INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9432376

"A darker cloud": The effects of factionalism between the city and the court on the poetry that portrays the physical aspect of London life (c. 1600–1666).

Rosenblum, Marc, Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1994

Copyright ©1994 by Rosenblum, Marc. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

"A DARKER CLOUD": THE EFFECTS OF FACTIONALISM BETWEEN THE CITY AND THE COURT ON THE POETRY THAT PORTRAYS THE PHYSICAL ASPECT OF LONDON LIFE (C. 1600-1666).

by

MARC ROSENBLUM

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in English in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1994

© 1994

MARC ROSENBLUM

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in English in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 6, 1994
Date

Chair of Examining Committee

6 April 1994
Date

Executive Officer

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

"A DARKER CLOUD": THE EFFECTS OF FACTIONALISM BETWEEN THE CITY AND THE COURT ON THE POETRY THAT PORTRAYS THE PHYSICAL ASPECT OF LONDON LIFE (C. 1600-1666).

by

MARC ROSENBLUM

Adviser: Dr. Felicia Bonaparte

The factionalism existing in the London scene during the reigns of James I, Charles I, and Charles II has a major effect upon the Stuart poets and is in turn the subject of much of their poetry written about London life during the early and mid-17th century. This concern with the escalating factionalism in the capital city is particularly evident in those urban poems which describe the physical metropolis in term of its landmarks, panoramas, and pollution problems. London, in these urban poems describing the physical aspect of the city's life, is portrayed as being a kind of battle-ground in which there is a persistent struggle for political dominance between, on the one side, the Monarch and his court, and, on the other side, the city's entrepreneurial middle-class along with their representative voice in Parliament's House of Commons. The courtier poets emphasize the King's commanding physical presence within and his encompassing view of the metropolitan scene, the Monarch's anti-urban vision of the filthy City of London, the King's or a member of the sovereign family's repair and improvement

of royal landmarks in the capital, and the centralized, majestic prospects of the surrounding city afforded by these monarchical structures. The King's relationship with the physical city is a continuing preoccupation in these urban poems because the courtier poets want to assert the continued dominance of the Stuart Monarchy in the political and religious life of the capital city at a time when its prerogatives and its aspirations to attain a more absolute rule are being challenged by radical urban sects who advocate, because of their growing affluence and business acumen in the modern capitalist society, the need to create a more limited Monarchy so that they will have a greater voice in the nation's government.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation is dedicated to my Father and Mother, to my adviser, Dr. Felicia Bonaparte, and to my readers, Dr. Martin Elsky and Dr. Thomas Hayes, whose guidance enabled me to successfully complete this project. I also wish to express gratitude to George Ziskind for his use of innovative computer methods in the production of this dissertation.

Table of Contents

Title Page i

Copyright Page ii

Approval Page iii

Abstract iv

Acknowledgements vi

Table of Contents vii

Introduction 1

Chapter 1 - The Reign of James I 20

Chapter 2 - The Reign of Charles I 109

Chapter 3 - The Reign of Charles II 209

Bibliography 335

INTRODUCTION

More poems about London life were composed during the early and mid-17th century than in any prior or later period. There are several reasons for the Stuart poets' interest in writing about this city in their poetry: London at this time was undergoing a radical transformation in terms of its expanding physical size, its rapidly growing population, its development from a medieval to a capitalist economy, its increasingly central place in the nation's social, cultural, and political life. Furthermore, this enormous urban development invited the English poets when discussing the vices of their city's life to imitate an already established classical literary tradition of satire that arose in response to the ancient metropolis of Rome. In addition to these reasons, I will prove in this dissertation that the courtier-poets' concern for and their desire to defend the status of the Monarchy in its factious capital city was also a major cause for this poetic interest in the London scene.

What had once been the most prominent yet still provincial city in medieval England was becoming during the course of our period with the development of overseas trade in the late Elizabethan years a cosmopolitan metropolis--a first class city which through its commerce had economic ties with the rest of the world. London by the 17th century dominated

the English nation as no other European city was able to do in their respective nation because it was the only one which combined so many important functions, being its nation-state's most important port and center of road transportation, center of commerce and industry, center of government, center of the legal system, and center of social and cultural life as the country gentry sought more than ever before during this period to spend at least part of the year in the metropolis. Consequently, whereas other European nations such as France, the Netherlands, and Italy had several comparably sized important cities carrying on one or more of the above activities that were characteristic of a major urban center, London because of its monopolization of all of these activities was far greater in its population than other cities in England. F. J. Fisher in the course of making his argument that London was the engine for economic growth for England notes that "at the beginning of the sixteenth century it was probably five times as large as the largest provincial town; at the end of the seventeenth century it was fifteen times as large" (205); C. G. A. Clay remarks that "by the end of the seventeenth century, ... , the number of its people had risen to about 575,000, so that it was nineteen times the size of Norwich, and more than twenty-five times that of Bristol, and accounted for nearly half the urban population of the country (197). London's development into England's pre-eminent city was, according

to the historian Fernand Braudel, part of the larger European trend in the 16th and 17th centuries when the first great cities in the West came into being to provide "powerful political concentrations" in order to run Europe's modern nation-states (77-78). In terms of its precipitous growth, London was in the vanguard of the European capital cities which developed physically and economically in order to provide goods, services, and facilities for those members of the nobility who were responsible for attending to the administrative and bureaucratic needs of the modern nation-states. As Clay points out:

> The growth of London was one of the most striking and important of the changes which occurred within English society and the English economy between 1500 and 1700. By the standards of contemporary Europe London at the end of the Middle Ages was very much a city of the second rank, in no way comparable in size to Paris, Rome, Naples or Milan. Two hundred years later it was larger than all those places, the largest city in Europe, except for Constantinople. (213)

The central paradox revealed in the urban poetry of the Stuart period is that while the primary stimulus for London's growth as a commercial center was the material needs of the Court and the gentry who conducted the affairs of national government, the merchants and tradesmen who prospered by providing for the needs and luxurious wants of the noble classes gradually came to resent the prerogatives of their well born customers. In the late 16th and 17th centuries the profits that the city businessmen amassed by

selling goods and services to the gentry was invested in industrial activities and most significantly in overseas trading ventures in which these merchants prospered greatly. At the same time the Monarch, his courtiers, and the urban gentry became poorer as the stable revenues that they received from their rural lands could not keep up with the price rise that was brought about by the activities of the modern capitalist economy, particularly the inflationary effect that the introduction of the gold and silver discovered in the Americas had upon the European economy. Meanwhile, the increasingly impoverished Monarchy was burdened with fulfilling its medieval role of providing for the public welfare in this time of inflation when providing for the basic needs of an underemployed populace became ever more costly. Consequently, the Stuart Monarchy became increasingly dependent both on Parliament and the city merchants to provide revenue so that it could continue to carry out its domestic and foreign policies. Factional strife arose amongst the City of London's mercantile middle class against those who had a higher rank in the hierarchical order of society than themselves, because these city entrepreneurs demanded with the wealth that they had acquired by doing business with the nobility and through their subsequent international investments a more distinguished social status, and a greater voice in the nation's political and religious life.

Given London's position of being the pre-eminent city in England in the 17th century and its leading role as one of the rising capital cities in Europe to administer to the needs of the modern nation-state, it is not surprising that so many aspects of London life were written about by the late Tudor and Stuart poets. Gail Paster in her study of the urban comedies of Shakespeare, Jonson, and Middleton in The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare remarks that the growth of London into a "world-city" stimulated the production of literature about urban life in this metropolis to an extent unknown in the medieval city as well as created a receptive audience for such literary productions:

> A new urban self-consciousness is apparent everywhere in Elizabethan writing, as can be seen in the verse of citizen-poets like John Taylor or in the London pamphleteering of Greene, Nashe, and Dekker with its fascination with London trades, occupations, and idioms. London was thus growing in importance not only as the dominant location for the production of English letters, but also as a dominant literary subject. (6-7)

What is surprising is that this topic, the poems written about urban life in London in the early and mid-17th century, has been neglected by literary scholars. While such scholars as Max Byrd in London Transformed and William Henry Irving in John Gay's London discuss the London poetry of the late 17th and 18th centuries and William B. Thesing in The London Muse: Victorian Poetic Responses to the City focuses on the poetry written about the London scene in the 19th century, no book length study has been written about the

poetry written about London life during its most radical period of evolution from a medieval, provincial city to a cosmopolitan metropolis in the early and mid-17th century.

Several other scholars take a wider view about the poetry written about the London scene that spans several centuries and/or seek to compare the literature written about this English metropolis with the literature written about other places such as the English countryside or other major cities of the world. G. Robert Stange in his essay "The Frightened Poets" compares the Victorian poets neglect of the metropolis with the 18th century poets celebration of it. Raymond William in The Country and the City discusses the manner in which English writers have described life in the country and life in the city from the middle ages to the present time. John Johnston in The Poet and the City considers in the first half of his book how several English poets in the 17th, 18th, and early 19th centuries depicted London life in topographical poems that followed in the Virgilian tradition established in the Georgics. This scholar particularly refers to such 17th century poems that refer briefly to London life as Drayton's Poly-Olbion and Denham's "Cooper's Hill." He also returns later in his book to consider T. S. Eliot's "The Waste Land" as a 20th century topographical poem about London life. While these latter scholars might refer briefly to one or two of the many poems written about

the London scene in the early and mid-17th century, this topic, because of the great amount of poetry that was written about London during the late Tudor and Stuart era and the remarkable development of the metropolis during this period, demands far more exclusive and in-depth treatment in order to ascertain what was the major concern or concerns in the urban poetry of this period, what aspects of urban life were the poets of this period interested in writing about, and what was the historic basis for this interest.

The Stuart urban poetry about the London scene can be divided into three major aspects: firstly, those poems describing the physical city; secondly, those that refer to historical events that occurred in London; and, thirdly, those that satirize the predominant vices of the metropolis's life. In relation to this first major aspect of London life that is frequently presented in the Stuart poetry, I have sought to identify in this dissertation that a common concern about factional disturbances between the city and the court (and, therefore, between the mercantile and noble communities that the two places in the metropolis represent) is persistently expressed when the poets describe the physical aspect of the London scene in the early and mid-17th century. These urban poems will be regarded by me in this dissertation not only as literary but also as historical artifacts because the common subject that I have found expressed in them mirrors

the actual concerns that preoccupied the citizens and courtiers who lived in London during this period. As Lewis Mumford recognized in his book The Culture of Cities, the study of poetry and other forms of literature are essential pieces of evidence in determining what the experience of city life is like in a particular place and during a particular time:

> There is, indeed, no better clue to what people see and feel and do than what finds its way into contemporary poems, plays and stories: they have a sort of veracity which court records, account books, and newspaper clippings do not possess: for they contain, in an excellent state of preservation, the living man and so much of his environment as he could respond to and express. (502)

Sharing Mumford's conviction about the historical value of works of the imagination, many scholars have provided this kind of exclusive and in-depth treatment when determining how the Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights when creating the characters, plots, and dialogue of their city comedies were influenced by the historical situation then existing in the City and the Nation. Lionel Charles Knight in Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson, Brian Gibbons in Jacobean City Comedy, Steven Mullaney in The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England, and Susan Wells in "Jacobean City Comedy and the Ideology of the City" are all interested in determining the manner in which the historical situation existing in London and in England influenced the content of the city plays. Knights, Gibbons, and Wells study

the economic situation in London and in England at the time to provide a historical context to better understand why the playwrights of the period create and satirize such characters as merchants, tradesmen, and usurers who are involved in the City's commercial life and their social-climbing wives at this particular time. Mullaney takes another historical approach when he considers how the plays created in the late Elizabethan and Jacobean period were influenced by the kind of place in which they were performed within the city's geographical make-up. The fact that the theater was licensed by the monarchy but that the City of London refused to allow performances to take place within its jurisdiction within the walls of the city forced the acting companies if they were still to serve their metropolitan audience that consisted of the commoners of the city and the upper classes affiliated with the court to build their theaters in the liberties (i.e. suburbs) of London. Mullaney argues that the fact that the plays were performed in the licentious liminal area of the city, just beyond its restrictive control, influenced the playwrights' perspective of the city, the court, and the nation. Gail Paster in several chapters of her book The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare studies the manner in which such literary genres as the city pageants, the court masques, and the city comedies of Jonson and Middleton portrayed Elizabethan and Jacobean London. Unlike the other scholars mentioned above, she doesn't deal

in depth with the historicity of these literary works that focus on the London scene. Paster puts her discussion of specific works by Jonson, Middleton, and Shakespeare in the context of the urban literary tradition of the Classical and Renaissance eras.

The fact that such a wealth of literary scholarship exists on the topic of the city plays written during the late Tudor and Stuart periods emphasizes the lack of such scholarship in putting the urban poems of the London scene during the same period by Jonson, Donne, Herrick, Drayton, Cowley, Waller, Davenant, Butler, Taylor, and Rowlands in the same kind of historical and literary context that we see in the works of Knights, Gibbons, Mullaney, Wells, and Paster.

Emulating the efforts of Knights, Gibbons, and Wells, I intend in this dissertation to establish a historical context within which to prove my thesis that the threat of factional strife between the city and the court was a major preoccupation that affected the poet's portrayal of the physical aspect of London life during the reigns of three of the Stuart Monarchs: James I, Charles I, and Charles II; emulating the effort of Mullaney, I intend to determine how the place of the poet within the urban society, having ties with both the mercantile city and the noble court, influenced his description of the metropolis's physical land-

marks, panoramas, and pollution problems.

As the two cities of London and Westminster grew into one entity, factionalism grew as the inhabitants of the latter city that embodied the old hierarchical mode of governing a feudal society came into regular contact with the new self-reliant, economically independent, citizens of a modern capitalist society. In these poems of London life written in the early and mid-17th century, and particularly as this dissertation will show in those urban poem portraying the physical aspect of London life during the Stuart period, a growing tension between the court and the city, between the monarch and Londoners, between the gentry and the middle-class merchants, tradesmen and their apprentices is revealed because of their conflicting ethics, lifestyles, aspirations, and prerogatives. As the two cities grew physically closer together the interaction of these two different social classes, the middle and upper classes, increased and the differences in their manner of living became more apparent and less tolerable. Fundamentally, this factionalism existing in the metropolis--which became the major subject of Stuart urban poetry, and which led to the disruption of government, the flight of King Charles I and his court from Westminster, and ultimately culminated in Civil War--is based upon the gradual displacement of the medieval economy with the capitalistic one. The relationship between the

different social classes within the metropolis was disrupted because money rather than heredity became the great factor in social position, prestige, and power. While C. V. Wedgwood mentions in her early background chapters in The King's Peace that social mobility always existed in English society (49-51), the radical transformation of the city and later the nation's economic life in the late 16th and 17th centuries accelerated that mobility to such an extent that by the mid-17th century it threatened to destabilize the entire hierarchical structure of English society and created the preoccupation with factional strife between the different orders of society that we see reflected in the Stuart urban poems describing the physical life of the capital city. The growing dominance of this new kind of economy made the city businessmen richer, more independent, and (through their greater representative voice in Parliament) more politically powerful, while inversely making the court because of its income (which could not keep up with the inflation that was a characteristic of the capitalist economy of the period), its burdensome responsibility to provide for the public welfare of an increasingly underemployed and impoverished populace, and its lavish wants of fashionable imported commodities (which could be more easily procured through the development of overseas trade in this type of modern economy) more dependent upon these wealthy businessmen for loans and revenue. While the court was still obliged

to live up to its medieval role of providing for the general public good, the new middle-class men of the metropolis were widely criticized and satirized in the literature of the period for making private gain their highest priority so that the atomistic individualism of the self-made businessman supplanted concern for the communal welfare as the leading urban ethos, whereas caring for the needs of the overall community was still the responsibility of the hierarchical institutions of the Monarchy and the Church of England. Other divisive issues which expressed the factionalism of London life such as the growing disenchantment with hierarchical modes of power in Church and State are secondary and proceed as effects from this more fundamental economic one that empowered the rising middle class to have a greater voice in politics and religion which was symbolized by the growing influence of Parliament and the Puritan Movement.

The English poets of the early and mid-17th century made this factionalism existing between the hierarchical orders of the Monarchy and the Church of England and the city's businessmen their major theme in the urban poetry because they were both socially and physically placed in the threshold regions of these two increasingly hostile groups, having their former familial ties in the city and struggling to acquire and to maintain a precarious affiliation with the

Stuart courts. These poets were best able because of their personal histories to appreciate the perspectives of both factions. The poets of this period had for the most part their roots in the City of London as the sons of tradesmen, but aspired because of their acquirement of a higher education to become members of the court. The fact that many of the poets of this period migrated from their original residence in the City of London to reside closer to the court in the middle ground of what was known as "the town" (the suburban housing built to the north of the Strand in the formerly uninhabited land between the City of Westminster and the City of London for the increasing numbers of the country gentry who wished to reside in the metropolis) physically symbolizes the desire of these poets to dissociate themselves from the capitalistic ethic of the city's middle class and to associate themselves with the medieval ethic of the court which still upheld the landed gentry's traditional ways of providing hospitality and patronage to the nation's cultural elite, the artists and the educators. In addressing this growing factionalism arising within the metropolis, the Stuart poets, being not yet ready for the most part to change their gentlemanly pastime to a money-making profession by publishing their poetry for a wider urban audience, tend to side with their patrons--the gentry, the courtiers, and the monarch--in their power struggle with the city's rising, wealthy middle-class of merchants and

tradesmen.

A simile from Sir John Denham's poem "Cooper's Hill" that compares the inhabitants of London who are obsessively caught up in their ruthless money-making activities to "a darker cloud" is the title of my dissertation because it best expresses the foreboding of the poet's patrons, the King and the court, which in turn became the courtier poet's primary underlying theme in his urban poetry that the rising middle class of the City of London would eventually displace because of their social aspirations the King, the court, and the gentry from their exclusive positions in the social and political life of English society. Denham's comparison of the city's entrepreneurs to "a darker cloud" intimates that these new and successful practitioners of business in a capitalist economy who were becoming richer and politically more powerful, while the court was becoming poorer and less able to rule unilaterally (relying increasingly upon Parliament to grant it subsidies to carry out the responsibilities of government), would eventually through their unseemly levelling activities deprive the hierarchical orders of Church and State of much if not all of their privileges and powers. These levelling activities that were equated with "a darker cloud" consisted, on the cultural front, in the city's middle-class emulating the fashions and behavior of the aristocratic ladies and gentlemen of the court and, on

the political front, in their increasing degree of representation in Parliament's House of Commons.

The English poets who wrote about life in the metropolis during the late Tudor and Stuart period were for the most part aspiring to become involved with the court life of Westminster because of the preferments, power, and financial rewards that they could hope to gain from such a connection with the Monarch and his/her coterie. What lends tension and drama to this aspiration to gain patronage at Court by means of their literary output was the fact that such poets as Donne, Jonson, Herrick, and Davenant because of their family background were unlikely aspirants to find such favor in the royal court. They were born into the very middle class whose social, religious, and political aspirations threatened to disrupt the hierarchical order of English society. These poets were the children (or in the case of Jonson a step-child) of craftsmen (in Donne's and Herrick's cases) from the City of London, (in Jonson's case) the City of Westminster, and (in Davenant'e case) Oxford, although Davenant after his father's death went to the City of London with the understanding that he would become an apprentice of a merchant or a tradesmen in the city. Donne's father had been an ironmonger, Jonson's step-father, a bricklayer, Herrick's father, a goldsmith, and Davenant's father, a vintner, so that rather than having connections at court

their fathers and relatives were members of city guilds regulating their respective crafts. Moreover, in the cases of Jonson and Herrick they were both for a time apprenticed in their fathers' occupations so that these poets could to some extent sympathize with the perspective and the aspirations of London's middle-class society who resented the exclusive privileges and powers belonging to the nobility.

These pre-eminent late Tudor and Stuart poets distanced themselves from their middle-class mercantile origins to find a less confrontational means to achieve their social aspirations, using their poetic gifts as a means to ingratiate themselves with the Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline Courts. They attempt to assert in their urban poem that describe the city's physical life the Monarch's dominating physical presence in the metropolis, the ability of renovated royal landmarks to provide a commanding panoramic view of the surrounding capital city because of their centralized location, the power of members of the royal family to uplift the London citizenry from their paltry commercial aims and from their polluted surroundings, the power of the Crown to provide funds and manpower to charitably take care of the larger needs of the entire community by improving various landmarks, such as cathedrals and parks in the metropolis for the greater public good, and, in contrast to these positive evocations of London life that are made in order to

bolster the stature of the Monarchy and the court within it, these poets are found to reflect as well in certain poems the anti-urban vision and policies of the earlier Stuart Monarch whose senses were revolted by the dirty streets and waterways of the overcrowded commercial city.

The urban poems of the late 17th century and thereafter would move away from this preoccupation with the relationship of court and city because the poet as the political and economic power of the court dwindled would seek patronage and an audience from a wider, wealthier, more well educated readership amongst the urban citizenry. This poetic concern with the sovereign's relationship with the urban populace and the growing factionalism amongst the London citizenry that posed a threat to the monarch's authority is a unique characteristic of the urban poetry of the late Tudor and Stuart periods when the struggle for political power between the court and the rising middle-class entrepreneurs of the city was most acute. In their effort to defend the Stuart Monarchy against the contentious factions in the city seeking to limit the powers of the Crown, the courtier-poets create urban poems in which the King and his royal structures are portrayed as being both physically dominant; furthermore, these poets demonstrate that these latter newly renovated structures that serve the members and institutions of the Monarchy afford a commanding prospect of the sur-

rounding panorama of the city. The physical dominance of royal figures, parks, and residences within the metropolis are emphasized in order to symbolize the point that Londoners should recognize that their desire to live in a unified, orderly environment in which their legal rights, property, and all their commercial ventures within the domain of the capital city and on the high seas are safeguarded is linked to their supporting the Stuart Kings and their anachronistic dream of having an absolute monarchy.

My dissertation will be divided into three chapters. In each of these chapters that deal with the successive reigns of James I, Charles I, and Charles II, I will prove my thesis that the poets who described the physical aspect of London life in their urban poems during the rule of these particular Stuart Kings were reacting to the factional strife that threatened to displace the Monarchy from its position of dominance in the capital city.

CHAPTER 1: THE REIGN OF JAMES I

The growing friction between the court, the city, and the country factions can be seen from a variety of different viewpoints in the urban poems that describe the physical aspect of life in the capital city during the reign of James I. In his poem "Upon His Majesty's Repairing of St. Paul's," the courtier-poet Edmund Waller pays a retrospective tribute to James I's first efforts to initiate plans to repair St. Paul's Cathedral that his son and eventual heir to the throne was able to bring to partial completion after his father's passing. This courtier-poet downplays whatever reservations and opposition middle-class Puritan Londoners would have towards the King spending his limited revenues (increasingly acquired by taxing their business profits obtained through their investments in overseas trade, industrial projects, and selling imported luxury items to affluent members of the court and the gentry) to purchase the building materials, construction equipment, and manpower needed to repair a Cathedral that was widely believed by London's entrepreneurial middle-class to be an unwelcome vestige of Popery, and symbolic of the Popish elements that were still to be generally found in the Church of England which these Puritan London businessmen believed to be in need of further radical Protestant reforms. However, Waller in attempting as a courtier-poet to bolster the image of the

Stuart Monarchy by portraying the conscientious manner in which James I fulfilled his role as the head of the Church of England, further asserting that this attention to renovating the Cathedral was appreciated by the London populace, alludes inadvertently to the flaws in James's character as well as the financial problem that this Stuart Monarch was experiencing which caused him to abandon his plans to renovate St. Paul's.

In "On the Famous Voyage," the courtier-poet Ben Jonson also serves the interest of the court faction, but instead of doing this by defending the King's plans to perform good works by improving physical structures in the City, he defends the King's anti-urban vision of a hellish, polluted, over-populated City of London in order to support James I's policies of prohibiting further building in the city as well as discouraging the continued migration of the country gentry and the country poor to the city which would consequently add to the already monumental problem of pollution and disease already proliferating there because of the city's unsanitary and overcrowded condition. In Jonson's poem the Fleet River is described as epitomizing a city that is generally drowning in human waste and other forms of garbage. However, underlying this criticism of the City of London as an unliveable place, a greater unstated fear exists both in the poet's and King's mind that those busi-

nessmen who are growing wealthy in that city's capitalist economy and seeking a greater representative voice in social and theological issues will one day pose a serious threat to the Monarchy's leadership in political and religious affairs. Therefore, the city's problems with overcrowding, pollution, and disease serve as a pretext for arguing in the King's proclamations and more indirectly in Johnson's poem for the future downsizing of London. It is actually the increasing wealth and power of the city businessmen, and their escalating resentment towards the prerogatives of the Crown and the future representation of that hostility in such bodies as the House of Commons, that is in reality a greater cause for the King's wish to curb London's growth in size and population than the unmanageable environmental problems that are portrayed in Jonson's poem.

In contrast to these two courtier-poets, Michael Drayton in the chorographical poem Poly-Olbion expresses the country faction's hostility to the particularly irresolute Monarchical rule of James I and to his spendthrift, ostentatious, and licentious court as well as this faction's resentment towards the city entrepreneurs who are becoming because of their economic might increasingly influential at court, while the country faction grows proportionately less able to influence the Stuart Monarchy's foreign and domestic policies so as to further their interests.

Edmund Waller in an early poem of his dating from 1633 ignores the growing discord between the Monarchy and Londoners in religious, political, and economic matters in his presentation of a united, loyal, and grateful London citizenry admiring and assisting the Stuart Kings, James I and Charles I, in their efforts to repair the most prominent symbol of the episcopal Church of England within the increasingly Puritan City of London. The repair of St. Paul's is symbolic of the conservative religious policy of the Stuart Kings to "refine" the Church of England rather than to be pressured by the more radical Puritan sects of London "to frame" a "new church." Londoners are portrayed in this poem as approving James I's and Charles I's policies of refining this particular Cathedral and being impressed by the beauty of the restored Cathedral during the reign of Charles I. This portrait of a London populace being pleased by the Stuart Kings' ongoing project of renovating St. Paul's belies the subsequent fate of this Cathedral when it was during the Civil War and Interregnum desecrated, vandalized, and used as a stable for the horses of the Parliamentary Army without the slightest bit of protest being uttered by the London citizenry, because those among them belonging to Puritan sects perceived such grandiose, ostentatious religious structures as St. Paul's as being a throwback to the kind of overbearing Roman Catholic institution in which a passive congregation became excessively dependent for

their religious instruction on idolatrous physical symbols and upon an episcopal order conducting overly elaborate and pretentious rituals during the services held in such Cathedrals.

Although much of the praise for repairing St. Paul's Cathedral is given to Charles I, Edmund Waller in -Upon His Majesty's Repairing of St. Paul's" attributes the initial idea to restore the Cathedral to its former physical and formal grandeur to his father, James I. This king had toured the medieval cathedral on Sunday, 26 March 1620 and agreed that St. Paul's was badly in need of repair and appointed a commission "to determine what needed to be done, to procure estimates and to collect contributions." But enthusiasm for this project "soon flagged" so that the building materials that had already been purchased in order to make some of the necessary repairs lay in neglected heaps about the Cathedral and eventually James I gave permission to his favorite courtier, the Duke of Buckingham, to "borrow" some of the unused material, a large quantity of Portland stone, for his own rebuilding project (Bald 402-404). Waller is careful in comparing James I's and Charles I's respective efforts to restore the Cathedral to flatter the son's success so that his superior competence, at least in this matter of completing the restoration project, is suggested while not denigrating the well meaning father's unfulfilled plans who

after all "had this work of cost and piety begun." The poet tactfully avoids in his reference to James I being a ruler of "ample thought" stating outright that this King was a dreamer who lacked Charles's strong ideals and drive to put his dream of repairing St. Paul's into action. Referring obliquely to James I's irresolute character as a leader, having allowed the building materials bought to repair the Cathedral to lay in "confus'd heaps" about the churchyard of St. Paul's, Waller portrays the more capable son as creating order out of his father's confused legacy of unfulfilled plans and unutilized materials:

> When the first monarch [James I] of this happy isle,
> Moved with the ruin of so brave a pile,
> This work of cost and piety begun,
> To be accomplish'd by his glorious son,
> Who all that came within the ample thought
> Of his wise sire has to perfection brought;
> He, like Amphion, makes those quarries leap
> Into fair figures from a confus'd heap;
> For in his art of regiment is found
> A power like that of harmony in sound.

Although Waller's intention is to cover up whatever discord exists between the Stuart Kings and Londoners by describing how the later monarch, Charles I, and his subjects joined together in welcoming and performing this restoration project, the poet alludes unintentionally in the subtext of his poem to the criticism of Puritan Londoners that the former king, James I, possessed an irresolute character and, consequently, paid only sporadic attention to state affairs, when he describes this king not being able to put his plans

of repairing St. Paul's into effect, so that this project of improving St. Paul's had to await the new reign of the more purposeful Charles I "to be accomplish'd." Contrary to Waller's aim as a courtier-poet to bolster the prestige of past and present Stuart Monarchs in the eyes of the London citizenry, because of his omission of James I's reasons for not completing the restoration of St. Paul's, he gives room for Londoners who were already critical of this former Monarch to interpret this failure to complete the renovation project as yet another sign of the King's irresponsible character. Indeed, the above passage from Waller's poem that is intended to pay tribute to these two Stuart Monarchs for their good works in the City of London unintentionally emphasizes the cause for much of the London public's dislike of this former Monarch who handled domestic and foreign affairs in a lackadaisical manner. Gibbons' remarks upon James I's irresponsible rule which Waller unwittingly illustrates in his poem:

> James's interest in government was from the outset notoriously unzealous. Here is what the Venetian ambassador communicated to the Doge on February 10th, 1605: "I hear the King has written a letter to Council, in which he tells them that having been recently for nearly three weeks in London he finds this sedentary life very prejudicial to his health; .... He says he is bound to consider his health above all things, and so he must tell them that for the future he means to come to London but seldom, passing most of his time in the country in the chase; and as he will be thus far away from court he cannot attend to business, and so he commits all to them .... Many who went to him with petitions and grievances have been told to go to the Council, for they are fully authorised ....This is the

> cause of indescribable ill-humour among the King's subjects .... (56-58)

Gibbons further notes that James I's inattention to affairs of state, symbolized retrospectively by Waller's description of the King's allowing the materials that had been provided to restore St. Paul's to lie in a "confus'd heap," caused Londoners to shift their attention from an inactive Monarch seeking holidays in the country to a more committed and productive Parliament that filled the political void left in the metropolis. Consequently, the institution and authority of Monarchy was weakened in the eyes of the citizenry because of James I's incompetent rule:

> The king, it was plainly well known, cared nothing for the Commons. On the other hand there was sufficient popular interest in Parliamentary business to arouse demand for copies of speeches and the subsequent introduction of Parliamentary newsletters. Beaulieu wrote in February 1610 "the Parliament here doth chiefly now occupy the Minds of our Court and the Tounges of our Exchange", ... (56-58)

Although Waller's purpose in "Upon His Majesty's Repairing of St. Paul's" is to bolster the Stuart Monarchy, particularly the current reign of Charles I, in the eyes of Londoners by extolling the good works it has performed in the city, he at least in relation to James I achieves the opposite effect by giving hostile city factions the opportunity to conjecture that it was the laxness of this former King's rule which was the reason why this project, related to enhancing amongst the urban populace the aesthetic experi-

ence of religious worship within the state-run Church of England, was not more expeditiously carried out. For Londoners, James I's careless management of the affairs concerning the national church must have provided a counterpoint to the zealous manner in which affairs concerning the increasingly popular Puritan religion were attended to by their members. In his failure to carry out this improvement scheme, James I not only contributes to his weakening the prestige of the Monarchy but also that of the Church of England, both being the kind of hierarchical institutions of government and religion that had flourished in a medieval society. Richard Helgerson points out that both the fortunes of the Monarchy and the Church of England, both being divinely sanctioned hierarchical orders, were closely linked, so that the decline in the prestige and power of one institution would ultimately bring about to a reciprocal degree the weakening of the other:

> In a recent paper, Conrad Russell has looked closely at those men who were active members of parliament in both the 1620s and 1640s to see if positions they took in the earlier decade would allow one to predict the side they would choose later. He examined attitudes regarding court and country, law and liberty, parliamentary privilege, prosecution of recusants, Buckingham, and the petition of right. On none was there a significant correlation between speeches delivered in the 1620s and party allegiance in the 1640s. Only religion provided an element of consistency. In the 1620s, future royalists thought religious reform had gone far enough; future parliamentarians thought it hadn't. And since this was also the single most divisive issue of Elizabeth's reign, one can surmise ... that religious differences dating back eighty years and more gave ideological form to a conflict that eventually erupted into war. At the very least, Russell's findings confirm

> once again the sense that in early modern England the language of politics was most often the language of religion. (251-252)

In allowing the decay of the most prominent physical symbol of the Church of England in the City of London to continue unabated, James I further contributed to the decay of the Londoners' reverence for that other institution which occupied the highest rank in the hierarchical ordering of society and which was sanctioned by divine will to be head of the religious and political life of the nation, the English Monarchy. Waller in portraying Charles I's strong leadership in seeing to it that the Cathedral was finally repaired, indirectly by contrast portrays James I's neglect of political and religious matters that the Monarch was supposed to attend to and which contributed to the growing perception amongst Londoners that the members of Parliament and the religious leaders of the Puritan Movement were far more capable of being responsive to their needs and providing effective leadership in political and religious affairs than the antiquated hierarchical orders of the Monarchy and the Church of England under the leadership of James I were.

Waller's omission of the reason or reasons why the renovation of St. Paul's had to await the reign of Charles I "to be accomplish'd" could be indicative not only of James I's character flaws, but of the financial problems that the

Stuart Monarchy was experiencing at this time. In contrast to this King's incompetent management of state affairs, the Crown's persistent fiscal difficulties which caused it to become more dependent on Parliament and London's prosperous businessmen would affect the reigns of later Stuart Monarchs and would ultimately bring about the temporary overthrow of the Stuart Monarchy during the Interregnum. It can be easily understood that in both the former case of James I's failure to bring about the repairs upon the Cathedral because of his indecisive, procrastinating nature or in the latter case of his being prevented from carrying out his project because of the fiscal problems his regime was having, Waller would not care to advertise either weakness as a reason for the Crown's initial inability to carry out its plans in a poem that is designed to exemplify the Stuart Monarchy's strengths.

Both Knights and Gibbons note the kind of financial problems that the last Tudor Monarch passed on to the successive kings of the Stuart Monarchy which would have made such ambitious and costly projects of repairing St. Paul's difficult to carry out unilaterally without the active cooperation of Parliament in approving subsidies and of the city's prosperous businessmen in granting loans. These city businessmen as has already been intimated were more inclined as members of Puritan sects to see a lessening in the

Monarchy's dominance in political and religious matters. Furthermore, they would not be interested in advancing loans for a project to rebuild a Cathedral which was in their eyes a relic of popery. Gibbons's remarks about the financial problems of the late Tudor and Stuart Monarchies would provide us with ample reason to conjecture that James I's failure to proceed in the repair of St. Paul's could be sufficiently attributed to the Crown's fiscal troubles. This historian points out that the crown during this period because of its fixed and/or decreasing income was unable to meet its expenditures and became increasingly reliant for revenues and loans upon the entrepreneurs and their political institutions which respectively prospered, became more powerful, and consequently more resentful of the crown's parasitical efforts to tax, to regulate, and to curb their profits in the capitalist economy:

> The greatest landlord was in fact the monarch; though his income was fixed, he also had the highest expenditure in the land, and therefore had most to lose by inflation. The Tudor governmental budget was unfortunately based on this fixed income, from which all ordinary expenses were supposed to be paid. How far the income had become inadequate by Elizabeth's reign is revealed by the fact that her ordinary revenue stood at £200,000 per annum, yet it cost her £120,000 to send men to the Netherlands in 1585. As a result in the six war parliaments between 1585 and 1601 she was forced to ask for subsidies, but even with them, and higher income from raising rent on crown lands, she was forced to find more capital by selling off crown lands like her father before her. The significance of this steady royal impoverishment during the price rise may be clearly seen in the struggle between James I and parliament, and becomes crucial in the struggle between Charles I and parliament. The House of Commons was aware that the king's power and dominion contrasted

> with his progressive pauperisation; they appreciated the connection between capital and power. (38)

As we can see in Waller's poem which omits to provide any explanation of why James I could not immediately proceed with the renovation project that he had planned after being initially "moved" on his tour of the Cathedral as the head of the Church of England by "the ruin of so brave a pile," the historical reality of the Stuart Monarchy's increasing economic and political impotence as it is described by Gibbons is not revealed by the Stuart courtier-poets when they describe the Monarch's relationship with the physical city. When portraying this physical aspect of London life, the Stuart Kings are revealed to be all powerful in their unilateral, absolute ability to control and to change various elements within the urban panorama--the king is portrayed as a gargantuan and divine figure overseeing and single-handedly bringing about improvements in the urban landscape while the citizens of the metropolis, who seem ant-like in their relative proportions, marvel at the physical improvements that their king has brought about in the metropolis. The growing contentiousness of enterprising Londoners during the Stuart era who have come to question the king's parasitical financial relationship with the city is overlooked as the courtier poets portray a king who has the sufficient independent means of both funding and carrying out the repairs of palaces and cathedrals within the

capital city that provide the institutional settings within which the hierarchical orders of the monarchy and the Church of England can perform their national functions.

James I's anti-urban policies to restrict the growth of London because of his fear of the further development and consolidation of hostile urban factions within it rather than any plans for the repair of landmarks within the metropolis affects the content of another courtier poet's poem that focuses upon the physical aspect of London life. While the king's renovation projects upon structures within the city might lead the courtier poet to present a positive physical image of London and the gratitude of Londoners because of the monarch's role in enhancing the beauty of that urban scene, James I's hostile statutes and proclamations against the city's continued, unrestricted growth would lead the Stuart courtier poet to portray a metropolis grown to monstrous, odious, and uncontrollable proportions. Through several royal decrees the King sought to discourage migration of the country gentry and the country poor to the metropolis and to put a halt to the further construction of housing within the city. Riggs remarks that this Stuart King commanded the country gentry who were flocking to his court for its entertainments and preferments (services which in its increasing poverty the court was less able to provide) and to the shops of the city to purchase luxurious merchan-

dise that had been imported by the merchants from abroad to leave their residences in the city and return to their country estates:

> After noting with displeasure that many of the rural gentry came to London "during the Christmas time," a royal proclamation of 1614 ordered the newly urbanized gentlemen to "repaire unto their severall Countreys ... and to keeps House and Hospitalitie." The following December saw another proclamation requiring "all Noblemen, and Gentlemen whatsoever, to live in the steps and examples of their worthy Ancestours, by keeping and entertaining Hospitalitie." In his "Speech in the Star Chamber," which he delivered on June 20, 1616, and published in the closing pages of his folio Works (1616), James again instructed the migrant gentry to "get them into the Countrey....
>
> At the conclusion of his "Speech in the Star Chamber" James likens the growth of the city to a humoral disease in the body politic and complains that "all the countrey is gotten into London." (246-247)

Marcus comments on James I's anti-urban policies that were directed against further development of housing in the City of London for the gentry and the poor who were migrating to the metropolis from the country:

> In the last section of his speech [before the Star Chamber on 20 June 1616] James applied his caveats against innovation and overpresumption to the changing economic and social conditions in London and the countryside. He defied the judicial opposition to his policies by calling for even stricter measures to prevent new building in London: "And for the decrease of new Buildings heere, I would have the builders restrained, and committed to prison; and if the builder cannot be found, then the workemen to be imprisoned; and not this onely, but likewise the buildings to bee cast downe." (68-70)

According to Braudel, instead of discouraging the metropolis's further growth, along with the accompanying gain in economic and political power that that continued growth meant, James I's prohibition of further construction within London, which was a continuation of Elizabeth's policy, encouraged builders eager to make a profit by meeting the great demand by migrants from the country for new housing to covertly construct ramshackle housing in backyards and alleys, thereby increasing London's congestion and the potential chances of fires starting and rapidly spreading. These undesirable consequences of James I's policy limiting further construction of housing in the city in turn further aroused the resentment of Londoners towards a Monarch who when he did intervene in urban affairs acted against their best interests:

> The royal government ... was ... in constant fear of the enormous capital. In its eyes London was a monster whose unhealthy growth had to be limited at all costs. What alarmed the influential propertied classes was the invasion by the poor and the proliferation of hovels and vermin that meant a threat to the whole population, including the rich. "And so a danger to the Queen's own life and the spreading of mortality of the whole nation," wrote Stow, who feared for the health of Queen Elizabeth and the whole population of his town. The first prohibition on new building (with exceptions in favour of the rich) appeared in 1580. Others followed in 1593, 1607 and 1625. The result was to encourage the dividing-up of existing houses and secret construction work in poor brick in the courtyards of old houses, away from the street and even from minor alleys. What in fact ensued was a whole clandestine proliferation of hovels and shanties on lands of doubtful ownership. It was no great loss if one or other of these building fell victim to the law. Everybody therefore tried their luck, and the network, the labyrinth of lanes and

> alleys, and the houses with double, triple, even quadruple entrances and exits, grew up as a result.
> (Braudel 83)

It was not only because of these anti-urban policies that the reign of James I marked the beginning of a growing rift between the increasingly Puritan City of London and the Stuart Monarchy. The city's Puritan sects criticized James I and his later heirs for the favoritism that they showed to English Roman Catholics and to his pacifist policies towards Roman Catholic nations, such as Spain, which were invading Protestant countries on the Continent. They also were censorious of the Popish tendences of James I's and his heirs' royal courts in that they were too ornate and too festive.

To rebut these criticisms of the city's puritans, particularly the latter one aimed at James I's overly decorous "popish" court, the courtier poet Ben Jonson, being himself at the time a convert to the Roman Catholic faith, satirizes the city's puritans for their austerity in the anti-masque portions of several of his masques performed at court before James I. He criticizes London's Puritan middle-class for their frugality in failing to loan the King money to maintain his court in the lavish style that befits a monarch, particularly their dislike of and unwillingness to finance the court's sumptuous banquets and the expensive masques written by Jonson and designed by Inigo Jones. This courtier poet also censures the Puritan sects of the city in other

matters in which they demonstrate their parsimonious and gloomy natures, such as their failure to celebrate the holiday of Christmas and participate in various forms of merry-making which the Monarchy encouraged on the Sabbath, their reluctance to hold regular pageants to celebrate the royal family's special occasions, such as their marriages, birthdays, returns, their civic prohibitions against plays being performed in the city, relegating their performance to the suburbs, even while hypocritically allowing puppet-plays to be performed at Bartholomew Fair (Riggs 181-182, 246-247). Because of Jonson's willingness to defend James I against his puritan critics in the City of London, it would not be surprising to see this poet's later willingness to defend in his verse the wisdom of James I's anti-urban policies that were proclaimed in the second decade of his reign.

James I's anti-urban position grew during the course of his reign since he felt threatened by the lack of financial, moral, and cultural support from the "new men" of London who prospered because of their ability to meet the challenge of a capitalist economy. These "new men" are defined and distinguished from the courtiers in the following manner by Knights:

> --clothiers, financiers, merchants, entrepreneurs. These owed their power not to the possession of land, like the old feudal nobility, nor to political-administrative talents, like the newer members of the Tudor

> aristocracy, but solely to their business ability. There were "new men", of course, in the Middle Ages, but from the mid-sixteenth century onwards there were far greater opportunities for a far greater number, and the opportunities were not merely economic; the nouveau riches of the reigns of Elizabeth and James I acquired social and political power, and exercised a dominating influence on the course of English history. (88)

According to Marcus, James I's domineering manner towards these "new men" of London whom he was in reality financially dependent upon served only to antagonize them and this in turn, when this King's requests were not complied with by the city's entrepreneurs, brought about James I's reciprocal disaffection towards the mercantile city:

> James's proprietary behavior often created friction with the City. And how far was James willing to carry his identification of the City's burgeoning commercialism with his own regal glory? As time went on and it became obvious that the City was not willing to be subservient and all-giving, James strove to distance himself from it .... (64-66)

James I's awareness of the grumblings of his puritan critics in the city led him eventually in the 1620s to prohibit his London subjects from commenting on affairs of state. Furthermore, not visiting the City of London very frequently because of this mutual disaffection, it can be conjectured that this Stuart King's mental image of the physical state of the City of London began to become as unfavorable as his estimation of its upstart, opinionated, disloyal inhabitants was.

Ben Jonson reflects both the-anti-urban position of James I's court in his mock-heroic poem "On the Famous Voyage" (1613) and the unsavory mental image that this King most likely had of this hostile puritan city by presenting a sector of the overcrowded, impoverished, filthy metropolis that is overwhelmed by its waste products. The poet focuses upon the unliveable, hellish area just west of the city walls of London (but still within the City of London's jurisdiction, lying eastward of Temple and Holborn Bars), consisting of the Fleet River and its banks into which the city's sewage flows.

We will see in later chapters that while Jonson's negative portrait of the physical aspect of London life illustrates the prudence of James I's anti-urban policy of limiting the city's growth, Abraham Cowley and Edmund Waller, composing their poems during the later reigns of Charles I and Charles II which were more conciliatory in their policies towards the city since the Monarchy had become even more dependent upon the city businessmen for its revenue, presented more complimentary portraits of the metropolis's majestic landmarks and panorama. Waller's and Cowley's poems describing the harmonious relationship between court and city, between the king and Londoners, reflect the political and financial reality that:

> London was essential to the court's conspicuous consumption, a source of massive loans to the

> crown of projects and mono-polies--a whole range of fiscal and material "evils" that the king and his advisors relied on desperately yet preferred to disavow. (Marcus 64-66)

Jonson, on the other hand, unlike these later courtier poets fostered through his anti-urban court masques and poems James I's illusions that he could still limit London's growth and its businessmen's influence and preside in an absolute fashion over a predominantly agrarian, feudal society.

Jonson's portrait, although selective and hyperbolic in its panoramic vision of London's physical life, is not entirely inaccurate. Several features of the city's actual sanitary problems in the early and mid-17th century are highlighted in "On the Famous Voyage." In order to advance James I's policy of discouraging further immigration to and development of the metropolis, Jonson presents a series of unsavory sights. During the course of his boat expedition up the Fleet River from its juncture with the Thames to Holborn, Jonson describes such nauseating sights as the city's poor and diseased inhabitants as well as stray animals scavenging through the refuse of its muddy, excrement-coated banks, human waste being dumped from carts or being poured from sewage drains into the Fleet, offal being thrown into the river from nearby butcher's shops, the difficulty navigating past other vessels heading downriver as the garbage gradually fills in the Fleet's basin to create a more narrow chan-

nel, and the river's general polluted composition and stench.

The factious quarrels of James I with Londoners and the King's anti-urban policies are not directly referred to in "On the Famous Voyage," yet they inform Jonson's effort as a courtier-poet to create this mock-heroic poem that through allusions to characters, places, and incidents in classical mythology persistently equates the dwelling place of the King's opponents, the City of London, and its immediate suburbs, with Hades. Loyal to James I's policies against London's growth. Jonson's effort to provide graphic illustrations of city life that will deter the country gentry and poor from migrating to London begins with his description of the hellish nature of the Fleet River. The poet compares a journey up the Fleet River for about a half mile to Holborn with a journey up any one of the four rivers--Styx. Acheron, Cocytus, and Phlegethon--of Hades. All the separate horrors to be found on each river of Hades are found cumulatively on an expedition up London's Fleet River. The poet associates "filth, stench, [and] noyse" as the primary unpleasant characteristics of the Fleet:

> All, that they boast of Styx, of Acheron,
> Cocytus, Phlegethon, ours have prov'd in one;
> The filth, stench, noyse: save only what was there
> Subtly distinguish'd, was confused here.

