

CULTIVATING POWER:
TRANSFORMATIONS OF THE GARDENER-KING TROPE
IN THE INTERREGNUM AND THE RESTORATION

Jennifer Bolton Verdun

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
Department of English and Comparative Literature.

Chapel Hill
2009

Approved by:

Reid Barbour

Darryl Gless

Megan Matchinske

Joseph Wittig

Jessica Wolfe

© 2009
Jennifer Bolton Verdun
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

JENNIFER BOLTON VERDUN: Cultivating Power: Transformations of
the Gardener-King Trope in the Interregnum and the Restoration
(Under the direction of Reid Barbour)

This dissertation examines the significance of Interregnum and Restoration tropes that depict political power in terms of gardening. I argue that these tropes, as responses to images of England as a garden and of the king as gardener, register the political, moral, and scientific upheavals that accompanied the Civil Wars, the regicide, and the abolition of the monarchy. The first chapter explores communist Gerrard Winstanley's application of the gardener-king trope solely to God and his presentation of Christ, as both plant and husbandman, as a model that better befits humans' limited agency over the land and themselves. The second chapter investigates how Andrew Marvell tests out but ultimately rejects the gardener-general trope in favor of others that suggest England's lost garden status. The third chapter interprets Sir Thomas Browne's interest in quincunxes and gardener-princes as means of advocating religious and political mediocrity in the context of the Interregnum. The fourth chapter shows how John Evelyn uses the gardener-king trope to epitomize his vision of a social and political, as well as a natural, *discordia concors*. The epilogue, which focuses on Edmund Waller's and the Earl of Rochester's poems on St. James's Park after its renovation by Charles II, extends my consideration of the gardener-king trope's Restoration standing.

To Todd, because we tend the same plots,
and Luke, our best little bud.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would not have completed this project without the guidance and support of some extraordinary people, to whom I extend my joyfully sincere, if sadly inadequate, thanks.

My committee members made finishing this dissertation all the more fun and fulfilling, and I deeply appreciate their reading of and comments on my work. I also have some more particular and longstanding debts to acknowledge.

In my coursework and in the writing of this dissertation, Reid Barbour helped me to refine my thinking and my prose alike; his enthusiasm for his subject proved infectious, and his encouragement of my studies, invaluable. I am grateful to him both for challenging me and for cheering me on.

I also wish to thank Jessica Wolfe, whose brilliant advice about scholarship and writing gave me direction through murky places in the course of developing and writing this project; Darryl Gless, whose excitement about his work inspired me to re-imagine my own; Megan Matchinske, whose willingness to join my committee in the final stages of this project is typical of her generosity; and Joe Wittig, whose attention to detail made me a better reader, thinker, writer, and teacher.

The professionalism and kindness of Washington and Jefferson College's U. Grant Miller Library staff, past and present, deserve special praise. I am especially grateful to Jennifer Corbin, Cindy Schwartz, Mande Williams, and Rachael Bolden for their outstanding help with interlibrary loans. And the staff of the Walter Royal Davis

Library, at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, has my lasting gratitude for the services that allowed me to complete my research from afar.

For excellent writing environments, remarkably tasty coffees, and friendly conversation, I want to thank the past and present staffs of Bean Traders Coffee, especially Christy, Dave, Chris, Josh, Kirsten, and Alex; Blue Horse Coffee, especially Annette, Melissa, Mike, Katie, and Theo; and Aldo Coffee Co., especially Rich, Melanie, Michelle, Lauren, Therese, and John.

For their loving, attentive care of my son, Emily Cerrone and Nicole Gable have my everlasting gratitude.

My friends and family have encouraged me in many ways, all of them wonderful. Lisa Klotz and John Ware provided camaraderie and commiseration in our writing group. Amy Sweitzer and B.J. Barry sustained me with much-needed hilarity. Lauryn Mayer administered sage advice and wry humor in perfect doses. Sam and Tara Fee's good cheer has made my life infinitely richer; their friendship is a rare treasure. Pamela Kirkpatrick's warmth and hospitality, like those of her dear late Robert, have been a great blessing and a joy. And my nieces, Jessica and Sophia Galey, illuminated dark times.

My parents, Charles and Ruby Bolton, have contributed profoundly to the completion of this project. In their generosity, sensitivity, faith, and love, they make me doubly grateful: for their help and for the model they offer of cheerful sacrifice. I admire them as I love them, infinitely.

My husband, Todd, is the love of my life. He has devoted tremendous time and energy to making it possible for me to finish my degree. In addition, he has supplied ready words of encouragement, inexhaustible patience and kindness, and truly excellent

snacks. For his sacrifices, for all the ways he has nourished my work and me, and for a life in which we can share our struggles and triumphs, I will always be thankful.

Lastly, I want to thank our son, Luke, whose presence has transformed my life in the best possible ways. Seeing him toddle about the house with a copy of Sallust made me appreciate my work as I never had before; his joy and wonder daily renew my own.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	x
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Chapter	
1. WINSTANLEY AGAINST GARDENS: THE HUMBLE HUSBANDMAN UNDER GOD THE GARDENER-KING.....	8
I. Winstanley against Kings.....	9
II. Winstanley against Gardens?	27
III. Cultivation Metaphors and the Status of the Humble Husbandman.....	56
Conclusion.....	65
2. THE GARDENER-GENERAL TROPE AND SOME ALTERNATIVES IN MARVELL’S “HORATIAN ODE” AND “UPON APPLETON HOUSE”	67
I. Gardener and Farmer in “A Horatian Ode”	68
II. Gardener and Forester in “Upon Appleton House”	100
Conclusion.....	162
3. THE QUINCUNX, MEDIOCRITY, AND GARDENER-PRINCES IN BROWNE’S <i>THE GARDEN OF CYRUS</i>	164
I. Mediocrity and the Quincunx.....	166
II. Mediocrity and Faith.....	196

III. Browne's Gardener-Princes.....	224
Conclusion.....	276
4. THE LEGIBLE GARDEN: MORAL AND POLITICAL LESSONS IN EVELYN'S <i>ELYSIUM BRITANNICUM</i>	279
I. The "Universall" Garden and the Book of Nature.....	283
II. Problems of Comprehension.....	297
III. Garden Monarchs.....	316
Conclusion.....	320
EPILOGUE.....	321
WORKS CITED.....	335

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>EB</i>	<i>Elysium Britannicum</i>
<i>EEBO</i>	<i>Early English Books Online</i>
<i>ELH</i>	<i>English Literary History</i>
<i>ELP</i>	<i>English Lyric Poetry</i>
<i>KH</i>	<i>Kalendarium Hortense</i>
<i>MLN</i>	<i>Modern Language Notes</i>
<i>NB</i>	<i>Nicholas Bacon</i>
<i>ODNB</i>	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i>
<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
<i>PL</i>	<i>Paradise Lost</i>
<i>RM</i>	<i>Religio Medici</i>
<i>STB</i>	<i>Sir Thomas Browne</i>
<i>TB</i>	<i>Thomas Browne</i>

INTRODUCTION

“Now ’tis the spring, and weeds are shallow-rooted; / Suffer them now, and they’ll o’ergrow the garden, / And choke the herbs for want of husbandry,” Queen Margaret warns the king in Shakespeare’s *King Henry VI, Part 2* (3.1.31-33). The queen, fearful of Gloucester’s influence over “the commons’ hearts” in a potential bid for the throne (3.1.28), casts Henry as a gardener-king whose duties include preserving the kingdom’s health by keeping subjects’ aggression in check. Although the analogy on which she draws, which figures England as a garden and the king as its cultivator, implies pleasure and nourishment, the queen’s images of weeding and “chok[ing]” remind us more clearly of the violent aspects of both gardening and governing.

Shakespeare’s play, which dates from between 1587 and 1592 (Cairncross xlv), was written shortly after the 1587 execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, removed what Patrick Collinson calls “a constant threat” to Elizabeth I’s reign (“Elizabeth I,” *ODNB*). Roughly a half-century later, Britain would be thrown into civil war, and a few years after that, Charles I would be beheaded and monarchy abolished. Andrew Marvell, in “Upon Appleton House, To My Lord Fairfax,” would lament the ruin of the “Paradise of four seas”: “What luckless apple did we taste, / To make us mortal, and thee waste?” (323, 327-28). The chaotic violence imagined by Shakespeare’s Margaret would become only too real in the garden of England.

The Gardener-King Trope

In this project, I examine Interregnum and Restoration responses to the gardener-king trope, arguing that these responses reveal much about perceptions of Charles I's reign, the nature of the Civil Wars, and England's political, moral, and spiritual status in the years after the regicide. As the chaos of civil strife challenged the trope of England as a garden, the value of the gardener-king trope too came into question. Some writers, seeing the opportunity or the necessity of redefining national ideals in the realms of politics, social hierarchy, or land cultivation, rejected or revised the trope to reflect the abolition of the monarchy and the new opportunities that followed from that change; others, however, clung to the trope as a way of communicating and nurturing Royalist ideals in a time of adversity. The Restoration, in turn, saw Charles II celebrated, as a gardener-king who would revive the values of his father's reign even as he renewed the land, and criticized, as a king who cultivated vice and whose sexual fertility overmatched his land's fecundity. The very diversity of these responses suggests the power the gardener-king trope held in the English imagination.

The trope figures in discussions of princely vice and virtue in a range of sources, pagan and Scriptural, ancient and modern. In Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, for example, Socrates proposes the Persian king as a good model for householders to follow, valuing as he does "husbandry and the art of war" as exceptionally good occupations (4.4); the detailed tribute to this king's interest in cultivation is followed by praise of Cyrus the Younger's planting of trees on his own land (4.8-15, 4.22-25). The Song of Solomon depicts the king's bride as "A garden enclosed" (4:12), in a passage that came to be interpreted as signifying Christ's relationship to the Church and to the individual soul

(Stewart 19).¹ And Shakespeare uses the trope not only in *Henry VI, Part 2*, but also in *Richard II*, in which, once again, a king is criticized for failing to maintain the garden of England with care and discipline (3.4.55-66).

Given such well-known examples, it might seem surprising that compliments to Charles I tend to make only the most oblique references to the gardener-king trope. Even court masques' praise of Charles and Henrietta Maria in terms of fertility emphasizes Neoplatonic love to the exclusion of more direct gardening images; indeed, in *The Temple of Love* (1635), the song of "Amianteros or Chaste Love" (Davenant, *Temple* 499) to the king and queen explicitly distinguishes between literal and figurative cultivation:

Whilst by a mixture thus made one
You're th' emblem of my deity,
And now you may in yonder throne
The pattern of your union see,

Softly as fruitful showers I fall,
And th'undiscerned increase I bring
Is of more precious worth than all
A plenteous summer pays a spring.

The benefit it doth impart
Will not the barren earth improve,
But fructify each barren heart
And give eternal growth to love. (499-510)

Anti-Royalist responses to the gardener-king trope suggest rejections of even this faint an image of Charles as the cultivator of the land, in addition, at least in some cases, to registering protests against monarchy itself. Royalist uses of the trope during the Interregnum and the Restoration, on the other hand, might reflect the peacefulness of Charles's reign in the 1630s, or, insofar as they imply hope for England's future as a

¹All Scriptural citations are to the King James Version (*Holy Bible, Translated*) unless otherwise noted.

garden-nation, they might constitute tacit recognitions of the problems that led to the Civil Wars.

The Critical Background

In studying the image of the gardener-king, I seek to bring together two lines of inquiry about mid-seventeenth-century culture and literature: explorations of the significance of gardens both literal and literary, and representations of kings and kingship. Though each of these matters has received considerable attention, the combination of them in the figure of the gardener-king has so far garnered little interest, perhaps because scholars of the two fields have been asking such different questions.

Book-length studies of English gardens have tended to focus on either the history of garden design or literary representations of horticulture. Some studies of actual gardens do consider the political import of certain features or designs, but even when they consider a monarch's involvement in gardening, they have little to say about the significance that accrues to that involvement. John Dixon Hunt's *Garden and Grove: The Italian Renaissance Garden in the English Imagination, 1600-1750*, for example, offers a brilliant overview of the relationship between garden design and ideology (143-44), but it gives only a cursory treatment of garden images' political significance in Caroline court masques (111-12). And in *The Renaissance Garden in England*, Roy Strong describes Henrietta Maria's influence on two royal gardens, at St. James's Palace and Wimbledon House (186-97), but his focus is on design rather than meaning.

Studies of gardens' literary significance exhibit a similarly narrow emphasis. Stanley Stewart's *The Enclosed Garden: The Tradition and the Image in Seventeenth-Century Poetry* provides an impressively detailed discussion of the poetic deployment of imagery

from the Song of Songs. But Stewart's thoroughgoing emphasis on theology never extends to the relationship between religion and politics or to that between garden poetry and actual gardens. A. Bartlett Giamatti, in *The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic*, likewise limits his work to gardens in poetic traditions. Terry Comito's *The Idea of the Garden in the Renaissance*, like Giamatti's work, takes into account both English and Continental, both medieval and Renaissance, literature; in addition, Comito considers "images in art" and "occurrences in the physical world" as ways of better understanding gardens' significance (2). The breadth of his work, however, precludes any detailed examination of gardens' political resonances.

Like these studies of garden literature, scholars' examinations of how kingship and kings are represented have produced rich discussions of numerous topics. But gardening has been largely ignored in favor of other, perhaps more widely used, tropes. In *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England*, for instance, Kevin Sharpe's examples of analogues for the figure of the king include the lion and the father (7). Sharpe does acknowledge that "a full appreciation of the country house poem requires a[n] . . . imaginative grasp of the Stuart perception that gardening, ordering the raw material of nature, was an ideological and political pursuit" (51), but he finds horseback riding a more productive "illustration of the ideological significance of cultural practices" (51). *The Royal Image*, a collection of articles edited by Thomas N. Corns, offers a striking array of approaches to representations of Charles I, none of which, however, explores garden imagery in any extensive way. I want to suggest that the very dearth of images of Charles I as a gardener makes the emergence of responses to the gardener-king trope in and after 1649 all the more remarkable.

Chapter Summaries

This project takes a case-study approach to Interregnum and Restoration representations of the gardener-king and some closely related tropes: my chapters focus on works by Gerrard Winstanley, Andrew Marvell, Sir Thomas Browne, and John Evelyn respectively. Despite the chronological organization, I do not argue for any particular development of responses to the gardener-king trope over the periods in question; such a strategy would be tricky even for a greater number of primary texts. The other organizing principle for the chapters, however, is perhaps more suggestive of significant patterns: namely, the progression along the spectrum from radical Puritanism (Winstanley) through moderate Royalism (Marvell and Browne) to conservative Royalism (Evelyn). One disadvantage to devoting each chapter to works by one author is, of course, that it sacrifices breadth for the sake of depth. But that depth, I believe, is necessary for establishing just how nuanced these responses to the figure of the gardener-king are.

In Chapter 1, I argue that Gerrard Winstanley's works entirely reject the identification of any human ruler as a gardener-king, reserving that title for God alone; humans are figured sometimes as plants and sometimes as husbandmen in God's service, reflecting our middling degree of agency in the world and emphasizing Christ's role, to Winstanley's thinking, as a model for us. Chapter 2 discusses Marvell's examination, in the wake of the Civil Wars and regicide, of the gardener-general trope and two alternatives to it: the farmer-general, in "A Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland," and the forester-father, in "Upon Appleton House, To My Lord Fairfax." The poems' treatments of these alternative tropes, I propose, suggest Marvell's skepticism as

to whether England could ever be fittingly represented as a garden again. Chapter 3 interprets the figure of the quincunx in Browne's *The Garden of Cyrus* as a symbol for mediocrity, a virtue important to the Bacon family, one member of which was the essay's dedicatee. The quincunx, I argue, represents for Browne the *via media* of the English Church as well as the kinds of moderation that constitute appropriate responses to the upheavals of the 1640s and 1650s, upheavals for which Browne's invocations of the gardener-prince trope offer consolation. In Chapter 4, I read Evelyn's *Elysium Britannicum* as using analogies to elucidate relationships between the natural world and human society, but also as recognizing the difficulties of reading the Book of Nature, and even the gardens that serve as that book's compendia, correctly. Evelyn's references to the gardener-king trope, I show, exemplify the ways in which his manuscript uses analogies not only to describe but also to comment on gardens. Finally, my epilogue briefly discusses the quite different representations of Charles II as a gardener-king in Edmund Waller's "On St. James's Park, As Lately Improved by His Majesty" and John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester's "A Ramble in St. James's Park." Each part of this project thus demonstrates how the gardener-king or a related trope both describes the power of cultivating the land and participates in or modifies the cultivation of power.

CHAPTER 1

WINSTANLEY AGAINST GARDENS: THE HUMBLE HUSBANDMAN UNDER GOD THE GARDENER-KING

The trope of the gardener-king often focuses attention on artistic or aesthetic matters—garden design, for example, or appreciation of England’s beauty and fertility—or on the ruler’s role in figurative cultivation: cultural development, political power, the people’s godliness, and so forth. But Gerrard Winstanley (1609-76)—a leader of the Diggers, a communist group who attempted to till common lands at St. George’s Hill and Cobham, Surrey—subordinates such meanings to a project of literal cultivation. In its usual forms, the trope recognizes and reinforces the king’s power over his land and people and thus works against Winstanley’s agenda. But Winstanley revises this trope by applying it solely to God and by representing himself and other poor workers as God’s under-husbandmen. His writings thus limit the image’s significance and present an alternative model for humans’ service to each other and to God.

Winstanley challenges the gardener-king trope on two fronts: the status of kings, whom he regards as an evil to their subjects, and that of gardens, which are for him vexed images at best. Although he reveres the Garden of Eden as godly, good, and useful, he sees enclosure, and by extension all private property, as reflecting and encouraging corrupt values: selfishness, love of power, and lack of charity. Edenic life, he argues, is achievable in England (or any other nation) only if people relinquish private land rights and the attendant love of power. For him, then, private or enclosed gardens, far from

symbolically exhorting the people or their rulers to virtue, actually represent modes of thought and conduct antithetical to those that Winstanley finds necessary for realizing England's Edenic potential.

Ultimately, Winstanley redeems the gardener-king trope, but only as it applies to God. This use of the trope implies that he sees it as too dangerous to be applied to humans because it emphasizes a position of power over the land and people alike. For him, humans are better represented as both God's plants and His under-husbandmen; we occupy, in Winstanley's view, a middle ground in which we have significant but limited agency. Winstanley thus reserves the gardener-king trope for God the Father, and he depicts Christ the Son, in a dual role as both flourishing plant and "levell[ing]" husbandman (448), as a more appropriate model for humans.

