



Holberton, E. W., Dzelzainis, M., & Coster, S. (2020). Andrew Marvell and the Dutch Fifth Column: New Evidence from a Copy of Mr Smirke with Authorial Annotations. *Seventeenth Century*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2020.1830158>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):  
[10.1080/0268117X.2020.1830158](https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2020.1830158)

[Link to publication record on the Bristol Research Portal](#)  
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Taylor and Francis at <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2020.1830158>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

## University of Bristol – Bristol Research Portal

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available: <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/brp-terms/>

## **Andrew Marvell and the Dutch Fifth Column: New Evidence from a Copy of *Mr Smirke* with Authorial Annotations**

Edward Holberton, Martin Dzelzainis, and Steph Coster

This essay discusses a previously-unknown copy of Andrew Marvell's *Mr Smirke*, which features annotations in his hand. We argue that the recipient of the volume was the Anglo-Dutch agent 'William Freeman', who was closely involved with a Dutch fifth column, set up by William of Orange and his spymaster Pierre Du Moulin, which lobbied Parliament during the Third Anglo-Dutch War. The essay discusses further archival evidence of Marvell's links to Freeman, and argues that their connection persisted after the end of the Third Anglo-Dutch war. Finally, the essay argues that these links throw new light onto the development of Marvell's late prose work, *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*, which is more closely influenced by other pamphlets associated with William's propaganda efforts in England in the 1670s than has been hitherto realised.

### **Keywords**

Marvell, Dutch, pamphlet, William of Orange, Restoration, spy

Was Andrew Marvell a Dutch spy? The question has long tantalised Marvell scholars, because during the Third Anglo-Dutch war (1672-74) he was named in connection with a pro-Dutch ‘fifth column’ organised by Pierre Du Moulin, a former civil servant in England, turned propagandist and spymaster for William of Orange. This group of spies worked to sway the English Parliament against the war. They came into England under false names, contacted and lobbied several MPs, and distributed smuggled pamphlets which were critical of Charles II’s pro-French foreign policy.<sup>1</sup> Eventually, following two tumultuous sessions in the winter of 1673-74, Charles was forced by Parliament to negotiate a peace with the Dutch. An informer, William Carr, reported that during this time Marvell had been smuggled across the North Sea for a secret meeting with William: “Once came over a Parliam̄nt man under ye name of Mr George by du Moulin’s order, was but one night at ye Hague, and having spoken with the Prince returned. Carre saw him. Was a thicke short man, as Carre judged much like Mervell [sic], but he could not say it was he, though he knows, as he says, Marvell very well.”<sup>2</sup>

What lends some credence to this report is that Marvell had many Dutch connections prior to his alleged meeting with William. He was an MP for the port of Hull, which had strong commercial and cultural links with the Netherlands, and he focused on Northern European diplomatic affairs in the course of his work for the Cromwellian secretariat for Foreign Tongues.<sup>3</sup> He made several documented journeys to the United Provinces too, as part of his European travels during the 1640s, and on an official mission during 1662-63, the purpose of which is unclear, when he stayed with Charles II’s resident at The Hague, George Downing.<sup>4</sup> Works such as *The Character of Holland* (1653/1665) and *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* (1677) showed that he amassed detailed knowledge of Dutch culture and political affairs.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, at the time of the reported meeting with William, Marvell had recently become involved with an emerging ‘country’

party of MPs, who opposed the court's attempts to manage Parliament through the distribution of offices and bribes. This group was increasingly suspicious of the influence at court of Catholicism and France, so the possibility that he intrigued with William is prima facie plausible. Furthermore, Marvell was well-placed to help with intelligence and influence: in February 1674 he was named on a Commons committee to "draw up reasons for a conference with the Lords concerning the address for peace" with the Dutch.<sup>6</sup> However, the source of the claim about the secret visit during the third Anglo-Dutch war, William Carr, is not very reliable. Carr was a double agent whom no-one at the time seems to have trusted, and Carr's identification of Marvell is uncharacteristically tentative.<sup>7</sup> Marvell's name also appears on a list of code-words (this time Marvell is "Mr Thomas") in the archives of William's diplomatic secretary, Gaspar Fagel.<sup>8</sup> But it is not clear from this list whether Marvell was a conspirator or one of the conspirators' targets. Recent accounts of Marvell's life have therefore treated the story of his alleged meeting with William of Orange with due caution.<sup>9</sup>

