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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In the first book of his ambitious revision of *Arcadia*, Philip Sidney describes the titular pastoral paradise as a land that possesses a “civil wildness.” The contradictions of this phrase first prompted my interest in depictions of the natural world in Elizabethan pastoral works, including Sidney’s text, raising simple questions about the seemingly paradoxical term. What exactly does “civil wildness” mean? As we will see shortly, this question quickly proved complex as I considered the new resonances wildness took on once England began looking to the Americas with colonial ambitions. Here, though, the two words that make up the term are incongruous: the political order and presence of a governing political body in the definition of “civil” are at odds with the lack of order, cultivation and, even, desolation implied by “wildness.”¹ In fact, the most common, sixteenth-century uses of the latter term play on the complete absence of human presence in any place so described: “uncultivated state (of a place or region); the character or aspect of such a place; a wild place, a wilderness” or “waste, desert, desolate” (“wildness, n.” 2, “wildness, adj.” 4). The lack of humanity in the natural world gave the term “wild” its negative connotation. Sixteenth-century individuals might believe that without “civilization” to bring order to nature’s wildness, the land itself could be, at best, a waste of natural resources or, at worst, a threatening or degenerative force for hapless or non-resistant individuals passing through. These connotations of “wildness” make Sidney’s modifier jarring for the reader. If “wildness,” by definition, lacks civility and order, how can Arcadia be both “civil” and “wild”?  

¹ The definition of “civil” from the *OED* focuses mainly on the establishment of civilization through order and politics. “Civil” signals a “collection of people in a country, etc.” and a “body politic” (2 and 3).
Later on (by the late seventeenth century), the same phrase might not cause such a problem. The word “wilderness” would, paradoxically, become a reference to artistically arranged landscapes, and this association between art and “wild” land had left a lasting impression in English culture. For instance, a mid-nineteenth century term, “wild garden,” a phrase similar to Sidney’s “civil wildness,” refers to a garden that contains “hardy plants” arranged “in an informal setting, designed to look as natural as possible” (“wild garden”). The cultural transition of “wildness” from wilderness and desolate land with no cultivation to an informal, but artfully arranged, garden reveals to the reader what Sidney’s seemingly oxymoronic term might mean. With their reference to sculpted landscapes and human intention, later definitions of “wilderness” and “wild garden” are a stark contrast to the earlier connotations associated with words derived from “wild.” The “wilderness,” rather than being an untamed, empty “waste,” is now a result of cultivated artifice: it is “a piece of ground in a large garden or park, planted with trees, and laid out in an ornamental or fantastic style, often in the form of a maze or labyrinth” (1c, ca. 1644). The carefully planned gardens and decorative style of this supposed wilderness are not wild or desolate in any sense. These sculpted landscapes are a presentation of

---

2 Several of the words and terms I use in reference to the natural world have complicated histories. For the sake of clarification, I provide definitions here that I intend to use throughout this chapter and my project. Lawrence Buell defines “landscape” as “the totality of what the gaze can see,” and he recognizes that the word itself “implies controlled arrangement” (The Environmental Imagination 143, 141). John Barrell defines “landscape” as “seeing the land pictorially” (The Idea of Landscape and the Sense of Place). Though the term does not enter into the English lexicon until after my period, I use the word similarly to these critics in that I emphasize a human viewer in relation to land. Early modern pastorals, both literary and colonial, provide highly detailed descriptions of an idealized natural world. Though the word “landscape” as I use it here may not exist in the English language during this time, authors were still creating aesthetically pleasing, highly stylized descriptions of the natural world. “Nature” is another complex term. Throughout this project, though, I use it simply to mean “nature as the material world” (Williams, Keywords) or “the phenomenon of the physical world, collectively” (OED, 11a). Unlike “landscape,” “nature” refers to the environment in its natural state, that is its “innate,” or untouched state (“natural,” OED, A.1)
nature that masquerades, as least in name, as untouched “wilderness” but is really meticulously designed to provide a “natural” beauty for the viewer.

In my project, “civil wildness” serves as a specific type of colonial pastoral, one which defines a land as ideal when that land contains some indication that humanity has brought order to the innate beauty of the natural world and channeled its fecundity into productive ends. This application of “civil wildness,” like later use of the word “wildness,” calls to mind extravagant Renaissance gardens, where elaborate feats of engineering turned plots of land into works of art that were meant to be aesthetically pleasing and politically significant. A phenomenon that began in Italy, by the late fifteenth century these gardens had made their way to the English court of Henry VII. Renaissance gardens may, as Alexander Samson recognizes, act as “expressions of power and courtly magnificence.” The ironic use of “wilderness” to describe elaborate gardens not only demonstrates a strategic and symbolic attempt to assert control over the natural world but also shows an interest in domesticating its aesthetics, while making this control and domestication appear effortless and organic. These artfully arranged “wildernesses”

---

3 Alexander Samson, Locus Amoenus: Gardens and Horticulture in the Renaissance: “Gardens, horticulture and their literary representations intersected with many of the critical, defining social transformations of the early modern period; from shifting patterns of land use to evolving political discourses of magnificence and power, new scientific ideas about the natural world, botany and medical writing, religious changes and aesthetics. The natural world was invoked to justify and make sense of unprecedented social, cultural, and political change” (1). As Samson notes, these “large formal gardens were expressions of power and courtly magnificence” (5). For more on early modern English gardens and husbandry, see Elizabeth Hyde, A Cultural History of Gardens in the Renaissance and Leah Knight, Of Books and Botany in Early Modern England.

4 The arrangement of nature into “wild gardens” that reflected a supposedly spontaneous order recalls the concept of sprezzatura first described in Baldassare Castiglione’s Il Cortegiano (1528), translated into English by Thomas Hoby and published as The Courtier (1561). Hoby’s translation defines sprezzatura as a natural grace that strives “to cover art withal, and seem whatsoever he doth and sayeth to do it without pain, and, as it were, not minding it” (647). In Renaissance Self-fashioning, Stephen Greenblatt explains that “it is the essence of sprezzatura to create the impression of a spontaneous improvisation by means of careful rehearsals” (297). The application of sprezzatura to natural spaces is done with the same intent as it is for people. That is, it is meant to make the garden, which is really made through the hard work of husbandry and land formation, appear as an indication of the English noble’s innate grace and gentility.
were symbolic of England’s power, as the seemingly inherent beauty and order of the natural world were meant to serve as a mirror of innate traits found in the people and civilization. Just as these Renaissance gardens exhibited cultural and courtly power, textual representations of idealized landscapes, such Sidney’s description of Arcadia as a “civil wildness,” used descriptions of environment to create a link between a culture’s ability to control and shape the natural world and its supposed superiority.

The later definition of “wilderness” and Sidney’s “civil wildness” reflect English desires both to see and to make the natural world an idealized product that reflects political stability and power. Retaining the words “wildness” and “wilderness,” however, indicates an attempt to make such order seem organic rather than constructed. Such presentations of artificially idealized nature are less a foil to civilization than a reflection of what the English see as its best traits. In Arcadia, as I show in the next chapter, Sidney defines his “civil wildness” as an idealized landscape that looks as if it is cut off from civilization, but which is actually presented as an ordered, designed natural space that provides its inhabitants with the best of both worlds. Though Sidney’s “civil wildness” pre-dates the later use of “wilderness” by at least fifty years, his description of Arcadia is similar to those of the gardens in the seventeenth-century meaning of the word. For example, Arcadia’s homes are ornamental and designed to maintain the appearance of solitude, but are also close enough to encourage community: they are placed within hills and delightful groves and “scattered, no two being one by the other, and yet not so far off as that it barred mutual succor” (70). Though not a reference to the natural world in particular, the careful placement of the homes reveals action on and arrangement of nature to serve the inhabitants of Arcadia. The strategic arrangement of the homes takes
advantage of the openness of the landscape, so that the Arcadians appear to have skillfully organized their village within an environment that allows them to enjoy both solitude and community. That which is ideal in this scene is not just the beauty of the natural world but humanity’s abilities to position itself within nature to create a peaceful village.

With its careful attention to the Arcadians’ ability to manipulate nature, Sidney’s description in *Arcadia* reveals unconventional features not normally associated with the pastoral mode. The narrator cannot see the bucolic scene and its rustic characters without also noticing the ordered construction of their dwellings. This is not just a retreat where shepherds and rustics gather to sing poetic songs. It is a civilization of its own, with quaint homes placed strategically within a bucolic setting. Sidney’s Arcadian “civil wildness,” like the seventeenth-century version of “wilderness,” takes desolate, uncultivated traits of the original connotations of the word “wild” and replaces them with a version of how the English thought nature should appear: ornamental and ordered, made “better” through human ingenuity.

The connection between human ingenuity and the natural world appears, I argue, in other pastoral works as a specific subgenre, one connected with England’s burgeoning colonial project. Later, we will note that other theorists have proposed new subgeneric categories of pastoral that concentrate on the ways in which characters engage with or change the natural world to create such versions of ideal landscapes. This dissertation focuses on these subgenres as a group and argues that they are distinct from other forms of pastoral in several ways. For instance, they contain encomia to or expectations of labor in the service of leisure or of almost paradisal experience in ways that can seem
paradoxical or jarring to readers trained to expect only *otium*—leisure—within pastorals. However, as I will show, many familiar pastorals in fact display this call for labor in ways that have been ignored by scholars. This mixture of labor and leisure means that the pastorals that interest me combine components of the georgic with their more familiar generic elements, a second distinct feature. For instance, authors trace the origin and maintenance of the pastoral landscapes back to the characters themselves, rather than having these lands come from or be protected by a divine or unknown source.

Representations of idealized landscape and rustic environments play a central role in these subgenres of the pastoral. The authors’ depictions of the natural world, however, serve a more complicated role than merely acting as romanticized backdrops for shepherds’ poetic games. In these texts, landscape becomes the conduit through which rustic characters build idealized, productive communities. As we will see throughout this project, labor is key in the creation of pastoral communities, which are ideal when every

---

5 The term “pastoral” refers to a literary genre and mode, made popular by Virgil, in which authors depict “a *locus amoenus*, or peaceful rural location with flowing water and shady trees” (Payne 1005). The poetic form associated with ancient pastoral is the eclogue. As M.M. Gaylord remarks in his entry on modern “pastoral” in the *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetic Terms*, fourth edition, Renaissance attention to the pastoral added certain traits to the kind. The pastoral drama, for instance, provided a “rustic diversion to audiences in cities and aristocratic courts, using the kind’s stylized settings as backdrop for staging such concerns as workings for the affect, temperament, passions, virtues, and good government” (1006). Various scholars, such as Paul Alpers, have identified the pastoral as a “mode.” (For more on Alpers’s extensive discussion on the pastoral as a mode, see the second chapter, “Mode and Genre,” in *What is Pastoral?*) I see the pastoral as both a genre and mode: a genre in the sense that we get various formal characteristics and traits (such as the eclogue) and mode in the sense that there are prevailing themes in works defined as “pastoral,” such as that of the harmony between citizens of the pastoral place and between humanity and nature and peace associated with the pastoral. The georgic is a separate mode, also made popular by Virgil. Anthony Low declares that is a “mode that stresses the value of intensive and persistent labor against hardships and difficulties” (12). This attention to labor and hardships is what makes scholars see the georgic as “preeminently the mode suited to the establishment of civilization and the founding of nations” (Low 12). Georgic’s focus also makes it didactic, in the sense that it teaches readers to value overcoming obstacles (Congleton and Brogan 461). The georgic’s theme of labor is generally taken to differentiate it from pastoral. However, many scholars, including Congleton and Brogan, also identify similarities between the pastoral and georgic, such as their celebration of the small landowner and idealization of the simple country life. These last two traits are featured in both colonial and literary pastorals, as they allow for the glorification of labor.
shepherd contributes work that benefits all. The presence of labor in these texts results in a fourth distinct feature, in which readers will notice that humanity becomes the triumphant ruler of nature when laborers bring order to wildness and form it into idealized landscapes that, at first glance, appear simple and untouched by human hands.

Critics of the pastoral often disapprovingly cite the harmony between man and nature as a key trope for the mode, but the idea of human heroics with nature complicates that expectation. As we will see throughout my project, when authors include references to humanity’s triumph over nature, they are insinuating that the natural world—despite its innate beauty and fertility—needs constant human intervention in order to be truly ideal. Thus, the concept of the ideal is not solely rooted in the land itself, but also in the labor that shapes that land into pastures and fields. By implying the land requires such labor, these authors subtly acknowledge a more resistant natural world, one that challenges the inhabitants of the bucolic paradise.

My project argues that scholars of the pastoral have neglected to appreciate the cultural work performed by depictions of character and landscape in works by Sidney and other Elizabethan authors. Just as meticulously designed Renaissance gardens hold political, as well as aesthetic, meaning for those who conceive of and create them, the ways in which authors portray pastoral inhabitants shaping and influencing their natural surroundings can tell us more about early modern English ethics of labor and concepts of personal and national identity. In this interpretive context, pastoral labors, such as herding sheep and attending the land, often signal the rustic character’s superior moral fiber, whereas the refusal to engage in industry indicates ethical corruption. A herding shepherd boy and knitting shepherdess of Sidney’s *Arcadia*, for instance, are rustic
characters whom Sidney celebrates, whereas the clownish Dametas is a rustic character whom Sidney portrays as a foolish, uneducated boor, whose only labor is his sycophantic flattery of Duke Basilius. While the dignity of labor and the immorality of indolence are familiar tropes within English literature, in the context of contact with the Americas, they take on new valences, as the success of England’s colonial ambitions depends upon the labor performed by settlers.

Authors of English exploration literature, as I show in chapter III, exploit any reference to labor and the land as a way to claim the New World as rightfully belonging to their country. English authors often argued that the riches of the Americas should belong to those who possessed the drive and technology bring the land to its greatest productivity. Writers such as Richard Hakluyt and Thomas Harriot promoted the colonial project by arguing that the performance of labor proved beneficial to a variety of interests. While explorers, for instance, argued that establishing colonies in the New World would benefit England as a whole, they were also careful to point out the specific economic and moral rewards that settlers would enjoy from their initial investments of labor into the land. Settlers who channeled the fertility of the New World into productive crops, Harriot and others posited, would enjoy a life of ease, supported by abundant yields and unbelievable profits. Explorers and promoters of the colonial project also argued that an English presence in the New World would benefit the fertile but uncultivated land and transform it into a true paradise. As they explain, English labor and technology could convert the innate abundance of the landscape into a settlement that had

---

6 In chapter II, I discuss the significance of both the unnamed shepherd and shepherdess, who are depicted among the carefully arranged houses in Arcadia, and of Dametas, whom Basilius meets on a hunt in the woods. For his part, Basilius lacks the capacity to distinguish between the good, industrious rustic and the lazy, greedy one, as he uses Dametas and his family as a model for his pastoral retreat.
a type of “civil wildness.” For these writers, the ideal settlement would be “civil” due to its enhanced productivity, but would also retain the “wild,” unimaginable fertility that the English first encountered in the New World.

English arguments for colonization, presented in exploration literature pre-dating the establishment of the first successful colony at Jamestown in 1607, draw upon references to agricultural labor and its ability to shape the abundance of the newly found land into an English stronghold in the Americas. From one perspective it seems obvious that authors of exploration literature would focus on the labor involved in establishing a settlement; however, it is crucial to note that the same authors also often invoked a pastoral vision of a Golden Age, in which no labor would be required to benefit from the fertility of newly acquired lands. The emphasis on labor is in fact at odds with a related fantasy about colonial profit and leisure, and the presence of both in texts promoting New World colonialism indicates a larger cultural change in perceptions of idealized landscapes. By attempting to forge a connection between labor and the Golden Age, authors of exploration literature argued that humanity’s labor, not divine blessing, was the driving force behind the creation of the bucolic paradise. Although these texts often portray English settlers as real-life rustics, enjoying a life of leisure in a fertile landscape, they are also careful to point out that this leisure comes as a result of an initial investment.

\[7\] I derive my definition for “exploration literature” from the first chapter of *The Oxford Handbook of Early American Literature*, titled “The Literatures of Exploration” by E. Thomson Shields, Jr. Shields defines “exploration literature” as “a rhetorical genre, a group of writings that share a rhetorical purpose, in this case, the desire to convey experiences of a new place to people who have not shared that experience” (24). It is important to remember, though, that in English exploration literature produced from the 1580s-1609, during what Shields identifies as the “second and third” periods of English exploration of the New World, these authors also write New World lands and experiences with the expressed purpose of persuading their readers of the benefits of establishing a productive working colony. To Shields’s definition, then, I would add that “exploration literature” also includes a projection of what the English view as an ideal colonial situation: promising land that is made ideal through human intervention. This is an ideal that changes based on the author’s specific goals for the colony.
of labor that ordered land so that it could become more productive and truly ideal. Thus, in the colonial context, the ease connected to the idealized landscape is a reward—not a right—for those who have invested labor into the land. This portrayal of the idealized landscape subtly changed the cultural sense of the pastoral and the Golden Age.

In exploration literature, the bucolic paradise becomes the product of humanity’s industry and ingenuity. Settlers travelling to the Americas would earn their place within this paradise when they contributed their labor to its formation. Industrious labor, though, did not just provide the settler with a ticket into paradise. The performance of this labor could benefit the individual, economically and morally, and the well-being of the English marketplace. In his 1578 report of Martin Frobisher’s voyage to the Americas and treatise on the benefits of New World colonialism, for instance, Thomas Churchyarde cites how labor might help the laborer and his community:

The subject of our soile can lose but little in settyng idle men to worke about honest affaires: and both this lande and diverse of our neighbours maie winne muche by their aduenture, in bringing among Christians that treasure, whiche Gods enemies neither knewe howe to use, nor are worthie of. (12)

Though Churchyard references labor when he states that the men will “work about honest affaires,” he concentrates less on the act of working than what it can give the settlers and the country that supports them. For the “idle,” or unemployed, man, going to the New World will provide the opportunity to engage in honorable employment. Churchyarde’s juxtaposition of “idle men” and “honest affaires” reveals his assumption about those who

---

8 Though Churchyard does not define “idle men” here, the same term was used by other writers to describe unemployed laborers, many of whom were agricultural workers who moved to London after being displaced by the enclosure movement and had little chance of finding work in the city. In chapter III, I examine the economic shift caused by the enclosure movement and its impact on exploration literature.
are “idle”—when these men do not work, he insinuates, they are not occupied in honest affairs. In this case, industrious labor shapes the idle man by making him a productive part of his community.

For Churchyard, this ability of hard work to transform an “idle man” into an honest worker also transforms the community. In this quotation, the benefits of labor do not merely accrue to the individual worker. Churchyard’s opening phrase, “the subject of our soile,” stresses the advantages that establishing a colony would have for England as a whole. Inhabitants of England, he argues, might have to invest a little to get these men to the New World, but making this investment will “winne muche” for the country and her allies. In the last clauses Churchyard reveals what England stands to “winne” in settling the New World, and he provides an argument in support of English control of the land. The “honest affaires” of the prospective settlers will, he posits, extract “treasures” from the land and bring them among industrious Christians. As Churchyard sees it, industry improves nature by allowing its treasures to be possessed by worthy, rightful owners. “Gods enemies,” he argues, do not “knewe how to use” the treasures the land has to offer, so they are not worthy to possess its bounty. Here we see ownership determined by the ability to productively use the innate fertility of the land.

As I show in the third chapter, Churchyard is just one English author who uses references to industrious labor to claim ownership of the fertile lands of the New World. Rather than depict labor and the golden world paradise as antithetical, these authors write

---

9 An interesting antecedent to the productive “civil wildness” and the use of labor to claim colonial lands is the discussion of land use and colonialism in Thomas More’s *Utopia*. On the subject of colonial expansion, More writes that the Utopians “think it is quite just to wage war against someone who has land that he himself does not use, leaving it fallow and unproductive, but denying its use to someone who has a right, by law of nature, to be maintained by it” (67). Though my focus on texts written between the years of 1570 to 1607 places *Utopia* outside the scope of my argument, we can look to this text, and this sentiment in particular, as evidence of a long-standing link between colonial expansion and the idealization of labor.
about promising environments that can only be made ideal through the labor of industrious individuals. The act of laboring allows the settler to become a virtuous, conquering hero (as we see in Drayton below) and the “idle man” to become a productive member of society. In the colonial context, we see that pastoral depictions do not have to exclude labor. It is the performance of labor, in fact, that authors such as Churchyard, Thomas Harriot, and Richard Hakluyt use to justify English control and possession of the New World’s bounty—even in their literary representations. Importantly, though, authors of exploration literature also argued that this natural world, despite its innate promise, could not be truly ideal until those living within its boundaries used its “treasures” productively. Thus, these authors claimed that the labor settlers performed—extracting natural resources and helping the land to produce crops—not only benefited the English but also the very land itself. Exploration literature almost invariably featured New World land as set apart and distinct in its fertility and beauty, but, in a contradictory vein, authors also claimed this innate promise was lacking without human intervention. The New World was used to create a new understanding of the perfect situation: a space of immense promise that needed—at times even called out for—English styles of cultivation and farming to become a true paradise. As I demonstrate chapter III, reading these idealized representations of nature in the New World provides insight into the integral role labor played in building the English colonial ideology.

**Labor and Leisure in Early Modern English Pastorals**

Providing a closer examination of the ways in which characters in conventional pastorals interact with their environments will, I argue, offer greater understanding of

---

In chapter III, I elaborate on these authors’ understandings of an “ideal” colonial landscape, essentially one that is productive.
how English understanding of humanity’s place in the idealized natural world shifted as the country faced monumental cultural developments linked to trans-Atlantic exploration and early attempts at colonialism. As we see in texts by authors such as Churchyard, Hakluyt, and Harriot, the English linked the success of their New World colonial project to the labor of individual settlers, who would work hard to impose English forms of agriculture on New World lands. The same period’s literary pastoral, I argue in chapter IV, responds to this view of labor by featuring landscapes that reflect English ideals of community and productivity. Critics of the pastoral mode have not fully explored or appreciated how pastoral representations of the natural world and references to labor contribute to an unexpected complexity of bucolic paradises, which can go beyond serving as innocent and simple retreats for those seeking refuge from the corruption and intricacies of courtly life. When representations of pastoral landscapes include references to labor, I argue, they demonstrate the ways in which authors adapted their views of “ideal” to accommodate cultural responses to the economic and social changes brought on by the possibility of establishing a real-life paradise in the New World. For scholars of the pastoral, an analysis of labor reveals that the idealized landscape is not merely a wistful or celebratory representation of a simple, perfect natural world. Instead, these landscapes prove significant in that they reflect larger cultural concerns that focus on determining humanity’s place in and responsibility to shape nature.

Influenced by the colonial significance of labor in creating the idealized paradise, as I argue in chapter IV, Elizabethan pastoral works feature rustic communities that are functionally dependent upon the characters’ willingness to engage in some type of work. Laboring within the landscape—either through the actual manipulation of nature or
through contributions to the larger community—becomes the device that distinguishes the approved ease of “leisure” and the unapproved laziness of “indolence.” A character’s refusal to invest some type of labor into the community has an impact that is felt throughout the character’s pastoral world, as we see in Book 6 of Spenser’s *Faerie Queene*. Here, Spenser identifies a contrast between characters who labor and those who do not. Though the idealized shepherd Meliboe does not have to toil in his pastoral paradise, he still earns his place by looking after his herd and “attend[ing]” the landscape that provides for him.\(^{11}\) In contrast, the “salvage nation” and brigands, two groups also introduced in Book 6, live in the desolate wilder-nesses, terrorize their neighbors, and—as Spenser is careful to point out in both cases—obtain their livelihood through thieving and not honest labor. Spenser bases the distinction between earned leisure (Meliboe) and destructive indolence (the brigands and the salvage nation) on the idea that labor brings order to the landscape. For Spenser, and Sidney as well, labor is formative to an individual’s morality. Such labor, though, does not contribute to the simple life and the humbled persona of the rustic, but also plays a key role in contributing to the stability and order of the pastoral itself.

Scholars have recognized that the allusive quality of the pastoral allows the seemingly naïve, simple rustics to take on a complexity that reveals the political and cultural

\(^{11}\) He also leaves the pastoral for a while to be a gardener at court. Meliboe’s pursuit of gardening is unacceptable because, as he explains, he leave his pasture to seek his fortune. Spenser contrasts Meliboe with the brigands and their refusal to participate in work. I find that greed is the vice that drives both Meliboe-as-gardener and the brigands to pursue their paths. However, with Meliboe’s denial of greed and his return to the pastoral, Spenser demonstrates the proper way for humanity to approach nature and cultivate it to create a paradise. Another work to consider is one that is also presumably by Spenser, *A View on the Present State of Ireland*. In this work, Eudoxus and Irenius discuss England’s colonial presence in Ireland. As we see in the dialogue between the two characters, the shaping of nature plays a key role in building this ideology, as Irenius cites supposed misuse of natural resources as justification for English occupation of Irish lands. Spenser’s text demonstrates how early modern authors used poetics, here the political dialogue, to serve practical, often cruel, colonial ends.
concerns of the author. Pastoral works use the interactions of the rustic characters as mirrors for courtly matters. This is also the case with landscape that is a complex product of a character’s labor. Both Philip Sidney and George Puttenham, in important works of early English literary criticism, argue that the simplicity of rustic characters and their situations allows authors to address complicated social issues safely. Sidney writes, for instance, that “pretty tales of wolves and sheep” can make moral lessons more palatable to the reader, who will find within the simple stories “whole considerations of wrong-doing and patience” (“Defense of English Poesy,” 229). In his analysis of Virgil, George Puttenham argues that the rustic characters’ “rude speech” allows authors to safely “glaunce at greater matters,” such as the critique of state policy, without having to worry about the disapproval of those implicated in the shepherds’ comments. These are the arguments that William Empson builds on when he states that the pastoral objective is “putting the complex into the simple.” For both early modern and later critics, the responsibilities and dialogue of the shepherds are simpler than those of a courtier, and they are right to an extent. A simple shepherd does not have to worry about maintaining courtly relationships or eluding punitive attention from courtly powers, but critics often conflate the rustic life with one lived only in leisure, where the only labor is composing songs and competing in poetic contests. Living closer to nature does not always allow the shepherd to live a life free of complications.

12 From Sidney’s “Defense of Poesy”: “what blessedness is derived to them that lie lowest from the goodness of them that sit highest; sometimes, under the pretty tales of wolves and sheep, can include the whole considerations of wrong-doing and patience” (Duncan-Jones 229). From Puttenham’s “The Arte of English Poesy”: “but under the vaile of homely persons, and in rude speeches to insinuate and glaunce at greater matters, and such as perchance had not bene safe to haue beene disclosed in any other sort, which may be perceiued by the Eglogues of Virgil, in which are treated by figure matters of greater importance then the loues of Titirus and Corydon. These Eglogues came after to containe and enforme morall discipline, for the amendment of mans behauiour.”
Dependent upon the land, these shepherds often have to navigate their own complicated social situations. Though the bucolic settlement exists as a foil to cities and the court, the peace of the rustic character is often dependent upon and subject to economic and political forces that exist outside their paradise. The representation of labor within pastoral work alludes to these forces and allows the author to comment on elements of hierarchy or governance that render the rustic worker vulnerable. In Thomas Lodge’s *Rosalynde* (1590), for instance, Corydon’s endorsement of the country life to Aliena begins with a reference to his landlord’s intent to sell the property the shepherd lives on: “Marry, mistress….you came in good time, for my landslord [sic] intends to sell both the farm I till, and the flock I keep, and cheap you may have them for ready money” (47). Though in the speech that comes after, Corydon provides a typical description of the shepherd’s life (fortune smiles on him by increasing his flock, envy does not plague him, and his simplicity provides him peace) all that he possesses—the land and the flock—does not actually belong to him, but to his landlord, who is willing to sell it all “cheap…for ready money.” Far from living the simple life, free from care or worries, Corydon’s precarious position as a laborer—not a landowner—means that the shepherd must worry that those things that give him peace and enjoyment, “the farm I till, and the flock I keep,” can be taken away.

---

13 Interestingly, Thomas Lodge writes in the dedicatory epistle to Lord Chamberlin that he wrote *Rosalynde* while on a voyage: “Having with Captain Clarke made a voyage to the island of Terceras and the Canaries, to beguile the time with labour I wrote this book” (xxvii). Though he does not mention the Americas specifically, Brian Nellist writes in his introduction to *Rosalynde* that, in addition to his voyage with Clark in 1588, Lodge did travel to Brazil in 1591. Tomás Monterrey argues in “Thomas Lodge’s *Rosalynde* and the Canary Islands” that the “landscape of the Atlantic Islands influenced Lodge’s construction of the Forest of Arden” (132). Lodge’s experience with travelling and exploration and Monterrey’s theory that the Forest of Arden might have been influenced by the topography of the Canary islands helps to reinforce the connection I identify between nature in the Americas and representations of nature in literary pastorals.
To preserve his place in the pastoral, the shepherd must practice the art of persuasion, which we see him do in his pitch of the country life to Aliena. Corydon’s interests are protected if he can find a buyer who will allow him to remain on the property and continue living the shepherding life. When his pitch convinces Aliena to buy the property and she allows him to stay, the shepherd is relieved: “This news so gladdened the heart of Corydon, that he should not be put out of his farm” (48). Lodge’s shepherd knows that his livelihood depends upon the individual who owns his farm, and his speech is an act to help preserve his way of life. Corydon’s happiness is tied to his tilling and keeping of land and sheep that with his labor provide him enough on which to live. His ability to reap the benefits of his work, though, do not just depend on his own efforts, but upon a complicated social hierarchy that places him in a position where he does not actually own the farm or the flock or the goods he produces by working with them. By referencing Corydon’s labor, Lodge adds complexity to his pastoral landscape. The underlying argument of the shepherd’s speech to the displaced courtiers deems the landowner’s flippant displacement of Corydon, whose work supports both worker and owner, as unfair and unjust.

Lodge’s depiction of Corydon’s position alludes to the enclosure movement, in which landlords sold or converted farmlands into pastures, an act that displaced many agrarian workers. The relationship between the shepherd, as the laborer, and his landlord—not
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14 Within each chapter, I provide a comprehensive analysis of how the enclosure movement influences the culture on several fronts: first, in arguments promoting colonialism (chapter III); next, in representations of pastoral landscapes, such as this one by Lodge (chapters II and IV). Here, though, I find it helpful to include Joan Thirsk’s (self-identified) “crude” definition of the enclosure movement, as explained in the chapter “Tudor Enclosures” from The Rural Economy of England: “In the crudest accounts the movement is described thus: all over England men were enclosing their land and turning it into sheep pasture, because the wool of the sheep was more profitable to grow than any other produce of the farm. Enclosures were carried out with ruthless disregard for the rights and interests of the smaller farmers and cottagers, and were the cause of much misery and social unrest” (64).
the typical trappings of the pastoral life—is what allows Lodge to explore the social ramifications of the enclosure movement. While the countryside is a retreat for Aliena and Rosalynde, who seek refuge after their unjust banishment from court, Corydon’s references to the work he does and the threat to his way of life make this pastoral something more than a simplistic paradise. Corydon’s labor on the land, not just the abundance of nature, provides him a peaceful pastoral existence, but even his labor is not a guarantee that he will enjoy a carefree pastoral life. The interaction between the character and his environment invests the pastoral with a complexity that critics do not always recognize or appreciate.

Though critics focusing on pastoral, such as William Empson, Louis Montrose, and Annabel Patterson, do take interest in the allegorical function of the pastoral to address complex situations, they have focused their analysis on pastoral characters—not pastoral landscapes and, in particular, not on accounts of the economies and ethics of modes of production on the land. Empson, author of the seminal Some Versions of Pastoral, concentrates his analysis on “double-plots” in pastoral texts. He explains that stories about shepherds and other rustic characters serve as allegories for pastoralists’ own cultural experience. Empson, of course, coins the term that has since become a compact, go-to definition: the pastoral, he argues, “is the process of putting the complex into the simple” (23). In another important work, “‘Eliza, Queen of the shepheardes,’ and the Pastoral of Power,” Louis Montrose gives his own impression of Empson’s definition, identifying the “complex” as Elizabethan politics and arguing that the main focus of contemporary pastorals was to use the simplicity of the mode as a “symbolic meditation of social relationships,” that were, he emphasizes, “intrinsically, relationships of power”
In *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valery*, Annabel Patterson also establishes a connection between politics and pastoral. In an interesting reading of *The Shepheards Calendar*, for instance, Patterson argues that Spenser uses the social relationships between his shepherds as an allegory to comment on political and religious issues that would have been dangerous to address outright (120-127). Each of these scholars recognizes the underlying complexity within pastoral texts, and each stresses a connection between the bucolic landscape and the political world beyond the fictional paradise. In this project, however, I advocate a reading of the pastoral that looks more closely at the ways Elizabethan authors depict characters interacting with their natural surroundings, laboring within the bucolic paradise, and/or questioning or contemplating issues of ownership. The intersection of pastoral character and bucolic setting results in landscapes that are, *contra* Empson, themselves complex. I argue that it is through the creation of these landscapes that authors infuse their works with complex inquiries about personal and national identity based on views of nature and labor that changed in response to the colonial project.

Scholars who do examine the pastoral landscape often fail to see its potential for complexity. In fact, in an influential book, Paul Alpers argues that when scholars focus their study of pastoral works on ideal landscapes instead of representations of character, they often tend to see the pastoral as “feeble and self-indulgent” (34). Alpers locates the foundation of such views in the work of eighteenth-century critic Friedrich Schiller, whose essay “On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry,” written in 1796, served as an influential
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15 Patterson and Montrose thus echo Puttenham’s earlier argument that the pastoral allowed authors to make political comments that would have been impossible to do with other types of writing: “under the vaile of homely persons, and in rude speeches to insinuate and glaunce at greater matters, and such as perchance had not bene safe to haue beene disclosed in any other sort.”
resource for later pastoral scholars. Schiller argued that the ideal natural world found in
the pastoral depicts a “golden age” of innocence that is at odds with man’s fallen state.
The idealized pastoral landscape, in Schiller’s view, is separate from real-world humanity
in that it symbolizes a harmony between man and nature that man can never truly achieve
in a postlapsarian world. Alpers believes that Schiller’s reading results in later
scholarship that sees pastoral texts in three simplistic ways: as sentimental elegies that
mourn the Fall and man’s loss of innocence, as critical satires that create rustic paradises
as foils for corrupt civilization, or as hopeful idylls that “bring the real and ideal together”
and “express dissatisfaction with modern society and the individual’s desire for harmony
within himself and his environment” (32). These readings lead to the view that pastoral
works are wistful representations of an ideal that the author, and humanity generally, can
never actually attain. This means that critics who define the pastoral text by its idealized
setting can only see the work as limited and static. Such poetry is escapist, and Alpers
identifies this escapism as the quality that leads critics such as Bruno Snell and Renato
Poggioli to see pastoral works as “self-indulgent,” “jejune or callow.”

While Alpers argues that readings of pastoral works that focus on idealized
representations of nature often result in critics dismissing these texts as limited and
compromised, he does not advocate that scholars completely ignore the pastoral
landscape. Instead he directs critics to view the pastoral depiction of nature as something
that allows the character to act as a representation of humanity’s experience: “The
presence, emergence, and history of the pastoral landscape is not a matter of nature
poetry or of visionary or psychological projection but rather an interpretation, a selective
emphasis determined by individual or cultural motives, of the central fiction that
shepherds’ lives represent human lives” (27). Thus, Alpers argues, an examination of
landscape will not reveal to the reader the author’s perceptions of what constitutes ideal
nature so much as it will prove helpful in an analysis of character.

I partly agree with Alpers’s view of pastoral landscapes. When critics view the idyllic
settings as “nature poetry” or representations of some wished-for ideal, they often dismiss
the value of pastoral texts. Like Alpers, I believe that we can look to the depictions of
character to discover new significance for the pastoral landscape. Authors create bucolic
settings, Alpers argues, whose significance is in providing explanation of how rustic
characters serve the central function of the “representative anecdote,” meaning their lives
and trials represent or gesture toward the lives or trials of humanity (28). From this
perspective, pastoralists do not create these landscapes to celebrate perfect nature or to
provide an image of what they think nature should be. Rather, in Alpers’s view, the
author is concerned with providing characters with a setting that allows them to be a
specific type of “representative anecdote.” The landscape itself, then, is a blank space that
the authors construct to serve their needs for the character. Thus, Alpers states, the
pastoral can be a pasture, a forest, or any setting that allows the shepherd to serve the
author’s needs for the plot. Readers can look to the details of pastoral landscapes to
interpret the character’s significance. As Alpers argues, these landscapes often signal
how the character is a “representative anecdote” of humanity along with the author’s
“individual or cultural motives” in creating the character and this particular pastoral
world (27).

Alpers posits that the pastoral landscape is not a “visionary or psychological
projection, but rather an interpretation” of the cultural motives that the authors have for
constructing shepherds’ lives that serve as reflections of reality (27). As we see in his juxtaposition of “projection” against “interpretation,” Alpers only grants interpretive worth to the pastoral landscape insofar as it helps readers understand exactly how the shepherd is a “representative anecdote.” For him, landscape is an extension of character. The pastoralist, he argues, does not construct the pastoral setting to have a meaning or design of its own. Alpers’s analysis of landscape does much to grant pastoral texts a legitimacy of complexity, but his analysis does not give enough attention to the interaction of pastoral characters with their settings. I argue throughout this project that the introduction of labor into Elizabethan pastorals often makes the landscapes both “projections” and “interpretations.” By that I mean that pastoral landscapes do act as “interpretations” that show readers how the shepherd or rustic character is representative of humanity, but part of what these landscapes illustrate is what Alpers would call a “psychological projection” of what the author and culture see as the ideal design for interaction between humanity and the natural world. While the landscape’s meaning is not independent of the author’s representation of character, regarding the setting as a “projection” allows the reader to consider the pastoral landscape as an entity within the text that challenges the pastoral inhabitant. The interaction between pastoral character and landscape serves as a “visionary and psychological projection” of what the author sees as the ideal method of humanity’s answer to that challenge. Thus, it functions as a complement to rather than an extension of character, giving the landscape a significance that goes beyond simply acting as a backdrop for the pastoral inhabitants’ poetic games.

Elizabethan pastoralists represent the ideal interaction between humanity and nature as based on formative labor that turns the innately promising natural world into a land
that possesses a “civil wildness.” These writers are, I argue, influenced by the way in which contemporary explorers and writers use the golden age trope to describe the innate fertility and promise of New World lands. Just as authors such as Churchyard and Harriot called on English settlers to transform the fertility of the Americas into productive paradises, Elizabethan pastoralists begin to depict characters forming their own places within the natural world. My identification of this interaction between character and landscape, which turns nature into a “civil wildness,” is similar to Jeffery Theis’s analysis of what he identifies as the “sylvan pastoral,” a pastoral subgenre that also includes references to labor. Theis argues that English authors who set their pastorals in forests use the setting and its demands on character to address issues of national and personal identity and anxieties about space and place in domestic forests. My argument builds on Theis’s by seeing the landscape as a central focus of the pastoral, but I posit that the importance of the colonial project pushes these authors to extend their scope beyond concerns of domestic land practices. Instead, we see the issues and anxieties concerning the use and stewardship of land entering into an international stage. Establishing a successful colony in the Americas and showing the proper management of nature are themes that resonate in key pastoral texts in the early modern England. The presence of these themes demonstrates the cultural belief that control of the natural world serves as
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16 While Theis admits that he cannot provide a compact, neat definition of “sylvan pastoral,” his explanation of its characteristics are as follows: “The most recurrent features of sylvan pastoral are wide ranging, focusing on nature, culture, and the construction of space/place, and they manifest a decidedly performative view of identity….As such, sylvan pastoral recasts the pastoral dialects of country versus city and art versus nature to interrogate how such pairings problematize distinctions between nature and civilization” (6).

17 In chapter III, I use the work of Place Studies pioneer Yi-Fu Tuan to show how explorers use the pastoral to create “place” out of the unfamiliar “space” of the New World. These textual representations of the New World as pastoral places play a key role in situating the New World for a wider English audience, most of whom would never actually see the lands for themselves. Thus, the explorers use the pastoral as a projection—a design—of what they wish for an English presence in the New World.
physical proof of personal integrity that, eventually, leads to the formation of a colonial identity.