I. Winstanley against Kings

Winstanley's works indirectly challenge the gardener-king trope, and such permutations of it as the husbandman-ruler, partly by rejecting images of kings—and indeed almost all rulers—as good cultivators of their domains. Although he does not directly discuss rulers as gardeners or husbandmen, he bases his evaluation of them largely on how they dispose the land and the degree to which they foster life. And he does so both in general terms and in regard to England in particular: Charles, like all kings, he argues, hindered equitable cultivation by upholding private property and its attendant evils. Rather than care for the nation as one garden, the king supported the divisions that prevented this unity. And because "kingly power" persists even after the abolishment of the monarchy, England remained under the Curse. Winstanley's analysis

of England's woes thus calls into question the image of Charles as a gardener and that of England as a garden or paradise, thereby opposing the English gardener-king trope on two counts.

"Kingly" Rulers, the Curse, and Disposal of Land

Winstanley indicts rulers who govern according to self-interest—not only kings, but most other rulers as well. Although his criticisms of them never refer to the gardener-king trope, he does accuse rulers of perpetuating Adam's Curse (Gen. 3:17-19), which afflicts humankind and prevents the best use of the land. His belief that they properly value neither the land nor human life implicitly challenges the gardener-king trope as it is usually applied to human rulers.

Winstanley criticizes kings and other rulers on the same grounds: that they are selfish, corrupt, indifferent to the plight of the poor, and disobedient to God's commands about how to treat the earth and other people. He emphasizes these likenesses between kings and other rulers partly by employing the notion of the King's Two Bodies, the idea that although each individual king, the "body natural," died, the King, the power and authority of the "body politic," survived from one monarch to the next (Kantorowicz 13). In *The Law of Freedom in a Platform* (1652), Winstanley extends this notion from monarchy to commonwealth as he exhorts England's ruling Army not to reinstitute the "Kingly Authority" that Charles I had asserted: "For the strength of a King lies not in the visible appearance of his body, but in his Will, Laws and Authority, which is called Monarchial Government" (574). He defines *monarchy* broadly, claiming that it is "either for one King to rule, or for many to rule by Kingly Principles; for the Kings Power lies in

his Laws, not in the Name . . .” (527).² Similarly, in *A New-Yeers Gift Sent to the Parliament and Armie* (1650), he contends that “Kingly power” is not limited to governments headed by kings: it “is usually set in the Chair of Government, under the name of Prerogative, when he rules in one over other: And under the name of State Priviledge of Parliament, when he rules in many over others . . .” (354). Although traditionally the idea of the King’s Two Bodies helped to legitimate or emphasize a new or existing monarch’s authority (Kantorowicz 314-17, 4-5), Winstanley invokes it to the opposite effects, namely to warn England’s new powers away from becoming the king’s true successors and to discredit kings and most other rulers.

Winstanley argues that “kingly” rulers’ selfishness and covetousness perpetuate the curse laid on people and the earth after the Fall. These rulers are guilty of poor cultivation, figurative and literal. In *The New Law of Righteousnes* (1649), for example, Winstanley explains that “Adam is the commer in of bondage, and is the curse that hath taken hold of the Creation: And he may wel be called A-dam, for indeed he does dam and stop up the streams of the waters of life and libertie” (201-2). Although this bondage is internal for every person (202), it also manifests itself in human rule, which is maintained by the sword rather than love and motivated by self-interest rather than responsibility to the rest of Creation:

this A-dam, being the power of covetous, proud flesh, he sets up one part of the Creation, man, to rule over another, and makes Laws to kil and hang that part of the Creation, that wil not submit to the ruling part. And so he is become a God, ruling in the spirits own house, not preserving the Creation, but does set the Creation together by the ears, to kil it self, to the mighty dishonour of our Maker: Therefore when the

²The closest contemporary senses of *monarchy* recorded by the *OED* are “exclusive dominion (of a body of people)” (1.c), “[s]upremacy” or “control” (6), and “leadership regarded as comparable to that of a monarch” (6). Winstanley’s usage of the term, however, compares governments’ motives as well as their effects.

people would have *Saul* to rule them; the Spirit declared, that that outward ruling power was the curse; and he set him up in his wrath to be a scourge, not a blessing. (202)³

In his accusation that “the power of covetous, proud flesh” leads to “kil[ling] and hang[ing]” and, far from “preserving the Creation,” encourages destruction, Winstanley depicts “kingly” rulers as bad cultivators of their dominions because they attend to death rather than life. This characterization is not peculiar to *The New Law*: in *The True Levellers Standard Advanced* (1649), he asserts that “two Powers,” rulers and priests, “still hath been the Curse, that hath led the Earth, mankind, into confusion and death by their imaginary and selvisish teaching and ruling . . .” (255).

The above passages involve figurative cultivation, with “the Earth,” for instance, identified as “mankind.” But Winstanley also associates rulers’ social injustices and death-dealing power more specifically with the land and the language of cultivation, particularly when he compares rulers and the clergy and gentry who support them to Cain and Esau.⁴ In *The True Levellers Standard Advanced*, he accuses those in power of a

³The example of Saul perhaps implies that Winstanley is thinking of kings in particular, especially given that he uses the same example in *The True Levellers Standard Advanced* (1649) to indict the Israelites’ “casting off the Lord, and chusing *Saul*, one like themselves to be their King . . .” (252); the references to God as “only King” and “that righteous King” also seem to direct attention to monarchs strictly speaking (252). But in both passages Winstanley criticizes all rulers who exercise a power rightly belonging only to God: in the long passage quoted above he does not limit his remarks to kings, merely to “the ruling part,” and in the later treatise he likewise faults “Teachers and Rulers that sets themselves down in the Spirits room, to teach and rule . . .” (252). Moreover, in *The True Levellers Standard Advanced*, Winstanley, writing of the period between Moses and Christ, inclusively identifies “the Rulers, as Kings and Governors,” as not only perpetuators but originators of social and economic ills (255).

⁴Winstanley generally argues that rulers perpetuate the curse and that in this regard they prevent the land from being fertile. Citing Paul’s assertion that “all kindes of creatures” suffer from the curse, Winstanley prophesies that “[w]hen man-kinde shall be restored, and delivered from the curse, and all spirited with this one power, then other creatures shall be restored likewise, and freed from their burdens: as the Earth, from thorns, and

motivating impulse that victimizes the innocent, murders the poor, and corrupts the land: “Thou teaching and ruling power of flesh . . . thou that wast a self-lover in *Cain*, killed thy brother *Abel*, a plain-hearted man that loved righteousness: And thou by thy wisdom and beastly government, made the whole Earth to stinck . . .” (254). He also identifies the “powers of the Earth” with “Lord *Esau*, the Elder brother, because you have appeared to rule the Creation” and warns them that “the power that sets you to work, is selvisish Covetousnes, and an aspiring Pride, to live in glory and ease over *Iacob*, the meek Spirit; that is, the Seed that lies hid, in & among the poor Common People, or yonger Brother, out of whom the blessing of Deliverance is to rise and spring up to all Nations” (254). Here, the poor commoners are linked with the image of “the Seed,” with life and growth, in contrast to the ruling powers that stifle fecundity and goodness.⁵

Yet Winstanley’s allusions to Esau and Cain involve the land even more directly. Esau forfeits his birthright, presumably including whatever land he would have inherited from Isaac, to his brother (Gen. 25:29-34). And Isaac clearly meant Esau to have mastery over foreign peoples and his own brothers alike (Gen. 27:29) and to benefit from “the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine” (Gen. 27:28). More surprisingly,

briars, and barrennesse; the Air and winds from unseasonable storms and distempers; the Cattle from bitterness and rage one against another” (169).

⁵Winstanley’s association of kingly power with Esau also emphasizes deadliness: “Esau was a cunning hunter, a man of the field . . .” (Gen. 25:27). The treatise *More Light Shining in Buckinghamshire* (1649)—according to Winstanley’s editor George H. Sabine, likely a Leveller work (605)—makes a similar but more direct comparison in its complaints against kings’ creation of titles (“and priviledges accordingly, as to hunt, hawk, &c.”): “all which vain titles are forbidden by our Saviour as heathenish: for it arose from mans own sensuality, darkness, and wickedness, and murder, for *Nimrod* was the first King, and he was such a bloody wretch, that he was called a Hunter, *Gen.* 10. 8, 9, 10. that is, a Hunter of his own kind in the presence of the Jehovah even against Gods Ordinance, so wicked was he . . .” (in Winstanley 628-29).

perhaps, Winstanley sees Cain's deadly dispute with Abel as a dispute about the land: "The quarrell rise about the Earth; for *Abels* industry made the earth more fruitfull than *Cain*; thereupon *Cain* would take away *Abels* labour from him by force. Gen. 4. 3" (425). The Scriptural account never explicitly attributes Abel's murder to questions of fertility and labor (Gen. 4:8), though the description of Cain as "very wroth" at God's acceptance of Abel's offering but not Cain's (4:5) suggests envy as a possible motive. What matters to my argument, however, is not the defensibility of Winstanley's interpretation but rather his emphasis, far stronger and more specific than Scripture's, on the land's role in Cain's corruption.⁶

This emphasis, when Winstanley compares rulers to Cain, implies that they, too, jealously guard the earth and the benefits of fertile land. Indeed, Winstanley's description of the advent of private landholding resembles his account of Cain's sin: "But when Mankind *began to quarrell about the earth*; and some would have all, and shut out others, forcing them to be servants; This was Mans fall, it is the ruling of the curse, and is the cause of all divisions, wars, and pluckings up. Jer. 45. 5" (424, emphasis added). This description helps to explain why Winstanley claims that rulers perpetuate the curse: he regards their governance as encouraging landownership and thus maintaining fallen values. In "The Curse and Blessing That Is in Mankinde" (1650), he puts the point bluntly regarding kings in particular: "The several Nations of the Earth where Kings rule, are the several situation [*sic*] of such grand Theeves and Murderers, that will rule over

⁶In *A Letter to the Lord Fairfax and His Councell of War*, Winstanley asserts that "*Cain* killed *Abel*, because *Abels* principles, or religion, was contrary to his . . ." (290). But this account does not wholly contradict the one given above, for Winstanley explains the dispute in terms of "angry covetousness" that supports private property gotten by violence (290).

others by the Sword, upholding a forced Propriety, which is the Curse; and persecuting the community of Love, which is Christ the blessing” (384-85).

But in *The Law of Freedom* he applies this principle to all “Kingly” rulers, citing Saul as an example of “Kingly Government . . . which is the power of covetousness and pride,” a power, as we have seen, not limited to monarchs:

For indeed we never read, that the people began to complain of Oppression, till Kingly Government rose up, which is the power of covetousness and pride; and which *Samuel* sets forth to be a plague and a curse upon the people in the first rise of it.

He will take your sons and your daughters to be his servants, and to run before his charrets, to plant his ground, and to reap his harvest: He will take your fields, your Vineyards and Oliveyards, even the best of them, and give to his servants as pleaseth him: He will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his Officers, or Ministers. 1 *Sam.* 8. (532)

Samuel’s prophecy about Saul’s rule emphasizes precisely the issues with which the Diggers were concerned: liberty, labor, and land. And the prophesied “Oppression” encourages the kind of unrest that, for Winstanley, characterizes much of human history: “the Government of Kings is a breeder of Wars, because men being put into the straits of poverty, are moved to fight for Liberty, and to take one anothers Estates from them, and to obtain Mastery” (513). And although this comment, addressed to Cromwell, appears to indict kings specifically, Winstanley also turns it to criticism of armies in general and, implicitly, of England’s Army in particular: “Look into all Armies, and see what they do more, but make some poor, some rich; put some into freedom, and others into bondage: And is not this a plague among Mankinde?” (513).

Ultimately, then, Winstanley represents kings and other rulers, especially insofar as they uphold private property, as perpetuating division and disunity. Of the “traditional law of Kings,” which executes their wills and protects their interests (588-89), he writes, “This is the souldier, who cut Christs garment into pieces, which was to have remained

uncut and without seame; this law moves the people to fight one against another for those pieces, viz. for the several inclosures of the earth, who shall possess the earth, and who shall be Ruler over others” (589).⁷ And just as Winstanley tends to apply his other criticisms of kings to all worldly, selfish rulers, he affirms in the *Appeal to the House of Commons* (1649) and *The Law of Freedom* (1652) that this “law of Kings” can persist even in governments without kings (307-8, 574). All such rulers, he asserts, support the enclosures that result from, provoke, and represent the divisions among their owners: the condition of the land symbolizes that of the people. Moreover, the image of the land as Christ’s torn clothing links kingly government with death by recalling Gospel descriptions of Christ’s crucifixion (Matt. 27:35, Mark 15:24, Luke 23:34, John 19:24): Winstanley states explicitly in *The True Levellers Standard Advanced* that “pleading for Propriety and single Interest, divides the People of a land, and the whole world into Parties, and is the cause of all Wars and Bloud-shed, and Contention every where” (262).

For Winstanley, then, kingly practices, and especially support for private property, encourage death rather than life, dissension rather than unity. To his way of thinking, kings, and any rulers motivated by selfishness and lust for power, fail to cultivate thoroughly and productively the nations they rule: literally, because they divide the land with regard for “propriety” rather than beneficial use, and figuratively, because they discourage loving or even equitable interactions with and among their subjects.

⁷Winstanley apparently misremembers the passage from John’s Gospel, which, like the other three Gospels, records the dividing of Jesus’ other garments (John 19:23) but which also describes a seamless coat, kept intact, for which the soldiers cast lots (19:24).

Winstanley thus implicitly encourages skepticism toward the gardener-king trope as well as its analogues for other kinds of rulers.⁸

England's False Gardener-Kings

Winstanley's criticisms of English governments in particular discredit the gardener-king trope's application both to English kings and to the republican forces that succeeded Charles. As with governments in general, Winstanley accuses kings and the Parliament and Army alike of a self-interest that devalues life and charity and divides the people as well as the land itself: the monarchs and republicans both prove poor cultivators and poor rulers. These accusations, as we shall see, take on special significance given the frequent comparisons of England to a garden, before as well as during the Interregnum.

Winstanley uses Scriptural examples of the ills of kingship in order to convince readers of English kings' corruption and injustice. Nebuchadnezzar's poor treatment of the Israelites, for instance, symbolizes England's sufferings under William the Conqueror and his successors:

this outward Teaching and Ruling power, is the Babylonish yoke laid upon Israel of old, under *Nebuchadnezzar*, and so Successively from that time, the Conquering Enemy, have still laid these yokes upon Israel to keep *Jacob* down: And the last enslaving Conquest which the Enemy got over Israel, was the *Norman* over *England*; and from that time, Kings, Lords, Judges, Justices, Bayliffs, and the violent bitter people that are Free-holders, and have been Successively: The *Norman* Bastard *William* himself, his Colonels, Captains, inferiour Officers, and Common Souldiers, who still are from that time to this day in pursuite of that victory, Imprisoning, Robbing, and killing the poor enslaved *English* Israelites. (259)

Nebuchadnezzar, trying to impose conformity of worship (Dan. 3:1-6), persecuted three Jews, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, for disobeying him (Dan. 3:13-23);

⁸The treatise *More Light Shining in Buckinghamshire* (1649) refers disparagingly to "Lords of the Mannors" as "*Hedg-kings*" who "can keep a Court-leet, and enslave all within their Territories . . ." (in Winstanley 636).

Winstanley's identification of the English commoners with the Israelites shows how dire his people's situation seemed to Winstanley, particularly under the likes of Archbishop Laud and Charles I. His emphasis on the burdensome "Babylonish yoke" and the oppression laid on by the powerful and the "violent bitter . . . Freeholders" depicts a limiting, self-serving cultivation of English resources, one that harms one group to benefit others.

If the English people are like the Israelites, furthermore, then their kings are like Israel's: all, in Winstanley's eyes, perpetuate the curse. Repeated references to 1 Samuel 8, which describes the suffering a king would impose on Israel, enrich the Digger's complaints against English monarchs. One such complaint about English "slavery under the Kingly power," for example, closely echoes the description in 1 Samuel 8:14-17 of the sweeping, arbitrary power Saul would hold:

In the time of the Kings, who came in as Conquerors, and ruled by the power of the Sword, not only the Common land, but the Inclosures also were captivated under the will of those Kings, till now of late that our later Kings granted more freedom to the Gentry than they had presently after the Conquest; yet under bondage still: for what are prisons, whips and gallows in the times of peace, but the laws and power of the sword, forcing and compelling obedience, and so enslaving, as if the sword raged in the open field? (369)

English kings' "captivat[ion]" of private lands closely resembles the prophesied seizure and redistribution of the Israelites' land by a king interested in benefiting himself and rewarding his officers. And the assertion that English subjects are "under bondage" or "enslav[ed]" sounds like Samuel's prophecy that the Israelites would become "servants" to their king (1 Sam. 8:17). The desires for private property and for power over other people, as well as the exercise of violence, align English kings with Saul and with the curse.

More specifically, Winstanley criticizes Charles in terms reminiscent of the Scriptural critique of Saul. In *A New-Yeers Gift*, Winstanley's objection to Charles's rule echoes God's objection to the Israelites' demand for a king. Just as the oppression prophesied by Samuel followed from the people's sin of choosing to be ruled by a human rather than by God (1 Sam. 8:7), Winstanley accuses Charles of usurping God's prerogative to dispose of the land as He wished and of ignoring God's will that all people have access to land⁹:

King *Charles*, it is true, was the Head of this Kingly power in *England*, and he Reigned as he was a Successor of the last Norman Conqueror: and whosoever you be, that hath Propriety of Land, hath your Titles and Evidences made to you in his or his Ancestors Name, and from his and their Will and Kingly power; I am sure, he was not our Creator, and therefore parceled out the Earth to some, and denied it to others, therefore he must needs stand as a Conqueror, and was the Head of this Kingly power, that burdens and oppresses the People, and that is the cause of all our Wars and Divisions . . . (356)

Similarly, Winstanley's assertion that Charles, trying to protect his "Prerogative-tyranny" (369), "took WILLIAM the *Conqueror's* Sword into his hand again, thereby to keep under the former conquered English, and to uphold his Kingly power of self-will and Prerogative, which was the power got by former Conquests; that is, to rule over the lives and estates of all men at his will, and so to make us pure slaves and vassals" (369-70) recalls Samuel's prophecy about the ills—including having one's children and lands seized for royal service—that would result from the fulfillment of the Israelites' desire for a king (1 Sam. 8:11-17). And Winstanley's emphasis on "tyranny," "self-will," "Prerogative," and reliance on military might to quash subjects' freedom encourages comparison of Charles to Saul as well as to the other death-dealing, selfish kings Winstanley condemns.

⁹In the same treatise, Winstanley declares that "the Earth in the first Creation of it, was freely given to whole mankind, without respect of Persons . . ." (357).