But new evidence has come to light which connects Marvell to William's secret network much more strongly: a copy of Marvell's clandestinely-published 1676 pamphlet *Mr. Smirke*, with annotations in Marvell's hand, now held in the Wellcome Library, London. Not only is this the only known copy of a printed work by Marvell to feature his handwriting, but it is also part of a volume with a Dutch provenance. This provenance leads directly to Du Moulin's network. The longest of Marvell's annotations (fig. 1 (compare the handwriting from the letter by Marvell in fig. 2)), which was damaged when the page was cut down, reports an attempt to censor *Mr. Smirke*:

this sheet in the Council

order is stiled tend

Sedition and the d

tion of the Chr

Religion<sup>10</sup>

The phrasing mimics a Privy Council warrant which was issued for the detention of the pamphlet's publisher, Nathaniel Ponder:

A Warrant to committ Nathaniell Ponder to the Gatehouse for carrying to the Presse to be printed an unlicenced Pamphlett tending to Sedition and Defamation of the Christian Religion Dated the 10th of May.<sup>11</sup>

The full annotation would probably have read:

this sheet in the Counci[l]

order is stiled tend[ing to]

Sedition and the d[efama]

tion of the Chr[istian]

Religion

Marvell, without ever being prosecuted himself, evidently knew a great deal about the efforts to suppress *Mr. Smirke*. Not only was he aware of the contents of the Privy Council papers, but, as his annotations show, he also knew the exact section of *Mr. Smirke* that had so exercised the authorities. His likely source was the Earl of Anglesey, the Lord Privy Seal, who in 1672 had intervened to prevent the suppression of a previous Marvell polemic, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*.<sup>12</sup>

Whereas all of the legal papers relating to Ponder's arrest and subsequent release refer in more general terms to an "unlicenced Pamphlett tending to Sediton and Defamation of the Christian Religion" (our emphasis), in the Wellcome Library copy of *Mr. Smirke*, Marvell indicates that a particular sheet – gathering I[=J] of the pamphlet – was the principal cause of offence. He marks both where "this sheet" begins and, on its eighth page, where "[th]at sheet ends".<sup>13</sup> The pages thus highlighted offer a corrosive account of the Councils of Nicaea (325CE) and Constantinople (381CE), and by extension bring into question the imposition of doctrinal uniformity by the church. Both Councils are cast as egregious examples of the factionalism of bishops. The Council of Nicaea had not ended the Arian controversy it was meant to resolve. There followed an oecumenical tug-of-war, ending with the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed that finally condemned Arianism and adopted Trinitarian doctrine. Even if, for Marvell, Arianism was "the wrong side of Christianity", he despaired at bishops "Bawling, and Scratching one another" in order to define "the Divinity then in Mode".<sup>14</sup> His quoting the fiercely Trinitarian bishop, St Hilary of Poitiers, neatly made his point for him: "while we Quarrel about things doubtful...there is none now almost that is Christ's."<sup>15</sup>

*Mr. Smirke* was a response to current infighting between bishops, who were divided over the appropriate way to treat religious nonconformists. With a powerful lobby in the House of Lords and positions on the Privy Council, the bishops held considerable sway over lawmaking. In writing *Mr. Smirke*, Marvell had come to the rescue of the bishop of Hereford, Herbert Croft, who had argued in his pamphlet, *The Naked Truth* (1675), for a more lenient government policy towards nonconformists.<sup>16</sup> The bishop of London, Henry Compton and his allies, who favoured severer penalties for dissenters, reacted harshly to Croft, denouncing him vociferously in the pulpit and in print. Setting this dispute about nonconformity in the context of Nicaea invited readers to make obvious comparisons.

Because *Mr. Smirke* decried conciliar doctrine fundamental to the church, it gave the

authorities ammunition to censor it. Marvell knew that it was inflammatory. In a letter to Sir Edward Harley (fig. 2), a parliamentary sponsor of Croft's pamphlet, he makes another reference to the contents of "this sheet": "Dr Stillingfleets answer to Godwin, where in his prefatory Epistle to the Bp of London he seems to haue read the sheet so seditious and defamatory to Christian Religion."<sup>17</sup> Edward Stillingfleet was then archdeacon of London. His epistle prefaced a rebuke to Roman Catholic attacks on the Church of England, but does indeed refer to material which features in gathering I[=J]. Rejecting the aspersions cast by 'men of ill minds', Stillingfleet's epistle defends the behaviour of bishops in the time of Constantinople: "the *Bishops* of that time were men of that exemplary *Piety* ... of that excellent *Conduct* and *Magnanimity*, as set them above the contempt or reproach of any"<sup>18</sup> Though Stillingfleet wrote primarily in reference to Catholic criticisms of the church, he had broader analogies to make. Stillingfleet thought that the Church of England "comes the nearest to" the superior conduct of the early church for its bishops' insistence on uniformity of worship.<sup>19</sup> All this was addressed to Henry Compton – and it was Compton who, brandishing his own marked-up copy of *Mr. Smirke*, had pushed for the Privy Council to repress it.