To further discourage any country gentry from visiting or residing in the metropolis, Jonson compares the City of London with a City of the Dead by continuing his parallel between an expedition up the Fleet with the mythical river journey to Hades where visitors departed the land of the living to enter the land of the dead. To develop this parallel, the poet equates the sailless wherry that he is a passenger in with a similar vessel managed by Charon, the waterman in charge of ferrying the dead across the river Styx to Hades. In addition, the poet, instead of seeing the dog Cerberus who guarded the entrance of the underworld, observes an entire army of hungry dogs roaming the banks of the Fleet in search of food scraps and, thereby, acting Cerberus-like in making perilous any attempt to enter or to leave the hellish City of London via the Fleet River boat landings. Furthermore, the poor, diseased vagrants of the city whom Jonson views from the wherry scavenging on the banks of the Fleet appear in their spectre thin appearance to be losing the struggle for survival; consequently, they illustrate this courtier poet's point that London is on the verge of becoming, like Hades, a necropolis.

It is unlikely that Jonson's mock-heroic poem would find an audience amongst the country poor who contemplated migrating to London; therefore, this poem would not be useful in attempting to discourage them from making the effort by

portraying the plight of the poor already residing in the metropolis. However, the poet's portrayal of the urban poor would be agreeable to the likely readership of this poem, the King and his courtiers, because it would support their own vision of the City's destitute as responsible for the increase in ramshackle housing, unsanitary conditions, and disease in the metropolis that directly threatened the physical well being of the gentry and the court. Moreover, it would serve to make the country gentry think twice about migrating to the suburban region of "the town" being developed midway between Westminster and London that lay just to the west of such sordid sights of a degraded, displaced humanity to be found along the banks of the Fleet.

Rather than empathizing with the plight of the city's vagrant poor, Jonson satirizes their condition in order to illustrate James I's point that those dwelling in the countryside who migrate to the city because they see it as a panacea for the countryside's ills of sporadic employment and boredom in spite of his royal edicts against doing this are themselves to blame for whatever unfortunate fate befalls them in the metropolis. The King had argued that the rural poor were sadly deluded if they thought that the city's prosperous economy which best served those merchants who had capital to invest would similarly enrich the dispossessed agricultural laborers who were victims of land enclo-

sures. In order to reflect the King's disdain of those rural poor who disobeyed his commands not to flock to the city because their needs could not all be accommodated there, the poet describes in a pitiless manner the fate of many of the rural poor who had immigrated to London in the hope of finding a better life than they had in the subsistence economy of the country. The poor, diseased people and animals pass wind as they rummage along the garbage strewn banks of the river. Both the destitute people and abandoned animals serve in their flatulent state as contemporary counterparts to the frogs of Hades, so that "Arses were heard to croak, instead of frogs." Moreover, this unsavory satiric treatment of the city's poor is further apparent when Jonson describes two types of people loitering along the banks of the Fleet. The first type, the scolds or rude clamorous women, also evident one hundred years later in Pope's "Spenser: The Alley," are compared with the Furies. There presence in this latter day urban version of Hades is appropriate since the Furies in classical myths carried out their vengeance upon wrongdoers after their deaths in the underworld. Considering James I's proclamation in which he described any member of the country gentry who neglected his country estates so as to visit the city as a wrongdoer, such sights as these scolds would be sufficient punishment alone for daring to abandon one's rural responsibilities to venture into such areas of the city against the King's edicts.

The second type of persons to be found commonly populating the banks of the Fleet are identified as being victims of the plague who in their last moment offer repentance for their sins. Jonson's portrayal of these dying vagrants who were the most common victim of the plague is a reflection of the court's and gentry's fear that "the proliferation of hovels and vermin," because of the country poor's persistence in choosing to concentrate themelves in a city that could not adequately maintain them, would give rise to such diseases that would threaten "the whole population, including the rich" (Braudel 83). These victims of the plague found along the banks of the Fleet become the contemporary counterparts of the ghosts of Hades:

> And, for the cryes of Ghosts, women, and men,
> Laden with plague-sores, and their sinnes, were heard,
> Lash'd by their consciences, to die, affeard.

There was a valid basis for the King's and court's fear of the more frequent occurrence of epidemics as the rural poor who migrated to the city increased the metropolls's population density. Jonson's satiric treatment of the plague-ridden urban poor reflects the sad reality of the time: the poor were the most frequent victims of the plague which usually spread in the city during the summertime because they had no country estates to retreat to as the gentry did at this perilous time of year. Riggs notes:

> Visitations of the plague in England were generally confined to congested urban areas, particularly London.

> Any city dweller who had access to a country house could be virtually certain of escaping the disease by vacating the town. The mortality bills for the great epidemic of 1665, to cite an extreme case, list over 100,000 Londoners but do not include a single magistrate, courtier, or wealthy merchant. Members of the lower classes were forbidden to leave the city; they had no choice but to remain there and die. During a major epidemic, like that of 1603, mortality rates could run higher than 50 percent in the crowded London parishes, such as St. Giles, Cripplegate, that lay adjacent to the city walls. (93-94)

Although Jonson's treatment of urban vagrants in "On the Famous Voyage" could have been politically useful in supporting James I's anti-urban policies of seeking to discourage further settlement in the metropolis by both the country gentry and the poor by portraying the more unattractive and disease-ridden elements of the London population, the very fact that there were so many homeless poor in the city could also be viewed as a criticism of both the Elizabethan and Jacobean policies of refusing to permit further development of decent housing in London. Indeed, the Elizabethan and Jacobean anti-urban policies of refusing to allow the city to physically grow with the proper urban planning to accommodate the needs of the hordes of immigrants who were arriving daily contributed to the deplorable conditions of poverty, homelessness, shoddy housing, overcrowded living arrangements, and unsanitary conditions depicted in Jonson's poem.

To further James I's anti-urban policies of discouraging the continued settlement of the metropolis by portraying a hellish, unliveable city, the poet does not only satirize the vagrants who populate the banks of the Fleet, but also the deplorable physical conditions of this area of the city. Successive segments of the Fleet River are compared with each of the four individual rivers in Hades to emphasize the Fleet River's hellish features. In each segment different sensuous aspects of the polluted river are described, such as its smell, its sources of pollution, its resulting composition, its sounds, and its narrow channel which makes travel past other incoming vessels hazardous.

The river's stench is first remarked upon as the voyagers enter its mouth and pass by Bridewell Prison and Dock, situated at this juncture between the Fleet and the Thames:

> But hold my torch, while I describe the entry
> To this dire passage. Say, thou stop thy nose:
> 'Tis but light paines: Indeede this Dock's no rose.

Next, the river's foul composition of solid waste is described as the voyagers, proceeding upriver. begin to stir the waters of the Fleet with their oars. They deduce from the stirred up water's muddiness and stench that there is a high level of human waste in this river and envision the dung cart drivers who use the Fleet as a dumping ground to dispose of the contents in their carts. The men described in

this passage are the rakers and scavengers whom the City Corporation employed to clear away the solid, transportable forms of garbage from the city kennels/culverts and other places where waste accumulated (Leasor 12-21):

> In the first Jawes appear'd that ugly monster,
> Ycleped Mud, which when their cares did once stirre,
> Belch'd forth an ayre, as hot, as at the muster
> Of all your night-tubs, when the carts doe cluster,
> Who shall discharge first his merd-urinous load:

Along with the river's nauseating stench and composition, the deafening sounds of the city's sewers pouring their contents into the Fleet is also overwhelming. The 17th century city's sewage system consisted primarily of the kind of crude culverts, described even one hundred years later in Jonathan Swift's concluding tercets of "A Description of a City Shower," that awaited a heavy rainfall to carry all the remaining kitchen wastes and other forms of garbage that the rakers, "scavenging dogs, cats, pigs, and beggars could not remove" towards the City of London's primary sewage outlet: the Fleet River (Leasor 12-21). The voyagers in Jonson's poem hear the loud noise made by these sewers which continually pour out their contents into the Fleet in a hideously foul urban version of a pristine country waterfalls:

> But they unfrighted passe, though many a privie
> Spake to 'hem louder, then the oxe in Livie:
> And many a sinke pour'd out her rage anenst 'hem;
> But still their valour, and their vertue fenc't 'hem,

Two other unattractive features of the Fleet--its channel which has been constricted by the accumulation of sewage and such hideous forms of water traffic as the barges carrying mountains of garbage and offal--is described as well in a single episode in the poem's narrative to further substantiate James I's reasons for wishing to restrict, if not to reduce, the monstrous size to which the metropolis has grown which has led to this correspondingly grotesque amount of human waste. When the voyagers perilously try to pass a barge heading down the Fleet that is loaded with all forms of waste that had been dumped into it from the rakers' and scavengers' dung carts or shovelled into it from the laystalls, which were pyramid-shaped piles of refuse that were erected on the river's banks, it can be said that these voyagers at last encounter a more sanitary form of garbage disposal that is preferable to the solid forms of garbage being dumped directly into the river. But even this more sanitary method of garbage disposal, utilizing barges to transport the waste products down the Fleet into the Thames presumably to dump its contents somewhere downriver in the Thames's estuary or the immediate sea beyond the mouth of the Thames instead of dumping directly into the shallow and narrow Fleet to putrefy, has its potentially foul hazard, since the poet and the other voyagers in their little row-boat fear that if they collide with this vessel in the Fleet River's narrow channel they will start an avalanche in which

the human and animal waste loaded precariously in a mountainous pile atop the barge will fall off onto them ("Alas, they will beshite us").

Yet Jonson, true to his thematic determination in this mock-heroic poem to concretely explore all the scatological details associated with London's filthy underbelly, the Fleet River, for the political purpose of, first, creating a sensuous basis that would justify the King's and the court's anti-urban sentiments and, second, furthering the King's intention of teaching the country gentry to discountenance an urban life, has the voyagers give us a close-up concrete impression of the smell, sound, and sight of the garbage atop this barge as they desperately seek to manipulate their light wherry to avoid the ponderous barge in a river whose channel is slowly shrinking as its waters are gradually supplanted by solid waste because of London's inefficient waste disposal methods. The croaking sound of flatulence that Jonson associated in his introduction as something commonly heard amongst the vagrants rummaging through the garbage on the Fleet's banks becomes manifest again as the voyagers about to collide with the barge on this warm summer's day hear the gaseous contents in the animal guts and bladders, the unedible remnants of animals slaughtered in the city's butcher and cook shops, being emitted to relieve the pressure of gas building up in the putrefying

pile of garbage on the barge. Furthermore, the adventurers smell the mercurous compound known as calomel which was used by Londoners in the 17th century as a laxative and whose odor, Jonson claims, could be detected in the human excrement aboard this vessel. As they scrape against the barge pieces of the waste products fall over its sides onto the adventurers' heads:

> ... What croaking sound
> Is this we heare? No, guts wind-bound,
> Over your head: Well, row. At this a loud
> Crack did report it selfe, as if a cloud
> Had burst with storme, and downe fell, ab excelsis,

Coming so close to colliding fully with the barge gives Jonson the opportunity to give a detailed appraisal of the barge's stench, pointing out that the barge's garbage smelled worse than the offal from London's butcher and cook shops, a portion of which is frugally sold by these kinds of business establishments in the city and carried on barges down the Fleet and across the Thames to the Bankside, the street running along the river's south bank in Southwark, to feed the bears used for baiting the dogs in Paris Garden ("The meate-boate of Beares colledge, Paris-garden,/Stunke not so ill;").

Having used this opportunity to examine other unpleasant features of the Fleet River--its garbage barges and its channel constricted by its accumulating sewage so that two vessels can scarcely pass one another without colliding,

Jonson now withdraws himself and the other voyagers from this potential danger of having their boat overturned and themselves drowned so that he and his comrades can proceed further up the Fleet and witness additional scatological sights in which human and animal waste products rather than being disposed of in the more sanitary method of being loaded onto barges whose contents will be dumped at sea are instead dumped directly into this river already overloaded with solid wastes. Describing these inefficient and indeed environmentally dangerous and disease-producing methods of waste disposal, further contributes to Jonson's effort as a court poet to contribute by poetic means to James I's campaign of discouraging the continued migration of the gentry and the poor to the overly congested and uncooperative metropolis while alerting those members of the gentry who are currently in the city to the more unpleasant, and indeed life-threatening, aspects of life there, so that they might return to maintaining their rural estates, and to representing the Crown's interests and administering to its responsibilities of preserving law and order in the countryside.

More closely approaching the dumping grounds where the dung carts empty their contents directly into the Fleet, Jonson's mock-heroic voyagers find solid pieces of excrement not only in the water but also dumped directly upon the western banks of the river and caking the western city walls which border

this river to await the incoming flood tide so that this fecal matter will be dissolved and eventually carried away with the ebb tide into the Thames and eventually out to sea. Jonson observes that the excrement, accumulating in the Fleet's waters, laying upon its banks, and plastered upon the city walls erected along the eastern bank, creates a foul smelling vapor that rises like a mist above the surface of the river to assault the unstopped nasal passages of the rowers on this warm, sunny summer's day. Moreover, in his simile that compares the fecal matter to be found on the banks and in the water to a "usurers masse," this courtier-poet expresses James I's and the court's hostile attitude to the rampant opportunism of businessmen in the city's capitalist economy who have made private gain a greater virtue than having a sense of loyalty to the public good that the monarchy is bound to attend to even with its increasingly more limited funds. By referring in a simile to the prodigious accumulation of fecal matter as being "like an usurers masse," Jonson is able through this figurative juxtaposition of the city's physical pollution with the moral corruption inherent in its economic practices to make a more comprehensive indictment of city life that would be in keeping with James I's own anti-urban sentiments:

> These be the cause of those thicke frequent mists
> Arising in that place, through which, who goes,
> Must trie the un-used valour of a nose:
> And that ours did. For, yet, no nare was tainted,
> But open, and un-armed encounter'd all:
> Whether it languishing stucke upon the wall,

> Or were precipitated downe the Jakes,
> And, after, sworn abroad in ample flakes,
> Or, that it lay, heap'd llke an usurers masse.

Jonson, however, loses an opportunity to further James I's anti-urban policies here because the limited scope of his subject, a concrete description of what his senses experienced journeying up the Fleet, restrict his ability to point out that this noxious odor was not only a characteristic of this river but an endemic problem of the entire city. Leasor remarks that "the streets of London, slippery with dung and urine, gave off a stench that was Oriental" and later adds that "Courtiers and ladies of fashion" walking throughout the city "carried scented handkerchiefs or held posies of flowers to their noses to filter the air they breathed" (12-21).

The last unsavory feature of the Fleet River that Jonson describes in his effort to present a grotesque vision of life in the metropolis to further the anti-urban position of James I are the bloated, rotting carcasses of animals that have been tossed into the Fleet River. Whereas further downriver the voyagers had found excrement creating the muddy texture of the river, in this new stretch they find offal because many cook shops and butcher's stalls, located along Newgate Street and in Newgate Market, used the Fleet

River as a convenient, readily accessible place in which to dump the unwanted portions of the animal's carcass:

> ... , they were to passe,
> And so they did, from Stix, to Acheron:
> The ever-boyling floud. Whose bankes upon
> Your Fleet-lane Furies; and hot cookes doe dwell,
> That, with still-scalding steemes, make the place hell.
> The sinkes ran grease, and hairs of meazled hogs,
> The heads, boughs, entrailes, and the hides of dogs:
> For, to say truth, what scullion is so nastie,
> To put the skins, and offall in a pastie?
> Cats there lay divers had beene flead, and rosted,
> And, after mouldie growne, againe were tosted,
> Then, selling not, a dish was tane to mince 'hem.
> But still, it seem'd, the ranknesse did convince 'hem,
> For, here they were throwne in with the melted pewter,
> Yet drown'd they not. They had five lives in future.

The consequence of the butchers of Newgate Street being given permission by the City Corporation "to use a wharf near Fleet Prison to cleanse entrailes" was that the inmates of this prison, as Jonson describes in his poem, were tortured by the smell of animal parts rotting in the river (Hibbert 284):

> ... when the noise doth beate
> Upon your eares, of discords so un-sweet
> And out-cryes of the damned in the Fleet

At a more fantastical moment in the poem, one of the carcasses, a dead cat, floating on the surface of the river's waters, comes to life. In its monologue addressed to the voyagers who dare to travel via the Fleet River into the midst of the city, this re-animated corpse sounds like a spokesman for the royal court, since it expresses the court's fearful view of the filthy, uncontrollable excesses

of the city that have grown to monstrously overwhelming proportions. In addition to this re-animated creature pointing out that the summer's hot weather makes the river's smell its most nauseating, it remarks that at this season there is the greatest abundance of putrefying human waste and garbage in this river which serves as the city's sink. This cat criticizes the voyagers for their foolhardiness in daring to row up the Fleet River at this time of year when the urban population of London is well fed, enjoying the plentiful harvest of vegetables, which consequently results in more frequent trips to the "privies seate" and more excrement being conveyed by dung carts and culverts to the river:

> ... How dare
> Your daintie nostrill (in so hot a season,
> When every clerke eates artichokes, and peason,
> Laxative lettuce, and such windie meate)
> Tempte such a passage? When each privies seats
> Is fill'd with buttock? And the walls doe sweate
> Urine, and plaisters? ...

Further reprising the sights of diseased vagrants marked with plague sores dying on the Fleet River's banks that the voyagers have already seen, the cat voices the concerns of the court and the gentry that the plague manifesting itself in the poorer and more congested neighborhoods of the city will spread to the more affluent quarters of the metropolis and afflict them before they have had enough time to retreat to their country estates. This re-animated creature, hover-

ing in a spectral manner just above the polluted waters of the Fleet, reminds the voyagers of the ubiquitous signs ("plague-bills" and "bells") which reveal that the plague is prevalent in the metropolis during this particular summer season. Indeed, these travellers can hear the tolling of the bells of St. Bride's and St. Sepulchres, both located in the vicinity of the Fleet River, which in their incessant sounding signify that numerous burials of the highly infectious corpses of the plague victims are taking place in the nearby churchyards of these religious institutions at the very moment that Jonson and the other adventurers make their journey upriver.

When it questions not only the voyagers' effort to travel up the Fleet, the most repellant part of the city, but also their very persistence in remaining in the metropolis during these summer months when anybody with the means to leave the city to escape the plague has done so, the cat's corpse, momentarily re-animated with life, becomes an eloquent mouthpiece for James I's anti-urban policies echoing the King's proclamations to the gentry in which he urges them to leave the court and the metropolis. Like James I'e proclamations and statutes, it is not only the waterway that the voyagers have chosen, nor their destination of Holborn, but also the entire City of London that is implicated in the cat's criticism of the adventurers' visit to "grisly Pluto's

Hall," since at this time when plague is killing the city's inhabitants left and right all of London seem to be a Hades and ruled by Pluto, the god of the underworld:

> Cannot the plague-bill keepe you backe? nor bells
> Of loud Sepulchres with their hourly knells,
> But you will visit grisly Pluto's hall?

Continuing to reflect the royal court's view of the entire city as being comparable to Hell, the cat persists in referring to not only the Fleet River but also the City of London as a hellish place in a later passage in which it describes the particular inhabitants of Hades the voyagers will encounter at Holborn Bars after they have docked their vessel at Holborn Bridge and proceeded to walk westward along Holborn Street. In addition to his earlier reference to the dogs on the banks of the Fleet being a reminder of the multi-headed guard dog of Hell, Jonson continues to develop this allusion when he compares the guards who are stationed at Holborn Bars which demarcates the western boundary of the City of London's jurisdiction with Cerberus who guarded the exit from Hades in order to prevent the ghosts of the dead from escaping.

Expressing James I's and his courtiers' resentment toward the London citizenry's failure after the King's initial coronal procession to further honor the monarchy in costly pageants, banquets, and entertainments, Jonson satirizes both the frugality and the vulgarity of the city's merchants

and officials who, in presenting a pile of dung, a pyramid, to the voyagers to commemorate their courageous exploit of travelling a half mile up the polluted Fleet River to Holborn in summertime, utilize the resource that the infernal city is most richly endowed with. Jonson's depiction of the city officials' cost-effective decision to bestow "in memorie of which most liquid deed,/... a Pyramid" is a fitting conclusion to a poem that in its political purpose of advancing the court's position against further settlement of London frequently has occasion to describe in lavishly concrete detail the excrement, animal corpses, and garbage polluting the Fleet and its banks. This "pyramid" actually refers to the manner in which excrement and garbage, being transported beyond the city walls in dung-carts, was piled up in the outskirts of the city, particularly along the banks of the Fleet, to be either transported out to sea by barge or swallowed up by the river's tides, which Jonson's description of the filthy river laden with excrement suggests occurred more frequently (Leasor 12-21).

If the King's anti-urban policies of limiting the further development of the city and its immigration rate as well as Jonson's indirect effort in "On the Famous Voyage" to poetically illustrate the wisdom of such policies had been more effective, the result would have been London's shrinking in both size and population. Without the continuing flow of

immigrants to the city, London's population would have decreased because the mortality rate was higher than the rate of births. This condition was due to the frequent occurrence of epidemics and the generally poor living conditions in the city, both aspects of city life that are portrayed in Jonson's poem. This diminishment of London's size and population, however, did not occur. Instead of its population decreasing, London's population during the course of the reigns of the first three Stuart Kings doubled from approximately 250,000 to 500,000. That neither the King's anti-urban policies nor Jonson's effort as a courtier poet to use his poetry as a medium to propagandize them were effective is revealed in Clay's discussion of the manner in which London developed in terms of its population and its housing during the period of the late 16th and early 17th centuries:

> The scale of this movement of people to London was enormous. By the end of the period [the late 17th century] net immigration may have averaged 8-10,000 a year, ... In relation to the size of the existing city, however, immigration was at its most important in the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and particularly at this period there is no doubt that it caused acute social problems. The extremely rapid growth of the city made it inevitable that large areas of bad housing should develop in the spreading suburbs, such as Whitechapel, Wapping and Shoreditch to the East, and St. Giles to the West. There was serious overcrowding in some areas, Westminster for instance, where some people lived five or six to a room. This was made worse by the efforts of the government to stem the growth of the capital by prohibiting the erection of new buildings, even though these were largely unavailing. Elsewhere pressure on space was less acute, but the dwellings were flimsy, often single-storied, sometimes mere sheds and so tightly packed together

> that they were built as many as fifty to the acre, whilst entire communities grew up without any amenities whatsoever. As late as the 1660s the 40,000 people of the emergent East End were without a single market of their own. Besides not only did people come to London faster than adequate accommodation could be provided, they also came faster than was warranted by the expansion of old forms of economic activity and the emergence of new ones. Extensive unemployment and underemployment with their concomitants of crime and prostitution, were thus inevitable. ... The conditions of life in the rapidly growing city thus made it difficult for immigrants to find a secure and settled place in urban society, and ensured many of them would fail to do so. (211-212)

Both Waller, in his effort to praise James I's intended good works of improving one of the landmarks of London, St. Paul's Cathedral, in his poem "Upon His Majesty's Repairing of St. Paul's," and Jonson, in his effort in his poem "On the Famous Voyage" to advance through the means of his poetry the same King's anti-urban policies, function as courtier-poets who see the metropolis not as an independent entity in itself but in terms of the King's relationship with and attitude towards it. In contrast, Michael Drayton in his chorographical poem Poly-Olbion that is also composed during the reign of James I offers a perspective of London in which the King's relationship with and attitude towards this metropolis are matters that are not spoken of. This poet does not comment on the relationship between this particular Monarch and his capital city because he, unlike Waller and Jonson, had sought but not received patronage from the royal court and consequently did not feel bound to

advance the court's interests in the metropolis by means of his poetry. On the other hand, Drayton did not feel free to criticize the King or his relationship with the city in an open manner either in the second part of his poem, because of James I's "Proclamation against Excess of Lavish and Licentious Speech of Matters of State" that had been made two years prior to the publication in 1622 of the second part of Poly-Olbion. However, this poet's omitting all reference to the current King at a time when citizens were being imprisoned by the monarchical government for speaking out in a censorious manner about the Crown's handling of state affairs, probably led many of the poet's contemporaries to make the inference Drayton was silent on this matter because he had only critical comments to make in relation to the reigning Monarch. Indeed, the fact that James I should not be mentioned in passages from Songs XVI and XVII of Poly-Olbion in which Drayton seeks to provide a complimentary description of the capital city, including the Abbey that is connected with monarchical ceremonies and the Palace in which the King and his royal family reside, and his court conducts its affairs, becomes politically significant because such an omission was widely viewed by Drayton's contemporaries as expressing his animosity towards this particular Stuart King. This disapproval of James I that is indirectly expressed by means of omitting all references to the King in these passages from this chorographical poem is

reflective not only of Drayton's being personally slighted by this Monarch, but also of this poet's siding with the country faction in deploring James I's unseemly moral behavior, his extravagant court, and his irresponsible management of the nation's affairs.

Although in his later years Drayton was esteemed by the faction of the country gentry for his independence from and criticism of the immoral and pacifist Stuart court and his nostalgic celebration of Elizabeth's rule (Hardin 74), in his earlier years in London Drayton did his utmost to receive patronage from James I:

> From every indication, Drayton at first hoped for both national and personal advancement under James I. He published his first tribute to the King in the final sonnet of the 1600 "Idea," hailing James as "Of Kings a poet and of Poets King.'" He is more effusive three years later in a panegyric, "To The Majesty of King James," published in haste, perhaps even while the Queen was yet unburied ....
>
> These verse-tributes contain little to distinguish Drayton from any of the dozens of poets who scrambled for royal patronage in the first years of James's reign.
>
> (Hardin 77-78)

While one of Drayton's biographers, Richard Hardin, believes that the royal neglect might have contributed to both the poet's silence upon and satiric criticism of James I in the poetry of his later years, he argues that it was this King's domestic and foreign policies as well as his and his court's immoral behavior that were the deciding factors in Drayton's

disenchantment with this Stuart King which is reflected in the poet's failure to pay tribute to James I in his celebration of the capital city's positive attributes in Poly-Olbion:

> Direct attacks on the King were unthinkable, so when Drayton could not insult James through recondite allusion, he seems to have resorted to slighting him. This is the tactic behind the closing lines of the "Ballad of Agincourt" ("O, when shall ... England breed again such a King Harry?"), and behind the omission of James from the list of England's rulers in Song XVII of Poly-Olbion....
>
> It is hard to believe that this inconspicuous but steady campaign was waged merely out of personal spite, particularly since Drayton's growing hostility toward James parallels the attitude of most knowledgeable Englishmen who did not depend upon the Court for a livelihood. The underlying causes of this general feeling were no doubt inherited from Elizabeth's time, as the whole nation continued the painful transition from feudal to parliamentary government--a movement whose origins lie well before James or any of his Tudor relatives came to the throne. Yet for all his supposed difficulty with Elizabeth, Drayton like the rest of his generation, has nothing but praise for the Queen.. If he was the sort of person to spite anyone who did not pay him attention, why didn't he treat Elizabeth as he did James? The answer can only lie in the character of the King himself--or in the abuses of his Court, which he both tolerated and actively fostered: the cheapening of titles, the extravagant waste of public funds, his cultivation of worthless favorites or "minions," his refusal to prosecute the war against popery, especially abroad, and his obsequious conduct (as it appeared) toward the Spanish ambassador Count Gondomar. (84-86)

Drayton's criticism of James I and his court also extended to the fawning efforts of the courtier-poets to find favor through flattery of this unworthy King in their poetry of city and court life. Although Drayton like these courtier-poets resided for much of the year in the metropolis his

audience was less elitist than theirs. While Drayton appealed to the plainer, more strait-laced tastes of a more rural-based, unaffected audience who were suspicious of the florid artifices and effeminate Continental influences of cosmopolitan London, the courtier-poets wrote for an "urbanized" and "sophisticated coterie" of "London professional men, intellectuals, members of the Establishment." "Drayton, like Spenser, was a public poet moved by an educated faith in English destiny--truly 'Elizabethan"' (Hardin vi). Appreciating this difference between himself and the typical courtier-poets who found patronage in James I's court, Drayton allows himself to satirically attack the urbane courtier-poets in a far more direct manner than he is able to in those other poems in which he adopts the strategem of allegory to veil his criticism of the King. In fact, through his criticism of the smug cronyism, the sheltered, self-indulgent decadence, and the artistic preciosities of these courtier-poets, he indirectly vents his disdain for this irresponsible King who also possesses these same character flaws:

> ... In the 1613 preface to Poly-Olbion he berates the present fashion, "when verses are wholly deduc'd to chambers, and nothing esteem'd in this lunatic age but what is kept in cabinets, and must only pass by transcription." ... All the evidence argues that Drayton had in mind here and elsewhere the poetry of Donne and other moderns, like Carew, Henry King, and Sir Edward Wotton. All four of these poets had verses circulating in manuscript in the 1610s and 1620s and they in turn had courtly imitators by the score .... What Drayton objected to in this school is clear. First, its members were probably ambitious young men who had found

> favor with the Court. Second, their idea of the poet's office was decidedly un-Spenserian: poetry was no way of life, but simply one among the many accomplishments of the accomplished gentleman. (Hardin 100-107)

In Songs XVI and XVII of Poly-Olbion Drayton seizes an opportunity to distinguish himself from these courtier-poets who felt obliged when depicting the physical aspect of the city's life to bring into the foreground the King's person, good works, or policies in connection with this urban scene (in effect joining the head of state with its body--the urban populace and landscape). Unlike these courtier-poets, he refuses in his poem to represent James I's and his court's relationship with the metropolis. Indeed, Richard Helgerson explains that the genre of the chorographical poem, the category of artistic endeavor that Drayton's Poly-Olbion belongs in, was recognized by James I and his court as being used by a faction that was antagonistic to the Stuart Monarchy because this type of poem sought through its focus on the nation's varied landscapes to divorce the head of state from his national body. Unlike James I's and his successor's efforts to unify these regions into one nation of homogeneous parts in order to facilitate the Crown's ability to achieve a singular, overbearing dominion over its kingdom, the chorographical poem celebrated the English landscape in its topographical, cultural, and economic multiplicity, both in its rural and urban forms; therefore, the chorographical poem's emphasis upon the differences

amongst England's diverse regions was antithetical to the Monarchy's effort to suppress such diversity:

> For Drayton's generation, ... , an intensely patriotic attachment to the land and its depiction and an equally intense nostalgia for the age of Elizabeth went hand in hand with a disdain for the Stuart monarch and his court .... Ideally, [a Spenserian] poet would simultaneously serve, as they supposed Spenser had done, the interests of crown and country. But under James, this was no longer possible. So, forced to choose, these men took the side of the country--a country they identified with the memory of the great queen ....
>
> ... Service to the country alone--with all the ambiguous meaning the word country then had: kingdom, county, locality, countryside--was displacing service to God and his church or service to one's liege lord regardless of country. The emergence of the country as a single, if variously significant, term for the focal point of allegiance parallels the emergence of description, survey, or chorography as an autonomous and widely practiced genre .... Kings and their doings, when they are not simply eliminated, are marginalized. They move, as they did on Drayton's frontispiece, from the center to the periphery. What moves to the center in their place is not, however, the land as a whole, at least not most frequently, but rather the land in all its most particular divisions.
>
> ... In Poly-Olbion, the poet, the Muse, and the land at last assume the monarchic role toward which their counterparts in more than a dozen chorographic descriptions had been unconsciously moving. No wonder the poem, whatever its aesthetic qualities, was not much liked at court. (129-130, 132-133, 146)

Drayton's intentional failure to directly establish the King's physical presence in the metropolis and the effect of his actions and policies upon this urban scene is a characteristic of the genre of poetry he has chosen. Moreover, the poet's decision to use this genre to portray the Monarch's marginal role in the affairs of the capital city reflects the actual historical tendencies of the time. While the poet

cannot obliterate that once vital, symbiotic relationship between the King and his capital city in the mind of the London reader--the former medieval city's primary function being to provide goods and services to those members of the wealthy aristocracy who functioned within the centralized government of the Crown--he has succeeded in performing on an artistic level the revolutionary task that was indeed to occur as well on the political front in the succeeding years of marginalizing the relationship between the city and the Monarchy. The diverse and divisive religious and political sects of the city, which sprang up and flourished in the intellectual climate created by the Protestant Movement's challenge to the medieval hierarchical orders of Church and State, began to strain against the oppressive Monarchy's tendencies of seeking to create unity and conformity over those subjected to its rule. Furthermore, the marginalization of the Monarchy and the nobility became possible in the early 17th century because the city businessmen, the increasingly affluent middle class of the city, financing industrial and overseas commercial projects, could now afford to displace (with the exception of those aristocrats who adapted to the modern economy and invested their rural wealth in the lucrative capitalist economy of the metropolis) the landed aristocracy's role as affluent consumers within the metropolis. The increasingly wealthy middle class of the city could now afford to buy the kind of

luxurious, imported merchandise that their once primary source of customers, the court and the gentry, could no longer afford to buy either because they had sold off their country estates and all their other assets to pay their city debts or because of their growing impoverishment in the inflationary capitalist economy--the stable income which they received from the rental of their rural lands not being able to keep up with the spiralling cost of merchandise in the city. While these city entrepreneurs became financially independent from the court and the gentry who initially provided them with their raison d'etre, the Monarchy which was continuing to sell off its rural lands and received as a result a dwindling income from this source became to an increasing degree parasitically dependent on the city's businessmen for revenue and loans.

Therefore, Drayton's use of the genre of the chorographical poem mirrors the diminishment of the Monarchy's and the aristocracy's importance in the city's political, religious, and economic life, Drayton's Muse as Helgerson points out replaces the Monarch as the central figure in its tour of the urban and rural landscapes of the nation:

> One critic has noticed a likeness between the Muse's peregrination over England and Wales and a royal progress .... Whatever royal authority accrues to the Muse by virtue of this likeness is, however, shared by the poet ....

> In its almost exclusive emphasis on the land's revelation of itself, the chorographic progress of Poly-Olbion differs strikingly from the royal progresses of either Elizabeth or James. ... They traveled more to be seen than to see. They were set, as both several times remarked, high on a stage "in the sight and view of all the world." Their authority depended on its visibility, ... But here too chorography invades the royal domain, usurps the stage, puts its image of the land in the place of the monarch .... (144-145)

This displacement is particularly apparent as we will now see in Songs XVI and XVII of Poly-Olbion in which the poet's Muse makes its progress down the Thames past the metropolis. There is a much greater probability that a courtier-poet, in contrast, would choose to depict James I sailing down the Thames past his capital city on his royal barge to establish the King's presence, good works, and policies within and perspective of this urban scene so that the city would be complimented as being a product of the King's prudent dominion over it.

It is Drayton's Muse instead of the King who is impressed by London's variety of differently shaped buildings which border the north bank of the Thames (where the Cities of Westminster and London are located) and the south bank (where the Bankside and Southwark are situated). Unlike several of the courtier-poets who describe the physical aspect of London life, Drayton doesn't attribute the erection or the repair of any of these urban structures to the reigning Monarch. The buildings ("Turrets, Fanes, Spyres")

of the City of London are generically referred to so that their origins and history are unknown and stand independent of any political dominion:

> But goodly Londons sight their further purpose broke:
> When Tames his either Banks adorn'd with buildings faire,
> The City to salute doth bid the Muse prepare.
> Whose Turrets, Fanes, Spyres, when wistly she beholds,
> Her wonder at the site, thus strangely she unfolds:

Not seeking to offer any sycophantic flattery to James I from whom he had already failed to find any favor and whose policies and personal behavior he disapproved of, Drayton fails to identify any recent building projects funded and planned by this King and completed under his supervision that have enhanced the Monarchy's prestige amongst the citizenry. provided a stage from which the Sovereign could commandingly gaze and be gazed upon by his subjects in order to theatrically display the power of his rule, or accentuated the already impressive beauty of the formidable metropolitan skyline. Instead of looking for patronage from the rich and powerful contemporary shapers of his society who exercise influence in the metropolis's affairs, this poet instead seeks to spread his tributes and compliments to anonymous personages of antiquity who were responsible for London's founding. The poet marvels at the wisdom of those first founders of London who selected such an excellent site to construct a city ("At thy great Builders wit, who's he but wonder may").

In Drayton's view of the physical city, it is Nature as symbolized by the Thames and not the King who has dominion over London; the metropolis is as much a product of natural forces as man-made ones. According to Drayton, London's ruler is not James I but the Thames. This ownership is suggested when the masculine Thames is described passing through the feminine city: the river as it passes by "her" sees to it by means of his "surging waves" that "his Towne" does not physically expand beyond the limits that the Thames's tides have established:

> And where faire Tames his course into a Crescent casts
> (That, forced by his Tydes, as still by her he hasts,
> He might his surging waves into her bosome send)
> Because too farre in length, his Towne should not
> extend.

As part of his effort to marginalize the King's presence and dominion over the urban and rural landscapes, Drayton gives the Thames, a force of Nature that is described in masculine terms, possession of the feminine city. Drayton's granting possession of London to the Thames and not to the King would have been regarded by James I and his court, as an insult, because it contradicted or calculatedly ignored the King's own professions of ownership of all the parts of England. As Jonathan Goldberg points out James I often asserted in his speeches his absolute ownership of all English lands. In making this claim, this Stuart King often referred to this

ownership in the sexual terms of a male taking possession of a female:

> Ownership was central to James's absolutist claims, fundamental to the patriarchal rights he declared on the basis of Roman law. The language of the royal performance and the royal gift is entwined in these claim, and in its broadest extension James declared that all that was belonged to him. As we have seen, this attitude toward his kingdom was perhaps most strikingly embodied in his first speech to Parliament in 1603, when he declared: "I am the Husband, all the whole Isle is my lawfull Wife; I am the Head, and it is my Body." ... Incorporation of the kingdom is a sign of the king's singularity; the king is beyond comparison because that which is other --other people--or sexually other, whether it is his wife or his kingdom, are nonetheless his .... (141-142)

Although it might not have been Drayton's intention, the poet's description of the Thames's possession of the city is worded in such a manner that it seems to parody James I's own rhetorical style of expressing his ownership of all the British lands in connubial terms. Surely, this poet's inadvertent mimicking of the King's sexually suggestive manner of speech that is used to demonstrate his dominion over all of the British Isles is apparent when Drayton describes the Thames as a dominant force in shaping the physical boundaries of the city in such expressions as "forced by his Tydes" and "his surging waves into her bosome send." The irony is that Drayton, however unwittingly, is adopting the King's rhetorical style to make an antithetical point that would marginalize James I's relationship with the land rather than to assert his dominion over it. As the posses-

sive phrase "his Towne" would suggest, the Thames has displaced the King as the dominant ruler of London, the capital city.

An additional instance of irony can be found in the fact that the Thames's dominion over the city is more efficacious than the King's. While James I sought and failed to discourage London's growth, this river is able to restrict the city's further expansion. Whereas the river is successful at limiting the construction of housing along its banks and, as a result of the daily encroachment of its tides, able to create the concave part of the metropolis's crescent shape, James I was unable in spite of his decrees to limit immigration to the city and to put an end to the further construction of housing therein. In fact, another instance of mimickry of James I's style of speech occurs in connection with the river's more successful efforts to limit the city's size. In a style that is reminiscent of James I's proclamations that attempted to limit the further development of London, the Thames displays its proprietorship over the city in an equally regal style when the masculine river decrees that "too farre in length, his Towne should not extend."

While these nuances of tone and style to achieve a satirical effect of ridiculing the King's professions of proprietorship might seem unintentional, the more fundamental fact

that Drayton attributes ownership of the capital city, which is such because of the presence of the King, his court, and the centralization of the offices and institutions of monarchical government therein, to the Thames would seem to be a more calculated act of defiance towards James I and his professions of possessing all of the British lands, because it would even deny the King dominion over the spot of ground where he most immediately resided with his court. Referring to the capital city as the masculine river's possession ("his Towne") must have been regarded by James I as an offensive, if not a treasonable, creative act.

But the Thames is not the only entity that Drayton honors by allowing it to possess the capital city. Further augmenting this insult to James I at another juncture in Song XVI in which he describes the excellent port that the "goodly Tames" provides London, Drayton gives possession of the contemporary city to its ancient Roman founders ("where Brute's City stands") who wished to civilize the early Britons by creating such urban centers under their colonial administration as London:

> And such a Road for Ships scarce all the world commands,
> As is the goodly Tames, neer where Brute's City stands.
> Nor any Haven lies to which is more resort,
> Commodities to bring, as also to transport.

This additional instance of Drayton's failure to recognize James I's current dominion over the capital city is made more insulting by again parodying the King's style of speech, borrowing the classical rhetoric and imagery which this King, particularly in the pageantry and speeches that were a part of his coronational procession through London, used to assert to the gaping hordes of Londoners his authority as an absolute ruler over all of England and Great Britain:

> Insistently, in his entrance, James is seen as a Roman emperor. Thus, at the end of the first spectacle, cut to save James from tedium but preserved in print, James is heralded as the founder of Troynovant, and verses by Martial name him Caesar anew; as Dekker says, the citizens flocked "like so many Roman Aediles" to take part in the "Tryumphes" of peace. When James began his progress from the Tower, he started at "the Hall of the Romans Caesar," as Hubbocke calls it, a symbolic locale proclaiming his "soveraigne authority." ...
>
> * * * * *
>
> From the start, then, the king who declared his marriage to his nation, proclaiming himself the peacemaker and uniter of Scotland and England into Great Britain, restorer of pristine unity to the realm, presented himself in the Roman image, stamped with the Roman stamp. (Goldberg 43, 46)

This latter slight to the King of giving possession of the city to a figure who played a part in Classical history can be seen as even more threatening in its tone, because of Drayton's attributing ownership of London to Brutus, the defender of the Roman Senate and Republic and one of the slayers of Julius Caesar, who had been suspected by Brutus and his conspirators of aspiring to the autocratic position

of Emperor. Considering James I's pretension of being a latter day Emperor, his difficulty working with the Parliaments that were called and soon dismissed by him in 1614 and 1621, and his widely suspected aspiration as a consequence of this difficulty of wishing to create an unlimited Mionarchy, Drayton's reference to London being "Brute's City" implies that this poet instead of supporting James I's autocratic, Emperor-like, ambitions, admired that ancient Roman Senator who feared the absolute powers of an Emperor who ruled independently of the Senate, and created and successfully carried out the plot to assassinate a would-be Emperor. It can be presumed, therefore, from such attributions of ownership of the capital city to the Senator of ancient Rome that in the historical situation of his contemporary London Drayton was on the side of the Parliamentary faction in its dispute with this Stuart King. By calling London "Brute's City" this poet gives proprietorship of the city to the representative forces of the law-making body of Parliament over the potentially tyrannical power of the Monarchy. Nevertheless, Drayton's giving possession of the modern capital city to a member of a classical legislative body to symbolize Parliament's dominant political role in the contemporary urban scene, all but declaring it to be the capital of a republic, is not reflective of the current political circumstance involving the relationship between the King and Parliament during the reign of James I when the

executive branch of government that was represented by the Monarchy had the upper hand in the political life of the capital. The King had the prerogative of both calling Parliament into session and of dissolving this legislative body to rule unilaterally when its members proved themslves to be uncooperative in passing the kinds of legislation and granting the kinds of subsidies that the Monarch desired. However, in spite of this state of affairs in which the Monarchy was the dominant political force, the very genre of the chorographical poem encouraged Drayton to make this choice in favor of London's being possessed by the members of Parliament as this poet's reference to "Brute's City" would symbolically indicate. As Helgerson remarks:

> If a chorography was a representative body, so was parliament. The same anatomical metaphor--the "body of all England"--was used repeatedly for both, as it was for the land itself. As tension increased between monarch and parliament, between court and country, so too did the importance of those things in which chorographers were specialists--local difference, local identity, and local representation--until parliament came almost to seem a living chorography, a map made flesh. (136)

Drayton fails to directly refer to James I and his court in Song XVII of Poly-Olbion when he describes several palaces in the western outskirts of the metropolis as well as the palace and other institutions associated with the Monarchy in the City of Westminster. In Song XVII Drayton abandons the summarial overview of the metropolis's topographical situation and composition and delves more deeply into the

actual juxtaposition of the different sectors of the metropolis bordering the Thames's north bank, providing a linear perspective of the urban panorama along the east-west axis of the river. Drayton personifies the Thames as a masculine figure that surveys the cities of Westminster and London and their suburbs as his waters flow down river towards the sea. In this Song we see again that the Thames is allowed to usurp James I's place, since it is this river that makes its progress through the city and not the King. The portions of the capital city bordering the Thames are described from this river's perspective so that this personified natural feature becomes the dominating figure that perceives and in turn is recognized and paid tribute to by various landmarks in the urban landscape.

The royal palaces in the western outskirts of the metropolis are described as paying their respects to the mighty river's passage so that when juxtaposed with the Thames they appear as subordinate landmarks that grace this prestigious river's banks. Windsor Castle is described as standing reverently on "tip-toe" to behold the Thames's passage past her and the other royal palaces in the western outskirts are referred to as "Kingly houses" that "Crown" this river so that in these acts of obeisance the river usurps the honors that the dutiful courtier-poet would have these personified royal landmarks pay to their owner, the King:

> But now this mighty Flood, upon his voiage prest
> (That found how with his strength, his beauties still
> increast,
> From where, brave Windsor stood on tip-toe to behold
> The faire and goodly Tames, so farre as ere he could,
> With Kingly houses Crown'd, of more then earthly pride,
> Upon his either Banks, as he along doth glide)
> With wonderfull delight, doth his long course pursue,
> Where Otlands, Hampton Court, and Richmond he doth
> view,

In portraying the Thames gazing upon the City of Westminster, Drayton fails to describe James I presiding over his court in this city. Instead this poet has the personified river observe the two major institutions associated with the monarchical government, the unspecified palace, which could refer to either Westminster or Whitehall, and the Abbey where Kings are generically referred to as being crowned and buried. All suggestions, however, of the current King's reign there is absent. As we have previously seen in Song XVI in the poet's description of London, the City of Westminster in Song XVII is also referred to in feminine term. But unlike the description of London where that feminine city is possessed by the masculine Thames ("his Towne"), the feminine City of Westminster is described as taking possession of these landmarks ("her Palace large, and her most sumptuous Fane") associated with the royal government. The City of Westminster, instead of James I, oversees and maintains the institutions associated with the Monarchy. Depicting this city in which the King and his court are centered, the poet in referring to the grand dimensions and

ornamentation of the Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey portrays a city of institutions rather than of political leaders who function within and humanize them. Moreover, Drayton's characterization of these edifices being "large" and "sumptuous" emphasizes the grandiose and profusely embellished natures of these structures associated with the monarchical government in the City of Westminster, so that they reflect the effect that the decorous, ritualistic nature of the Roman Catholic Church had upon shaping the British nation's hierarchical institutions and the impressive architectural structures that house them. Given the lavish nature of these structures that were reminders of the nation's past religious affiliation, the suspicions of and charges made by the city's Puritan sects against the Monarchy and the Episcopal State Church being relics of Popery become more understandable:

> Then Westminster the next great Tames doth-entertaine;
> That vaunts her Palace large, and her most sumptuous Fane:
> The Lands tribunall seate that challengeth for hers,
> The crowning of our Kings, their famous sepulchres.

If we are to infer what is more probable (because of the parallel construction of the line in which the poet gives possession of both the Palace and the Fane to Westminster) that Drayton is referring to the Palace of Westminster instead of to Whitehall Palace in his description of the City of Westminster, the poet is committing a further slight

to the King and his court by referring solely to a former royal palace that had become during Henry VIII's reign, as a consequence of this Tudor King moving his court to Whitehall Palace, a structure associated primarily with the institution of representative government in which the members of Parliament meet, while not paying a similar tribute to Whitehall Palace where since 1512 the institution of monarchical government, containing the King's court, has conducted its affairs. This oversight cannot be excused by the Thames's limited perspective, since both the Palace of Westminster and Whitehall Palace are situated on this river's northern bank and can be seen by the personified Thames as its waters make their progress eastward to the sea. This omission can also, therefore, be regarded as a further indirect insult to James I in failing to acknowledge him and the palatial structure most directly connected with his rule.

