Title
Making Land, Making People: Rhetorics of Value and Improvement in Early Modern English Literature

Author
Sarpong, Ashley Ann

Publication Date
2021

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

Making Land, Making People: Rhetorics of Value and Improvement in Early Modern English Literature

By

ASHLEY SARPONG
DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

English

in the

OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

of the

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

DAVIS

Approved:

Frances E. Dolan, Chair

Parama Roy

Margaret W. Ferguson

Committee in Charge

2021

Dissertation Abstract

"Making Land, Making People: Rhetorics of Value and Improvement in Early Modern English Literature," explores early modern English conceptions of land use and agriculture as they appear in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century agricultural treatises and poetry. I argue that the overlap we see between agriculture and poetry reveal how early modern English conceptions of land, property, and possession functioned within genealogies of racial capitalism. Despite the popularity of ecocritical studies of early modern literature, little attention has been given to how the ecological transformations in the early modern period— especially in terms of agriculture— can help us understand the legacies of colonialism and the formation of racialized difference. My study is the first to interrogate the relationship between literature and agriculture through an integrated framework of ecocriticism and premodern critical race studies. Central to my argument is the premise that regimes of land use in the early modern period allow us to see the imbrications of ecological control and rhetorics of difference and savagery that undergird the nascent English colonial project and infuse English Renaissance poetry and drama. Throughout *Making Land, Making People,* I make the subtexts of expropriation, appropriation, and subjugation in references to land use in early modern poetry and agricultural treaties my main focus. In this way, my dissertation invites an understanding of early modern ecology as interpenetrated with the formation of racial capitalism. In so doing, I offer a compelling account of the imbricated nature of ecology, racial capitalism, and colonialism in early modern literature.

After an introduction that situates early modern husbandry within the formation of agrarian capitalism and its vectors of resource extraction and racialization, each chapter of *Making Land, Making People* pairs a concept of land use management with a consideration of poetic form. Chapter 1, "Country House Poems and the Mystification of Seventeenth-Century English Land Valuation," analyzes the concepts of value and value-creation in early modern estates that we can find in seventeenth-century surveying manuals and the country house poem. This chapter proffers an historical materialist framework for the dissertation in order to elucidate how representations of land, land use, and agricultural productivity in the surveying manual and the country house poem both respond to what we may understand are the beginning conditions of the capitalist mode of production in the early modern period. In Chapter 2, "The Wild and the Sown: Husbandry and Colonization in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene,*" I posit that Books 5 and 6 of Spenser's epic reveal that land and land use were essential to the English colonial ethos. Through these latter portions of *The Faerie Queene*, which many scholars argue are directly related to Spenser's time as an English colonial officer in Ireland, we can see that the English colonial project relied on a binary opposition between properly used land (in state-sanctioned plantations) and improperly used land (through either extreme wealth extraction or nomadism). A version of this chapter is currently in preparation for publication. Finally, in chapter 3, " 'A Most Majestic Vision': Plantations and the Political Ecology of Shakespeare's *The Tempest,*" I attend to the ways land dispossession operates as the central node of the colonial dynamics of the play and in turn read Caliban's dispossession in terms of early modern notions of land rights and property. My argument offers a novel way to understand this play and its well-studied colonial discourses through political ecology and the tensions between the English forms of land use that the plantation form mobilizes and the dispossession of indigenous peoples. Together, these three chapters form a fresh perspective on ecocritical readings of early modern literature by studying early modern English land practices in the context of property formation and colonial land dispossession, to provide a richer understanding of the ecological vectors of racialized capitalism in this period.

Introduction to *Making Land, Making People*[1]

In the prefatory matter for the second edition of Walter Blith's *The English Improver Improv'd* (1652), we find an 18-line dedicatory poem "To The Book," which reads as follows:

Go tell the World of Wealth, that's got with ease,
Of certain profit (gain most men doth please)
Of Lands Improvement to a Treble worth,
A Five, a Tenfold Plenty's here held forth;
The greedy Land-Lord may himself suffise,
The toyling Tenant to Estate may rise,
The poor may be enricht, *England* supply'd
For twice so many People to provide;
Though this a Paradox may seem to you,
Experience and Reason proves it true;
By floating Dry, and purging Boggy Land,
The Plough old pasture betters to your hand;
Directions to Inclose, to all Men's gain,
Minerals found out, land rich'd with little pain;
Woods ordred so, in few yeares yeeld such store,
So large, so good, as you'l desire no more.
In fine, all Land in each Capacity,
In which it lies, made Pleasant to your eye. (emphasis in original)

In these lines, Blith's improvement manual is exhorted to multiply profit by means of better methods of land use. The poem delineates a selection of parties who would benefit from the book's advice: the "greedy Land-Lord," the "toyling Tenant," "the poor," and the nation of "England."

About halfway into the poem, the text alludes to a "paradox," a hinge that invites the poem to list the "experience and reason," the main topics of advice in Blith's manual, that form the basis of the second half of the poem. In the manual, Blith outlines a six-step process for improving land, which he defines as the reduction of a piece of land's barrenness and the maximization of its fruitfulness. These steps trace the major changes in land practice arising out of and influencing new modes of ownership and distribution of land in the period: flooding land, draining fens, creating enclosures, assessing the agricultural use of certain kinds of land (when to till, when to pasture, and when to plow), assessing soil for later use, and felling forests in favor of plantations. The "paradox" splits the first half of the poem (listing the socio-economic classes who would benefit from Blith's suggestions) from the second half of the poem (the major categories of land use practices). This textual split separates people from land. Yet, the poem also positions the "paradox" as a hinge that connects land and people together through the "experience and reason" presented by a manual like Blith's. In this way, the poem figures practices exhorted in agricultural treatises like *The English Improver Improv'd* as means of improving land as well as improving (the fortunes of) people.

The prefatory poem to Blith's agricultural manual posits that the fortunes of different socio-economic classes and the whole nation of England are advanced through practices of land use. This shared fortune among differentialized economic classes may appear to center on the English countryside. Yet by the mid-seventeenth century, when the second edition of *The English Improver Improv'd* appears in print, the rhetoric of land practices and their effects on classes or groups of people applied not only to England but to its colonies. In order to distinguish England from its rivals Spain and France, as Paul Slack explains in *The Invention of Improvement,* propagandists and merchants were drawn to the idea of cultivating land as a more effective way of civilizing and Christianizing "barbarous" peoples than evangelizing or trade. Early modern English colonial apologists remarked that the land they were able to procure decades after Spain's initial land grabs was "already more thinly populated than the territories seized by Spain and its land by comparison wholly untouched by intensive farming of any kind…English planters who regarded themselves as industrious farmers and not avaricious conquistadors turned readily

to a discourse of improvement which allowed them to treat as vacant any land left uncultivated and not profitably used."[1] The efforts required to build up and sustain these plantations called upon the same principles of improvement that were transforming the English countryside. Settlers also utilized the same language of custom and public values to justify their plantations.[2] The desire to view colonial settlements, particularly those in North America and the Caribbean, through this ideology of land improvement yielded mixed results in terms of crops. However, as Jennifer Mylander explains, agricultural texts like Gervase Markham's *A Way to Get Wealth,* "based in the English tradition of land 'improvement' as a sign of landownership…[, locate] authentic English identity in agricultural work and provincial life."[3] In the case of Markham, Mylander finds that he "figures Englishness as productive labor and, as he promises to make land more productive through the use of English practices, suggests that the land will be made more English as well."[4] This description of Markham's manual is nearly identical to the aims espoused by the prefatory poem in Blith's manual. Thus, the link we find between cultivated people and cultivated land through the rhetoric of improvement in *The English Improver Improv'd* extends beyond the island of England to the many lands England sought to bring under its control—to "civilize" and also to plunder.

The English saw themselves as an agricultural society through and through, and this agrarian identity formed the basis of their national and racial identity. In a recent essay, Steve Mentz frames brown

[1] Paul Slack, *The Invention of Improvement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 68.
[2] As Slack explains, "in their own little commonwealths, in English enclaves planted abroad and new companies and associations at home, they naturally used the familiar language of reformation, civic virtue, and the common weal, to justify their undertakings; but they were consciously embarking on innovations which were initially precarious and required prolonged and repeated effort if they were to deliver public as well as private benefit. They were engaged in improvement" (66).
[3] Jennifer Mylander, "Early Modern 'How-To' Books: Impractical Manuals and the Construction of Englishness in the Atlantic World" *JEMCS* 9.1 (2009), 125. Mylander explains that "A Virginia planter would find [the advice espoused in the husbandry manual of Gervase Markham, a noted influence on Blith's manual] inefficient, and therefore impractical compared to the methods used by fellow colonists" (125). One could make the case that the issue at hand is that Markham's manual was erroneous or that the general advice found in Markham's text and other husbandry manuals was written without the climate of North America in mind. But for Mylander, the point is less about the accuracy of the advice given in the manuals and more about the power that national identity, based on husbandry, offered English colonists.
[4] Ibid 125.

as "the color on which all agricultural societies, which is to say, all human societies, depend."[5] Despite the centrality of brown to agriculture, and thus human societies, in the next paragraph of his essay, Mentz expresses hesitancy to address the connection between the brown of life and human societies with "our culture's most insistently social brown, human skin color."[6] As he puts it, "this racialized brown stains my metaphors" and thus "this chapter wants to bracket race and explore brown as an organic-inorganic borderlands [sic], a swampy terrain of hybridity and exchange."[7] I take issue with this desire—a desire which moves from the author onto the projected wants of the text—to bracket race. While a "racialized brown" might "stain" one's "metaphors," the material history of racialized violence around land theft and labor, especially in an era of ascendant colonialism, is not a subject that can easily be bracketed; indeed, bracketing or cordoning off race reproduces the extraction that birthed the racial subject.[8] As Kathryn Yusoff explains, "the birth of [the] racial subject is tied to colonialism and the conquest of space."[9] Instead of bracketing race, I seek to settle race into our understandings of land use and the implications of land expropriation. Given that early modern England was a society that expressed its identity and sense of power through discourses of agricultural productivity, I believe it is imperative to consider the power relations that such discourses advanced— relations which justified land theft and inscribed mythologies of inferiority onto (often brown) bodies. Thus, brown is the color of land, agriculture, and skin represented in racialized discourses. These multiple facets of brown are very much interrelated, and as I will show later, rely on gradations of violence and control.

My dissertation, "Making Land, Making People: Rhetorics of Value and Improvement in Early Modern English Literature," explores early modern English conceptions of land use and agriculture as they appear in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century agricultural treatises and literature. Approaching this

[5] Steve Mentz, "Brown" in *Prismatic Ecologies* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013), eds. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen and Lawrence Buell, 194.
[6] Ibid 194.
[7] Ibid 194.
[8] In 1992, 500 years after Columbus' "discovery," Toni Morrison writes that "the world does not become raceless or will not become unracialized by assertion. The act of enforcing racelessness in literary discourse is itself a racial act" (qtd in Yusoff p. 58).
[9] Kathryn Yusoff, *A Billion Black Anthropocenes or None* (Minnesota: University of Minessota Press, 2018), 58.

topic from the intersection of ecocriticism and racial capitalism, I argue that these distinct archives reflect a shared response to the pressures on conceptions of belonging, difference, and value that accompanied nascent agrarian colonial and capitalist practices of land, property, and possession. Each chapter of "Making Land, Making People" pairs an analytic derived from the history of land use management with a consideration of literary form.

Despite the recent popularity of ecocritical studies of early modern literature in England, relatively little attention has been given to how the ecological transformations in the early modern period— especially in terms of agriculture— can help us understand the legacies of colonialism and the construction of difference. In this dissertation, I aim to understand how early modern texts anticipate the logics of uneven development and ecological injustice in our present in the conception of colonialism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Central to my argument is the premise that regimes of land use in the early modern period allow us to see the imbrications of ecological control and rhetorics of difference and savagery that undergird the nascent English colonial project. Throughout "Making Land, Making People," I make salient the subtexts of racialized expropriation, appropriation, and subjugation in reference to land use in early modern poetry and agricultural treatises. In this way, my dissertation invites an understanding of early modern ecology and of notions of difference through a framework of political ecology of land use in order to offer a fresh account of the interwoven threads of agroecology, capitalism, and colonialism in early modern literature.

"Questions of origins," Kathryn Yusoff argues in *A Billion Black Anthropocenes or None*, "are never too far away from questions of difference and belonging and the various bifurcations of human into its subcategories of fully human, subhuman, and inhuman. Origins also nurture; they grow an armature for narratives; they root a set of emplacements or belongings into place."[10] Yusoff comes to this observation in her account of the ways that the impending ecological collapse brought to the fore by the concept of the "Anthropocene" erases the racialized violence already bound up in the long history of

[10] Ibid 65.

dispossession, enslavement, and genocide that mark "modernity." If the "early modern" period is one in which scholars can trace out the beginnings of modernity, at least in the Western ascent to colonialist control and industrialization, then the origin stories we as scholars trace must properly account for the asymmetries of domination, violence, and dispossession embedded in these origins. In Yusoff's account, the end that the (universalizing and homogenizing) term Anthropocene portends overlooks the various endings and threats to survival experienced by Black and Indigenous people, including the theft of Black bodies and Indigenous lands that ushered in the European colonial regime in the early modern period. These racialized violences are premised on an "extractive praxis [which] sets up an instrumental relation to land, ecology and people."[11] In turn, the colonialist mindset that transforms land, ecology, and people into instruments for surplus value was (and continues to be) predicated upon "the purchase and extraction of the territorial *impulse* (to conquer lands for resource extraction and to organize labor forms to mobilize that extraction, while simultaneously severing the bonds of attachment and territory of enslaved peoples)."[12] When we turn our attention to these practices of extraction inherent in the colonial project (and the ongoing effects of colonial relations), we find that they form what Yusoff (by way of Hortense Spillers and Saidiya Hartman) argues is a grammar of extraction which places the (White) European as subject and the land and bodies of (racialized) non-Europeans as objects.[13] By attending to this grammar of extraction, we find that ecological harm is an ongoing product of colonial relations that subjugate lands and peoples. This dissertation seeks to uncover the ways this territorial impulse and its organizing extractive regimes find their expression in early modern English ideologies of land use and related literary forms—such as the country house poem, the georgic, and the pastoral-utopian.

The English were unique in their belief that possession came from settling and improving land. In *Ceremonies of Possession,* Patricia Seed examines the competing rhetorics of land possession employed

[11] Yusoff 81.
[12] Ibid 81 (emphasis in original).
[13] To this point, Achille Mbeme further argues that "the notion of race made it possible to represent non-European human groups as trapped in a lesser form of being. They were the impoverished reflection of the ideal man, separated from him by an insurmountable temporal divide, a difference nearly impossible to overcome" (17 qtd in Yusoff p.77).

by the early modern English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Dutch, who relied on ideas, respectively, of land use, theatrical processions, military conquest, nautical science, and the penetration of undiscovered nautical routes as the primary means of establishing territory. Seed finds that "Englishmen occupying the New World initially inscribed their possession of the New World by affixing their own powerful cultural symbols of ownership … [by] simply using it, engaging in agricultural or pastoral activities."[14] Seed traces this custom of land possession from the medieval practices of using hedges, houses and gardens, to the explosion of the appetite for "improving" land emerging from the enclosure movement in the sixteenth century, through to the burgeoning labor theory of property in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that came to see the evidence of productive land use as based on "grazing (domestic animals) and planting."[15] Barbara Arneil's 1996 study *John Locke and America: The Defence of English Colonialism* explains that English imperial models in the new world shift from an emphasis on trade, to land settlement along customary models (like those described by Seed), to a patent system as the emphasis on property ownership became more dependent on larger plantations as a form of agricultural settlement.[16] According to Jess Edwards, while the English were keen on determining legible cues of cultivation to mark territory, there was a tension between relying on "customary land use" (like Iris' catalogue of agricultural activity in *The Tempest,* as we will see in chapter three) and mathematical models used by surveyors (as I show in chapter one, on country house poems) to determine the legitimacy of territorial claims. While early modern English colonists reached for an array of legal and scientific mechanisms to take, distribute, and settle land, they centered on land use as their organizing system for expropriating Indigenous lands. In the three chapters that comprise the body of this dissertation, I trace this ethos of land use within early modern English agricultural treatises and literary texts to determine how this land-based ideology shapes conceptions of identity, difference, and power relations in these

[14] Patricia Seed, *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 25.
[15] Seed, 25.
[16] Barbara Arneil, *John Locke and America: The Defence of English Colonialism* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996),70.

texts.

In Chapter 1, "Country House Poems and the Mystification of Seventeenth-Century English Land Valuation," I seek to understand the way the country estate is assessed in country house poems and in surveying manuals; both genres consider the value of these large pieces of property. While these two genres evince a shared interest in appraising value, they diverge in the kinds of value they depict—the surveying manual is keen to understand exchange value whereas the country house poem prizes use value. This divergence in the metrics of evaluation underscores the ways these genres provide contrasting views of the rise of agrarian capitalism and discourses of agricultural productivity as the basis of English identity. Whereas the surveying manual's focus on exchange value primes the property of the country house estate in relation to capitalist accumulation, the country house poem promotes a residual, more feudal view of the country estate that resists the tide of world-system capitalist circulation. By uncovering the shared investment in appraising the country estate in these two genres as well as their contrasting responses to the emergence of agrarian capitalism, this chapter provides an important examination of the modern concepts of value and value-creation that helped define the early modern landed estate and, after it, the plantation complex.

In Chapter 2, "The Wild and the Sown: Husbandry and Colonization in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene,*" I explore how attending to land use or descriptions of land can help us better understand the colonial dynamics at play in Books Five and Six of *The Faerie Queene.* I am particularly interested in understanding how georgic ideology and its emphasis on proper land use finds its way into Book Five's analyses of justice and land distribution and in Book Six's depiction of savagery through figures who do not plow. I argue that Books Five and Six of Spenser's epic are symptomatic of a widespread entanglement of apparently domestic and retrospective concerns about agricultural land use with the development of an early English settler-colonial ethos. In these latter portions of *The Faerie Queene*, which many scholars argue refer directly to Spenser's time as an English colonial officer in Ireland, we can see that the English colonial project relied on a binary opposition between properly used land (in plot-style plantations) and improperly used land (through either extreme wealth extraction or nomadism). By

drawing our attention to the ways land figures in Spenser's illustrations of the virtues of justice and courtesy, I demonstrate how the material circumstances of Spenser's time in Ireland and the ideology of land use that Elizabethans like Spenser employed to justify the expropriation of Irish lands shape and inflect *The Faerie Queene*'s treatment of these virtues.

Finally, in chapter 3, "'A Most Majestic Vision:' Plantations and the Political Ecology of Shakespeare's *The Tempest,*" I attend to the ways land dispossession operates in the play as the central node of the colonial dynamics and in the competing rhetorics of land possession in the play—Caliban's invocation of inherited property and local description, in contrast to Prospero's and Gonzalo's projections of colonial power through the discourse of husbandry and plantation. By analyzing how these three characters mobilize wilderness, pastoral, and Utopian discourses respectively, this chapter demonstrates how ecological ideologies fit within the early modern English colonial expansion being explored, and critiqued, in Shakespeare's play. My argument offers a new reading of the play that foregrounds its discourse of colonialism within the context of land dispossession. Through this attention to rhetorics of land rights and property in *The Tempest*, I elucidate how vital land use is to understanding the early modern English colonial project that runs throughout the play and shapes the play's depiction of Caliban as not only a racialized Other, but an ecological Other as well.

The colonial dynamics that I trace in the seventeenth-century country house poem, Spenser's epic, and Shakespeare's play, anchored in rhetorics of land use and justifications of land expropriation and dispossession, illuminate the ecological and racial dimensions of early modern English attitudes towards agriculture and land use. These ideologies about land use, value extraction, and (dis)possession also form the basis and ethos informing agricultural treatises such as husbandry and surveying manuals. Thus, my attention to the shared investments in discourses and imaginaries around proper land use in early modern literary and agricultural texts proffers a multidimensional account of the centrality of land use in early modern culture. Moreover, this dissertation underscores the ways in which extractive

ecological practices, bound up in these conceptions of land, created the "racialized inequalities"[17] that emerge from the ascendant English colonial accumulation of land, territory, bodies, and value.

In a brief essay entitled "Why Study the Past?" Gayatari Chakravorty Spivak goes on what she calls a "feminist digression." In this "digression," Spivak explains that our "convictions"[18] or "collective hatred" come "from narrative[s] of cultural memory."[19] These dispositions, which often exceed "the evidentiary" and can appear as "intuition,"[20] are forms of social reproduction. These dispositions are both crushed by and structured through the flow and "social productivity of capital,"[21] a circumstance which normalizes behavior toward underrepresented groups that "ranges from violence to alibi. It is the asymmetries between these alternatives that constitute the socius."[22] What I take Spivak to mean here is that belief systems that structure the creation of difference and the violences inherent in the ongoing legacies of colonialism come from ideologies generated by a sense of cultural memory, tradition, or "the way things have always been"; these mythologies of heritage or social order are handed down from generation to generation in order to preserve the status quo prized by capitalism. In this system, "violence and alibi coexist in a chiasmus rather than as a critical pair."[23] As a remedy, Spivak argues that "a broad study of the past can swing chiasmus to critique—balance to double bind—persistently."[24] In essence, studying the past in a way that opens up and interrogates passed down ideologies would do away with the seeming juxtaposition of violence ("wow that was racist!") and alibi ("but we're not racist anymore!"/ "at the time it wasn't seen as racist!") and instead use the violences and alibis from earlier times to critically interrogate the ideologies that structure our current moment. By interrogating the ideologies of land use in early modern English literature and culture, my dissertation seeks to broaden how we understand the practices of land dispossession, capitalist accumulation, and narratives of the racialized and ethnic

[17] Yusoff 12.
[18] Gayatari Chakravorty Spivak, "Why study the past?" *MLQ* 73.1 (2012), 6.
[19] Ibid 5.
[20] Ibid 5.
[21] Ibid 6.
[22] Ibid 6.
[23] Ibid 6.
[24] Ibid 6.

difference that produced the supposed inferiority of the colonized Other. In doing so, I hope not only to broaden our understandings of the violences and alibis of the past, but also to name the inherited belief systems (passed down through canonical literary texts and contemporaneous agricultural texts) that midwifed and nursed the legacies of extraction, dispossession, and racial/ethnic difference that we live in today.

As a whole, "Making Land, Making People: Rhetorics of Value and Improvement in Early Modern Literature" examines the depiction of land use in early modern literature in relation to contemporaneous agricultural treatises in order to elucidate the relationship between ecological control and the projection of colonial power that emerge from agrarian capitalism and the rhetorics surrounding land dispossession. By investigating the role of agriculture and land use in producing ecological, colonial, and capitalist vectors of control for the nascent English empire, this study will help us better understand how early modern literature fits within the genealogy of racial capitalism.

While the texts I investigate in this project were written several centuries ago, I write about these texts and conditions in a time and space shaped and produced by the violences of the process I chart. As I will explore in the epilogue to this dissertation, the struggle for land justice—particularly for Black farmers locked out of land ownership by decades of discriminatory agricultural policy—is a struggle against centuries of ideology that separated Black, Indigenous, and other people of color from the value (and value creation) of land ownership and stewardship. Non-Europeans, notably enslaved Africans, were always farming and working the land; however, because their bodies were seen as extractable labor, the connection between land and people espoused in the poem to Blith's manual was severed by the extractive grammars of colonial structures. The continued dispossession of Black people and others of color from land ownership reflects this continued racialized violence. Yet, this legacy of land discrimination and distributive injustice is made possible by another form of racialized violence: the theft of indigenous land.

I wrote the majority of this dissertation on the stolen land of the Patwin people, now constituted as "three federally recognized Patwin tribes" according to the University of California-Davis Land

Acknowledgment Statement: “Cachil DeHe Band of Wintun Indians of the Colusa Indian Community, Kletsel Dehe Wintun Nation, and Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation.” “The Patwin people,” the statement goes on to say, “have remained committed to the stewardship of this land over many centuries. It has been cherished and protected, as elders have instructed the young through generations.” This statement of land acknowledgment is in fact an acknowledgement of people, and thus illustrates the crucial link between land and people I demonstrate throughout the dissertation. This acknowledgement of the Patwin people, however, offers little beyond cold comfort to the violence and trauma of their land being stolen, but I offer this acknowledgement to honor those whose traditional lands serve as the central site upon which I composed this study. Moreover, the institution to whom I submit this dissertation came to be through the 1862 Morrill Act which sold land expropriated from tribal nations as seed money. The University of California sold 150,000 acres of Indigenous land (of the roughly 11 million acres sold nationwide through the act) to begin its construction and development. The resources to conduct the academic research contained in the pages that follow are the very fruits of the theft and sale of Indigenous land. It is only right for me to draw attention to the ideologies of land dispossession that made such theft come to be.

Chapter 1:

Country House Poems and the Mystification of Seventeenth-Century English Land Valuation

"And abouve all, you looke into the values of mens land, whereby the Lords of the Manors do rack their tenants to a bigger rent and rate then euer before: and therefore not only I, but many poore tenants else, haue good cause to speake against the profession."

—John Norden, *The Surveyor's Dialogue.*

To understand the emergence of the capitalist mode of production, we must look at land. Land and its transformation from communal property to private property allow us to understand Karl Marx's account of "so-called primitive accumulation" in *Capital* vol. 1. Primitive accumulation is a term Marx borrows and subverts from Adam Smith as an "original sin" that spurred capitalism into motion. This "sin" or turn in history would explain how one major class (capitalists) gained a monopoly on the means of production, and how the other classes had to sell their labor in order to furnish themselves with the necessities of life. One promising account of this so-called primitive accumulation—this original sin that ushered in capitalism—can be traced in the changes in land use (especially in England) from the late fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries. In *Poetics of Primitive Accumulation*, Richard Halpern remarks that:

> Land was profitable to feudal landowners mainly because of the tenants who occupied and worked it. With the rise of markets for land and wool and with the development of improved methods of agriculture, however, land became transferable and in some cases more profitable when stripped of its customary inhabitants.[25]

According to Halpern, and Marx, the legal and economic transformation of land— from fixed property that gained value from inhabitation into a transferable, marketable good— incentivized landowners to decouple tenants from the land. But this transformation, I argue, is predicated not just on expanding markets and improved methods of agriculture but on a specific principle: value.

In the pages that follow I explore how seventeenth-century English private property was *depicted* as having value. I seek to understand the rhetorics and figuration of value—how value is to be appraised, how it is used, and how it is created. In the Marxist tradition, the term "value" asserts that a product's value derives from its potential to be exchanged.[26] But this notion of value, during the transition from feudalism to agrarian capitalism still in process in seventeenth-century England, is in competition with the traditional notion of value as use value. The seventeenth-century country house is a key site to observe the competing concepts of value and what makes a piece of private property valuable because these estates came to replace feudal fortified manors and castles. In this chapter I examine how surveying manuals and country house poems select and represent the most valuable aspects of country houses. In the first section I analyze how surveying manuals and country house poems present similar priorities for the

---

[25] Richard Halpern, *The Poetics of Primitive Accumulation: English Renaissance Culture and the Genealogy of Capital* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1991), 71.

[26] As Marx explains in the opening chapter of *Capital vol. 1*, trans. Ben Fowkes (New York: Penguin, 2004): "What exclusively determines the magnitude of the value of any article is therefore the amount of labour socially necessary, or the labour-time socially necessary for its production… 'As exchange-values, all commodities are merely definite quantities of congealed labour-time'"(130).

country home as a site principally for agricultural production. In the second section, I examine the nativist bent of some country house poems to show how the resistance these poems express towards global mercantilism signifies the genre's pre-capitalist fantasies of the country house as a site of excess use value. This use value fantasy is in tension with the emergent agrarian capitalist model in surveying manuals which presuppose exchange, and thus exchange value. Therefore, while both surveying manuals and country house poems prize the country house's agricultural productivity, they diverge in which notion of value they use to assess this productivity. For the surveying manual, agricultural productivity is framed in terms of exchange value derived from the geometrically measurable topographic details of an estate and the related labor relations needed to cultivate crops and livestock. On the other hand, the country house poem delineates the agricultural productivity of an estate through use value and the estate's ability to produce crops and livestock so extravagantly that labor relations are nearly non-existent.

By exploring how the genres of the surveying manual and the country house poem focus on one site, the country estate, this chapter offers insight into a massive shift in social relations in the early modern period that accompanied the rise of agrarian capitalism and its role within English global expansion. This chapter engages with the much-debated country house poem and the connection between property and communal relations bound up in emerging regimes of seventeenth-century land appraisal. While many have recognized the importance of the manor as site of cultural transformation and have thought about the genres attached to the country house, I seek to understand how the country house highlights the tensions in land, labor, and notions of identity. As in my other chapters, I attend to form and employ close reading in order to scrutinize the ways discursive practices encode land and the people who inhabit these spaces. Later chapters move away from England to its colonies, but in this chapter my focus is on the English

countryside and how authors deploy agricultural productivity as a means of constructing English identity through a dialectic of native and foreign— a dialectic that sets up my central contention about the relationship between making lands and making peoples through conceptions of agriculture practices. Depending on how you look at the country estate—either through the aspirations to technocratic expertise of the surveying manual or the fantasies of abundance that constitute the gaze of the country-house poem—these relationships between land and people can be magnified or minimized. Still, this chapter argues that the relationships between making land and making people, and the imperatives of agricultural productivity that undergird these relationships, are central to understanding how early modern English writers contended with English identity within England and abroad.