So Marvell sent someone a copy of *Mr. Smirke* to which he added commentary on the government's efforts to suppress the pamphlet and track down its publisher and printers. What connects it to Du Moulin's network is the evidence of this copy's early provenance. It has been bound with several other pamphlets, including Croft's *The Naked Truth*, as a volume.<sup>20</sup> Holes in the pages of *Mr. Smirke* near the spine suggest that it had previously been bound as a pamphlet. This explains why Marvell's comments are missing some letters, which were lost when the annotated pages were cut down to the smaller format of the book. Furthermore, the book's binding suggests that it was put together in the Dutch republic. It is an example of 'Hollandse band' or 'spitselband' binding. Thin bands of parchment – spitsels

– attach the vellum to the bookblock. This technique was commonly used in the Dutch Republic, but not in England.<sup>21</sup>

This material evidence supports the Dutch provenance suggested by a note on the flyleaf: “Nine volum’s of Freemans pamphlets at ye Hague”. Who was Freeman? K. H. D. Haley’s *William of Orange and the English Opposition* identifies Freeman as a leading agent in the Du Moulin network. Haley suggests that Freeman was originally William Medley, a scribe and archivist for the radical religious sect the Fifth Monarchists, who signed a pamphlet – *A Standard Set Up* – written against Oliver Cromwell’s Protectorate in 1657, and perhaps also wrote *A Door of Hope*, the manifesto of the Fifth Monarchists’ 1661 uprising.<sup>22</sup> During the 1670s he travelled backwards and forwards between London and the Netherlands, where he used the name William Freeman. He helped to organise the importation to England and distribution among MPs of several pro-Dutch pamphlets, including Du Moulin’s influential *Englands Appeal from the Private Cabal at White-Hall to the Great Council of the Nation, the Lords and Commons in Parliament Assembled*.<sup>23</sup> A letter signed by Freeman in the Fagel Archive, apparently unknown to Haley, describes his activities and claims that he played a leading role in planning the content and distribution of *Englands Appeal* and other Dutch pamphlets which targeted the English Parliament in 1673-74.<sup>24</sup> It also supports Haley’s identification of Freeman with Medley, because it mentions that his brother was involved in the distribution of Dutch Pamphlets and was arrested, and this matches records of a Samuel Medley who was arrested in the course of searches for *Englands Appeal*.<sup>25</sup>

Du Moulin and Marvell had earlier crossed paths when they served as secretaries on overlapping diplomatic missions to Denmark in late 1664 (Marvell was secretary to the Earl of Carlisle, Du Moulin to Sir Gilbert Talbot), but they had since been pushed away from government service by the English court’s turn towards a pro-French foreign policy.<sup>26</sup> As *Mr. Smirke* witnesses, Marvell saw an inclusive, tolerant Church of England as the best bulwark



against this threat. Marvell was no admirer of Fifth Monarchists, however. His 1655 poem *The First Anniversary* scathingly compares them to “locusts”, because their sectarianism undermines Cromwell’s attempts to create precisely this kind of broader church settlement.<sup>27</sup> It might be that Freeman – if he was indeed originally William Medley – had moderated his views by the time that he came to work with Du Moulin and Marvell in the 1670s. Even if he had not, then Marvell, Du Moulin, and Freeman would still have shared an interest in issues and arguments concerning religious toleration and dissent, as well as an antipathy to overweening bishops. Toleration was well-established in the United Provinces, although it also presented William of Orange with his own political balancing-act, as he sought to draw support from across the Dutch religious spectrum. As a religious dissenter and advisor on English affairs to William, Freeman would presumably have maintained a close interest in the English government’s changing policies towards toleration at this time. He would have been keen to know about where bishops such as Compton were drawing the battle-lines. Marvell’s annotations provide valuable information in that regard: they highlight the fact that the growing political influence of Compton and his allies at court included an insistence on narrow credal conformity.

Freeman is recorded as a regular presence at William’s court through the later 1670s and early 1680s, where his influence survived the death of Du Moulin in 1676. When William married Mary Stuart in 1677, he promised his uncle Charles II that he had ceased intriguing with English MPs.<sup>28</sup> Diplomatic and archival records of Freeman’s activities suggest that, notwithstanding William’s assurances, Freeman continued to maintain his contacts in England and lobby on behalf of the Dutch.<sup>29</sup> The English ambassador in The Hague, Henry Sidney, met with Freeman in January 1680 and reported him as being “horribly unsatisfied with the King, a friend to the Prince [of Orange], and ready to do him any service, a great enemy to the Duke [of York]”; Freeman hoped that Charles would recall