This depiction of Charles suggests that he, like other kings, was no good gardener of his nation. Like his predecessors, Charles supported private property and divided both the land and the people. In this regard, he proved a cultivator of only parts of his kingdom, not the whole: “*King Charles* was the successour of the *Norman Conquest*, and raigned as a Conquerour over *England*, for his Power held the Land from us, and would rather see us die in poverty, or hang us up, then suffer us to plant the *Commons* for our livelihood” (410).¹⁰ Charles, Winstanley argues, did not cultivate life among the common people or on the common land. Any claim that Charles was a gardener-king, then, is for Winstanley a highly misleading half-truth at best.¹¹

Yet Winstanley also implicitly rejects the gardener-governor trope for England’s Interregnum government. We have already seen that, for Winstanley, non-monarchical governments could nonetheless be “kingly” if their laws favored rich over poor and “propriety” over community. Like kings, then, such governments cultivated only part of the land, not all of it, and thus nourished death alongside of, or even instead of, life. Winstanley repeatedly worries that England’s postwar government tends in this direction, and he eventually accuses the Parliament and Army of the same corruption Charles had

¹⁰The mention of hanging introduces a literal, and fatal, separation of a commoner from the land.

¹¹The dedicatory epistle in John Parkinson’s *Theatrum Botanicum* (1640) represents exactly the problem Winstanley describes, identifying Charles I as the life-protecting monarch who establishes God’s peace (Mic. 4:1-4) but also as a supporter of private property: “For as your Majesty is *Summus Pater patriæ*, the chiefe of your people under God, that not onely provideth for their soules health, that they may have the pure Word of God, whereby to live ever, . . . but many wayes also for their bodily estates, by good and wholesome Lawes, that every one may live obediently and peaceably under their owne Vine and Figtree, and by protection, &c.” (sig. A3r).

exhibited. He thus finds England's present and past governments alike guilty of poor cultivation.

Winstanley's concern about the Parliament's and the Army's kingliness emerges in various treatises. In *The Law of Freedom*, addressed to Cromwell, he writes that army officers who defeat a king "but reserve some part of the Kingly Power to advance their own particular Interest . . . are worse Thieves and Tyrants then the Kings they cast out . . ." (574); the comment, though phrased hypothetically, clearly alludes to England's Army. And in other works Winstanley more directly compares England's ruling forces to Charles. In *The True Levellers Standard Advanced*, he accuses the "Powers of *England*" of a "self-seeking humour" that has resulted in greater "oppression" of the commoners than in Charles's reign (255). And as with kings, so with these powers: he associates them with the three biblical figures that for him symbolize sinful selfishness and oppression unto death: "O thou *A-dam*, thou *Esau*, thou *Cain*, thou Hypocritical man of flesh, when wilt thou cease to kill thy yonger Brother?" (256). Again, in *A Watch-Word to the City of London and the Armie* (1649), in which he criticizes the legal system's handling of his and two other Diggers' arrest for trespassing on St. George's Hill (319), he challenges Lord of the Manor Francis Drake's moral claim on the land: "Mr. *Drake*, you are a Parliament man, and was not the beginning of the quarrel between King *Charles* and your House? This the King pleaded to uphold Prerogative, and you were against it, and yet must a Parliament man be the first man to uphold Prerogative, who are but servants to the Nation for the peace and liberty of every one, not conquering Kings to make their wil a Law?" (337-38).

The problems Winstanley anticipates from the Interregnum powers is the same he identifies in other governments: decisions based on self-interest rather than charity, which in turn create divisions and disunity in the nation and neglect certain parts of the land in favor of others. He describes this divisiveness as arising from both the people's resentment of injustices and their dissatisfaction with what they perceived as dishonesty about the new powers' intentions. In *A New-Yeers Gift*, he chastises the Parliament and the Army for failing to follow through on the Parliament's "Act to cast out Kingly power, and to make *England* a free Common-wealth" (353):

O that there were such a heart in Parliament and Army, as to perform your own Act; then People would never complain of you for breach of Covenant, for your Covetousness, Pride, and too much Self-seeking that is in you. And you on the other-side would never have cause to complain of the Peoples murmurings against you. Truly this jarring that is between you and the People is The Kingly Power; yea that very Kingly power which you have made an Act to cast out . . . (354)

Within a year after the regicide, then, Winstanley already blames Parliament and the Army for divisions within England.

As his insistence on "an equal freedom in the Earth" for all people suggests, he sees lack of access to land as deepening these divisions (355). In *A Watch-Word to the City of London and the Armie*, he figures the values associated with enclosure and private property as military maneuvers and thus emphasizes what he sees as their dangers, writing of "Lords of Mannours, . . . Lawyers and Priests, . . . Freeholders, and Land-lords, . . . Bailiffes . . . and all the ignorant bawling women against our digging for freedome . . ." (330),

These are all striving to get into a body againe, that they may set up a new Norman slaverie over us; and the place of their rendezvous, Prerogative power is fenced already about, with a Line of Communication. An act made by a piece of the Parliament to maintain the old Lawes; which if once this Camp be fortified in his full strength, it will cost many a sighing heart, and burdened spirit before it be taken. (330-31)

This passage recognizes English disunity in its mention of “a piece of the Parliament,” the Rump. Furthermore, the language of war here—“rendezvous,” “a Line of Communication,” “this Camp,” “fortified,” “taken”—depicts the threats of “Kingly power” to which Winstanley refers in *A New-Yeers Gift*, raising the specter of a new Norman Conquest months after Charles’s execution. As Nigel Smith has noted (“Gerrard” 51), Winstanley ends the description with an image of enclosure, the “Line of Communication” surrounding and protecting “Prerogative power” and potentially leading to a “fortified” encampment. The image reinforces figuratively two points Winstanley often makes about the “propriety” whose supporters “hedge[] some into the Earth, and hedge[] others out . . .” (492, 493): that it originates from and supports self-interest (252; 489, 493), and that it thus leads to war (262; 493).

The threat, however, is more literal than these war metaphors suggest: kingly governments, precisely because they operate by selfish principles, result in spotty, partial husbandry. For Winstanley, the most important benefit of shaking off the yoke of “Kingly power” is right use of the land: addressing Fairfax and his war council, Winstanley questions “[w]hether the freedom which the common people have got, by casting out the Kingly power, lie not herein principally, to have the land of their nativity for their livelihood, freed from intanglement of Lords, Lords of Mannours, and Landlords, which are our taskmasters” (287). The kingly distribution of land, he tells Cromwell in the epistle accompanying *The Law of Freedom*, has injured a whole class of subjects and the animals on which they depend: “the rich *Norman* Free-holders, or the new (more covetous) Gentry, over-stock the Commons with Sheep and Cattle; so that inferior Tenants and poor Laborers can hardly keep a Cow, but half starve her; so that the

poor are kept poor still, and the Common Freedom of the Earth is kept from them, and the poor have no more relief then they had when the King (or Conqueror) was in power” (506). The new government, Winstanley argues, has failed to correct the problem of bad husbandry, and the land, animals, and people suffer the consequences.¹²

The problem also extends specifically to cultivation. By preventing the poor from working the common land, Winstanley argues, the ruling powers miss opportunities not only to act charitably toward their fellow humans but also to improve England on a national scale. He finds the current land distribution needlessly wasteful: “Wee desire noe more of yow,” he writes to Fairfax and the war council, “then freedome to worke, and to enioy the benefit of our labours—for here is wast land enough and to spare to supply all our wants . . .” (348).¹³ If the poor were allowed to cultivate the commons, he contends,

England would bee enriched with all commodity with in it selfe which they each would afford; and truely this is a stayne to Christian religion in England, that wee have soe much land ly wast, and soe many starve for want; and further, if this freedome bee granted, the whole land wilbee united in love and strength, that if a forraigne enemy like an army of ratts and mice come to take our inheritance from us, wee shall all rise as one man to defend it. (349)

Equitable and thorough cultivation is linked, in Winstanley’s mind, with a vision of subjects “united in love and strength,” so that the wholeness of the land and that of its

¹²Of Winstanley’s account of his enemies’ attack on some cows he was tending, George M. Shulman writes, “How the elder brothers use, sell, and beat the cows provides a metaphor for how they treat the poor and the earth. Most obviously, the Normans rob the people of their livelihood and nourishment . . .” (167). He goes on to explain that “the Normans’ attitude toward the cows represents the exact opposite of digging: they deny reciprocity with the earth and with ‘fellow creatures’” (167).

¹³Indeed Winstanley writes to the House of Commons, “The maine thing that you should look upon is the Land, which calls upon her children to be freed from the entanglement of the *Norman* Task-masters, for one third part lies waste and barren, and her children starve for want, in regard the Lords of Manors will not suffer the poor to manure it” (304).

people are interdependent. In not promoting cultivation of the common lands, the Army promotes death rather than life, starvation rather than plenty, and “wast” rather than use.

Moreover, as Winstanley’s protests against the Diggers’ treatment suggest, the Parliament and Army cultivated England poorly not only by disregarding life but also by risking death in at least two ways. Firstly, he criticizes the government for having failed to keep its promise of reform (354) and for thus remaining vulnerable to “Kingly power,” which supports private property as “the cause of all Wars and Complainings . . .” (355). Secondly, he accuses the Parliament and the Army of behaving murderously in denying to the common people the use of “our crown Lands and waste Lands” (363-64):

we paid you your wages to help us to recover it, but not to take it to your selves, and turn us out, and buy and sell it among your selves; . . . we profess to all the Creation, That in so doing, you rob us of our Rights; & you kill us, by denying to give us our livelihood in our own inheritance freely, which is the crown Land and Comon Land and waste Lands, Bishops & Deans, which some of you begin to say you are not satisfied in your conscience to let us have: . . . if you do so, you will uphold the Kinglie power, and so disobey both Acts of Parliament, and break your Oath, and you will live in the breach of those Two Commandements, *Thou shalt not kill: Thou shalt not steal*; by denying us the Earth which is our Livelyhood, and thereby killing us by a lingring death. (364)

Thus England’s rulers not only risk further social and military upheaval but actually withhold the commoners’ “Livelyhood,” which, Winstanley argues, amounts to slow starvation.¹⁴ These rulers cultivate England poorly on two counts: neglecting parts of the nation’s land, they fail to support vegetable life, and disregarding the poor, they interfere with human life as well.

Winstanley’s plea for equitable treatment responded to real opposition to the Digger project: legal action (302, 319, 327-8); stealing and destruction of property (328, 333,

¹⁴George H. Sabine summarizes the plight of the poor in the late 1640s in his introduction to Winstanley’s *Works* (13). In particular, he notes, “The news sheets published during 1649 contain accounts from many parts of England of conditions bordering on famine and pestilence” (13).

335, 344, 434); and violent attacks on the Diggers, one of which caused a pregnant woman to miscarry (284-85, 295, 433).¹⁵ Winstanley recognizes the warlike nature of even the attacks on cattle he was keeping: “And thus Lords of Mannours, their Bailiffes the true upholders of the *Norman* power, and some Freeholders that doe oppose this publick work, are such as the countrey knowes have beene no friends to that Cause the Parliament declared for, but to the Kingly power; and now if they get the foot fast in the stirrup, they will lift themselves again into the *Norman* saddle . . .” (329-30). The protests against the Diggers, and the continued adherence to property-rights laws and customs, uphold literal divisions of land as well as figurative divisions among the people; the image of “the *Norman* saddle,” moreover, suggests aristocratic, military, warlike power rather than peaceable, homely tilling of the land.¹⁶ And as Winstanley describes it, the resistance to the Diggers’ literal cultivation appears symptomatic of the larger problem: that the powerful care not for the whole land but only for the parts that benefit them.

Winstanley’s indictment of England’s present as well as past governments calls into question applications of the gardener-king trope to human rulers. But we shall see that his limited yet complex use of the garden image suggests a subtler treatment of the trope, one compatible with Winstanley’s social agenda and with some fairly orthodox Christian conceptions of God.

¹⁵For a summary of such harassments in 1649, see “A Bill of Account of the Most Remarkable Sufferings That the Diggers Have Met with from the Great Red Dragons Power since April 1. 1649 . . .” (Winstanley 392-96). Sabine, in his introduction, discusses the various actions taken against the Diggers in both 1649 and 1650 (14-21).

¹⁶As Nigel Smith observes, “The ‘Norman’ powers of landlords are described as lordly horsemanship, which, after property and dress, was the most obvious sign of social ascendancy . . .” (“Gerrard Winstanley” 49).

II. Winstanley against Gardens?

Winstanley's second challenge to the gardener-king trope lies in his remarks about cultivation and gardening. He calls into question both England's often-asserted garden status and the tendency to uphold the Garden of Eden as a model for the nation as well as the nation's gardens. Although he does not altogether reject the image of England as a garden, he redefines the gardener-king trope so that it no longer involves enclosure and private property, transforming the human gardener-king into the husbandman-governor and reserving the gardener-king trope for God alone.¹⁷

England No Garden

We have already seen that Winstanley challenges the notion of an English gardener-king partly by characterizing the nation's kings—and potentially all its rulers, at least since the Conquest—as poor cultivators of the nation. But he does so also by calling into doubt the image of England as a garden and by representing the desire for a garden as problematic. By associating gardens with self-interest, he discourages the idealization of any human ruler as a gardener-king.

¹⁷In *The Law of Freedom*, Winstanley uses the term “Husbandry” for “the right planting of the Earth to make it fruitful” and identifies “two branches of it” (577). One, which also goes by the name of “Husbandry” (578), is “planting, digging, dunging, liming, burning, grubbing, and right ordering of Land, to make it fit to receive seed, that it may bring forth a plentiful crop” (577-78). The other “is Gardening, how to plant, graft, and set all sort of fruit-trees, and how to order to the ground for flowers, Herbs and Roots for pleasure, food, or medicinal” (578). Thus for Winstanley, “[g]ardening” includes more than creating enclosed pleasure gardens, and when he complains against enclosure, he is not necessarily complaining against gardening. On the other hand, Rosemary Kegl observes that “[d]uring the seventeenth century, experiments within enclosed gardens were central to the success of larger enclosing practices” (105). See also Nigel Smith's discussion of the relationship between enclosed fields and enclosed gardens as it applies to Andrew Marvell's Mower poems (*Poems* 129, 132).

Winstanley never directly refers to England as a garden or paradise; to do so would damage his argument that the nation needs more thorough cultivation. Yet such metaphors pervade earlier and contemporary works. John of Gaunt in Shakespeare's *Richard II*, prompted by England's island setting, calls the country "This other Eden, demi-paradise, / This fortress built by Nature for herself / Against infection and the hand of war, / This happy breed of men, this little world" (2.1.42-45), and a servant refers to "our sea-walled garden, the whole land" (3.4.43). William Prynne, in a 1641 treatise against the Church of England prelates (1641), quotes supposed former Greyfriar Roderyck Mors—actually, according to Alec Ryrie ("Brinklow," *ODNB*), one Henry Brinklow, mercer—on Henry VIII's dissolution of England's religious houses: "The Kings Grace began well to weed the Garden of England . . ." (Prynne, *Antipathie* 409). And in *Englands Out-Cry* (1644), Parliamentarian John Harris hopes that "the Lord may heare us and have mercy on us, and heale our iniquities, and give a close to our differences, . . . and make *England* once more a Garden of pleasure, which now appears a terrene *Golgotha*, a bloody field of Slaughter" (5). The enclosure on which Winstanley focuses, in contrast, is more figurative but also more threatening, at least for the commoners: "*England* is a Prison; the variety of subtilties in the Laws preserved by the Sword, are bolts, bars, and doors of the prison; the Lawyers are the Jaylors, and poor men are the prisoners . . ." (361). Winstanley's image evokes both the punishments of poor people driven to crime and his own objections to Norman law as leading to a loss of freedom.

Elsewhere Winstanley directly implicates the power of law in England's corrupt condition, suggesting that it can severely damage humans' relationships with God and

each other. In *An Appeal to the House of Commons*, he protests against the legal claims on common lands urged by the Diggers' enemies, "Surely if these Lords and Free-holders have their Inclosures established to them in peace, is not that freedom enough? Must they needs have the Common-land likewise? As *Ahab*, that was restlesse till he had *Naboths* Vineyard, and so in the midst of their abundance, yet will eat the bread of the poores mouthes" (307). This biblical allusion supports Winstanley's characterization of such selfishness as ungodly (305): God threatens to destroy Ahab for creating the circumstances in which Naboth was killed and his land freed for the taking (1 Kings 21:19-26). More importantly for this study, the reference illustrates Winstanley's contention that private property leads to strife, abuse of power, and even death: Naboth was killed by his townsmen at Queen Jezebel's instigation (21:7-13). For Winstanley this story exemplifies the unwillingness of the rich to be content with what they have and to leave some land for their poorer countrymen to work. But, given that it begins with King Ahab's desire for a convenient herb garden (1 Kings 21:2), it also specifically implicates private gardens in the desire for land.

Indeed, Ahab's desire opposes two principles espoused by Winstanley: the necessity of forgoing the covetousness and power that lead to abuses of land and people, and the status of land as an "inheritance" not to be forfeited. The king emphasizes convenience, explaining that he wants Naboth's land "because it is near unto my house . . ." (1 Kings 21:2). Yet his reaction—"heavy and displeased," he even refuses food (21:4)—suggests that more is at stake. Jezebel implies that the question of power is central to the king's response: "Dost thou now govern the kingdom of Israel?" (21:7). The story thus describes a king's desire for a subject's land in much the way Samuel's prophecy about

Saul does (1 Sam. 8:14). Moreover, it exemplifies the ways in which the desire for power and the desire for a private garden prove detrimental to others and to one's relationship with God. Even Ahab's offer to compensate Naboth for the vineyard (1 Kings 21:2) participates in this problem, according to Winstanley's ideals: "buying and selling of Land, and the fruits of the earth . . . is the art of cheating one another . . ." (425).