When pastoralists foreground representations of nature and write landscapes with features that challenge the pastoral inhabitants, they use those characters’ reaction to the natural world as a way to demonstrate individuals’ strength and flaws. As we will see, the characters’ ability (or inability) to manage the landscape speaks to cultural anxieties concerning the proper stewardship of the natural world. This happens, for instance, in the February eclogue of Spenser’s *The Shepheards Calendar*. Through Thenot’s fable of the Oak and Briar, which the older shepherd tells to Cuddie as a lesson about age and youth, Spenser brings the natural world to the forefront of his text. He personifies the Briar and the Oak in order to place them in the position of subjects to their master, the Husbandman. As the Briar presents an argument, the plant addresses the Husbandman with reverence and recognizes the man’s control over the aesthetics of the landscape. The Briar attempts to convince the Husbandman to cut down the aged Oak in order to preserve the pleasing aesthetics of the garden:

> Ah my soveraigne, Lord of creatures all,
> Thou placer of plants both humble and tall,
> Was not I planted of thine owne hand,
> To be the primrose of all thy land,
> With flowring blossomes, to furnish the prime… (163-167).

By creating the garden, the Husbandman—as “placer of plants both humble and tall”—has manipulated the natural world to suit his needs. That is, his ability to order plants into a strategically planned garden allows him to take on a powerful, almost divine position in
relation to the Briar, as the humble gardener becomes the “Lord of Creatures all.”

Spenser further highlights the gardener’s power over nature in the Briar’s acknowledgement that the gardener intentionally planted the Briar to “be the primrose of thy land.” The Briar serves an aesthetic, ornamental function within the garden, and the plant’s argument privileges this role above that of the aged Oak, whose function is not valued because it does not appeal to the Briar’s definition of beauty.

Though the Husbandman’s power is evident in his placement of Briar and Oak, his subsequent actions are flawed. When, at the end of the tale, the gardener listens to the Briar and cuts down the Oak tree, he shows his weakness. Rather than listen to both sides of the argument and react with a reasoned, logical response, the Husbandman allows the Briar’s words to whip him into a passionate frenzy: the Briar

Had kindled such coles of displeasure,
That the good man noulde stay his leasure,
But home him hasted with furious heate,
Encreasing his wrath with many a threate.

His harmful Hatchet he hent in hand,

Anger nould let him speake to the tree,
Enaunter his rage mought cooled bee:
But to the roote bent his sturdy stroke,

And made many wounds in the wast of the Oak. (191-195, 199-202)

Instead of making a balanced decision, as a good steward might, the Husbandman demonstrates poor judgment when he indulges the Briar and assesses the garden based
solely on aesthetic appeal. Additionally, the gardener demonstrates a lack of control when he allows the Briar to arouse an uncontrollable, unrestrained hatred toward the Oake. The man’s growing ire, which the poet deftly describes as “kindled…coles,” becomes so absurd and over-the-top that it comes across as almost comical. In almost every line, Spenser showcases the Husbandman’s foolishness through words such as “furious heate,” “increasing…wrath,” “harmful Hatchet,” “Anger,” and “rage.” Is this man the same “soveraigne, Lord of creatures all” that the Briar spoke to in such reverent, flattering terms? Though Thenot’s tale ends abruptly and is unresolved, as the youthful Cuddie interrupts him, Spenser’s depiction of the Briar’s plea to the Husbandman brings to the forefront human responsibility to nature. The proper stewardship of nature should balance aesthetics and function, and the gardener should have responded to the argument with a reasoned, logical approach, but this is something that he fails to do. By showing human fallibility in response to challenges found within the natural world, Spenser demonstrates what is at stake when humanity cannot approach nature with a sensible frame of mind. The “wildness” of the landscape is no longer “civil,” and it drives the individual who should be in control to react without logic or reason.

The interaction between character and nature depicted in Spenser is even more intriguing when we consider that the English, in addition to being concerned with domestic forests, were also confronted with the prospect of New World colonialism. Thenot tells his fable about the Oak and Briar in hopes of teaching Cuddie a lesson about respecting one’s elders, but Spenser’s reference to the natural world also touches on anxieties regarding human control over nature—anxieties that are augmented by England’s unsuccessful attempts to establish a colony in the Americas. As we see in
various examples of exploration literature written in the decades pre-dating Jamestown, English authors approached the lands of the New World, which they saw as untouched and pristine, with both hope and concern. Hakluyt argues repeatedly, for instance, that the innate promise of the landscape would only yield commodities to those who took initiative and cultivated its bounty. Failure to establish a productive and successful settlement, he argues in *Discourse on Western Planting*, would mean leaving the land open for other European powers to claim (Chapter XV). Thenot’s fable and Hakluyt’s argument both demonstrate pastoral situations in which the natural world is only ideal when humanity intervenes to create and maintain paradises within their peaceful environs. Just as the Husbandman must order and sustain the peace of his garden, the settler must reach out and claim the bounty offered by the New World and then cultivate that fertility to profitable ends. Improper or delayed stewardship of the land does not just make an individual look foolish, it also threatens the nation’s power by unseating its control over promising territory.

**Colonial Pastoral and Ecocritical Scholarship**

As we have seen, Spenser and Hakluyt make similar points in their representations of nature in the pastoral. Though their motivations for writing differ significantly, both authors present an interaction between humanity and nature and foreground questions concerning the role of industry and labor in determining humanity’s place and success in the natural world. These authors also feature humanity failing at this
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18 The chapter itself has a lengthy title that points to this concern: “That spedie plantinge in divers fit places is moste necessarie upon these laste luckye western discoveries for feare of the danger of beinge prevented by other nations wth have the like intention: wth the order thereof and other reasons therewthall alleaged” (274). Hakluyt ends the chapter with this warning: “To conclude yf wee doe procrastinate the plantinge….the frenche, the Normans, the Brytons, or the duche, or some other nation….will deprive us of that goodde land which nowe wee have discovered” (279).
task: the Husbandman’s haste and anger destroys the peace of his garden, and England’s inability to establish a colony threatens its ability to claim a paradise that Hakluyt argues should belong to it. The parallel between these two texts is symptomatic of a larger similarity between poetic and colonial uses of the pastoral in the decades prior to Jamestown. Just as explorers base their use of the pastoral on representations of idealized nature, which they connect to industrious labor, I argue that contemporary pastoral authors also build connections between their bucolic paradises and the development of such places using technology and industry.

To explore the cultural implications of the parallels between the use of pastoral in exploration and poetic literature, we can turn to the critical apparatus outlined in works by ecocritical scholars. Ecocritics, such as Lawrence Buell and William Cronon, study urban and manmade landscapes in order to reveal how nature and culture overlap and analyze the conflicts that arise out of that relationship. Recently, scholars have applied the tenets of ecocritical studies to early modern works, but their studies have not yet taken into account the use of the pastoral in early modern exploration literature. Late sixteenth-century English explorers to the Northeastern coast of North America,

---

19 While a first-wave scholars might look to a supposedly untouched landscape as an ideal example of nature, second-wave ecocritics would argue that no landscape, no matter how wild it may appear, is free from human influence. Thus, the latter scholars would see as much worth in studying “built,” or manmade and urban environments, as they would in supposedly pristine tracts of land.

20 Ecocriticism itself is a very diverse field, a diversity that is reflected in its application to early modern literature. Texts on early modern ecocritical scholarship range from historical examinations of human interaction with the natural world to analyses of representations of human and animal interactions. Some important texts that I do not discuss in this project include: *Early Modern Ecostudies: From the Florentine Codex to Shakespeare*, edited by Ivo Kamps, Karen Raber, and Thomas Hallock; Simon Estok, *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia*; Gabriel Egan, *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism; The Indistinct Human in Renaissance Literature*, edited by Jean E. Feerick and Vin Nardizzi. Karen Raber has also published a very helpful bibliography, “Recent Ecocritical Studies of English Renaissance Literature,” in *English Literary Renaissance*. Published in 2007, it is dated, but it provides a good starting point for those interested in exploring ecocritical scholarship in the early modern period.
specifically the central coasts of present-day Virginia and North Carolina, depict its natural resources as innately and lavishly fertile, but they also stress that the land they find is either uncultivated or under-cultivated. For modern scholars, these representations provide a fascinating case study of the transformation of a land from a supposed wilderness to a “built” landscape. The pastoral operates at two levels in this process: first, as a type of nature poetry that the English use to foreground the promise they find within the raw materials of the natural world, and second, as a state of reward to be claimed by intrepid settlers whose labor can create idyllic towns, fields, and pastures that harness the land’s fertility and direct it to aesthetically pleasing and productive ends.

These uses of the pastoral within textual accounts of exploration allow the English to build a fictive colonial presence in the New World before they are able to create an actual settlement. While the first application of the pastoral—as nature poetry employed by authors of exploration literature—might work to make these unfamiliar lands attractive to potential settlers and investors, the second use truly drives the colonial project. As I show below and in chapter III, English explorers might portray nature in the New World as a type of paradise, but they also argue that it will not be truly ideal until settlers irrevocably change it to resemble an English countryside. Ecocritical scholars such as Buell, in *The Environmental Imagination*, and Graham Huggan and Helen Tiffin, in *Postcolonial Ecocriticism*, recognize that colonizers often deploy the pastoral to make their representations of colonized lands seem more familiar and attractive to readers. However, these scholars often have not recognized the dual role that the pastoral plays in
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21 As a contrast to “natural” landscapes, examples of “built” landscapes would be urban areas, farms, ranches, or any place where humanity has obviously altered the natural world. Second-wave ecocritics, such as Lawrence Buell—in *Writing for an Endangered World*—and William Cronon, would argue that there is no such thing as a “natural landscape,” as even supposed wildernesses or uncultivated landscapes are still influenced and shaped by humanity and civilization.
the colonial context. A review of early English exploration literature, particularly texts written before 1607, reveals that explorers used the pastoral in conjunction with references to labor to make representations of nature more than just nature poetry. Authors depict what they saw as ideal by representing the land as already reflecting interaction between humanity and a promising natural world. In particular, I argue, these writings feature technology and labor as key features in shaping the idealized landscape, implying that human intervention into nature is a necessary component of the bucolic paradise.

Ecocritical scholars recognize the important role that the pastoral had in New World texts, but they often fail to recognize that while authors may praise the land within these texts as innate paradises, English explorers do not immediately portray them as already ideal. In his description of the pastoral’s role in building a European “environmental imagination” about the New World, for instance, Buell demonstrates that pastoral thought provided both a frame for the unfamiliar landscape and the motivation to establish actual settlements:

Renaissance invention of Europe’s new worlds under the sign of the pastoral…set all the following in motion: it held out the prospect that the never-never lands of pastoral might truly be located in actual somewheres; it helped energize quests, both selfish and unselfish, to map and understand those territories; and it thereby helped ensure a future interplay between projective fantasy and responsiveness to actual environments in which pastoral thinking both energized environmental perception and organized that energy into schemas. (*The Environmental Imagination* 54)
Buell is right to use the noun “invention” here, as representations within these texts are often romanticized and quite different from the lands explorers encountered. Authors of exploration literature use the pastoral, in part, to “invent” the New World for a reading public who will have little to no actual experience with the land. Buell assumes, though, that these romanticized versions of New World nature are the “never-never lands of the pastoral.” These “never-never lands,” he goes on to explain, are places that exist “under the sign of nature” (54). That is, they are places where nature is fertile, uncluttered, and pristine. While the paradisal nature in the New World is certainly all of these things, authors of exploration literature continually demonstrate that the ideal is something more. As we see in texts by Harriot, Hakluyt, and Churchyard, the “never-never lands” of the pastoral are not places that explorers find initially, but places that these authors argue can be created from the promising raw materials of the landscape. While nature poetry might provide the writers with a familiar and attractive frame for the colonial project, it is the shaping of that fertility into productive fields and settlements that the English find to be truly ideal. As we will see with Michael Drayton’s “Ode to the Virginian Voyage,” for instance, even seemingly straightforward uses of the golden age trope are juxtaposed with references to humanity subduing and maintaining the natural world. Given the role of labor in transforming the landscape into these fields, we can begin to approach the latter part of Buell’s quotation a bit differently.

While the pastoral might have helped to “energize quests” and inspire the English to map and understand New World lands, it is also apparent in these texts (and important to understand) that the “fantasy” of pastoral was projected onto the landscape as

---

22 Part of this definition comes from Buell’s definition of the pastoral ideal that he uses in Writing for an Endangered World (38).
something that explorers argued settlers could create. Human intervention in the fertile landscape, not the landscape itself, was the main component of this pastoral fantasy. Explorers perceived and invented a version of the environment based upon those parts of the land that they felt the English could convert into commodities. The energy that these early texts “organized into schemas,” then, was less dependent upon promising potential settlers the chance to enter into and enjoy a leisurely life in a paradise than on using the potential for an easy life as a reward to inspire the shaping of land through hard work and agricultural labor. Recognizing the role of labor and human intervention in creating idealized landscapes in the New World challenges the way in which both first- and second-wave ecocritical scholars view the presence of technology and labor within the pastoral.

Scholars such as Buell and Leo Marx argue that references to technology within pastoral texts result in tension. They find that the peace and reverie that come with the bucolic paradise are destroyed when obviously man-made objects invade the scene. This presence results in what Marx calls “complex pastorals,” texts that feature tension that arises when the narrator’s or character’s appreciation of the pastoral nature is interrupted by reminders of the outside world. This tradition reaches back to Virgil’s first eclogue, where the shepherd Melibœus laments the loss of his land due to the Roman government giving it to a soldier returning from war, and Marx argues that this tension between ideal and real has become commonplace in pastoral texts. Nineteenth-century American writers, such as Nathanial Hawthorne and Henry David Thoreau, feature this contrast between the rural retreat and the urban world, though technology is the reminder that

23 I focus mainly on Marx here, since his was a groundbreaking argument. For Buell’s take on the tensions that arise when humanity interferes with idyllic nature, see “Toxic Discourse,” the first chapter of Writing for an Endangered World, specifically 37-38.
invades the pastoral landscape—this is the “machine in the garden” (23). Both Hawthorne and Thoreau, Marx points out, feature the startling presence of a train whistle, which diverts the attention of both narrators away from the aesthetic appeal of the landscape.\textsuperscript{24} By making room for this reminder of the world outside the bucolic landscape, Marx argues, the “pastoral design….embraces some token of a larger, more complicated order of experience” (25). This design results in what he calls a “counterforce” that “brings a world which is more ‘real’ into juxtaposition with an idyllic vision” (25). Marx argues that many pastoral texts feature a counterforce, such as the presence of the machine, and he points out that such occurrences show the limitations of pastoral texts. The conflict between the real and ideal can never fully be resolved; art and nature are at odds in the pastoral world.

Both first- and second-wave ecocritical scholars argue that pastoral landscapes are unable to remain ideal when the text also includes references to technology or a reminder of the world beyond the bucolic paradise. In early English exploration literature, however, explorers depict lands that do not truly become ideal until they contain some reference to human interference within the natural world. In a excerpt from his \textit{First Voyage to Roanoke} (1584), for instance, Arthur Barlowe describes the beauty of the landscape by interspersing his description of nature with references to humanity:

\begin{quote}
24 Marx uses the following scene from Hawthorne’s journals to illustrate his point: “But, Hark! there is the whistle of the locomotive—the long shriek, harsh, above all other harshness, for the space of a mile cannot mollify it into harmony. It tells the story of busy men, citizens, from the hot street, who have come to spend a day in the country village, men of business; in short of all unquietness; and no wonder that it gives such a startling shriek, since it brings the noisy world into the midst of our slumbrous [sic] peace. As our thoughts repose again, after this interruption, we find ourselves gazing up at the leaves, and comparing their different aspect, the beautiful diversity of green” (qtd in Marx 13-14). There is a similar scene in \textit{Walden}, in which Thoreau compares the train whistle to a hawk’s cry, and he—like Hawthorne—shows how the train brings people who are not normally found within the countryside, such as merchants, buyers, etc.
\end{quote}
This lande laye stretching it selfe to the West, which after wee founde to be but an Island of twentie leagues long, and not above sixe miles broade. Under the banke or hill, whereon we stoode, we beheld the vallies replenished with goodly Cedar trees, and having discharged our harquebushot, such flocke of Cranes (the most part white) arose under us, with such a crye redoubled by many Ecchoes, as if an armie of men had showted all together. (3)

In the very first sentence, Barlowe personifies the natural world as “stretching it selfe” and presenting its glory to the explorers who view it from their vantage point on a hill. Barlowe highlights the details of the valley, and this allows the reader to be in the scene with Barlowe and his group, looking out at and appreciating the island with its “vallies replenished with goodly Cedar trees.” Elements of the natural world dominate the description until the middle of the quotation. Some indeterminate individual in the group—he references “we” throughout—fires a weapon and the sound of the “harquebushot” startles a “flock of Cranes (for the most part white).” Here Barlowe weaves references to humanity and technology with the detail he provides about the natural world so that the juxtaposition enhances the scene’s aesthetic appeal. The gunshot results in a scene where the green valley covered in cedar trees becomes the backdrop for a large number of white cranes, who ascend into the sky with a cry in response to the men. This quotation includes obvious references to the world normally found outside the

---

25 As I will show in the third chapter, using the work of Yi-Fu Tuan, providing a textual detail that puts the colonizer on top or above the land is one of the ways in which authors wrote an unfamiliar landscape as place. Even the position is strategic, placing the narrator on a hill allow the author to place the English in a position above the land and take in all they see. This positioning ties in with what Buell notes in the quotation above, where the dream of the pastoral pushes explorers to map and understand the unfamiliar terrain. Additionally, Barlowe’s use of perspective here anticipates later ways of thinking about landscape, as described by John Barrell in The Idea of Landscape and the Sense of Place. Barrell writes that “landscape” was introduced by the Dutch in the sixteenth century and used by Milton in his L’Allegro (1632), and it “referred to a tract of land, or its representation in painting, which lay in prospect—that is to say, which could be seen all at one glance, from a fixed point of view” (1).
pastoral: the gunshot and the birds’ cry that reminds Barlowe of “an armie of men.”

There is no indication, however, that the human elements in Barlowe’s text have the effect that Marx and Buell argue occur when authors include references to technology and humanity in their pastorals—the human elements do not rupture the natural phenomena, but rather help to flush them out and even to understand them by allowing them to know the nature of the cranes’ cry.

The loud, piercing noise of the man-made object interrupts the group’s absorption in nature, but the sound actually adds to the appeal this valley has for Barlowe and his men. Paired with the birds’ army-like cry, the gunshot provides Barlowe with the chance to symbolically claim the landscape for the English. The group stands on their perch above the valley and uses the gunshot to manipulate the scene before them. They might like the land and its “goodly Cedar trees,” but their intervention into the landscape allows them to make what they see more ideal by adding the dramatic rise of cranes to the beautiful trees before them. While the birds reply to the shot with a cry that reminds Barlowe of an “armie of men,” this does not take away from the group’s appreciation of what the landscape has to offer. In fact, immediately after this scene, Barlowe launches into a list of all the wild game, trees, and other resources that might be taken from this valley (3). While the cranes remind Barlowe of an army, his description of them ascending into the sky portrays that army as in retreat. The initial gunshot allows Barlowe to empty out the valley—with dramatic flair—so that the English are left to appreciate and claim all the trees and game they find within the valley.26

26 According to Michael Shrubb, in Feasting, Fowling, and Feathers: A History of the Exploitation of Wild Birds, Cranes were used in grand feasts and, along with herons and swan, were an “important mark of status” (23). Shrubb remarks that Cranes were no longer breeding in England by the seventeenth century (24). This makes the presence of cranes in the Americas and Barlowe’s reference to them specifically in
This scene features a representation of idealized nature that is different than what ecocritical scholars normally associate with the pastoral. For the early English explorer, the landscape’s innate beauty was not ideal until it could be made productive. The goal behind these texts was to show the promise that this untouched nature could have for those who properly order and use its abundance of animals. These explorers hoped to invest this landscape with a type of “civil wildness,” where the unrestrained bounty of nature could be controlled and directed at commercial aims. The gunshot and landscape in Barlowe’s scene allows the author to demonstrate the first steps toward such ordering. Though the men do not perform the labor of cultivation, the gunshot and its effect on the birds allows the group to show the ability of their technology to profit from their natural surroundings. I argue that Barlowe is not alone in his use of technology within this scene. Authors who refer to the golden age in their descriptions of the New World often weave together natural details and references to technology and human intervention. Rather than destroying the pastoral dream, this interweaving is a way in which the English assert control over the paradises of the New World.

My position arguing that authors of exploration literature see labor and technology as a means to influence nature and to create an idealized landscape puts me at odds with many genre critics and ecocritical scholars, who most often associate the golden age trope with *otium* and the absence of toil. While many critics have long associated colonial texts with Edenic tropes, their focus on leisure causes them—like Marx—to see the use of the pastoral in a colonial context as compromised. The dream of

---

this scene even more significant to the portrayal of this landscape as a golden world. Barlowe’s text shows readers a land where cranes, a mark of status that was difficult to attain in England, were readily available to those who were brave enough to make the trip across the Atlantic.
a paradise, they argue, breaks down once settlers experience the realities of frontier life.\(^{27}\) Ken Hiltner argues in the last chapter of *What Else is Pastoral?*, for instance, that the *otium* associated with pastoral makes it unfit for long-term use in colonial texts. The georgic tropes of toil and conquest, he reasons, are better suited for such ventures. I agree that early English writers did not prepare the settlers for what they would actually face in Virginia. However, I maintain that the earliest explorers attempted to incorporate georgic tropes into traditional pastoral conventions as a way to accommodate and idealize the need for labor in the New World. How the combination of georgic with pastoral works varies depending upon the individual author, but the effect across these exploration texts is similar. Labor, or some other form of human intervention into nature, becomes the tool that the English can use to shape their own pastoral paradises.

Historians often identify Barlowe’s narrative of his visit to Virginia as one of the most idealized.\(^{28}\) Despite his frequent use of adjectives such as “sweete,” “fruitfull,” and “plentiful” to describe land in the New World, however, Barlowe’s overtly positive text does gesture toward the georgic valuation of labor. In the example above, his idealistic view of nature in the New World is enhanced by the presence of technology. This overlap between nature and culture continues as he describes the agricultural practices of the Secotan. He tailors his description of agriculture to appeal to an English audience and to show the ease associated with work in the New World: “they cast the corn into the ground, breaking a little of the soft turf with a wooden mattocke, or pickeaxe: ourselves

\(^{27}\) This is a line of argument that runs from genre to ecocritical and colonial scholarship. For more, see Buell’s *The Environmental Landscape* and his argument about the “settler pastoral” (54). Also, Jeffrey Knapp references the “delusory pastoral” in his book about the colonizer’s use of poetics to create a fictional “nowhere” that draws more from pastoral ideals than from actual landscapes.

\(^{28}\) For instance, David Quinn links Arthur Barlowe’s favorable portrayal of New World land as an Eden to the English failure to set up a colony in the decades preceding Jamestown (*Set Fair for Roanoke* 32).
prooved the soile, and put some of our Pease into the ground, and in ten days they were of foureteene ynches high” (7). With his references to the wooden tools and the “soft turf,” Barlowe certainly preserves a sense of ease in his description of the farming techniques. While reading this description, however, one must not dismiss the fact that the author is depicting and idealizing methods of agriculture. The sense of the golden age remains, with his reference to the fertility of the soil that allows English peas to grow “fourteen ynches high” in just ten days, but men must take advantage of the soil’s fertility by performing some work. The labor Barlowe depicts is not the toil readers associate with the georgic, but the activity within the quotation is also not the *otium* normally associated with the pastoral. Barlowe juxtaposes ease and labor so that the labor itself becomes idealized, and doing so allows him to show that the reward for such activities is a bountiful return. In this passage, Barlowe incorporates the georgic into the pastoral as a way to show that, given the right fertile environment, the English could form their own paradises.

The explorers’ incorporation of labor into representations of idyllic nature influences contemporary pastoral literature in early modern England. As I argue in chapter IV, authors of late Tudor pastorals also begin to expand the boundaries of their paradises in order to incorporate more georgic tropes, such as references to labor and representations of humanity acting as masters of the natural world. Landscapes in these pastorals are influenced, maintained, and even created by characters rather than being the product of an unseen, divine hand. While recognition of the pastoral’s allusive potential has ensured that scholars see some political complexity in these works, I argue that given the cultural anxiety over the unsuccessful colonial project, these texts also depict
complex interactions between characters and their environment. I stop short, though, of claiming (as Hiltner does) that pastoralists are often writing about “literal landscapes” (Chapter II). For many of these pastoralists, the Americas were a figurative space. Though the Americas did actually exist, the writers’ experience with it came entirely from texts written by explorers such as Barlowe and Harriot. The combination of georgic and pastoral conventions that occurs within exploration literature brings to light several issues that pastoralists also contemplate, such as those of land ownership, productivity, and the role of labor in idealized landscapes. Just as scholars view the pastoral as a simple, safe platform from which to address complex political issues, I argue that it also provides a figurative space where writers and readers can contemplate the origins and philosophies of idealized natural worlds.

When authors include labor within their pastorals and use their texts to consider issues related to the origins of the idealized landscape, they are often also addressing complex cultural and social concerns. Many scholars, such as Raymond Williams, see the pastoral fantasy as idealizing country life to the point that it offensively elides any mention of the social and economic realities of those who actually live and work within the countryside (26, 45). Other ecocritical and genre scholars read the pastoral similarly.²⁹ When viewing late Tudor pastorals with an eye toward human intervention into nature, however, one can see a subtle trend emerging that challenges this common complaint against the pastoral. Revisiting the scene when Lodge’s Corydon appeals to Aliena, for instance, we see a pastoral that actually does take into account the vulnerability of the rustic worker, who labors and keeps the landlord’s property, but who

²⁹ Among a few there are: Greg Garrard’s chapter “Pastoral” in Ecocriticism, Huggan and Tiffin in the “Entitlement” chapter of Postcolonial Ecologies, and Buell in “American Pastoral Ideology Reappraised.”
does not own what he produces. Though Rosalynde is a pastoral romance, including this scene within the text allows Lodge to pull the reader’s attention away from the fantasy for just a moment. Here is a character whose existence is as vulnerable as an actual laborer’s, and who must contend with the reality that his life within the pastoral is threatened by forces out of his control—forces driven by a hierarchy that privileges landowners over laborers.

Lodge acknowledges this privilege in Aliena’s response to Corydon’s predicament. When she agrees to buy the property, the displaced princess is careful to point out that any labor she and Rosalynde, her “page,” perform will be done for pleasure and not out of necessity: “I will buy thy farm and thy flocks, and thou shalt still under me be overseer of them both: only for pleasure sake I and my page will serve you, lead the flocks to the field, and fold them” (47). Not only does this response reinforce Aliena’s privilege as a courtier (she apparently wanders around the countryside with enough cash to buy a farm), but it also gestures to the very same class system that threatens Corydon’s livelihood. Aliena appoints Corydon as an overseer, but she is still the owner of all livestock and property. He may be saved by this purchase, but in his position “under” Aliena, Corydon is just as vulnerable as he was with his last landlord. While the shepherd finds hope within this transaction, at the end of the scene Lodge carefully reminds readers what is at stake for those who live as laborers on another’s land: “This news [Aliena’s purchase] so gladded the heart of Corydon, that he should not be put out of his farm” (48). 30 Read with Aliena’s speech, this quotation presses the urgency and the inequality

30 At the end of the work, Gerismond, the rightful king whose rule has been usurped by Torismond, is restored and Aliena returns to court. Gerismond makes Corydon the “master of Aliena’s flocks,” and his place is secured. While his place and happiness in the pastoral world is secure, it is clear that the fruits of his labor do not belong to him, but to his landlord, Aliena.
between the shepherd and the princesses. Aliena and Rosalynde work because they find it
a pleasant diversion, while Corydon labors so that he may afford his life in the
countryside. Unlike the banished Aliena and Rosalynde, who have the resources to
purchase land after they are turned away from court, being “put out of his farm” means
he would have little hope of finding refuge elsewhere.

I argue throughout this project that other pastoralists are, like Lodge, beginning to
stretch pastoral conventions to address and explore issues of land ownership and labor
within idealized landscapes. Prompted by a larger cultural desire to form a “civil
wildness” in the Americas, more pastoralists are seeking ways to explore the issues that
come with building a paradise. In writing about unruly or uncultivated nature in such
artistic, idealized terms, these writers and their colonial counterparts subtly redefine
cultural attitudes toward uncultivated nature. Ecocritical scholar William Cronon argues
that up until the eighteenth century, the term “wilderness” evoked fear in the audience—
fear of desolate, savage nature (70). However, representations of uncultivated nature
within exploration literature feature a different way of seeing wilderness as more
promising than threatening.

In fact, these texts have descriptions of wilderness that describe it in ways similar
to later uses of the word “landscape.” John Barrell notes that the educated eighteenth-
century viewer could not help look at a tract of land without regarding (and
reconstructing) it in terms of artistic patterns applied in landscape paintings. He argues
that “The contemplation of landscape was not…a passive activity: it involved
reconstructing the landscape in the imagination, according to principles of composition
that had to be learned” (6). Sixteenth-century English explorers of the Americas
anticipated Barrell’s way of viewing landscape through the filter of artistic conventions. As we’ve seen, Barlowe and other authors imposed the conventions associated with the golden age trope (specifically overwhelming fertility and the harmonious interaction between nature and humanity) upon the land they encountered. Thus, they viewed and reconstructed in their texts the actual terrain in terms of pastoral ideals and georgic work ethic. As we will see, this approach to wilderness, which sees it as already shaped and formed into an aesthetically pleasing landscape, proves to be a strategic move that allows the English to impose a colonial sense of ownership over the land without actually having to build a settlement. The text, then, becomes a figurative space in which the author and reader can cognitively engage with, reconstruct, and claim actual terrain. This sets the precedent for pastoralists, I argue, who also begin to see the idealized landscape less as a work of art and more as a way to approach and engage with the issues that arise with land in reality.

Tied to the fantasy of the pastoral but rooted in the realities of creating a settlement, authors of exploration literature seek to tame the unrestrained fertility of nature by combining references to labor with the conventions of the golden age. Explorers’ use of the pastoral in their descriptions of the New World operates as more than just a celebration of nature or propaganda to lure potential settlers and investors. Rather, they change pastoral conventions to bolster a colonial ideology that promotes the idea that they are the ones best equipped and most qualified to make the promising land a “civil wildness.” Their use of the pastoral in this way changes how authors use pastoral conventions in their poetic literature. As I will show in the subsequent chapters, we see hints of this occurring in *As You Like It*, in Book 6 of Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene* and
throughout his *Shepherd’s Calendar*, and in Sidney’s *New Arcadia*. The pastoral landscape itself becomes more complex as authors address the issues of land and ownership that arise in the culture as England develops a growing interest in colonial endeavors.

**Pastoral and Property Rights in the New World**

Strategic deployment of the pastoral to describe American wildernesses as promising landscapes helped English writers and explorers such as Richard Hakluyt, Thomas Harriot, Walter Raleigh, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, and Michael Drayton to assert and justify ownership of these newly discovered lands. Authors of exploration literature do not just use the pastoral to create a fantasy landscape that would inflame English desire to explore new lands and, possibly, find new trade routes and commodities. By joining pastoral and georgic conventions, these writers sought to prove that English settlers were the ones who were best equipped to draw out and enhance the natural world. Altering the environments they encountered would allow the English to create a physical signal of their right to claim the land as their own. In these texts, the bucolic paradise normally associated with the pastoral is transformed into a landscape that resembles Sidney’s “civil wildness” or Theis’s “sylvan pastoral.” Exploration literature often features a natural world that is fertile and aesthetically pleasing, but it also represents nature as uncultivated enough so that it challenges the settlers to reorder the natural resources to productive, profitable ends. This reordering, explorers argue in their texts, proves England’s right to possess the land.

Depictions of physical changes to nature, such as the transfer and manipulation of its fertility into agricultural productivity, are in line with early modern theories of
ownership and colonialism. Historian Patricia Seed argues that the English asserted ownership of the New World lands through the written word, specifically in official letters of patent, and by “taking possession—the placing of the bodies of Englishmen on American soil with the intent to remain” (190-191). Unlike Spain, England’s form of taking possession did not include performing elaborate ceremonies to show dominance over native inhabitants. Instead, the English showed their “intent to remain” and, thus, their ownership of the land, by changing how the environment looked: “In the New World, building houses, forts, or other property, which the letters patent describe as habitation, was sufficient to prove possession. Building permanent dwelling places or boundary markers manifested the intention to remain that was essential to taking possession” (191). As Seed recognizes, establishing habitation could only occur outside of a written text. She states that the English were distinct from other European powers in that they believed creating visual, physical representations of control over the environment was the most important step in proving their right to stay in the New World and to take land from native populations, some nomadic, that did not create similar dwellings. Building forts, houses, and other properties meant clearing room in dense
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31 Spanish and Catholic officials produced the “Requiemiento” in 1513. This document declared Spain the rightful owner of American lands and supposedly gave Spanish emissaries right over the native inhabitants of the land. Officials argued that the solemn reading of this document to those inhabitants provided adequate chance for the indigenous peoples to convert or submit to Spanish rule. If there was any sign of resistance, or no reaction at all, the document gave the Spanish conquistadors full right to enslave and kill the native population. In Historia de las Indias, Bartolomé de las Casas provides an account of the reading of the Spanish Requirement in the Americas. He writes that the reading of the document was often useless, as the indigenous population did not know the language: “Estos, salidos del puerto de Santo Domingo, porque de allí era su embarcaje, llegaban á la isla ó á la parte de tierra firme donde ir acordaban que más cómodo hallaban, y desde los navíos hacían sus requerimientos, y aunque los hicieran al oído de cada uno de moradores, como fuese en nuestra algarabía, no entendieran ni entendían palabra, y desto daba testimonio el: Veedor como en tal puerto de tal isla ó provincial de la tierra firme se había heco el requerimiento que Su Alteza mandaba” (188). Additionally, historian Lewis Hanke points out that ship captains often read the document either while on board (so only they or their men could hear) or to empty huts or villages whose inhabitants were sleeping (34). When they received no response, these captains and conquistadors would attack and decimate the villages, enslaving and killing the inhabitants.
forestland and constructing structures that looked like the ones in England and Europe, which was no easy feat in unfamiliar terrain.

Asserting mastery of the natural world and creating visual representation of control over land meant that settlers needed to perform toilsome labor, which might seem out of place in texts that promise an abundant nature that readily provides for the human inhabitants. However, as I argue in chapter III and with my reading of Drayton’s “Ode to the Virginian Voyage” below, when explorers write about the New World nature and describe it in terms of the pastoral, they are already asserting their “intent to inhabit” the land, establishing place within the undefined space through surveys, evocations of future settlement, and poetic treatments of American abundance. Though they are not erecting a structure or putting up a fence, by building fictional representations of supposedly untouched lands they take the first step in establishing a colonial ideology and claiming ownership of the New World.

**Drayton’s “Ode to the Virginian Voyage”**

In his “Ode to the Virginian Voyage,” written in 1606 to celebrate the impending voyage that would eventually establish the Jamestown colony, Michael Drayton uses subtle references to the interaction between humanity and nature to establish a claim over the resources and land of the New World. Drayton deploys the pastoral convention of the golden age in his description of a natural world so fertile and abundant it makes its resources readily available with little to no labor. There are, however, tropes within the ode that ground the fantasy of the pastoral within the realities of conquest and possession. For instance, while Drayton invokes the pastoral when he charges Britons to take advantage of the abundant natural riches offered by “Virginia/Earth’s only paradise!”, he
also charges them to “Go and subdue!” that very same paradise (l. 24-25, 4). “Subdue” has a martial connotation, as it brings to mind forced, violent control, and its use is paradoxical next to Drayton’s idealized description of Virginia’s lush environment. The land may offer pearls and gold, game, and bountiful harvests to those who make the journey, all riches the poet promises will come with little toil on behalf of the settlers, but Drayton’s choice of “subdue” indicates that this unrestrained, uncultivated fertility needs to be controlled. Virginia in the ode is a fertile and accommodating paradise, but the presence of words such as “subdue” indicate that Drayton’s approach to the land is more complex. The English might claim to find paradise in the New World, but the ode insinuates that even paradise requires the show of force and, maybe, intimidation to be made into a successful habitation.

In the second stanza of the ode, Drayton extends his representation of the complex interaction between humanity and fertile nature. In this stanza, Drayton charges the settlers to harness the power of potentially destructive nature, which becomes productive and helpful with English intervention. The last line of the stanza, for instance, ends in a simile that compares the “merry gale,” which fills the sails and propels the settlers’ ship, with the settlers’ “vows”:

Britons, you stay too long;
Quickly aboard bestow you
And with a merry gale
swell your stretch’d sail,
with vows as strong
as the winds that blow you!” (l. 7-12).
Drayton begins his stanza with a command that readers might see as a rebuke. The English “stay too long” on their island, and Drayton pushes them to venture to Virginia in order to fulfill their destiny. The subsequent simile works on in two ways. First, Drayton compares the strength of the vows with that of the winds, imagining human intention and the natural forces that physically propel them as fundamentally similar. The formation of these vows and the willingness to follow them are just as important in driving the settlers forward as the wind that pushes their ship. In this reading, the natural and human worlds operate with similar direction and force but are still separate.

Secondly, the placement of the simile, right after the description of gales that “swell your stretch’d sail,” conflates the vows and winds, making both work in tandem to push the ship. Drayton’s use of “with” at the beginning of line 11 ties the word “vows” to “gales” and “winds.” Each noun exists as an equal agent in the narrative, and each plays an equal and active part as one in order to get the English to the New World. Though this stanza shows nature and humanity in partnership, the poet’s description of the “merry gale” is discordant, as is his charge to “subdue” paradise. In nature, “gales” are not “merry.” They are, in fact, winds “of considerable strength” and are associated with storms (“gale” n3.1 OED). Drayton may assign a positive adjective to these winds and recognize that they are strong enough to fill the sails, but this does nothing to alleviate the implication of what might happen if skillful sailors are not on hand to harness their strength. While the placement of the simile initially appears to conflate the human and natural worlds, the discordance between Drayton’s upbeat tone and his references to these strong winds actually advocates human control of land. In this stanza, the English
harness the potentially dangerous gale and direct its power to useful ends. Through labor, unrestrained nature is controlled to be productive and helpful.

For Drayton, the demonstration of control over nature does not just apply to potentially dangerous weather. The poet inserts a reference to force later in the ode, upon his description of the settlers landing in the New World paradise. Just as Drayton portrays the control of the “gale” as a tool the English can use in support of their voyage, the show of force in this stanza reveals another way the English might control and “subdue” the natural world for their gain. He writes,

In kenning of the shore,
Thanks to God first given,
O you, the happiest men,
Be frolic then!
Let cannons roar
Frightening the wide heaven. (49-54)

The first hint of complexity in this stanza occurs in the order of its lines. Drayton’s reference to the divine occurs as a parenthetical insert reminding the settlers to thank God for their safe arrival. This placement of the divine—wedge between the first view of the shore and the “happiest of men”—allows the poet to acknowledge God but it does not make the divine the central focus of the stanza. In fact, the curious last line, in which cannons “roar/Frightening the wide heaven,” produces a moment when the settlers seem to challenge God for this fertile, uncultivated land. The force and violence of a word like “frightening” contrasts with the gleeful “frolic” of the newly arrived settlers. This ode supposedly promises easy living in a fertile space, but for the second time, Drayton feels
compelled to create a show of force that proves man’s dominance over the natural world. This dominance extends not only to nature and the heavens, but to God as well. While the word “heaven” here means the sky and all that the settlers can see, the word—of course—also has a religious connotation. While readers might not think to push this religious subtext, the mention of God in the second line brings this meaning to the forefront. Thus, the settlers are not just “frightening the wide heaven,” but also challenging the divine being whom Drayton recognizes as the creator of the land. The implication of this link between the frightened heavens and God is that the poet sees the land as belonging to those who can properly subdue the natural world. Man, not divine force, can claim this paradise.