Parliament and ratify an Anglo-Dutch alliance, he noted.<sup>30</sup> Sidney was also told by Carr that Freeman kept company with John Phelps, who had been one of the judges in Charles I's trial, and who was living in hiding in Holland. The French ambassador, Jean-Antoine de Mesmes, Count D'Avaux, kept a close eye on Freeman's activities. In his account, Freeman appears as "Frymans", but it is clear that this is Freeman because he is identified as the agent of William "who raised such cabals in the house of commons in 1674".<sup>31</sup> Avaux reports that Freeman had been sent by William on a similar mission to England in the later 1670s, to meet with MPs just before the opening of a new session of Parliament, and to persuade them to pressure Charles II into a full alliance with the Dutch. Avaux does not date this mission precisely, but it seems likely that it took place in the runup to, or during, the parliamentary sessions of 1677, when Parliament debated the issue of supply and a Dutch alliance, and the king suspected that William's agents had been lobbying English MPs.<sup>32</sup> This was the period when Marvell began to write *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*.<sup>33</sup> Freeman continued his activities during the Exclusion Crisis too: a long policy memorandum written by Freeman in 1680, now in the British Library, details the political proposals that Freeman later discussed with Sidney. Drawing heavily on Machiavellian ideas to analyse, for William's benefit, the historical role and power of the English Parliament, it sets out the political and religious rationales for a new anti-French alliance between the Dutch republic and England. It also advises William on the arguments he should use to persuade in turn Charles, the English Parliament, and the Dutch States General.<sup>34</sup> By the time that Freeman wrote the memorandum in 1680, Avaux suspected, William's policy was to make Charles as dependent upon Parliament as possible, and his real aim was dynastic.<sup>35</sup> He hoped that a new parliamentary session would unleash even more anticatholic feeling in Parliament, and exclude the Duke of York from the succession. William could position himself as an alternative heir.

Marvell's connection to Freeman in 1676 brings into clearer focus the influence of pro-Dutch writing and lobbying on *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*. This is but one of a series of 1670s opposition polemics which allege that pro-French conspirators are undermining English institutions, particularly Parliament and the church. The origins of this idea went back at least as far as the anti-French tracts of the imperial diplomat François Paul de Lisola, whom *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* cites as a formative influence on the English opposition. It was then developed by Du Moulin's *Englands Appeal*, and by several English pamphlets, notably the Earl of Shaftesbury's *Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend in the Country* (1675).<sup>36</sup> Du Moulin, Shaftesbury, and Marvell each refer to sinister "master-piece[s]" of courtly conspiracy, as if the court's battles with Parliament over foreign policy and the religious settlement formed a sequence of baroque paintings or sculptures, for the private pleasure of Whitehall courtiers.<sup>37</sup> *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* combines elements from its predecessor secret histories, notwithstanding the differences of time and political perspective between them: *Englands Appeal* emphasises the external threat of an expansionist France, while *A Letter from a Person of Quality* frames Danby's Test Bill as a plot by "Great Church Men" in England to make the "Government *absolute* and *Arbitrary*, and allow Monarchy as well as Episcopacy to be *Iure Divino*, and not to be bounded, or limited by humane Laws".<sup>38</sup> Marvell's synthesis is nevertheless not without some strain, as Nigel Smith remarks: the machinations of the Cabal government around the Third Anglo-Dutch war and Danby's attempts to manage Parliament after the Cabal's fall are presented as part of the same pro-France, pro-Catholic conspiracy, as are the 1672 Declaration of Indulgence (which Marvell like Shaftesbury and Du Moulin had supported at the time), and the Anglican revival later pursued by Danby (who in fact recognised the need to distance Charles from French influence).<sup>39</sup>

Like Du Moulin's argument in *England's Appeal*, Marvell's analysis is primarily political, and concerns the spread of "Arbitrary Government" more than "Popery". In both tracts, the root of the problem is French expansionism, which instrumentalises religious conflict as a means of spreading French power militarily and diplomatically.<sup>40</sup> But Marvell additionally includes a prefatory section which satirises Popery as "such a thing as cannot, but for want of a word to express it, be called a Religion".<sup>41</sup> Popery is religion deformed by arbitrary power, so Arbitrary Government in England will bring Catholicism with it: this somewhat awkward interpolation seems designed to expand the scope of the political argument in order to draw energy from the mounting public anti-Catholicism which followed confirmation of the Duke of York's religion in 1673.<sup>42</sup> Marvell's narrative of political events between the second Anglo-Dutch war and the opening of Parliament in January 1678 draws extensively on arguments and rhetorical tactics which had proved effective in Du Moulin's *England's Appeal*: both Du Moulin and Marvell write to the moment of parliamentary crises in which closer Anglo-Dutch diplomatic ties would be made the condition of supply, and heap pressure on the government by arguing that a Dutch alliance is in the public and Protestant interest.<sup>43</sup> Marvell ends *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* by alleging, provocatively, that the latest adjournments are designed to let Louis XIV complete his military campaign, the recent successes of which horrified many English MPs:

Wherein it seemed not so strange, because often done before, as unfortunate that the French should still have so much further leisure allowed him to compleat his design upon Flanders, before the Nation should have the last opportunity of interposing their Counsels with his Majesty (it cannot now be said) to prevent it.<sup>44</sup>

As Levillain has pointed out, Marvell follows *England's Appeal* closely in his description of

the confessional arguments used by Louis XIV to other Catholic states in justifying the war in 1672: in both texts, Louis justifies his attack on the Netherlands as a “War of Religion” for the “extirpating of Heresie”.<sup>45</sup> Marvell also draws on some of the other Dutch-printed English language materials circulated by Freeman at the same time, which allow Marvell to shade his secret history with glimpses of the Dutch perspective as Anglo-French conspirators undermined the 1668 Triple Alliance with the Netherlands and Sweden.<sup>46</sup> Marvell defends Freeman’s 1673 print campaign as “industrious” diplomacy which “undeceived the generality of the Nation”, and protests at the treatment of two of William’s agents, Gerbrand Zas and William Arton, who entered England at this time on clandestine diplomatic missions, and who were treated not as diplomats but as spies – as well Marvell might, given that his own contacts with Freeman made him vulnerable to similar accusations of spying.<sup>47</sup> Marvell thus sought to knit together a patchwork of materials to give momentum and scope to the opposition’s campaign for a Dutch alliance in the session of 1678. Roger L’Estrange’s *An Account of the Growth of Knavery*, published in reply to Marvell later that year, dismisses *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* as a derivative product of Shaftesbury’s patronage. But, in fact, it was Marvell’s personal understanding – refined through Anglo-Dutch exchanges such as the one recorded in Freeman’s copy of *Mr. Smirke* – of how the decade’s religious and foreign politics might mesh into a bigger picture which fitted him to this task.<sup>48</sup>

The problems inherent in synthesizing this array of materials also help to explain what is otherwise a puzzling omission in *An Account of the Growth of Popery*. The marriage between William and Mary Stuart in 1677 goes “conspicuously unmentioned” there notwithstanding the tract’s focus on Anglo-Dutch diplomacy that year, and the fact that Marvell’s letters show that he was following news about the negotiation of the marriage long before it took place.<sup>49</sup> *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government*

mentions William by name only in the conclusion, as having been neglected by his uncle Charles.<sup>50</sup> This is likely because news of William's marriage to Mary had been greeted with dismay and suspicion by some members of the opposition, who suspected that William too had been bought by France.<sup>51</sup> At the turn of 1678, Parliament seemed closer than at any point in the previous decade to compelling Charles to make an anti-French alliance with the Dutch, and even though the marriage had contributed to the Anglo-Dutch rapprochement of 1677, it undermined Marvell's grand narrative of conspiracy, because it was supported by Danby and other courtiers. Marvell sidesteps the topic, and so leaves undisturbed the identification of interests between Parliament, William, and the Dutch.

Because it is written in Freeman's handwriting (which matches the handwritten table of contents in the Wellcome Library volume), the 1680 memorandum also allows Freeman to be identified as the author of a letter intercepted by the Secretary of State, Henry Coventry, which Nicholas von Maltzahn recently discovered in the Coventry archive, and which he discusses in the *Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*. Signed W. F., from The Hague, it reports receiving recent news of Marvell's death:

Your Letter of the 20. August I haue received, and haue not been a little troubled for the loss of my friend and countryman, Andrew Marvel, but my curiosity in the death of so great a man, puts me upon inquiry what his disease was, and after what manner he dyed especially what satisfaction he had and evidence he gave in that great work which I should be very glad you would give me som accompt of.<sup>52</sup>

The "great work", von Maltzahn suggests, was Marvell's *Account*, the full contents and success of which Freeman is understandably keen to learn about as much as possible. The identification of Freeman as the writer of this letter, and a "friend" of Marvell's who knew

very quickly about his death, confirms that the connection between Marvell and William of Orange remained strong long after the end of the Third Anglo-Dutch War. Existing accounts of the Du Moulin network, which assume that it fell apart at that time, need revision. The letter from W. F. adds some intriguing names to the list of possible members of that network: Colonel Edward Grosvenor, a former Cromwellian MP who remained well-connected in Westminster, and whom von Maltzahn suspects was the addressee of the letter; and “Mr Davenport”, to whom Freeman asks to be remembered at the end of his letter. The government interceptor of this letter recognised that this was a pseudonym for Richard Cromwell, the former Lord Protector, who was supposedly keeping himself out of the way of English politics. Marvell had worked in Richard’s government, and praised him in his elegy for Oliver Cromwell. The Wellcome Library copy of *Mr. Smirke* is thus intrinsically of great interest and significance because it is the only annotated book that we have in Marvell’s hand. But, as physical evidence of the link between Marvell and Freeman, it also offers a glimpse into a political network which spans two revolutions: it connects Cromwellians and radicals from the 1650s to the first of William of Orange’s interventions in English affairs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Haley, *William of Orange*, 52-184.