I. Agrarian Productivity and the Affairs of the Country House Estate

At the turn of the seventeenth century, the English literary marketplace experienced an explosive proliferation of the surveying manual.[27] Surveying, the charting of land plots, was revolutionized by new surveying tools and the translation of mathematical, in particular geometric, treatises into English.[28] This technology, in conjunction with the economic pressures of land scarcity, redistribution of monastic land, and the increasing frequency with which land changed hands in the mid to late sixteenth century, led to an increased demand "among landowners and tenants alike to have a reliable account of property lines"—more reliable than the written descriptions that medieval surveyors previously used as evidence in manorial court.[29] The surveying manual, the technical guide to the surveying practice, intended to "both educate

[27] Martin Bruckner and Kristen Poole, "The Plot Thickens: Surveying Manuals, Drama, and the Materiality of Narrative Form in Early Modern England," *ELH* 69.3 (2002).
[28] Bruckner and Poole 619.
[29] Ibid 619.

fellow practitioners and reshape the public perception of surveying."[30] Some of these manuals stressed the need for landlords to have a "parfyte knowledge" of their lands, in order to extract the appropriate amount of rent from their land, or to improve their grounds to increase rent revenues.[31] Other manuals moved beyond explicitly economic arguments. They reimagined land rights as objective and measurable, in the manner of acreage and boundaries. This kind of logic was in opposition to the customary tenures and claims that relied on the stubbornly social evidence of testimony and communal memory.[32]

The rise of the estate map produced by surveyors coincided with land scarcity and redistribution of land in the mid to late sixteenth century. At the same time, the estate map whet the appetite stirred up by the contemporaneous interest in geometry and cartography.[33] The manorial survey could sometimes provide maps "with a color coded key to land use and decorated with the arms of the lord and illustrations of the manor house and agricultural activities."[34] Coterminous with the survey's outcome of "fix[ing] the price of land as well as the station of the landowner,"[35] the surveying manual presented the magical proposition that "the surface of the land could suddenly be measured and perceived as an extensive, proliferating series of triangles…[whereby] the individual landowner or tenant was empowered to read and

[30] Andrew McRae, "To Know One's Own: Estate Surveying and the Representation of Land in Early Modern England," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 56.4 (1993), 334.
[31] Such as in the earliest surveying manual, John Fitzherbert's 1523 *The Boke of Surveying and Improvements*, here quoted in McRae.
[32] McRae 341.
[33] McRae. Henry S. Turner makes a similar claim, steeped deeply in the cross pollination occurring among cartographers, poets, military strategists, and general mathematicians in "Plotting Early Modernity" in *The Culture of Capital: Property, Cities, and Knowledge in Early Modern England* ed. Henry S. Turner (New York: Routledge 2002). The argument about the rising interest in cartography in Early Modern English culture is famously made in Richard Helgerson's *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).
[34] McRae 350.
[35] Garrett Sullivan, *The Drama of Landscape* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1998), 40.

write the world in geometric, structural terms."[36] Some surveying manuals explicitly countered the anxieties regarding the transformation of the communal and social relations of the estate into visual, geometric representation. However, as a whole, the surveying manual gestured toward a social sphere where "landlords and tenants alike were being encouraged to alter their appreciation of 'one's own,' as a socio-economic outlook dominated by moral standards and interpersonal relationships gave way to a discourse which facilitated economic individualism and competition."[37]

John Norden's *The Surveyor's Dialogue*, the source of this chapter's epigraph, provides a prime example of this microcosmic logic. Norden's surveying manual organizes its defense of the surveying enterprise around five major dialogues. In the first, the surveyor and the tenant-farmer debate the risk of surveying in order to establish rents. Next, the surveyor meets with the landlord to explain what is lost when land, and thus rent, is not appraised appropriately. Afterwards, the surveyor reconnects with the tenant-farmer and they take a walk through the farming plot and apply abstract geometry to practical cultivation purposes. In the fourth dialogue, the surveyor converses with the bailiff about detailed measurements and computations of land areas. Finally, in the fifth dialogue, the surveyor and the bailiff meet again, this time to talk about the value of different kinds of land in terms of topography, climate, and soil. Through Norden's dialogues we see that the manor is not simply a plot of land to be measured and valued. Instead, it is a dynamic site. Consequently, any consideration of geometric and economic computation must include tenant farmers, estate laborers and managers (in the figure of the bailiff), and the property owner.

The exchange between the surveyor and the tenant farmer that opens the *Surveyor's*

[36] Bruckner and Poole 626, 630.
[37] McRae 352.

Dialogue is particularly illustrative of the ways in which the manor is believed to be a microcosm of the social relationships that comprise the community and the English commonwealth. The tenant first airs his contempt of the surveyor's profession as one in which:

> many millions [are] disturbed that might liue quietly in their farmes, tenements, houses, and lands, that are now dayly troubled with your so narrow looking thereinto, measuring the quantity, obseruving the quality, recounting the value, and acquainting the Lords with the estates of all mens liuings, whose ancestors did liue better with little, than we can do now wich is much more, because by your meanes rents are raysed & lands knowne to the uttermost Acre, fines inhanced farre higher then ever before measuring of land and surueying came in, and therefore I thinke you can not but confesse, that other men as well as I, haue good cause to speake of you and your profession, as I doe.[38]

Within the first few pages of his treatise, Norden presents both the mission of and the major anxiety surrounding the surveying profession. The surveyor is charged with "narrow"[ly] studying the "estates of all men's livings," through the use of the tools in his surveying pouch and geometric concepts, and using this information to measure the quantity, observe the quality, and reappraise the value of an estate "to the uttermost Acre." And this study, the tenant bemoans, leads to rents "farre higher than ever before measuring of land and surveying came in." But beneath this explicit pecuniary anxiety is fear of an underlying overturning of custom, which provided better living conditions for the tenants' "ancestors" because, despite their lower incomes, they were able to afford their dwelling since their rents were not "disturbed." Moreover, this new practice of surveying enacts a terror on "many millions" "dayly", speaking to anxieties about how frequently estates across a wide geographical spread were being reappraised

[38] Norden 4.

and, therefore, how many people throughout England faced more and more frequent rent hikes.

In response to the tenant farmer, the surveyor immediately mounts a defense of his profession that creatively reimagines what land is and what the relationships between tenants and landlords might be. The surveyor states:

> for as the King is Supreme head and Prince and defendour of all his Subiects, so vnder the King is euery Lord of a Mannor chiefe and head ouer his Tenants, namely, ouer such as hold of him: And he hath a kinde of commaund, and superious power ouer them, as they are his tenants, and for that cause he is called, and they doe acknowledge him to be their Lord. And what doth the word *Lord* import, but a Ruler or Gouernor?... so that I may well say, that in a sort, euen your lands your selues are the Lords. The vse and occupation is yours, but if the land were so yours as were none aboue you, you might then call it yours: but so is none but the Kingdome which the King holdeth of none but of God. And no man is so absolute within the Kingdome, but he holdeth his land of some Mannor, or person, or of the King.[39]

The surveyor corrects the tenant's concern by suggesting that the landlord-tenant relationship is not one predicated on rents that are established or acknowledged through customary regimes but that their relationship is one of "Lord" and subject. This line of reasoning may amount to an anachronistic rhetoric of feudal loyalty in an increasingly capitalized valuation of land. However, the explicit relationship the surveyor draws out is one of governance and not protection. He scrutinizes the title of "landlord," making it clear that the landlord is a lord or ruler over his tenants, and this governance is predicated on the ownership of the land. Thus, private property is transformed into a territory. Moreover, the lands become synonymous with the tenants, when the

[39] Norden (1607), 5.

surveyor explains that "euen your lands your selues are the Lords." The manor, in the surveyor's thinking, is the territory of the landlord and thus the tenant is a subject who "is" the landlord's, and not merely a person who pays the landlord rents. Here, we are told that the communal relationship of the landlord and the tenant is explicitly one of governance wherein the landlord of the manor is king over his tenants. This notion of the manor stretches the estate into a country.

While scholars have linked surveying manuals to the rise of property, nascent capitalism, nationalism, or narrative, little attention has been paid to the relationship between surveying manuals and another genre that represented agrarian property— the seventeenth-century country house poem. The English manor that appears in both surveying manuals and country house poems is a miniature expression of the English commonwealth. While surveying manuals promoted the ability of surveys and surveyors to improve agricultural productivity through mathematical principles, the country house poem delineated the agricultural productivity of an estate through the harmonious social relations it produced, particularly through gestures of hospitality.

Ben Jonson's "To Penshurst" (1616), perhaps the most famous seventeenth-century country house poem, illustrates the genre's characteristic depiction of the manor as a commonwealth centered on agricultural productivity. The poem famously begins with the line: "Thou are not, Penshurst, built to envious show." Operating in the negative, the speaker lists various features of architectural ornament—marble, pillars, gold, lanterns, stairs, courts—which oppose the real beauty or value of the estate. Next, shifting to the affirmative, the speaker explains that "Thou joy'st in better marks, of soil, of air,/ of wood, of water: therein thou art fair" (7-8). The estate is to be praised for its soil, climate, and raw materials. This juxtaposition between architecture and husbandry reveals the true value of the estate, from the outset, to reside

in its agricultural production.

Because Jonson emphasizes the agrarian productivity of the Penshurst manor, the poem's rich local description mirrors the description of land patterns in surveying manuals. While scholars like John Adrian contend that "To Penshurst" imagines the country house estate "in terms of the same categories of local definition that chorography helped to establish,"[40] I believe that the poem's interest in local description emerges from its interest in appraising the value and appeal of the estate. Chorography, which the *Oxford English Dictionary* defines as "the art or practice of describing, or of delineating on a map or chart, particular regions, or districts"[41] or "a description or delineation of a particular region or district,"[42] is a form of mapping that extends beyond the country estate. While chorography and surveying are both interested in mapping the topographic details—like "To Penshurst"'s interest in mapping the high, middle, and lower grounds of the estate and the river Medway that borders the estate—surveying maps those topographic details solely on the estate itself. In surveying manuals, authors explained the necessity and complexity of taking stock of the topographic details of a manor. As William Folkingham explains in his 1610 *Synoposis or Epitome of Surveying Methodologized*:

> it is not impertinent to particularize, how the Plot is accommodated for Tillage, Meddow, Pasture, Wood, water, Fewel, Fish, Fowle, Ayte, &c as also the Confinage with Champion, Wood-land, other Lords and Manors, with the Commodities and conueniences deriuable from the propinquitie and competent distance of Cities, Townes,

[40]John Adrian, *Local Negotiations of English Nationhood: 1570-1680* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 154.
[41] *OED* "chorography," 1. The entry for this definition continues: "as distinguished from *geography,* taken as dealing with the earth in general, and (less distinctly) from *topography*, which deals with particular places, as towns, etc" (emphasis in original). In this entry we see the *OED* situates the kind of mapping involved in chorography in terms of scale: it is more specific than geography, the general practice of mapping the whole earth, and more general than topography, which is the mapping of specific natural features or towns. But, to the point I make above, neither chorography nor its compatriots (topography or geography) involve the description of specific estates the way that surveying manuals do.
[42] *OED* "chorography," 2.

> Markets, Faires, Ports, Hauens, Seas, Forests, Woodes, Wasts, Commons, Peres, Moores, Riuers, Quarries, Mines, &c, by opportunity for vent and intercourse of passage for Commerce, and inter-parlee for Conuerse, &c. with the Waies and Venues to the same & their conueniency of Conduct, as by land ouersmooth, facil and firme plaines, and by water, nauigable Rivers, loughes, Lakes &c.[43]

The key aspects that a "plot" or manor must consider are both natural and manmade. The manor should be studied in terms of the climatological and soil properties that can be used for different kinds of cultivation: arable land, meadows, pasture land, woodland, and fishing. The surveyor should also study the manor to consider its proximity to other manors, and by extension "other Lords," nearby roads, communities, markets, fairs, ports, and common land. Lastly, the manor should also be examined in terms of its position relative to major topographical and mineralogical formations, such as rivers and quarries.

Just as Jonson's text reflects the surveying manuals' understanding of the topography of land, the poem likewise imitates surveying manuals' frequent discussion of human relationships. These relationships within Penshurst have, according to John Adrian:

> been much commented on by literary critics, who focus on the social function of estates and the hospitality offered by benevolent landlords. Certainly such social interactions are crucial for the poets' constructions of local community. Otherwise, country house poems would not be full of communal feasts in the great hall, charity and provision to strangers, obliging laborers, country sports and diversions, and other images of social harmony.[44]

While social community is a key generic function of country house poems, as seen in their descriptions of dining and rustic revelry, I argue that the celebration of social community is not

[43] William Folkingham, *Feudigraphia. The Synopsis or Epitome of Surueying Methodized.* (1610), 51.
[44] Adrian 154-155.

materially incidental to the country house estate.

That is why we observe roughly halfway through the poem that the speaker transitions out of the division of land on the estate to an analysis of the estate's social relations. This gesture is traditionally interpreted as the evocation of a discourse of hospitality.[45] Thus, the lines:

> And though thy walls be of country stone,
>
> They're reared with no man's ruin, no man's groan;
>
> There's none that dwell about them wish them down;
>
> But all come in, the farmer and the clown. (46-49)

Despite the welcome that the estate may provide "the farmer and the clown," this whole gesture of hospitality is centered on "the wall." This description of the wall, as the site of social relationships and the production of ruin and pain, is placed in the negative. The speaker omits the affirmative benefits of the wall. Instead, the speaker lauds the wall for the social relationships it does not produce: ruin, pain, or dissatisfaction. There is "none that dwell about them wish them down." Yet surveying manuals frequently praised walls for their defensive capabilities.[46] Moreover, these manuals' notion of defense is, itself, formulated by way of negation: the wall does not let in roaming livestock, lowly commoners, or envious neighbors. "But," the speaker of Jonson's poem contends, "all come in, the farmer and the clown." The farmers and servants may be able to come onto the estate. But they are not a part of it. In essence, the wall, as a key

[45] One such argument is offered by Linda Cevlosky in "Ben Jonson and Sidneian Legacies of Hospitality," *Studies in Philology* 106.2 (2009): 178-206. Cevlosky contends that hospitality functioned as "'symbolic capital" which allowed the Sidneys to be "as much 'new capitalists' as they were 'feudal aristocrats'" (179) by attesting to their links to England's long past and the English landscape while also adapting to new modes of capital acquisition. This adaptation was necessary since the mere possession of land no longer served as the primary sign of noble status.

[46] In his essay "Making Private Property: Enclosures, Common Rights and the Work of Hedges," *Rural History* 18.1 (2007), Nicholas Blomley points to John Worlidge's 1669 *Systema Agriculturae*, which endorsed the use of "the fence or hedge as a protection against cattle and 'the lusts of vile persons'" (85). He recommends white-thorn, as fast-growing, or the holly that "'may compare to a Wall or a Pale to defend your inclosure from Winds, or the eyes of ill-neighbours, and for its strength against man or beast it [is] impregnable' (86)" (qtd in Blomley p. 9).

mechanism in drawing boundaries in surveying manuals, undoes the easy gesture to hospitality. Instead, the wall is the central site of the poem's engagement with social relationships.

In the same way that Jonson's "To Penshurst" welcomes people despite the presence of walls, Thomas Carew's "To Saxham" (c. 1620s) showcases social relations that are free of judgment. Following the Jonsonian example, Carew emphasizes that:

> the stranger's welcome each man there
> stamped on his cheerful brow doth wear,
> Nor doth this welcome or his cheer,
> Grow less 'cause he stays longer here;
> There's none observes, much less repines,
> How often this man sups or dines. (43-48)

But this moment of judgement-free dining is notably shorter than Jonson's model (6 lines rather than roughly 30) and takes up less space in the overall portrait of the estate (roughly 10% of Carew's poem as compared to roughly 30% of Jonson's poem). And quite quickly, the audience is moved to the door: "Thou hast no porter at the door/T'examine or keep back the poor" (49-50). Carew's examination of Saxham's doors and the lack of interest in keeping people out operates as a modified version of Jonson's discussion of the wall in Penshurst.

The difference between the wall and the door is telling. At Penshurst the wall provides a clear boundary between the Sidneys and their neighbors. The door, on the other hand, creates a nuanced entry for strangers and not a division among neighbors. The speaker claims that the door's purpose is to "let strangers in" (51) and that they are "untaught to shut" (52). This confidence that allows the door to "stand wide open all the year" (53) comes from what is communicated in the last lines of the poem: "thy bounty such,/They cannot steal thou gives't so

much" (57-58). The Saxham estate holds plenty. In Jonson's poem, the wall protects the estate, lending weight to one early modern argument that "we are obliged to maintain a good Fence if we expect an answerable success to our labours."[47] For Saxham, the estate is so brimming with bounty that it freely distributes its produce. In effect, Saxham's estate has no labor, and thus no need for a wall, but rather the door to a storehouse, or a diluvian Ark.[48]

Just as Jonson's poem famously begins with "building," it also famously ends this way. The narrator states that:

> Now Penshurst, they that will proportion thee
> With other edifices, when they see
> Those proud, ambitious heaps, and nothing else
> May say, their lords have built, but thy lord dwells. (99-102)

Architecture is again placed in opposition to the real work of the estate. Dwelling is placed in opposition to building. For Heidegger, "dwelling is the manner in which mortals are on the earth" whereas "building as dwelling unfolds into the building that cultivates growing things and the building that erects buildings."[49] By opposing "building" with "dwelling," Jonson's poem explains that cultivation of the land in Penshurst is harmonious and about being with the earth, in a way that extends to cultivation and housing. While Norden's tenant farmer may bemoan the appraisal of the manor made by surveyors that threaten housing, the speaker of Jonson's poem uses surveying principles to examine the topography and reinforce the agricultural productivity of the estate as a natural extension of properly using the estate and thus, properly dwelling on it.

---

[47] Worlidge (1669), qtd in Blomley 9.
[48] See Peter Remien, "'Home to the slaughter': Noah's Ark and the Seventeenth-Century Country House Poem," *Modern Philology* (2016): 507-529.
[49] Martin Heidegger, "Building Dwelling Thinking" in *Poetry, Language, Thought,* trans. Albert Hofstadter, (New York: Harper Perennial Modern Thought, 2013), 146.

As we have seen, agrarian production is the central purpose that links the various classes and bodies on the country estate. This inconvenient truth even seeps into communal celebration and rustic revelry, as is the case in Robert Herrick's "The Hock-Cart" (c. 1640s).[50] When the laborers in the poem sit down to drink, the speaker tells them to first "freely drink to your lord's health" (39). Following this first formality, the toast continues:

> Then to the plow, the commonwealth,
> Next to your flails, your fans, your fats;
> Then to the maids with wheaten hats;
> To the rough sickle, and crooked scythe,
> Drink frolic boys, till all be blithe. (40-44)

This progression is noteworthy. In seeming order of importance, the speaker instructs the country laborers to direct their praises to: the lord, the plow, the commonwealth, the vessels for holding agricultural products ("fats" or vats), their "maids," and the tools of their labor (the sickle and the scythe). This progression mirrors the priorities important to the owner of the estate in the surveying manual: the sowing of fields and the manor as a part of a larger commonwealth of England.[51] The storage of produce, familial relationships, and harvest are, in turn, subordinated to the primal image of the estate as a piece of the larger commonwealth.

The speaker implores the laborers to meditate on the deeper ways that the lord-subject relationship on the manor impresses on and even determines their livelihood. The speaker tells the laborers to:

---

[50] Herrick's poetry was published in one large (1200 line? poem) volume entitled *Hesperides* in 1648.

[51] Gabriel Plattes, in the 1639 preface to *A Discovery of Infinite Treasvre, Hidden Since the Worlds Beginning,* argues that rhetorical, legal, and philosophical (or alchemical) training is useless if husbandry is not well conducted. He forcefully explains that: "there is no approved medicine but this, in an over-peopled Common-wealth, to wit, good improvements of the earth; which may be effected by the new inventions contained in this Book."

Feed, and grow fat; and as ye eat,

Be mindful that the laboring neat,

As you, may have their fill of meat.

And know, besides, ye must revoke

The patient ox unto the yoke

And all go back unto the plow

And harrow, though they're hanged up now. (45-50)

Here the image of the sons of summer as pests is further elaborated: they feed on the grain and grow fat. In the course of eating, the ecology of production is one that these laborers should "be mindful" of: that as they eat meat, they must remember the laboring cattle that are now being eaten. And in due time, the speaker reminds them "ye must revoke/the patient ox unto the yoke/and all go back unto the plow." In this formulation, the feast is only a moment of suspension in a long cycle of work that includes the very food they are eating.

Having established the central relationship of the farmers and their landlord as a reflection of the commonwealth, the speaker of "The Hock-Cart" closes the poem:

And you must know, your lord's word's true,

Feed him ye must, whose food fills you,

And that this pleasure is like rain,

Not sent ye for to drown your pain,

But for to make it spring again. (51-55)

In many ways these lines close the circle of manorial relations established at the beginning of the poem. But there is a twist. While the laborers are the ones whose "rough hands" (1) made the lord a lord of wine and oil, ultimately the food is his. This relationship is articulated in the line

"feed him ye must, whose food fills you." The transmogrification of feed into food doubly emphasizes the alimentary ecology of the manor. And, in an encouraging swoop, the speaker compares this relationship to "rain", without which, all agricultural activity would cease.

Between surveying manuals and country house poems, we find a shared view of the manor as the microcosm of state relations. Within this miniature kingdom, the focus that ties the landlord to his subject-tenants is the use of land for agrarian productivity. The real value of the estate is derived from agricultural production, even as it is subtly revealed in "To Penshurst" and more explicitly in "The Hock-Cart." By making the political economy the central work of the community, the manor that is described by both the surveying manual and the country house poem emerges as a dynamic site that includes a matrix of farmers, laborers, managers, and the property owner, all of whom enact on a micro-level the complex social relations that comprise the English commonwealth. This conception of the manor—which revises what Norden's tenant farmer once believed was about custom and dwelling in terms of territory—enables a unique commentary on English agricultural political economy. In many ways, this land-based agrarian economy stands in contrast to the contemporaneous imperial mercantile practices in which the English state is increasingly involved.

II. Country House Fantasies, Imperialist Realities, and the Symbolism of Private Property

The generic conventions of the country house poem provide a localized and particularized setting, unlike the generic rural setting of sixteenth-century English pastorals. While the pastoral provides a general rural backdrop, the country house poem brings the specific topography of the estate to the fore.[52] This move is especially important in that the country house estate in

[52] Adrian explains that "localized topography, climate, and nature are prominent features of the early country house poem. Together, they anchor the genre in the reality of time and space and keep it from succumbing to pastoral escapism" (158).

surveying manuals had to be seen in terms of specific topography, climate, and nature to more accurately evaluate the value of a manor. Similarly, the country house poem appraises and fixes the value of the individual estates. While this value is not explicitly pecuniary, the poems use the same category of analysis—topographic details— to ascribe value that the surveying manuals do. I believe this common rubric respects a deep, shared understanding of the country house estate as a locus of production—above the nobility and hospitality of the family.

However, the seventeenth-century country house poem also provided an occasion for the deep and widespread "desire of the wealthy to assert an intrinsic connection between their identities and their properties."[53] As Brian Patton explains, "the country house…[in these poems] is not only a nexus of social relations, but a visible emblem of the benevolent authority of the nobility, a showplace for spectacular displays of well-managed wealth."[54] To produce this display, country house poems resorted to the "metonymic chain of topographic features, plants, and (particularly) animals that constitute the estate's bounty."[55] Despite this abiding and primary objective of the country house poem, Mary Ann C. McGuire explains that the country-house poem genre transmogrified over the four decades between Jonson's "To Penshurst" and the writings of Richard Lovelace and Andrew Marvell. Important to this transformation was the "alteration in the social myths about the nature and function of the landed aristocracy."[56]

The change over time present in the seventeenth-century country house poem records a corresponding revision in the mythology of landholdings and landholders. In McGuire's telling:

Jonson's defense of the country-house community [in "To Penshurst"] as a functional and

[53] Brian Patton, "Preserving Property: History, Genealogy, and Inheritance in 'Upon Appleton House'," *Renaissance Quarterly* 49.4 (1996), 825.
[54] Ibid 826.
[55] Remien 509.
[56] McGuire, "The Cavalier Country-House Poem: Mutations on a Jonsonian Tradition," *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 19.1 (1979), 93.

> morally sound social microcosm, within which the aristocratic owner plays a necessary role as governor, gives way during the early decades of the seventeenth century to the cavalier justification of the country house as a private stronghold, within which aristocratic comforts and powers can be preserved against the rising tide of opposition.[57]

If surveying, according to Jeremy Black, "was seen as a tool with which landlords controlled their estates and introduced agrarian change,"[58] how are these regimes of control and productivity reflected in representations of these estates in the seventeenth-century country house poem?

In Aemelia Lanyer's "A Description of Cookeham" (1611), the elements of the estate itself are personified. This personification critically displaces human labor onto the very topography of the estate, transforming the very grounds of Cookeham into the ultimate agrarian laborer. We see this move on display when the narrator says:

> The walks puts on their liveries
> And all things else did hold like similes:
> The trees with leaves, with fruits, with flowers clad,
> Embraced each other, seeming to be glad,
> Turning themselves to beauteous canopies
> To shade the bright sun from your brighter eyes. (21-26)

Here, the "walks" or garden paths wear the garb of country house servants. And following suit, "all things else" perform the work of estate servants: trees pleasantly formed into "shade"—all the while embracing each other in affection. Later in the poem, the speaker remarks that:

> The very hills right humbly did descend,

[57] Ibid 93-94.
[58] Jeremy Black, *Visions of the World* (London: Michell Beazley, 2003), 52.

When you to tread upon them did intend,

And as you set your feet, they still did rise,

Glad that they could receive so rich a prize. (35-38)

Lanyer transmogrifies the topography of the estate into a servant: the hills are bowing before the "great Lady" Margaret Clifford. The hills "humbly did descend", as the "you" (Clifford), "tread upon them." Thereafter, the hills "did rise" as Clifford set her feet upon them. This image transforms the motion of walking up a hill into a form of obsequiousness on the part of the land itself. In other words, the Lady's walking is transformed from an arduous ascent into a graceful one wherein the hills conspire to lift the Lady up.

This transformation of land on the estate—gardens, orchards, and hills—into a servant of the estate owner, extends the formal inquiry into the uses of land on a manor present in surveying discourse to the very limit. The land becomes a servant itself. Ultimately, the speaker explains, "each arbor, bank, each seat, each stately tree / Thought themselves honored in supporting thee" (45-46). Like a surveyor, the Lady (and the poet) "being seated, you might plainly see, / Hills, vales, and woods, as if on bended knee" (67-68). While Lanyer's poem may not centrally figure agricultural productivity in the manner Jonson's and Herrick's do,[59] it does present a fantastical conception of the country house estate as the full optimization of property for the service of the landowner.

This view of private property makes sense when we situate landed property in a large-scale revision of dominion and geometric representations of land. As Katherine O. Acheson explains, notions of land were being rewritten as a

[59] The lines I quote here are not specifically about agriculture. Instead, they reference general topography (like hills) and gardens. Lanyer's poem provides scant reference to other farms (in contrast to Jonson) or farm laborers (in contrast to Herrick). Lanyer's poem registers the loss of ownership experienced by the mistress of the estate, Ann Clifford, and thus showcases a divorce of land from female owners.

> result of changes to English society in the course of the seventeenth century: the commodification of land, which contributed to the development of political theories, national ideologies, and structures of epistemology, required measurement and representation. Dominion, whether achieved through cultivation or conquest, had a length, a breadth, and a function, and was described through the arts of the diagram.[60]

As we have seen in the previous section, the surveying manual was a crucial technology in this process of commodifying land. In the case of Andrew Marvell's country house poem, "Upon Appleton House" (1652), Acheson contends that "Marvell's militarization of the garden at Nun Appleton reaches backwards in time to the earliest definitions of landedness, and forwards to the efflorescence of [a] market-based economy in which the most valuable commodity will be real estate, whether as marketable property in the city, acreage in the country, or territory in the colonies."[61] Diagrams of land—military designs, gardening manuals, maps, as well as, in our case, estate surveys— promulgated this geometric approach to knowing, valuing, and ultimately making land. Lanyer's poem is also, in its way, a geometric diagram of land, portraying this transformation of land into exchange value.

The country house poem and the surveying manual not only wedded owner to land, and revised land as a site of production, material and abstract, but also reached beyond the confines of the estate to land "abroad." The country house poem, which brought within itself many of the same logics of cultivation and political economy espoused in surveying manuals, also raised similar concerns about the political economy of English mercantile expansion and military exploits. These poems frequently juxtapose native production and the global economy as terms

[60] Katherine O. Acheson, "Military Illustration, Garden Design, and Marvell's 'Upon Appleton House' [with illustrations]," *English Literary Renaissance* 41.1 (2011), 180.
[61] Ibid 184.

that are oppositional and incompatible, in order to negotiate the place of English agricultural practice in global expansion. One striking example of this juxtaposition is the opening of Robert Herrick's "The Country Life" (c. 1640s), which proffers a realm of agricultural production that is placed in opposition to global mercantilism. The poem opens with a dismissal of mercantile and imperial activity:

> Sweet country life, to such unknown,
> Whose lives are others', not their own!
> But serving courts and cities, be
> Less happy, less enjoying thee.
> Thou never plows't the ocean's foam
> To seek and bring rough pepper home;
> Nor to the Eastern Ind dost rove
> To bring from thence the scorched clove;
> Nor, with the loss of thy loved rest,
> Brings home the ingot from the West.
> No, thy ambition's masterpiece
> Flies no thought higher than a fleece. (1-12)

These lines dismiss ambition in the country life, relegating the vice to mercantile expansion. If any ambition is to exist in the country life, it is transferred to sheep shearing (which by this point in English history had been a century-old consternation to those bemoaning the transformation of arable land into pastoral land).[62] Interestingly, this transference of ambition from mercantilism to sheep-shearing to create "a fleece" provides a quick allusion to Jason's Golden Fleece, but in

[62] Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516) is a canonical example of this critique.

turn transforms that very nautical, mythical story into a token of English agrarian production. As a result, the poem opens with a gesture towards global mercantile trade but finds it "incompatible with the virtues of country living."[63] Indeed, the rest of Herrick's poem delves into the divinity of husbandry and the delights of rustic revelry. But the opening of "Country Life", with its uneasy acknowledgment of global trade, sets English agrarian production as its steady opposite.

