



Project  
**MUSE**<sup>®</sup>

*Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.*

<http://muse.jhu.edu>

## “PARTIAL TO SOME ONE SIDE”: THE ADVICE-TO-A-PAINTER POEM AS HISTORICAL WRITING

BY NOELLE GALLAGHER

In the preface to *Annus Mirabilis*, John Dryden announces the subject matter of his 1667 long poem as an account of “a most just and necessary War,” followed by a narrative of the great fire. “I have call’d my poem *Historical*, not *Epick*,” he explains, “though both the Actions and Actors are as much Heroick, as any Poem can contain.”<sup>1</sup> Dryden’s decision to subtitle his panegyric “an historical poem” was meant to emphasize the degree to which *Annus Mirabilis* was concerned with the representation of a real, rather than an imagined, past; and while not every historian could endorse Dryden’s “Heroick” depiction of the events, the poem’s preoccupation with historical subject matter was a feature that it shared with many other Restoration satires and panegyrics.

While it’s doubtful that any critic today would take Dryden’s epic pretensions at face value, it seems remarkable that the poem’s declared purpose—its role as historical writing—has so sharply receded from view. We have a vast body of scholarship on *Annus Mirabilis* and other such works, and many critics over the years have noted the wide range of topics that could be addressed by Restoration panegyrics and satires. George deF. Lord has observed that the satirical and eulogistic verses known as “poems on affairs of state,” for instance, could address any aspect of public affairs, “from national issues of the greatest consequence down to trivial incidents of life at court.”<sup>2</sup> More recent scholarship—by Harold Love, Andrew McRae, Abigail Williams, and others—has sharpened the emphasis on public life, fruitfully reading satiric and panegyric works as expressions of Restoration writers’ sociopolitical views.<sup>3</sup> The predominance of historicist criticism in the treatment of such works would itself seem to bestow upon them a certain historical status: not only do we have a clear sense of the Restoration as an “age of satire,” we have a strong sense of the period as historical—as dominated by the events of its history. Indeed, scholars of Restoration literature have often paid particular attention to the period’s wealth of topical satires and panegyrics, using these works as entryways into the culture of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England.

But poems like Dryden's were not just "historical" in the sense of being historical artifacts. They were historical in the sense that they actively contributed to the shaping of historical writing—to history as "a group of overlapping and related genres," to use Mark Salber Phillips's words.<sup>4</sup> Not only did many Restoration satirists and eulogists situate their works within an English historiographical tradition, I would suggest, but many also engaged directly with other varieties of historical literature, simultaneously treating historical phenomena and making historical representation itself a central issue in the portrayal of past persons and events. By applying literary techniques to historical subject matter, satirists and eulogists could transform—sometimes very consciously—the ways in which Restoration writers and readers thought about the past. More specifically, their poems could challenge the strategies and viewpoints of formal historical narrative, representing history with a greater attention to what, in the aftermath of Ian Watt's *Rise of the Novel*, we might describe as the features of "novelistic realism": particularity of time and place, complex individual psychology, an empiricist focus on specific details.<sup>5</sup>

While there is much to say about the role of satiric and panegyric verse in shaping English historiography, it is these works' preoccupation with particular details—their attention to specific aspects of specific phenomena—that will be my ultimate focus here. In the pages that follow, I propose that satire and panegyric existed in tension with formal history, and that this generic friction allowed for the definition of satire and panegyric as "partial" varieties of historical writing. Satirists and eulogists could exploit the features of their chosen genre, I suggest, by challenging the bird's-eye viewpoint typical of formal history and juxtaposing it against an up-close perspective aligned with poetic or painterly styles of representation. For the purposes of clarity, I draw on the particularly self-conscious articulation of historiographical tropes provided by four of the period's most prominent advice-to-a-painter poems: Edmund Waller's *Instructions to a Painter* and Andrew Marvell's *Second Advice to a Painter*, *Third Advice to a Painter*, and *Last Instructions to a Painter*.

#### I. SATIRE AND PANEGYRIC AS FORMS OF HISTORICAL WRITING

While poets like Dryden often sought to justify their works on the basis of claims to historical accuracy, Restoration historians tended to use "satire" and "panegyric" as derogatory terms. For these writers, labelling a text satirical or panegyric offered an expedient means of

denigrating a rival history by demoting it to the status of argumentative prose. James Welwood, for example, boasted in the preface to his *Memoirs of the Most Material Transactions in England* (1700) to have “trac’d the Truth as near as [he] could,” declaring, “I leave Satyr and Panegyrick to others. I envy no man the Art of making Court to the Great by Flattery, and have not Ill Nature enough for Detraction.”<sup>6</sup> Gilbert Burnet similarly critiqued rival historians in the preface to his *Memoirs of the . . . Dukes of Hamilton and Castleherald* (1677), complaining that “most of our late Histories are written either in the style or strain of *Panegyricks* or *Satyrs*, which of all things an Historian that would be believed ought to avoid.”<sup>7</sup> While the accusation was most frequently levelled at contemporary writers, the neoclassical *artes historicae* of the period warned of the ease with which any history could degenerate into a panegyric or satire. René Rapin’s *Instructions for History* (1680), for example, cautioned readers that “there are hardly any Historians, who have not their Inclinations and Avertions . . . and they make Eulogies or Satyrs according to the dispositions of their own Hearts.”<sup>8</sup>

At the same time as critics like Burnet and Rapin attempted to impose rigid hierarchical boundaries between history and the opposed poles of satire and panegyric, their remarks also hinted at the degree of slippage that existed between the three forms. Notwithstanding their lesser status on the hierarchy of genres, satires and panegyrics could share many of the features of history proper. For one thing, both satire and panegyric were, like formal history, traditionally understood as classical genres designed to treat great public persons and important events—a feature that was often emphasized by critics seeking to align satire and panegyric with elevated verse forms like epic or tragedy. John Milton, for example, argued in a 1642 pamphlet that “a Satyr as it was borne out of a Tragedy, so ought to resemble his parentage, to strike high, and adventure dangerously at the most eminent vices among the greatest persons.”<sup>9</sup> Similarly, Richard Blackmore connected satire, tragedy, and epic on the grounds that all three genres aimed at “the Representation of great and illustrious Characters, . . . their Impious, or their Generous Actions, and the different Event that attended them”:

Tragedy design’d to Scare Men, Comedy to Laugh them out of their Vices. And ’tis very plain, that Satyr is intended for the same End, the Promotion of Virtue, and exposing of Vice; which it pursues by sharp Reproaches, vehement and bitter Invectives, or by a Courtly, but not less cutting Raillery.<sup>10</sup>

As Blackmore's remarks suggest, satire and panegyric were often understood as sharing not just history's weighty subject matter, but also its noble didactic goals of promoting virtue and discouraging vice. Indeed, the moral purposes of satire and panegyric were frequently articulated in terms very similar to the neoclassical definitions of history as a "school for virtue," or as "Moral Philosophy, cloathed in Examples."<sup>11</sup> Dryden's *Discourse*, for example, praised satire as "of the nature of Moral Philosophy, as being instructive," and Nahum Tate declared that "The Representing of *Vertue* and *Vice* in their respective *Beauties* and *Deformities*, is the genuine Task of *Poetry*: the true and proper themes of *Panegyrick* and *Satyr*."<sup>12</sup> Invariably, writers and critics would disagree over which texts actually managed to meet these lofty standards, but the depiction of historical figures who could serve as moral exemplars was ostensibly as crucial a goal for the satirist or eulogist as it was for the neoclassical historian.

