“He grafts upon the wild the tame”: Marvell’s Mower Poems as Alternative Literary History
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ABSTRACT. Students of English pastoral—Raymond Williams, Frank Kermode, Helen Cooper, Sukanta Chaudhuri—have long assumed that the mode withers after the death of Marvell. This is mistaken; in fact, it flourishes in Restoration and Georgian Britain as mock-pastoral. Marvell, followed by Rochester, Swift, John Gay, Mary Wortley Montagu, and others, grafts Greco-Roman pastoral’s ironic, satiric energies back onto soft, “arcadian” English pastoral, restoring the mode’s premodern balance of buffo/serio, preeminently in the Mower poems. He recasts the farcical Polyphemus of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (the archetypal pastoral lover in Theocritus’ *Idylls* and Virgil’s *Eclogues*) as Damon the Mower, whose “polyphemic” plaints are at once poignant and comical. The pathos is not in the Mower’s erotic frustrations, however, but in his dispossession by changes to land tenure and agriculture after civil war (reactivating, again, Theocritus and Virgil, especially *Eclogues* 1 and 9). Marvell and his mock-pastoral inheritors, then, represent not the end of pastoral but its renewal.

In *The Mower against Gardens*, Marvell’s speaker famously complains that “man, that sov’reign thing and proud” has lately been engaging in unnatural acts of horticulture: “No plant now knew the stock from which it came; / He grafts upon the wild the tame: / That the uncertain and adultrate fruit / Might put the palate in dispute” (ll. 23-26). This horticultural practice of grafting, it seems to me, figures Marvell’s own, poetic practice in writing his versions of pastoral, especially the four Mower poems. By grafting “tame” Greco-Roman pastoral onto the “wild” stock of vernacular pastoral, Marvell vibrantly renews this poetic mode in English, in particular with graftings from Theocritus’ *Idylls* and Virgil’s *Eclogues*. In the Mower poems he regrows the hard and ironic qualities latent in the pastoral mode, and prunes away the earnest and idyllic offshoots from its main trunk, what we might call its “arcadian” qualities, after Sannazaro’s *Arcadia* (1504), which has these qualities in eminence. Along with daughter texts such as Tasso’s *Aminta*, Montemayor’s *Diana*, Sidney’s *New Arcadia*, and d’Urfé’s *L’Astrée*, Sannazaro’s *Arcadia* decisively skewed the conventions of early modern pastoral to the arcadian or soft side: earnest rather
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than ironic, and marked by idealizing, sentimental, romance conventions, which came to seem typical of the mode.

The result of Marvell’s grafting and pruning in the Mower poems is an “uncertain and adult’rate fruit,” a version of pastoral that has long put the critical palate in dispute because it is both highly ironized and what we might call “hard pastoral”: sexually frank, skeptical of erotic love, socially critical. Since the critical palate is accustomed to mostly arcadian or soft pastoral in the century and a half before Marvell, it tends to find the acidulous flavor and hard texture of the Mower poems a novelty, even off-putting. Yet until the early modern period, pastoral had always been understood by careful readers to be at its origins an ironized and hard mode as well as a soft.

Arcadian pastoral is nonetheless widespread in the Italian and later the English Renaissance. There are of course plenty of “hard” Renaissance pastoral texts, in no way soft: Mantuan’s Elegies (1498); the eclogues of Alexander Barclay (1513-14, printed 1548 and 1570) and Barnabe Googe (printed 1563); Spenser’s Shepheardes Calender (1579); William Browne’s Britannia’s Pastorals (1613, 1616), which protest sharply against improving landowners’ abuses of tenants; and of course Milton’s anticlerical pastoral “Lycidas.” All of these texts are “hard” and in some cases sharply satirical. Nevertheless, there is in them little ironic distance between pastoral poet and his poem’s speaker or characters, as there had been a marked distance in Theocritus’s Idylls and Virgil’s Eclogues. And so the protagonist of San-nazaro’s Arcadia (1504) is named Sincero, and the irony deficit that this betokens sets the tone for much early modern arcadian pastoral, against which Marvell reacts.

