John Donne Journal
Vol. 6, No. 2 (1987)

Marvell's Dialogics of History: Upon Appleton House, XI-XXXV

Daniel P. Jaeckle

Critics generally agree that the history of the estate in stanzas XI through XXXV is the least successful section of Marvell's *Upon Appleton House*. Whether they read the passage as a founder's myth appropriate to the country-house genre, as part of a dialectic of retirement and action, as a version of false retirement to Fairfax's true, or as an attack on the errors of Roman piety, they feel that this narrative is both too long and too facile in its treatment of the nuns.[1] But if *Upon Appleton House* has become quintessential Marvell, as Harold Toliver has suggested,[2] then these twenty-five stanzas, a full quarter of his quintessence, merit renewed consideration. This essay therefore focuses on the historical episode, not to defend the poet from his critics, but rather to explore from a new perspective the intentions, strategies, successes and failures of the passage. Specifically, I argue that in the historical narrative Marvell acts like a Bakhtinian novelist, representing the conflict between the Roman Catholic and proto-Protestant voices and ideologies during the reformation of the Nunappleton estate in the early sixteenth century. I hope to show that his greatest success results from his refusal to empower the allied discourses of William Fairfax and the persona, while his greatest failure follows from his confusing representation of the relations between the Roman religion and truth. Along the way I also hope to show that Bakhtin's analytic, designed for novels, helps us understand Marvell's poetic as well.

Two Bakhtinian terms, dialogism and novelization, are essential to the perspective of this study. In the last essay of *The Dialogic Imagination* entitled "Discourse in the Novel," Bakhtin defines dialogism by means of a contrast between traditional poetry and the novel.[3] According to his argument, in traditional poetry the poet seeks to create a unified language and dominant voice adequate to realize the vision of the work (pp. 285-86). This process of unification requires the reduction of the many

languages and voices of society to monologic discourse, at least within the boundaries of the poem. In contrast, the primary feature of the novel is dialogism, the artistic organization of the diverse types of social speech and the diverse voices of the social milieu (pp. 262-63). Bakhtin assumes that every type of social speech is informed by an ideology, so that by inscribing the heteroglossia of a society into a work, the novelist represents the ideological conflicts of that society. Although the novelist cannot remain neutral in the struggle of values that the heteroglossia of society entails—if only because he or she must adopt some linguistic and therefore ideological stance in order to structure and control the many other voices of the work—nevertheless the authorial voice is itself finally only another voice, capable of interacting with and even, as we shall see, overlapping with the other voices (p. 263).[4] It does not constitute the unity of the work. That unity is instead a function of the constructed interrelationships among all the languages and voices that enter the work, including those of the author, just as the style of the novel is a function of the way in which the novelist represents those languages and voices and the interrelationships among them.

Upon Appleton House, of course, is not a novel. But in Bakhtinian terms, at least the nunnery episode is novelized poetry. In the first essay of *The Dialogic Imagination* entitled "Epic and Novel," Bakhtin enumerates the distinguishing traits of novelization as follows:

> What are the salient features of this novelization of other genres . . . ? They become more free and flexible, their language renews itself by incorporating extraliterary heteroglossia and the "novelistic" layers of literary language, they become dialogized, permeated with laughter, irony, humor, elements of self-parody and finally—this is the most important thing—the novel inserts into these other genres an indeterminacy, a certain semantic openendedness, a living contact with unfinished, still-evolving contemporary reality (the openended present). (pp. 6-7)

Several elements of this definition apply to the historical narrative of *Upon Appleton House*. In the Roman Catholic discourse of the nun and the proto-Protestant discourse of William Fairfax, the episode reconstructs the extraliterary, specifically religious, heteroglossia of the early sixteenth century. The languages and voices of this religious conflict are dialogized, organized by the authorial voice to point their differences.

