

2005

# Waller's Machiavellian Cromwell: The Imperial Argument of A Panegyrick to my Lord Protector

Timothy Raylor  
Carleton College

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.carleton.edu/engl\\_faculty](https://digitalcommons.carleton.edu/engl_faculty)

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Raylor, Timothy. "Waller's Machiavellian Cromwell: The Imperial Argument of A Panegyrick to my Lord Protector." *Review of English Studies* 56.235 (2005): 386-411. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/res/hgi057>. Accessed via Faculty Work. English. *Carleton Digital Commons*. [https://digitalcommons.carleton.edu/engl\\_faculty/1](https://digitalcommons.carleton.edu/engl_faculty/1)  
The definitive version is available at <https://doi.org/10.1093/res/hgi057>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English at Carleton Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Work by an authorized administrator of Carleton Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcollections@carleton.edu](mailto:digitalcollections@carleton.edu).

# WALLER'S MACHIAVELLIAN CROMWELL: THE IMPERIAL ARGUMENT OF *A PANEGYRICK TO MY LORD PROTECTOR*

BY TIMOTHY RAYLOR

Recent work on Waller's *Panegyrick to my Lord Protector* has focused on its effort to dress Cromwell in Augustan garb to translate his power into authority over a quiescent populace. Drawing on recently discovered evidence about the poem's composition, about Waller's reading of Machiavelli, and about his association with a fellow Buckinghamshire gentleman and MP, Sir William Drake (a figure known to have been influenced by Machiavelli), this article suggests that Augustan rhetoric forms only one strand in a discursive tapestry dominated by a Machiavellian argument for England's imperial expansion.

## I

*A Panegyrick to my Lord Protector* is Edmund Waller's most accomplished poem: 'the first of his poetical productions', as Dr Johnson put it.<sup>1</sup> It appeared in print at the end of May 1655 and its importance was instantly recognized.<sup>2</sup> Its addressee was pleased enough to compose a complimentary letter of thanks, expressing the desire to redeem himself from the debt in which the poet had placed him. A few months later he appointed Waller to his Council for Trade, thereby acknowledging the seriousness of the poet's concern, so forcefully expressed in the poem, for England's maritime power and trade supremacy.<sup>3</sup> The public was

I am indebted to the Dean and President of Carleton College for the research leave that allowed me the time to write this article, and to my ever-supportive colleagues in the Department of English for tolerating my absence. Members of the Northfield Medieval and Renaissance Colloquium kindly read and commented on a draft of my argument, as did Michael P. Parker, John Safford, and Blair Worden. Although I do not entirely agree with their readings of Waller's poem, I hope that my debts to the work of Warren Chernaik, James D. Garrison, Howard Erskine-Hill, and David Norbrook are adequately reflected in the footnotes to this article. For their support of my work on Waller I thank Paul Hammond, David Norbrook, and Lois Potter. I regret that Mikael Hornqvist's *Machiavelli and Empire* (Cambridge, 2004) appeared too late for me to take account of its arguments here.

1 Johnson, *Lives of the English Poets*, ed. G. Birkbeck Hill, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1905), i. 269.

2 The London stationer George Thomason dated his copy of the quarto 'May 31'; British Library, E. 841 (2).

3 *The Poems of Edmund Waller*, ed. G. Thorn Drury, 2 vols. (London, 1901), i, pp. lxi–lxii (all references to Waller's poems are to this edition, hereafter *WP*); W. C. Abbott,

sufficiently impressed to warrant the issue of two editions within a few days. And the two dozen surviving scribal transcripts suggest its continued relevance: most are directly based upon these printed texts and almost all date from the period between the exhaustion of the two editions and its first reprinting in 1690.<sup>4</sup>

But if the poem was widely read, it was not universally admired. Certainly, the would-be Cromwellian laureate Payne Fisher was moved to compose a poem in its praise; but other readers responded in less celebratory accents.<sup>5</sup> At one extreme, the unreconstructed royalist Charles Cotton penned a vitriolic attack on the turncoat ('This Panegerick is thy Elegie'), while another royalist (an anonymous exile generally supposed to be the cleric Richard Watson) composed a stanza-by-stanza rebuttal of the poem, savaging Waller as 'the *Panegyrist of rebellion, hypocrisy, & yet unchastised murder*':<sup>6</sup> At the other end of the political spectrum, Lucy Hutchinson adopted a similar plan—though with rather more flair—composing a line-for-line demolition from a republican perspective.<sup>7</sup> Indeed, many of the surviving manuscript copies of the poem appear alongside such critiques or rewritings.

From right or left, the character of such objections is remarkably consistent: Waller is a smooth and servile trimmer; the ease with which he has redirected his addresses from the legitimate monarch to the conqueror is morally repellent. The distaste was long in lingering. In his remarks upon the *Panegyrick*, the great Victorian Samuel Rawson Gardiner alluded acerbically to Waller's 'facile verse'.<sup>8</sup> Not all critics have been quite so repelled;<sup>9</sup> but even those who admire the poem's rhetorical deftness are obliged to acknowledge that its success depends

*The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1937–47), iii, 748–9. The letter is dated 13 June 1655. Peter Beal raises questions about its genuineness: P. Beal (comp.), *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, vol. ii: 1625–1700, pt. 2: *Lee–Wycherley* (London and New York, 1993), 553–4 (hereafter *IELM*). Waller was appointed to the Council on 12 December 1655: *WP* i, p. lxii; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series 1655–6*, 54.

4 On the printing of the poem, see *WP* ii, 194–6. On the manuscript circulation, see *IELM* 592–4. The poem was first reprinted in *The Second Part of Mr. Waller's Poems* (London, 1690), 62–72, and *The Maid's Tragedy Altered. With some other pieces* (London, 1690), 65–75.

5 P. Fisher, 'In Elegantissima POEMATA jampridem vulgata, | Nec non elimatissimam | PANEGYRIM OLIVARIAM | Nuper editam, | Viri verè prænobilis, & eruditissimi | Dom. ED. WALLERI, de Bekonsfield, &c.;', in *Piscatoris Poemata* (London, 1656), sigs. A1<sup>r</sup>–A4<sup>r</sup> (the contents of Fisher's works are not stable; the poem on Waller appears in British Library 837 m. 6).

6 *Poems of Charles Cotton*, ed. J. Buxton (London, 1958), 113–14; [R. Watson?], *The Panegyrike and The Storme* (n.p., 1659), sig. 2C1<sup>r</sup>; see also *IELM* 567.

7 D. Norbrook, 'Lucy Hutchinson versus Edmund Waller: An Unpublished Reply to Waller's *A Panegyrick to my Lord Protector*', *The Seventeenth Century*, 11 (1996), 61–86; id., *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge, 1999), 307–16; T. R. Langley, *Image Government: Monarchical Metamorphoses in English Literature and Art, 1649–1702* (Pittsburgh, 2001), 13, 16–17, 19, 23–5, 39, 43, 63–4, 66.

8 *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649–1656*, 4 vols. (London, 1903), iv, 193.

9 John Buxton, for example, sees it as 'stately, restrained, in no way obsequious': *A Tradition of Poetry* (London and New York, 1967), 100.

upon a successful obfuscation of the source of Cromwell's power. Dr Johnson's assessment of the poem is typical in this regard:

His choice of encomiastick topicks is very judicious, for he considers Cromwell in his exaltation, without enquiring how he attained it; there is consequently no mention of the rebel or the regicide. All the former part of his hero's life is veiled with shades, and nothing is brought to view but the chief, the governor, the defender of England's honour, and the enlarger of her dominion. The act of violence by which he obtained the supreme power is lightly treated, and decently justified. It was certainly to be desired that the detestable band should be dissolved which had destroyed the church, murdered the King, and filled the nation with tumult and oppression; yet Cromwell had not the right of dissolving them, for all that he had before done could be justified only by supposing them invested with lawful authority.<sup>10</sup>

Johnson's summary set the terms for future discussion of the poem.

Modern critics, by whom the poem has been well served, have focused Johnson's generalities by determining with greater exactitude the poem's rhetorical purpose and method and tracing its considerable influence upon later public poetry.<sup>11</sup> Although the poem remains slippery and hard to pin down on many if not most of the constitutional and political questions it raises, there is general agreement that it pushes towards advocating Cromwellian monarchy—is in fact itself designed (in the words of Howard Erskine-Hill) 'to close the narrowing gap between Protectorate and monarchy'.<sup>12</sup> But there is no consensus about how far, exactly, it does push. The poet was extraordinarily careful, in light of the shifting and unstable political circumstances in which he was working—with certain members of the Council agitating to offer Cromwell the crown and the

10 *Lives of the English Poets*, i. 269.

