'the Rabble,' as exhausting and unproductive drudgery."[67] Paradoxically, however, it remains essential to the libertine's social status. Rochester's predecessor, Suckling, came to a similar conclusion. In "Against Fruition [I]," the speaker tells the "fond youth,"

Urge not 'tis necessary, alas! we know

The homeliest thing which mankind does is so;

The World is of a vast extent we see,

And must be peopled; Children then must be;

So must bread too; but since there are enough

Born to the drudgery, what need we plough?

Women enjoy'd (what s'ere before th'ave been)

Are like Romances read, or sights once seen:

Fruition's dull, and spoils the Play much more

---

[66]Rochester, "A Ramble in St. James's Park" 23-32.

[67]Chernaik 65.

> Than if one read or knew the plot before.[68]

For the speaker of this poem,

> Sex is much overrated.... [T]he old sexual metaphor of ploughing receives an additional charge from the 'scorn for the laborer' that Suckling implies. The reduction in effect offers a critique of the court's cult of love, and it accords with the self-image of the young, rich tough which Suckling assiduously projects.[69]

Both Suckling and Rochester destroy the distinction of sexual licence that had traditionally been a marker of aristocratic social status. In addition, this claim on the part of both writers results in an ironic understanding of the sexual element of political status. Elias states that the mechanisms that perpetuated court society take on their "own ghostly existence like an economy uncoupled from its purpose of providing the means of life."[70] While sex may be seen as drudgery, one must still go through the motions. Power is a space of simulation and this puts an end to meaning "because it is simulacrum and because it undergoes a metamorphosis into signs and is invented on the basis of signs. (This is why *parody*, the reversal of signs or their hyperextension, can touch power more deeply than any force relation)."[71] Whether it relies on a platonic or libertine code, power is an empty form. "In Rochester," writes Stephen Clark, "...there is not a failed attempt to 'transform the penis into the phallus,' but often a strikingly literal dramatization of the reverse process: what is sought

---

[68]Suckling 13-22.

[69]Corns, "Thomas Carew" 213.

[70]Elias 86.

is not power, but powerlessness."[72]

The gender issues raised, then, remain a point of contention amongst critics of Rochester's work. In terms of the equality of gender that some see in such promiscuous swiving, Clark states that "Even celebrations of female sexual desire defines the gender in terms of an innate eroticism rather than an autonomous subjectivity."[73] For Clark, the aristocratic male remains the privileged subject. "The Imperfect Enjoyment," perhaps, encapsulates Clark's point best: the speaker's penis, "Stiffly resolved, 'twould carelessly invade / Woman or man, nor ought its fury stayed: / Where'er it pierced, a cunt it found or made."[74] Fully functioning, the privileged male subject feminizes what it penetrates. Disabled sexually, however, the libertine is now disabled politically:

> When vice, disease, and scandal lead the way,
>
> With what officious haste dost thou obey!
>
> Like a rude, roaring hector in the streets
>
> Who scuffles, cuffs, and justles all he meets,
>
> But if his King or country claim his aid,
>
> The rakehell villain shrinks and hides his head.[75]

While the Debauchee's words of self-abuse become "a more than adequate substitute" for

---

[71]Baudrillard 59.

[72]Clark, "'Something Generous in Mere Lust'?: Rochester and Misogyny," *Reading Rochester*, ed. Edward Burns (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1995) 37.

[73]Clark 24.

[74]Rochester, "The Imperfect Enjoyment" 41-3.

[75]Rochester, "The Imperfect Enjoyment" 52-57.

these failings, the "betrayal by the body" reveals "a truth of the body to be found through its very humiliation."[76] What results, then, is an "obdurate refusal of culturally endorsed mastery;"[77] this carries with it wider political implications. By not producing a legitimate heir, Charles II is, in a sense, also disabled politically and sexually.

While Sarah Wintle generally supports the libertinism of Rochester in terms of its recognition of female sexuality, stating that Rochester's poetry articulates "the problematic implications of a considered female libertinism," she does recognise the limitations of Rochester's views.[78] Discussing "To a Lady," Wintle argues that the poem relies on an "unstable"analogy to excuse unfaithfulness:

> the poem generously gives to the lady the appearance of equal activity, though actually the reality...is mostly on the man's side. But the poem contains rather more than rhetorical trickery. The speaker's unfaithfulness is to the bottle not to a rival mistress, so the joke is to excuse another joke--or is it? Rochester did tell Saville he thought he was better at drinking than womanizing.[79]

In Rochester's poetry, as in Milton's divorce tracts and *Paradise Lost*, the "novelty" of the female poses both sexual and political problems.

But Wintle's citing of Rochester's letters leads us back to the homosocial bond that both ethos rely on. Rochester writes to Saville, "I have seriously considerd one thinge, that of

---

[76]Clark 38-9.

[77]Clark 39.

[78]Wintle, "Libertinism and Sexual Politics," *Spirit of Wit: Reconsiderations of Rochester*, ed. Jeremy Treglown (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982) 165.