The poet resolves this central conflict in the laughter of mock-heroic. And despite the fact that the episode treats the past, it maintains at least indirect contact with a still evolving reality. As a complication of Bakhtin's assumptions, this last point needs preliminary development. In the passage in which Bakhtin defines novelization, he points out that social changes, as well as purely literary ones, can directly influence the process of novelization (p. 7). In this regard, it bears recalling that *Upon Appleton House* was almost surely written between the regicide and the establishment of the protectorate. During this chaotic period, numerous parties and sects were arguing over nothing less important than the futures of the nation, the faith, and the people. The once privileged languages of the royalty, nobility, and hierarchized clergy were being challenged by the popular voices of the Independents, Levellers, Diggers, and only Christopher Hill knows who all else.[5] In such a social setting Marvell struggles within the poem to find a form for reflecting the dynamic of his society. No wonder, then, that when he turns to the history of the estate he focuses exclusively on another period of reformation, during which voice fought voice, and language battled language. He represents this past condition of radical heteroglossia not so much, I believe, to find solutions to contemporary problems as better to understand a similar condition of radical heteroglossia in his own day. The form he chooses, understandably, is novelized poetry.

In light of these definitions of dialogism and novelization, I can now clarify the argument of this study. In the first and by far larger of the two parts of the historical narrative Marvell represents the heteroglossia of the sixteenth-century reformation of the estate by directly quoting the Roman Catholic and proto-Protestant antagonists, and by tightly controlling these voices by means of the authorial voice. Specifically, the Protestant persona colors both direct quotations—in the case of the nun's speech by means of prior characterization and what V. N. VoloSinov calls particularized direct discourse in the quotation itself, and in the case of the speech by William Fairfax by means of a prior statement of its futility and a subsequent use of what VoloSinov terms substituted direct discourse.[6] By means of this authorial control of the quotations Marvell at first makes it appear that the discourse of the nun is riddled with error and that truth is in the mouth of William Fairfax. But after it becomes clear that the discourse of truth has no privileged power in this dialogic, even despite the alignment of the authorial voice with the voice of William, Marvell further complicates matters by having the persona ascribe some truth to the religion of the nuns. Consequently, the first portion of the episode is strategically confused, and the reader is placed on uncertain ground for assessing the dialogic. At this point, the poet

begins the second portion of the episode by shifting strategies from closely controlled direct discourse to action represented by means of mock-heroic, itself a dialogic form, but one now displaced from the level of content to the level of expression. By this shift in strategy, Marvell resolves the historical conflict in favor of William Fairfax and his proto-Protestantism, but leaves open the question of how heteroglossic conflict can be resolved short of an appeal to violence. The implications for the condition of radical heteroglossia in his own day are clear and alarming.

Throughout the first portion of the episode the authorial voice, aggressively Protestant, colors the speeches of the nun and William Fairfax to such a degree that truth appears to belong exclusively to the latter. Indeed, the treatment of the nuns with which the episode begins is almost crassly critical. Before the persona lets their spokeswoman speak, he takes care to characterize the group as both sexually impure and devious. Pausing in his tour of the estate to tell the history of the house, he remarks that "A *Nunnery* first gave it birth,"[7] referring to the fact that the stones of the convent were subsequently used to build Appleton House. But in a one-liner occasioned by the birth metaphor, he adds "For *Virgin Buildings* oft brought forth" (86). Although this attack on the cloistered life of the nuns has disturbed readers like Legouis,[8] questioning the virginity of the nuns can perhaps be justified on the grounds of direct relevance to the history being presented. For the prize of the struggle between the nuns and William is herself a "blooming Virgin" (90), whose choice between perpetual virginity and marriage is apparently the fundamental issue of the narrative. By glancing at the sexual impurity of the nuns, the authorial voice is suggesting that this choice is false, that the nuns do not practice celibate living, and that the actual choice is between illicit and sanctioned sexuality. As a result, the reader suspects, even if Isabel does not, that her sole correct course is marriage. This Protestant perspective is even more evident in the charge of deviousness leveled against the nuns, and particularly against the one who speaks. The authorial voice directly calls the group subtle (94), and suggests the reason for their interest in Isabel when he points out that she is the heir of the estate (91). The couplet introducing the nun's discourse marks her deviousness explicitly: "Whence in these Words one to her weav'd, / (As 'twere by Chance) Thoughts long conceiv'd" (95-96). Clearly, Isabel is being set up. Suspecting nothing, she is intent to pursue what she believes to be spiritually edifying dialogue. But with the help of the authorial voice, the reader comes thoroughly to distrust the nun and is prepared for deceit.[9]