11 The major discussions are: R. Nevo, *The Dial of Virtue: A Study of Poems on Affairs of State in the Seventeenth Century* (Princeton, 1963), 116–17; W. L. Chernaik, *The Poetry of Limitation: A Study of Edmund Waller* (New Haven and London, 1968), 153–71; J. D. Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1975), 120–9; J. G. Gilbert, *Edmund Waller* (Boston, 1979), 76–86; H. Erskine-Hill, *The Augustan Idea in English Literature* (London, 1983), 200–2; Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 302–9; W. Chernaik, '“Every conqueror creates a muse”: Conquest and Constitutions in Marvell and Waller', in W. Chernaik and M. Dzelzainis (edd.), *Marvell and Liberty* (London, 1999), 195–216; 195–200; L. L. Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645–1661* (Cambridge, 2000), 102–4; S. Kaul, *Poems of Nation, Anthems of Empire: English Verse in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Charlottesville and London, 2000), 61–3; Langley, *Image Government*. See also Buxton, *A Tradition of Poetry*, 100; C. S. Hensley, 'Wither, Waller and Marvell: Panegyrists for the Protector', *Ariel*, 3 (1972), 5–16; 9; P. J. Korshin, *From Concord to Dissent: Major Themes in English Poetic Theory 1640–1700* (Menston, 1973), 57–8; C. Burrow, *Epic Romance: Homer to Milton* (Oxford, 1993), 179–80; R. Pooley, 'The Poets' Cromwell', *Critical Survey*, 5 (1993), 223–34; 228–9; J. Le Drew Metcalfe, 'The Politics of Panegyric: Poetic Representations of Oliver Cromwell', *Restoration*, 18 (1994), 1–16; 2–7.

12 Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, 122, 127–8; Erskine-Hill, *The Augustan Idea*, 200; Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 299; Langley, *Image Government*, 28, 43, 52. Only Nigel Smith among modern critics disagrees, suggesting that 'Waller seems incapable of praising Cromwell as a king' and describing the *Panegyrick* as 'a true commonwealth poem', in *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640–1660* (New Haven and London, 1994), 281, 283.

army leadership pressing for the title of emperor—to avoid too much precision in matters of constitutional detail.<sup>13</sup> *A Panegyrick* has also been explicated in terms of its genre, especially by Warren Chernaik and James Garrison—the latter arguing that it is, in fact, a ‘heroic panegyric’: a skilful merger of epic theme with panegyric purpose, which effects ‘a reconciliation between Cromwell as hero and Cromwell as monarch.’<sup>14</sup> While panegyric conventionally celebrates institutions rather than individuals, demonstrating to the people the legitimacy of the governing authorities and instructing governors in their duties towards the governed, it is only by recourse to the epic, Garrison argues, with its emphasis on martial heroism, that Waller can achieve the first of the twin goals of panegyric: the demonstration of Cromwell’s right to rule.<sup>15</sup> Warren Chernaik has illuminated the discursive context of this argument by demonstrating that the poem is aimed primarily at moderate ex-royalists like the poet himself, encouraging them, by an appeal to Hobbes-inflected conquest theory and self-interest, to pledge their allegiance to the Protectorate by warning of renewed public disorder should the regime collapse.<sup>16</sup> More recently, Howard Erskine-Hill, David Norbrook, Laura Lunger Knoppers, and T. R. Langley have shed light on Waller’s legitimizing tactics by tracing his deployment of the discourse of Augustanism, by which strong, quasi-monarchical government is presented as the sole guarantor of peace and prosperity in the wake of civil war.<sup>17</sup>

While this emphasis on Augustanism is surely helpful, it does not provide the sole key to the discursive context of the poem, and attempts to use it as such tend to run into difficulties. As Erskine-Hill points out, for example, ‘the Augustan parallel is evoked at moments of dynastic or national expansion. At the same time the parallel with the *pax Augustana* requires either that the expansion shall have been achieved peacefully, or if by war, that the warfare be now concluded in a

13 On the various schemes at this time, see R. Sherwood, *Oliver Cromwell: King in All But Name, 1653–1658* (Stroud, 1997), 49–50. Derek Hirst examines Marvell’s struggle with the same set of problems in composing *The First Anniversary of the Government under His Highness the Lord Protector* (1654), in “‘That Sober Liberty’: Marvell’s Cromwell in 1654”, in J. M. Wallace (ed.), *The Golden and the Brazen World: Papers in Literature and History, 1650–1800* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1985), 17–53: 25–6.

14 Chernaik, *Poetry of Limitation*, 153–71; Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, 120–8. Paul Korshin had earlier noticed the same phenomenon, explaining the poem as a combination of panegyric (public praise) and *laus* (praise of an individual): *From Concord to Dissent*, 57–8.

15 Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, 114–15, 120–8. The subtitle of the quarto text of 1655 registers this dual purpose, billing the occasion and subject of the poem as ‘The present Greatness and joynt Innterest of His Highness, and this Nation’: *WP* ii. 194.

16 Chernaik, *Poetry of Limitation*, 153–4, 158, 164; id., “‘Every conqueror creates a muse’”, 196–200. See also, Gilbert, *Edmund Waller*, 81–3. He had reason to do so: the early part of 1655, when Waller was working on the poem, was a period of renewed royalist conspiracy: D. Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649–1660* (New Haven, 1960), 127–58.

17 Erskine-Hill, *The Augustan Idea*, 200–2; Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 302–9; Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell*, 102–4; Langley, *Image Government*, 16, 31, 36–8, 42–3.

lasting peace'.<sup>18</sup> But this is most definitely *not* the emphasis of Waller's *Panegyrick*, which, as most critics concur,<sup>19</sup> authorizes Cromwell by reference to his military prowess (the only authorizing strategy available to the poet) and concludes with sixteen lines of emphatically bellicose imperialism:

Then let the Muses, with such notes as these,  
 Instruct us what belongs unto our peace;  
 Your battles they hereafter shall indite,  
 And draw the image of our Mars in fight;  
  
 Tell of towns stormed, of armies overrun,  
 And mighty kingdoms by your conduct won;  
 How, while you thundered, clouds of dust did choke  
 Contending troops, and seas lay hid in smoke.  
  
 Illustrious acts high raptures do infuse,  
 And every conqueror creates a muse.  
 Here, in low strains, your milder deeds we sing;  
 But there, my lord; we'll bays and olive bring  
  
 To crown your head; while you in triumph ride  
 O'er vanquished nations, and the sea beside;  
 While all your neighbour-princes unto you,  
 Like Joseph's sheaves, pay reverence, and bow.

(ll. 173–88)<sup>20</sup>

The immediate difficulty for the reader here is to determine whether the future tense of line 175 refers exclusively to the poet's celebrations or whether it incorporates also the Protector's conquests, the outlines of which are sketched in the perfect tense (ll. 177–80). That is to say: are the victories Waller promises to celebrate already won at the time of writing? Or are they only to have been won by the time he infuses his high raptures? It is difficult to decide and, once one has decided, hard to remain convinced: the matter is another interpretative crux, akin to the question of how far Waller here presses the kingship argument. In 1968, for instance, Warren Chernaik claimed that 'The final four stanzas provide a kind of coda, a recapitulation of some earlier themes along with a quick survey of Cromwell's achievements'—the poet will, in the future, celebrate past victories.<sup>21</sup> More recently, however (in 1999), Chernaik found in the final stanza a reference to future conquests.<sup>22</sup>

18 Erskine-Hill, *The Augustan Idea*, 132.

19 The sole exception seems to be Metcalfe, who asserts that 'Waller characteristically rejects praising military conquest in favor of writing about peaceful society': 'The Politics of Panegyric', 7.

20 *WP* ii. 17. Further references to *A Panegyrick* are by line number only.

21 Chernaik, *Poetry of Limitation*, 167.

22 *Id.*, "Every conqueror creates a muse", 200; cf. Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 306.

However one reads the tense and scope of these lines, the fact remains that they unsettle the Augustan reading of the poem. Indeed, in order to read the poem as an essay in Augustanism one is obliged either to downplay or to ignore them. Thus, to square the poem to his Augustan model, Professor Erskine-Hill ignores them, citing as the poem's 'conclusion' the lines immediately preceding them:<sup>23</sup>

As the vexed world, to find repose, at last  
Itself into Augustus' arms did cast;  
So England now does, with like toil oppressed,  
Her weary head upon your bosom rest.

(ll. 169–72)

In one sense, of course, he is absolutely right: here we have the expected introduction of the *pax Augustana* and with it the inevitable panegyric conclusion: peace after war, rest after strife, order after chaos. But the conclusion of this Augustan panegyric is not the end of the poem. David Norbrook likewise rests his reading of the poem on this stanza, expertly teasing out the way in which it celebrates the retreat of a people into quietism and stasis: 'The values of civic humanism are inverted: the movement is from the active life to the calm of the contemplative life, surrendering authority and judgement to the ruler'; Cromwell 'is active so that the people may achieve "repose" and "rest"'.<sup>24</sup> Professor Norbrook goes on to acknowledge that the poem 'does then look forward to future successful campaigns', but, he concludes, 'the emphasis is on Cromwell's personal role in writing history'.<sup>25</sup> While I see nothing to dispute in his analysis of the constitutional import of Waller's argument, I am not sure that Professor Norbrook's account does justice to the weight of those vigorous final lines, which suggest not a nation in stasis but one engaged in the heroic exertions of continuing conquest. The problem, I think, is that recent accounts of the poem have been a little too focused on its constitutional arguments and the Augustan framework that supports them. This focus has obscured the fact that these are important but finally subordinate elements in its overall design. My goal in this article is to sketch out a fresh context for reading the poem by pursuing the implications afforded by the recent discovery of some draft verses by Waller towards a panegyric poem on Cromwell, apparently dating from 1654, in his carefully marked-up copy of Machiavelli's *Prince*.<sup>26</sup> I shall suggest that

23 Erskine-Hill, *The Augustan Idea*, 201. Cf. V. de Sola Pinto's abridged version of the poem in *Poetry of the Restoration* (London, 1966), 18.