Why is it that English agrarian production and global trade must be opposites, antagonists? Why not adjuncts? The country house poem straddles between the georgic and pastoral mode. For Robert Markley, if Marvell "questions his own fantasies of pastoral retreat, he also wittily interrogates the values and assumptions of a georgic virtue which unendingly exploits nature for profit."[64] As is the case of Marvell's "Upon Appleton House", country house poems wrestled with "the violent realities of how humankind interacts with itself and the creation"[65] through regimes of agricultural management.

The georgic modality in Marvell can also be seen in Thomas Carew's "To Saxham." In the opening lines of the poem, the speaker toggles from an idyllic landscape outside of the estate to an examination of the products housed within Saxham. The speaker implies that he is distracted by the beauty outside of the physical house: the frost and snow, which are meteorological, and the gardens, orchards, and walks which are pleasurable bounds for recess (though incidentally, according to discourses of cultivation in the period, only accessories for the manor and not part of its direct production). Once the speaker does turn his attention inside the house, he states that within the gates of Saxham are "native sweets" (7). The term native may be taken to denote the specific plants and other agrarian products grown on that estate. But, within

[63] Adrian 158.
[64] As quoted in Remien 525.
[65] Remien 527.

the context of English expansion and emerging discourse surrounding the cultivation of foreign and exotic plants to whet the appetite for commodities from the new world or elsewhere, this term "native" takes on an oppositional contrast to imperial and cash crop structures of cultivation and extraction. In other words, the "native" indexes the specifically English character of Saxham.

In another poem, "To the King at His Entrance into Saxham" (c. 1620s), Carew returns to this pride in the native. The poem opens with a plea to King James:

> Ere you pass this threshold, stay,
> And give your creature leave to pay
> Those pious rites, which unto you,
> As to our household gods is due.

The poet eagerly asks the monarch to stay—in order for a display of devotion. He asks the king to resist passing (perhaps in reference to the monarchical habit of performing processionals throughout England to show power) and instead to stay in place. The opposition between staying and moving is reprised in the center of the poem when the speaker states that: "To show your welcome and our care / Such rarities that come from far / From poor men's houses banished are" (24-26). Here the poem delineates a logic of hospitality based on offering what is native to England rather than "rarities that come from afar." Nestled into this show of hospitality to the king is the idea that his welcome, and also "our care" must be shown through pride in English cultivation. The exotic commodities of mercantilism must be "banished" in order to show a proper devotion for the English crown and the English nation. The play between stasis and movement is intensified; the very objects within the Saxham estate display what stays in and comes from England. In order to supply these native objects and products, the poet states that: "We'll have whatever the season yields, / Out of the neighbouring woods and fields" (29-30).

The land on and "neighbouring" the country house estate issues the necessities and luxuries that are needed to support and show devotion to the English monarch, within the diegetic frame of the poem—and, quite obviously, within the political economy of the English nation.

This theme of indigeneity is found in yet another Carew poem—"To My Friend G.N. From Wrest" (1639). In this poem, the speaker praises the country estate, musing that:

> Her porous bosom doth rich odors sweat;
> Whose perfumes through the ambient air diffuse
> Such native aromatics, as we use
> No foreign gums, nor essence fetched from far,
> No volatile spirits, nor compounds that are
> Adulterate, but at Nature's cheap expense
> With far more genuine sweats refresh the sense. (12-18)

Here the poet explains that native sweat, the sweat of laborers in the English countryside, abets foreign fragrances, and volatile spirits, and modified, "adulterate[d]" fragrances. The sweat is honest and native, thus it is secure and pure. This view places agrarian production and labor as the stark and honest contrast to foreign mercantilism. And thus, while country house poems describe localized economies, they also aggressively bolster these economies above global mercantilism as the stable and unadulterated alternative.

Together these three poems by Carew denote an investment in a fantasy of indigeneity. For "To Saxham," "native sweets" bring the visitor from the orchards and gardens inside the cultivation matrix of the estate and sustain the birds, poor, and the nobleman. In "To the King," the monarch is shown appropriate devotion and hospitality through what is grown nearby, in the neighboring woods and fields, rather than the exotic commodities from abroad. And in "To My

Friend G.N. from Wrest," the estate wafts native aromatics, far exceeding famed perfumes from the East, or increasingly from the West.[66]

Carew's nativist rhetoric resists the route of capital. As Marx reminds us: "A precondition of production based on capital is therefore the production of a constantly widening sphere of circulation, whether the sphere itself is directly expanded or whether more points within it are created as points of production."[67] Hence, in order for the country estate to mobilize private property into capital, and thus, for the country house landlord to own the means of production necessary for an emerging market economy, the country house estate must of necessity look beyond the border of the estate—to wider and wider spheres of circulation.[68] Thus Carew's poems form a kind of wishful thinking, in which the estate operates in a highly localized (i.e. only within the estate itself) political economy. This fantasy of a self-enclosed estate riffs on the claims about the political economy of the estate made in surveying manuals, like Norden's. But with a twist. Norden, Folkingham, Plattes and others saw the country house estate as a microcosmic commonwealth, but these estates also had to consider important things like walls, roads, and nearby markets. In other words, the single country house operates in relationship to

[66] To this point, Adrian adds that: "'native' [in Carew's poems] is employed to denote both place or origin (indigenous, not 'fetched from far') and quality ('more genuine'). Whereas the importation of rarities was outside the capacity of the humbled host in 'To the King', here ranging from Wrest's native bounty seems not only superfluous but undesirable; there is a sort of taint and spuriousness associated with the introduction of unnatural additives" (158).

[67] Karl Marx, *Grundrisse* (London: Penguin, 2005), trans. Martin Nicolaus, 407.

[68] I would add here that Marx's argument about capital, especially in this section on circulation in the *Grundrisse*, sees "the world market [as] directly given in the concept of capital itself...Commerce no longer appears here as a function taking place between independent productions for the exchange of their excess, but rather as an essentially all-embracing presupposition and moment of production itself" (408). Essentially, any mobilization of property into capital--such as land in order to produce agriculture and pay its workers' wages (rather than simply a use of land for subsistence and potential tribute)--presupposes that there is a larger world market with which the commodities produced by the capitalist can be exchanged. This exchange may be direct, in terms of selling the commodity to the other global players, or indirect, through the transformation of the commodity into money, and money which can be used again to buy commodities from afar.

other country houses—capitalizing the production of its crops using improvement techniques and better appraisal of land in order to sell its commodities. But for Carew, the view of the country house estate is isolationist: the estate produces things native to it and excludes potential for exchange with other entities. Carew's desire for native sweets and sweat goes against the orbit of capital, which, as Marx contends, "drives beyond national barriers and prejudices as much as beyond nature worship, as well as all traditional, confined, complacent, encrusted satisfactions of present needs, and reproductions of old ways of life."[69] The desire for indigenous, subsistence style farming in Carew is foregone and forlorn. And while Carew's poems insist upon bounty and wealth, they enact an absurdist fantasy wherein the optimization of the country house estate––which we have seen to be a central concern in surveying manuals of the period—is not for a world market. In fact, the Carew country house is closed off from the world market completely and further erects a national boundary so high that pesky capital cannot tear it down.

Why does Carew want to build a wall? Was it not also Carew who famously wrote in "To Saxham," that the doors of the estate were "untaught to shut"? If this is the case, from whence does this nativist opposition to global trade originate? Contemporary objections to English imperial ambitions were sprung from general fears that contact with heathen and savage countries could "contaminate England", or corrupt the individual merchant, or that "luxury consumption was both idolatrous and effeminizing."[70] Furthermore, some fears were specific to this moment of European expansion into the new world—such as the financial gamble of overseas colonization, the dangers of conflict and cooperation with Catholic nations, and the idea that "the importation of cheap goods could lead to the loss of domestic jobs and even have a

[69] *Grundrisse* 410.
[70] Adrian 164.

leveling effect on the social order."[71] Despite the political and economic sources of the anxieties about overseas trade, Adrian finds that "significantly, many of these commercial fears were cast in terms of nationhood."[72]

In many ways, Carew's resistance to global mercantilism brings to mind Sir Guyon's resistance to Mammon in Book 2 of Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* (1590/1596). Regarding this episode, Daniel Vitkus argues that "Mammon's snappy answers to Guyon's stupid questions refer to a systemic economic power—the ability to control markers and the circulation of commodities and money. Mammon himself is the spirit of primitive accumulation, the maker and breaker of kings, but he is at the same time the spirit of global economy."[73] I bring up this episode because, as Vitkus notes, "Guyon's refusal of Mammon's gold invokes this fantasy of a feudal power that could function by means of mutual obligation rather than by participation in the marketplace and its values."[74] Guyon forwards a conservative, residual impulse to utilize feudal models of power that rely on moral debts rather than the circulation of pecuniary credit. Pecuniary credit, which, for Marx, enables the circulation of capital and constitutes a lever that pulls all production into "commerce" (and not merely the excess), is what Guyon and Carew resist. They instead wish to retreat to a view of landholdings wherein the landholder is insulated and supported by the crops and people on his land. All other connections are made by neighbors or friends, and not from trade abroad. The example of Guyon and Mammon, and, in particular, Guyon's interest in Mammon's horde of gold but his outright resistance to becoming indebted to Guyon, is a critical moment in Book 2 because it is after this

[71] Ibid 164.
[72] Ibid 164
[73] Daniel Vitkus, "The New Globalism: Transcultural Commerce, Global Systems Theory, and Spenser's Mammon," in *A Companion to the Global Renaissance: English Literature and Culture in the Era of Expansion*, ed. Jyotsna G. Singh (Malden MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2013), 42.
[74] Ibid 42.

argument that Guyon collapses. For Vitkus, "What the allegory of Guyon demonstrates is that the refusal to participate in that global system of exchange, in the new economy of capital, may exhibit temperance, but to gaze upon the workings of Mammon and refuse to serve Mammon's mastery will bring on a crisis and vulnerability that can only be averted by divine intervention."[75] Extending this argument to the curious nativism of Carew's country house poems, I suggest that Carew's "To Saxham", "To The King", and "To my friend G.N. at Wrest" all attempt to resist the arc of global trade—and thus capital—but must rely on mystic and romantic imagery to do so.

The native, localized country house that resides in the Cavalier country house poetry of Thomas Carew and Robert Herrick relies upon a political economy that is set against global mercantilism, and thus, against the world-system of the capitalist mode of production. The kind of political economy this country estate presents might be feudal. Or it might be drawn from a more generalized pre-capitalist formation. But its mode of operation is not coherent. It is instead a wishful gaze, full of mysticism and Virgilian *sponte sua,*[76] into a pre-capitalist past. This Golden Age bounty, in fact, is not a political economy at all. It is magic.

But if we are to consider the Cavalier country house poem, and its modifications on the Jonsonian model, as a reactionary response to agrarian capitalism, we should entertain how its logics of production act as a photo-negative to this emergent process. For one, while the country home may reflect a desire to ostentatiously present the landowner's wealth, it does not portray the production and multiplication of value. In this manner, the country house poem illustrates a

[75] Ibid 45.

[76] Alastair Fowler, in "Country House Poems: The Politics of a Genre," *The Seventeenth Century* 1.1 (1986), explains that in the country house poem "the estate enjoys a providential plenitude, whereby bountiful nature seems almost to offer itself, as in the Golden Age, of its own free will--a hyperbole known from Virgil's phrase as the *sponte sua* motif" (2). The term "sponte sua" loosely translates to "of one's own accord" and it is the etymological origin of our word "spontaneous" in English.

character of pre-capitalist forms, in Marx's terms: "the aim of this work [on land] is not the *creation of value*—although they may do surplus labour in order to obtain *alien,* i.e. surplus products in exchange—rather its aim is sustenance of the individual proprietor and of his family, as well as the total community."[77] Turning to Carew's "To the King" we find that the bounty of the estate is used as sustenance and a display of hospitality to the monarch. When foreign goods are mentioned, they are banished, rather than used for opportunities for exchange. A country house system predicated on creating value would operate in a fashion that appropriates and exploits human labor and glorifies labor productivity—[78]in the way that Norden's surveyor binds the tenant's lands and "selves" and places them under the dominion of the landlord. The survey's drive to accurately approximate the value of a parcel of land brings in tow the fixing of rents, and correspondingly the fixing of wages to pay for these rents, and subsequently, ideologies of improving parcels of land to increase labor productivity (appropriating value) and rents (expropriating value).[79] But whereas the surveying manual takes flight out of the value-oriented working of the country home, the country house poem stays parked on the tarmac.

The sticky residue that keeps the country house poem from fully embracing agrarian capitalism can be better understood when we mobilize Raymond Williams' understanding of the structure of feeling outlined in *The Country and the City*. Williams finds various periods' interest in a seemingly well-ordered past that "keeps appearing [and] reappearing, at bewilderingly various dates" to be significant "not primarily [as] a matter of historical explanation and analysis

[77] Marx, *Grundrisse* 471-472.
[78] Jason Moore, *Capitalism in the Web of Life* (London: Verso, 2015), 16.
[79] Raymond Williams provides a fascinating look at agrarian capitalism's fetishism of improvement in the chapter "The Morality of Improvement" in his seminal *The Country and The City* (New York: Oxford UP, 1973). His exploration can best be summed up in this claim: "In this development [the move from feudal to the post-feudal modes of agrarian capitalism], an ideology of improvement—of a transformed and regulated land—became significant and directive. Social relations which stood in the way of this kind of modernisation were steadily and at times ruthlessly broken down" (62).

[but as] this particular kind of reaction to the fact of change."[80] In other words, the fact that Carew's poems and their generic compatriots dig their heels in and insist on an older form of living is not important for what they try to explain, but for what they try to resist.

Williams' conception of a structure of feeling offers a framework for understanding the country house poems' conservatism. Moreover, Williams provides an explanation that is particular to the political economic circumstances that the seventeenth-century country house poem wrestles against: "the idealisation of feudal and immediately post feudal values: of an order based on settled and reciprocal social and economic relations of an avowedly total kind."[81] This idealization of the vanishing feudal or quasi-feudal set of relations between a landlord and tenant registers a conflict of moral attitudes towards property. The sacred, self-enclosed, self-(re)generating country estate produces bounty that can sustain the inhabitants and provide hospitality for the monarch all the way down to the birds. This mythos forwards a strategic strike against the tide of improvement-oriented agrarian capitalism. Williams explains that this kind of wishful thinking reveals that:

> A sanctity of property has to co-exist with violently changing property relations, and an ideal of charity with the harshness of labour relations in both the new and the old modes. This is then the third source of the idea of an ordered and happier past set against the disturbance and disorder of the present. An idealisation, based on a temporary situation and on a deep desire for stability, served to cover and to evade the actual and bitter contradictions of the time.[82]

The conservative political economy of the country house poem operates as a photo-negative

[80] Williams 35.
[81] Ibid 35.
[82] Ibid 45.

making dark the kinds of changing property and social relations predicated on value coming to light and making light the residues of ostentatious feudal-like hospitality and bounty that are receding in the seventeenth-century countryside.

The political economy that the seventeenth-century country house poem reacts against recalls the political economic circumstances that underwrite its models in antiquity. In his discussion of various pre-capitalist modes of production,[83] Marx explains that the classical political economy that marked the Roman Empire saw property as a reward for participation in the governmental and military affairs of the city. Thus, property was part of "the existence of the commune," in that one had his property through the polity of the Empire. Because of this relationship among proprietor, polity, and parcel of land, Marx explains that in the classical model: "it is not cooperation in wealth-producing labour by means of which the commune member [the proprietor] reproduces himself, but rather cooperation in labour for the communal interests (imaginary and real) for the upholding of the association inwardly or outwardly."[84] In short, property in classical times was never about sustaining the individual landlord but rather for the glory of the Empire and in service of the Empire. It is no accident that some of the tropes we find in Carew and the country house poem—of the land as being in the service of the

[83] Namely the Asiatic commune (where the whole village works on communal land), the classical mode (used in the Roman empire, where the city awarded parcels of land to patricians and soldiers and thus the land was really a function of the "ruralization of the city" that brought in products from the outlying provinces into the metropole), and the Germanic-feudal model (where patriarchs held swathes of land belonging to the clan at large). The city was never really more than a gathering place for exchange and beyond a common language and distant common past, the clans had little relationship with each other. The latter two formations are of interest to me in thinking through the seventeenth-century country house poem but I find that there is not a coherent model that these poems put forward. In some ways, saying they gesture towards a feudal past, as Williams does, would reflect the Germanic model. Norden's argument that the estate is a mini-commonwealth somewhat sees the landlord as a Germanic patriarch. But, nonetheless, he still thinks about the commonwealth of England as a whole and desires a scientific approximation of land value that is not feudal. On the other hand, the country house poem's interest in communal obligation brings to mind the classical mode, which saw property as a reward for and in the interest of the larger polity. This classical mode is the subject of the present paragraph.

[84] *Grundrisse* 476.

community—exist if we recall that the seventeenth century country house poem appropriates the country house poem from antiquity.[85]

It is also not an accident that the anxieties in seventeenth-century culture regarding global mercantilism find their way into the seventeenth-century country house poem. John Adrian explains that some of the fears about British imperial expansion concerned the desire to avoid dangers of "overstretching" that "[led] to the fall of the Roman Empire."[86] In this line of thinking, the Roman Empire lacked a centered political economic enterprise and became so decentralized in the trade of commodities that it collapsed. But this understanding of the Roman example is not quite correct. For, in fact, as Marx reminds us, "antiquity unanimously esteemed agriculture as the proper occupation of the free man, the soldier's school. In it the ancestral stock of the nation sustains itself; it changes in the cities, where alien merchants and dealers settle, just as the indigenous move where gain entices them."[87] So while the Roman Empire did fall, the early modern calculus of danger Adrian identifies is, like most forms of anxiety, incorrect. In fact, Romans themselves believed that the successful polity should be centered in agriculture. It is in agriculture that the native, ancestral stock is cultivated. Thus, the cavalier country house poem, which borrows the generic models of the Roman country house poem, also borrows this opposition between the native aromatics of the country and the foul and volatile smells from abroad. The incompatibility between the country and the city in Rome is able to speak to a new epoch of imperialism a millennium later in England. However, we must note, this kind of imperialism is modelled on a mode of production very different from the classical one. While the

[85] A particularly sound illustration of the Early Modern appropriation of the classical country house poem, Alastair Fowler argues, is Marvell's "Upon Appleton House" which "conjugate[s] the georgic paradigm" found in Hesiod's *Works and Days* and Virgil's *Georgics* in its wide-ranging and zany episodes. We must also remember that Lord Fairfax was rewarded with retirement to this estate for his military service to the Republic.
[86] Adrian 164.
[87] Marx, *Grundrisse* 477.

seventeenth-century country house poem takes its model from the classical georgic and thus the classical mode of production, the surveying manual writes a more accurate model of the country house which is being shaped by the capitalist mode of value-oriented production.

In this section, I have unpacked the precapitalist forms nestled in the country house poem's reactionary gaze. By exploring the political economic dimensions of the country home within the country house poem, we come to understand how the country house poem in seventeenth-century England mimics the georgic mode of Rome, and in turn fetishizes the classical mode of production. In this older pre-capitalist formation, landed property is for the larger polity. The country house is therefore for England and its glory, and not for the individual landowner's profit. The landowner gains his praise in being a model citizen of England. This connection between land and English identity promotes a fiction of separation between agriculture and Englishness on the one hand and commerce and foreignness on the other hand. In subsequent chapters I will examine how this land-based ideology of Englishness shapes constructions of the colonial Other through notions of agricultural activity. But for now, I draw our attention to how this interest in agricultural bounty—particularly in the country house poem's fantasy of an estate that produces sustenance without labor or concern for exchange value—demonstrates the ways in which early modern English writers tied English identity to the features and abundance of land held in enclosed manors. Of course, these poems largely erase the labor of workers on the estate, overlook the anxieties tenants of these estates held around dispossession and raised rents, and disregard the already-present and continually imbricating influences of foreign trade on the domestic life of these estates. In short, the seventeenth-century country house poem demonstrates that in order to construct a fiction of English identity, early modern writers played up the importance of agriculture and downplayed the social relations and

wider networks of political economy that sustain agricultural activity.

III. Conclusion

In this chapter I have examined how the country house estate described in the surveying manual and the country house poem used and created value. My analysis of surveying manuals, such as John Norden's *The Surveyor's Dialogue*, and country house poems, such as Ben Jonson's "To Penshurst" and Robert Herrick's "The Hock-Cart," reveals how the country house estate was valued above all as a site of agricultural productivity. While both genres forward a vision of agrarian productivity, they present two fundamentally contrasting perspectives on it. In the case of the surveying manual, the grounds of the estate and the people living and working on the estate presupposed conditions of exchange and participation in a market. For the country house poem, exchange proves an anathema. Poems such as Herrick's "The Country Life" and Thomas Carew's contributions to the genre display a considerable nativist bent that shuns the global market. I have argued that this resistance to circulation is a conservative reaction to emergent conditions of the capital mode of production wherein the main function of the country estate is to produce an abundance of crops to be used (and not exchanged). Through this comparison, I have demonstrated the tension produced by the transition in landed property relations—from feudal manors to private estates. This tension yields critical insights into the reactionary political economic ideology of the country house poem genre while also demonstrating that the country house poem genre is a site for understanding representations of agricultural productivity. Likewise, by putting the country house poem in conversation with the surveying manual, I have elucidated some ways in which two genres of writing *about* sites of agrarian labor and land relations can trace outlines of the cultural work of imagining and making sense of Early Modern

England's so-called primitive accumulation.

The country house, aestheticized in the country house poem and scientifically valorized in the surveying manual, is a key site in a watershed moment in English history. The markers of capital formation, and what we consider modern modes of living, come from the change in land from the material basis of subsistence and the site of labor to achieve sustenance into a lever for value-extraction. Accompanying this change is a change from an individual operating as a part of community to a private landowner.[88] These markers can be tracked legally in the rise of country estates that replace the fortified manors and castles of old.[89] This change in land relations and the extraction of wealth-as-improved value sets the stage for accumulation and production that not only signals the change in registers from the feudal manor to the country home, but also the "model of the city and country called imperialism."[90] And while the country homes as rendered in the country house poem resisted products from abroad, in reality, they were built out of, fortified by, and became repositories of imported goods and mercantile profits.[91] As I have shown in this chapter, the country estate is an important site for understanding the emergence of private property and its role in reshaping social relations and ushering waves of land dispossession in the English countryside and in colonies abroad.

While country houses constellate the changes in class relations in England and the emergence of colonial extraction abroad, the agricultural productivity promoted by the surveying manual and the country house poem further illustrates the role of land in constructions of identity

[88] Marx, *Grundrisse* 485.
[89] Williams, *The Country and The City* 39.
[90] Ibid 39.
[91] Williams reminds us that: "European expansion into the rest of the world had already, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, brought back significant wealth, which found its way into the internal system. Important parts of the country-house system, from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, were built on the profits of that trade. Spices, sugar, tea, coffee, tobacco, gold and silver: these fed, as mercantile profits, into an English social order, over and above the profits on English stock and crops" (280).

in early modern England. The country home, as a mini-commonwealth and/or as a fortress against the rising tide of global trade, must maximize its agricultural productivity. In turn, this productivity frames the English landowner as a patriot of the larger commonwealth and sublimates the labor of non-landowning classes in England and the labor of subjugated, often-enslaved peoples in other parts of the Atlantic into the abundance of the country estate. These social relations produce a notion of belonging (of Englishness) rooted in owning the means of agricultural production. With the construction of English belonging comes the construction of difference, which in the following chapters I trace in depictions of land use in *The Faerie Queene* and *The Tempest*. In the case of the seventeenth-century country house poem, discourses of difference and material dispossession are co-constructed through the occlusion of non-landowning laboring bodies and the threatening specter of foreign products.

Much of this is the familiar story of the history of capitalism. In order for the capitalist mode of production to form, people needed to be alienated from land and view their labor as alienated from their sustenance in the form of wages. I am interested in the alienation of community that these changes produce. The local community that seems to cohere in the country house poem resists, if only for a moment, these alienations. And, indeed, native subsistence is praised above alien commodities. But even as the surveying manual writes of the estate in terms of local topographic relations and a patriarchal relationship between the landlord and the tenants, it also writes rubrics of geometric rationalization and pecuniary value that go beyond any individual community or estate. Through its promotion of exchange value-maximizing agrarian capitalist modes of production, the surveying manual measures out "new qualities in themselves, [and] develop[s] new powers and ideas, new modes of intercourse, new needs, and new

language."[92] We find that while agriculture might be the true work of the polity, the country house reflects the renovation of agriculture in this historic moment—and the political and communal belonging that is renovated alongside it. Unlike the mathematical model-oriented surveying manual, the seventeenth-century country house poem holds on to a mystical image of "'the earth [as] the great workshop, the arsenal which furnishes both means and material of labour, as well as the seat, the *base* of the community"[93] that marks life before capital. But, as I have argued, this view of land-for-community recedes across this century and is now gone from view.

[92] Marx, *Grundrisse* 494.
[93] Ibid 472.

Chapter 2:

The Wild and the Sown:

Husbandry and Colonization in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*

In the fall of 1584, English administrators conducted an extensive crown-sponsored survey for over half a million acres of land in Counties Limerick, Cork, Waterford, and Kerry as well as some other areas of Ireland. The Crown declared that these lands had been "legally forfeited"—in effect, confiscated— just two years earlier, as a response to the insurgency of Gerald Fitzgerald (the Old English fifteenth earl of Desmond) against the English. Desmond (the title held by Fitzgerald which comes from the Irish Deas Mumhain or "West Munster") was formally declared a traitor in 1579 and was eventually beheaded 4 years later. In the aftermath of his rebellion, Queen Elizabeth I's administrators assessed the land he and his confederates held in order to "compute its value, and name the present occupier."[94] The survey produced the following verdict: the land held by Desmond and his family for fifteen generations spanned 577,000 acres—but only 300,000 of those acres were usable and thus granted for distribution. This land became known as the Munster Plantation.

William Cecil, Lord Burleigh, and other administrators working on behalf of Queen Elizabeth intended for the Munster Plantation to be divided into plots to be distributed among a designated group of grantees who would repopulate them and make them profitable. These English administrators desired to revise the practice of having "Old English" families (families

[94] Thomas Herron, "Colonialism and the Irish Plantation," in *Edmund Spenser in Context*, ed. Andrew Escobedo (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 78.

who held land from around the time of Henry II's campaign of Irish conquest and settlement in the twelfth century) oversee Ireland because Queen Elizabeth no longer trusted them. Instead, Elizabeth's administrators believed that New English settlers needed to be injected into Ireland so that they could properly reform and place Ireland under Queen Elizabeth's control in an orderly fashion. At first, in 1586, administrators projected there would be 86 grantees. But by 1588, when the administrators actually redistributed the land, only 35 grantees received plots that ranged from 4,000 to 12,000 acres each. Edmund Spenser, secretary to administrator Lord Grey, received 3,000 acres of usable land around Kilcolman Castle.[95]

While English administrators contracted grantees to "boost the economy and Anglicize the country"[96] by importing laborer-settlers from England to engage in agricultural, mining, timber, and other land-based industry, many grantees failed to live up to that objective. Historians have attributed these failures to the following reasons: often the land was vacant or destroyed because of the brutal war against Desmond's rebellion (including slashing and burning land to promote starvation and desperation); or rebels lived on their land; or sometimes the land was harder to develop and improve than had been estimated; or occasionally, grantees themselves had little investment in the land beyond merely holding and speculating on it. Moreover, the scattered and frequently isolated plots of land did not help grantees' odds. In fact, the plots were so scattered that even the term the "Pale", which referred to a boundary that marked the end of the Munster Plantation, could hardly account for the pockets of land held in a grantee's plot that were surrounded by Old English and Gaelic Irish sympathizers. Spenser's own relatively small plot was not contiguous. With little oversight from distant administrators in

[95] "These were located, however, in an enviably central place on fertile land near key sites of settlement, security, and commerce such as Mallow (the seat of Norris, the President of Munster), the town of Buttevant, the impressive walled town of Killamock, and the Cork-to-Limerick road" (Herron 76).
[96] Herron 77.

London or frequently corrupt ones in Dublin, grantees "had difficulty fulfilling [the] long-term goal of creating an English-style commonwealth at the expense of the so-called 'degenerate' Old English and 'savage' native Irish populations, who were meant to emulate the example of their neighbors and new masters."[97]

It is within this context that Edmund Spenser, secretary to Lord Grey and landowner in the Munster Plantation, wrote his epic *The Faerie Queene*. I argue that remembering and attending to this context excavates the ideologies of civilizing predicated on land use that root the representation of justice (v. power) in Book Five and courtesy (v. savagery) in Book Six. In the previous chapter, I analyzed how surveying manuals and country house poems share an interest in depicting country estates as sites of agricultural productivity and their potential to create value—and how these two genres' contrasting views of value (the country house poem's interest in use value as compared to the surveying manual's concentration on exchange value) demonstrate the tension bound up in the emergence of agrarian capitalism and the resulting changes in social relations. In sum, chapter one offered an illustration of how discourses surrounding agricultural production linked notions of land to notions of people in the early modern English countryside. In this chapter, I leave the English countryside and move to the avatars of Elizabethan Anglo-Irish settler colonialism found in Spenser's Faery-Land. In the pages that follow, I trace episodes in Books Five and Six of *The Faerie Queene* that deal with notions related to land and husbandry, and shadowed concepts of wealth and savagery, to uncover the network of colonial and ecological references in Spenser's epic. In each of these books, I look at three episodes—resulting in an analysis of six episodes in total; I also draw upon material from Spenser's prose tract, *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, and the legacies of

[97] Herron 77.

colonialism that scholarship has excavated from Spenser's prose tract and long poem. By analyzing these episodes, this chapter will demonstrate more fully than previous scholarly studies have how deeply land was constitutive of the English colonial ethos, first seen in Ireland, and then applied elsewhere. In particular, georgic-based approaches to land in *The Faerie Queene* relied on a binary opposition between proper-use (plot-style plantations) and improper use (either extreme wealth extraction or nomadism). In addition to examining how land conditioned nascent English colonialism, this chapter also shows how English colonialism conditioned land use, amplifying surveying and value extraction techniques on a larger, nearly national scale.