While Drayton's failure to refer to the supreme political leader of the English state, James I, seems to intentionally convey the poet's political purpose of expressing his disapproval of this particular King by means of this omission, his failure to refer to the civilian population of Westminster is an oversight that would just as readily occur in a courtier-poet's description of this city. For a courtier-poet to fail to mention the current King as the head of

government in the City of Westminster would be an inexcusable oversight, whereas a similar failure to refer to the civilian population of this city would be more understandable. As Walter Besant observes, life in Westminster revolved around the political and religious affairs of respectively the Palace and the Abbey, so that the ordinary citizens had only a subservient role to play in the city's life. This historian notes that the enormous structures of the Palace and Abbey dominated the area of this city which had been built upon Thorney Island and was surrounded, until it was finally drained, by swamp land, so that there was scarcely any room for the laborers who worked within the Palace and the Abbey to live (Westminster 2-4)

Along with the similar absence of the citizenry of Westminster, the only other thing in Drayton's characterization that would coincide with the courtier-poet's treatment of this city is his emphasis upon the prominent landmark of Westminster Abbey that plays a central political and religious role in its providing a site in which the ceremonies associated with the beginning and ending of a monarch's reign can be carried out before the eyes of God and the eyes of the nation's populace. But whereas a courtier-poet would be more likely to refer specifically to James I's particular coronation ceremony as the most recent illustration of a British King being crowned in "the Lands tribunall seate,"

Drayton persists in failing to recognize what he regards to be a poor example of a king by referring in generic terms to Westminster Abbey's serving as the ceremonial site in which Monarchs are crowned and buried, so that he can identify this structure with the more distant, but illustrious, royal figures of England's heroic past. Drayton aptly characterizes Westminster as a city of institutions rather than as a city of people, but diverges at least from the courtier-poet's sentiments by not establishing in his poem that the currently reigning King occupies and has a ceremonial role to play in those institutions connected with the royal government.

Drayton, similarly, could be regarded as being generically pro-Court in his description of the next area of the metropolis that the Thames's waters pass in their journey to the sea because he identifies it inaccurately as being the exclusive domain of the aristocracy. The personified river proceeds to survey the man-made structures in that middle ground between Westminster and London occupied by those lordly mansions along the Strand. Drayton is perhaps correct in his identifying the "wealthy" and "brave" courtiers and bishops as the owners of these "sumptuous Bowres" that are within convenient walking distance of the Palace and the Abbey and prominently arise along the northern bank of the Thames, but he seems to be pro-Court in his failure to have

the Thames take note of the early 17th century phenomenon (so displeasing to both Elizabeth and James I and inviting their anti-urban policies) that consisted in the ambitious migration of the mercantile community once centered within the City of London into this and other suburban areas outside the city walls to serve the needs and luxurious wants of both the already resident noble courtiers and the more recent arrival of the gentry who had flocked to this middle ground of the metropolis from their country estates to partake in the social, cultural, and commercial amenities of urban life. This area, particularly in the undeveloped land immediately north of the Strand which was to become known as "the Town," was the first heterogeneous place in the metropolis where the inherited, land-based wealth of those men who were connected with the hierarchical orders of the Monarchy and the Episcopacy met the earned wealth of the self-made businessmen who where involved in the capitalist economy of the city. For the first time a greater familiarity, with all the tensions and factionalism that that intense interaction between different socio-economic groups involved, would occur between those men who respectively lived within the world of the court and those who lived within the world of the mercantile city. In the heterogeneous community north of the Strand the inherited wealth of the court and the country more easily flowed into the pockets of the city merchants

and tradesmen to the increasing enrichment of the latter and impoverishment of the former.

This growing diminishment of the courtiers' wealth, prestige, and power as it is symbolized by their residence in these "sumptuous Bowres" is not referred to in Drayton's description of this metropolitan area:

> Then goes he on along by that more beautious Strand,
> Expressing both the wealth and bravery of the Land.
> (So many sumptuous Bowres, within so little space,
> The All-beholding Sun scarce sees in all his race.)

While according to Drayton the structures of the City of Westminster express the primary religious and political institutions of the metropolis, the prominent residential structures of the Strand represent the power and the prestige of the men who next to the King have the greatest authority in running these kinds of hierarchical insitutions in which the affairs of the nation are conducted. These noblemen residing in their "sumptuous Bowres" in the middle ground, serve as intermediaries between the austere institutions of the monarchy which capture the essence of Westminster and the throng of warm-blooded humanity which capture the essence of London in Drayton's west to east survey of the metropolis in this chorographical poem. A case in point would be such poets as Donne, Herrick, and Davenant who grew up and/or lived in the City of London and were first able to be introduced at court because of their making these initial contacts with these influential courtiers, such as Endymion

Porter, whose grand homes were situated along this middle ground of the Strand.

Although it is not expressed in Drayton's poem, which still claims the middle ground between the two cities as the exclusive domain of those leading members of the court and the Church of England, this transfer of the courtier's and gentry's inherited wealth to the city's businessmen can be seen in other descriptions which show commercial institutions gradually becoming more prevalent in this middle ground. Two historians point out that this heterogeneity and the potential factionalism that would arise from this condition in the neighborhood north of the Strand occurred during the late Elizabethan and early Stuart reigns. Besant, in describing this largely uninhabited middle ground which consisted exclusively of the aristocratic homes situated between the Strand and the north bank of the Thames during the early portion of Elizabeth's reign, lists the particular palaces along the Strand that were most prominent during the Elizabethan period and which Drayton refers to as "sumptuous Bowres" "expressing the wealth and bravery of the Land":

> ... The lawns of the Temple, planted with elm, slope down to the river, and these were followed westward by the palaces along the Strand--Exeter House, Arundel House, the Bishop of Llandaff's House, Somerset House, the Savoy, Bedford House, Cecil House, and Northumberland House.
>
> (London 184-185)

But Hibbert notes that the neighborhood was changing at the time of Drayton's poem during the Jacobean era and was attracting the wealthiest tradesmen and merchants from the City of London who began to settle there, selecting more modest scale homes to reside in: "... in the early 17th century the large mansions had been replaced by smaller houses for fairly well-to-do citizens and shops had begun to appear" (829). This area, David Riggs, remarks in his biography of Ben Jonson, was developed not only for the country gentry but also for the city's businessmen to establish new business enterprises and to purchase more commodious homes to display their newly acquired affluence in the capitalist economy that was flourishing in the metropolis:

> The lifeline of the area between London and Westminster was the Strand, ... This neighborhood was filling up with town-houses and expensive shops during the years that followed the Spanish peace of 1604, and it had become a prime gathering place for affluent customers. The Strand, and Drury Lane [and by 1639 Covent Garden as well] were at once "the places where most of the Gentry lived" and bustling centers of trade. The institution that epitomized the conjunction of court and city was the New Exchange, a vast shopping center that Salisbury erected on the Strand (157-158)

This change in the neighborhood of the Strand, even while Drayton was exclusively celebrating the "wealth and bravery" of the courtiers who resided there, reflects the growing wealth of the businessmen of the City of London who were expanding their business enterprises beyond the city into this new locale, buying and developing property bought from the increasingly in debt courtiers and aristocrats whose

income from their rural and urban lands could not keep up with the inflation brought about by the growing demand for imported goods procured by overseas trade. While this subject of the encroachment of the mercantile commmunity into neighborhoods of the city that were once the exclusive domain of the aristocracy is absent from Drayton's poem, it is a major preoccupation in the Jacobean city comedies. As both Knights and Gibbons inform us the efforts of city businessmen to buy property owned from impoverished gentry and aristocrats so as to establish themselves both as entrepreneurs and leisured property owners both in the vicinity of London and in the rural countryside is a common theme of the Jacobean city comedies because the playwrights wish to satirize the overreaching behavior of the businessmen in their attempt to disturb the hierarchical order of English society by assuming through their pursuit of money, property, and political influence at court the part of gentlemen.

Although the pretext can be given that Drayton neglects to mention in his chorographical survey the commercial development that began to take place just north of the Strand during the early 17th century because he is presenting his view of the metropolis from the personified Thames's limited physical perspective that would not extend much beyond the impressive palatial residences on its immediate banks, there are deeper political reasons for this omission. As Hardin

points out Drayton's political positions in regard to particular urban social groups were representative of the country faction who criticized not only the current immorality, the imprudent policies, and spendthrift ways of the King and the court which in the latter case caused burdensome taxes to be levied upon the country gentry, but also resented and wished to curb the influence of the city's rapacious businessmen who were becoming increasingly wealthy and powerful in the capitalist economy, so that their influence at court and with the King grew while the country's influence in helping to shape national policies to a commensurate degree declined:

> Not that there is anything unique in Drayton's loathing the City. By the early seventeenth century the dominance of London had already made itself felt in the farthest province of England, and resulted in a measure of resentment, if not of envy, among rural people of every class. To these people the evils of the City were virtually indistinct from those of Court life. Drayton likewise condemns both in the same breath, so that here as in most of his satire his bias is absolutely for the Country.

We can see in Hardin's description of Drayton's and the Country faction's disdain for both the court and city a political motive for this poet's willingness to overlook the most recent ambitious attempts by the city's businessmen to reach beyond their proper scope of influence within England's hierarchical order by migrating into the neighborhood of the Strand which was formerly the exclusive domain of the courtiers and the gentry to play, by means of their

new clothes and new, more handsome residences, the part of gentlemen. Drayton's audience, the country faction, would be displeased by any effort to commend the social climbing of the city's entrepreneurs which led ultimately to their having a greater input in the policy making of the elite, oligarchical circles of government. Therefore, this poet in describing this middle ground of the Strand overlooks the fact that these merchants were mingling more frequently and ingratiating themselves with the noblemen of the court who lived in this region so that this latter group gradually learned and participated in the ways of the capitalist businessmen while these entrepreneurs through their association with the nobility gradually acquired the ways of gentlemen with the negative end result for the country faction that their influence in the nation's political life which was becoming increasingly centralized in the capital was correspondingly diminished.

Why, if Drayton's disdain for both the city and court is equal, does this poet celebrate in Song XVII of Poly-Olbion the courtiers' "sumptuous Bowres" along the Strand? As Hardin inform us, this dislike of both the monarch and his courtiers was not generic (as it was in the case of the city's overreaching businessmen), but related only to the current Monarch, James I, and his particular courtiers. Clearly, in the portion of his description devoted to de-

scribing the courtiers' majestic residences along the Strand he is harkening back nostalgically to those noble courtiers of Elizabeth's day who, indeed, had at that time, before the migration of the City of London's entrepreneurial middle class to that urban sector, exclusive possession of the Strand and the middle ground of the metropolis. Hardin quotes a particular historian to point out that the country faction was not an opponent of the hierarchical institution of the monarchy:

> Drayton's sentiments place him among the increasingly vocal faction of his day known as "the Country," which one historian has aptly described as "that large, indeterminate, unpolitical, but highly sensitive miscellany of men," who would rebel "not against the monarchy (they had long clung to monarchist beliefs) nor against economic archaism (it was they who were the archaists), but against the vast, oppressive, ever-extending apparatus of parasitic bureaucracy which had grown up around the throne and above the economy of England. (12)

Hardin associates Drayton with those Puritans who even after the Civil War were to canonize such representatives of the monarchy as Queen Elizabeth and her courtier, Sir Walter Ralegh, while reviling the excesses of the Stuart Monarchy (25-29).

Indeed, we can see Drayton's high esteem for the hierarchical institutions of monarchy in the descriptive attention he pays to the royal palaces in the western outskirts of the metropolis, to the former residences of the English monarchs in the Palace of Westminster, to Westminster Abbey which he

specifically identifies as the site where English kings are crowned and buried in the City of Westminster, and to the majestic homes along the Strand of the leading courtiers, nobles, and bishops of predominantly the Tudor reigns. As I have pointed out it is only praise for the most current monarch, James I, that is lacking in this poet's descriptions of these sectors of the metropolis that are most closely associated with the daily functioning of the English monarchy. This high esteem for the institutions of the Monarchy and the Church of England is even indirectly apparent in Drayton's failure to describe such ignoble entrepreneurial structures as taverns, markets, shops, and exchanges associated with the lower orders of society that existed in close proximity to these noble structures of the nation's political and religious elite in the City of Westminster and the increasingly commercialized Strand. To identify and lend a measure of dignity to the people and artifacts associated with the lowest rungs of the social hierarchical order in the same passage in which these noblemen and artifacts associated with the Monarchy and the Church of England which occupied the highest rungs of the social hierarchical order are described would ultimately have a demeaning, levelling effect on these noble institutions. Therefore, Drayton in his verse isolates and highlights in these western sectors of the capital city the beauty of these noble landmarks

while ignoring the ignoble intrusion of those other more vulgar symbols of the city's prosperous commercial life.

In contrast, all reference to hierarchical order is absent in Drayton's physical description of the City of London. Instead of seeking to impose, as the courtier-poet would, upon the City of London signs of the monarch's good works, policies, attitudes, or even physical presence within it, Drayton describes the democratic spirit of a city in which massive numbers of certain types of buildings and crowds outweigh any considerations of prominent landmarks or singular people. Yet rather than condemning this republican city that the poet depicts as being antithetical to the hierarchical institution of monarchy, Drayton celebrates the physical aspect of this sector of the metropolis as well. In his physical description of the City of London, he appeals at first to the sensibility of his primary audience, the country gentry, by comparing urban structures within this city to natural objects that are still to be found in immediate juxtaposition to it, creating in effect a pastoralized urban landscape.

As Drayton views the Thames's progress past the City of London, he marvels at several numerous, instead of singularly profound, generic features of this city's physical landscape. Observing the buildings along the river's north bank,

he describes the effect created by the multitude of windows upon the beholder: "Whose windowes seem to mock the Star-befreckled skies;/ . . . ." In addition, to identifying the collective effect created by the vast number of windows in London's large quantity of buildings, he also expresses awe at a particular type of structure, the city's churches, to be found in great numbers and at regular intervals throughout the city: "her rising Spyres, so thick themselves that show/As doe the bristling reeds, within his Banks that growe." In both instances Drayton compares a man-made feature of the city with a natural object that is also found in immediate visible juxtaposition to it. In the former case, the windows of the city buildings at night seem either to be heavenly stars because their surfaces reflect the moonlight and starlight, or the windows appear like stars because they are illumined by candlelit rooms, while in the latter case the spires of London's churches resemble the reeds that grow upon the banks of the Thames.

The poet portrays the multitudinous nature of this city to symbolize the democratic spirit of Londoners that has been brought about in large part because of the qualities of levelling and self-reliance that have been encouraged by the Protestant Movement. When referring to the city's buildings and their structural features, Drayton makes no effort to distinguish or to rank one artifact from or above another,

so as to establish a hierarchical order that identifies certain features in London's landscape that are superior to or more noteworthy than another. These buildings in contrast with the structures described by the poet in other sectors of the metropolis seem designed for the common masses of Londoners rather than for the nobility or the episcopacy. Furthermore, his pluralistic reference to the city's churches ("her rising Spyres") would be more pleasing to the largely Puritan middle-class Londoners who became increasingly critical during the early and mid-17th century of the Stuart Monarchy's efforts to repair such singular religious landmarks as St. Paul's Cathedral which they looked upon as a vestige of England's past history as a Roman Catholic nation. Drayton's celebration of the city's many churches, instead of its most prominent "Popish" Cathedral, would be more appealing to those radical religious sects who became critical of the kind of centralized religious structures that the mammoth St. Paul's represented, and which because of its episcopal admininstrative structure bred conformity and an adherence to formal rituals amongst the Cathedral's potentially large body of parishioners.

In contrast with his emphasis on the variety of different generic types of buildings within London in Song XVI ("Turret, Fanes, and Spyres"), Drayton is more impressed by the cumulatively monolithic impact of the structures of the City

of London in Song XVII, emphasizing the great numbers of glistening windows and the great number of "rising Spyres" rather than attempting to identify a singularly impressive edifice or a type of edifice amongst the multitude. This description of the massive, monolithic impact of the London scene from the river's perspective, also contrasts with his description of the most individually prominent structures of the City of Westminster (i.e. the Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey) which in their singularity create a proper showcase to display the key events in the life of the monarch. It is clearly the imposing sight of London en masse which impresses him in Song XVII.

Without referring to any singular structures within the City of London as, for example, St. Paul's Cathedral or the Tower of London but instead choosing to celebrate the general impression made by the city's collective body of numerous structures, Drayton creates a sector of the metropolis that is entirely alien to the spirit of hierarchical order because there is no effort to rank the structures within it by means of particular criteria. It is, consequently, a city that such a monarch as James I would feel alien from and have little impact in for his singularity as head of state would clash with a city whose physical aspect was characterized, according to Drayton's description of it in Song XVII, by the large numbers of uniform structures which composed

its massive body. Amidst such vast numbers of indistinguishable structures any good works of improvement, any political policies, or public appearances by this King would be dwarfed by the city's massively uniform scale. While Drayton's descriptions of the royal institutions of the City of Westminster and the noble residences of the Strand reflect the principles of singularity and rank that are characteristics of the hierarchical order to which the monarchy belongs and in which it occupies the highest level, this poet's physical portrayal of the London scene fails to project these singular, hierarchical qualities. Within this mercantile city as Drayton describes it, no fitting site would afford the King with an appropriate tribune from which to address the London masses. To the extent that this poet's description was an accurate reflection of the actual early 17th century city, it would suggest why James I after his initial coronation pageant through London's Cheapside visited this city rarely and sought to advance anti-urban policies that would reduce its further development and expansion. London's uniform panorama and the uniformity that the city's merchants threatened to bring to other more aristocratic neighborhoods of the metropolis as they expanded their business operations offered a poor backdrop from which to display the singularly privileged nature of a monarch's rule.

In contrast to Drayton's portrait of this sector of the metropolis, Davenant's later mid-17th century description of the City of London in a prose passage from one of his plays portrays a city in which the buildings and streets are remarkably varied in their appearance:

> Is unanimity of inhabitants of wise cities better exprest then by their coherence and uniformity of building? Where streets begin, continue, and end in a like stature and shape: but [London's buildings] (as if they were rais'd in a general insurrection, where every man hath a several design) differ in all things that can make distinction. Here stands one that aimes to be a palace, and, next to it, another that professes to be a hovel. Here a giant, there a dwarf, here slender, there broad; and all most admirably different in their faces as well as in their height and bulk .... 'Tis your custom, where men vary often the mode of their habits, to terme the nation fantastical; but where streets continually change fashion, you should make haste to chain up the city, for 'tis certainly mad .... (Harbage 216-217)

While this portrayal of a profuse diversity of urban structures would seem to conflict with Drayton's depiction of the uniformity of the city's physical aspect, one should consider that Davenant's predecessor was perhaps referring in his physical description in impressionistic terms to the uniformity of the city's cultural as well as socio-economic milieu which the physical city in all its maddeningly variegated structural forms uniformly projected.

Drayton's evocations of the exclusivity of the institutions and residences described in the western outskirts of the metropolis, in the City of Westminster, and along the Strand as contrasted with the inclusivity of the unindividualized,

numerous structures of the City of London can be viewed as part of a larger cultural trend taking place amongst the upper classes between the 16th and 18th centuries in which, according to Burke, these superior people sought to segregate their social and cultural lives from that of the ignoble commoners. Even the resolution of James I to visit London as little as possible during his reign and make his court rather than the city the site of his merry-making and pageantry as well as the efforts of the more prosperous city merchants to migrate westward away from the city toward "the town" and the court and to emulate the behavior and lifestyle of gentlemen can be regarded as part of this growing exclusivity amongst the upper classes:

> In the three centuries from 1500 to 1800, the aristocracy, the gentry, and the wealthiest merchants, clergymen, and professional men of most parts of Europe purged themselves of the popular culture their ancestors had shared with the lower orders. Peter Burke has called this process "the withdrawal of the upper classes" and has claimed for it an important social function. "As their military role declined," Burke writes, "the nobility had to find other ways of justifying their privileges: they had to show they were different from other people. The polished manners of the nobility were imitated by officials, lawyers, and merchants who wanted to pass for noblemen."
>
> (Helgerson 241-242)

The undifferentiated, numerous mass of uniform buildings and churches in the City of London in Drayton's description of that urban area can be seen as the sedimentary residue of mundane residences, workplaces, and places of religious worship of the unaspiring commoners who were left behind in the westward migration of the nobility, gentry, and the

prosperous merchants. These members of the upper class in their desire to rise or to maintain their exclusive places in the social, cultural, and political hierarchical order built, repaired, and maintained more palatial homes and invested in other forms of conspicuous consumption, such as clothing and coaches, to distinguish themselves from the plebeian Londoners.

Similarly, the City of London's humanity is described in an undifferentiated mass so that it too offers an antithesis to the hierarchical order of monarchy and the profound singularity of the King's person. In his description of the western portions of the metropolis, Drayton focuses on the residences and institutions of the monarchy and the nobility but these places are devoid of human activity; in fact, these areas and the structures within them are personified to take on active roles in place of their absent human owners: Windsor Palace stands on "tip-toe" to behold the Thames, the City of Westminster is described both as "entertain[ing]" this river on its journey past her and "vaunt[ing] her Palace large, and her most sumptuous Fane," while the Strand by means of its palatial residences "express[es] both the wealth and bravery of the Land." The City of London, on the other hand, is portrayed as an urban center that is overwhelmed by its human activity. Contrasting with his description of the City of Westminster, por-

trayed as a desolate city of a few grand yet isolated structures within which singular ceremonial activities of national significance take place that are described as being performed by this city rather than the people within it ("The Lands tribunall seate that challengeth for hers,/The crowning of our Kings, their famous sepulchres"), Drayton observes the City of London's abundant, even tumultuous human activity as he has the masculinely personified waters of the Thames observe the busy waterfront of the city. London is characterized as a city of multitudes both in terms of its physical structures as well as in terms of its humanity. The people of this city are no more singularly profound or distinguishable from one another than are its multitudes of buildings and churches. As with its structures, there is no effort to rank the activities of its inhabitants in terms of their relative degree of importance. Both its structures and its citizenry are portrayed as an undifferentiated mass. Drayton's portrayal of "crouded Wharfes," "people-pestred shores," and "shoales of labouring ores" all similarly depict both the city's waterfront and the portion of the Thames that passes by it as being alive with a collective, intensely active, ant-like humanity:

> There sees his crouded Wharfes, and people-pestred shores,
> His Bosome over-spread with shoales of labouring ores:

In contrast to the other more western areas of the metropolis where the poet stresses the affluence of its nobility and monarchy by means of referring to such singular products of conspicuous consumption as the palaces and institutions of government owned and occupied by them, the City of London, although rich in its numbers of structures and people, seems poor in terms of the nondescript, uniform quality of these things. Drayton fails to depict the fact that the converse was true: that entrepreneurs and laborers of the City of London were generating wealth and, at least amongst the former group, growing more affluent while the nobility and monarchy who were expending their wealth on these forms of conspicuous consumption were growing increasingly in debt. The Londoners in Drayton's poem seem too industrious to have found the leisure time of these noblemen to squander their incomes by erecting the kind of lavish structures that are to be found in the City of Westminster and the Strand. Described in the above passage from Song XVII as being industriously employed on the waterfront of this port, the more successful entrepreneurs amongst these inhabitants of the city would seem more likely to invest their profits in further industrial and commercial schemes than to spend it upon fashionable forms of conspicuous consumption as stylish residences, attire, and vehicular transport. But as we have noted earlier, the more successful London businessmen spent their profits in both ways, investing their capital in

further money-making projects as well as in vulgarly emulating because of their nouveau riche status the behavior of gentlemen who sought to acquire fashionable artifacts to advertise their privileged upper class status in society.

One exception to Drayton's general principle of singularly describing things in the western portion of the metropolis and plurally describing things to be found in the City of London occurs in his portrayal of that city's London Bridge. But even in this one exceptional instance, the poet emphasizes such aspects of the Bridge's singularity that reflect the capitalist ethic that has been the key to the prosperity of London's middle class. Although London Bridge'is described as the Thames's possession, it clearly mirrors in terms of such qualities as its "cost[liness]" and the part it plays as the deciding factor in the Thames's competition for pre-eminence with other English rivers the high esteem that is placed by the City of London's capitalist businessmen upon wealth and the ability to outdo one's competitors:

> With that must costly Bridge, that doth him most renowne,
> By which he cleerely puts all other Rivers downe.

Indeed, Drayton's emphasis upon London Bridge's costliness makes it an appropriate symbol to reflect the high value that the businessmen of the City of London placed upon money, believing it to be in this new capitalist economy the most instrumental force in determining one's status in

English society. Drayton emphasizes the very quality of this structure that would most readily stimulate a civic sense of pride and affection on the part of business-minded Londoners towards an urban artifact that in its "costly" appearance symbolizes their materialistic values. As Knights points out the development of the capitalist economy primarily in the City of London--where such business activities as "the formation of overseas trading companies, the rise of large-scale speculation, and an almost feverish pursuit of industrial projects" (118-123) predominately took place--caused in the late and early 17th centuries:

> ... medieval "status" [to be] superseded by the modern "class," and the ranks of the class system were determined, in the long run, by the possession of money. National policy was becoming more and more clearly determined by the conflicting claims of different industrial and commercial interests. And the things that money could buy had become far more numerous, and were taking a far greater place in men's thoughts than a century previously. "No man can be ignorant," said Bacon, "of the idolatry that is generally committed in these degenerate times to money, as if it could do all things public and private." By the middle of the seventeenth century it was a commonplace. "Whoever wanteth money is ever subject to contempt and scorn in the world, let him be furnished with never so good gifts, either of body or of mind... (118-123)

Drayton, by suggesting that the Thames is the most renowned of English rivers because it alone possesses such a "costly Bridge," is introducing alien capitalist values in his effort to compliment this natural feature, when such materialistic values were in reality only first gaining widespread acceptance in the City of London at the time. This high

regard for an item's costliness would have greatest currency in early 17th century England amongst the Elizabethan and Jacobean businessmen of the City of London who were involved in making costly investments in the hope of receiving far more lucrative returns.

During the reign of James I the effects of factionalism amongst the inhabitants of the city, the court, and the country upon the urban poetry that describes the physical aspect of London life is evident. The courtier-poet, Edmund Waller, attempts to reconcile in his poem "Upon His Majestie's Repairing of St. Paul's" the feuding city and court factions by portraying James I as wishing to perform good works in the city by making plans and gathering materials to make the much needed repairs of St. Paul's Cathedral. On the other hand, the courtier-poet Ben Jonson, writing unlike Waller during the actual reign of James I and not that of his son, best expresses through his concrete description of a particularly dirty area of the City of London in the poem "On the Famous Voyage" the cause for James I's and his court's contempt for and dread of life in the City of London where unsanitary conditions, as best symbolized by the Fleet River, prevail and all form of disease and plague flourish amidst its filthy parishes and inhabitants and threaten the more prosperous neighborhoods of the metropolis inhabited by the King and his courtiers. These attitudes of

James I and his court towards the city, in addition to the wish to impede London's development into an economically powerful urban center harboring political and religious factions that are hostile to hierarchical form of rule, have given rise to this King's anti-urban policies that seek to restrict its further physical growth and to stem the tides of migration on the part of the country gentry and poor. Therefore, by portraying a dirty, uninhabitable city, Jonson produces in his poem propaganda to further James I's aim of discouraging the country gentry from abandoning their country estates to flock to the metropolis. Finally, Michael Drayton, a poet hostile to James I and his court and representative of the country faction, describes in Songs XVI and XVII of Poly-Olbion a capital city of both royal residences and institutions in its western sectors and business activities in its eastern sector, but over which no current king effectively reigns and provides a unifying impact that would consolidate the subjects of the entire city behind one divinely sanctioned hierarch. Fearful of imprisonment because of James I's "royal proclamations of 1620, forbidding public discussion of state affairs" (Hardin 86-90), Drayton resorts to indirect means of demonstrating his discontent with James I's personal behavior, his management of domestic and foreign policy, and his failure to offer him patronage, by omitting, for example, all mention of this particular king in the tribute he pays to the capital city and empha-

sizing instead the residences and ceremonies that are generically associated with all of England's monarchs. Moreover, Drayton in these two songs offers because of his affiliation with the country faction which was mutually disdainful of both city and court (in that both places tended to draw political influence away from the countryside so that it became centered in the capital) the most objective appraisal of the essential qualities of those respective areas of the metropolis where the antithetical and rival hierarchical and capitalist orders prevailed and did much to shape the disparate physical characteristics of the respective cities of Westminster and London in which these orders resided. The former city is praised for its singular structures that serve the Monarchy and the latter city is celebrated for its multitudinous ones that serve the masses of London's entrepreneurs and laborers.

CHAPTER 2: THE REIGN OF CHARLES I

During the reign of Charles I the physical aspect of London life is described primarily from the perspective of courtier-poets who attempt in their descriptions of the physical city to heal the growing breach between the court and the city, the monarch and the city's businessmen, and the Church of England and the Puritan Movement. It is clear in such poems as Sir Edmund Waller's "Upon His Majesty's Repairing of St. Paul's," Sir John Denham's "Cooper's Hill," Sir William Davenant's "The Queene, returning to London after a long absence," and Robert Herrick's "His tears to Thamasis" that these courtier/cavalier poets because they have grown wary of the city factions' increasing economic and political strength no longer feel free to insult or to bully the citizenry into submission to the hierarchical orders of the Monarchy and the Church of England. There is an increasing awareness on the part of these courtier-poets that money has displaced these religious and political hierarchies as the primary determinant of one's status and ability to influence the future development of English society which finds indirect expression in their poems that describe the physical city. The tone of these courtier-poets is a bit too shrill and defensive as they try to assert the Monarchy's position of strength in the metropolis in terms of Waller's and Denham's descriptions of Charles I's effort to perform with

the appreciative support and assistance of the citizenry such good works in the City of London as the repair of St. Paul's, and Davenant's effort to alert Londoners to the reverence toward the monarch and his royal family that still lies buried in their hearts and which enables them to endure such urban hardships as trudging about their business affairs in the polluted city.

Both Waller and Denham in their descriptions of Charles I repairing St. Paul's Cathedral attempt to restore the prestige of the hierarchical orders of the monarchy and the Church of England in the city. They attempt to portray a city, unlike Drayton's, in which singular structures and individuals can be ranked above the generality of buildings and people by virtue of their pre-eminent position in the hierarchical political and religious orders. Their poems attack the city's businessmen and religious reformers whose levelling activities appear as "a darker cloud" that cannot obscure the good works of Charles I as reflected in the Cathedral that towers as a symbol of state institutionalized religion both morally and physically above these urban representatives of the capitalist economy and these divisive religious sects.

Steven Mullaney, however, provides evidence that would suggest that Drayton's description of a city whose struc-

tures and people were noted for their quantity rather than their qualitative rank in a social, religious, and political hierarchical order is more accurate. This literary historian points out that the breakdown of the hierarchical orders of Church and State and the accompanying diminishment of the reverence shown to the urban landmarks which housed these institutions began to occur before the unpopular reigns of the Stuart Kings, James I and Charles I, during that of the much beloved Queen Elizabeth I when Stow published his Survay of London and the city doubled and quadrupled in size as it was overwhelmed by immigrants from the country who sought to escape the constraints of these traditional hierarchical and feudal structures that were still dominant factors in the life of the countryside in order to rise as self-made men in the developing capitalist economy of London:

> At the moment in history that Stow conducted his Survay of London, the traditional structures of hierarchic society in England were breaking down; Elizabethan culture was taking a decidedly alien warp, such that even native forms of significance began to appear in contexts far removed from, if not subversive of, their customary usage. It was in 1589, in the midst of unprecedented social and cultural upheavals, that John Lyly described Elizabethan England as a kind of genera mixta writ large, a highly complex emblem or device that was increasingly resistant to interpretation or explication ....What was true of Lyly's England ... was most emphatically true of Elizabethan London. As the city expanded far beyond its customary social, cultural, and geographical limits, it indeed became a "Gallimaufrey" of the nation (if not of all nations) as a whole. Distinguishing citizen from noncitizen became a doubtful task as the displaced and marginal population of the country came to London in increasing numbers to take advantage of the anonymity the city of-

> fered and to escape from the rigid traditional structures which the city itself had once served to embody. (18-20)

Many of the people and structures which once fitted into and derived their significance from these hierarchical orders lost their stature in the City of London's progression during the course of the Tudor and Stuart Monarchy from a medieval to a capitalist society in which wealth became the most signifying factor in determining one's place in the urban social order. Instead of continuing to be a showcase for the profound landmarks and people who were once more readily perceived within the City of London as long as the medieval hierarchical orders which gave them prominence prevailed, the city became during this time of transition, in the words of Lyly, a "hodge podge" in which an unstratified, undistinguishable multitude of buildings and people were seen, the latter struggling to out-do one another so as to rise within the modern class structure created by the capitalist economy.

St. Paul's Cathedral, in either of its two forms before and after the Great Fire of 1666, is the physical landmark in the Greater London scene most consistently referred to by the English poets of the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries because in its juxtaposition with the rest of the urban landscape it best symbolizes the conflict between the medieval hierarchic and modern capitalist orders that struggled

for social, spiritual, economic, and political supremacy within the City of London. The courtier-poet Edmund Waller in "Upon His Majesties Repairing of St. Paul's" by portraying primarily Charles I's good work in seeing to it that this most physically impressive City of London Cathedral was repaired attempts to bolster both representatives of medieval hierarchic orders, the Monarchy and the Church of England, against the modern order of the capitalist economy in which one's status is based upon one's degree of wealth and one's position of influence within a business enterprise. In Waller's poem the pre-eminent representative of the political hierarchical order, Charles I, is described as defending the tarnished reputation of the Church of England and its episcopal order by restoring with the help of Londoners the pre-eminent physical landmark in which the ecclesiastical officials of that order function. By repairing St. Paul's, Waller suggests that the King is also strengthening, along with the reputation of his monarchical regime, that other remnant of a medieval hierarchy, the episcopal order of the Church of England that has been challenged by the Puritan movement which has found its primary supporters amongst the city's self-made capitalist businessmen who in both their religious and political activities against the Monarchy and the state-run Church of England seek radical reform that rewards individual efforts to acquire wealth, power, and religious enlightenment.

By seeing to it that St. Paul's is repaired, Charles I is fulfilling his role as the head of the Church of England in seeing to it that the citizens of the City of London worship collectively in a state-run, institutionalized setting as opposed to the free-thinking, independent, religious sects who opposed such conformity. Helgerson in his discussion of John Foxe's and Richard Hooker's differing religious philosophies as they are expressed respectively in Acts and Monuments and Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity explains why such structures as the Cathedral were an integral part of the religious philosophy upon which the Church of England was based. His explanation would suggest why the repaired St. Paul's Cathedral would be symbolically important in re-establishing, in the face of growing opposition on the part of the city's puritan religious factions, the state-controlled Church of England's and the King's, because of his position as the head of its episcopal order, supremacy over the religious life of the City of London:

> Foxe represents an invisible, or at least underground, community of Bible readers, a community brought into occasional visibility by persecution or, more rarely, by the support of a godly ruler. Hooker [as a supporter of the Church of England] represents a thoroughly visible community of worshippers, a community identified by large and handsome church buildings, by an established ministry with a formal hierarchy of ecclesiastical officers, and by a set and publicly observed order of service. Where members of Foxe's church experience God's presence most intensely while reading his word alone or in small groups, members of Hooker's experience that presence through the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, celebrated by an ordained minister in a consecrated building as part of a congregation brought together, if not by devotion, then by

> the coercive power of the state. Where Foxe's church opposes the world, Hooker's replicates the world and its governing structure. (276)

While Foxe provides the philosophical basis behind the 17th century Puritan Movement, Hooker offers the best defense of the King and the Church of England in their opposition to these contentious religious factions. In Helgerson's summary of Hooker's defense of the Church of England, it can better be understood that Waller's poetic tribute to Charles I for repairing St. Paul's is, in fact, an effort by this courtier-poet to defend the King's pre-eminent role as the religious leader of a metropolitan religious community that was becoming increasingly decentralized and factious and opposed to such efforts by the King to re-establish centralized control over the religious life of the city by restoring such structures as the Cathedral that provided a centralized, state-controlled, conformist setting for worship:

> [According to Hooker] because men and women cannot know the invisible church of Christ and thus cannot know whether they themselves are members of it or not, they cannot act on its behalf. The only church to which they obviously belong is the visible church established in their own politic society, and for Englishmen that means the church of England. To its laws they must submit both body and spirit. Authority in Foxe's apocalyptic church resides ultimately with the individual believer, with the individual reader of God's word. Authority in the apologetic church of Hooker belongs to the state, which, though itself a wholly contingent product of history, provides the institutional setting in which orderly public worship and thus the saving transmission of grace can take place. (277-278)

Waller celebrates in "Upon His Majesties Repairing of St. Paul's" this Cathedral ("Our nation's glory") because it symbolizes the Monarchy's and the Church of England's effort to uphold a religious institution that provides centralized, formal worship within an episcopal order which were legacies of the Church of Rome, but refers to it as "our nations crime" because of the failure of Londoners to revere through their words and actions over the centuries since it was first built such a symbol of England's centralized and authoritarian religious life. This courtier-poet in his opening lines compares this Cathedral to a "shipwreck'd vessel" to establish the fact that by the time Charles I was crowned in 1625 this Cathedral was a grand ruin which could only be restored by a King who was committed to funding and to providing the necessary expertise and labor to perform an enormous restoration project:

> That shipwreck'd vessel which th' Apostle bore,
> Scarce suffer'd more upon Melita's shore,
> Than did this temple in the sea of time,
> Our nation's glory, and our nation's crime.

But Waller only alludes to the positive and negative characteristics of St. Paul's condition in the above passage that reveals both the medieval and reformation Londoners' ambivalence towards such grandiose landmarks of a centralized, state-run church. There were several concrete reasons pertaining to the Cathedral's construction that would explain why it symbolized "our nation's glory." It was a 12th centu-

ry Norman Cathedral that had been "built of Caen stone, brought by sea and up the Thames" and was "considerably larger and higher than" the contemporary St. Paul's; furthermore, it was topped by the tallest spire ever to have been built" (Hibbert 756-758).

But St. Paul's Cathedral, even before the 16th and 17th century reformation movements in which the Church of England and later the Puritan religious sects were created, when it was still part of the Church of Rome, was almost from the outset used in an irreverent manner by Londoners perhaps because there was a contentious streak in the character of urban Englishmen that was antipathetic to figures and institutions which symbolized centralized authority. Waller, therefore, had equal justification for alluding to the misuse of the Cathedral, and the disrespect for hierarchical forms of authority that such misuse indicated, as symbolizing "our nation's crime." Mitchell and Leys claim that during the middle ages St. Paul's nave and transepts had become thoroughfares for citizens, with the central nave, Paul's Walk, being used as a marketplace (117-118).

The Cathedral was further misused and widely regarded as a remnant of Popery during the Reformation in the early and mid-16th century and during the rise of the Puritan movement in the late 16th and early 17th centuries. While the nave,

Paul's Walk, continued to serve as a thoroughfare "between Carter Lane and Paternoster Row for people with vessels of ale and beer, baskets of bread, fish, flesh, and fruit, man leading mules, horses and other beasts" as well as a market-place so that "the rood-loft, tombs and font were used as shop-counters" (Hibbert 756-758), there were further profane innovations that occurred within the sacred Cathedral: the city gallants used Paul's Walk as a fashionable promenade to show off their new French and Italian clothes and to make "assignations with lewd women" which "were more frequently made in Paul's Walk than in any other part of London save in the Bankside Stews," while in addition to the shop-counters, petty-hawkers now strolled down the nave as well "crying out their wares" (Stephenson 90-92). During the period when John Donne served as Dean of St. Paul's in the early 17th century, he too had trouble controlling the misbehavior of the public in the nave and transepts of the Cathedral. During his tenure as Dean of the Cathedral he observed neighborhood children using St. Paul's as a playground. One man caught urinating within the Cathedral argued as his defense that he was not aware he was in a church (Bald 402-404) which given the profane activity going on all about him would not be an unlikely argument to make.

All these forms of misuse of the Cathedral which were committed by Londoners over the centuries before and after the

Reformation are abstractly alluded to in Waller's reference to the ruined Cathedral's symbolizing "our nation's crime." The "crimes" committed by Londoners against the Cathedral, in part because it was a symbol of the nation's oligarchically controlled religious and political life, consisted in their traditionally ambivalent displays of reverence and disrespect shown to this medieval institution. Furthermore, these forms of misuse that constitute "our nation's crime," which Waller fails to concretize, qualifies the verisimilitude of this courtier-poet's characterization of the London citizenry's helpful and appreciative attitude toward the King's project of using their tax dollars to restore St. Paul's to its former grandeur. It is doubtful that a religious landmark in which the Church of England's episcopal order functioned as "authorities" on religious matters would have been appreciated by middle class Londoners who were well educated and had the greater ability to purchase and to comprehend as a result of their own independent intellectual efforts both sacred and profane texts that were written in English. Many bourgeoise Londoners were in the process of rejecting, the state-run, centralized, authoritarian Church of England and its grandiose institutions in favor of the smaller plainer houses of worship belonging to the independent religious sects because these schismatic institutions allowed greater leeway for them to express their own understandings of religious texts and to select

preachers who were representatives of their own entrepreneurial middle-class. These independent preachers who were appointed by and dependent upon these urban middle-class congregations for their livelihood tended to interpret the Bible in such a way that it would confirm the virtue of their audience's daily behavior and aspirations when carrying out their business affairs in the capitalist economy.

As was mentioned in the previous section, Waller as a member of Charles I's court gives this king a greater role than his father, James I, in the restoration of St. Paul's Cathedral to its former physical grandeur. It has been Charles I's task to bring his father's plans to fulfillment. By referring to both the father's and son's respective efforts to repair the Cathedral, Waller's overall political purpose is to portray the Stuart Kings, James I and Charles I, as defenders of the Church of England and the Monarchy which oversees it against the contentious sectaries of the city who would use their religious non-conformity as a political tool to undermine the hierarchical orders of both Church and State. It is also because of this courtier-poet's political motive of seeking to depict the Stuart Monarchy as defenders of a state-run Church that Waller exaggerates upon the degree of Charles I's participation in this effort to repair St. Paul's, since he forgets to mention that the Bishop of London, William Laud, was the administrator who decided in

1628 that the extensive repairs of the Cathedral should be conducted by the King's Surveyor, Inigo Jones (Hibbert 756-758). Although Laud and Jones were both acting with Charles I's consent, they were more directly involved with the project than Charles was, but neither their names nor their more active contribution is mentioned by Waller in his poetic compliment to his patron, the King.

In contrast to Waller's giving in his poem greater credit to the aristocratic patron, in this case the Monarch Charles I, rather than to the artisan, Inigo Jones, in the renovation of St. Paul's, the literary scholar Helgerson points out that many artists during the reigns of the Tudor and Stuart Monarchs challenged the traditional notion that the sovereign or nobleman who authorized that a particular work should be done should be regarded as being more significant than the artisan who actually carried out the project (111). During the period of particularly the late 16th and 17th centuries various artists and artisans sought to distance themselves from the court and its oppressive patronage and align themselves with other factions, such as the city and country, that gave greater recognition to the achievements of the self-reliant individual.

To counteract the accurate perception that the Stuart Monarchy was increasingly unable because of its growing financial

dependency on the city businessmen to bring about unilateral change, acting independently from Parliament and that body's constituency of increasingly hostile city and country factions, to bolster those institutions and landmarks most clearly associated with its hierarchic order, Waller in this 1633 poem offers propaganda to demonstrate Charles I's potent ability to effect improvements in the midst of the contentious City of London upon a landmark within it that is a symbol of the centralizing effect of such hierarchical, religious and political, institutions as the Church of England and the Monarchy. This courtier-poet refers to specific repairs and improvements that were made upon St. Paul's Cathedral that were financed by Charles I, such as the King's having the churchyard cleared of the shops, sheds, and stalls that cluttered it and partially obscured the Cathedral, having Inigo Jones rebuild the west front of the Cathedral into a magnificent near-replica of a Classical Roman temple's portico, and having the walls of the Cathedral's transepts and nave refaced with Portland Stone (Hibbert 756-758; Leasor 12-21). Particularly in the case of removing those structures that cluttered the churchyard of the Cathedral and which were symbols of the capitalist ethos that was becoming pervasive in the city, Charles I demonstrates the antipathy that existed between such hierarchical institutions as his monarchy and the homogenizing, levelling impact of such institutions of a capitalist soci-

ety that detracted from the sacred import of the Cathedral. These were all repairs and improvements that could only be carried out within a society in which the medieval hierarchic orders of Church and State and their concerns for the general public welfare were still struggling to prevail against the exclusive profit-motive and self-interest of atomized urban individuals who functioned within and helped to shape the ethics of a capitalist society.

The poet observes and characterizes through metaphor the act of removing those ramshackle sheds of commerce, mostly consisting of bookshops and stationers' stalls (Stephenson 96-97), that obscured and conflicted with the spiritual majesty of the Cathedral which they surrounded. Hibbert attributes the decision to clear the "incongruous houses and shops" encircling St. Paul's to Inigo Jones, the King's Surveyor, whereas Waller, who generally portrays the King as taking a more active role in the repair of the Cathedral, describes Charles I who in the previous passage made "those quarries leap/ Into fair figures" as being actively involved as well in this particular decision to remove those sheds cluttering the precincts of St. Paul's.

The key phrase in the following passage is "state-obscuring sheds" because it suggests the ongoing conflict between the two factions of the court and the city which respectively

represented the medieval hierarchic orders of religion and government and the modern capitalist order. These "sheds" that are representative of the city's burgeoning commercial life in which self-reliant individuals pursue a relentless quest for wealth to rise in society are said by Waller to "obscure" the most prominent State Church, St. Paul's Cathedral, which is one of the few remaining landmarks within the City of London that still symbolize the medieval hierarchical orders of the Monarchy and the Church of England in which rank is still determined not exclusively by individual effort but by means of heredity and/or preferment from those already with high-ranking positions within the divinely sanctioned hierarchy.

Furthermore, the poet intensifies the harmful effect of this commercial growth around the Cathedral in succeeding lines in which he describes not just their "obscur[ing]" but their imprisoning impact on hierarchical institutions. Whereas Elizabeth and James I advocated the limitation of the City of London's physical and economic growth so that it could be still managed and made malleable to the will of the Court, Waller indicates the failure of their efforts when he describes Charles I struggling to free an isolated Cathedral that is symbolic of the threatened hierarchical orders of Church and State that has become "fetter[ed]" by this cancerous growth of commerce within the City of London. This

courtier-poet portrays Charles I as acting as England's true religious leader in his effort to rid the churchyard of St. Paul's Cathedral of all structural signs of the capitalist's levelling, homogenizing, relativistic, anarchic, and (on the religious front) sectarian activities that if allowed to continue unabated would "obscure" the sacred, transcendental import of the Cathedral that the hierarchical political and religious institutions of the State have been entrusted with the duty of preserving:

> So all our minds with his conspire to grace
> The Gentiles' great Apostle, and deface
> These state-obscuring sheds, that like a chain
> Seem'd to confine and fetter him again;
> Which the glad saint shakes off at his command,
> As once the viper from his sacred hand.
> So joys the aged oak, when we divide
> The creeping ivy from his injured side.

By saying that "all our minds with his conspire to grace/The Gentiles' great Apostle," Waller suggests improbably that even within the City of London, the bastions of both the capitalist economy and the Puritan sects (see Hill Society and Puritanism ... 499-500), the urban citizenry is as committed as Charles I to this mission of repairing the Cathedral which in turn symbolizes the bolstering of the hierarchical religious and political orders of the Church of England and the Monarchy. Waller emphasizes the willingness with which London's artisans and laborers join with Charles I in carrying out his plan to clear the immediate vicinity

of St. Paul's of all those commercial artifacts which detract from the divine nature of the Cathedral.

In order to symbolize the capitalist order's opposition to the hierarchical orders of Church and State, Waller compares the menacing nature of these "State-obscuring sheds" in the precincts of St. Paul's to the predatory, poisonous nature of the "the viper" and the parasitical nature of "creeping ivy" which both attack the metaphoric representations of St. Paul Cathedral as, in the former case, the "great Apostle" Paul, and, in the latter case, an "aged oak." In both metaphoric comparisons, the courtier-poet represents the predatory nature of capitalism upon such hierarchical institutions as St. Paul's which claim a transcendental, divine sanction. As the commercial establishments produced by a capitalist economy proliferate because of their profitableness they encroach upon the exclusive places reserved for the hierarchical institutions of Church and State as well as seek to undermine the authority and privileges of the noblemen who administer them.