<sup>2</sup> The National Archives, London (TNA), State Papers 105/222, fol.127. Journal of Joseph Williamson, secretary of state, 6/16 May 1674.

<sup>3</sup> Holberton, ‘Marvell and Diplomacy’, 99-100.

<sup>4</sup> Smith, *Andrew Marvell*, 170-72; Levillain, “Andrew Marvell and the Low Countries”, 114-127.

<sup>5</sup> Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English*, 238–42; Zwicker, “What’s the Problem with the Dutch?”

<sup>6</sup> Smith, *Andrew Marvell*, 281.

<sup>7</sup> Haley, *William of Orange*, 57-58.

<sup>8</sup> Haley, *William of Orange*, 58, quoting Nationaal Archief, The Hague, Fagal Papers, Folder 244.

<sup>9</sup> Smith, *Andrew Marvell*, 280-81; Levillain, “Andrew Marvell and the Low Countries”, 124.

<sup>10</sup> Marvell, *Mr. Smirke*, sig.I[=J]1r/p.. 62[=61] (Wellcome Library, shelfmark 34023/B; Wing M843, but misreported in the Wellcome catalogue and by ESTC as an example of Wing M873A). Only two comments in the volume are in Marvell’s hand. Other marginalia comprise corrections to the text in at least three other distinct hands, one of which may be

William Freeman's (see page 6 below). The full list of MS corrections (excluding the two comments by Marvell himself) is as follows:

- 1) Sig. . χ1r 'traced': caret between 'a' and 'c' and 'du' added in the margin; these changes to the prefatory note 'To the CAPTIOUS READER' are found in the same hand in almost all copies of the first edition of *Mr. Smirke* (that is, Wing M873 and M873A).  
'Laities': 's' deleted with a vertical stroke; likewise found in almost all copies of M873 and M873A.  
'mi-represented': corrected with a long s through the hyphen. No known copy featuring 'mi-represented' (later corrected in the press to 'mis-represented' in most copies of M873 and M873A) has been changed by hand in this way. The formation of the long s in the Wellcome copy resembles the capital S found in Freeman's 'Memorial' (for example, 'Sea' and 'Switzers' in British Library, Add MSS 32680, at fols 188r and 188v respectively).
- 2) P. 12 '*Gnaz'as*': struck through and 'Ganza's' written in the margin.
- 3) P.24. 'Cooek-boat': 'Cooek' struck through and 'Coach' written in the margin.
- 4) P.35. '*Elieson*': 'ie' struck through and 'ei' written in the margin.
- 5) P.40. '*Pettie Fraud*': struck through and 'ia Fraus' written in the margin (because the page was cropped, 'pia' has been added above in a later hand by way of clarification). For the same correction, with 'Pia Fraus' spelled out in full in a very similar print-like hand, see Regent's Park College, Oxford, Angus Library, shelfmark 6.h.12(h).
- 6) P.64. 'then particular': caret inserted between the two words and 'for a' written in the margin.
- 7) P.74. 'were': caret with interlinear 'a' added above to read 'weare'.  
'the pretences': caret inserted between the two words and 'same' added in the margin. The same correction, though not in a similar hand, can be seen in the Regent's Park College copy (see above). For further details see Martin Dzelzainis, 'Unrecorded variants in the first edition of *Mr. Smirke*', *Notes and Queries* (forthcoming).

<sup>11</sup> TNA, PC2/65 fol.217.

<sup>12</sup> Dzelzainis and Coster, 540.

<sup>13</sup> Marvell, *Mr. Smirke*, sig.II[=J]4v/p. 68.

<sup>14</sup> Marvell, *Mr. Smirke*, sig.I[=J]1r/p. 62[=61]; sig.I[=J]3v/p. 66.

<sup>15</sup> Marvell, *Mr. Smirke*, sig.I[=J]2r/p. 63.

<sup>16</sup> Dzelzainis and Coster, 542-46.

<sup>17</sup> British Library, Add MS 70120, Andrew Marvell folder, 1<sup>st</sup> July 1676.

<sup>18</sup> Stillingfleet, *A Defence* [sig.A7r].

<sup>19</sup> Stillingfleet, *A Defence* [sig.A6v].