Scholars have frequently situated Spenser's epic poem within the context of his tenure as a colonial administrator in the New English colonization of Ireland in the latter part of the sixteenth-century. In doing so, many critics have focused on Books Five and Six and the ways various avatars reflect and refract the native Irish and the Old English families who banded together to resist Elizabethan colonization efforts. Much of this scholarship involves reading the narrative world of the *Faerie Queene* as a heterotopic space that, as Anne Fogarty puts it, "constructs a revised version of the social and political order [of the English Irish colonial effort].[98]" This analysis of how Spenser's poem dramatizes Elizabethan Anglo-Irish colonial dynamics routinely appears in readings of the poem in the context of Spenser's prose dialogue *A View of the Present State of Ireland.*

This technique of comparative reading dominates a large body of work from scholars such as Andrew Hadfield, Willy Maley and Walter S.H. Lim, among others. In the case of Lim, especially, the prose dialogue is noteworthy for how its emphasis on "military force" gives way

[98] Anne Fogarty, "The Colonisation of Language: Narrative Strategy in *The Faerie Queene,* Book VI," reprinted in *Edmund Spenser (Longman Critical Readers)*, ed. Andrew Hadfield (Harlow: Longman, 1996), 197.

to discussion of husbandry as a more sustainable way to "help civilize the [native] Irish."[99] The long history of reading the *Faerie Queene* in the context of sixteenth-century Anglo-Irish colonization and in relation to *A View* rightly places the poem within the material practice of colonization that Spenser was engaged in as a colonial administrator at the time of his writing the 1596 edition of the poem, wherein we find Books Five and Six. As a consequence, this scholarship provides a crucial groundwork for reading the poem within the backdrop of the violence and turmoil of the English colonial project in Ireland. However, these readings of the poem have paid only minimal attention to how this colonial effort centered on early modern English beliefs about land use and management.

Additionally, many historians of early modern land possession and agricultural practices have illustrated the deep connection between land use and the Elizabethan English colonial ethos. In his book *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland,* historian Joseph Patrick Montaño outlines the ways the Tudors emphasized land management in their many (failed) attempts to subjugate the Irish and clamp down on native Irish insurrection. Montaño powerfully explains that "by enclosing their lands, establishing private property, cultivating fields, and building walls, the settlers constructed their version of civilization; at the same time, they created physical boundaries between the cultivated and the wild, between civil and savage."[100] In the light of these influential arguments, we can see how the many episodes in which the *Faerie Queene* mobilizes ideas of land use and improvement assume or insist on a binary opposition between proper land use and improper land use.

---

[99] Walter S.H. Lim, "Figuring Justice: Imperial Ideology and the Discourse of Colonialism in Book V of *The Faerie Queene* and *A View of the Present State of Ireland,*" *Renaissance and Reformation* /Renaissance et Réforme, New Series/Nouvelle Serie 19.1(1995), 65.

[100] Joseph Patrick Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 217.

Still, much of this scholarship regarding cultivation and its relationship with larger structures of land claims, improvement, and colonization exists in historical studies of the period and has yet to inform readings of *The Faerie Queene.* Moreover, historical studies like Montaño's do not analyze how literary genres like the georgic operate as frameworks through which the figure of the plow or plowman circulate in early modern texts. In his book *What Else is Pastoral?,* Ken Hiltner uncovers how the georgic, as an ethos, "positions humans in an active, aggressive posture towards the earth."[101] This ethos is not simply rooted in an appreciation of agriculture; rather, the georgic foregrounds labor and reimagines the properties of land in a way that moves beyond the leisure of the pastoral towards "generating the hard work that colonization requires."[102] Hiltner usefully concedes that the transformation in attitudes regarding agriculture from the fourteenth century to the late sixteenth century is less a story of material re-engagement with property and more a reimagining of the leisurely absent landlord into a landlord actively invested in farming his land. This is certainly not to say that these wealthy landowners suddenly engaged in backbreaking labor, or even transitioned from a sheep-based pasture economy to one based on crops; rather, the georgic genre generates a discursive possibility of viewing one's position through constructs of labor and productivity. Such a view of identity through labor pervades Spenser's *Faerie Queene.* As Hiltner helpfully points out, Redcrosse Knight is raised as a plowman and this origin provides his true name (George). Hiltner's reading of *The Faerie Queene* as georgic usefully frames the literary genre within the larger context of environmental discourse in early modern England and allows us to better understand the genre's role in colonization of lands (and not just people). However, Hiltner's focus on the georgic as a tool for

[101] Ken Hiltner, *What Else Is Pastoral?* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011), 162.
[102] Ibid 159.

imagining or "consolidat[ing] a sense of self at the expense of indigenous people"[103] in Spenser's Ireland overlooks the intensive discursive tension that the georgic holds within the narrative landscape of the poem.

Hiltner's approach provides a framework for, as Julian Yates argues, thinking ecologically with Spenser. This ecological thinking involves attending to "[Spenser's] manipulation of georgic imagery and splicing of georgic industry with the more languid forms of pastoral retreat."[104] For scholars like Yates and Hillary Eklund, representations of agriculture in Spenser's poetry mobilize the concept of *oikos* to conceive of the household and use of land together as a way of maximizing profit. Understanding environmental practice and thinking along these lines of *oikos*, utility, and extraction brings us towards a key understanding of ecology that is often minimized: early modern environmental practices worked in tandem with the material realities of British colonialism and nascent capitalism. As Vin Nardizzi and Tiffany Jo Werth argue in their recent collection, *Premodern Ecologies in the Modern Literary Imagination*, we must recall that "lethal danger—to health, communities, and their environments—has historically attended attempts at forging connection in colonial and settler contexts."[105] This is certainly the case regarding Spenser's time in Ireland. The mileage that Anglo-Irish settlers like Spenser found in the georgic ethos and in the investment in land use helped propel a productive fiction of separation between the civilized and the savage and warranted the expropriation of land and resources that characterized the Munster Plantation and Spenser's role within it.

---

[103] Ibid 157-158.
[104] Yates, "Early Modern Ecology," 334.
[105] Vin Nardizzi and Tiffany Jo Werth, "Introduction: Oecologies: Engaging the World, From Here," in *Premodern Ecologies in the Modern Literary Imagination* eds. Vin Nardizzi and Tiffany Jo. Werth (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019), 12.

During this settler-colonial campaign, English administrators stationed Spenser and eventually granted him land. Spenser also belonged to circles of fellow grantees and administrators who predicated their place in Ireland explicitly on ethnic and national difference. Spenser and his circle were likely aware that they were perceived among the Old English and Gaelic Irish as land-grabbers, cronies, and upstarts uninterested in understanding or allowing thousands of years of Irish linguistic, legal, and social custom or addressing centuries of prior English intervention. English administrators tasked Spenser, his employer Lord Grey, and his fellow-grantees with managing and improving plots of land. We cannot neatly cleave Spenser's ecological sense from his colonial function.

We can say the same about his neighbors in the Irish settler circle. Spenser's own experiences with husbandry and agriculture are predicated on an explicitly colonial regime. The model Henri LeFebvre outlines in *The Production of Space,* which understands "space" in three domains, helps refine my point. Lefebvre defines these three domains as: spatial practice as the customs that navigate how we move through spaces; representations of space as the techno-scientific protocols that visualize and legislate the uses of spaces; and representative spaces as artistic renderings of the prior two domains. For instance, Barnabe Googe, Spenser's neighbor and peer in intellectual circles, authored a number of georgics in addition to as a well-known a translation of Conrad Heresbach's *The Boke of Husbandry.* Googe sought to outline representations of space that would better facilitate the objectives of the spatial practices they inhabited as colonists; like other writers and translators of husbandry manuals, Googe turned to Virgil's *Georgics* for inspiration. Googe and Spenser also rendered representative spaces in their art (Googe in his georgic poems and Spenser in his romance-epic *The Faerie Queene*) that were highly influenced by their tenure as colonial administrator-grantees (spatial practice) as well as

the well-circulated conceptions of proper husbandry (representations of space). As Willy Maley contends, "Googe is instructive for our understanding of the ways in which Spenser's Irish circle forces us to rethink the nature of a plantation community. This is not a metaphor. We must remember that English colonists in Ireland were penning livestock as well as lyrics, composting as well as composing or compositing. The world 'culture' itself is bound up with 'cultivation,' as is the early modern understanding of 'colony.'"[106] Maley is correct to point out the linguistic and cultural overlay between culture, cultivation, and colony as mutually informing practices within Spenser's Irish circle. However, Googe (and Spenser, for that matter) did not just write with a labile relationship to the georgic imagination, as both a kind of poetry and as a system of well-executed husbandry; colonial subjugation provided the very basis of their georgic activities (written and material). Spenser, Googe, and the other New English grantees held their land and endeavored to put their plots to good use because of the spatial practice of New English settler colonialism.

This land was the result of the Desmond rebellion and reflected the Elizabethan "New English" model of settler colonialism wherein a commonwealth of well-ordered plots would create a subservient and profitable colony for the English metropole. A brutal history of colonial practice lies beyond the neat etymological slippage, and creates the linkages among intellectual activity, agricultural practice, and imperialism. Additionally, practitioners of this colonial modality required a deep ideological apparatus to justify it. Therefore, I argue that when we find references to savagery, nationhood, and other regimes of difference in Spenser's epic it behooves us to situate them within Spenser's time and place in Ireland. Particularly, we must pay attention to how land—its administration, ordering, and improvement; its reflection of attitudinal trends

[106] Willy Maley, "Colonialism and the Irish Plantation," in *Edmund Spenser in Context*, ed. Andrew Escobedo (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 85.

and its economies and ecologies of difference—operates within the text, because it conditions Spenser and his circle's understanding of their mission and place in Ireland in the 1580s and 1590s wherein *The Faerie Queene* was composed.

I. Land, Territory, and the Colonial Rubrics of Justice

In this section, I will examine three episodes in which justice appears as a topos upon which the text is able to meditate with regard to the distribution of land. The first two episodes appear in canto two: Pollente and Munera, and the Egalitarian Giant. Both, I argue, meditate on the violent practices of land distribution that made the New English plantation mission that Spenser engaged in possible. The third episode concerns Bracidas and Amidas in canto four. I argue that the impasses that occur in canto two not only paint Artegall's role of knight of justice as much more successful, and ordinary, but also highlight the way the more ordinary administration of justice in canto four is colored by Spenser's status as a colonial landowner in Ireland and the racial mythologies that Spenser used to justify his position as a colonial settler.

According to Gerald Morgan, the virtue of justice appears in three major forms in Book Five of *The Faerie Queene*: legal justice, which pertains to the administration of law in disputes and crimes; particular justice, which relates to earning and preserving gains; and equity, which serves as a corrective for times that legal justice leads to particular circumstances that are patently unfair. Particular justice, in turn, is composed of two parts: distributive justice, which pertains to "the distribution of honours [and] wealth"; and rectificatory justice, which considers the fairness of interactions that both parties agree to (like sales or loans) and those that are "involuntary transactions" like theft, murder, and adultery.[107] We can use particular justice to

[107] Gerald Morgan, "Spenser's Conception of Courtesy and the Design *The Faerie Queene*," *The Review of English Studies, New Series* 32.125 (1981): 17-36.

understand property relations surrounding land use in Book Five. Distributive justice is frequently rooted in landed property and the profit extracted from it. Rectifactory justice considers cases where landed property (or claims to it) might circulate via peaceful sales or more violent expropriation. Morgan points out that particular justice appears in two episodes of interest in this section of the chapter: Pollente and Munera and Braciadas and Amidas.

As Morgan explains, the *Nicomachean Ethics* defines justice as an extension of virtue beyond an individual person to one's neighbor. This definition makes sense when we consider the progress of virtues seen in the *Faerie Queene.* The most inward virtue, "holiness", constitutes the starting point of Spenser's epic. Then come the more social virtues, in expanding spheres of relation to one's own inner moral status: temperance or self-regulation in social situations in Book Two; chastity or self-regulation of sexuality in Book Three (of course helmed by a female knight); friendship, or amiable relations between people in Book Four; justice, as one's duty to do right by one's neighbor in Book Five; and lastly courtesy, a looser, more defuse form of management of the self in relation to others of both higher and lower social status in Book Six, which I will analyze in the second half of this chapter.

In the second canto of Book 5, Artegall describes Pollente as "The Sarazin, awaiting for some spoile."[108] By characterizing Pollente as a Muslim (Sarazin) first, Artegall overlays Pollente's expropriatory practice with a sheen of racial difference. Artegall does not see Pollente as a simple villain but as a Muslim first and a person engaged in expropriation ("spoile") second. Thus, we already come to understand Artegall's opposition to Pollente explicitly in terms of racial difference from the outset. Pollente's quality of being "a man of great defence; / Expert in battle and in deeds of armes" (5.2.4.3-4) leads to the distribution and subjugation of estates and

[108] All references to the text come from Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene,* ed. A.C. Hamilton (Harlow: Longman, 1977).

farms. This attribute makes sense, since the victors of war divide the spoils, including land and territory, among themselves. Artegall's vanquishing of Pollente recalls the defeat of the major military leader of the Desmond Rebellion, John Fitzgerald (brother of Gerald Fitzgerald). This is true in Spenser's case as the recipient of farmable land as a result of brutal conflict: the New English architects of the Munster Plantation believed that by breaking the plantation down into plots of farmable land, they could make the English dominion over Ireland more operable and accountable.

The text also separates "Lordships" and "goodly farmes," suggesting that both kinds of land parcels are separate but equal—in that they are differently classed but require equal space in the mention of how Pollente exercises his power. Moreover, the poem states that: "[Pollente's] corps was carried downe along the Lee" (5.2.19.1), the same river that Fitzgerald's head was mounted over. The historical event and the narratological defeat of "power" by "justice" are similar in several ways. For one, Artegall kills Pollente in a river, decapitates him, and mounts his head on a pole (granting Pollente's name a third pun). In the case of the historical John Fitzgerald, his head was also placed on a pole.[109] Not only does the river Lee telegraph the connection between Pollente to John Fitzgerald, it also offers a moment of rupture because the presumed setting of Faerie Land is swapped out for the geography of Ireland. This one to one substitution of Faerie Land for Ireland is also rich because the historical defeat of Fitzgerald was a watershed moment that ushered in the creation of the Munster Plantation, which Spenser would come to participate in. Through this scene, and its substitution of a faerie conquest for an Irish one, we find the resolution of justice and abuses of power must occur along the same lines as the origins of plantation settler-colonialism.

[109] Cf notes on this portion of the poem in the A.C. Hamilton edition about the puns on "poll" and the river Lee.

After defeating Pollente, Artegall seeks out Pollente's daughter Munera. The word "munera" is Latin for profit. Earlier in the canto, Florimell's dwarf establishes the link between father and daughter:

> Then doth he [Pollente] take the spoile of them at will,
> And to his daughter brings, that dwels thereby:
> Who all that comes doth take, and therewith fill
> The coffers of her wicked threasury;
> Which she with wrongs hath heaped up so hy,
> That many Princes she in wealth exceedes,
> And purchast all the countrey lying ny,
> With the revenue of her plenteous meedes,
> Her name is *Munera*, agreeing with her deedes. (5.2.9)

As the dwarf reveals, Pollente takes his spoils that come from force and brings them to his daughter, who in turn uses this money to purchase more land. Power enhances profit, which in turn leads to land grabs. This is a crystal clear illustration of Marx's account of appropriation and expropriation.[110] By placing this in terms of a familial relationship, Spenser poignantly places power as the father of profits.

When Artegall reaches Munera's castle, she tries to bribe him and his servant Talus by tossing gold over the walls. Talus, who leads the assault on Munera's castle, is "nothing mov'd" (5.2.23.9) by this gesture. Instead, he finds that she "hidden lay/Under an heape of gold"

[110] Marx closes chapter 27 of *Capital* Vol. 1 by explaining that: "The spoliation of the church's property, the fraudulent alienation of the State domains, the robbery of the common lands, the usurpation of feudal and clan property, and its transformation into modern private property under circumstances of reckless terrorism, were just so many idyllic methods of primitive accumulation. They conquered the field of capitalistic agriculture, made the soil part and parcel of capital, and created for the town industries the necessary supply of a 'free' and outlawed proletariat" (516), trans. Ben Fowkes.

(5.2.25.5-6). Once Talus finds her, he grabs her by her hair and drags her. Because of this coarseness, “Artegall him selfe her seemelesse plight did rew” (5.2.25.9). During this scene, the text provides a split perspective between Talus and Artegall. Talus is unmoved by Munera’s gold, her “fair lockes” (5.2.25.7) or “her goodly hew” (5.2.25.8). Unlike Artegall, Talus is not distracted from executing justice because of bribes or beauty. This lack of distraction may go to illustrate the stalwartness of Talus, who is made up of iron, as opposed to Artegall, who is composed of flesh.

By presenting Talus as unmoved by Munera’s bribes and beauty, the text offers a critique of the common weaknesses to the execution of justice. Instead, Talus’ cruel mutilation of Munera—cutting off her “hands of gold” and “feete of silver trye” and posting them on a wall and then tossing her trunk in the same river as her father—amounts to cutting off and drowning the profit that results from violent war and power struggles. Yet, Talus does not redistribute these ill-gotten gains. Instead:

> Thereafter all that mucky pelfe he tooke
> The spoils of peoples evill gotten good,
> The which her sire had scrap’t by hooke and crooke,
> And burning all to ashes, powr’d it downe the brooke. (5.2.27.6-9)

By burning these profits, Talus removes them from circulation, which, stops further gain from this money. But also by burning this money, Talus closes off any possibility that these ills can be redistributed to redress those harmed, or help others. In effect, Talus closes off the possibility of rectifying the ills of land and wealth expropriation beyond his brutal punishment.

Ironically Talus resolves Munera’s villainous expropriation (via her father’s) simply by burning her profits rather than redistributing them. Talus destroys Munera’s hoard so completely

that:

> pall that castle quite he [Talus] raced.
> Even from the sole of his foundation,
> And all the hewen stones thereof defaced
> That there mote be no hope of reparation
> Nor memory thereof to any nation. (5.2.28. 5-9)

The poem describes Talus' destruction of Munera's profit as something so absolute that it removes all "hope of reparation" and "memory." This resolution counters what we would expect of rectificatory justice, the form of particular justice that deals with concerns of theft. We might assume that rectifying Munera and her father's expropriation would involve a set of actions that would give their ill-gotten gains to those who suffered from her and her father's crimes. Yet, the solution Talus provides removes reparation (not just for defenders of Munera but also for her victims).

How can it be just to remove the memory of Pollente and Munera's schemes from "any nation", thus removing some object lesson to prevent others from suffering from similar crimes in the future? And yet, the poem asserts that "all which when Talus thoroughly had perfourmed,/Sir Artegall undid the evil fashion,/And wicked customes of that Bridge refourmed" (5.2.28.11-13). Crucially, the conjunction "when" connects Talus—who had utterly destroyed everything—to Sir Artegall's mission of "reform". At first, Talus' destruction and Artegall's reform seem antithetical to each other. Yet, when we remember the brutal military strategy that led to the suppression of the Desmond Rebellion, we find echoes of Talus and Artegall's twinned mission. The English relied on a slash-and-burn strategy that would destroy as much farmable land as possible in Ireland in order to force surrender. The outcome of this destruction and

defeat, English rule and the establishment of the Munster Plantation, brought about so-called "reforms" of Irish character via English husbandry. Thus, by using the conjunction "when", Spenser suggests that cold destruction is necessary for reform. As an instance of particular justice, the Pollente and Munera episode oddly does not result in an arbitration of distribution or rectification, but instead in total destruction and erasure. When we read this episode of particular justice through the avatars of racial difference and the slash-and-burn strategy that made the Munster Plantation possible, we discover how the poem attempts to justify the Irish colonial project.

After defeating Pollente and Munera, Artegall and Talus find "a mighty Gyant stand[ing]/Upon a rocke, and holding forth on hie/An huge great paire of ballance in his hand" (5.2.30.1-3), talking to a large crowd of people. This Giant, whom scholarship frequently calls the "Egalitarian Giant," says he wants to weigh the whole world. Coming on the heels of Artegall and Talus' brutal defeat of Pollente and Munera, the Giant's message refines this canto's meditation on the nature of particular justice. Particular justice aims to ensure balance and restoration through distribution and rectification. The expropriation Pollente and Munera are involved in is a form of violence and theft that would be redressed through direct rectification and indirect distribution of wealth (by redistributing the wealth they've stolen). The Egalitarian Giant offers an appealing mission of redistribution:

> He sayd that he would all the earth uptake,
> And all the sea, devided each from either:
> So would he of all fire one ballaunce make,
> And one of th'ayre, without or wind, or wether
> Then would he ballaunce heaven and hell together,

And all that did within them all containe;

Of all whose weight, he would not misse a fether.

And looke what surplus did of each remaine,

He would to his owne part restore the same againe. (5.2.31)

Here we gather the Giant's full ambition. He desires to take all four of the Aristotelian elements of nature and handle them equally. He wants to separate the earth from the sea and ensure that they had equal amounts of territory without either encroaching on the other's. He would do the same with fire and air, putting all fire on one scale and all air on another to ensure that they were equal. Once he's taken care of these natural elements, the Egalitarian Giant will tackle heaven and hell "and all that did within them all contained"; he assures his audience that he "would not misse a fether".

The Egalitarian Giant sees his mission as one that takes the Aristotelian elements of nature and assigns them patches of territory. In a way, this mission is not unlike that of the surveyors assessing the land that would comprise the Munster Plantation that colonial administrators would distribute as patches of land in the larger New English territory. The Giant then seeks to keep the territories properly bounded, in that no one could encroach on another's territory. The Giant believes that once visible, material elements can be separate, only then can invisible domains, like heaven and hell, be properly ordered. His message progresses from the solid earth and the four elements that are believed to compose it, to the two abstract and invisible entities above and below the earth. The Giant asserts that by equally dividing the territory belonging to the natural and supernatural elements, he will be able to enact a form of justice that is based on balance and restoration. We can summarize his animating question into something like this: if justice is fair, why not ensure that all elements that make up the world we live in be as equal as possible?

Yet, the Giant radically asserts that a just state of things is an equally distributed state of things, a state that is explicitly predicated on equal shares of territory. To support his argument, the Giant mobilizes the notion of encroachment. First the Giant claims that the reason redistribution is needed is because:

For why, he sayd they all unequall were,
And had encroached uppon others share,
Like as the sea (which plaine he shewed there)
Had worne the earth, so did the fire the aire
So all the rest did others parts empaire. (5.2.32.1-5)

The Sea had encroached upon and worn down (through erosion) the earth. Likewise, fire encroached upon air, through smoke and pollution. The Giant then links these forms of natural encroachment to geosocial encroachment. Since even these natural elements encroach upon each other, "[a]nd so were realmes and nations run awry" (5.2.32.7). The conjunction "so" creates a causal chain between nature and nations. In turn, this conjunction implies that in order for the Giant to fix the geopolitical forms of encroachment, he has to repair the forms of encroachment that occurred in nature. The Giant concludes his monologue by saying "all things [he] would reduce unto equality" (5.2.32.9). This word choice paints the Giant's enterprise as a reductive one. Thus, the text casts the Giant's impulse for equal distribution as a harmful one, where the elements and nations are worse off when they are made equal.

This dangerously diminutive form of distributive justice moves Artegall to respond. Artegall asserts that the Giant's mission is troubling because:

Thou that presum'st to weigh the world anew,
And all things to an equall to restore,

In stead of right me seemes great wrong dost shew,

And far above thy forces pitch to sore…

In every thing thou oughtest first know,

What was poyse of every part of yore:

And looke then how much it doth overflow

Or faile thereof, so much is more than just to trow. (5.2.34.5-8, 10-13)

Here Artegall summarizes the Giant's mission of equal distribution, and characterizes it as wrong and above the Giant's own capabilities. In other words, the Giant's mission fails because it lacks a knowledge of how things were originally, and thus cannot accurately assess any activity as "encroachment." Yet Artegall's own logic—that a sound method of distributing lands and wealth must rely on prior knowledge—is also problematic. Artegall bases his argument on the conservation of the cosmological status quo. As Elizabeth Folwer puts it: "Artegall…dismisses the giant as presumptuous and demands that he obey the present order without questioning it, even so far as to suggest that questioning the distribution of wealth will cause the stars to fall out their orbits."[111]

Both the Giant and Artegall rely on natural law to justify their distributive programs. The Giant believes that equitable natural distribution will usher in equitable socio-political relations. Artegall asserts that the way things are distributed, naturally and politically, is providentially ordained. Yet while both speakers utilize natural law, Artegall defangs distributive justice of any political bite: since the heavens ordain the distribution of wealth and land, distribution is devoid of any prior violent histories of encroachment. Not only does Artegall's rebuttal proffer a conservative response to the Giant's radical program, it also stages a challenge between two

[111] Elizabeth Fowler, "The Failure of Moral Philosophy in the Work of Edmund Spenser," *Representations* 51 (1995): 47-76.

forms of methodology for dealing with distributive justice.

If particular justice is concerned with distribution (of land, wealth, territory) and rectification (of faulty interactions like sales or outright theft), the Giant and Artegall's debate is centered on whether any injustice has even occurred. According to Artegall, the world is ordered via "heavenly justice": a divinely ordered hierarchy. As such, distribution is what it is and no one has taken anyone's territory. According to the Giant, all elements—and by extension all people—have a right to an equal share of the universe's territory and wealth, and thus inequality signals thefts (encroachment) that need to be rectified. These two diametrically opposed views of political (understood as "natural") circumstances yield two different methodologies for opposing particular justice. The Giant approaches particular justice from the material realm—the distribution of materials among elements and among people—because his concern is on how much each actor has. However, Artegall's questions about the Giant's method spring from a concern with preserving hierarchy, and thus he lodges his method in what Annabel Patterson observes are "platonic forms" of necessary protocols and procedures, "the abstract ideal and concrete instance" wherein abstract principles become encoded into material circumstances.[112] If the universe is ordered in this Platonist way, there can be no problem with how wealth is distributed. Thus, the methodological concerns Artegall raises proceed from what at first blush may seem like an ordering of space: territory (in practice), techno-scientific representation (like prior knowledge of boundaries), and lastly, social organization. But his methodological concerns emerge because of Artegall's primary belief that there is no particular injustice, while the Giant asserts that there is—thereby implicitly questioning a providential view of God's original "act" of creating the universe.

[112] Annabel Patterson, "The Egalitarian Giant: Representations of Justice in History/Literature." *Journal of British Studies* 31.2 (1992): 97-132.

The Egalitarian Giant responds to Artegall's initial dismissal of his redistributive regime by explaining that even the plain eye can see that the natural elements encroach upon each other. Mobilizing this visual image of inequality, the Giant then sketches out his mission to change the very topography of our world to equalize it, which in turn will lead to social transformation. The Giant passionately contends that:

> Seest not, how badly all things present bee,
> And each estate quite out of order goth?
> The sea it selfe doest thou not plainely see
> Encroch uppon the land there under thee;
> And th'earth it selfe how daily its increast,
> By all that dying to it turned be?
> Were it not good that wrong were then surceast,
> And from the most, that some were given to the least? (5.2.37.2-9)

In his rebuttal, the Giant brings up two points. First, he argues that it is obvious to the plain eye that the natural elements overflow their bounds and gain more than what they originally have. Secondly, he suggests, in the form of a rhetorical question framed in the negative, that it is noble to take from the rich and give to the poor. From this conjecture, the Giant sketches out his aspirations to change even the topography to reflect this equalizing impulse: to push the mountains into the valleys to "them equalize againe" (5.2.38.5) and likewise:

> Tyrants that make men subject to their law,
> I will suppresse, that they no more may raine;
> And Lordings curbe, that commons over-aw;
> And all the wealth of rich men to the poore will draw. (5.2.38.6-9)

The Giant envisages that not only will the topographic details of the earth—the mountains and the valleys—change, but so also will the uneven landscape of economic conditions.

As we have already established, both debaters mobilize natural law as the premise of their arguments. Natural law, according to Fowler, is not a form of legal jurisprudence that can actually administrate property; property is administered by written law and documents, like deeds and treaties. Yet, the Giant endeavors to *apply* the premise of natural law to material property, resulting in what Fowler describes as "the giant's [application of] topographical allegory…to territorial sovereignty."[113] Artegall not only strains the premise of natural law when he tries to essentialize social relations (which, no matter how much Artegall tries to ignore it, result from political actions) but also when he asks the Giant to use a concrete techno-scientific tool, like a scale, to weigh abstractions. For his part, Artegall struggles to arbitrate justice using the correct premises or tools, employing the rule book of one game (natural law) to judge the play of another game (property relations). Thus, what we see in this episode is what Patterson explains is "the confrontation between two ways of conceptualizing justice, the abstract and the applied."[114] Natural law, the province of both the Giant and Artegall, proves unsuitable for arbitrating material-economic conditions, and in turn the social hierarchies that distributive justices would enact.

Artegall approaches justice as an ethical virtue while the Giant animates justice as a kind of political philosophy—a mode to enact power relations. We can see this discrepancy since Artegall asks the Giant to weigh abstract ethics (right and wrong) as if they were materials one can weigh on a scale. The two debaters push justice to the limit through fantasies of techno-scientific precision when they use the scales to weigh both concrete things like the elements of

[113] Fowler 60.
[114] Patterson 113.

nature or abstract things like “right and wrong”, the fantasies of techno-scientific precision, embodied in the scales. As a result, justice (through the scales) fails to yield a convincing result. The debaters’ failed application of techno-scientific approaches to natural law illustrates how distributive justice (as virtue) is inert when it doesn’t consider how power, particular in terms of territory, actually circulates.