In his essay on the poem, Michael D. West writes that Drayton’s concentration on Virginia as a golden world is antithetical to the poet’s desire to portray the English as heroic conquerors of the New World. The inconsistency between the pastoral and the heroic in the ode, West argues, represents the poet’s unwillingness or inability to recognize the discrepancy between the two modes. Having both, though, does not necessarily signal the author’s shortcomings. The poet’s references to heroic actions do not oppose the pastoral details of Virginia’s “fruitful’st soil” and its enjoyment of a “golden age.” The English settlers are not heroic in opposition to pastoral Virginia. Rather, they are heroic in that they are able to assert their claim over the riches of this golden world. Brief references to forceful human control or an unruly natural world do not contradict the poet’s insistence that the soil will provide “without your toil,/Three harvests more,/All greater than your wish” (28-30). Rather, demonstrations of this control show how labor and human intervention can take the promising natural soil and make it
into a golden world of the pastoral, all while using labor and the reformation of the land to claim ownership over the land the English encounter. This interaction between pastoral and georgic conventions fits with the central argument of England’s colonial ideology. Those who work hard to form the fields and pastures needed to make this land ideal and productive, it posits, deserve the right to claim the land as their own. As Seed points out, the belief that changing the land by forming settlements served as a cornerstone of England’s imperial and national identity. What we see in Drayton, then, is how poetic treatments of America play into this ideology, through their use of pastoral and georgic elements that highlight the promise of the American landscape.

**Project Overview**

I began this chapter with the question that prompted my interest in the pastoral: “What does ‘civil wildness’ mean?” This introduction provides an answer to that question, first through the exploration of the pastoral mode and then through exploring the use of the pastoral in a colonial context. My next chapters continue to explore the “civil wildness” by providing close readings of both colonial and literary versions of the pastoral. This project begins with a case study of Sidney’s *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia*, specifically the three versions of the pastoral the author presents in the first book. Even this idealized pastoral romance, I argue, includes references to georgic tropes that indicate that proper management of landscape is key to making Arcadia truly ideal. We see this in the progression from Sidney’s opening scene, featuring the shepherds Claius and Strephon lamenting the loss of their beloved, Urania, to the “civil wildness” found in the landscape of the country Arcadia. Sidney’s transition from the first type of pastoral to the second highlights, I argue, a greater emphasis on the stewardship of
nature. In particular, Sidney features a landscape where the “civil” manifests as human mediation of the land’s promising innate features, the “wild.” This ideal way of managing the land, however, breaks down with Sidney’s final version of the pastoral, that of Basilius’s encampment in the woods, where little labor occurs.\(^{32}\) I argue that Sidney, as a landowner and an investor in the New World colonial project, was influenced by the changes that occurred in colonial pastoral and this influenced how he presented the idealized landscape in his monumental work. There is a thin line between leisure and indolence in Sidney’s pastoral landscapes. That line, as we will see, is determined by the type and amount of work that the inhabitants invest in their paradises.

In Chapter III, I continue to establish pastoral’s importance in the early colonial project. Though explorers used familiar conventions of the pastoral golden age, their use of the mode was more strategic than creating paradises that would attract settler and investors. These explorers, I argue, joined pastoral and georgic tropes to promote a new version of the golden world: one that was both ideal and commercial. Using the work of place scholar Yi-Fu Tuan, I show how the creation of these productive paradises was key in taking the New World from an uncultivated, unfamiliar space to a defined place. As I have just suggested, these texts operate much like the physical dwellings that Seed argues signaled English control of newly discovered lands. They feature the English figuratively forming pastoral landscapes in the New World, an important first step in establishing a colony. Pulling from both pastoral and georgic traditions, authors of exploration literature

\(^{32}\) After hearing a prophecy from the Oracle of Delphi predicting that his two daughters, Pamela and Philoclea, will be wooed by two lovers who will threaten his rule, Basilius leaves his post as duke of Arcadia to escape his fate. The “pastoral retreat” that he establishes is less than ideal: it is a distraction that takes him away from his duties as ruler and it is place where gender, class, and sexual boundaries are blurred or erased. In addition, as I argue in the final chapter, this version of the pastoral—unlike that of Arcadia—also features very little stewardship of the natural world, and the unrestrained wildness of nature serves as the center of conflict for much of the work.
helped to lay a foundation for an English colonial ideology that argues land rightfully belongs to those who can use it best.

Authors of exploration literature clearly foreground representations of nature in their depictions of America as a golden world. My next chapter looks at sixteenth-century literary “versions of the pastoral,” and it argues that authors such as Shakespeare and Spenser pick up on the importance of nature in their use of pastoral conventions. While scholars such as Alpers focus more on rustic characters’ interactions with each other, I argue that given the use of the pastoral in exploration literature, we need to pay more attention to how literary characters interact with their natural surroundings. Drawing on the work of genre scholars such as Empson, Alpers, Patterson, Anthony Low, and Alastair Fowler, I show how these pastorals often blend georgic and pastoral conventions to make their representations of nature—like those found in the colonial texts—more complex than previous scholars have recognized. Focusing on how characters influence, manipulate, or build their pastoral landscapes allows readers to see that leading literary figures were incorporating references to labor and technology to explore the manner in which human intervention and stewardship of the natural world determined the individual’s right to remain or exist in paradise.

This dissertation ends by asserting that the pastoral-georgic, influenced by colonial use of pastoral tropes, is an antecedent to the country house poems. These works, I argue, share similar themes with the pastoral-georgic, such as harmony between the classes and between humanity and the natural world. This puts the works that I discuss here on a timeline that leads us to the idealization of place, nature, and class that we see in the country house poems. The pastoral-georgic, then, with its idealization of labor and
the control of nature, has long-lasting influences on English perceptions of the stewardship of land and helps to influence the way that the English view ideal landscapes on their island. The estates of austere noblemen resemble ordered mini-settlements, with every person working to create harmony and land celebrated for its aesthetic beauty but that is also tightly controlled.

The use of the golden age convention in exploration literature went beyond simply promoting the idea that England can find a new Eden within the fertile lands of the Americas. Rather, the combination of pastoral and georgic tropes promoted the idea that the English possessed the power to form their own productive paradises out of the promising, fertile landscapes they explored. This way of viewing the pastoral landscape complicates how scholars have traditionally categorized the idealized settings in pastoral works, which is often as simplistic, naïve dreamscapes that are sometimes at odds with the complex and allusive conversations broached by its rustic inhabitants. The representation of human intervention into the natural world shows that the English viewed productivity, labor, and the control of nature as a new ideal, one that looks less like the Garden of Eden and more like a profitable settlement. In the following chapter, we will see what such a paradise looks and the labor that it takes to sustain its status as “ideal.”
CHAPTER II

LABOR AND THE BALANCE OF OTIUM IN THE THREE PASTORALS OF SIDNEY’S NEW ARCADIA

As for the houses of the country (for many houses came under their eye), they were all scattered, no two being one by th’other, and yet not so far off as that it barred mutual succour—a show as it were of an accompanable solitariness, and of a civil wildness.
—Philip Sidney, The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia

The reader of Sidney’s revised Arcadia first encounters the pastoral settlement of Arcadia through the gaze of the wandering prince Musidorus who, upon pausing to appreciate the beautiful landscape, takes note of some skillful community planning. The tranquil village, he notes, is a display—a “shew”—of civility and order nestled against the backdrop of idyllic hills with “stately trees,” valleys with “silver rivers,” and meadows with “all sorts of eye-pleasing flowers” (11). Our first view of Arcadia appears to fulfill common expectations of a delightful pastoral setting, with inhabitants living in harmony with each other in an aesthetically pleasing natural world. And we, along with Musidorus, admire the overall effect of this scene, where homes, inhabitants, and nature all exist to generate a feeling of ease, peace, and tranquility. Arcadia seemingly offers an exemplary pastoral world, where character and readers can retreat and enjoy moments of otium, leisure, or “a time and space for the mind to be creative or recreative” (Lindenheim 2). 33 Here is a land, we think, where a weary traveller might find some respite and rest.

33 For such a seemingly simple word, otium has a complex definition and reception history. While I will discuss this complexity later in the chapter, those who are interested might read Brian Vickers’s Leisure and Idleness in the Renaissance: the Ambivalence of Otium. These essays provide a history of the term from ancient Greek to early modern reception. Also, Thomas Rosenmeyer’s chapter on otium in The Green Cabinet examines otium’s pastoral beginnings in Theocritus, but he also goes further, rooting the concept in Roman military history and Epicurean philosophy.
Just as we settle in to take a break within this village, however, the *synoeciosis* at the end of the description pulls us back into the reality of the demands of interpretation.\textsuperscript{34} How can a land be both “civil” and “wild”? How might a community provide both companionship and “solitariness”? The inherent contradictions within these phrases and the questions we ask color our reading of the entire Arcadian settlement. All of a sudden we see that this is not a paradise where ease and rest just happen, but a place constructed with rhetorical care, with Sidney using the adjectives (“accompanable” and “civil”) to wrest control from potentially threatening nouns (“solitariness” and “wildness”). Such nouns, left untended, would ruin the effect of *otium* that initially draws us and Musidorus to appreciate the settlement within the landscape. Sidney’s terms call attention to the scaffolding that supports the creation of the pastoral dream. His prose makes clear to the reader that the idealization of this landscape is not natural, but, instead, is the result of humanity’s ability to create community and order. The resultant artificiality of the pastoral would not be surprising to readers—influential scholars including Raymond Williams have found fault with the mode for exactly this trait—but the contradiction of the terms reveals a subtle tension within Sidney’s depiction of the ideal landscape. This tension arises from a complex (and fragile) network of power required to support the existence of this seemingly simple paradise.

Sidney acknowledges that that Arcadian landscape is a “show,” a display or exhibition, of the conventions that readers expect to see in a pastoral world, but his use of contradiction also reveals an underlying threat to this carefully constructed paradise. As Arthur Amos acknowledges, Sidney’s *synoeciosis* calls attention to a problem in Arcadia:

\textsuperscript{34} Arthur Amos identifies this contradiction as *synoeciosis* in *Time, Space, and Value: The Narrative Structure of the New Arcadia*. 
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the terms “clearly point to a need for a proper balance between nature and what might be called the forces of civilization in Arcadia” (40). In this paradise, humanity must work to maintain the “proper balance” between nature and civilization; failure to uphold this balance could make the settlement too crowded (with “many homes”), too isolated (with “solitariness”), or allow the innate wildness of nature to overrun the carefully planned settlement, which would make it neither welcoming nor supportive of life. Sidney not only depicts a paradise in which inhabitants engineer the landscape’s tranquility, but his prose reminds us that the shepherds must remain diligent in using “forces of civilization” to exercise authority over the natural world. Sidney’s Arcadian landscape is only ideal when the inhabitants form and maintain their rustic community and work continually to maintain control of a natural world that pushes against their efforts.

This chapter offers a reading of a well-known pastoral text to show how one author both reflects and shapes changing ideas of the pastoral. I argue that England’s early colonial ambitions influenced Sidney to make Arcadia a “civil wildness,” a paradoxical term which highlights the tension between nature and the “forces of civilization,” as well as labor and leisure. In subsequent chapters, I take up colonial narratives and other early modern pastoral works in more detail and with more attention to the ways in which the culture begins to incorporate labor into representations of idealized landscapes. This reading provides a new way of seeing pastoral as a mode whose development chronicles changing attitudes toward land and the natural world. In Sidney, labor, not leisure, is what makes Arcadia a paradise, and the failure to remain at work could threaten the balance between civilization and nature. As we will see both in this and the next chapter, this portrayal of the ideal landscape as one that humanity must
construct and maintain becomes an important device for those promoting English colonial expansion.

Sidney’s acknowledgement of the problem of balance between nature and civilization could undermine the tranquility of the pastoral in Arcadia, as we become aware of conflict within its boundaries. However, his decision to include the potentially subversive elements “wildness” and “solitude” in the description of the village actually makes the settlement more ideal by giving the author a chance to address and overcome threats that could undermine the paradise. Attentive to just such a strategy, in his analysis of the “invisible bullets” episode from Thomas Harriot’s A True Report on the Present State of Virginia, Stephen Greenblatt argues that acknowledging threats within a text allows an author to “stimulate” a culture’s power. In answering why Harriot chooses to include native voices in his text, voices that propose “subversive inquiries” concerning Christian beliefs, Greenblatt explains that “power thrives on vigilance, and human beings are vigilant if they sense a threat; in part…power defines itself in relation to such threats or simply to that which is not identical with it” (37). For Greenblatt, Harriot’s “true report” of native inquiry gives the explorer a chance to define English values as superior

35 The “invisible bullets” episode, found in the “of the nature and manners of the people” section of True Report, tells of the deaths that struck different native settlements after those settlements had come into contact with the English travellers. It is likely that the indigenous population began dying after being exposed to European diseases to which they had no immunity; Quinn argues that they most likely suffered from measles or smallpox. Harriot’s explanation of the deaths and their effects on English relations with the Algonquian runs about two pages and ends with an account of how the Algonquian supposedly understood the deaths:

They noted there were no women amongst us, neither that we did care for any of theirs. Some therefore were of the opinion that wee were not born of women, and therefore not mortall, but that wee were men of an olde generation many yeeres past, then risen again to immoralitie. Some woulde likewise seeme to prophacie, that there were more of our generation yet to come, to kill theirs and take their places, as some thought the purpose was, by that which was alreadie done. Those that were immediately to come after us they imagined to be in the ayre, yet invisible and without bodies, and that they were by our intreatie and for the love of us, did make the people to die in that sort as they did, by shooting invisible bullets into them. (73)

While Greenblatt reads Harriot’s account of native voices as the explorer recording a “competing theory,” Jonathan Goldberg reminds us not to take such accounts as Harriot’s at face value.
to those of the natives. This moment also plays a part in establishing England as a colonial power above and against the pagan, supposedly naïve Algonquians. Though he is addressing a colonial situation, Greenblatt’s theory of power can explain Sidney’s use of contradiction to describe Arcadia as a “civil wildness.” Like Harriot, Sidney does not ignore the possibility of threat. Instead, the courtier defines his ideal landscape by depicting georgic styles of labor that control forces which, left unattended, could destroy the paradise. Humanity in Arcadia, by remaining vigilant to threats of excess “wildness” and “solitude,” demonstrates its ability to achieve balance between nature and civilization and achieve stable community. *Otium*, or leisure, can exist in the village, but it can only happen within the confines of the shepherds’ duty to form and maintain the “civil wildness.” The rustic characters must remain diligent.

Examining the text by Harriot on which Greenblatt bases his argument reveals a connection between Sidney’s text and key arguments in early modern exploration literature. Both Sidney and Harriot present an ideal landscape whose peace and stability result from human labor, and both, as I will show later in this chapter, vilify excess *otium* and idleness. For their part, the authors of exploration literature also define the ideal settlement as one in which humanity has achieved a balance between nature and civilization. Sixteenth-century authors of exploration literature, though, also have to acknowledge and explain England’s colonial failures without undermining their promotion of exploration and expansion. They seek to achieve this by blaming England’s failure in America on idleness. For example, as we will in chapter IV, Edward Hayes, the author of the 1583 chronicle of Sir Humphrey Gilbert’s voyage to the Americas, cites the “foolish sloth” of prospective settlers who either refuse to perform the labor required to
establish a settlement or who do not want to venture away from England. The threat here is not in nature but in settlers who are unable or unwilling to do the work necessary to form the ideal settlement. As Shannon Miller notes, this appeal to the cultural fear of idleness becomes a major theme in early modern English colonial literature, as authors juxtapose elaborate descriptions of the riches to be gleaned from the beautiful, fertile landscapes with what they saw as England’s “sluggishness” and wasted opportunities (27). These narratives took great care to portray the delay in colonization as an indication of wicked idleness that not only wasted the supposedly divine gifts of the American landscape, but, maybe worse, would leave that untouched abundance open for other European powers to claim.

What is at stake in these texts is not just personal glory but national pride, and authors try to make failed settlers’ complaints of hardship and scarcity in Virginia sound—in comparison to the possible returns—as petty and flimsy as possible. Charges of idleness were the explorers’ favored attack against those who looked to England’s delay in colonization and doubted the viability of its colonial project, as failure due to idleness did not take away from their claims that land in the Americas was desirable.36 Harriot, for instance, begins his True Report with a defense of the colonial project that addresses the (mostly true) rumors started by his fellow travelers in Richard Grenville’s 1585 voyage to the Americas, rumors that claim that cultivating the unfamiliar land in Virginia was too difficult and that the English were dangerously at odds with the native population. Harriot builds his case against these charges by attacking the fortitude of those who circulate the rumors: “Because there were not to bee found any English cities,

36 See E. Thomson Shield’s “The literature of exploration” in The Oxford Handbook of Early American Literature, specifically the section titled “Apologia,” 33-35.
nor such faire houses, nor at their owne wish any of their old accustomed daintie food, nor any soft beds of downe or fethers: the countrey was to them miserable” (49). For Harriot, shaming these supposedly pampered settlers who could not forego luxury allows an acknowledgment of English doubts while still maintaining his narrative of prospective prosperity. The travelers’ mistake is in their expectation that they can enter into the newly discovered land and expect to find their fortune immediately. Harriot reminds his readers that prosperity comes after hard work and cultivation, and, in doing so, he reestablishes England’s potential as a colonial power. To succeed in the Americas, he argues, English settlers only need to change their expectations.

I argue that both Sidney’s text and English tracts promoting colonization confront and attempt to reconcile the same two threats. The first threat to the ideal in both texts is humanity’s propensity for idleness and sin. In his chapter on the Theocritan origins and history of pastoral otium, Thomas Rosenmeyer observes that Sidney’s text gives readers a complicated presentation of leisure: “It is an indication of the complexity of the otium ideal in Sidney’s Arcadia that it features both the Epicurean-pastoral delight in its pleasures, and the Stoic doubts concerning its feasibility in a sinful world” (73). For Rosenmeyer, the complexity in Sidney is the result of humanity living in a postlapsarian world. We can see evidence of this complexity in Sidney’s use of contradiction to describe Arcadia as a “civil wildness,” where inhabitants work hard to maintain their paradise. Sidney’s pastoral shows that though they might be fallen, the Arcadians’ performance of labor to create order out of nature’s “wildness” keeps them focused on duty.
Sidney juxtaposes this village with two other and, I argue, less ideal versions of the pastoral—that of the shoreline where Claius and Strephon, two shepherds who mourn the absence of their beloved Urania, lament the loss of their love and that of Duke Basilius’s retreat in the Arcadian forest. The other sites of pastoral feature characters whose *otium* is less regulated than that of the Arcadian rustics and whose control over nature and community is less complete. The pursuit of pleasure in Basilius’s retreat, for instance, overrides the courtiers’ sense of duty and, in turn, threatens the existence of the entire country. In acknowledging these complexities, Sidney’s text provides a pastoral ideal that resembles what we see in exploration literature, where a settlement is a success if it features inhabitants who are willing to work toward prosperity. The two unappealing alternatives to that ideal show that *otium* becomes idleness when labor is not present in the pastoral.

The second threat that both Sidney and explorers promoting the colonial project acknowledge is closely related to the threat of idleness: a threat that nature requires something from humanity and gets unruly when not controlled and husbanded. As I have argued, Sidney confronts this threat by revealing nature’s innate “wildness” and arguing

---

37 Sidney’s revised *Arcadia* is, as many have noted, more complicated than the first version (now called *Old Arcadia*), which was a straightforward pastoral romance. For more on Sidney’s revision and the complexity of the New Arcadia, see: V.L. Forsyth, “The Two Arcadias of Sidney’s Two Arcadias”; Peter Lindenbaum, “Chapter II” and “Chapter III,” *Changing Landscapes*; Joan Rees, “Chapter V,” *Philip Sidney and Arcadia*. The basic plot of both *Arcadias* is this: Two princes and cousins, Pyrocles and Musidorus, surreptitiously leave their kingdoms to experience adventure abroad. Along the way, they experience pirates, battles, etc. until they end up in Arcadia, where they see and fall in love with the daughters of the Arcadian ruler, Basilius. Meanwhile, Basilius, having heard a prophecy that his daughters will fall in love with suitors who will attempt to usurp his throne, leaves court and sets up a retreat with his family: wife, Gynecia and daughters, Pamela and Philoclea. The princes sneak into the retreat dressed in disguise: Pyrocles as an Amazonian princess, Zelmane, and Musidorus as a shepherd, Dorus. (Pyrocles and Musidorus are, of course, the suitors from the prophecy, but they do not seek to usurp Basilius.) When the two disguised princes enter into the retreat, Basilius falls in love with Zelname/Pyrocles, not realizing she is a man, and Gynecia falls in love with Pyrocles/Zelmane, seeing through the disguise. The two princes also woo their respective ladies. All the while, Cecropia, Basilius’s sister, is trying to stage a coup and kill Basilius so that her son, Amphialus, can become ruler. Hijinks ensue.
that the Arcadians control it through exercise of civility. Authors of exploration literature also posit nature’s need for order when they make claims that American fertility is wasted without cultivation that would yield commodities and riches. Nature’s fertility, they argue, must be controlled and directed into productive ends in order to be truly useful. Lack of order and control means a waste of resources and that waste undermines a settlement’s success. I argue here that texts like Harriot’s, which build the perception of nature as needing just a bit of cultivation to form the ideal settlement, are as much works of fantasy as Sidney’s Arcadian paradise.

As we know from numerous historical sources, most notably David Quinn’s work on Roanoke, the English had a difficult time contending with the unfamiliar topography and climate of Virginia. Thus, texts like Harriot’s—which claim prosperity is only a plowed field away—are what Jonathan Goldberg would call “fantastically projective.” Goldberg argues that Harriot, knowing that he will have to defend himself against rumors that Virginian land could not support a colony, does not describe the reality of its land but uses his text to create a fantasy: “Harriot is projecting a future, seeking to silence the naysayers and skeptics, to advance the project of colonization” (397). The explorer has to account for England’s failures, and he does this in part by building a perception that the failure is not in the land or the endeavor, but in individual settlers’ willingness to give the land what it needs. Without proper labor, in other words, Virginia’s fertile landscape proves overwhelming and uninviting.

See Quinn’s *Set Voyage for Fair Roanoke* and also Kupperman, *Roanoke: The Abandoned Colony*

As I will explain in the next chapter, Goldberg’s essay, “The History that Will Be,” is a reply to Greenblatt’s assertion that Harriot provides a “true report” of his experiences with both the Algonquian and the Virginian landscape.
My chapter extends Goldberg’s position by arguing that when explorers depict the possibilities for American nature and frame England’s failure in terms of the settlers’ idleness, they unseat skeptics by “projecting a future” settlement whose success depends almost entirely upon the individual’s willingness to work. Considering this argument in light of Sidney’s “civil wildness,” we see that the cultural perception of the ideal landscape has changed from a retreat into bucolic simplicity to a land that invites humanity to demonstrate its power in creating an ideal paradise. Scholars can approach the Arcadian village of Sidney’s text, then, as a symbolic landscape that represents the type of productive tranquility the English wished to establish in their failed colonial settlements. Another look at the complexity of Arcadian otium and role of labor in creating a landscape where humanity can both fulfill their responsibilities and live at ease can help scholars understand that complications to the pastoral did not always mean complete rupture of the bucolic paradise. Instead, they provide evidence of how ideals changed to feature industrious labor that strengthens the pastoral landscape, a change that occurs in response to England’s colonial aspirations.

Though scholars such as Mary C. Fuller, Robert Kuin, and Katherine Duncan-Jones have recognized Sidney’s participation in the colonial project, very few have connected the author’s depiction of pastoral landscape in Arcadia to England’s early attempts at American colonization and westward expansion. In his analysis of Sidney’s decades-long interest in colonization, for instance, Kuin mentions Arcadia in a single footnote:

It is intriguing that nowhere in either version of the Arcadia is there any allusion to the New World. One can more usefully see the romance and America as
parallel ‘other worlds,’ each of which was originally an escape, an alternative, but each of which he was in the process of revising to bring close to life’s urgent and serious affairs. (570, Kuin’s italics)

Despite the lack of obvious allusions to colonial sites, Sidney’s depiction of humanity within a pastoral landscape provides evidence that the author was seeing land and the control and management of nature, not leisure, as ideal for his culture. Kuin is right in his assertion that America and Arcadia are for Sidney “parallel ‘other worlds’” that initially offered “an escape, an alternative,” but he does not go far enough to explain how this parallel progressed into a “process of revisi[on].” I assert that one of the “urgent and serious affairs” that Sidney sought to revise was the issue of England’s colonial failure. The poet’s involvement in Humphrey Gilbert’s unsuccessful voyage to Newfoundland in 1583 would have, I argue, made the poet aware of the challenges nature presented to explorers, and it would have given him the inspiration he needed to use Arcadia as a place to address and work through the problem of the balance between nature and culture—a problem that would-be English colonizers also faced in the form of unfamiliar landscape.

**Governance, Otium, and Landscape Management in the Ideal**

As Peter Lindenbaum and Nandini Das have noted, Sidney revised the pastoral landscape of his *Old Arcadia* in order to make it more geographically accurate; changes included relocating the country from the shoreline in order to more accurately represent the geography of the province of Arcadia, located in present-day Greece (Lindenbaum, “Geography” 526, Das 73). Lindenbaum argues that this increased level of detail in the depiction of the Arcadian landscape in the *New Arcadia* makes the setting more realistic.
and contributes to Sidney’s commentary on the importance of governance: “Sidney sought geographical accuracy as part of his overall insistence that every place, even a land called Arcadia, needed at all times to be actively governed by a responsible ruler” (530). As Lindenbaum explains, when the descriptions of Arcadia become more accurate, the pastoral landscape goes from being a “landscape of the mind” to an actual place that “needs to be governed” (528). The Arcadia of Sidney’s pastoral, in other words, is not just a simple, pretty backdrop, but a reflection of a real country that needed guidance and order for the inhabitants to prosper. The remainder of this chapter builds on Lindenbaum’s assertion, arguing that Sidney’s interest in depicting a pastoral requiring portrayals of governance stems from his involvement as an investor in England’s colonial expansion. In the following sections, I argue that Sidney’s interest influences his depiction of ideal otium, as he would have been aware of exploration literature that idealized the lands of the Americas as unbelievably fertile and that claimed agricultural labor could form profitable settlements. In Arcadia, Sidney’s portrays a balance between nature and civilization that recalls the arguments in the exploration literature.

Despite the larger love plot of the pastoral romance, Sidney is more interested in how the village’s political stability and the inhabitants’ attention to labor and class division make Arcadia a welcoming and peaceful place. As we learn from both the shepherd Claius, one of Musidorus’s guides into Arcadia, and the nobleman Kalendar, what makes Arcadia so ideal is that the shepherds’ poetic games do not interfere with their positions as rustic workers and the jobs they perform within society. For instance, when Musidorus asks how the Arcadian landscape could be so different from that of Laconia, its war-torn neighbor, Claius gives credit to the rustic inhabitants:
this country being decked with peace and, the child of peace, good husbandry. These houses you see so scattered are of men as we two are that live upon the commodity of their sheep, and therefore in the division of the Arcadian estate are termed shepherds—a happy people because they desire not much. (11)

Claius describes the prosperity of the landscape by comparing it to a family dynamic: “peace” is the parent of “good husbandry.” This provides additional insight into what makes the wildness “civil,” as the shepherd recognizes that the land is cultivated through the “good husbandry” of its inhabitants. We find out that the Arcadians have the luxury of cultivating their landscape when they, unlike their neighbors, live without worry of war or conflict and can devote time to ordering the land and building a good community. 

Otium here is not the absence of or even a break from labor, but a peace that allows the inhabitants to work to better their land so that they can live their lives happily and prosperously. Claius also goes further down the family line, as he explains that Arcadia’s peace originates with the shepherds, who recognize and respect the “division of the Arcadian estate.” As a member of the laboring class, Claius has insight into the mindset and disposition of his peers and, thus, has the experience to tell Musidorus that these rustics live happily “upon the commodity of their sheep.” Though he is not in a position of authority, Claius’s testimony serves as an initial assessment of the society that indicates to us this is a place that has, so far, been governed properly and efficiently.

Kalendar, an Arcadian nobleman whose home is “hard by” the village, also provides a positive assessment of the rustic community. His testimony refigures otium as occurring in the course of duty, as Kalendar explains to Musidorus that even in contemplation and composition, the shepherds perform their labor. He also calls attention
to an economic distinction between the shepherds of other countries and those of Arcadia, as the latter own sheep and do not work as paid labor:

ordinary it is among the meanest sort to make songs and dialogues in metre, either love whetting their brain or, long peace having begun it, example and emulation amending it. But no sort of people so excellent in that kind as the pastors, for their living standing but upon looking to their beasts, they have ease, the nurse of poetry. Neither are our shepherds such as I hear they be in other countries, but they are the very owners of the sheep to which either themselves look, or their children give daily attendance. (24)

Kalander begins by setting up a typical moment of *otium*: shepherds engaged in poetic composition—or what Nancy Lindenheim would call “moments of creation or recreation.” He idealizes the Arcadian rustics by indicating that they are so blessed that even the “meanest sort” possess the ability to make “songs and dialogues in metre”—not an easy task even for the most learned scholar. Neither do their songs focus solely on love. Rather, love serves as one spur that, in “whetting their brain,” might inspire the shepherds to compose verses. Peace, Kalander argues, also gives the shepherd material for their poetic games, as they have time listen to and are inspired to emulate others’ poems and songs. This all occurs, though, while they work. Their moments of ease do not take away from the shepherds’ duties, and while the idea of having shepherds versify while they work might not be too revolutionary, as this is essentially what happens in Virgil and Theocritus, Kalander’s assessment of their duties provides a unique perspective of a nobleman assessing the labor that the shepherds perform.
Sidney uses Kalendar to express an ambivalence about rustic labor. Kalendar initially downplays any tedium in the shepherds’ duties, which he says consists of standing around and watching sheep. This is a life defined by ease, which allows the shepherds to compose the verses, as ease is “the nurse of poetry.” The nobleman, though, then goes into greater detail about the lives of those living in the bucolic paradise. The shepherds are economically independent; they are the “very owners of the sheep to which they look,” and while independence is good for the shepherds, it also means that they alone are responsible for their financial success. The shepherds and their children must provide “daily attendance” to their flocks in order to survive. The work might not be hard, but the sheep do require constant attention. In his opening speech, for instance, Strephon outlines the work the shepherds do: “some were running after their sheep strayed beyond their bounds…some medicining their sick ewes, some setting a bell for an ensign of sheepish squadron” (5). Despite Kalendar’s insistence that the shepherds live a life of ease, Strephon’s speech reminds the reader that the rustic workers must labor to minimize threats such as sickness and loss. Greenblatt argues that “power thrives on vigilance,” and in this speech we see that the shepherds’ vulnerability to threats keeps them vigilant and empowers them with a heightened subjectivity. Though they enjoy moments of leisure, these moments must arise within the boundaries of their duties to the flock.

In Arcadia, the shepherds have an active part in constructing the pastoral paradise, as the stability of their country comes both from the work that they do to remain economically stable and from their respect for the “division of the Arcadian estate.” Sidney continually revisits the shepherds and their ability to contribute to the pleasing
effect of the idealized landscape. Musidorus notes when he first sees the Arcadian
landscape, for instance, that the rustic inhabitants are able to create a feeling of peace
even when they are faced with a reality that could threaten their tranquility: “here, a
shepherd’s boy piping, as though he should never be old; there, a young shepherdess
knitting and withal singing, and it seemed her voice comforted her hands to work, her
hands kept time to her voice’s music” (11). Here we see that what initially looks like
a typical pastoral scenario is actually a show of human ingenuity in the face of harsh
reality. As in the “civil wildness,” that which initially looks threatening (aging and toil) in
fact helps to make the scene more ideal.

The boy can engineer the effect that his youth is timeless, regardless of the fact
that Sidney acknowledges the shepherd will age, with the description “as though he will
never grow old.” Similarly, the shepherdess can sing to create a charming scene, even
though she needs the song to “comfort” her knitting hands. The labor she performs may
seem easy and enjoyable, but the fact she needs this comfort indicates that her knitting
may also be toilsome. These traditional forms of otium—piping and singing—take on a
power they would lack without the georgic contextualization. The leisurely activities,
therefore, perform real work both within the Arcadian landscape and for Sidney as a
theorist of pastoral: by juxtaposing the pastoral with the georgic, Sidney shows us that the
inhabitants of Arcadia have the power to ease the effects of realities such as aging and
toil. Though this scene does not feature “civil wildness” in the sense that the two
characters are engaged in the control of nature, we see that the actions of the pastoral
figures directly contribute to the order of pastoral environment. Rather than live at rest in
a bucolic paradise, both the shepherd and shepherdess play an active role in creating a sense of civic participation in their environment.

The order of the “civil wildness” is also reflected in the Arcadian landscape. In addition to the homes, which are carefully “scattered” so as to offer both solitude and community, the natural world takes on the qualities of the inhabitants who are focused on duty and labor. This is a moment, as Lindenbaum notes, where Sidney’s revision to accurately portray Arcadia as a landlocked province plays an important role. In the older version of the text Sidney places Arcadia on the shoreline, an anatopism as the Arcadia of ancient Greece was not near the sea. The change allows the characters to move from the shore (where the shepherds find Musidorus) through Laconia and into Arcadia. This movement allows for a comparison between the two countries:

they went on their journey which, by and by welcomed Musidorus’ eyes (wearied with the wasted soil of Laconia) with delightful prospects. There were hills, which garnished their proud heights with stately trees; humble valleys, whose base estate seemed comforted with the refreshing of silver rivers; meadows, enameled with all sorts of eye-pleasing flowers; thickets, which being lined with most pleasant shade, were witnessed to by the cheerful disposition of so many well-tuned birds; each pasture stored with sheep feeding with sober security, while pretty lambs with bleating oratory craved the dams’ comfort. (11)

In setting a boundary between the lush landscape of Arcadia and the “wasted soil” of its war-torn neighbor, Sidney immediately imposes a sense of order on the pastoral country. Given the similarity between the topography of the two countries, as Claius later tells Musidorus, we know that the sorry state of Laconia’s landscape comes from human
misuse. The warring country could look like Arcadia, but its resources have been squandered by war. The tragedy of its wasted resources is reinforced by Sidney’s transition into the Arcadian landscape, which begins with various topographical features, such as hills and rivers, and moves to the pastures “stored” with sheep. One of the main contrasts between Laconia and Arcadia, with its “delightful prospects,” is that every non-human thing—both animal and vegetable—is carefully controlled to appeal to the viewer’s economic, political, social, and aesthetic sensibilities. Such order and its status as ideal in the text indicates that Sidney views the Arcadians as using their landscape properly.

Though at first glance the landscape described by Musidorus might appear to be a typical pastoral paradise, where shepherds live in complete harmony with nature, Sidney’s use of “civil wildness” to describe the Arcadian village signals to us that its landscape is more complex. As I have described, the presence of “wildness” in that phrase indicates that the inhabitants continually have to work to maintain order. We see a reflection of that order in the parallel structures that Sidney uses to build up the natural features of the scene. Each noun (“hills,” “valleys,” “meadows,” “thickets”) receives a modifier that augments a picturesque setting with details that pull the reader into the landscape with Musidorus: the hills have “proud trees,” the valleys have silver rivers, and the meadows are inlaid with flowers that please the eye. The parallel structure allows Sidney to pile on the detail without making the passage seem overburdened. It also presents the landscape to the reader in such a way that makes it apparent why Arcadia is a “civil wildness,” as the order of the land enhances its natural topography rather than highlighting that it is in fact artificial.
The Arcadian landscape is a testament to the inhabitants’ ability to maintain balance between nature and civilization. We see this as Sidney begins to break the parallel structure as he depicts its animal inhabitants. He presents the “well-tuned” birds and their “cheerful disposition” as witnesses to the to the pleasant shade of the thickets. This personification contributes to the idealized tone of the scene by offering a glimpse of what we can expect as we move to the creatures of the natural world. Not only are the plants ordered, but the animals are as well. Even they can contribute to the order and peace of the landscape by showing their appreciation of the thicket’s shade and beauty. The birds lead us to the pasture, which is home to sheep and “bleating lambs” who live in “sober security.” This depiction of the pasture acts as the climax of the Arcadian environment. As Claius tells Musidorus, these animals and the shepherding industry that they support provide the rustic workers with a livelihood and, thus, help to bolster the Arcadian economy. The pasture and the security in which the sheep live serve as testaments to the civility and order that humanity imposes upon the landscape. It represents the ultimate balance between nature and civilization.

The presentation of Arcadia as an intricately ordered society, where each person and animal has a proper place, is similar to the idealized settlements described in promotional exploration literature. Sidney would have been familiar with such idealized descriptive appeals to investors. In 1582, he invested in the voyage of the explorer Sir Humphrey Gilbert, who promised the courtier the right to settle “thirty hundred thousand” acres of land, which Gilbert had hoped to find in a 1583 expedition to Newfoundland and the eastern coast of North America. The terms of the contract are reminiscent of the well-ordered village of Arcadia, with workers and nobleman striving
together for the success of the settlement. Sidney, Gilbert writes in the contract, would be entitled to:

- thirteyn hundred thousand acres of grounde and woode every acre to conteyne
- fowre pole in breadth and forty pole in length and to allow sixtene foote to every pole with full power and authoritie….with all Jurisdictions privileges liberties benefyttes commodities and emolumentes whatsoever for the governing
- enhabitinge disposing peoplinge and manuringe the premyses. (Quinn, *Gilbert* 258)

These terms are quite precise, with a plot of land measured out and written as if Gilbert already had access to the land that had both “grounde and woode.” Despite the precise level of detail, the contract ends up being what Goldberg would call “fantastically projective.” Though this is a legal document, Gilbert’s description here is clearly promotional, as he describes the settlement by giving the best possible scenario. It is a scenario that never came to fruition. Gilbert did not establish the colony that Sidney had paid him to settle, and the prospect of future settlements was impossible since the explorer died on the return from his 1583 voyage.

The terms of the contract, though, provide a valuable glimpse into what the English, and Sidney, saw as the ideal colonial process. As the investor, Sidney would have “authoritie” over the governance of the region as well as over the “disposing,” or distributing, of settlers who would work to cultivate, or “manure,” the land. Sidney’s right to the “commodities and emolumentes” indicates that Gilbert expected this prospective settlement to be prosperous, or was at least selling the promise of prosperity to his wealthy investor. Entirely speculative, the contract provides a glimpse of a colonial
plan that, like the Arcadian village, defined success as a result of hard work invested in establishing stability and cultivating the land into a “civil wildness.” In this new settlement, the land’s soil would be cultivated and productive, not “wasted” through conflict or selfishness. And though it does not feature *otium* in the sense of poetic games or a moment to be “recreative,” the contract does offer a kind of freedom for the settlement’s ruler. Sidney, Gilbert promises, would have full authority and liberty over the settlement, an attractive draw for a headstrong courtier living under a demanding sovereign.

Given his attraction to the failed Gilbert expedition, it makes sense that Sidney would be inclined to create an ideal landscape where land management and the careful placement of homes and pastures create a “civil wildness” and where all subjects see the performance of work as an important and even enjoyable part of their lives. The prospect of having a land under his full authority would have been attractive to the courtier. As Kuin writes, the New World for Sidney—while not an “overriding preoccupation”—did connote a place of “greater safety….far from the capricious reach of a Machiavellian prince” (554). An American settlement represented a retreat for the courtier, where he could build a colony dedicated to a Protestant vision, away from his political ties and an overbearing monarch (Kuin 570, 575). In the Americas, Sidney could create his own society in the way that he wished without having to answer to Elizabeth.

Taken as a whole, from ordered landscape and carefully planned village to the inhabitants whose work and humbleness define them, we can view the Arcadian village as a kind of fantastical draft of an English nobleman’s picture of an ideal settlement. Arcadia depends upon a static class system in which everyone, from noble to rustic, is
prosperous. Claius indicates that the shepherds, themselves small freeholders, flourish in Arcadia, but they are not so ambitious that they seek to transcend their position. They are “a happy people, wanting little because they desire not much.” Such shepherds would make good settlers: they would be driven to labor in order to maintain the “civil wildness,” as their own prosperity depends upon that labor. The Arcadian nobles also proper, as they too benefit from the rustic labor that maintains the tranquility of their home. They also provide for the security of this idealized place. When the ruler, Basilius, leaves his post, we see that Arcadia depends upon the governance and protection that the sovereign and noble class provide. In fact, governance and dedication to community are lacking in the other sites of pastoral in the first book of Arcadia, where characters are more focused on the pursuit of love than they to their duties to maintain the stability of the social order.