Given these characterizations of the nuns as impure and deceitful, the reader is not surprised to find both impurity and deceit in the nun's discourse. But in fact her speech is not all of a piece. Early in her argument to win Isabel, the nun misrepresents life in the convent in such a way as to attract the maiden to its alleged spirituality. The nun knows that the ideals of the cloistered life—particularly innocence, chastity, and piety—appeal to Isabel, and so dwells on them. In stanza XIII, for example, she stresses innocence and sexual purity:

> 'Within this holy leisure we
> 'Live innocently as you see.
> 'These Walls restrain the World without,
> 'But hedge our Liberty about.
> 'These Bars inclose that wider Den
> 'Of those wild Creatures, called Men.
> 'The Cloyster outward shuts its Gates,
> 'And, from us, locks on them the Grates. (97-104)

In the next stanza, she again emphasizes chastity, but now also adds a reference to the life of prayer:

> 'And our chast *Lamps* we hourly trim,
> 'Lest the great *Bridegroom* find them dim.
> 'Our *Orient* Breaths perfumed are
> 'With insense of incessant Pray'r. (107-10)

The use of the word "leisure" in the first passage and the metaphor of "perfumed" and "insense" in the latter may signal a hidden sensuousness underneath convent life, but Isabel has no reason to suspect as much. From her point of view they are merely descriptors of a rich spirituality. Based on such passages as these, it is easy to see why Isabel eventually decides to enter the nunnery for a trial period, for in them the persona has not taken the most rigorous Protestant line against cloistered life. Unlike, for example, the Calvin of the *Institutes*, he has not said, or even implied, that the vow of chastity is presumptuous, given the proneness to sin that marks the human condition after the fall.[10] Rather, he allows the nun her position on the ideals of the spiritual life. If the reader must reject the nun's allurements even early in her speech, it is not because her principles are tainted, but rather because the authorial voice has previously revealed that at night, behind the appearance of innocence, sexual experience is the rule and that the veil of purity is merely another characteristic deception by the nuns. In such passages, the reader must read on two levels—the surface level of principles that

attracts Isabel, and the deeper level, hinted at by words like "perfumed," that bespeaks a flawed practice.

But the further the nun's speech progresses the more apparent becomes the true lifestyle of the nuns. Stanza XX provides a clear example:

> 'Here live beloved, and obey'd:
> 'Each one your Sister, each your Maid.
> 'And, if our Rule seem strictly pend,
> 'The Rule it self to you shall bend.
> 'Our *Abbess* too, now far in Age,
> 'Doth your succession near presage.
> 'How soft the yoke on us would lye,
> 'Might such fair Hands as yours it tye! (153-60)

If Isabel values the vows of the nuns, in this case specifically the vow of obedience, she should be able to see through the claims that she herself would be obeyed, that the rule would bend to her wishes, and that she, as abbess, could lighten the yoke of the vows at will or whim. In stanza XXIV, the nun goes further still:

> 'Each Night among us to your side
> 'Appoint a fresh and Virgin Bride;
> 'Whom if *our Lord* at midnight find,
> 'Yet Neither should be left behind.
> 'Where you may lye as chast in Bed,
> 'As Pearls together billeted.
> 'All Night embracing Arm in Arm,
> 'Like Chrystal pure with Cotton warm. (185-92)

Given the less than pure spirituality of this bedroom scene, it is shocking when in the next stanza the persona reports that the nun's smooth tongue has sucked Isabel in (200). The impurity of these midnight activities may be sugar-coated with successful figures like the simile "Like Chrystal pure with Cotton warm," but even an innocent should be able to see through that coating to the violation of the vow of chastity that the nun is offering as a compensation of convent life.