[79]Wintle 151.

the three Buisnisses of this Age, Woemen, Polliticks & drinking, the last is the only exercise att wch you & I have nott prouv'd our selves Errant fumblers."[80] Frequently in Rochester's poetry, drinking is linked to a strong bonding in which "women stand in opposition to a superior masculine world of good friends and genuine fellowship."[81] While drinking clearly stirs sexual passion in males that must be relieved, the homosocial bond is superior to a heterosexual relationship which is strictly physical and lacks an intellectual component: "You rival bottle must allow, / I'll suffer rival fop."[82] Women do not rival masculine relationships--they are marginalized as sexual beings by nature, a means to sexual gratification and essential to the libertine's self-identity through conquest. But, while perhaps preferable, they are not particularly essential in terms of lust. At least for some of the speakers in Rochester's poetry, males are just as satisfying:

> Nor shall our love-fits, Chloris, be forgot,
>
> When each the well-looked linkboy strove t'enjoy,
>
> And the best kiss was the deciding lot
>
> Whether the boy fucked you, or I the boy.[83]

Indeed, in one instance, the "type of future joys" is the embrace of "two lovely boys."[84] As Harold Weber argues, this does not demand our modern label of homosexual for some of

---

[80]*The Letters of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*, ed. Jeremy Treglown (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980) 67.

[81]Weber 100.

[82]Rochester, "To a Lady in A Letter" 7-8. In an earlier version of this poem, the lines read "If rival bottle you'll allow / I'll suffer rival fop." This earlier version is a more mutual agreement between the parties than the later "To a Lady in A Letter."

[83]Rochester, "The Disabled Debauchee" 37-40.

[84]Rochester, "Upon his Drinking a Bowl" 17-20.

Rochester's speakers.[85] Such comments often appear for their shock value or as somewhat humorous asides, as in another letter of Rochester's to Saville signed from "a tired bugger who will be, all the rest of his fucking life, your very faithful friend."[86] The libertine, after all, is a violator of social norms.

Both Milton and Rochester treat sex within the Christian tradition as a distinctly post-lapsarian problem resulting from the separation of will and body. This is evident in many of Rochester's poems--the mind gives in to desire but the body fails to function properly, leading to the anger related to sex by some of Rochester's speakers. To forego reason and give in to passion, however, is slavery and carries damaging political consequences. Both writers attack the aristocratic distinction of sublimated sexual desire in their work in order to attack political ideals--Rochester far more graphically and brutally inverts this status attribute than does Milton. Milton's metaphors construct a more clear-cut binary of sexual politics: "For indeed, none can love freedom heartily but good men; the rest love not freedom but licence, which never hath more scope or more indulgence than under tyrants."[87] The usurpation of reason, for Milton, leads to slavery to both the individual will and, politically, to the tyrannical will of the monarch. Rochester, too, recognises that sexual licence is slavery--a frantic search by the male for an orifice. Yet, pre-lapsarian sex described in a far more sedate tone: "Enjoyment waited on desire; / Each member did their wills obey, / Nor could a

---

[85]See Weber's "'Drudging in Fair Aurelia's Womb': Constructing Homosexual Economies in Rochester's Poetry," *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 33.2 (1992): 99-117.

[86]Rochester, *Letters* 26.

[87]*Tenure*, *CPW* 3: 190.

wish set pleasure higher."[88] The frustrations of post-lapsarian sexuality, for both writers, depends on this "wish" to regain paradisal union, to break from slavery, though in a particularly masculine way.

The ready and easy way of sexuality in Milton's paradise is located within a homosocial circuit of reason and liberty. For Rochester, sex remains, albeit ironically, a status attribute within a closed social grouping, one which, as the aristocracy was gradually losing its legitimacy to represent the national interests became increasingly frustrating and ultimately "fatal to my fame," as the speaker of "The Imperfect Enjoyment" so succinctly expresses his sexual failure. Male genitalia become a grotesque joke, as the aristocrats run through the streets in pursuit of Signior Dildo:

> The good Lady Sandys burst into laughter
>
> To see how the ballocks came wobbling after,
>
> And had not their weight retarded the foe,
>
> Indeed 't had gone hard with Signior Dildo.[89]

"[P]rick heraldry" fails.[90] The premise on which the aristocratic male bases his status, in fact, signifies his, and the ruling class's, sexual / political impotence. The power to represent is lost and taken over, in the case of "Signior Dildo," by a sexual surrogate. But, the "good old cause," while realising this, is also lost because of its reliance on defining itself against the excesses of the king's body, its negative guarantor of a political ideal. The cause fails also in its

---

[88]Rochester, "The Fall" 6-8.

[89]"Rochester, "Signior Dildo" 89-92.

[90]"On his Prick," 2. Paddy Lyons attributes this poem to Rochester in his edition of the complete works. Vieth excludes it from his edition as a poor attempt at pornography. Regardless of attribution, the phrase neatly sums up my point in the context of Restoration sexual politics.

inability to control a political symbolism which remained based on the family analogy it shared with royalist political theorists.[91]

Foucault sums up this problem, which he suggests continues to this day:

> At bottom, despite the differences in epochs and objectives, the representation of power has remained under the spell of monarchy. In political thought and analysis, we still have not cut off the head of the king. Hence the importance that the theory of power gives to the problem of right and violence, law and illegality, freedom and will, and especially the state and sovereignty (even if the latter is questioned insofar as it is personified in a collective being and no longer a sovereign individual).[92]

Milton's construction of a public that exists as "a sphere of political communication"[93] is, indeed, suited to a developing patriarchal bourgeois order and a key concept of its hegemonic pursuit to this day, but it, like Rochester's aristocratic concept of political status remains somewhat limited in its sexual / political imagination. Charles I literally lost his head on January 30, 1649, but the sovereign's head remains figuratively attached to the body politic. Though Milton denies the divine right of the monarchy, his concept of a godly commonwealth never escapes the sovereign paternal analogy and its gender implications. As Eve states,

> My author and disposer, what thou bidst

---

[91]See Boehrer 98-9.