This exercise (of weighing abstract ethical matters on the Giant’s scales) parodies the Giant’s desire to use scientific measurement to redistribute territory. And yet the joke seems to be on Artegall who also cannot see that justice *can* be particular—something that can applied to distribution and rectification. We also see the strain in the Giant’s program through his desire to connect prior power plays with only measurement and not through an appreciation of the complex legacies of conquest. Both Artegall and the Giant apply an explicitly abstract system of logic (natural law) that does not study the lived, material circulation of power that causes issues in distributive and rectificatory justice. Moreover, both speakers insist upon using natural law as a template, a system that overlooks how the people/actors whom the laws apply to perceive themselves as political subjects or wronged parties— like the Irish people, who as Spenser explains in *View of the Present State of Ireland* "rage and and rend in pieces" the laws the English try to impose on them.[115]

Without considerations of who takes power over whom, what kinds of laws are imposed and administered, and how people perceive themselves, natural law seems like an appealing tabula rasa for arbitrating what is virtuous and socially desirable. Artegall and the Giant’s debate veers away from the material conditions that the Egalitarian Giant desperately seeks to ameliorate. Nonetheless, the Giant becomes so incensed by Artegall’s argument that he

[115] Ibid 124.

approaches the latter. In response, Talus pushes the Giant off the cliff and into the water below—drowning him. Of this move, Patterson observes: "A reader who does not begin with a political bias against the Giant can experience this episode as destabilizing and problematizing the icon of the scales and the usually unexamined vocabulary we use to conceive justice—as weighing right against wrong, truth against falsehood…[As a result, the reader] experiences frustration rather than satisfaction when Artegall and Talus break the rules of debate and solve the intellectual problem by using brute force."[116]

We should pause here and note that the debate between Artegall and the Giant—who at points represent the opposition between abstract and concrete justice, justice as virtue and justice as political philosophy, or leftist and right-wing approaches to property distribution—is won not by logic, but through force. This resolution echoes a dialogue that plays out between the two speakers in Spenser's *View*—Eudoxius and Irenius. Eudoxius (whose name signifies "right belief" in Greek) stands in for the English reader, whereas Irenius (whose name plays both on the Greek "peace" and the name the Irish call their nation, "Eire") stands in for a seasoned New English colonial officer. Early in the tract, Eudoxius asks Irenius about the latter's provisional statement that laws should always fit the people they govern. Irenius in turn says he will hold off on discussing the specific application of English law in Ireland because, as Andrew Hadfield explains, it is only when "Ireland's faults and defects have been described and Irenius's proposal has been made that the Irish are so alien, so 'other,' that only a fresh conquest can restore peace and harmony"; further, according to Hadfield, Irenius finds "that there is no need to change the laws or create new ones for Ireland, as the very act of making Ireland a governable place means that it will have to become like England."[117] Irenius' thinking finds its expression in the

[116] Ibid 113.
[117] Andrew Hadfield. "Spenser, Ireland, and Sixteenth-Century Political Theory," *The Modern Language Review*

resolution of Artegall and the Giant's debate: instead of law (natural or civil) being debated, force will settle the result in the just distribution of territory.

Characteristically, Talus uses excessive force to accomplish the mission of quelling the insurrection:

> But when at them he with flaile gan lay,
> He like a swarme of flyes them overthrew;
> Ne any of them durst come in his way,
> But here and there before his presence flew,
> And hid themselves in holes and bushes from his vew. (5.2.53.5-9)

Here, the poem casts the insurrection as a nuisance, "a swarm of flies", that Talus rids his knight of. This crowd underscores the discrepancy between the abstract debate between Artegall and the Giant and the brute force that is used to resolve the debate. In response to the Giant's murder, the crowd "gan to gather in tumultuous rout, / And mutining, to stir up civill faction" (5.2.51.3-4). This insurrection demonstrates the political potential that the Giant's crowd saw in his message. By assassinating the crowd's beloved leader, Talus inspires an equal action of violence, or at least many feelings sympathetic to violence. The fact that Talus's violence inspires an insurrection and the fact that he alone squashes this uproar with more violence highlights his master's (Artegall's) unwillingness and unpreparedness to see justice in a political domain.

Just as with Munera's hoard, Artegall is presented with an issue regarding the distribution of wealth and concerns with seemingly unfair practices that lead to the suffering of many and the gains of a few. And yet, he asks his servant Talus to use violence rather than redress these material concerns. The insurrection inspired by the Giant's murder echoes the cries

89.1 (1994): 1-18.

for land redistribution made by proto-socialist groups in Spenser's period, whose cries reach their apex a century later with groups like the Levellers and the Diggers. Artegall and the Egalitarian Giant's exchange rehearses a debate about equity and justice that is timely for Spenser's era, and contemplates (even if it is resolved in a conservative manner) the purpose of justice in relation to redressing material, economic suffering. The use of violence over debate displays how the questions of particular justice that the Giant opened up touch a political nerve that Talus (and Artegall) either are unaware of or fundamentally do not care about.

Artegall's response to the crowd further illustrates this lack of interest: he "much was troubled, ne wist what to doo./For loth he was his noble hands t'embrew/In the base blood of such rascals crew" (5.2.52.5-7). Artegall's panic, as well his unwillingness to engage with non-noble people, demonstrates the Knight's apathy for using justice to improve the lives of people (offering his view of justice as an extension of the status quo and of abstract ethics) or even viewing the stakes of justice as applicable to any conception of a *polis*. Artegall's response seems to suggest that the only way to adjudicate sociopolitical concerns is through more and more violence.

Yet, in a later episode in Book 4, Artegall stumbles upon an opportunity to adjudicate matters of land and territory with reason and without brute force. But beneath this seemingly benign episode lie sedimented histories of colonial domination and racialized mythology. In canto four of Book Five, Artegall, the Knight of Justice, happens upon two brothers locked in a fierce dispute. After Artegall stops to ask what the brothers are arguing about, stanza seven explains that:

To whom the elder did this aunswere frame;

Then weete' ye Sir, that we two brethren be,

To whom our sire, *Milesio* by name,

Did equally bequeath his lands in fee,

Two Ilands, which ye there before you see

Not farre in sea; of which the one appeares

But like a little Mount of small degree;

Yet was as great and wide ere many yeares,

As that same other Isle, that greater bredth now beares. (5.4.7).

As Bracidas, the elder brother, explains, each brother received an island of equal size. These islands are described as being so close together that "the one appears but like a little Mount of small degree" to the other. This description of distance is important for underscoring how likely erosion between one island and the other is to occur. In the last line of this stanza, Artegall and the audience learn that over time, "that same other Isle" of the younger brother has now become wider and more substantial due to the erosion of the older brother's land and the depositing of that sediment onto the other's land. This dispute over property due to erosion is known as the jurdicial problem of alluvion.[118]

While these details of alluvion are fleshed out further in the subsequent stanzas, we learn from the very start— before Bracidas explains the property dispute in full—that his father's name was "Milesio." According to racial mythologies that many Anglo-Irish settlers held about Ireland, Milesio was a Scythian warrior who invaded Ireland and whose two heirs fight over the island.[119] From this context, the poem makes clear that the land under dispute is Ireland, and not

[118] Stoll glosses this episode in his edition of the poem—Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene: Book 5,* ed. Abraham Stoll (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2006)— as follows: "The brothers' two equal islands have become unequal through erosion. This judicial problem is called alluvion, in which the movement of water causes the formation of new land, setting off property disputes."

[119] As Stoll explains in the note to this line, "Gough suggests a relation to Milesius of Irish legend. Milesius was a Scythian invader of Ireland, whose sons quarreled over the island."

simply a portion of Faery-Land. Moreover, given that the first identifying feature of the geography of the property dispute is the identifier "Milesio," the audience is drawn to racialized lore to make sense of the ecological undoing of one island to the benefit of the other. In *A View of the Present State of Ireland,* Irenius considers Scythian blood as one of the causes of the defective Irish character, particularly in terms of land husbandry.[120] The Scythian-ness of this episode nests this dispute about erosion and land within discourses about husbandry and race that Spenser draws upon in the *View.* In particular, these discourses of land use and racial genealogy code Ireland as a land that is mismanaged due to the Irish people's supposed hostile and deficient character. Thus, the land dispute between the two brothers (emerging from the ecological process of erosion) brings to the fore specters of land mismanagement and racialized tropes of Scythian savagery that served to justify the Elizabethan colonization of Ireland. In this way, the text inextricably ties race and land together and invites the audience to understand questions of land possession through a discourse of savagery. Thus, we should place Artegall's rich opportunity to arbitrate land ownership based on ecological damage in the context of Elizabethan efforts to colonize Ireland, and the racial mythologies upon which these colonial practices were predicated.

After listening to the brothers' cases, Artegall decides that since Amidas takes what the sea gave him, land-wise, Bracidas should take what the sea gave him, love and money-wise.

He pronounces:

For equall right in equall things doth stand,

[120] See for instance, Irenius' contention that ". . . the customes, that now are in Ireland, being some of them indeede very strange and almost heathenish, were first brought in. . . by those nations from whom that countrrey was first peopled; for the difference in manners and customes, doth follow the difference of nations and people. The which I have declared to you, to have beene three especially which seated themselves here: to wit, first the Scythian, then the Gaules, and lastly the English" (54). After this initial overview of Irish "heritage," Irenius proceeds to explain to Eudoxius that a variety of untoward behaviors, such as lack of stationary farming, singing, and loud funeral rites come from Scythian heritage. I refer to the following facsimile edition of *A View:* Edmund Spenser, *A View of the State of Ireland: From the first printed edition (1633)*, ed. Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997).

For what the mighty Sea hath once possest,

And plucked quite from all possessors hand,

Whether by rage of waves, that never rest,

Or else by wrack, that wretches hath distrest,

He may dispose by his imperiall might,

As thing at randon left, to whom he list.

So *Amidas*, the land was yours first hight,

And so the threasure yours is *Bracidas* by right. (5.4.9. 2-9)

Artegall arrives at an interesting verdict based on a view of the Sea as the arbiter of possessions. The "mighty" Sea is the one that plucks possessions and gives these possessions "to whom he list". In this arrangement, the Sea "dispose[s] his imperial might." Artegall places nature as the arbiter of possession. Artegall's understanding of property as being determined by nature's whim forwards an ecological understanding of property, but one that simply states that human logic can only deal with land disputes after ecological elements take effect. This verdict takes notions of property and territory to the geographical and geological limit, and out of the realm of human and political exercise. The verdict transforms the Sea into the major player in this property dispute, in turn, transforming the legal doctrine of "alluvion" —in which the movement of water causes the formation of land, setting off property disputes—into an action of imperial imposition. The Sea does not merely erode property and deposit it elsewhere, it has desires and judgement—it "list[s]" where possessions go. Perhaps the sea stands in for the logic of Providence, but within the limits of the text, Artegall places the power onto the Sea.

Furthermore, Artegall is able to decide how to redress a problem with the knowledge he chides the Egalitarian Giant for not having—the knowledge of how property was before. Just as

in the previous episodes, particular justice, which dwells in distribution and redistribution, is up for debate. This episode not only allows Artegall to redress a problem with the knowledge of how things were before, but also allows him to forward an understanding of property that is ecological, wherein humans must decide property and territory only after nature has shaped it. Thus the obscure legal doctrine around soil erosion sets off an understanding of natural forces as "mighty," "imperial," and having volition. The dispute, over land and the problems that result from the sea's erosion, including marriage and treasure, leads Artegall to count the distribution of land (to one brother) and the distribution of money (to the other) as equal, since they equally came as a result of the sea's waves.

II. Savagery, Courtesy, and the Georgic Imaginary

As we've seen in Book Five, the administration of distributive justice—as ethical virtue, political philosophy, and arbitrator—draws upon strokes of historical, mythological, and agricultural discourses that emerge from the logics of plantation colonialism that marked the Munster Plantation from which Spenser composed *The Faerie Queene.* In this section, I examine the ways savagery—which slips out in discussion of Irish husbandry—find its place as a foil to the titular virtue of "Courtesy" in Book Five.

In Book 6 canto 8, a band of savages abduct Serena, a lady who had gone off to look for her lover, Calepine, in the wild forest. The narrator characterizes the savages as follows:

> In these wylde deserts, where she now abode,
> There dwelt a saluage nation, which did liue
> Of stealth and spoile, and making nightly rode

Into their neighbours borders; ne did giue

Them selues to any trade, as for to driue

The painefull plough, or cattell for to breed,

Or by aduentrous marchandize to thriue;

But on the labours of poore men to feed,

And serue their owne necessities with others need. (6.8.35)

In these lines, we are told that in order to maintain themselves the Salvage Nation "live of stealth and spoile," sustaining themselves based on theft. This is the only affirmative (albeit critical) statement about the Salvage Nation we are offered. The poem renders the remainder of their description in the negative—the husbandry and trade they do not conduct. The narrator explains that Serena's captors do not take up actual occupations: they do not plow; they do not raise livestock, nor do they engage in trade. By extension, the poem casts the Salvage Nation as the negation of georgic industry that operated as an "'informing spirit' which moralized agricultural labor in the service of a growing sense of importance or work."[121]

The poem characterizes the Salvage Nation as the negation of cultivation in both of its major denotations: cultivation as both a set of activities based on husbandry and as the antithesis to uncivilized behavior. The poem pictures the Salvage Nation as parasites— "on the labors of poor men to feed"—who live off of the needs (and thus also off the work required to fulfill these needs) of their neighbors. This depiction, in turn, casts the Salvage Nation's non-husbandry as something that must feed on the industriousness of their neighbor farmers. The stanza's Alexandrine further emphasizes this parasitism: "And serue their own necessities with others

[121] Julian Yates, "Early Modern Ecology," in *Edmund Spenser in Context*, ed. Andrew Escobedo (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 338.

need." The line cleverly reinforces the notion of "need" by using the word in two senses: the savages' own necessities, and the fulfillment of these necessities through the "need" that drives others to work.

Why is it that the Salvage Nation's savagery is so closely tied to their non-cultivation? In this section, I will examine how Book Six of *The Faerie Queene* foregrounds cultivation and plowing as foundational to Elizabethan efforts to colonize Ireland. I will also outline how Spenser's description of the Salvage Nation and the similarly non-agricultural Brigands in Book Six accords with key arguments regarding the ills of native Irish savagery and the merits of Elizabethan English land-based colonial practices—such as those offered by Irenius in Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland*. In so doing, I hope to illuminate the ways in which Spenser's poem depicts the colonial Other through the language of land mismanagement.

Focusing on Book Six in particular, Fogarty argues that "[t]hrough the depiction of a feudal world of villainous knights and noble savages and of the attractions and vulnerabilities of the pastoral life, it acts out the difficulties encountered by the New English colonists in Ireland who likewise found themselves trapped between competing cultures and political systems and beliefs."[122] Furthermore, Spenser's participation in the discourse among Anglo-Irish intellectuals regarding the ethics and efficacy of colonial domination is modeled within the diegetic frame of *A View* and distributed throughout *Faerie Queene* Book 6 in figures like the Salvage Nation. Elizabethan (and later Jacobean) colonial schema in Ireland and other parts of the Atlantic centered on the belief that English colonizers could put land to better use than the natives whose lands they endeavored to take. This ethos of land management, I will demonstrate, animates the depiction of savage elements in Book Six, in the figures of the Salvage Nation and the Brigands.

[122] Fogarty 197.

We see this binary quite clearly in the example of the Salvage Nation whose nomadism and non-plowing mark them as savage—whereas the unmarked reader presumably is someone who does plow or lives in a society that plows, like the English. Moreover, Hiltner explains that Book Six "is in some sense devoted to the georgic mode,"[123] with examples from cantos four, five, six, and nine. Most noteworthy, though, is Hiltner's accurate assessment that the Salvage Nation of canto eight, the Salvage Man of cantos four and five, and the Brigands of canto ten are all depicted in terms of their non-engagement of the plow. Certainly, the plow metonymically operates as a distinction between the colonizing English and the colonized Irish in the *Faerie Queene*. But we must also consider the ways in which this sense of identity becomes fraught within the errancy of the poem and operates as a productive fiction. In this section, I interrogate how the specters of savagery we encounter in Book Six in the Salvage Nation and the Brigands operate as antithetical elements to the courtesy that Calidore, the titular knight, wrestles with defending in Book Six.

In the *Faerie Queene,* the Salvage Nation is described in terms not only of their lack of plowing but also of their nomadism. The poem links their lack of husbandry to this nomadism in a causal relationship: "Of stealth and spoile, and making nightly rode/Into their neighbors borders." Given the unstable boundaries and borders that demarcated the perimeters of many New English grantees' estates, like Spenser's own Kilcolman estate, planters benefited from the moral economy of the georgic to provide a more stable (albeit fictive) division between planters and the native Irish. The marauding Salvage Nation are the threat that drives one to have a border in the first place—the savagery and lawlessness that prompt or justify erecting higher walls. Moreover, as they raid their "neighbours borders," they come to personify the work of a border,

[123] Hiltner 165.

a mechanism by which individual plots of land are adjoined as neighboring plots rather than a communal plot of land.

The Salvage Nation approximate a nightmare for the New English grantee contracted to properly husband plots of Irish soil. Philip Schwyzer notes: "in his years in Ireland, Spenser was inevitably preoccupied with borders of various kinds, including those of his own Kilcolman estate, those separating 'New English' settlers such as himself from neighboring 'Old English' landholders, those between English and Gaelic communities, and the real [and] metaphorical boundaries separating England from Ireland."[124] As Schwyzer sees it, the Salvage Nation, as a group who "make nightly raids into their 'neighbours borders,' while also seizing upon anyone unlucky enough to fetch up on the border… are the products, as well as exploiters, of border country."[125] Within these contexts, I contend that the division between a nation of savages and the plowers and sowers cut from georgic cloth functioned as a rich, reassuring imaginary boundary.

After introducing the audience to the Salvage Nation, primarily as a people who do not farm, the poem goes on to explain that:

Thereto they vsde one most accursed order,
To eate the flesh of men, whom they mote fynde,
And straungers to deuoure, which on their border
Were brought by errour, or by wreckfull wynde.
A monstrous cruelty gainst course of kynde.
They towards euening wandring euery way,

[124] Philip Schwyzer, "Land, Boundaries, Borders," *Edmund Spenser in Context*, ed. Andrew Escobedo (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 90-91.
[125] Ibid 90.

To seeke for booty, came by fortune blynde,

Whereas this Lady, like a sheepe astray,

Now drowned in the depth of sleepe all fearlesse lay. (6.8.36)

In its very first lines, the stanza explains that the Salvage Nation's key mode of survival is cannibalism. The poem casts this practice as "one most accursed order," designating cannibalism as the only order or code the Salvage Nation follows. This cannibalism in turn drives the Salvage Nation's nomadism, because they roam the land by night to look for other humans to eat.

The Salvage Nation's nomadism operates as a shadow of the errancy that famously propels much of the action in *The Faerie Queene*.[126] In the above stanza, the poem connects the Salvage Nation's theft and cannibalism to Serena's own errancy when it explains that the Salvage Nation preys on those "which on their border/Were brought by error, or by wreckfull wynde" (6.8.3-4), which leads them to stumble upon Serena who "like a sheepe astray,/Now drowned in the depth of sleepe all fearlesse lay" (6.8.8-9). This connection between the "wandring" Salvage Nation and the "astray" Serena underscores the threat Serena incurs as she participates in the errancy that drives the poem's narrative. In this episode, Serena wanders around at night, just as the Savage Nation does. It only makes sense that these two forms of errancy would meet. Here the errancy that propels the narrative world of Spenser's knights and

[126] In *The Language of Allegory* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979), Maureen Quilligan observes that "[t]he basic 'plot' of the Book of Holiness—by which I mean what the characters do—unfolds as Spenser's investigation into the meaning of one particular word: error. The etymology of the term, that in Latin it means 'wandering,' names what the Redcrosse Knight and Una do throughout the greater part of the book" (33). The errant pattern of movement in Book One operates as support for Qulligan's overall argument that allegorical narrative takes on the shape of central wordplay in a given text, and so I do not mean to suggest that the term "error" is the central pun that drives Book Six. In fact, elsewhere in *The Language of Allegory*, Quilligan examines the etymological slippage of "courtesy" that in turn generates the unspooling and ultimate failure of allegory in Book Six—an argument I will reprise later in this chapter. But for the purposes of my present argument, I draw attention to the topic of errancy in order to point out the ways the Salvage Nation's nomadism operates as a foil to the wandering of the knights and ladies that we see throughout *The Faerie Queene*, especially the wandering that leads lady Serena to cross paths with the nomadic Salvage Nation.

ladies collides with the errancy that comes from theft rather than cultivation. The Salvage Nation's capturing of Serena juxtaposes cultivation (which in the practice of the Elizabethan Anglo-Irish plantation would require discrete plots of land protected by borders) with wandering (either on the part of a noble like Serena or cannibalistic thieves like the Salvage Nation). Even though Serena is rescued in the nick of time by Calepine, this scene provides a dark parallel between errancy and cannibalistic nomadism that this neat resolution cannot easily erase.

Of course, canto eight is not the first time Serena and Calepine happen upon savages in the woods of Faery Land. In canto four, Serena and Calepine are saved from their mortal wounds by a lone Salvage Man, who uses his ecological knowledge of the forest and its herbs to bind their respective wounds—Serena's caused by the venom inflicted by the Blatant Beast's bites and Calepine's caused by Turpine's ambush. The Salvage Man who saves them, we are told, "neither plough'd nor sowed,/Ne fed on flesh, ne ever of wyld beast/Did taste the bloud, obaying natures first beheast" (6.4.14-7-9). Just like the Salvage Nation of canto eight, the Salvage Man does not engage in cultivation. This textual echo indicates that the descriptor "salvage" designates a lack of cultivation that emerges from the absence of physical cultivation activities—which in the case of the Salvage Man, interferes with his ability to be a suitable host for Serena and Calepine because he can only offer "signes" and "lookes" for entertainment (6.4.14.3), a moss covered ground as a bed with a "pillow [that] was unsowed" (6.4.14.4-5), and only "the frutes of the forest" as "their feast" (6.4.14.6). This description of the Salvage Man's rustic hospitality illustrates the double valences of cultivation: cultivation as the physical act of ploughing and sowing, and cultivation as a set of refined and civilized manners.[127] But this lack

[127] The term "salvage," when applied to the Salvage Man, comes to indicate not only the opposite of cultivation but also the ability to "save" or "salvage" others and potentially one's own self. This second valence of "salvage" as saving is notable given that before the Salvage Man appears, Calepine is wounded by a discourteous knight and Serena is wounded by a beast signifying rough, slanderous speech. Moreover, in the last we see of the Salvage Man,

of cultivation is critically different from that of the Salvage Nation because while the Salvage Nation engages in cannibalism, the Salvage Man does not eat any flesh—let alone the flesh of his fellow human. This dietary divide provides what Brian Lockey explains are "the opposite extremes of untainted nature on one side and corrupted and omnivorous language and custom on the other."[128] The Salvage Man's adherence to mankind's original vegetarian diet[129] designates him as gentle and nearly Edenic in his behaviors, whereas the similarly non-plowing Salvage Nation engage in stark cannibalism that renders them shocking and inhumane in their practices. This contrast underscores Lockey's observation that "[t]he blatantly unnatural collectives of later cantos, the salvage nation which attempts to cannibalize Serena and the brigands who attack the shepherds from the hinterlands, are clearly meant to portray the 'wild' Irish. Unlike the salvage man of the earlier cantos, Spenser presents both collectives as unredeemable and deserving of annihilation. They are analogous to those "evil" Irish which the Spenser of *A View* says "muste firste be Cutt awaie by a stronge hands before anie good Cane be planted."[130] The juxtaposition that Spenser offers the reader between innocent savagery (embodied by the Salvage Man) and evil savagery (demonstrated by the Salvage Nation and later the Brigands) illustrates the wide range of attitudes about the colonial Other held by European colonists in Ireland and the "New World."[131] Nonetheless, this savagery—either "good" or "bad"—is rooted in a lack of plowing

---

we are told he will become Arthur's squire, which, in the realm of Faery Land, is the best opportunity to cultivate chivalric and magnanimous behavior a person could have.

[128] Lockey, "Spencer's Legalization of the Irish Conquest in *A View* and *Faerie Queene* VI," *English Literary Renaissance* 31.3 (2001), 382.

[129] In their edition of Book Six (*The Faerie Queene Book Six and the Mutabilitie Cantos* [Indianapolis: Hackett, 2007]), Andrew Hadfield and Abraham Stoll note that the Salvage Man's diet alludes to Genesis 9.4 "'[b]ut flesh with the life thereof, I mean, with the blood thereof shall ye not eate.' The Salvage Man appears to represent uncorrupted, good nature—although the signs are not without some ambiguity" (58).

[130] Lockey 385.

[131] As Melissa Sanchez observes: "The 'saluage nation' that nearly devours Serena in Book VI resembles New World natives in their imputed cannibalism and the Irish in their nomadism and bagpipe playing" ("Sex and Eroticism in the Renaissance," in *Edmund Spenser in Context,* ed. Andrew Escobedo (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 343.

and sowing.

Spenser's description of the Salvage Nation's cannibalism also calls to mind his graphic description of Irish cannibalism as a result of famine in *A View of the Present State of Ireland*. In one of the more notorious scenes in the prose dialogue, Irenius narrates to Eudoxius the unseemly sight of native Irish feeding on human corpses, saying:

> [F]or notwithstandinge that the same was a most ritch and plentyfull countrye, full of corne and cattell, that you would have thought they could have beene hable to stand longe, yett eare one yeare and a half they weare brought to such wretchednes, as that anye stonye herte would have rewed the same. Out of everye corner of the woode and glenns they came creepinge forth upon theire handes, for theire legges could not beare them; they looked Anatomies [of] death, they spake like ghostes, crying out of theire graves; they did eate of the carrions, happye wheare they could find them, yea, and one another soone after, in soe much as the verye carcasses they spared not to scrape out of theire graves; and if they found a plott of water-cresses or shamrockes, theyr they flocked as to a feast for the time, yett not able long to contynewe therewithall; that in a shorte space there were none almost left, and a most populous and plentyfull countrye suddenly lefte voyde of man or beast: yett sure in all that warr, there perished not manye by the sworde, but all by the extreamytie of famyne which they themselves hadd wrought. (101-102)

Irenius is commonly regarded by scholars as an avatar for Spenser himself, as Irenius speaks from the perspective of a New English colonial administrator frustrated by the difficulties in imposing Elizabethan rule on the native Irish or uncooperative Old English earls. In Irenius' account, the Irish are so famished that they crawl on their hands and knees out of weakness and gobble up dead beasts and their deceased country-folk, sometimes to the point of dragging out

bodies from graves to devour. But strikingly, this famine does not come about from "[the] late warres of Mounster"(101) in which the English used slash and burn strategies to quickly subdue the native Irish, similar to the ones Irenius champions elsewhere in the prose tract—rather, Irenius contends that the Irish "themselves had wrought" their famine despite the allegedly plenteously rich landscape. This shocking rhetorical turn intentionally nudges the readers' response to the horrific image of emaciated humans away from the possibility of sympathy towards an indictment of the supposed flaws in the Irish character that lead to such savage behavior and self-sabotage. While the prose tract discusses a wide range of supposed deficiencies of the Irish people—from their mythical Scythian ancestry to their dress and hair—the net effect of Irenius' argument amounts to the rhetorical effect we observe in this shocking scene: the Irish are so savage that they themselves are beyond redemption by means of gentle civilizing efforts like education or religion. The episode of cannibalism in *A View* presents the audience with a rhetorical bridge too far. Likewise, the Salvage Nation we encounter in Book Six appear to be beyond humanity due to their cannibalism.

The Salvage Nation's resemblances to the native Irish and their departure from the Edenic diet of the Salvage Man complicates the dynamic between savagery and the central virtue of courtesy in Book Six. Kenneth Borris observes that Book Six's treatment of courtesy frames the titular virtue as the "root of 'civill conversation and 'Civility'" and—borrowing from Donald Cheney's influential study of the relationship between the Salvage Man and Calepine—suggests that "the basically favorable portrayal of a primitive human state applies allegorically to human capacities for both courtesy and the advancement of civilization. The knight or courtier and the savage become complementary figures."[132] This reading of the Salvage Man as a primitive,

[132]Kenneth Borris, "Salvage Man" in *Spenser Encyclopedia,* eds. A.C. Hamilton and William W. Barker (Toronto: University of Toronto Press: 1990), 624.

noble savage figure renders savagery as an absence of the influence of civilization. This definitional tension brings us to the act of civilizing, an action that imputes civility into the vacuum of primitivism. The *Oxford English Dictionary's* first recorded use of the verb "civilize"—"transitive. To bring (a person, place, group of people) to a stage of social development considered to be more advanced, esp. by bringing to conformity with the social norm as of a developed society; to enlighten, refine, and educate; to make more cultured and sophisticated"[133]— appears in Anthony Copley's 1595 poem *Love's Owl* in the lines: "The plough-lob I can ciuillize/The francticke man with grace aguize [dress]." This connection between civility and the plow is inherent from the very first use of the term in the English language, which is recorded as occurring just a year before the publication of the edition of *The Faerie Queene* in which we find Book Six. Moreover, the *OED* affixes to the first entry of the adjective/noun "civilized," which appears in 1611, the note that "in early use often contrasted with savage or barbarous."[134] Thus we can draw a direct line from the plow, to civility, and to savagery. This etymological connection emphasizes the dynamic between plowing and savagery we observe in the poem's description of the Salvage Man and Salvage Nation.

However, the dynamic between the Salvage Man and Calepine does not find a similar analogue with the Salvage Nation. What would this civility-primitivism dynamic (and, in turn, savage-courtesy dynamic) look like when grafted onto the barbarous, violent, and cannibalistically irredeemable Salvage Nation? Would savagery and courtesy retain a complementary relationship to each other? First, we must note that the Salvage Nation appear arrested in cantos eight as a threat from which Serena should be rescued. They do not have the opportunity in Spenser's narrative to become civilized, to be brought to a "more advanced" state.

[133] "civilize, v. 1" *OED Online.* March 2021. Oxford University Press.
[134] "civilized," n./adj. *OED Online.* March 2021. Oxford University Press.