Isabel may be forgiven for her decision to enter the convent, however, if the more damning passages late in the discourse of the nun are seen not so much as a faithful account of what the nun actually says, but rather as instances of what VoloSinov has termed particularized direct discourse, which he defines as follows:

> The authorial context here is so constructed that the traits the author used to define a character cast heavy shadows on his directly reported speech. The value judgments and attitudes in which the character's portrayal is steeped carry over into the words he utters. (p. 134)

If I read VoloSinov correctly, the results of particularized direct discourse are two. First, the character's utterance confirms the authorial opinion of that character and thus maintains a consistent perspective across the passage of authorial context and direct discourse. Second, it becomes difficult, if not impossible, for the reader to separate what the character should say in a situation from what the authorial voice attributes to the character in order to reveal his or her true colors. In the case of the latter portion of the nun's speech, specifically, it appears that the authorial voice is picking up the thread of his negative characterization of the nuns prior to their spokeswoman's discourse: he has her reveal her true character while at the same time he has her round off the speech that is to persuade Isabel to join the convent. But two problems mar this strategy. First, the characterization and the persuasion are incompatible to the degree that it is difficult to see how this latter portion of the speech attracts Isabel. And second, between the prior characterization and this particularized direct discourse intervenes the early portion of the nun's speech that presents apparently acceptable ideals, thereby disturbing the flow of the characterization of the nuns.

The effect of the nun's speech taken as a whole is thus confused. On the one hand, the Roman Catholic ideals expressed in her early words—innocence, chastity, perpetual prayer—are represented as having the power to attract an early sixteenth-century maiden, and they are not criticized by the authorial voice. But on the other hand, when the persona puts into the nun's own words evidence of the abuses of cloistered living, these ideals disappear from view, and the reader has trouble believing that Isabel falls into the nun's trap. Those readers who object to the speech have a right to do so. On the level of strategy, Marvell does not join what a lying nun would say with what he has her say to reveal her true character. Consequently, Isabel appears to be either unbelievably naive or deaf to the second portion of the speech. On the level of ideology, he never makes a necessary connection between the ideals of the early portion and the abuses that dominate the end. Consequently, the reader cannot decide whether the cloistered life of the convent is wrong in principle or only in practice. To this

ideological confusion we shall have to return, but only after we assess the speech of Wilham and its authorical context.

Immediately after the persona ends his relation of the nun's speech, even before he says that her smooth tongue has won Isabel, he addresses his hero: "Now *Fairfax* seek her promis'd faith" (197). The coalition of hero and persona indicated by this exhortation seems to promise a sure and easy victory over the erring nuns. And yet, unexpectedly, in his introduction to Fairfax's address first to the nuns and then to Isabel the authorial voice makes clear that the speech will be futile and that William himself knows it: "Oft, though he knew it was in vain, / Yet would he valiantly complain" (201-02). The question raised by this presupposition of vanity—namely, why is Fairfax's discourse of truth weaker than the error-ridden speech of the nun?—receives no explicit answer anywhere in the episode. But this presupposition does reveal much about the poet's attitude toward the dialogue between truth and error in a fallen world. Unlike the Milton of *Areopagitica*, who believes that in an open and fair fight the discourse of truth will eventually prevail over the discourse of error,[11] Marvell is not so sure. Perhaps he fears that the dialogue is never open enough or fair enough for Milton's optimism to be justified. Perhaps he remembers the debate on the invasion of Scotland, the loss of which led the Lord General to retire.[12] But in any case, in this episode the discourse of truth, in spite of the persona's alignment with it, is accorded no privileged status, and William's speech comes onto the scene already fatally wounded.

In Fairfax's relatively short speech—it is less than one-quarter as long as the nun's discourse—the hero scores a series of palpable hits against the nuns: they are hypocrites (205), they have left the faith (212), they have midnight assignations, presumably with men (219-20), and they want Isabel for the sake of her property, not her soul (221-22). In short, he knows all that the persona knows about these women and is not afraid to speak. Moreover, he argues well in an attempt to persuade Isabel to leave the convent. Evil, he asserts, is contagious, so that, like the walls of the nunnery itself, Isabel will be infected by the error of the nuns, even if she remains personally guiltless (223-24). But the most significant fact about this speech is that it has absolutely no effect. If at the end of the nun's speech Isabel enters the convent, after William's speech not only does she not leave the nunnery, but neither she nor the nuns respond in any way whatsoever. It is as if William had not said a word.