[92]*The History of Sexuality* 88-9.

[93]Achinstein, *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader* 65.

Unargued I obey; so God ordains,

God is thy law, thou mine: to know no more

Is woman's happiest knowledge and her praise.[94]

Paradise Lost, in particular, betrays the underlying sexual model of political submission, and it is this which motivates accusations of sexual transgression in polemical attacks on the Irish rebels and the monarchy.

[94]*Paradise Lost* 4. 635-8.

Conclusion

> I offered mercy to the garrison of Treedagh, in sending the Governor a summons before I attempted the taking of it, which being refused brought their evil upon them.[1]

We are not many pages into *Observations* before Milton provides his opinion of the Irish character:

> a disposition not onely sottish but indocible and averse from all Civility and amendment, and what hopes they give for the future, who rejecting the ingenuity of all other Nations to improve and waxe more civill by a civilizing Conquest, though all these many yeares better shown and taught, preferre their own absurd and savage Customes before the most convincing evidence of reason and demonstration: a testimony of their true Barbarisme and obdurate wilfulnesse to be expected no lesse in other matters of greatest moment.[2]

Milton's views of the Irish are shared by many of his contemporaries. The centuries of Irish resistance to English rule is seen as evidence of an inherent barbarism that is unamenable to a colonial, civilizing force. Throughout *Observations* and the other passages in his prose works where he deals with the situation in Ireland, Milton attempts to represent the binary opposition of civility and barbarism as self-evident. There is, however, a problem. The

---

[1]Cromwell to the commanding officer of the Dundalk garrison, Sept. 1649, Abbott 2: 122.

[2]*CPW* 3: 304.

barbaric stereotype deflects any internal critique of the godly, civilizing force. Civility fails not because it is flawed but, rather, because the Irish are. Running up against the barbaric obstacle that Ireland represents, in fact, challenges the underlying values that the term "civility" encompasses. Milton would only turn to face this problem following the defeat of the "Good Old Cause" in his epics and *Samson Agonistes*.

To say that Milton struggled in his writings with the politics of rebellion is not a novel observation. But if we reorientate that issue towards Ireland and contextualize it within the Irish Rebellion, we gain insights into how the Irish Rebellion fundamentally challenged the socio-political order in not only a literal but also in a figurative sense. Both of these factors point to the danger posed in Milton's comment on the hopes for the future and "other matters of greatest moment." First, of course, is the fact of an armed uprising and the potential that large numbers of Irish troops would be brought over from Ireland to fight in England and Scotland. This threat had existed throughout the civil wars and was still a possibility at the time that *Observations* was published. On the figurative level, the Irish Rebellion highlighted and exacerbated the problems of political representation faced in the conflict between parliamentarians and royalists. It also challenged the new commonwealth's attempt to define itself.

This concern is evident in contemporary uses of the gunpowder plot analogy, biblical narratives, and the paternal analogy of sovereignty (in terms of either the monarch or the representative body of parliament). Milton's political ideal, a godly commonwealth, obviously remains patriarchal. He can never escape the paternal analogy that underlies, though in a slightly different guise, his opponents' political thought. The deflection of a

colonial struggle onto godly examples of deliverance such as the discovery of the 1605 and Irish Gunpowder Plots and the events depicted in Judges attempts to raise that struggle to an instance of far greater threat to the fundamental socio-political foundations of England, a chosen nation. These analogies perform an ideological function which colours the interpretation of very real social events in order to unify the individual responses of "true borne" Englishmen to the rebellion.[3] He is able to use the religious, political, and sexual implications of these analogies to discredit the Irish.

Milton entwines the political and religious significance of the Irish Rebellion in a very fascinating way. While an individual's sense of identity in the early modern period would be determined by religion and nationality rather than sexuality, Milton's writings demonstrate how sexual relations are always a repressed factor which emerges from within any variety of religious and political transgressions. This is not entirely surprising as sexual transgression and pollution underpin the social structure of many cultures. In the case of Ireland, the sexual component of the rebellion's threat to religion and politics takes a very particular form. Patriarchal discourse prioritizes the act of begetting. This male ability structures the gender hierarchy and the relationship between a subject and the representative body of the nation, be it a representative institution or the monarch. In turn, gender and politics structure the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised. Charges range from uxoriousness and effeminacy levelled at Charles I to sodomy in the case of the Irish rebels. Anticatholicism, to a certain degree, goes some way to explaining the charge of sodomy, as this links with conventional views of Italy as a den of vice and the speculation in anticlerical satire of what

---

[3]*Observations, CPW* 3: 301.

sexual outlets an unmarried clergy may engage in. However, the charge of sodomy also represents the goals of the Irish rebels as unproductive, contrary to the politicisation of sex through the paternal analogy.

In regards to the religious element of the rebellion, the corporate body of the church, like that of the nation, must be purged. The protestant victims of 1641 come to be seen as martyrs to religious and political ideals, upholders of the true word in the face of papist persecution. Through their suffering, they uphold both their religion and their civility. In the case of the latter, they do not go "native." In terms of their religion, their blood sacrifice begets the impetus which leads to the violent regeneration of the godly commonwealth. The justification of the martyrs of 1641 came with Cromwell's Irish campaign, and so did that of the commonwealth.