**Non-ideal Pastoral Landscapes**

Sidney’s New Arcadia opens with two rustic characters at a shoreline conversing about love while looking out onto the distant island, Cythera. The love-sick shepherds, Claius and Strephon, have left their county of Arcadia, but they offer a familiar pastoral scenario. Their lamentations mourning the absence of their beloved Urania recall similar shepherds from Virgil’s first eclogue, Meliboeus and Tityrus, but Sidney does not idealize them. Claius and Strephon may engage in an ennobling contemplation of love, but their focus on Urania isolates the two from their community as well as from their work as shepherds, which we see when Strephon asks his companion:

I pray you when we were amid our flock, and that of other shepherds some were running after their sheep strayed beyond their bounds, some delighting their eyes
with seeing them nibble upon the short and sweet grass, some medicining their sick ewes, some setting a bell for an ensign of a sheepish squadron, some with more leisure inventing new games of exercising their bodies and sporting their wit, did remembrance grant us any holiday either for pastime or devotion, nay, either for necessary food or natural rest, but that still it forced our thoughts to work upon this place where we last (alas, that the word last should be so long last!) did grace our eyes upon her ever-flourishing beauty? (3)

Strephon begins by giving us a peek at life in the pastoral landscape and by establishing a border around the pastoral world: shepherds work to protect their flock and are careful to keep their sheep within the safety of the pasture. It is commonplace for authors to feature a boundary between the pastoral and outside worlds, but here we see that Claius and Strephon are outside that boundary and are not a part of the activities happening within the pasture. Sidney gives us a bucolic paradise we would expect, which only makes the isolation of the shepherds, presented near the end of the quotation, more jarring to the reader. Claius and Strephon are completely isolated from their pastoral community. Their peers are never idle (even in rest the shepherds “exercise their body” and “sport their wit”), but Claius and Strephon’s preoccupation with Urania renders them unable to join the others in that activity, or do anything beyond praising their beloved’s beauty and lamenting her absence. As Strephon mentions, they never get a break from their distress at Urania’s absence, not even for “necessary food or natural rest.”

It seems clear that what the shepherds experience is far from *otium*. Their composition of songs and speeches in praise of Urania proves to be hard work, as Strephon recognizes they get no “holiday” or “pastime” from their dedication to her.
Jeffrey Dolven notes that this scene, which begins the revision of *Arcadia*, serves as an example of what the story will not become: “It is almost as though the shepherds stand for something that must be pointedly left behind, a quintessence, perhaps, of…unworldliness” (174). I agree with Dolven that the text moves us beyond the shepherds’ “unworldly” and detached devotion in favor of the heroic adventures of the princes Musidorius and Pyrocles. However, in moving us away from Claius and Strephon and into the Arcadian village, Sidney also “pointedly [leaves] behind” a pastoral in which the pursuit of personal desire undermines an individual’s devotion to community and duty. Claius and Strephon, though common pastoral figures in a familiar pastoral scenario, are unsuitable for Sidney’s vision of the ideal in the *New Arcadia*.

This leaves us with Basilius’s forest retreat which, with its courtiers seeking refuge in an ideal landscape, presents another common pastoral setting. Walter Davis, in fact, identifies this retreat as the most ideal of the three. As he explains in *A Map of Arcadia*, pastoral romances often feature a distinct structure in which the author depicts separate scenes as “concentric circles” or worlds that the hero must go through in his journey toward a “refined pastoral inner circle,” in which he finds a “purification of life” (35). For *Arcadia*, specifically, Davis argues that Basilius’s retreat occupies the position of the innermost circle: as a “usual pastoral place, the purely artificial domain of the natural, amorous, and contemplative” (52). Basilius’s forest refuge is certainly “artificial,” but it lacks the purity and refinement that Davis identifies as a trait of the innermost pastoral site. This is especially clear when we consider that the retreat comes about as a result of Basilius abandoning Arcadia. His cultivation of indolence is depicted as coming at the cost of the entire country’s vulnerability in the absence of their ruler. In
this way, Sidney signals that ideal places may not facilitate the abandonment of the labors of civil responsibility. This is true not only for shepherds, but also for princes.

Sidney gives the first detailed description of Basilius’s forest refuge through the observations of the disguised Pyrocles. When Musidorus stumbles upon the love-struck prince dressed as the Amazon, Zelmana, Pyrocles explains that his love for Philoclea is the reason that he has adopted a woman’s costume. At the beginning of the work, Sidney introduced the Arcadian village as a place where the scattered homes in the landscape created the effect of a “civil wildness.” But whereas the village possessed a balance between nature and civilization, Basilius’s retreat is decidedly artificial and ornamental:

I was invited and brought down to sup with them [Basilius’s family] in the garden, a place not fairer in natural ornaments than artificial inventions, where in a banqueting house among certain pleasant trees….the table was set near to an excellent waterwork, for by the casting of the water in the most cunning manner it makes with the shining of the sun upon it a perfect rainbow…There were birds also, made so finely that they did not only deceive the sight with their figure, but the hearing with their songs which the watery instruments did make their gorge deliver. (86)

Artificiality dominates in Basilius’s garden, where “artificial inventions” surpass the beauty of “natural ornaments.” Every detail is geared toward delighting the eye and encouraging leisure. The “waterwork” makes the water “cunning” so that it produces a pleasing rainbow for the viewer. The installation is also outfitted with mechanical birds,

40 As mentioned in footnote 3, Pyrocles dresses as a women in order to gain access to Philoclea, who is in Basilius’s retreat. While referring to Pyrocles as Zelmana, Sidney uses the feminine pronoun, signaling that though Gynecia can see though the disguise, the others definitely do not.
which are so “finely made” that their appearance and sound are a deceptive duplication of real birds.

Sidney’s use of “deceive” to describe the water and birds casts the garden in a negative light and signals that he disapproves of its artificiality. This is not a land like that of the village, where nature was idealized but not overly wrought. This highly stylized garden is a place where the forces of civilization have overpowered the land’s natural appeal, so that all we can see is evidence of humanity. Also unlike the village, civilization has not directed the nature to order and civility but toward leisure and pleasure. Every element of the garden is made to delight the viewer. As a whole, when we compare this image of the retreat with the Arcadian village, we see that it is purely ornamental and completely frivolous. Unlike the “civil wildness,” there is nothing about Basilius’s retreat that might inspire work or responsibility.

This highly ornamental retreat provides a place where the courtiers can engage in leisure with no thought of duty or responsibility. Davis argues that the Arcadian village is not ideal, based on the grounds that within it we find the “seeds of civil disruption,” such as the coup attempted by Basilius’s sister, Cecropia. I find, however, that in providing a retreat where Basilius can live in leisure and ignore his responsibilities as ruler, the forest refuge is actually the place that allows these seeds of corruption to flower. When Basilius goes into the forest, he leaves his country without a ruler. The retreat is not a perfect pastoral ideal but a dangerous distraction from duty and responsibility. When, in Book 2, a group of Arcadian rebels invades the retreat to attack Basilius, we learn that the ruler’s absence has provided Cecropia with the chance to deploy an agent who stirs up revolt and effectively dismantles the happiness that made Arcadia so peaceful and inviting. The
agent puts his plan into motion during a country-wide birthday celebration for the absent ruler, underscoring Basilius’s problematic absence:

This fellow [Clinias] was become of near trust to Cecropia, Amphialus’ mother, so that he was privy to all the mischievous devices wherewith she went about to ruin Basilius and his children for the advancing of her son...[he] had by his mistress been used, ever since the strange retiring of Basilius, to whisper rumours into the people’s ears; and this time finding great aptness in the multitude, was one of the chief that set them in the uproar. (288)

Though the rebellion begins in the Arcadian village, as Davis recognizes, it is the “strange retiring of Basilius” that offers Cecropia a prime opportunity to make her move against the throne. Arcadia’s inhabitants become susceptible to the usurper’s corrupting influence when they lack a ruler to provide a sense of stability; they are “apt” to rebel under these circumstances. Basilius might not be the strongest governor—Kalendar faintly praises him as “a prince of sufficient skill to govern so quiet a country”—but his presence at least provided the semblance of authority and control. In his absence, the people grow restless, and Clinias is able to “whisper rumors” and inflame the Arcadians to move against the prince who has abandoned them. The existence of the retreat, and the refuge it offers the courtiers, contributes to the downfall of peace in Arcadia as a whole.

The forest retreat lacks refinement in the sense that it offers Basilius and other courtiers the worst type of otium. Their move into the refuge proves escapist. The retreat serves as an example of what Brian Vickers recognizes as the “predominantly negative association” otium had in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: “A recurring episode in Renaissance epic and romance, borrowed from classical epic, describes a hero putting
aside his proper masculine pursuit of the *vita activa*….abandoning himself to a life of ease and sensual indulgence” (134). As Vickers notes, the hero never willingly leaves the retreat and is eventually forced to return to the active life by circumstances beyond his control. We see this, in one case, with Spenser’s Calidore in Book 6 of the *Faerie Queene*.

Basilius’s encampment proves more transgressive than other pastoral retreats in that Sidney actually provides evidence of the destruction that results when the Arcadian ruler leaves his post. We can compare the “civil wildness” from the beginning of the work with the destruction that happens to the village when Cecropia poisons the happiness of its residents, who turn from contented rustics into what Sidney portrays as a rioting mob. In *Changing Landscapes*, Lindenbaum argues that when civil unrest occurs in Arcadia, the country is essentially no different from its war-torn neighbor, Laconia (74). Such a comparison is striking given that Sidney took great care in distinguishing between what he called the “wasted soil” of Laconia and the lush, well-ordered landscape of the Arcadian paradise. With the people in Arcadia no longer content, we infer, the land is also neglected and misused. This knowledge taints our view of the retreat. In the world of *Arcadia*, where governance and duty are so important, it is clear that the existence of a refuge has led to the destruction of the entire pastoral paradise.

I would argue also that this pastoral retreat does not even provide moments of contemplation for the courtiers. While they do engage in poetic games, represented mostly in the eclogues that end each of the books, the courtiers’ focus on love is so overwhelming that they are more distracted and distraught than contemplative. The erotic theme is the focus in the forest retreat, and there is no duty to keep *otium* from becoming
idleness of love from becoming passion. Courtiers’ *otium* in the forest refuge gives them the time to pursue “sensual indulgence” rather than ennobling contemplation. In a scene set in a familiar bucolic meadow, for instance, love has made several courtiers agitated and miserable:

In this place, while Gynecia walked hard by them carrying many unquiet contentions about her, the ladies sate them down, inquiring many questions of the shepherd Dorus, who keeping his eye still upon Pamela, answered with such a trembling voice and abashed countenance…. Zelmane, that saw in him the glass of her own misery, [took] the hand of Philoclea, and with burning kisses [set] it close to her lips. (111)

The characters’ suffering is reminiscent of the melancholic, unfulfilled lover, such as we see with Claius and Strephon. For the courtiers, love is not ennobling as it is for the two shepherds, who use their time away from work, their *otium*, to educate themselves so they can create better verses to celebrate Urania.\(^4\) Whereas love pushes the shepherds to “raise our thoughts above the ordinary level,” Sidney’s depiction of the courtiers displays the physicality of their passion, culminating in Pyrocles (as Zelmane) reaching out and grasping Philoclea’s hand. We progress from the pacing Gynecia’s “unquiet contentions,” which are caused by her lust for Pyrocles (she sees through the Zelmane disguise), to Musidorus, disguised as the shepherd Dorus, who is so distracted by his desire for Pamela that he has a “trembling voice and abashed countenance.” In the true style of romance,

\(^4\) Claius asks Strephon, for instance: “Hath not the only love of her made us, being silly ignorant shepherds, raise up our thoughts above the ordinary level of the world so as great clerks do not disdain our conference? Hath not the desire to seem worthy in her eyes made us, when others were sleeping, to sit viewing the course of heavens; when others were running at base, to run over learned writings; when other mark their sheep, we to mark ourselves?”
neither character is able to control the physical manifestation of his or her desire. Finally, Sidney portrays Pyrocles as so unable to control his passions that he reaches out, grasps, and plants “burning kisses” on Philoclea’s hand.

We might expect to see such a scene in *Arcadia*, since it is, after all, a pastoral romance. But Sidney portrays these characters negatively when he features them as unable to govern their passions or direct their love toward higher, more noble pursuits. In the larger context of the work, these characters and their inability to temper their emotions come across as dangerous rather than ideal. Instead of the “civil wildness,” where the adjective limits and controls the possibly unruly noun, here we see adjectives, “unquiet,” “trembling,” “abashed,” and “burning,” that either add pejorative meanings to their nouns (“voice” and “countenance”) or modify nouns that are themselves negative (“contention”). In the case of “burning kisses,” too, we see the transgressive nature of these passions, as Pyrocles uses the cover of his disguise as a woman to reach out and ardently kiss his beloved. These actions are indicative of a negative version of *otium*, one that leads to sensual indulgence rather than intellectual contemplation. This is a pastoral world where governance and order make the landscape ideal by controlling “wildness” to make it civil, and moments of passion, such as when Pyrocles lets his love overtake him, do not represent the ideal.

While I disagree with his characterization of Basilius’s retreat, Davis usefully directs the attention of *Arcadia’s* reader to the book’s structure. For Davis, the structure of Sidney’s text is innovative in that its center is “less clearly focused” than its predecessors, which he argues makes the retreat “less supernatural than microcosmic” (52). My main argument with Davis is that the retreat does not lead to the “peace of the contemplative” (53). Instead, I find that in focusing on the matters of “love, lust, and death,” the characters in the retreat are unable to find true peace. For those in Sidney’s *Arcadia*, peace and contentment—even contemplation—come when the characters are able to live in a politically secure and ordered world, such as in the village.
the different pastoral sites prompted me to reevaluate how they were interconnected. I found Sidney’s structure innovative in that he relocates the ideal from what we would expect, from the innermost “concentric circle,” and places it in the middle, the village where the shepherds balance their contemplation and poetic games with the labor they do to uphold their duty. Sidney’s ideal is a place that looks more like a productive settlement than an escapist retreat. This is an image that would have served the colonial project well. It promotes as ideal a landscape that, like the “civil wildness,” tests and encourages the individual to work in an effort to control the natural world. Such an inspiration would have harmonized with those writing exploration literature, which often blamed English failures in the Americas on the indolence of settlers who were unprepared for the hard work needed to form successful settlements and colonies.

**Conclusion**

In *Arcadia*, we see a version of how pastoral *otium* looks when an author seeks to achieve a balance between labor and leisure, nature and civilization. The stability of community that Sidney depicts in the village promotes a new type of *otium*, in which labor creates a place where characters have a chance to attain a life of peace and relative prosperity. Characters recognize the need for and the rigors of work, but they use their songs and games to make that work more enjoyable. We see this also in the shepherdess who sings while knitting, when the song provides comfort to her laboring hands. We see this too in the shepherds who engage in poetic games while watching over their sheep. Sidney does not depict characters who reject complexity and civilization. Instead, he features rustic individuals who achieve ideal *otium* when characters are mindful of their responsibilities. When they are not, *otium* becomes like the occupations in Basilius’
retreat: given to idleness and passion. This indolence ultimately destroys the ideal balance between nature and civilization that the Arcadian village is close to achieving.

The identification of *otium* as a foundational aspect of pastoral has misled scholars of early modern literature into thinking that labor is either absent in the idealized landscape or is only represented as serving a destructive purpose. From this perspective, texts in the pastoral mode are unfit for colonial purposes. For instance, Ken Hiltner frames his whole understanding of pastoral around the belief that it self-evidently does not represent colonialism:

While pastoral literature was initially instrumental in portraying colonies as desirable, Edenlike places, pastoral *otium* was clearly in conflict with the hard work required to colonize a place. As the georgic ethic readily lent itself to this type of project, georgic literature…grew in popularity throughout English Renaissance (14).

Yet, as we see in *New Arcadia*, the pastoral itself can sustain both *otium* and labor, both leisure and complexity. Sidney does not replace the leisure of the pastoral with hard work of the georgic. Rather, he shows how georgic and pastoral can be connected to make a more realistic, complicated ideal in which the tranquility of paradise becomes a product of humanity, such as in the homes strategically placed for “accompanable solitariness” on the Arcadian landscape. Just as Sidney characterizes the Arcadian village as ideal when it is a product of human ingenuity shaping the promising natural resources into comforting landscapes, authors of exploration literature, as we will see in the next chapter, write to encourage the English to direct the fertility of the American landscape into profitable commodities.
CHAPTER III
PUTTING THE CIVIL INTO THE WILD: COLONIAL PASTORAL AND THE SYMBOLIC LANDSCAPE

[We] discovered a River, which the All-creating God, with his most liberall hand, hath made above report notable with his foresaid blessings, bordered with a land, whose pleasant fertility betraith itself to be a garden of nature, wherein she only intended to delight hirselfe; having hitherto obscured it to any, except to a purblind generation, whose understanding it hath pleased God to darken, as they can neither discern, use or rightly esteeme the unvaluable riches in middest whereon they live sensually content with the barke and outward rind, as neither knowing the sweetnes of the inward marrow, nor acknowledging the Deity of the Almighty giver.

—John Rosier, A True Relation of Waymouth’s Virginian Voyage (1605)

Why Pastoral?

As scholars from a wide range of fields have recognized, early modern English explorers used pastoral tropes as a way to define and situate the unfamiliar lands of the New World for their English audience, most of whom would never make the trek across the Atlantic to experience the land for themselves. Early modern use of the pastoral in a New World pre-colonial context, however, is much more complicated than these studies might lead readers to believe. As we see in Rosier above, and in texts by other colonial

---

43 According to Henry Burrage’s Early English and French Voyages, published in 1906, little is known about Rosier outside of his involvement with George Waymouth’s voyage to Virginia in 1605. Burrage explains that in 1605, the text was printed in London and included by Samuel Purchas in his Pilgrimes (1625). Additional reprints of the text were mainly in the nineteenth century. On Waymouth himself: Burrage explains that, in addition to the voyage that Rosier documents, the explorer embarked on a trip to New England in 1602, where he tried and failed to find a passage to India. Waymouth’s investors pulled their support after the 1605 journey, and he never returned to the Americas. Though there is no record of his death, it is thought that Waymouth died sometime in 1612, when a yearly pension that awarded to him stopped being paid (335). I begin my chapter with this text because his characterization of abundant nature as a divine garden that, nevertheless, needs to be better appreciated is representative of the rhetorical arguments we see throughout exploration literature. It also provides a vivid image of nature and of the characteristic dismissal of native claims to the land.

44 The fields are: history: David Quinn, Karen Kupperman; genre studies: Leo Marx, Ken Hiltner; ecocriticism: Laurence Buell, Todd Borlik.
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promoters such as Richard Hakluyt, Thomas Harriot, and James Brereton, explorers and writers do depict New World nature, specifically that located in what is now North Carolina and Virginia, as a type of divinely blessed golden world possessing an unbelievable and exaggerated fertility. They also argue, though, that this depiction of abundance was intended to serve rather economic, rather than pastoral, needs. The fertility the explorers encountered in America was valueless, writers such as Rosier argued, without an English form of cultivation that could take the abundance and put it to a commercial and, they would say, productive, use.

The explorers’ interest in the commercial potential of the land led the English to adapt their idea of an idealized landscape to include labor and commercialism, traits that readers do not usually associate with the pastoral. For Rosier and others, the wild fertility of the New World was wasted unless English settlers could “civilize” it by applying agricultural techniques to increase the land’s yield, and convert its produce into commodities that not only could sustain a colony but be sold in the English marketplace. As David Quinn argues, writers and exploration leaders carefully crafted texts so that they balanced this desire for economic prosperity with representations of American land and people as ideal: “every effort was made to render country and people alike idyllic and, at the same time, potentially valuable to intending colonists. This was almost certainly circulated to possible subscribers” (Quinn, *North America* 327). The dominant presentation of American nature and peoples attempts to merge conflicting images of the land as both idealized and productive. The excerpt from Rosier above is representative of this conflicting image, where the land is a blessed paradise whose secrets have been hitherto only been revealed to a “purblind generation,” here a reference to Algonquian
tribes located around Virginia and modern-day North Carolina, who are supposedly unable to understand or properly use nature’s “unvaluable” gifts. Rosier, like many of his contemporaries, argued that without the use of cultivation to access the “inward marrow” of the landscape and produce European-style commodities, the Algonquians had no right to possess a land that God had blessed as abundant and fertile. As Quinn argues, the explorers are driven by an economic motive in their presentation of nature and indigenous Americans to their English readers.

There are, however, complications with this focus on economic prosperity. Depictions of American nature in English texts predating the settlement of Jamestown in 1607, I argue, feature a complex merging of the pastoral with commercial intent. Authors used elaborate poetic language to depict the countryside as almost overwhelmingly blessed with fertility and yet also deficient in its lack of “proper,” or commercial, development. In the same texts in which authors extolled the innate virtues of American nature (i.e. its fertility and beauty), they also promoted irrevocably changing those virtues so that land would come to resemble an English countryside. These aims result in images such as that seen in Rosier, where fertile Virginian land “betraith itself to be the garden of nature” that is at present hidden from European view. The blessed garden metaphor works to familiarize the unfamiliar landscape to Rosier’s readers by allowing for cultivation. Virginia is not a wilderness, but a garden that God has created for nature’s own enjoyment. But solely existing for “delight” is not enough for this garden, as we can also detect a subtle tone of conquest underlying Rosier’s metaphor. That the garden has remained hidden, and only revealed to those who lack the ability to access the “sweetness

45 As I will discuss later in this chapter, such arguments did not recognize the crops and settlements of the Algonquian as “cultivation.”
of the inward marrow” of nature’s bounty, means that it is available for exploitation by the English, who will cultivate its riches and take advantage of the “unvaluable” resources. Images of Virginian landscape, such as we see in Rosier, prove complicated in their descriptions that both celebrate and denigrate the bounty of the natural world. God might have blessed this land with fertility, but even this fertility is deficient if it is not cultivated into productive crops.

My emphasis on the overlap between pastoral and georgic offers a deeper analysis of the pastoral’s importance in the formation of England’s American colonies. Though some scholarship does reference the presence of pastoral tropes in early modern pre-colonial literature, most critics—if they discuss it at all—often define the mode’s role solely in terms of its ability to sell an idealized picture of the land.46 While a few literary scholars, such as Jeffery Knapp and Walter Lim, examine the link between colonialism and the pastoral, their scholarship does not extend to early texts, that is, to the use of pastoral by authors of exploration literature produced in the years before England’s first successful colony in 1607. Scholars who do examine at the earliest English treatments of exploration in Virginia, such as David Quinn and Karen Kupperman, are historians, and do not provide an extensive examination of the pastoral’s role in building the symbolic landscape of the Americas. This has resulted in a gap in the scholarship, which has not fully accounted for how the pastoral is part of English colonial logics within pre-settlement texts or how such logics influence the culture as a whole, as we see from apposing literary pastoral with these non-literary texts.

---

46 See: Karen Schramm, “Promotion Literature” in The Oxford Handbook of Early American Literature; and various works by David Quinn, including Set Voyage to Fair Roanoke, “England’s First Virginia, 1584-1590” in North America from Earliest Discovery to First Settlements.
I argue that by using poetic pastoral tropes in their representations of American nature, the English began to create a symbolic landscape that garnered support for the appropriation of actual American lands. Settlers who travelled to Virginia faced a harsh reality, and Quinn and numerous historians have reminded us of the difficulty the English had in acclimating to unfamiliar topography and climate. By the end of the sixteenth century, English explorers had embarked on numerous unsuccessful voyages to the Americas and had tried and failed twice to establish a settlement at Roanoke. With settlers and investors beginning to doubt the viability of the colonial project, explorers used pastoral tropes in an attempt to counter doubts with an image of Virginia as an unformed paradise with the potential to become a thriving commercial settlement. The Virginian landscape represented in these texts became a symbol of the immense possibility open to those English settlers intrepid enough to journey to the Americas and willing to invest hard work into cultivating the landscape. These texts also hinted at what would result from cultivation, when the wild fertility would be tamed into crops, which these authors claimed would also witness England’s cultural and technological superiority.

In this chapter, using the work of place studies scholars, such as Yi-Fu Tuan and Denis Cosgrove, I assert that pre-colonial authors use the pastoral in an attempt to reconcile the American landscape as both a fertile, unshaped “space” and a cultivated, commercial “place.” This distinction between land as undefined “space” and settled “place” allows me examine how the English used the image of ideal nature to construct a

symbolic landscape that acquainted readers with Virginia’s unfamiliar topography while at the same time asserting English control over the land. Symbolic landscapes are, as sociologists Thomas Greider and Lorraine Garkovich argue, “symbolic environments created by human acts of conferring meaning on nature and environment, of giving the environment definition and form from a particular angle of vision and through a special filter of values” (1). When explorers, such as Rosier, Harriot, Hakluyt, Brereton, and Barlowe, cite the divine beauty of Virginia’s supposedly untouched nature in order to make these landscapes more familiar, they imposed a specific “filter of values” upon that landscape, making it recognizable to their English, Protestant readers. This is the beginning of the formation of “place,” as Virginia becomes a latent paradise waiting for cultivation. The English argue, however, that the land’s fertility and beauty are not enough. They assert that even when it is blessed with fertile nature, a landscape would only really become an “ideal” place when productivity becomes part of its beauty and prosperity. Thus, these authors also create a projective symbolic landscape, where their “particular angle of vision” assigns meaning to Virginia based on what it could become with English styles of cultivation. Such depictions of land are, of course, a paradox, with the natural elements that the authors see as blessed by the divine (the fertility and beauty) comprising the very things these authors want to change.

With such a contradictory view of the landscape, the pastoral in these texts extends beyond a simple appreciation of beauty. Explorers and writers do not just use pastoral tropes in an attempt to depict the New World as an abundant paradise. Instead, they use these images to conform the supposed wildness of an unfamiliar nature to their
The portrayal of land in the Americas as a divinely blessed hidden garden, for instance, allows authors like Rosier to tout the land’s potential for commercial development while also acknowledging an Algonquian presence and denigrating their methods of cultivation for their failure to understand or exploit the true value of the land’s riches. As we will see, explorers use this narrative of wasted resources to justify taking possession of the land. For the English, pastoral tropes figure twice in the colonial process: in the presentation of land as innately blessed and, more importantly, in elaborate descriptions of prospective settlements in which writers promise that the investment of a little cultivation will result in a life of plentitude and profit.

Though the focus on the New World as paradise is certainly present in these English exploration texts, each of the above authors uses the pastoral to mediate the landscape’s change from merely aesthetically appealing space to profitable, but still idealized, place. Mobilizing classic pastoral tropes, such as that of the golden world, English explorers impose order and stability upon the nature they describe. Through their descriptions of intense beauty and fertility, these authors create landscapes that provoke their readers to respond both emotionally and rationally. Several tensions arise, however, when the authors attempt to balance their emotional reactions to the land’s innate fertility and beauty with their desire to use its resources for commercial purposes. Explorers initially express awestruck admiration in response to the land they encounter, but they also portray disgust at its lack of cultivation, in part to mask their own cupidity. We see this in the epigraph above, in which Rosier defames the supposed simplicity of the

---

48 I use the term “supposed” here because the land, of course, had been cultivated by various tribes of the Algonquians for many generations. Most English, however, deemed it “wild” either because the Algonquian method of cultivation did not resemble English ones or because native methods did not produce a surplus of product.
Algonquian inhabitants, who—he claims—without commercial cultivation cannot access the “inward marrow” of Virginia’s resources and to fulfill God’s plan. Rosier may feel a genuine unease at a seeming Algonquian indifference in maximizing yield. However, the twenty-first-century reader may be more troubled by the fine line between the pious desire to bring a divinely endowed potential to fruition and the less altruistic desire for commercial gain.

Several tensions resulting from the use of the pastoral by these English explorers influence the writers’ use of the mode and the presentation of the New World in their texts. I address these tensions throughout the chapter and allow them to shape my own argument, as they create a new type of pastoral, changing the way readers encounter and understand idealized landscapes. These tensions reveal that authors used the golden age trope and the idealization of labor as a way to claim the land as belonging to the English. In order to do this, authors present two seemingly contradictory views of the land: where nature is first an idyllic “found” Eden and, second, a land that needs to be cultivated into productive crops and fields. As I show in the first section of this chapter, exploration author James Brereton exploits the tension by using his intense response to the land’s beauty as a way to establish “place” within an unfamiliar landscape. But the pastoral here only serves as an entry point for the reader to encounter the abundant natural world, which Brereton later presents as a type of catalogue, itemizing all of the plants and animals that can be used for goods and products. The underlying argument within Brereton’s text is that, despite the land’s fertility, English success in the Americas

---

49 My next chapter addresses how the idealized landscapes operated in literary versions of the pastoral. Both colonial and literary pastorals, I argue throughout this dissertation, play an important role in shaping English attitudes to land—both domestically and in the New World.
depends almost entirely upon settlers’ labor and willingness to work, a point he alludes to at the end of his work.

In *A Brief and True Report of the New Founde Land of Virginia*, Thomas Harriot and artist Theodore de Bry take a different route. Unlike Brereton, or even Rosier, who portrays the land as mostly uncultivated, Harriot and de Bry feature the Algonquian village of Secotan in which the inhabitants have intervened to order and harvest the fertility of the natural world. In this case, they claim the land is underutilized. While the Secotan carefully ordered the fertile land to yield all desired crops, which allowed them to live in relative simplicity and ease, the land is still not ideal because, according to Harriot, it does not provide excess goods for trade or production. In both instances, the depiction of land as a golden world brings attention to the promise of the landscape as it provides a way for the authors (and artist) to order and define Virginia for their readers. Despite their portrayal of the land as fertile, simple, and aesthetically pleasing, however, Harriot and de Bry do not imply that that the New World is perfect in its found state. They each argue that labor is needed to make the land a true paradise.

Another complication arises when these explorers depict labor in the latent paradise of the New World. Authors of exploration literature, such as Arthur Barlowe, use the poetics of the pastoral to devalue native labor, a tactic by means of which the English deny indigenous groups right to the land. At the same time, however, these writers celebrate English labor for its supposed ability to form idealized settlements and communities in the Americas. As they enumerate the possibilities of these settlements, authors like Richard Hakluyt perforce acknowledge key social issues in England, most notably the problem of “vagabonds” or “idle men,” unemployed workers displaced by the
conversion of common lands into enclosures. In the fourth chapter of his *Discourse Concerning Western Planting*, Hakluyt discusses this population, arguing that the innate prosperity of the New World provides a land where these “idle persons” might find honest labor, to the benefit of themselves and the nation. The second section of this chapter examines Hakluyt’s text and finds that the idealized landscape here is one in which the unemployed population is put to work reshaping and forming the promising nature of New World spaces into productive places. The symbolic landscape in Hakluyt’s chapter is ultimately English, as it is an ideal that indicates how the English may use the colonial project to form and refine a national identity based on values of capitalism and exchange. According to Hakluyt, idle men, or “masterless men” as A. L. Beier calls them, are only useful to the nation when they exchange their labor for a livelihood that shapes the natural world so that it yields commodities for the English market. Using the golden world trope, Hakluyt features an idealized landscape where the work needed to transform wild space into fields and crops gives another chance not only to the displaced workers, but to English society, whose conversion to enclosures first pushed those workers out of ancestral farmlands.

All of my authors therefore rely on familiar pastoral tropes to make their arguments more vivid and convincing. In addition to the catalogues of potential commodities and lists of natural resources, these authors use poetics to portray the land as a latent paradise. Even when these arguments seem to pertain most directly to realistic conditions of colony and marketplace, they call upon the images of a supernaturally fertile and blessed land to make that land more amenable to their English readers. Poetic
descriptions of landscape help to situate the land in the reader’s mind as a favorable space to build a colony.

The Pastoral and the Creation of Place in the New World

Using the theoretical framework of place studies and its definitions of “space” and “place,” we can begin to understand how these early texts use the pastoral as a crucial, strategic tool in constructing a symbolic landscape that reflected England’s colonial (and national) identity. In his critical introduction to place studies, Tim Cresswell writes that “space” is a “realm without meaning,” while “place” is a space “invest[ed] with meaning” by “humans [who] become attached to it in some way (naming is one such way)” (10). As Cresswell’s definitions imply, the human observer does not have to physically mark or manipulate the environment of a space to make it a place; a symbolic or cognitive shift is sufficient. Geographer Yi-Fu Tuan also highlights the importance of naming in the construction of place, as he argues that the process of labeling natural features in the land is key in allowing the explorer to create “temporary places of habitation” in an unfamiliar space.\(^5^0\) Such moments of naming and labeling cause the individual to stop, assess, and define unfamiliar spaces, and this moment of pause is the first step in allowing an individual to define “place.” As Tuan asserts in *Space and Place*, place is formed when individuals moving through a space pause: “if we think of space as that which allows movement, then place is pause; each pause in movement makes it possible for location to be transformed into place” (6). Throughout this section, we will see how explorers pull descriptions of nature as nurturing from pastoral cannon in order to portray their appreciation of landscape. These interludes offer

\(^5^0\) From “Place and Language: A Narrative-Descriptive Approach” (1991): “Words like ‘mount’ and ‘meadow,’ applied to unfamiliar features, made them into temporary places of habitation, without which the explorer would be disoriented and could have no way or reason to proceed” (687).
moments of pause that are the first steps the English take in investing the landscape with symbolic meaning, thus turning the unfamiliar land from space to place.

Early modern English authors did not use the terms “space” and “place” to refer to uncultivated and cultivated land. They did, however, have terminology to differentiate the two. When land was uncultivated or uninhabited the English referred to it as a “desert” or a “waste.” This did not mean that such lands could not support life. It only meant that the land was sparsely populated or lacked European influence. In Philip Sidney’s *New Arcadia*, for instance, Basilius refers to his retreat as a “desert.” Identifying markers of cultivation in the land, such as referring to it as a “garden” or referencing the presence of pastures and crops, served to identify land that had been defined by humanity for a particular use.

Though the term “landscape” did not make its way into English until 1605, I argue that descriptions of nature and environment as prospects in exploration literature are precursors to what the English came to understand as “landscape.” The crux of the idea of landscape is the assumption that spatial configuration of land exists from the point of view of the aesthetic of a particular observer. Just as naming and labeling can transform space into place with no physical manipulation of land, the formation of landscape begins as a mental process from the perspective of this observer. In *Landscapes of Fear*, for instance, Tuan points out that “landscapes are a construction of the mind.” Geographer and historian Denis Cosgrove asserts that landscapes are an “an ideological concept” that humanity uses to construct an “imagined relationship with nature” (15). Most often used in defining the eighteenth-century style of painting, the word “landscape” has little to do with actual natural spaces. Instead, as Cosgrove notes,
landscapes are mainly characterized by the emotions nature evokes in the observer: “they engaged a subjective response in those who observed or experienced them. Landscape was therefore invested from the outside with human meaning” (17). As we will see, in exploration literature, the pastoral becomes the “outside” force, a discursive one, which transforms the explorer’s “subjective response” of Virginian nature into representations of uncultivated or underutilized paradises that the English argue they have a divine right to settle. The use of pastoral in this way is both emotional and logical. It pulls the reader in by describing the overwhelming beauty and fertility of nature, but it also provides the English with images of a land that will give its riches only to those who know how to cultivate it. This process of forming and defining of landscape happens entirely within the mind of the explorer and his readers, who now are tutored in how to see and understand the land. The initial representation of America as a latent paradise creates an ideological and representational link between old world and new, a link characterized by the pastoral vision of unfamiliar land as nurturing and idealized. This abstract link lays the foundation for the actual construction of English settlements in the Americas.

Explorers draw on specifically pastoral motifs in expressing landscape appreciation via aestheticized depictions of nature as a nurturing and unsullied paradise. These passages are landscape writing in that they feature a human observer with a privileged perspective assessing and defining the land based on his own personal, emotional experience. These moments are also pastoral in that they take on a sentimental view of nature as a divine gift that is ready to support prosperous European settlements. Kim Schramm argues that this idealization of landscape brings together “‘magic rhetoric’ with the rhetoric of erasure,” and she uses these two phrases to show

51 For a concise explanation of landscape writing see John Wylie, *Landscape*, 206-213.
how strategic diction within text can assert authority and control: “Magic rhetoric refers to the language of agency, the phrasing of fiat. The rhetoric of erasure concerns strategic omission of unsavory realities” (75-76). In other words, Schramm argues, the idealization of American peoples and nature is one way in which the English claim the land long before they are able to establish a successful colony. Conflicts with the indigenous population and difficulties with nature are carefully elided so that perception of the colonial project in the Americas—regardless of actual success—is continually framed in terms of what the land can provide those who are strong enough to wrest control of American riches. I extend Schramm’s position by arguing that English explorers use pastoral tropes in two ways to form place out of space: first, by erasing native claims to the natural world and its riches and, then, by symbolically rebuilding those lands into projective, idealized settlements that promise settlers an easy, profitable existence in return for the initially rigorous labor of cultivation.

The first step in this process of cognitive colonization is to use the idealization of Virginian topography not only to define unfamiliar space according to the terms of familiar landscape features, but also to keep the reader focused on the possibility that the natural world could be made to provide commercial and community success. We see the formation and appreciation of symbolic landscape and place offered in such terms in the following vivid description from John Brereton’s *A Briefe Relation of the North Part of Virginie* (1602), which Brereton wrote to chronicle Bartholomew Gosnold’s 1602 voyage to the Americas. The passage is particularly useful, as it gives a striking example

52 I use the terms “productive” and “commercial” throughout this chapter. I use the following definitions for the terms: “commercial” describes the cultivation of land to extract goods that might become sellable commodities while “productive” describes land that is either put to this aim or made to sustain those living and working on it.
of Brereton and his group’s reaction to encountering a beautiful piece of land, and in it we see the author using the group’s reaction to frame the unfamiliar space so that it resembles a pastoral setting:

coming ashore, we stood a while like men ravished at the beauty and delicacie of this sweet soil; for besides divers cleere Lakes of fresh water (whereof we saw no end) Medowes very large and full of greene grasse; even the most woody places (I speake only of such as I saw) doe grow so distinct and apart, one tree from another, upon greene grassie ground, somewhat higher than the Plaines, as if Nature would shew herself above her power, artificial. (7)

Brereton’s depiction of the landscape is so ideal, with its “sweete soil,” “clear lakes,” and “large and full” meadows, that it would not be difficult to imagine it populated by singing shepherds and docile, gamboling lambs. As we will see shortly, well-known pastorals rely on similar descriptions. Brereton’s representation creates a textual “landscape” in which the “imagined relationship” between the English and the natural setting they encounter presents them as travellers entering into a familiar pastoral setting. The landscape is beautiful, fertile, and seemingly benign, and the men pause their trek forward as they enter into the space and stand “a while,” marveling at the natural world that renders them “like men ravished.” The pleasure that Brereton describes here is the first step in investing the land with meaning, as he draws the readers’ attention to the natural world so as to hint at what it might be to the English: a peaceful refuge with plenty of clear, fresh water; meadows that recall the pastoral’s bucolic landscape; and trees that are abundant and ordered, not tangled or threatening. As a whole, Brereton produces a scene where nature, as he supposedly first encounters it, is benign and
welcoming. This attention to nature at this moment also results in a “rhetoric of erasure,” in that it elides the presence of an indigenous population, depicting the landscape instead as empty and untouched by humanity and cultivation. The group’s pause and Brereton’s landscape description are, then, where the English begin to create symbolic boundaries that empty out and identify a particular landscape as worthwhile and desirable for cultivation and colonization.

This moment of appreciation—of standing as observers of the beauty before them—is also when the explorers begin to assert a claim to the land. With Brereton’s juxtaposition of the English group as both observers and assessors of the landscape, the scene complicates Cresswell’s distinction between landscape and place, a distinction he draws based on human involvement within the natural world: “Landscape is an intensely visual idea. In most definitions of landscape the viewer is outside of it. This is the primary way in which it differs from place. Places are very much things to be inside of” (10). While the explorer does feature an “intensely visual” description of the landscape and places his group outside of the land they encounter, his labels of the different parts of the landscape in the terms of pastoral meadows indicate the group’s desire to be “inside” it as place and not just observers of its beauty. As Tuan so succinctly recognizes, “place is pause.” Those moments of pause give the individual a chance to observe and define his or her surroundings and invest a space with meaning. Though Brereton and his group are “like men ravished,” or entranced, by what they see before them, they use this moment of pause to assert their influence on the space. The beauty of the scene calls them to take notice of the landscape, which gives the group time to label and frame what they see as pastoral. Though they do engage with the landscape in an “intensely visual” manner, they
also seek a way to understand and become an essential part of the landscape they see before them. This conflict between the desire to be both outside and inside the landscape results in a tension that becomes apparent in the last sentence of the quotation.