24 Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 306, 305; Knoppers shows how Waller's political agenda here is embodied in the texture of the verse: *Constructing Cromwell*, 103–4.

25 Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 306.

26 T. Raylor, 'Reading Machiavelli; Writing Cromwell: Edmund Waller's Copy of the "The Prince" and its draft Verses towards "A Panegyrick to my Lord Protector"', *Turnbull Library Record*, 35 (2002), 9–32.

Machiavellianism affords a vital yet neglected interpretative key to the *Panegyrick*: a key that allows us to account more readily than hitherto for its distinctive structural features and local cruxes.

I should like to begin by asserting that the ultimate perspective towards which *A Panegyrick* works is not constitutional but imperial, not domestic but international. This is no novel claim. Over forty years ago, Ruth Nevo observed that ‘The real subject of Waller’s panegyric is England as a glorious state, the seat of empire, balance to the awed countries of Europe, unified, fortified, mistress of the seas and of their commerce.’<sup>27</sup> Other critics concur: Warren Chernaik observes that the *Panegyrick* tends to subordinate ‘peace and prosperity to military glory and a parade of conquests’; Gerald M. MacLean notes that Waller attempts ‘to endorse the Protector’s rule by celebrating successful overseas conquests’; and James Garrison alludes to the ‘frankly imperialist tone’ of the poem, pointing to a general desire in Waller ‘to reach beyond the traditional goal of national reconciliation to the goal of conquest.’<sup>28</sup> Suvir Kaul is still more precise about the relationship between these two goals: ‘Cromwell may be responsible for the stilling of forces threatening the domestic fabric of England, but he is, most importantly, the guarantor of England’s power beyond its borders.’<sup>29</sup> Most recently, Derek Hirst and Blair Hoxby have pointed up Waller’s linking of commerce, empire, and Cromwell’s personal authority.<sup>30</sup> The imperial thrust of the poem, its push beyond panegyric and Augustan rhetoric towards the heroic celebration of ongoing foreign conquest, has been frequently noticed. What has not, I think, been adequately examined is the philosophical and discursive foundation on which this movement is predicated. Thus, for example, Chernaik notes the return from peace to warfare at the poem’s conclusion, suggesting that Waller is here striving ‘To end his poem on a properly resounding note.’<sup>31</sup> He is of course right; but such a note would be decidedly improper in the context of panegyric poetry and of Augustan rhetoric. Garrison’s emphasis on Waller’s blending of panegyric with epic furnishes a generic explanation without quite explaining the underlying logic that generates such a movement. In order fully to grasp the arc of the poem’s movement we need to attend not just to its Hobbesian

27 Nevo, *Dial of Virtue*, 116.

28 Chernaik, *Poetry of Limitation*, 163; G. M. MacLean, *Time’s Witness: Historical Representation in English Poetry, 1603–1660* (Madison and London, 1990), 122; Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, 163, 118.

29 Kaul, *Poems of Nation*, 63.

30 D. Hirst, ‘Literature and National Identity’, in D. Loewenstein and J. Mueller (edd.), *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature* (Cambridge, 2002), 633–63: 659–60; B. Hoxby, *Mammon’s Music: Literature and Economics in the Age of Milton* (New Haven and London, 2002), 70–1.

31 Chernaik, *Poetry of Limitation*, 167.

underpinnings and its Augustan discourse; we also need also to examine its debt to the discourse of Machiavellianism.

## II

The suggestion that *A Panegyrick to my Lord Protector* should be read as a Machiavellian poem may raise eyebrows: we tend to associate Machiavellianism at this time with the culture of classical republicanism, with figures like Milton and Harrington, Marvell and Nedham; this is not a culture with which Waller is readily associated.<sup>32</sup> Yet we are perhaps sometimes too dazzled by Machiavelli's republicanism always to keep in view other aspects of his writings which caught the attention of early modern readers.<sup>33</sup> Blair Worden has demonstrated how, in their attempts to make sense of Cromwell, both Harrington in *Oceana* and Marvell in the 'Horatian Ode' drew heavily on *The Prince*.<sup>34</sup> Nor is the suggestion that *A Panegyrick* should be seen in a Machiavellian light unprecedented: Jack Gilbert proposed some years ago that the poem's assumptions are, in a general sense, Hobbesian and Machiavellian, and David Norbrook recently drew attention to two possible borrowings from Machiavelli in the poem.<sup>35</sup> The first of these is Waller's comment about the successful handling of the Scots: 'Here foreign gold no more shall make them come; | Our English iron holds them fast at home' (ll. 87–8), which Norbrook plausibly identifies as an allusion to Machiavelli's assertion that iron, not gold, is the sinews of war (*Discourses*, II. x); the second is the association of Cromwell's 'restoration' of the state with the concept of Machiavellian 'reduction' by a single, all-powerful legislator (*Discourses*, I. ix). These allusions point the way to a fuller investigation of the poet's Machiavellianism.

Waller was evidently a keen student of Machiavelli. Several editions of the Florentine's works appear in the 1832 sale catalogue of books and pictures from the Waller family seat at Hall Barn, Buckinghamshire, including three editions of *The Prince* (two of the Latin *Princeps*—1578 and 1599—and a 1584 Palermo *Il prencipe*), a 1588 *De Republica*, and a 1550 quarto *Opere*.<sup>36</sup> We do not know when he first encountered Machiavelli, but by the late 1630s he was deploying

32 Although David Norbrook notes that Waller was evidently 'familiar with the language of classical republicanism': *Writing the English Republic*, 103.

33 Victoria Kahn offers a valuable corrective to any exclusively 'republican' reading in *Machiavellian Rhetoric: From the Counter-Reformation to Milton* (Princeton, 1994), esp. 48, 55–7.

34 B. Worden, 'Andrew Marvell, Oliver Cromwell, and the Horatian Ode', in K. Sharpe and S. N. Zwicker (edd.), *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1987), 147–80: 162–8.

35 Gilbert, *Edmund Waller*, 83; Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 304, 305.

36 Lots 246, 457, 460, and 477 in the sale catalogue of 17 Sept. 1832, reproduced in A. N. L. Munby (ed.), *Sale Catalogues of Libraries of Eminent Persons*, vol. i: *Poets and Men of Letters* (London, 1971), 3–44: 21, 32, 37. We cannot, of course, be absolutely certain that these were all in the library in the poet's day.

Machiavellian vocabulary in his poems. His celebration of the Laudian repair of St Paul's, 'Upon His Majesty's repairing of Paul's', thrusts into relief, by means of a rare enjambment, the Machiavellian keyword 'reduce': 'And things half swallowed from the jaws of Time | Reduce' (*WP* i. 17; ll. 34–5).<sup>37</sup> A possible echo of *The Prince* has also been detected in one of Waller's parliamentary speeches of 1641, although it is insufficiently distinctive for certainty.<sup>38</sup>

That Machiavelli was on Waller's mind at the time of the Long Parliament seems likely if we consider his close but previously unnoticed association with Sir William Drake, an obscure provincial gentleman who has recently emerged, through Kevin Sharpe's account of his voluminous notebooks, as a figure of central importance to the new discipline of the history of reading.<sup>39</sup> As Sharpe and Michael Mendle have demonstrated, Machiavellian ideas framed and guided Sir William's extensive reading and informed his infrequent interventions in parliament: in a Commons speech of 1641, for instance, he defended the Triennial Act by paraphrasing Machiavelli on the need for regular reductions to first principles.<sup>40</sup> As David Norbrook has noted, Waller and Drake were near neighbours in Buckinghamshire and, in the Short Parliament, MPs for Amersham.<sup>41</sup> They were also fellow MPs in the Long Parliament, during the early days of which Waller was one of the leaders and Drake one of the followers of the moderates who fought to defend what they saw as the traditional balanced constitution of church and state, first from royal and then from popular innovations.<sup>42</sup> Both spent the later 1640s in European exile. They were evidently intimate: in the late 1660s Drake left Waller £20 in his will and nominated him

37 David Norbrook draws attention to the word, noting (on the basis of Thorn Drury) the curious sense in which it is employed ('bring back: *reducere*': *WP* ii. 163); he does not, however, explicitly connect this with Machiavellianism (despite discussing Machiavellian reduction elsewhere in his study), apparently because he believes that Waller was insufficiently radical to propose a truly Machiavellian '*ridurre ai principii*': *Writing the English Republic*, 77, 103, 344. As Victoria Kahn demonstrates, however, Machiavelli's use of the term is flexible and does not always refer to a return to republican principles: *Machiavellian Rhetoric*, 54.

38 Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 106.

39 K. Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven and London, 2000).

40 Ibid. 152–4, 158–9; M. Mendle, 'A Machiavellian in the Long Parliament Before the Civil War', *Parliamentary History*, 8 (1989), 116–24: 119; Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 98.

41 'Safety First in Buckinghamshire', *TLS* 5078 (28 July 2000), 22; see also id., *Writing the English Republic*, 102; *WP* i, p. xxx.