There is, in the end, a lingering irony when considering the important influence of Ireland in the context of Milton's political thought. The man who, in his Irish tract, praised Cromwell and Pride's Purge, who saw the Irish as inherently barbaric and fit to be ruled only by "Edicts and Garrison," found himself, as did the nation, increasingly disgruntled with the protectorate and the army. Once the Celtic periphery had been conquered, the threatening antithesis of civility and the godly commonwealth was removed and an evaluative eye could be turned on England. The commonwealth simply did not measure up to expectations. The ideals that it was supposedly upholding in the Irish and Scottish campaigns had disappeared along the way. In the last months before the Restoration and in the years following that event, Milton would increasingly turn inward in search of just what had gone wrong. The political and religious issues that preoccupied Milton and his contemporaries in regards to the Irish

Rebellion highlighted and exacerbated domestic problems. A variety of literary strategies were employed in an attempt to deal with these issues while differentiating the Irish from the English. These attempts, however, were never quite successful. With the defeat of the Irish and the Scottish threat, it became increasingly clear that an equally significant threat resided within the nation and within the individual.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Abbott, Wilbur Cortez, ed. *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell: With an Introduction, Notes, and an Account of His Life by Wilbur Cortez Abbot*. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1939.

An Answer to a Book, Intituled, the Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, or, A Plea for Ladies and Gentlewomen, and all other Maried Women against Divorce. Wherein, Both Sexes are vindicated from all bonadge of Canon Law, and other mistakes whatsoever: And the unfound Principles of the Author are examined and fully confuted by authority of Holy Scripture, the Laws of this Land, and sound Reason. London: 1644.

A Copy of a Letter Concerning the Traiterous Conspiracy of the Rebellious Papists in Ireland: Being a true Relation, written by a Gentleman of good worth, who hath suffered by them much dammage and losse in his estate, and hardly escaped with his life. London: 1641.

An Exact and true Relation of the Late Plots which were contrived and hatched in Ireland. London: 1641.

A Gun-Powder-Plot in IRELAND for the blowing up of the chiefest Church in Dublin, when the Lords and others were at Sermon, on Sunday, *October, 31, 1641. Which Conspiracie was plotted to be done by the Papists and Priests in* Dublin. *With a further Discovery of their bloody intention for the Massacring of the* English *Protestants in* Ireland. *By the*

Information of Thomas Creamor *of* Grayes-Inn *Gentleman, taken before the Mayor of* Chester, November *5. 1641. And Related in a Letter sent from two chiefe Justices in* Ireland *to the Parliament.* London: 1641.

A Late and True Relation from Ireland. London: 1641.

A more exact Relation of the great Victory obtained by the Parliaments Forces in Naisby Field. London: 1645.

A more particular and exact Relation of the Victory [at Naseby]. London: 1645.

A Presse Full of Pamphlets: Wherein, are set Diversity of Prints, containing deformed and misfigured Letters: Composed into Books fraught with Libellous and Scandalous Sentences. London: 1642.

A Relation Touching the present state and condition of Ireland. Collected by a Committee of the house of Commons, out of severall letters, lately come from the Lords Justices of Ireland and others, and Printed by order of the said House. And also the Examination of Hubert Petit, *taken the 19. of February, 1641 by direction of the Lords Justices, and Counsell of* Ireland. London: 1642.

Bible, Authorised Version, 1611. London: nd.

Brown, George. *A Modell of the Fire-workes to be presented in* Lincolnes-Inne *Fields on the 5th of* Novemb. *1647 Before the Lords and Commons of Parliament, and the Militia of* London. London: 1647.

Cambrensis, Giraldus. *The Topography of Ireland, and the History of the Conquest of Ireland. The Historical Works of Giraldus Cambrensis.* Trans. Thomas Forester. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1968.

Charles I (attr. John Gauden). *Eikon Basilike. The portraicture of His Sacred Majestie in his solitudes and sufferings. With a perfect copie of prayers used by His Majesty in the time of his sufferings. Delivered to Doctor Juxon, bishop of London, immediately before his death.* London: 1649. Wing E. 268.

Cleveland, John. *The Character of a London-Diurnall: With Several Selected Poems By the Same Author.* London: 1647.

Davies, Sir John. *A Discovery of the True Causes Why Ireland was Never Entirely Subdued, nor Brought Under Obedience of the Crown of England, Until the Beginning of His Majesty's Happy Reign. Elizabethan Ireland: A Selection of Writings by Elizabethan Writers on Ireland.* Ed. James P. Myers. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1983. 146-184.

Donne, John. *Complete English Poems.* Ed. C. A. Patrides. London: J. M. Dent, 1994.

Emitie, Thomas. *A New Remonstrance from Ireland: Declaring the barberous cruelty and inhumanity of the Irish Rebels against the Protestants there. Also an Exact Discoverie of the manners and behaviour of the Irish Renegadoes here in* England, *with infallible Notes whereby they may be knowne and distinguished, together with the places they usually frequent and many other things remarkable.* London: 1642.

Filmer, Sir Robert. *Patriarcha and Other Writings.* Ed. Johann P. Sommerville. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

French, J. Milton. *The Life Records of John Milton.* 5 vols. Rpt. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers UP, 1949-58. New York: Gordian Press, 1966.