As further evidence of Charles I's continuing financial and political power to create positive change within the City of London by repairing certain landmarks within it that perpetuate hierarchical institutions, Waller describes an improvement that is directly related to the Cathedral itself rather

than to its immediate surroundings. Waller alludes to one specific new addition to, rather than repair of, St. Paul's that has been made at Charles I's own expense, consisting of the classic portico that Charles I had Inigo Jones build at the Cathedral's western end. Charles I and his efforts to both repair and improve St. Paul's Cathedral are juxtaposed with that of God and his creation to emphasize the monarch's and the Church of England's transcendental aspirations as hierarchical orders to both revere and to emulate the good works of the deity. The poet argues that Charles on a microcosmic scale is manifesting the god-like power of Creation which at once "threatens" Heaven because the King's creative power seems to be in competition with God's own, yet "obliges" Heaven as well since Charles is using his creative powers so as to beautify a house dedicated to the worship of God:

> The sun, which riseth to salute the quire
> Already finished, setting shall admire
> How private bounty could so far extend:
> The King built all, but Charles the western-end.
> So proud a fabric to devotion given,
> At once it threatens and obliges Heaven!

Waller creates very effective propaganda here by covering up the King's growing dependence upon Parliament and the city businessmen's wealth in order to fund affairs of state. At a time when the Stuart Monarchy was at its weakest in terms of political and financial power, this poet celebrates the king's omnipotence in tearing down commercial structures at

will within the City of London while raising up religious structures that he sought to further ennoble as reminders of his divinely sanctioned authority as religious leader of the British nation's State Church. While in the previous passage this seemingly all powerful Charles I could unilaterally decide to wipe away all signs of an encroaching capitalist order that was invading the precincts of the Cathedral, the poet furthers this impression of this Stuart Monarch's independent financial and political omnipotence by comparing his unlimited ability to create things on earth with God's. To deceptively emphasize Charles I's limitless financial resources and largesse that enable and motivate him to produce extensive changes upon the massive Cathedral, Waller notes improvements made at both extremities of the Cathedral as well as throughout the Cathedral's interior. In the former case, he remarks upon the "quire/already finished" at the eastern end of St. Paul's and the newly built portico at the western end, remarking, moreover, to highlight the ambitious nature of the restoration project that the sun upon its daily passage from the eastern to western horizon is consistently confronted with these improvements and repairs that the Cathedral has undergone as a result of this king's "private bounty."

A second improvement made upon the Cathedral that Waller describes in order to provide further evidence of

Charles I's continued financial and political power to perform the good works of renovating hierarchical landmarks in the City of London takes place between the improvements made at the eastern and western extremities of the Cathedral and concerns the reinforcement of the walls of the Cathedral along its nave and transepts with Portland stone. Waller compares the durability and height of the repaired Cathedral walls with the supposedly impregnable walls of Troy to point out Charles I's more effective ability as a ruler to get the best work possible out of his architects, artisans, and laborers who were engaged in restoring St. Paul's. The poet asserts that the gods, Apollo and Neptune, who were forced by Zeus to labor for the king of Troy, Laomedon (Howatson ed. 314), could not raise under this Trojan king's supervision a structure as magnificently sturdy and high as St. Paul's renovated walls, for if they had been able to, the walls of Troy, which they were said in myths to have constructed, would not have succumbed to the Grecian warriors' onslaught during the Trojan Wars:

> Laomedon, that had the gods in pay,
> Neptune, with him [Apollo] that rules the sacred day,
> Could no such structure raise; Troy wall'd so high,
> Th' Atrides might as well have forced the sky.

To emphasize Charles I's divinely sanctioned status as the head of the hierarchical orders of the Monarchy and the Church of England, Waller describes God's providential assistance in helping this king complete this renovation of

the Cathedral. The courtier-poet points out to Londoners who feel deprived because of the lack of rain that has fallen while this project was being undertaken which has led to poor harvests and a consequent diminishment of food supplies in the metropolis that their priorities are wrong. The completion of this spiritual work is more important than their carnal needs and their divisive political and sectarian pursuits. God supports the head of the Church of England in his effort to restore a Cathedral that is symbolic of a state-run, episcopal church in which the religious worship of individuals can be collectively guided and supervised in a formal setting by those religious leaders who are authorities in matters of biblical interpretation. Waller suggests that the long period of dry weather teaches Londoners that it is more important to support the King and the Church of England in their efforts to rebuild a house of worship, before attending to the needs of the flesh as they are symbolized by the "vital food" that withers in the fields of London's rural environs during this sustained period of drought. Acting in a providential Way, God causes this dry weather to help Charles I complete the restoration project in an expeditious manner:

> While the propitious heavens this work attend
> Long-wanted showers they forget to send;
> As if they meant to make it understood
> Of more importance than our vital food.

Waller praises Charles I's overall manner in which he has chosen to repair and to improve St. Paul's Cathedral. The King is described as having displayed modesty in not seeking to build a new cathedral to aggrandize himself, intending rather to restore the beauty and magnificence of the old structure that had also been repaired by his royal predecessors. Most significantly, Waller commends Charles I's religious position in continuing to be the defender of the episcopal order and the institutions of the Church of England in its conflict with the Puritan sects of the City of London which are advocating greater religious reform that would decentralize authority in spiritual matters and consequently put an end to such ecclesiastical officials and institutions as Bishops and Cathedrals. This king's continued support of the Church of England is symbolized by his "grand design" in repairing centralized settings of religious worship such as St. Paul's ("the old refine") and refusing "to frame no new church" as the Puritan factions would want him to do:

> Ambition rather would affect the fame
> Of some new structure, to have borne her name.
> To modest virtues in one act we find
> The modesty and greatness of his mind;
> Which, not content to be above the rage,
> And injury of all-impairing age,
> In its own worth secure, doth higher climb,
> And things half-swallow'd from the jaws of Time
> Reduce; an earnest of his grand design,
> To frame no new church, but the old refine;

In addition, what is also alluded to in Charles I's ambition--as it is symbolized by his repair of St. Paul's--"To frame no new church, but the old refine" is this King's desire to preserve with certain "refine[ments]" the rituals of worship (the prescribed formula of prayers, songs, and sacraments) and to de-emphasize, if not to abolish, the importance of that more unpredictable, individualized segment of the service given to preaching because of the potential political harm that such sermonizing could cause to the centralized hierarchical institutions of the Monarchy and the State Church. It is this more free-thinking and politically volatile aspect of religious worship, the preacher's sermon, that the Puritans would like to make a more prominent part of the "new church" that is being created by their London sects.

In this decision to repair the old Cathedral, Charles I, one of the succession of relatively unpopular Kings associated with the Stuart Monarchy, is following in the footsteps of a more popular Tudor predecessor, Queen Elizabeth I, who raised contributions to repair St. Paul's both from her own personal funds and from the donations of citizens when the Cathedral was severely damaged by a bolt of lightning that hit the steeple and roof of St. Paul's during a thunderstorm in 1561 and set them ablaze so that only the walls of the Cathedral remained wholly intact after the fire was put out

(Stephenson 104-105). Therefore, Charles I in his decision to repair the Cathedral's "injury of all-impairing age" rather than build a new cathedral was following the precedent, even traditional behavior, of previous monarchs, such as Queen Elizabeth, who nostalgically viewed the repeated renovations of St. Paul's as a symbolic means of demonstrating to the London populace, particularly those belonging to religious sects that were pushing for further reforms, that the Monarchy was interested in upholding all religious and political hierarchical institutions, knowing that if St. Paul's and the episcopal order that administered it were allowed to crumble, the power and privileges of that other hierarchical order, the Monarchy, would one day be challenged as well by the contentious sectarian forces proliferating within the City of London's modern capitalist economy.

Waller offers a more pedantic compliment that is critical of Charles I's earlier efforts to win the reverence of Londoners for his monarchical rule. This courtier-poet suggests that even amongst those self-made men of the city struggling within a capitalist economy there is a deep instinctual reverence for hierarchical order because such forms of political and religious government are linked with the transcendental nature of a deity which sanctions them and of a divine government which stands as a paradigm (i.e. the order of angels) for such systems of ranking within the

Church and the State. Waller argues that because of mankind's deep instinctual reverence for a divinely sanctioned hierarchical order the King's restoration of St. Paul's to its former sublime grandeur is more effective than his more contentious abilities as a military leader and a political speaker in regaining the esteem of Londoners because in the former activity he symbolically juxtaposes himself with the divinity in using his earthly power to rebuild a State Church dedicated to the worship of God, while in the latter activities he places himself purely on a temporal plain upon which he juxtaposes his power against other earthly powers of either force or reason which challenge it. He specifically alludes to Charles I's unsuccessful military ventures on the Continent in the late 1620s in order to point out that the King has learned from the comparative experiences of these wars and the effort to renovate the Cathedral that a ruler can reawaken the loyalty of his subjects towards the hierarchical orders of Church and State, not by rhetorical gifts (a furtherslight against Charles I's more eloquent father as well as being possibly a reference to Charles's speech impediment) or by the threat of military force, but rather by appealing by means of the restoration of St. Paul's to the people's spiritual longing for a sublime beauty that transcends the contentious, competitive nature of the self-made, self-devoted, materialistic individual who is a creation of the modern capitalist

society. The restored St. Paul's is best able to symbolize the ennobling, transcendental aspirations of such institutions of the Church of England and the Monarchy. The renovated Cathedral offers itself in a "spouse-like" partnership to the London populace so that they can be swept up in a collective spiritual endeavor instead of being imprisoned by their selfish quest for private gain and their self-assertive insistence upon divisive individualistic expression in matters of religion and politics. The awe-inspiring beauty of this lofty landmark finds, according to this courtier-poet, "a welcome sovereignty in rudest minds," being revered as an absolute product of a divinely sanctioned hierarchical rule by a citizenry who has grown disenchanted with the relative merits of competing individuals, factions, and sects within a capitalist society:

> [St. Paul's Cathedral], spouse-like, may with comely grace command,
> More than by force of argument or hand.
> For doubtful reason few can apprehend,
> And war brings ruin where it should amend;
> But beauty, with a bloodless conquest finds
> A welcome sovereignty in rudest minds.

In this above passage this courtier-poet implies that even those Londoners who outwardly demonstrate their support of the city's divisive sects seek in their innermost beings to find an authoritative leadership in sacred and profane affairs from a virtuous, divinely inspired Monarch and State Church; therefore, even in the "rudest minds" of these self-made businessmen and laborers of the city, the restored

Cathedral that is symbolic of the Monarchy's conscientious administration of the Church of England finds "a welcome sovereignty."

In such terms as "state-obscuring sheds" and "welcome sovereignty in rudest minds" we can see allusions being made to the factional struggle for religious and political dominance within the metropolis between the increasingly powerful businessmen of the mercantile city and the ambitious court that wishes to rule independently of Parliament and the vulgar, opinionated masses. In the former case, the entrepreneurial establishments of the city businessmen threaten to physically overshadow the hierarchical institutions of Church and State, whereas in the latter case the poet argues that the Monarchy is able to quiet the contentiousness of the urban masses and regain their loyalty because of its virtuous deeds of renovating grand houses of religious worship and looking out for the general welfare of Londoners.

Waller's belief that Charles I's efforts to restore such hierarchical institutions as St. Paul's within the city would be appreciated by most Londoners ("beauty, with a bloodless conquest finds/A welcome sovereignty in rudest minds"), perhaps even those belonging to the more radical religious and political movements within the city, is cast

in a doubtful light by the continued neglect, misuse, and actual acts of vandalism that were suffered by the Cathedral in the later years of Charles I's reign and during the Civil War and Interregnum. Several historians and contemporary eyewitnesses of the period note that the repairs upon the Cathedral, being interrupted by the Civil War and the Interregnum, were never entirely completed; furthermore, they remark that the partially renovated St. Paul's continued to be misused even more severely than in its previous history during the Civil War, Interregnum, and the Restoration, right up until its irreparable destruction in the Great Fire of 1666. Rather than the "beauty" of this restored Cathedral's reconciling Londoners to the "sovereignty" of such institutions as the state church and the monarchy, subsequent historic events indicate that the Puritan and Republican movements continued to gather momentum within the capitalist City of London, and, consequently, the desecrations that were levelled at the Cathedral escalated in their frequency and severity because of its being an artifact of those medieval hierarchical orders that these radical sects were seeking to overthrow. The Puritan perpetrators of these acts of vandalism saw them as symbolic acts of rebellion against those officials within these hierarchical orders, the King and the Bishops, who were St. Paul's administrators. These historians and contemporary writers demonstrate that in Waller's words the neglect and abuse of the

Cathedral continued to be a symbol of "our nation's crime" and that those responsible for this crime were the growing political and religious factions in the city that challenged what they saw as the antiquated, unrepresentative hierarchical orders of the church and state that insisted upon holding onto their medieval prerogatives and excluding those of "ignoble" status, even though certain "ignoble" members of the lower orders, such as the urban entrepreneurial middle class, had with the transition from a medieval subsistence economy to a capitalist one become more well educated, astute in commercial matters, and civic-minded, so that they wished to have a greater say in shaping the political, religious, and economic environment within which they had to function.

Ample testimony of how the Cathedral served as a whipping boy for Puritan Londoners to express their grievances towards the Monarchy and the Church of England that prevented them from participating sufficiently in determining the nation's political and religious life is to be found in the writings of historians and contemporaries of the period. During the Civil War and in its immediate aftermath, the Cathedral was desecrated by Parliamentary troops. First, the Parliamentarians halted all further repairs of the Cathedral and "seized £17,000 remaining in the restoration fund to pay their troops" (Hibbert 756-758). Then,

Cromwell's army proceeded to use the nave of the Cathedral that had recently been rebuilt with Portland stone as a cavalry barracks. Meanwhile the porch of St. Paul's, the classical Roman portico that had been erected by Inigo Jones at the Cathedral's western end and which Waller had complimented Charles I for funding ("The King built all, but Charles the western end"), was also desecrated by this army when the Parliamentary soldiers demonstrated their contempt for the restored Popish Cathedral by playing ninepins in Inigo Jones's portico. Afterwards St. Paul's portico suffered further misuse when it was occupied during the Interregnum by seamstresses, pedlars and other small traders (Hibbert 756-758). In addition to these instances of desecration, the Parliamentary Army, dominated by the Independent religious sects, vandalized what was in their estimation a Popish Cathedral by smashing windows, mutilating effigies, burning carved woodwork for firewood, and destroying the statues of James I and Charles I which had stood on the classical portico at the Cathedral's western end. Besides seizing the remaining funds that had been allotted for completing the repairs on the Cathedral, the Parliamentarians also profited from the vandalization of St. Paul's by selling the scaffolding that had held up the nave so that consequently the roof fell in (Hibbert 756-758).

Even after the political influence of the Puritan and Independent sects faded into the background during the early years of the Restoration of the Stuart Monarchy and the destruction of the Cathedral that had been motivated by the religious zealotry of the Parliamentary Army and the radical sects had come to an end, the social and commercial kinds of misuses that had been witnessed in the Cathedral prior to the Civil War were renewed once again after Charles II became king. Vendors used the nave as a place from which to sell their wares, young gallants of the City and the Court used it as a promenade to show off their fine clothes and meet friends, while prostitutes found it an excellent place to solicit customers. Unlike his father Charles I whom Waller portrayed as conscientiously seeking to uphold and to beautify this landmark that was symbolic of the complementary hierarchical orders of the Church of England and the Monarchy by funding and pushing forward the project of repairing St. Paul's, Charles II, in the more lackadaisical manner of his grandfather, James I, was content to neglect his role as head of the Church of England in this matter and permit the pile of building materials and the scaffolding that were remnants of Charles I's uncompleted effort of repair to remain unused where they had lain throughout the Civil War and the Interregnum when the restoration of the Cathedral was initially halted. In addition to Charles II's neglect of his father's project, during the early years of

his rule he allowed certain improvements made during his father's reign to be reversed, including the gradual re-introduction of commercial enterprises once again into St. Paul's Churchyard, so that added to the piles of stone and scaffolding littering it, this Churchyard was filled with "a mass of grimy, tottering timber houses which crept up to the Cathedral's walls" (Leasor 12-21). Therefore, even during the restoration of the Stuart monarchy further desecration of hierarchical institutions was allowed to be committed by allowing structures that were characteristic of the individualistic, enterprising, competitive spirit of the modern capitalist order to proliferate in the midst of landmarks belonging to the Church of England and the Monarchy and to obscure them. In fact, Charles II's allowing these commercial structures to fill up the Cathedral's churchyard once again is symbolic of the more inclusive, accommodating manner in which this latter Stuart king ruled. On the basis of this historical evidence from the periods of the Civil War, Interregnum, and the early years of the Restoration prior to the Great Fire, it is apparent that Waller anticipates too much when he congratulates in 1633 Charles I upon his renovation of St. Paul's Cathedral, and his restoring allegedly by means of this act the popularity of this Stuart monarch amongst the London citizenry, because neither occurrences were fait accompli that endured. He inaccurately asserts that under Charles I's funding and guidance of the

project the act of "those quarries leap[ing]/ Into fair figures from a confus'd heap" was fully accomplished since the radical religious and political factions arising within the city and the country eventually interrupted and reversed the constructive process of repairing the Cathedral as well as put an end to Charles I's effort to restore the reputation of those hierarchical orders charged with the responsibility of overseeing it.

James Howel, an eyewitness to the Cathedral's misuse during the Interregnum, records in his book Londinopolis (published in 1657) what was commonly being said about the condition of the Cathedral by Protestant visitors from the Continent as well as by Londoners who supported the royalist cause and discountenanced the excesses that the Puritan and Independent sects committed against hierarchical institutions and officials. In their recorded comments they allude to and object to the fact that portions of the Cathedral had taken on the appearance of a "stable" because they were being used as cavalry barracks during the Civil War and Interregnum; furthermore, they argue that the religious fanaticism of the Puritan factions that has resulted in the death of such oligarchical forms of religious and political government as the Church of England and the monarchy that were exclusively the domain of the nobility is most likely to give birth in the new capitalist spirit of competitive, and relativistic

sectarianism to the Anti-Christ. Implied in Howel's eyewitness description of St. Paul's during the Interregnum is the sentiment that the delapidated condition that the Cathedral has fallen into is symbolic of the declining fortunes of such hierarchical institutions of the Church of England and the Monarchy during this same period in which the concept of rule by the divine right of a privileged few has been challenged:

> ... this famous Fabrick, which was accounted the greatest glory of London, is become her greatest shame; For, many Forrainers, who are none of those that place any inherent Sanctity in senseless inanimate stones have bin overboard to say that Pauls Church in that posture she now is, is the saddest sight, and most ruthful Spectacle upon the Surface of the whole Earth; nay, some have bin heard to say, that whereas a Stable became once a Temple in Palestine, a Temple among us hath bin made a Stable; nay, they went further not sticking to say, that as Christ was born in a stable, so Antichrist is like to be born in a Stable in England .... (399-400)

Howel's remark that St. Paul's "accounted the greatest glory of London, is become her greatest shame" echoes Waller's similarly dichotomous remark twenty-five years earlier of the Cathedral's symbolizing, prior to its repair by the Stuart Kings, James I .and Charles I, "our nation's glory, and our nation's crime." If this courtier-poet were to be more explicit, the crime that the desecration of St. Paul's is symbolic of is the recurring neglect of divinely sanctioned hierarchical orders of government and their institutions given the predilection of Londoners to defend the political, religious, and economic rights of the individual

as best being looked after by more representative religious and political bodies, such as the Puritan Movement and Parliament's House of Commons, until the civic disorder created by the escalating factionalism and intolerant fanaticism bred by these republican bodies, because such a form of representative government did not yet have a vital unifying center, results in a renewed acceptance of the need for a stronger institutionalized form of executive leadership in matter of politics and religion that Cromwell's government did not provide. Waller, of course, in his role as propagandist for the "successful" policies of Charles I's reign would assert the permanent, instead of only transitory, effect of this king's effort to restore the London public's reverence for the Monarchy and the Church of England by renovating the Cathedral.

To indicate the transitory nature of Charles I's repair of such hierarchical institutions as St. Paul's in the face of the mounting factionalism that was arising amongst the London public, Howel in the aftermath of this King's efforts to restore the Cathedral to its former glory seems to be almost paraphrasing Waller's metaphoric description of the ruinous state that St. Paul's Cathedral was in prior to this sovereign's determined effort to renovate it ("That shipwreck'd vessel which th' Apostle bore,/Scarce suffer'd more upon Melita's shore,/Than did his temple in the sea of

time"). Because of the desecration of the Cathedral by various political and religious factions which has caused this state church to regress back to its former ruinous state, this Interregnum eyewitness also describes St. Paul's in a trope that is similar to Waller's as an ancient, over-used ship that has,long since served its purpose and now lies abandoned, a decaying ruin. Howel's comparison of the delapidated condition of the Cathedral to a worn out 'rading ship can be regarded as symbolic of the manner in which the enterprising spirit of England's 17th century capitalist economy that is epitomized by its involvement in international commerce has become the dominant frame of reference in urban society so that institutions that were affiliated formerly with a more hierarchically structured society appear in their demise in a different, inappropriate context. Through his use of this trope, Howel suggests that even antipathetic structures that once housed the institutions of the Monarchy and the Church of England are being profanely subverted in order to serve the materialistic ends of the modern republican, capitalist state:

> Such was the reverence, that London showed her Cathedral Church, not long agoe, which may be said, to look now like the hulk of a great weather beaten Ship, that had cross'd the Line eight times, forward and backward, to the East Indies, and lies rotting upon the Carine: such is the condition of this stately Church, which is like to be buried shortly in her own ruines, and so become a heap of red rubbish; and then how bald London will look, let them Judge, who have taken a judicious prospect of Her. (399-400)

Sir John Denham's description of St. Paul's Cathedral in his chorographical poem "Cooper's Hill" in contrast to Waller's does not only focus on the sacred Cathedral but also contemplates and attempts to provide a symbolic image that is representative of the dynamics of the surrounding profane activities, occurring most immediately inside the Cathedral along the nave popularly known as "Paul's Walk" and in the commercial sheds in the Churchyard--the latter being only briefly alluded to in Waller's poem as having been swept away in Charles I's improvement scheme. But these two areas of frantic business activity inside of and within the precincts of the Cathedral are used symbolically to evoke Denham's indictment of the pervasive, ruthless commercialism which has become the primary characteristic of the City of London and whose enterprising practitioners are so irreverently oblivious to such landmarks as St. Paul's which are representatives of the traditional hierarchical orders of Church and State. By juxtaposing the sacred, towering, massive Cathedral that is charitably devoted to the general public good of the citizenry with the businessmen's avaricious drive for private gain that is symbolized by the "darker cloud" which characterizes life in the remainder of the city, this courtier/cavalier poet depicts the antithetical natures of the traditional hierarchical orders of the Monarchy and the Church of England and the modern capitalist economy that has become the dominant animating force amongst

the London citizenry. Although Denham argues that this Cathedral will never be obscured by this "darker cloud" of London's business life as long as Charles I so ardently commits his financial resources and manpower to repairing and defending it from harm from the Puritan and Republican factions, the threat still remains and is indeed carried out as the Stuart Monarchy is overthrown and the Cathedral is desecrated by these sects in the years when Denham is revising and publishing new editions of this poem (1642-1668). Denham's depiction of the city's businessmen who in their profane activities are blind to the transcendental import of St. Paul's is more faithful to the historic reality of the factionalism existing in these contentious times than Waller's effort to portray Londoners in the 1630s as willing to selflessly set aside their business preoccupations and other material needs to both assist in and to admire the King's project to restore the Cathedral.

Denham is a courtier/cavalier poet writing at a time when the wealth of the gentry was declining because rents on their properties, often fixed, could not keep up with the steady rate of inflation that occurred in the 16th and 17th centuries in England (Morrill 296). The rise in prices was first initiated by the massive importation of American gold and silver into the European nations so that their stocks of precious metals trebled between 1500 and 1600 (Knights 34-

37) which in turn had the effect of providing the financial resources with which to dramatically stimulate further investment in industrial and commercial activities and, consequently, to lift England from its medieval economy that centered upon the noble feudal landowner to a modern capitalist one that centered upon the enterprising urban businessman. Because of the impoverishment of the court and the gentry that was a direct result of the price rise that was created by the capitalist activities of the entrepreneurial middle class who were the quickest to take advantage of the immense investment opportunities that were opening up at home and abroad, Denham enviously criticizes the industrious Puritan middle class in London, the only sector of the populace who were growing wealthier at this time and creating an economic situation that would ensure that the remainder of English society, the nobility and the lower menial orders, would grow poorer. This courtier/cavalier poet condemns the behavior of this London bourgeoisie who were composed of "merchants, manufacturers, entrepreneurs, bankers, shipowners, and tradesmen" (Bush 10-13) by pointing out that their excessive preoccupation with trade will not reap any enduring, tangible reward, nor leave any enduring imprint on London's urban landscape as the religious and political institutions of the nobility have done in the physical forms of such substantial, durable structures as St. Paul's.

In spite of the tumultuous revolutionary events that were occurring that made Denham's references to the Cathedral and to Charles I outdated, Sir John Denham in the various drafts of "Cooper's Hill" which appeared from 1642-1668 constantly stresses that St. Paul's is the dominant landmark in London's skyline and that it will continue to be so because the institutions of the Monarchy and the Church of England that oversee it are impervious to the factionalism permeating the rest of the city and the country. He remarks upon the great size of the Cathedral, particularly its height, even though this was substantially reduced when the steeple was destroyed by fire in 1561. From the southern prospect of Cooper's Hill that is seventeen miles from the capital city (Johnston 26-27) Denham's eye can only discern the substantial bulk of St. Paul's emerging from the otherwise hazy vision that he has from that distance of the rest of the edifices of the metropolis that appear as a gray indistinguishable mass that lies about this dominant structure:

> My eye, which swift as thought contracts the space
> That lies between, and first salutes the place
> Crown'd with that sacred pile, so vast, so high,
> That whether 'tis a part of Earth, or sky,
> Uncertain seems, and may be thought a proud
> Aspiring mountain, or descending cloud.

There is a similarity between Denham's and Waller's later treatment of religious landmarks that serve the interests of the Monarchy and the state-established Church. Waller in "On St. James's Park, as Lately Improved by His Majesty"

symbolically describes Westminster Abbey as resembling lofty Mount Aetna in the years just prior to the Civil War because of its ability to remain icily aloof and to staunchly uphold the institutions of the Monarchy and the Church of England even amidst the heated political debates taking place just across the street in the House of Commons' St. Stephen's Chapel between the parliamentary representatives charged with furthering the religious and political interests of the Puritan factions who were in the early 1640s out-maneuvering those remaining supporters of the hierarchical orders of Church and State. In "Cooper's Hill" Denham similarly marvels at St. Paul's structure which appears as an "aspiring mountain" because of its ability to remain steadfast in its symbolic role of upholding the traditional hierarchical orders of Church and State so that through the physical landmark of this Cathedral these noble oligarchical orders can be seen to transcend the profane commercial activity and escalating factionalism of the surrounding metropolis. Both these religious landmarks that serve the institutions of Monarchy and the Anglican Church are seen in the respective poems of these two courtier/cavalier poets as durable, and, therefore, enduring mountains towering above the transient commercial, political, and religious frays of the urban middle class that are a characteristic of the relativism and divisiveness bred by the modern capitalist society.

Denham makes St. Paul's connection with the Monarchy explicit when he remarks that the City of London, otherwise shrouded in actual and symbolic "mists," is "crown'd with that sacred pile." Moreover, by means of his physical description of this Cathedral being "so vast, so high" he symbolizes the continuing dominance of hierarchical religious and political orders over the factious effect that those businessmen were having upon society because of their economic enterprises and their growing involvement in political and religious affairs--the cumulative factious effect of their activities being symbolically characterized as a "darker cloud." The Cathedral as symbolic of the divinely sanctioned Monarchy and Church of England leaves a substantial, enduring mark upon the urban landscape and provides a transcendental link between temporal and divine affairs ("whether 'tis a part of earth, or sky,/Uncertain seems"), whereas the various business, political, and religious factions are portrayed as being able to produce nothing of substantial, material or spiritual, worth because they are at competitive cross-purposes both in their material and verbal transactions with one another:

> ... the City lies,
> And like a mist beneath a hill doth rise;
> Whose state and wealth the business and the crowd,
> Seems at this distance but a darker cloud:

Furthermore, being restricted purely to the temporal, profane plain, these businessmen and the factions that they are members of in their efforts to out-do and out-reason one

another are portrayed as redundantly criss-crossing and ultimately erasing the traces of one another's path:

> As Rivers lost in Seas some secret vein
> Thence reconveighs, there to be lost again.

This courtier-poet through his description of the transcendental effect created by St. Paul's physical appearance as being either an "aspiring mountain, or descending cloud" implicitly challenges the contentions of the Puritan factions that the Monarchy and the Church of England were not divinely sanctioned institutions, because this Cathedral as representative of these hierarchical orders seems to offer concrete proof to the contrary. It appears to provide a physical point within the metropolis because of its towering height in which contact between earth and heaven, between man and God is made concretely possible. The Cathedral is the only structure within the city that has the physical power to raise the sufficiently reverent citizen's eye upward along a vertical plain towards heaven and towards a divine sense of the absolute and harmonious ordering of things, whereas those citizens belonging to various factions that are rebelling against the exclusive prerogatives of the Monarchy, the nobility, and the Church of England in political and religious matters as well as seeking to change their own position in the established social order of a hierarchical society are incapable of seeing things along this vertical plain in which the mortal and divine creatures dwelling within earth and heaven are ranked; their vision is

restricted along the horizontal plain of relativism that is symbolized by this darkening cloud of factional strife. St. Paul's stands in counterpoint to these members of the city factions who in their rebellious desire to rise above their rank in the established hierarchical order have ceased to acknowledge this vertical stratification, of which the Cathedral because of the physical impression it creates as a link between earth and heaven is a symbol.

This juxtaposition of the Cathedral that exists on a vertical plain because it symbolizes religious and political hierarchic orders that encompass both earth and heaven with the surrounding crowds of profane, business-minded Londoners who exist strictly on a horizontal, temporal plain remains a constant in the poetry written even after the Great Fire of 1666 when St. Paul's Cathedral was entirely rebuilt by Christopher Wren. Such Romantic and post-Romantic poets as William Wordsworth and James Thomson perceive the transcendental nature of the majestic Cathedral that exists on an alien plain from that of most Londoners. However, the surrounding urban crowds are oblivious to it because of their exclusively temporal struggle to survive and to succeed within the capitalist economic order in which ideas and things have relative merits rather than absolute value. In these Romantic and post-Romantic poems, the former poetic portrayal of the religious and political factionalism that

once challenged the divine nature of the Monarchy and the Church of England and the hierarchical orders established by these institutions is no longer expressed. Instead with the progressive weakening of the authority of the Monarchy and the abolishment of a state-run episcopal church, the modern individual's quest for self-determination which once fueled the factional struggles against these now defeated hierarchical orders have become internalized into a psychological malaise in which the individual poet describes himself and others suffering from inner conflict because of a lack of structure and order in the surrounding relativistic, competitive urban world around them. Both poets when observing the Cathedral are transported from the chaotic, homogeneous business life of the metropolis to this new level of transcendental awareness that is a legacy of these hierarchical orders of Church and State. As the old Norman Cathedral inspired Denham to look above the surrounding "darker cloud" of profane activity in the metropolis, similarly William Wordsworth, writing in an unpublished piece of verse composed in 1808 about a troubled time spent in London with his friend Coleridge, is momentarily relieved from his personal problem, his own subjective "darker cloud," when he catches sight of Wren's magnificent Cathedral and experiences, while trudging through the newly fallen snow on Fleet Street as he walks eastward towards Ludgate Hill, a sense of order and proportion that comes from an intimation of a lost absolute

ruler and religion that is momentarily re-expressed by means of the symbolic import of this sacred, majestic Cathedral:

> Press'd with conflicting thoughts of love and fear
> I parted with thee, Friend, and took my way
> Through the great City, pacing with an eye
> Downcast, ear sleeping, and feet masterless,
> That were sufficient guide unto themselves,
> . . . . . .
> And high above this winding length of street,
> This moveless and unpeopled avenue,
> Pure silent, solemn, beautiful, was seen
> The huge majestic temple of St. Paul
> In awful sequestration, through a veil,
> Through his own sacred veil of falling snow.
> (Moorman II: 125-126)

In contrast to Denham's "Cooper's Hill" in which the Cathedral is seen to soar above the "darker cloud" which represents the commercial life of the city, Wordsworth in his verse isolates the Cathedral, with the exception of himself, from all signs of the people and things involved in the pervasive capitalist order ("This moveless and unpeopled avenue") so as to more fully restore the symbolic sense of the Cathedral's transcendental nature that still exists as a legacy of the Monarchy and the State-administered Church "in awful sequestration" from the modern profane city. Wordsworth becomes, therefore, the sole representative of the levelling, soul deadening impact that a meterialistic society, after rejecting all absolute, hierarchical orders, has upon the individual as he walks. before glancing upon the awe-inspiring spectacle of the Cathedral, with "eye/ Downcast, ear sleeping, and feet masterless."

The Victorian poet James Thomson in his poem "The Approach to St. Paul's" seems to imitate Denham's conflicting portrait of the Cathedral and the anxious crowds in "Cooper's Hill." Thomson, in referring to the general "darker cloud" of an urban populace, adopts a similarly bleak trope in his reference to the capitalist order within which the Londoners function as a "desert." Having overthrown through representative government almost all the prerogatives of Monarchy and abolished through various toleration acts the state-run Church, these Londoners, absorbed in the "ceaseless uproar" of their materialistic, money-making schemes, fail to realize the majesty of the Cathedral towering above them. Unlike Denham and even Wordsworth, however, Thomson is unable to recognize the Cathedral as the contemporary bastion of the true Christian religion. St. Paul's is presented in this Victorian poet's verse as a historic artifact of the hierarchical religious and political orders that have been fully defeated by the modern capitalist, democratic society. The Cathedral is now impressive because of its value as an anachronistic relic of these past oligarchically-run medieval orders rather than being a valuable religious symbol, since this post-Romantic poet describes this religious landmark "as a pyramid/Isled in its desert":

> Right in my path stood out that solemn Fane
> Whose soaring cupola of stern gray stone
> Lifteth (its) awful beacon to the sky
> The burning Cross: silent and sole amid

> That ceaseless uproar, as a pyramid
> Isled in its desert ....

As the pyramids served as the burial sites of the Egyptian kings of a bygone civilization, St. Paul's similarly, as Thomson envisions it, symbolizes the death and final resting place of the defeated political and religious hierarchical orders. Thomson suggests that such grandiose landmarks are a bygone consequence of a medieval society that was ruled by such centralized religious and political institutions as the Church of Rome and the Monarchy and have no meaningful place in his pluralistic Victorian world.

It is ironic that a monarch, Henry VIII--in taking the first step in decentralizing absolute authority in matters of religion by creating the national state-run church over which he, not the Pope, was the head--initiated this faction-creating, pluralistic process by which political authority would one day also be decentralized in the form of a head-less parliamentary body. Recognizing that the formation of the Church of England was the first-step in this contentious faction-making process in which all forms of absolute authority were challenged, both Charles II and James II came to the realization that Monarchy could only survive with its prerogatives intact by England's rejoining the Roman Catholic faith.

In contrast to Denham and Wordsworth, Thomson seems to be one with the crowd in his inability to be spiritually awed by the Cathedral. But unlike the crowds of Londoners "absorbed in dreams of Mammon-gain" this Victorian poet acknowledges the resulting emptiness of a life without a transcendental sense of absolute religious and political authority. St. Paul's as symbolic of these overthrown divinely sanctioned hierarchical orders of the Monarchy and the Church of England exists in an alien world that neither the poet nor the London citizenry preoccupied with their selfish, materialistic concerns have access to:

> ... The great throngs pressed by
> Heedless and urgent: thus religion towers
> Above this sordid, restless life of ours.

As a courtier/cavalier poet, Denham in "Cooper's Hill" vainly tries to uphold these absolute, centralized institutions that Henry VIII took the first modern, schismatic step away from. He is the last poet who argues that it is within the Stuart King's power to preserve St. Paul's from the Puritan and Parliamentary factions' desire to desecrate it because of its symbolizing the Monarch's and the Church of England's absolute authority in matters of politics and religion. In "Cooper's Hill" Denham alludes to Waller's recent poem about Charles I's efforts to repair the Cathedral in which that poet also claimed the central importance of the restored and revitalized St. Paul's as a symbol of the Monarchy's and the Church of England's continued potent

ability to maintain political, religious, and social order in both the city and the nation against the decentralizing impetus of various factions. Denham argues that St. Paul's reputation is secure now that its beauty has been restored because of Charles I's architectural repairs and additions and Waller's poetic celebration of its restored beauty. But Denham refers to those destructive forces that pose a danger to St. Paul's which are represented both by the "zeal[ous]" religious and political urban factions that have performed acts of desecration in the Cathedral as well as natural forces, such as the decay that ages physical matter and the threat of fire. Yet, in regards to this former threat, the poet persists in his belief that the "sword" and "zeal more fierce" of these destructive urban factions who are "conspir[ing]" in the Cathedral's "fall" as well as all that the Cathedral symbolizes are no match for the designs of a great King and a great courtier-poet who respectively seek to renovate St. Paul's and to celebrate the restoration of this Cathedral's physical beauty so that it continues to effectively symbolize the Monarchy's and the Church of England's dominance as absolute political and religious authorities:

> Pauls, the late theme of such a Muse whose flight
> Has bravely reach't and soar'd above thy height:
> Now shalt thou stand though sword, or time, or fire,
> Or zeal more fierce than they, thy fall conspire,
> Secure, whilst thee the best of Poets sings,
> Preserv'd from ruine by the best of Kings.

That the main threat to St. Paul's and to the hierarchical institutions of Church and State that supported it came primarily from "urban" Puritan factions is undoubted by Christopher Hill. This historian points out that both before and during the Civil War/Interregnum and even afterwards during the Restoration the factional struggle against the authority of the Monarchy and the State Church was primarily centered in the urban scene:

> Puritanism had been especially an urban phenomenon, or rather one whose strength came from the industrious sort of people in town ..... In one aspect the Restoration was aimed against the missionary work of Quakers and others who were extending radical sectarian ideas into the countryside, just as Cromwell's determination to suppress the Levellers in 1649 may have been influenced by the fact that they too were turning outwards from their main centres, London and the Army, to undertake propaganda activities in the country at large. The Clarendon Code failed to eradicate nonconformity from the towns, because it was too strong among those who formed the natural ruling classes there .... (Hill, Society and Puritanism ... 499-500)

Both courtier-poets, Waller and Denham, ascribe to the concept of the Divine Right of Kings. Denham--particularly, in the lines from "Coeper's Hill" describing Charles I's divinely granted authority and assured ability to preserve St. Paul's and the Church of England from the "zeal[ous]" religious factions calling for further reform, consisting of the abolishment of the episcopal order and the heightened persecution and banishment of all traces of Roman Catholicism from England--demonstrates the King's absolute supremacy in religious and political matters that allows both him

and the Cathedral he defends to be impervious to the hostile actions of these sacrilegious sects. The spirit of Romans 13 that was widely regarded to represent the biblical foundation for Monarchy and a centralized state-run Church informs the poetic attitudes of both Waller and Denham towards Charles I and towards this King's efforts to restore the Cathedral as a symbol of his absolute authority in religious and political matters:

> Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God, and the powers that be are ordained by God.
> Therefore, he that resisteth that power, withstandeth the ordinance of God; and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgement.
> (Cannon and Griffiths 415)

Both Waller and Denham in their descriptions of the Stuart Monarch's efforts to repair and defend the Cathedral against the desecrations committed against it by the contentious religious and political factions of the city misrepresent the resentment of these radical sects by making it appear that the continued existence of the institutions of Monarchy and a State-run Church were the essential issues of their contention. Informing much of the zeal of these radical urban sects for greater religious and political reform was the fear that the Monarchy and the Church of England under the reigns of James I, Charles I, and Charles II were backsliding towards Roman Catholicism and the subsequent diminishment of the English peoples acquired religious and polit-

ical rights that would be a consequence of that kind of backslide; therefore, these radical factions pushed for further decentralization of the Monarch's political and religious authority to alleviate this fear of this turn backwards to the Church of Rome. Charles I's efforts to repair and to beautify such grandiose landmarks as St. Paul's harkened back to the spirit in which the Cathedral was first built under the auspices of the Roman Catholic Church to serve its need for such centralized religious structures of formal, ritualized worship that were administered by an episcopal order; this king's effort to repair the Cathedral as well as his and his father's inclination to rule without calling Parliament into session confirmed the radical factions' fears that this backsliding towards the centralized tyrannical institution of Popery was occurring. While these radical factions would contend that they were not challenging the institution of Monarchy, and indeed sought to preserve it as a necessary part of executive government that should rule in conjunction with the legislative body of Parliament, they did fear that the Stuart Kings, instead of being committed to further religious and political reform that would support the individual rights of their British subjects, wanted to create the kind of absolute Monarchy that would best function in a nation that had rejoined the oligarchical Church of Rome.

In contrast to the religious and political factions who, in seeking to rid the State Church of its observance of popish rituals and to further the individual's freedom of worship, would have liked to have decentralized the absolute authority of both the monarchy and the Church of England and to have abandoned such centralized structures, like the Cathedral, that symbolized that tyrannical authority in matters of religion, the courtier-poets and other supporters of these hierarchical institutions celebrated the continued physical and spiritual dominance of such massive landmarks as St. Paul's that were conducive to the maintenance of religious conformity under the supervision of an episcopal order. In order to emphasize the continued dominance of the State Church in the religious life of the capital city in spite of the protests, petitions, and demonstrations of Puritan Londoners, both in Waller's and Denham's poems published before the Civil War, along with the retrospective account of James Howel of the Cathedral's more majestic appearance prior to the Interregnum, St. Paul's is portrayed as being the centerpiece of the London skyline. As Denham sees St. Paul's as "crown[ing]" the rest of the city, Howel similarly points out in his nostalgic account that the Cathedral prior to the overthrow of the Stuart Monarchy and the episcopal order of the Anglican Church was the most distinct and dominant structure in the London skyline:

> For a stately Cathedral Temple, and Dome of devotion, the time was, that London did not yield to any City

> under the Sun in this particular; Saint Paul's Church being esteemed by all Nations, to be one of the eminentest, and visiblest Temple, one of the most glorious Piles of Stones under Heaven, taking all the dimensions, together with the chearful conspicuous site thereof, being near the Center of the City, and upon a rising ground; ... Add hereunto what a comfortable Object it was to behold about twenty miles distance round about, this goodly Structure, raysing it self above the rest, and serving as it were for a crest to the whole City; .... (399-400)

As Denham does just prior to the Civil War in "Cooper's Hill," Howel during these years of the Interregnum also represents the conflict between the city's "darker cloud" of citizens who are either in their business pursuits oblivious to the Cathedral's importance in unifying and adding to the city's prestige or in the case of the Puritan factions openly antagonistic to the Cathedral's role in perpetuating the religious conformity under an episcopal order that is a vestige of Popery and contributing to the denial of their individual religious freedom. Furthermore, Howel depicts during the late 1650s a Cathedral whose condition and stature in the religious life of the metropolis has deteriorated significantly because of the recent neglect and desecration it has suffered during these years of the Interregnum, so that, consequently, his retrospective description of St. Paul's as "one of the most glorious Piles of Stones under Heaven" during the reign of Charles I when it as being renovated is no longer applicable. Whereas Denham could blithely claim in "Cooper's Hill" that St. Paul's would be protected by Charles I from any harm to it being committed

by the Puritan sects, with the overthrow of the Cathedral's and the Church of England's defender, the Stuart Monarchy, Howel is left in the weak position of arguing in a plaintive tone for the Cathedral's continued survival to an audience who is generally hostile to the hierarchical institutions that the Cathedral once represented and who would prefer to see St. Paul's and all other such vestiges of popery torn down:

> ... If Paul were down, She [i.e. London] forfeits the name of a City; for all Lawyers concur in this opinion, that there can be no City, without a Cathedral Church; t'is but a Village without one, or a Town at most: therefore London hath great cause to wish, that those unlucky Scismaticks had never bin born, who first brought Pauls Church to this pittiful passe; (399-400)

While Denham believed that Charles I could defend the Cathedral against the "sword" and "zeal" of the Puritan sects, Howel represents as a fait accompli the subsequent desecrations that the "Scismaticks" performed upon St. Paul's after this Stuart King fled from his capital city just before the commencement of the Civil War.

Lewis Mumford explains that such beliefs as Denham's and Howel's in regards to the need for the Cathedral to be a physically and spiritually dominant factor in the urban scene were characteristic of a medieval sensibility. This social historian of an evolving urban landscape notes the central physical and spiritual position that the Cathedral

occupied in the typical medieval city when the western world was united under the Roman Catholic faith:

> ... the central position of the church or cathedral is the key to the layout of the medieval city: within its narrow area its towers, or the shadows they throw are visible from every point, and the difference in size between its towering walls and the little houses that huddle at the base is a symbol of the relation between sacred and profane affairs .... The towers of the churches raised the eyes to heaven: their masses rose, in hierarchical rank, over all the lesser symbols of earthly wealth and power: .... (54-55, 62)

In the post-Reformation era the poets, from the 17th century poets, Waller and Denham, to the Romantic and Victorian poets, Wordsworth and Thomson, offer a "medieval" conception of the majesty and centrality of St. Paul's Cathedral--a conception that is sharply contrasted in such poems as "Cooper's Hill" and "The Approach to St. Paul's" with the poet's contemporaneous urban multitudes who, because they are too engrossed in transacting their business schemes, have shoved the Cathedral's dominating physical presence and its spiritual import to the periphery of their consciousness. Denham was the last post-Reformation poet who believed that the Monarch could restore the medieval preeminence of the Cathedral within the urban scene as part of the larger cause of defending centralized authority, institutions, and landmarks against the modern pluralistic trends that gave greater religious, political, and economic authority to the individual. Both Denham and Thomson in very similar poems composed two hundred and fifty years apart in

their jJuxtapositon of the sacred Cathedral with the profane urban masses respectively denigrate the Puritan's and middle-class's exclusive absorption in commercial success. Denham in his poem "Cooper's Hill" and Howel in his prose portrait of London in Londinopolis both persist in presenting a medieval view of the spiritual and physical centrality of St. Paul's Cathedral in the 17th century City of London when perhaps only the dominance of the latter physical aspect of the semi-ruined Cathedral was still evident, whereas the "Scismaticks," who Howel criticizes for their abuse of St. Paul's and for their general effort to decentralize religious authority, as well as those business-minded adherents of the Protestant ethic that extolled the virtues of industrious self-determination who are portrayed in Denham's and Thomson's poems, represent the indifference, if not outright disdain of the modern, post-Reformation sensibility towards such centralized, monolithic, and authoritarian religious institutions as the Cathedral which were increasingly looked upon by the ultra-Protestant sects of the 17th century as a remnant of Popery.