42 M. F. Keeler, *The Long Parliament, 1640–1641: A Biographical Study of its Members* (Philadelphia, 1954); H. Trevor-Roper, 'The Great Tew Circle', in *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays* (London, 1987), 166–230: 176–7; Mendle, 'A Machiavellian in the Long Parliament', 122; Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, 71, 118–20, 152–6. I am especially grateful to John Safford for help on connections between Waller and Drake.

one of the executors of the almshouse he had founded at Amersham.<sup>43</sup> Waller and Drake shared a number of distinctive attitudes. Both were men of considerable means and conservative temperament, sharing an acute fear of the mob as a threat to public order and private property, the protection of which they saw as the main goal of government; both saw or came to see strong rule by a single authority as the means of guaranteeing such protection. In Machiavelli they found an unillusioned advocate of such control: a purveyor of hard-nosed maxims of realpolitik, rather than a high-minded celebrant of civic virtue and republican liberty.<sup>44</sup> But they were not proponents of mere absolutism; they were both, rather, devotees of 'interest' theory, according to which stability came from balancing the different interests of the several key parts of the polity.

A possible intellectual grounding for such similarities of outlook is suggested by another donation in Drake's will, that of £100 to his 'kinsman & Tutor' George Morley, under whom he studied at Christ Church, Oxford in the early 1620s.<sup>45</sup> As Norbrook points out, Waller also studied under Morley, hiring him as a private tutor to guide him in his reading of the classics.<sup>46</sup> And it is generally thought to have been Morley who introduced Waller to the Falkland circle at Great Tew. He was a man of great erudition (lightly worn) and sceptical disposition, admirably suiting him for participation in that extraordinary *convivium philosophicum*.<sup>47</sup> If there was a Tavian aspect to Drake's and Waller's readings of Machiavelli it did not go hand in hand with a Tavian commitment to a traditional moral

43 Buckinghamshire Record Office, D/DR/1/68, fos. 125–6, 140 (depositions in a court case regarding Drake's will); I thank Miss E. A. Whittingham for providing me with a copy of this document. The poet is on both occasions misnamed 'Edward'; on the second this is corrected, by deletion, to 'Ed.'; his identity is confirmed by the reference to him as 'of Beckensfeild'; G. Eland identified Waller as the recipient of a bequest from Drake in *Shardeloes Papers of the 17th and 18th Centuries* (London, 1947), p. viii.

44 Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, 80–1, 82, 105, 116, 118, 170, 176–7, 183, 185–6, 216, 236–9, 251, 267, 316–17, 331–3; Raylor, 'Reading Machiavelli; Writing Cromwell', 12–17.

45 Buckinghamshire Record Office, D/DR/1/68, fo. 137; Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, 69, 308–9; Eland, *Shardeloes Papers*, p. viii.

46 Norbrook, 'Safety First'; id., *Writing the English Republic*, 98 n. 19; [Edward Hyde, earl of Clarendon, *Selections from 'The History of the Rebellion' and 'The Life by Himself'*; ed. G. Huehns (1955; Oxford, 1978), 48. The kinship of Morley and Drake gives the former a county connection that lends some circumstantial weight to the unsubstantiated claim by the anonymous author of the 1711 *Life of Waller* that the cleric actually resided with the poet in Beaconsfield for an extended period; Waller, *Poems, &c.* (London, 1711), p. xi. The decade proposed by the biographer is uniformly rejected by commentators: *WP* i, pp. xxii–xxiii; K. Weber, *Lucius Cary, Second Viscount Falkland* (New York, 1940), 103, 109.

47 Clarendon, *Selections*, 298–9. On Morley generally, see 'Illustrations of the State of the Church during the Great Rebellion', *Theologian and Ecclesiastic*, 13 (1852), 238–50; F. Bussy, 'George Morley: Caroline Divine', *Church Quarterly Record*, 165 (1964), 185–95; id., 'An Anglican in Exile', *Church Quarterly Record*, 166 (1965); id., 'George Morley: Bishop of Winchester, 1662–1684', *Church Quarterly Record*, 168 (1967), 433–42. On the Tew circle see J. C. Hayward, 'New Directions in Studies of the Falkland Circle', *The Seventeenth Century*, 2 (1987), 19–48: 32; Trevor-Roper, 'Great Tew'.

world-view.<sup>48</sup> Indeed, the two men appear to have followed the path from Tew cut by the arch-apostate of the group, Hobbes, into the ethically weightless world of conquest theory and interest calculation.<sup>49</sup> Waller was to follow his friend Hobbes in practice as well as theory, returning to England in 1652 and making his peace with the conqueror; Drake apparently avoided committing himself to any side in the armed struggle.<sup>50</sup> We cannot say for certain that Morley introduced both Waller and Drake to the study of Machiavelli, but he did own at least one collected edition of the Italian's works and his sceptical approach to matters of faith and tradition may well have influenced his pupils.<sup>51</sup>

Whatever the precise nature of his association with Sir William Drake, Machiavelli was certainly on Waller's mind at the time he set about writing his

48 There are local similarities between Drake's and Waller's readings of Machiavelli and that of Clarendon: like the poet, Clarendon emphasized the need to square one's actions to the times; Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Clarendon 126, fo. 60<sup>v</sup> ('55') (cf. Clarendon's comments on the use of the term 'liberty' as a tool for one party to tyrannize over others (MS Clarendon 126, fo. 60<sup>v</sup> ('52')) with *Panegyrick*, ll. 5–8); in his *History*, Clarendon singles out in reference to Cromwell the maxim, from *The Prince*, ch. vii (also highlighted by Waller in his copy), that the would-be ruler 'must make [no] scruple of doing all those impious things which are necessary to compass and support the impiety to which they have devoted themselves'; E. [Hyde], earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1888), iv. 304–5. But the superficiality of such similarities is felt when one reflects upon the gap between the overarching moral framework into which Clarendon incorporates his Machiavellian observations and the absence of any such structure from the thought of Drake or Waller. For accounts of Clarendon's reading of Machiavelli and comparison with Drake's see, respectively, F. Raab, *The English Face of Machiavelli: A Changing Interpretation 1500–1700* (London and Toronto, 1965), 146–9; Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, 303–6.

49 On Hobbes's defection from Tew, see Hayward, 'New Directions', 30–9; Trevor-Roper, 'Great Tew', 182–6. On Drake and interest theory, see Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, 262–6. The subtitle of the quarto edition of Waller's *Panegyrick* deploys the language of interest theory, describing the poem as an argument for the 'joynt Innterest of His Highness, and this Nation': *WP* ii. 194.

50 In France in 1645 Waller hired Hobbes to tutor his son and expressed interest in translating *De cive* into English. At this time he evidently discussed with the philosopher the practical and ethical difficulties involved in returning to England: Hobbes, *The Correspondence*, ed. N. Malcolm, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1994), i. 124–5. With Waller's calculations on this point should be contrasted the resolve of Clarendon: Trevor-Roper, 'Great Tew', 212–13. On Waller's Hobbism see Chernaik, *Poetry of Limitation*, 44–5, 153–4. On Drake's apparent non-commitment, see Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, 71, 119–20.

51 Morley's library catalogue of 16 Jan. 1672/3 and the catalogue of his intended bequest to Winchester Cathedral Library of 28 Nov. 1682 include, respectively, a two-volume collected edition for which no date is given and a collected quarto edition of 1550. These are probably the same work, one of the several complete editions of 1550—*Opere di Niccolò Machiavelli*, vol. x: see S. Bertelli and P. Innocenti, *Bibliografia* (Verona, 1979), nos. 203–7. I am most grateful to Mr John Hardacre of Winchester Cathedral Library for information about these catalogues. For a useful brief account of them, see Hayward, 'New Directions', 41–2. Further research on connections between Waller and Drake might allow us to situate Sir William in a more generous social and intellectual context than hitherto—perhaps permitting a clearer sense of the influence on him of Waller's friend, Hobbes: Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, 351, 104–8, 130, 236–8, 268, 334.

*Panegyrick*. I have recently argued that, probably during the spring and summer of 1654, the poet carefully read *The Prince*, marking up his copy to highlight passages of especial interest in light of Cromwell's efforts to consolidate his authority at this time.<sup>52</sup> In what Victoria Kahn has argued is a typically 'double-faced' early modern manner, Waller first disavowed the volume for its immorality—inscribing on the end flyleaf the pious self-admonition 'his vt resistam non vt vtar'—and then apparently went on to devour its amoral strategies, highlighting such dicta as 'a ruler who wishes to maintain his power is often forced to act immorally'.<sup>53</sup> Waller's is no resistant reading of Machiavelli; it is a quest for strategies—a quest, above all, for strategies to allow a ruler to consolidate his grip on dominions acquired by force. In addition to plundering its contents, Waller used the flyleaves of his copy to draft verses towards a gratulatory poem celebrating Cromwell's foreign and domestic conquests and lauding his efforts to heal his country—a poem that eventually became *A Panegyrick*. Waller's composition of *A Panegyrick* seems, therefore, to have sprung at least in part from an attentive reading of Machiavelli in the middle of 1654.<sup>54</sup>

The topics Waller picked out of *The Prince* may have helped shape the rhetorical organization and arguments of *A Panegyrick*. The poem seeks to argue its readers out of the mistaken human tendency, noticed by Machiavelli (ch. iii) and highlighted by Waller (on page 4 of his edition), to think that a change in ruler will improve their lot in life by demonstrating, as the subtitle of the quarto edition puts it, 'The present Greatness and joynt Innterest of his Highness, and this Nation' (*WP* ii. 194). As Chernaik notes, the poem falls roughly into two halves: one demonstrating the greatness of the Nation, the other that of his Highness, while all the time insisting on their interdependence.<sup>55</sup> In demonstrating England's present greatness and happiness—'the Peace, Union, and Prosperity of the English Nation', as the subtitle of the Folio puts it—the poet seeks to prevent dissent, as Machiavelli urged one should (ch. xix), by reminding readers that they are content under the current regime and in danger should it fall (ll. 149–72). In celebrating the Protector, Waller implements Machiavelli's injunction that the prince should acquire a reputation for greatness and magnanimity (ch. xxi). The poet proceeds by way of a lengthy demonstration of Cromwell's private and public virtues, his natural inclination and ability to govern, and his success in mastering and uniting, by a mixture of strength and gentleness, those factional interests—the commons, the nobility, and the army—which,

52 'Reading Machiavelli; Writing Cromwell', 12–17.