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson, ed. *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-*

1660. 3rd ed. Rpt. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

G. S. *A Briefe Declaration of the Barbarous And inhumane dealings of the Northerne* Irish *Rebels. Written to Excite the* English *Nation. By G. S. Minister of Gods word in Ireland.* London: 1641.

Haward, Lazarus, *A Few Collections for Irelands Souldiers*. London: 1647.

Herrick, Robert. *The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick*. Ed. L. C. Martin. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.

---. *Robert Herrick*. Brooks-Davies, Douglas, ed. London: J. M. Dent, 1996.

Hutchinson, Lucy. *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*. Ed. N. H. Keeble. London: J. M. Dent, 1995.

James VI and I. *King James VI and I: Political Writings*. Ed. Johann P. Sommerville. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Jonson, Ben. *Ben Jonson: the Complete Masques*. Ed. Stephen Orgel. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1969.

Maclure, Miller, ed. *The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534-1642*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1958.

Marvell, Andrew. *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*. Ed. H. M. Margoliouth. 2 vols. 3rd. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Milton, John. *The Complete Prose Works of John Milton*. Ed. Don M. Wolfe, et al. 8 vols. New Haven: Yale UP, 1953-82.

---. *Milton: Complete Shorter Poems*. Ed. John Carey. 2nd ed. London and New York: Longman, 1997.

---. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Alastair Fowler. 2nd ed. London and New York: Longman, 1998.

Moryson, Fynes. *An Itinerary. Elizabethan Ireland: A Selection of Writings by Elizabethan Writers on Ireland.* Ed. James P. Myers, Jr. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1983. 185-240.

Parker, Henry, attr. *The Kings Cabinet Opened: or, Certain Packets of Secret Letters & Papers, Written with the Kings own Hand, and Taken in His Cabinet at Nasby-Field, June 14, 1645. Together with Some Annotations.* London: 1645.

Parker, William Riley, ed. *Milton's Contemporary Reputation.* New York: Haskell House Publishers, Ltd., 1971.

R. C. *A Declaration Sent to the King of France and Spayne, From the Catholiques or Rebells in Ireland: With a manifesto of the Covenant or Oath they have made and taken for the defence of the Catholique League against the Protestants in that Kingdome. Wherein is discovered their treacherous practizes under the pretence of Religion, and their bloody Actions full of Cruelty and Barbarisme. Published in Paris, April the 24. 1642. And translated out of French by R. C. Gent.* London: 1642.

Ralegh, Sir Walter. *The Discoverie of the Large, Rich and Bewtiful Empyre of Guiana.* Ed. Neil L. Whitehead. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1997.

Raymond, Joad, ed. *Making the News: An Anthology of the Newsbooks of Revolutionary England 1641-1660.* Moreton-in-Marsh: Windrush Press, 1993.

Shakespeare, William. *The Poems.* Ed. F. T. Prince. London: Methuen, 1960.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene.* Ed. Thomas P. Roche Jr. and C. Patrick O'Donnell Jr. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1987.

---. *A View of the Present State of Ireland.* Ed. W. L. Renwick. Oxford: Clarendon Press,

1970.

---. *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*. Ed. William A. Oram, et al. New Haven: Yale UP, 1989.

Suckling, Sir John. *The Works of Sir John Suckling: the Non-Dramatic Works*. Ed. Thomas Clayton. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Temple, Sir John. *The Irish Rebellion: or An History of the Beginnings and first Progresse of the Generall Rebellion raised within the Kingdom of Ireland, upon the three and twentieth day of October, in the Year, 1641. Together With the Barbarous Cruelties and Bloody Massacres which ensued thereupon*. London: 1646.

The Coppy of a letter sen [sic.] *from the Earle of* Traquere *in* Ireland *the third of* October *1641. To Old Father* Philips, *heere in* England, *and now prisone* [sic.] *in the* Tower. *Which letter was intercepted, at a certaine time by Sir* Robert Richardson, *kept private but now disclosed. Upon which old Father* Philips *was committed to the* Tower. *With a true relation how the number of Rebels dayly increase in the woods at* Ireland. London: 1641.

The Craft and Cruelty of the Churches Adversaries: a Sermon Preached on Nov. 5, 1642 at St Margaret's in Westminster, before the House of Commons. London: 1642.

The Last Newes from Ireland. Being a Relation of the Hostile and Bloody Proceedings of the Rebels. Related in a letter and dated at Dublin, October 27, 1641. And read in Parliament here, November 5, 1641. London: 1641.

Two Ordinances of Parliament; one commanding no Quarter to any Irishman taken in armes against the Parliament, the other for the better observation of the Monethly Fast.

London: 1644.

Wilmot, John, Second Earl of Rochester. *The Letters of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*. Ed. Jeremy Treglown. Oxford: Blackwell, 1980.

---. *The Works of the Earl of Rochester*. Ed. David M. Vieth. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1968.

Worse and Worse Newes from Ireland Being the Coppy of a Letter read in the House of Parliament 14 Dec. 1641. London: 1641.

Secondary Sources

Achinstein, Sharon. "Milton and King Charles." *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*. Ed. Thomas N. Corns. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 141-61.

---. *Milton and the Revolutionary Reader*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.

Adamson, John. "Strafford's Ghost: the British Context of Viscount Lisle's Lieutenancy of Ireland." *Ireland from Independence to Occupation, 1641-1660*. Ed. Jane H. Ohlmeyer. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 128-59.