Mumford discusses the declining spiritual importance of the church in the European city as an effect of the development of the capitalist economy and the Protestant movement in the 16th and 17th centuries, referring at one point to how this situation manifested itself specifically in England in

regards to the diminished importance of St. Paul's Cathedral as a sacred symbol to Londoners who because of the growing power of money to determine one's place in society were increasingly preoccupied with commercial matters:

> In the medieval city the Church was a dominant: no part of life could fail to record its existence and influence. In the great seventeenth century capitals, the Church had become a recessive: still an imposing visible presence, but no longer a unifying and dynamic social force .... in the 17th century the brokers plied their trade in the nave of St. Paul's, and the money changers all but drove the representatives of Christ from the temple--.... Wren's unused plan for the reconstruction of London after the fire handsomely recognized this new order of life. He did not give the dominating site to St. Paul's: he planned the new avenues so as to give this honor to the Royal Stock Exchange. (74, 106)

Both Sir John Denham in "Cooper's Hill" and Sir William Davenant in "The Queens, returning to London after a long absence" allude to London's problem with air pollution in an effort to bolster the Monarchy's stature in the metropolis. In the passage that immediately fellows Denham's assertions that St. Paul's will be "preserv'd from ruins by the best of Kings," the poet remarks that "Under his proud survey the City lies" which would suggest that the noun antecedent for the pronoun "his" would be the "King." Charles I is given in Denham's poem a dominant position from which to view the panorama of his capital city. He is able to view not only the city's physical problems with air pollution but also the city's moral pollution that is an effect of the often ruth-

less, unscrupulous activities ef Londoners participating in the capitalist economy of that urban center:

> Under his [the king's] proud survey the City lies,
> And like a mist beneath a hill doth rise;
> Whose state and wealth the business and the crowd,
> Seem at this distance but a darker cloud:

While the "mist" and the "darker cloud" that the King can see from his prospect that affords a panoramic view of the entire metropolis can be interpreted as literally referring to the city's problem with air pollution caused by the burning of coal in homes and industries, it also can be regarded on a figurative level that would have greater political significance. From the King's perspective, the city's air pollution is symbolic of the immoral behavior of Londoners who actively participate in the capitalist economy and, consequently, place their own private gain above the welfare of the public good. According to the poet, Charles I finds the "business" of the urban "crowd" ominous because it has brought them greater "wealth" and influence in affairs of "state." The "darker cloud" expresses the monarch's foreboding that the growing wealth, power, and factious discontent of the London merchants promises future storms that will disrupt the smooth, traditional functioning of the hierarchically ordered state over which he presides. By means of this association that is made in the poet's portrayal of the King's dual recognition of the city's physical and moral ills, Londoners are citicized for creating disorder in the state --the "darker cloud" in its more symbolic

sense--because they are oblivious in their industrious activities of self-determination to its general well being. Yet this courtier-poet continues to assert in such lines as "Under his proud survey the City lies" that the King in perceiving the activities and grievances of this urban scene is in a dominant position to have a mitigating effect upon its moral ills. Charles I's commanding intellectual grasp of the city's moral corruption that is a product of its citizens' frenzied commercial preoccupations, the corollary desire of its citizens to rise by means of their newly acquired wealth above their social rank, and their factious religious and political activities offers the promise that this king will have the upper hand in dealing with any threats to the Monarchy and to the Church of England that might arise within that contentious city. By portraying the King as being in a comanding position to both perceive and to manage any forms of discontent that might arise amongst the sects and factions of the city, this courtier-poet is able to bolster this Monarch's reputation as a competent, authoritative ruler.

In Sir William Davenant's poem "The Queene, returning to London after a long absence" the poet also refers to the city's air pollution in an effort to strengthen the reputation of the Monarchy amongst Londoners. While in Denham's poem the city's air pollution was regarded in the more

symbolic sense of being both a consequence and reflection of the obsessive absorption of Londoners in their industrious, profit-creating activities, in Davenant's poem the physical impact of air pollution on the lives of Londoners is considered on both a literal and a figurative level. On the more literal level, the poet argues that it is only Charles I's Queen, Henrietta Maria, who is able to make Londoners forget the unattractive environmental circumstances under which they conduct their daily lives because of her great beauty and continued residence in the capital city's court:

> How had you walk'd in Mists of Sea-Coale-smoake,
> Such as your ever teeming Wives would choak
> (False Sonnes of thrift:) did not her beauties light
> Dispell your Clouds, and quicken your dull sight?

On this literal level, the courtier-poet portrays how Londoners are plagued by their commercial successes. The very impetus of the capitalist economy to create profitable business ventures produces this air pollution within the city that clouds both the physical and moral vision of London businessmen. Increasing supplies of coal are shipped from England's northern and midland regions by sea (hence the term "sea-coal") to warm the households of Londoners and as Ben Jonson in "An Execration Upon Vulcan" notes the growth of industrial production in the capitalist economy augments the air pollution problem. Vulcan, the god of fire, has been put to industrious uses in which he is "confine[d] ... to the Brew-houses,/The Glass-house, Dye fats,

and their Fornaces;/To live in Sea-Coale, and goe forth in smoake."

But on the more figurative level, Davenant creates tropes that bear a great deal of similarity to Denham's. In Davenant's poem such terms as "Clouds" and "dull sight" replace references to "mists" and "a darker cloud"; however, in both poems, both sets of terms symbolically refer to the mental confusion and moral corruption that affect Londoners who are caught up in the profit-making concerns of the urban capitalist economy. As Denham pointed out that the physical and moral ills of London life are "rightly" viewed and judged from the seemingly omniscient perspective of the Monarch who looks from his great height of moral authority down upon the "darker cloud" of the capitalist city which lies "under his proud survey," in Davenant's poem another member of the royal family, the Queen, Henrietta Maria, is also able to create a sense of proportion in which Londoners can recognize and momentarily cast aside the physical and moral ills of their mercantile existence. In both Denham's and Davenant's poems, the Stuart Monarchy offers a perspective from which those Londoners who participate in the capitalist economy can become aware of the destructive impact that the excesses of that manner of life have upon them. Davenant points out that it is only the dazzling beauty of this member of the royal family that is momentari-

ly able to lift the minds of Londoners from their "clouds" and "dull sight" to more aesthetically pleasurable concerns. The "clouds" and "dull sight" of these Londoners is symbolic of the stultifying effect their one-sided dedication to managing their shops and crafts in the relentless pursuit of amassing a fortune has upon them. Davenant points out that their intellectual and moral vision is limited by such concerns that the capitalist climate of the city has created. The poet argues that only thoughts of their Monarch and the members of his royal family can restore a sense of proportion to the city's businessmen, because such thoughts that remind them of a greater transcendental, divinely sanctioned, hierarchical order has the effect of broadening and enlightening the minds of an entrepreneurial middle class who live, as a consequence of their money-making preoccupations, a dark, narrow-minded existence.

What Davenant is presenting here in an effort to bolster the prestige of the Monarchy amongst Londoners, however, is far from the reality; instead it is more a product of wishful thinking of how the political position of the Stuart Monarchy would be strengthened if the the sentiments and inclinations of Londoners towards their monarch, Charles I, and to the members of the royal family were more favorable. In fact, in subsequent lines Davenant exposes the fiction that he is creating about thoughts of the Queen brightening the

days of Londoners when he has to convince these same urban citizens, who allegedly adore their Queen, that it will be worth their while to provide the funds with which to make a more public display of their reverence by celebrating her birthdays and returns to the metropolis after progresses in the provinces. Davenant's assertion that the polluted air is made tolerable to Londoners because of their constant meditations upon and proximity to the great beauty of their Queen, Henrietta Maria, stretches the limits of credibility because Charles I's Queen instead of being a source of comfort to them was a source of much of their disquiet because of her Roman Catholic faith. Charles I's choice of bride exacerbated the fears of Londoners because it further signified to them that he intended to return England back to a Roman Catholic nation. Several historians point out that the fear of England sliding back into Popery under the Stuart Monarchy was the chief cause of the rise of political and religious factionalism in the city against the untrustworthy hierarchical orders of Church and State. According to John Cannon and Ralph Griffiths, Charles I's marriage to the Roman Catholic Henrietta Maria was one amongst several other incidents which occurred during this King's reign that made his London subjects question the resilience of this Monarch's Protestant faith:

> ... Charles I's marriage to Henrietta Maria was ominous, especially since her ardent Catholicism was well known: each English defeat or set-back could be ex-

> plained by treachery at the very heart of government. (372)

Davenant, therefore, in this poem "The Queene, returning to London after a long absence" in seeking to convince the citizens to support the reign of Charles I launches upon a means of achieving this end that in the given historic situation is least likely to succeed: thoughts of Henrietta Maria and her Roman Catholic faith instead of being a source of solace are a source of worry about Charles I's future religious and political goals. In such a state of worry the symbolic "clouds" of confusion, chaos, and anarchy are bred under which conditions the city's political and religious factions have their origin and it is these factions which urge further limits to the untrustworthy Monarchy's power to shape the future direction of the nation. The Queen and her faith instead of winning the favor of Londoners gives occasion for their mental confusion which is symbolized by the very "clouds" that "dull" their "sight." Given the actual historical circumstances it is not the commercial preoccupations of Londoners but thoughts of their Monarch's future religious and political direction towards respectively Roman Catholicism and an absolute monarchy that "clouds" the sight of concerned Londoners and makes them resort to supporting radical factions.

Although Ben Jonson and William Davenant describe a polluted metropolis in their poems, "On the Famous Voyage" and "The

Queene ...," the former poet, who became Poet Laureate of James I's court and wrote verse that was often reflective of that court's increasingly hostile attitude and consequent anti-urban policies towards the City of London, uses that city's pollution problem to create a relentlessly bleak portrait of that city in his poem in order to attack the merits of urban living, comparing the City of London with Hell, because of its unsanitary environment and its poor, diseased populace whom he portrays scavenging through the refuse on the banks of the Fleet, whereas the latter poet, one of the prominent poets associated with Charles I's reign and eventually selected as Poet Laureate of this king's court, reflects this monarch's greater reluctance to alienate the increasingly powerful city. Davenant's greater desire to conciliate the inhabitants of the city by not using London's pollution problems as a means to denigrate urban life is apparent in his song "London is smother'd with sulph'rous fires." In spite of its air pollution, this poet points out in this song that London has other redeeming qualities that make it more prosperous and more livable than other European cities. Furthermore, this conciliatory attitude of Charles I's court is even more apparent in Davenant's earlier poem "The Queene ..." in which this poet fails to take advantage of yet another opportunity to use London's problems with air pollution as a means to discountenance the value of urban life as Jonson would have done in

order to reflect the anti-urban sentiments and policies of James I's court. Instead of criticizing Londoners for choosing to carry out their daily business affairs in a polluted city, Davenant attempts to raise the stature of the Monarchy in the eyes of Londoners by arguing that their daily lives in the polluted city would be more endurable if they sufficiently revered the King and the members of his royal family.

Because of factional strife both Michael Drayton and Robert Herrick avoid referring in poems that examine the physical aspect of London life to the Stuart Monarch's presence within his capital city. As in Songs XVI and XVII of Poly-Olbion in which Drayton describes the city and the institutions of monarchy that exist within it but intentionally fails to mention the current head of the capital and the nation, James I, Robert Herrick also in "His tears to Thamasis" excludes all reference to Charles I when the poet describes his departure from the metropolis in 1629. In contrast to Drayton's reason for this omission which consists in his political opposition as a member of the country faction to James I's conduct and policies, Herrick as a successful courtier has every reason to be grateful to Charles I for the patronage and preferment that he has received from him--and, in fact, in an earlier draft of the poem that was written during Charles I's reign, particularly

during his period of residence in London prior to the Civil War, it would have been possible and even likely that a direct complimentary reference to Charles I's benevolent presence within and generous rule over his capital city and its subjects would have been made. On this more impersonal level, Herrick could have expressed sentiments that parallel Denham's in "Cooper's Hill" that under Charles's "proud survey the City lies" to establish this King's role as the head of the political life of his capital city. Moreover, in a poem that addresses the poet's personal relationship with the capital city it would be thematically appropriate for Herrick to acknowledge the specific kindnesses that the King and several of his courtiers have shown directly to him in advancing his religious and poetic career.

Although "His tears to Thamasis" was most likely written in 1629 because the poet seems to be in the process of leaving London permanently to serve as a vicar for the Church of England in the western provinces instead of his writing retrospectively of this event, Herrick's poem was not actually published until 1648 when it was included in his volume of verse entitled Hesperides. Therefore, even though Herrick has ample reason to be grateful to Charles I and his courtiers for the patronage and preferments that they had given him, the political climate of the post-Civil War period when the King was on the verge of being beheaded

would not be a propitious moment to express his appreciation of the King's past generosity or to acknowledge the King's gracious presence and commanding rule within his capital city. He could not, as Denham does, express Charles I as occupying a dominant position of authority on the political and religious affairs of the city and nation at a time when he was just prior to his trial a virtual prisoner of Parliamentary troops assigned to watch over him in Windsor Castle. Reflecting the actual political situation existing in 1648, several landmarks associated with the Monarchy and the court are referred to, but, as in Drayton, they are untenanted by the current King and, therefore, no Hierarch is celebrated as presiding over the London scene. The historical situation of a King who is about to be charged with treason by a Parliament which has been purged of all royalist and Anglican supporters by Colonel Pride and beheaded and the consequent abolition of monarchical rule in England is reflected in Herrick's description of a capital city which in terms of its political and religious leadership is headless.

In a poem in which Herrick describes his personal experiences of walking along the Strand, swimming in the Thames, sailing upriver to visit the royal palaces in the western outskirts as well as to visit Westminster, and being born in London's Cheapside, his failure to describe his experiences at Court creates a significant gap in his relation of his

personal history in the metropolis which consisted most notably in his rise up the social order from his plebeian origins in the City of London to a courtier in the City of Westminster. In order to downplay his connections with Charles I's court in 1648, Herrick omits all references to his friendship with the courtier, Endymion Porter, through whom he met the King and his leading minister, George Villiers, the first Duke of Buckingham, and to the fact that he wrote "several songs which were set to music and sung in the King's presence at Whitehall" (Chute 199-200); moreover, he fails to mention that the King bestowed upon him the vicarage of Dean Prior, in Devon, in September 1629 because of his service as a chaplain to the Duke of Buckingham's forces during the ill-fated action on the Isle of Rhe (Chute 197-198). These key experiences in his relationship with the King and his courtiers could be alluded to without Herrick becoming too prosaic, particularly because it constitutes the climax of his rise up the urban social order and because it provides the explanation of why the poet in the service of the King's interests as head of the Church of England is departing from London. In spite of the topic of the poem, the poet's much lamented, pending departure from London, Herrick because of the political moment in which "His tears to Thamasis" was published is compelled to leave out such relevant if not crucial information pertaining to how the King brought about those circumstances by which he

was put in the position in which he, the poet, must depart from his beloved city. If the poem was published in the 1630s when Charles I was in residence at Whitehall Palace such an oversight in failing to pay tribute to the King's role in the capital as its political and religious leader and failing to express his own gratitude for the personal rewards that he received from the monarch would have been seen by the King and his court as a mark of disloyalty.

Forced by historical circumstances to distance himself in "His tears to Thamasis" from his past relationship with Charles I and his court so that neither the King nor his relationship with the Stuart Court are directly referred to in the poem, Herrick becomes in this poem a chorographical poet. Whereas Drayton assumed this role intentionally because of his dislike of James I, Herrick is cast unwillingly into this role because of the political situation in which Charles I's monarchical rule is about to be overthrown. As a chorographical poet, Herrick celebrates as Drayton had done the natural features of the London scene while being compelled to displace the monarch to the margins of his poetic description of the urban landscape, so that both the presence of the sovereign and the residual institutions of monarchy within the metropolis during the Interregnum are only suggested by certain landmarks referred to in the poem. In fact, Herrick makes far less generic references to the

monarchy than Drayton does, since this latter poet--as a member of the country faction which believed in the institution of Monarchy but disliked the particular monarch, James I --in Song XVII of Poly-Olbion celebrated generically the sovereigns who were both crowned and buried in Westminster Abbey, while Herrick, because of the political climate in which the institution of Monarchy is about to be overthrown in order to create a republican regime within which Parliament would be the dominant governing body, fails to even celebrate generically as the former poet had done those sovereigns who are divinely chosen to preside over this executive branch of government. The body of the urban landscape, consisting of all its natural and man-made features, is presented in Herrick's poem. while its head, the king, is absent from the picture. Herrick's opening lines stress the pristine refreshing quality of the river's water. No longer able to maintain his role as a loyal courtier poet paying tribute to his King's presence in the capital, it is to this river that provides the city with its port and not to Charles I's hand that Herrick offers to plant his "supremest kiss":

> I send, I send here my supremest kiss
> To thee my silver-footed Thamasis.

Rather than paying tribute to Charles I's efforts to bolster the hierarchical institutions of the Monarchy and the Church of England which are symbolized in both Waller's and Denham's poems by the King's efforts to repair, to beautify,

and to defend St. Paul's, Herrick as a courtier poet during the Interregnum is forced to overlook his high regard for figures, institutions, and landmarks that are representative of hierarchical religious and political orders that are about to be overthrown and celebrate the more democratic pleasures of urban life that are shared by all Londoners. Therefore, Herrick, while exercising restraint in his complimentary references to all matters pertaining to his experiences with the King and his courtiers, feels considerably more free to celebrate the similar enjoyment that he shares with the lower social orders of bathing in the Thames. This courtier poet is compelled by the political climate existing during the Interregnum to dwell upon his more ordinary experiences that can be shared by the multitude of Londoners instead of his more exceptional achievement of socially rising above his plebeian origins and gaining patronage within the Court:

> Nor in the summers sweeter evenings go,
> To bath in thee (as thousands others doe.)

Because of the rise of political and religious factions within the City to positions of power and authority in the reconstituted State and Church during the Interregnum, Herrick's references to his visiting places in the metropolis connected with the Stuart Court--such as the palaces in the western outskirts, the City of Westminster, and the Strand--are muted in terms of' his not specifically mention-

ing whom he is going to see and for what purpose; therefore, the poet alludes to his court connections but without explicitly establishing the nature or the extent of his relationship. The first area of the metropolis, the Strand, which Herrick refers to as being a possession of the Thames ("Thy Strand") because of the thoroughfare's proximity, to the river, paralleling its banks, should follow (if a strict west-east spatial sequence is observed) his descriptions of the royal palaces in the western outskirts of the metropolis and the City of Westminster, but instead it precedes his descriptions of these places perhaps because of the special position that it has in his personal/ emotional experience so that he would have a subjective reason for referring to it unsequentially. Although Herrick is not free to provide the personal reasons for this unsequential presentation because of the emphasis that it would place upon his ties with prominent members of the court, it is probable that the poet describes the "Stately Structures" built along the Strand first because it represents his initial efforts to make contact with courtiers who were able to facilitate his introduction at Court to the King and to members of his royal family. One of these "Stately Structures" represents the residence of his courtier friend, Endymion Porter, who was known for his patronage of talented poets, such as Herrick and Sir William Davenant, and for his introducing them to the King and Queen at Court. For Herrick, his walks

along the Strand to visit Porter symbolize his efforts to leave behind his life as a goldsmith's apprentice in the City of London and to adopt the life of a courtier-poet at the "Stately" homes of noblemen along the Strand and at the King's Whitehall Palace in the City of Westminster. The Strand, therefore, which physically linked the two cities of Westminster and London, served as Herrick's personal bridge that enabled him to cross from one kind of life in the City of London to another more privileged one to be experienced in the palatial residences of the courtiers along that thoroughfare:

> No more shall I reiterate thy Strand,
> Whereon so many Stately Structures stand:

His alliteration of "s" ("...shall...Strand,/...so many Stately Structures stand") stresses the seductive nature of the Strand's appeal to him in his upwardly mobile journey, symbolizing the luxurious world of the fashionable, affluent courtiers who attended the court, and which contrasted with his plainer, more unpretentious, plebeian origins as the son of a craftsman in Cheapside.

Another example of Herrick's effort in this poem to downplay his prior connections with the Stuart Court (because of the incipient rise at the time of the poem's publication in 1648 of a Republican regime) is provided by his vague reference to "Stately Structures." By using this term, Herrick makes a veiled allusion to the fact that at the time of his depar-

ture from London in 1629 these noblemen's homes along the Strand were owned by some of the leading statesmen of the Stuart Court; therefore, one can understand the term "stately" referring both to the physical handsomeness of these residences as well as more connotatively to the fact that these homes were owned by some of the most important ministers and advisers of the monarchically ruled State. However, at the time this poem was published the ownership of many of these palaces along the Strand had changed hands, in much the same manner in which the former occupant of Whitehall Palace, King Charles I, was replaced by the new executive of the republican government, the Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell. Therefore, the term "stately" still could be used connotatively to refer to the fact that these residences continued to be, even at the time of the poem's publication in 1648, owned by statesmen because several of the leading members of Cromwell's government had taken over many of these palaces after their occupants, the courtiers and bishops who owed their preferments to the overthrown Stuart regime, fled with the defeat of the royalist army into exile upon the Continent. Consequently, Herrick's reference to "Stately Structures" in this poem, given the contemporaneous historical circumstances of their being owned by republican statesmen, could not be viewed as exclusively being a partisan tribute to the former courtiers who lived in the Strand's palatial homes during the reign of Charles I.

Herrick is more reserved in his tribute to these palaces situated along the Strand than Drayton is in the compliment that he pays to them in Poly-Olbion, even though Herrick has a stronger emotional attachment to this place that witnessed his first introductions into courtly society. The poet of "His tears to Thamasis" in recalling his departure from London in 1629 when these palatial homes were still owned by the Stuart courtiers and bishops deliberately obscures his ties of friendship with the former owners of these palaces situated along the Strand so as not to alienate the current Cromwellian regime. Rather than portraying his actual circumstances during this bygone era of being a particular guest who was welcomed within these palatial homes along the Strand by their owners, the Stuart courtiers and bishops, Herrick presents himself as a casual sightseer, walking on the Strand to view these handsome structures from the outside. In contrast, Drayton in that previously discussed poem has the personified Thames more effusively remark that even the royal palaces in the western outskirts and in Westminster cannot compete with:

> ... that more beautious Strand,
> Expressing both the wealth and bravery of the Land.
> (So many sumptuous Bowres, within so little space,
> The All-beholding sun scarce sees in all his race.)

Another effect of the victory of the Puritan and Parliamentary factions over the Stuart Monarchy can be seen in subsequent passages of "His tears to Thamasis" when Herrick

similarly refers in an evasive manner to landmarks in the western outskirts of the metropolis and in Westminster. In describing these landmarks previously linked with the Stuart Monarchy, he does not explicitly connect them with either their former royal occupants or their current Interregnum owners. Therefore, in the minds of the 1648 readers of this poem who would not necessarily be familiar with his personal history of leaving the metropolis in 1629 to accept a preferment that he was granted by the Stuart court it would not be clear that Herrick is saying farewell to specifically the people, palaces, and institutions directly associated with the royal court.

After expressing his common pleasures that can be enjoyed by a multitude of other Londoners not necessarily affiliated with the Stuart Court of walking along the Strand and swimming in the Thames, which seems to be his greatest ones since he impetuously mentions them out of the spatial sequence established in the remainder of the poem, Herrick follows Drayton's more objective chorographical method in Poly-Olbion in subsequent passages from "His tears to Thamasis," mentally reviewing the physical landmarks, cities, and places to be observed along the north bank of the Thames in a geographically arranged west to east sequence as one travels downriver. When describing his landings at or passage by the western palaces, recalling the luxurious

manner in which his boat was outfitted as he passed them, he deliberately omits any direct reference to the fact that prior to his departure from London in 1629 he had been visiting as a court poet the royal occupants of these structures. Like Drayton, but as has been established for the different reason of not wanting to antagonize the Cromwellian regime by celebrating his past affiliation with the Stuart court, Herrick portrays the physical landmarks, institutions, and cities that he had occasion to visit as a courtier-poet of Charles I's court as grand but deserted settings:

> No more shall I along thy Christall glide,
> In Barge (with boughes and rushes beautifi'd)
> With soft-smooth Virgins (for our chast disport)
> To Richmond, Kingstone, and to Hampton-Court:

Also because of his fear of alienating the Cromwellian regime, Herrick, when he speaks of in the future missing his trips less further upriver to the City of Westminster, avoids all mention of his ties with Charles I and his court, passing over most notably his visits with the King and his courtiers who gathered together in Whitehall Palace:

> Never againe shall I with Finnie-Ore
> Put from, or draw unto the faithful shore:
> And Landing here, or safely Landing there,
> Make way to my Beloved Westminster:

By omitting all references to Charles I and his court situated at Whitehall Palace in Westminster, he enigmatically fails to establish why in 1629 Westminster was for him a

dearly "beloved" place in which his worldly aspirations were nurtured. However, this tone of finality that would have seemed either remarkably prescient or irrationally morbid upon the thirty-eight year old poet's departure in 1629 of "never againe" seeing London because of his ministerial duties in the provinces seems more understandable if this poem was revised for its inclusion in Hesperides in 1648. Herrick retrospectively expresses not so much his fear of never again seeing London, but rather his knowledge that he will never again see as a courtier poet the old London that was presided over by this poet's benefactor, the Stuart King Charles I, and particularly that part of the metropolis, the "Beloved Westminster" where his royal court was situated. Therefore, Herrick's tone reveals what the absence of specific details attempts to hide: his attachment to and his regret at never again seeing the "beloved" London, the capital city, over which Charles I was once supreme ruler.

In both Poly-Olbion and "His tears to Thamasis" the royal head of state is not paid tribute to when describing the palaces and the sector of the metropolis inhabited by both himself and his court: in Drayton's case the current King's absence is a product of the wishful thinking of a poet belonging to the country faction that while loyal to the institution of monarchical government is hostile to Jamas I's particularly inept rule, but in Herrick's case the courtier poet is forced by the current political reality,

the incipient establishment of the republican regime of the Interregnum, to deny himself the opportunity of paying tribute to Charles I in a poem whose subject matter, as the above passage concerning the City of Westminster indicates, gives ample occasion for it.

When referring to the urban scene in the City of London, Herrick is free to mention specific people and places with whom and with which he has particularly strong ties that were formed in his childhood and adolescence. This concreteness of detail contrasts with the earlier passages of the poem in which Herrick presents a more abstract portrayal of the other more western sectors of the metropolis that were more closely associated with the daily life of the Stuart court. This difference in style exists because of Herrick's fear of alienating the incipient Cromwellian government by mentioning the specific names of Stuart courtiers and members of the royal family with whom he formed ties of friendship and patronage as a young man in such places as the Strand, the court at Westminster, and the palaces in the western outskirts of the metropolis.

Although he is not free because of factional strife to pay tribute to the overthrown Stuart Monarchy and the presence of Charles I in his capital city, Herrick is able to celebrate the specific trades and people connected with his

birth and early life in the particular neighborhood of Cheapside within the City of London. When he expresses regret about never again being able to travel by boat to his birthplace, the poet explicitly refers to his mother and refers obliquely to the particularly lucrative craft of the goldsmiths, which are both associated with his early domestic and occupational experiences in this particular neighborhood:

> Or to the Golden-cheap-side, where the earth
> Of Julia Herrick gave to me my Birth.

In contrast to his failure to discuss his controversial affiliations as a courtier-poet, Herrick alludes when describing the City of London to his past employment as a goldsmith's apprentice. Furthermore, he celebrates by means of the term "Golden-cheap-side" the prosperity being experienced by the rising middle-class of merchants, tradesmen, and craftsmen in the City of London that has fueled the religious and political strife of self-made, more well educated Londoners, calling for more representative forms of political and religious government, and seeking to limit the prerogatives of the hierarchical modes of administration. In effect through this epithet for this London neighborhood he compliments the very capitalist order that gave rise to such forms of political and religious factional strife through which the Stuart Monarchy, a regime that he had aspired to be part of and to serve, was toppled.

Because the capitalist businessmen and the more representative political and religious institutions which they supported had become by 1648 a more dominant factor in shaping the future course of the nation, Herrick in "His tears to Thamasis" must obscure all references to the life of a courtier-poet that he had lived up until his departure from the metropolis in 1629 while highlighting his prior personal involvement in the commercial life of the City of London. Marchette Chute in his biography of the poet explains that the reference in this poem to "Golden-cheap-side" was fitting for several reasons: first, Herrick's family lived on the street in that neighborhood called Goldsmiths' Row where the trade and craft of the goldsmith was predominantly practiced; in addition, one of the most prosperous of these goldsmiths conducting their businesses on this row was Herrick's father, Nicholas; furthermore, the series of houses on Goldsmiths' Row were decorously gilded to advertise the kind of business being practiced on that street (161). Herrick's first contact with nobility which initiated his aspiration to leave behind his artisan background in Cheapside to mingle amongst this elite group as a courtier-poet and a theologian came about as a result of his work as a goldsmith's apprentice. Chute remarks that amongst the "clientele" of Herrick's father were "several noble families" (161).

As further evidence that Herrick wishes to emphasize his particular mercantile background to the same extent that he wishes to downplay his later specific affiliations with the Stuart court because of the levelling climate in the social order that has brought about the overthrow of the Stuart Monarchy, the poet denies the actual commercial make-up of Cheapside to point out by means of the epithet "golden" that he remembers this neighborhood of his youth most because of the substantial period of time in which he served as an apprentice goldsmith under his uncle William (Chute 164) and fails to establish the fact that Cheapside was best known for being the City of London's most comprehensive market-place with each of its streets having shops or stalls specializing in the production and or sale of a different product (Stephenson 153-157).

Herrick's personal reasons for seeking to obscure his prior relationship with the Stuart court and to celebrate his prior participation in the city's mercantile life is further explained by the fact that by 1647 he lost with the defeat of the royalist forces the preferment that he received from Charles I to serve as vicar in Dean Prior so that he no longer possessed nor could hope to further acquire future benefits from this King given the current political situation. Furthermore, this poet's inclination to emphasize his past mercantile roots and family connections in the city is

also explained by the fact that after being ejected from his parish in the western provinces he immediately returned to London and no longer being able to renew old ties with his courtier friends and patrons he relied upon the financial help of his Cheapside family, many of whom in the political turmoil had risen within the social order as a result of their wealth and through marriage with nobility to the status of gentlemen and knights (Chute 241-242). Seeking to have his volume of poetry Hesperides published upon his return to the London scene in 1648, Herrick realized that such poems as "His tears to Thamasis" must be addressed to flatter new potential patrons instead of those former ones who were no longer in a position to assist him during the Interregnum.

Both Drayton and Herrick in their respective descriptions of the City of London in Poly-Olbion and "His tears to Thamasis" reveal their factional sympathies. Drayton by comparing London's "rising Spyros" to "bristling reeds" and innumerable "windows" to "star-befreckled skies" addresses the country faction, many of whom, never having visited London, could best visualize the multitudinous physical aspect of the city if it were compared to natural imagery possessing this same characteristic that they would be more readily familiar with. Moreover, because he is impressed by the City of London's multitudes of people and buildings, its

plural rather than singular features, Drayton betrays his position as a poet who is addressing a country audiance who as newcomers to the urban scene would be more impressed by numerous rather than singular features because they would need a greater familiarity with and knowledge of the London scene to be able to distinguish between various urban types of people, structures, and activities. Herrick, on the other hand, is appealing to the city factions by referring to those aspects of his personal history that would either appeal to or flatter them. His description of his visits to prominent landmarks along the Strand, Westminster, and the palaces in the western outskirts of the metropolis would appeal to the aspirations for upward mobility within the social order that was experienced by many within the City of London's mercantile community (who were in fact as we have seen moving their business establishments westward to these more aristocratic sectors of the city). Furthermore, his descriptions would not alienate those Londoners who supported the parliamentary cause during the Civil War because he does not emphasize the fact that he visited these places when they were owned by, and as the guest of, various members of the Stuart court. Rather than addressing like Drayton an audience unfamiliar with the urban scene, his reference to a particular neighborhood in the City of London as "Golden-cheap-side" would flatter those self-made, enterprising London businessmen who were realizing a measure of

affluence that was reflected in their putting on the airs of gentlemen by purchasing fashionable clothes, more handsome homes, and more comfortable modes of vehicular transport. These urban entrepreneurs were able to make such neighborhoods as Cheapside in the figurative sense "golden"because of their profitable activities in the burgeoning capitalist economy. In this promising business climate there was a greater potential than ever before to realize a high interest return on investments in global trade and industry which enabled these investors to purchase all the trappings of a more prosperous-existence and in turn make the shopkeepers and tradesmen of such marketplaces in the city as Cheapside prosper as well by supplying these wealthy capitalists with their luxurious wants.

The respective ways that Drayton in the 1620s poem Poly-Olbion and Herrick in the 1640s poem "His tears to Thamasis" address the Thames's relationship with the city are indicative of the manner in which the growing dominance of a capitalist economy alters the urban man's attitudes towards natural phenomena. The hierarchical order of Monarchy which grew out of and flourished best in a feudal/agrarian subsistence economy was more respectful towards natural phenomena and its caprices. The rural people of England, prior to the rise of capitalism in its major city of London, by and large conducted their lives within this kind of subsistence econo-

my in which rural individuals relied mostly on their own efforts to produce goods to satisfy their own essential needs and that of the noble landowner from whom they rented the land. Such a life demanded a closer, more respectful relationship with nature. Each individual personally interacted with nature in producing the food, clothing and shelter that he needed. In its relationship with subjects who functioned in this subsistence economy, the monarchy could rely upon a steady source of income based on the rental of crown lands for agricultural purposes and the continued maintenance of a stable income rather than one that was reduced by inflationary prices that only later became a problem in the late 16th and 17th centuries that was initiated by the development of the capitalist economy in England's urban centers.

When describing London's relationship with the Thames, Drayton in Poly-Olbion expresses the sensibility of a country person. He provides this kind of perspective because he had spent his youth and early adulthood in the country, not taking up residence in London to pursue his career as a poet until he was twenty-eight, so that a rural person's way of looking at things was an ingrained part of his character. Furthermore, he wished to appeal to his audience, which was primarily amongst the landed gentry and who consequently also possessed this kind of rural sensibility. In Poly-

Olbion Drayton represents as a member of the country faction the tolerant, even submissive attitude of the aristocratic rural landowners towards the caprices of nature, because they must take into account and make plans to accommodate certain natural forces if they are to continue to make the agricultural activities taking place on their country estates profitable. Therefore, the poet, given his own background and his audience, portrays the city behaving in a manner that is not characteristic of a modern city whose port conducts trade with the rest of the world. London is described as acquiescing to the Thames's will that decrees through the physical means of its tidal surges that the metropolis should not expand into those low-lying areas in danger of being flooded in times of high tide:

> He might his surging waves into her bosome send)
> Because too farre in length, his Towne should not extend.

This kind of submissive attitude towards the forces of nature is a legacy of England's medieval, agrarian, subsistence economy over which the hierarchical orders of the Monarchy and nobility most successfully presided. In fact, Drayton's depiction of the personified Thames's desire not to have London expand any further along its unpredictable banks reflects almost verbatim the proclamations of the Stuart court faction who in their anti-urban policies tried to limit the physical and economic growth of the city so

that its citizens would continue to remain subservient to the needs of the King and his court. But as the capitalist economy of London became a more predominant force in English society, in spite of the efforts of the court and country factions to limit the growing influence of its entrepreneurial practitioners, it became intolerable to the city's manufacturers and merchants who relied on London's port to safely export and import goods that this river should be a capricious and, therefore, unreliable body of water that should impede the progress of shipping upriver and downriver, make loading and unloading the vessels difficult, disrupt the building of port facilities along the city's waterfront, and flood the docks, wharves, and warehouses that were already established on the banks of the river. Therefore, the city's entrepreneurs who wanted to create a situation in which a steady flow of profits could be realized sought to regulate the urban environment so that they could live in an exclusively man-made city whose planning and construction would make it impervious to the disruptive effects of natural forces.

Drayton expresses in Poly-Olbion the country and court factions' attitude that the city must limit both its physical and economic growth because of the unpredictability of the river. Such a view, however, is not just a reflection of a rural sensibility which sought to respond submissively

to, rather than to eliminate, the effects of natural phenomena but also a consequence of political motives as well. The country and the court factions were fearful of the city's middle class having too large a say in the future political, religious, and economic policies of the nation because of their increasing wealth and resulting power in the modern capitalist society. Herrick, in contrast, in "His tears to Thamasis" reflects the attitudes of the city's businessmen who in the new capitalist economy they have created perceive the river as a subordinate factor that must serve the needs of commerce if the city's entrepreneurs are to prosper in their overseas trading ventures.

In Herrick's poem published almost thirty years after Poly-Olbion the prestige and pre-eminence of the metropolis has grown to such an extent (in terms of increased trade, a rising middle class of entrepreneurs, and a population in the process of doubling with the influx of the rural gentry and unemployed rural laborers seeking work) that the poet now commands the natural river to accommodate the needs of the capitalist economy of the man-made city by controlling its excessive tides so as not to disrupt the port's laborers or damage its facilities:

> Keep up your state ye stream; and as ye spring,
> Never make sick your Banks by surfeiting.

As much as Drayton's lines are reflective of the court faction's anti-urban proclamations against further urban

growth, Herrick's above lines sound like the kind of directive that would be made by a city businessman to his workers. Reflecting the dominance of the capitalist economy in London, the Thames is directed by the poet, mimicking the city's entrepreneurs rather than the King, to manage its material resource, its tidal waters, in a prudent manner so that the port can efficiently serve the ships bringing imported and exported goods to and from the city. Clearly, Herrick's lines indicate that the city's businessmen no longer see themselves as subservient either to natural forces or to the hierarchical order of Monarchy which as a medieval vestige that has ruled most effectively over subjects who were part of a rural subsistence economy seeks to preserve a wise proportion between the affairs of man and the affairs of God's natural order. The city's businessmen have made the needs of the capitalist economy the center of their attentive devotion, and have sought to limit both the powers of the Monarchy and of Nature so that they can satisfy their need for a government and an environment in which their businesses can be profitably conducted without outside interference.

It is only in the poems of several Romantic and post-Romantic poets that one can see the long-term consequences of the court faction's defeated effort to preserve its oligarchical dominion over capitalist businessmen through such means as

taxation and through such regulative means as the sale of patents and the right of monopoly to entrepreneurs which ensured that the courtiers and the crown would be enriched by the profits that these businessmen had made through their commercial and industrial ventures. In Matthew Arnold's poem "The Future" the blind avarice and other vicious excesses of the businessmen, functioning within the capitalist economy, are no longer checked by, on the one hand, the regulative policies of the Crown that sought to obtain for the royal family and for the other members of the court sufficient revenue from these urban entrepreneurs to make up for the decline in their income from their landed estates and, on the other hand, by the Stuart Monarchy's anti-urban policies that sought to maintain a balance between Nature and Man in which both could harmoniously subsist. This unregulated development of commerce and industry has led to the epidemic growth of cities, along with the proliferation of trade and industry occurring within and between them, and the proportionate dwindling of the natural environment. The rural/agrarian landscape of a subsistence economy over which the hierarchical orders of the landed aristocracy and Monarchy were most effectively able to rule and which served as the setting for many of their recreational pursuits has been replaced by an urban/industrial landscape that has been generated by the city businessmen's opportunistic capitalist economy. Drayton's expression in Poly-Olbion of the

court/country factions' desire that the city learn to limit its growth to accommodate the river's unpredictable tides reflects the presence of a still effective monarchical government within the capital which seeks to regulate the city's physical and economic expansion, whereas Herrick's representation of the city faction's intolerance of an inefficient river in "His tears to Thamasis," instead of voicing the court's more tolerant and even reverential view of such natural forces as the Thames, reflects the historical reality of the monarchy's overthrow by the time this poem was published in 1648 in part because of the impediments it sought to place on the capitalist economy's development.

Although voicing the antithetical attitudes of the opposing city and court/country factions in regards to the relationship that London should have with the Thames, neither Drayton nor Herrick expresses while surveying the extent of urban construction along the Thames's banks in the early and mid-17th century metropolis the Romantic or post-Romantic fear that urban life along the Thanms will grow to nightmarish, uncontrollable proportions as Matthew Arnold would later intimate in his poem "The Future." This post-Romantic poet abstracts from the specific relationship of London with the Thames to universalize the predicament of a planet rapidly becoming urbanized because of the unchecked powers

of the businessmen functioning within the capitalist economy. Firstly, as a result of the declining influence of the landed aristocracy, the Monarchy and its court, which all had a high regard for the natural scene that once had provided the nobility and the crown with its greatest source of revenue because of the rental of their lands for agricultural purposes and that continued to afford them an aesthetically congenial setting within which they--the noblemen, the courtiers, and the King--could spend their hours of leisure in such recreational pursuits as horseback riding and hunting and secondly, as a result of the concurrent rise of the city's capitalist businessmen as a dominant social, political, and religious force in the nation, Arnold foresees the terrible continuation of the process of urban development for the sake of commercial gain until the natural scene is entirely eliminated:

> This tract which the river of Time
> Now flows through with us, is the plain.
> Gone is the calm of its earlier shore.
> Bordered by cities and hoarse
> With a thousand cries is its stream.
> . . . . . .
> And we say that repose has fled
> For ever the course of the river of Time.
> That cities will crowd to its edge
> In a blacker, incessanter line;
> That the din will be more on its banks,
> Denser the trade on its stream,
> Flatter the plain where it flows,
> Fiercer the sun overhead.
> That never will those on its breast
> See an ennobling sight,
> Drink of the feeling of quiet again.

It is primarily courtier-poets who in the pursuit of patronage from the court are most strongly motivated to describe the physical aspect of London life during the reign of Charles I as one over which the King securely presides. According to Waller and Denham, Charles I's repair of St. Paul's Cathedral is a testament to the continued dominance of the Monarchy and the Church of England over the political and religious affairs of the city and the nation, and, according to Davenant, the love of Londoners for Charles I's Queen allows them to endure the polluted air of the city. In their poems portraying London's physical landmarks, panoramas, and pollution problems, these courtier-poets seek to relieve Charles I's fears of the potential threat posed by the radical religious and political sects emanating from the city. In the case of the poem "Upon His MaJesty's Repairing of St. Paul's," Waller attempts to ignore the religious and political factional strife between the court and the city and to portray instead a London citizenry who reveres and assists the King in his project of repairing and beautifying the Cathedral which is symbolic of their loyalty to the Church of England over which he is the head. In the case of the poem "Cooper's Hill," Denham bolsters the King's confidence in his military might by arguing that even in spite of this factional strife the King will be able to defend and preserve such landmarks as St. Paul's against the desire of the radical religious sects to desecrate what they see as a

Popish Cathedral. In the case of the poem "The Queene, returning to London after a long absence," Davenant suggests to the Monarch and his family that Londoners bear a deep reverence for Charles I's Queen, her ardent devotion to her Roman Catholic faith being no source of divisiveness between the city and the court, which helps brighten their dreary days in the polluted city and that, moreover, they can be readily persuaded to put aside their commercial cares and frugal natures to make a public display of their devotion to the royal family. Another poet who would seem to have a similar motivation for paying tribute to the King's presence as head of state in his physical description of the capital city and contribute to Charles I's delusion that he is an omnipotent figure therein is Robert Herrick. This poet has every reason to express his gratitude to the King in a poem in which he bids farewell to the physical places and landmarks in London upon his departure from the city in 1629 to accept the preferment which the King had granted him of a religious living in the provinces. However, he demonstrates in a poem "His tears to Thamasis," which was published just prior to the Interregnum, by virtue of omitting to refer to Charles I as being the head of state who occupies the royal landmarks that he describes in the capital city, the extent of the deception created by Sir Edmund Waller, Sir John Denham, and Sir William Davenant in attempting to persuade the King that the factionalism existing between the city and

the court is not as great a threat to his rule as he fears. At the time of this poem's publication, Charles I was about to be brought to trial on charges of treason that had been made by a residual House of Commons that had been purged by Cromwell and the army leaders who fought against the royalist forces in the First and Second Civil Wars and to receive judgement from a High Court of Justice established by this Rump Parliament (Cannon and Griffiths 385). With Charles I's trial and execution about to take place and with the resulting overthrow of the Stuart Monarchy, Herrick, therefore, cannot refer in a complimentary fashion to the King's former position of pre-eminence within his capital city nor to the gracious favors that he received from this monarch and his courtiers without alienating the incipient republican regime.

CHAPTER 3: THE REIGN OF CHARLES II

A strident tone is evident in the poems in the previous section that attempts to reassure Charles I that he and the members of his royal family are beloved by the London populace, and his policies of defending the prerogatives and landmarks associated with the Monarchy and the State Church are supported by them. This strident tone, masking the anxiety of these courtier-poets and the King in regards to the true nature of his relationship with Londoners, is apparent in Walker's "Upon His Majesty's Repairing of St. Paul's" when the courtier-poet asserts that Londoners are eager to help the King in his repair of the Cathedral, expressed in such lines as "our minds with his conspire" to remove the stalls and sheds in the churchyard that obscure this structure, and when this same poet claims that the renewed beauty that Charles I has brought to such landmarks of the Church of England as St. Paul's "finds/ A welcome sovereignty in rudest minds." This same strident tone that propagandistically covers up the actual troubled relationship between the king and his urban subjects is evident in Denham's "Cooper's Hill" when this courtier-poet argues that the Cathedral will continue to stand for the institutions of Monarchy and the Anglican Church as long as it is "Preserv'd from ruine by the best of Kings," and in Davenant's "The Queene, returning to London after a long absence" when the courtier-poet points out that it is the reverence of London-

ers for their Monarch and his Queen that brighten their minds and allow them to "walk" through the "Mists of Sea-coale-smoake" to be found in their city streets. In the poems of these courtier-poets which describe the physical aspect of the metropolis during the reign of Charles I one finds a defensive effort to convince the Monarch that his position of political and religious authority in the city is unassailable. The strident tone which is an effect of this defensive effort masks the anxiety of these poets that the growing religious and political factionalism on the part of the city's businessmen who have grown wealthy and influential through the development of the capitalist economy will lead to the overthrow of the traditional hierarchical orders that consist of the Monarchy And such nobility as the country peers and gentry who have gained and inherited their positions of power and wealth through service to and obedience to the Crown.

The insistent nature of the tone that is used to assert Charles I's favorable position in the urban scene is an effect of these courtier-poets and their King denying the radical transformation that was occurring in English society as a result of the rise of the great cities and the birth of the modern economic spirit of capitalism that flourished within and, in fact, engendered them. As a consequence of this economic transformation the institutions of a central-

ized state and religion that was administratively essential in a feudal society experienced a decline in importance; therefore, the institutions of the Monarchy and the State Church were challenged by Parliament and the radical Protestant sects which were political and religious institutions that were better able to express the needs and aspirations of the more independent, entrepreneurial spirit that thrived in an urban society.

While the refusal of Charles I's courtier-poets to recognize the increasing marginalization of the Monarchy and State Church is evident in the insistent tone that attempts to assert this King's dominant position in the urban scene, the acceptance of this increasing marginalization is to be found at least on an underlying level in the poems of the courtier-posts of Charles II who portray in passages that describe the physical aspect of London life the situation of the restored Stuart Monarchy in the capital city. Replacing the monolithic tone of insistent denial that is to be found in the courtier-poets of the previous monarchical regime when describing the Monarch's relationship with the physical aspect of London life, a more ambivalent tone is to be found in these latter poems of the Restoration that consists of a mixture of confidence in the Monarchy's restored position of political dominance that is expressed on a superficial, overt level that seeks to anachronistically maintain the

myth that the monarchy presides over a feudal society and an underlying, more realistic fear that that restored position can be easily toppled unless the King adopts a conciliatory, obliging diplomatic policy that recognizes the needs and religious and political rights of the various factions that were both for and against the Monarchy's restoration. Unlike Charles I's courtier-poets, the courtier-poets of Charles II could more easily conceive of the institution of Monarchy as a precarious institution that could succumb in a struggle with the various, more powerful factions that were emerging in a modern urban society if it was not sufficiently vigilant in monitoring the activities of these discontented groups. Amintore Fanfani asserts that the most significant faction that was a consequence of a modern urban capitalist society, the Protestant sects, offered the most conspicuous ethical challenge to the institution of Monarchy and its prerogatives:

> Protestantism, where it was represented by a minority or wherever it had the sovereign against it, encouraged the rise of a sentiment that is wholly modern, even if it was not unknown to some or other mediaeval politician. It presented subjects with the problem of whether they were the State or whether the Sovereign was the State; of whether their policy, interests, and will should prevail, or that of their sovereign. It does not take much reflection to see the immense importance of even the raising of such a problem in regard to capitalistic aims. The moment it was raised, in view of the struggle to obtain possession of the State, efforts would be made by the capitalistically minded to make the interests defended by the State coincide with their own, which they idealized to appear as the interests of civilization. The final victories in this struggle would be provided by parliamentary regimes and democratic systems, which, as Weber, has shown, found full

> justification in the idea, peculiar to the Calvinistic groups, that creatures must not be glorified or accorded any differential treatment. (88-89)

With the Restoration of the Stuart Monarchy in 1660this tone of anxiety, insistence, and defensiveness that is expressed in the poem that describe the physical landmarks and panorama of the London scene during the reign of Charles I is replaced on the overt, and consequently most superficial and propagandistic, level in the early years of the new Monarch's reign with one of calm assurance that Charles II will now preside over the affairs of his capital city and of the nation without further interference from the contentious city factions who through their increasingly riotous demonstrations in Westminster drove the previous King out of Whitehall Palace and the metropolis in 1642 to seek refuge at Oxford to build a royalist army to defend the hierarchical structure of England's religious and political life against the levelling interests of the upstart urban entrepreneurial middle-class. Such poems as Abraham Cowley's "On the Queens Repairing Somerset House," Edmund Waller's "Upon Her Majesty's New Buildings at Somerset House" and "On St. Jamse's Park, as Lately Improved by His Majesty" all depict the King and his Queen Mother repairing and improving structures within the metropolis that were vandalized during the Interregnum by lawless, levelling members of the Parliamentary Army. These restored royal landmarks and palaces serve

as a focal point from which the Monarch or his Queen Mother, Henrietta Maria, can survey in a commanding manner the circular panorama of the sovereign's capital city whose citizens have once again, recognizing the need for a strong executive figure to lead the city and nation out of its factional strife, relapsed into their customary feudal state of obedience to the King's divinely empowered will. Both Cowley and Waller create chorographical poems of the London scene, but instead of using this kind of verse as Drayton does to brush the Monarch as the head of the state to the side in order to celebrate the body of the urban landscape, these courtier-poets assert the supreme political and religious power of the King and members of his royal family by situating them in the center of their physical description of the capital city. These poets of the early Restoration years portray royal figures who are supremely able to demonstrate their dominion over the extensive urban panorama by looking out upon this urban scene from the landmarks and places within the metropolis that they have repaired. These Restoration poets by re-establishing the Monarchy's central presence in the urban scene are able to portray the expansive and multiple nature of the capital city as being drawn centripetally into a coherent unity because the metropolis is seen to revolve around the landmarks and figures who are representative of the Crown.