53 Niccolò Machiavelli, *Princeps* (Basle, 1580), 139; Stuart 239–41, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington, New Zealand; *The Prince*, ed. and trans. Q. Skinner and R. Price (Cambridge, 1988), 68; Kahn, *Machiavellian Rhetoric*, 6–8, 10.

54 Raylor, 'Reading Machiavelli; Writing Cromwell', 21–9.

55 *Poetry of Limitation*, 154–5.

Machiavelli had argued (chs. vi, xix), threaten a ruler's power and authority (ll. 1–4, 157–68).<sup>56</sup>

But the chance survival of Waller's marked-up copy of *The Prince* should not distort our understanding of the poet's reading of Machiavelli. Even in his reading of *The Prince*, Waller's interests were not restricted to questions of domestic politics; he was fascinated by Machiavelli's reflections on territorial expansion and, in particular, by his praise of Roman colonial policy (ch. iii): a concern reflected in his handling of the conquest and imperial integration of Ireland and Scotland in *A Panegyrick* (ll. 81–100). Given this concern with imperialism, it is hardly surprising to find that Waller was also an avid student of *The Discourses*, especially of its second book, wherein the theory of imperial expansion is adumbrated at greater length. In a letter to Thomas Hobbes of July 1656 he cites as 'a perfect foundation of Gouernment' Cromwell's plan to govern by means of the major-generals: 'I mean by the Ma: Gen<sup>s</sup> reducing vs to prouences & ruling vs by those prouincials w<sup>th</sup> the newe Leuied Army &c.:'<sup>57</sup> Waller's expression of such an idea has confounded one commentator and been taken by another as evidence for his fundamental insincerity;<sup>58</sup> the idea in fact provides further evidence for Waller's Machiavellianism: the phrase 'reducing vs to prouences' comes directly from *The Discourses* (II. iv, xxi), in which Machiavelli assigns the expansion of Rome's power to the city's success in reducing kingdoms and states to provinces ('ridurre . . . in provincie') ruled by Roman praetors.<sup>59</sup> In the autumn of the same year, in his celebration of Captain Stayner's victory over the Spanish plate fleet in September (*Of a War with Spain, and a fight at Sea*), Waller would make an even more explicit employment of the allusion to *Discourses* II. x noted in the *Panegyrick* by Norbrook:

When Britain, looking with a just disdain  
Upon this gilded majesty of Spain,  
And knowing well that empire must decline,  
Whose chief support and sinews are of coin,  
Our nation's solid virtue did oppose  
To the rich troublers of the world's repose.

(*WP* ii. 23; ll. 13–18)

56 It is tempting to speculate that Waller's technique of demonstrating Cromwell's fitness for kingship by demonstrating his military prowess (on which see Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, 120) might have been prompted in part by the saying Machiavelli recalls from Justinus about Hiero, who rose from private citizenship through the army to become king of Syracuse: 'the only thing he lacked to be a ruler was a kingdom' (ch. vi) (*The Prince*, 22).

57 Hobbes, *Correspondence*, i. 296.

58 P. H. Hardacre, 'A Letter of Edmund Waller to Thomas Hobbes', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 11 (1947–8), 431–3: 431; Gilbert, *Edmund Waller*, 93.

59 The phrase appears at least twice: *Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio*, ed. C. Vivanti (Turin, 2000), 147, 191.

The passage is little more than a versified summary of Book II, chapter x of *The Discourses*, in which Machiavelli instances states and rulers who have lost their dominions due to excessive reliance upon foreign mercenaries instead of home-grown soldiers. The text of the poem exists in various states; in one version the penultimate line in the passage just quoted is replaced by a still more striking phrase: 'Her native force and virtue did oppose'. Empire and sinews, *virtù* and *forza*: the Machiavellianism of such terms could hardly be more apparent.

It is not, of course, the republican theorizing but the imperialism of *The Discourses* that appealed to Waller; indeed, in an energetic misreading, the poet studiously ignored the constitutional foundations of Machiavelli's imperial argument (republican liberty), grafting it instead onto the domestic politics of *The Prince*.<sup>60</sup> In his elegy on Cromwell, 'Upon the late storm, and of the death of His Highness ensuing the same', the poet celebrates the Protector's reconstitution of England as a state for expansion, in which the potentially destructive energies of its inhabitants are successfully directed at foreign targets (*Discourses*, I. vi):

The ocean, which so long our hopes confined,  
 Could give no limits to his vaster mind;  
 Our bounds' enlargement was his latest toil,  
 Nor hath he left us prisoners to our isle;  
 Under the tropic is our language spoke,  
 And part of Flanders hath received our yoke.  
 From civil broils he did us disengage,  
 Found nobler objects for our martial rage;  
 And, with wise conduct, to his country showed  
 Their ancient way of conquering abroad.  
 Ungrateful then! if we no tears allow  
 To him, that gave us peace and empire too.

(WP ii. 34–5; ll. 17–28)<sup>61</sup>

Underlying both this and the previous passages I quoted is Machiavelli's Polybian view of history as a cyclical process, in which states grow and decay, empires rise and fall (*Discourses*, I. ii, vi). Spain, having lost its force and virtue, is an empire in decline; England, having only recently (thanks to Cromwell)

60 The quest for a form of state that would guarantee both internal stability and external expansion was an understandable preoccupation of English readers of Machiavelli during the 1650s: see the accounts of Harrington by V. Sullivan, 'The Civic Humanist Portrait of Machiavelli's English Successors', *History of Political Thought*, 15 (1994), 73–96: 76–87, and J. Scott, 'The Rapture of Motion: James Harrington's Republicanism', in N. Phillipson and Q. Skinner (edd), *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1993), 139–63; and the general overview of the struggle for balance between liberty and empire by D. Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge, 2000), esp. 100–45.

61 Waller had earlier presented the 1639 expedition against the Scots in similar terms, as an opportunity for a sluggish nation to shape up, in 'To my Lord of Falkland' (WP i. 76; ll. 31–6).

redirected its native belligerence outward, from civil war to foreign wars, is a state in full vigour with a burgeoning empire. The resolution of civic discord through Cromwell's assumption of power does not involve a diminution of native virtue, but its redirection. As Warren Chernaik has noticed, domestic peace is not an end in itself; it is merely the prerequisite for imperial expansion: 'Make us unite, and make us conquer too' (l. 4).<sup>62</sup>

By the same token, failure abroad endangered stability at home. In his letter to Hobbes of late July 1656, Waller expressed anxieties about the strength of Cromwell's domestic 'settlement' in light of recent failures in the Caribbean: 'fayling of the good succes hoped for abroad, & these arrears & want of Mony att home, may perhaps giue occasion & oportunity to such as are enemys to a settlement to retard & shocke his desseins'.<sup>63</sup> The comment sheds light on the urgency underlying Waller's celebration of Stayner's September triumph.

### III

The influence of Machiavelli permeates the language of *A Panegyrick* and dictates the imperial thrust of its argument. The introduction of the verb 'bridle' in the poem's opening lines announces its commitment:

While with a strong and yet a gentle hand  
You bridle faction, and our hearts command,  
Protect us from our selves, and from the foe,  
Make us unite, and make us conquer too

(ll. 1–4)

The first couplet invokes Machiavelli's account of the Roman tribunes, whose role was to bridle (*frenare*) the otherwise excessive power of the nobility against the plebs, and that of the nobility against one another (*Discourses*, I. i), while the final line introduces Cromwell's unification of England as the prerequisite for foreign conquest and imperial expansion. The argument of the poem is already clear: empire follows, indeed depends upon, domestic unity; and this can be instituted only by a leader like Cromwell: a leader able to curtail factional squabbles by riding roughshod, where necessary, over nice constitutional quibbles. The Cromwellian Waller is indifferent to those scruples over ancient rights and

<sup>62</sup> *Poetry of Limitation*, 154. Jonathan Scott points out that, even for Machiavelli, republican liberty was merely the means to military expansion: 'The Peace of Silence: Thucydides and the English Civil War', in G. A. J. Rogers and T. Sorell (edd.), *Hobbes and History* (London and New York, 2000), 112–36: 115.

<sup>63</sup> Hobbes, *Correspondence*, i. 296. Noel Malcolm is no doubt right that Waller refers here to the Hispaniola debacle of spring 1655 (Hobbes, *Correspondence*, i. 297 n. 13); but also relevant (and perhaps more immediately pertinent, given the emphasis on lack of money), was the failure of efforts to intercept the Spanish plate fleet during the spring and summer of 1656.

liberties that had so exercised him in the Short Parliament; indeed, the term 'liberty' is here demonized as a mere Hobbesian licence to prey (ll. 5–8).