The last clauses of the description feature a simile containing a grammatical shift, in the modal verb “would,” a shift which indicates the importance and uncertainty of Brereton’s description. He strains to categorize the entirety of the landscape for his readers but he cannot label it with the same certainty as he did the meadows and lakes: the land is made “as if Nature would shew herself above her power, artificial.” Brereton’s phrasing suggests that what is “artificial” is better than what is natural, as art is “above her [Nature’s] power.” This juxtaposition of natural and artificial, along with “would” signaling possibility, results in a tension between Brereton’s characterization of nature as perfect and his desire to exploit its resources through cultivation. Brereton imagines each element of the scene, from its meadows with “greene grasse” and the “greene grassie ground” visible between the carefully placed trees, as aestheticized and potentially crafted. Brereton’s repetition and alliteration in describing the green, grassy meadows and the land among the trees draws attention to the artfulness Nature took to create these places, as the entire scene appears sculpted and maintained to produce a pleasing aesthetic effect.

Though poetry means artfulness and Brereton is describing the scene in intricate poetic detail, here the explorer sees Nature, not himself, as the one imposing artificial categories upon the land. Nature has, illogically, created an “artificial” setting that surpasses anything that she “would” create naturally. This paradox is indicative of the difficulty Brereton and other exploration writers have in distinguishing between the
natural (what they claim to find) and the artificial (the generic categorization they impose and the cultivation they promote). The explorer here deals with that difficulty by blurring the line between natural and artificial and—like Rosier—making it seem as if American land has already been cultivated into a perfectly aesthetic scene. The landscape Brereton spies is so beautiful that even in its “pristine” state, it can only be artificial. His description upholds a familiar English ideal of a perfect countryside, implying that the land itself can be ruled and cultivated like that in England.

Brereton invokes the pastoral not only in his exaggeration of the land’s beauty, relayed in the paradox that Nature has created something that surpasses nature, but in the assertion that such abundance of beauty has to be artificial. As a literary mode, the pastoral is often criticized by scholars, such as Raymond Williams, who see its simplicity as an artificial ideal that masks the reality and hardships of country life. Just as in exploration literature, moments where pastoral authors celebrate idealized nature often gloss over the difficulties that occur in cultivating and maintaining actual natural spaces. In Philip Sidney’s *New Arcadia*, for instance, Prince Pyrocles describes the landscape of Basilius’ pastoral retreat in highly idealized terms that mirror the scene in Brereton:

> you are come to a pretty height…it gives the eye lordship over a good large circuit; which according to the nature of the country being diversified between

---

53. The process of identifying newly found landscape as already cultivated recalls Jean Feerick’s argument concerning Richard Ligon’s *True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados* (1652), in which Ligon recreates courtly hierarchy in the plants of Barbados. (He calls the pineapple, for instance, the “king of fruit.”) As Feerick argues, “‘Pristine’ nature—in Barbados or at court—is revealed in this moment to be always already infused with cultural categories and, in turn, to possess the power to uphold or to undermine socio-political relations” (138). In Brereton, Rosier, Barlowe, or any other colonial writer, defining American nature as a latent pastoral paradise means investing social and political meaning into the land.

54. As I explained in the last chapter, Pyrocles is the prince of Macedon, who leaves his kingdom with this cousin, Musidorus, to seek adventure. They come to Arcadia, a Greek setting classically identified as pastoral, where they learn the story of its ruler, Basilius, who has left the kingdom with his daughters, Pamela and Philoclea, to seek refuge in a forest retreat, which he calls his pastoral paradise. This moment is Pyrocles describing his first glance of the land from the vantage point of Basilius’s lodge.
hills and dales, woods and plains, one place more clear and the other more
darksome, it seems a pleasant picture of nature, with lovely lightsomeness and
artificial shadows. (85)

This scene is, in a sense, landscape writing in that it features a character at a vantage
point that gives his “eye lordship over a good large circuit.” Once more, that is, emphasis
is placed on the viewer’s appreciation of the land’s seeming arrangement from the point
of view of a particular site. As in Brereton, Pyrocles celebrates the diversity of the
landscape, with its “hills and dales, woods and plains.” Also like Brereton, the prince
links the scene to the pleasures of artificiality when he notes the shadows. What makes
scenes like these specifically pastoral is that they evoke within the observer a sense of
pleasantness and “lightsomeness,” or “ease and cheerfulness” (OED “lightsome”). Even
the shadows, which could be threatening, are controlled to offer merely pleasing contrast,
as we see when Sidney says they are “artificial.” There is a distinct sense that the
landscape visible from Basilius’ encampment has been crafted or formed by labor,
though Pyrocles focuses only on the joy that the landscape gives him. Idealization of
land, even in literary pastorals, can employ the “rhetoric of erasure”—and not only in
exploration pastoral, as when Brereton credits the land’s peacefulness to Nature’s craft or
Rosier attributes it to being a trait of Nature’s “garden.”

I have argued that in aestheticizing Virginia’s natural world as an unsullied
paradise, authors of colonial pastoral seek to downplay potential difficulties in
colonization and to omit mention of prior indigenous methods of cultivation and prior
claims to the land. We see this when, at the end of his text, Brereton describes the
commodities that the land could yield and gets even closer to characterizing Virginia and its bounty as a golden age paradise:

The ground bringeth forth without industrie, Pease, Roses, Grapes, hempe, besides other plants, fruits, herbs and flowers, whose pleasant view and delectable smelles, doe demonstrate sufficiently the fertilitie and sweetnesse of that soile and aire. (16).

Brereton invokes the golden age when he depicts the “fertilitie and sweetnesse of that soile and aire” and claims that nature gives its bounty to man “without industrie.” Through idealization of this land, Brereton subtly elides the presence of native methods of cultivation. We know from historians such a David Ezzo and Michael H. Moskowitz, Michael Oberg, and Kim Sloan that various Algonquian tribes depended upon forms of agriculture for survival. Harriot and de Bry, as I will discuss later, also reference and describe the types of agriculture they find in the Virginian village of Secotan. When Brereton and others claim that the land produces “pease, roses, grapes, hempe” without the need for industry and labor, he is producing an English-chauvinist view of the land that effaces the work that native inhabitants have done to maintain productive crops and settlements. By listing products that the land yields without industry, Brereton also projects the possibilities of what might come when the English do cultivate the land. If this is what the land offers with no labor and little difficulty, Brereton’s passage insinuates, imagine what could happen if the English do decide to cultivate its riches.

While the publication of Brereton’s account did not lead to settlement in this case, through all of the figurative operations described above, Brereton’s writing participated

55 For more information on Algonquian history see: Ezzo and Moskowitz, Papers on Historical Algonquian and Iroquois Topics; Oberg, Dominion and Civility: English Imperialism and Native America, 1585-1685; and Pritzker, A Native American Encyclopedia: History, Culture, and Peoples.
more generally in the colonial project. In a colonial context, textual representation is an important first movement towards creating habitation and place. As Tuan recognizes, these depictions of unfamiliar lands can be as significant in colonization as the setting up of actual buildings:

With the keeping of journals and field notes, and especially with their subsequent rewriting and publication, [the explorer’s] private experiences—his temporary places of habitation—could gain access to and take hold on public consciousness and achieve thereby a higher degree of stability and permanence even though no physical manipulation of nature had occurred. (688)

The explorer’s description of land and experience becomes the basis on which the larger public begins to form their impression of unfamiliar space. Solely through its consumption of descriptions, Tuan asserts, a reading public that has no direct experience with a space can create a consciousness favorable to “temporary places of habitation,” those where the describing explorer—and his reader—can dwell comfortably, surrounded by the familiar. The pastoral’s use in texts like Brereton’s, then, is not meant just to provide readers with a familiar model of paradise on which to build their knowledge of the New World. In addition, it uses the pastoral and the promise of paradise to shape a colonialist “public consciousness” by framing the explorer’s experience in poetic terms, making the land seem familiar and generative and its people harmless. Colonial use of the pastoral also allows the English to establish “stability and permanence.” Through pastoral tropes, the English form a symbolic landscape where American nature in its innate state is the recipient of divine, supernatural blessing, whether from God or Nature, and in its cultivated state is a paradise that provides commercial success for its inhabitants in
exchange for minimal labor. In other words, these explorers use golden world tropes in their texts as a way to establish place as a paradise that the English can create, maintain, enhance, and profit from.

Brereton’s moment of pause and others like it do not stop at appropriative admiration. They also outline an exploitative future participation for the observer in the landscape by labeling and itemizing its parts. This explains the often startling rapidity of a transition in exploration writing from marveling at the supposedly pristine nature to documenting specific features of the American landscape and simultaneously explaining how each might be used for mercantile purposes. These texts offer their readers “evidence” of the possibility of an idealized settlement where the land provides, with industrious labor, commercial prosperity for the English. In the middle of a catalogue, for instance, Brereton argues:

So as the commodities there to be raised both of the sea and land (after that we have planted our people skillfull and industrious) will be, fish, Whale and Seale oiles….masts, timber and boards of cedars, firres, and pines, hempe, flares, cables and ropes…grapes and raisens and wines, corne, rape-seeds and oiles, hides, skinnes…pearle, metals, and other minerals. (17)

The variety of goods that Brereton names, along with the idea that they must be “raised” from the land and sea, indicates his attempt to merge the pastoral ideals of plentitude and variety with the need for labor and cultivation. This is the same land that Brereton earlier stopped and admired, and then claimed to produced goods (such as peas and grapes) with no labor. Here, though, he projects an image of what the land might be if the English add

---

56 Though this particular scene in the text does not feature a gesture to commercialism, at the end of his work, the explorer includes an extensive list of natural features found in the entire land of Virginia (including that which he describes here) and that can be turned into products, as will be discussed below.
cultivation to the aesthetically idealized landscape. The land has meaning that extends beyond being an attractive paradise, as its constituent parts can be made into marketable goods. Even by referring to the natural objects as “commodities,” Brereton is already claiming that they do not exist for themselves, but in relation to English valuation. Throughout the list, in fact, Brereton combines his references to raw materials (hemp, pines, firs, and grapes) with man-made products, such as rope, masts, wines, and oils. In this way, the natural features of the American landscape are primarily or in large part recognizable only as the commodities into which they may be transformed.

Brereton’s catalogue of possible commodities colors his presentation of uncultivated, idealized goods such as peas or roses. Though they might appear purely aesthetic, the natural features described in pastoral lists are linked cognitively with the commodities described in the catalogue. Both, for instance, depend upon a trope of pleasurable variety. The depictions of nature in exploration literature, no matter how idealized, are projections of what the English wanted to see in the Americas, rather than a faithful account of what they actually encountered. Jonathan Goldberg writes of such projection in the catalogue of “merchantable commodities” in Thomas Harriot’s True Report: “While many pages of his tract look merely like a list of resources of the new-found land, it is less a catalogue of what is there as of what may be there once English agricultural habits are transported, English plants are planted, and European animals are foraging” (397). For the English, representations of nature serve as a way to merge the explorer’s awe at the landscape’s beauty with hopes for commercial prosperity. All features of the land, no matter how idealized in their supposedly pristine state, become possible sites of exploitation. Their presence in the text is a projection of an ideal that can
occur after the English have established what they deem a successful colony, one that is shaped by “English agricultural habits” and that contains “English plants” and “European animals.”

Unlike literary pastoral, idyllic descriptions of American land in exploration texts offer little in the way of leisure or retreat from the bleak realities of economics and politics. Instead, their ultimate purpose in representing land as productive is to promote building settlements that would extend England’s mercantile economy. In the most far-reaching and disturbing of such representations, English explorers directly argue that those who possess the ability to foster a landscape that is both ideal and commercial are entitled to own the land, while those who cannot foster such a landscape—explicitly their indigenous inhabitants—may not claim it. Though I agree with Leo Marx that the New World, represented an “unspoiled hemisphere” that embodied the “dream of a retreat to an oasis of harmony and joy,” where Europeans thought they might create a “new beginning for Western Society,” these early English exploration texts feature pastoral tropes that create more than an elaborate dreamscape (3). These texts do not use the ideal to signal separation or retreat from the European world. Rather, they promote the commercial society as ideal, while still possessing the specifically pastoral charms of abundant, varied, beauty natural and artificial world.

The dream of retreat found in colonial texts is not what scholars might identify as a familiar pastoral retreat, where a noble man or woman flees or is banished from a complicated life of court politics and finds refuge in the simplicity of country life. Labor in these literary pastorals, if depicted, might be easy and enjoyable and the landscape is self-contained—separate from the court. Colonial use of the mode reverses this
separation by finding or fabricating similarities between elements of New World nature or native civilizations and the most idealized landscapes of England. Focusing on similarities and advocating a commercial use for the land’s fertility, these English authors establish the unfamiliar New World as an English “place.” Some idealized representations of American landscape executing this creation of place by erasing references to native cultivation and land development and replacing them with English models.

Thomas Harriot’s A Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia, however, provides an example of an explorer who establishes place by recognizing and, seemingly, faithfully depicting some aspects of Algonquian culture. Harriot’s attention to Algonquian culture has been much discussed by critics. For instance, in An Empire Nowhere, Jeffery Knapp draws our attention to Harriot’s portrayal of the native uses for tobacco, a plant indigenous to the Americas. Knapp argues that Harriot’s praise of the plant’s supposed medicinal properties is meant to hint at its marketability in England, an effort Harriot makes to scold the English for dismissing the viability of a colonial project in Virginia on the basis that the land lacks gold (146). Stephen Greenblatt, in perhaps one of the most famous treatments of Harriot’s text, argues that the explorer’s recording of native, “alien voices” not only preserves Indian culture, but is potentially subversive to English beliefs (“Invisible Bullets” 37). Greenblatt takes as the chief example, and title of his essay, Harriot’s description of the “invisible bullets” episode. In this passage, the explorer describes Algonquian reaction to the decimating sickness and death suffered by some native tribes who came into contact with the English. They express to Harriot an

---

57 Leo Marx makes a similar point in his chapter on The Tempest, where he mentions that the civilization that Prospero builds is an idealized English situation mapped on a New World island.
interesting belief: “Those that were immediately to come after us [the first English explorers], they imagined to be in the air, yet invisible and without bodies, and that they by our entreaty and for the love of us did make the people to die…by shooting invisible bullets into them” (Harriot qtd. in Greenblatt 36). Greenblatt reads this example as prescient of “unintended biological warfare,” as later science came to explain the Algonquians’ sickness and death from their exposure to European pathogens that they had never before experienced (36). Greenblatt also notices that Harriot subtly considers a similar possibility: if the English remain healthy, the explorer reasons, maybe the Algonquians who suffer are receiving divine punishment. This juxtaposition of English and Algonquian beliefs, Greenblatt argues, results in a momentary equality between the two cultures: “it may seem to us that there were no absolute assurance of God’s national interest, as if the drive to displace and absorb the other had given way to conversation among equals, as if all meanings were provisional” (36).

In “The History that Will Be,” Jonathan Goldberg replies to Greenblatt’s argument and argues that the ‘invisible bullets’ episode represents a “metaphor for historicity, a future projection.” Goldberg takes issue with scholars like Greenblatt, who cite germ theory and place the majority of the blame for the decimation of native peoples on the spread of disease. This, he argues, renders “invisible” the violent actions taken by English settlers against native peoples, and it understates the role Harriot’s men, and those who came before them, played in exploiting Algonquian resources. Furthermore, unlike Greenblatt, who sees the representation of the Algonquians as a preservation of their culture, Goldberg calls into question Harriot’s account of native voices within the colonial text, arguing that the Englishman’s portrayal of these interactions produces a
Collectively, these arguments about Harriot’s depiction of Algonquian culture have influenced my own reading of the illustrations that accompany the 1590 version of *True Report*. In particular, while—like Greenblatt—I find that Harriot’s text seems to give more attention and credence to the native customs and beliefs than other early modern explorers and authors, I find myself agreeing more with Goldberg that these images of native culture are less faithful reproductions than they are projections of the settlements the English *hope* to have in the Americas. We see evidence of this in Knapp’s analysis of Harriot’s portrayal of tobacco, which the explorer plays up as an acceptable substitute for gold. Overall, I argue that the depictions of Algonquian agriculture are what Goldberg would call a “mistranslation” of actual native practices in that they are used to provide examples of familiar, cultivated European and English landscapes. The depictions of Algonquian villages and crops, in other words, are “projective” of what the English want to establish in their own future settlements.

Plate XX (Figure 1, see Appendix A) from the set of engravings that Flemish artist Theodore de Bry created for the 1590 publication of *True Report* most clearly illustrates the way in which Harriot allows his desire to corrupt observation.\(^{58}\) De Bry,

---

\(^{58}\) The inscription by Harriot that accompanies the engraving, provides a useful key for deciphering the different parts of the image:

For the howses are Scattered heer and ther, and they haue gardein expressed by the letter E. wherein growth Tobacco which the inhabitants call Vppowoc. They haue groaues wherein they take deer, and fields vherin they sowe their corne. In their corne fields they builde as yt weare a scaffold wheron they sett a cottage like to a rownde chaire, signified by F. wherin they place one to watche for there are suche number of fowles, and beasts, that vnless they keepe the better watche, they would soone deuoure all their corne…They sowe their corne with a certaine distance noted by H. other wise one stalke would choke the growthe of another and the corne would not come unto his rypeurs G….They haue also a severall broade plotte C. whear they meete with their neighbours, to celebrate their cheefe solemne feastes…and a place D. whear after they haue ended their feaste
who never actually travelled to the Americas, based his work on Harriot’s written
descriptions and a series of watercolors produced by John White, an English artist and
colonial promoter who accompanied Harriot on the expedition. Plate XX, and White’s
Corresponding watercolor (Figure 2, see Appendix B), depict the native village of
Secotan. While both artists feature the village with the same basic layout, similar crops
and buildings, and scenes of Algonquians at worship, De Bry’s engraving presents a
noticeably larger amount of agricultural industry and order within the village. As Kim
Sloane recognizes in her analysis of the two works, de Bry’s engraving is closer to
Harriot’s description and is tailored to make the village look more productive and more
English than White’s original:

Harriot’s accompanying written account has led de Bry to add further details
including a hunting scene and plots of tobacco, sunflowers and pumpkins, and he
has tidied up the scene considerably to make neat pathways and gardens rivaling
those of an English country house. (110)

I argue that the transition in the village from White’s watercolor to de Bry’s engraving
reveals an important colonial process: the subtle merging of pastoral ideals (which

they make meerie together. Ouer against this place they have a rownd plott B. wher they assemble
tehmselues to make their solemne prayers. Not far from this large building A. wherein are the
tombes of their kings and princes…likewise they have garden notten bey the letter I. wherein they
use to sweve pompions. Also a place marked K. werin the make a fyre att their solemne feasts, and
hard without the towne a riuer L. from whence they fetche their water (Harriot 68).

59 In “Between Reproduction, Invention, and Propaganda: Theodore de Bry’s Engravings after John
White’s Watercolors,” Ute Kuhlmann explains that de Bry acquired his set of watercolors from Richard
Hakluyt, who “seemed to have persuaded” the Flemish artist to produce an illustrated version of Harriot’s
original 1588 text. Kuhlmann further hypothesizes that the watercolors that made it into de Bry’s
possession were “very similar, if not identical” to the ones currently held in the British library (81).

60 This change is not the only one found in the engravings. As critics have noticed, de Bry’s engravings are
often more idealized, with alterations in White’s depictions of Algonquian peoples and added landscapes.
For more on these differences, see: Michael Alexander, Discovering the New World, 64; Alexander
Hatfield, Literature, Travel, and Colonial Writing in the English Renaissance, 1545-1625, 112-116; and
familiarize the unfamiliar land) with the English desire to inhabit and build a commercially productive landscape that will provide settlers with profitable, easy life. Notably, however, De Bry does not Europeanize the worship ceremonies from White’s original watercolor. This decision to include the worship ceremony, as we will see, allows de Bry to maintain some distance between the European and Algonquian cultures, and it is this distance—in conjunction with the familiar landscape—that contributes to Harriot’s argument that this fertile and productive land is ripe for the taking.

By featuring a similar layout and choosing to dedicate a majority of the image to representations of dwellings and agricultural development, both White and de Bry turn a potentially alien Secotan space into a place comprehensible to their English audience. On the left of the image, both artists depict trees, buildings, and a fire that marks “a place of solemn prayer” (White). The right sides of both also feature a worship ceremony in progress on the bottom corner and, above it, three plots of corn in various stages of growth. A pathway divides the two sides and both images feature within the pathway a group of Secotan gathering around a table for a community meal. As a model for de Bry, White’s watercolor features tentative moves to establish place within an unfamiliar space.

A few of the details White chooses to include in his image—buildings and crops—would have looked familiar to his English audience and would have shown a connection between their culture and that of the Secotan. Specifically, the type of farming he illustrates is almost certainly altered to resemble English techniques. Kim Sloan provides some detail about the Secotan method of farming in the course of her analysis of White’s watercolor, explaining that the Secotan had “developed a way of growing [corn] in mounds surrounded by beans which gave nitrogen to the soil and increased the yield—
far greater than the European method of ploughing and planting alone in rows” (110).\(^{61}\)

The bottom field in White’s image, labeled by the artist as “Corne newly sprong,” depicts neatly ordered rows without beans. De Bry’s image intensifies White’s Anglicization of native methods by making the neat rows of corn more distinct, a quality that admittedly may in part result from the nature of engraving (as opposed to White’s watercolors), and including upon its borders plots bursting with ripe beans and pumpkins. While the depiction of farming in rows is subtle, its position as a key part of the image allows it to serve as a familiar feature that the English reader could see, relate to, and understand.\(^{62}\) The top two rows, marked in White as “Their greene corne” and “Their rype corn,” feature growth that is denser than that of the first field—a testament to the land’s fertility—but they are also in an ordered, row-like fashion. These fields do not look like the “mounds” Sloan describes as a component of Algonquian agricultural practice. Instead, they seem as if they are dense growth organized in rows that resemble English-style farming.\(^{63}\) The depiction of these crops is a subtle way in which both artists shape the unknown land in the consciousness of their English audience.

\(^{61}\) In *Political Gastronomy: Food and Authority in the English Atlantic World*, Michael LaCombe identifies this process as *milpa*, a farming technique originating in Mexico that Northeastern native tribes often used. The process, LaCombe explains, included a field that was “planted with maize along with beans and squash” (15).

\(^{62}\) It is important to note, however, that White and de Bry might have been unable to recognize the native organization, so they might not be purposefully altering the depiction of the landscape. Their projection of English styles of farming onto the village could be what they expected and wanted to see in the land. If so, they are themselves subject to a colonial mind as well as shapers of it.

\(^{63}\) The farming in this scene is one example of a larger move by White—and de Bry—to depict the complexity of the Secotan culture. Sloan argues that though White depicts individuals, “as though [they are] acting out their lives on a stage for the English,” he at times “presents their culture as complex and sophisticated, using categories that his English audience would recognize. The Secotan live in villages that resemble English ones with central greens and lands and protective walls, their lives were led by civil government supported by an official agricultural system and an organized religion with an annual round of ceremonies” (107).
By including the worship ceremony, however, both artists also preserve a bit of instability within the image. Though the row-style farming makes the image somewhat familiar to the audience, the religious sites and ceremony remind the English reader that the Secotan have a different culture. White even describes the ceremony as one including “strange gestures and songs.” This depiction of religious difference, which could alienate the Protestant English viewer, actually works in conjunction with familiar row-style farming to promote the colonial project. While I agree with historian Joyce Chaplin that this, and other depictions of pagan worship in Secotan culture, creates “distance” between the Secotan and the Protestant English, I find that the illustration’s depictions of land use offer an intriguing complication of the difference generated by the presence of the ceremony. In both White’s and de Bry’s versions of the village, the Secotan maintain an ordered and productive landscape. While the ceremony clearly defines the Secotan people as “other” for the mainly Protestant audience, the ordered landscapes would have suggested for the English reader that there was colonial potential in the village. The ordered, productive landscape might signal that the Secotan do not need the English. The ceremony, however, reminds the Protestant audience that despite this order, there is work to be done in the New World. Given that many explorers—including Harriot—portray the Virginian land as blessed by a Christian God, highlighting the Secotan’s pagan beliefs would serve as evidence that they do not deserve the fertile land that they inhabit. Furthermore, the agricultural plenitude that the Secotan maintain becomes—like the tobacco that Knapp draws our attention to—a profitable substitute for gold as it demonstrates a perceived ability to support English population in the place.64 This is an effect that de Bry capitalizes on in his reproduction of the watercolor.

64 Chaplin notes the overall optimistic view of White’s watercolors. Life for the Secotan was far from ideal,
The most apparent change de Bry makes in his engraving is to increase the
depictions of abundance and production, as he shows every available surface of land as
having some type of crop. This increase in production is clearly linked to English beliefs
about land use, which historian Joan Thirsk explains mandated that every part of the land
should be a place where “everything could and should be employed and improved” and
“every living thing, where possible, was pressed into the service of man—wild fruits,
wild animals, weeds, wildflowers, insects—all found use in agriculture or as medicines to
promote the health of men and stock” (161). According to Thirsk, the English felt that all
parts of the natural world needed to be cultivated or “improved” to provide goods for
humanity. Living things in their natural state, however, do not always provide food and
medicines. Specific elements of nature, she recognizes, had to be “pressed” into service
through labor and cultivation.

De Bry’s image represents efforts at this type of “pressing.” Whereas White’s
image had quite a few open spaces in the landscape, de Bry makes sure that all fields are
made to produce something for the inhabitants of the village. He even takes care to add a
tiny crop, planted in careful rows, in the fenced-in yard of the structure to the left of the
middle cornfield. Though more in line with the native practice of milpa than his source
text’s own depiction, de Bry’s decision to include the crops of pumpkins on the border of
the bottom cornfield also serves to make the village more attractive to an English
audience. More abundant crops now surround the plentiful plots of corn, and the overall

but making it seem as if it was ideal allows—Chaplin argues—both White and Harriot to put forth an
optimistic message for the colonial project: “[Harriot] speculated that the Indians could plant and harvest
two crops of corn per year. And he thought one Englishman could, in twenty-four hours, clear and plant
enough corn to feed himself for a year. (The assumption was that an Englishman could do much more, with
metal tools, than an Indian woman could do with her shell hoe and wooden digging stick.) On that basis,
Harriot concluded that the land could hold many more people than it currently did—meaning that English
people could easily insert themselves into the landscape” (59).
effect not only promotes this land’s extraordinary fertility but shows the ways in which the fertility has been “pressed into the service of man.” This is underscored by de Bry’s decision to include the forestland on the left-hand side of the image. The juxtaposition of forest with productive fields suggests that the Secotan have ordered and cultivated the landscape by converting forestland into cropland. De Bry’s image, then, shows the inhabitants’ labor has shaped village out of the forest, making every part of the landscape useful to sustaining a joyful life.

The abundance of the land and its ability to support the village of Secotan would have appealed to the English, who often had to carve farmland out of inhospitable regions. The ideal community would have been one where plants and game were readily available, requiring only easy labor. Such a land would represent a paradise for those who had to fight England’s topography in order to survive. Thirsk describes the harsh life of the English farmer by using the metaphor of war to describe the English working against—not with—nature on their island to make it provide for their needs:

In the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries men made war upon the forests, moors, and fens with a zeal which they had not felt for some three hundred years. They cleared woods and drained wet, low-lying land to make new pastures, they turned old pastures into cornland, old cornland into grass. Even on the least promising soils, many a hopeful, energetic farmer hacked out an acre or two of scrub to make a sweeter pasture….In some places the desire of men at this period to improve their environment seemed to admit no obstacles. (2)

Thirsk later acknowledges that England’s harsh terrain often thwarted these battles against nature, but her use of militaristic language here reveals her belief that the English
desired to control the natural world and force it into submission and profitable ends.

English farmers and landowners approached the natural elements of their landscape with the specific purpose of razing what they found and reshaping it to fit their needs. In such a culture, the natural state of the environment was seen as fluid. It was something that could change based on the needs of the landowner and the sweat of a workman. The original state of the land mattered little, Thirsk recognizes, if pastures could be “hacked out” of even the most discouraging landscapes. De Bry’s engraving represents a paradise not only in that it depicts an idealized, instead of antagonistic, relationship between humanity and nature but in its implication that the landscape as the English first encounter it is already productive, ordered, and flexible.

The absence of any sign of hard labor or landscape manipulation within the engraving suggests that the natural world is so fertile and accommodating that an initial investment of labor (clearing forest land, forming crops) ensures that a continuing struggle is unnecessary. De Bry’s depiction of a fertile land promotes a vision of harmony, not war, between humanity and nature in that it features a natural world that provides for those who put labor into the land. The scene represents similarities between English and American topography—allowing the English to imagine their sustained potential presence there (in Tuan’s terms, allowing a fantasy of “stability and permanence”). At the same time, de Bry suggests that in this hospitable region, English methods of agriculture can extract more from the landscape with less labor. Taken on its own, de Bry’s engraving idealizes the village of Secotan via the impressive abundance of

---

65 The English husbandman’s work, Thirsk claims, was never truly seen as done, even after making improvements to the landscape: “In the cultivation of land, contemporaries regarded the labours of the husbandman as a continuous war upon nature to preserve the land from reverting to scrub and woodland” (163).
the land that provides for the entire community and that delineates a harmonious, ordered civilization. Labor is also idealized, since this community exists alongside carefully manicured groves and crops. Such life, de Bry’s engraving hints, can only happen after labor has shaped the fertility of the landscape to productive ends. As we will see in the next chapter, this merges representation of idealized landscape with acts of labor, which influences the formation of the georgic-pastoral in imaginative literature.

Harriot’s description of the engraving on the facing page underscores the connection between a pastoral ideal and industrious labor. He begins by describing the crops and dwellings found in the town and ends with a romantic portrayal of the village’s inhabitants: “This people therefore voyde of all couetousnes lyue cherfullye and att their harts ease. Butt they solemnise their feasts in the nigt, and thefore they keepe verye great fyres to auoyde darkenes, ant to testifie their Ioye” (XX). This portrayal of the Secotan, who according to Harriot live joyfully at their “harts ease” and free of covetousness, would be appropriate in a pastoral text alongside descriptions of shepherds and other “simple” rustic characters. Like the simple shepherd, the Secotan of Harriot’s description live modest, innocent lives free of the negative trappings of an urban, courtly existence. The simplicity that Harriot attaches to the Secotan conveniently allows him to imply that they would be accommodating to English settlers.

These innocent lives, however, do not occur in the absence of social order or labor. Every inhabitant depicted has his or her place and is performing some duty. Every individual plays a part in the larger community. The hunters at the top left corner of the engraving provide the community with meat, and an individual directly across from the hunters, marked “F” in the top cornfield, protects the corn from grazing animals. The
table in the pathways shows some inhabitants preparing and enjoying the “solemn” feast, and another group of individuals attends to a fire, which Harriot says the Secotan use to “auoyde darkenes, and to testifie their Ioye.” Idealizing this labor allows both Harriot and de Bry to convince the reader that the cheerful life, “voyde of all couetousnes,” can be achieved through industry, production, and cooperation.

Ecocritical scholars theorists Graham Huggan and Helen Tiffin, while mostly focused on how indigenous authors use pastoral to address and challenge colonial influence in their countries, suggest an additional role for pastoral in colonial texts. They argue that invading cultures use the pastoral to paper over the violent process of colonization, making the subjugation of a culture and place seem less destructive and the best option for all involved. In part of their explanation of the mode’s use in colonialism, Huggan and Tiffin use the work of literary scholar Annabel Patterson to show how the colonizing culture uses pastoral ideology and representations of the natural world to explain the interaction between the colonized and colonizer:

Pastoral…. is about the legitimation of highly codified relations between socially differentiated people: relations mediated but also mystified, by supposedly universal cultural attitudes to land. Through these and other means, pastoral ideologies tend to emphasize the stability, or work toward the stabilization, of the dominant order, in part through the symbolic management—which sometimes means the silencing—of less privileged social groups. (Huggan and Tiffin 84)

Huggan and Tiffin base their claim of the mode’s role in colonial thought on Patterson’s original argument, one that states that the “culture spoken throughout [the pastoral] is high culture” (Patterson 10). In their application, Huggan and Tiffin equate the colonizing
culture with the “high culture,” arguing that the colonizer often uses his or her place of privilege to produce propaganda that stabilizes his or hers as the dominant culture and symbolically manage the land by silencing indigenous voices. Authors use “supposedly universal” attitudes to land use to explain the relations between the noble and rustic. Through the use of the pastoral, Huggan and Tiffin argue, the colonizer erases or misrepresents the experience of the indigenous group to rewrite its history in a way that suits the colonizing presence.

In de Bry’s engraving, and Harriot’s description of the Secotan village, this occurs in the use of the pastoral in the representation of production and the idealization of the Secotan as a people who live “voyde of all couetousnes…cherfullye and att their harts ease.” The European artist and explorer center their depiction of the village on the premise that the Secotan and the English share an attitude toward land use. Though this mediates the relations between the English and Secotan—by making it appear as if both groups have similar goals for the land—the engraving also “mystifies” these relations by casting the Secotan civilization in a way that makes it more palatable to an English audience.

For example, De Bry’s depiction of Secotan agricultural production—along with the representation of their buildings as an orderly village—make the village of Secotan appear to be an established and permanent town. However, as Michael LaCombe explains, Algonquian groups such as the Secotan participated in “seasonal migration,” moving to coastal settlements like the village of Secotan during early spring and further inland during the early fall in order to “exploit the sources of food when and where they were most abundant” (15, 16). Additionally, though the Secotan depended upon the
harvesting of corn, hunting, and fishing for their survival, they also foraged for plants to supplement the community’s diet (16). Harriot and de Bry recognize that the Secotan had a highly ordered agricultural system; however, the Europeans fail to comprehend (or to relate) the practice of migration or the importance of foraging to the diet. The Secotan did clear land for crops, but instead of sticking it out in inhospitable regions or “hacking” farmland out of rough terrain, they moved with the seasons to derive the most from what nature had to offer. Thus, like Goldberg, we might question the reliability of Harriot and de Bry’s representations of the village. Though we do know that the Secotan maintained crops and settlements, the representation of quasi-English orderly plantings and seemingly permanent habitation is a type of “symbolic management” in which the English reaffirm the dominant forms of order in the New World. This practice also “mystifies” the relation between the English and Secotan in a way that proves detrimental to the native culture. Representations like de Bry’s and Harriot’s, which call on the pastoral to make the Secotan seem like simple, benign rustics, make it seem as if the indigenous population are harmless and will not give too much resistance to the English colonizing their land. This misrepresentation of the land as a fertile paradise and the Secotan as harmless also does not prepare the potential settler or investor for the enormous task of setting up a colony in the New World—a task that the English would not undertake until much later. Overall, the pastoral allows these explorers to use poetics to shape the way English audiences approached actual American lands.

“Industrious, Industrious”: Colonial Pastoral and Rights to the Land

I have argued that the use of pastoral in English descriptions of American nature helps to form “symbolic landscapes,” where explorers depict supposedly uncultivated
nature as an unformed, divinely blessed paradise whose raw materials can be easily converted into “merchantable commodities.” A further consequence of colonial pastoral is that it enables the English writer to devalue indigenous labor through a complex process that reconstitutes the definition of an idealized landscape. For colonial writers, the ideal landscape is not a place where nature provides for all of humanity’s needs, but one in which labor has turned fertile space into a productive place. While exploration authors might write narratives in which they cast indigenous Americans as the benign inhabitants of a golden world, the English also use this casting to belittle native ways of life as rustic or primitive. Even when the English do recognize native cultivation, as de Bry and Harriot do with the village of Secotan, they do not register such subsistence agriculture as the mark of an idealized society. Instead, they view the true pastoral paradise as one in which humanity uses agricultural development to turn the raw materials of the fertile landscape into commodities that can be sold in the English market.

In *Changes to the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England*, William Cronon studies the impact that England’s commercial focus had on the ecosystems of colonial New England. Since the English were mostly concerned with commercial development of American lands, Cronon argues, they failed to appreciate the practicality of native customs such as seasonal migration to more fertile lands. Puritan settlers coming to America in the mid-seventeenth century, he explains, used such misunderstandings as justification for taking possession of native territories: “A people who moved so much and worked so little did not deserve to lay claim to the land they

---

66 Though his examination of early modern texts is mainly focused on mid- to late seventeenth-century tracts, such as those by John Winthrop and John Smith, Cronon does look back to Richard Hakluyt’s *Discourse on Western Planting* and the explorer’s interest in finding “merchantable commodities.” The text, Cronon argues, serves as evidence that the English viewed American nature as valuable solely for the commercial goods it could provide (20).
inhabited. Their supposed failure to ‘improve’ that land was a token not of their chosen way of life but of their laziness” (55). As Cronon remarks, seventeenth-century English settlers did not recognize native labor as actual work on the grounds that this labor did not establish permanent settlements and did not “improve” the land. “Improvement” to the English, of course, meant the development of land into profitable crops and settlements through the building of towns and enclosures. Late sixteenth-century exploration literature, such as Harriot’s True Report, generally provided a more positive depiction of Algonquian tribes in and around Virginia, a position taken in part as a result of the dependence of early English settlers on native tribes for food. But within these positive, poetic descriptions of Algonquian peoples as rustics living in a latent paradise, we see hints of the pejorative depictions that Cronon mentions above.

Using the work of pastoral theorist Andrew Ettin, Huggan and Tiffin argue that the pastoral form of the eclogue is easily adapted by colonizers to assert a “benign form of Euro-imperialism,” either by establishing “unchallengeable social and cultural hierarchies” or by acting as “the watchful figure of a non-authoritarian (often invisible) overseer/landlord, whose duty it is to see that work is done and everything remains in its proper place” (84). Huggan and Tiffin argue that colonizers adapt the form of the eclogue, a short, poetic work that idealizes nature and rustics, to establish a hierarchy that favors the colonizing culture. The promotion of hierarchy occurs when the idealization of both land and rustic workers makes it seem as if living a country life is simple and without significant toil. In this fantasy, laborers are happy to work on the idyllic land to

---

67 One only need perform a quick search of the Oxford English Dictionary to reveal that for early modern England the primary definitions for “improvement” concern humanity making land more profitable or enclosing and cultivating “wasteland” or wilderness into farmland (“improvement” 1a, 2a).
produce goods for the nobles and landowners. Additionally, Huggan and Tiffin recognize that colonizers often write themselves in the role of observers or appraisers who protect the idyllic land by making sure that everything is in its “proper place.” Not only do colonizers use pastoral tropes to represent the colonized land as a paradise, but the mode can offer a foundational narrative in which colonizers serve in the role of protector or preserver of the idealized utopia.

Perhaps since their focus is on the postcolonial use of pastoral, Huggan and Tiffin do not explain how colonizers use the actual form of the eclogue to this end. Excerpts from Arthur Barlowe’s *Narrative of the 1584 Virginian Voyage*, however, demonstrate the ideological effectiveness of including short, poetic interludes in exploration literature. In his text, which offers one of the most idealized depictions of Virginia, Barlowe describes Roanoke as a paradise, often fitting poetic, idyllic descriptions of its people and lands into the prose at random intervals. The following interlude, for instance, comes right after the explorer is welcomed into the home of Grangyno, the “Kings Brother,” and takes note of all the goods kept by the family and their hospitality:

> we found the people most gentle, loving, and faithful, void of all guile, and treason, and such as lived after the manner of the golden age. The earth bringeth forth all things of aboundance, as in the first creation, without toile or labour. The people only care to defend themselves from the cold in their short winter, and to feede themselves with such meate as the soile affoordeth. (8)

Though Barlowe is not quite in the position of “overseer/landlord,” he uses the poetic trope of the golden age to assess the Secotan from a position of authority. He defines them based on a Christian perspective; they live “as in the first creation” and do not have
to toil in order to feed themselves as they live off of what the soil gives them. Barlowe’s depiction of the Algonquian as “most gentle, loving, and faithful, void of all guile,” though, is a patronizing view of their culture and civilization. This assessment of the land as fertile and the people as gentle and loving is Barlowe’s way of asserting “a benign form of Euro-imperialism,” as he places everything in its “proper place”: the abundant land remains uncultivated and its inhabitants are gentle and harmless.