However, even in these urban poems of the early years of the Restoration there is to be found an underlying tone of fear that factional strife is about to ripen once again into open rebellion in the streets of London against the restored Stuart Monarchy which has been unable to pressure the Cavalier Parliament into creating legislation that would allow greater tolerance of the religious practices of the Nonconformist sects and to prevent this Parliament from passing the Act of Uniformity which was supposed to restore the supremacy of the episcopalian Church of England to its role of regulating the nation's religious life. Indeed, we shall see how several actual risings in the London scene in the early 1660s by those citizens who were still loyal to the republic because of the greater religious freedom they had experienced under that regime helped to create the underlying tone of alarm that gave rise to the sentiment existing amongst the King and his courtiers and expressed in the urban poems that the restored Stuart Monarchy must be vigilant in defending its renewed position of power within the capital against those factions who still favored a return to a Commonwealth.

The overtly triumphant tone of these poems which establishes the Monarch's and his royal family's renewed position of dominance within the metropolitan landscape is a direct consequence of the abrupt turnaround in the fortunes of the

Stuart Monarchy after its recent nadir which had been poetically reflected in Herrick's intentional failure in the Interregnum poem "His tears to Thamasis" to pay tribute to Charles I's presence in the capital city. In contrast to the absence in Herrick's poem of all reference to the royal head of state, his court, and his ownership of various landmarks within the metropolis, Cowley in "On the Queens Repairing Somerset House" personified a royal landmark that he explicitly states has been repaired by the Queen Mother of Charles II. By means of describing the panoramic view that this personified Somerset House has of the surrounding metropolis, Cowley establishes the restored dominion that the Stuart Monarchy has over the capital city.

With the royal landmark of Somerset House at the central crossing point the surrounding metropolis is physically described along two different axes: north-south and west-east. Every city, structure, and phenomena is perceived and exists in juxtaposed relationship with this particular landmark that served over the course of several Stuart reigns as a residence for members of the royal family. One of Drayton's "sumptuous Bowres" and Herrick's "Stately Structures" that was located almost precisely at the Strand's midpoint was Somerset House which was first the home of James I's Queen Anne and then the residence of Charles I's wife, Henrietta Maria, which she returned in the

early years of her son Charles II's reign to repair and enlarge.

Cowley begins his physical description of the surrounding urban panorama along Somerset House's north-south axis. The personified residence of the Queen Mother describes the two features that are to be immediately seen along this axis: the Strand and the Thames. The Strand, no longer exclusively inhabited by the nobility, has become a busier thoroughfare because of the commercial development which has arisen as a consequence of the westward migration of the City of London's merchants and tradesmen who desired to be in closer proximity to their most affluent customers, those members of the gentry and the court residing in Westminster and the "town" that has sprung up just north of the Strand on the undeveloped land between the two cities:

> Before my Gate a Street's broad Channel goes,
> Which still with Waves of crowding people flows.

But even this demonstration of the capitalist economy's power to affect the urban landscape through the proliferation of businessmen, shops, and the industrious money-making activities connected with them is portrayed by this courtier-poet as being subordinate to the royal structure of Somerset House which is described as overseeing these spreading signs of capitalist enterprise:

> ... my Front looks down
> On all the Pride, and Business of the Town.

No anxiety, stridency, and defensiveness is apparent in this description of the crowded commercial street that the noble front face of Somerset House looks down upon. There is no suggestion that this residence of the Queen Mother must be safeguarded against being displaced or desecrated by these phenomena of the capitalist economy. Although in the juxtaposition of these royal and capitalist phenomena, the royal landmark of Somerset House has the commanding position, looking down upon the hordes of Londoners conducting their businesses in the shops and new exchange built on the Strand, there is no suggestion that these different kinds of phenomena are antithetical in nature. Both this royal landmark and the business enterprises being conducted along this thoroughfare seem to be able to peacefully co-exist alongside one another. The co-existence of these disparate capitalist and monarchical elements within the urban landscape can be viewed as being reflective of Charles II's intention of adopting a conciliatory policy that was first realized in his official appointments and land and financial settlements of not alienating or antagonizing (except for the regicides) any faction of the nation, dealing even-handedly not only with royalists who had remained loyal to the Stuart Monarchy during the years of the Commonwealth but also with those republican factions that had after the administrative chaos that had arisen after Oliver Cromwell's death welcomed and even with those who had opposed the restoration of the

Monarchy because he did not wish a renewal of the kind of factional strife that had led to the overthrow of his father's rule. In both Denham's "Cooper's Hill" and Cowley's "On the Queen's Repairing Somerset House" the commercial activity of Londoners is portrayed as occurring in the immediate vicinity of a noble landmark that is associated with the Monarchy and the Anglican Church: in the former poem the city's businessmen conduct their transactions in the nave and churchyard of St. Paul's Cathedral and throughout the remainder of the city, while in the latter poem by Cowley the commercial activity along the Strand similarly takes place in immediate proximity to the royal landmark of Somerset House. In both cases the city's businessmen engrossed in their competitive transactions with each other are oblivious to the beauty of the noble landmarks connected with the hierarchical orders of Church and State which tower physically and morally above their materialistic, money-making cares. While in Denham's poem these signs of the capitalist economy are criticized as "a darker cloud" that is a moral blight upon the urban landscape which only such landmarks that are nurtured by the Monarchy and the Church of England can rise transcendentally above, Cowley in his poem avoids the opportunity to make a similar criticism of the city'e capitalist economy. Again, this latter courtier-poet in his less critical treatment of the city's business community seem to be reflecting the more

conciliatory attitude and policies of Charles II which were shaped by his experiences of watching his father's rule overthrown and his having to spend over a decade in exile on the Continent because of the failure of the previous Stuart regimes to recognize and to respond effectively to the religious and economic concerns of the urban entrepreneurial middle class. Indeed, one of the first signs that Charles II would be more responsive to the needs of this mercantile class occurred just prior to his return to power in.England when he met representatives from the City of London who were sent to The Hague to congratulate this Stuart Monarch on his incipient restoration and reminded them "that he was himelf a Londoner, and knighted the lot" (Hutton 131). Whereas Denham, reflecting Charles I's own aloof attitude, is intent on distinguishing the royal landmarks of the metropolis from the less worthy mercantile ones, Charles II and as a consequence his courtier-poets stress the new King's commonality with these burghers as a fellow citizen of London. Therefore, it follows that there will be a greater tendency where politically prudent in the poems of these courtier-poets describing the physical aspect of London life to also stress the commonality of the institutions, landmarks, and figures associated with his restored reign so as not to alienate or to antagonize the city's aspiring mercantile community which would resent any hierarchical pretensions and prerogatives that would place limits upon their own social ambitions. In

this scene referred to by Hutton, Charles II doesn't stress his royal heredity or the fact that he was born in St. James's Palace, but rather strives to assure these city representatives of the similar roots that he shares with them. Furthermore, to lessen the differences in social status between his aristocratic and their plebeian natures he ceremoniously knights them. It is this policy of appeasement that was most clearly pronounced during the first years of his reign on the part of the King that is reflected in Cowley's effort not to denigrate the scene of commercial activity that surrounds Somerset House.

Moreover, in this Restoration poem Cowley does not see the commercial activity being conducted along the Strand as being portentous in nature. This courtier-poet seem more willing to ackowledge the fact that revenue that the Monarchy gained because of the prosperity of the capitalist economy strengthened rather than threatened the Crown's ability to carry out the responsibilities of government:

> As the [17th century] wore on, revenues from Crown lands and Crown feudal and prerogative right fell away to an insignificant part of royal revenues. The ordinary revenues of the Crown became predominantly those derived from taxing trade: customs duties on the movement of goods into and out of the country and excise duties, a sales tax on basic consumer goods ....
>
> The buoyancy of trade, especially after 1630, was the greatest single cause of the steady growth in royal income--well ahead of inflation--that made Stuart monarchy at almost every point the least indebted in Europe .... (Morrill 298)

To further indicate the lack of factional divisiveness existing in the metropolis, the throngs of pedestrians to be found along the Strand are not portrayed as being monolithic in their antipathy to hierarchical institutions in "On the Queens Repairing Somerset House." Unlike "Cooper's Hill" where the crowds surrounding the Cathedral and to be found in the remainder of the city consist exclusively of businessmen whose ruthless activities cast "a darker cloud" over the metropolis, Cowley describes an integrated population of gentlemen and entrepreneurs who are symbolic of the Town's "Pride" and "Business" conducting their respective affairs below the watchful eye of the personified royal landmark of Somerset House that overlooks the Strand which is in turn symbolic of the restored executive powers of the Monarchy in the early years of the Restoration. By depicting such an integrated populace this courtier-poet suggests that a reconciliation has occurred between the factions represented by the gentry and the city businessmen which led to the popular desire to have Charles II return from exile to resume the rule of the Stuart Monarchy.

Not only is the royal landmark of Somerset House portrayed as occupying a dominant position in terms of its being able to "look down upon" the Strand's commercial life from its lofty height, but it also is shown to command a dominating position in its juxtaposition to such natural features as

the Thames. As with the Strand's busy traffic, this river also occupies a subordinate position, subserviently providing a mirror that Somerset House can look down upon as well to vainly admire the charm of its physical beauty that has been restored by the Queen Mother after being desecrated by the Parliamentary Army during the Civil War and Interregnum:

> My other fair and more Majestick Face
> . . . . . .
> For ever gazes on it self below
> In the best mirrour that the world can show.

Such courtier-poets as Cowley demonstrate that natural features of the urban landscape recognize their lower rank in God's design of the hierarchical order and are willing to express their allegiance to and to serve the wants and needs of Monarchy. Yet in this relationship between Monarchy and Nature within the urban scene, the latter is not disrupted in serving the primarily aesthetic and recreational needs of the former: the physical characteristics of royal landmarks and such natural features as the Thames are preserved respectfully intact in their interactions with one another. In contrast, the commercial city's relationship with Nature is vastly more obtrusive and manipulative. The courtier-poets portray London businessmen as aggressively capitalizing upon the material asset that the river provides them with, altering its flow and its banks to provide a serviceable port within which they can bring and take products to and from the city. Such courtier-poets as Drayton and Cowley describe the physical results of the City of London's entrepreneurs

financing the building of such structures as bridges, wharves, and vessels that have the effect of altering the natural shape and flow of the river so that it will be able to function as England's chief port.

In subsequent passages from Cowley's poem in which this royal residence remarks upon its more long range view of the urban scene that it has upon this same axis, the different responses of the city and court factions to the problem of urban poverty are comparatively examined for the purpose of praising the royal family's more commendable altruistic behavior in this matter. Looking further outward along its north-south axis the personified Somerset House can see across the Thames the poorer housing that has been built in the suburban areas of Southwark and the Bankside for those recent immigrants to the city who have come from the provinces to find jobs. Cowley in this passage attempts to differentiate the Stuart Monarchy's more sympathetic and more active response to the needs of the unemployed and impoverished when compared to the harsher treatment that the able-bodied poor and unemployed received at the hands of the City's Puritan and Parliamentary factions during the Interregnum. London's burghers, who were members of the City Corporation and represented in that civic political body the interests of the city's capitalist economy, restricted the ability of outsiders to gain the freedom of the City and to

start certain types of businesses that would be a source of competition to the already established merchants and craftsmen within it who were regulated and protected by various city guilds. The ordinances this political body passed, indirectly led to the creation and growth of these suburbs as a kind of alternative city for the poor immigrants. In contrast to the more exclusive concerns of the city faction who regulated the capitalist economy so that it proved to be most profitable for the already established London entrepreneurs, the Monarchy was responsible, as Cowley's passage describing these suburban neighborhoods emphasizes, for the welfare of all of its subjects. Knights remarks upon the earlier commitment of the Tudor Monarchy to regulating the capitalist economy so that the needs of the public good could be taken care of. It sought:

> to endeavor by even-handed pressure to enforce social obligations on great and small, and to prevent the public interest being sacrificed to an unconscionable appetite for private gain'. The Elizabethan government followed the medieval tradition in attempting to moderate, if it could not abolish, usury, and to regulate wages and prices. Its concern for the continuation of the traditional economic system is seen in the way in which it dealt with the problem of poverty and unemployment. By the Statute of Apprentices it attempted to cure long engagements of service; it exerted pressure on merchants to buy, and manufacturers to produce, even when trade was bad; it took steps to relieve the distress caused by dearth, and in the series of statutes culminating in the Acts of 1597 and 1601 it made provision for the relief of the destitute, the employment of the able-bodied, and the punishment of the sturdy beggar. The whole policy of the governments of the period aimed at stability and a controlled order (160-163)

During the years of the Stuart Monarchy, the Crown persisted even to the point of bankruptcy in its involvement in attending to the needs of the poor and unemployed (whose destitute situation was exacerbated if not caused by the dynamics of the capitalist economy) even when it meant alienating the faction of London businessmen who provided much of the Stuart Monarchy's revenue:

> One effect of the difficulties of rural employment was to drive large numbers of men and women into the cities--above all to London--where the problems were no less but rather more volatile .... High food prices meant less demand for other goods and this in turn meant less scope for non-agrichltural wages. Those who most needed additional wages for food were most likely to find less work available. Once more, the government had been drawn in to organize and superintend a national scheme of poor relief, and ancillary codes of practice governing geographical mobility, house building, and the promotion of overseas trade. Thus a growing population greatly increased the duties and responsibilities of the government, arguably beyond the Crown's resources and capacity. Those who produced and sold goods ... wanted to enjoy the fruits of their success; others looked to the Crown to prevent or to mitigate the effects of structural change. A dynamic economy is one in which government has to arbitrate between competing and irreconcilable interests. No wonder the Crown found itself disparaged and increasingly distrusted.
>
> (Morrill 290)

In a comparative manner that will cast the government of the restored Monarchy in the more favorable light, the courtier-poet Cowley pointedly contrasts the conflicting attitudes of the city and court factions to the predominantly poor immigrants from the provinces settling in such suburbs as

Southwark who have been denied the freedom of the City of London. The city businessmen are portrayed as "prouder Vertuoso[s]" who have, as the term "virtuoso" denotes, the specialized skill or know how to manipulate this capitalist economy to serve their interests in amassing private gains while neglecting those pressing needs of the poor for adequate food and shelter. The court in its effort to fulfill its traditional medieval role of providing for the public good in the more stable subsistence economy of a feudal society is represented by the Queen Mother who is described as being Somerset House's "God-like Mistress." The Queen Mother's charitable response to the needs of the poor inhabiting the "meaner Cabanes" of Southwark is contrasted with the London businessmen who "take offence" when observing those impoverished immigrants from the rural hinterlands who seek to find jobs and to ultimately acquire the capital to open new businesses in the suburbs that will one day draw away trade from the already established enterprises of these city merchants:

> If any prouder Vertuoso's sence
> At that part of my Prospect take offence,
> By which the meaner Cabanes are descri'd,
> Of my Imperial River's humbler side,
> If they call that a Blemish, let them know,
> God, and my God-like Mistress think: not so;
> For the distrest and the afflicted lye
> Most in their Care, and always in their Eye.

Although in the final line of this passage the possessive pronoun "their" agrees in number with the two singular noun

antecedents "God, and my God-like Mistress," Cowley is able to suggest to the reader by means of this plural pronoun that the "car[ing]" response of God and the Queen Mother to the metropolis's "needy" is also representative of the entire divinely blessed family's behavior toward this disadvantaged social group.

Leasor notes that the restoration of the Stuart Monarchy increased the rate of immigration to London. This immigration particularly on the part of the rural unemployed poor was probably in part motivated by the knowledge that the Crown which constituted the executive branch of the government was traditionally best able to carry out the responsibility of attending to the public good of all of its subjects so that in times of need it was best to migrate to the capital city where the King could more effectively act in their behalf:

> If living conditions within the City walls were disturbing, the situation in the "liberties" and "out-parishes" immediately bordering the City was far worse. The restoration of Charles II to the throne had brought with it a wave of optimism in the future; rich and poor had flocked to London in the confident expectation of a settled reign and a new prosperity. ... One contemporary estimate thought that they numbered a hundred thousand .... The City was quite incapable of absorbing these newcomers, and this had resulted in the rapid growth of out-parishes, or suburbs, which spread in a rash of wooden shanties outwards from the City walls into the green fields that had formerly ringed the capital.
> ... Within a few years after the Restoration, it was calculated that more than a quarter of a million people lived in these parishes, far more densely packed together, even, than in the City. (12-21)

Furthermore, we can see from Leasor's description of London's suburbs in the mid-17th century why Cowley's term "meaner Cabanes" that he uses to characterize the kind of housing to be found in these suburban areas is particularly apt:

> Within the decaying arc around the City, thousands of mean dwellings were built back to back, their shaky timber frames filled in with wattle or planks, water-proofed with pitch, or at best with laths and roughcast plaster. Building with brick and stone was still only for the well-to-do. (12-21)

While many of the poor rural unemployed who migrated to the city, according to Leasor's historic and Cowley's poetic testimony, placed their faith in Charles II's ability to care for the "distrest and the afflicted," this politically shrewd King had, in fact, little incentive to act against the interest of the city's businessmen upon whom he depended for much of his court's revenue. Such historians as C. G. A. Clay point out that London's municipal statutes did much to create such suburban slums as Southwark in which the "meaner Cabanes that Cowley describes in his poem proliferated. The leading businessmen functioning within London's capitalist economy who also tended to rise to positions of political power within city government enacted poor laws that sought to exclude these rural poor from the City of London so that the profits from their various lucrative enterprises would not be drained away by caring for the public good of these vagrants from the provinces:

> ... as a result of what was happening in the countryside, the population of many urban centres was expanding more rapidly than the rather limited growth of economic opportunities warranted. The result was the development of a highly visible substratum to urban society, living in cellars, divided tenements and hastily erected cottages, and surviving by begging. prostitution and crime. Already in the 1510s London and York were finding it necessary to enact regulations against unwelcome immigrants, and by the middle decades of the century not only these places but a number of other large provincial centres had been driven to take more comprehensive action. They undertook counts of their poor, established licensing schemes which permitted those incapable of earning a living to beg and attempted to drive away other beggars by threatening savage punishments and sometimes carrying them out .... (216-219)

Therefore, there is an ample historical basis for Cowley's belief that while Charles II's Queen Mother cares for "the distrest and afflicted," the "prouder Vertuoso" who is representative of the London capitalist businessman would take "offence" at the poverty and high unemployment that is symbolized by the abundance of "meaner Cabanes" to be seen in London's suburbs. Regarding idleness as an evil, these Puritan businessmen did not necessarily recognize that the able-bodied poor were not always to be held solely accountable for their idleness and poverty:

> The attitude of most articulate contemporaries to the able bodied unemployed had, however, been moulded by the generations of relative labour scarcity which had succeeded the fourteenth century plagues, and it was therefore widely accepted that if someone was without a job it was their own fault. Such voluntary idleness was viewed as a moral offence, harmful to the perpetrator, and one from which he or she must be deterred. But it was also an offonce against society, for it was taken for granted that every individual had an allotted role, which was determined by the circumstances of their birth and which they had no business to abandon, and

> that of the lower orders was to perform manual labour. (Clay 223-224)

Furthermore, these "prouder Vertuoso[s]" were as Cowley describes them offended by the "Blemish" that these hordes of rural poor and unemployed created when they built these "meaner Cabanes" to form ad hoc communities without any authorization to do so on the fringes of the metropolis. The city's Puritan and Capitalist factions were, as Christopher Hill points out, critical of the Monarchy's efforts to act in a charitable manner towards these unfortunates who when barred from living and working in the City of London formed their own rival communities in the suburban outskirts:

> ... William Perkins ... was forced to conclude that the very poor must be wicked, since "rogues, beggars, vagabonds ... commonly are of no civil society or corporation"; "they join not themselves to any settled congregation for the obtaining of God's kingdom". Those who were members of no stable community, and their families, had no access to the means of grace, sacraments and sermons. They were outside the commonwealth and Church. ...Indiscriminate charity enabled the idle poor to evade the obligations of living in society. ... George Wither included "discreet and fond compassion" for the poor among the passions pilloried in "Abuses Stript and Whipt", finding men "often erring in their charity". Thomas Heywood regarded refusal of charity to the idle as a specifically puritan attitude. ... (Society and Puritanism ... 283, 285-289)

By juxtaposing the respective attitudes of the Monarchy and the city's Puritan capitalist businessmen towards the unemployed or underemployed poor of Southwark and the Bankside, Cowley reveals in this Restoration poem the residual tensions that still exist because of a conflicting code of

moral ethics between the Crown which still sought to fulfill the charitable role that it had had in the medieval economy that flourished in England when it was still part of the Roman Catholic Church and the uncharitable modern capitalist economy within which the chief English practitioners, the city's Puritan middle-class entrepreneurs, encouraged individualistic self-determination that was achieved by one's diligent perseverance in one's "calling" (occupation) in life. The Monarchy as represented by Charles II's Roman Catholic Queen Mother in Cowley's poem symbolizes the antiquated feudal, Popish ethic of charity towards the poor and concern for the welfare of the overall community, while the intolerant attitude of the city's businessmen represents the atomizing effect of the modern urban capitalist ethic:

> It is a comprehensive indictment, and it is the indictment of one system of ideas and social relationships in terms of the values of another. Popery is suited to a static agricultural society, which offers the mass of the population no possibility of becoming richer than their fellows, and in which poverty is a holy state. Protestantism is suited to a competitive society in which God helps those who help themselves, in which thrift, accumulation and industry are the cardinal virtues, and poverty very nearly a crime. (Hill, Society and Puritanism ... 131-134)

As in Cowley's poem, Edmund Waller in "Upon Her Majesty's New Buildings at Somerset House" also stresses the Queen Mother's consideration of the needs of the poor. But in this latter poem Waller describes a practical consequence of Henrietta Maria's charitable sentiments. While describing the particular physical features of the House that have been

improved or been added to it as a consequence of the renovation project, Waller remarks that this work of restoration has not only been beneficial for its owners the royal family, but also for the poor of the metropolis who are now provided with "employment" because of the large number of construction workers needed in this re-building project:

> Frugality and bounty too
> (Those diff'ring virtues), meet in you;
> From a confined, well-managed store,
> You both employ and feed the poor.

Waller's description of the Queen Mother's "diff'ring Virtues" of "Frugality and bounty" suggest that Henrietta Maria was emulating her son Charles II's policy in the early years of his Restoration of creating an inclusive government that drew upon the talents and ideologies of various sectors of English society that represented factions that had been both allies and enemies of his father Charles I. The Queen Mother's "bounty" towards the poor of the metropolis reflects the Monarchy's traditional charitable role in caring for the needy in the medieval economy of a feudal society, while her "frugality" would be her personal adoption of a more alien urban ethic of the city's Puritan capitalists who had rejected the rural gentry's concept of hospitality as well as the urban gentry's and courtiers' ostentatious tastes in clothing, banqueting, and theatrical entertainments.

Max Weber and his apologists who attempted to identify the links between the Protestant ethic and the development of modern capitalism identify "frugality" as one of the essential characteristics of the Puritan sects that enabled them, along with the emphasis they placed upon industrious perseverance in one's calling, to accumulate the requisite capital to fund various commercial, industrial, and governmental projects. The Puritan businessmen were encouraged by their ethical code to live industrious lives while at the same time they were discouraged by their religious leaders and texts from deriving fleshly, luxurious pleasures from the monetary wealth acquired through such industrious application to their vocations:

> The direct economic effects of the Puritan mode of life in calling are manifested in two ways. In the first place the "ascetic" mode of life worked powerfully toward the limitation of consumption. The Puritan looked, for example, with suspicion upon fine clothes. He looked with suspicion upon all the enjoyments of the senses as inclining to the worship of the creature. As a protest against the extravagant life of the feudal nobility the Puritan exalted the idea of stewardship. ... To spend money upon one's self leads to unfaithfulness in stewardship. Frugality comes to be a cardinal virtue .... (Fullerton 18)

Waller's description of the Queen Mother's behavior towards the metropolis's poor is, in contrast to Cowley's, designed to alleviate instead of to exacerbate factional tensions between the Court and the city's Puritan capitalists by appealing to the latter group's "frugal" tastes. Unlike the lavish, irresponsible handling of the Crown's revenues which

was a characteristic of the reigns of the previous Stuart Monarchs, James I and Charles I, the Queen Mother's ambivalent "frugal" and "bountiful" behavior towards the urban poor, providing for them from the royal famlly's "bounty" of a "confined, well-managed store" indicates that the reign of Charles II promises to exercise a more wise stewardship of the income allotted to it in the form of periodic loans from the City Corporation and the revenues appropriated for it by the Cavalier Parliament so that the Crown's fortunes would not be recklessly spent for purposes of personal aggrandizement, the exaltation of the creature comforts that the Puritan ethic railed against. The fact that the Queen Mother intends not only to perform acts of charity such as "feed[ing] the poor" but also seeing to it that the more able-bSdied are given useful work to perform in such projects as renovating Somerset House would appeal to the frugal sensibilities of the city's Puritan and capitalist factions who demanded that the court spend the revenue that was raised for its maintenance and its public policies in a prudent manner and who were opposed to a policy of public welfare in which the "bounty" of the Court could be spent in a wasteful manner that would encourage the poor to persist in their lives of idle dependence upon the generosity of the Crown and upon the more affluent members of society who provided the Monarchy with its revenue.

In Cowley's poem the Queen Mother takes a distinctly un-Puritan position in her purely charitable response to the situation of the poor living in their "meaner Cabanes" in Southwark whose plight lies "Most in [her and God's] Care, and always in their Eye." Cowley presents us with a contentious pre-bellum portrait of the Monarchy's and the city's Puritan and capitalist factions divergent responses to the plight of the urban poor which was more a characteristic of the stubborn, idealistic reign of Charles I who insisted upon his divine right to set the moral tone of the city and the nation, whereas Waller in his portrait of a more flexible Queen Mother who is willing to apply both traditional and more modern approaches in dealing with the problem of urban poverty, mixing the Monarchy's traditional trait of charitably giving to the poor from its "bounty" with the Puritan, capitalist businessman's trait of "frugality," captures the more open-minded, inclusive, diplomatic manner and tone of Charles II's post-bellum reign.

Both poets in their different manners, which were in the case of Cowley's antagonistic to and in the case of Waller's conciliatory to the city's Puritan capitalists, are perhaps addressing the charges raised by this hostile faction that the Stuart court even during the reign of Charles II continued to squander the revenue that was raised for it by Parliament for hedonistic purposes. Therefore, both poets by

noting the manner in which the members of the royal family used the income of the Crown for such worthy causes as that of alleviating urban poverty would mitigate the criticism brought against Charles and his court for being spendthrifts intent upon living in an ostentatious manner. In fact, several of the King's ministers in the years immediately following his First Dutch War of 1664-1667 would be investigated by Parliament because it was suspected that a significant portion of the revenue raised for the maintenance of a naval fleet during this conflict had been misappropriated for the King and his courtiers' private uses. In this kind of climate of suspicion created by those factions hostile to the restored Monarchy, it would be incumbent upon such courtier-poets as Cowley and Waller to counter such beliefs with a different portrait of a selfless royal family that was not only intent on restoring such royal landmarks as Somerset House, but also using its revenue altruistically to further the public good of its more unfortunate subjects.

It is, however, in Cowley's poetic description of the personified Somerset House's view of the urban landscape that lies upon its east-west axis, which would encompass both the court located in the City of Westminster and the City of London, that one can most strongly perceive the effect of factionalism upon the way that the physical city is described during the early years of the Stuart Nonarchy's

Restoration. In the earlier chapters we studied the defensive. piecemeal way the physical city is described in order to bolster the reigns of James I and Charles I. The courtier-poets in describing the physical city would most frequently isolate the sector of the metropolis harboring the most hostile factions opposed to the Crown's inept rule and either offer a denigrating view that reflected the King's and his court's attitude towards the populace living in that sector or offer a pacific treatment of that unfriendly area, portraying for propagandistic purposes an urban populace who had not according to these courtier-poets abandoned their loyalty to the King and his royal family. For example, the problematic City of London that harbors factions that are hostile to the court is isolated by Ben Jonson so as to focus on its pollution problem to prove that life there is unliveable in order to further James I's anti-urban policies and is also isolated during the next reign by Edmund Waller and Sir John Denham to show how Charles I is still a powerful enough political and religious leader to restore with the allegedly whole-hearted cooperation of Puritan Londoners, St. Paul's Cathedral, a symbol of the Monarchically-run Anglican Church that has become neglected amidst the "darker cloud" of an increasingly sectarian City. Unlike these fragmentary portraits of the physical aspect of London life during these prior Stuart reigns in which monarchical landmarks were either absent from poetic descriptions which

highlighted the ignoble urban scene, shown to be revered by a supportive urban citizenry, or contrasted with a surrounding factious metropolis, Cowley in a more comprehensive, integrated manner emphasizes Somerset House's central position within a sweeping panorama of the urban scene along its east-west axis. The fact that this royal landmark is situated at the mid-point of the Strand and, therefore, also located between the two cities of Westminster and London is stressed for the purpose of symbolizing the restored Monarchy's inclusive rule over an entire, unified, loyal city that is no longer riddled with a divisive factionalism as well as for the purpose of re-asserting the Stuart Monarchy's dominant role in governing the affairs of the whole capital city and the nation after the years of the Interregnum when all signs of monarchical power as in Herrick's description of the physical city in "His tears to Thamasis" had been obliterated.

The poet considers the Queen Mother's residence of Somerset House as part of the extensive row of structures built along the Thames's north bank. In a particularly vivid and incisive description, Cowley describes the grand, curving panorama of the metropolis as one would view it sailing up the Thames when the long and massive row of structures rising from the Thames's north bank, bending between London and Westminster to create the concave southern side of the

metropolis's crescent shape, would seem to make a "glorious Bow" to greet the eye of the beholder. Rather than being portrayed as standing in opposition to or appealing for the favor of the populace dwelling in a particular sector of the city, the Monarchy and its landmarks are portrayed in this Restoration poem as being part of one integral urban fabric:

> And here, Behold, in a long bending row,
> Here two Joynt Cities make one glorious Bow,

Cowley uses the phrase "two Joynt Cities" to stress the fact that the factional strife between the nobility in one city and the commoners in another is no longer evident. During the early years of Charles II's reign, according to this courtier-poet, both Westminster, the city containing the aristocratic institutions of the Court and Parliament, and London, the city of capitalist enterprise, are as is befitting the notion of "two Joynt Cities" reconciled with and mutually dependent upon one another so that they together create one interdependent metropolis.

To further emphasize the fact that the capital city during these early years of Charles II's reign is not torn by the factionalism that characterized the reigns of the previous Stuart Monarchs, Cowley establishes the dominant position of the royal landmark of Somerset House in the middle of this sweeping urban panorama of the structures rising upon the north bank of the Thames. The restoration of the Monarchy, its institutions, and its landmarks becomes the keystone

that is able to bring coherence, order, and integrity to London's entire urban panorama:

> The Midst, the noblest Place, possess'd by Me;
> Best to be Seen by all, and all O'resee.

Cowley's purposes in the above passage are twofold: he wishes to portray this royal landmark as an integral part of the urban community as well as to point out that the order and well being of that community are dependent upon having the strong centralizing impact of a Monarch and the institutions and landmarks that symbolize his power preside over the atomized will of its populace for the benefit of the common good. Therefore, the Monarch and the Monarchical artifacts that serve to symbolize his power are not just a part of the urban landscape but a dominating part of that overall scene that holds the metropolis together and prevents divisive factions from gaining the upper hand within it.

The poet in the above passage also builds upon his theme established earlier in this poem that Monarchy and its artifacts demonstrates its power by theatrical, egoistic means. Somerset House not only has an excellent prospect from which to observe the surrounding metropolis but also its vanity can be satisfied by its being the subject of the admiring gaze of the citizens of the metropolis who can readily view it from its prominent position along the busiest thoroughfare between London and Westminster. This dual

desire to not only observe the city's life but to be observed by the citizens of the metropolis is a reiteration of the previously discussed passage in which Somerset House delighted both in its role as an observer of the Strand's traffic and in its self-absorbed observations of its other face reflected in the Thames's waters.

This theatrical aspect of Monarchy and its artifices, which Cowley refers to when describing Somerset House's conspicuous presence within the urban panorama, exists for the purpose of demonstrating the sovereign's omnipotent power and asserts his ability to stamp out any factional discord that threatens to create chaos in his midst. As Jonathan Goldberg observes the public, theatrical display of both the King's person and such trappings of his reign as the renovated Somerset House so that he and they can see and be seen are essential ingredients in the assertion of the Monarch's power over his subjects:

> ... power is manifested in the spectacle, the mirror of the king. Most radically, this means that the king's public person includes, quite literally owns, the public; they are all included in his gaze, ... whereas the sovereign sees all, since all he sees he is--the spectators of the sovereign cannot see the king; they see the mirrors of his power, ... (149-150)

By claiming the "noblest place" in the metropolis is occupied by itself where it universally can be seen by all and omnipotently and omnisciently see and, therefore, preside over all, the personified residence of the Queen Mother as

one such trapping of Charles II's reign proclaims itself to be a symbol of the renewed dominance of the divinely sanctioned Stuart Monarchy that has at last subjugated the contentious religious and political factions of the city to its will.

However, this supremely confident faith in the restored Monarchy's uncontested dominance as it is best symbolized by the central location and majestic beauty of the repaired royal landmark of Somerset House which can "be Seen by all, and all O'resee" is unintentionally surrendered in subsequent passages that suggest fears on the part of the King, his court, and his courtier-poets that a renewed factionalism within the metropolis will arise even under Charles II's more conciliatory reign. Indeed, it is inevitable that this underlying fear of a renewed factionalism would emerge, since as we will ultimately see there was little historical basis for Cowley's propagandistic overt theme asserting the restored Stuart Monarchy's predominance in the political and religious life of the capital city and the nation. In fact, Charles II's frequent reliance upon such political techniques of secret accords, subterfuges, and contradictory agreements when dealing with various domestic and foreign factions would all belie Cowley's poetic assertion of a Monarchy that was fully in command of the urban and national scene.

Historic inaccuracy can be found in the commentary that Cowley's personified Somerset House provides as it gazes along its east-west axis towards the Cities of Westminster and London. The Queen Mother's residence presents an abstract evocation of each city's respective nature that overlooks the fact that during the Elizabethan and Stuart reigns the development of London's capitalist economy caused a drift in political power away from the City of Westminster's Court to the City of London and to the legislative body of Parliament's House of Commons which often tended to voice the interests of this city's rising middle-class businessmen (see Gibbons 38, 50-51). The poet has the personified royal residence refer to the most significant characteristics of these "two joynt Cities" as it stands with its face looking southward across the Thames so that on its right side is the City of Westminster and on its left side is the City of London:

> Which way soe'r I turn my joyful Eye,
> Here the Great Court, there the rich Town, I spy;
> On either side dwells Safety and Delight;
> Wealth on the Left, and Power upon the Right.

When asserting that the two "joynt Cities" which have combined to form one metropolis can be distinguished in terms of the City of Westminster containing the "Great Court" which is characterized by its political "Power" and the "rich" City of London being the wealthy administrative center of the capitalist economy in which middle class

merchants and industrialists are active, this courtier-poet presents a formula that is overly simplistic. He over-optimistically points out by exclusively locating a unilateral degree of political power within the "Great Court" that the Restoration of the Stuart Monarchy witnessed the cessation of such trends as political power ebbing away from the increasingly pauperised Court. Instead of the Court becoming more politically independent as Cowley suggests, it was becoming throughout the reigns of the Stuart Monarchs more dependent upon the City's wealthy capitalist entrepreneurs for its revenue and upon dealing on the political scene with these London businessmen's strong representative voice in a Parliament that was responsible for determining the taxes that should be levied to provide sufficient income to support the Crown's needs and to finance its domestic and foreign policies.

As a courtier-poet, Cowley would argue for the specialized functions of these two cities, since the exclusive location of political power within the "Great Court" of the City of Westminster would be desirable and was perhaps a secret dream of both the King and his courtiers. This coveting of absolute power would explain the King's, his brother's, and many other courtiers' flirtations with Catholicism, a religious order in which a more absolute form of Monarchical rule flourished. The more absolute nature of the French

Monarchy in that Catholic nation was more to the taste of Charles II, his royal family, and his courtiers. Charles II attempted to conciliate the various factions within English society and to stay on a good footing with the Cavalier Parliament not because he thought that it was ideal for power to rest in so many different hands but because it was necessary to deal diplomatically with these groups in order for the Monarchy to prevent further prerogatives slipping away from it and to have its measures passed in the latter legislative body. Therefore, the sharing of power with these factions and institutions was a diplomatic necessity, while Cowley's fiction of a Monarchy able to wield unilateral, arbitrary power from its "Great Court" in the City of Westminster was the unrealizable ideal.

Furthermore, as a courtier-poet, Cowley would argue for the symbiotic relationship that resulted from these cities performing their allegedly exclusive, specialized political and economic functions. In this symbiotic, rather than parasitic, relationship between a "Great Court" and the "rich Town," the respective strengths of each city, which Cowley identifies as the "Wealth [of London] on the left, and [the] Power [of Westminster] upon the Right," would bind the two disparate types of cities permanently together since in this symbiotic partnership between the sister cities what one city was lacking in could be provided for by its coun-

terpart: the businessmen of the City of London through loans and/or taxation levied upon them by Parliament could finance the King's policies, while the form of centralized government located in the City of Westminster, a characteristic of the modern nation-state, which consisted of the King's Court, the Houses of Parliament, the highest judicial courts, and the bureaucratic offices at Westminster, attracted the wealthy noblemen and gentry from their provincial estates throughout Great Britain who in turn created the kind of affluent consumer demand in the capital city which encouraged the merchants to invest in overseas trade in order to acquire fine, luxurious, and exotic merchandise to sell to that aristocratic market.

Cowley, however, in this simplistic formula arguing for this symbiotic relationship overlooks the fact that the late 16th and 17th centuries witnessed a growing disapproval among middle-class entrepreneurs in regards to the concept of political power being exclusively a privilege of the aristocracy. These merchants believed that their knowledge of the modern capitalist economy enabled them to govern the domestic and foreign affairs of the nation more prudently. Therefore, they would resent this courtier-poet's oversimplified assertion that political power was or should in the future continue to be ideally the exclusive responsibility of the "Great Court" to be financed by the still subordinate

capitalists of the "rich Town." This resentment felt by the City of London's capitalist businessmen who didn't want to be like Parliament, a body that had a part in political affairs only when it was summoned by the Crown to provide revenue and to pass legislation that the Crown favored and prorogued when it did not fulfill these royal needs, maneuvered like pawns in a political game conducted primarily by the Monarchy, inevitably had its part in the prior Stuart reign of Charles I of leading to the struggle spearheaded by the factious citizenry of the City of London for greater political power during the Civil War and the Interregnum. Helgerson points out in his summary of the Elizabethan Hakluyt's reasoning that the capitalist merchants even by the late 16th century were no longer satisfied with having a subordinate role in the affairs of government to be manipulated by the Crown:

> ... mercantile activity assumes a prominence that can hardly help but upset the usual assessment of the relative importance of various social groups within the English polity. If England's "wealth and honor," as the tirelessly repeated formula has it, depend above all on overseas trade, then it follows that merchants are exceptionally important Englishmen, perhaps no less important than their traditional superiors, the landowning gentry and aristocracy. (171)

The capitalist's impatience with this subordinate role in the affairs of government whose perpetuation as the status quo is suggested as being continued in the reign of Charles II by Cowley's characterization of Somerset House's and symbolically the Monarchy's self-satisfied view of the

politically powerful "Great Court" having its financial. needs supplied by the politically voiceless "rich Town," the "Wealth" of the latter primarily existing to fuel the "Power" of the former, is expressed even more volubly in Helgerson's summary of Thomas Mun's argument in the mid-1620s that merchants and not aristocrats were the proper political leaders of the modern nation-state:

> But now, as was never possible in Hakluyt, the popular writers who praised merchants, men of trade are preferred to nobles, and they are preferred not for their magnanimity and valor, but for qualities intrinsic to their commercial activity, for diligence, thrift, and worldly knowledge. Indeed, Mun presents such qualities as autonomous and self-sufficient. No other set of duties than the specifically commercial ones he enumerates need be considered in defining either the ideal merchant or the true national interest. And from this it follows that merchants, not aristocrats, are the proper governors of a modern state. (188)

The most substantial historical basis for Cowley's treating in this Restoration poem as if it were an actuality the "Great Court['s]" continued effort as in previous Stuart reigns to acquire absolute possession of political power is the fact that all the powers that were taken away from the Monarchy by the Parliament during the Civil War and the Interregnum were restored when Charles II became monarch so that this courtier-poet could conceive in the first years of his reign of this new King following in the footsteps of James I and Charles I of turning a deaf ear to the political protests of the commoners and nonconformists and dissolving Parliament for indefinite periods of time:

> Charles was restored unconditionally. His reign was declared to have begun at the moment of his father's death; those Acts of Parliament to which his father had assented were in force, all the rest were null and void ... Parliament assured itself of no greater role in the government than it had possessed under Elizabeth and the early Stuarts (except for a toothless act requiring a triennial session of Parliament, an Act Charles II ignored without popular protest in 1684). Since the Long Parliament and those of the Interregnum had abused their authority as freely as Charles I had done, it seemed pointless to build them up as a counterpoise to the Crown .... (Morrill 330)

But this claim that Cowley makes of the "Great Court['s]" exclusively wielding political "Power" is challenged by the actual reality of the Elizabethan and Stuart reigns that the degree of wealth and political power became proportional to one another in the modern capitalist state. Therefore, because of Parliament's budgetary responsibilities, its role in formulating and approving any taxes that were to be levied upon the citizenry, the Great Court's political power was not absolute because the city merchants' denial of loans and Parliament's failure to vote for sufficient revenues to fund the policies of Charles II which its members did not approve of inevitably inhibited the Monarchy's power to act unilaterally in both foreign and domestic affairs. As Knights points out national policy even during the Jacobean era was no longer the exclusive province of the Monarchy and the aristocracy to determine as England moved from a rural/agrarian feudal to an urban/industrial capitalist economy (118-123). Consequently, Cowley's view of the two cities of London and Westminster having separate, non-overlapping

roles, the one being that of unilateral political government by the "Great Court" of an Absolute Monarchy and the other of the "rich Town" being purely economic and subservient to the Monarchy's will, was an outdated medieval one that the Stuart Monarchy's restoration could not bring back into being.

Cowley, in fact, as I previously suggested at the outset betrays in the following line from this passage "Here the Great Court, there the rich Town, I spy" his own uncertainty in the renewed dominance of the Stuart Monarchy over the political and religious affairs of the nation. Even in the 17th century the word "spy" which is the activity that the personified residence of the Queen Mother performs when it looks right and left at both cities would have the connotation of glancing in a surreptitious, suspicious manner at the respective conditions and primary activities of Westminster and London to see if these urban centers were such orderly places that were as free of factional discord as the courtier-poet for the propagandistic purposes of bolstering the Stuart Monarchy pretends. This courtier-poet by using this term suggests unwittingly that he himself is not so certain that his formulaic attempt to define the essences of the two urban centers and the Monarchy's relationship with them is a valid one. Moreover, there is a contradiction in the personified Somerset House "spy[ingS]" upon activities

in the "Great Court" and the "rich Town" and on the other hand in a subsequent line from this passage deriving a sense of "Safety and Delight" from the respective political and commercial activities that it envisions to be occurring within these two cities that this royal residence lies between. This term "spy[ing]" also presents the Stuart Monarchy symbolized by the royal residence of Somerset House in a far less authoritative light than the former term of "oversee[ing]" had done. While the former term of "oversee[ing]" had evoked the commanding vigilance of the Stuart Monarchy that was visibly apparent to all its subjects and also created the connotation of the Monarchy being like a proprietor in the management of the affairs of the capital city and the kingdom, this latter term of "spy[ing]" suggests that the restored Monarchy was surrounded by enemies and forced by the prevalence of these still powerful, hostile factions to act in a secretive, duplicitous, underhanded manner to bolster its rule. Therefore, by vacillating between these two terms of "oversee[ing]" and "spy[ing]" that denote the same act on the part of Somerset House viewing the surrounding urban panorama but which have different connotations, Cowley unintentionally reveals the instability of the restored Monarchy and the susceptibility that is perceived by the King and his courtiers to being potentially overthrown by the republican and nonconformist factions in the capital city and in the nation which in turn

affected Charles II's policies during the first years of the reign which were as a result of these fears of further factional strife of a conciliatory nature.

Somerset House's act of "spy[ing]" harkens back to the more contentious situation existing in the pre-bellum years of Charles I's reign when the Monarchy became increasingly fearful of the political and religious factionalism that was emanating from the "rich Town" and which led to the demonstrations in Westminster that ultimately drove the King and his wife Henrietta Maria from their capital city. As this courtier-poet's use of the term "spy" reveals, the language of terror that was associated with a period which Cowley could recall first-hand is not quick to be banished from his mind even when he is in the midst of asserting by means of his pat descriptions of the two cities that vastly different and, in fact, regressive historical circumstances currently exist that have restored the old medieval separation between the roles of tradesmen and aristocrats in both the metropolis and the nation.

Although Cowley's overt theme consists in his asserting the restored political dominance of the Stuart Monarchy as it is symbolized by the repaired and enlarged royal landmark of Somerset House which is shown to have a commanding view of the entire metropolis, this courtier-poet also betrays an

underlying theme that is fearful of renewed factionalism arising and leading to Civil War and which challenges and contradicts his more overt assertions. While on the one hand such expressions as "two joynt Cities," the simplistic divisions of political and commercial responsibility between Westminster and London, and the notion that the personified residence of the Queen Mother is impressed by the "Safety and Delight" that "dwells" in both cities suggest a capital in which factionalism is no longer evident, there exists on the other hand in this same poem such expressions as that of Somerset House "spy[ing]" upon the two cities as well as more revealing subsequent passages which express the courtier-poet's and by reflection the King's and court's fears that further factional strife is on the verge of being renewed. A further example of this underlying fear of renewed factionalism jeopardizing the future well-being of the Monarchy occurs in a later passage from the poem in which this royal landmark expresses the desire to look upon its neighboring structures along the Strand as "mighty Forts" and "Guards" "t'assure" its "defence." These term would suggest cowley's own not altogether repressed fears that factional strife directed against the Monarchy might be resumed and, therefore, must be defended against in the absence of a more diplomatic solution by militaristic means as such term as "defence," "Forts," and "Guards" intimate. As with the term "spy[ing]" these "Forts" that Cowley refers

to that this royal landmark relies upon for its protection seem entirely out of context given his overt argument that Somerset House i situated between two cities where "Safety and Delight" in the absence of factionalism supposedly reigns.

The "mighty Forts" that Somerset House describes are also to be found along its east-west axis. The Queen Mother's residence sees on its more immediate right and left hand sides ("On either hand") two neighboring structures, the Savoy Palace and Arundel House, also built upon the Strand:

> T'assure yet my defence, on either hand,
> Like mighty Forts, in equal distance stand
> Two of the best and stateliest piles, ...
> . . . . . .
> My Neighbours and my Guards, watch and command.