Like Waller's other protectoral poems, *A Panegyrick* assumes a cyclical view of history as the rise and fall of states according both to the vicissitudes of fortune and the rise and fall of men of unusual *virtù*. As David Norbrook hints, the poem frames Cromwell as that supremely powerful dictator, the figure of sole authority and exceptional *virtù*, who will 'reduce' (*ridurre*) or 'restore' a corrupt and degenerate state to a condition of pristine virtue (*Discourses*, I. ix, III. i).<sup>64</sup> Waller underlines the fact that only Cromwell's exercise of unchallenged power could have cured the nation of its ills:

When fate, or error, had our age misled,  
And o'er these nations such confusion spread,  
The only cure, which could from Heaven come down,  
Was so much power and clemency in one!

(ll. 121–4)

The Machiavellian language of restoration provides the measure of Cromwell's achievement: 'Your drooping country, torn with civil hate, | Restored by you, is made a glorious state' (ll. 13–14).

Anglophone readers tend to think of such founders of states in republican terms—in part, I suspect, because of the large shadow cast by James Harrington's Olphaus Megaletor, self-denying founder of the republic of Oceana.<sup>65</sup> Nothing in Machiavelli's *Discourses* themselves, however, implies that such a restoration need involve the institution of a republic and the immediate resignation of the supreme authority; on the contrary, Machiavelli is explicit that what he has in mind is the establishment of *either* a republic *or* a kingdom (I. ix, III. i). On the one hand, therefore, Waller's presentation of Cromwell as such a figure does not commit him to any particular form of government; but, on the other hand, by celebrating Cromwell in terms that exclude the possibility of republicanism—'The only cure, which could from Heaven come down, | Was so much power and clemency *in one!*' (ll. 123–4; my emphasis)—he affirms the Constitution as it stands under the Instrument of Government, with supreme legislative authority residing 'in one person' and, by so doing, hints at the direction in which he expects and wishes Cromwell to move.<sup>66</sup>

64 *Writing the English Republic*, 305.

65 See, for example, David Norbrook's attempt to distinguish Waller's use of the notion of a Cromwellian 'restoration' from Marvell's on the grounds that Marvell's is more radical and therefore exciting: *Writing the English Republic*, 342.

66 *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, ed. S. R. Gardiner, 3rd. edn. (Oxford, 1906), 405; Abbott, *Writings and Speeches of Cromwell*, iii. 458. The absence of any explicit discussion of parliament in the poem is striking in this respect: two brief allusions to 'our senate' serve to distance and demote it (ll. 92, 157–9); cf. Marvell's attempt to account for the balance between Protector and parliament in *The First Anniversary*, especially ll. 75–98, on which see J. Raymond, "Framing Liberty":

As is fitting for a poem designed to neutralize moderate or conservative opposition to the Protectorate, Waller expends much effort in countering objections to Cromwell and his rule. In so doing he draws upon the discourse of Augustanism; but he deploys it in a manner that is not always Augustan in spirit. One can see this by looking at his appropriation and transformation of the commonplaces of Augustan thinking. Here, for example, is his account of the rising Cromwell:

Still as you rise, the state, exalted too,  
Finds no distemper while 'tis changed by you;  
Changed like the world's great scene! when, without noise,  
The rising sun night's vulgar light destroys.

(ll. 141–4)

The rising sun is, as has often been noticed, a stock monarchical image, and this merges into a stock Augustan topos: that of the turning of the political wheel.<sup>67</sup> Waller's silently changing scene is most immediately indebted to Justus Lipsius's admiring account of Augustus in *De politicorum libri sex*, to which the poet had access in his 1637 edition of Lipsius's works.<sup>68</sup> I quote from the English translation of 1594:

in this case we must proceede gently, and in such sort, *that this globe in the commonwealth may be turned with the least noise that may be*: and slowly, and as it were by degrees, and not at one push: by the example of *Augustus*, who in the beginning of his Empire *did not execute all things immediatly, as was decreed: fearing that all things would not succeed well, if he should transpose and change all men from their places at one time; but certaine things he disposed at the present time, and referred others to fitter oportunitie*. And this is it, that *Tacitus* speaketh of him: *that he did rise by little and little*.<sup>69</sup>

Waller borrows from Lipsius the ultimately Ciceronian image of the noiseless turning of the political wheel but reverses its implications.<sup>70</sup> Lipsius used it to endorse Augustus's rise by means of slow, piecemeal, and barely perceptible constitutional change; Waller however, repairs to the strategies of the Stuart court masque and diminishes the Lipsian image of the turning globe, figuring it instead as a theatrical *scena versatilis* (thus implying the controlling hand of an artist at

Marvell's *First Anniversary* and the Instrument of Government', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 62 (2001), 315–50. Waller would, of course, call explicitly for replacing Cromwell's crown of bays with a crown of Spanish gold in his celebration of Stayner's naval victory of late 1656: *WP* ii. 27 (ll. 103–10).

67 J. M. Wallace, *Destiny his Choice: The Loyolism of Andrew Marvell* (Cambridge, 1968), 135; Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 305.

68 *IELM* 562 (no. 21).

69 *Sixte Bookes of Politickes or Civil Doctrine*, trans. W. Jones (London, 1594), 80–1 (IV. ix), quoted in Erskine-Hill, *The Augustan Idea*, 69–70. The passage appears at iv. 55a in Lipsius's *Opera omnia* (Antwerp, 1637)—the edition owned by Waller.

70 On the classical sources from which the passage is composed, see Erskine-Hill, *The Augustan Idea*, 69.

work behind it);<sup>71</sup> onto this he grafts the image of the rising sun to suggest the dramatic speed, inevitability, and naturalness of Cromwell's ascent. The Protector thus rises as suddenly as the sun at daybreak, instantly eclipsing lesser lights. This is the very opposite of Lipsius's point. And the half-realized image of Cromwell spinning the globe on its axis shadows the fundamental Machiavellianism of the poem, with its implied celebration of those who have the power and audacity to master fortune. Waller is using Augustan imagery, but he is doing so in a Machiavellian manner. And it is Machiavellianism that generates the poem's argumentative strategy of celebrating Cromwell as hero, as Machiavellian prince, rather than Augustan monarch.

The poem's Machiavellianism is further apparent in the lines that follow the stanza quoted above, lines which celebrate Cromwell for the un-Augustan qualities of swiftness of action and thirst for glory, and which, accordingly, highlight his *virtù*:

Had you, some ages past, this race of glory  
Run, with amazement we should read your story;  
But living virtue, all achievements past,  
Meets envy still, to grapple with at last.

(ll. 145–8)

These lines versify Machiavelli's argument in the Preface to Book II of *The Discourses* that fear and envy of the present lead to the denigration of contemporary achievements and to the over-praise of the past.<sup>72</sup>

There is certainly a strong Augustan element in Waller's celebration of Cromwell as the restorer of domestic peace and national unity. With great deftness, Waller invokes the Roman civil wars, figuring Charles I fleetingly as Caesar, and then Cromwell as both Augustus *and* Caesar (ll. 149–56).<sup>73</sup> In so far as unity is once more apparent under the Protector's rule, Waller parallels Cromwell

71 The masque-like character of the scene change is noticed in Langley, *Image Government*, 41.

72 The notion is clearly Machiavellian in origin, but Waller's recourse to it might have been mediated by Davenant's use of the same source in his *Preface to Gondibert* (1650), to which Waller contributed a commendatory poem: *Sir William Davenant's Gondibert*, ed. D. F. Gladish (Oxford, 1971), 11.

73 This is another crux, the product of a deliberate open-endedness on Waller's part. Some critics argue that the poem excludes Charles I from view (e.g. Chernaik, "Every conqueror creates a muse", 198; Johnson, *Lives of the English Poets*, i. 269); others insist that it offers no specific English counterparts for Caesar and Brutus (Erskine-Hill, *The Augustan Idea*, 202). The most persuasive critical accounts, however, argue that the associations are designed to be fluid and shifting; see A. W. Allison, *Toward an Augustan Poetic: Edmund Waller's 'Reform' of English Poetry* ([Lexington], 1962), 14–15; Gilbert, *Edmund Waller*, 84–5; Norbrook, 'Hutchinson versus Waller', 66; Langley, *Image Government*, 24; *Selected Poems of Abraham Cowley, Edmund Waller and John Oldham*, ed. J. Griffin (Harmondsworth, 1998), 160–1. Waller's strategy should be compared with Marvell's use of Caesar in 'An Horatian Ode', on which see *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. N. Smith (London, 2003), 269–70, and with Dryden's in *Heroique Stanza's*, on which see Garrison,

momentarily with Caesar in order to warn against an assassination attempt that would be attended by the collapse of public order and the immediate seizure of power by the army.<sup>74</sup> The warning to royalist plotters, fitfully if futilely active between the spring of 1654 and that of 1655 (the period of the poem's composition), is clear enough:<sup>75</sup>

This Caesar found; and that ungrateful age,  
With losing him fell back to blood and rage;  
Mistaken Brutus thought to break that yoke,  
But cut the bond of union with that stroke.

That sun once set, a thousand meaner stars  
Gave a dim light to violence, and wars,  
To such a tempest as now threatens all,  
Did not your mighty arm prevent the fall.

If Rome's great senate could not wield that sword,  
Which of the conquered world had made them lord,  
What hope had ours, while yet their power was new,  
To rule victorious armies, but by you?