Naboth's resistance to Ahab thus serves as an emblem for the commoners' resistance to the corrupt gardener-king. Naboth's refusal of Ahab's offer is grounded in the principle that land is an "inheritance" to be safeguarded: "And Naboth said to Ahab, The LORD forbid it me, that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee" (1 Kings 21:3). Likewise, Winstanley repeatedly appeals to what he calls the universal "Creation-Right," instituted at the beginning of human existence and "confirmed by Covenant from God, to *Noah*, and his Seed, without limitation or respect of persons. Gen. 9. 9" (424). "In the first entrance into the Creation," he asserts in *The New Law of Righteousnes*, "every man had an equall freedom given him of his Maker to till the earth, and to have dominion over the beasts of the field, the fowls of heaven, and fish in the Seas" (182). And in *The True Levellers Standard Advanced*, Winstanley calls "universal Liberty and Freedom" "our Birthright, which our Maker gave us . . ." (256). This notion of birthright he associates specifically with the land: "if the Earth be not peculiar to any one branch, or branches of mankind, but the Inheritance of all; Then it is Free and Common for all, to work together, and eate together" (262).¹⁸ And like Naboth, Winstanley sees a violation

¹⁸George M. Shulman offers a detailed discussion of Winstanley's identification of the poor with Israel and his emphasis on inheritance as a means to social and economic reformation (103-15).

of this God-given inheritance as shameful: “If you labour the earth, and work for others that lives [*sic*] at ease, and follows the waies of the flesh by our labours, eating the bread which you get by the sweat of your brows, not their own: Know this, that the hand of the Lord shal break out upon every such hireling labourer, and you shal perish with the covetous rich men, that have held, and yet doth hold the Creation under the bondage of the curse” (194). He therefore enjoins the commoners not to relinquish their birthright, the common land, in favor of an unjust human system of cultivation.¹⁹

Winstanley’s representations of England’s actual and ideal conditions, then, avoid using the garden as a symbol of peace, plenty, or perfection. The example of Ahab associates gardens and other enclosures, especially those owned or cultivated by kings, with corrupt values and discord. Winstanley’s allusion to the story illustrates a potential danger of gardener-kings and the temptations that accompany the promise or the acquisition of private land: if a king mishandles his desire for a private garden, how can his people trust him with the nation?

¹⁹In a sermon on a passage from Luke 20:14 (“This is the heir: come, let us kill him, that the inheritance may be ours”), John Allington, whose title page identifies him as “A Sequestred Divine,” remarks, “Inheritances they are lookt upon as the best of Titles, as including the most unquestionable of all properties. . . . He who hath only an *Elective* and *Conditionall* property, of his property the same may be said, that we proverbially say of *Service*, it is no Heritage. But he who *comes as Heir* into a possession, he who holds what he hath as *Inheritance*; such an one we look upon as an *absolute* owner, as one *who so holds*, that nothing but *Treason* or his own *Exorbitances*, can deprive him.” Allington then cites Naboth’s experience as an example: “for as much as his *Vineyard* was his *Inheritance*, *Ahab* (though a King) could neither *Command*, nor *Exchange*, nor buy it of him” (193).

England's Distance from Eden

Winstanley also avoids writing of the literal Garden of Eden as an image of or ideal for England.²⁰ For many early-modern English writers, the Garden of Eden served as a model for other enclosed gardens, real and fictional, and for the nation as a whole.²¹ For Winstanley, however, the Garden of Eden is a more complex image. He recognizes this garden as godly, good, and useful, but he routinely ignores or denies the notion that it is or was a literal place. He uses it not as a pattern for earthly gardens or nations but rather as a figure for a person's moral condition. By challenging the idea that a king, or any other traditional government, can return England to an Edenic state, Winstanley calls into question a specific form of the gardener-king trope.²²

The Garden of Eden always has positive associations for Winstanley: it represents humans' unity with each other, with the creatures, and with God, in the time before self-interest destroyed this peace (155-56). But he does not write of this garden as a literal paradise; its value for him is always figurative or symbolic, though the meaning varies from one work to another. In *A Letter to the Lord Fairfax* (1649), for example, the Garden of Eden stands for "the earth" as tended by humans "in love, freedom, and

²⁰Timothy Kenyon discusses "Stuart England as the fallen condition" in Winstanley's works (145-51), but without attention to the image of the Garden of Eden.

²¹On the Garden of Eden as inspiration for the work of Puritan agricultural reformers, see Charles Webster's *The Great Instauration* (465-83). On fictional gardens, see A. Bartlett Giamatti's *The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic*.

²²Indeed the closest Winstanley comes to associating an English government with Eden is his promise to Fairfax and the war council that if they will defend the Diggers, "we shall live in quietnesse, and the Nation will be brought into peace, while you that are the souldierie, are a wall of fire round about the Nation to keep out a forraign enemy . . ." (286). The image of soldiers' forming "a wall of fire" that surrounds and protects a peaceful place recalls the "flaming sword" that guarded the Garden of Eden after the Fall (Gen. 3:24).

righteousnesse” (289). Yet in *Fire in the Bush*, it represents humans in true, prelapsarian communion with God: “For as the great Earth, and the inferiour creatures therein are as the Commons, Forrests, and delights of God in the out Coasts of the Creation; Even so Mankind, The living Earth is the very Garden of *Eden*, wherein that spirit of Love, did walke, and delight himselfe principally, as being the Head and Lord of all the rest” (451). Winstanley’s switch from simile (“the great Earth, and the inferiour creatures therein are as the Commons . . .”) to metaphor (“Mankind, The living Earth is the very Garden of *Eden* . . .”) intensifies this figuration of humankind rather than the earth as the Garden.²³ Correspondingly, he explains Adam and Eve’s exile from the Garden (Gen. 3:23-24) as humankind’s being “driven . . . out of himselfe,” when “he enjoyes not himselfe, he knowes not himselfe; he lives without the true God, or ruler, and is like the Beasts of the field, who live upon objects without them . . .” (452). When “mankinde” instead eats the fruit of “the Tree of Life, . . . universall Love, or pure knowledge,” however, he “enters into the garden of Gods rest, and lives for ever . . .” (453). Again, the garden appears as a positive, desirable image for Winstanley, a symbol of “mankinde” in “communion” with God (459). Yet for Winstanley, Nigel Smith has suggested, even this image of the Garden of Eden has little to do with enclosed gardens. Noting the similarities in tone and Scriptural quotation between the preface for *Fire in the Bush* and some Ranter works, in

²³The passage also seems to justify the Diggers’ projects at St. George’s Hill and Cobham by associating God’s initial commands to humankind—“doe thou take possession, over the fish, fowle, Beast; and doe thou till the Earth; and doe thou multiplie and fill the Earth” (451)—with working untilld land: if “the great Earth, and the inferiour creatures therein are as the Commons, Forrests, and delights of God in the out Coasts of the Creation,” then the Diggers’ attention to the common lands corresponds especially well to God’s injunction to humans to “till the Earth.” See Sabine’s editorial remarks (443-44), however, on the problems of dating *Fire in the Bush* in relation to the Digger activity at St. George’s Hill and Cobham.

spite of Winstanley's desire to distance the Diggers from the Ranters, Smith writes, "Spiritual Eden requires an apocalyptic de-enclosing that both frees the self and unlocks the treasure of the earth . . ." ("Gerrard" 54).

Even when Winstanley associates the Garden of Eden with Heaven, he describes it as neither perfect nor literal, thus undercutting the idealization of this garden and the contemporary tendency to think of it as a real, albeit inaccessible, place:

In one word then, the innocencie of mankind, which is the Image of God, is plaine heartednesse without guile, quiet, patient, chaste, loving, without envy: yet through weaknesse is flexible, and open to temptation and change; This is the living soule, which God breathed the breath of life into; This is the Garden of *Eden*, it is the spirits house or mansion, and in the body of Mankind the spirit hath many mansions or dwelling places; this is the field or heaven, wherein *Michaell* and the Dragon fights the great battell of God Almighty. (481)

Although he does anticipate eventual perfection, affirming that "God principally resolves to set up his throne of righteous government" in "Heaven," which is also "the garden of *Eden*," he still identifies these places with "mankind," with individual souls, not an original or final home (457).²⁴ In fact Winstanley openly acknowledges that he values the Garden of Eden as a figure rather than a literal place and, indeed, that he finds an exclusively literal interpretation pernicious:

And that which hath by Imagination, or *Judas* Ministry, been held forth to us, to be without us, as *Adam*; the Serpent, the Garden, the Tree of Knowledge, of Good and evill; and the Tree of Life; and the fall of Man, and promise of redemption, all to be without; yet all these are within the heart of man clearly.

And whether there was any such outward things or no, it matters not much, if thou seest all within, this will be thy life. (462)

²⁴That Winstanley applies the Fall and redemption to each person's life is clear from his assertion that "this Innocencie, or plaine heartednesse in man, was not an estate 6000. yeare agoe onely; But every branch of mankind passes through it, & first is defiled by imaginary covetousnesse, and thereby is made a Devill; and then he is delivered from that darknesse, by Christ the restorer, and by him made one with the Father and the Son" (480-81).

Conceiving of the Garden of Eden primarily as a literal place is dangerous, the phrase “*Judas Ministry*” implies; doing so, Winstanley believes, distracts people from examining their souls and lives and encourages them instead to focus on “outward things.”

Winstanley further discourages readers from picturing the literal Garden of Eden by obscuring the image of this Garden as an enclosed space. In *A Letter to the Lord Fairfax* he asserts that as a result of the Fall, Adam—i.e., mankind—“was sent into the earth to eat his bread in sorrow . . .” (289), implying a distinction between the Garden and the rest of the land. But in the same passage, Winstanley subtly questions the notion of the Garden as an enclosure or paradise by identifying it with “the earth” in general, not a particular plot of ground: “Before the fall, *Adam*, or the Man did dresse the garden, or the earth, in love, freedom, and righteousness . . .” (289). Ultimately, then, in denying its literal significance or casting doubt on its status as an enclosure, Winstanley rejects the Garden of Eden as a horticultural image either for English gardens or for England itself.

By avoiding images of the Garden of Eden as a literal garden, furthermore, Winstanley distances it from the self-serving values he finds responsible for other enclosed spaces. He associates postlapsarian enclosures with the profit and pleasure of the upper classes and the labor of the lower:

The Earth (which was made to be a Common Treasury of relief for all, both Beasts and Men) was hedged in to In-closures by the teachers and rulers, and the others were made Servants and Slaves: And that Earth that is within this Creation, made a Common Store-house for all, is bought and sold, and kept in the hands of a few, whereby the great Creator is mightily dishonored, as if he were a respecter of persons, delighting in the comfortable Livelihood of some, and rejoicing in the miserable povertie and straits of others. (252)

By refusing to write of the Garden of Eden as a literal paradise, he avoids associating the first Garden with the corrupt postlapsarian values against which he and the other Diggers

protested in word and deed. In *An Humble Request* (1650), for example, Winstanley defends physical labor rather than uninterrupted leisure as a central feature of unfallen life. He notes that one of God's commands in Genesis was "*To subdue the Earth*. And this implies, plowing, digging, and all kind of manuring. So then observe. That bare and simple working in the Earth, according to the freedome of the Creation, though it be in the sweat of mans browes, is not the curse" (423). Instead, he explains, the curse involves the separation of "Mankind" into two groups—"Task-master[s]" on the one hand, "servant[s] and slave[s]" on the other (423)—"which makes mankind eat his bread in sorrow by the sweat of his browes" (424). For the Digger, then, the difference between unfallen and cursed life lies not in work but in "sorrow."²⁵

By refusing to describe England as a Garden of Eden, Winstanley reinforces his complaints that the nation suffers from the same postlapsarian values he associates with private property. In *The New Law of Righteousnes* he describes as "miserie" England's condition (200), in which "dominion and Lordship" governed social relationships (201) and, with barely a third of the land fertilized for cultivation, many people starved or hardly survived (200). English land labor is carried out by the poor to the benefit of the rich, Winstanley contends in both *A New-Yeers Gift* (363) and the epistle to Cromwell that accompanies *The Law of Freedom* (511). And the image of slavery appears explicitly in *A New-Yeers Gift*: "the government we have gives freedom and livelihood to the Gentry, to have abundance, and to lock up Treasures of the Earth from the poor, so that rich men may have chests full of Gold and Silver, and houses full of Corn and Goods

²⁵For many writers of the period, the Garden of Eden raised strenuous questions about moral philosophy—in particular, about the roles of labor, leisure, and pleasure in human life before the Fall. Charles Webster offers a brief but excellent discussion of Puritan agriculturalists' emphasis on work in the Garden of Eden (465-66).

to look upon; and the poor that works to get it, can hardly live, and if they cannot work like Slaves, then they must starve” (361). Thus although the need for land labor may be Edenic, the way in which England responds to that need, in Winstanley’s view, most certainly is not.

Yet Winstanley does not totally discount pleasure in favor of work. Ideally, the land would be a source not only of sustenance but also of pleasure to all of England’s inhabitants and ultimately the world’s: “This great Leveller, Christ our King of righteousness in us, shall cause men to beat their swords into plowshares, and spears into pruning hooks, and nations shall learn war no more, and every one shall delight to let each other enjoy the pleasures of the earth, and shall hold each other no more in bondage . . .” (391). Indeed, in his own plans for a communist society, he describes two kinds of husbandry: one for raising crops (577-78), and the other, “Gardening,” for cultivating “all sort of fruit-trees” as well as “flowers, Herbs and Roots for pleasure, food, or medicinal” (578). This passage, like Winstanley’s desire that everyone labor to improve the land, offers a glimpse of England’s Edenic potential, but without the problems caused by private gardens.

Ultimately, Winstanley depicts moderate pleasure in the created world as Edenic and certain Englishmen’s pleasure in the land as excessive and thus postlapsarian. In “The Curse and Blessing That Is in Mankinde,” for example, he emphasizes the Edenic goodness of rightly ordered pleasure: “When they enjoy the sweet delight of the Unitie of one Spirit, and the free content of the fruits and crops of this outward Earth, upon which their bodies stand: this was called The mans innocency, or pleasure in the Garden before his fall . . .” (377-78). The Fall came as a result of excessive pleasure in created things:

“when man began to fall out of his Maker, and to leave his joy and rest which he had in the spirit of Righteousnesse, and sought content from creatures and outward objects, then he lost his dominion . . .” (156). It is this latter condition in which Winstanley finds England:

Nay, is it not the bottome of all National lawes, to dispose of the Earth: and does not this appear to be true, by the practise of Lords of Mannors and the Gentry, that cannot be at rest for vexing and fretting, because poore men begins to see their creation-freedom, and begins to build upon, and plant the Commons.

And men that in other cases are mild and seemingly loving, are like Lions and Devils, ready to kill and destroy these poore diggers . . . (429)

Winstanley’s comparison of land- and income-hungry men to “Lions and Devils” suggests their fallenness, especially given that since the Fall, “as the man is become selfish; so are all the beasts and creatures become selfish; and man and beast act like each other . . .” (156). Indeed, he concludes the above passage by assuming that “the power of darknesse, and the fall, rules in these men; for if the restoring spirit, Christ, were in them, they would doe as they would be done by” (429).

Winstanley’s identification of the Garden of Eden with humans suggests that making England more Edenic would depend on the improvement of its people, on the cultivation of justice and righteousness rather than simply of beautiful landscapes or private interests. The point, for him, is not the image of the ideal garden but instead the peace and unity associated with that garden.

The Cultivation of England

For all Winstanley’s seeming reluctance to identify England with gardens in general or the Garden of Eden in particular, however, images of gardening and especially arboriculture pervade his remarks about the nation’s social problems. These images

sometimes link gardens with self-interest and related fallen values. But they sometimes signal a more complex response than wholesale rejection of the gardener-king trope. Instead, Winstanley limits and alters this trope: governments should not have all the power or agency that the trope implies, his writings suggest. He thus undercuts governments' existing power and argues against giving them more.

In *The Law of Freedom*, Winstanley implicitly compares England to a garden in a way that draws upon the image's positive and negative implications. Explaining the differences between "Monarchial souldiers," who take advantage of the people they are meant to serve, and "souldiers of true noble spirits," he writes that the latter "will help the weak, and set the oppressed free, and delight to see the *Common-wealth* flourish in freedom, as wel as their own gardens. There is none of this true nobility in the Monarchial Army, for they are all self lovers; the best is as a briar, and the most upright amongst them is as a thorne held . . ." (575). He thus envisions the soldiers' cultivating the nation much as they might their private lands, and he contrasts the resulting redemptive fertility with their counterparts' cursed infertility. The parallel between England and the soldiers' private gardens suggests that the nation is like a garden. The "noble" soldiers would cultivate it figuratively by ensuring freedom and thus enabling the people to cultivate it literally: the "freedom" Winstanley idealizes here involves license to work the common land unhindered, as is clear from his complaint against the "Monarchial" "engagement breaker" who promises access to the land but means instead to secure it for himself (575). In earlier treatises, Winstanley's disapproval of private property is clear. Here, though his ideals are the same, he uses the well-maintained private garden as an image for England's potential.

For Winstanley, as the above example suggests, the common people have a special role in England's cultivation. He uses the language of planting to explicate the relationship between kings and subjects. For instance, he depicts England as an estate of which William the Conqueror was the lord and the English the manual workers responsible for cultivating the land for others' pleasure: "When *William Duke of Normandy* had conquered *England*, he took possession of the earth for his freedom, and disposed of our *English* ground to his friends as he pleased, and made the conquered *English* his servants, to plant the earth for him and his friends" (521). This scheme, Winstanley indicates in *A New-Yeers Gift*, persisted into his own day in the form of "Lords of Mannors":

They were *William* the Conquerors Colonels and Favourites, and he gave a large circuit of Land to every one, called A Lord-ship, that they might have a watchful eye, that if any of the conquered English should begin to Plant themselves upon any Common or waste Land, to live out of sight or out of slavery, that then some Lord of Mannor or other might see and know of it, and drive them off, as these Lords of Mannors now a dayes, endeavours to drive off the Diggers from Digging upon the Commons . . . (359)

Winstanley's reference to the possibility that the poor and landless English might "Plant themselves" on unused land depicts them as both cultivators and, potentially, plants—both agents and objects. And the parallel with the Diggers' project suggests that the same is true of Winstanley and his companions, that they too both bring about and constitute improvement of the land.²⁶ The question is partly one of power: if William meant the English to be menial workers only, the possibility of their "Plant[ing] themselves" where they chose signified the possibility of their control over themselves as well as the land.

So much is clear also from Winstanley's urging the House of Commons to "suffer us to

²⁶Winstanley protests the jury sentence against himself and two other Diggers for their activity at St. George's Hill, Surrey, in part because, he maintains, "our digging upon that barren Common hath done the Common good . . ." (327).

plant our selves upon the Commons, and waste land, which is ours by the law of our Creation, and which is ours now by conquest from under our oppressor, for which we have paid taxes, given free-quarter, and adventured our lives; the Common-land now is as freely the common peoples, as you can say the Inclosures are your propriety” (306). Winstanley thus claims for the poor a kind of ownership of the common lands, one comparable to the gentry’s private property. The language of planting here does not necessarily imply that Winstanley thinks of England as a garden, but it does accord with the value he places on redemptive planting of the land, a kind not heretofore practiced by rulers.