The Mower poems differ from predecessors like The Shepheardes Calender or “Lycidas,” say, because they are both hard and ironized.

I approach this reading through Marvell’s close modeling of his Mower on Polyphemus, more famous as the Cyclops of the Odyssey and Euripides’s satyr play. Polyphemus’s buffo/serio personality and speech are central to Theocritus’s Idylls 6 and 11 and to Virgil, Eclogue 2, where he is modified to the shepherd Corydon. Polypheus means in Greek “much-spoken of,” or famous, but also “many-voiced,” with clear overtones of plural speech or signification. Thus Polyphemus, now gentle, now savage, and his speech, earnest and ironized by turns, set the tone for pastoral’s hard/soft duality, and its earnest/ironic rhetoric, from its earliest beginnings. And Marvell grafts this plurality onto the speaker of the Mower poems. The Mower is thus what we might call polyphemic; he is and says two things at once, often contradictory. I suggest “polyphemic” over the better-known “polyphonic” because it is The Mower’s plural speech or signification, rather than his plural voice or tone, which has crucial interpretive consequences. And the Mower poems themselves are polyphemic, as Marvell makes Damon say one thing but himself means another. The Mower poems, then, in one aspect, are ironic as to author, ironized as to speaker, and gently satiric in effect.
Indeed they are a first, early flowering of a peculiarly Restoration and Georgian strain, mock-pastoral—which, importantly, is not a mode that mocks pastoral but one that mocks modern foibles, including the arcadian impulse, by exaggerating and foregrounding the hard and ironic tempers in pastoral. The Mower poems, the first in a long time to assert the buffo side of pastoral on par with its serio, are also the first of a long line of mock-pastorals that extends forward 150 years, through Rochester’s “Fair Cloris in a piggst lay” and the urban pastorals of Swift, John Gay, and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, to late eighteenth-century “town eclogues” by Charles Jenner and Andrew Erskine.5

Using the Mower poems as a test case, then, I would suggest that the still-dominant literary history of pastoral in English, which sees this poetic mode in terminal decline after the mid-seventeenth century, needs reconfiguring. Marvell is not the end of true pastoral in English, as students of pastoral from William Empson and Frank Kermode to Sukanta Chaudhuri and Helen Cooper have argued, but its renewal, an invigoration of arcadian rootstock with graftings from the sharply ironized, often satirical Idylls and Eclogues. Like the marvel of Peru, which the Mower against Gardens deprecates, Marvell’s grafted pastoral grows flowers of two different colors, sometimes in the same bloom. It exhibits a satiric strain and a pathetic strain at once, like its long eighteenth-century inheritors, or like its pretexts in Theocritus and Virgil, to look the other way round at the “chain of receptions,” in Hans Robert Jauss’s term. As in the ancient exemplars the satire in the Mower poems is subtle, however, keeping buffo in equilibrium with serio, and it is of two different kinds.

The first, more obvious kind is Marvell’s gravely ironic way with Damon’s mooning over Juliana. Marvell, like his Scriblerian mock-pastoral inheritors, uses his swain’s erotic frustration, and the self-absorption that it betokens, as an occasion for wit rather than woe. Of course Marvell is far from making Damon a broad figure of fun; as Paul Davis has observed, “Such ironies as he ventures at Damon’s expense are carefully restrained, never escalating to the pitch of sarcastic exposure.”6 Marvell does not affirmatively make Damon look foolish; rather, he lets Damon’s complaints wax so plangent that they become self-parodic, and the Mower finally undercutts himself (literally, in “Damon the Mower”).

In his Longman edition of Marvell’s poems, Nigel Smith notes two telling aspects of the etymology of “mower” in the mid-seventeenth century. First, as late as the mid-eighteenth century the verb “to mow” also meant “to grimace or make a face,” and the noun “mow” could mean a grimace; the Mower may therefore be one who grimaces or makes faces, ruefully or sardonically, or both. And second, “to mow” was also a bit of bawdry, meaning “to copulate with,” giving the sickle phallic overtones. These etymologies suggest that Marvell wants us, even before moving from title to text, to see the libido beneath the Mower’s protestations of love for Juliana; and if the Mower is making faces as he speaks, isn’t he undercutting his own version
of events? Building on these etymologies, I think that if we pay close attention to precisely which lines and tags Marvell clips from ancient idyll and eclogue, we find good evidence that the Mower poems graft a deftly ironized speaker, and a deftly ironic poet, back onto early modern English pastoral.