(ll. 149–60)

Despite its Augustanism, there is a Machiavellian context for this allusion to ingratitude, the subject of which formed the burden of *Discourses*, I. xxviii–xxx. The passage concludes by presenting the Protector in explicitly Augustan terms:

As the vexed world, to find repose, at last  
Itself into Augustus' arms did cast;  
So England now does, with like toil oppressed,  
Her weary head upon your bosom rest.

(ll. 169–72)

Waller here alludes to Cromwell's speech of 12 September 1654, in which the Protector had appealed to parliament to consider the people 'who looked for nothing but peace, and quietness, and rest, and settlement.'<sup>76</sup> It is a resonant conclusion; but it is not the end of the poem.

*Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, 151–2. The association between Cromwell and Caesar would have been timely at the time Waller was writing because there had been talk, between the spring and autumn of 1654, of Cromwell being named either Caesar or Emperor Augustus: Abbott, *Writings and Speeches of Cromwell*, iii. 285; D. Armitage, 'The Cromwellian Protectorate and the Languages of Empire', *Historical Journal*, 35 (1992), 531–55: 532.

<sup>74</sup> The Protectorate was nervous about its vulnerability to assassination; several plots involving assassination were contemplated in the middle 1650s: Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, 100–1, 163, 171–3.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.* 97–158.

<sup>76</sup> Abbott, *Writings and Speeches of Cromwell*, iii. 461.

We can make sense of the four stanzas that follow if we set the poem in its Machiavellian context. We earlier noticed Waller's use, in *Of a War with Spain, and a fight at Sea*, of the theme of Cromwell's redirection of potentially destructive energies from civil disputes to foreign wars; we have noticed that the same movement is implied in the opening lines of *A Panegyrick*. This movement also, I suggest, underlies the argument of the whole poem, the thrust of which is from civil war to peaceful settlement to subsequent imperial expansion.

The movement of which I speak begins with the rise of a man of extraordinary *virtù*: a man who lifts with him the English state: 'Still as you rise, the state, exalted too, | Finds no distemper while 'tis changed by you' (ll. 141–2). The reconstitution of the state is followed by the incorporation of neighbouring states: the fall of the Scots turns out to be fortunate:

Preferred by conquest, happily o'erthrown,  
Falling they rise, to be with us made one;  
So kind dictators made, when they came home,  
Their vanquished foes free citizens of Rome.  
Like favour find the Irish, with like fate,  
Advanced to be a portion of our state

(ll. 93–8)

Waller's insistence that by being vanquished the Scots have gained their freedom is not mere rhetorical ingenuity (although it certainly is that);<sup>77</sup> it invokes the policy of 'donating' (the aptness of the term is arguable) *ius Latii*, a limited form of Roman citizenship, to the citizens of incorporated territories—a policy for which the Consul Camillus (five times dictator: hence Waller's 'kind dictators') had argued in Livy's *History* (VIII. xiii. 11–18; cf. VIII. xxi), and whose arguments were quoted approvingly by Machiavelli (*Discourses*, II. xxiii). The discussion accords with the terms in which Waller has presented England's means of imperial expansion earlier in the poem. In *The Discourses*, II. iv Machiavelli observed that there are three ways of establishing empire: by forming equal leagues or confederations, by establishing unequal leagues, or by subjugating the defeated. Only the second method could, he claimed, succeed in the long run, as it had for Rome, which established such leagues with its neighbours on the Italian peninsula, offering them the benefits of Roman citizenship, and retaining for herself 'la sedia dello imperio': the seat of empire.<sup>78</sup> Waller translates the phrase in line 15 of his poem: England under Cromwell, he writes, has become 'The seat of empire, where the Irish come, | And the unwilling Scotch, to fetch their doom'

77 As is suggested in Chernaik, "Every conqueror creates a muse", 200.

78 *Discorsi*, 147.

(ll. 15–16). As Rome was to Latium, so now is England the seat of an empire within the British Isles.<sup>79</sup>

The donation of citizenship to conquered peoples and their incorporation by means of unequal leagues were of course the cornerstones of the imperial policy elaborated at length by Harrington in *The Commonwealth of Oceana*—a work composed at the same time as Waller's *Panegyrick*, and from the same Machiavellian sources.<sup>80</sup> The proximity between the two accounts shows that the Machiavellian theory of empire need not necessarily be yoked to a republican theory of government, and this emphasizes once more the point that Florentine ideas were not the exclusive property of those we retrospectively identify as classical republicans.

The poem's expansive movement does not halt with the establishment of an empire within the British Isles. Waller broadens his focus to claim sovereignty over the ocean:

The sea's our own; and now all nations greet,  
With bending sails, each vessel of our fleet;  
Your power extends as far as winds can blow,  
Or swelling sails upon the globe may go.

(ll. 17–20)

He has in mind here the Treaty of Westminster, which required that Dutch ships 'meeting with any of the Ships of War of this Common-wealth in the *British Seas* shall strike their Flag and lower their Top-sail'; but he also implies the more general point, insisted upon in Marchamont Nedham's *Of the Dominion, Or, Ownership of the Sea*—a translation of John Selden's *Mare Clausum* published 'by the appointment of the Council of State' at the outbreak of hostilities in 1652, and a copy of which he owned, that *all* nations were obliged to do so.<sup>81</sup> The deliberate vagueness in the first couplet about what sea is at issue here (technically it must be the British seas, here referred to in the singular), and the looseness in the relationship of the second couplet to the first (by means of which the second may either be a direct consequence of the first or merely the poet's apostrophic extrapolation from it) allows Waller to imply, by synecdoche, the extension of

79 This was the earlier scope of the term 'British empire': C. H. Firth, "'The British Empire'", *Scottish Historical Review*, 15 (1918), 185–9, and, more generally, Armitage, *Ideological Origins*, 24–60.

80 *The Political Works of James Harrington*, ed. J. G. A. Pocock (Cambridge, 1977), 71–2, 323–32. Harrington claims in his preface to have been working on the book for about two years; it was entered in the Stationers' Register in September 1656: *Political Works of Harrington*, 6. Z. S. Fink summarizes the main aspects of Harrington's imperial theory in *The Classical Republicans*, 2nd edn. (Evanston, 1962), 82–5. See also Armitage, 'Cromwellian Protectorate', 548–53; B. Worden, 'James Harrington and the Commonwealth of Oceana', in D. Wootton (ed.), *Republicanism, Liberty, and Commercial Society, 1649–1776* (Stanford, 1994), 82–110: 105.

81 Abbott, *Writings and Speeches of Cromwell*, iii. 900; *Of the Dominion, Or, Ownership of the Sea* (London, 1652), II. xxvi (pp. 398–402).

English sovereignty from the British seas to the oceans of the world.<sup>82</sup> Perhaps he was here indebted to 'Klareamont', the pseudonymous author of a set of verses on the frontispiece attached to *Of the Dominion*, which addressed 'the Commonwealth of England', insisting that 'Narrow Seas are found too straight | For thy capacious heart', and suggesting that Britannia should rule 'o're all seas.'<sup>83</sup>

Waller goes on to present England's burgeoning international trade as a direct consequence of her maritime supremacy:

Lords of the world's great waste, the ocean, we  
Whole forests send to reign upon the sea . . .

Our little world, the image of the great,  
Like that, amidst the boundless ocean set,  
Of her own growth has all that Nature craves;  
And all that's rare, as tribute from the waves.

(ll. 41–2, 49–52)

Imported goods are not purchased; they are offered up as tribute. The basis of this trope is that the Dutch treaty had opened up the riches of the East Indies to English merchants.<sup>84</sup> In such a context trade was no mere private enterprise, involving a circumscription of national virtue; it was, as others were also beginning to argue, the very lifeblood of empire.<sup>85</sup>

#### IV

Although critics have long noticed that *A Panegyrick* is a poem about empire, they have not noticed that it is, more precisely, a Machiavellian poem of empire: both in its general understanding of history as the rise and fall of states, contingent upon the conjunction of national *virtù* with that of individual leaders, and in its adherence to Machiavelli's advocacy of imperial expansion by the incorporation of foreign citizens and the establishment of unequal leagues.<sup>86</sup> Looked at in this light, Augustanism appears not so much a controlling ideology as one thread in a

82 He had earlier made the same move in 'To my Lord of Falkland', where he claimed (l. 23) that 'all the sea [is] our own': *WP* i. 76.

83 *Of the Dominion*, sig. b1<sup>r-v</sup>. David Norbrook proposes that 'Klareamont' may be an anagram for Thomas Chaloner (*Writing the English Republic*, 294 n. 146); it seems possible, however, that the name denotes Nedham himself, the last letters of whose Christian name (*Marchamont*) conclude it. Could 'Clare-amont' be Nedham in his role as explicator (Latin: *clare*) of the frontispiece?

84 I am thinking here of the rhetorical presentation of the treaty rather than its actual consequences, which were contested and remain open to debate; see S. C. A. Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and the Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650–1668* (Cambridge, 1996), 172–8.

85 Armitage, *Ideological Origins*, 141–5.

86 Nevo, *Dial of Virtue*, 116; Chernaik, *Poetry of Limitation*, 163; MacLean, *Time's Witness*, 122; Chernaik, "Every conqueror creates a muse"; 200.

complex argumentative tapestry: a local discourse deployed to lend the lustre of authority to what is, at root, a glamourless, Hobbesian argument for obedience from self-interest.<sup>87</sup> The poem's overall scope both contains and exceeds this discourse, celebrating not a nation that has abandoned action for repose, but a well-ordered state in the full vigour of imperial growth: a country that has rediscovered 'Her native force and virtue', now properly refocused by Cromwell from domestic disputes to her 'ancient way of conquering abroad'.