Second, unlike the Salvage Man, the Salvage Nation do not appear to have a foil within the narrative, as the Salvage Man does. If anything, the Salvage Nation are foils for the Salvage Man—a figure devoid of language and a taste for flesh who appears alone. If the Salvage Man serves as a complementary foil for Calepine, the Salvage Nation appear as the violent, unreformable villains from whom he must save Serena. Canto eight ends with Calepine massacring the Salvage Nation (who operate as a loud, violent, and cannibalistic collective) and Calepine freeing and frantically trying to clothe a naked Serena. In this way, the Salvage Nation remain a group so brutish they must only be killed rather than civilized. The Salvage Nation are flat, rather than dynamic, characters in Spenser's allegory, and in so being, collapse the neat civilized-primitive dynamic afforded in the complementary relationship between the Salvage Man and Calepine. As such, the Salvage Nation's savagery presents a limit case for the notion of civilizing, civility, and courtesy.

While primitive individuals like the Salvage Man may allegorize the capacity for civilizing and cultivating courtesy, the Salvage Nation suggest this civilizing project cannot be done on the part of a collectivity—or at least a collective so barbarous as they are and as are also the native Irish to which they allude. Margo Hendricks observes that "the Renaissance concept of race is based on an elaborate system of metaphors and synonyms whose rhetorical and interpretative strength lies in its fluidity."[135] Certainly, the term "savage" and figures like a "Salvage Nation" represent this metaphorical and synonymous complexity; indeed, the concept of savagery is a rhetorical device that allocates a division between unmarked whiteness and marked non-whiteness within *The Faerie Queene* and the larger colonialist framework that materially supported and intellectually informed the poem's author. In *Shakespeare and the*

[135] Margo Hendricks, "Race: A Renaissance Category?" in *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture Vol. 1* ed. Michael Hattaway (Hoboken: Blackwell, 2010), 536.

Cultivation of Difference: Race and Conduct in the Early Modern World, Patricia Akhimie illustrates how "the ideology of cultivation called upon subjects to assign relative value to one another based upon the performance of approved behaviors…the imaginative work of cultivation—self-improvement through good conduct—depended upon the exclusion of some groups from the practice of social malleability and the promise of upward social mobility."[136] In this vein, the notion of savages—who are marked by the activities they perform or do not perform—must be understood within a system of categorization that assigns value: this categorization "displays a key feature of race thinking, the impulse toward classification."[137] Conduct is crucial for understanding the Salvage Nation's place in a book dedicated to the virtue of courtesy. Unlike the Salvage Man, and much like the native Irish, the Salvage Nation (as a racialized group) are not offered the ability to change their conduct, and thus remain arrested in the text as the antithesis of civility—the presumed root of courtesy.

Even though Book Six disposes of the Salvage Nation in canto eight, a similarly violent, savage, and non-plowing collective appears two cantos later in the figure of nameless Brigands.[138] When the Brigands appear and wreak havoc on Meliboe's pastoral inlet, the poem describes them as follows:

> A lawlesse people, *Brigants* hight of yore,
> That neuer used to liue by plough nor spade,
> But fed on spoile and booty, which they made
> Upon their neighbours, which did nigh them border,
> The dwelling of these shepheards did inuade,

[136] Patricia Akhimie, *Shakespeare and the Cultivation of Difference* (New York: Routledge, 2018), 12.
[137] Akhimie 12.
[138] Quilligan keenly observes that the brigands "are nameless, they come from nowhere" (169).

And spoyld their houses, and them selues did murder;

And droue away their flocks, with other much disorder. (6.10.39.3-9)

Just like the Salvage Nation, the Brigands do not live "by plough nor spade."[139]Additionally, the poem makes note of the borders the Brigands share with their victims, just as it does with the Salvage Nation. The rhyme scheme of this stanza links the word "border" to "murder" and "disorder," creating a clear sonic connection between the physical proximity of the Brigands and the pastoral inlet and the violence and chaos they eventually heap onto the shepherds. Similarly, the stanza links the words "invade" with "spade" and "made" to connect the Brigands' intrusion with their lack of husbandry and the plunder that comes from that predation. In this way, the poem depicts the Brigands' violence as part and parcel of their non-husbandry and proximity to their neighbors, and in so doing, furthers its use of husbandry as a rhetorical dividing line between civility and savage violence.

While non-husbandry operates as the predicate of both the Salvage Nation and the Brigands' savagery, the two groups act in distinctly different ways. The Salvage Nation engage in a simple cannibalism of agricultural labor, whereas the Brigands peel off the spoils of agricultural labor for the market. This preparation for the market, however, is not in goods, but in slavery. This sinister end is revealed in the second to last stanza of canto ten, where the text explains:

Hither those *Brigants* brought their present pray,

And kept them with continuall watch and ward,

Meaning so soone, as they conuenient may,

[139] A connection that Hadfield and Stoll also mention in the footnotes to these lines in their edition: Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene, Book Six and the Mutabilitie Cantos*, eds. Andrew Hadfield and Abraham Stoll (Indianapolis, Hacknett, 2007), 151.

For slaues to sell them, for no small reward,

To merchants, which them kept in bondage hard,

Or sold againe. (6.10.43.1-6)

On the surface, the Brigands' practices allude to the Atlantic slave trade that is nascent at the time of Spenser's composition of the poem.[140] But upon closer inspection, the text casts slavery as an outgrowth of a theft from husbandry. The simple self-contained and self-sustaining world of the pastoral is now disrupted by the forces of markets and coercive labor. The Brigands symbolize intrusive market forces (and their dependence on coerced labor). Their proximity to the cannibalistic Salvage Nation through their lack of husbandry underscores the ways in which the poem links cultivation to courtesy (or the promise of a world free of incivility). But this episode also shows the seductive yet ultimately vulnerable status of the pastoral lifestyle. Unlike the georgic, which prizes individuals' efforts to cultivate their lands, the pastoral favors *otium* across unbounded fields. Before the Brigands appear, the pastoral appears as an oasis in a book invested in the defeat of savagery and incivility. Without the borders New English grantees would erect to protect their lands, and with knights sworn to protect courtesy on vacation, the pastoral offers little defense against the ravages of savage mercantilism.

We should remember that the Brigands' invasion of Meliboe's pastoral hamlet occurs

[140] See also Elizabeth Mazzolo's article "Working Postulates and Humanist Promises: Slavery and Mythology in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*" in *Soundings* 82.3/4 (1999), 465-480. As she explains: "[the] colonizing project, which Walter D. Mignolo describes as the 'dark Side' [why the cap "S"?] of the Renaissance, was closely linked to the emergence of slavery in the New World. And Spenser himself intimates toward the close of the *Faerie Queene* that poetry may fail because it can neither prevent such a project nor do without it" (Mazzolo 465-466). Mazzolo also adds that: "Boundary figures threaten both Spenser's poem and the perimeter of early-modern world views, and the conceptually empty term 'race' emerges to fill gaps between the dangerously fluid categories of geography, history, and nation. However, Calidore appears to operate comfortably within this hazardous terrain. In Book 6 (where the term 'slavery' is mentioned more than anywhere else in the poem) he occupies a space 'neither wholly inside or outside'; presiding over what Homi Bhabha terms a 'gestalt of betweenness,' Calidore seemingly reinvents the romance world he repeatedly courts and upsets" (Mazzolo 470).

immediately after Calidore retires from his duties as Knight of Courtesy. To put it another way, the Brigands appear once courtesy disappears from action.[141] This narrative dynamic places the Brigands and Calidore as foils to each other, and suggests that the savagery that marks the Brigands and the courtesy that Calidore is purported to protect are also foils. So now I turn to exploring how this juxtaposition between savagery and courtesy plays out in the pastoral environment upon which Calidore retreats from his knightly service and the Brigands wreak havoc. From this examination of the pastoral set piece, we will understand how the cultivation-savagery divide I have outlined, in turn, colors the characterization of the titular knight of Book Six.

From the outset, Book Six appears skeptical of the central virtue of "courtesy." In *The Language of Allegory,* Maureen Qulligan points to the narrator's opening inquiry into the word courtesy as seeming to emerge from the word "court" because "it there most vseth to abound" (6.1.2). But this connection between court and courtesy is troubled by the introduction of the hero Calidore, whose name means "beautiful gift,"[142] and in "whom it seemes, that gentlenesse of spright/And manners mylde were planted naturall" (6.2.3-4). Thus, in the very first two stanzas of Book 6, the poem presents a split between the virtue of courtesy, rooted in the court, and the hero of the virtue, whose mild demeanor is connected to the natural world. This tension between the virtue and the knight tasked with its protection, on the level of the word, leads to an unspooling of the allegorical narrative. This narrative friction comes in large part because, as

[141] Quilligan calls to our attention the fact that this invasion occurs "[i]Immediately after Calidore leaves Colin to his mountaintop contemplations" (169). This sequence of events offers a resounding indictment of "Calidore's failure to understand the significance of what he admits he 'mote not see'—that is, the vision of poetry presented by the dancing maidens and graces on Mt. Acidale…Calidore is not directly changed by his vision" (170). Rather than Calidore being transformed by the vision of poetry he sees, the poem itself changes, collapsing from an allegorical form into a romance "a genre which may be allegorized but is not allegory" (170-171). This failure of allegory finds its first concrete embodiment in the Brigands, who, as Quilligan points out, engage in a "banal evil [which is] presented in its unglossed, menacing existence" (170).

[142] Which in turn links Calidore to "primal unlearned grace" (Quilligan, 48).

Quilligan observes, "Book VI fluctuates between the two poles of court and pastoral nature, and the dichotomy is presented at the outset in the clash between the hero's name and the virtue he represents."[143] This inherent ambiguity around Calidore and his virtue culminates in the collapse of Calidore's quest to defend the court from the Blatant Beast. Instead Calidore chooses to retire in a "pastoral paradise."[144] This connection between etymological ambiguity and narrative culmination cuts both ways: not only does the ambiguous meaning of courtesy lead to the pastoral, the pastoral also points to the poem's own skepticism around the virtue of courtesy.

It is fair to say that Calidore would not have retreated into the pastoral landscape that marks the last cantos of Book 6 if it had not been for Meliboe. Critics have roundly cast Meliboe as a poor influence on Calidore, pulling Calidore into the fantasy land of the pastoral in, at best, a form of naiveté, at worst a form of deceit. Yet we would do well to heed Paul Alpers' advice to "… view Melibee … seriously as a pastoral speaker—which means to take him seriously as the self-representation of a courtier or a city-dweller. Melibee represents a way of life that Calidore values and desires; he can even be said to represent the knight himself, in that his rejection of the court and return to the country offer a challenging version of the choice Calidore claims to want to make."[145] Both Meliboe and Colin Clout (the latter of whom critics view much more favorably, because of his status as an avatar for the poet) "[hold] out to the hero an alternative attitude and role… so completely defined by a single place and a single round of activities as Melibee's and Colin Clout's."[146] Meliboe explains that he was motivated to join the knighthood because: "[of] further fortune then I would inquire./And leauing home, to roiall court I sought" (6.9.24.5-6). Meliboe describes his initial intentions to pursue knightly service in a conditional

[143] Quilligan 48
[144] Ibid 48.
[145] Paul Alpers, "Spenser's Late Pastoral," *ELH.* 56.4 (1989), 800-801.
[146] Ibid 801.

form, a form that frames his views of the court with ambiguity. Next, he describes what happened to him, in terms of agricultural labor: "I did sell my selfe for yearely hire,/And in the Princes gardin daily wrought" (6.9.24.7-8). Meliboe compares his knighthood to a day laborer who merely sells his labor for wages. Together, Meliboe's initial descriptions of the court take on a tone of ambiguity and cynicism. This suspicion around the court matches the poem's initial skepticism around the virtue of courtesy and the dynamic between the court and the pastoral that emerge in the opening stanzas of Book 6.

When Meliboe analogizes his time in the court to that of working in the prince's garden, he frames courtly duty as a form of cultivation. Early modern rhetoricians also used gardens as metaphors for imagining gentlemanly sophistication, as Henry Peachum does in his 1577 text *The Garden of Eloquence*. Yet, this gentlemanly space of the garden does not suit Meliboe at all. Reflecting upon his ten years as a young knight, Meliboe says that: "I gan my follies to my selfe to plaine" (6.9.25.5). Despite the "further fortune" Meliboe sought, he tells Calidore that "there [in this garden of knighthood] I beheld such vainnesse, as I neuer thought" (6.9.24.9). The garden Meliboe refers to is the court, and his indictment of the court's vanity is a common critique of court politics. Additionally, the term vanity is loaded because it refers not only to pride but also to a lack of usefulness. Through Meliboe's experience in the court, the text offers Calidore justification, beyond his own dissatisfaction, to cease pursuing the Blatant Beast. This disillusionment with the court draws upon the initial mistrust of courtesy in Book 6, which in turn, leads to "the breakdown of allegorical procedure [which] reveals also the politically destructive potency of language, figured in the Blatant Beast itself with his hundred or thousand slanderous tongues."[147] When Meliboe explains that the court is not to be trusted and that

[147] Quilligan 167.

knightly service is a vain enterprise, Calidore comes to question his role in defending the vain court from the dangerous Blatant Beast. But the Blatant Beast is also an allegory for the political and social danger of language. If the Beast stands in for the danger of language, the slippage we see on the level of the etymology regarding the virtue of courtesy also shows the danger in trusting language to discern the origins and nature of courtesy itself, let alone using courtesy as a virtue to protect against dangerous speech. Rather than chasing a discourteous beast to tame poor conduct, Calidore comes to the realization that the court he is tasked to protect is itself vain.

The agricultural metaphor Meliboe mobilizes further emphasizes this point, likening the labor of a knight to a gardener cultivating a plot of land in vain. Here, metaphorical cultivation is a framework for understanding the vanity of knightly service, the vanity of the court, and the futility of protecting the court from dangerous language. Yet Meliboe's own description of his time in courtly service also explains how cultivation is a way of understanding (even if only metaphorically) the environment in which courtesy would seem to be a central virtue. By using cultivation imagery to describe his prior life in the court, Meliboe yokes the court, and courtesy, to cultivation. By luring the hero out from the courtly cultivation to the pastoral space, the poem moves the site of action from a metaphorically georgic space to a narratively pastoral one. Once this move is complete, and Calidore settles into his pastoral retirement, the narrative immediately disrupts this retirement when the Brigands intrude into Meliboe's pastoral hamlet, pillage it, murder some of the shepherds and take others as captives. The non-cultivating Brigands invade the space inhabited by Meliboe and Calidore, who themselves have given up cultivating. Even though the kinds of cultivation at stake are different—the Brigands do not take up physical plows while the retired knights abjure figuratively tending the court's garden—the shared abandonment of cultivation activity juxtaposes the connection between non-cultivation and savagery with the

supposed cultivation (of the court) and courtesy. Thus cultivation operates as a precarious marker: on the side of cultivation we find courtly service and the virtue of courtesy, and on the side of non-cultivation we find savagery and also the pastoral. In this troubled juxtaposition, we find the poem's attempts to negotiate the court-pastoral divide established at the outset of Book Six complicated by the intrusion of savage elements.

Despite Meliboe's disavowal of the court due to its vain cultivation, Calidore praises Meliboe's pastoral lifestyle through the language of cultivation. In response to Meliboe's story, Calidore exclaims:

> That euen I which daily doe behold
> The glorie of the great, mongst whom I won,
> And now haue prou'd, what happinesse ye hold
> In this small plot of your dominion,
> Now loath great Lordship and ambition;
> And wish the heauens so much had graced mee,
> As graunt me liue in like condition;
> Or that my fortunes might transposed bee
> From pitch of higher place, vnto this low degree. (6.9.28)

In these lines, Calidore compares Meliboe's happiness, which he connects to the cultivation of his land, to the glory many seek in courtly life and the dominion that emerges from political power. In short, Calidore attempts to understand pastoral life in terms of the courtly life with which he is most familiar. Within Calidore's rough translation of pastoral life in terms of courtly activity, he explicitly links plots of land to political capital. On the surface, this specific analogy may appear as an indictment of the court, echoing Meliboe's own cynicism about the courtly

garden. But when placed in the context of Anglo-Irish colonial activity, Calidore's figuring of Meliboe's land as a form of dominion calls to mind the ethos of the Elizabethan plantation. The plantation model centers on breaking up appropriated colonial land into smaller plots of land and distributing these plots to English colonists. In *A View,* Irenius explains to Eudoxious that the best way to manage and disperse newly acquired rebel lands is to "give [all of them] unto Englishmen" who can then rent to Irish tenants in a way that "disperse[s] [them] wide from their acquaintance, and scatter[s] [them] farre abroad thorough all the country: For that is the evill which now I finde in all Ireland, that the Irish dwell altogether by their septs, and severall nations, so as they may practice or conspire what they will" (120). Moreover, we know that Spenser himself received lands from the parceling out of the Munster Plantation after the Desmond Rebellion. Thus, in a directly material way, Calidore's praise of Meliboe's pastoral lifestyle illustrates the desired ends of colonial land practices: the distribution of plots of land to establish colonial dominion. Once land is properly ordered in small plots, tranquility and prosperity may actually emerge.

Yet Calidore's attempt to equate land possession and domination with Meliboe's pastoral lifestyle misunderstands what the pastoral is.[148] This misunderstanding is the first in a series of errors of comprehension Calidore displays during Book Six's pastoral cantos. Another notable misunderstanding of the pastoral occurs in the following canto, when Calidore intrudes upon Colin Clout's pastoral song— an intrusion so frustrating that Colin breaks his pipe. As Calidore stumbles around the pastoral space, sticking out like a sore thumb, he leaves Meliboe's hamlet

[148] In a recent article, Jessie Herrada Nance explains that the pastoral typically "depict[s] a traditional 'golden world' landscape, where nature freely provides for its inhabitants, who live simple, rustic lives without the need for labor" ("'Civil Wildness': Colonial Landscapes in Philip Sidney's *New Arcadia,*" *Studies in Philology* 116.2 (2019), 229). However, this typical depiction mutates in pastoral works like Sidney's revised *Arcadia* to present an idealized version of the natural environment where "a promising, fertile environment …invites cultivation" (229). Thus, Calidore may not be the only late sixteenth-century figure to envision the pastoral (and the pastoral landscape) as a precursor for cultivation—a pre-georgic, if you will.

vulnerable to the Brigands, who attack later in canto ten. Once the poem's narrative action moves from the pastoral space into the mercantile space of the Brigands—and the poem transforms from a pastoral into a romance—Calidore redeems himself by rescuing Pastorella and the other shepherds from the Brigands. This sequence of events underscores how Calidore's time in the pastoral, from start to finish, can be characterized by a failure to understand the definition of pastoral— a failure that echoes the poem's inability at the start of Book Six to adequately define the virtue of courtesy or Calidore's relation to it. Calidore's decision to join the pastoral is rooted in misunderstanding; he translates the pastoral life in terms of a georgic ideology of land, power, and cultivation.

Earlier in Book Six, where the allegory is more tightly wound, the georgic ethos provides the reader with a dividing line between the savages who do not plow and the (unmarked) civilized people who do plow. As I have shown, Book Six of *The Faerie Queene* frequently mobilizes the concept of plowing as a key dividing line between the savage and the civilized. In so doing, Spenser's poem illustrates a central element of the Anglo-Irish colonial ethos: agricultural practice as a system of domination and land appropriation. This system of land management, emerging out of a mythos of the poor land management of the native Irish, undergirds Spenser's descriptions of the Salvage Nation and the Brigands in Book Six, and the depictions of the native Irish in *A View of the Present State of Ireland*. Nonetheless, this savage-civilized divide appears in an allegory marked from the start by a misunderstanding of definitions and whose main character unravels the plot due to his own inability to understand the signs and codes around him. Given the etymological and epistemological slippage that characterizes and ultimately unravels Book Six, it may be wise on the part of the reader to read the deceptively simple split between the plow and the savage with a large grain of salt.

Chapter 3:

"A Most Majestic Vision":

Plantations and the Political Ecology of Shakespeare's *The Tempest*

William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* is set on an unnamed island—an island that scholars have sought to locate in a variety of places: the Americas, Ireland, the Mediterranean, and even England itself.[149] Nevertheless, as Barbara Fuchs persuasively argues, no matter the location, there still remain "insistent colonial concerns [in] Shakespeare's island play."[150] Because of its unspecified location, *The Tempest* invites the audience to think through the multiple planes and ideologies of colonial activity that appear in the play and opens up the possibility of reading colonial activity over (and against) a particular geographical location**.** Indeed, the swirl of referents and discourses, to me, makes *how* colonial activity is cited, mobilized, and justified in the play more interesting than *where* these activities occur**.** While discussion of these colonial activities has often focused on cultural memory, mythology, or Otherness,[151] I wish to consider how the (described and imagined) ecology of Shakespeare's unnamed island courses through the

[149] As Roger Strimatter and Lynne Kositsky explain: "After decades of the dominance of Americanist readings, there is now a renewed appreciation for the topographical complexity of Shakespeare's imaginative landscape. Since the 1990s the pendulum has swung back towards a Mediterranean focus, with recent studies emphasizing sources and symbolism that connect *The Tempest* as much to the Old World of Aeneas as to the New World of Christopher Columbus" (Strimatter and Kositsky, "O Brave New World: *The Tempest* and Peter Martyr's *De Orbo Novo*," *Critical Survey* 21.2 [2009]: 7).

[150] Fuchs, "Conquering Islands: Contextualizing *The Tempest*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48.1 (1997): 45.

[151] Notably, Dympna Callaghan has written persuasively about the "misrepresentations of colonial memory and…what colonial memory chooses to forget" in her analysis of the play through an Irish context in *Shakespeare Without Women* (London: Routledge, 2000), 100. Roland Wymer's "*The Tempest* and the Origins of Britain*"* (*Critical Survey* 11.1 [2009]) carefully reads the play within early modern mythologies around the pre-Roman British past to expand our understandings of the treatment of rulership and coloniality in the play. Recently, Amanda Bailey demonstrates, in "Race, Personhood, and the Human in *The Tempest"* (in *Renaissance Personhood: Materiality, Taxonomy, Process*, ed. Kevin Curran [2020]) how Sylvia Wynter's theorizations about the overdetermined whiteness implicated in early modern humanist notions of the "human" can explain the racialized dynamics between Prospero and Caliban.

"condensed layers of colonialist ideology"[152] that make up the play.

In her own attempt at unpacking these sedimented colonialist logics, Fuchs turns to the notion of "quotation," which she explains as "the references by colonial writers to the works of earlier explorers and planters as well as the larger rhetorical maneuver of assimilating the unknown by equating it with the already-known."[153] It only makes sense that to describe a place or people, one must have language to do so. This desire to make sense of the sites of colonial expansion appears, as Fuchs shows, in the work of colonial apologists like John Smith and Samuel Purchas, who equated Native Americans with the Irish.[154] Yet, while Fuchs is right to connect "the basic discourse of savagery developed by the English in Ireland to their eventual experiences in the Americas,"[155] as a means of illustrating "the connection that colonial quotation establishes between England's two main Western plantations,"[156] she overlooks the work that those plantations were tasked with doing. From the *Oxford English Dictionary* we learn that by the 1611 first performance of Shakespeare's play, the word plantation referred to "a settlement in a conquered or dominated country; a colony"[157] but also denoted a three way meaning of "the action of planting seeds or plants in the ground" or "the settling of people, usually in a conquered or dominated country" or "the action of establishing or founding

[152] Fuchs 45.
[153] Fuchs 47.
[154] As Fuchs analyzes Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, she cites Spenser's own form of "quotation" when he connects the Irish to Scythians, suggesting that, for Spenser, this former Scythian heritage was similar to the English's own degeneracy before Rome's conquest of Britain. As I argue in the previous chapter, this racialized mythology (and implied genealogy of backwardness) is alluded to in the property dispute between Amidas and Bracidas in Book 5 of the *Faerie Queene* as a means of marking out the fictional land in question as Ireland.
[155] Fuchs 54.
[156] Fuchs 54.
[157] *OED* "plantation" 4a. In its note for this entry, the *OED* indicates that the word is used "chiefly with reference to the colonies founded in North America and on the forfeited lands in Ireland in the 16th and 17th centuries." In this way, Fuchs' earlier claim that the discourse of savagery connects the two "main Western plantations" reinforces the direct connection between the term "plantation" and the two geographic locations for English colonial activity in the seventeenth century.

something, such as a religion or an institution; the implanting or instilling *of* a quality."[158] Thus the concept of the "plantation" provides us the direct language for describing colonial settlement which emerges out of an ethos of cultivating land, settling people, and establishing power. In other words, colonization through plantations inscribes land and people into a political and ecological project.

Thus far, in this dissertation I have uncovered how husbandry and the ideologies of well-ordered landscapes functioned within colonialism. In chapter one, I demonstrated how surveying manuals and country house poems depicted the seventeenth-century country estate in terms of agricultural productivity. These two genres, I argued, assessed the large estate based on competing metrics of value—the country house poem fixated on the creation of excessive use value whereas the surveying manual appraised the prospective exchange value an estate could produce—which pointed to the emergence of agrarian capitalism and the unease regarding this ascendant political economy and its related changes in social relations, national identity, and ecology**.** In chapter two, I investigated the ways land use figured in portrayals of territory and savagery in Books Five and Six of Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene.* Territory and savagery, I showed, operated as shadow concepts to the titular virtues of justice and courtesy, respectively, and also illuminated the georgic-inflected view of land use in the epic and in the justifications of colonial settlement of Ireland. Together, these two chapters have illustrated how land use constellates notions of the social, the national, and the colonial and the construction of ideas about belonging and difference in the early modern English imaginary. Moreover, I have shown how early modern English beliefs about national identity and the justifications for colonial endeavors are rooted in ideologies of land and agriculture.

[158] *OED* "plantation" 2a,2b,2c, emphasis in original.

In this chapter, I continue and conclude this line of inquiry by exploring this relationship between land use and identity in the colonial imagination in Shakespeare's insistently colonial play. In the pages that follow, I attend to how the discourses of land possession and dispossession that swirl in *The Tempest* anchor the colonial dynamics at the center of the play. In the process, I identify three major competing rhetorics of land possession in the play: Prospero and Gonzalo's projections of colonial power through idealized landscapes and Caliban's invocation of inherited property and local description. By analyzing how Gonzalo, Prospero, and Caliban mobilize Utopian, pastoral, and wilderness discursive forms, respectively, this chapter demonstrates how ecological ideologies fit within the early modern English colonial expansion being explored, and arguably critiqued, in Shakespeare's play. Through this attention to rhetorics of land rights and property in *The Tempest*, I elucidate how land use operates within the early modern English colonial project that runs throughout the play.

I. Gonzalo's Utopia and the Appeal of Colonial Projection

The relationship between land and people figured in notions of cultivated fields and civilized people promoted ideas of place, character, and social relations, justifying the accumulation of resources and labor that characterized the enclosures of the English countryside and the plantations of Ireland, North America, and the Caribbean. In his landmark study *Green Imperialism,* Richard Grove contends that the colonial endeavors in the early modern Atlantic World initiated "[t]he kind of homogenising capital-intensive transformation of people, trade, economy and environment with which we are familiar today."[159] As I have shown thus far, this "transformation" of people with and through the land in the early modern English context, rested

[159] Richard Grove, *Green Imperialism: Colonial Expansion, Tropical Island Edens and the Origins of Environmentalism 1600-1860* (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 2.

on conceptions of land use that emphasized rhetorics of value and improvement.

In order to make sense of the ever-greater number of landscapes (not cultivated in ways that were legible to the Europeans), flora and fauna, and climates they encountered, Europeans, Grove argues, projected their pre-existing ideals onto these new spaces, viewing them as abundant, well-conserved paradises.[160] These paradises operated as incentives and rewards through which the intensified economic accumulation of early colonialism could be justified and promoted. This "imaginative hegemony,"[161] as Grove calls the European ideal of paradise, shaped "new valuations of nature"[162] that both sought to create these idealized landscapes and guard against the already-apparent ecological harm that emerged from the rapid accumulation of capital and labor in colonial expansion. According to Grove, the symbols of the garden and the island were particularly popular projections to organize and understand the natural world because each of these symbolic spaces provided language and semi-neat "analogues: of society, of the world, of climate, of economy."[163] These symbols represent, promote, and shape the colonial projections involved in the manipulation and extraction of resources in early colonialism (as well as the perils such intensive extraction created).

Along with colonial expansion, and its related projections of paradise and idealized landscapes, came colonial violence. This violence was, as Kathryn Yusoff points out, "a process of alienation from geography, self, and the possibility of relation,"[164] particularly for Indigenous peoples of the Americas and the Caribbean through genocide, land dispossession, and enslavement as well as for Africans who were kidnapped, sold, and enslaved. In the case of

[160] Grove traces the concept of paradise, figured biblically in the Garden of Eden, to the Zoroastrian concept of "Pairidaeza" from which the Garden of Eden draws.
[161] Grove 5.
[162] Grove 5.
[163] Grove 13.
[164] Kathryn Yusoff, *A Billion Black Anthropocenes or None* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2018), 30.

tropical islands, like those in the Caribbean, the use of islands for experiments and exploitation of plants and animals worked in tandem with the dispossession of Indigenous peoples from their lands. In these new relations to lands and peoples, "the colonial Other is displaced, along with existing ecological relations and connections of the colonized to earth."[165] Taking the colonies of North America and the Caribbean as one context (or "quotation") that could shape our understanding of *The Tempest*, we come to see how integral ecology is to the colonial project—and how the colonial project relied on ecological projections to promote and assess the goals of colonial extraction and facilitate colonial violences.[166] As Rachel Bryant contends, "*The Tempest* reflects a deep and characteristically Shakespearean anxiety about what might be called the *colonial contract*—a term meant to encompass the various ways in which explorers and colonists compulsively treated 'new world' lands and populations as available resources to be acquired, exploited and sold at market."[167] Within this appetite for resources, we find that colonial projections operated "as a kind of *worlding*, which Gayatri Spivak defines as the inscription 'of a world upon supposedly uninscribed territory'… This is the logic through which European colonists worked to characterize indigenous lands as empty and/or available."[168] This "worlding" is at the heart of the projections that Europeans like Gonzalo and Prospero place onto the unnamed island in *The Tempest*.