Specifically, Marvell redeployls lines and tags from ancient idyll and eclogue to stack the cards against Damon, making him repeat lines already spoken by doomed, self-absorbed pastoral speakers in Theocritus and Virgil. Damon’s “Nor am I so deform’d to sight” (l. 57) quotes the lovelorn Corydon’s plaint at *Ecl.* 2.25, “nec sum adeo informis,” and the endearingly fatuous lines “I am the Mower Damon, known / Through all the Meadows I have mown” reactivates Daphnis’s quaint boast at *Ecl.* 5.43: “Daphnis ego in siluis, hinc usque ad sidera notus.” And then *Damon the Mower* closely imitates Theocritus, *Idylls* 11 and 6, the Polyphemus poems, and *Idyll* 4, where the herdman Battus gets a bad wound in his foot, while the poem’s title invites us to think of the georgic *Idyll* 10, a dialogue between the reapers Milon and Bucaeus (since reapers do work very similar to mowers'). It might seem, then, that Marvell wants us to focus primarily on the Mower’s pathetic, serio side.

But the chain of receptions does not link directly from Theocritus and Virgil to Marvell, of course. In a technique that Charles Martindale has termed “layering” or “double-distancing,” Marvell receives Theocritus and Virgil through Ovid, who read them first, and who in *Metamorphoses,* book 13 takes the *Idylls’s* droll Polyphemus and the *Eclogues’s* gravely ironized Corydon, and runs with them. Ovid fashions a Polyphemus who is funny, even farcical, and broadens the farce by making Galatea an onstage character; she lies hidden with her lover Acis, tittering at Polyphemus’s mooning monologue. Significantly, in *Metamorphoses* 13 the gigantic Cyclops combs his matted hair with a rake, and trims his beard with a sickle—so when he starts admiring his own unsightly features, he is no doubt peering into that sickle, a combination razor and shaving mirror. Thus Damon the Mower, when he peers admiringly at the reflection in his scythe, is restaging specifically Ovid’s Polyphemus. This conclusion is also suggested by his threat, in “The Mower’s Song,” to scythe down himself and everything around him so that “Flow’rs, and Grass, and I and all, / Will in one common Ruine fall” (ll. 21-22), a threat he makes good at the end of *Damon the Mower*—an echo of Polyphemus threatening Acis and Galatea with death, and in Acis’s case heaving up a chunk of mountain and crushing him with it.

Marvell thus invites us to see Damon though the lens of the Ovidian, comical Polyphemus. This stands to reason, for Ovid’s Polyphemus, and even particular phrases that he uses, seem to fascinate Marvell and persist in his memory. In *Hortus* for instance, as Nicholas von Maltzahn points out, the speaker quotes *Metamorphoses* 13.799 verbatim, so that Ovid’s tag *durior annosa quercu* (harder than aged oak), used to describe Galatea, in *Hortus* becomes “Jupiter annosam, neglecta coniuge, quercum / Deperit,” that is, “Jupiter, his wife forgotten, pines for the aged oak.” This may be
the Royal Oak of Stuart legitimacy but also, as von Maltzahn notes, a sly
knock on Charles II as ungainly lover and on the Countess of Castlemaine
as dried-up old wood. Remaking Polyphemus as Damon would, moreover,
be consistent with Marvell’s known habits of reading and composition in the
late 1640s and early 1650s, in the context of his intimacy with the poetic
circle centered on Thomas Stanley, which included Lovelace, Herrick, and
Shirley; *To His Coy Mistress* for instance seems to rework Shirley’s Ovidian
*Narcissus or, the Selfe-Lover* (1646) and other poems by members of the
Stanley circle, and *Damon the Mower* (1652) and its shadow Polyphemus
are doubtless indebted both directly and via poets such as Shirley to Ovid’s
Narcissus, another self-pitying reflection-gazer.