At the same time as many satires and panegyrics claimed the materials and purposes of history proper, they also diverged from full-length historical narratives in several important ways. For one thing, satires and panegyrics often used controversial or indecorous means to fulfill their didactic or historiographical goals. Unlike history, which sought to inspire ethical behaviour by depicting great men as idealized generic types, satire and panegyric could praise virtue or chastise vice using mockery, flattery, or ridicule.<sup>13</sup> Equally, where history was meant to be written in a disinterested tone, satires and panegyrics were expected both to convey and to evoke a strong emotional response to the past, with the satirist provoking "Hatred, or Laughter, or Indignation," while the panegyrist attempted to make his reader "in Love with Honor."<sup>14</sup> As Rapin's *Instructions for History* explained, "The Orator may break forth into Sallies of Eloquence. . . . The Poet may expatiate out of his subject. . . . But the Historian, who speaks in cold blood, ought ever to be Master of himself, have the command of his thoughts, and not speak any thing but what is judicious."<sup>15</sup> Satirists and panegyrists shared the freedom of the poet and the orator in this regard, enjoying a potentially greater license in their treatment of historical subject matter.

## II. SATIRE, PANEGYRIC, AND PARTIALITY

Perhaps the most important distinction between history and the sister genres was one of perspective or scale. Satires and panegyrics provided an account of the past that was, to borrow Welwood's phrase,

“partial to some one Side”; they openly embraced a political prejudice that would be considered “one of the great Blemishes of History.”<sup>16</sup> Although Restoration histories of course also betrayed biases in practice, neoclassical *artes historicae* invariably advocated strict political neutrality, insisting that the historian’s task lay in the search for the long-term causes of events, and not in the expression of present-day ideological commitments. Guides like Rapin’s *Instructions*, Thomas Hearne’s *Ductor Historicus* (1698), and Pierre Le Moynes’s *Of the Art Both of Writing and Judging of History* (1695) instructed the historian to guard against potential prejudice by maintaining a bird’s eye view that avoided temporal, biographical, or geographic specificity. “Let the Historian possess himself he is of all countries or none,” Le Moynes’s manual, for example, advised; “he is without Father and Mother; without Genealogy or Race. . . . [H]e is of no Party but that of Truth, whatever Livery he wears, or whatever Language he speaks.”<sup>17</sup> The historian’s detached perspective also protected against partial history in a formal sense, as the emphasis on large-scale narrative ensured that he would recount the “whole” event rather than just a part therein. By outlining the “Motives of the [characters’] Actions” and the larger “Circumstances” of the events, Rapin explained, the historian was able to “make a Narration complete.”<sup>18</sup>

Satire and panegyric, by contrast, embraced partiality, not only insofar as they displayed an overt political prejudice, but also in the sense that they were designedly focused on certain parts of the past. And just as the historian’s detachment resulted in a broad or general narrative of events, so the satirist’s or eulogist’s partiality facilitated an emphasis on discrete episodes and particular persons. Dryden’s *Discourse* advocated perhaps the most extreme model for satiric writing in this regard, touting a dramatic-style ideal that stressed singularity of subject, stance, and moral purpose: a satire “ought only to treat of one Subject, to be confin’d to one particular Theme” and to reveal “one main Design,” he explained; the satirist should aim to “give his Reader some one Precept of Moral Virtue; and to caution him against some one particular Vice or Folly.”<sup>19</sup> Charles Gildon defined panegyric as similarly narrow in scope, locating the genre’s moral value in its detailed characterizations: by maintaining a biographical focus, he explained, panegyrics were able to offer concrete examples for emulation, “presenting so exact a portraiture of *Virtue*, that you can’t mistake, or not know it at first sight.”<sup>20</sup> The sense of satire and panegyric as specific forms was also crucial to attacks on the two genres, and many contemporary critics complained of satirists and panegyrists whose

detailed plotlines and characterizations threatened to undercut their work's claims to a generally-applicable moral lesson.<sup>21</sup>

Despite such attacks on their overparticularity many satirists and eulogists exploited their genre's narrow perspective, using the convention of formal partiality as a means of depicting historical phenomena in new and innovative ways. By including only those features or episodes that supported their rhetorical purposes, satirists and eulogists could present an account of the past that was more vividly detailed than the grand narratives provided by history proper. The literary characteristics of satire and panegyric—emotionally-rousing or hyperbolic language, opinionated commentary, vivid or grotesque visual imagery—could be a poet's chief weapons, enabling him to destabilize the idea of a comprehensive or complete historical narrative. The distinction between partial and impartial varieties of historical representation itself became a central conceit in many satirical and panegyric writings—and perhaps nowhere more prominently than in the popular verse subgenre of the advice-to-a-painter poem.

### III. RESTORATION HISTORY PAINTING AND THE ADVICE-TO-A-PAINTER POEM

While the model of the advice-to-a-painter poem could be traced back to various Classical examples, it wasn't until the 1660s that the form gained popularity in England as a vehicle for historical or historiographical commentary.<sup>22</sup> The form reached its zenith in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries: according to bibliographer Mary Tom Osborne, thirty-two painter poems appeared between the Restoration and Glorious Revolution, followed by another seventeen during the reign of William, and another eight under Queen Anne.<sup>23</sup> While most of the painter poems that appeared between 1660 and 1688 were satires, the form was employed for both satirical and panegyric purposes throughout the Restoration and eighteenth century.

As their title suggests, advice-to-a-painter poems invoked an *ut pictura poesis* tradition that aligned poetry with painting.<sup>24</sup> Focusing primarily on recent events and public persons, such works usually took their frame of reference from the style of emblematic representation used by baroque history painters like Antonio Verrio, John Vanderbank, and Peter Lely. Baroque history painting shared both history's grand scale and its didactic goals, presenting large, emblematic depictions of men who could serve as moral exemplars for the elite viewer. The genre included scenes from Biblical or Classical narratives as well as from history proper, with the same aggrandizing style—colorful,

large-scale depictions of muscular heroes and soaring supernatural figures—used to depict both historical and mythic events. When applied to non-mythical figures, the form served a clear panegyric purpose, elevating English monarchs and other public leaders to the status of epic or Biblical archetypes. History painting's lavish, iconographic style made it a natural choice for state-sponsored political propaganda, and, as Edward Copeland has observed, such works were frequently commissioned by Stuart monarchs as adornments for public buildings.<sup>25</sup>

While history paintings were typically executed on a grand scale, they maintained a narrow scope in regards to subject matter. Depicting the triumphs of the past in a single image or series of images necessarily made the communication of narrative a challenge. Accordingly, baroque history painters tended to limit their representation to one or two major figures or scenes, relying on a vocabulary of easily recognizable emblems—personified images of the virtues or other abstract ideas, metonymic symbols like crowns and staves—in order to imply a narrative of past events and convey a work's propagandistic intentions. By substituting an iconic portrait of a particular person or scene for a broader account of the historical process, history painters transformed their human subjects into metonyms, reiterating in visual terms the connection between great men and great events.