While Bryant brings to our attention the ecological relations of parasitism that undergird the colonial dynamic of the play, I wish to draw particular attention to the specific forms this

[165] Yusoff 32.
[166] In *Extraction Ecologies and the Literature of the Long Exhaustion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2021), Liz Miller tracks how the extraction of natural resources, namely fossil fuels, takes on a central role in the English literary imagination between 1830 and 1930. While this current chapter touches on the extractive ecologies of English colonialism in the early 1600s, Miller's study reminds us of the long (and indeed ongoing) history of extraction, centuries afterward.
[167] Rachel Bryant, "Toward the Desertion of Sycorax's Island: Challenging the Colonial Contract," *ESC: English Studies in Canada* 39.4 (2013), 94. Emphasis in original.
[168] Bryant 100. Emphasis in original.

siphoning of natural resources takes in the play. To bring these colonial projections into being, colonizers must erase or empty a space, physically and imaginatively, so that they can project a new world onto it. Physically, this erasure is facilitated by land grabs. These land grabs are in turn perpetuated by discourses of land use that imagine land as unused or underutilized. In the play, and in the larger early modern English imaginary, discourses of husbandry and the creation of plantations frame land dispossession as a molding of colonial ecologies into idealized paradisiacal spaces. This kind of imaginative thinking is directly articulated in Gonzalo's conjuring up of a plantation-utopia in Act Two scene one. Gonzalo's speech illustrates the extent to which the Europeans project their ideas of society, a "world" they may have held in their minds in Europe, onto the "uninscribed" island of the play.

In an attempt to cheer up King Alonso's court after their shipwreck onto Prospero's island and the assumed death of Alonso's son Ferdinand, Gonzalo stumbles upon an opportunity to provide a full- throated speech on the political possibilities of the island. He surmises that:

> Had I plantation of this isle, my lord…
> And were the king on't, what would I do?…
> I'th' commonwealth would I by contraries
> Execute all things. For no kind of traffic
> Would I admit; no name of magistrate;
> Letters should not be known; riches, poverty,
> Bourn, bound of land, tilth, vineyard, none;
> No use of metal, corn, or wine, or oil;
> No occupation, all men idle, all;
> And women too, but innocent and pure;

No sovereignty— (2.1.138, 141, 143-151)[169]

Gonzalo terms his projected plantation a commonwealth and structurally describes how his plantation will run, moving from large to small. But he does this primarily through negation. This structure provides Gonzalo's projected treatise on his plantation an opportunity to delineate the key expectations of a society with punctuated reminders that his plantation will defy or refuse these expectations. He claims that he would close off trade, the judiciary, and literature. He also contends that he will eliminate boundaries, property limits, tilling, and viticulture. With that elimination also comes the elimination of riches and poverty. The elimination of riches would suggest a communal poverty, and the elimination of poverty would suggest a communal wealth. But by eliminating both ends of the wealth spectrum, Gonzalo suggests a complete elimination of any political economy. This nullification of economy is tied grammatically to the elimination of boundaries, property, and agriculture through Gonzalo's serial list. Shakespeare syntactically connects the removal of the political economy of Gonzalo's proposed commonwealth to the elimination of laws and processes surrounding agriculture such as boundaries and property and the courts that would adjudicate property disputes. Moreover, Gonzalo eliminates mining, grain crops, viticulture (again!), and oils for fuel or lighting. After he opines about the things he would eliminate in his counter-culture plantation/commonwealth, Gonzalo begins to say "no sovereignty" before he gets cut off by Sebastian and Antonio. Shakespeare crafts this interruption, I argue, to keep the idea of "no sovereignty" (which is a quite treasonous sentiment) from being fully developed in Gonzalo's words and instead opens it up to direct ridicule from Sebastian and Antonio. But Gonzalo's execution by contraries has already made the argument for "no sovereignty" quite clear: if there is no trade, laws, education, agriculture, wealth (to be

[169] Quotations of *The Tempest* in this chapter come from the 2004 *Norton Critical Edition*, eds. Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.).

distributed), or industry, is there even a need for a government—let alone one led by a sovereign?[170]

For nearly three centuries, scholars have agreed that Gonzalo's speech is a nearly word-for-word borrowing of John Florio's 1603 translation of Michel de Montaigne's 1569 essay "Des Cannibales."[171] This (at times verbatim) intertextuality between Montaigne's essay and Gonzalo's speech, leads scholars like Kenji Go to divide the speech into three parts.[172] The first portion of the speech, which I quote above; the second portion of the speech, which follows Sebastian and Antonio's interruption and contains Gonzalo's views on nature's role in replacing these hallmarks of political economy (which I will analyze shortly); and the final portion of the speech, which contains just two lines: "I would with such perfection gouerne Sir:/T'Excell the Golden Age" (2.1.162-163). I draw attention to the broader structure of Gonzalo's speech in order to identify the three major topics of Gonzalo's utopia: political economy and civil society; nature's role in supporting humans; and the paradisiacal Golden Age. Regarding the first topic—political economy and civil society—Gonzalo's (and Montagne's) deployment of negative rhetorical structure evacuates the island, piece by piece, of the structures that organize social relations. This negative rhetorical structure, in other words, enacts a worlding onto the island through subtraction. It inscribes the space of the island by emptying it out—much like the extractive regimes of early modern English coloniality.

If the first portion of Gonzalo's speech erases the political economy of his projected

---

[170] According to the *OED*, the term "sovereignty" as it relates to an independent community or state only comes into use in the eighteenth century.

[171] Kenji Go recounts in "Montagne's 'Cannibals' and *The Tempest* Revisited," *Studies in Philology* 109.1 (2012), that Edward Malone notes in his 1790 edition of *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare* that "Our author here closely followed a passage in Montaigne's ESSAIES, translated by John Florio, folio, 1603: 'It is a nation, (would I answer Plato,) that hath no kind of trafficke, no knowledge of letters…The very words that import lying falsehood, treason, dissiumulations, covetousness, envie, detraction, and pardon, were never heard amongst them'" (qtd in Go 456).

[172] Go 458.

colony, the second portion frames nature as the best substitute for this now-absent political economy. After Antonio and Sebastian's interruption, Gonzalo continues to opine that in his prospective plantation:

> All things in common nature should produce
> Without sweat or endeavor: treason, felony,
> Sword, pike, knife, gun or need of any engine
> Would I not have; but nature should bring forth
> Of its own kind, all foison, all abundance,
> To feed my innocent people. (2.1.156-160)

In these lines, Gonzalo posits that nature can sustain his commonwealth, and do so without the "sweat or endeavor" of labor. This erasure of labor evacuates agricultural activity such as cultivation and harvesting, and depicts, quite like the country house poems I discuss in chapter one, a land that offers up its fruits of its own accord. Moreover, Gonzalo argues here that because there is no economic activity or corresponding legal and political activity to guard it, there is also no need for violence. In his telling, Gonzalo structurally differentiates between the instruments of violence and nature by a semi-colon that creates a caesura in line 158.[173] To the left of the semi-colon Gonzalo uses the conditional "would I not have" while on the right side, he says "but nature should bring forth." This caesura creates a pairing of opposites, the "I"[Gonzalo] and "nature" as subjects, the weak "have" and the beckoning "bring forth" as the verbs, the negative "not" and the positive "should bring" as the conditional. This split between the annihilating violence of humans and the powerful replenishing of nature continues for the remainder of

[173] The Norton Critical Edition of the text punctuates this line with a semi-colon, whereas the first folio version of the text uses a colon. I will refer to this punctuation mark as a semi-colon in this reading as it is the punctuation present in the edition I use. In either case, punctuation marks the caesura in the line on which I focus.

Gonzalo's speech, when, following the semi-colon, he contends that nature, left to her own devices, will be able to "feed my innocent people." If in the first portion of his speech Gonzalo deploys a rhetorical structure of subtraction, in this second portion of the speech Gonzalo implements a structure of juxtaposition. This juxtaposition between humans (and their violence) and nature (and its sustenance) posits that human activity is passive and destructive whereas the natural world is active and nurturing. However, this opposition between humans and nature speaks to the tension at the heart of colonial extraction. If projecting an idealized landscape onto a space, as Gonzalo does, makes it an appealing place to settle, then humans will not only settle there but they will also use these spaces to accumulate "all foison, all abundance" and thus deplete these ecologies of their balance. Thus, not only does this portion of the speech inscribe an idealized landscape untouched by humans onto the prospective plantation/commonwealth, but it also subtly alludes to extracting bounty from nature for the gain of colonists.

This idealized landscape, evacuated of all human political economy, culminates in the last portion of Gonzalo's speech. Gonzalo concludes his projection by stating: "I would with such perfection gouerne Sir:/T'Excell the Golden Age" (2.1.165-166). These two short lines, according to Go, reference a portion of Montaigne's essay where he "speaks of the New World 'nations' that he says 'exceede' the picture of the 'golden age'."[174] In Gonzalo's telling, the idealized landscape, emptied of political economy and sustained solely by nature, would be governed by him in such a way that it would run better than even the Golden Age. However, in the Florio translation of Montaigne, it is the nations of the New World who go beyond the "picture" of the Golden Age. There are two major distinctions between Gonzalo and Florio-Montaigne. First, the nations of the Indigenous peoples in Montaigne's essay are erased and

[174] Go 463.

written over by Gonzalo's prospective plantation. Gonzalo projects over the bodies and culture of the indigenous people found in Montaigne and instead envisions a plantation—which as I point out earlier in this chapter, is a term that is nearly synonymous with the word "colony"—that he himself would govern. Second, whereas Montaigne describes the nations of the New World as peoples whose innocence goes beyond the "pictures" or descriptions of the Golden Age in poetry and art, Gonzalo brags that his own governance will be better than the actual Golden Age. Montaigne's essay provides a crucial distancing between the Golden Age and the New World through the concept of the picture. Montaigne's larger claim in "Of Cannibales" is that the New World nations disrupt notions of culture and art that philosophers, most notably Plato, claim are important to a polity. Art and culture at its best can only picture the Golden Age, whereas the Indigenous peoples of the New World live in a society that goes beyond what even those pictures of the Golden Age depict. On the other hand, Gonzalo embraces direct, solipsistic thinking wherein his skills as a political practitioner can directly create a community that is better than the Golden Age.

Gonzalo's "quoting" of Florio's translation of Montaigne erases the peoples of the New World and their role in reshaping the European imagination (as Montaigne asserts) and writes over their land a Utopian colony run by his own imagination and strength as a political practitioner. As Richard Halpern explains, "Gonzalo's utopian project appropriates colonial descriptions of the New World but effaces or occludes this influence by reinscribing it within a closed and Eurocentric textual economy."[175] This erasure and writing over—this palimpsest—of

[175] Richard Halpern, "'The picture of Nobody': White Cannibalism in *The Tempest*" in *The Production of English Renaissance Culture* eds. David Lee Miller, Sharon O'Dair, Harold Weber (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), 272. Halpern extends this important critique of Gonzalo's divergence from Florio's translation of Montaigne's essay and his reference to More's *Utopia* by explaining: "Gonzalo's erasure of non-Western influences is completed when he populates his ideal commonwealth with Europeans rather than Native Americans, thereby removing the bodily as well as the cultural presence of those indigenous subjects. Consuming or erasing the racial body covers up all the remaining traces of non-Western origin: Gonzalo's commonwealth is now peopled by Europeans and apparently

colonial description in Gonzalo's proposed colony brings to the fore the violence bound up in European colonial projection. To view a parcel of land as worthy of settlement, colonists like Gonzalo need to empty it out, idealize it, and fix it within the closed loop of their own imagination. Gonzalo's speech from start ("had I plantation") to finish ("the Golden Age") illustrates the process of worlding that inscribes a world of political domination and colonization over the supposedly uninscribed territory of the island through erasure, extraction, and idealization.

II. Prospero's Pastoral and the Promise of English Husbandry

If Gonzalo's worlding of the unnamed island in *The Tempest* mirrors the broad strokes of European colonial projection then, two acts later, Prospero's masque fills in the picture of colonial worlding with the details specific to early modern English ideologies of land use. In her seminal study *Ceremonies of Possession,* Patricia Seed argues that the five major European colonial powers—England, France, Spain, Portugal, and the Netherlands—mobilized different concepts, emanating from older cultural traditions, to justify and stage the possession of colonial territory in the new world. According to Seed, the rhetoric of land possession employed by the French, Spanish Portuguese, and Dutch relied, respectively, on theatrical processions, military conquest, nautical science, and the penetration of undiscovered nautical routes as the primary means of establishing territory. The early modern English, Seed argues, were unique in their belief that possession came from settling and improving land. According to Seed*,* "Englishmen

created by the Western philosophical imagination drawing on classical tradition. This double erasure is what I have chosen to call white cannibalism: Gonzalo in effect consumes the body of the racial other in order to appropriate its cultural force" (272). I heartily agree with Halpern's assessment that Gonzalo's violent erasure of non-European bodies, cultures, and references enacts a white cannibalism. In the space of this chapter, I seek to focus mainly on the ways land and land use operate within this white cannibalistic logic and, in particular, how ideas of English husbandry enact this process of subsuming New World peoples and lands and writing over them in the mold of legible cues of possession.

occupying the New World initially inscribed their possession of the New World by affixing their own powerful cultural symbols of ownership … [by] simply using it, engaging in agricultural or pastoral activities."[176] Seed traces this custom of land possession from the medieval practices of using hedges, houses and gardens, through the explosion of the appetite for "improving" land emerging from the enclosure movement in the sixteenth century (as I describe in my discussion on country house poems), to the burgeoning labor theory of property in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that came to see the evidence of productive land use as based on "grazing (domestic animals) and planting."[177] This genealogy of how early modern English land use becomes central to the project of colonial land possession demonstrates the manner by which cultural ideologies around land respond to the emerging pressures and imperatives of accumulation emanating from ascendent capitalist modes of production and colonial models of extraction.

Relatedly, the concept of property, as Barbara Arneil explores in *John Locke and America: The Defence of English Colonialism,* became a central notion by which colonists fashioned their ideas of land possession. Arneil explains that English beliefs about gaining a foothold colonizing New World lands shifted from establishing trade, to claiming and settling land through legible agricultural markers (like those Seed describes), and finally ossifying to a patent system as the emphasis on property ownership became more dependent on larger plantations as a form of agricultural settlement.[178] According to Jess Edwards, while the English were keen on marking territory through their own forms of cultivation, there was a tension

[176] Patricia Seed, *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 25.
[177] Seed 25.
[178] Barbara Arneil, *John Locke and America: The Defence of English Colonialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 70.

between relying on customary land use (like that I will outline in Prospero's masque shortly) and mathematical models used by surveyors (as I show in the chapter on country house poems) to determine the legitimacy of territorial claims. This tension between custom and mathematical models, Edwards contends, emerges from "the ambivalent discourses regarding the right use and representation of land, discourses which were only beginning to be able to disparage and discount customary, common practice in favor of capitalist land use."[179] In both Edwards' and Arneil's accounts, early modern English notions of land possession sediment social relations and accounts of land use into discrete units of property; notions of property, in turn, are mobilized to justify the acquisition of colonial lands for profit in the form of plantations. This connection between land possession and profitable agricultural colonies promotes a notion of desirable land as that which colonists can inscribe (and describe) with legible evidence of husbandry.

Prospero's masque, which takes up the entirety of Act Four of the play, registers the ways early modern English land possession was predicated on first establishing agricultural activity. The masque opens with Iris, the messenger of the gods, inviting Ceres to come to Prospero's island:

> Ceres, most bounteous lady, thy rich leas
> Of wheat, rye, barley, vetches, oats, and peas;
> Thy turfy mountains, where live nibbling sheep,

[179] Jess Edwards, "Between 'Plain Wilderness' and 'Goodly Corn Fields': Representing Land Use in Early Virginia," in *Envisioning an English Empire: Jamestown and the Making of the North Atlantic World*, eds. Robert Applebaum and John Wood Sweet (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 219. In her essay, Edwards close reads John Norden's 1607 *The Surveyor's Dialogue* alongside John Smith's mapping of Virginia to demonstrate that "the political values and the epistemology of contemporary local geography…may leave room for profit and the abstract calculations of mathematics, but not the exclusion of customary, social usages of land, defined in the concrete particularities of verbal testimony and written law" (222). In chapter one of this dissertation, I examine how this relationship between customary accounts of land possession and the mathematical models offered by surveying in Norden's text play out in the context of seventeenth-century country house poems and how poems in this genre oscillate between describing the social relations on an estate and the topographic details that produce the estates' described values.

And flat meads thatched with stover, them to keep;

Thy banks with pioned and twilled brims

Which spongy April at thy hest betrims

To make cold nymphs chaste crowns; and thy broom-groves,

Whose shadow thy dismissed bachelor loves,

Being lass-lorn; thy poll-clipped vineyard,

And thy sea-marge, sterile and rocky hard…

[Juno] bids thee leave these, and with her sovereign grace,

Here on this grass-plot, in this very place

To come and sport… (4.1.60-69, 71-74)

Iris lists out a wide range of *loci* that Ceres, the goddess of agriculture, inhabits: fertile lands for the production of starches, steep pastoral land for grazing, as well as flat meadows, well-maintained river banks (with "pioned [or heavily vegetated] and twilled brims" to prevent erosion), lush forests, well-pruned vineyards, and rocky sea coasts (presumably where fishermen make their living). This long list of *loci* creates a catalog of the major domains of agricultural activity: the cultivation of crops; the grazing of sheep; the maintenance of meadows, riverbanks, and forests; the husbanding of vineyards; and the occupation of fishing. By having Iris start the masque by imploring Ceres to come to "this grass-plot" of the island, Prospero ventriloquizes his wish for the full spectrum of agricultural activity to come to his island—and to inscribe the island with legible cues of husbandry.

Once Ceres' agricultural domains come to the island, then all talk of political affairs can begin. But Ceres asks Iris: "why hath thy queen/Summoned me hither to this short-grassed green?" (4.1.81-82). When Ceres calls the island "short grassed," she alludes to the advice given

in husbandry manuals like William Folkingham's 1610 *Feudographia* which, observing the "depth and colour of grasse," offers the surveyor the ability to discern how "(sans further search) the Species and habitude of the ground, wherein they grow, are ingeniously intimated."[180] Ceres' assessment of the island as a "short-grassed green," according to Richard Surflet's 1606 translation of Charles Estienne and John Liebault's *Maison Rustique,* suggests that the island is fertile because "small grassee…do shew the goodness and fruitfulness of the soile, for… [small grasses in addition to rushes, roses, three-leaved grass, and elderberry trees] are not found or nourished any where almost but in the sweete veines of the earth."[181] Thus, Ceres, like a good husbandman, enters the scene appraising whether the island is ready to be planted, and, remarking on the state of the grasses growing, finds Prospero's island quite satisfactory.

In response to Ceres' question, Iris explains that Ceres is needed because of "a contract of true love to celebrate/And some donation freely to estate/On the blest lovers" (4.1.83-85). Iris' response connects the occasion of Miranda and Ferdinand's engagement to a request to give them a gift. This connection positions the impending marital bonds, and the establishment of a future political lineage between Prince Alonso of Naples and the erstwhile Duchess Miranda of Milan, as linked to the agricultural bounty that Ceres could "freely" give them. Moreover, since Iris first invites Ceres to come to the island—before her mistress Juno, and certainly without Venus or even Hymen—the masque demonstrates the early modern English appetite for ordering a landscape along legible agricultural markers before any romantic or political matters can be settled. Husbandry and its territorial claims to property appear to function as more central to the political economy of Prospero's island than political alliances formed by marriage. Simply put,

[180] William Folkingham, *Feudigraphia. The Synopsis or Epitome of Surueying Methodized* (London, 1610), 5.
[181] Charles Estienne, *Maison Rustique, or The Countrey Farme: Compiled in the French Tongue by Charles Steuens and Iohn Liebault Doctors of Physicke: And Translated into English by Richard Surflet* (London, 1606), 17.

land possession must be established first before Miranda and Ferdinand's impending marital contract (and the resulting political alliance) can even be tended to.

When it's Ceres' turn to bless the couple, she issues a wish for pastoral abundance akin to Gonzalo's utopian paradise as we have seen in Act two scene one. She wishes the couple would enjoy a life where:

> Earth's increase, and foison plenty,
> Barns and garners never empty,
> Vines, with clustering bunches growing,
> Plants, with goodly burden bowing;
> Spring come to you at the farthest,
> In the very end of harvest.
> Scarcity and want shall shun you,
> Ceres' blessing so is on you. (4. 1.110-117)

Ceres' blessing invokes a golden age-like agricultural abundance: the earth willingly provides its fruits, with storehouses, bunches, and boughs filled to the brim with sustenance. This bounty comes from the earth's increase, and nothing is mentioned of rural labor. Ceres further emphasizes the absence of agricultural labor by ending her blessing with the personification of deprivation—"scarcity" and "want". This rhetorical device places the onus of labor on these two economic conditions: they would do the work of "shunning" the couple, their offspring, and their polity. Ceres' proclamation erases any activity that Ferdinand, Miranda, or other laborers could perform to the point that even the specters of deprivation themselves would do the work of staying away. Ceres' blessing, like Gonzalo's utopia, traffics in what Patricia Akhimie calls, "marvelous husbandry." This kind of husbandry, according to Akhimie, "promises

the benefits to self, land, and commonwealth that husbandry manuals prescribe, but obfuscates the labor required to reap such benefits. It includes…fantasies like those of d'Anghiera and Raleigh: tilled and planted fields and well stocked hunting chases in the midst of the wilderness with no sign of the laborers who accomplished these feats, magical country estates call out to be claimed, oases that tend themselves, requiring no labor."[182] In Ceres' telling, the island will stay in a state of ever-green harvest, without the need for labor—a state that at first glance mirrors Gonzalo's nature which "should produce/Without sweat or endeavor" to "feed [his] innocent people." But there is a major difference between Gonzalo's form of marvelous husbandry and Prospero's: Gonzalo's utopia removes all forms of agriculture as part of his larger project of removing political economy. Prospero's masque, on the other hand, invokes the goddess of agriculture and retains the infrastructures of husbandry: barns and garners, vines and harvests. Moreover, Ceres refers to the rhythm of agricultural time by hoping that spring "stretches" into the harvest time of year. In other words, Gonzalo's utopia is agriculture-free, whereas Prospero's inscribes the island with the infrastructure and rhythm of agriculture, but with the promise of such plentiful bounty that labor is not needed.

It is no wonder that as soon as Ceres says these lines, Ferdinand exclaims that "This is a most majestic vision, and / Harmonious charmingly" (4.1.116-117). Shortly after this, Ferdinand again exclaims: "Let me live here ever" (123). The vision Ferdinand has just witnessed prophesies that the land he is currently inhabiting will be so bountiful that no work will need to be done. Sandwiched between his initial exclamation (after Ceres' benediction) that "this is a most majestic vision" and his hope to "live here ever" is a brief exchange between him and Prospero, which allows Prospero to brag that "mine art/…[has called spirits]to enact/ My present

[182] Patricia Akhimie, *Shakespeare and the Cultivation of Difference: Race and Conduct in the Early Modern World* (New York: Routledge, 2018), 179.

fancies" (120-122). Ferdinand believes that he can "live here" not because the place is a paradise but because of the illusion of paradise Prospero conjures in his masque. Kristen Poole points out that, "for much of the play, characters have been imagining themselves in a different space—in Milan, in Tunis, under the sea."[183] This is until, she argues, Prospero invents the pastoral landscape in his masque; she reads Ferdinand's awed response of being "here, on this grass-plot, in this very place" as Prospero's aim to create a fertile land for his slowly unifying court.[184] Prospero's masque mobilizes English concepts of husbandry to inscribe a vision of paradise onto the island, in order to, like an early modern English colonist, stake out territory, claim possession, and promote political control.

Ferdinand caps his desire to live in the "here" of the play (an unnamed island; or perhaps simply the "here" of the fantastical masque) with his discernment that "So rare a wondered father and a wise/Makes this place paradise" (124-125). Ferdinand appears to be less interested in the actual island than in the fact that Prospero, his prospective father-in-law, *makes* the island a paradise. Prospero's pastoral masque, using discourses of husbandry appealing to Shakespeare's Jacobean audience, creates a desirable place for Ferdinand to colonize. The masque embodies the expectation and desire of colonial spaces to be a paradise, and thus establishes the island in Ferdinand's and the reader's mind as a place to inhabit.

III. Caliban's Wilderness and the Discourse of Colonial Land Dispossession

Unlike Gonzalo, Prospero does not directly voice his desires to colonize the island, nor

[183] Kristen Poole, *Supernatural Environments in Shakespeare's England: Spaces of Demonism, Divinity, and Drama* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 209.
[184] Poole 209.

does he ever use the word "plantation" in his masque. But he doesn't really have to—considering that the island in question, the one he makes a paradise, is under his control. Throughout the play, as Kevin Pask puts it, Prospero "characteristically controls the climate and spirits of the air"[185] and creates a tempest to restore his political position in Milan. From the start of the play through the masque scene, the audience observes Prospero mobilizing the island's climate and its ecology for his own profit; this profit may not take the form of cash crops, but it nevertheless rewards Prospero's manipulation of the island with personal gain. The pastoral masque is the culmination of this profit-seeking view of the island: Prospero inscribes the island with the fantasy of agricultural abundance that entrances his prospective son-in-law and solidifies the territorial and political allegiances he seeks to form through the bonds of marriage. That is, until he is reminded of Caliban.

As the nymphs and mowers rejoice in the masque's rustic dance, Prospero remembers "the foul conspiracy/Of the beast Caliban and his confederates" (4.1.139-140). As soon as he remembers the plot, his fanciful masque evaporates into thin air. In response to this panic, Ariel tells Prospero: "When I presented Ceres/I thought t'have told thee of it, but I feared/Lest it might anger thee" (4.1.166-169). As Francis Barker and Peter Hulme observe, "the text is strangely emphatic about this moment of disturbance, insisting not only on Prospero's sudden vexation but also on the 'strange hollow, and confused noise' with which the Nymphs and Reapers—two lines earlier gracefully dancing—now 'heavily vanish'; and the apprehension voiced by Ferdinand and Miranda [about Prospero's 'anger' and 'distemper'd' state] (4.1.145)."[186] The very thought of Caliban and his "foul conspiracy" works Prospero into a state

[185] Kevin Pask, "Prospero's Counter-Pastoral," *Criticism* 44.4 (2002): 391.
[186] Francis Barker and Peter Hulme, "NYMPHS AND REAPERS HEAVILY VANISH: The discursive con-texts of *The Tempest*," in *Alternative Shakespeares*, ed. John Drakakis, 2nd ed. (Routledge, 2002), 205.

of agitation that breaks the spell of paradisiacal projection—a state that even the entranced audience member Ferdinand notices and that filled the performer Ariel so much with dread that the sprite "feared" bringing it to Prospero's attention before starting the masque. The fact that Ariel dreaded mentioning Caliban's conspiracy before the performance "marks the recurrent difficulty that Caliban causes Prospero."[187] This persistent dynamic between Prospero and Caliban centers on the colonial relation between the two. In their analysis of this dramatic interruption, Barker and Hulme argue that this scene demonstrates "the process of occlusion"[188] which "European and North American critics [engage in by]…tend[ing] to listen exclusively to Prospero's voice," in turn, making them "complicit, whether consciously or not, with a colonialist ideology."[189] The colonial ideology that I have thus far traced in Prospero's masque is one in which English husbandry inscribes the island as a paradisiacal colony. But the mere thought of Caliban's "conspiracy"—his aim to seize the island back from Prospero with the help of Stephano and Trinculo—throws the vision of land use and political economy found in Prospero's masque into complete disarray. In this brief moment in the play, we observe that Prospero's fantasy of husbandry-based dominion over the island cannot coexist with Caliban's quest to re-establish his possession of the island.[190]

Caliban first appears in the play cursing Prospero. But immediately after Prospero promises to punish Caliban with more cramps, Caliban responds by first saying "I must eat my dinner" (1.2.329) and then launches into an account of how he believes Prospero stole his land. He says:

This island's mine by Sycorax, my mother,

[187] Ibid 205.
[188] Ibid 198.
[189] Ibid 207.
[190] One may note that this possession of the island spans only one generation—it has only been in Caliban's family since Sycorax's settlement. Moreover, Caliban's claims to the island are matrilineal, not patrilineal.

Which thou tak'st from me. When thou cam'st first

Thou strok'st me and made much of me; wouldst give me

Water with berries in't; and teach me how

To name the bigger light, and how the less,

That burn by day and night. And then I loved thee

And showed thee all the qualities o'th'isle,

The fresh sprigs, brine-pits, barren place and fertile.

Cursed be I that did so! All the charms

Of Sycorax—toads, beetles, bats—light on you!

For I am all the subjects that you have,

Which first was mine own king; and here you sty me. (1.2.330-342)

The first thing Caliban says is that the island belongs to him based on a hereditary claim—he inherited it from his mother. The syntax of this statement is especially revealing. He uses a declarative clause (this island (is) mine), followed by a prepositional phrase (by Sycorax), followed by a series of modifiers (first, "my mother", then "which thou task'st from me"). The syntax creates an almost paratactic effect, piling on a series of modifications to the original claim of the island being Caliban's with a series of reminders to strengthen it—Sycorax had the island, Sycorax was my mother, but you now have taken the island from me—without giving a sense of subordination of cause and effect (such as a "because", "through," "but now"). I draw attention to the grammar of Caliban's opening claim because it gives the reader the sense of an exasperated Caliban trying to remind Prospero (for the first time to us, but for the umpteenth time to Prospero) that this island actually belongs to him, piling on all the justifications he has about his claim to this parcel of land.

The second thing Caliban says, and what takes up the bulk of this passage, is that Prospero tricked him into giving up his land. Caliban's narrative presents Prospero as a cunning person who approached him with affection and gentle education. Prospero's ploy led Caliban to "love" him and to then show him "all the qualities" of the island. The fact that Caliban provided Prospero this local knowledge of "the fresh springs, brine-pits, barren place and fertile" is what makes Caliban curse himself; this provision of ecological knowledge was Caliban's greatest source of power and surrendering it is his biggest regret.