With this argument in view, we may return to the concluding stanzas of the poem and attempt to unravel that curious ambiguity over the precise occasion and focus of Waller's yet to be written epic:

Then let the Muses, with such notes as these,  
 Instruct us what belongs unto our peace;  
 Your battles they hereafter shall indite,  
 And draw the image of our Mars in fight;  
  
 Tell of towns stormed, of armies overrun,  
 And mighty kingdoms by your conduct won;  
 How, while you thundered, clouds of dust did choke  
 Contending troops, and seas lay hid in smoke.

(ll. 173–80)

Temporal and generic distinctions are preserved—though only just: here, in a panegyric, 'with such notes as these', Waller celebrates Cromwell's triumphs in the sphere of politics and nation-building. And yet the poet clearly reaches towards another occasion (and another genre) on which he will celebrate the Protector's martial accomplishments. The question we asked earlier was: is this an argument for Cromwell to provide fresh conquests for the poet to celebrate? We may now answer that question by turning to consider the source of the passage.

Students of Waller have not hitherto noticed that he is here borrowing from his favourite poem (which he also echoes elsewhere in the *Panegyrick*), Edward Fairfax's *Godfrey of Bulloigne*, a translation of Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata*.<sup>88</sup> In his introductory stanzas, Fairfax's Tasso dedicates his poem to his princely patrons thus:

Ye noble Princes, that protect and save  
 The pilgrim muses, and their ship defend  
 From rocke of ignorance, and errors waue,

87 The key texts here are, as Gilbert (*Edmund Waller*, 81) and Chernaik ("Every conqueror creates a muse", 199) note, those in which Hobbes sets out 'the mutuall Relation between Protection and Obedience': *Leviathan* (London, 1651), 395–6, 114, 174, 390–1; cf. ll. 2–3.

88 The borrowing was drawn to my attention by *Godfrey of Bulloigne: A Critical Edition of Edward Fairfax's Translation of Tasso's Gerusalemme Liberata, Together with Fairfax's Original Poems*, ed. K. M. Lea and T. M. Gang (Oxford, 1981), 601. For other borrowings, see *WP* ii. 196–7.

Your gracious eies vpon this labour bend:  
 To you these tales of loue and conquests braue  
 I dedicate, to you this worke I send,  
 My muse hereafter shall perhaps vnfold  
 Your fights, your battailes, and your combats bold.<sup>89</sup>

While this is clearly the source of Waller's reference to a future martial epic, the full weight of its explanatory power is felt only when we recall the way in which the dedication continues and concludes:

For if the Christian Princes ever striue  
 To win faire Greece out of the tyrants hands,  
 And those vsurping Ismalites depriue  
 Of wofull Thrace, which now captiued stands,  
 You must from realmes and seas the Turkes forth driue,  
 As *Godfrey* chased them from Iudais lands,  
 And in this legend, all that glorious deede  
 Read, whilst you arme you; arme you, whilst you reed.<sup>90</sup>

The uniting of European Christendom in a fresh crusade against the Turks was a favourite topic, to which Waller would return, especially at moments of domestic tension, and most insistently during the succession crisis of the 1680s.<sup>91</sup> A few years later, the Protector having committed himself to an alliance with France and a war with Spain, Waller would employ a loose imitation of the closing lines of Tasso's dedication to conclude his complimentary poem to Thomas Higgons on his translation of Busenello's *Prospective of the Naval Triumph of the Vénetians over the Turk* (1658):

If, listening to your charms, we could our jars  
 Compose, and on the Turk discharge these wars,  
 Our British arms the sacred tomb might wrest  
 From Pagan hands, and triumph o'er the East;  
 And then you might our own high deeds recite,  
 And with great Tasso celebrate the fight.<sup>92</sup>

There can, I think, be little doubt that the intertextual pressure of the unquoted stanza from Tasso conditions—and is designed to condition—our reading of the stanzas that follow and conclude Waller's *Panegyrick*. Waller invokes the passage, referencing its opening but not its conclusion. But that opening is surely designed to prompt a memory of its overall import. And that memory cannot help but colour our understanding of the final stanzas of *A Panegyrick*.

89 *Godfrey of Bulloigne*, ed. Lea and Gang, 95 (I. 4).

90 *Ibid.* (I. 5).

91 Gilbert, *Edmund Waller*, 106–7; Garrison, *Dryden and the Tradition of Panegyric*, 112, 119–20; see e.g. *WP* ii. 100–7.

92 *WP* ii. 28 (ll. 17–22).

The intertextual weight of Tasso's invocation colours our reading of the concluding stanzas of *A Panegyrick*, with their vision of the Protector crowned—as yet with bays and olive only—and riding in triumph over conquered nations and the ocean. Without such pressure, it is just possible to restrict the subject of this as yet unwritten martial epic to the victories Cromwell has already, by the time of writing, achieved: the conquered nations over which he triumphs need be no more than Scotland, Ireland, and Holland, whose fates were recounted in lines 81–104; the sea may denote merely the British seas.<sup>93</sup> But the attendant vision of Cromwell's neighbour princes bowing down before him seems not merely to involve international acknowledgement of past successes; it also predicts England's future European dominance by allusion to the sheaves which bowed before Joseph, representing his dominion over his brothers (Genesis 37: 6–8): of neighbour princes, only the House of Orange could in the spring of 1655 be said to have been thus reduced by Cromwell.<sup>94</sup> The biblical allusion implies that the story of Cromwell's and England's conquests is not yet over.<sup>95</sup> And, for those who are able to situate Waller's poem in the context he invites, the Tassonian intertext tips the entire conclusion into what would become one of the poet's favourite topoi: a call for Christendom to unite in a crusade to rid Europe of the Turk.<sup>96</sup> The full impact of the conclusion is thus clear only to those who can see beyond the local, British dimension and situate both the Protector and his poet in the broad European context to which Waller so deftly draws attention. It is a particularly fine instance of the poet's characteristic technique of arguing by implication rather than direct assertion.

But the poem's strategy of tactful indirection may be explained not only by reference to Waller's habitual manner but also as a response to the circumstances of its composition and publication. The public appearance of *A Panegyrick* has generally been linked with either the campaign to offer Cromwell the crown or with the commencement of his aggressive Protestant foreign policy against Spain, the so-called Western Design.<sup>97</sup> To contemporaries the two initiatives were,

93 There is no trace of any such poem; but it may be relevant that in September 1653 Dorothy Osborne had heard of some plan of Waller's for a romance on the subject of the civil wars: D. Osborne, *Letters to Sir William Temple*, ed. K. Parker (Harmondsworth, 1987), 132.

94 It is tempting to associate this vision with the iconography of the great protectoral warship, the *Naseby*, launched on 11 April 1655, and which John Evelyn saw two days earlier: 'In the *Prov* was *Oliver* on horseback trampling 6 nations under foote, a *Scott*, *Irishman*, *Dutch*, *French*, *Spaniard* & English as was easily made out by their several habits: A *Fame* held a laurell over his insulting head, & the word *God with us* . . .'; *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E. S. de Beer, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1955), iii, 149–50.

95 It works in the same manner as the claim in 'To my Lord of Falkland' that England's 'proud neighbours' will soon learn to mourn her newfound military prowess (ll. 33–6); *WP* i, 76.

96 See e.g. *WP* ii, 28, 100–2, 103–5, 106–7.

97 Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, 307; Gardiner, *Commonwealth and Protectorate*, iv, 193; Armitage, 'Cromwellian Protectorate', 531–2.

importantly, connected: indeed, they would later read Cromwell's decision not to take the crown as a response to the failure of his Western Design, and they were (as Blair Worden has shown) almost certainly right to do so.<sup>98</sup> The poem, we recall, was printed at the end of May: at the height of the kingship campaign and well before news of the humiliation of the expeditionary force at San Domingo reached England.<sup>99</sup> The moment therefore involved both opportunities and dangers. On the two crucial initiatives of the time Waller clearly had views he wished to argue. And yet he could not know precisely how those initiatives might take shape: whether, for instance, Cromwell would take the title of king or of emperor, or what, exactly, would happen in the western Atlantic. Under such circumstances, to imply one's goals forcefully, but without too much precision on matters of detail, was a prudent strategy. Never, perhaps, was the poet's peculiar talent for organizing his work by means of agreeable association rather than logical argument better suited to so weighty an occasion.<sup>100</sup>

*Carleton College*

<sup>98</sup> Armitage, 'Cromwellian Protectorate', 531–2, 539–40; B. Worden, 'Oliver Cromwell and the Sin of Achan', in D. Beales and G. Best (edd.), *History, Society and the Churches: Essays in Honour of Owen Chadwick* (Cambridge, 1985), 125–45: 135–45.

<sup>99</sup> On the kingship campaign, see Sherwood, *Oliver Cromwell*, 49–50. Early reports of the success of the expedition (grossly exaggerated) trickled back to England in April: on 3 April Thomason bought a copy of *A great and wonderful Victory obtained by the English forces, under the command of General Pen and General Vénables against the French and others in the West Indies* (London, 1655); in late July, however, news of the disaster hit: Armitage, 'Cromwellian Protectorate', 340–1.

<sup>100</sup> Allison, *Towards an Augustan Poetic*, 15, 21.