The impotence of Fairfax's discourse is all the more remarkable because Marvell makes the transition from the words of William back to the authorial voice by means of substituted direct discourse, which VoloSinov defines in these terms: "Here the author stands in for his hero,

says in his stead what the hero might or should have said, says what the given occasion calls for" (p. 138). Adopting this strongest means of aligning the views of author and character, Marvell has his persona speak what Fairfax must be thinking: "What should he do?" (225). Only the pronoun needs amendment for these to be the words of William, not of the persona.[13] But even this near identification of character and authorial voice has no power to persuade Isabel. As a result, not only William's discourse but now also that of the persona has been put into the position of relative weakness vis-à-vis the speech of the nun. At this point in the episode, the primary strategy of representing the heteroglossia of the reformation of the estate has come to a surprisingly anticlimactic and unresolved end.

What happens next is the most startling move of the narrative so far: still closely aligned with William's thoughts, the authorial voice gives to the religion of the nuns a measure of truth. Probing Fairfax's irresolution, the persona introduces a complex notion of religion:

> He would respect
> Religion, but not Right neglect:
> For first Religion taught him Right,
> And dazled not but clear'd his sight. (225-28)

The second couplet defines William's view of religion as the spiritual tradition imparted to him in his youth. But the first couplet allies that tradition, if not totally, at least in part with the nuns. For if they had no relationship to religion, William could respect it and still not neglect right by extricating Isabel from their clutches. Marvell here seems to be subscribing to what Peter Fraenkel has called the law of relativity in Melanchthon's theory of Church history.[14] According to this law, even the most errant church still preserves a remnant of truth. Thus, even though the nuns are portrayed as being given to a thoroughly perverted view of the contemplative life, the religion that undergirds their institution can still teach William enough truth to make him hesitate in attacking its representatives; from that truth the nuns gain at least some authority. At this point, however, the reader is entitled to be puzzled. If earlier the nun's speech was confusing because Marvell did not clarify whether the nuns erred in principle or only in practice, it is now clear that at least some of their principles bear the truth. But what then has been the purpose of the previous entirely one-sided strategies of the negative characterization of the nuns, of assigning truth to William's voice, and of the close alignment between the hero and the persona? It was difficult enough for the reader to adjust to the impotence of the

discourse of truth; but now that the truth itself has been partially reapportioned, the reader is left dangling, without a solid position from which to assess what has transpired. Until this discussion of religion, the persona's representation of the dialogue between truth and error has been less relative than the actual positions of the antagonists themselves, and retrospectively the reader must question the justice of the authorial voice.

In order to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the first portion of the historical narrative, it is necessary to clarify the distinction between the impotence and the injustice of the authorial voice. From the point of view of this essay, the powerlessness of the authorial voice to sway the dialogue between truth and error in the direction of truth is a strength. Only in monologic poetry should readers expect the persona to reduce the other voices in the poem (if there are any) to the program of the author. In dialogic poetry the persona does not stand above the heteroglossia of society. Consequently, if the authorial voice joins with that of one of the characters, then it must also accept the fate of that character's discourse. Even though the discourses of William and the persona remain at least relatively truer than the discourse of the nun throughout, in an open-ended conflict among the languages and voices of a still evolving reality, Marvell does not prejudice his dialogism by privileging the discourse of relative truth. Instead, he believes that the discourse of relative error sometimes has its way, and symbolizes that belief by having Isabel remain in the nunnery after William's speech. The impotence of the persona, then, may be read as a sign of the poet's integrity. In contrast, his unjust representation of the heteroglossia of the estate's reformation is a flaw in the episode. It first appears darkly when in representing the nun's speech the persona makes no connection between the ideals of the beginning and the abuses of the end; it then becomes evident when in stanza XXIX by implication he ascribes some truth to the religion of the nuns. To be sure, that ascription is just, but it contradicts the view of the nuns that has been dominant to that point. Of course, nowhere does the persona directly attack the doctrine of the nuns. But neither has he earlier given them credit for holding some true doctrines, and in fact nowhere does he suggest what these true doctrines might be. Ideologically, this failure to be completely fair may be no problem: after all, the persona is a participant in a reformative movement and must concentrate on abuses. But artistically his early concentration on abuses fails because, when he must assign some truth to the nuns in order to explain William's irresolution, he confuses the reader. Dialogized poetry does not need to be confusing in this way.