Barlowe’s assertion that the land “bringeth forth…abundance…without toil or labor” is, as we know, untrue. Not only does the historical record prove that the Secotan did, in fact, work for their food, but Barlowe himself references their agricultural labor. He intersperses pastoral tropes within his narrative, though, in order to represent native labor as primitive and rustic. Two paragraphs before, he asserts that the Secotan live “without toil or labor,” Barlowe explains the frequency of their cultivation, “in Maye they sowe, in July they reape: in June they sow, in August they reap: in July they sowe, in September they reape: onely they cast the corn into the ground, breaking up a little of the soft turfe with a woodden mattock, or pixaxe” (7). The explorer’s use of epistrophe to describe the process of planting and sowing suggests that he wishes to highlight the quick and easy yields that the Secotan enjoy, but in doing this he also acknowledges that they must perform “labour” for their food. Barlowe’s explanation at the end of the quotation ensures that his portrayal of Secotan agriculture comes across as rustic and “gentle.” He ends the repetition of sowing and planting with a qualification that categorizes their agricultural labor as primitive. He claims that even their process of planting and sowing is easy, as it only consists of throwing corn onto the ground and breaking the land with
primitive wooden tools.\textsuperscript{68} This allows Barlowe to show not only that the Secotan are harmless, but that they lack the proper technology to take full advantage of the land’s fertility.

It might appear commonplace for Barlowe to celebrate the lives of the Secotan as prelapsarian, or “living as in first creation,” lauding the ease of their labor and lives due to the fertility of their land. His identification of their agricultural labor and tools as primitive, though, associates them with Adam and Eve after, not before, their expulsion from the Garden of Eden. This association linking Algonquian tribes with the newly fallen couple is not unique. We find it also at the beginning of de Bry’s series of engravings, which opens with a plate depicting Adam and Eve both before and after the fall. In the middle foreground, the engraver shows them right before the fall. Both are naked as they stand in front the tree of knowledge, in which the serpent is intertwined. In the background, however, de Bry depicts the two after the fall. Fallen Eve, now clothed, appears behind prelapsarian Adam, under a hut and holding a child. Fallen Adam, also clothed, is behind prelapsarian Eve. He is wearing a loincloth and working in the fields, tilling the ground with a wooden mattock like the one mentioned in Barlowe’s description. As Michael Gaudio argues in \textit{Engraving the Savage}, the engraving’s juxtaposition at the beginning of the work draws a parallel between primitive, fallen man and the Secotan: “De Bry included the engraving of Adam and Eve because he wanted to leave us with no doubts as to the proper origins of the Indians” (16). Despite being sporadically associated with prelapsarian humanity by authors such as Barlowe, the

\textsuperscript{68} For a discussion on the representation of primitive tools and labor in Jean Ribault’s “Discoverie of Florida,” Barlowe’s narrative, and Hakluyt’s \textit{Principle Navigations}, see Makenthun pages 34-48.
native way of labor and life was never ideal in the sense of free from labor. In de Bry, labor imposed upon land through indigenous husbandry is depicted as punishment for human sin, but this familiar equation of labor and sin does not appear to apply in such a straightforward manner to the depictions of labor that Hakluyt, Harriot, and other propose for English settlers.

We get an example of the idealized landscape state that the English hope to achieve in the Americas in Richard Hakluyt’s *Discourse on Western Planting* (1584), a lengthy and neglected text in which Hakluyt makes a case for England’s colonial project. Hakluyt dedicates each of the work’s twenty-one chapters to a different reason for establishing a colony. In the fourth chapter, he argues that in addition to yielding commodities for the English market, settling the New World would have the added advantage of providing employment opportunities and solving the problem of “loyterers and the idle vagabonds,” a term he uses to describe unemployed farmers and workers who were displaced by the enclosure movement (234). Hakluyt’s insistence that the

---

69 As Cronon points out, John Locke will also condemn native labor for not taking full advantage of the fertility that they had been given (*Changes in the land* 79). For the quotation in context, see Chapter V, section 41 in *Two Treatises of Government*.

70 For an interesting treatment of Francis Bacon and intellectual labor in the seventeenth century, see Joanna Picciotto’s *Labors of Innocence in Early Modern England*.

71 Hakluyt claims that the problems of vagrancy and “idle men” occur when the population booms due to an abundance of blessings, but—as historian A.J. Beier recognizes—such social conflict actually resulted from the English economy shifting from feudalism to capitalism. Without the manorial ties of the feudal society, Beier argues, these “masterless men” had to depend on wage labor and the whims of a market economy (12). The rise of poverty among agricultural workers happened in response to two key developments in early modern English society: a rise in population and dramatic changes in agriculture and land use. Hakluyt is partly right when he argues that population contributed to the scarcity of employment, food, and resources, as the number of people in England “nearly doubled from about 2.7 million in 1541 to 5.2 million in 1651” (20). But this growth in population was only part of the problem. As Beier recognizes, changes in agriculture and land use—such as enclosures and engrossings—caused significant strains for the laboring class (22). Common lands and villages were taken from the public to provide more land and profits for the land-owning class, leaving the workers and residents without lands to work or places to live. Lacking access to proper resources, the landless class had to turn to wage labor, which—as Beier notes—
investment of labor in the Americas would allow England to address the problem of poverty reflects a new ideal, one that fits with the needs of the colonial project and a paradisal state. In this case, the transfer of agricultural labor into American lands provides England’s poorest citizens with a chance to achieve a good life and to benefit their country by farming and building settlements in a supposedly uncultivated, but temperate and fertile, landscape.

Hakluyt uses his chapter on “idle men” to provide an example of the advantages derived from the implementation of his colonial goals. He begins his chapter by asserting that opportunities for employment have not kept up with a rise in England’s population, which occurs—he claims—due to the absence of war and disease. Without employment and “havinge no way to sett on worke,” Hakluyt contends, “idle men” resort to becoming “mutinous,” often getting by on thievery or “pilferinge” (234). Rather than condemn these men to prison or death, Hakluyt proposes sending them to settle the Americas, where wrangling the land’s fertility into profitable commodities would provide opportunities for “manifold employment” (233). For Hakluyt, the Americas represented a promising space where these men could find labor and, thus, become productive citizens through the building of place.

Hakluyt’s proposal here is so skillfully crafted that while calling attention to a serious social problem, it also accentuates England’s supposed prosperity and providential superintendence: he links the rise in population to “long peace and seldom sicknes (two singuler blessings of almightie god)” (234). Though Hakluyt acknowledges this social issue in the most positive way possible, his reference to high unemployment offered no guarantee of a stable economic existence, as workers were then “exposed to the pressures of the market” (28).
and “idle men” in the argument for colonization reveals the severity of the issue and the key role labor and industry play in his plan to solve this problem. For Hakluyt, idleness and leisure—any situation in which these men (mostly of lower social degree) are not working—lead to disorder and thievery. The fertile landscape, then, is not only a lure to readers with deep pockets and potential settlers. It serves as the tool that these “idle men” may use to shape a colony and a future for themselves, exchanging labor for livelihood. Hakluyt presents his argument as a solution that will benefit all involved. While the New World provides a place where these idle men can find employment that will enable them to transform from thieves into honest laborers, their toil proves advantageous to England’s formation of place and profit in what he refers to as unfamiliar, uncultivated land, or “waste”—in Tuan’s terms, space (Hakluyt 314). Hakluyt suggests that for a country struggling to establish a colony in the Americas and manage scarcity at home, the ideal landscape would not be one in which rustic poets sat around composing verses and conversing while leisurely watching their sheep gazing on a pasture.

In Hakluyt’s chapter on idle men, then, we see how the pastoral incorporates a new ideal, one in which labor is enjoyable because it benefits self and nation. His quotations blend georgic references to industry with his desire for a paradise in which nature readily provides its human inhabitants, a trope familiar in the pastoral. Hakluyt argues that the profits and trade that come from the commodities that the “vagabonds”-turned-laborers extract from fertile nature (not produced spontaneously by nature) result in a peaceful and happy existence for all involved. While he claims that the New World does provide fertile soil and an untouched paradise, according to his assessment, the English cannot achieve an ideal situation until the “idle men” shape this fertility into
commodities and products. When joined with promising nature, labor forms a landscape that is ideal:

   And the soile thus aboundinge w\textsuperscript{th} corne, fleshe, mylke, butter, cheese, herbes, rootes, and frutes, \&c. and the seas that enyron the same so infinitely abounding in fishe….the people being industrious, industrious I say, there should be found victualls ynoughe at the full in all bounty to suffice them all. (239)

Hakluyt begins this quotation by listing the natural resources that come from the “soile” and the “seas.” However, his list of products supposedly “abounding” in the earth is, like Brereton’s, a curious mixture of resources that occur with little or no human intervention (“herbes,” “rootes,” “frutes”), commodities cultivated for human consumption whose names presume and anthropocentric perspective (“fleshe,” “mylke,” and “corne”), and those products that only come into existence as the result of human labor (“butter, cheese”). Hakluyt’s blending of natural with man-made products means that he, just as Goldberg argues of Harriot, is creating a projective fantasy. This explorer creates an ideal that he wants to see, one in which the poorest citizens of England are taken to the Americas and, through the manipulation of land, are able to live prosperous, happy lives while helping the entire community. The repetition of “industrious” puts a strong emphasis on work, indicating how labor will allow the “idle men,” who languish in England, to achieve stability through their work in the New World. With labor as the linchpin of his argument and the key force that makes an ideal landscape that provides for its human inhabitants, Hakluyt’s fourth chapter reveals the gradual turn of English ideology toward an ideal based on labor and industry.
Unlike native labor, which the English see as primitive and a punishment, English labor in texts like Hakluyt becomes a saving grace for those who are suffering from poverty. Labor depicted in *Discourse* provides these individuals the chance to participate in building an idealized landscape, where industry yields “victualls ynoughe…to suffice them all.” What results from agricultural work and the creation of commodities, he argues, is a paradise in which all contribute to the well-being of the community and the land provides for all the community’s needs. At the beginning of this chapter, Hakluyt stresses the abundance of the natural world in the Americas. He dedicates almost an entire page to a list of the different types of employment the masterless men might find in the New World: “yf this voyadge were put in execution, these pety teves mighte be condemned for certen yeres…in new founde lande in sawing a felling of tymber for mastes of shippes and deale boards…in building of fortes, townes, and churches” (234-235). Hakluyt’s argument throughout this chapter stresses that when provided with fertile and yielding natural world, the workers’ labor results in personal, moral development as well as the formation of a settlement. Shaping a promising landscape into commercial prosperity, he argues, allows workers to improve their moral, as well as their economic, lives.

In Hakluyt’s text, the well-being of the individual and the state is tied to production. He argues, for instance, that rather than receiving goods from other countries, already “wrought” or created, England can import raw materials from the Americas so that those poor still living domestically can make them into commodities. This further stresses the importance of industry in alleviating poverty: “to conclude what in the nomber of thinges that go out [of England] wroughte, and to come in [to England]
unwroughte, there need not one poore creature to steale, to sterve, or to begge as they
do” (238). Here, Hakluyt places the blame for thievery, poverty, and begging on an
economic system that imports goods rather than produces goods for export and trade.
These problems will only be solved, he argues, when England gains control of fertile
American soil, which will yield the raw materials needed to make commodities that the
English can sell in foreign and domestic markets. A colony, he posits, would provide the
English with the resources and space to produce goods that would ensure that the “poore
creatures” who languish in England could remain moral citizens whose labor provides a
way out of poverty.

Hakluyt further argues that idealized labor in the fertile paradise of the Americas
would strengthen the English communities. He stresses the connections between labor,
production, and morality when he claims that given a chance at employment and honest
labor, “vagabonds” can create stronger family units: “for when people knowe howe to
lyve, and howe to manynetayne and feede their wyves and children, they will not abstain
from marriage as nowe they doe” (239). Here, Hakluyt equates labor with the ability to
maintain life and family. The chance at work provides the laborer with lessons about
responsibility that benefit his entire life. For Hakluyt, labor can form a better person and
a stronger citizen. It transforms the beggar and thief into the citizen whose work has far-
reaching benefits. He argues that any benefits or hope of transformation for the poor must
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72 E. Taylor, the editor of this edition of Hakluyt’s work, reads this sentence as being an argument that
modern nations engage in industrial, rather than agricultural, labor. While I agree that Hakluyt’s proposal to
import raw materials and export manmade products and commodities does lend itself to such a reading, I
also find that throughout the chapter, he also references agricultural labor as a way to create products and
commodities. For example, Hakluyt argues that American settlers would find employment “in gatheringe of
cotton whereof there is plenty, tillinge of the soile for grain, in dressinge the vines there is greate
abundance for wyne, olyves whereof the soile is capable for oyle, trees for oranges, lymons, almondes,
figges, and other fruutes all wth are found to growe there already” (234-235). I do not think we can
underestimate, then, the importance of agricultural labor in creating this industrial economy.
come from the state itself. For Hakluyt, for whom this outcome is a fantasy, the American landscape symbolizes England’s chance to solve this serious domestic issue.

Hakluyt’s example promoting settlement in the Americas through the labor of England’s poorest citizens is not just a sign of his altruism. The English saw the performance of labor and the manipulation of landscape as an important step in claiming colonial lands for their country. John Locke’s much later theory of private property, explained in *Two Treatises of Government* (1689), helps to illuminate the nascent assumption on which Hakluyt relies when he projects his arguments about labor and formation of settlement onto the American landscape:

27. Though the Earth…be common to all Men, yet every Man has a Property in his own Person; this nobody has any Right to but himself. The labour of his Body, and the work of his Hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatsoever then he removes out of the State that Nature hath provided, and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property. It being by him removed from the common state nature hath placed it in, it hath by his labour something annexed to it, that excludes the common right of other men. (134)

Locke argues here that every man has ownership over his own body and the labor that he engages in, which he calls the “Work of his Hands.” A man gains right to land when he “mixes” his labor with the earth and brings it out of the “State that Nature hath provided.” Mixing labor with nature transforms the earth from a thing that all men can claim through “common right” to “Property” that belongs to one man, the one who shaped the land through the “Labour of his Body.”
In Locke, the earth has three distinct categories: earth in its natural state that is “common to all Men,” earth that man shapes through work and labor, and earth that man has shaped and that is now personal property. Hakluyt and other authors of exploration literature create similar distinctions among visions of progressively transformed New World land: its natural fertile state that has yet to be claimed by European forces (there is little talk of native claims to the land), its transformation state in which authors claim cultivation and labor can change the land for the better, and the final paradise state where English control and cultivation of the land results in a golden world where nature provides for humanity’s personal and commercial needs with little or easy labor. The performance of labor that takes the land through this process ensures that its riches belong to the laborer and his country. For instance, Hakluyt argues in the third chapter of his *Discourse on Western Planting* that when settlers manipulate nature to resemble familiar models, other European powers—specifically the Spanish—will see that it clearly belongs to the English:

> This enterprise may staye the spanishe kinke from flowinge over all the face of that waste firme of America, yf wee seate and plante there in tyme, in tyme I say, wee by plantinge shall let him from making more shorte and more safe returnes out of the noble portes of the purposed places of our plantinge. (“Chapter 20,” *Planting*, 314-315)

Like Locke’s better-known claim in the *Two Treatises*, Hakluyt bases English rights to the land on the labor associated with “planting,” where agricultural labor has formed land into settlements. Representations of the land as “noble” and “fertile,” and as yielding enough to feed everyone, with enough product left over to form profitable commodities,
are not only meant to lure potential settlers to the Americas. Labor might provide a paradise, where all work together to form a community, but it also, according to the developing theories of property law, serves as irrefutable proof of ownership.

We see this “proof” in the sense of urgency in Hakluyt’s tone above, as in his repetition of “tyme” in the second clause of the sentence, which implies that the first person to “plant” will own the land. The English must establish a colony as soon as possible in order to keep the Spanish from claiming—from “flowing” to—the “best partes” of America, which he has already indicated should belong to the English. Hakluyt adds force to his charge by using repetition, which we see in the three instances of “plant” and “planting” and in his use of consonance throughout. The sibilant and plosive words intertwine to drive home the argument that not settling New World would be a grave, national mistake. Hakluyt leads his readers to consider the natural world as it is, “waste firme of America,” and the paradise it could be after it is planted and clearly marked as English territory. His use of “waste” to describe the land indicates that he sees it as empty and purposeless without cultivation. He implies that English agriculture will create the land as it should be: producing goods for settlers and the English market. Conversely, he implies that when land is not producing, it almost does not exist. Despite this land being a “waste,” however, it is still desirable and in demand, as we see from the threat of Spanish incursion.

Hakluyt’s transition from uncultivated, “waste[d],” land to that which is put to a commercial purpose reminds the reader of what is at stake if the English do not establish a colony in the New World. And the text’s central argument, written almost one hundred
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73 As is often the case in early modern references to nature or land, “waste” means “uncultivated” or “not applied to any purpose” and “firme” is reference to “dry land” and “solid earth,” a variation of the Latin terre firma (“waste,” 1a and 1c; “firm,” adj. 8).
years before Locke, is an antecedent of Locke’s theory of property ownership. A delay in settlement, Hakluyt argues, not only leaves the Spanish free to possess the “beste partes” of America, but it will also mean that they have rights to all the riches the land has to offer. The labor of “planting,” in this quotation and elsewhere in Hakluyt, becomes the action that allows the English to claim the fertility of the New World as their own, keeping the Spanish and other powers from gaining more of a foothold in the northern parts of the continent. “Planting,” in other words, is not only an action that builds a colony, but also a symbol of English colonial control, a control that Hakluyt argues will result in a pastoral paradise in which the land provides for those who learn to transform its innate fertility into commercial ends.

**Conclusion**

In many early colonial texts, explorers document test plantings of English vegetation on American soil to help determine whether the land will support the colonial project. Both Barlowe and Brereton, for instance, document planting seeds from England, to find that the plants quickly grow to amazing heights. Barlowe claims that in ten days, the peas he planted grew fourteen inches, while Brereton claims that a crop of oats, wheat, barley, and peas grew nine inches in fourteen days (Barlowe 7, Brereton 6). As my chapter has suggested, this act of planting was more than just a scientific experiment. As I have argued, such symbolic agricultural labor and its documentation provide both material and cognitive support for English claims to the land whose fertility and responsiveness they commend. Patricia Seed connects the importance of gardens in English culture to the way in which seventeenth-century settlers wrote about and
considered their cultivation of colonized land. Manipulation of land, she writes, served a different purpose for the English than it did for other European powers:

As a sign of possession the garden represented the entire colonial ambition to possess the land by establishing a part of the project in a central and visible way. No other country used the garden in the same way, because in no other European country was the garden a symbol of possession. While the garden itself represented the colonial endeavor in a fixed, visible form, Englishmen described themselves as 'planting' the garden….The action of the colonists in the New World was planting; the colonists were metaphorically plants in relation to the soil, and hence their colonial settlements were referred to as plantations. (29)

The act of planting seeds is a “visible” signs of England’s colonial intent. Such planting promotes the ordering of the wild fertility of American lands into colonies, a transformation that the English see as a way to signal their possession of the land. So important is the act of planting that the word itself becomes, as Seed argues, an integral part of colonial discourse.

I have argued that the use of pastoral tropes, along with the references to planting in the Americas, allows the English to create an idealized landscape that is something other than a space where the natural world effortlessly provides for all of humanity’s needs. Instead, it is a “civil wildness”: a place where the innate but unharnessed fertility of the natural world inspires English settlers to labor in order to create prosperous colonies. This juxtaposition of divinely blessed nature with a call to labor creates a change in cultural attitudes towards labor and land. As we will see in the next chapter, where I address the use of labor and georgic tropes in conventional pastorals, even
English poets begin to define an idealized pastoral landscape as one whose order and civility demonstrate the strength of the community and humanity’s power over the natural world.
CHAPTER IV
THE PASTORAL-GEORGIC

But look, a stormy shower doth rise,
which will fall here anon.
Menalcas, best we now depart;
my cottage us shall keep,
For there is room for thee and me,
and eke for all our sheep.
Some chestnuts have I there in store
with cheese and pleasant whey;
God sends me victuals for me need,
and I sing care away.
—Barnabe Googe, Third Eclogue, Eclogues (1563)

We could not observe the hundredth part of creatures in those unhabited lands; but these mentioned may induce us to glorify the magnificent God, who hath super-abundantly replenished the earth with creatures serving for the use of man, though man hath not used the fifth part of the same, which the more doth aggravate the fault and foolish sloth in many of our nation, choosing rather to live indirectly, and very miserably to live and die within this realm pestered with inhabitant, than to adventure as becometh men, to obtain an habitation in those remote lands, in which nature very prodigally doth minister to men’s endeavors, and for art to work upon.
—Edward Hayes on Sir Humphrey Gilbert’s Voyage to Newfoundland 1583.

Refiguring the Ideal Landscape

The prior chapter focused on how the use of pastoral in exploration writing extended beyond representations of American nature as an abundant golden world and how these depictions of the natural world featured writers’ and shaped readers’ attitudes toward nation and empire. This chapter focuses on how literary versions of the pastoral golden world changed in similar ways during this period. In the pastoral texts most highly regarded by scholars, such as Spenser’s The Shepherd’s Calendar and Book 6 of The Faerie Queene and Shakespeare’s As You Like It, authors do not depict characters who exist passively within an idealized landscape. Rather than being gifted by some divine or

74 Though Gilbert made several trips to Newfoundland, he never returned from his last voyage. Hayes writes in his narrative that on the return journey, a storm overtook Gilbert’s ship, The Golden Hind, which sunk along with all those aboard.
unseen hand, bucolic landscapes in texts by Spenser and Shakespeare are often peaceful and successful due to georgic labor—agricultural, industrious—that the rustic characters either allude to or perform. The land is not simply a sentimentalized setting or stage for the depiction of rustic enjoyment or plentitude. These later sixteenth-century representations of nature also do more than, as Paul Alpers argues, provide readers with a better understanding of character. The landscapes depicted or described within these texts are more in line with what Jeffery Theis calls the “sylvan pastoral.” That is, these natural settings either challenge or require scrutiny and labor from the pastoral characters and, in doing so, they complicate the way readers define the idealized landscape. When labor is introduced into the pastoral, characters become responsible for the formation and maintenance of their bucolic paradises.

The epigraphs above both use the pastoral convention of the golden age to portray the pleasantness of the natural world. There is a difference, though, in what the authors portray as happening—or in what should be happening—within their landscapes. For Hayes, American land might be “super-abundantly replenished” by God and “temperate and fertile,” but it is also lacking, without cultivation or technology. In this epigraph, we see the colonial desire to direct the fertility of the land into a type of “civil wildness,” where the English will “use” the land as Hayes argues it is meant to be used. The crux

75 As explained in the introduction, Theis defines the “sylvan pastoral” as those pastorals set in forests (such as the one in As You Like It). While he admits this subgenre of the pastoral is difficult to define, Theis argues that the “tangled topography” of the woods within them challenges the characters to make their own habitations. He argues that this focus is prompted by English anxieties about forest and wooded territories on their island.

76 As stated in the introduction of this project, Sidney’s paradoxical term “civil wildness” is useful when discussing the presence of labor in the idealized landscape. As a subgenre of the pastoral, a “civil wildness” represents a natural world in which humanity brings order to nature’s unrestrained, though promising, wilderness. It is a place in which the peace of nature appears spontaneous but is actually carefully maintained through agricultural and other types of industrious labor. By joining the two terms, Sidney
of Hayes’s argument lies in his advocacy of the formation of “habitations.” He defines the supposedly uncultivated land that he first encounters as promising—not perfect. Hayes points out that though nature here may be blessed by a divine power, inhabitants cannot enjoy its true riches merely by taking what is there. The Americas, he argues, provide a promising landscape meant for “art to work upon.”

The connection between an imagined golden age and labor that we see in Hayes departs from the leisure and repose that readers normally associate with the pastoral. In the first of the epigraphs, excerpted from one of the first pastoral texts in the English language, Googe’s shepherd Coridon provides an example of that more leisurely version of the pastoral. In the eclogue, two shepherds, Menalcas and Coridon, periodically pause their conversation so that they can take in and appreciate their desirable setting. Their discussion touches on decidedly non-ideal subject matter: Menalcas questions the other herdsman about the plight of an aging ram and Coridon’s experience with the corruptions of town life. The moments when the shepherds pause to appreciate their landscape provides the shepherds with a retreat into and a reminder of the idealized simplicity of their surroundings. For instance, in the opening lines, Menalcas describes

creates a pastoral world that is not defined solely by the presence and interactions of the shepherds with other rustics and the occasional wandering courtier or by the beauty of the land itself. With his reference to “civil wildness,” Sidney forces his readers to consider how his characters influence their landscapes. The pastoral setting is thrust into the forefront of the text with this deliberate reference to the connection between the natural world and human labor. In conventional pastorals, a key component of idealized landscape is the characters’ ability to work and maintain their pastoral surroundings for the benefit of themselves and their communities. These conventional texts have a unique connection with their colonial counterparts, I argue, in their attention to the interaction between character and setting.

For an example of a vision of nature as idealized retreat see Christopher Marlowe’s “The Passionate Shepherd to his Love” (1599-1600), Thomas Wyatt’s “Mine Own John Poinz” (1536), or to see nature as a retreat that clashes with the narrator’s state of mind, see Surrey’s “The Soote Season” (1557). For antecedents of Spenser’s more complicated representation of nature and labor in the pastoral see the Kalendar of Shepherds, a 1518 translation of a 1493 French text, and Alexander Barclay’s Eclogues (1530). Both of these texts discuss labor in the pastoral (see Andrew McRae’s commentary in God Speed the Plough, 264-267). Though both works address work in the pastoral, I find that Spenser’s Shepheards Calendar gives a fuller treatment to the importance of labor to the idealized landscape.
the “pleasant weather”; the “joyful tunes” of the birds; and the lambs and “aged ewes,” who both bounce, leap, and kick in the fields before contrasting that joyful setting with the gloominess of the aged ram (1-8). In this case, Menalcas’s attention to setting serves as an idealized frame for a discussion of the ram’s melancholy. By placing the ram’s story into such a beautiful, “joyful” setting, Googe shows that the ram’s aging does not threaten the tranquility of the bucolic paradise. What happens to the animal does not change the idealized nature of the pastoral locale.

Googe once again emphasizes the shepherds’ idealized surroundings when, immediately after hearing the ram’s story, Menalcas dismisses its importance and returns to a perusal of setting. He calls Coridon to lie with him in “yonder bush of juniper,” claiming the bush would be a “pleasant place” to have a conversation, before asking Coridon about his experiences in town (47-49). While the shepherds discuss complex topics of aging and corruption, their conversations are constantly framed by an appreciation of the idealized landscape in which they live. Nature in Googe is a retreat into a life of leisure, where outside forces cannot penetrate the boundaries of the ideal and more local reminders of aging (such as the ram) are easily dismissed and pose no threat to the inhabitants’ tranquility.

Yet the shepherds’ descriptions of their surroundings in Googe are also similar to those we see in epigraphs taken from Hayes. Both lands are blessed by God and temperate and fertile. In Googe, unlike Hayes, though, there is no push to make the shepherds change their environment in order to produce anything. Menalcas and Coridon have a passive relationship with their landscape, drawing on it for inspiration and renewal instead of touting their role in or responsibility for creating that place. Googe’s references
to nature occur mostly in these interludes, where descriptions of landscape underscore the peace and tranquility of the environment and demonstrate that any corruption either exists safely outside the borders of this idealized world or is no real threat to the paradise in which the two live. The presentation of the country in this way is in line with how Anthony Low reads “normal” landscapes in sixteenth-century pastorals: “Poets normally employ the country as a place on which they can project the psychological vicissitudes of love or of religious aspiration, or to which they can retreat in order to recoup their energies or tame their ambition” (The Georgic Revolution 28-19). In Googe’s eclogue, nature figures as a device that allows the characters to “recoup their energies” as they hold more unpleasant conversations. The pleasantness of nature also serves to tame the ambitions of the shepherds, as Coridon admits the corruption and ambition associated with town life is in no way preferable to the pastoral retreat.

Googe’s lines excerpted above come at the end of the eclogue, and they once again emphasize the shepherds’ leisure and their passive relationship with the idealized setting. Here, Coridon invites Menalcas to his cottage to take refuge from an impending rain shower. Coridon’s leisurely life is apparent in his assertion that the food that he eats—“chestnuts,” “cheese,” and “whey”—all seemingly come from God. Katherine Little proposes that this reference to “cheese and pleasant whey” is an indication of Coridon’s labor and his independence as a worker. This, she argues, shows the gradual referential shifts in pastoral invoking an ambient agrarian proto-capitalism, with

78 As if it is seemingly touched by a magical force, Coridon’s cottage—which readers most likely associate with a “dwelling-house of small size and humble character”—is big enough to welcome and shelter Menalcas, and it has a pen to keep the shepherds’ flocks (“cottage, n” 1). The juxtaposition of cozy, inclusive cottage with the “stormy shower,” “stormy” here referencing the possibly threatening force of the rain, reminds the reader of the comforts that the pastoral offers to its inhabitants. Coridon’s humble cottage is able to accommodate and provide shelter for any shepherd who might need to take refuge from potentially threatening weather.
shepherds acting as independent laborers and producing their own goods (103). 79 Though her argument is intriguing in its analysis of the text’s demonstration of a connection between pastoral texts and early capitalism, there is no indication in the poem that the “cheese and pleasant whey” actually came from Coridon’s own hands. Though both are human-made products, in the line immediately following, Coridon cites God as the source of all his “victuals.” This reference to divine providence casts doubt on Coridon’s producing the food himself, as it poetically displaces the labor to a divine source who has “sen[t]” it, allowing Coridon to “sing his cares away.” This complicates Little’s reading. Instead of showing a partiality for labor, I argue that Googe’s eclogue plays exactly to the expectations of the reader that singing shepherds live in ease and plenty. Googe’s reference to food here again emphasizes the pastoral as a retreat. Even these products—products that in reality are produced by human hands—come from a divine source who provides for Coridon and frees the shepherd from labor, allowing him to live a life of leisure.

Readers familiar with early modern pastorals may therefore see the excerpt from Googe as a representative example of the mode, whose authors use the simple topics of shepherds’ conversations (but not their landscapes) to address complicated issues relating to human experience such as politics and love. 80 Such readers might also define pastoral

79 Little published Transforming Work in 2013, one year after I began this project. Her overall argument is intriguing and links the medieval figure of the plowman to leading pastorals. While her work intersects with mine in its attention to labor in pastorals, she argues that the plowman tradition—not georgic tropes inspired by colonial ambitions—was more influential in this inclusion. In this particular instance, as I explain above, I believe that Little is too quick in attributing labor to this moment in Googe. She’s right to say that “cheese” and ‘whey’ are products that are made, but Coridon’s next two lines complicate that reading.

80 Alpers, for instance, argues that as the “representative anecdote” of the pastoral, shepherds—not landscapes—are the central concern of the pastoral. In the introduction, I extend Alpers’s argument by calling for a deeper consideration of the overlap between character and landscape. As Paul E. Parnell points
texts as conventionally featuring idealized lands that provide a peaceful retreat in which shepherds can safely have allegorical conversations that celebrate or subtly critique the larger culture, the court, or the monarch. Texts such as Googe’s demonstrate what William Empson would call “putting the complex into the simple,” and representations of nature such as this one are what readers have come to expect from the pastoral. These readers would not be wrong, of course; texts like Googe’s fit neatly into such readings of landscape. And for those trained to see the pastoral setting in this way, even later works by (better) writers such as Spenser and Shakespeare seem to offer a clear-cut representation of land as a retreat from outside cares.

It is not fair to characterize pastoral scholarship as overly simplistic. Leading pastoral scholars have performed brilliant readings of character and complexity in texts such as *The Shepherd’s Calendar*, *The Faerie Queene*, and *As You Like It*. The fault with these readings, I argue here, is that they do not go far enough to analyze the pastoral setting as a complex entity within the text, one that possesses an allegorical potential to address attitudes toward actual landscapes, labor, and the formation of empire. Patrick Cullen, for example, recognizes complexity in the pastoral by distinguishing between “Arcadian” and “Mantuanesque” pastorals, but his analysis of fictional landscape is similar in both cases. In “Arcadian pastoral,” the type Cullen most associates with simplicity and *otium*, the fictional ideal landscape is “lush and pleasant but at the same time almost always vulnerable and precarious” (2). While mostly defined by simplicity, the Arcadian landscape cannot stand up to outside forces. The “lush and pleasant”

---

out in “Barnabe Googe: A Puritan in Arcadia,” the shepherds’ conversation about the aged ram, who has tried and failed to fight a younger rival for access to ewes, is meant to point to the futility and impracticality of love and lust, while the conversation about town and its inhabitants is a comment upon the corruption of the rising merchant class, whom Coridon calls “churlish” and cruel, and the threat of Catholicism (276).
environment is always threatened. In “Mantuanesque” pastoral, where authors use shepherds’ situations as allegory for faith and religious growth, the idealized landscape is similarly symbolic of innocence threatened by the corruption and temptations from the outside, secular world (19, 25). While Cullen recognizes the significance and potential complexity of the pastoral setting, his analysis of fictional landscapes in these two types of pastoral texts does not leave much room for what representations of nature might tell readers about authors’ view of how labor shapes actual landscapes that demonstrate empire. In subsequent readings of Spenser’s The Shepherd’s Calendar, for instance, Cullen argues that the landscapes can symbolize everything from the contrast between age and youth to the “debate between ambition and low estate” (56). Landscapes in early modern pastorals can symbolize so much, it seems, but literary scholars like Cullen have not yet appreciated what they might tell us about English culture’s ideas of and attitudes toward the natural world.

With its representation of nature as benign and soothing, Googe’s work serves merely as a starting point of what I find to be a significant development in the pastoral mode. As we will see, later authors subtly begin to include georgic tropes within their representations of landscape and, thus, gradually transition their representations of humanity’s engagement with setting and landscape from passive reception and enjoyment to more active and, thus, more complex shaping of their environment to create its soothing and nurturing qualities themselves. Works by these authors begin to resemble Hayes’s epigraph above, in which the explorer manipulates the golden age trope by adding references to the actual work necessary for establishing settlement in the New World.
In pursuing this argument, my project does not seek to supplant previous scholarship on early modern pastoral works. Much work, such as that by Cullen, Alpers, and Empson, provides valuable analysis of the significance of character and the importance of the mode in allegorizing the author’s views about political and religious matters. This chapter extends such scholarship by taking a serious look at the ways in which pastoral representations of landscape can tell us about attitudes toward actual landscapes.\(^1\) I argue that pastoral depictions of humanity interacting with idealized landscapes—either alluding to such activity or actually doing labor—allegorize changing English attitudes toward land and labor, attitudes that were, in part, put in flux by England’s desire to establish an American colony and by the difficult realities of fulfilling that desire.

The pastoral-georgic text responds to these difficulties by featuring landscapes that challenge characters by requiring them to perform some labor in order to generate the tranquility of the pastoral place. In recognizing the resulting presence and importance of georgic tropes to these works, I align my discussion of early modern georgic with that of genre scholar Alastair Fowler. Fowler addresses critics who suggest that it was not until

\[^1\] I focus as much on pastoral landscape and setting as I do the rustic characters within early modern pastorals. Thus, this chapter also expands the work of leading genre scholar Paul Alpers. As I explained in the introduction, Alpers encourages scholars to look at pastoral landscapes as “fit habitations” for shepherds rather than as “nature poetry” or “visionary or psychological projections” of what the authors see as ideal nature. Alpers identifies the main goal of the pastoral as building a fiction in which the shepherd serves as a “representative anecdote” of human lives (22). I find, however, that looking at pastoral landscapes as “visionary or psychological projections” can help scholars understand larger, “cultural motives” in the authors’ depictions of character. With the presence of georgic tropes and references to multiple forms of labor, characters of early modern pastorals have a greater stake in building and contributing to the peace, tranquility, and order of their environments. Looking at these texts from this perspective, we can view the “central fiction” of the pastoral a bit differently. If purpose of the pastoral is to show how these “shepherds’ lives represent human lives,” then the pastoral-georgic blend in these texts is meant to address and call the reader’s attention to questions concerning humanity’s place in the natural world. Such analysis of the landscape reveals that its status as “ideal” does not depend on its depiction of simple, uncomplicated natural world. Instead, these landscapes are “ideal” when they reflect humanity’s ability to order the promise of nature to productive ends.

149
the Augustan period that the English first began favoring georgic conventions over those of the pastoral. Fowler counters these speculations by arguing that georgic tropes began to appear in pastoral works as early as the sixteenth century.\(^8\) He points out that late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century authors, such as Spenser, had a different understanding of georgic conventions. For these authors, he argues, the Virgilian georgic model was

a digressive poem containing precepts, instruction in an art, or meditation on the good life. It might touch on labor and the retired life of the country; comparison of historical periods; seasonal change; or landscape description. And it was spoken in the poet’s own person, neither elevated like epic nor dramatized and deliberately unlearned like pastoral. (111)

Fowler’s definition establishes a wider understanding of the georgic as a mode, going beyond seeing it as defined by the presence of agricultural toil within the text and recognizing that these “digressive poems” provided moments of instruction and meditation. Georgic, then, is not just characterized by content but by narratorial stance. Also important in this understanding of the georgic is the attention to a landscape and history that is not static. As we will see, when the natural world around them ceases to be static, either through “seasonal changes” or from the influence of historical change, authors must adjust pastoral characterizations to accommodate those fluctuations. For Fowler, this wider understanding of “georgic” and its demand on character changes how pastoralists present their rustic inhabitants, with shepherds meeting the demands of the

\(^8\) Fowler traces the beginning of the belief he disputes to John Chalker’s *The English Georgic* and Dwight L. Durling’s *Georgic Tradition in English Poetry*. Fowler specifically counters the argument of Anthony Low who, in *The Georgic Revolution* argued that a Tudor and Stuart disdain for labor kept authors, most of whom were courtiers, from celebrating the georgic as a literary mode. For court authors, Low argues, the leisure and ease of the pastoral life were much more attractive (19).
text and becoming less “deliberately unlearned” and not quite so naïve. Alpers is right about pure pastoral, but pure pastoral is a rarity in the age of colonial aspiration, since the basic trope of natural idealism is one that both fantasizes and mediates on the uses of the land.

My definition of pastoral-georgic texts builds on Fowler’s assessment of georgic conventions. Throughout this chapter, I concentrate on how the moments where authors’ “touch on labor” serves a didactic purpose. Pastoralists use landscape description and references to industrious labor as a way to prove that hard work is what results in the laborer obtaining the “good life.” The presence of georgic tropes within these pastorals indicates a larger cultural shift in conceptions and attitudes concerning what constitutes ideal nature. Rather than see paradise as defined by leisure and complete harmony with the natural world, the use of georgic tropes signals a cultural preference for land that possesses a type of “civil wildness,” that is, which requires work to form community and to perfect promising natural worlds. This means that literary authors, too, promote an ideology that resembles that featured in exploration literature like that quoted above from Hayes. In the texts we now see as exploration literature, the successful formation and maintenance of landscape is meant to indicate a civilization’s ethics, power, and refinement. When pastoralists recognize labor as part of their works, however, they are also forced to consider how an idealized landscape can be ideal if it also features hard work.

The Land Meant for “Art to Work Upon”

If I ask my readers to picture a typical pastoral scene, they might think of something like we see in Googe: rolling hills, temperate weather, frolicking livestock,
and shepherds enjoying it all while leisurely composing songs and poems. The pastoral landscape, one might say, is a place of rest, renewal, and retreat, where any trouble or work that shepherds might address in their poetics exists outside the boundaries of their ideal surroundings. If readers approach pastorals by primarily looking—as Alpers and countless others have done—at how the shepherds and their conversations are “representative” of more complex realities, then pastoral landscapes either recede into the background as unsustainable examples of some naïve, sentimental ideal or have worth only insofar as they reflect a character’s emotions. For instance, in a chapter aptly titled “Spenser’s Pastoral Landscape: The Mind’s ‘Myrrhour,’” Nancy Jo Hoffman argues, “the representative mind creates fictional, seasonal landscape outside of itself that reflects and accommodates inner psychological states” (79). For Hoffman, this means that the natural world can serve as “pure metaphor,” resulting in what she calls a “complex use of nature in service of human nature” (79). Many readings of Spenser’s settings are similar to Hoffman’s, with scholars analyzing the complexity of landscapes through a reading of character. 

83 Schol...
simple pastoral setting. Just as in Alpers, Hoffman’s analysis deems landscape as meaningful only in that it communicates to readers more details about the shepherds’ lives and their connection to human lives.