<sup>20</sup> It is not clear what connects this diverse collection of pamphlets, which includes a collection of bills of mortality for the plague year of 1664, *The Principles of Faith: presented by Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sydrach Simson, and other Ministers, to the Committee of Parliament for Religion* (London, 1654), and Marchamont Nedham's *Interest will not Lie, Or, A View of England's True Interest* (London, 1659). Interestingly, the volume also includes *A Sermon Preached before the King by Edward Stillingfleet* (London, 1667) which had criticised the royal court, and which Marvell had sent to his patron Lord Wharton. See *Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, ed. Margoliouth, ii. 309–11; von Maltzahn, 'Marvell and Patronage', 55.

<sup>21</sup> We are very grateful to Professor Paul Hoftijzer for this information.

<sup>22</sup> Haley, *William of Orange*, 54-56; [Anon], *A standard set up*, 1; [Anon], *A door of hope*; Capp, 'A Door of Hope Re-opened', 18-19.

<sup>23</sup> Haley, *William of Orange*, 98, 166; British Library, Add MS 37981 fol. 69v; [Du Moulin], *Englands Appeal*.

<sup>24</sup> Nationaal Archief, The Hague, 3.01.18, 47.



- 
- <sup>25</sup>Nationaal Archief, The Hague, 3.01.18, 47, fol. 1; McKenzie and Bell, ii, 55-56.
- <sup>26</sup> Haley, *William of Orange*, pp. 15-17.
- <sup>27</sup> *Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. Smith, 296.
- <sup>28</sup> Haley, 'The Anglo-Dutch Rapprochement', 614-648.
- <sup>29</sup> Nationaal Archief, The Hague, 3.01.18, 47, fol. 6.
- <sup>30</sup> Sidney, *Diary of the times of Charles the Second*. i. 256, ii. 5, 59.
- <sup>31</sup> *The Negotiations of Count D' Avaux*, i. 8-9.
- <sup>32</sup> Haley, "Anglo-Dutch Rapprochement", 622-31.
- <sup>33</sup> *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 185.
- <sup>34</sup> British Library, Add MS 32680, fols.187-211.
- <sup>35</sup> *The Negotiations of Count D' Avaux*, i. 24.
- <sup>36</sup> *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 276; Levillain, "Marvell and the Low Countries", 121-22; see also Goldie and Levillain, "François-Paul De Lisola", 15, 20-21; de Lisola, *The Buckler of State*; de Lisola, *Le Politique du Temps*.
- <sup>37</sup> *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 259; [Anon], *A Letter from a Person of Quality*, 1; [Du Moulin] *Englands appeal*, 21.
- <sup>38</sup> [Anon], *A Letter from a Person of Quality*, 1; Packham, "Marvell, Political Print, and Picturing the Catholic", 577.
- <sup>39</sup> Smith, *Andrew Marvell*, 322.
- <sup>40</sup> *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 182; [Du Moulin], *Englands Appeal*, 3-22.
- <sup>41</sup> *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 227.
- <sup>42</sup> *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 234.
- <sup>43</sup> *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 271.
- <sup>44</sup> *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 372; Levillain, "Marvell and the Low Countries", 125-26.
- <sup>45</sup> Levillain, "Marvell and the Low Countries", 122-23; *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 262.
- <sup>46</sup> See, for example, Marvell's narrative (*Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 253) of a key incident cited in the English Declaration of war, when a fleet of Dutch ships neglected to lower their topsails to acknowledge an English yacht which had been sailed amongst them provocatively. In its sympathetic account of the perplexity of the Dutch Admiral on this occasion, Marvell appears to draw on the Freeman-circulated *The Answer of the States Generall* (The Hague, 1674), p. 27. For Freeman's involvement with the writing and distribution of this pamphlet see Nationaal Archief, The Hague, 3.01.18, 47.
- <sup>47</sup> *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 275; ii. 266; Haley, *William of Orange*, 76-77.
- <sup>48</sup> L'Estrange, *An account of the growth of knavery*, 4-5; Marchamont Nedham seems to point to *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* when he notes the "Discontents" who write about affairs of state before the meeting Parliament, and frequent the houses of foreign ambassadors and agents in search of intelligence. If so, he saw through the double-bluff of the Account's feigned "Amsterdam" imprint, which it shared with several other oppositional pamphlets associated with John Darby at this time: Nedham, *Christianissimus christianandus*, 73; *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 188.
- <sup>49</sup> *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 374; *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 143-44.
- <sup>50</sup> *Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, ii. 374.
- <sup>51</sup> Haley, "Anglo-Dutch Rapprochement", 647.
- <sup>52</sup> Longleat House, MS Coventry 43, f. 260r; see von Maltzahn, "Marvell and Patronage", 578. The authors are grateful to Paul Hoftijzer, Sjoerd Levelt, Rena Bood and Jack Avery for their assistance in writing this essay.