The advice-to-a-painter poem took an imagined painting as its subject, using the comparison between pictorial and poetic forms of representation to highlight the tensions between partial and impartial treatments of history. Like the baroque artist, the poet offered an account of past persons and events that was formally, as well as politically, partial. He too was obliged to limit the scale of his representation to a single person or group of persons; and he too used emblematic representation—in this case, literary metonymy—to transform individual figures into symbols of larger historical ideas or processes.

While some of the painter poems were, like their visual counterparts, functionally propagandistic in their political orientation, Restoration poets exercised an advantage over history painters in regards to their potential subject matter. After all, the expense of writing a poem was nothing like the expense of executing a massive ceiling fresco; state sponsorship was not necessary for the dissemination of either eulogistic or satiric depictions of historical persons and events. Accordingly, the poet's process of selection could also be a process of evaluation, as he grappled with the larger historiographical questions of which particular subjects best merited historical representation, and which methods of historical representation best captured the particular subject. Further,



where the painter was obliged to make his choice of subject matter and means of representation manifest only through the final product, the poet had the advantage of incorporating narrative or commentary that directly explicated the relationship between the partial account he offered and the larger implied whole. It was by virtue of these kinds of remarks—passages that demonstrated how and why certain persons or events should be given the symbolic status accorded to epic heroes and battles—that the painter poems were able to offer historiographical as well as historical commentary.

Like many other satiric and panegyric subgenres, advice-to-a-painter poems tended to feature portraits that deliberately emphasized physical over psychological details. This focus on the visual facilitated the incorporation of another level of metonymic expression: the poems' portraits often highlighted a particular body part or feature of an historical figure, using that part as a metonym for the person in much the same way that the person then functioned as a broader metonym for the historical episode as a whole. In establishing these systems of interlocking metonyms, the painter poems not only referenced the system of emblems popular in baroque painting, they also translated historiographical questions of relative value into perspectival questions of relative size. By aligning poetic and painterly representations of history, writers of advice-to-a-painter poems could use visual symbolism to present their own biased views of past events, substituting their partial descriptions for the ostensibly comprehensive narratives characteristic of history proper. Conversely, by distinguishing poetry from painting, advice poets could contrast their use of narrative against the baroque painter's reliance on images, lauding their own ostensibly complete accounts over the partial representations provided by visual art.

#### IV. PARTIAL PAINTERS: WALLER AND MARVELL

The panegyric that marked the commencement of the painter poem's popularity as an historiographical form was Edmund Waller's *Instructions to a Painter* (1665).<sup>26</sup> Written to commemorate the Duke of York's victory at Lowestoft, Waller's poem was modelled on Giovanni Francesco Busenello's *A Prospective of the Naval Triumph of the Venetians*, a work that Waller himself had translated in 1658. Like Busenello's *Prospective*, Waller's panegyric took a naval victory as its subject, using distortions of scale to record the English ascendancy over the Dutch. The poem begins with one such shift in perspective, as Waller's speaker instructs the artist to depict first the sea, then the

British and Dutch fleets upon it, then “the whole world expecting who shall reign” (*I*, 5), and finally, “Heav’n concern’d” in the fate of the battle (*I*, 7). The increasing scale of Waller’s account reflects the importance of the English victory on both a macrocosmic and a microcosmic level, as the centrality of the battle on the human canvas is ultimately complemented by the presence of “an unusual star / [that] Declare[s] th’importance of th’approaching war” (*I*, 8–9).

Waller incorporates similar geographic expansions throughout the poem, improbably extending the influence of the conquest to far-flown earthly locales: “His high command to Afric’s coast extend / And make the Moors before the English bend,” the speaker declares (*I*, 47–48); “Europe and Africa, from either shore, / Spectators are and hear our cannon roar” (*I*, 61–62). The temporal range of the poem likewise expands to encompass both the distant past and the future, as the victory at Lowestoft mimics “the Roman fleets at Actium” as well as divine dominance over the human world (*I*, 114). This isolated episode stands in for English domination as a whole, condensing a propagandistic narrative of development and progress into a discrete emblematic moment. The fate of all the world is reduced to a single battle, while the battle itself is expanded into an event of enormous representative importance.

The same play between representative part and narrative whole also appears in the poem’s portrait of its hero. Waller’s York dominates the poem, the physical embodiment of England’s naval prowess. Just as Lowestoft condenses all English victories into one, so the “royal blood as ancient as the sea” (*I*, 123) running through York’s body connects his veins with “the veins of mighty monarchs” before him (*I*, 125). Because York is the leader and representative of his officers, his moods and actions are reflected in his men: “all / the English youth flock to their Admiral” (*I*, 9–10) and “all appear, where such a prince is by, / Resolv’d to conquer or resolv’d to die” (*I*, 17–18).<sup>27</sup>

York’s representative importance, like that of the battle he emblemizes, is indicated by means of distortions in size, as Waller’s speaker instructs his addressee to commemorate an enormous Duke looming over his comparatively miniscule surroundings:

Make him bestride the ocean and mankind  
Ask his consent to use the sea and wind;  
While his tall ships in the barr’d channel stand,  
He gysps the Indies in his armed hand.

(*I*, 25–28)

Similarly, the speaker later declares that “His fatal hands their bulwarks will o’erthrow / And let in both the ocean and the foe!” (*I*, 281–82).<sup>28</sup> England’s naval dominance, a conventional subject of historical narrative, is neatly encapsulated here in a discrete representative portrait, as James’ “glorious mind” puffs the “proud sails” of the ships (*I*, 20), and his hand, to the frightened Dutch, “seems at ev’ry door to knock” (*I*, 268). The Duke’s body, itself a metonym for the larger victory, is likewise a unified whole split into representative parts: James’ legs bstride the ocean, his hand grasps the Indies. His “great heart” grieves at the deaths of three noblemen (*I*, 146) and he vows to take revenge “with his own arm” (*I*, 173).