The presentation of nature in pastoral-georgic texts, however, complicates such readings of the landscape. When authors feature pastoral environments that demand attention or labor from the character, they are writing landscapes that are themselves complex. These pastoral-georgic landscapes reflect the ways in which colonial ambitions and Protestant beliefs resulted in a growing cultural preference for labor over leisure. These representations of ideal nature place responsibility for the success of the rustic figure within the pastoral on him- or herself. The interactions between character and nature in these fictional landscapes provide insight into what the English considered the ideal role for humanity in the natural world. Since they reveal attitudes about actual environments, we can look to these texts using the work of leading landscape scholars, such as Denis Cosgrove and Kenneth Olwig, who argue that actual landscapes act as texts that societies use to communicate cultural identity. Cosgrove argues,

---

84 For more on the allegorical nature of pastoral and its connection to political and philosophical inquiry, see Andrew Ettin, Literature and the Pastoral and Patrick Cullen’s discussion of the “Arcadian Pastoral” in Spenser, Marvell, and the Renaissance Pastoral, which I discuss later in this chapter. See, also, the sources referenced in the introduction: Louis Montrose, “Of gentlemen and shepherds: The politics of Elizabethan pastoral”; Annabel Patterson, Pastoral Ideology; Paul Alpers, What is Pastoral?; and—of course—William Empson’s Some Versions of Pastoral. Interestingly, when pastoral gets too complex, scholars often identify a split in the mode. So, Ettin makes a distinction between Arcadian pastoral, focused on leisure and possessing a sentimentalized view of nature, and Mantuanesque pastoral, named after the poet Baptista Mantuan and focused more on religious allegory (2-3). Leo Marx also identifies two different strains in the pastoral, the “sentimental” and the “complex.” The “complex” pastoral contains a counterforce that works against the idealized, sentimental view of nature as a paradise that provides peace and prosperity with little to no labor. In my argument, I see the presence of georgic tropes as an attempt to bring together, not separate, the idealized and more complex strands of the pastoral. So, what others might see as a “counterforce”—pointing to more realistic engagement with landscape—is actually meant to bolster, not counter, the pastoral dream.
Landscape…is an ideological concept. It represents a way in which certain classes of people have signified themselves and their world through their imagined relationship with nature, and through which they have underlined and communicated their own social role and that of others with respect to external nature. (Social Formation and the Symbolic Landscape 15)

Cosgrove’s definition of landscape resembles Hoffman’s assessment of pastoral landscapes. Both Cosgrove and Hoffman look at how depictions of “external nature” reflect something about humanity. In Cosgrove, one can determine the social ideologies of a culture by looking at how the landscape’s inhabitants relate their natural world. However, unlike Hoffman’s fictional shepherds, who project their emotional state on external nature, the individuals in Cosgrove’s quotation construct their landscape to communicate social roles and identity. People, he argues, depend upon their “imagined relationship with nature” to define their place in society, and they manipulate the concept of landscape to communicate that definition to others.

Though Cosgrove analyzes real, not fictional natural worlds as Hoffman does, both scholars are concerned with representations of nature, and I find we can apply Cosgrove’s argument that actual landscapes are “ideological concepts” to fictional pastoral-georgic environments. That is, when authors depict the natural world working against or challenging the pastoral figure, they do not just provide a reader with insight into the character’s troubled mind. In constructing these landscapes, pastoral authors communicate cultural ideologies concerning humanity’s place in the natural world. These ideologies are, I argue throughout, similar to the ones we see promoted in exploration literature, by which explorers argue that paradise is made, not found. In referencing
human responsibility to transform gifts of nature, authors use their pastoral landscapes to delimit both the social identity of the rustic figure, as the one who works within and on the land, and England’s national identity, as the country that promotes the improvement of such landscapes. As I briefly discussed in the introduction, the manicured topography of the Renaissance garden symbolizes political stability and order. The pastoral-georgic landscape (or the “civil wildness”) has a similar representative function, as the order of the landscape embodies England’s social and political values.

The landscapes described in the September eclogue of Spenser’s *The Shepheardes Calendar* reveal a complexity lacking in the example from Googe above. The eclogues have similar subjects, using descriptions of the corrupt worlds outside of the pastoral environs to symbolize a Catholic threat to Protestant believers, and both end with a pair of shepherds seeking refuge in a cottage. For Spenser and Googe, the idealization of the pastoral retreat is meant to allegorize England’s Protestant superiority over outside Catholic forces, forces that both authors see as a constant threat. Nature, however, serves a more important role in Spenser’s eclogue. While Googe references the misuse of land in town, Spenser takes time to describe his characters’ experiences with different versions of landscapes.85 Though these references to the landscape are subtle, moments when characters mention the “soyle” or describe the natural world reveal a cultural preference for industrious labor and a belief in its ability to form an ideal landscape.

The shepherds in Spenser’s eclogue, Diggon Davy and Hobbinol, are safely ensconced in their pastoral landscape, but Diggon’s complaints about the pastures he

85 The lines where Googe references the misuse of landscape directly are 118-128: “The seely sheep that shepherds good/have fostered up with pains,/And brought away from stinking dales/on pleasant hills to feed,/-O cruel clownish Cordon!/O cursed carlish seed!/-The simple sheep constrainèd he/their pasture sweet to leave,/ and to their old corrupted grass/enforceth them to cleave.”
encounters when he travels to “forrein costes” complicate Spenser’s presentation of ideal land. When Diggon explains why he failed to thrive within these foreign pastures, the shepherd indirectly defines a proper way for humanity to approach landscape:

But sicker so it is, as the bright starre
Seemeth ay greater, when it is farre:
I thought the soyle would haue made me rich:
But nowe I wote, it is nothing sich.
For eyther the shepeheards bene ydle and still,
And ledde of theyr sheepe what way they wyll:
Or they bene false, and full of couetise,
And casten to compasse many wrong emprise. (76-83)

Labor is not figured directly in these lines, but by blaming the shepherds outside the boundaries of his pastoral world for being “ydle and still,” Diggon implicitly puts value on the virtue of hard work. While the line immediately after his charge that the shepherds are lazy references a specific type of work that the bad shepherd does incorrectly, that of unsuitably leading their sheep, Spenser’s reference to “soyle” near the beginning of the lines and his use of “casten” and “emprise” at the end add another type of labor to the eclogue. As we will see, taking care of sheep is not the only responsibility these misguided shepherds fail to perform properly.

Spenser presents the misuse of natural resources as one of the sins committed by the bad shepherds. When Diggon leaves his pastoral home, he is under the impression that the land will “haue made me rich,” but the idleness, lying, and greediness of the foreign shepherds thwarts his attempts. In part, the fault for Diggon’s failed expedition is
with the shepherd himself for seeking to get rich quickly by moving to another, more promising pasture (this is a narrative that we will see repeated with Melibeous in *The Faerie Queene*), but it is telling that the end of the second sentence ends with the shepherd recognizing that the others engage in the “wrong emprise.” According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, “emprise” could mean “intention” or “purpose” (“emprise, n.” 1). It could also mean an “undertaking” or “enterprise” (“emprise, n.” 2). Both these meanings work when put back into the context of the lines. The lazy shepherds approach the land with the wrong intent when they look to it and see only a chance to undertake a life of leisure. Those “false” shepherds who do work are no better, as they are full of “covetise.” Given the importance Diggon places on soil, believing it “would haue made me rich,” it is probable that other shepherds also look to the soil for their chance to gain material wealth. With their focus on greed and personal gain, however, these bad shepherds do nothing to foster community, and their failure to do so contributes to Diggon’s failure. In this case, the land itself is neutral, but Spenser’s portrayal of the unsavory shepherds offers insight into an ideological concept that places significance on labor and community, not personal gain, as the proper stewardship of land.

The link between “emprise” and the working of landscape becomes more apparent when one considers the resonance of “soyle” in line 78 with “casten” in line 83. The editors of the Yale edition of Spenser’s shorter poems gloss the phrase “casten to compass” as “attempt to achieve” (154). With this gloss, the meaning of the line appears straightforward, with Diggon condemning the shepherds’ misguided attempts to achieve the “wrong emprise.” Viewing the line from the perspective of a different definition,

---

86 The fault with Diggon Davy’s leaving his familiar pastoral world is similar to the fault Spenser portrays with Melibeous. Their mistake is not that they leave the pastoral, but that they leave it for the purpose of seeking personal wealth.
however, complicates this straightforward reading by suggesting greater detail than “attempt to achieve.” The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines “cast” as the act of plowing with a shovel or digging up soil (28a, 29), and “compasse” can reference the “boundary of a space or area” or a “circumscribed area or space” (7a, 8a). These meanings link the enterprise the shepherds are attempting to achieve to the “soyle” Diggon references in line 78. Since these characters are shepherds, readers would not normally associate them with this figurative plowing, but these definitions and their connection to “soyle” add depth to what the shepherds of the foreign pastoral “attempt to achieve.”

When these shepherds approach the land with greed and “casten to compasse the wrong emprise,” they are not just engaging in something wrong, but they are purposefully misusing the land with an improper purpose and to an unsuccessful end. There is nothing wrong with the “soyle” itself, as Diggon looks to it from afar and sees that it could be fruitful. What he is not able to see, or to account for, from afar is the corruption of the land’s inhabitants, who are the chief source of Diggon’s woe. The eclogue demonstrates the liabilities for the misuse of the land by the bad shepherds. With their greed and dishonesty, these shepherds approach the land with the intention of building personal wealth and they neglect to support the community as a whole, which means honest shepherds cannot sustain themselves within the pastures of the “forrein costes.”

As one of the “moral eclogues,” September’s chief allegory is the contrast between Protestant and Catholic beliefs, with the lazy, greedy shepherds and their pursuits symbolizing the supposed corruption of Catholic priests. Scholarly readings of this eclogue take a variety of perspectives, but most critics fail to seriously analyze the
presentation of nature for what it might tell us about early modern English attitudes toward labor and the working of real landscapes. In fact, Hoffman goes so far as to argue that when Spenser provides a description of landscape and portrays the “qualities of geographical place,” his “interest in them lies, not in the *flora* and *fauna* they produce or in the detail and individuality of their particular beauty, but in their symbolic potential to characterize a state of mind” (30). Hoffman detaches the textual landscape and its aesthetic appeal from any connection to actual natural spaces and views presentations of nature as important for what they might attest of the character’s or author’s “state of mind.” Thus, she does not account for the full symbolic potential of Spenser’s depiction of landscapes. While I agree that Spenser makes his landscapes complex by allowing them to symbolize the minds of the poet and of his characters, I am not so quick to dismiss the notion that the presence of these geographical details might give some insight into early modern ideas and attitudes toward colonial landscapes.

Spenser is able to communicate his figurative meaning, that of the bad (i.e. Catholic) shepherds as unsavory, by first constructing a representation of landscape that appeals to a larger cultural sensibility—placing importance on the proper use of land and
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87 Nancy Hoffman relates the landscape and its economy to the temperament of religious folk: “In a simple golden world economy, the qualities needed by pastors can be those of shepherds—meekness, mildness, simplicity, humility, equality. In the golden world, no hierarchy need develop in which certain people become moral exemplars to unshaped, slack psyches: rather each man lives in an exemplary fashion” (114). For her, the simplicity of landscape is important because it allows for the characterization of the good shepherd. Patrick Cullen examines this eclogue for the presentation of both shepherds’ attitudes towards land, with Diggon’s “impractical” and “wild-eyed” and Hobbinol’s a more “practical ideal” (67). Cullen examines how both shepherds present the “limited perspective” of the pastoral, with these limited perspectives making “September” a satirical eclogue. Robert Lane, in *Shepheards Devices: Edmund Spenser’s Shepheardes Calender and the Institutions of Elizabethan Society*, is probably closest to my argument, as he discusses actual landscapes. He argues that this eclogue in particular concerns the growing impact of enclosure on workers who become wanderers and “vagrants” when they are displaced by the enclosing of their farmlands and the commons. Lane does not reference the working of land, however, as he is more concerned with the social impact the enclosure movement has on the economy and its laborers (12-13). It is worth noting, as well, that Lane opposes the readings of both Hoffman and Cullen, citing the critics’ focus on character and their refusal to engage with the “social matrix of exploitation that the eclogue explores” (12).
defining the right attitude for shepherds as one that opposes idleness and covetousness. By taking a closer look at the role of landscape in the allegory of *The Shepheards Calendar*, my argument benefits from the work of A. C. Hamilton, whose analysis of allegory in *The Faerie Queene* calls scholars to reconcile the text’s literal images and metaphorical meaning (12). Too often, he argues, critics labor to look beyond the image itself in favor of accessing the author’s deeper, allegorical purpose. Hamilton proposes that taking a moment to appreciate the literal image will result in a better understanding of the text:

> Once we allow that in reading Spenser’s poem we should focus upon the image, rather than upon some idea behind the image, our understanding gathers around our response to the poem’s literal level because it arises from it. Our sense of that other reality to which the poem points, by first pointing to itself, grows from our sense of the poem’s reality. (43)

Critics such as Hoffman and Alpers seek to go beyond the representations of landscape in the pastoral, looking for the ways in which the author’s literal image of nature reflects or contributes to an understanding of character. However, focusing instead on the image of nature as nature (and not a character’s mind or emotion) in the September eclogue of *The Shepheards Calendar*, for instance, we see a land that is initially promising but whose promise is wasted due to greed and neglect. This image of nature as one that requires, and does not get, labor from its inhabitants reveals Spenser’s access and contribution to a cultural ideology concerning landscape—one that favors hard work and that views the
misuse of promising land as a grievous sin. As we will see, the poem’s allegorical “reality” rises out of Spenser’s presentation of landscape and setting, which subtly pushes the reader to consider some labor, not leisure, as the ideal pastime for residents of the pastoral world.

Later in the September eclogue, Diggon uses the image of boggy land to describe the greed of the foreign shepherds. As Hoffman might argue, the geographical details of the landscape point to a meaning behind those details, as they work as part of a simile that explains the corruption of the bad shepherds. These same details, however, also reveal the culture’s apprehension about “wasted” natural spaces, as the bog has no productive use. Though the simile provides insight into character, Spenser’s comparison between the minds of the shepherds and the bog communicates the shepherds’ corruption by playing upon cultural attitudes surrounding wildernesses as uncultivated and, thus, wasted natural space. Diggon comments that the shepherds are

… like foule wagmoires ouergrast,

That if thy galage once sticketh fast,

The more to wind it out thou doest swick,

Thou mought ay deeper and deeper sinck.

Yet better leaue of with a little losse,

---

88 This, if we recall, is similar to an ideology that we see reflected in the epigraph from Hayes above, in which the explorer portrays staying in England as laziness that causes the country to miss out on the supposed riches of the New World.

89 Bogs, associated with Ireland and Scotland, though they are also present in England, show up in other works by Spenser, where the author either defines them as wasteland or as hiding places for rebels. In Book 5, Canto 10 of The Faerie Queene, the displaced queen, Belge, laments that she has been forced from her home and can only find refuge in “marshes and myrie bogs” (23.6). In A View on the Present State of Ireland, Irenius characterizes bogs mainly as hiding places for England’s “flying enemy” who hides himself in “woodes and bogs.” This view of bogs as “waste” does not take into account the historical use of peat for fuel in Ireland. (For more on the process and uses of peat, see: Foss and O’Connell, “Bogland: Study and Utilization,” in Nature in Ireland: A Scientific and Cultural History, eds. Foster and Chesney.)
Then by much wrestling to lesse the grosse. (130-135)

Diggon’s simile draws the reader in by creating the vivid image of a galosh (“galage”) becoming stuck in a “wagmoire,” or bog.  

Spenser’s striking, even realistic, description of an annoying boggy landscape that sucks in a walker’s boot makes the simile appealing to the reader and skillfully communicates the allegorical meaning. As we read, we can imagine the sound of trying to pull a foot out of the muck, only to have such futile actions result in the boot sinking “deeper and deeper.”  

The bog, of course, is a representation meant to symbolize what greed does to a person, but to communicate that meaning in such an efficient manner, Spenser first appeals to the reader’s experience with landscape or boggy terrain. The ideological concept that he accesses in order to build his allegory is one that sees “boggy” uncultivated land as irritating, wasteful, and threatening, as the landscape works directly against the individual’s attempts to free the galosh from the sludge.

In the December eclogue, too, Spenser appeals to cultural fears of underutilized nature as a rhetorical device to make his allegory more vivid. By the end of *The Shepheards Calendar*, Colin, the central figure of the work, is an old man. As he reflects on his wasted youth, Colin describes the emptiness of his passionate, childish pursuits in terms of a wasted harvest:

---

90 “Wagmoire” is an antiquated version of “quagmire,” which is how the editors of the Yale edition of Spenser’s shorter poem gloss the word. A quagmire is, of course, a difficult or hazardous situation, but its primary definition as a “wet, boggy land” works better in the context of these lines (“quagmire, n 2,” “quagmire, n1”).

91 In his reading of the “error” episode from Book I of the Faerie Queene, Hamilton argues that the realistic detail in the presentation of the monster signals the author’s skill and labor. Dismissing the literal image, he argues, is discounting this effort: “Clearly the poet labours to make us see. His whole effort is to render a clearly defined, exact, and visual image...Spenser’s reader must respect the primacy and integrity of the poem’s literal level” (33). The same could, I argue, be said of the detail presented within these lines from the September eclogue.
Thus is my sommer worn away and wasted,
Thus is my harvest hastened all to rathe:
The eare that budded faire, is burnt and blasted,
And all my hoped gaine is turned to scathe.

Of all the seede, that in my youth was sowne,
Was nought but brakes and brambles to be mowne. (97-103)

Nature plays a key role in demonstrating the tragedy of Colin’s wasted youth pining for love. Spenser’s decision to use the natural world here might seem commonplace, but the poet’s use of nature to frame such a poignant moment of regret deepens the level of tragedy. It provides vivid details that highlight the waste and resonate with an early modern audience. Even the construction of the lines themselves communicates the devastation of a truncated, misused harvest. Though the first four lines have promising beginnings, in “sommer,” “harvest,” “budded,” and “gaine,” they end with words such as “worn away and wasted” and “burnt and blasted,” thus cutting down the promise before it is able to grow into fruition. The final two lines emphasize wastefulness, as Spenser demonstrates the futility of labor to make the land yield riches. Nothing good comes from the seeds Colin planted in his youth, only “brakes and brambles” that must be cleared away. References to nature help the reader to visualize the waste of Colin’s life, and they communicate that for the English culture, such waste of natural resources was a ready image of tragedy.

The allusions to labor in the September and December eclogues do not destroy the tranquility of the shepherds’ surroundings. Rather, they figure the wrong type of labor, that done out of greed, and the misuse of resources, as that which makes labor futile, that
which undercut the shepherd’s happiness within the pastoral. In December, for instance, the work Colin does sowing and mowing is not what causes his regret. The shepherd laments that the seeds he planted were the wrong ones, as they result in nothing but weeds. Colin’s realization that the fault was in the choice of seeds implies that, had the shepherd planned better, by choosing better seeds or nurturing his choices, the sowing could have resulted in a successful harvest. If Colin had picked the right seeds and nurtured them properly, his labor would have resulted in security and happiness.

These eclogues demonstrate a larger cultural shift in attitudes toward labor in general, according to which acts of hard work are not themselves portrayed as shameful. Joan Picciotto argues that conceptions of labor in the later seventeenth century began to shift from being a reminder of and punishment for humanity’s fall in the Garden. Picciotto argues that philosophers such as Francis Bacon began celebrating labor as a “natural and free exercise” that was both productive and enjoyable (3). Picciotto’s argument seems right to me, but her temporality is belated. Such a shift in fact happens earlier, as the presence of georgic tropes in sixteenth-century pastoral literature demonstrates the belief that physical paradise can only come about through hard work. But such work did not have to be toilsome or unpleasant; it could itself be idealized as a method that allowed shepherds and other rustics to create community, a process that granted them a specialized knowledge of nature and themselves.92 In Spenser’s eclogues,

---

92 In the introduction to Writing the Forest in early modern England: A Sylvan Pastoral Nation, Jeffery Thesis argues that the “tangled topography” of the wooded landscape challenges the rustic figure. The setting’s demands on character result, Theis argues, in “a performative view of identity,” according to which the pastoral figures prove their mettle as they contend with nature in an “attempt to create a place for themselves in the wood” (25). The identity of the sylvan pastoral rustic is shaped by the work that he or she does in response to challenges presented by the natural world. Theis equates the formation of identity with the formation of place, as the character performs an identity as he or she manipulates the forest environment into a pastoral setting. Theis’s identification of formative labor in the sylvan pastoral is an indication of the type of attitude that Picciotto references.
it is the absence of productive labor that causes the paradise to falter. When characters demonstrate a lack of control over their environments, they put themselves and the peace of their landscapes at risk.

In the September eclogue, in fact, it is an excess of “leisure” and “pleasure” that threatens the peace of the pastoral landscape. The shepherds, who are either too lazy or too greedy, do not discipline or protect their sheep, and this lack of guidance, Diggon explains, leaves the pasture and its inhabitants vulnerable:

But if he call hem at theyr good choice,
They wander at wil, and stray at pleasure,
And to theyr foldes, yeeld at their owne leasure.
But they had be better come at their cal:
For many han into mischief fall,
And bene of rauenous Wolues yrent
All for they nould be buxome and bent.

The figurative meaning here, as we remember, is that the undisciplined “sheep” are the followers of the Catholic “shepherds,” who are themselves corrupt. In order to communicate that, however, Spenser complicates a pastoral scene in order to portray the passive nature of “pleasure” and “leasure” as unsatisfactory and even dangerous. Spenser does not directly discuss the use of landscape within these lines, but his juxtaposition of “leasure” with “foldes” signals that a lack of stewardship and order within the foreign pastoral is what allows the sheep to be threatened by an outside force. Leisure here means the sheep lack direction and “wander at wil,” leaving them free to find “mischief.” In their pursuit of pleasures, these sheep have also learned to spurn direction (“nould be
buxome and bent”), which puts them at the mercy of “rauenous Wolues” that find their way into the pastures. The shepherds in the foreign pastoral scene fail to order their pastures appropriately, and their lack of direction and industry brings trouble into what could be a safe and productive landscape.

Threats to the pastoral landscape are quite common, as most critics agree that although the simplicity and innocence of the bucolic paradise might offer retreat, the world is under constant threat from outside forces. The threat in the September eclogue, however, proves notable in its source, which is not the encroaching “Wolues” (though they are dangerous) but the distracted, lazy shepherds who fail to discipline their sheep and protect them from danger. The threat originates inside the pastoral world, as the danger is rooted in the shepherds’ predilection for greed and laziness, which allows the sheep in turn to pursue leisure and pleasure to their own destruction. Diggon tells of his experiences while safely in his own pastoral paradise, but by centering the failure of the “forrein” pastures on the bad shepherds, he inevitably draws parallels between that pastoral and his own. Diggon’s tale becomes a warning to Hobbinol and any shepherd in the “good pastoral” that the bucolic paradise’s success depends upon the stewardship of the shepherd. Pastorals like Spenser’s promote the idea that even the most promising of landscapes will fail without proper guidance.

When an ideal landscape is meant for “art to work upon,” to recall Hayes’s phrase, the characters recognize the worth of a natural world that does not provide everything for its inhabitants. The rustic character who must do something to maintain the paradise and himself is able to form a community and social identity. As we see in the
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93 David Shore points out, for instance: “most versions of the pastoral recognize that the shepherd’s life of contentment does not pass entirely unthreatened” (50).
September and December eclogues, excess leisure leaves room for “mischief,” room which threatens the peace of the pastoral place as it allows the characters to become idle and bored. As the shepherd Piers states in the May eclogue, when God readily provides “butter enough, honye, milke, and whay” for the shepherds without requiring their labor, the shepherds’ prosperity becomes the “nource of vice, this of insolencie” (115, 118). Maintaining a flock and the field provides balance for the pastoral space, and having “soyle” or “foldes” that needs something from the character not only keeps them from getting into trouble but—in the spirit of the allegory—allows the shepherds to model Protestant and English values. Spenser’s depiction of bad shepherds who do not engage in such labors, as we see reflected in the readings above, allows him to communicate the values via a cautionary tale. In both cases, the lessons are clear: shepherds can enjoy themselves in the pastoral, but they must also labor to shape their community and themselves. As we will see, the ideology of landscape promoted in pastoral literature intersects with sixteenth-century colonial ideologies in interesting, sometimes contradictory, ways.

“To Obtain an Habitation”: Forming and Owning Place in the Pastoral

As we have seen, the pastoral-georgic landscape is not always so ideal. Its promise is not only vulnerable to outside forces, but can be thwarted by the characters, as shepherds who prove greedy, lazy, or distracted by love either fail to take advantage of what the natural world offers or exploit its riches for personal gain. The pastoralist’s presentation of characters in these not-so-ideal landscapes reveals a shift in early modern English approaches to the natural world. Characters, these texts suggest, cannot be passive in their enjoyment of the pastoral landscape. Rather, authors use georgic tropes in
order to demonstrate that some labor is needed in order to preserve the tranquility of the bucolic world. Alastair Fowler attributes the increase in the use of georgic tropes in pastoral texts to a Protestant preference for labor, which promotes the active rather than contemplative life (107). The moral eclogues of Spenser’s *Shepheardes Calendar* support this argument, as we see the poet in September using the bad, “Catholic” shepherds’ failure to work as a symbol of their laziness and corruption. But, while the Protestant influence is certainly important, with closer inspection we can see that there is a complex nexus of cultural influences that shape the presentation of nature within these eclogues.

In the late sixteenth century, England’s desire for colonial expansion, along with the effects of the enclosure movement, changed the culture’s view of humanity’s place in the natural world. As Beier explains, the enclosure movement in England displaced agricultural workers who became unemployed vagrants or “masterless men.” Many explorers and authors who promoted English exploration, including Hayes and Hakluyt above, argued that the abundant and supposedly unclaimed land of the Americas could solve the domestic problem of unemployment, as the labor of forming settlements would give these workers purpose and allow them to contribute to society.94 This colonial argument promotes the formation of “place,” as it infers that workers need fixity and employment upon a certain piece of land in order to be productive citizens. In the
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94 This argument could be found in many of Hakluyt’s works, including *Discourse on Western Planting*, and the epigraph from Hayes above. This is a familiar argument for much colonial propaganda of the late sixteenth century, which in recruiting potential settlers (and investors) idealized the raising of crops and establishment of “habitations” as a fulfillment of divine mandate that could help lift under- or unemployed workers out of their lives of hardship, providing them with riches they could never dream of attaining in England. As David Quinn notes, colonial planner John White looked to the working class families of London for potential settlers, pitching his cause in part on the basis of agricultural opportunity: “from such accounts as White could give them, the raising of crops was a great deal easier in North America than in England, with better weather, higher yields, and differing crops, all pointing to some easier degree of subsistence” (*Set Voyage* 254). In accounts like White’s (or Hakluyt’s, or Hayes’s), the fertile lands require cultivation for direction and purpose, but this same fertility makes the work required to attain that purpose enjoyable, easy, and more profitable.
cramped landscapes of England, the enclosure movement alienates workers from their livelihood by denying them any access to farm lands. These vagrants wander the “spaces” of London with no employment and, in the view of many, no purpose. As we saw in the prior chapter, explorers and promoters of the colonial project argue that the New World offers these workers a chance to establish place and purpose, as their ability to order the supposedly vast and fertile natural world into “habitations” transforms the vagrant from living in “foolish sloth” into adventuring men conquering a new world. This colonial argument calling men to form place within a land “super-abundantly replenished by God,” I argue, is part of what influences the presence of georgic tropes within pastoral texts.

In his analysis of the philosophical history of space and place, Edward S. Casey argues that for early modern philosophers and theologians, the contemplation of humanity’s position in relation to the infinite, divine space eclipsed serious study of the individual’s connection with specific place. Recent scholarship in English literature, however, complicates Casey’s account of early modern attitudes toward space and place. Andrew Mattison, who responds to Casey directly, argues that in Paradise Lost John Milton demonstrates concern with and “understanding” of place, while Tim Fitzpatrick posits that early modern playwrights, including Shakespeare, were concerned with writing dialogue that would help the audience see place upon the blank space of the stage.

According to Tuan, the familiar “place” need not be a specific locale, but can encompass cognitive access to any location’s potential to be detailed, distinctive, and safe. In an analysis of infants learning “space” and “place,” for instance, Tuan argues that the child’s “place” is in its parent: “A strange world holds little fear for the young child provided his mother is nearby, for she is his familiar environment and haven. A child is adrift—placeless—without a supportive parent” (29). As we see here, “place” is not only defined by a person’s ability to “pause” within a space, but to do so in order to gain familiarity and build security. I argue that though the “vagrants” are in the place of London, for them this built, urban environment is a “space.” As the name itself implies, the vagrant has no fixed place. He lacks the security of the employment, and his farming skills (somewhat useful but not needed to find employment here) means that he is unfamiliar with the demands needed to thrive in an urban space.
(Mattison 5, Fitzpatrick 9). Mattison and Fitzpatrick each demonstrate the ways in which early modern English authors and playwrights were interested in using their texts to explore how individuals establish place. I extend this argument to pastoral authors, such as Spenser above, who create idealized landscapes that require characters to perform some place-making labor and act as stewards of the natural world.

The presence of georgic tropes in pastoral texts suggests that early modern English authors were more concerned with place, and the individual’s connection to his or her surroundings, than previous scholarship has recognized. Such attention to place makes sense for a culture experiencing both the enclosure movement and the prospect of colonial expansion, movements that plainly revealed how important the ties of location and ownership were to an individual’s identity. The pastoralists’ use of georgic tropes reveals their interest in exploring the distinction between space and place, and it demonstrates their attention to theorizing how an individual’s industrious labor within a circumscribed, defined area not only establishes the laborer’s identity but also helps to define the his or her community. As the enclosure movement revealed, when individuals were without employment or a place to labor, the entire country suffered. Exploration authors, as we saw in the last chapter, viewed expansion to the Americas and the establishment of a colony as a way to solve this domestic problem by giving the unemployed a designated piece of land on which to work. In pastoral-georgic texts, the “civil wildness” reflects the economic concerns of the author’s culture in that it defines
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96 Historical studies of the early modern labor laws reveal that the Elizabethan government was acutely aware of the importance of “place” for encouraging work and productivity. The threat of “masterless men” and vagrants was their lack of attachment to an estate, a farm, or a workshop. As we see in numerous texts by A.L. Beier (Masterless Men, “A New Serfdom” in Cast Out: Vagrancy and Homelessness in Global and Historical Context), K. D. Snell (The Annals of the Laboring Poor), and Linda Woodbridge (Vagrancy, Homelessness, and English Renaissance Literature), laws such as the Act of Artificers sought to tie workers to stable industries by attaching them to lands as farmers or workshops as apprentices.
the ideal interaction between the bucolic setting and its human inhabitants as one characterized by labor. Pastoral authors create landscapes that idealize industrious labor as a place-making activity that allows the individual to define their place and bolster community by changing landscape and differentiating it from surrounding environments—be they urban, court, or wilderness.

We see the fictional depiction of this place-making labor in the opening stanza of Canto 9, Book 6 of Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*, a canto in which the poet depicts a pastoral retreat. After spending the first part of the book focused on other characters, Spenser once again picks up the story of Calidore’s pursuit of the Blatant beast:

Now turne again my teme thou iolly swayne,
Back to the furrow which I lately left;
I lately left a furrow, one or twayne
Vnplough’d, the which my coulter hath not cleft;
Yet seem’d the soyle both fayre and frutefull eft,
As I it past, that were too great a shame,
That so rich frute should be from vs bereft;
Besides the great dishonour and defame,
Which should befall to Calidore immortall name. (6.9.1)

As an agricultural metaphor, this stanza relates Spenser’s identity as a poet by comparing the labor of his writing to a recognizably georgic convention. The “teme” of the first line, for instance, is both the thematic oxen of plowing and the progression to the pastoral sojourn within the epic. This stanza is also didactic, communicating the figurative meaning of the stanza by demonstrating humanity’s proper interaction with the natural
world. It is important to see that the didacticism of the line is also conventionally georgic. As Fowler notes above, the georgic contains “precepts, instruction in an art, or meditation on the good life” (111). Here, the “meditation of the good life” occurs when Spenser not only portrays georgic forms of labor positively, but also demonstrates the power and responsibility of the individual to create and establish his own idealized landscape.

This comparison between writing and agricultural labor also helps to orient the reader within the poetic space. We read the lines and follow along with the actions he describes with spatial verbs such as “turne,” “left,” and “past.” Spenser contrasts the act of moving through space (going “past” the “fayre and frutefull” soil) to the act of forming place (“now turne my teme/Back to the furrow”). Readers do not have to be authors or even laborers to understand the metaphor and gain a familiarity with the writing process that Spenser portrays as industrious labor. The vivid descriptions of Spenser’s writing allow us to move along with the laborer/poet. The portrayal of landscape and plowing demonstrates a favorable view of agricultural labor as an activity that allows the author to form place and situate his readers within the text.

Spenser depicts the formation of poetic lines (of the “furrows”) as an enjoyable and necessary industry. His portrayal of the “iolly swayne” and the worker’s surroundings defines labor as a valuable task that provides the individual with the power and responsibility to bring the potential of the land’s promise into reality. The labor he describes is not tedious (the rustic worker is “iolly”), but the act of leaving fruitful ground unplowed proves to be a sin, as the use of “shame” and “bereft” at the ends of lines six and seven highlight the how terrible it is to neglect fruitful soil. We see the seriousness of neglect in Spenser’s repetition in the second and third lines: “Backe to the furrow which I
lately left/I lately left a furrow, one or twayne.” The repetition here ensures that Spenser communicates the idea that something troubling about leaving the furrows unattended. The poet’s use of antimetabole with the reversal of “furrow” and “lately left” in the fourth line emphasizes the poet’s oversight. Ending the line with “one or twayne” also stresses the error the poet-swayne commits in not attending properly to the poem-land. By identifying a possible number of furrows that he (and the “iolly swayne”) has neglected, Spenser further evokes a sense of place for his readers. He calls attention to the labor he should be doing by describing the landscape and explaining the ideal interaction between nature and inhabitant as one in which the individual labors to bring land to its greatest fruition.

Agricultural toil is a fit metaphor for poetic toil. The literal image of plowing provides a readily comprehensible concrete example of the waste that results when the poet neglects his duties. Spenser portrays the performance of labor as necessary, and he identifies the “great[ly]…shame[ful]” crime in leaving lines unwritten (and furrows unplowed) as the waste of land’s potential: “the soyle both fayre and frutefull eft…that were too great a shame,/That so rich frute should be from vs bereft.” Spenser’s use of agricultural imagery in this metaphor allows him to highlight the importance of human labor. He figures both the soil and the story as lifeless and meaningless until they are cultivated by skillful laborers who can see their promise and shape them into furrows and lines that benefit humanity. Failure to complete agricultural and poetic labor is a shame in that it is a bereavement to the reader who is denied the “rich frute.” By placing this reference to the georgic directly before Calidore’s adventure in a pastoral landscape, Spenser demonstrates that representations of ideal place emerge out of toil: both
agricultural and poetic. The pastoral landscape can only be a peaceful refuge and fruitful site of meaning if someone sets out to make it that way.

The image also incidentally demonstrates Spenser’s view of the individual’s power and obligation to shape a promising space into a fully productive environment, a sentiment which recalls arguments expressed in exploration literature like that in the epigraph from Hayes above and in the prior chapter. Just as Spenser’s “soyle” does not plow itself, Hayes depicts American nature as promising but incomplete without human labor: it “very prodigally doth minister to men’s endeavors, and for art to work upon.” Spenser’s reference to the individual’s ability to cultivate the promising environment reflects colonial arguments, which we see explained in Tuan and Patricia Seed, in which colonizers claim that the manipulation of wilderness to form commodities out of promising fertility gives them right to possess colonized lands. For this culture, control of nature, like control of poetics, signals the laborer’s sovereignty over the land and his willingness to contribute something productive to a corporate body. In poem, this corporate body now includes the readers whom Spenser grants the position of overseer to the plowman/poet by giving us insight into his writing process. The act of writing puts Spenser in the role of sovereign over his story, which he humbly likens to “rich frute” in this stanza, but he also makes himself beholden to the reader when he acknowledges that he has left work undone. Spenser recognizes and communicates his responsibility to write the lines, and he empowers the reader to hold him to this obligation.

Authors such as Spenser idealize hard work and its ability to give individuals power over the natural world in order to contribute to a fantasy that sees the ideal landscape resulting from human labor invested in the land. We see this in Hayes as well,
where the success of the English colonial project in the Americas depended upon the settlers’ ability to “obtain an habitation in those remote lands.” In the epigraph Hayes also creates an ideal landscape when he discusses ways in which explorers promoted colonial expansion as an ideal solution for vagrants unable to find employment in England. The workers who choose to stay in England, he argues, live “miserably” and in “fault and foolish sloth,” but they can travel to the Americas where labor and adventure will allow them to “becometh men.” Given land and the chance at hard work, he argues, these unemployed laborers can live prosperous lives in a fertile landscape that their labor has cultivated into productive fields and pastures. In their respective texts, Hayes and Spenser reference labor in order to address concerns surrounding humanity’s duty to perform work in order to shape land and demonstrate humanity’s sovereignty over the natural world.

Several scholars, including Jeffery Knapp and Walter Lim, have identified a connection between England’s hope of colonial expansion in the early modern period and literature by authors such as Spenser and Shakespeare. In *The Arts of Empire*, for instance, Walter Lim argues that England’s poets could not help but recognize their country’s “expansionist potential,” and used their literary works both to support and question their culture’s colonial ideologies and ambitions (18). There is a greater

---

97 For more on this see David Read, *Temperate Conquests: Spenser and the New World*; Brian Lockey, *Law and Empire in English Renaissance Literature*; Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Politics, and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance*.

98 Lim’s argument here extends Jeffery Knapp’s position on colonial and literary texts in *An Empire Nowhere*. Knapp argues that literary works such as Thomas More’s *Utopia*, Edmund Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*, and Shakespeare’s *The Tempest* all entertain “interlocking issues” advertsing to the possibility of New World colonialism: “the problem of an island empire; colonialism as a special solution to the problem; and poetry as a special model of both problem and solution” (7). Knapp identifies the important role poetry has in allowing the English to work through the issues they encounter in their efforts to use colonialism to promote national interests in an international stage. He defines the “Nowhere” of his title as the setting that
frequency of figuration of colonial issues as the English try and fail in the later decades of the sixteenth-century to establish a colony in the New World. As Lim explains, “England’s nonviable position as a colonial power in the period finds itself expressed in literary texts very much concerned with the possibilities of revising such a position” (25). Writing about these concerns, either in colonial texts or literary texts, allowed authors to create a revisionist history of England’s involvement in colonization of America, one in which failure might be understood differently or might even be avoided.

Specifically, Lim argues that authors such as Walter Raleigh and Shakespeare used literature to revise the power differential that made the English, unfamiliar with American topography, dependent upon their native “hosts.” He compares the character of Caliban in *The Tempest*, for instance, to John White’s representations of Powhatan, an Algonquian weroance (or chief) and father of Pocahontas. Both the literary character and each of the above authors uses for his work. The otherworldly setting, he argues, “displaces” issues related to colonial interests to a “literary no-place” where the author is able to project the “immaterial values” of English culture into a infinite imaginative space, a process that reveals the “limitations of a material investment in little England alone” (7). Through literature, Knapp argues, English authors seek to show that their national values are viable—in fact, they belong—on an international stage. Like Knapp, Lim sees literature as a place to work though the questions associated with a colonial project. I opted to include Lim and not Knapp in the body above because his position on revisionist nature of literature is more germane my argument on landscape and labor.