These connections among plant imagery, rulers, and commoners are borne out more fully in Winstanley’s images of overgrown trees that endanger surrounding plants, images that often contrast the commoners’ cultivation of the land with unjust rulers’ hindrance of that work. Sometimes, as in *A New-Yeers Gift*, he credits the Interregnum government, as well as the commoners, with restraining the growth of “Kingly power”:

Thereupon you that were the Gentry, when you were assembled in Parliament, you called upon the poor Common-People to come and help you, and cast out oppression; and you that complained are helped and freed, and that top-bow is lopped off the tree of Tyrannie, and Kingly power in that one particular is cast out; but alas oppression is a great tree still, and keeps off the sun of freedome from the poor Commons still, he hath many branches and great roots which must be grub’d up, before every one can sing Sions songs in peace. (357)

The “Kingly power” that we have already seen as a bad gardener-king now appears as a threatening tree, interfering, as before, with the people’s lives and livelihoods.

Winstanley places the “great tree” of “oppression” in the context of the land in which it has grown: the phrase “the poor Commons” refers primarily to the common people but also identifies them with the land that, he argues repeatedly, is rightfully theirs to cultivate. Ultimately the treatise calls on the government to cultivate England well by

protecting “the poor Commons” from the tree’s overgrowth: “but we expect the Rulers of the Land will grant unto us their Friends, the benefit of their own Acts against Kingly power, and not suffer that Norman power to crush the poor Oppressed, who helped them in their straits, nor suffer that Norman power to bud fresher out, & so in time may come to over-top our deer bought Freedom more then ever” (359). Both of the passages quoted here offer evocative images of England as land that requires careful tending by those in power, on behalf of and with the support of those they claim to represent.²⁷

Yet Winstanley advocates an active role for the commoners in this cultivation of England: “Now Sirs, wheresoever we spie out Kingly power, no man I hope shall be troubled to declare it, nor afraid to cast it out, having both Act of Parliament, the Souldiers Oath, and the common peoples consent on his side; for Kingly power is like a great spread tree, if you lop the head or top-bow, and let the other Branches and root stand, it will grow again and recover fresher strength” (353). The inclusiveness of his language—“we,” “no man”—suggests cooperation among the Army, Parliament, and commoners, as does the reference to each group’s authority. But it also implies a certain autonomy: a commoner, for example, should feel free to fight “Kingly power” without fear of retribution and with a sense of his responsibility to the nation. Winstanley thus

²⁷In *The Law of Freedom*, Winstanley suggests that “some Officers of the Commonwealth are grown so mossy for want of removing, that they will hardly speak to an old acquaintance, if he be an inferior man, though they were very familiar before these Wars began” (541). He goes on to propose annual selection of new officers lest “Burthens and Oppressions should grow up in our Laws and in our Officers for want of removing, as Moss and Weeds grow in some Land for want of stirring . . .” (541). Again he intimates that England needs better cultivating; the images of moss rather than huge trees may reflect the lesser dangers posed by the attitudes of the officers he describes, as opposed to the considerable power and corruption of kinglier governors.

casts the Parliament and Army but also the commoners as gardeners responsible for keeping unwanted growth in check and eradicating harmful plants.

The role of the common people becomes even more important in “The Curse and Blessing That Is in Mankind,” an essay appended to *A New-Yeers Gift* that takes a much harsher tone with England’s ruling powers: “And this shall be your miserie O you covetous oppressing Tyrants of the Earth, not only you great self-seeking powers of *England*, but you powers of all the World. The people shall all fall off from you, and you shall fall on a sudden like a great tree that is undermined at the root. And you powers of *England* you cannot say another day but you had warning, this falling off is begun already . . .” (390). Here the nation’s government appears as the kind of threatening tree that it had professed to want to root up, and the common people become the force that will remove it.²⁸

The threats of destroying corrupt trees align corrupt government with Charles’s reign in a specific way, in addition to the more general ways outlined above. A passage from *A New-Yeers Gift* that urges the Parliament and the Army to overturn the injustices evident in Charles’s rule recalls the Root and Branch Petition of 1640, which demanded an end to episcopacy: “this Kingly power was not in the hand of the King alone; but Lords, and Lords of Manors, and corrupt Judges, and Lawyers especially, held it up likewise; for he

²⁸Shulman indicates how this might be so: “By promising not ‘to give or take hire,’ the poor will challenge the emerging market in labor and land, for there will be no one to work enclosed land or buy commodities with wages” (123-24). Thus, he later points out, “When he [Winstanley] says, ‘All we desire is to live quietly in the land of our nativity by our righteous labor, upon common land that is our own,’ he knows full well that he hopes thereby to uproot their [“the elder brothers”] government and property. The rulers are right to see the diggers as making more than an innocent claim to a small piece of land . . .” (169). See also Christopher Hill’s (26-27) and James Holstun’s (177) remarks on the economic and social implications of Winstanley’s ideals.

was the head, and they, with the Tything-priests are the branches of that Tyrannical Kingly power; and all the several limbs and members must be cast out, before Kingly power can be pulled up root and branch” (372). Aside from the phrase “root and branch” and the explicit criticism of the clergy, this passage evokes the fervor surrounding the petition in another way—namely, as John Rogers notes (*Matter* 49), by associating “Kingly power” with trees to be uprooted: “The proponents of the antiprelatical Root and Branch Petition had been prepared to publicize their political cause by destroying the famous procession of elms in St. James’s Park” (Rogers, *Matter* 49).

Yet Winstanley’s arboreal imagery, as applied to governmental powers, is not entirely negative. Good government can be like a sheltering, nourishing tree: in *The Law of Freedom*, Winstanley identifies “common Preservation” as “the root of the tree Magistracy, and the Law of Righteousness and Peace” and “all particular Laws found out by experience, necessary to be practiced for common Preservation” as “the boughs and branches of that Tree” (537). This image is the positive counterpart to “the Tree Tyranny, and the Law of Unrighteousness,” whose root is “Self preservation,” whose “boughs and branches” are “all particular Kingly Laws found out by covetous Policy to enslave one brother to another, whereby bondage, tears, sorrows and poverty are brought upon many men,” and whose “Officers . . . are fallen from true Magistracy, and are no Members thereof, but the Members of Tyranny, who is the Devil and Satan” (537). “[T]rue Magistracy,” the contrast with “the Devil and Satan” suggests, is godly.²⁹ Thus the passage partly redeems the tree as an image that can serve positive purposes.

²⁹This implication is confirmed by a passage in *Fire in the Bush*, in which Winstanley, quoting from Daniel 7:4, argues that the “Beast lifted up from the Earth, and made to stand upon the feet like a man . . . should be the Image of true Magistracie, and while the

The arboreal images in Winstanley's political commentaries perform dual functions. On the one hand, they represent the unchecked power of unjust governments and thus encourage England's common people and the Parliament and Army to act as the nation's caretakers, controlling unruliness much as a gardener or orchardist would. On the other hand, they also represent the principles of good governments, so that England's governors ought to be comparable to good trees as well as to good gardeners, objects as well as subjects. Winstanley's complex use of tree imagery, then, posits these governors as having limited agency: if they are part of "the tree Magistracy," who tends it and them?

God the Gardener-King

The answer, for Winstanley, is God: He is, in Winstanley's way of thinking, the one true gardener-king. Whereas applying the trope to humans is often misleading and always requires qualification, God enables the "true Magistracy" praised by Winstanley (537). This use of the trope supports Winstanley's agenda in at least two ways. It firmly subjugates human authorities to the divine, and it vindicates the Diggers. Winstanley situates in the context of God's will the Diggers' aim of cultivating the nation more justly and fully than any "kingly power" had done: He is the Master Gardener, and the righteous poor and their defenders are the under-laborers who do His will.

Beastly power of self-Love rules in the hearts of mankinde; this Kingly power should be the preserver of the meeke in spirit, and so help the woman" of Revelation 12 (465). Similarly, John Gurney has noted that "[i]n *Breaking of the Day of God* [(1648)] Winstanley had spoken favourably of magistracy—including kingly authority—as a higher power ordained by God to preserve peace in the world, though troubled and corrupted by ecclesiastical power" (93).

God's status as Gardener-King is suggested most overtly by a brief passage in *The New Law of Righteousnes* in which Winstanley anticipates the "restor[ation]" of humankind and the entire created world (169): "For the power that shall now appear, is no other but the Lord himself, dwelling every where: And the whole Creation is his garden wherein he walks and delights himself, And now the Kingdome is delivered up into the Fathers hand, the *one Spirit* that fils *all*, and *is in all*. *Psa.* 110.1. *1 Cor.* 15.24" (170). Although Winstanley never explicitly refers to God as a gardener in the way that, for example, Sir Francis Bacon or John Evelyn does, this passage echoes Genesis 3:8 ("And they heard the voice of the LORD God walking in the garden in the cool of the day . . .") and thus recalls the statement in Genesis 2:8 that "the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden."³⁰ And it implies that we should read Winstanley's imagery of planting and cultivation, applied to God, in terms of gardening and not simply husbandry. Yet Winstanley uses the gardener-king trope infrequently even to refer to God, and usually in the context of God's cultivation of the soul. This usage suggests the great difference between God's work and humans' and thus prevents Winstanley's gardener-king images from interfering with his exhortations to humans to give up power and private property and to husband the land in common.

For Winstanley, earthly powers that uphold private property and its attendant oppressions of the poor usurp kingly power that properly belongs only to the divine. Identifying the ten-horned beast of Revelation 17 as "Kingly propriety," Winstanley cautions that "if *England* must be the tenth part of the City *Babylon* that fals off from the

³⁰Bacon begins his essay "Of Gardens" with the statement, "GOD ALMIGHTY first planted a garden" (485). Evelyn writes that gardens "were planted by the hands of God . . ." (*EB* 31).

Beast first, and would have that honour, he must cheerfully (and dally no longer) cast out Kingly covetous Propriety, and set the Crown upon Christs head, who is the universal Love or Free community . . .” (385-86). The class structure that underlies landownership, he implies in *The Law of Freedom*, misrepresents God’s will much as does Calvinist double predestination:

This Kingly Government is he that makes the elder brethren freemen in the Earth, and the younger brethren slaves in the Earth, before they have lost their Freedom by transgression to the Law.

Nay he makes one brother a Lord, and another a servant, while they are in their Mothers womb, before they have done either good or evil: This is the mighty Ruler, that hath made the Election and Rejection of Brethren from their birth to their death, or from Eternity to Eternity. (530)

Kingly rulers thus assume a kind of power typically associated only with God. But because Winstanley denies the doctrine of predestination, this passage implies that kingly powers are all the more wrong to execute a kind of judgment not even God uses.³¹

Winstanley’s next sentence more directly accuses “Kingly Government” of usurping divine power: “He calls himself the Lord God of the whole Creation, for he makes one brother to pay rent to another brother for the use of the Water, Earth, and Ayr, or else he will not suffer him by his Laws and Lawyers to live above ground, but in beggary, and yet he will be called righteous” (530). Winstanley sees God as the true ruler over the created world, and he argues that any recognition of that title must involve sharing the land and its produce and so living charitably with other people.

Winstanley frequently refers to God or Christ as King. And although many writers reconcile their notion of God as the highest King with the idea of earthly rulers who act

³¹Winstanley repeatedly asserts that God will offer universal salvation and that the destruction of the wicked will extend only to the power of evil in each person, not to the soul itself. See *Truth Lifting Up Its Head* (132-33) and *The New Law of Righteousnes* (159, 168).

as under-kings, Winstanley explicitly intends God to be a replacement for, not an overseer of, such rulers. In *A Letter to the Lord Fairfax*, he responds to soldiers' violent attack on a Digger man and boy, and the stealing and destruction of property (283-8), by limiting the Army's power even as he appeals to it:

Sir, The intent of our writing to you, is not to request your protection, though we have received an unchristian-like abuse from some of your souldiers; for truly we dare not cast off the Lord, and make choice of a man or men to rule us. For the Creation hath smarted deeply for such a thing, since Israel chose *Saul* to be their King; therefore we acknowledge before you in plain English, That we have chosen the Lord God Almighty to be our King and Protector. (284)

Winstanley's next comment reinforces this limitation on worldly powers, identifying Fairfax and the war council as "our brethren (as an English Tribe) . . . for the present . . . owned to be the outward Governors, Protectors and Saviours of this Land . . ." (284).

The qualifications here—"for the present," "owned to be," and "outward"—all circumscribe the Army's authority while buttressing the Diggers' commitment to God as their true ruler.³² Later, in *Fire in the Bush*, Winstanley explains that each worldly government has had an end, "for when it was universally proved a Devill, a destroyer, and waster: then it was throne [*sic*] down" (472); peaceful government will survive unmolested, he contends, only when "Christ, The Law of universall Love comes to reigne . . ." (472). This comment denies any human ruler the true or lasting title of "king" and, in identifying Christ as "The Law of universall Love" rather than as a historical person,

³²In his introduction to Winstanley's *Works*, Sabine notes that at their April 20, 1649, meeting with General Fairfax, Winstanley and fellow Digger William Everard protested the signs of respect traditionally shown those of superior rank by keeping their hats on (15).

dissociates the notion of a king from a human figure.³³ Thus, for Winstanley, the only possible true gardener-king is the divine one.

Winstanley does portray God not only as King but also, in echoes of Scripture, as Cultivator. Even then, however, he sometimes avoids describing God as a gardener. In defining his understanding of “divine power” (236) for example, he employs the image of the “day-vine” (237) for “Christ that filleth the whole Creation with himself” (236):

Christ is said to be the divine, because he grows and flourishes in the time of light; he is the Sonne himself; he is a vine or tree that grows by day in the heat of light, and so brings forth abundance of fruit to the glory of the Father; Trees that grow in the heat of the Sun bring forth pleasant fruit.

So those that are branches of this vine, that grows in the heat and life of one spirit the King of Righteousnesse, bring forth abundance of the fruit of Righteousnesse, according to the nature of the vine they grow from. (236-37)

The image of the vine’s growth prompted by “the King of Righteousnesse” credits God the Father with life-giving power. But it does so by comparing God to the sun, an important departure from the phrasing of the Scriptural source: “I AM the true vine,” Christ tells his disciples, “and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every *branch* that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit” (John 15:1-2). Winstanley’s use of the vine image implicitly acknowledges this image of God: Christ’s fruitfulness glorifies God much as a fruitful vine testifies to its husbandman’s care and skill. But his choice of the sun rather than the husbandman as the image for God is significant, if mysterious. It may, however, reflect an objection to anthropomorphism or, in avoiding the reference to God’s cutting away unproductive branches, Winstanley’s belief that ultimately all people would be converted and saved from damnation.

³³On the distinction Winstanley draws between the historical Jesus and the “Christ within” (113), see *Truth Lifting Up Its Head above Scandals* (112-13).

A second Scriptural passage strengthens this image in Winstanley's writing. The passage, from Matthew 15:13, signals, for Winstanley, an end to corrupt governments: "But now Christ, or the Anoynting, is arising up in sonnes and daughters, they ["the imaginary power" represented by "*Iudas and the Pharisees*"] must dye: Therefore, whatsoever government is set up by Imagination, shall be throwne downe; *For every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted out*" (463). A few pages later he again invokes this passage, this time, significantly, as he criticizes governments that mistreat their subjects by denying them land use:

For such a Government, as preserves part, and destroyes another part of the Creation, is not the power of Christ, but of Antichrist; That Government that gives liberty to the Gentry to have all the Earth, and shuts out the poore Commoners from enjoying any part: ruling by the tyrannicall Law of Conquest over brethren; this is the Government of imaginarie, selfe-seeking Antichrist; And every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted out. (472)

Kingly governments oppose the rule of Christ by tending only some of "the Creation," thus discouraging unity of the land and of the people and cultivating death and life simultaneously. In contrast, the biblical passage depicts God as the good Gardener Who tends profitable plants and weeds away those that work contrary to His plan.

Other passages from Winstanley's works show how God does both in England. God, Winstanley suggests in *A Declaration of the Bloudie and Unchristian Acting of William Star and John Taylor of Walton* (1649), encourages the land's fertility much as the Diggers set out to "manure" the unused commons (274):

England is a Land, wherein the Power of the most High hath greatly declared his Power, both in casting down the pride of many mens hearts, and making them subject to righteousness, and in casting down the bodies of some that were proud oppressors to be as dung to the earth, dashing one power against another, changing times and customes, and therein trying the sincerity of many that make a great shew of love to him. (296-97)

The “dung[ing]” described here may be literal; one implication is that men like King Charles do the land more good dead than alive.³⁴ And God cultivates the nation in a positive way by inducing the change of heart Winstanley describes: Winstanley associates “righteousnesse” with the just use of the land, i.e., cultivating “waste” land and rejecting private property; thus in “mak[ing] them subject to righteousnesse,” God enables “mens hearts” to support the Diggers’ literal cultivation.³⁵

But if Winstanley indirectly invests God with the title of gardener-king, his arboreal images show how different this divine Gardener-King is from human ones. We have seen that Winstanley opposes the trope’s application to kingly rulers partly by depicting their power as a tree to be pruned back and ultimately eradicated by Parliament, the

³⁴Such a reading contradicts the notion expressed in the early treatise *Truth Lifting up Its Head above Scandals* (1649) that the bodies of morally corrupt people “did still poyson and corrupt the earth, and caused it to bring forth poysonous Vipers, Todes and Serpents, and Thornes and Bryars” (113). But the discrepancy can be explained by the dynamism of Winstanley’s thought in theology and politics. Shulman, for example, notes the development of Winstanley’s acceptance of enclosures alongside common land (158) and his support of the Engagement “in spite of Parliament’s obvious deficiencies and its failure thus far to fulfill its promises” (159).

³⁵This point raises the question of whether Winstanley attributes the land’s eventual fertility to divine will and power or to human action. The answer, I think, is both, at least in most of Winstanley’s works. (In *The Law of Freedom*, his last treatise, he mentions only human labor.) He repeatedly advocates action, as in *An Appeale to All Englishmen* (1650), in which he exhorts readers to “make the wast Land fruitfull” (408). Yet in *An Humble Request*, published the same year, he proclaims that the world will be transformed only “in the day of Christs Power” (426); most of the Scriptural passages he cites attribute peace and fertility to the Lord’s will, but because Winstanley identifies Christ as “[u]niversall Love” (382, 453), he may mean that people will change the world when they act on love rather than greed. Shulman’s interpretation of Winstanley’s understanding of the Digger project is useful here: “In part . . . he believes that he must ‘wait on the rising of Christ in the poor,’ as if to say that the diggers’ covenant is a visible sign of a grace already experienced. But he also believes that digging can be an instrument in the process of Christ rising: by calling digging a true religion, he must mean that it is a conversion experience that works a profound transformation” (124). Timothy Kenyon also offers a helpful study of this question (151-92).

