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Abstract

*Seigneur Dildoe*, as this dissertation will contend, was a fixture in Restoration literature and culture (1660-1700). But what was his provenance, by what means did he travel, and why did he come? This dissertation provides a literary history of the fascinating and highly irreverent dildo satire tradition, tracing the dildo satire’s long and winding progress from antiquity to Restoration England, where the tradition reached its early modern zenith. Adding breadth, context, and texture to existing treatments of the trope’s political and sexual potency, this dissertation investigates the dildo satire’s roots in both Greek comedy (Aristophanes, Herodas) and Latin invective (Martial, Juvenal), its influential association in early modern Italy with Catholicism and monastic life (Aretino), and its introduction in early modern England (Nashe), where it cropped up in the works of a surprising number of literary giants (Shakespeare, Jonson, Donne, Marvell). In Restoration England, we find in the satiric dildos of Butler, Rochester, and the contextually rich “Seigneur Dildoe” articulations of a dildo gone viral: the mock-heroic *Seigneur* deployed as a politically central motif symptomatic of its society’s acute patriarchal fissures. Throughout I argue that the dildo satire’s longevity is due not to a uniformity of purpose or signification (misogynist, anti-Catholic, emasculating, or otherwise), but to its innate versatility and ambiguity as a fugitive sexual and political figure. I also argue that what does in fact unite the satiric dildo’s variety of contingent ends, against what has been assumed in the scholarship, is its status as a markedly anti-Phallic figure.