With both sides in the debate having spoken their pieces, Isabel remains in the convent. But for historical reasons Marvell cannot leave her there, and he has left himself no choice on how to extricate her. The appeal of the hero to the law in stanza XXX is predictably futile, for the law itself is weaker than the religion that supports it. Only brute force remains. But recourse to violence puts Marvell in a ticklish predicament for, as the persona puts it, "Small Honour would be in the Storm" (233). The poet answers his question of how to rescue Isabel without making his hero appear to be a bully by turning to mock-heroic. After the persona addresses the nuns directly in the couplet "Ill-counsell'd Women, do you know / Whom you resist, or what you do?" (239-40), and after he sings the praises of the Fairfacian line to spring from the marriage of William and Isabel (241-48), he depicts the final battle for the virgin Thwaites, elaborating on the defenses of the nuns:

> Some to the Breach against their Foes
> Their *Wooden Saints* in vain oppose.
> Another bolder stands at push
> With their old *Holy-Water Brush.*
> While the disjointed *Abbess* threads
> The gingling Chain-shot of her *Beads.*
> But their lowd'st Cannon were their Lungs;
> And sharpest Weapons were their Tongues. (249-56)

If in this stanza the poet's antipapism emerges again in full force, at least there is no confusion or hesitation in his representation of the scene. The decorum of mock-heroic permits such one-sided attacks against the enemy in order to provoke laughter. But underneath this laughter there is also point: in the final couplet the persona takes his revenge against the tongues of the nuns, thus preparing the way for William's victory. To assert the ultimate power of truth, but also no doubt to minimize his hero's violence, the persona spends just one couplet on the assault: "But, waving these aside like Flyes, / Young *Fairfax* through the Wall does rise" (257-58). In the rest of stanza XXXIII, he quickly resolves any remaining ambiguities about the characters and their positions: the superstitions of the nuns, we are told, were "vainly fear'd" (260), and Isabel has remained "truly bright and holy" (263). Thereafter the passage moves quickly to a close. Isabel is saved, and the cloister is "dispossest" (272), with the obvious pun on the demonic and economic senses of the word. Dropping the mock-heroic strategy in the last stanza of the section, the persona returns to the tonic chord of the house itself. At the dissolution the Fairfaxes possess it, and establish it as a truly holy

dwelling: "Though many a *Nun* there made her Vow, / 'Twas no *Religious House* till now" (279-80).

But the brief excursion into mock-heroic to resolve the central conflict of the episode reveals much about the poet's intentions in the historical narrative. When the conflict inscribed on the level of content cannot be resolved by dialogue and Marvell must turn to action, he does not abandon dialogism. Instead, he displaces the struggle of voices onto the level of expression. By adopting the strategy of parody, he at once affirms the heroic status of William and undermines that status by his mockery of the nuns. The strategy works in the sense that the struggle between the nuns and William for the person of Isabel is resolved in laughter, and also in the sense that any lingering ambiguities about the location of truth are put to rest. But we must also notice what this laughing judgment helps to conceal. It is not just that in the mock-heroic the nuns become unworthy opponents of the founding father of the Fairfacian line, or even that he resorts to a violent act against actually weaponless women. The mock-heroic also obscures Marvell's unhappy realization that in a fallen heteroglossic world truth must at times be violent to prevail. When the persona claims that Appleton House "Twas no *Religious House* till now," Marvell may have made a successful recovery from the problems of the historical narrative, but he has made little progress in dealing with his contemporary world. For if the ideological dialogue of the past can be resolved only by force, and the poet can only mitigate that fact with laughter, there remains the chaos of the England of his own day. How can mock-heroic laugh away the regicide, the invasion of Scotland, and whatever other violent acts lie on the horizon? It is no wonder that in the setpiece of stanzas XLI through XLV the more recent history of England evokes a lament from Marvell. And the immediate future, with Fairfax in retirement, looks darker still.