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)." *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Trans. Ben Brewster. London: New Left Books, 1971. 121-73.

Armitage, David. "John Milton: Poet Against Empire." *Milton and Republicanism*. Ed. David Armitage, Armand Himy, and Quentin Skinner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 206-25.

Baker, David J. "Off the Map: Charting Uncertainty in Renaissance Ireland." *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660*. Ed. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 76-92.

Barker, Francis. "*Areopagitica*: Subjectivity and the Moment of Censorship." *John Milton*. Ed. Annabel Patterson. Rpt. *The Tremulous Private Body*. New York and London: Longman, 1984. London: Longman, 1992. 65-73.

---. "In the Wars of Truth: Violence, True Knowledge, and Power in Milton and Hobbes." *Literature and the English Civil War*. Ed. Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. 91-109.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulations*. Trans. Paul Foss, Paul Patton, and Philip Beitchman. New York: Semiotext(e), 1983.

Belsey, Catherine. *John Milton: Language, Gender, Power*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988.

Benjamin, Walter. *The Origins of German Tragic Drama*. Trans. John Osborne. London: New Left Books, 1977.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Blum, Abbé. "The Author's Authority: *Areopagitica* and the Labour of Licensing." *Remembering Milton: Essays on the Texts and Traditions*. Ed. Mary Nyquist and Margaret W. Ferguson. New York and London: Methuen, 1988. 74-96.

Boehrer, Bruce. "Elementary Structures of Kingship: Milton, Regicide, and the Family." *Milton Studies* 23 (1987): 97-117.

Bottigheimer, Karl S. "Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Western Enterprise, 1536-1660." *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and*

America, 1480-1650. Ed. K. R. Andrews, N. P. Canny, and P. E. H. Hair. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1978. 45-65.

Brady, Ciaran. "Spenser's Irish Crisis: Humanism and Experience in the 1590s." *Past and Present* 111: 17-49.

Bray, Alan. *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*. 2nd ed. London: Gay Men's Press, 1988.

---. "Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship in Elizabethan England" *Queering the Renaissance*. Ed. Jonathan Goldberg. Durham and London: Duke UP, 1994. 40-61.

Breitenberg, Mark. *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Brown, Paul. "'This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine': *The Tempest* and the Discourse of Colonialism." *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Ed Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. 2nd ed. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994. 48-71.

Burger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Trans. Michael Shaw. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984.

Cable, Lana. *Carnal Rhetoric: Iconoclasm and the Poetics of Desire*. Durham and London: Duke UP, 1995.

Campbell, Gordon. "The Life Records." *A Companion to Milton*. Ed. Thomas N. Corns. Oxford: Blackwell, forthcoming.

Canny, Nicholas. *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World 1560-1800*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1988.

Carlin, Norah. "Extreme or Mainstream?: the English Independents and the Cromwellian Reconquest of Ireland." *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict,*

1534-1660. Ed. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 209-26.

Carlton, Charles. *Going to the Wars: the Experience of the British Civil Wars, 1638-1651*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

Chernaik, Warren. *Sexual Freedom in Restoration Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.

Clark, Stephen. "'Something Generous in Mere Lust?: Rochester and Misogyny." *Reading Rochester*. Ed. Edward Burns. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1995. 21-41.

Corns, Thomas N. "Milton's *Observations Upon the Articles of Peace*: Ireland Under English Eyes." *Politics, Poetics, and Hermeneutics in Milton's Prose*. Ed. David Loewenstein and James Grantham Turner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. 123-34.

---. "Milton and the Characteristics of a Free Commonwealth." *Milton and Republicanism*. Ed. David Armitage, Armand Himy, and Quentin Skinner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 25-42.

---. "Thomas Carew, Sir John Suckling, and Richard Lovelace." *The Cambridge Companion to English Poetry: Donne to Marvell*. Ed. Thomas N. Corns. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. 200-20.

---. *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640-1660*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Coughlan, Patricia. "'Cheap and Common Animals': the English Anatomy of Ireland in the Seventeenth Century." *Literature and the English Civil War*. Ed. Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. 205-23.

Cuddy, Neil. "Reinventing a Monarchy: the Changing Structure and Political Function of the Stuart Court, 1603-88." *The Stuart Courts*. Ed. Eveline Cruickshanks. Thrupp: Sutton Publishing Ltd., 2000. 59-85.

Daems, Jim. "Dividing Conjunctions: Milton's *Observations Upon the Articles of Peace*." *Milton Quarterly* 33:2 (1999): 51-5.

---, and Carl Lynden Peters. "King Arthur and Ireland: the Discursive Landscape of Edmund Spenser's *A View* and *The Faerie Queene*." *Foundational Narratives: Proceedings from the Foundational Narratives Interdisciplinary Graduate Student Conference, Simon Fraser University, February 1998*. Ed. Sharon-Ruth Alker and Stephen Collis. Burnaby, B. C.: SFSS Printers, 1999. 116-23.

Digangi, Mario. *The Homoerotics of Early Modern Drama*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Donnelly, M. L. "The Rack of Fancy and the Trade of Love: Conventions of *Précieux* and *Libertin* in Amatory Lyrics by Suckling and Carew." *Renaissance Discourses of Desire*. Ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia and London: U of Missouri P, 1993. 107-29.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: an Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.

Dzelzainis, Martin. "'Incindiaries of the State': Charles I and Tyranny." *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*. Ed. Thomas N. Corns. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 74-95.