English unity is both a formal motif and an interpretive device in Waller’s poem, as the English fleet remain cohesive under James, while the Dutch are quickly divided, “like a num’rous flock / Of fowl which scatter to avoid the shock” (*I*, 37–38). “Some sink, some yield, and flying, some escape” (*I*, 60) as the Dutch fleet is reduced to “fragments of vessels,” and other disparate parts (*I*, 219). “Flags, arms, and Belgian carcasses” are carried at random along the waves (*I*, 220), while “English valor . . . / Led by th’example of victorious York” guides the nation on to victory (*I*, 277–78). The English emerge as both a united and a unifying force, as Waller’s speaker declares, “the divided world in this agree, / Men that fight so deserve to rule the sea” (*I*, 63–64).

The final lines of the *Instructions* return to the opposition between visual and textual forms of historical representation, but register a clever reversal, as Waller’s speaker apologizes to his addressee for having gradually “Forgot thy art and us’d another style” (*I*, 288). In contrast to the poem’s emphatic use of selected visual tableaux, the speaker ends by claiming that he has chosen to narrate rather than illustrate the past, arguing that the painter can only “draw arm’d heroes as they sit,” whereas the versifying historian can represent action: “The task in battle does the Muses fit” (*I*, 289–90). Suddenly endorsing the model of sustained narration that the previous stanzas of his poem have all but ignored, Waller’s speaker concludes that it is the “brave actions” of York (*I*, 293), and not his appearance in battle regalia, that will ultimately secure him a place in history:

Ages to come shall know that leader’s toil  
 And his great name on whom the Muses smile.  
 Their dictates here let thy fam’d pencil trace,  
 And this relation with thy colors grace.  
(*I*, 295–98)

The artist initially exalted by Waller's speaker is now reduced to the role of illustrator, his work serving only as an "ornament" for the more important historical interpretation provided by the "relation" of the narrative.

In many ways, it was Waller's claim to be narrating rather than depicting the battle that provoked such virulent satiric responses to his poem. To politically-opposed writers, Waller's panegyric was more noticeable for what it didn't narrate than for what it did. By focusing solely on the Duke of York, for example, the *Instructions* omitted any mention of inadequate leaders like Henry Brouncker, the gentleman volunteer who had allowed the Dutch to escape by ordering the English fleet to slacken sail at a crucial moment. Similarly, by condensing the entirety of the conflict at Smyrna into a single engagement, Waller avoided depicting the English fleet's disastrous first attack. Perhaps most damning of all, Waller's poem obscured the tactical errors that led to the English fleet's hasty return to port for badly-needed provisions, presenting the retreat instead as a fanciful interlude with "the beauties of the British court" (*I*, 80). Whatever its concluding claims to narrative accuracy, the *Instructions* clearly did substitute representation for narration here, as a sumptuous portrait of "Th'illustrious Duchess and her glorious train" stood in for a whole series of embarrassing tactical blunders (*I*, 81).

The months following the poem's initial appearance accordingly witnessed a flurry of satirical and panegyric responses, many of them taking up the advice-to-a-painter form.<sup>29</sup> Among the most prominent of the resultant poems were three satires probably written by Andrew Marvell: *The Second Advice to a Painter*, *The Third Advice to a Painter* (1666), and *The Last Instructions to a Painter* (1667).<sup>30</sup> As deF. Lord has observed, Marvell's sequence of poems is largely accurate in its historical details, offering "a complete and continuous record of England's part in the Second Dutch War" that "is in the main remarkably faithful to the facts insofar as they can be determined from other sources."<sup>31</sup> It is also clear from the content of the poems that Marvell intended for the three satires to function as a unit: in addition to their temporal continuity and other formal similarities, the opening lines of the *Last Instructions* depict the poems as the three "sittings" requisite for the completion of a portrait, as Marvell's speaker introduces "our Lady State," who, "After two sittings . . . / To end her picture, does the third time wait."<sup>32</sup> Taken together, these three satires counter Waller's hyperbole with litotes and his heroic with the grotesque, depicting the war as a haphazard series of blunders perpetrated by corrupt, incompetent officials.

The first poem in the series begins by turning Waller's concluding claims against him, as Marvell's speaker insists it would be difficult to "design that fight / Which Waller only courage had to write."<sup>33</sup> Renewing the emphasis on visual representation, Marvell's speaker uses the appeal to painterly values to present his own account of the war as more explicit than Waller's. The expanded timeline of the *Second Advice*—it details the space of a year, rather than a single battle—draws attention to both the partiality and the partialness of Waller's text, while Marvell's own selection of representative persons and moments results in an equally-biased satirical account of the period in question. The *Second Advice* mimics the tableau form used in the *Instructions* with a larger cast of characters, producing a series of thematically-related portraits rather than an isolated all-encompassing one. Thus, while it, like the *Instructions*, can be said to present something of a narrative, the structure of that narrative is essentially journalistic: it focuses on noteworthy episodes from the recent past, rather than on the search for long-term historical causes.<sup>34</sup>

The poem's connection to other forms of historical reportage is highlighted by the speaker's explicit claims to be giving an account with comparable or superior accuracy to that of a contemporary gazette. After detailing the cowardice of Lord Sandwich, for example, Marvell's speaker explains that "by the gazetteer he was mistook, / As unconcern'd as if at Hinchinbrooke" (S, 107–08). Likewise, the speaker vouches for the reliability of his evidence by offering to publish a correction of his own poem—presumably similar to a newspaper retraction—if "after stories disagree" with his account (S, 231). Like Waller's *Instructions*, however, the *Second Advice* typically emphasizes detailed portraits over broad-scale narrative, as Marvell's speaker vows to expose the incompetent while commemorating those who were "not well known or not well recompens'd" (S, 224). "What others did let none omitted blame;" the speaker insists, "I shall record, whos'e'er brings in his name" (S, 229–30).

Where the opening lines of Waller's poem enact an expansion of geographic scale, Marvell's offer a collapse, as a depiction of the English fleet narrows to an image of one of its ships, "the flaming *London*," and then to the portrait of a single man on board: Sir William Coventry, secretary to the Duke (S, 13). The rhetorical shift enacted by these opening lines is subsequently reflected in the syntax of the poem's initial portraits, as the narrowing of focus from event to representative individual is echoed by the frequent, and sometimes cryptic, elision of verbs:

Steel to the magnet, Coventry to gold.  
Muscovy sells us hemp and pitch and tar,  
Iron and copper, Sweden; Munster, war;  
Ashley, prize; Warwick, customs; Cart'ret, pay;  
But Coventry sells the whole fleet away.

(S, 36–40)<sup>35</sup>

The conglomerations of nouns in these lines establish subject-predicate relations by means of analogy, creating metonymic associations between the persons involved and the items that they sell.