Prospero takes over Caliban's island because of his knowledge of the island's ecology—a knowledge Caliban taught him. And yet, one act later, Caliban offers up this lay of the land again to Stephano and Trinculo:

> I'll show thee every fertile inch o' th' island, and I will kiss thy foot…
>
> I'll show thee the best springs; I'll pluck thee berries;
>
> I'll fish for thee and get thee wood enough…
>
> I prithee let me bring thee where crabs grow;
>
> And I with my long nails will dig thee pig-nuts,
>
> Show thee a jay's nest, and instruct thee how
>
> To snare the nimble marmoset; I'll bring thee
>
> To clustering filberts, and sometimes I'll get thee
>
> Young scamels from the rock. Wilt thou go with me. (2.2.143-144, 155-156, 161-166)

The language that Caliban uses of "doing" rather than "having" clearly indicates that his inheritance of the island resides in knowledge rather than possession. Caliban's offer to Stephano and Trinculo, like his account of the exchange with Prospero, consists primarily of showing, instructing, and demonstrating different ways of gathering the natural resources of the island.

While he argues that the island belongs to him, he can only show and tell the features of the island to the man in the moon; he cannot transfer the island as a parcel of property or territory, he can only describe it. This exemplifies the nature of his dynastic claim to the island; as Kevin Pask explains, "all that remains of Sycorax's power is Caliban's knowledge of the island."[191] Similarly, Akhimie comments that "it is Caliban's knowledge of the island's husbandry and his willingness to engage in the labor of husbandry that truly stake his claim to mastery and lordship of the island."[192] This knowledge of the island's resources countervails the discourse of husbandry we see in Prospero's masque because Caliban describes best practices for gathering the island's resources based on his upbringing and intimacy with the island of his birth rather than on the English husbandry manuals that inform the speeches of Roman goddesses in Prospero's masque. Caliban's tie to the land is also a tie to his knowledge of the natural resources of the island and not an imported notion of utopia or pastoral that he projects onto the land.

I bring attention to the intense similarity between what Caliban says he once gave Prospero and what he offers to give Stephano and Trinculo to underscore the centrality of the ecological nature of the colonial apparatus of the play. As Monique Alleweart argues, "attending to the environmental fantasies that circulate in the play" helps us to understand the relationship between environmental knowledge and subjugated personhood.[193] In particular, Caliban's ecological perspectives "figured nonhuman bodies, organic or not, as vectors for subaltern

[191] Pask 391.
[192]Akhimie, *Shakespeare and the Cultivation of Difference*, 164. It can be argued that the term "husbandry" connotes agricultural practices that accord with the biblical exhortation for man to "increase and multiply." The knowledge Caliban provides Prospero, Stephano and Trinculo falls more under "hunting and gathering" resources; he doesn't "husband" the land to make it increase its productivity, and surely that's one reason why he is "like" an Indigenous person whose claim to the land can be so readily abrogated according to English ideologies of "terra nullius."
[193] Monique Allewaert, *Ariel's Ecology: Plantations, Personhood, and Colonialism in the American Tropics* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2013), 7.

resistance, thus challenging the colonial assumption that any body that was not definitively human was an exchangeable product."[194] This alliance between Caliban and the larger non-human world acts as a counterweight to Prospero's project of harnessing the environment of the island for his own ends. But this intimate relationship between Caliban and the non-human world also provides the condition by which Caliban becomes subjugated. Caliban is willing to give his knowledge of the island's ecology to whomever is nicest to him, which at the start is Prospero and later becomes Stephano and Trinculo. In other words, this knowledge of the island's ecology operates as the central grounds for Caliban's subjugation.

Caliban's knowledge of the island takes on the features of what Michel Foucault explains in *Society Must Be Defended* as "subjugated knowledge": "a knowledge that is local, regional, or differential…which derives its power solely from the fact that it is different from all knowledges that surround, it is the reappearance of what people know at a local level."[195] As such, his knowledge lies on what Foucault deems the "discourse-power" axis rather than on the "cognition-truth" axis.[196] This means Caliban's knowledge registers a struggle between disseminated knowledge (discourse) and power structures that dictate what knowledge is told. This is opposed to the cognition-truth axis, the axiom that knowledge is known through the proof of thought as truth. To put this another way, Caliban's knowledge *describes* the island whereas Prospero's deployment of husbandry discourse *inscribes* the island. Description denotes writing *down* the details of the island whereas inscription denotes writing *onto* the island (which in the case of Prospero, involves writing onto the island markers of English husbandry or in the case of Gonzalo, writing onto the island a utopian community that surpasses the Golden Age).

---

[194] Alleweart 8.
[195] Michel Foucault and François Ewald, *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976*, trans. David Macey (New York: Macmillan, 2003), 8.
[196] Ibid 179.

By mobilizing a discourse of husbandry, Prospero seeks to establish his possession of the island, and in the process disseminates a knowledge system that subjugates Caliban's lived experience and local knowledge of the island. Likewise, husbandry operates as a disciplining knowledge, providing a normative and dominant view of the island and a means of disciplining his only "subject," Caliban. In *Cultivation of Difference*, Akhimie argues that Prospero's pinching and punishing of Caliban is a form of husbandry. She explains that "it is the role of farmer or husbandman to manage stores in anticipation of the pinch of want to come and indeed husbandry might be described as the art of preparing for want… Husbandry manuals describe the pinch as that point of contact with the natural world that may allow control of your own want [deprivation] or another's."[197] This preoccupation with deprivation is highlighted at the end of Ceres' blessing to Ferdinand and Miranda: "scarcity and want shall shun you." Akhimie argues that pinching, particularly as it relates to human laborers, cultivates the ideal laborer to work for the wealthy landowning presumed audience of husbandry manuals. She contends that laborers "are…constructed actively and discursively by means of a continuous withholding, a physical and epistemological injury that I call the 'pinch,' adopting a term used by both Prospero and Caliban to describe both the action and the injury as well as the mark it leaves on the skin."[198] In this logic, Prospero's husbandry is not confined only to the pastoral masque of Act Four, which disintegrates at the thought of Caliban's insurrection; rather, Prospero deploys husbandry throughout the play, primarily by means of cultivating Caliban into a subservient subject who provides the agricultural labor that Ceres' pronouncements seemingly erase.

Act Two scene two of the play opens with Caliban cursing his master while suffering, or imagining suffering, intense pain. He notes and justifies his urge to curse Prospero by reflecting

[197]Akhimie 167.
[198] Ibid 180.

to himself:

> His spirits hear me,
>
> And yet I needs must curse. But they'll nor pinch,
>
> Fright me with urchin-shows, pitch me i'th'mire,
>
> Nor lead me, like a firebrand in the dark,
>
> Out of my way unless he bid'em. But
>
> For every trifle are they set upon me:
>
> Sometimes like apes that mow and chatter at me
>
> And after bite me, then like hedgehogs which
>
> Lie tumbling in my barefoot way and mount
>
> Their pricks at my footfall. Sometime am I
>
> All wound with adders, who with cloven tongues
>
> Do hiss me into madness. (2.2.3-13)

In these lines, Caliban reviews and substantiates his rhetoric of cursing. Oddly, in the previous act, we learn that Caliban learned European language under Prospero's daughter Miranda and argues "my profit on't is I know how to curse" (1.2.364-365). Caliban invests his linguistic education into cursing because he "needs must curse." He is aware that there are consequences for being heard cursing Prospero, but he asserts "and yet" when insisting he must curse. His reflection takes the form of the negative "and yet" rather than "because" and "nor" rather than "will." Thus, his argument takes on an air of resistance to the penalties he is aware that he will suffer if Prospero's spirits hear him. Caliban's resistance reveals not only his insistence on cursing even though he is aware it is punishable, and thereby illegal under Prospero's rule, but also his knowledge of how the island is governed. According to Caliban, Prospero's spirits will

not hurt him unless they are ordered to do so by Prospero himself. In other words, the spirits, as seen later in the play with Ariel, do not work with their own agency but only execute the law based on Prospero's word. By employing negatives in his speech, Caliban is able to list the very punishments he would hypothetically suffer. These punishments by pinching and torture logically serve as an explanation for his cursing. His descriptions impel the audience to sympathize with him and his need to curse his master. But by presenting these punishments in the negative, Caliban is not only able to achieve sympathy, but also project his resistance and resilience.

Yet in Caliban's argument for his need to curse lies the subtext of ethical punishment. Caliban's speech strongly echoes Florio's translation of Montaigne, where Montaigne contends:

> I think there is more barbarisme in eating men alive, than to feede upon them being dead; to mangle by tortures and torment a body full of lively sense, to roast him to peeces, to make dogges and swine to gnawe and tear him in mamockes.[199]

Caliban notes that he is bitten as well as being pinched and pushed around. Obviously, he is a "body full of lively sense," a living body aware of its pain, that is mangled "by tortures and torment." And he is aware that this treatment can occur "at any trifle." If we take Caliban at his word, he challenges Prospero's insistence that he is only punished for attempting to have sex with Miranda, and thereby procreate. It seems that Caliban could be punished for any annoyance or affront to Prospero's sensibility rather than for infractions of some hard and set legal or moral code. This form of disciplining is much like Prospero's treatment of his natural environment, which he alters to conform to his sensibilities of idyllic landscapes or to stir up dangerous storms

[199] Michel de Montaigne, "Of the cannibals" [1580], in *The Essays,* trans. John Florio (London: V. Sims for E. Blount 1603), pp. 101-2,104,106-107. Reprinted in William Shakespeare, *The Tempest: A Norton Critical Edition,* eds. Peter Hulme and William Sherman (New York: W.W. Norton Company, Inc.), 330.

to restore his political power. Combined with not only the frequency but also the very nature of his torture of Caliban, Prospero fits Montaigne's notion of "barbarisme" and is set up to the audience as a tyrant. Of course, Ariel also notes abuse and hints at Prospero's tyranny. But the ruler, in turn, justifies his governing practices by noting his prowess in releasing Ariel from a tree, and in turn, Ariel's previous history of enslavement. Caliban, on the other hand, is native to the island and has no previous history of enslavement, and yet is tied to a rock because of his desire to "people" the island with "Calibans." It appears, then, that Caliban's treatment is a mirror through which to view Prospero's barbarism and his desire to control nature rather than allow it to act according to its own laws.

Rhetorically, Caliban's speech, like the first part of Gonzalo's plantation speech, deploys negation.[200] This use of negation is reminiscent of Mikhail Bahktin's claim that "[i]n the example of grotesque the object of mockery is a specific negative phenomenon, something that 'should not exist'…[T]he basic nature of the grotesque: it exaggerates and caricatures the negative, the inappropriate."[201] Throughout the play, Caliban is described as disfigured or monstrous, though no actual descriptions of his body are rendered.[202] This disfigurement is most

[200] This shared rhetorical structure and the fact that both Gonzalo's and Caliban's speeches echo Montaigne perhaps suggest that Montaigne's essay, or at least Shakespeare's interest in quoting from it, frames the figure of the New World cannibal/savage as an important negation of European humanism. That is, Montaigne (or Shakespeare's view of Montaigne) prizes the ways the New World cannibal negates the societal and cultural practices that European cultural traditions insist are necessary to human cultures.

[201] Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*, trans. Helene Iswolsky (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1984), 306.

[202] Akhimie notes: "There is evidence throughout the play that Caliban is somehow strange to look at. Alonso is perhaps the most blunt, saying of Caliban, 'This is a strange thing as e'er I looked on' (5.1.290). However, there is no clear description of the appearance of Caliban in the text of the play. While descriptions of Caliban do not form a complete picture, his body and his conduct are conflated into a unified whole. As Prospero says, 'He is as disproportioned in his manners / as in his shape' (5.1.290-91). This relation is of particular interest because my own object of inquiry is the discursive production of race through the stigmatization of somatic marks rather than an autopsy or anatomy of a specific phenotype. I am interested in implicit and explicit links between Caliban's body and his behavior, and in the treatment of Caliban's body. The received analogy between Caliban's monstrous body and his monstrous behavior substantiates a belief that Caliban's (and Calibans') difference is racial" (169).

likely the result of the continual pinching that he undergoes, as described in the previous speech. In short, Prospero's use of pinching as a form of husbanding Caliban as his laborer, produces Caliban's monstrous shape through somatic marking. The image of the grotesque that he paints in this scene speaks to two maxims Bahktin observes in his chapter "The Grotesque Image of the Body" in *Rabelais and His World*. Firstly, we can see that labeling the grotesque names what "should not exist", which reinforces the notion of what "should be" by actively opposing it. As evidenced in the dissolution of Prospero's husbandry-based masque by the thought of Caliban's conspiracy, Caliban's description of the island actively opposes the paradisiacal view of the island as it "should be," which in turn frames Caliban's subjugated knowledge of the island as one that should not exist.

The second lens for viewing Caliban as grotesque is the conflation of human and animal characteristics. Bahktin asserts, "the grotesque character of the transformation of the human element into an animal one; the combination of human and animal traits, is, as we know, one of the most ancient grotesque forms."[203] By naming Caliban a monster, Shakespeare alerts the Jacobean audience to recall medical definitions of monster during the Renaissance, including the notion of children who are either malformed or do not resemble their parents.[204] Paromita Chakravarti asserts that "monsters blurred species differences, disrupting natural order, as did natural fools, who appeared to lack what sixteenth-century philosophers regarded as defining human traits: language, reason and moral responsibility."[205] The term monster, and its resonances in Renaissance humanist notions of humanity, mark Caliban's body as something that is unnatural and, more stringently, inhuman. The rhetoric of monstrosity separates him from an

[203] Bakhtin 316.
[204] Paromita Chakravarti, "Natural Fools and the Historiography of Renaissance Folly," *Renaissance Studies* 25. 2 (2011), 215.
[205] Chakravarti 215.

identifiable label as a species and specifically pushes him away from encompassing the human definition of language, reason and moral responsibility. That he has to learn language and that he is reprimanded for moral licentiousness reinforce his state as not quite human. More potently, Caliban being named a monster makes him a usurper of natural order. This makes him a troublesome figure in Prospero's conception of an idyllic pastoral island and works against Prospero's claims of possession.

Caliban's rhetorics of resistance and his grotesque body work in concert to underscore how Prospero's pinching seeks to govern and discipline him as a subject and laborer. Caliban's status as a grotesque figure places him outside and squarely at odds with Prospero's husbandry-based, and seemingly attractive, fantasy of the island. In this regard Caliban functions much like a Wild Man. He embodies many of the attributes of licentiousness and knowledge of the "forests' secrets."[206] Wild Men, like nature itself, were also largely mute or figured as babblers, which Caliban is described as being before he learned language.[207] Aside from the possible physical and psychological attributes that Caliban shares with this archetype, he functions like a Wild Man, serving society's psychological need of symbolizing "humanity's lustful, animalistic characteristics…[remaining] human in body while behaving in many respects as an animal."[208] More importantly, Alden Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan note, "the wild man opposed and rejected civilization—its values and beliefs, its virtues and order."[209] In contrast with Prospero's masque, where the magician repeatedly reminds Miranda and Ferdinand to be chaste, Caliban and his attempted rape of Miranda function as a direct opposition, or negation, of

[206] Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 70.
[207] Ibid 70.
[208] Ibid 63.
[209] Ibid 64.

Prospero's word as law. He is a reminder of the limits of Prospero's language of ruling.

This reading of Caliban as a destabilizing force in Prospero's carefully curated island fits well with the fact that he actually plots to overthrow "his tyrant". This plot is constructed when Stephano and Trinculo lead him to a point of inebriation. This scene, as the Vaughans explain, has resonances with the scene in the *Odyssey* where the cunning Odysseus gives Polyphemus "a special wine that fuddles the one-eyed giant's wits."[210] According to the Vaughans, as well as Roger Bartra, "Polyphemus is a prototype of the wild man; he lives apart from civilized society and embodies barbaric qualities in opposition to the polis."[211] Connecting Caliban and Polyphemus in both type and scenario allows us to see how Caliban serves as a liminal and oppositional character to the *polis*, comically with Stephano and politically with Prospero.

Caliban attempts to mobilize his ecological knowledge of the island as a means of exacting his revenge on Prospero. This weaponization of his knowledge relies on Stephano and Trinculo's willingness to be more just and equitable in their treatment of Caliban than Prospero's disciplining husbandry. We ultimately never see this alternative arrangement in action. But eventually Caliban does get his island back—not by active restoration but by Prospero's abandonment of it. The terms of negation return once Prospero has no need for the island because his ideal governance, the rightful rule of Milan, is restored. Caliban's suffering by the magic machinery of Prospero's word-as-law is a clear outcome of governance by manipulation and suppression, just like the climate of the island for the creation of the storm. Given that Caliban appears to be the only source of actual knowledge of the island as a food source, Prospero's discipline of him shows the magician's use of art and imagination to manipulate and

[210] Ibid 58.
[211] Ibid 58. See also Roger Bartra, *Wild Men in the Looking Glass: The Mythic Origins of European Otherness* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994).

suppress nature when it encroaches on the imagined order of the island. In this way, the play ends with Caliban getting his land back through Prospero's abandonment, and thus what we see is the undoing of land dispossession rather than an active restoration of Caliban's property rights or honoring of his ecological intimacy with the island.

IV. Conclusion

The fact that Caliban's local description and Prospero and Gonzalo's colonial inscription offer two divergent forms of writing about/onto the island underscores how land illuminates not only the power dynamics between European colonists and colonized natives, but also the importance of discursive practices to shape what that land and possession look like. This connection between power and discourse illustrates Yusoff's contention that: "taking place is also taking ways in which people realize themselves through the specific geologies of a land."[212] In Caliban's case, he relates to the island through its specific properties and details the topography and major flora and fauna of the island by means of the variety of activities he can instruct Prospero, Stephano, and Trinculo to undertake. However, when Prospero takes the island from him, Caliban complains that he is "sty[ed]…/In this hard rock, whiles you [Prospero] do keep from me [Caliban]/The rest of the island" (1.2.343-345). When Prospero departs for Milan, it is unclear whether Caliban is freed, and if he will ever see the rest of the island.

In this chapter, I have examined how *The Tempest* figures claims to the island**.** On the one hand**,** Caliban stakes his claim to the island using the language of inherited property and deep local description and intimate knowledge of the island's ecology**.** On the other hand,

[212] Yussoff 35.

Prospero and Gonzalo pitch their claims through projections steeped in English discourses of husbandry and plantations. This rhetorical divergence between Caliban's local *description* and Prospero and Gonzalo's colonial *inscriptions* demonstrates that the tense power dynamics of colonialism that animate the play are rooted in discourses about land use. Yet this tension is not a blunt tug of war between two oppositional claims to the land. Instead, Shakespeare frames these rhetorical strategies in distinct formal categories. Gonzalo's thesis about his would-be plantation on the island subverts the logic of the plantation as a labor-intensive endeavor and instead relies upon a utopian discourse that in effect makes his commonwealth on the island a "no place" where no legible signs of social organization can be found. Prospero's masque evokes the form of pastoral to cast upon the island a projection of a well-ordered landscape pleasing enough to live in and call "paradise." Finally, Caliban's description of the island mirrors a wilderness discourse, one in which the island can be understood through the subjugated knowledge of labor and lived experience rather than the discipline of English husbandry.[213]

By understanding these three competing claims to the island in terms of form, we can observe the ways in which each of these claims is rooted in legible early modern ecological views of land use and colonial exploits. The utopian, pastoral, and Wild Man discourses each offers a distinct perspective on the island's ecology and the ways that ecology fits within early modern English colonial expansion regimes**.** By paying attention to these formal representations, I argue that we must think more explicitly about land use in the play and its critique of the

[213] Caliban's labor principally involves hunting and gathering through knowledge of the island's "secret" places, not the digging and harvesting of "husbandry." Although I do not explore this connotation in this dissertation, husbandry, through the metaphor of the husband, almost always involves ideas of penetration—the plow goes into the feminized earth. Caliban's desire for procreative sex and his knowledge of the island's secret places takes on a sexual nature that while not like a husband(men) presents a reproductive and sexualized view of the island that does not involve the penetration of the island with a plow. It can therefore be argued that Caliban's subjugated knowledge of the island and Prospero's disciplining projection of husbandry onto the island forward divergent ecological *and* sexualized/reproductive views.

centrality of land use in the early modern colonial project.

Coda

The structures of dispossession and racial capitalism bound up in agriculture that I have traced in this dissertation are alive and well in our present day. On June 23, 2021, Florida district Judge Marcia Morales Howard blocked nationwide United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) debt relief payments to farmers of color. These debt payments were part of a recently passed $1.9 trillion relief package in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and the related economic fallout. The decision to block the $4 billion debt relief to farmers and ranchers who had "been subjected to racial or ethnic prejudice because of their identity as members of a group without regard to their individual identities" was the result of Howard's ruling in favor of a White farmer who sued the USDA for discrimination because he believed "the government can't allow some people to take part in federal programs while denying others based solely on the color of their skin."[214] This lawsuit was the second in what is shaping up to be a series of lawsuits by White farmers in states like Wisconsin, Texas, Tennessee, Wyoming, and Illinois who believe that they are being discriminated against because they, as White people, cannot partake in the government's targeted debt relief for farmers of color. This charge of what is essentially reverse racism flies in the face of the reality that "of all private U.S. agricultural land, Whites account for 96 percent of the owners, 97 percent of the value, and 98 percent of the acres,"[215] due in large part to decades of discrimination against Black, Native American, Asian, and Hispanic farmers.

The plight of the Black farmer in the United States over the past century encapsulates the legacies of racial discrimination propagated through land ownership and agriculture. Jess Gilbert,

[214] Chandelis Duster, "Florida judge blocks USDA debt relief payments to farmers of color," *CNN,* July 12, 2021, https://www.cnn.com/2021/06/24/politics/florida-usda-debt-relief-farmers-of-color/index.html.
[215] Jess Gilbert, Spencer D. Wood, and Gwen Sharp, "Who Owns the Land? Agricultural Land Ownership by Race/Ethnicity," *Rural America* 17.4 (2002), 55.

Gwen Sharp, and M. Sindy Felin explain that "In 1920, 14 percent of all U.S. farmers were black (926,000) and all but 10,000 were in the South. They owned over 16 million acres. By 1997, fewer than 20,000 were black, and they owned only 2 million acres, according to the Census of Agriculture."[216] This massive decline in Black farm ownership over the past century is one of the many symptoms of the racial terror that Black people experienced during the Jim Crow era and the resulting Great Migration to cities—particularly those in the North, Midwest, and West Coast. But this decline in landownership is also a story of what Gilbert et al, in their review of the literature on Black farm ownership, characterize as "African-American participation in and success at farming [being] primarily determined by the social and economic power structures operating in agriculture."[217] Historically, these power structures include lack of access to credit and federal assistance programs, like the USDA's debt relief programs, resulting in "minority farmers [being] disproportionately small scale farmers"[218] who hold smaller tracts of land and/or hold land through agricultural cooperatives. Gilbert et al contend that "racism stands out both by itself and as a contributing factor to many of the other causes of black land loss. Almost all the literature [the authors reviewed points to] continued racism as among the major causes of land loss by African Americans. Minority farmers today experience racism in the form of discriminatory implementation of federal government programs."[219] One particularly pernicious form of racism that Gilbert et al—as well as Pete Daniels, Monica White and other scholars—identify is the near total control of local USDA offices and boards by White employees and

[216] Jess Gilbert, Gwen Sharp, and M. Sidney Felin, "The Loss and Persistence of Black-owned Farms and Farmland: A Review of the Research Literature and Its Implications," *Journal of Rural Social Sciences* 18(2): 2. See also "The Land of our Fathers", Part 1 & Part 2 of the *1619 Podcast,* ed. Nikole Hannah-Jones, which, through the narrative of the Provost family's multi-generational struggles to secure and maintain their farmland, traces the unequal granting of bank funds to black farmers in the past going right up into the present (https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/23/podcasts/1619-podcast.html).
[217] Ibid 7.
[218] Ibid 7.
[219] Ibid 10.

landowners, even in Black majority rural counties. These all-White local USDA offices block Black farmers from learning about, applying for, or otherwise receiving assistance from the USDA as well as colluding with local banks to preclude Black farmers from accessing bank loans to purchase land or pay off debts. The targeted debt relief allocated in the recent COVID-19 stimulus was an attempt to redress this longstanding inequity in American farming—but just like the factors that contributed to the inequity, this federal relief for Black and other minority farmers was crushed by the weight of racism.

In many ways, the discrimination that Black landowners are subjected to is a form of retaliation against the struggle and victories of Black political power and freedom in this country. Gilbert et al recount that "black landowners were among the first to join and support the Civil Rights Movement in the rural South."[220] Moreover, Pete Daniel argues in *Dispossession: Discrimination against African American Farmers in the Age of Civil Rights,* "[t]he 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act a year later, plus growing enthusiasm for civil rights throughout the country, increased apprehension among rural elites, who feared that, despite their hold over federal programs and funds, African Americans would gain a voice in federal policy. They hoped to counter civil rights initiatives by posing as representatives of all farmers while subverting black efforts to participate in and benefit from USDA programs."[221] This discursive strategy of framing federal agricultural programs as race neutral while simultaneously undermining Black participation in these programs is exactly the one deployed in the recent Florida lawsuit. The White rural elites' investment in sabotaging Black landownership is an important tool of racial capitalism because, as Gilbert et al point out, "Landownership is

[220] Ibid 2.
[221] Pete Daniel, *Dispossession: Discrimination against African American Farmers in the Age of Civil Rights* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013), 24.

important because it is a form of wealth, not just income. As such, it can provide a spur to economic development and broader investment including the education of children."[222] With land comes wealth, and related civic and political flourishing;[223] thus, by sabotaging Black access to land, the White elite sabotage the personal and communal well-being of Black farmers. In short, by blocking Black land ownership, racist structures undermine the power of Black people.

The case of the disenfranchised African American farmer in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries demonstrates, in miniature, the argument I have made about the connection between land and people in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English literature. Throughout this dissertation, I have sought to investigate how notions of land and agricultural activity operated as central to the early modern English construction of English identity and the colonial Other and how these ideologies of land use represent, highlight, and shape land dispossession of non-landowning peoples in England and its emergent colonies in the Atlantic World. Central to my argument is the premise that regimes of land use in the early modern period allow us to see the imbrications of ecological control and rhetorics of difference and savagery that undergird the nascent English colonial project. Throughout "Making Land, Making People", I make salient the subtexts of racialized expropriation, appropriation, and subjugation in reference to land use in early modern poetry and agricultural treatises. These constructions of identity, difference, and dispossession in the country estate, avatars for Anglo-Irish settlement, and colonial projections

[222] Gilbert et al 5.

[223] Gilbert et al continue: "In the Black Belt of the rural South, where most African-American farms are located, land is still key to cultural and political power as well" (5). Additionally, they argue that "Among the studies reviewed here are those claiming that landowners make up the backbone of civic and political life in rural black communities…studies have shown that other advantages of landownership include increased personal pride, higher educational achievement of children, and an overall better sense of well-being. Property ownership, in other words, goes hand in hand with active citizenship and social independence" (2).

demonstrate the understudied centrality of agricultural practices and ideologies to the English colonial project, and thus our understanding of early modern English literature.

Moreover, the plight of African American farmers in our current day illuminates the continued legacies of the colonial violences that these ideologies of land use perpetuated. The United States of America began as an English colony that violently dispossessed Indigenous peoples of their lands and as an independent nation continued to remove Indigenous people from their ancestral lands well into the nineteenth century; the farmland of the rural Black belt, and the United States as a whole, is stolen land. Moreover, it was worked by stolen people. As Daniel contends: "Black farmers who endured to the twenty-first century represented the remnants of former slaves who began the long march to ownership during the Civil War and Reconstruction. It was difficult to move from sharecropping, where the landlord sold the crop and paid the farmer, to tenancy, where the farmer sold the crop and paid rent to the landlord, to ownership."[224] This slow, arduous crawl of Black farmers from enslaved laborers, to sharecroppers, to tenants, to landowners tells the story of the separation of African peoples from their ancestral lands through kidnapping and enslavement and the struggle to regain their personhood, labor, and access to the means of production—a struggle met at every turn by racist violence.

Still, the African American farmer of the twenty-first century also represents the capacity to resist the legacies of racial capitalist and colonial violence that flow from the ideologies of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century agriculture that I outline in this dissertation. In *Freedom Fighters: Agricultural Resistance and the Black Movement*, Monica White outlines how Black agricultural cooperatives "engaged in community development efforts as a strategy of resistance [and how] in response to extreme conditions of financial, social, and political oppression, black

[224] Daniel 5.

farmers created agricultural cooperatives as a space to practice freedom."[225] A key means by which these agricultural cooperatives, formed out of necessity as a result of lack of access to capital from banks and the USDA, staged resistance to the structures of racial capitalism was though "collective agency and community resilience."[226] According to White, Black farming collectives fostered this collective agency and community resilience through the centering of communal landownership, the promotion of political education and civic life, and the pooling of resources (such as technology and equipment as well as bartering). These kinds of strategies, White argues, first emerged with slave gardens (where enslaved people grew their own foodstuffs to supplement the very little food they were allocated by slaveowners) and continued through the nineteenth-century Colored Farmers National Alliance and Cooperative Union, the early twentieth-century Universal Negro Improvement Association (created by Marcus Garvey), and the supporters of Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Poor People's Campaign during the Civil Rights Movement. Despite centuries of colonial violence and racial capitalism bound up in agriculture, emanating from the ideologies of land use I investigate in this dissertation, nevertheless the farmer of color persists—and resists.

[225] Monica White, *Freedom Fighters: Agricultural Resistance and the Black Movement* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2018), 6.

[226] White designates collective agency as "agency that includes a willingness to give up the individual rewards granted by the hegemonic power of the social hierarchy and to find rewards in movement participation" (7). Community resilience, she explains, "concentrates on ways to adjust, withstand, and absorb disturbance, and to reorganize while undergoing change. It emphasizes structural approaches and community engagement, including types of indigenous knowledge, emotional experiences, and intraracial/interracial exchanges that communities need in order to adapt to unforeseen conditions" (8).