Simply by naming his mower Damon, moreover, Marvell suggests that we
should identify him with Polyphemus, warts and all. How so? In Virgil’s
*Ecl.* 8, a song contest between the herdsmen Damon and Alphesiboeus,
Damon complains that his girlfriend Nysa has deserted him for one Mopsus.
He sings:

O what a worthy man you’ve wed, while you despise
Us all, and while my pan-pipe and my little goats
And shaggy brow and jutting beard are your disgust,
And you believe no god cares for humanity...
Inside our fence I saw you, as a little girl
(I was your guide) with mother, picking dewy apples.
I had just entered then upon my thirteenth year,
And could just reach the brittle branches from the ground.
I looked and I was lost. How fantasy misled me!

A glance at Virgil’s reception of Theocritus here shows that the apple doesn’t
fall very far from the pastoral tree. In *Idyll* 11, Theocritus has Polyphemus
sing to Galatea:

I fell in love with you, my sweet, when first you came
With my mother to gather flowers of hyacinth
On the mountain, and I was your guide. From the day
I set eyes on you up to this moment, I’ve loved you
Without a break, but you care nothing, nothing at all.
I know, my beautiful girl, why you run from me:
A shaggy brow spreads right across my face
From ear to ear in one unbroken line...

Virgil’s reception of this is almost quotation, so that in *Ecl.* 8 Damon is
another Polyphemus, right down to his shaggy brow and acting as smitten
guide to the cool, flower-picking beloved. (Virgil’s recasting of Polyphemus’s
hyacinths as apples is still a borrowing from Theocritus, this time *Idyll* 3,
where an unnamed goatherd tries to move Amaryllis by bringing her ten
apples, but unfortunately she is turned off by his bristling beard—just as
Damon’s bristling beard drives Nysa into the arms of Mopsus in *Ecl.* 8.)
Virgil’s Damon is, in short, a shadow Polyphemus, and by in turn calling
his mower Damon, Marvell strengthens the identity with Polyphemus. And
the net effect of all this nudging us to see Polyphemus in Damon the Mower,
is to charge the Mower with the ancient Cyclops’s now-pathetic, now-funny
personality.

But if the first, more obvious kind of satire in the Mower poems is Mar-
vell’s gently ironic way with Damon’s mooning over Juliana, the second
kind is more elusive, because Marvell finds its object not amusing but some-
ting to be regretted: namely, practices of agricultural and horticultural
improvement that are leaving people like Damon behind economically and
socially. The Mower poems add to a literature of rural protest in English
that critiques the condition of agricultural laborers, one going back to Piers
Plowman and beyond, as Andrew McRae has argued. Marvell’s addition
to this literature is to graft in themes and tropes from Theocritus, Idyll 10
and especially Virgil, whose Ecl. 1 and 9 confront the plight of stock-raisers
and farmers who have lost their land to state expropriation in the wake of
civil war. No wonder then that Marvell approaches this topic so obliquely
in the Mower poems—in 1640s and 1650s England, men close to his patron
Fairfax, like the Cromwellian land commissioner and agricultural improver
Walter Blith, did very well by the award or purchase of Crown and royalist
lands seized by Parliament in the Civil Wars.

One such rural-protest grafting is Damon the Mower’s georgic claim that
agriculture is superior to the grazing culture of “the piping Shepherd,” his ri-
val. Neatly inverting Corydon’s boast at Ecl. 2.21 that he grazes a thousand
lambs, which is itself an imitation of Polyphemus’s at Idyll 11.34, Damon
says:

This Sithe of mine discovers
More ground than all his Sheep do hide.
With this the golden fleece I shear
Of all these Closes ev’ry Year.
And though in Wooll more poor than they,
Yet am I richer far in Hay.