As in Waller's poem, historical figures are also subject to representation by synecdoche, as the bodies of statesmen and generals are known by means of their characteristic physiological parts. Thus, Prince Rupert, who keeps "state suspended in a chaise-volante," is recognizable only by virtue of the head that emerges from his sedan chair, cloaked in a lion-skin cap that "represent[s] the Hercules within" (S, 93). Just as the arms of Waller's York symbolize English might, so Rupert's disembodied head denotes his position as a hapless head of state. The Prince's feelings and sensations, like York's, find expression in the populace he represents, as Marvell's speaker warns, "Dear shall the Dutch his twinging anguish know, / And feel what valor whet with pain can do" (S, 97–98).

As this example suggests, Marvell's poem parodies the vast limbs and great heart of Waller's York by selecting absurd or grotesque parts as metonymic symbols. The poem's depictions of Clarendon and Sir Robert Paston, for example, employ the same hyperbolic scale used by Waller, but turn it to satiric purposes:

First, let our navy scour through silver froth,  
The ocean's burden and the kingdom's both,  
Whose very bulk may represent its birth  
From Hyde and Paston, burdens of the earth:  
Hyde, whose transcendent paunch so swells of late  
That he the rupture seems of law and state;  
Paston, whose belly bears more millions  
Than Indian carracks and contains more tuns.

(S, 113–20)

Here distortions of scale are used to symbolize a dangerous excess, as the ministers' bellies serve as emblems both the men's own individual greed, and the burgeoning cost of naval wars to "law and state."

The public officials in the *Second Advice* are rendered even more hapless by virtue of the compressed narrative action of the poem. Where Waller uses the compression of temporal scope to depict an

English victory as inevitable, Marvell uses it to present decontextualized encounters that, by virtue of their emphasis on error, accident, and incompetence, depict the Second Anglo-Dutch war as an event of random chance. Thus, Falmouth's fatal wounding by "an untaught bullet in its wanton scope" (S, 183), for example, is described by Marvell's speaker as a chance event—but no more so than Falmouth's future career might have been: "A chance shot sooner took than chance him rais'd" (S, 186).<sup>36</sup> Similarly, when the Dutch ship *Urania* attacks the *Mary*, the narrative of battle is replaced with a metonymic description that conveys the speaker's sense of the meaninglessness of the conflict: "The noise, the smoke, the sweat, the fire, the blood, / Are not to be express'd nor understood" (S, 207–08). There is no divine justice being served here, the speaker makes clear, as Marlborough meets an "undistinguish'd" demise unbefitting a "soul so clear" (S, 218), and "Death picks the valiant out, the cow'rds survive" (S, 220).

Ultimately, Marvell's speaker will draw no conclusions about either the past causes or the future consequences of the war, encapsulating his interpretation of the battle in a single tongue-twisting couplet: "Thus having fought we know not why, as yet, / We've done we know not what nor what we get" (S, 317–18). Even those who attempt to commemorate the war, he argues, are destined to dispute its meaning: "historians argue con and pro: / Denham saith thus, though Waller always so" (S, 315–16). Accordingly, the poem's historical record concludes with the two men presented as representative of the navy's future—the Dukes of Cumberland and Albemarle—sailing away in the fittingly-titled HMS *Experiment* (S, 344). In a final direct address to the king, Marvell's speaker warns Charles II, "Kings are in war but cards: they're gods in peace" (S, 368). Replaced with the trivializing metonym of the king in a card deck, the monarch is ultimately reduced to an empty symbol whose authority is being "played" by ministers caught up in a game of chance.

In a direct continuation of this gambling metaphor, *The Third Advice to a Painter* begins by introducing Rupert and Albemarle as "the two dice of war," and depicting Monck as a rash gambler: "He plays at danger and his bullets trolls / (As 'twere at trou-madam) through all their holls."<sup>37</sup> Once again, Marvell's speaker situates his poem in the milieu of journalistic writing, offering his account as a corrective to "court-gazettes" that proclaim "our empty triumph" (T, 164). Warning readers that "Paper shall want to print that lie of state," the victory commemorated by Waller, the speaker presents even England's own leaders as ignorant readers misled by false reports (T, 167): the Sec-

retary of State himself “had never yet / Intelligence but from his own *Gazette*,” Marvell’s speaker complains (*T*, 283–84).

Like the other painter poems, the *Third Advice* advances an argument in favour of artistic representation as historical record, with Marvell’s speaker declaring that “What servants will conceal and couns’lors spare / To tell, the painter and the poet dare” (*T*, 439–40). Drawing on a Classical example, the speaker celebrates the power of visual art to capture and explain the past, citing Philomel as an artist whose embroidery “in colors loud reveal’d / The tragedies of court so long conceal’d” (*T*, 453–54). Synaesthesia blurs the construction of the visual and the verbal here, as Marvell’s speaker praises the “loud” colours spun by “her needle’s tongue,” and claims that her embroideries “restor’d to voice” narratives “long conceal’d” by other means (*T*, 452–54). Indeed, so accurate is pictorial representation in revealing the truth about past persons and events, the speaker suggests, that it may sometimes be “better o’er to veil” than to depict a scene (*T*, 131): “Ah, rather than transmit our scorn to fame,” he tells the painter after one particularly mortifying defeat, “Draw curtains, gentle artist, o’er this shame” (*T*, 105–106).<sup>38</sup>

Despite these protestations, of course, Marvell’s *Third Advice* itself provides a detailed depiction of historical persons and events, once again using the conventions of the painter poem to establish a partial view of the past. Where Waller’s speaker commanded expansions of scale, the speaker of the *Third Advice* demands a reduction in representative size, as he invites Richard Gibson, a dwarf painter of miniatures, to “mix thy water-colours and express, / Drawing in little, how we do yet less” (*T*, 9–10). The poem’s central event—the rash division of the navy into two smaller groups and the subsequent attack on the reduced fleet at Dunkirk by a much larger Dutch squadron—itself results, after all, from errors in the calculation of relative size. Accordingly, Marvell’s speaker often juxtaposes great against small to satirical effect, contrasting the vastness of Albemarle’s arrogance, for example, with his relatively modest-sized fleet: though “half their number,” the speaker remarks, Albemarle “thinks the odds too great” (*T*, 34). Similarly, the speaker describes Arlington and Coventry in diminutive terms as meddling housewives orchestrating the navy’s downfall “by small arts” (*T*, 333).

Like Waller’s *Instructions*, the *Third Advice* establishes a series of metonymic relations, identifying larger narrative events by means of individual representative persons, and individual persons by means of representative (typically, physical) defects. Where Waller’s York is the



“British thunder,” Marvell’s Rupert has “Lightning so fierce, but never such a clap!” the pun swiftly translating Waller’s heroic emblem into a crass metonym of sexual disease (*T*, 16). Similarly, when Albemarle is wounded, the site of his injury conspires to make him literally, as well as figuratively, the “butt” of the joke:

Conceal (as Honor would) his Grace’s bum,  
When the rude bullet a large collop tore  
Out of that buttock never turn’d before.  
Fortune, it seem’d, would give him by that lash  
Gentle correction for his fight so rash,  
But should the Rump perceiv’t, they’d say that Mars  
Had now reveng’d them upon Aumarle’s arse.