Eagleton, Terry. "The God that Failed." *Re-membering Milton: Essays on the Texts and*

Traditions. Ed. Mary Nyquist and Margaret W. Ferguson. New York and London: Methuen, 1988. 345-49.

Elias, Norbert. *The Court Society*. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.

Evans, J. Martin. *Milton's Imperial Epic: Paradise Lost and the Discourse of Colonialism*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996.

Faderman, Lillian. *Surpassing the Love of Men: Friendship and Love Between Women from the Renaissance to the Present*. London: Women's Press Ltd., 1991.

Fish, Stanley. "Wanting a Supplement: the Question of Interpretation in Milton's Early Prose." *Politics, Poetics, and Hermeneutics in Milton's Prose*. Ed. David Loewenstein and James Grantham Turner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. 41-68.

Fogarty, Anne. "The Colonization of Language: Narrative Strategy in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* and *The Faerie Queene*, Book VI." *Spenser and Ireland: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Ed. Patricia Coughlan. Cork: Cork UP, 1989. 75-108.

Foucault, Michel. "Politics and Reason." *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984*. Ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman. Trans. Alan Sheridan, et al. New York: Routledge, 1990. 57-85.

---. *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. 2nd ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

---. *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.

Fraser, Antonia. *The Gunpowder Plot: Terror & Faith in 1605*. London: Orion Publishing Ltd., 1996.

Frazer, Sir James George. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion. Part IV Adonis, Attis, Osiris*. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1936.

Gentles, I. J. *The New Model Army in England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1645-1653*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Godzich, Wlad, and Jeffrey Kittay. *The Emergence of Prose: An Essay in Prosaics*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1987.

Goldberg, Jonathan. *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1992.

---. "Sodomy and Society: the Case of Christopher Marlowe." *Staging the Renaissance: Reinterpretations of Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama*. Ed. David Scott Kastan and Peter Stallybrass. New York: Routledge, 1991. 75-82.

Greenblatt, Stephen J. *Marvellous Possessions: the Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991.

---. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1980.

Guibbory, Achsah. "Sexual Politics / Political Sex: Seventeenth-Century Love Poetry." *Renaissance Discourses of Desire*. Ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia and London: U of Missouri P, 1993. 206-22.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Trans. Thomas Burger. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

Hadfield, Andrew. "Briton and Scythian: Tudor Representations of Irish Origins." *Irish*

Historical Studies 28 (1993): 390-408.

---. "Spenser, Ireland, and Sixteenth-Century Political Theory." *Modern Language Review* 89 (1994): 1-18.

---, and Willy Maley. "Introduction: Irish Represenations and English Alternatives." *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660*. Ed. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 1-23.

Hammond, Paul. *Love Between Men in English Literature*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1996.

Hill, Christopher. *Milton and the English Revolution*. London: Faber and Faber, 1977.

---. *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*. 2nd ed. London: Sphere Books, Ltd., 1972.

Holton, Robert. "Sexuality and Social Hierarchy in Sidney and Rochester." *Mosaic* 24/1 (1991): 47-65.

Jameson, Fredric. *Marxism and Form: Twentieth-Century Dialectical Theories of Literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972.

Jed, Stephanie. *Chaste Thinking: the Rape of Lucretia and the Birth of Humanism*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1989.

Kelly, Kathleen Coyne. "Menaced Masculinity and Imperiled Virginity in Malory's *Morte Darthur*." *Menacing Virgins: Representing Virginity in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Ed. Kathleen Coyne Kelly and Marina Leslie. Newark: U of Delaware P; London: Associated UP, 1999. 97-114.

Kelsey, Sean. *Inventing a Republic: the Political Culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649-*

1653. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1997.

Kenyon, J. P. *The Stuarts: A Study in English Kingship*. Glasgow: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., 1982.

---, and Jane H. Ohlmeyer. "The Background to the Civil Wars in the Stuart Kingdoms." *The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland 1638-1660*. Ed. John Kenyon and Jane Ohlmeyer. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998. 3-40.

King, Thomas A. "Displacing Masculinity: Edward Kynaston and the Politics of Effeminacy." *The Image of Manhood in Early Modern Literature: Viewing the Male*. Ed. Andrew P. Williams. Westport, Conn. & London: Greenwood Press Inc., 1999. 119-40.

Knoppers, Laura Lunger. *Historicizing Milton: Spectacle, Power, and Poetry in Restoration England*. Athens, GA and London: U of Georgia P, 1994.

Knott, John R. *Discourses of Martyrdom in English Literature, 1563-1694*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Langer, Lawrence L. *Admitting the Holocaust: Collected Essays*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995.

Lieb, Michael. *Milton and the Culture of Violence*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994.

Lim, Walter S. H. *The Arts of Empire: the Poetics of Colonialism from Ralegh to Milton*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1998.

Loewenstein, David. *Milton and the Drama of History: Historical Vision, Iconoclasm, and the Literary Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

---. "Representing the Irish Revolt: Militant Protestantism and the English Republic." British Milton Seminar 19, Birmingham 1999.

Loewenstein, Joseph. "Echo's Ring: Orpheus and Spenser's Career." *English Literary Renaissance.* 16:2 (1986): 287-302.

Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism-Postcolonialism.* New York: Routlege, 1998.