(Damon the Mower, ll. 51-56)

We note that Damon mows not a village commons but “all these Closes”
(l. 54). In the poem’s fictive but historically inflected world, enclosure of
common land as private freehold is a known and operative economic force.
Damon’s defensive boast refracts the fact in 1650s and 1660s England, that
landowners who enclosed arable or mowable common and turned it into graze
were unlike Damon “richer far in” wool than they had been before in hay, or
cereals and other food crops. And they were certainly “richer far in” coin of
the realm than the copyholders and larger tenantry whose interests in open
lands or common lands they frequently extinguished to clear the way for
grazing sheep, ominous ovines like those in More’s Utopia that “be become
so greate denowerers and so wydle, that they eate vp and swallow down the
very men them selfes.” Damon’s defensiveness about enclosure, though
oblique, is no laughing matter, and enforces the recollection that pastoral in
the round has a serio side as well as a buffo. And Marvell’s pastoral serio,
like Theocritus, Idyll 10 or Virgil’s Ecls. 1 and 9, is concerned not with
one man’s erotic frustration but with the far more important experience
of disruption of traditional land tenures and agricultural labor, and even
expulsion from an ancestral home (concerns also limned in Upon Appleton
House, written perhaps a year prior to Damon the Mower).

Given Marvell’s restoration of a balanced sense of the pastoral mode,
then, by reintegrating its serio with its buffo, it seems odd that literary
historiography has failed to take seriously mock-pastoral’s claims to be pas-
torial. Most critics have accepted that pastoral in English had gone to seed
by the end of the seventeenth century, enlivened only by a few late blooms
(Oldham’s Lament for Bion, Pope’s anodyne Pastorals). The title of Frank
Kermode’s classic anthology and critical introduction, English Pastoral Po-
etry from the Beginnings to Marvell (1952), for instance, is telling. Kermode
judged correctly that earnest “true pastorals” are fairly inert after Marvell’s
death in 1678:

With Marvell the story really ends, for the later Pastoral
lived in a quite different atmosphere, and in a quite differ-
ent relationship to its readers... the true impulse of rustic
Pastoral petered out; it was something the Giant Race had
understood.16

This is sound so far as it goes: the Pastorals of Pope’s antagonist Ambrose
Philips, “Namby Pamby,” say, are fairly feeble. But earnest pastoral is far
from the whole story in the long eighteenth century, which saw a flourishing
of satiric pastoral: Swift’s “A Pastoral Dialogue,” Lady Mary Wortley Mon-
tagnu’s scathing Town Eclogues, John Gay’s The Shepherd’s Week, and the
Handel comic opera Acis and Galatea (1718) with libretto by Gay. Like the
Mower poems, which receive Theocritus and Virgil through Ovid, Acis and
Galatea’s libretto also exhibits layering or double-distancing: Gay receives
his comically Ovidian Polyphemus through Dryden, who rendered Metamor-
phoses 13 in Examen Poeticum (1693).17 In addition to writing the titular
lovers and Polyphemus, Gay also inserts a character called Damon, who as
in Marvell takes an earnestly arcadian view of things, telling Polyphemus to
“Consider, fond shepherd, / How fleeting’s the pleasure, / That flatters our
hopes / In pursuit of the fair! / The joys that attend it, / By moments we
measure, / But life is too little / To measure our care.”

In short, Kermode’s judgment that “[w]ith Marvell the story really ends”
is too neat as literary history. He does concede that the “eighteenth cen-
tury excelled in the mock-Pastoral,” but then makes the rather Spenglerian
comment that it “is a kind of pantomime following the great play.”18 Yet to
pigeonhole the Mower poems or Rochester’s “Faire Cloris in a pigsty lay” or
Swift’s “Pastoral Dialogue” as The Decline of the Pastoral because they are
amusing (in Swift’s case outright funny) is to miss the point that pastoral
becomes more, not less, pastoral beginning with Marvell by reactivating the ironic, satiric energies of Greco-Roman idyll and eclogue.

I would emphasize here that the revised chronology of pastoral I am proposing is not merely a reaction to the criticism of sixty years ago. Contemporary scholars of pastoral such as Helen Cooper, Sukanta Chaudhuri, and Judith Haber continue to follow the traditional periodization, and literary history has yet to improve on the supposition that, in Kermode’s words, the “old [pastoral] poetry, and everything that gave it its peculiar richness, had been largely forgotten by the time Johnson expressed his rational objections to ‘Lycidas.’”  