(*T*, 124–30)

In these lines, a series of puns establishes metonymic relations between “Aumarle’s arse,” his role as erring leader (in need of the lash), and his courtly (thus Rump-less) political affiliations. Marvell’s portrait of Arlington likewise uses a representative detail to denote a larger situation, as the Secretary of State is known by way of the “slit . . . in his nose” (a wound obtained in the Civil War), and corresponding “slit in’s pen” (*T*, 296). Both openings present the possibility of a leak, with the latter incision threatening to leave “the fleet divided like his face” by means of a perilous release of information to “the Dutch chink”—the anatomical “slit” that functions as a crass metonym for Arlington’s Dutch wife (*T*, 298, 300). In this scenario, the historical figure being satirized is both split into parts himself, and a dangerous dividing force in political terms, as Arlington’s scarred nose serves as a symbol not only of his individual untrustworthiness, but also of the more general dangers resultant from the division of the English fleet.

While the *Third Advice* contains perhaps the most dazzling puns of Marvell’s series, it is the *Last Instructions* that ultimately offers the wittiest deconstruction of Waller’s distortions of scale. Both the opening and the concluding lines of the *Last Instructions* play on conventional notions of large and small or part and whole, as Marvell’s speaker begins by warning his painter that the task may be “too slight grown . . . for thee” (*L*, 4): “canst thou daub a sign-post, and that ill?” the speaker asks; “Twill suit our great debauch and little skill” (*L*, 7–8). As with the portrait of Albemarle in the *Third Advice*, Marvell’s speaker contrasts his characters’ immense moral failings with their diminutive heroic value. Thus, the crimes and luxury of the court, he argues, may be drawn out in “plumes” (large-scale arrangements of feathers), but

its “compendious fame” can only be depicted in miniature (*L*, 14–15). Indeed, so short of the Classical heroic ideal are the men he will depict, Marvell’s speaker claims, that his painter must “With Hooke . . . through the microscope take aim” (*L*, 16).

The play on scale continues as Marvell’s speaker launches into a series of distorted portraits, beginning with a depiction of the new Comptroller of the Household, clutching the staff of his office, as one of Hooke’s famed microscopic subjects, “a tall louse” clinging to a human hair (*L*, 18). The English ambassador to the French court, by contrast, is enlarged to the point of grotesquerie, with “drayman’s shoulders” and an “elephantine chine” (*L*, 33–34). Once again, an historical figure is both the particularized representative of a wider whole, and a whole represented by particular parts, as we are told that the ambassador’s breeches—a reference to his alleged affair with Henrietta Maria—“were the instrument of peace” (*L*, 42).

The poem’s account of the parliamentary debate over the 1666 excise bill similarly focuses on particular agents, as the speaker announces a roll-call of some of the court party representatives who supported the excise: Denham, Wood, Fox, Progers, Brouncker, Wren, Charlton. Key physical features again take pride of place, as Wood is known for his deformed “hook-shoulder” (*L*, 163), Charlton for his “coif” (*L*, 181), and Powell for the pox that leaves him “welt’ring in his stride” (*L*, 214). Lady Castlemaine is captured, in equally unflattering terms, as washing the “sweaty Hooves” of her lover: both the anatomical part by which the lover is symbolized, and the term used to describe that part, are indicative of his lowly status as a groom (*L*, 96). Perhaps the most unflattering metonym of all, however, is reserved for Clarendon: known by his “secret part,” Clarendon’s penis features a “sacramental wart” on which the bankers to whom he has offered financial security nuzzle, like “Horse-leeches circling at the hem’rroid vein: / He sucks the King, they him, he them again” (*L*, 495–98).<sup>39</sup>

Ironically, at the same time as these men function as emblems of the nation’s failings, their own sense of their representative power is also a chief subject of the poem’s mockery. Indeed, one of the things that makes the *Last Instructions* particularly remarkable as a response to Waller’s panegyric is that Marvell’s satire, like Waller’s conclusion, ultimately presents an historical argument that counters its formal methodology. Thus, just as Waller’s speaker concludes his visually symbolic poem by claiming to have narrated rather than sketched the battle, so Marvell’s speaker in the *Last Instructions* continually makes claims to possessing a more general, impartial view of the past than

that of his political opponents, despite his own tendency to depict that past by means of representative details.

The Parliamentary proceedings offer a clear example of this kind of reversal, as Marvell's speaker uses the MPs as symbolic figures at the same time as he undercuts their representative value in the context of a larger historical framework, describing their debates in mock-heroic terms as "a battle from all gunshot free" (*L*, 230), or with scathing litotes, as a backgammon match at which MPs "draw lots / For the command of politics or sots" (*L*, 199–200).<sup>40</sup> As with the poem's opening juxtapositions of large sins and small fame, Marvell's speaker remarks "With what small arts the public game they play" (*L*, 118), ridiculing the MPs' grandiose sense of their own representative or heroic importance:

Each thinks his person represents the whole  
And with that thought does multiply his soul,  
Believes himself an army, theirs one man  
As eas'ly conquer'd; and, believing, can;  
With heart of bees so full, and head of mites,  
That each, though duelling, a battle fights.  
(*L*, 269–74)

Here Marvell's poem pushes off against its own methodology, contrasting the formal and historical representativeness of the MPs with their relative insignificance in the wider course of history. Once again linking the partial with the particular, Marvell's speaker makes his own claims to a broad-based view of events at the same time as he provides an account of the past that, like Waller's, remains functionally narrow in scope.

The contrast between particular and general is equally central to Marvell's critique of the navy's attempts to make a scapegoat out of Chatham dockyard superintendent Peter Pett. Where the MPs are insignificant men inflating their own importance, Pett is a single individual unjustly accorded blame for large-scale losses. In an impressive display of poetic agility, Pett's surname serves as the rhyme word for sixteen couplets, as Marvell's speaker poses a series of ironic questions to which the single word "Pett" serves as the uniform response. As in the descriptions of Coventry and Carteret in the *Second Advice* (*S*, 36–40), Marvell's speaker omits the operative verbs, leaving Pett's name, like his person, to carry the weight of the entirety of the events detailed:

All our miscarriages on Pett must fall:  
His name alone seems fit to answer all.  
Whose counsel first did this mad war beget?  
Who all commands sold through the navy? *Pett*.  
Who would not follow when the Dutch were beat?  
Who treated out the time at Bergen? *Pett*[.]

(*L*, 767–72)

On a formal level, these lines can be understood as a critique of the overspecific encomium offered by Waller, with Pett standing in mock-heroic contrast to Waller's do-it-all Duke of York. As in the earlier account of parliamentary proceedings, however, the methodology of the passage pushes against the content of its own historical analysis, as Marvell's speaker offers his own ironic selection of representative particulars in order to critique the very same process of selection (in this instance, the choice of Pett as the scapegoat for a wide range of errors) that was employed by the corrupt naval officials.