Madway, Lorraine. "'The Most Conspicuous Solemnity': the Coronation of Charles II." *The Stuart Courts*. Ed. Eveline Cruickshanks. Thrupp: Sutton Publishing Ltd., 2000. 141-157.

Malcolm, Joyce Lee. *Caesar's Due: Loyalty and King Charles, 1642-1646.* London: Royal Historical Society, 1983.

Maley, Willy. "How Milton and Some Contemporaries Read Spenser's *View.*" *Representing Ireland: Literature and the Origins of Conflict, 1534-1660.* Ed. Brendan Bradshaw, Andrew Hadfield, and Willy Maley. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 191-208.

---. *Salvaging Spenser: Colonialism, Culture and Identity.* London: Macmillan Press, Ltd., 1997.

Masson, David. *The Life of John Milton.* 7 vols. London: Macmillan, 1859-94.

Miller, John. *Popery and Politics in England, 1660-1688.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1973.

Morash, Chris. "Literature Memory Atrocity." *Fearful Realities: New Perspectives on the Famine.* Ed. Chris Morash and Richard Hayes. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1996. 110-18.

Morgan, Hiram. "Giraldus Cambrensis and the Tudor Conquest of Ireland." *Political Ideology in Ireland, 1541-1641*. Ed. Hiram Morgan. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999. 22-44.

Morrill, John. *The Nature of the English Revolution.* London and New York: Longman, 1993.

Niditch, Susan. "The 'Sodomite' Theme in Judges 19-20." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44

(1982): 365-78.

Ohlmeyer, Jane H. "The Civil Wars in Ireland." *The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1638-1660.* Ed. John Kenyon and Jane H. Ohlmeyer. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998. 73-102.

Orgel, Stephen and Jonathan Goldberg, ed. *John Milton: A Critical Edition of the Major Works.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991.

Parker, William Riley. *Milton: A Biography.* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Patterson, Annabel. "The Egalitarian Giant: Representations of Justice in History / Literature." *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992): 97-132.

---. "No Mere Amatorious Novel?" *Politics, Poetics, and Hermeneutics in Milton's Prose.* Ed. David Loewenstein and James Grantham Turner. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. 85-102.

Potter, Lois. *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

Quint, David. *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Forms from Virgil to Milton.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993.

Radzinowicz, Mary Ann. "'In Those Days There Was No King in Israel': Milton's Politics and Biblical Narrative." *Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991): 242-52.

Rapaport, Herman. *Milton and the Postmodern.* Lincoln and London: Nebraska UP, 1983.

Raymond, Joad. *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks 1641-1649.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

---. "Popular Representations of Charles I." *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I.*

Ed. Thomas N. Corns. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 47-73.

Revard, Stella. *The War in Heaven: Paradise Lost and the Tradition of Satan's Rebellion.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1980.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism.* New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Schenck, Celeste Marguerite. *Mourning and Panegyric: the Poetics of Pastoral Ceremony.* Pennsylvania State UP, 1988.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire.* New York: Columbia UP, 1985.

Sharpe, Kevin. *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies.* London and New York: Pinter Publishers, 1989.

Shawcross, John. *John Milton: the Self and the World.* Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1993.

Sherman, Sandra. "Printing the Mind: the Economics of Authorship in *Areopagitica.*" *ELH* 60 (1993): 323-47.

Shuger, Deborah. "Irishmen, Aristocrats, and Other White Barbarians." *Renaissance Quarterly* 50 (1997): 494-525.

Slights, William. *Ben Jonson and the Art of Secrecy.* Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1994.

Smith, Nigel. *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1994.

Stevens, Paul, "*Paradise Lost* and the Colonial Imperative," *Milton Studies* 34 (1996): 3-22.

---. "Spenser and Milton on Ireland: Civility, Exclusion, and the Politics of Wisdom." *Ariel* 26 (1995): 151-67.

Stevenson, David. "Cromwell, Scotland and Ireland." *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution.* Ed. John Morrill. London and New York: Longman, 1990. 149-80.

Stone, Ken. "Gender and Homosexuality in Judges 19: Subject-Honour, Object-Shame?" *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 67 (1995): 87-107.

Traub, Valerie. "The (In)Significance of 'Lesbian' Desire in Early Modern England." *Queering the Renaissance*. Ed. Jonathan Goldberg. Durham and London: Duke UP, 1994. 62-83.

Turner, James Grantham. *One Flesh: Paradisal Marriage and Sexual Relations in the Age of Milton*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

Veevers, Erica. *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

Weber, Harold. "'Drudging in Fair Aurelia's Womb': Constructing Homosexual Economies in Rochester's Poetry." *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 33.2 (1992): 99-117.

Wedgwood, C. V. *The King's War, 1641-1647: the Great Rebellion*. London: Collins Fontana, 1970.

Wilson, Scott. *Cultural Materialism: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.

Wintle, Sarah. "Libertinism and Sexual Politics." *Spirit of Wit: Reconsiderations of Rochester*. Ed. Jeremy Treglown. Oxford: Blackwell, 1982. 133-65.

Wiseman, Susan J. *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Wynne, Sonya. "The Mistresses of Charles II and Restoration Court Politics." *The Stuart Courts*. Ed. Eveline Cruickshanks. Thrupp: Sutton Publishing Ltd., 2000. 171-90.

Young, Michael B. *James VI and I and the History of Homosexuality*. London: Macmillan Press, Ltd., 2000.

Zwicker, Steven. *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649-1689*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993.