---

## Bibliography

### Manuscripts

British Library, Add MS 32680

British Library, Add MS 70120

Longleat House, MS Coventry 43

Nationaal Archief, The Hague, 3.01.18, 47

Nationaal Archief, The Hague, Fagal Papers, Folder 244

The National Archives, London (TNA), PC2/65 f.217 “Journal of Joseph Williamson, secretary of state”

The National Archives, London, State Papers 105/222

### Printed Sources

Anon. *A door of hope: or, A call and declaration for the gathering together of the first ripe fruits unto the standard of our Lord, King Jesus*. n. p., 1661.

Anon. *A Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend in the Country*. n.p., 1675.

Anon. *A standard set up: whereunto the true seed and saints of the most High may be gathered together into one, out of their several forms*. n. p. 1657.

Anon. *The Answer of the States Generall*. The Hague, 1674.

Avaux, Jean-Antoine des Mesmes. *The Negotiations of Count D' Avaux, Ambassador from His Most Christian Majesty to the States General of the United Provinces*. 2 vols. n.p., 1754.

Capp, Bernard, ‘*A Door of Hope Re-opened: The Fifth Monarchy, King Charles and King Jesus*’, *Journal of Religious History*, 32 (2008): 16-30.

---

Dzelzainis, M and S. Coster. "The Commissioning, Writing, and Printing of Mr. Smirke: A New Account." In *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, edited by M. Dzelzainis and E. Holberton, 534-57. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Goldie, M. and C. E. Levillain, "Francois-Paul de Lisola and English Opposition to Louis XIV." *The Historical Journal* (2019): 1-22.

Haley, K.H.D. *William of Orange and the English Opposition, 1672-4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

Haley, K.H.D. "The Anglo-Dutch Rapprochement of 1677." *English Historical Review*, 73 (1958): 614-48.

Holberton, E., "Marvell and Diplomacy." In *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, edited by M. Dzelzainis and E. Holberton, 96-113. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Kerrigan, J. *Archipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics, 1603-1707*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

L'Estrange, R. *An account of the growth of knavery under the pretended fears of arbitrary government and popery with a parallel betwixt the reformers of 1677 and those of 1641 in their methods and designs: in a letter to a friend*. London, 1678.

Levillain, C.É., "Andrew Marvell and the Low Countries." In *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, edited by M. Dzelzainis and E. Holberton, 114-27. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Maltzahn, N. V. "Marvell and Patronage." In *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, edited by M. Dzelzainis and E. Holberton, 43-60. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

---

[Marvell, Andrew], *Mr. Smirke; or, The Divine in Mode: Being Certain Annotations, upon the Animadversions on the Naked Truth. Together with a Short Historical Essay, concerning General Councils, Creeds, and Impositions, in Matters of Religion.* n.p., 1676.

Marvell, Andrew. *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell.* Edited by H.M. Margoliouth, revised by P. Legouis with the collaboration of E.E. Duncan-Jones, 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Marvell, Andrew. *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell.* Edited by A. Patterson, M. Dzelzainis, N. v. Maltzahn and N.H. Keeble. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Marvell, Andrew. *The Poems of Andrew Marvell.* Edited by N. Smith, revised edition. Harlow: Longman, 2007.

McKenzie, D.F. and M. Bell. *A Chronology and Calendar of Documents Relating to the London Book Trade, 1641-1700.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

[Moulin, Pierre Du]. *Englands Appeal from the Private Cabal at White-Hall to the Great Council of the Nation, the Lords and Commons in Parliament Assembled.* n.p., 1673.

Nedham, Marchamont. *Interest will not Lie, Or, a View of England's True Interest.* London, 1659.

[Nedham, Marchamont]. *Christianissimus christianandus; or Reasons for the Reduction of France to a more Christian State in Europe.* London, 1678.

Packham, K. "Marvell, Political Print, and Picturing the Catholic." In *The Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, edited by M. Dzelzainis and E. Holberton, 558-80. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

---

Sidney, Henry, *Diary of the Times of Charles the Second by the Honourable Henry Sidney, afterwards Earl of Romney*. Edited by Robert Blencowe, 2 vols. London, 1843.

Smith, N. *Andrew Marvell: The Chameleon*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Stillingfleet, E. *A Sermon Preached before the King*. London, 1667.

Stillingfleet, E. *A Defence of the Discourse . . . in answer to a book entituled Catholicks, no Idolaters*. London, 1676.

*The Principles of Faith: presented by Mr. Tho. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sydrach Simson, and other Ministers, to the Committee of Parliament for Religion*. London, 1654.

Zwicker, S.N., "What's the Problem with the Dutch? Andrew Marvell, the Trade Wars, Toleration, and the Dutch Republic." *Marvell Studies*, 3 (2018).