The *Last Instructions* concludes with yet another juxtaposition of the general and the particular, this time by way of a pseudo-allegorical episode in which a visionary figure representing "England or the Peace" appears before the king (*L*, 906). As Steven N. Zwicker has demonstrated, the visionary virgin had a likely historical referent in Frances Stuart, a court beauty admired by Charles.<sup>41</sup> Stewart was the physical embodiment of the nation in very concrete terms, having posed as the model for the emblem of Britannia that appeared on the Peace of Breda medal. In this scene, she appears before the king in her symbolic capacity, "Her mouth lock'd up, a blind before her eyes" (*L*, 895). Despite both her veiled eyes and her muteness, however, the virgin's troubles are readily apparent, as "beneath the veil her blushes rise, / And silent tears her secret anguish speak" (*L*, 896–97). Yet Charles errs in interpreting the vision, responding to Stuart not as a general representative, but as an individual woman: his feelings move swiftly from wonder to pity to lust. Ignoring the clear visual cues of her unhappiness, Charles reacts to the communal need she represents by expressing his personal sexual desires, recognizing the vision's broader symbolic value only after she has disappeared.

Just as Charles' response to the visionary figure suggests that his views are too contracted for him to be able to comprehend what he sees, so the poem's final address to the king suggests that his blindness to a general view of the past has led him to look for information in all the wrong places. These concluding lines reverse the microscopic perspective of the poem's introduction, as Marvell's speaker critiques

Charles for his telescopic focus on distant evils. By searching for sunspots through his “optic trunk” (*L*, 953), the speaker argues, Charles has cut himself off from a wider view of history, remaining blind to the dangers that are “too near” to enter his field of vision: ministers who “seem his courtiers” (*L*, 951–52), but who are themselves dark spots on the “Sun of our world” (*L*, 956). The king’s partial view of public persons and events—much like Waller’s—privileges the large and distant over the specific and immediate, favouring the sun through a telescope over the louse through a microscope. “The smallest vermin make the greatest waste,” Marvell’s speaker warns, renewing the analogy of his opening lines in a final visual contrast (*L*, 981). Those who are truly possessed with “large souls” (*L*, 986), he concludes, are sadly “few [in] number,” visible only in the peripheries of the political sphere (*L*, 989).

The concluding lines of the *Last Instructions*, themselves indicative of a wider historical idea, offer a witty encapsulation of the painter poems’ intervention in Restoration historiography. History’s grand causal narratives, Marvell suggests, suffer from their own form of blindness in their inability to capture the crucial details that define the nation’s heroes and determine important public events. What the speaker’s parting advice to the king effectively provides is a contrasting set of instructions to those propounded by neoclassical *artes historicae*: it is only by viewing the past in detail, Marvell’s speaker suggests, by examining individual persons and episodes up close, that we can understand—and, more crucially, learn from—the past. The contribution of “historical poems” like the *Last Instructions*, for both the readers and writers of Restoration and eighteenth-century historical literatures, lay in exactly this ability to demonstrate the advantages of partial representation—to suggest that history might be less comprehensible from a lofty vista than from beneath the narrowing lens of a microscope.

*University of Manchester*

NOTES

I would like to thank Cynthia Wall, Robin Valenza, Peter Sabor, Mark Salber Phillips, Sandra Macpherson, Michael McKeon, Heather Keenleyside, J. Paul Hunter, Neil Chudgar, and James Chandler for their generous willingness to read and offer advice on previous or alternate versions of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> John Dryden, *Annus Mirabilis: The Year of Wonders, 1666*, in *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. Edward Niles Hooker, H. T. Swedenberg Jr., Alan Roper, and Vinton A. Dearing, 20 vol. (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1956–89), 1:50.

<sup>2</sup> George deF. Lord, introduction to *Poems on Affairs of State*, ed. George deF. Lord, 7 vol. (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1963–75), 1:xvi.

<sup>3</sup> See Harold Love, *English Clandestine Satire, 1660–1702* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004); Andrew McRae, *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004); and Abigail Williams, *Poetry and the Creation of a Whig Literary Culture, 1681–1714* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2005).

<sup>4</sup> Mark Salber Phillips, *Society and Sentiment: Genres of Historical Writing in Britain, 1740–1820* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2000), 10.

<sup>5</sup> See Ian Watt, *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson, and Fielding* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957).

<sup>6</sup> James Welwood, preface to *Memoirs of the Most Material Transactions in England, for the Last Hundred Years, Preceding the Revolution in 1688* (London, 1700), A7r-v.

<sup>7</sup> Gilbert Burnet, preface to *The Memoires of the Lives and Actions of James and William, Dukes of Hamilton and Castleherald* (London, 1677), alv. For similar commentary, see, for example, Daniel Neal, *The History of the Puritans*, 4 vol. (London, 1732–38), 2:vi; Thomas Lediard, *The Life of John, Duke of Marlborough*, 3 vol. (London, 1736), 1:xiii–xiv; *The History of the Reign of King George* (London, 1719), 1–4; Michel LeVassor, *The History of the Reign of Lewis XIII* (London, 1700), 4; *Scrinia Reclusa: Or, Brief Remarks upon the Reigns of Several of our English Princes* (London, 1709), A2r.

<sup>8</sup> René Rapin, *Instructions for History* (London, 1680), 118.

<sup>9</sup> John Milton, *An Apology against a Pamphlet call'd A modest Confutation of the Animadversions upon the Remonstrant against Smectymnuus* (London, 1642), 33.

<sup>10</sup> Richard Blackmore, *Prince Arthur, An Heroic Poem in 10 Books* (London, 1695), 2v. Heroic poetry's decorous subject matter linked it, in turn, with forms of historical literature. As Dryden's preface to *Annus Mirabilis* explained, "the same images serve equally for the Epique Poesie, and for the Historique and Panegyrique, which are branches of it" (1:56).

<sup>11</sup> Degory Wheare, *The Method and Order of Reading both Civil and Ecclesiastical Histories* (London, 1698), 298; for other examples, see Dryden, 17.274; Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, *Letters on the Study and Use of History* (London, 1752), 15. For a broader discussion of the exemplar theory of history, see George H. Nadel, "Philosophy of History Before Historicism" *History and Theory* 2 (1964): 291–315.

<sup>12</sup> Dryden, 4.55; Nahum Tate, preface to *Characters of Virtue and Vice* (London, 1691), A2r. See also, for example, Charles Gildon's dedication to his edited collection *Miscellany Poems* (London, 1692): "Panegyric gives a Noble, and taking prospect of Virtue, stirring up Emulation in others, and a Caution in him that is Prais'd, not to be guilty of any thing contrary to the character the World has of him" (A4v).