University of Houston-Victoria, Victoria, TX

Notes

[1] The four types of interpretations are exemplified by the following critics: (1) the founder's myth by William A. McClung, *The Country House in English Renaissance Poetry* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1977), pp. 165-66; and R. I. V. Hodge, *Foreshortened Time: Andrew Marvell and Seventeenth Century Revolutions* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1978), p. 145; (2) the dialectic of retirement and action by M. J. K. O'Loughlin, "This Sober Frame: A Reading of 'Upon Appleton House,'" in George deF. Lord, ed., *Andrew Marvell: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968), pp. 120-42; (3) a version of false retirement by Joseph H. Summers, "Introduction" to *Marvell* (New York: Dell, 1961), pp. 18-19; Donald M. Friedman, *Marvell's*

Pastoral Art (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1970), pp. 220-25; Frederic H. Roth, Jr., "Marvell's 'Upon Appleton House': A Study in Perspective," *TSLL* 14 (1972), 276; and John Klause, *The Unfortunate Fall: Theodicy and the Moral Imagination of Andrew Marvell* (Hamden, CT: Archon, 1983), p. 103; and (4) an attack on Roman sensuality by Ruth Wallerstein, *Studies in Seventeenth-Century Poetic* (1950; rpt. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1965), pp. 297-98; and Pierre Legouis, *Andrew Marvell: Poet, Puritan, Patriot*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970), p. 67. Many agree with C. A. Patrides, "'Till Prepared for Longer Flight': The Sublunar Poetry of Andrew Marvell," in Patrides, ed., *Approaches to Marvell: The York Tercentenary Lectures* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), p. 45: "Extreme in length, the episode is also extreme in tone."

[2] "The Critical Reprocessing of Andrew Marvell," *ELH* 47 (1980), 188.

[3] *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1981), pp. 259-422. Hereafter cited parenthetically in the text by page numbers.

[4] To indicate the distinction between Marvell's voice *in* the text and his control *over* the text, throughout this essay I use the terms "authorial voice" and "persona" for the former, and "Marvell" and "the poet" for the latter. If in some passages the boundary between the two is blurred, nevertheless the distinction holds well enough to be useful. Another note on terminology: I use "proto-Protestant" for the ideology of William Fairfax only because the events of the narrative take place before the English Reformation. The persona is clearly a Protestant throughout.

[5] See *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (New York: Penguin, 1975).

[6] *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, trans. Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1986), pp. 134, 138. Hereafter cited parenthetically in the text by page numbers.

[7] *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, ed. H. M. Margoliouth, 3rd ed., rev. Pierre Legouis (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), I, 65. Hereafter cited parenthetically in the text by line numbers.

[8] Legouis comments on this passage: "here indecency, or at least bad taste, can hardly be excused by Marvell's antipapist zeal" (p. 67).

[9] On deceit in the poem, see Peter Schwenger, "'To Make His Saying True': Deceit in *Appleton House*," *SP* 78 (1980), 84-104, esp. 89-91.

[10] See *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (1845; rpt. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1983), II, 475:

> Priests, monks, and nuns, forgetful of their infirmity, are confident of their fitness for celibacy. But by what oracle have they been instructed, that the chastity which they vow to the end of life, they will be able through life to maintain? . . . How can they presume to shake off the common feelings of their nature for a whole lifetime . . . ? In such perverse conduct they must not expect God to be their helper; let them rather remember the words, "Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God" (Deut. vi.16).

[11] *Areopagitica*, in *Complete Prose Works of John Milton, Volume II. 1643-1648*, ed. Ernest Sirluck (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1959), pp. 480-570.

[12] Citing Clements R. Markham, *A Life of the Great Lord Fairfax, Commander-in-Chief of the Army of the Parliament of England* (New York: Macmillan, 1870), p. 360, E. E. Duncan-Jones annotates line 354 in Margoliouth, p. 285, as follows:

> *Conscience*: In his speech to the committee of the Council of State in which he refused to carry the war into Scotland in 1650 Fairfax had said: 'What my conscience yields unto as just and lawful I shall follow. . . . My conscience is not satisfied and therefore I must desire to be excused.'

[13] In describing "character zones" (those authorial passages colored by the language and ideology of a character), Bakhtin, p. 316, mentions "those invasions into authorial speech of others' expressive indicators" and names questions like this one specifically as one frequent type of such invasion.

[14] *Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon* (Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1961), pp. 74-75.