Haber’s study _Pastoral and the Poetics of Self-Contradiction, Theocritus to Marvell_ (1994), for instance, titles its epilogue “Farewell to Pastoral: The Shepherd’s Week,” and argues that Gay’s sextet of mock-pastoral eclogues, rather than the Mower poems as per Kermode, marks the twilight of the pastoral.

Most anthologies and critical introductions since Kermode’s, moreover, such as John Barrell’s and John Bull’s _The Penguin Book of English Pastoral Verse_ (1974, now out of print) have contained only a scattering of mock-pastorals, one each by Rochester and Swift in the Penguin for instance. The Penguin editors’ critical sin here is like Kermode’s one of omission, to sweep 150 years of pastoral poems beginning with Marvell under the rug because they are more or less ironized and satiric, and so prevent a tidy taxonomy of a mode that has been polyphemic and paradoxical from its Hellenistic and Roman beginnings.

I suggest that we should complicate these received ideas, and return pastoral to the center of Restoration and Georgian literary history, that we should see its main trunk not only alive after Marvell, but well, shooting out fresh new growth in the form of mock-pastoral. In doing so, we can follow the lead of Judith Hawley, Juan Christian Pellicer, and other scholars whose work has begun to rebalance long eighteenth-century literary history to take account of the lively persistence and thick growth of pastoral, best seen in its polyphemic, mock-pastoral strain after 1660—a persistence and growth directly traceable, I would argue, to Marvell’s Mower poems, and their grafting of “tame” ancient pastoral, especially its neglected ironic and satiric energies, back onto “wild” early modern English pastoral.
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Notes

1 Marvell also seems to graft georgic onto pastoral in the Mower poems, mixing a hay-mower into a mode ostensibly concerned with herdsmen, though haymaking of course implies livestock to eat it. Pastoral and georgic had in any case been intertwined from their Greco-Roman beginnings (Theocritus’s *Idyll* 10, a dialogue between two reapers; Virgil’s *Eclogue* 2, with its shepherd complaining as a crew of reapers toils in the background). In English poetry too, the two modes have long been mutually implicated; in Alastair Fowler’s phrase, “English pastoral is specially characterized by mixture with georgic.” See Fowler, “Georgic and Pastoral: Laws of Genre in the Seventeenth Century,” in *Culture and Cultivation in Early Modern England: Writing and the Land*, ed. Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992), 85.

2 The impulse to reduce and flatten the multifarious pastoral poetry written in English in the sixteenth and earlier seventeenth centuries to “Renaissance pastoral,” by which is meant arcadian or soft pastoral, can trip up even experienced readers. Thus in Raymond Williams’s Marxist account of the reception of pastoral in sixteenth-century Britain, the “achievement, if it can be called that, of the Renaissance adaptation of just these classical modes [hard and soft] is that, step by step, these living tensions are excised, until there is nothing countervailing, and selected images stand as themselves: not in a living but in an enameled world.” Williams, “Pastoral and Counter-Pastoral,” in *The Country and the City* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), 18. A similar misprision had tripped up William Empson in his 1935 *Some Versions of Pastoral*, which proceeds from the unexamined assumption that all pastoral is arcadian pastoral, and so falsifies the conditions of agricultural production and the relation between urban elites and rural laborers.


4 *The Shepheardes Calender* and “Lycidas,” for instance, are unquestionably hard pastoral as a thematic matter, concerned as they are with loss and death, and they function as hard-hitting Puritan satire or Nonconformist religious polemic. But while they are thematically hard, and at times even harsh, *The Shepheardes Calender* and “Lycidas” are conspicuously not ironized, and their rhetorical earnestness is closer to the tone of arcadian or soft Renaissance pastoral than to ancient idyll or eclogue, in which the poet keeps an ironic distance from his speakers and characters, in addition to taking up “hard” themes. For those who prefer ideas in proposition or Venn diagram form, we might say that all arcadian or soft pastoral is rhetorically earnest, but not all rhetorically earnest pastoral is arcadian or soft (as, again, “Lycidas” and *The Shepheardes Calender* tend to show).