100 According to Marnie Hughes-Warrington, historical revisionism is a process by which scholars and reporters of history strategically revise historical events. She explains, “revision is not an innate feature of the historical evidence and is therefore not necessitated by historiographical logic. Rather it is an instrument of what are taken to be ‘external’ dispositions, beliefs and values such as the will to bring about social transformation or revolution” (Hughes-Warrington 10). These “external dispositions” could influence the reporting of historical events in a variety of ways, those like Hughes-Warrington identifies as “transformation” and “revolution” or like what we see in early modern exploration literature. In the early modern texts, for instance, explorers project their desire for colonial success upon their depictions of American lands, often downplaying hardships and difficulties that could discourage future settlement.
Powhatan, he notes, offer their knowledge of native topography in order to help the colonial figure (Prospero and John White, respectively). But whereas Powhatan strategically used his knowledge of landscape and agriculture to his advantage by keeping the English dependent upon him to “ensur[e] that the balance of power never shifted to the complete advantage of the colonists,” Caliban is more trusting and forthcoming with his assistance in helping Prospero acclimate to his island (43). Lim argues that “Shakespeare grounds Caliban’s inability to pose any form of effective resistance to Prospero’s appropriation of his island in the simple trust he exhibits at the moment of original encounter” (43). In other words, Shakespeare’s portrayal of Caliban revises the notion of English dependence on the native peoples by depicting the colonized subject as knowledgeable but sufficiently naive and gullible to be rendered powerless against the colonizing force. My reading of Spenser and Shakespeare shows that authors use representations of human interaction with the natural world in a similar manner, as a way to address and revise the difficult reality settlers had in adapting to the unfamiliar topography of the New World. Rather than feature characters who are able to enjoy the fruits of a golden world without having to do much labor, the pastoral authors create landscapes in which characters use labor to form idealized settlements out of sometimes uncooperative environments. This is a revision of the golden world trope into a new type

101 John Smith’s chronicle of his experience with Powhatan is The Proceedings of the English Colony in Virginia, published in 1612—roughly one year before Shakespeare is thought to have written The Tempest. Lim’s argument here still stands. Other sources for the play, including Ralph Lane’s Narrative of the Settlement of Roanoke Island, 1585-1586, likewise figure English settlers as dependent upon the indigenous population for survival. At one point, Lane explains the deteriorating relations with Pemisapan (also known as Wingina), the leader of the Algonquian tribe at Roanoke, who upon the death of his brother (an ally to the English), Granamino, in March 1585 changed his name pulled support from the English settlement. Though Lane does not provide an explanation of why relations soured between the English and Pemisapan, Karen Ordahl Kupperman suggests that the cause might have been Lane’s harsh rule or the drain the English had become on Algonquian food sources (76). Given that Lane’s account was published in Hakluyt’s Principle Navigations, it is feasible that Shakespeare would have encountered it or similar stories about the New World, so he would have been able to address English dependence in the Americas in the figure of Caliban even if he is not addressing the figure of Powhatan specifically.
of idealized landscape, where nature that is initially challenging is actually more desirable than one that provides for all of man’s needs since it gives characters a chance to demonstrate their ability to act as sovereigns over the natural world.

The pastoral landscapes of *As You Like It* test and challenge their inhabitants. They employ georgic tropes idealizing productivity as they do so, thereby providing a good example of the connection between colonial logics and more literary iterations of pastoral-georgic. Such landscapes, I argue, require characters to work against the wildness of nature by using labor or courtly values to define place within the undefined space. The Forest of Arden from Shakespeare’s *As You Like It* is one such natural space. The challenges that the forest presents to the courtiers do not necessarily make the setting or the play “anti-pastoral,” or a critique of the idealized vision of the mode, as Lindenbaum might argue. Rather, by depicting his characters attending to and ordering the natural world, Shakespeare figures place-making labor, and the landscapes that it forms, as truly ideal.

While Charles, Duke Frederick’s wrestler, initially describes life in the exiled Duke Senior’s encampment in Arden as “carele[ss]” and like the “golden age,” the forest itself proves initially unwelcoming to courtly refugees Orlando and Adam and Celia.

---

102 Theis also argues that the courtiers’ experience in the Forest of Arden features them trying to form place. He draws attention to the diverse topography of the forest (open fields, dense woods) and argues that the varied experiences of the characters means each of them is trying to “define what this place is” (44). While his perspective on the characters forming place in the forest is similar to mine, Theis is primarily interested in the play’s figuration of domestic forestland, not colonial exploit. Nor is Theis interested in the characters’ responses to challenges in their new environment, as I am. I argue that instead of focusing on immediate goals of self-preservation, these characters seek to make the forest a “civil wildness.” That is, they attempt to form place that is freer than the court, but also—paradoxically— influenced by courtly values. Robert Watson, in *Back to Nature*, also looks at Shakespeare’s representations of forest landscape in the play. Like Theis, Watson argues that the tests of the natural world help address the realities of human life (79). He argues that the challenges that the characters face (such as the need for hunting) are realities that remind the readers that the idealized, Edenic pastoral is not attainable. I argue, instead, that in having his characters encounter these realities, Shakespeare is looking for ways that humanity might acknowledge and rework these realities into something “ideal.”
Rosalind, and Touchstone (1.1.109-113). These outsiders enter into the forest in separate groups in two different scenes within the second act (Rosalind et al. at 2.4 and Orlando at 2.6), but both groups enter describing their experience of similar hardships within the space. Adam is, almost comically, ready to lie down and die of starvation at his entrance into the forest, while (in a move very much like that of early modern English explorers) the weary Celia and Rosalind ask if the shepherd Corin would be willing to trade his food for gold.

These courtiers’ entrances into the forest recall descriptions of early English would-be settlers of the Americas, such as Ralph Lane’s *Narrative of the Settlement of Roanoke Island, 1585-1586.* Both the play and Lane’s narrative feature individuals wandering the wilderness, searching for food and protection. This identification of the overlap between the play and narrative extends Peter Hulme’s definition of colonial discourse in *Colonial Encounters.* He argues that European colonial discourse brings together styles and imagery from disparate genres in order promote settlement and exploration: it is an “ensemble of linguistically-based practices unified by their common deployment in the management of colonial relationships” (2). Though *As You Like It* does not have the readily identifiable colonial features that scholars find in *The Tempest,* a work that Hulme examines, the play’s challenging forest setting allows Shakespeare to construct a plot that also aids in the “management of colonial relationships.” In *As You Like It,* Shakespeare rewrites colonial reality by providing an example of the ideal

---

103 Ralph Lane tells of the numerous difficulties his expedition encountered while attempting to settle the island. Lane’s attempts at colonization were a dismal failure, and his account—though at times using the familiar golden age tropes associated with exploration literature—also frankly discusses the hardships he and his men faced. The chief causes of these hardships, according to Lane’s narrative, were the harsh, unfamiliar conditions on the island, the unwillingness of his men to work, and the company’s dependence upon the native population for food and farming (33-35).
interaction between humanity and nature. While Lane’s attempt at setting up habitation on Roanoke proved a dismal failure, due to lack of resources and deteriorating relations with the Algonquian, Shakespeare’s characters have the ability to confront difficulties in the forest and are eventually able to find peace and freedom in their pastoral retreat. Exactly how they are able to succeed within the forest becomes the “revision” of England’s thus-so far “nonviable position,” to quote from Lim, in the New World.

This revision begins when Shakespeare depicts two banished characters, Rosalind and Orlando, who cannot at first conceive of living life outside of court. The playwright contrasts two different versions of the pastoral, one carefree—which we see in Charles the Wrestler’s assessment of Duke Senior’s retreat—and one initially fraught with fear and anxiety. Though at court Rosalind and Orlando are each subject to the whims of his or her oppressors, Duke Frederic and Oliver, respectively, neither character initially views the sojourn away from court as pleasant. When the elderly servant Adam warns of Oliver’s plan to kill Orlando and suggests that it might be safer for the younger brother to flee, Orlando expresses doubt and hopelessness, vowing to subject himself to his brother’s tyranny rather than leaving and having to resort to thieving and begging (2.3.32). For Orlando, there are no other imaginable options for livelihood when displaced from court. Rosalind, too, voices doubt when, upon her banishment, Celia
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104 While some critics, such as C.L. Barber in *Shakespeare’s Festive Comedy*, see the escape to Arden as a traditional pastoral retreat characterized by freedom and liberty, other literary scholars have recognized and explored the presence hardship in this pastoral play (260). As Linda Woodbridge recognizes in “Country Matters: As You Like It,” those who do recognize the complexity of the pastoral world of Arden often argue that such moments are anti-pastoral. For treatments of the forest as anti-pastoral, see Renato Poggioli’s *The Oaten Flute* and Peter Lindenbaum’s *Changing Landscapes*. Other scholars, including Theis and Alpers, defend these scenes as pastoral, though for different reasons. Alpers argues, in *What is Pastoral?*, that the forest is pastoral because it creates a nurturing community among those who have been banished from court (131). Theis replies to this argument, arguing that though such moments create a “community of suffering,” the main reason the retreat is pastoral is because nature provides all that the courtiers need to survive (62).
suggests they seek out Duke Senior, Rosalind’s father, in the Forest of Arden: “Alas, what danger it will be to us,/Maids as we are to travel forth so far!/Beauty provoketh thieves sooner than gold” (1.3.107-109). Though by the end of the scene, Celia calms her cousin’s fears by redefining the banishment as “liberty,” the moment of Rosalind’s skepticism at “travel[ling] forth so far” here speaks volumes. Both characters, though in precarious positions at court, are more willing to exist in a familiar place than to encounter unknown—and hence fearful—space. But though Shakespeare depicts them equating life away from court with crime and immorality, he also shows these characters venturing forth, encountering, and then overcoming the hardships they face in the Forest of Arden.

In Duke Senior’s first scene, as well, Shakespeare chooses to associate wandering in the wild space with initial suffering. Subject to the elements while in the forest, Duke Senior sees suffering in nature as ideal when compared to the corruption, flattery, and enviousness he faced at court:

Now, my co-mates, brothers in exile,
Hath not old custom made this life more sweet
Than of that painted pomp? Are not these woods
More free from peril than the envious court?
Here feel we not the penalty of Adam,
The seasons’ difference, as the icy fang
And churlish chiding of the winter’s wind,
Which when it bites and blows upon my body
Even till I shrink with cold, I smile, and say
'This is no flattery. These are counselors

That feelingly persuade me what I am.’

Sweet are the uses of adversity

Which, like the toad, ugly and venomous,

Wears yet a precious jewel in his head;

And this our life, exempt from public haunt,

Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,

Sermons in stones, and good in everything. (2.1.1-17)

The juxtaposition of country and court in this lengthy quotation is nothing new; such comparisons are common in pastoral works. The Duke’s acknowledgement of winter’s “churlish chiding” and “icy fang,” however, evokes a sense of suffering and passing of time that produce more georgic effects. The presence of these georgic tropes allows for Duke Senior to assess the hardships he has encountered in both court and country. There is suffering in both places, but the “bites” and “blows” his body endures in the Forest of Arden are natural, and the harm he experiences is more beneficial than the masked artifice and deception of the flatterers at court.¹⁰⁵ There is adversity within the pastoral of *As You Like It*, but in providing a natural foil for the court’s corruption, this adversity actually makes the forest ideal. When the Duke recognizes that the trials he faces in Arden are able to “feelingly persuade me what I am,” he is demonstrating that his moral perspective aids in converting the possibly alienating elements of the forest space into
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¹⁰⁵ In “Pastorlism Gone Awry,” Albert Cirilo makes a similar point: “The exiled Duke is describing the hardships of nature as an endurable and God-given condition, a “natural” state as opposed to the hypocrisy and human deviousness of the court” (27). He argues, however, that the presence of this view—which sees the country as preferable—and that of Touchstone, who prefers the court, indicates “Shakespeare’s recognition of life’s ambiguities and complexities” (28). Such contrasting views, he posits, serve as “gentle satire, that each is insufficient in itself” (28).
factors that help him to establish a comforting place. Thus, hardship paradoxically makes Shakespeare’s presentation of comforts of the pastoral world stronger.

In his assessment of the speech, Robert Watson finds the Duke here “asinine” in his “assumption that he can cross the border, into nature, so easily” (81). Though Duke Senior claims to have an “authentic experience with nature,” Watson argues, the banished courtier’s anthropomorphizing of natural elements and his ostentatious use of alliteration in the last lines demonstrate an unwillingness to see the natural world as anything but a reflection of humanity (81). The Duke’s acknowledgement of suffering, however, complicates Watson’s view of the speech as anthropocentric and, thus, reductive. Instead, we might view the passage from the perspective of Andrew Mattison, who in a reading of Virgil’s *Georgics* remarks that personification of nature can actually “create distance from humanity instead of closeness” (32). This, he argues, is true of Virgil’s pastoral work as well: “the distinctly georgic image of a landscape whose human-like power over itself can separate it from humanity exists in subtle ways within the *Eclogues*” (32).

Looking again at Duke Senior’s personification of winter’s “churlish chiding,” with its “bites” and “blows,” we can see the type of distancing that Mattison describes.

Winter’s human-like actions call attention to the separation between the Duke and his surroundings. It is clear from his shrinking from the cold that the Duke is not initially living in peace within nature, typically thought commonplace for inhabitants of the pastoral landscape. His tranquility is something that originates within him. As an outsider within this space, he might not be accustomed to facing such weather, but it is precisely the discomfort that Duke Senior experiences that elicits his “smile” and assessment of the artifice that he encounters at court. Distance provides perspective. The alienation he
encounters as a victim of winter’s “blows” and “bites” leads Duke Senior to a realization that eventually allows him to find comfort in the natural world and look to the elements of nature as “tongues,” “books,” and “sermons.” The Duke and his men might not “feel the penalty of Adam,” but this is not due to their existing in an Eden where such trials do not exist. Rather, the Duke can establish pastoral place within the Forest of Arden due to the cognitive labor he performs when he views the suffering he experiences from a specific, moral perspective.

Establishing place proves difficult for the other courtiers as well. As they wander through the forest, the land does not just yield its riches to them. Celia, Rosalind, and, later, Adam each complain about their weary travels and voice a need for food. Their weariness and hunger are not alleviated, however, until they pause their wandering and find stability within the natural space: Orlando and Adam in Duke Senior’s encampment and Rosalind, Celia, and Touchstone with Corin the shepherd. Just as the men in Lane’s expedition sought to establish a settlement in Roanoke by forging alliances with the Algonquian, the groups of wandering courtiers in the fictional pastoral are only able to find stability when they connect with communities that are already established within the forest.

Shakespeare’s play can progress into a pastoral romance when the characters’ security is ensured and they no longer have to worry about hardships such as starvation and weariness. Orlando is free to carve his terrible verses on trees when the Duke accepts the young courtier and his servant into the encampment and Orlando—thanks to the Duke’s hunting—no longer has to try and save poor Adam from starvation. Rosalind is in place to find those verses when she and Celia purchase Corin’s pastures. The courtiers
are ultimately able to find stability when they demonstrate superiority over the natural space and the forest’s inhabitants, through the acts either of hunting or purchasing the pastures. Shakespeare portrays the courtiers using certain courtly values, which equip them to survive and give them the right to rule over the natural world.

For example, the Duke’s expression of regret at having to hunt in the forest is not only a demonstration of his gentility but also of his ability to balance the needs of his men with an awareness of their impact on the landscape. The violence of the hunt, and the killing of animals for sustenance, is out of place in a pastoral work. Critics have argued that the references to hunting in As You Like It either reveal anti-pastoral sentiments or moments in which Shakespeare addresses the social complexities of actual hunting rules and practices in early modern England. In “The idea of hunting in As You Like It,” however, A. Stuart Daley argues that Shakespeare’s references to hunting in the play contribute to the pastoral in that they allow exiled Duke and his men to “contro[1]
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106 For more scholarship on the impact humanity has on the natural world of the Forest of Arden, see Theis; Linda Woodbridge, The Scythe of Saturn: Shakespeare’s Magical Thinking; and Edward Berry. In Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study, Berry argues that the personification implies a “community between humanity and animals rarely found in Elizabethan literature” (188). He also argues that Shakespeare “uses the image of the hunt to challenge the sentimental idealism that often characterizes conventional pastoral and the green world motif. He uses it as well to challenge implicitly the notion of hunting for sport. More subtly and ambivalently, he uses it to underlie… the moral dilemma posed by the human dependence upon animal food” (187). I argue, instead, that—while showing regret at such dependence and critiquing the idea of hunting for sport—the presentation of hunting here actually bolsters, not satirizes, the pastoral. It does so by allowing the Duke to demonstrate his courtly values and his willingness to protect and support his men.

107 In his analysis of hunting in The Taming of the Shrew, Brian Gibbons argues, “A hunt celebrates violence while sanctioning and culturally transforming it” (90). Berry argues that Shakespeare’s paradoxical treatment of the hunt in As You Like It ties to the complex attitudes Elizabethans had toward hunting in general: “In bringing the hunt into the pastoral, Shakespeare achieves a complex and paradoxical effect: on the one hand, he ‘pastoralizes’ hunting based on necessity by suggesting its essential harmony with nature; on the other, however, he reveals the tragic undercurrents within that accommodation” (171-2). Early modern hunting also revealed class discrepancies, as squatters in an estate’s forest would have lived off game that lawfully belonged to the noblemen and owner of the estate. For more on the social aspects of hunting, see Berry (170) and A. Stuart Daley, “The Idea of Hunting in As You Like It” (174). Gibbons also discusses the role of hunting in Elizabethan “myth-making” and hierarchy (90).
their circumstance” and “make clear their altruism of their sharing their scanty fare with Orlando and Adam” (89). Daley posits that the violence of hunting becomes pastoral when it allows the banished lords to form a stable community and to open that community to the young courtier and his elderly servant. As we see with the exiled courtiers, whose lack of stability in this space results in the threat of starvation, exercising some control within the forest proves a necessary task. This natural space does not easily yield riches to its inhabitants. By challenging the inhabitants, and requiring the violence of hunting, the pastoral place in the Forest of Arden proves quite complex.

Duke Senior’s reaction to the need to hunt, expressed immediately after his first speech, indicates the of the complexity of Shakespeare’s pastoral. The action of hunting allows the Duke to gain stability within the forest, though he regrets that he has to kill the deer:

Come, shall we go and kill us venison?
And yet it irks me that the poor dappled fools,
Being native burghers of this desert city,
Should in their own confines with forkéd heads
Have their haunches gored. (2.1.20-24)

This lament demonstrates the Duke’s awareness of what needs to be done in order to help his men survive within this landscape. His regret at having to resort to such an act is meant to indicate the Duke’s gentility, which kills the natural citizens of the landscape only in order to survive. With such a reaction, the Duke establishes that he and his men do not hunt for sport or for greed, but only in order to survive as a community. Though violent, the act of hunting proves ideal in that it allows the courtier to show generosity to
other outsiders, as Daley recognizes (“Idea of Hunting” 18). It also provides a moment where the Duke is used to demonstrate the proper way to extract resources from the natural world: taking what you need to sustain yourself and your community, but not doing so out of greed or desire for personal gain.

The personification of the deer here, and in the following description of the wounded “sobbing” stag, complicates this reading. Robert Watson sees this personification as another indication of the Duke’s anthropocentric view of the natural world, but I would again call my readers to consider this trope using the view of personification in pastoral works Mattison makes available (Watson 81, Mattison 32). When the Duke assigns human traits to the deer, as “poor dappled fools” and “native burghers” (or noble citizens), of the “city” of Arden, he implies that they exist within this space free of human influence. Unlike the game that we see in later country poems such as Ben Jonson’s “To Penshurst” (1616), the deer do not willing give their flesh for food. The First Lord, for example, describes the grief of a wounded stag in terms that compare him to the melancholic Jacques:

The wretched animal heaved forth such groans
That their discharge did stretch the leathern coat
Almost to bursting, and the big round tears
Coursed one another down his innocent nose
In piteous chase…. (2.1.36-40).

Theis also sees the deer as distinct from humanity, though he argues that “including hunting within the pastoral is most tellingly difficult for Shakespeare because it evokes the essential problem in the human relationship with nature, a problem evaded by conventional pastoral, that of violent and murderous conflict” (186).
Though the Lord means to mock the sorrow of Jacques, his personification of the stag, and his later assessment of the “careless” herd that passes the wounded stag as Jacques grieves over its body, shows that the animals exist independently of the courtiers. These are animals are “careless” enough not to register a human presence or that one of their own has fallen, but they are not without feeling. The Lord’s vivid description of the stag’s death humanizes the animal and shows it has an existence outside of its usefulness to the courtiers. This means that no matter how sensitive the Duke and his courtiers try to portray their killing of the deer, the act of hunting displaces the forest’s native inhabitants. Thus, hunting serves as a way for the courtiers to prove their control over the region and its denizens.

The “big round tears” that “course” down the stag’s nose evoke an image of suffering and sadness that emphasizes the tragedy of this violent act. This, in turn, makes the Duke’s speech of regret at having to kill the deer more poignant. In considering the deer in this way, the audience sees that the men do not needlessly engage in the violent act and cause such pain. Rather, Shakespeare shows that the courtiers view the deer’s death as a sacrifice, necessary for the survival of their community. The rhetoric seeks to redeem the courtiers for their killing of the deer by advertising their courtly values of restraint and sensitivity. These lines try to moderate the violence by voicing regret at having to commit it and arguing that it should only be done for survival, but the Duke’s characterization of these deer as “burghers” problematizes this supposed sensitivity. No matter how regretful the courtiers are, their actions still murder the “poor dappled fools” of the forest. What we see in this scene is a lesson similar to the ones featured in colonial texts. The act of hunting becomes a way to force the deer into human service,
and it serves an ideology that argues the humanity’s rightful place in nature is that of control and power, no matter how tragic that act might be.

Another way in which Shakespeare features the courtier’s control over the natural space is through the portrayal of Celia and Rosalind, who—just as in Lodge—enter into the forest and buy the pastures in which Corin keeps his flock. The women initially wander the forest aimlessly and complain of hunger, and when they ask the shepherd for help, they offer to exchange gold in return. Rosalind, as Ganymede, appeals to Corin by highlighting Celia’s weariness:

I prithee, shepherd, if that love or gold
Can in this desert place buy entertainment,
Bring us where we may rest ourselves, and feed.
Here’s a young maid with travel much oppressed,
And faints for succour. (2.4.70-75)

Here, we see the toll that travelling has on the wanderer, as without place and stability the travelers do not have “rest” and Celia is “oppressed.” In order to recover, the group requires place, as the pause in their travels would allow them to rest themselves and find food. Daley argues that this scene allows the women to demonstrate the privileges of their rank and “deal forthrightly with the social problems the find [in Arden]” (“Dispraise of Country” 310). It is also important to remember, however, that though they eventually buy the entire pasture and secure themselves within the forest, in this moment, Shakespeare features the two courtiers in a precarious position and at the mercy of the rustic figure. While their offer to “buy entertainment” is likely a request for food or shelter, as the Oxford editors gloss it, the word “entertainment” could also mean the act
of “taking a person into service” (OED, “entertainment,” n. 2). Thus, they are not just asking to buy food and shelter, they are also implying that they wish to employ the services of Corin, as they would a servant. However, their gold, which they will later use to buy the pastures, can only help alleviate their weariness and hunger if Corin accepts such an exchange. Their position here upsets their position of power, as without the shepherd’s agreement to the exchange, their riches and rank will do little to comfort them.

When Corin replies to Rosalind with an expression of regret that his “churlish” master prevents him from performing acts of hospitality, what looks like a moment of distress for the courtiers is actually one of mutual opportunity. Corin notes that though he does not own any of the possessions, and therefore cannot offer them to the travellers, the property as a whole is for sale. Rosalind replies to this information by reasserting the courtiers’ power over Corin: “Buy thou the cottage, pasture, and the flock,/And thou shalt have to pay for it of us” (91-92). As we see, Corin is subject to the wishes of his landlord, and Rosalind offers him freedom from the undesirable owner of the pastures. Her offer, however, does not necessarily give Corin a place of power in the landscape, as he is still a servant, receiving money from the princesses. Thus, we see that he is just as (if not more) dependent upon them as they are upon him, and in buying the pastures, the two women are saving the tranquility and hospitality of the pastoral place, which is threatened by the master’s “churlish disposition.”

We also see Corin’s subjection when Celia replies that the women will “mend [Corin’s] wages,” as she “like[s] this place,/And willingly could waste my time in it” (2.4.91-92). Here, Celia asserts Corin’s position as a laborer and an earner of wages and
her own position of privilege, as she has the freedom to regulate his pay and to spend her time leisurely within the landscape. In trading gold for stability and helping to secure Corin, Rosalind and Celia do not remain (as Lane’s men do) at the mercy of the native inhabitant. With their gold readily accepted, they assert their power over the shepherd and are free to enjoy the place without worrying about having to endure the oppression of travelling. In this sense, the transaction offers a revisionist retelling of a colonial transaction. Unlike the English settlers, who remain dependent upon the Algonquian for food and survival, Rosalind and Celia’s money puts them in a position of authority. As the native inhabitant of the forest, Corin is willing to help the princesses and does so without transgressing their power. He accepts their gold and his place as servant in the pastoral landscape. This transaction, which demonstrates the power of the princesses, recalls the Duke and his hunting party. Though killing the deer of is framed as tragic, the violent murder of the “native burghers” of the forest also displaces any claim they might have to the land. Like Celia’s gold, Duke Senior’s hunting allows him to affirm sovereignty over the forest and its native inhabitants.

Conclusion

Through the use of georgic tropes, such as references to hunting, agricultural labor, starvation and hardship, and the need for humanity’s control of nature, early modern pastoral authors make the natural world something more than just a pretty backdrop unrelated to their songs and stories. This chapter provides a brief analysis of a few major pastoral works, showing that their natural settings, though helpful in examining character, are also useful in understanding how the English shifted their views of land and as they looked to the Americas with the hope of realizing what Marx calls,
the “dream of retreat” found in pastoral literature. Focus on landscape becomes important as the English begin to imagine how they might shape the natural world into a model settlement. In the colonial context, the ideal comes as a result of humanity’s cultivation of American nature’s innate fertility. Labor, as I have argued, allows the English a chance to build on and manipulate the land, a process they feel marks it as belonging to them.

The pastoral-georgic moments in the works feature an interaction between humanity and nature that has a similar effect: when nature challenges humanity by calling for cultivation and maintenance, it provides the characters with a chance to demonstrate power and sovereignty. Labor, as we saw in The Shepheardes Calendar keeps shepherds dedicated to community and duty, two points of focus that are also important for colonial settlers. Plowing also, as in The Faerie Queene, allows an individual to form ideal place, as the agricultural labor that Spenser depicts results in the formation of his pastoral world. Finally, the hardships that the courtiers initially suffer upon their entry into the Forest of Arden in As You Like It might make nature seem initially cruel, but they also provide the courtiers with the chance to engage in interactions and transactions that demonstrate their sovereignty over the native inhabitants of the forest. These pastorals might not have recognizable connections to European colonization, but like colonial pastorals, these texts promote an ideal that depends upon the rustic character’s willingness to work, as labor becomes the action that bolsters community, tames the natural world, and preserves class boundaries.
Before beginning this project, when I thought of the pastoral golden age and its use in colonial texts, I would call to mind something like what we see in Gonzalo’s speech from the second act of *The Tempest*, in which he cheerfully dreams of establishing a “plantation” on, what he thinks, is a deserted island (2.1.44). In his lines, which Shakespeare adapted from a passage in Michel de Montaigne’s essay “Of Cannibals,” Gonzalo dreams of presiding over a settlement that would “excel the Golden Age” (167). To achieve this supposed ideal, Gonzalo declares that all citizens would be equal, as he would ban all financial and class distinctions: “Would I admit, no name of magistrate;/Letters should not be known: riches, poverty./And use of service, none” (49-51). Inhabitants in his paradise would also live without having to labor, as Gonzalo promises that in his plantation, there would be “No occupation, all men idle, all;/ And women too” (154-155). No citizen of his plantation would need to “sweat or endeavor” to cultivate the land because nature would “bring forth/Of it own kind all foison, all abundance/To feed my innocent people” (160, 162-163). Though Gonzalo recites all of the necessary tropes for a literary Golden Age paradise, Shakespeare is careful to show that this fantasy is not the ideal.

Even reading Gonzalo’s words out of context, we begin to see that the fantastical “Golden Age” he describes is a naïve and an impractical model for a colonial settlement. His paradisal homestead is not even sustainable within the play, as even Prospero’s settlement on the island is an antithesis to the dream plantation that Gonzalo imagines. As
both William Rockett and Melvin Seiden argue in their respective essays, Gonzalo’s plantation is a naïve contrast to the labor (not all Prospero’s) and governance that Shakespeare depicts as being necessary for Prospero and Miranda’s survival on the island (Rockett 78, Seiden 8). The optimistic courtier’s fantasy of equality and leisure might seem commonplace for those wishing to establish a colony in the Americas, but—as the authors analyzed in this project have shown—Gonzalo’s version of the golden age was not an ideal for the colonial pastoral. It is not even an ideal for the early modern literary pastoral.

As I argued in the first, and subsequent chapters, the ideal paradise for a colonial situation is one that shares characteristics with the “civil wildness” of Sidney’s *New Arcadia*. Exploration authors draw upon the golden world trope when they describe divinely blessed, fertile natural world, but they do not idealize a prospective settlement in the Americas as a place in which inhabitants live idly, free of labor and responsibility. Nor do literary pastorals idealize leisure and the type of social equality that Gonzalo imagines for his plantation. Both types of pastoral, colonial and literary, feature what I call the pastoral-georgic, in which authors describe the ideal interaction between nature and humanity as one depending on labor and cultivation. These texts show that such labor is necessary in order to make a settlement truly flourish. As we see in Spenser’s May eclogue, for instance, too much bounty and idleness can be the “nource of vice, this of insolencie” (118). Other pastorals, such as the Arcadian village of Sidney’s *New Arcadia*, demonstrate the ways in which labor and industry can keep all inhabitants focused on responsibility, duty, and, perhaps most importantly, on class distinction. This reflects a new ideal that is far from Gonzalo’s idle, golden world fantasy. What results is the
pastoral-georgic, a mode whose tropes, I argue here, are a precursor to those that we see in the country house poems of the sixteenth century.

Country house poems are a type of encomium, as they take as their subject the praise of a nobleman’s home and estate. It is the praise of place, and the labor and social structure which creates and sustains that place, that makes this genre so similar to pastoral-georgic works and so unlike what we see in Gonzalo’s speech. The genre begins, as G.R. Hibbard explains, with Ben Jonson’s “To Penshurst” (1616), a poem lauding the estate and grounds of Robert Sidney, a viscount and the younger brother of Philip Sidney. Many, including Hibbard, identify the last poem of the genre as Andrew Marvell’s “Upon Appleton House” (1651), a lengthy, 776-line poem extolling the virtues of Thomas Fairfax’s Yorkshire estate. The focus on inanimate estates, and not the noblemen themselves, has proven an interesting topic for many literary scholars. Many speculate upon what led authors to create the country house poem and what genres are its true antecedents. As Heather Dubrow argues, the country house poem is part encomium, part Juvenalian satire, and part pastoral (4). Alastair Fowler argues that the poems draw more from the georgic, rather than pastoral, mode (4). This conclusion will briefly examine the representations of class distinction and humanity’s interaction with nature in the first and last of the country house poems, and it will extend the arguments of leading genre scholars, including Hibbard, Dubrow, and Fowler, by proposing the pastoral-georgic as an important forerunner to the country house genre in that it sets precedent for the idealization of humanity’s ability to use labor as a tool to establish order and place within the natural world.
In his analysis of Ben Jonson’s “To Penshurst,” G.R. Hibbard gives a brief overview of genre’s characteristics and identifies Martial’s epigram, *Baiana nostri villa, Basse, Faustini*, as its model (163). Country house poems, as Hibbard explains, contain a description of the house by stressing its simplicity and practicality. Unlike some ostentatious noble estates, those praised in these poems are not, as Jonson claims, “built to envious show” (1). Authors of the country house poem also laud the fertility of the estate’s grounds and idealize the relationship between man and nature (Hibbard 163). We see this in Jonson when the poet describes nature’s exaggerated willingness to provide for humanity, with partridges lying down in the field “willing to be killed,” and fish ready to become meals and “run[ning] into thy net” (30, 33). In just these first two tenets we see many parallels to the colonial and literary pastoral-georgic: simple, productive estates and an almost unimaginably fertile land that is willing to provide for humanity. But the last tenet that Hibbard identifies, the one concerning class distinction, solidifies the pastoral-georgic as an antecedent to the country house poem.

The depiction of class distinction in country house poems highlights a concern that pastoral-georgic works also feature. Both stress the importance of community and social responsibility for all inhabitants of the idealized place. Hibbard explains that when Jonson lauds country hospitality in “To Penshurst,” the poet is promoting the presence of “reciprocal duties between landlord and tenants” (9). The “reciprocal duties” between rustic and landlord keep every inhabitant happy and all focused on duty and community. Jonson’s depiction of the harmonious interaction between the classes and of the lord’s
hospitality recalls the idealized interactions that we see in Sidney’s Arcadian village.\textsuperscript{109}

Johnson writes

\begin{quote}
But all come in, the farmer and the clown,  
And no one empty-handed, to salute  
Thy lord and lady, though they have no suit.  

….  

But what can this (more than express their love)
Add to thy free provisions, far above  
The need of such? whose liberal board doth flow  
With all that hospitality doth know;  
Where comes no guest but is allowed to eat,  
Without his fear, and of thy lord’s own meat;  
Where the same beer and bread, and selfsame wine,  
That is his lordship’s shall also be mine,” (49-50, 57-64)
\end{quote}

What is so striking about these lines is that they depict a harmonious society without doing away with class distinctions. This idealized, yet classed, society is what makes Jonson’s poem like the Arcadian village of Sidney’s work. There, shepherds happily labor to maintain a “civil wildness,” while Kalander acts as a dutiful and gracious host to Musidorus. In Jonson, the “farmer and clown” are happy to pay homage to the lord of the estate, while all guests are treated with the same “meat” and “selfsame wine” that is given to the lord himself. Hibbard’s idea that this interaction is “reciprocal” is what links this

\textsuperscript{109} Though Hibbard does not draw a comparison between pastoral and the country house poems, he does compare “To Penshurst” to Sidney’s \textit{New Arcadia}. He mentions the similarities between Kalander’s home and Jonson’s description of the humble, practical estate of Penshurst, which may not be surprising since he also claims that “it was in fact his own home that Sidney was thinking of “when he wrote his description of Kalander’s home” (6).
trope closely to the pastoral-georgic. Just as we saw in Sidney, no person—not even the ruler—is exempt from responsibility and duty. In the country house poem, each inhabitant, from rustic to noble, has a hand in making the estate ideal. While buildings and structures are of course important in both works, what makes these places truly ideal is attention to duty, order, and hospitality, all features which can be traced back to the characters who labor to create such effects.

Authors of country house poems do not only celebrate class; humanity’s interaction with and control of idealized nature also proves important. In fact, it is the representation of benign and benevolent nature which ties the country house poem to the pastoral. Dubrow identifies the golden age trope of pastoral as one of the antecedents to the themes in country house poem, but she also argues that these poems are unique in that their themes are rooted in an actual place. She points out that in “To Penshurst,” Jonson evokes a Golden Age of plenty and prosperity, an idealized world in which beasts are actually willing to be killed and human inhabitants live together in harmony. But, unlike the pastorals in that tradition, this one is firmly located in the a recognizable and specific locale” (11). Dubrow recognizes that Jonson’s poem contains an idealized natural world that is so familiar in the use of golden world trope, such as we see in Gonzalo’s speech, in that it contains an exaggerated, anthropomorphic view of a natural world in which animals are willing to die for the place’s human inhabitants. Her argument that Penshurst is not like the golden world because it, like all country-house estates, is “firmly located in a recognizable and specific locale” also applies to the pastoral-georgic. As A. Stuart Daley argues, for instance, the sylvan setting in As You Like It would have also been a familiar locale for Shakespeare’s audience, many of whom would have had experience
with forestland and woods: “To many Elizabethans…the Forest of Arden was anything but a terra incognita” (175). Unlike Gonzalo’s unrealistic fantasy, the settings that we see in both *As You Like It* and in country house poems like “To Penshurst” have connections to actual places. This not only means that they are more attainable, but it also signals that they need something from humanity. These are not fantastical dreamlands like what we see in *The Tempest*.

Alastair Fowler goes further in his distancing of the country house poem from the pastoral. He argues, “of course they are not pastoral. Pastoral knows nothing of buildings, gardens, and estates. In fact, the estate poems belong to a mode in direct contrast with the pastoral: namely georgic” (4). If we recall from the engraving from Secotan by Theodore de Bry and the accompanying description by Harriot, however, a specific type of pastoral—that featured in exploration literature—does in fact feature a mixture of both georgic and pastoral traits. In *True Report*, both the author and artist depict the Secotan as living prosperously and “free of covetousness”—like the golden age—and in a perfectly ordered settlement marked by buildings and crops—like the georgic. There is, too, another trait of the pastoral-georgic in country house poems. Fowler argues, “Nature in the georgic is not so much benevolent as harmoniously controlled” (10). We see a parallel to this description in the labor implied in the term “civil wildness,” where order of “civil” keeps the threat of “wildness” contained. Other pastoral-georgic works also feature settings that creep a bit closer to georgic as Fowler defines it in the quotation above, such as Shakespeare’s Forest of Arden. These texts celebrate the same theme that the county house poem does. That is, they celebrate humanity’s use of labor to “harmoniously contro[l]” the natural world.
Humanity’s control of the natural world in both pastoral-georgic works and country house poems is what distances both from the trope of leisure that most scholars associate with the pastoral mode. It is the careful ordering of landscape through labor that makes both so ideal, even if it implies non-pastoral traits. In “Upon Appleton House,” for instance, Marvell uses militaristic imagery to idealize the security of the garden:

But when the vigilant patrol
Of stars walks round about the Pole,
Their [the flower’s] leaves, that to the stalks are curled,
Seem to their staves the ensigns furled.
Then in some flower’s beloved hut
Each bee as sentinel is shut,
And sleeps so too: but if once stirred,
She runs you through, or asks a word.” (313-320)

As with the shepherds who are vigilant against the “wildness” in Sidney’s Arcadian village, the natural world here is vigilant in its fortification against possible threats. We have stars on patrol and flowers as ensigns. We also have bees as sentinels who might be at rest, but who are also always ready to protect their flowers. Marvell describes a natural setting that is aesthetically pleasing but not merely ornamental. The poet’s use of personification to humanize the bees, flowers, and stars, also signals an idealized balance between the human and natural worlds. These elements of nature mimic human order as a way to protect the garden from invasion and its inhabitants from harm. Marvell strengthens this connection to the human control of nature with his description of the gardener, who takes the “soldier’s place” in the garden and uses skills of husbandry to
cultivate nature and graft its plants (337). Thus, the flowers, which stars and bees protect, can be traced back to human labor, which manipulates, orders, and engineers the garden’s pleasing aesthetic effect. As in the pastoral-georgic it is the control of nature and the demonstration of order that makes the setting of the country house poem so ideal.

With its focus on class distinction and the balance between nature and humanity, the country house poem presents many of the same themes that we see in the pastoral-georgic in both literary and exploration texts. These estates come to resemble mini-settlements like the ones idealized and projected in representations of nature featured in Harriot, Brereton, and other explorers. These authors create a fantasy that is different from Gonzalo’s, though still quite unrealistic; they imagine a self-contained settlement in which the land is ordered and productive and in which each inhabitant respects his or her responsibility to the community. Both types of texts, then, advocate not only the tight control of nature through cultivation and the building of estates and settlements, but also the control of people through class distinction and social responsibility. In proposing the pastoral-georgic as an antecedent for the country house poem, I argue that the colonial project had a cultural impact that not only influenced England’s participation in American and international settlement but that also worked to change how they saw their own lands and estates. The “change” that we see in both types of works is in the way the English perceived the labor of cultivation and governance in terms of the ideal, as both make their way into pastoral works as demonstrations of power and claims ownership over the natural world. The pastoral-georgic proves more ideal for a culture just at beginning of its imperial destiny. Gonzalo’s dream of the “Golden World” will not work for the English because it does not provide ample opportunities for the laborer to
demonstrate control and power. Thus, the English create a new model: one in which the
cultivation of land is seen as a marker of the culture’s “civil[ity]” and as evidence that it
has the power to control the threat implied by “wildness.”
Figure 1. Theodor de Bry. America, Part I: *A breife and true report of the new found land of Virginia, and the commodities and the nature and manners of the natruall inhabitants.* “Plate XX: The Indian Village of Secotan; bird’s eye view of the village with huts, lake or river, fire, fields and ceremony.” Engraving. © The British Library Board
APPENDIX B

JOHN WHITE’S WATERCOLOR OF SECOTAN

Figure 2. John White. “The Indian Village of Secotan; bird’s eye view of the village with huts, lake or river, fire, fields and ceremony.” Watercolor. © Trustees of The British Museum
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