Army, and the common people (353, 357, 359, 372, 390, 537); these images attribute to such rulers agency only to interfere with the land's health, not to nourish it. Yet even Parliament and the Army come under suspicion (390); Winstanley ultimately recognizes their potential for being either good cultivators of life throughout England or such "over-top[ping]" trees. When Winstanley applies the tree metaphor to God, by contrast, he locates in Him the true identity of gardener-king and life-giving tree, with at least two effects: to foreground the falseness of "covetous" gardener-kings and to demonstrate godly government's potential for becoming the heavenly gardener-king's earthly counterpart.

Fire in the Bush, for example, explicitly links the images of gardener, king, and tree. Here Winstanley identifies the Garden of Eden as "Mankind" (451) and "the Tree of Life" as "this blessing, or restoring power, called universall Love, or pure knowledge, . . . this Kingdome and Law within, which is Christ . . ." (453). This Tree of Life, however, is also "the Seed of life that lies under the clods of Earth, which in his time is now rising up to bruise the Serpents head . . ." (453); it is "the Father" (453) and the "Godhead that dwelt bodily in Christ . . ." (453-54).³⁶ But according to the same treatise, "this God, or almighty Ruler, is universall Love, strength and life; And as he begets and brings forth every thing, in their degree and kinde: so he is the Restorer of all things . . ." (451). This sentence yokes God's rule with His generative and regenerative power. And particularly as the Creator of the Garden of Eden—in Winstanley's view, humankind—God is, figuratively, the true gardener-king. Yet He is so literally, if indirectly, as well: His

³⁶The identification of the Tree of Life with the buried Seed reinforces Winstanley's point about the importance of sacrificing pride and living in a spirit of *humility*, a word ultimately derived from *humus*, "ground, earth" (*OED* "humility," "humble" *a.*¹). On the importance of this virtue for Winstanley, see *Fire in the Bush* (454, 459, 473, 480, 493).

influence produces “righteousnesse” that moves the Diggers to relinquish private property and tend the land unselfishly (283, 365).

As this latter point implies, Winstanley sometimes depicts God as England’s true gardener-king by showing how He is the individual soul’s gardener-king. Indeed Winstanley’s clearest conjunctions of the garden and king images occur in the introductory epistle for *Fire in the Bush*, in his discussions of the human soul. He begins with the corrupt king:

You shall finde I speake of the Garden of *Eden*, which is the spirit of man, not the spirit of Beasts. And in that Garden there are weeds and hearbs. The weeds are these. Selfe-Love, Pride, Envie; Covetousnesse after riches, honours, pleasures, Imagination, thinking he cannot live in peace, unlesse he enjoy this or that outward object; And sometimes the joy of envie when he obtaines his end; and sometimes the sorrow of Covetousnesse when he is crost, rules as King in the Garden. (446)

He goes on to equate these “weeds” with “outlandish men” and in turn with “one power of darknesse, Devill, or Father of lies” (446). Opposed to these are the soul’s virtues, which he associates with Christ:

There is likewise in the garden of *Eden* (mans heart) sweet flowers and hearbs; As Joy, Peace, Love, humility, selfe-denyall, patience, sincerity, truth, or equitie. These are the true inhabitants in the righteous Land; and all these make up but one power, or body, which is the seed or Tree of Life in you. And this power is the day-time of Mankinde, or the presence of the Sonne of righteousness in the heart; This power is the Elect, the Sonne of the Father in whom he delights . . . (447)

Although this passage does not link the images of king and garden, in the body of the essay, Winstanley writes of the longing to have such virtues “rule in power in me,” in the “Kingdome within” (459); in such a condition, “that righteous Ruler (God), The Seed and tree of Life, begins to walke in this coole of the day, with delight, in the middle of the garden (Mans heart) . . .” (460). Here, then, Winstanley presents the divine gardener-

king's ascendancy in the soul as the means to better cultivation, both literal and figurative, of the land and its inhabitants (472-76).³⁷

When the soul is righteous, Winstanley believes, the land will be improved; the righteous soul will assent to making the earth "a common Treasurie," and then "the barren land shal be made fruitfull; for the Lord wil take off the curse" (199). Cultivation of the land is justified by, rather than opposed to, God's will:

Well *Englishmen*, The Law of the *Scriptures*, gives you a free and full Warrant to plant the Earth, and to live comfortably and in love, doing as you would be done by: And condemns that covetous *Kingly* and *Lordly* power of darkness in men, that makes some men seeke their freedom in the Earth, and to deny others that freedom. And the *Scriptures* do establish this Law, to cast out *Kingly* and *Lordly* self-willed and oppressing power, and to make every Nation in the World a free *Common-wealth*. So that you have the *Scriptures* to protect you, in making the Earth a common Treasury, for the comfortable Livelihood of your bodies, while you live upon Earth. (410)

As we have seen, Winstanley repeatedly cites God's blessing on Adam and Eve—"Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it . . ." (Gen. 2:28)—as evidence of all humankind's "Creation-right" to the land. "*This freedom in the common earth*," he writes in *An Appeale to All Englishmen*, "*is the poorers right by the Law of Creation and equity of the Scriptures, for the earth was not made for a few, but for whole Mankind, for God is no respector of Persons*" (415). But the Diggers' cultivation of the commons not only accords with but actually partially fulfills God's will. Shulman identifies the Digger project's basis as a covenant with God (122):

diggers promise to work together and eat together rather than work for another and try to live on wages. . . . The covenant to work and eat together, however, takes the particular form of a promise to 'manure the earth.' Since idle land and the obstruction of landlords cause *unnecessary* starvation, diggers promise to cultivate 'unnurtured' commons, church, and royal lands. By raising crops to keep cattle alive

³⁷Kenyon suggests that Winstanley eventually gave up this notion of a conversion that begins internally and extends to behavior; *The Law of Freedom*, according to Kenyon, exemplifies Winstanley's later belief "that only extensive institutional reform could bring about moral regeneration" (152).

in the winter, and by using cattle to fertilize the land, the manuring of the earth not only feeds and empowers the poor but increases land utilization and yield. (123)

Thus, in Winstanley's view, the Digger covenant leads to superior cultivation of the land; obedience to the divine Gardener results in better gardening among humans.³⁸ For him the need is real and the waste unnecessary: Winstanley asserts several times that much land in England is uncultivated (200, 304, 348).³⁹

Ultimately, then, Winstanley represents God as the one true gardener-king and the Diggers as His under-laborers. In *The New Law of Righteousnes*, once Winstanley has "declared" God's command to "work together and eat bread together," he anticipates the Diggers' cultivation of the land as the fulfillment of God's will:

I have now obeyed the command of the Spirit that bid me declare this all abroad And when the Lord doth shew unto me the place and manner, how he wil have us that are called common people, to manure and work upon the common Lands, I wil then go forth and declare it in my action, to eat my bread with the sweat of my brows, without either giving or taking hire, looking upon the Land as freely mine as anothers; I have now peace in the Spirit, and I have an inward perswasion that the spirit of the poor, shal be drawn forth ere long, to act materially this Law of Righteousnesse. (194-95)

Moreover, he joins literal with figurative cultivation when he uses Christ's parables of the laborers in the vineyard (Matt. 20:1-16, 21:33-41; Mark 12:1-9; Luke 20:9-16) to upbraid the clergy for oppressing and misleading the common people and indulging their own selfish impulses:

The Father doth not send hear-say men, to be Labourers in his Vineyard, but such as he first fills with the Divine power, and then sends them to work in his Vineyard:

³⁸Shulman contends, however, that Winstanley's ideas about the relationship among God, people, and the land had changed radically by the time he published *The Law of Freedom* (Shulman 216-43). Winstanley ultimately came to believe, Shulman holds, that change had to come from human government rather than from Christ's rising in the people (222, 226).

³⁹David Mulder discusses contemporary land use around Cobham (191-212). John Gurney discusses the successes of gardening in mid-seventeenth-century Surrey (140-41).

So that still it is but Christ in them, that is, the one man that is sent of the Father; for the Father sends none but his beloved Son, who is the law of righteousness and peace, the spreading power.

And you shall find, you proud and covetous Priests, ere long, that poor despised ones of the world, that have this law in their hearts, are the labourers that are sent forth; and you that call your selves Divines, and Labourers, you are Traitors and Enemies to the spirit . . . (241)

The vineyard is figurative; in Christ's parables it represents the Kingdom of God, and Winstanley here claims that the uneducated poor rather than the educated clergy are truly doing the work of advancing the Spirit. But the Diggers are also God's "Labourers" more literally, in that they intend to cultivate food crops on the common lands according to His command (194-95).

For Winstanley, then, God, not an earthly monarch, is the true gardener-king, and this trope means little when applied to humans. Instead, Winstanley implies, people should seek to be faithful under-laborers and subjects of the divine gardener-king, a task that involves cultivating the gardens of their souls but also working the land in the interests of charity and social justice: to feed the poor, to eradicate pride, and to nourish virtue.

III. Cultivation Metaphors and the Status of the Humble Husbandman

Winstanley's cultivation metaphors, which, as we have seen, establish a complex relationship between the literal and the figurative, deepen our understanding of Winstanley's attitudes toward language and representation. And by articulating humans' middle status as both objects and subjects, gardens and husbandmen, these metaphors show how Winstanley refines the gardener-king trope in a time of opposition to and abolition of the monarchy. While Winstanley reserves that trope for God the Father alone, and even then uses it primarily to refer to divine cultivation of the soul, he presents Christ, the Son of God, as a model for humans. Christ, the perfect plant and ideal

husbandman, offers other tropes that, in Winstanley's view, better express our differences from God the Gardener-King and our proper role in relation to Him. And depicting Christ in such terms provides Winstanley a way to justify the Digger project by claiming legitimacy from the divine.

Although various scholars have written about Winstanley's uses of metaphor as a product of his revolutionary aims, their judgments about the quality and efficacy of these uses differ widely. T. Wilson Hayes, for example, admires Winstanley's figurative language as purposely concrete:

He self-consciously and deliberately sets out to change biblical figures of speech into specific acts because he actually wants to bring about the heavenly kingdom on earth. Repeatedly he insists that words must mean what they say; that is, a figure of speech must have some logical application to everyday reality. This is not simple naivete about figurative language. Winstanley understands what a metaphor is; he knows how to speak of one thing in terms of another, but he wants the correspondence between the signifier and the thing signified, between vehicle and tenor, to be explicit and particular, not abstract as in the thoughtless figuralism of contemporary pietists. . . . Because he constantly struggles to reverse the movement of scholarly prose into deeper abstraction and obfuscation, writing, for him, is a politically rebellious act. He employs biblical prose defiantly, as a way of insisting upon his right to use words with something approaching their tangible meanings. (26)

Hayes is right, I think, about Winstanley's intentions and his insistence on language grounded in experience, and Winstanley's individual figures do usually "have some logical application to everyday reality." But Hayes's assessment overlooks the fluidity of Winstanley's metaphors, a quality that proves challenging for readers.

James Holstun and Nigel Smith, who, like Hayes, believe that Winstanley's prose is influenced by his revolutionary project, each recognize the challenges posed by Winstanley's use of figurative language. For Holstun, the "half-parallelisms and confusions lie halfway between mere syntactic awkwardness and an effort to break down the relations of domination and hierarchy in received theology" (182). And Smith writes,

in his discussion of Winstanley's "vision" (Smith, "Gerrard" 53) of "restor[ation]" in *The New Law of Righteousnes* (Winstanley 169), "There are explanations of the relationship between God/reason, nature and man that are logically inconsistent, or internally incoherent. Elsewhere, there are webs of articulating images or metaphors that confuse or confound the reader. . . . The order of language has to be challenged if a heresy is to be articulated . . ." (Smith, "Gerrard" 53). Both writers make important points: Winstanley's metaphors, which often shift unexpectedly and which depend more on evocative images and rhetorical power than on clarity, reflect their author's unorthodox views of God and humans. But I want to suggest that Winstanley's figures of cultivation and vegetation have a richness that communicates not only his subversive ideas, in the ways identified by Holstun and Smith, but also a much more common notion: that humans occupy a strange middle ground as both subjects and objects, as "that amphibious piece between a corporall and spirituall essence," in Sir Thomas Browne's terms (1: 44). And in that regard, Winstanley's complex use of figurative language furthers his depictions of God as the gardener-king, each human as His garden, and the Diggers as His under-laborers as well.

Humans' dual nature as God's cultivable ground and as cultivators for God is evident in "The Curse and Blessing That Is in Mankinde." There Winstanley, anticipating a time when people will forgo formal worship and prefer the real over the symbolic, imagines humans first as "the living waters" of the original Chaos (Gen. 1:2) and then as seeds capable of producing good fruit trees or vines like those in Christ's teachings (Matt. 7:16-20, 12:33-37; Luke 7:43-45, 13:6-9; John 15:1-8):

Even so the Son of universal Love, who is the Spirit and power of universal Freedom, he moves upon the living waters mankind, and makes him, who all the dark

time past was a Chaos of confusion, lying under Types, Shadows, Ceremonies, Forms, Customes, Ordinances, and *heaps of waste words, under which the Spirit of Truth lay buried*, now to enlighten, to worship in Spirit and Truth, and *to bring forth fruit of Righteousness in action*. (377, emphasis added)

The mixed metaphors are clumsy. But the images of cultivation near the end of the passage are richer than they might first appear. They make humans the seeds to be nurtured by Christ and the trees that bear fruit; both images align people with God and Christ, who are the Seed and the Tree of Life.⁴⁰ But Winstanley's images also suggest that people are Christ's under-gardeners: "*action*" is a sign of humans' fertility as productive fruit trees for Christ, but it is also a means to literal fruitfulness, to making the land capable of supporting the people without slavery or strife.⁴¹ For Winstanley, life lived according to "the Spirit of universal Love" involves the ability to cultivate the land, and it is symbolized by the Garden of Eden: "When they enjoy the sweet delight of the Unitie of one Spirit, and the free content of the fruits and crops of this outward Earth, upon which their bodies stand: this was called The mans innocency, or pleasure in the Garden before his fall, or the day time of mankind; and day is more glorious then night; and greater honour to be a child of the day, then of the night" (377-78). The shifts between present and past tense here reflect Winstanley's belief that an Edenic existence can be recovered.

As the above cluster of images—seed, tree, fruit—suggests, humankind's responses to the divine imperative to share the land are complex, and the figures that represent them

⁴⁰These images are taken from Christ's teachings (Matt. 7:15-20, 12:33; Mark 4:3-20, 4:26-29; Luke 7:43-45, 8:5-15, 13:6-9; John 15:16) and Philippians 1:11.

⁴¹In this latter sense, the imagery of burial applies not only to the divinely cultivated seeds but also to human cultivators, the spiritually resurrected followers of Christ. And in John's Gospel, Mary Magdalene mistakes Christ, just after His Resurrection, for a gardener (20:15).

must be so as well. It is this complexity that John Rogers discounts in his argument that Winstanley's tree imagery undermines the Digger project. In *A Declaration from the Poor Oppressed People of England*, Winstanley announces the Diggers' intention "to cut and fell, and make the best advantage we can of the Woods and Trees, that grow upon the Commons . . ." (272). Rogers rightly points out that in doing so, Winstanley "is doing more than laying hold upon those resources of which he stood in need; he is tapping one of his culture's most weighted emblems for political intervention" (*Matter* 50).⁴² But for Rogers, this meaning undercuts the significance of tree imagery for Winstanley's "vision of a vegetative reformation" (Rogers, *Matter* 50):

The logical impasse that opens between the cutting down of trees and the cultivation of their growth—between the calls for radical action and the passive faith in a natural reformational process—manifests on a rhetorical level the logical fissure that seems to doom to incoherence the entirety of Winstanley's communist agenda. The Digger's activist rhetoric is desperately at odds with his pacifist theology, which figures an uninterrupted, organic reformation specifically as the cultivation of a tree, the biblical Tree of Life, as the one and only agent of revolution. However practical or useful the Diggers' actual clearing of the wooded commons, the felling of trees, as a symbolic gesture, carries with it a burden of association that quite simply overwhelms the political and theological vision of a meaningful arboreal growth. We know, of course, that the Diggers were dispersed a year after their formation because of the perception of their threat to the social order. But from a less historical, more literary perspective, we might justifiably say that the Diggers were victims, from the inception of the movement, not only of community opposition but of their own bad logic, the inescapable irony generated by the self-defeating interaction of their dominant tropes. (50-51)

Though Rogers's criticism of Winstanley's divergent uses of the tree image is understandable, it fails to recognize Winstanley's appreciation of the difference between

⁴²See Rogers (49-50) and Keith Thomas (218-19) on the political significance of trees and tree-felling.

literal and figurative trees. Winstanley privileged one over the other depending on the circumstances and apparently expected his readers to do the same.⁴³

Moreover, Winstanley's use of the tree as a symbol for two opposing powers, God and selfishness, draws upon readers' ability to see that a symbol can have multiple meanings that do not compromise each other. Indeed, using the tree to represent the power he despises allows Winstanley to show how fallen he finds that power to be: the figurative trees that the Diggers hoped to cut down—the oppressive powers associated with the monarchy and the established Church, in Rogers's reading—are perversions of the Tree of Life. Envisioning a godly magistracy, Winstanley identifies “common Preservation” as “the root of the tree Magistracy, and the Law of Righteousness and Peace” (537); the latter phrase establishes a close relationship between this tree and God's law, the law of the Tree of Life. By contrast, “the Tree Tyranny,” which has “Self preservation” as its root, is associated with “the Devil and Satan” (537), and the people who uphold it are thus opposed to the Tree of Life. This interpretation fits perfectly with the “historical” problem Rogers identifies above: that the Diggers were seen as a threat to established authorities. The “historical” and “literary” accounts, then, agree more closely than Rogers's comment implies. And Winstanley's complex tree symbolism—sometimes negative, sometimes positive—reflects what he thinks about “the objects of the Creation” generally: that they can be put to good or bad uses (251). This symbolism

⁴³This kind of distinction appears in different ways in Winstanley's works as well: for example, he emphasizes the importance of action to true worship, but he denies the spiritual efficacy of churchgoing and formal worship (111, 142-44). I suspect that the strict distinction he maintains in this regard between physical and spiritual experiences influences the complexity of his figurative language, but that is a question for another essay.

thus asks readers to do no more than what Winstanley believes they should always be doing: distinguishing between good and bad.⁴⁴

These moral distinctions are necessary to both kinds of gardening that Winstanley associates with God: the cultivation of virtue in the soul, and the just use of the land and its products for the betterment of all human life. And indeed Winstanley makes fine distinctions in how he uses the gardener-king trope for God the Father and rejects it when he writes about Christ. For example, he opposes the meditative tradition with which enclosed gardens are associated: whereas gardens often represent the contemplative life and withdrawal from the world, Winstanley champions action that betters earthly life.⁴⁵ Furthermore, in the prefatory epistle to *Fire in the Bush*, addressed to members of all churches, Winstanley strenuously objects to linking Christ with enclosure:

That which you call Gospell-worship, and the Kingdome without shall fall, that so the Kingdome within may be established; for all your particular Churches are like *the inclosures of Land which hedges in some to be heires of Life, and hedges out others* . . . but truly brethren, you shall see and finde, that Christ who is the universall power of Love is *not confined to parties, or private chambers*; but he is the power of Life, Light, and Truth, now rising up to fill the Earth, Mankinde with himselfe. (445-46, emphasis added)

Enclosure becomes here an image for a church that espouses certain beliefs about what is required for salvation. But Winstanley believes that ultimately everyone will be saved and that the churches are led by corrupt ministers (445, 428, 429), so he dissociates

⁴⁴As Rogers points out, the tree-felling Winstanley described “was accompanied by a sanction in Scripture. In the Gospel of Matthew, John the Baptist had issued a threat of arboreal sacrifice to warn the corrupt Pharisees and Sadducees that the Christian dispensation would uproot their long-held privilege and position: ‘And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire’ (Matt 3:10)” (*Matter* 50).