The Savoy Palace could be referred to as one of the "mighty Forts" since this "state[ly] pile" to the immediate west of Somerset House was "strengthened and fortified ... with a wall of stone and mortar in 1293" (Hibbert 773). Moreover, this defensive barrier was replaced by a more durable one "between 1404 and 1405" when "a new stone wall was built along the Strand frontage" (774). Arundel House could also play a military role in defense of the Queen Mother's residence since this "state[ly] pile" to the immediate east of Somerset House could also like the Savoy Palace be compared to a "mighty Fort" since it served as a garrison after 1640 and until the Restoration (Hibbert 28).

Cowley, himself, could be suggesting, by viewing Somerset House's neighboring palaces along the Strand as "Forts" in which permanent garrisons of military troops could take up residence, the need of the new King Charles II to have the kind of permanent, substantial, domestic army that his brother James II would raise during his brief reign between 1685 and 1688 to protect the Monarchy by subduing and arresting religious and political malcontents. By speaking in these militaristic terms of the Stuart Monarchy's future defense against factional discord in the capital city, Cowley could be reflecting upon what Charles II's future measures should be to forestall further rebellions, viewing as a negative example that the new Monarch should learn from the previous reign's vulnerability to the massive demonstrations of Londoners before the Houses of Parliament in the Palace of Westminster and the King's residence at Whitehall Palace just prior to the Civil War because there was an insufficient number of guards present to Subdue the protestors. With himself, his ministers, and his family insufficiently defended against this mob of factious Londoners, Charles I removed his court from the capital. Therefore, in this passage from his poem Cowley is delighted with the prospect of having a Monarchy that is well defended by a readily available military force, because he realizes that if such sizeable garrisons of thousands rather than hundreds of men loyal to the King and guarding the persons, institu-

tions, and landmarks connected with the Stuart Monarchy would have been quartered in such palatial neighboring residences functioning as garrisons, they would have put down this riotous mob of Londoners in the 1640s, allowed the King and his court to maintain their presence in Westminster to continue their political wrangling over their prerogatives with Parliament, and prevented the members of Parliament's House of Commons rising to fill the executive void in government that was caused by the departure of the King and his Court from the capital city.

The sentiment, however, that is uppermost in this entire verse paragraph and which expresses this courtier-poet's underlying theme is the need for this new Stuart King to be vigilant against future factional challenges to his reign. Therefore, such verbs as "oversee," "spy," and in this last passage "watch," all denoting this need to be vigilant, are most prevalent. All these verbs belie Cowley's overt theme, which is symbolized by Somerset House's physical dominance over the surrounding urban landscape, that the restored Stuart Monarchy securely reigns in a metropolis of "Safety and Delight."

A subsequent verse paragraph casts further doubt upon Cowley's overt theme of a restored Stuart Monarchy that has complete control over its London subjects. In this passage

the courtier-poet has the personified royal landmark of Somerset House compare its respective relationships with the contentious urban scene and the peaceful rural one:

> Amidst these lowder Honours of my Seat,
> And two vast Cities, troublesomly Great,
> In a large various plain the Country too
> Opens her gentler blessings to my View,
> In me the Active and the Quiet Mind
> By different ways equal content may find.

In contrast to the previous verse paragraph, in this one there is no neat separation between the essential natures of the two cities. Westminster and London are, therefore, portrayed similarly as both possessing "lowder Honours" than the country and being both "troublesomly Great" because of the contentious struggle for supremacy in determining national policies between the Monarchy and the Cavalier Parliament as well as between Westminster's aristocrats and London's businessmen. In the latter form of urban factional strife, the management of political, religious, and economic affairs that were prescribed within a feudal hierarchical order as being the exclusive concerns of the nobility are no longer recognized by London's rising Protestant middle class as being their exclusive, divinely sanctioned,. prerogatives. Unlike the factious city, the country in this verse paragraph is portrayed as a place in which the medieval hierarchical ordering of the different classes of society and between man and nature still prevails. The "troublesom[e]" nature of these two cities, which Somerset House's panoramic prospect of the surrounding rural country-

side is able to afford itself momentary relief from, develops the underlying contradictory theme of the vulnerable nature of the restored Monarchy that is evident in previous passages in the need of this royal residence to "spy" on the respective activities of Westminster and London as well as its desire to have its two neighboring palaces function as "mighty Forts" to garrison royalist troops for this royal landmark's defense against further factional strife

Indeed, there was ample reason for Charles II and such courtier-poets as Cowley to look upon London as a "troublesomely Great" metropolis in the early and mid-1660s and to justify the underlying theme of suspicion and fear that we discover in Cowley's poem in which he expresses the need for a vigilant Monarchy to take the necessary steps to defend its landmarks, institutions, and political power against opposing factions. One of Charles II's biographers, Ronald Hutton, refers to several plots, demonstrations, and conspiracies that took place within the capital city during the early years of this King's reign that helped to shape his vigilant outlook as well as that of his courtier-poets when observing the London scene. As early as January of 1661 a small armed uprising occurred in London which indicated to Charles II and his courtiers the threat that urban factionalism still posed to the Monarchy and consequently led to

the Crown's overreaction to the rebellion that became known as "Venner's rising":

> Thomas Venner was a London cooper, and leader of a gathered church. Inspired by the speeches of the regicides on the scaffold, he and his flock decided upon an armed rebellion to seize the capital and to impose not only a republic but the rule of the saints predicted in the Book of Daniel. They were, of course, politically, if not medically, insane, but they caught the government totally by surprise. Its spy system, as yet much inferior to Cromwell's, was only capable of reporting rumours without penetrating republican circles .... It took four days for the militia and royal guards to kill or capture the thirty-five or so rebels. Fourteen were subsequently executed and their heads placed upon London Bridge.
>
> ... The news, spreading out from London to alarm the provinces, was closely followed by a royal proclamation forbidding unauthorized meetings for any purpose and by directives to the militia to arrest all suspected persons and search houses .... In England armed gentry reinforced the trained bands in a general round-up of Quakers and sectarian churches, adding (to the catch) former republicans without obvious religious affiliations and some presbyterians. Within six weeks nearly five thousand Quakers were behind bars.
>
> ... In the long term Venner had left two ominous legacies: the decision to retain an unprecedently large force of royal guards, and an intensified public fear of rebellion in general and of religious radicals in particular. (162-163)

In a manner that was reminiscent of the pre-Civil War protests in Westminster in 1641 against the religious and political powers of Bishops in the State Church and the House of Lords, a few months later in that same year of 1661 many Londoners demonstrated their disapproval of the return to the Episcopalian State Church and the threatened persecution of religious dissenters by voting for new Members of Parliament to represent their urban community who were

determined to see that the city continued to be a haven for Presbyterians and non-conformist sects:

> [An] event which weakened the proponents of conciliation was the London election in March, one of the earliest for the Parliament called to succeed the Convention. ...London had always been a stronghold of presbyterianism, ...As a result, four firmly anti-episcopalian MPs were returned at a hustings where the crowd shouted "No Bishops! No Lord Bishops!" Furthermore, some of the more extreme City presbyterians wrote to allies in the provinces, encouraging them ta mount a similar campaign. Charles and his ministers were infuriated by this attempt to overturn their policy, and reacted swiftly. ... , he ordered the arrest of the men who had urged a general effort against episcopacy, ... the City election ... had a wider effect upon public opinion, making presbyterians appear the principal obstacles to a conciliatory religious settlement and awaking memories of the popular demonstrations in London which had preceded the Civil War .... (163-164)

The fact that the "Wildman Plot" was exposed in 1661 as a result of the activities of the Monarchy's network of spies gives greater connotative significance to Cowley's use of the term "spy" in his poem when describing the manner in which Somerset House regards the urban panorama that it is set in the midst of, since his usage of this word reflects Charles II's own suspicious frame of mind and tactical strategy after Venner's Rising of more aggressively determining the current activities of sympathizers of the Republican cause and imprisoning them before they embarked upon an actual rebellion:

> ..., the government could foster tension while it preached reconciliation. This process became easier in the course of 1661 as, to avoid being surprised again as they had been by Venner, the Secretaries of State constructed a system of spies which spanned the country

> . It was naturally most active in London, and towards the end of the year it reported there the so-called "Wildman Plot". All that can be established of the truth behind this is that a group of former republican soldiers, politicians, and writers had taken to meeting and discussing current affairs. In early winter they were arrested, and Clarendon informed Parliament that these men had been at the centre of a conspiracy to topple the monarchy. It was upon this "discovery" that the government based its appeal for a standing army. None of the accused were either tried or released after examination, being sent to remote prisons.
>
> (Hutton 170-171)

The Monarchy's vigilance in identifying and making efforts to root out all signs of factional opposition to the Crown that emanated from the City of London became in the following year even more hyperactive:

> As August progressed, ..., reports of an impending rising poured into Whitehall. The government destroyed the city gates and the walls of four towns with strong presbyterian populations. It also installed two new garrisons, added three foot regiments to the standing army, and kept the militia in arms all autumn. It also kept its intelligence network busy, a precaution which ironically may have produced the very phenomenon that it was designed to prevent. Two spies now took the easy step from agents to agents provocateurs and, having located a handful of disaffected London artisans, apparently religious separatists, encouraged them to plan a rising .... : the agents reported in November, their dupes were arrested, were shown the rack and confessed and four more heads joined the impressive collection already rotting on London Bridge. With that perfect circularity common in a process of repression, the affair called the "Tong Plot", reinforced the government's belief in the danger of conspiracy.
>
> (182-183)

All of these actual rebellions (Venner's Rising) and the allegedly planned rebellions which the Monarchy and its spies imagined or provoked (the Wildman and Tong Plots)

provide a historical basis to support the theory that the underlying theme in Cowley's poem "On the Queens Repairing Somerset House," which is expressed inadvertently, reveals the King's and his courtiers' at times realistic and at times obsessive concern with detecting and rooting out all manifestations of factionalism in the metropolis in order to make the poem's overt theme, the Stuart Monarchy's uncontested dominance in the political and religious life of the capital, an accomplished fact. Both in the actual historic events that occurred in London in 1661 and 1662 and in this poem, both Charles II and his courtier-poet Abraham Cowley indicate in their respective political and artistic spheres of endeavor that the recent memories of the Monarchy's overthrow and Charles I's execution at the hands of discontented factions were still fresh memories that excited the perhaps excessive vigilance and actions of the new King in protecting the restored prerogatives of his reign against any signs of renewed factionalism in the metropolis. While the poem's overt theme argues that the Monarchy's dominance as symbolized by Somerset House's conspicuous physical appearance and setting is apparent to all of the King's London subjects ("Best to be Seen by all, and all O'resee"), the poet inadvertently suggests as an underlying theme that this restored pre-eminence of the Stuart Monarchy as the executive power in the government cannot in the light of past historical events be taken for granted, that certain

defensive measures, expressed by the terms "spy[ing]" and "guard[ing]," must be taken in order to prevent further challenges to the Monarchy's reign.

Although Cowley, a courtier-poet, has, like Drayton who aligned himself with the country faction, no strong motive for celebrating the economic industriousness of the city businessmen who were pocksting the personal income of the courtiers and the country gentry because of their taste for both the imported and ostentatious merchandise sold by them and who were also diminishing their political influence, he does so, nevertheless, because as part of this poem's overt theme of the restored Stuart Monarchy being a dominant but conciliatory regime, he is intent upon proving in these early years of its reign that the court and the upstart urban middle-class, can peacefully co-exist and be mutually useful in serving one another's respective interests. For example, both the King and the city's businessmen are interested in not only developing international trade because the city merchants and the Monarchy through taxation of this former group's profits will be enriched by this pursuit but also in building a mighty naval fleet that will protect England's lucrative commercial shipping ventures. As Drayton celebrated in Poly-Olbion the City of London's industrious activity that is symbolized by its busy waterfront consisting of "crouded Wharfes, and people-pestred shores/ His

Bosoms over-spread with Shoales of labouring ores," Cowley by focusing on the bold effort to span the river by the enterprising erection of London Bridge ("that wondrous Street") similarly compliments the industry of the capitalist city that is able to dominate nature as it is symbolized by the river to serve its own economic ends. In contrast with the Thames's harmonious relationship with royal landmarks, serving as we have previously seen as a tranquil mirror upon which Somerset House can gaze upon its majestic face, Cowley commends the capitalist city upon its more confrontational struggle to subjugate the river so that vehicular traffic can cross it by means of London Bridge and so that it serves the City of London's utilitarian need for a port. Unlike the Thames's relationship with royal landmarks that are situated upon its banks, in the City of London's struggle to dominate the river so that it serves the city's materialistic ends the Thames is no longer viewed as an aesthetic prop but rather as a powerful force that must be tamed and subjugated to serve the interests of the city's capitalist businessmen.

After identifying along its east-west axis the City of Westminster and the City of London in the middle distance of this axis ("Here the Great Court, there the rich Town, I spy;") then, observing its most immediate neighbors on the Strand along this latitudinal line ("... on either

hand,/Like mighty Forts, in equal distance stand/ Two of the best and stateliest piles, ..."), Cowley proceeds to have this personified royal landmark describe what lies at the farthest reaches of its prospect of the metropolis along this axis. In contrast to the poem's overt theme that asserts the physical dominance of structures connected with the restored Stuart Monarchy, Somerset House remarks upon the King's "warlike Guard of Ships" situated in the Pool of London just to the east of London Bridge that are both blocked from its view and at once mimicked and dwarfed because of the closer proximity to the Queen Mother's residence of the buildings erected in a row atop a bridge that is physically a part of the City of London and representative of such traits as industry, ingenuity, daring, and resourcefulness that are rewarded by the capitalist economy of that city:

> My warlike Guard of Ships, which farther lye,
> Might be my object too were not the Eye
> Stopt by the Houses of that wondrous Street
> Which rides o're the broad River, like a Fleet.

But Cowley does not express resentment towards the upstart capitalist city whose most spectacular structure, London Bridge. both blocks the royal navy of Charles II situated in the Pool of London from the view of the' royal landmark of Somerset House and mimicks the King's navy because its succession of houses atop it appear also like a fleet of vessels crossing the river in a processional fashion. Al-

though London Bridge could be portrayed hostilely, being another example in its obstructing Somerset House's view of the royal navy of the mercantile City's desire to displace the personages, institutions, and structures associated with the Monarchy from the democratized and commercialized urban landscape, Cowley in his complimentary portrayal of this "wondrous Street" follows the tone set by Charles II's conciliatory policy towards those hostile factions that did much to take away his father's prerogatives as a Monarch.

Because of the fact that Charles II led as a commander during the Civil War and as an exiled King during the Interregnum a less sheltered life, having a much broader experience of the world, its hardships, and its various types of people than his royal predecessor Charles I who rarely ventured outside the sphere of his Court, Charles II was more inclined as a result of his prior experience to encourage a greater participation in the affairs of government on the part of several different factions, drawing in this eclectic manner upon the knowledge and insights of the city's entrepreneurial middle class. As Morrill notes this King did much to bring about a more inclusive form of government that invited the involvement of the once hostile City factions, bearing no grudges against a city which had done much to provide a steady and reliable flow of finances

and manpower for the Parliamentary Army so that it could win the Civil War over the long haul:

> What is more, with remarkable nerve and courage, Charles set out to build his regime on as broad a base as possible. He refused to give special positions of fayour and trust to his own and his father's friends. There was to be power-sharing at every level of government: in the council and in the distribution of office at court, in the bureaucracy, in local government. Old royalists, old parliamentarian moderates who had shunned the Interregnum regimes, Cromwellian loyalists, all found places .... (330)

While an underlying wariness of the Monarchy towards the possible conspiratorial activies of Londoners who were republicans or members of radical sects existed and found their way inadvertently into this courtier-poet's poem, such expressions as "wondrous Street" used by Cowley in describing London Bridge reflect at least on the surface the new conciliatory attitude of the restored Stuart Monarchy to the City of London and to its dynamic economic life. There is none of the patronizing and even contemptuous sentiments expressed by Davenant in "The Queens, returning to London ..." in regards to the mercantile city's "False Sonnes of thrift." Whereas during the reign of Charles I there were poetic celebrations by Waller and Denham in regards to landmarks that were particularly repaired by the Monarchy, such as St. Paul's, which that King, as the head of the Church of England, had renovated, Cowley because of Charles II's more open-minded policies of power-sharing and inclusive government feels more free to celebrate on the basis of

their own independent merits structures within the City of London which were not the immediate responsibility of the monarchy to manage and to maintain.

London Bridge, indeed, was a structure that epitomized the City's enterprising capitalist spirit: the houses that Cowley refers to that were built upon the span were in many cases shops, factories, and stalls. Describing the structures built atop the bridge, Stephenson notes:

> From end to end, with the exception of two small openings, London Bridge was covered with houses that enclosed and roofed a narrow street: dwellings above and shops below. There were many kinds of shops, but in the time of Elizabeth the bridge was especially noted for the manufacture of pins, and the fair dames of London often bargained among the narrow stalls above the water for this indispensable article of dress. (64-65)

Therefore, in Cowley's poem London Bridge, this "wondrous Street," is celebrated as a symbol of the capitalist City of London's enterprising, industrious, and resilient spirit. In contrast, during the reign of Charles I, there were efforts that are to be found for example in Waller's and Denham's praise of St. Paul's repaired beauty, to exacerbate factional strife by using a repaired landmark within the City of London that was a symbol and under the administrative control of the hierarchical orders of the Monarchy and the State Church to denigrate the more levelling commercial, political, and religious activities of the upstart, middle-class Londoners.

In both cases in "On the Queens Repairing Somerset House" in which Cowley presents the commercial activities of the metropolis occurring along the Strand and upon London Bridge in a favorable light, the poet resorts to alien, unfitting forms of either natural or aristocratic imagery in order to celebrate them. Helgerson points out that this difficulty in finding suitable words and images to praise the businessmen's money-making pursuits so that the words used to praise the merchant were commensurate with his deeds was a common problem of all artists of that period. Although during the course of the 16th and 17th centuries the activities of entrepreneurs became more respectable because they brought wealth not only to themelves but to those members of the nobility who invested in their trading and industrial schemes as well as to the Monarchy who taxed their profitable enterprises, there was no corresponding method of praising their mercantile exploits; consequently, the poetry and other art forms of the period praised these businessmen for noble, chivalrous attributes that had nothing to do with their actual bourgeoise skills and practices:

> While the older, negative stereotype of the merchant as a greedy usurer waned in the last decades of the sixteenth century, no more favorable image emerged--or rather none that would serve to distinguish merchants from the aristocratic leaders of society. Instead of praising merchants for their diligence, thrift, or financial talent, as their successors a hundred years later would do, Stevenson's popular authors "praised them for being 'magnanimous,' 'courtly,' 'chivalric,' vassals of the King .... Elizabethan praise of bourgeoise men was expressed in the rhetoric--and by

> extension in terms of social paradigm--of the aristocracy."
> ... Clearly, the producers of these images--poets, players, printers, preachers, and pamphleteers--felt some need to show the leading members of the urban commercial class in a more positive way than had been customary. The extraordinary growth and diversification of the English economy, particularly as a result of increased overseas trade, required new form of expression, ... The merchant hero was, ... , an unstable and short-lived paradox, an attempt to deny change even while expressing it, a reassertion of traditional social values and a familiar social hierarchy in the very midst of their subversion. (108-170)

The failure to accurately reflect and to esteem the real contributions made by London's capitalist entrepreneurs and laborers of the period in strengthening the nation which is demonstrated in Cowley's unfitting use of figurative language on several occasions in this poem could only heighten the factional resentment of the city's businessmen who felt themselves to be not adequately assimilated and represented within the elite circles of society that determined the nation's political and religious destiny. In an earlier verse paragraph Cowley creates for a thoroughfare that once exclusively provided residences for the nobility an unfitting metaphor that compares the commercialized Strand's activity to the natural phenomena of the Thames which passes by Somerset House's other side ("a Street's broad Channel goes,/ Which still with Waves of crowding people flows"), and at a later point he similarly employs the equally unsuitable imagery of heroic military endeavor that was most often used to highlight the gallantry of the nobility who

served as commanders in times of war to describe the industrious activities occurring within the "Houses of that wondrous Street" of London Bridge that "rides o're the broad River, like a Fleet." The plebeian activities that went on in these shops, factories, and homes erected atop London Bridge would bear little resemblance to the heroic gallantry of the aristocratic officers who led the King's naval fleet into battle during the First Dutch War of his reign in the mid-1660s, yet Cowley in order to compliment these symbols of London's industrious mercantile life creates an inappropriate simile that compares these residences and workplaces of commoners dwelling upon this span with the more illustrious, aristocratic artifacts of warfare. It can be argued that the personified Somerset House which expresses the restored royal family's perspective of the London scene has little awareness of the productive lives led by the city's lower class laborers and middle-class tradesmen and merchants. Therefore, when confronted by the physical phenomena of these houses built upon London Bridge, this personified royal residence is capable of evoking only the external appearance of these structures, comparing them, because it has no sense of the industrious bourgeoise activities going on inside them, with the kinds of artifacts of warfare that members of the nobility would have greater first-hand knowledge of. Consequently, the figurative language the royal residence uses to describe these houses of Londoners located

on London Bridge, comparing them to a naval fleet because of the external physical impression they make from the viewer's prospect, would unintentionally express the superficial understanding of the royal family and the courtier-poet in regards to the inner workings of the capitalist economy and the Londoners who function within it.

In spite of this inadvertent demonstration of the Crown's and this courtier-poet's superficial understanding of the industrious activities occurring within the City of London, it would seem that Cowley's purpose in this verse paragraph is, nevertheless, to celebrate the City of London by praising one of its most prominent landmarks. By means of juxtaposing London Bridge's "fleet" of shops with the royal naval fleet that lies just beyond it and remarking that Somerset House's view of these ships is obstructed by these edifices of commercial endeavor built atop that span, Cowley suggests that the prominence of the City of London's industrious capitalist activities has the power to overshadow the martial affairs being conducted by the monarchy. Indeed, as this courtier-poet's King was well aware, his ability to fit out a naval fleet to fight their Dutch counterpart was dependent upon a prosperous capitalist economy. Because it is the personified Somerset House, which expresses the royal family's perspective, that observes and creates the metaphor for the visual effect created by this row of buildings

erected atop London Bridge that bears a strong resemblance to the fleet of the royal navy anchored in the Pool of London just beyond it, Cowley implies that even from the perspective of the Monarchy the mercantile activity being conducted upon London Bridge and elsewhere within the City of London is just as essential to the nation's future well-being and prosperity as its military and naval activities that are presided over by the King and the aristocracy. Indeed, this willingness on the part of this courtier-poet to recognize and to celebrate (however, inaptly) the mercantile city would be reflective of Charles II's more inclusive form of government, since this King was more willing than his father, Charles I, to invite rather than like his predecessor to exclude the participation of various factions in his Court's affairs.

Unlike those royal landmarks situated on the metropolitan banks of the Thames which Drayton in Poly-Olbion, Herrick in "His tears to Thamasis," and Cowley in "On the Queens Repairing Somerset House" all portray as having an aesthetically complementary relationship with the river, in Cowley's poem the structures and people of the mercantile City of London as they are symbolized by London Bridge have a more confrontational and utilitarian relationship with the river. The durability and reliability of the City of London's river and road transportation system which is essential to the

efficient functioning of this urban center's capitalist economy is symbolized by London Bridge's ability to withstand with only a minimal amount of damage the tidal flow of the Thames's waters which pass to and fro beneath it between its obtrusive starlings. These starlings upon which the Bridge stood were under constant stress as Mitchell and Leys point out because they impeded the Thames's flow (132-133).

By emphasizing the combined durability of the bridge and the buildings erected upon it in their mutual determination to stand firm against the perpetual onslaught provided by the tidal flow of the river, Cowley represents the growth of the commercial City of London into its mature stage of development. This urban center in its maturity is no longer willing to acquiesce to the caprices of the Thames. The city's capitalist economy which is so reliant upon the need to have a safe port where ships can safely anchor to have goods loaded and unloaded from them is no longer willing to have its riverfront activities disrupted by the Thames's tidal excesses. London Bridge's physical dominance over the forces of Nature symbolizes the leading role that the activities associated with the capitalist economy have taken in the metropolis as well as the mercantile City of London's intolerance towards allowing its business affairs to be interfered with by natural forces:

> The Stream's eternal Siege they fixt abide,
> And the swoln Stream's Auxiliary Tide,
> Though both their ruine with Joynt power conspire,
> Both to out-brave, they nothing dread but Fire.

The City of London's development of a powerful capitalist economy is reflected both in its strong intolerance of disruptive natural forces as well as by its resistance to an Absolute Monarchy coming into being during the Stuart reigns of the early and mid-17th century which would interfere in its economic affairs. In fact, we will soon see that the former case is used at least by Cowley to symbolize the latter one of the city's struggle in part through its representation in the House of Commons to limit the ability of the Monarchy through its policies to have a harmful effect on the health of London's capitalist economy.

When considering exclusively the former case concerning the city's relationship with Nature, Drayton's Poly-Olbion, Herrick's "His tears to Thamasis," and Cowley's "On the Queens Repairing Somerset House" are all poems which reflect the city's progressive unwillingness to submit to the forces of Nature as its capitalist economy arrives at a mature stage of development. As we chronologically proceed from Drayton's poem published in the reign of James I, Herrick's poem published during the Interregnum, and Cowley's poem published in the early years of the Restoration, there is a progression in the mercantile city's ability, due to its

growing stature, to assert its dominating presence and influence in the urban landscape so that the natural, unpredictable might of the Thames is reduced to the submissive, servile role of supporting those activities associated with the City of London's economic importance as a port. In a passage from Drayton's poem it is the fragile "feminine" city that must acquiesce to the will of the "masculine" river because the mighty river sending "surging [tidal] waves" into London's "bosome" decrees that "too farre in length, his [the Thames's] Towne should not extend." In Herrick's poem the poet requests that the river limit its excessive tides for the good of the formative capitalist city which it should serve in London's quest to become a port conducting international trade, appealing to the Thames to never "as ye spring,/... make sick your Banks by surfeiting." However, at the time Cowley's lines are written the City of London has arrived at the mature state of a world-class city, by now the largest capital city in Europe; his lines reflecting this new status of the city neither express the need any longer for the metropolis to acquiesce to the tides of the river nor to appeal to the Thames to be more considerate of the city it passes through; instead, this poet observes that the fully developed city's durable structures can heroically contend with and prevail against the most severe displays of the Thames's might. In these successive poems the capitalist City of London is revealed to be

consolidating its presence along the banks of the Thames so that Drayton's equation of a feminine city having to yield to the will of the masculine river is no longer upheld in Herrick's and Cowley's poem where the river is spoken of in neutered terms: in Herrick's poem an appeal is made to the river to tame itself in order to serve the city's economic interests, whereas in Cowley's poem the established might of the City of London as symbolized by such sturdy structures as London Bridge have forcefully subdued the willful river into submissively serving the city's economic purposes. The development of London's capitalist economy, which is strongly tied to its need for a reliable port to service its overseas trade, can in these three poem be seen in term of three different stages of human growth: as a child in Poly-Olbion that must not disturb its guardian the river by overstepping its prescribed bounds, as an adolescent in "His tears to Thamasis" that needs the space to grow with the continued assistance if no longer required dominance of the river, and as an adult in "On the Queen's Repairing Somerset House" who can stand up to the rigors and assaults of an equally adult but no longer nurturing river, so that both city and river are now expressed as fellow competitive adults, each vying for their place within the physical landscape of the metropolis.

A parallel emerges between the City of London's relationship with the Thames and its relationship with the Stuart Monarchy. In both cases the development of its capitalist economy and the corresponding wealth and power which the city's businessmen have attained by means of this development makes them intolerant of both the excesses of Nature, symbolized by the tidal flow of the river, and the excesses of a Monarchy, which is in part symbolized by such prior Stuart Monarchs as James I and Charles I showing signs of seeking absolute powers for themselves by such arbitrary acts as proroguing and dissolving Parliament at will. The economic success of the prosperous middle-class citizens of the city makes them not only more confident in their ability to "outbrave" and to subdue the river to serve their capitalist purposes but also more confident in their ability to assert their opinions and active wills upon religious and political matters as well. Under such circumstances of a growing sense of self-reliance and self-determination amongst the city's entrepreneurs efforts are made not only to limit the power of such natural forces as the Thames to serve the materialist ends of the city's economy but also to limit the powers of Monarchy by seeking to have Parliament become a more independent legislative body that would provide a more powerful, representative voice for the citizens of the city.

A passage, therefore, in which Cowley describes London Bridge forcefully opposing and constricting the tidal power of the river so that the personified Thames protests ("Find[s] by Art his Natural forces broke,/And bearing Captive-like, the Arched Yoke,/Do's roar, and foam, and rage at the disgrace") can also be interpreted on an allegorical level in which the struggle to stand against and to circumscribe the power of the river can be seen as a figurative allusion to another concurrent struggle involving the republican and puritan factions within the City of London, empowered by their city's economic might, seeking to alter the obtrusive, ill-informed, self-seeking policies of the Monarchy in, for example, such economic matters as taxation and patents. The image, therefore, of London Bridge's starlings at first "abiding" the Thames's '"eternal siege'" and eventually "out-braving" the tidal river's conspiracy to "ruine" them corresponds with particular pre-bellum events in Charles I's reign in which the City of London, like London Bridge's struggle to withstand the Thames's siege, was also put in a defensive position as the King, aggressively seeking to have greater absolute powers over his subjects, particularly those dwelling in London where factional opposition to the Crown was at its worst, continued the anti-urban policies of James I in discouraging the city's continued growth, imprisoning and punishing those London commoners who spoke out against his regime, proroguing and dissolving

Parliaments that tended to vocalize the radical sentiments of these urban factions, and continuing to interfere in the economic affairs of his capital city to the detriment of the city businessmen's interests. The subsequent image of London Bridge, symbolic of the economic power of the City of London, breaking and imprisoning the "Natural forces" of the Thames by means of its starlings can be seen as a figurative description of the breaking up of the Stuart Monarchy's monopolization of political power by the city factions through their massive demonstrations and their representative voice in Parliament's House of Commons, and the imprisonment and execution of the Crown's leading figures. Such images of London Bridge "bearing [the Thames] Captive-like" as its waters are forced submissively through the "Arched Yoke" created by its starlings so that the tidal flow of the Thames, forced to flow through these constrictive man-made channels "roars," "foams," and "rages at the disgrace" closely parallels the still relatively recent events of a Monarch who was also deprived of his divinely sanctioned natural power to rule and led away, in spite of the protests ("roars") of royalists "[en]raged at the disgrace," "captive-like" into a genteel imprisonment in Windsor Palace subsequent to being tried in the upstart bourgeoisie metropolis for his life. In relation to the contemporary circumstances of the recently restored Stuart Monarchy which existed at the time Cowley's poem was composed, this court-

ier-poet's description of London Bridge and the City of London taming the Thames to serve its own ends can be taken allegorically as the capitalist city's having conditioned the restored Stuart Monarchy to adopt a more conciliatory policy of power-sharing because of the lesson it was taught during the Civil War and Interregnum.

The Thames's respective relationships with the City of London, as symbolized by London Bridge, and with the Monarchy, as symbolized by Whitehall Palace, as it is described in Cowley's poem can also be viewed as representing this courtier-poet's own respective political attitudes towards the upstart mercantile city which seeks to disrupt through its capitalist activities the established natural and hierarchical orders and to the Stuart Monarchy which seeks to preserve these orders. Therefore, his description of the Thames noisily protesting its displacement by the obtrusive starlings of London Bridge can also be viewed as an allegorical account of the humiliations and privations suffered after Charles I's execution both by those royalists who remained behind in Republican England and did without the patronage and preferments of the court as well as the penury suffered by the new King and his courtiers who while exiled from their kingdom were forced to rely on the often sporadic and unreliable assistance of their various Continental hosts. London Bridge's displacement of the Thames as it

flows beneath the disruptive foundations of London Bridge mirrors the situation of supporters of the Royalist cause who were similarly displaced from their position in society and dispossessed in many cases of their properties, including their landed estates under a Republican regime. The displacement of the Thames by London Bridge is just one example of the manner in which the capitalist economy of the City of London alters the divine sense of order existing between Man and Nature, God and Man, and King and subject.

In contrast to the conflict that exists between the natural river and London Bridge, a symbol of the disruptive, usurping tendencies of the City of London's merchants who seek to extend their economic, political, and religious influence beyond their appropriate bounds, a just sense of order and place within the urban landscape between the Monarchy's landmarks and Nature is revealed at the conclusion of this same verse paragraph because the Crown seeks to preserve the divine sense of hierarchical order between all things on Earth and Heaven. Therefore, the Thames is described by Cowley as calmly flowing past Whitehall Palace as its waters proceed upriver during the incoming tide past its earlier tumultuous confrontation with London Bridge:

> But recomposes strait and calms his Face,
> Is into reverence and submission strook,
> As soon as from afar he does but look
> Tow'rds the White Palace where the King does reign
> Who lays his Laws and Bridge o're the Main.

The Thames, seeing that its proper place within the urban landscape is not threatened by such royal landmarks as Somerset House. which in a previous passage used the river as a mirror to admire its own restored charms, and Whitehall Palace, is capable of experiencing sentiments of "reverence" and even offering without the coercion it suffered at London Bridge, which sought ("by Art") to displace the flow of the natural river a willing "submission" to the King who dwells within this royal residence that the Thames quietly passes beside.

The reaction of the Thames to the respective landmarks of London Bridge and to Whitehall Palace can be regarded as revelatory of the courtier-poet's feelings towards those people and institutions that these landmarks symbolize. In the former case, the Thames's raging at London Bridge, a symbol of the mercantile City's disruption of the hierarchical and natural order, can be viewed as representative of the courtier-poet's own rage at the city factions' efforts to usurp the Monarchy's powers just prior to and during the Civil War and Interregnum and as recently as Venner's Rising during the new King's reign, while in the latter case the personified Thames's calm waters which experience feelings of reverence and submission towards the royal landmark of Whitehall Palace are reflective of this courtier-poet's own feelings of devotion to the Stuart Monarchy which still

seeks to preserve the hierarchical order existing amongst Man, Nature, and God.

While Cowley initially sets out to compliment the one structure belonging to the City of London that he specifically describes in this poem, referring to it as that "wondrous Street," the remainder of the verse paragraph as we have seen, although accurately depicting the noisy rapids that are created by the starlings supporting the bridge, on an allegorical level criticizes London Bridge as being representative of the upstart City businessmen's efforts to create factional furor and to consequently arouse the rage of the King and his court because of their desire to step beyond their proper place in the social and political order.

This criticism of London Bridge as a symbol of the disorder and factionalism that is endemic to the mercantile city is continued in a more comparative manner when Cowley points out that while the citizens of London have the ability to lay a bridge over the Thames which creates much upset to the river the King has the greater power to build a fleet of naval and trading ships that can bridge the world's great oceans and seas. Therefore, the "wondrous Street" by the conclusion of this verse paragraph that is a product of the industriousness and ingenuity of the London citizenry pales in comparison to the mightier structures that the King can

build which can "Bridge o're the Main." Instead of continuing to develop his theme of the renewed harmony that exists between the restored Monarchy and the mercantile city, Cowley emphasizes instead a continued rivalry in relation to who can build the greater and more enduring structures.

What further suggests that the violent relationship between London Bridge and the Thames is symbolic of the factionalism that existed in recent memory between many Londoners and the Monarchy is the fact that Cowley in describing this phenomenon of the river's relationship with the bridge loses sight of the major theme of his poem. In this verse paragraph the personified Somerset House is no longer the center of attention to which other physical parts of the urban scene are subordinately juxtaposed because they lie along different axes (north-south, east-west) of this royal landmark's prospect of the surrounding metropolis. London Bridge as a part of Somerset House's prospect takes on greater importance than the personified royal residence that views and comments upon it. Even though we still see in this verse paragraph the parts of the physical city from the perspective of Somerset House, the poem's center of gravity has shifted because of this royal residence's intense focus (exertion of negative capability) upon London Bridge's tumultuous relationship with the river which would suggest that there is a greater allegorical resonance that is re-

vealed by this concern. In this intensification of focus upon this part of the physical city, the poem's theme concerning the physical dominance of Somerset House and symbolically the restored political dominance of the Stuart Monarchy is lost sight of as the violent confrontation between the Thames and London Bridge serves to remind the courtier-poet of the earlier violent pre-bellum factionalism of 1641-1642, which consisted of city mobs, whom the insufficient number of royal guards could not control, gathering to demonstrate support of the inroads that the House of Commons were making in taking away the Monarchy's prerogatives, that in turn drove the previous Stuart King from his capital city. This, therefore, becomes another instance in which Cowley's overt theme is subverted by underlying concerns (which are for the most part inadvertently expressed) about the restored Stuart Monarchy's vulnerability to being both influenced and coerced to follow a course of action that is dictated by the monied interests of the urban capitalist society. By portraying the river as being manipulated by London Bridge so that it remains subservient to the economic needs of the city for a dependable port and road transportation system, Cowley unintentionally discloses in an allegorical manner an underlying theme that the supposedly dominant Stuart Monarchy under Charles II's conciliatory reign which seeks the requisite amount of political support from the city's populace to preserve its popular mandate may similar-

ly be constrained and manipulated by the city's entrepreneurs to serve the needs of the urban capitalist economy so that as a result the Crown too, like the River Thames, bears the "Arched Yoke."

In Edmund Waller's poem "Upon Her Majesty's New Buildings at Somerset House" and "On St. James's Park, as Lately Improved by His Majesty" which were also written during the early years of the Restoration, there are fewer signs of the ambivalence to be found in Cowley's poem concerning the degree to which the renovated royal landmarks and the restored royal executive power of the Stuart Monarchy are dominant in the physical and political life of the metropolis. However, this ambivalence that vacillated between these already identified overt and underlying themes is still evident to a lesser degree in the latter of the two poems by Waller. Furthermore, in both of Waller's poems in order to heighten the celebration of the Stuart Monarchy's restoration to executive power in the nation's government the royal figure is physically portrayed as interacting with the royal landmark that he or she has been personally involved in restoring to its former beauty.

Both the titles of Cowley's and Waller's poems, respectively being "On the Queens Repairing Somerset House" and "'Upon Her Majesty's New Buildings at Somerset House" emphasize

both the healing brought about by a member of the restored royal family to a particular physical landmark of the metropolis as well as suggest as a causative factor that created this need for repair and new construction the destructive nature of the radical urban sects who drove the King and his courtiers from the capital city, and who desecrated landmarks connected with the Monarchy and the episcopal State Church. Both poets point out that the restored regime of the Stuart Monarchy, particularly in the person of the Queen Mother, is responsible for repairing and improving Somerset House which had been vandalized by Cromwell's Parliamentary Army during the Civil War and represented just one of several instances of vandalism performed by that Army in the metropolis during that period. The titles of both poems by these courtier-poets would remind Londoners of the damage that had been done to many of the palaces, cathedrals, chapels, and parks that had been associated with what was widely believed during the Interregnum to have been a Popish Court. This belief which was particularly prevalent amongst Puritan Londoners was a consequence of Charles I's favorable domestic and foreign policies towards Roman Catholics in England and Roman Catholic nations, such as Spain in its Continental wars with Protestant countries, even while this former king adopted increasingly oppressive measures towards Protestant dissenters whom he believed were a greater threat to his rule.

Edmund Waller in his poem "Upon Her Majesty's New Buildings at Somerset House" also proves, but in a more consistent manner, his theme that the Stuart Monarchy has once again been restored both in physical and political terms to a position of supreme dominance within the urban landscape of the capital city. Waller, however, establishes this physical dominance in a much less concrete manner than Cowley when celebrating the magnificent circular panorama of the metropolis that can be viewed from the vantage point of the repaired Somerset House. Waller's reference to "the fair view" only alludes to the physical landmarks surrounding the House that Cowley had described more specifically in his poem. Consequently, he gives himself less occasion to slip into Cowley's underlying theme concerning the potential threat of factionalism that lies only temporarily dormant in certain areas of the metropolis, such as the City of London, and can be readily awakened into a furor amongst the urban populace once further indications of Popish leanings by particular members of the Stuart Court become evident and later fears of a popish succession after the Duke of York's actual conversion manifest themselves. As Waller in his poem "Upon His Majesty's Repairing of St. Paul's" chooses to ignore the magnificent view that this Cathedral would afford of the surrounding panorama of the City of London because dwelling on such a physical landscape might cause him to allude to the Puritan members of its populace who did not welcome

efforts to repair a popish Cathedral, and focuses instead upon the particular repairs and improvements that Charles I made upon a landmark of the Church of England which he as Monarch was the head of, this same courtier-poet, similarly, devotes more attention to the restored royal landmark of Somerset House than he does to the potentially hostile elements of the surrounding metropolitan panorama that can be readily viewed from the upper floors of the Queen Mother's residence. In the case of both poems describing repairs and improvements made to royal landmarks within the capital city, Waller does not wish to detract from his primary theme of the Monarchy's restored power in the capital city and its kingdom by paying too much attention. to the surrounding physical panorama because he might reveal, as Cowley inadvertently does, the underlying truth that particular urban areas can be portrayed as symbolic reminders of the factionalism still persisting in the metropolis. Whereas Cowley primarily established Somerset House's physical dominance over the capital city by emphasizing its central position as a focal point from which to perceive the surrounding metropolis ("Best to be Seen by all, and all O'resee"), Waller creates this same sense of this restored monarchical landmark's physical dominance by the different means of emphasizing such concrete attributes of the improved Somerset House as its great height from which he describes in abstract terms the circular panorama of the

capital city that can be viewed from the Queen Mother's rooms on the uppermost floor:

> Each part [of Somerset House] with just proportion graced,
> And all to such advantage placed,
> That the fair view her window yields,
> The town, the river, and the fields,
> Ent'ring beneath us we descry,
> And wonder how we came so high.

The personified voice of Somerset House was present in Cowley's poem to humanize this royal landmark so as to win the empathy of the urban citizenry on behalf of its past sufferings during the Civil War and Interregnum and current triumph of being repaired by the Queen Mother during the Restoration. Because this personified voice is absent in Waller's poem, this latter poet resorts to another more obvious means of giving a human face to this royal landmark: he introduces the royal presence of the Queen Mother within Somerset House in order to represent the fact that this royal residence's physical restoration is symbolic of the restoration of the Stuart Monarchy to its former political height as the executive branch of government. The effortlessness ("without taking pains to rise") with which this aged Queen Mother climbs the stairs of Somerset House to reach her upper story rooms so that all "seems before her feet to bend" symbolizes the divine right of the royal family to rule because of their noble genealogy that entitled them to preside from their most well born rank over the

lower ranks within the hierarchical order of society. The Queen Mother's physical ascension to the uppermost floors of the renovated Somerset House to look out upon the landscape of the metropolis, therefore, parallels the restored Stuart Monarchy's renewed hierarchical ascendancy over the lower orders of society which is justified by the principles of divine right. Not only Somerset House's great physical height and mass which dominates the metropolis's skyline along the north bank of the Thames but also the fact that the royal figure of the Queen Mother can look out upon the surrounding panorama of the capital city from that towering and massive height both symbolize the restored political power of the Stuart Monarchy:

> She needs no weary steps ascend;
> All seems before her feet to bend;
> And here, as she was born, she lies;
> High, without taking pains to rise.

Furthermore, the effortlessness of the Queen Mother's re-ascension to a position of both physical and political dominance is a general characteristic of the restoration of the Stuart Monarchy. Charles II, the members of his royal family, and his courtiers could accomplish little by means of their active machinations to achieve a restoration of their kingdom in the 1650s when Cromwell took upon himself the executive duties of government during the years of the Protectorate and competently maintained through loyal generals a strong military presence to maintain order in the

English provinces; during the Interregnum, Charles II primarily had to play a waiting game for the political situation in England to change in a manner that would be favorable for the Stuart Monarchy being invited to return to power. After the passing of the de facto king Oliver Cromwell, the inept, short-lived rule of his son Richard, and the disbanding of the Rump Parliament, the activities of Lord General Monck and the new freely elected Parliament to restore what most Englishmen believed to be the only legitimate form of executive power that ruled by divine right led to Charles II being asked to restore the Stuart Monarchy. Except for the assurances made by Charles II to Parliament in various drafts of the Declaration of Breda to adopt while restoring the episcopal Church of England tolerant religious policies particularly to Protestant dissenters, to rule jointly with Parliament which he promised to call into session on a periodic basis, and to limit the scope of retribution to only those members of the Regicide Parliament who actually signed Charles I's death warrant, this chain of events leading up to the Restoration occurred in an effortless manner without the King or any other members of the royal family "taking pains to rise" to their former position of political and religious supremacy.

As in the poems about the repair and improvement of Somerset House, Waller in "On St. James's Park, as Lately Improved by

His Majesty" similarly portrays the steps that a member of the royal family, in this case Charles II, has taken to repair and improve a royal setting after the damage it had suffered by supporters of the Republic during the Interregnum. Unlike these previous poems in which Somerset House provides à focal point from which to view the circular panorama of the entire metropolis, Waller uses St. James's Park as a focal point from which to view the restored recreational and political pursuits of the Court within the Park as well as the more limited circular panorama of the most significant landmarks within the City of Westminster. St. James's Park in this poem is portrayed both as a setting in itself for the Court's deliberation upon national affairs and as a prospect from which to view other landmarks immediately surrounding the park that are closely linked to the Court's administration of the nation's affairs. In this poem the factionalism that led to the removal of the King and the Court from the capital city affects the content of this poem in terms of Waller's efforts to describe the manner in which Charles II has repaired and improved the park after the damage it sustained during the years of the Civil War when citizens used limbs from the trees in the park to heat their homes because of the disruption in the shipping of sea coal from the midland and northern regions of England, and in terms of this courtier-poet's effort in this poem to physically and politically establish the restoration of the

King's dominant presence, playing and administering to the needs of the nation both within the park and within the structures housing institutions of government which are to be found situated on the periphery of the park, after this Monarch had been for a decade and a half spent in exile upon the Continent absent from his park, his court, and his capital city.

In the first half of this poem Waller continues to develop the theme of the Monarchy's harmonious relationship with Nature. Nost immediately, the influence of factionalism in Waller's description of the Park can be seen in his effort to point out that all of Charles II's improvements that have enhanced the beauty of the park have occurred subsequent to the neglect and vandalism that was allowed to occur within the park when England was administered by a Republican government. Historians have noted that Charles II enlarged the park by 38 acres, re-landscaped the park by building paths and avenues and planting trees and shrubs, altered several bodies of water within the park by creating a canal out of several former ponds, stocked wildfowl and other forms of wildlife in the park, and built a long avenue lined with trees in order to play his favorite sport "pall-mall" (Hibbert 716-717). To pointedly contrast the damage that occurred within the park during Cromwell's government, Waller alludes to all these concrete improvements in St.

James's Park in the first half of his poem. First, in order to contrast the denudation and cutting down of the trees that occurred during the Civil War and Interregnum, he notes the trees that have been planted in the park by order of the restored king, and envisions a time when these recently planted trees shall approach the height of Whitehall Palace, Charles II's residence, which adjoins this park and serves as the Palace's enormous backyard:

> For future shade, young trees upon the banks
> Of the new stream appear in even ranks;
> The voice of Orpheus, or Amphion's hand,
> In better order could not make them stand;
> May they increase as fast, and spread their boughs,
> As the high fame of their great owner grows:
> May he live long enough to see them all
> Dark shadows cast, and as his palace as tall.

As with the previous poetic description of the improvement of Somerset House, the urban landscape as represented in this case by St. James's Park is described as undergoing a process of healing and repair after the damage done to it by the disorderly Republican administration. In these poems about the repair and improvement of Somerset House and St. James's Park, after the damage that these royal landmarks suffered during the Civil War and Interregnum, the orderly nature of the renovation project is emphasized; moreover, this order is able to be achieved because of the fact that the restoration project is being conducted in accord with a royal figure's plans and under his or her supervision. In the former case of Somerset House, Waller, to stress the

order that is restored to the urban landscape because of the Stuart Monarchy's return to power, asserts that it was the Queen Mother who "design'd" the extent of the repairs and improvements to be performed upon the renovated royal residence in such a manner so that when completed "each part with just proportion graced" reflected the "state and order" of her ingenious mind. Similarly, in the latter instance, it is the symbols of Nature, the trees of St. James's Park, that are to be planted so that they grow in "even ranks" beside the park's "new stream" created from the several pre-existing small ponds. The orderly manner in which the park is restored to and even surpasses its former beauty is symbolic of the order on a larger scale that has been restored to the capital city and to the kingdom as a result of the restoration of the Stuart Monarchy under what Waller wishes to portray as the "able" administration of Charles II.