5 Nigel Smith (*Poems*, 135) dates *Damon the Mower* to July-August 1652 and, following Allan Pritchard and Paul Hammond, the other Mower poems to 1668, on internal evidence (e.g. echoes of Cowley’s “The Garden,” published in 1668). The Mower poems thus precede Rochester’s mock-pastorals by date of composition, and so I assign them conceptual priority in this essay, though they were only printed posthumously in *Miscellaneous Poems* (1681), the year after Rochester’s death. As “it is only in the case of the post-Restoration satires” that scribal publication of Marvell’s poems “was genuinely extensive,” his influence on Rochester’s satiric neo-pastorals thus seems unlikely; see Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 63. “Tunbridge Wells” (1674), of course, alludes approvingly to *The Rehearsal Transpros’d* and


9 Marvell, like most Englishmen of his time who received an elite education, was from boyhood in Hull Grammar School intimately familiar with his Ovid as well as with Virgil, whose _Eclogues_ formed the foundation of grammar-school Latin studies. See Andrew Wallace, _Virgil’s Schoolboys: The Poetics of Pedagogy in Renaissance England_ (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 78-122. In _The Rehearsal Transpros’d_, Marvell gives anecdotally evidence of this easy familiarity; he remembers in detail the episode of Jupiter and Io from _Metamorphoses_ 1.568-667, and cites it as an instance of grammar-school curricula. _Prose Works_, 1:85.

10 Nicholas von Maltzahn, “Marvell’s Restoration Garden,” _Andrew Marvell Newsletter_ 1.1 (Summer 2009), 2.


15 More, _Utopia_, book 1, trans. Ralph Robynson (1551), repr. in _The Utopia of Sir Thomas More_, ed. J. H. Lupton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895), 51-52. The sheep are of course mere agents of the unscrupulous landlords who “leaue no grounde for tillage; they enclose all in pastures; they throw downe houses; they plucke downe townes; and leaue nothing stondynge but only the churche, to make of it a shepehowse.”


18 Kermode, _English Pastoral Poetry_, 42.

19 Kermode, _English Pastoral Poetry_, 42. See Helen Cooper, _Pastoral: Mediaeval into Renaissance?: “The debate about the nature of pastoral that raged in the early years of the eighteenth century shows how completely any sense of the mode as a dynamic idea had been lost. . . Dr Johnson gave pastoral its death-blow with his characterization of it as ‘easy, vulgar, and therefore disgusting.’ Pastoral had lost its focus: the sharp perspective it had given on society, its unique value as an optic on the nature of art, on
art and nature, were forgotten.” See also Sukanta Chaudhuri, *Renaissance Pastoral and its English Developments* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 6: “Such a substantial line of [pastoral] development can never be said to end; but Milton and Marvell provide a good stopping-point. The formal pastoral of later generations is a conventional shadow of its old self; while the vital inner concerns of the mode are conveyed through new types of nature-poetry and country literature which, though associated with formal pastoral and in many ways genuinely akin to it, are essentially different and in some respects opposed. The end of the Renaissance also marks the end of a long course of development in pastoral.”


21 John Barrell and John Bull, eds., *The Penguin Book of English Pastoral Verse* (London: Allen Lane, 1974, repr. New York: Penguin, 1982), 10. This omission of mock-pastorals may have been intentional, however, given the editors’ programmatic statement in their introduction that “the pastoral vision is, at base, a false vision, positing a simplistic, unhistorical relationship between the ruling, landowning class – the poet’s patrons and often the poet himself – and the workers of the land; as such its function is to mystify and to obscure the harshness of actual social and economic conditions” (4). As Seamus Heaney has pointed out, if the Penguin editors “had printed a translation of [Eclogue 1] in their anthology, they could hardly have got away with announcing” that Virgilian bucolic and Theocritean idyll, of all genres, are simplistic, sentimental, and escapist, and falsify the lives and conditions of rural laborers. Heaney, “Eclogues in extremis: On the Staying Power of Pastoral,” address to the Royal Irish Academy, 6 June 2002, repr. in Volk, *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Vergil’s Eclogues*, 248.