⁴⁵See, for example, the dedicatory epistle to *Fire in the Bush* (445). “For the Diggers,” writes James Holstun, “land is never a contemplative landscape, but a site of human praxis; it is always already fought over, worked, bled into, manured, subject to the struggle between Norman landlord and freeborn Briton” (192).

Christ's love from both these churches and the enclosures that symbolize their teachings. His simile refers primarily to the trend of enclosure that made less land available to the poor for planting, as he writes in *The New Law of Righteousnes* (201). But because he sees private property in general as an evil (201) and because he dissociates Christ even from "*private chambers*," he implicitly rejects the enclosed garden as an image for the site of Christ's work and His followers'.

Indeed, Winstanley associates this work specifically with the open fields. Christ, to Winstanley's mind, is "the greatest, first, and truest Leveller that ever was spoke of in the world," the champion of true "*Community*" (386), and, Winstanley writes in the prefatory epistle for *Fire in the Bush*, "he is coming on a maine, to breake downe all your pinfoulds, and to lay all open to the Common; the rough wayes he will make smooth, and crooked wayes strait; and levell mountaines and valleys" (448).⁴⁶ Christ's "levell[ing]" refers not only to ending the institution of enclosure but also to the social changes—honoring equality rather than class differences, love rather than self-interest—that would make that move possible: Winstanley pleads with his readers to "set the Earth free" and proclaims that "covetous, proud selfe-Love, and ruling and teaching hypocrisie shall tye up, or restraine his [Christ's] spirit no longer; for the voyce is gone out, freedome, freedome, freedome: he that hath eares to heare, let him heare, he that is filthie, let him be filthy still, till he be cast out as dung and unsavory salt . . ." (448). By promoting

⁴⁶The Diggers referred to themselves as the "true Levellers," a title that distinguished them from the Levellers, who believed in legal equality but upheld the institution of private property.

community, opposing private property, and resolving to dig the common land, the Diggers believed, they followed Christ's example.⁴⁷

This point is clearly borne out in "The Curse and Blessing That Is in Mankinde," in which Winstanley identifies "two Earths, in which the Spirit of Love declares himself": one is "*Mankinde*: . . . the Creation, or the living soul," and the other is "the great Body of Earth in which all creatures subsist . . ." (375). Initially, both were peaceful: "as the Spirit was a common Treasurie of Unitie and Peace within, so the Earth was a common Treasurie of delight for the preservation of their bodies without, so that there was nothing but peace upon the face of the whole Earth" (376). And the only way to "Restore[]" "the Creation," Winstanley contends, is to achieve "*Community of Mankind*, which is comprised in the unity of spirit of Love," and "*Community of the Earth*, for the quiet livelihood in food and raiment without using force, or restraining one another" (386). He goes on to identify "[t]hese two Communities, or rather one in two branches" as "that true Levelling which Christ will work at his more glorious appearance . . ." (386). Thus the Diggers' efforts to till the commons in a "spirit of Love" follow the model of Christ, who brings peace and fullness of life to both kinds of "Earth."⁴⁸

⁴⁷Winstanley did not, however, call for destruction of others' property or violation of existing enclosures.

⁴⁸Winstanley sees Christ as concerned explicitly with physical existence and earthly conditions. In *An Appeale to All Englishmen*, he pleads with ministers who try to persuade the poor not to grumble against their hardship, "Therefore . . . while we have bodies that must be fed and cloathed, let us have Earth to plant, to raise food and raiment by our labours, according to the Law of our Creation . . ." (409). He then invokes Christ's power: "the second Adam brings Man-kind into Freedom, plenty and peace, here in this Earth while bodies are living upon earth: therefore he is said to be the joy of all Nations here on Earth, and the restorer of the whole Creation, that groanes under bondage here on Earth" (410). The repetition of "here on Earth" emphasizes his certainty that Christ cares about human conditions in this life.

Winstanley's images of Christ's mission and of God the Father's relationship to humans appear contradictory. Whereas he refers to the soul as God's garden, he insists on the open field rather than the enclosed garden as an image for Christ's domain. The explanation for this seeming discrepancy, I think, lies in the distinction Winstanley makes between God the Father and Christ the Son: "The Father is the universall power, that hath spread himself in the whole globe; The Sonne is the same power drawn into, and appearing in one single person, making that person subject to the one Spirit, and to know him that dwels every where" (168). Winstanley identifies Christ as "the divine"⁴⁹ who will "grow up, flourish, remaine and bring forth abundance of fruit in you, when your created flesh is purged from bondage, and made subject to him. 1. *Co.* 15.27" (167). Christ is here figured as a fruitful plant in the soul; He has agency as a cultivator, but He is also cultivated by God.

Thus while God is the Gardener-King, Christ is the ideal Husbandman, the model for human husbandmen. As people follow this model, they must adopt new standards not only for land distribution and social status but also for government. The trope of the gardener-king thus comes, in Winstanley's writings, to represent God's relationship to each soul, but it has no immediate application to land cultivation or human government, the guiding trope for which is instead the humble husbandman.

Conclusion

The husbandman-brother emerges in Winstanley's works as an admirable alternative to the gardener-king, countering the notion that the divine Gardener-King ought to have

⁴⁹For Winstanley's explication of *divine* as "Day-vine[]," see *The New Law of Righteousnes* (236-37, 241).

an earthly analogue or representative, effacing the importance of social rank and private property, and reminding humans of their middling status, subjects of God but lords of the other creatures.⁵⁰ This change in tropes opposes the notion that England is a garden that can best be cultivated by a king or that it is the ruler's pleasure-garden; instead, Winstanley redirects attention to England's literal condition as a nation with some well-cultivated land but also much "waste" (304). Winstanley's revision of the gardener-king trope, then, does not reimagine the nature of monarchy or the duties of a king or lament the loss of England's prewar perfections. Instead, it assesses the condition of the land itself and the people whose lives depend on that land, and it describes a close relationship between God's cultivation of the individual human soul and humans' care for each other and the rest of the created world.

⁵⁰Winstanley asserts that "every one was made to be a Lord over the Creation of the Earth, Cattle, Fish, Fowl, Grasse, Trees, not any one to be a bond-slave and a beggar under the Creation of his own kinde. *Gen.* 1. 28" (180).

CHAPTER 2

THE GARDENER-GENERAL TROPE AND SOME ALTERNATIVES IN MARVELL'S "HORATIAN ODE" AND "UPON APPLETON HOUSE"

Like Winstanley's works, Andrew Marvell's poems "A Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland" and "Upon Appleton House, To My Lord Fairfax" explore an alternative to the gardener-king trope. But whereas Winstanley rejects any earthly power or ruler and focuses instead on humans' relationship to the land, Marvell, in these two poems, engages with questions of war and military power, examining the potential value as well as the problems of the gardener-general trope. The poems, taken together, depict two such generals: Cromwell, in his ascendancy, and Fairfax, recently retired from his post as Lord General. The poems represent the status of gardening, and thus the status of the trope, as uncertain: both works question the degree to which gardening and war-making are analogous activities, whether gardening is an art of war as well as an art of peace. The poems thus examine the trope's desirability and even viability in the wake of England's Civil Wars.

The poems' emphasis on study and literary art suggests a concern with how civil war threatens the order and correspondence on which analogy, simile, and metaphor, but also garden designs, are so often predicated. This concern is evident, too, in the poems' invocations of myths about kingship and Charles's court and in their juxtaposition of those myths with new ones about Cromwell and Fairfax respectively. Ultimately, these latter myths become a means for Marvell to present alternative tropes to the gardener-

general: the farmer-general in Cromwell's case, the forester-father in Fairfax's. But these latter tropes question the very identification of England with a garden, resisting the notion that the nation could ever be seen as peaceful or Edenic in the ways it had before the wars. These poems, then, written at moments of anticipated fighting and continued uncertainty about how the government was to be settled, explore a crucial question: what gardens mean to an England torn by civil war, with no immediate prospects for peace and no familiar order on which to rely.

I. Gardener and Farmer in "A Horatian Ode"

"A Horatian Ode" briefly but powerfully invokes the image of the gardener-general to describe Cromwell's remarkable rise to power and his transformation of the English state. But the gardener-general's emergence is linked, in the poem, with the Civil Wars' threats to the "arts of peace" (10), both literary and horticultural: the speaker implies that these arts must be transformed to accommodate the pressures of the wars and their consequences. Cromwell's military supremacy involves the explosion of myths about kingship and especially about Charles's reign, and the new government reflects in political terms the exploration and experimentation prompting revisions of the myths of natural philosophy. Ultimately, the poem aligns Cromwell's power not precisely with the trope of the gardener-general but rather with that of the farmer-general, an image that suggests a concern with productivity, the public good, and Cromwell's submission to the state rather than with leisure and aesthetics, private pleasure, and self-sufficiency.⁵¹

⁵¹Among the ways in which "[t]he poem's diction . . . parallels not only [John] Hall's political writings but his *Advancement of Learning* and Longinus translation," David Norbrook includes "the preference for a risky new experiment even at the cost of

The Transformation of the Literary “Arts of Peace”

The “Ode” recognizes the importance of both lyric poetry and drama, but it implies that these arts may not suit the England that emerged from the Civil Wars. On the one hand, the speaker exhorts the “forward youth” to give up writing lyric poetry for the sake of a military career (1-8); on the other, the regicide is presented in terms of a play (53-64). The relationship between these arts and lived experience is complex, but one implication—given the speaker’s description of Cromwell, his opening address to the bookish youth, and his account of Charles’s execution—is that the changed political climate necessitates different conceptions of literary art.⁵² The values that the poem associates with these new ways of thinking about literature are also crucial, as we shall see later, to Marvell’s depiction of Cromwell as a cultivator of the land.

Nigel Smith, in his annotations, traces what he calls a “portrayal throughout the *Ode* of Cromwell as a supreme artist” (*Poems* 274 n21-2). The allusion to the Jupiter Capitolium implicitly figures Cromwell as an architect of the new state (67-72; see Smith, *Poems* 277 n67-72), and Marvell’s speaker deems Cromwell’s weaving of the

violence over a safe, received beauty” (267). Norbrook does not, however, link this language of experiment to the poem’s images of cultivation.

⁵²David Norbrook finds that “[t]he poem’s sublime aspirations break its Horatian framework”: “the Horatian ode has a Pindaric ode inside it, struggling to escape” (269). For him, then, “the ‘*Clymacterick*’ of Marvell’s poem relates to literary as well as political culture. Finding his poetic *occasione*, he had seized it; . . . he had helped to lay new foundations, to open up the space for a new or recovered form of writing” (269). Michael Wilding emphasizes the poem’s opposition of war to poetry, with “new politico-military arts . . . hav[ing] now superseded the old aesthetic arts” (10). Nicholas McDowell reads the poem in terms of Cavalier concerns about the end of court patronage and the devaluation of wit; the decision Marvell, like other poets of the Stanley circle, faced as to whether “to solicit Commonwealth patronage through verse” (227); and the hope that Cromwell would protect wit from the suppressive threat posed by Presbyterian censorship (223-58).

“net” that would enclose Charles and ensure his entrapment an instance of the general’s “wiser art” (50, 48). The poem’s final lines reinforce this view of Cromwell as an artist (Smith, *Poems* 279 n119):

But thou the War’s and Fortune’s son
March indefatigably on;
And for the last effect
Still keep thy sword erect:

Besides the force it has to fright
The spirits of the shady night;
The same arts that did gain
A pow’r must it maintain. (113-20)

Smith glosses “arts” in the penultimate line as “the arts of war in the first instance, though also those of supreme statecraft generally. In Machiavellian terms,” he continues, “there is no difference between the arts of war and of peace” (*Poems* 279 n119). And, noting that one meaning of “effect” is “[t]he impression produced on a beholder . . .” (*OED* “effect,” n., 9.a [cited by Smith as 6]), Smith also finds here another depiction of Cromwell’s artistry (*Poems* 279 n115).

The representation of Cromwell’s martial feats as art implies not simply that war-making is on a par with other forms of art but that it might well supplant “the inglorious arts of peace” (10).⁵³ In the couplet “Then burning through the air he went, / And palaces and temples rent” (21-22), Nigel Smith finds an echo of John Hall of Durham’s translation of Longinus “on the activities of sublime poets, who ‘burn up all before them’[;] their poetry ‘wheresoever it *seasonably* breaks forth, bears down all before it like a whirlwind” (*Poems* 274 n21-2). In addition to the figurative devastation envisioned by Longinus, however, Cromwell, who once cared for “his private gardens”

⁵³Wilding writes of such a replacement as a foregone conclusion in the poem rather than simply a threat or danger (10-11).

(29), now literally damages structures (including defacement of English churches or “temples”), institutions, and people. Moreover, Cromwell’s military artistry poses an implicit threat to certain kinds of poetry. “The forward youth” of the poem’s opening lines, for example, is exhorted to “leave the books in dust, / And oil th’unused armour’s rust” (1, 5-6), to stop writing lyric poetry (Smith, *Poems* 273 n3-4) in order to go to war (Marvell 1-8). At the very least, the implication is that political and military circumstances might profoundly change the art of poetry, threatening some traditions even if potentially establishing others.

But the Army’s actions also threaten drama. Marvell’s speaker depicts the soldiers’ approval of the regicide in terms of an audience’s response to a theatrical performance: Charles, “the royal actor” (53), occupied “The tragic scaffold” (54) in a “memorable scene” (58), “While round the armèd bands / Did clap their bloody hands” (55-56). This passage alludes to Parliament’s closure of the theatres in 1642, and Smith sees it as a response to other writers’ reactions to this closure: “M[arvell] employs the contemporaneous theatrical imagery of the journalists, especially Royalist ones, some of whom had been playwrights. The practice dates from 1647, when some actors attempted to perform plays, despite prohibitions, and petitioned Parliament for freedom to act” (*Poems* 276 n53-64). The implication that the soldiers do not discriminate between literary representation and actual events, that for them seeing the king executed is like seeing a play, may suggest that the spectacle and tension of dramatic entertainment are

necessary or that the soldiers, because they recognize no need for drama independent of public spectacles like regicide, pose a long-term threat to dramatic art.⁵⁴

In its references to poetry and plays, Marvell's "Ode" records anticipated as well as accomplished changes to literary art as a result of the wars and the new political order. And indeed the poem's structure lends itself to such a reading. The transformation of drama from literature to lived experience occurs almost at the poem's midpoint (Post, *ELP* 269), in the speaker's description of the regicide as a play (53-64). The sacrifice of the arts of peace for those of war, moreover, appears in the relationship between the poem's beginning and its end: Nicholas McDowell notes that "in the third line of the 'Ode' the 'forward youth' must leave the 'shadows' in which he writes verse; in the third line from the end, line 117, 'the War's and Fortune's son' must enter 'the shady night' of Scotland" (235). The emphasis on experience above representation suggests that trial, danger, and activity are especially prized in the new regime; these values, as we shall see, have important implications for the poem's treatment of the gardener-general trope.

War and the Gardener's Art

The poem initially presents horticulture, like lyric poetry, as a feature of retired life, of a life that must be left behind for the sake of service to the state. The speaker primarily emphasizes the incompatibilities between these two kinds of experience. He implies that pleasure gardening, like lyric poetry and drama, is one of the "arts of peace" (10) renounced by Cromwell in favor of his military career (9-12): in the poem, then,

⁴For an excellent discussion of John Hall of Durham's "belief in the value of drama as an educative and instructive art form" (McDowell 239), and of the influence he apparently exerted in this matter during the Interregnum, see McDowell's recent book (239-40).

military maneuvers threaten to overwhelm certain kinds of horticultural as well as literary art. Yet the speaker also figures Cromwell's military successes in terms that evoke images of planting or sowing, so that the analogy between war and cultivation, though challenged or refined, persists.

The poem implicitly compares the youth's literary art and Cromwell's earlier horticultural art. The story of the general's rise from "rural" (Smith, *Poems* 274 n29-32) obscurity to spectacular military and political achievements (29-36) parallels the narrative imagined by the speaker at the poem's opening:

The forward youth that would appear
Must now forsake his Muses dear,
Nor in the shadows sing
His numbers languishing:

'Tis time to leave the books in dust,
And oil th'unusèd armour's rust;
Removing from the wall
The corslet of the hall. (1-8)

Though the poem never directly links Cromwell's gardening with the poetic concerns of "[t]he forward youth," these opening lines are offered for comparison with Cromwell's choice to engage in public matters, as is indicated by the conjunction that opens the next couplet: "So restless Cromwell could not cease / In the inglorious arts of peace" (9-10).⁵⁵ The choice to give up private, peaceful employments for the fray of battle is described as necessary for each man—"[m]ust" (2), "could not cease" (9)—but nonetheless difficult: Jonathan Post and Nicholas McDowell note the importance of the word "forsake" in

⁵⁵David Norbrook writes, "The regicide may have destroyed some forms of beauty, but it has opened the way to the sublime. The poet of the poem's opening becomes suddenly yoked to Cromwell at the ninth line by a decisive 'So' that lifts him out of traditional frameworks" (267). Norbrook does not, however, comment on the implicit analogy between lyric poetry and gardens.

conveying “reluctan[ce]” (Post, *ELP* 269) as well as disloyalty and “a painful and self-dividing act of self-interest” (McDowell 224), and the speaker’s assertion that “[m]uch to the man is due” because Cromwell left “his private gardens” and went on to military supremacy may imply not only the unlikelihood but also the difficulty of such a change.⁵⁶ A second resemblance between the youth’s circumstances and Cromwell’s may explain the difficulty of their respective choices. Each is faced with leaving the groves of retirement for the toil of public life: the youth must give up “the shadows” in which he composes verse; Cromwell likewise traded his cultivation of the bergamot for the heat of battle. Gardening is thus presumably one of the “arts of peace,” like lyric poetry itself, and is perhaps, the poem implies, incompatible with public, martial concerns.