Because the capital city was in recent memory a political battleground in which the competence of the Stuart Monarchy to rule was questioned and which threatened to become during the Civil War a military one between royalist and parliamentary armies, Waller, fearing a return to factional discord, attempts in this poem to defend the restored Stuart Monarchy in this poem by idealizing all the activities associated with the noble members of the Court which take place in this

park. Furthermore, he seeks to silence the contemporary critics of the Monarchy, including those republican and dissenting Londoners, who are critical of what they believe to be Charles II's and his courtiers' irresponsible, hedonistic behavior. Hutton points out that even in the first years of Charles II's reign there was widespread criticism anmngst Londoners concerning the King's and his courtiers' moral conduct:

> By late 1662 an ambassador could quote Londoners as saying that their sovereign only "hunts and lusts," and other observers confirmed this opinion less concisely. (189)

This historian also cites a proverb commonly articulated by many of this king's London subjects that expressed their general disenchantment and disgust with the heavy amount of taxes levied upon them in order to support the luxurious tastes of the favorites of the King's court as well as characterized Charles II and his courtiers as being inattentive to affairs of government and intent on pursuing their private pleasures:

> By August 1662 it was a proverb in London that "The bishops get all, the courtiers spend all, the citizens pay for all, the King neglects all, and the Devil take all." (196)

To counter these criticisms of Charles II and his courtiers that were most popular amongst hostile republican and sectarian London factions, which tended to stress the members of the court's "dissolute, spendthrift, and irresponsible"

moral behavior, Waller, in addition to describing how this king has restored the beauty of St. James's Park, also portrays in an idealized manner the activities of the ladies and gentlemen of the court within the park and focuses upon the most ideal physical and mental activities that King Charles II performs both in the park and in the administrative landmarks that this King can immediately see surrounding this park.

In order to alter the London public's perception of the Monarch's and his courtiers' licentious behavior, Waller presents the King and the members of his court in the most dignified and responsible light, and avoids all references to Charles II's and his courtiers' extra-marital or lewd dalliances with their mistresses within the setting of this restored royal park. This courtier-poet refers in a prospective manner to the more genteel displays of flirtation and love-making that will take place amongst the noble ladies and gentleman belonging to Charles II's court in connection with celebrating upon their completion the improvements that this King has made not only upon the plant life of the park but upon the beauty of its bodies of water that have been joined by artificial craft to form a single canal which in turn will provide the setting for bathing, ice skating, sailing, and fishing:

> Methinks I see the love that shall be made,
> The lovers walking in the am'rous shade;
> The gallants dancing by the river side;
> They bathe in summer, and in winter slide.
> Methinks I hear the music in the boats,
> And the loud echo which returns the notes;

Waller's effort to idealize the renovated park, the King who has restored both the park and the monarchy, and such amorous activities as the flirtation and merriment between the aristocratic ladies and gentlemen that take place within the park in order to quiet the divisive criticism of hostile London factions concerning the reign's immoral and irresponsible conduct can be contrasted with another later courtier-poet's satiric description of St. James's Park when the restoration of the Stuart Monarchy under Charles II's rule had settled in the early and mid-1670s into its second relatively untroubled decade of existence just prior to the revitalized factionalism that was brought into being by the Exclusion Crisis when cavaliers and roundheads were reborn as Tories and Whigs. Waller's idyllic and idealized description of the park and the king that was designed to create a more respectable image of the restored Monarchy amongst London's more puritanical critics can be compared with the earthy description made by a sometime favorite of the court, John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, a decade later when, in spite of the still existing factional squabbles between the Crown and Parliament, a greater sense of the Monarchy's unassailable stability was experienced by the King and his

courtiers which would have encouraged this latter courtier-poet to feel free to present a more candid portrait of the court's excesses. While in Waller's poem the King is seen soberly walking underneath the trees in the daylight park with his advisors to determine affairs of state, and love-making is portrayed in its more polite and decorous forms amongst members of the nobility, in Rochester's poem "A Ramble in St. James's Park" this later courtier-poet no longer feels the need to defend the restored Monarchy from charges of immorality made by the dissenting factions of the metropolis, such as that which appears in an entry from Pepys's diary that records in regards to the riotous events of March 24th, 1668 the remarks made by London sectarians who while burning down brothels in the city fought against the King's royal guards who attempted to stop them from doing so:

> But here it was said how these idle fellows have had the confidence to say that they did ill in contenting themselfs in pulling down the little bawdy houses and did not go and pull down the great bawdy house at Whitehall. And some of them have the last night had a word among them, and it was "Reformation and Reducement !" This doth make the courtiers ill at ease to see this spirit among people, though they think this matter will not come to much; but it speaks people's mind. And then they go say that there are men of understanding among them, that have been of Cromwell's army; but how true that is I know not. (894-895)

Rochester, feeling that the King's reign is secure in spite of the grumblings of Londoners, is no longer interested as his earlier counterpart was in correcting the impressions of the London citizenry concerning the Monarchy's licentious

conduct. In this latter courtier-poet's poem, the trees of the park are now portrayed as forming a backdrop to highlight, instead of a modest veil to hide, the carnal delights taking place in the nocturnal park. Furthermore, Rochester satirizes the abandonment of all sense of propriety by emphasizing the lasciviousness of the affairs between the high-born members of the court with the lower and middle-class citizenry of London who are indiscriminately coupled in a park that in Waller's earlier poem of Charles II's fledgling reign was idealistically portrayed as being both the exclusive and chaste pleasure ground of the aristocratic, well bred members of the court:

> Whence rows of mandrakes tall did rise
> Whose lewd tops fucked the very skies.
> Each imitative branch does twine
> In some loved fold of Aretine,
> And nightly now beneath their shade
> Are buggeries, rapes, and incests made.
> Unto this all-sin-sheltering grove
> Whores of the bulk and the alcove,
> Great ladies, chambermaids, and drudges,
> The ragpicker, and heiress trudges.
> Carmen, divines, great lords, and tailors,
> Prentices, poets, pimps, and jailers,
> Footmen, fine fops do here arrive,
> And here promiscuously they swive.

Instead of Rochester's satiric portrait of the grotesque and reckless nocturnal mating between men and women belonging to different ranks of society "Great ladies, chambermaids" locked in the embraces of "great lords, and tailors," for which Charles II's relations with the sometime actress Nell Gwyn served as a precedent for other members of his court, Waller, in order to defend the newly restored monarchy from

the substantial segment of republican and puritan Londoners all too ready to find fault with its incompetent, lax administration and moral excesses, describes a more coy and chaste form of courtship that takes place exclusively amongst the ladies and courtiers of Charles's court who see St. James's Park as a pleasure ground that is reserved for the nobility's exclusive use:

> The ladies, angling in the crystal lake,
> Feast on the waters with the prey they take;
> At once victorious with their lines, and eyes,
> They make the fishes, and the men, their prize.

Moreover, the effects of factionalism upon this poem can be seen in Waller's depiction of the Thames's harmonious, decorous, and reverential interaction with this royal park. In contrast to the City of London's utilitarian relationship with the Thames that we had seen in Drayton's description of the city waterfront's "crouded wharfes, and people-pestred shores" and in Cowley's description of London Bridge's violent confrontation with the Thames's tidal flow in which the river in being forced to wear the bridge's "Arched Yoke" "Do's roar, and foam, and rage at the disgrace," the Thames, while protesting against the efforts of the upstart mercantile city to subjugate it to serve its economic needs, continues to willingly serve in Waller's poem about St. James's Park as an aesthetic backdrop to further ennoble the Monarchy's landmarks and activities. The Thames, which had served in Cowley's poem as the "best Mirrour that the world

can show" upon which the personified royal landmark of Somerset House could see its face reflected, in Waller's poem similarly serves as a symbol of the natural order's loyalty to the Monarchy and the hierarchical order upon which Monarchy is based. Unlike previous courtier-poets' descriptions of the river's antipathy and resistance to the materialistic drive of the City of London's entrepreneurs to utilize the Thames as a resource to serve their commercial and industrial designs, in this courtier-poet's poem about the renovation of St. James's Park, the Thames is portrayed as reverentially casting itself in a subordinate role so as to serve the King's and his court's recreational pursuits in the park:

> Instead of rivers rolling by the side
> Of Eden's garden, here flows in the tide;
> The sea, which always served his empire, now
> Pays tribute to our Prince's pleasure too.

But Waller's effort in this poem to quiet the factional criticism of Charles II's and his court's "dissolute" and "irresponsible" behavior is most pronounced in his descriptions of the King's political and recreational activities in St. James's Park. In the first instance concerning the King's political activities in the park, the poet to placate the Monarchy's puritan critics stresses the sober and industrious manner in which Charles II uses St. James's Park as a place in which he receives the counselling of his ministers and in which he individually reflects and reaches his own

decisions of the policies he should adopt in dealing with his kingdom's affairs. Charles II is portrayed as soberly conducting affairs of state with his cabinet in the-shady groves of this park. By setting the king against a backdrop of "aged trees" that survived the tree cutting that occurred in the park during the Interregnum, Waller is able to establish a continuing traditional link between this latest Monarchical ruler of a fixed court set within the capital city of a modern urban capitalist society and the earlier more mobile, medieval courts of England's feudal kings who attended to the affairs of their kingdom while travelling throughout their predominantly rural/agrarian kingdom:

> In such green palaces the first kings reign'd,
> Slept in their shades, and angels entertain'd;
> With such old counsellors they did advise,
> And by frequenting sacred groves, grew wise.
> Free from th' impediments of light and noise,
> Man, thus retired, his nobler thoughts employs.
> Here Charles contrives the ord'ring of his states,
> Here he resolves his neighb'ring princes' fates;
> What nation shall have peace, where war be made,
> Determined is in this oraculous shade;

By firstly removing Charles II from the cosmopolitan and decadent world of "light and noise" that was, according to the restored Monarchy's critics, representative of his immoral court and enjoyed by the rakes, bastards, and mistresses who inhabited it, secondly linking this youthful king with his more august predecessors who conducted their affairs of state in similar rustic settings, and thirdly showing him to be industriously deciding upon the domestic

and foreign policies with his counsellors within this park, Waller, in this idealized passage which highlights Charles's "nobler" side, attempts to pacify in part those republican and sectarian Londoners who were particularly critical of Charles's hedonistic behavior. Hutton points out, however, that Charles II was prudent enough to generally categorize his courtiers into two types, those who were his playmates in all forms of recreation and those to whom he gave the more responsible tasks of government because of their hard-working and resourceful characters. Given this biographer's conclusions about Charles II's relationship with various courtiers, it would seem that both Waller and the hostile urban factions' criticisms of the King and his court present only half truths, because this monarch was prudent enough to enjoy both the immoral excesses of his court and to dutifully attend to or to delegate a responsible courtier to attend to the affairs of government; therefore, this king participated in the worlds of both business and pleasure, yet was wise enough never to mix or to neglect either of the two.

Moreover, to take further steps to silence the puritan and republican factions still at large within the metropolis who are eager to find signs of incompetence in their new Monarch, Waller complements the idealized demonstration within the renovated park of the king's mental fitness to carry out the responsibilities of government with another verse para-

graph in which he demonstrates Charles II's physical fitness to be a long-lived, energetic ruler. To respond to charges of the monarchy's critics that Charles II's strength has been dissipated by his more immoral form of recreation with his several mistresses amidst the "light and noise" of the decadent court, this courtier-poet portrays this monarch's athletic prowess when playing his favorite sport of pall mall within an avenue of the newly renovated St. James's Park that was specifically designed to be used for this form of invigorating recreation. Waller's political aim to bolster the strength of the restored Monarchy can be seen in his description of this supposedly most innocent of pastimes. When showing the king at play, this courtier-poet points out in his commentary that the physical vigor Charles II displays when he participates in this sport of pall mall provides evidence that this monarch who is so strong and agile in body will act tirelessly in the national interest during what promises because of his excellent physical health to be a long reign:

> Here, a well-polished Mall gives us the joy
> To see our Prince his matchless force employ;
> His manly posture, and his graceful mien,
> Vigour and youth in all his motions seen;
> Confirm our hopes we shall obey him long.
> No sooner has he touch'd the flying ball,
> But 'tis already more than half the Mall;
> And such a fury from his arm has got,
> As from a smoking culv'rin it were shot.

Waller most effectively achieves his desire to represent the restored dominance and prowess of the Stuart Monarchy in managing the nation's affairs by making Charles II's physical presence consistently evident in the second half of his poem. Not only does this courtier-poet describe St. James's Park as a setting for the king to demonstrate his physical and mental competence to be Great Britain's political and religious leader, but he also shows the king surveying the institutions of executive, legislative, and judicial government that border the park. As he gazes upon these government institutions, the king by means of the poem's limited omniscient point of view imagines himself within such landmarks as Westminster Hall interacting with his subjects. In no other poem describing the physical aspect of London life in terms of its landmarks, panoramas, and pollution problems is the presence of a royal figure sustained for so long a period. In Waller's poem about the Queen Mother's repair and improvement of Somerset House, Henrietta Maria, by way of contrast, makes only a cameo appearance in which she is portrayed as effortlessly ascending the stairs to the upper floors of her residence. Using a royal artifact rather than a member of the royal family to provide a sustained monarchical point of view, Cowley comes closest to Waller's effort to assert the restored dominance of the Monarchy in the capital city by personifying the royal landmark of Somerset House which because of its centralized situation

within the metropolis proceeds throughout the entirety of the poem to offer a perspective of the surrounding urban panorama. In Waller's poem about St. James's Park, the courtier-poet makes King Charles II himself in the second half of the poem the focal point within the park who perceives the institutions of government that are to be found within the capital city and by means of this all encompassing survey of these surrounding institutions brings about a sense of unity. By so doing Waller is able to symbolically assert by means of the Monarch's central position within the park and comprehensive view of the landmarks of government which surround him the restored dominance of the Monarchy over those divisive factions that temporarily usurped its authority.

Goldberg's point that the king most effectively demonstrates his dominance as a ruler by means of his comprehensive gaze upon the scene that surrounds him (149-150) is illustrated in the following passage by Waller in which this courtier-poet describes Charles II surveying from the vantage point of the park the nation's chief political, judicial, and religious landmarks over which he as King presides. In contrast to the forces of republicanism that threatened with the passing of Oliver Cromwell to create a divisive, multi-headed form of government, Charles II who unites the executive branch of government in his person is portrayed as

unifying by means of his comprehensive gaze the disparate kingdoms of England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland and the disparate populations contained therein. These "three kingdoms" whose constituents Charles II is able to imagine seeking recourse either in their persons or through their representatives within these institutions of government that border St. James's Park offer tangible proof of their having subjected themselves in their dread of further factional strife into becoming one "empire" over which he rules:

> His fancy objects from his view receives;
> The prospect thought and contemplation gives.
> That seat of empire here salutes his eye,
> To which three kingdoms do themselves apply;

References to the religious and political factionalism of the 16th and 17th centuries are evident in Waller's description of the first two structures that Charles II is able to see at the park's periphery. Whitehall Palace is described as being formerly the residence of the Roman Catholic prelate, Cardinal Wolsey, before England under Henry VIII's leadership permanently achieved a separation from the Church of Rome by creating the Protestant Anglican Church. When this residence belonged to Wolsey, he was serving, prior to becoming a Cardinal, as Archbishop of York. The Palace was then known as York Place because it served as the residence for whoever the current Archbishop of York was and only assumed the name of Whitehall Palace when it became the residence of the Tudor King Henry VIII who, after the fall

of Wolsey and the separation from the Church of Rome, found this to be a more suitable residence to house the Monarchy and its court because the Palace of Westminster was "ancient and decaying" (Hibbert 976). Wolsey's efforts as a Roman Catholic prelate to improve the Palace with finances provided by the Church of Rome when it was known as York Place between the years 1514 and 1529 by "greatly extend[ing] and alter[ing] it," "and buil[ding] the Great Hall in 1528" where "he lavishly entertained Henry VIII and his court" (Hibbert 976) are referred to in Waller's poem to make the point that since that time when York Place was renovated the fortunes of the Church of Rome have declined in England because of both the Tudor and Stuart Monarchies establishing and vigilantly assuming leadership and protection of the Church of England and suppressing all forms of religious dissent from the State Church. Therefore, only the current physical beauty of Whitehall Palace is a reminder of the former prestige and wealth of the Roman Catholic Church in England that has since become with either the active or passive complicity of the Tudor and Stuart Monarchies both impoverished and persecuted:

> The structure by a prelate raised, Whitehall,
> Built with the fortune of Rome's capitol;
> Both, disproportion'd to the present state
> Of their proud founders, were approved by Fate.

It is politically important for Waller as a courtier-poet who is loyal to the new King Charles II and who wishes to

further the interests of his royal patron to emphasize that even with the Restoration Of the Stuart Monarchy the fortunes of the Roman Catholic Church within England are and will continue to be at their lowest ebb so as to calm the fears of the members of both the Church of England and Protestant nonconformists that this king is intent upon leading the religious life of the English nation back towards the Church of Rome. For many reasons, Charles II was suspected from the outset of his reign, particularly by many Protestant dissenters amongst the London populace, of being sympathetic towards, if not indeed already a member of, the Roman Catholic faith. He had spent several years of exile in Roman Catholic France with close ties to the court of his cousin Louis XIV, a Roman Catholic King; in addition, both his mother, Henrietta Maria, and his wife, Catherine de Braganza, were Roman Catholics, and his brother, the Duke of York, was soon to openly convert to the Roman Catholic faith. Furthermore, as with his royal predecessor several events prior to and during his reign served to increase suspicions of Charles II's greater loyalty to the Church of Rome than to the Church of England:

> [Charles II] knew that wherever Catholicism was strong, monarchy was strong. The Catholics had remained conspicuously loyal to his father. If any theology of Grace made sense to Charles it was Catholic doctrine .... He was drawn to Catholicism and twice revealed that preference (in a secret treaty with France in 1670 and in his deathbed reception into the Catholic Church). He was much too sensible politically to declare himself except on his deathbed. But it did lead him to make clear his commitment to toleration. Both

> this and his obvious admiration for his cousin Louis XIV of France caused growing alarm in England.
> (Morrill 333)

Because of this "growing alarm" the majority of Englishmen loyal to the Anglican Church and the dissenting Protestant religious sects, Waller, in a poem designed to assert the renewed political and religious leadership of the restored Stuart Monarchy would be eager to assuage such fears concerning Charles II's waning loyalty to the Church of England, by, firstly, dissociating the King's residence at Whitehall Palace from its former ties to the Church of Rome and by, secondly, pointing out that the former prosperity of the Roman Catholic Church in England that was able to raise such a magnificent structure as Whitehall Palace has declined under the rule of the previous Stuart Monarchs, James I and Charles I, and promises to continue to do so under Charles II's regime, since he will like his predecessors remain loyal to defending the Anglican faith. Waller argues that Charles II when viewing Whitehall Palace from his vantage point in St. James's Park is cognizant of the fact that it was God's will ("approved by Fate") that both Wolsey's and the Church of Rome's fortunes should fall in England even while the structure that they reared should continue to be maintained in its magnificence as a symbol of the English Monarchy, the ruler of this executive institution of government being also the head of the Church of

England and as such dedicated to providing for that State Church unswerving religious leadership.

A reference to recent historical events involving political and religious factionalism occurs when Waller, next, portrays Charles II from his prospect in St. James's Park shifting his gaze in a clockwise direction from his easterly view of Whitehall Palace to his south-easterly view of the complex of structures that are either near or part of the Palace of Westminster. He, particularly, sees in his line of sight from his vantage point in the park the juxtaposition of Westminster Abbey, a symbol of the institution of Monarchy since it serves as the site of the crowning and burial of Kings and Queens, with that of St. Stephen's Chapel, a symbol of legislative government run amuck since it in turn served as the site in which the House of Commons conducted its rebellious sessions in which efforts were made to limit Charles I's powers as Monarch.

Upon looking at Westminster Abbey, Charles II is portrayed as being comforted by the fact that this religious landmark is the inviolable site where the Monarch's coronation and burial ceremonies are conducted. By emphasizing that the royal reign comes full circle as a consequence of the prescribed rites being performed in this one sacred place, Waller expresses the concept that the sovereign rules by

divine right. The poet in three different ways repeats the point that this Abbey is the religious setting in which the beginning and ending of the King's reign, sanctioned by the divine will of God, occurs so as to stress the sacred nature of this cycle that neither the political factionalism of a republican or Whiggish nature could manage to disrupt:

> From hence he does that antique pile behold,
> Where royal heads receive the sacred gold;
> It gives them crowns, and does their ashes keep;
> There made like gods, like mortals there they sleep;
> Making the circle of their reign complete,
> Those suns of empire where they rise, they set.

Yet in arguing in such a strenuous tone and in a repetitive styule for the inviolability of this cycle, Waller, recalling the still vivid memory of Charles I's fate, betrays real fears of the Monarchy's increasing vulnerability to factions that seek a greater voice in religious and political affairs and in pursuit of which are willing to prevent the Monarch and his line of successors to the throne from completing the "circle of their reign," choosing instead, as exemplified by their deposing and executing a king who is treasonably inclined to impose an Absolute Monarchy upon them, to violate the principle of the Monarch's divine right to rule and to be judged for his deeds by God alone.

Keeping these relatively recent historical events in mind, Waller points out that Westminster Abbey with the restoration of the Stuart Monarchy has been restored to its former role as a royal landmark where kings are crowned and buried,

having most recently served as the ceremonial site of Charles II's coronation. While many of those who fought both for and against the republican regime of the Interregnum have fallen, Waller points out that Westminster Abbey stood intact during those contentious times and still stands as living enduring proof that the Crown, as the only viable form of executive government, will ultimately triumph over the "popular rage." This "popular rage" that the Monarchy eventually "triumphed over" was manifested in two ways: firstly, as a characteristic of the low born demonstrators from the City of London who protested before the institutions of executive and legislative government in the City of Westminster in late 1641 and early 1642 against the political and religious hierarchies that were headed by the Monarchy and the Episcopacy, and secondly this "popular rage" of these same London artisans, tradesmen, and apprentices was later manifested in more violent ways by their providing during the Civil War the greatest source of manpower and funds for the military forces that fought on behalf of the Parliamentary Cause:

> When others fell, this, standing did presage
> The crown should triumph over popular rage;

Waller has Charles II look just beyond Westminster Abbey, the symbol of a sacrosanct Honarchy that rules by divine right, to the part of the Palace of Westminster that is known as St. Stephen's Chapel in which the House of Commons

in the Short and Long Parliaments just prior to the Civil War held their sessions which sought with the visible and vocal encouragement of London demonstrators and petition signers to either limit or to take away certain of the Crown's prerogatives. Amidst these rebellious scenes, this courtier-poet similarly notes that Westminster Abbey ("Th' auspicious temple") stood as an inviolable landmark that defended the institution of Monarchy against the petty machinations to constrain its divinely sanctioned powers engineered by the members of that representative branch of government conducting their sessions within St. Stephen's Chapel ("that House"). Westminster Abbey's continuing to stand opposite St. Stephen's Chapel as a royal institution even after Charles I and his court were driven out of the capital city just before the commencement of the Civil War was "auspicious" of the Stuart Monarchy's eventual restoration and victory over the forces of republicanism which strove to overthrow it.

Waller creates a metaphor to emphasize the Abbey's inviolability against the levelling forces of mid-17th century English society, particularly as they were represented by that portion of the legislative branch of government in the House of Commons and their most vocal and most immediately visible supporters, the industrious, self-made men of London's capitalist economy, along with their aprentices and

laborers, who by their collective effort to rise en masse within the social order created the primary impetus for the revolutionary upheaval in the mid-17th century capital city. In this courtier-poet's metaphor the Abbey as representative of the divinely empowered Monarchy is compared to the snow-capped Mount Aetna which because of its majestically transcendental height cannot be scorched by the "rolling flames and scatter'd cinders" that are symbolic of the political furor created by the more radical members in the House of Commons who in representing their middle-class Puritan constituency sought to diminish the role of the Monarchy in the political and religious life of the nation:

> Hard by that House, where all our ills were shaped,
> Th' auspicious temple stood, and yet escaped.
> So snow on Aetna does unmelted lie,
> Whence rolling flames and scatter'd cinders fly;

As St. Paul's Cathedral in Waller's previously discussed poem "Upon His Majesties Repairing of St. Paul's" rises above the "darker cloud" of the City of London's profane commercial life because of its status as a religious landmark belonging to the Church of England over which the Monarch Charles I is the head, Westminster Abbey, being affiliated also with both the Monarchy and the Church of England, is similarly portrayed as rising transcendentally heavenward beyond the tumultuous, earthbound reach of the factious, levelling, more lowly born multitudes of the urban capitalist society.

Given Mount Aetna's status as a volcano, it would seem that Waller's metaphor is not entirely appropriate since it is a volcano's nature to repeatedly blow a mountain's crowning top off. Therefore, this courtier-poet's effort to symbolize the inviolate nature of both the Abbey and the Monarchy by comparing them to the untouched snow that rests upon the walls of Aetna's summit that encircle the "rolling flames and scatter'd cinders" of the still active volcano's cauldron is unsuccessful, because this metaphor, rather than emphasizing the Abbey's and the Monarchy's inviolate, divine nature, would stress its being vulnerable to the earthbound volcano's power which in turn would be symbolic of the Monarchy's being subject to the will of the people, their "popular rage" being collectively expressed by the London demonstrators, petitioners, the city's puritan preachers, and by Parliament's House of Commons. The power of the volcano does not rest upon its snow-covered summit which is easily sullied and even displaced by the pent-up underlying force of the subterranean materials that are pressured upward in search of a vent. Rather than exhibiting the Monarchy's stability, sitting securely upon the highest rung of the hierarchical social ladder, this kind of metaphor that Waller uses would demonstrate the contradictory point in the long run that the Monarchy sits atop a natural powder keg and is susceptible to being blown away by the lower orders of English society that especially within the London

scene in the mid-17th century desired a greater voice in government that would be commensurate with their greater' affluence achieved in the urban capitalist economy and the crown's greater reliance upon that affluence as a source of revenue.

In order to emphasize Westminster Abbey's ability to safe-guard the institution of Monarchy in contentious times, Waller describes incidents that occurred in Charles I's reign just prior to the Civil War when he refers to the "popular rage" of the London citizenry and to the "rolling flames and scatter'd cinders" which symbolize the escalating factionalism that was apparent in the heated debates amongst members of the House of Commons which took place in St. Stephen's Chapel. However, in conjunction with the next structure, Westminster Hall, that Charles II observes and reflects upon as he continues to survey in a clockwise direction the landmarks to be seen upon the periphery of St. James's Park, Waller wishes to demonstrate that with the restoration of the Stuart Monarchy the relationship between the king and these formerly factious Londoners has changed for the better.

In contrast to his father who did much to alienate the affections of Londoners, he wishes to portray Charles II as a more astute politician who wisely knows how to get along

with his urban subjects. This courtier-poet portrays this current king as one whose practical, open-minded nature is not as likely to alienate his subjects as his stubborn, idealistic predecessor had done. Moreover, he wishes to silence the king's and the court's puritanical critics, those businessminded Londoners, who argue that unlike their industrious selves Charles II is too preoccupied with pursuing his licentious pleasures at court to attend to the responsibilities of ruling the nation-state. To illustrate the former point that Charles II is fondly looked upon by his subjects and to silence his critics who make the latter counterpoint about the king's dissolute behavior, Waller has Charles II not only observe towards the southeast from his vantage point in the park Westminster Hall, being like St. Stephen's Chapel part of the complex of structures that constitute the Palace of Westminster, but also visualize while seeing the Hall from that prospect times when he walked by himself in Westminster Hall's upper story gallery that "ran around the Hall at a height of twenty feet" (Hibbert 950-951). In order to silence the charges of "irresponsibility" levelled at the king by his critics, Waller describes Charles II during these walks along Westminster Hall's gallery putting aside the "private passion[s]" and "the pleasures of his youth" to attend to his public cares: both looking lovingly down upon his loyal subjects below in

a manner that would befit a "people's pastor" and meditating responsibly upon affairs of state:

> Next, that capacious Hall he sees, the room
> Where the whole nation does for justice come;
> Under whose large roof flourishes the gown,
> And judges grave, on high tribunals, frown.
> Here, like the people's pastor he does go,
> His flock subjected to his view below;
> On which reflecting in his mighty mind,
> No private passion does indulgence find;
> The pleasures of his youth suspended are,
> And made a sacrifice to public care.
> Here, free from court compliances, he walks,
> And with himself, his best adviser, talks;

While Waller uses Westminster Abbey to symbolize the retrospective fact that the institution of monarchy survived the radical factions of the pre-bellum period of 1641-1642, the Civil War, and the Interregnum that sought to first limit its powers and then to replace them with a republican mode of government, this courtier-poet uses Westminster Hall to make a current point about the new king of the restored Stuart Monarchy. Waller refers to the king's visits to Westminster Hall to symbolize the concept that Charles II rules over a "whole nation," unlike his father whose controversial policies caused him to rule over a divided nation. Unlike the previous structures mentioned on the periphery of the park that exclusively served in the cases of Whitehall Palace and Westminster Abbey the needs of the Monarchy and the court faction, Westminster Hall serves as an institution representing the judicial branch of government to which all subjects of the kingdom come to seek recourse: it is the

landmark on the periphery of the park "Where the whole nation does for justice come." It is, therefore, symbolically significant that Charles II would choose this place that is accessible to all the people in which to walk freely without advisors and without military guards amongst his subjects. In fact, Hutton in his biography of Charles II notes that this king throughout his reign in his walks in St. James's Park and about the city made himself readily accessible to the public. Waller wishes to portray Charles II as a ruler who relished being amongst his re-unified subjects, in contrast to his father who because of his more private, introspective, and elitist nature and because of the increasing factional strife was forced to become an ever more remote figure to his London subjects during the course of his reign. Charles II occupies a commanding physical position in Westminster Hall, gazing down upon the entirety of "his flock" from the Hall's gallery so that they, standing below him and being "subjected to his view," feel and what is more are comforted by the dominating nature of his royal power that has consolidated the nation once again into one entity that is free from the factional hostilities that characterized the last years of Charles I's reign and the Interregnum.

Furthermore, in this verse paragraph pertaining to Charles II's behavior amongst his subjects in Westminster Hall, this

courtier-poet continues his effort to present a virtuous, almost fatherly, image of the King that is antithetical to the licentious image presented of him by his Puritan critics. No epithet could be more effective in counteracting Charles II's satyr-like reputation amongst his Puritan critics than Waller's which refers to this King as being the "people's pastor."

This courtier-poet's argument that Charles II is preoccupied with his "public care" as he walks along the gallery of Westminster Hall ("How peaceful olives may his temples shade,/For mending laws, and for restoring trade") would, if it were true and not just a political ploy to silence the urban factions still critical of the "irresponsible" Monarchy, contrast with his predecessors James I and Charles I who only fitfully applied themselves to particular pet projects of interest to themselves, when not amusing themselves with their respective hobbies and recreational activities, instead of more consistently demonstrating their concern in managing the daily affairs of their kingdom by regularly meeting with their Privy Council and attending sessions of the House of Lords as Hutton points out Charles II routinely did. Moreover, by raising the possibility that the king may be considering possible military exploits ("... his brows may be with laurel charged,/For nations conquer'd and our bounds enlarged"), Waller pacifies the members of

the more radical religious factions who criticized James I and Charles I for not supporting the Protestant nations on the Continent who were being invaded by such Roman Catholic nations as France and Spain. In fact, Waller's effort to portray Charles II as reflecting in Westminster Hall upon wide-ranging interests in state affairs and diverse if not contradictory foreign policies, such as whether to be a peace-maker or a warmonger, is more truly indicative of this courtier-poet's not yet being sure of this latest Stuart king's own idiosyncratic predilections since it was still the first years of this new Monarch's reign.

Both Waller in "On St. James's Park, ..." and Cowley in "On The Queens Repairing Somerset House" conclude their poems on a similar note that the Monarchy is not only improving physical structures and landscapes within the capital city but also seeking to channel its revenues into establishing a global empire by means of building a powerful navy. By concluding in such a manner, these courtier-poets highlight an aspect of centralized monarchical government that would convince the once hostile city and court factions that they have common interests: the City of London's rising entrepreneurial middle-class would be able to realize in these concluding lines of Waller's and Cowley's respective poems that their international mercantile interests are best served by this kind of strong executive branch of government

that can urge Parliament to grant a sufficient subsidy to build and maintain a mighty naval force that can patrol the seas to protect English shipping engaged in overseas trade, while the court faction would realize by protecting the London merchants' investments in international trade an increase in the Crown's revenue which would be achieved by taxing the city's businessmen who have grown prosperous because of their sound overseas investments that are safe-guarded by a strong royal naval fleet. Cowley observes that:

> The Peaceful Mother on mild Thames does build;
> With her Son's Fabricks the rough Sea is fill'd.

while Waller, when he describes the king looking from his prospect in St. James's Park at his birthplace in St. James's Palace, which was situated at the park's northern periphery, also refers to Charles II's readiness to establish England as an imperialist power as being an effect of the prophecies made and astronomical signs evident at his birth, "foretell[ing]" that this prince would have a prominent future role in world affairs:

> Born the divided world to reconcile
> . . . . . .
> Reform these nations, and improve them more,
> Than this fair park, from what it was before.

As several historians note many of the City of London's middle class merchants became enthusiastic supporters of the Monarchy during the reign of Charles II and opponents of the republican, country, levelling, and the later Whiggish

factions who favored a more decentralized form of government that espoused isolationlet policies, because this king's strong monarchical regime promised to create by means of a strong navy a global empire in which the seas would be a safe place for the highly profitable overseas trade of these capitalist entrepreneurs:

> The alternative for England were to see either a strengthening of the central executive and administration at the expense of the independent country gentry; or else a further withering away of the centre, turning England into a series of semi-autonomous county-states, self-governing, undertaxed, stagnant. The latter was the preference of a range of "Country parties" visible in the Parliaments of the 1620s, the neutralist groups in the Civil War, and many Whigs in the 1670s and 1680s. It was also the preference of republicans such as John Milton, ... Most dramatically, it was the ideal of democratic groups such as the Levellers, who wanted to make governors more accountable, government subservient to the liberties of sovereign people, and who therefore urged devolution of power to elected local magistrates and juries. But these "Country" ideologies were incompatible with the development of global empire. The expansion into the West Indies, India, and Indonesia; even the protection of vital trade with the southern and eastern Mediterranean all required strong naval and military power. This could only be sustained by a massive increase in the ability of the State to tax and to wage war. (Morrill 342)

A city merchant, therefore, who read the concluding lines of both Cowley's and Waller's poems would feel pleased that Charles II intended to take a more active role than his predecessors in foreign affairs and to build as a consequence of this intention a mighty royal navy to patrol the high seas. Londoners, in fact, were highly supportive of Charles II's First Dutch War (1664-1667). Two events just

prior to the commencement of hostilities with the Dutch, England's greatest commercial rival in overseas trade, demonstrate the enthusiasm of London businessmen and the general London public for both this war and for the development of a formidable naval fleet that would have a significant role to play in an aggressive foreign policy that would protect the nation's international commercial shipping interests. In the first case, London's City corporation loaned the king substantial sums to finance, along with Parliament's later grant of a subsidy, the First Dutch War's cost:

> ... a promising start [to the First Dutch War] was made when the City corporation expressed its enthusiasm by lending the King £100,000 in June and a similar sum in October. (Hutton 219)

In the second case, Londoners favorably responded to the proclamation of a war that would be fought primarily by the strengthened royal naval fleet: "On 4 March 1665 two gorgeously apparelled heralds proclaimed it in London, while the crowds cheered lustily" (Hutton 220). Both these incidents would indicate that the Crown's policies, particularly its more aggressive foreign policy which benefitted overseas trade as well as these courtier-poets' efforts to advertise these beneficial policies to a London readership, were in large part intended to reduce factional tensions and to solidify the Monarchy's base of support in the city.

While the interests of the city and court factions had grown more compatible, this was clearly not the case as we have seen during the earlier reigns of James I and Charles I. The city businessmen during these reigns resented the limitations to express themselves in political and religious matters that were placed upon them by an increasingly absolute Monarchy, being forced instead to defer to their. presumed betters--the Crown, the nobility, and the episcopacy--in these matters because they occupied a superior rank in an anachronistic hierarchic order that was best adapted to serve the needs of a feudal society. This type of authoritative order that oversaw these matters of Church and State no longer served urban exigencies. Furthermore, the Monarchy's repressive policies against divisive factions affected the political influence of Londoners even as constituents of members of Parliament; these urban entrepreneurs resented their representative voice in political and religious matters being silenced because of the Stuart Monarchy's seemingly determined effort during the reigns of James and Charles I to rule unilaterally without Parliament once its members were deemed by the court to be uncooperative in furthering the Crown's policies. Most importantly on the economic front, London's bourgeoisie were embittered by James I's and Charles I's policies of excessive taxation and regulation which had a stultifying effect upon trade. The Monarchy had a detrimental influence upon the prosperous

capitalist economy of London because of its increasingly overbearing reliance upon the city's businessmen as a source of revenues. As Morrill notes:

> As the century wore on, revenues from Crown lands and Crown feudal and prerogative right fell away to be an insignificant part of royal revenues. The ordinary revenues of the Crown became predominantly those derived from taxing trade: custom duties on the movement of goods into and out of the country and excise duties, a sales tax on basic consumer goods .... (Morrill 298)

The possibility of healing the breach between the city and court factions during the first halcyon years of the reign of Charles II provides the basis for Cowley and Waller in their Restoration poem about Somerset House and St. James's Park asserting that the Stuart Monarchy is once again a dominant and unifying presence in the metropolis. These courtier-poets attempt to downplay any residual factional discord and to bolster the stature of the restored Stuart Monarchy in the eyes of their London subjects by presenting the capital city from the points of view of monarchical figures and personified royal landmarks who are portrayed as being bringers of a sense of unity and wholeness to the urban scene, serving as a stabilizing counterpoise to the factionalism that threatens to tear the city apart: the Queen Mother looks out upon the urban panorama from her renovated residence's upper story windows in Waller's "Upon Her Majesty's New Buildings at Somerset House," Charles II surveys the institutions of government on the periphery of

the royal park in "On St. James's Park, as Lately Improved by His Majesty," and the personified Somerset House comments on the surrounding urban panorama in Cowley's "On the Queens Repairing Somerset House" for the political purpose of portraying a metropolis over which the Crown effectively presides and within which factionalism has been eliminated because of the new Stuart king's conciliatory and/or agreeable policies.

There is still even in these poems whose overt theme asserts the restored Monarchy's dominance a subtext that expresses unease that factions hostile to the Crown are still present in the capital city. This underlying theme is revealed in Cowley's effort to unconvincingly portray a metropolis of "Safety and Delight" and in Waller's effort in "On St. James's Park ..." to portray Charles II's character in the most favorable light so as to protect this latest Stuart King from the republican and sectarian critics of his immoral, irresponsible lifestyle.

Because of the disparity between these thematic claims made by the text and subtext of these poems one can see that both the courtier-poets and their patron, Charles II, are wary that London still remains potentially a battleground for future confrontations between the factions of the city and the court. In spite of these courtier-poets' protestations

to the contrary in these Restoration poem, the Monarchy's stature within the capital city continued to diminish as a result of these factional interests; the lessening of the Crown's importance is reflected by the subsequent absence of royal figures and landmarks from poems that describe this urban scene in the 18th and 19th century. The fading of the Monarchy from the poems describing London life in the latter part of the 17th century and thereafter is symptomatic of the London scene serving as the forerunner of England's gradual transformation from a medieval (subsistence) economy to a capitalist (profit-making) one, from a rural/agrarian to an urban/ industrial society, and from a rigid feudal hierarchical order based on one's predetermined, inherited status over which Monarchy most effectively presided to a democratic social order composed of atomized self-made men who achieve their relative degree of stature on the basis of their individually determined degree of talent, merit, and wealth.

More than in any other period, London during the reign of the Stuart Monarchs is portrayed in terms of the Klng's and his court's unstable relationship with the city. This relationship is portrayed more frequently during this period of the early and mid-17th century because the courtier-poets were rightly concerned that the Monarchy's status in English society was jeopardized primarily by the religious and

political factions that arose in the urban scene to challenge its prerogatives that tyrannically circumscribed the aspirations of London's capitalist middle class. The disparity between these courtier-poets' texts and subtexts reveal the various strategies that they use overtly within the poem's text to bolster the Monarchy's stature while responding to factional grievances. Much of the unstrategic and consequently more truthful reactions which reveal the Monarchy's vulnerability to these divisive groups that challenged the Crown's authority are to be found unwittingly within the courtier-poet's subtexts because the prevailing manifestations of social unrest permeated the daily experience of life in London during these Stuart reigns to such an extent that these defenders of the court's prestige alluded to this factionalism in their urban poems even when such references were unintentional and politically disadvantageous to the interests of their royal patron.

Bibliography

Primary Texts:

Allott, Kenneth, ed. The Poems of MNatthew Arnold. London: Longman Group Limited, 1965.

Clarke, Charles Cowden, ed. The Poetical Works of Samuel Butler. 2 Vols. London: James Nibet and Co., 1862.

_____. The Poetical Works of Edmund Waller and Sir John Denham. London: James Nisbet and Co., 1862.

_____. The Poetical Works of John Dryden. 2 Vols. London: James Nisbet and Co., 1866.

Erdman, David V. ed. The Complete Poetry and Prose of William Blake. New York: Anchor Books, 1982.

Gerould, Gordon Hall, ed. Poems of James Thomson "B.V.". New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1927.

Gibbs, A. M., ed. Sir William Davenant: The Shorter Poems, and Songs from the Plays and Masques. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1972.

Hebel, William J., ed. The Works of Michael Drayton. Vol. IV--Poly-Olbion. Oxford: Basil Blackwell & Mott, Ltd., 1961.

Hindley Esq., Charles, ed. Works of John Taylor, The Water Poet. London and Westminster: Reeves and Turner, 1872.

Hughes, Merritt Y., ed. John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose. Indianopolis: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1957.

Hunter, Jr., William B., ed. The Complete Poetry of Ben Jonson. New York: New York University Press, 1963.

Hutchinson, Thomas, ed. Wordsworth Poetical Works. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Marilla, E. L., ed. The Secular Poems of Henry Vaughan. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Martin, L. C., ed. The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1956.

Primary Texts (contd.)

Milford, H. S., ed. Cowper Poetical Works. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.

Mllgate, W., ed. John Donne: The Satires, Epigrams and Verse Letters. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1967.

Thompson, A. Hamilton, ed. The Works of Sir John Suckling in Prose and Verse. New York: Russell & Russell, Inc., 1964.

Waller, A. R., ed. The Poems of Abraham Cowley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905.

Secondary Texts

Ashley, Maurice. Life in Stuart England. London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1964,

Bald, R. C. John Donne: A Life. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Besant, Walter. London. London: Chatto & Windus, 1898.

_____. Westminster. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1895.

Braudel, Fernand. "Pre-modern Towns." The Early Modern Town. ed. Peter Clark. London: Longman, 1976.

Burke, Peter. Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe. New York: New York University Press, 1978.

Bush, Douglas. English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century. 1600-1660. New York: Oxford University Press, 1945.

Cannon, John and Ralph Griffiths. The Oxford Illustrated History of the British Monarchy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Chute, Marchette. Two Gentlemen: The Lives of George Herbert and Robert Herrick. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1959.

Clark, Peter and Paul Slack. English Towns in Transition. 1500-1700. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Secondary Texts (contd.)

Clark, T. J. The Absolute Bourgeois. Artists and Politics in France 1848-1851. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1973.

Clay, C. G. A. Economic Expansion and Social Change: England 1500-1700. Vol. I--People, Land, and Towns. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Eliade, Mircea. The Sacred and the Profane. New York: Harper & Raw, Publishers, 1981.

Fanfani, Amintore. "Catholicism, Protestantism and Capitalism." Protestantism and Capitalism: The Weber Thesis and Its Critics. ed. Robert W. Green. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1959.

Fisher, F. J. "London as an 'Engine of economic growth'." The Early Modern Town. ed. Peter Clark. London: Longman, 1976.

Fullerton, Kemper. "Calvinism and Capitalism: an Explanation of the Weber Thesis." Protestantism and Capitalism: The Weber Thesis and Its Critics. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company. 1959.

George, M. Dorothy. London Life in the 18th Century. New York: Capricorn Books, 1965,

Gibbons, Brian. Jacobean City Comedy: A Study of Satiric Plays by Jonson, Marston and Middleton. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 1968.

Girouard, Mark. Cities and People. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1985.

Goldberg, Jonathan. James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne and Their Contemporaries. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Harbage, Alfred. Sir William Davenport. Poet Venturer 1606-1668. New York: Octagon Books, 1971.

Hardin, Richard F. Michael Drayton and the Passing of Elizabethan England. Lawrence: The University Press of Kansas, 1973.

Secondary Texts (contd.)

Helgerson, Richard. Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Hibbert, Christopher. The English: A Social History. New York: W. W. Norton a Company, 1987.

_____.The London Encyclopedia. Maryland: Adler & Adler, Publishers, Inc., 1983. (Unless otherwise noted all citations from Hibbert are taken from this text.)

_____. London: The Biography of a City. New York: William Morrow & Company, Inc., 1969.

Hill, Christopher. Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.

_____. The World Turned Upside Down: Radical. Ideas during the English Revolution. New York: The Viking Press, 1972.

Howatson, M.C. ed. The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Hutton, Ronald. Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Jenkyns, Richard, ed. The Legacy of Rome: A New Appraisal. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Johnston, John H. The Poet and the City: A Study in Urban Perspectives. Athens, Georgia: The University of Georgia Press, 1984.

King, Bruce. Seventeenth-Century English Literature. New York: Schocken Books, 1982.

Knights, Lionel Charles. Drama and Society in the Age of Jonson. London: Chatto and Windus, 1937.

Kupersmith, William. Roman Satirists in Seventeenth-Century England. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985.

Latham, Robert, ed. The Shorter Pepys. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.

Leasor, James. The Plague and The Fire. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.

Secondary Texts (contd.)

Marcus, Leah S. The Politics of Mirth. Jonson, Herrick, Hilton, Marvell, and the Defense Of Old Holiday Pastimes. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Marshall, Dorothy. Dr. Johnson's London. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.

Mitchell, R. J. and H. D. R. Leys. A History of London Life. London: Longman, Green and Co., 1958.

Moorman, Mary. William Wordsworth: A Biography. 2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.

Morrill, John. "The Stuarts." The Oxford Illustrated History of Britain. Ed. Kenneth O. Morgan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Mullaney, Steven. The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Mumford, Lewis. The Culture of Cities. New York: Harcourt. Brace and Company, 1938.

Nethercot, Arthur H. Sir William D'Avenant. New York: Russell & Russell, 1938.

Ordish. T. Fairman. Shakeepeare's London: A Study of London in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. 1897; Massachusetts: Corner House Publishers, 1975.

Paster, Gail Kern. The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1985.

Pearl, Valerie. London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Riggs, David. Ben Jonson: A Life. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Stambaugh, John. The Ancient Roman City. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Stephenson, Henry Thew. Shakespeare's London. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1905.

Secondary Texts (contd.)

Wedgwood, C. V. The King's Peace. 1637-1641. 1955; New York: Book-of-the-Month Club, 1991.

_____. The King's War. 1641-1647. 1958; New York: Book-of-the-Month Club, 1991.

_____. Poetry and Politics Under the Stuarts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Weinreb, Ben and Christopher Hibbert. The London Encyclopedia. Bethesda, Maryland: Adler & Adler, 1983.

Wilson, A. N. The Life of John Milton. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Winn, James A. John Dryden and His World. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.