<sup>13</sup> Both Rapin and Le Moynes advised the would-be historian to present idealized, generic portraits sketched in "two or three colours" (Pierre Le Moynes, *Of the Art Both of Writing and Judging of History* [London, 1694], 131, see 126–27; and Rapin, 78, 82). See also, for example, William Howell, *Medulla Historiæ Anglicanæ* (London, 1712), A3v.

<sup>14</sup> Dryden, 4:77; Gildon, A5r.

<sup>15</sup> Rapin, 110. See also, for example, Thomas Hearne, *Ductor Historicus* (London, 1698), 108–09. For a discussion of satire and panegyric as branches of oratorical rhetoric, see Jon Thomas Rowland, *Faint Praise and Civil Leer: The "Decline" of Eighteenth-Century Panegyric* (Newark: Univ. of Delaware Press, 1994), 11–21.

<sup>16</sup> Welwood, A7v.

<sup>17</sup> Le Moynes, 90–91. See also Hearne, 106, 111; and Rapin, 21.

<sup>18</sup> Rapin, 57.

<sup>19</sup> Dryden, 4:79–80.

<sup>20</sup> Gildon, A5r.

<sup>21</sup> For discussions or critiques of satire as overly-specific, see, for example, Roger L'Estrange, *A Brief History of the Times* (London, 1687), 3; Joseph Addison, *The Free-Holder*, 24 February 1716, 107; Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets* (London, 1691), 171, 350; Dryden, 4:70, 7:35–36; [A True Briton], *Remarks on Bishop Burnet's History of his Own Time* (London, 1723), 44; William Nicolson, *The English Historical Library*, 2 vol. (London, 1696), 1:200; and Abel Boyer, preface to *The History of the Life and Reign of Queen Anne* (London, 1722), ii. For similar discussions of panegyric as overly-specific, see, for example, Jonathan Swift, *A Tale of a Tub and Other Works*, ed. Angus Ross and David Woolley (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1999), 23; Michel Le Vassor, *The History of the Reign of Lewis XIII* (London, 1700), 4; Robert Gould, *Poems, Chiefly Consisting of Satyrs and Satyirical Epistles* (London, 1689), A6r; and Gildon, A4v–A5r.

<sup>22</sup> The most thorough published account of the genre is Mary Tom Osborne, *Advice-to-a-Painter Poems 1633–1856: An Annotated Finding List* (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1949), 9–22.

<sup>23</sup> See Osborne, 17–18.

<sup>24</sup> For discussions of the *ut pictura poesis* tradition, see Jean H. Hagstrum, *The Sister Arts: The Tradition of Literary Pictorialism and English Poetry from Dryden to Gray* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1958), 93–128; and Annabel Patterson, *Marvell: The Writer in Public Life* (Harlow: Pearson, 2000), 79–83.

<sup>25</sup> See Edward Copeland, “Absalom and Achitophel and The Banqueting House Ceiling: The Great Relation,” *Eighteenth-Century Life* 11.2 (1987): 22–40.

<sup>26</sup> See Edmund Waller, *Instructions to a Painter in Poems on Affairs of State*, 1:21–33. Hereafter abbreviated *I* and cited parenthetically by line number.

<sup>27</sup> See also *I*, 277–78.

<sup>28</sup> See also *I*, 132.

<sup>29</sup> For a list of these responses, see Osborne, 28–40.

<sup>30</sup> There is relatively little critical commentary on Marvell's advice-to-a-painter poems, with most of the criticism focusing on the *Last Instructions*, generally considered the best of a bad lot. The episodic structure, uneven tone, and burdensome number of “facts” in Marvell's painter poems have made them problematic for many critics. See deF. Lord, “From Contemplation to Action: Marvell's Poetical Career” *Philological Quarterly* 46 (1967): 207–24. Counter-arguments insisting on the internal coherence and literary value of the *Last Instructions* can be found in Earl Miner, “The ‘Poetic Picture, Painted Poetry’ of *The Last Instructions to a Painter*” *Modern Philology* 63 (1966): 288–94; Alan S. Fisher, “The Augustan Marvell: *The Last Instructions to a Painter*” *ELH* 2 (1971): 223–38; Michael Gearin-Tosh, “The Structure of Marvell's *Last Instructions to a Painter*” *Essays in Criticism* 22 (1972): 48–57; David Farley-Hills, *The Benevolence of Laughter: Comic Poetry of the Commonwealth and Restoration* (London: Macmillan, 1974): 72–98; and Denise E. Lynch, “Politics, Nature, and Structure in Marvell's *The Last Instructions to a Painter*” *Restoration* 16 (1992): 82–92. There is also a body of historicist criticism that reads the painter poems for their insight into contemporary politics. See, for example, Love, 107–15; Patterson, 72–106; Warren L. Cherniak, *The Poet's Time: Politics and Religion in the Work of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983), 73–82; and John M. Wal-

lace, *Destiny His Choice: The Loyalism of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968), 163–83.

<sup>31</sup> deF. Lord, introduction to *Poems on Affairs of State*, 1:97.

<sup>32</sup> Andrew Marvell, *The Last Instructions to a Painter* in *Poems on Affairs of State*, 1:99–139, lines 1–2. Hereafter abbreviated *L* and cited parenthetically by line number.

<sup>33</sup> Marvell, *The Second Advice to a Painter* in *Poems on Affairs of State*, 1:36–53, lines 1–2. Hereafter abbreviated *S* and cited parenthetically by line number.

<sup>34</sup> Pierre Legouis, *Andrew Marvell: Poet, Puritan, Patriot* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965) similarly observes of the *Last Instructions* that Marvell acts as “a political journalist in verse” and that his narrative “seems to be written day by day” (168); see also Love, 111.

<sup>35</sup> See also *S*, 83–87, 228.

<sup>36</sup> The comparison with Waller’s poem is particularly interesting here, as the *Instructions* depict Falmouth’s death as a deliberate or inevitable event by comparing it to a ritual sacrifice: see lines 132–33.

<sup>37</sup> Marvell, *The Third Advice to a Painter* in *Poems on Affairs of State*, 1:68–87, lines 12, 59–60. Hereafter abbreviated *T* and cited parenthetically by line number.

<sup>38</sup> See also *T*, 119–20.

<sup>39</sup> The discussion of the Dutch ships’ progress up the Thames and the ensuing battle is likewise organized around portraits of key figures: De Ruyter, Sir Edward Spragge, William Legge, Sir Thomas Daniel, Archibald Douglas. Each paragraph begins with a gesture advising the reader to “see” the man and identify him by a physical feature: Daniel by his impressive stature and “Large limbs” (*L*, 634), Douglas by the “yellow locks” (*L*, 653) that become “burning locks,” and so forth (*L*, 684).

<sup>40</sup> See also *L*, 109, 111–12.

<sup>41</sup> See Steven N. Zwicker, “Virgins and Whores: the Politics of Sexual Misconduct in the 1660s” in *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1990), 85–110, esp. 103–104.