Gardening’s status as an art of peace is also suggested by the seeming incongruity between Cromwell’s horticultural interests and the extent of his later military successes:

And, if we would speak true,
Much to the man is due:

Who, from his private gardens, where
He lived reserved and austere,
As if his highest plot
To plant the bergamot,

Could by industrious valour climb
To ruin the great work of time,
And cast the kingdoms old
Into another mould. (27-36)

Cromwell, the speaker proposes here, deserves special praise for leaving behind “his private gardens” and exercising “industrious valour” in the ambitious enterprise of

⁵⁶In a speech to Parliament on September 12, 1654, Cromwell declares, “I hoped to have had leave to have retired to a private life, I begged to be dismissed of my charge, I begged it again and again, and God be judge between me and all men if I lie in this matter” (43).

changing the English and Irish governments.⁵⁷ The speaker seems admiring but surprised that Cromwell traded his horticultural pursuits and private life for a spectacular military career. On the one hand, this surprise may result from the value the speaker places—or knows that other people place—on life out of the public eye and among gardens; he anticipates, or possibly echoes, the speaker of “The Garden,” who finds in gardens a welcome retreat from the pursuit of “the palm, the oak, or bays” (2) and who laments the loss of an Edenic existence that precluded human society (57-64).⁵⁸ On the other hand, however, the tone of the speaker’s praise in the “Ode” may register surprise that a “reserved and austere” gardener could go on to “ruin the great work of time” (30, 34), perhaps implying that gardening is poor preparation for a stellar military career and a bid for political supremacy. This latter reading is supported by the lines “As if his highest plot / To plant the bergamot” (31-32), which opposes the relative privacy, ease, and humility of cultivating pear trees to the public, difficult, and potentially ambitious or prideful alteration of the state. In either case, the response of Marvell’s speaker implies that planting pear trees does little to prepare one for winning a civil war and reforming the government.

⁷Nigel Smith reads “kingdoms” as anticipating a victory in which “Cromwell will recast the kingdom of Scotland as well . . .” (*Poems* 275 n35). Smith notes the hint, in “climb,” of images of Cromwell “as a social climber” (*Poems* 275 n33), but the word also suggests outright political ambition, especially following the reference to “his highest plot” in the foregoing stanza.

⁸Smith acknowledges the usual dating of “The Garden” to Marvell’s stay at Nun Appleton, between 1650 and 1652, but he favors Allan Pritchard’s dating of it to circa 1668 (Smith, *Poems* 152; Pritchard 373-83). Smith does propose, however, that “M[arvell] may have revised the poem in the Restoration, having first composed it during the Interregnum” (*Poems* 152). The similarity noted above between this poem and the “Ode” supports such a scenario.

The incompatibility of warmaking with gardening is further suggested by a later couplet that ostensibly praises Cromwell's bravery and fierceness. Writing about the lines "What field of all the civil wars / Where his were not the deepest scars?" (45-46), Thomas M. Greene recognizes the possibility that the scars belong to Cromwell or, more likely, to his enemies, but Greene also proposes a third option: that the scars belong to the fields, that Cromwell has injured the land itself (393). A similar image appears in the poem "To the Inslaved Commons of England," which prefaces Mercurius Melancholicus's play *Craftie Cromwell* (1648): it accuses the new regime of having "True Patriots supprest, and onely they / Advanc't to Offices, who have the way / To grind the Land, and cut the poore mans throat, / To Levell, and leave no man worth a groat" (9-12).⁵⁹

And yet for all the seeming incongruities between Cromwell's gardening and his subsequent military career, the poem also establishes important continuities between the two. The lines about Cromwell's intention "[t]o plant the bergamot" have been convincingly glossed as not simply contrasting gardening with military ambition but also suggesting that the former pursuit hinted at the latter. Nigel Smith sees Cromwell's horticultural goals as comparable to his later military ones: "Cromwell might have lived in rural withdrawal, but his ambition in this retirement was to aspire to the height of horticultural art, in anticipation of the military excellence to come" (*Poems* 274 n29-

⁹As we shall see, Marvell identifies the same problem in "Upon Appleton House," in which the speaker laments the time when horticulture produced England's only military experiences and then registers both the literal and figurative endangerment of gardens: "But war all this doth overgrow: / We ordnance plant and powder sow" (343-44).

32).⁶⁰ More pointedly, William R. Orwen reads the couplet as “say[ing] that he [Cromwell] acted ‘As if’ he were ‘plotting’ to become king . . .” (340; cited in Smith, *Poems* 274 n31). Orwen supports this reading by explaining the significance the bergamot would have held for seventeenth-century readers as “a favorite with kings,” and he cites John Bodaeus’s note in an edition of Theophrastus’ *Historia Plantarum* (1644) on the bergamot’s having been called “the pear of kings” in ancient times (340; cited in Smith, *Poems* 274 n32).⁶¹ As Smith and Orwen make clear, then, the poem invites us to see the relationship between Cromwell’s gardening and his military victories as something more complex than dissimilarity or disjunction. By presenting Cromwell’s horticultural interests as a foreshadowing of his later military and political ambitions, the poem complicates the notion that gardening is an art of peace only.

¹⁰In this note, Smith also refers readers to lines from *The First Anniversary of the Government under His Highness the Lord Protector* (1655): “For, neither didst thou from the first apply / Thy sober spirit unto things too high, / But in thine own fields exercised’st long, / An healthful mind within a body strong” (229-32). The speaker of that poem uses Cromwell’s cultivation of the land as evidence of humility, but the “fields” in these lines may also foreshadow the fields of battle in which Cromwell emerged as victor, especially because a few lines later, Cromwell is depicted as having power to make the land fruitful: “And down at last thou poured’st the fertile storm; / Which to the thirsty land did plenty bring, / But though forewarned, o’ertook and wet the king” (236-38).

¹¹*Bergamot* can refer to a kind of pear or a kind of citrus fruit (*OED* “bergamot”², “bergamot”¹). Simon Barbe, in *The French Perfumer* (1696), writes that the citrus fruit, the source of bergamot essence, “grows out of a Bough of a Citron-Tree grafted on a Bergamot Pear-Tree, so the Citron which grows on it, participates of the two qualities, the Citron and the Pear” (50). That Marvell meant the pear and not the citrus is suggested by Barbe’s referring to the bergamot citrus also as “Cedra,” which he defines as “a kind of Citron-Tree” (50), and also by the fact that other orchardists treat the bergamot with other varieties of pears, not citrus fruits (d’Andilly 74; Evelyn, *KH* 71). Barbe’s work, which appeared (in French) in 1693, constitutes the earliest evidence of the citrus bergamot’s “presence . . . in Europe” (Imbesi and De Pasquale 594). If Marvell is referring to the citrus rather than the pear, the former’s novelty and the need for grafting would enhance our sense of Cromwell’s ambition. But that reading seems less likely than the one that prefers the pear.

This effect is intensified by the description of Cromwell's achievements as "cast[ing] the kingdoms old / Into another mould" (35-36). The primary image in this couplet seems to be of metalworking or some other way of imposing form on a material (*OED* "mould," n.³, 9.a, 11.a); Smith (*Poems* 275 n36) also calls attention to uses of *mould* to refer to a human or animal body (see *OED* "mould," n.³, 4) and to shipbuilding (5, 10.b).⁶² But "mould" can also mean "earth" and, more particularly, "garden soil" (*OED* "mould," n.¹, 1.a, b).⁶³ Indeed, in *The First Anniversary of the Government under His Highness the Lord Protector*, the word means both "form" and "earth": "And thou, great Cromwell, for whose happy birth / A mould was chosen out of better earth" (159-60).⁶⁴ The word "cast" likewise operates in both senses: it can mean "[t]o form (metal, or the like) *into* a shape, by pouring it when melted or soft into a mould, where it is allowed to cool or harden" (*OED* "cast," v., 50), but it can also mean "[t]o throw" (I) and more specifically "to cast seed" (1.d); "[t]o throw up (earth, etc.) whence the current northern use in *to cast sods, turf, peat*: to dig them up" (28.a); "[t]o lay, place, put, with an action of force, decisiveness, or haste" (31.a); and "[t]o put into shape, dispose, arrange or order . . ." (45). These latter meanings, all potentially involving cultivation, endow the couplet with gardening imagery: the "kingdoms old" may be seeds or plants that Cromwell

¹²Of "mould," Smith writes, "The word is cognate with common political metaphors in the period—the body of the kingdom, with the king as the head, and the ship of state." And his example from Ben Jonson's *Catiline* deals specifically with metalworking (275 n36).

¹³For definition 1.b, the *OED* quotes as an example a passage from Nathaniel Bacon's 1651 *Continuation of An Historical Discourse of the Uniformity of the Government of England*: "Bared of the old Soile of the Papacy, yet transplanted into the new Mould of Royalty" (283).

¹⁴Smith's note on these lines refers readers to lines 35-36 of the "Horatian Ode," though his notes on the "Ode" itself make no mention of "mould" as a term for soil.

forcefully relocates to a different kind of earth. The couplet thus associates Cromwell's "ruin[ing] the great work of time" with sowing or planting and with working the earth.

Yet, because the terms of cultivation in the couplet can just as easily be read as terms of metalworking or shipbuilding, activities necessary for arming troops and strengthening a navy, the image remains ambiguous, simultaneously organic and inorganic. This ambiguity suggests not only possible similarities between gardening and the arts of war but also the potential for gardening, as an "art[] of peace" comparable in some ways to the writing of lyric verse, to be eradicated by the emphasis on war. And in this way the new "mould" may be no more nourishing of the kingdoms than the "forward youth" can afford to be of his lyrics or Cromwell of "his private gardens." Both literary and horticultural art, the poem implies, may be transformed, if not eclipsed, by the wars and their aftermath.

Problems Posed by the Gardener-General Trope

Just as the ambiguity of the terms "cast" and "mould" allows us to see the resemblances between war and gardening but also the former's ability to destroy the latter, so too the gardener-general trope suggests both Cromwell's potential for nourishing the land and the risks posed by his approach. The poem's emphasis on experience and on Cromwell's break with—even his destruction of—"the great work of time" (34) links his cultivation of England with the experimental techniques of the new philosophy espoused by Sir Francis Bacon in the earlier part of the century and developed by a range of mid-century individuals and groups, including notably Samuel Hartlib's circle. These associations imply great promise, but, at the same time, the ambiguity of

the cultivation metaphor records the limitations or potential problems with the gardener-general trope or at least with its application to Cromwell.

Marvell's phrasing in the lines "And cast the kingdoms old / Into another mould" (35-36) may refer to one of several horticultural and agricultural techniques, such as sowing seed in a different kind of soil or to transplanting trees or other plants from one kind of soil to another. The former option could involve using a different field in order to let the first lie fallow and recover its fertility. This metaphor would suggest a temporary changing of the government in order to make monarchy fruitful again, and indeed John Morrill writes that "there is no evidence that [Cromwell] believed in the permanent eradication of monarchy" in 1649 or even at the end of 1651. But the metaphor of transplantation has very different implications. This technique allowed horticulturalists to raise trees and other plants in the protected conditions of a nursery and then to move them to permanent locations in a garden. John Evelyn recommended transplanting trees to "something a better mould then the place from thenc they come" (*EB* 161); he noted that "[t]his worke was thought so sacred & so necessary for the melioration & civilizing of Trees & fruits, that the Antients thought fit to put it under the patronage of a Deity: when they made Vertumnus preside over all that in the field was turn'd or ~~Transplanted~~ transported to another place" (*EB* 161 n1). This metaphor would imply Cromwell's intention to alter permanently the nature of the government, presumably in order to improve it.

Marvell's lines also, however, permit less positive interpretations, ones that emphasize experimentation and risk. The speaker's reference to "another mould" gives us no indication of higher quality (36): the guarantee is one of difference, not betterment.

This uncertainty figures Cromwell as an experimenting gardener, trying out a new kind of soil to see what effect it has on seeds or plants; a republican government, as a form not native to England or Scotland, is indeed a foreign soil for “the kingdoms old” (35). Like the planting of seeds in a different kind of earth, transplanting was understood to involve some degree of experiment or risk: in the preface to *Gondibert*, William Davenant writes, “Language (which is the only Creature of Man’s creation) hath like a Plant, seasons of flourishing, and decay; like Plants is remov’d from one soile to an other, and by being so transplanted, doth often gather vigour and increase” (7, lines 151-54).⁶⁵ The word “often” signals the relative confidence that transplantation into suitable earth will improve a plant, but it also indicates the knowledge that failure is possible, especially in experimenting with either a new plant or a new mixture of soil. And fertilization, Charles Webster has noted, was among the topics discussed by agricultural writers Gabriel Plattes and Walter Blith (472, 474), each of whom was concerned to make his work readable for lower-class farmers and thus to share their knowledge of improvements as widely as possible (474-75). As such an aim implies, these writers and others like them saw a need for greater availability of good information and for more widespread use of better techniques (Webster 470, 471, 472, 474); fertilization might well seem like a risky technique for farmers without good authority or the benefit of experience as to how to go about it. In “cast[ing] the kingdoms old / Into another mould” (35-36), then, Cromwell may be a well-informed gardener-general, applying a helpful technique and “ruin[ing]” accumulated misinformation from ages past (34), or an experimenting one, possibly

¹⁵This preface was published in 1650, though none of the poem appeared until 1651 (Gladish ix).

willing to gamble on the kingdoms' health, presumably to make them better, but also perhaps to try something new, "[t]o ruin the great work of time" (34).

This reading is also supported by the meanings of and etymological relationship among *experience*, *experiment*, and *peril*; the first two of these words derive from *experiri* and the third from "an unattested verb only recorded in the compound *experiri* to try, make trial of" (*OED* "experience," n.; "experiment," n.; "peril," n.). In John Rider's English-Latin and Latin-English dictionary *Bibliotheca Scholastica* (1589), the entry for "To make Experience" includes the sense "*Experience, or triall*," the Latin translations of which it gives as "Experientia" (col. 536, lines 10-20, trans. 1) and "Periculum" (col. 536, lines 10-20, trans. 2); under the same heading is an entry for "An experiment" (col. 536 lines 20-30). The entry for "*Peril*" has as the first Latin translation "Periculum" (col. 1079, lines 10-20, trans. 1). Similarly, in *Corderius Dialogues* (1636), "a triall" is glossed as "a danger, an experiment" (Cordier 284). The same associations are made in Marvell's "The Mower against Gardens," in which the speaker complains against various kinds of artifice and innovation, including altering soil composition to create "a more luscious earth" (7), that horticulturalists might use to corrupt nature (1-32). Smith notes that Allan Pritchard and Paul Hammond have each argued that this poem dates from 1668 (Smith, *Poems* 131), but the relationship among cultivation, experiment, and risk or danger may have been a continuing interest of Marvell's; alternatively, the poem—which, according to Smith, contains "elements suggesting an earlier date"—may have been, like the other Mower poems (Smith, *Poems* 131), composed between 1650 and 1652.

All these meanings are implicit in the poem's description of Cromwell, which emphasizes action and particularly real or potential violence and destruction: he "[d]id thorough his own side / His fiery way divide" (15-16); he "palaces and temples rent; / And Caesar's head at last / Did through his laurels blast" (22-24); he has "ruin[ed] the great work of time" (34); and he is "[t]he English hunter" (110) threatening the Scot (105-12). The experimental nature of Cromwell's military and political supremacy, then, carries with it numerous dangers—for Scotland but also, the poem's ambiguities imply, for England. And this analogy between political and horticultural experimentation, with Cromwell as a gardener participating in the new science, is supported by other parts of the poem.

Old Myths and New Philosophy

The image of Cromwell as an experimenting gardener who has "ruin[ed] the great work of time" (34) suggests the reworking of myths about the natural and political worlds alike.⁶⁶ The old myths, those challenged or destroyed by Cromwell's actions, center on notions of kings as they relate to plant life and natural philosophy more generally; the new are based not, like the earlier ones, on analogy, correspondence, and traditional concepts of order but rather on experience and action. They are thus linked with the new philosophy that depended on experiment and observation. With the terms of inquiry into natural philosophy set against those of praise and political myth, the garden emerges as a crucial image: it evokes the myths of the old order, with the king organizing and

¹⁶Throughout this chapter, I use *myth* without intending any connotation of falsehood (*OED* "myth," n., 2.a); this argument is concerned not with the objective truth of the conceptions to which I refer but rather with what those conceptions have to do with mid-seventeenth-century patterns of thought and belief.

nurturing the state, and the realities of the new, marked by uncertainty and instability as well as promise and potential. And while the poem suggests new myths to replace the old, it leaves the significance of the garden and the aims of the gardener far from clear.

The references to Cromwell as private gardener and gardener-general establish a contrast between old and new myths. The bergamot, as we have seen, was known as “the pear of kings” (Smith, *Poems* 274 n32) and had been so famed “since antiquity” (Bodaeus’s ed. of Theophrastus, qtd. in Smith, *Poems* 274 n32). The designation arose from its superiority, its “excellent taste” and juiciness (Bodaeus’s ed. of Theophrastus, qtd. in Smith, *Poems* 274 n32). The bergamot thus represents the association of superior kinds, and superior pleasures, with kings: this kind of tree stands out in relation to other pear trees much as kings do in relation to their subjects. The name “pear of kings” thus registers an analogy between orders of pear trees and human political orders, between bergamot and king. Implicitly, this name endorses analogy, hierarchy, and authority, and it depends, significantly, upon the authority of the ancients. The image of Cromwell’s cultivation of this pear tree may, as we have seen, foreshadow his later political ambition; it may also imply his acquiescence in the myths of kingship and in the old order. If the superior pleasures offered by the bergamot are understood to involve a kind of luxury, then Cromwell’s cultivation of this fruit is at odds with the statement that “[h]e lived reservèd and austere” (30); more likely, I think, is the implication that Cromwell’s lifestyle was so “austere” that a choice pear was the greatest luxury he allowed himself. Similarly, the image of his cultivating this pear tree may, as we have seen, foreshadow

his later political ambition, but it may instead or additionally imply his former acquiescence in the myths of kingship and the old order.⁶⁷

Either reading is possible in light of the next lines of the poem. Cromwell, the speaker tells us, has gone on “[t]o ruin the great work of time” (34); he bears much of the responsibility for the regicide and for overturning England’s monarchy in favor of a republican government. He has thus “cast the kingdoms old / Into another mould” (35-36), but with no guarantee of success; furthermore, the metaphor’s ambiguity—its possible reference to horticulture, metalwork, or shipbuilding—implies uncertainty as to the meaning and effects of this new “mould.” And reading the metaphor as a horticultural one results in an image of Cromwell as a gardener-general testing out a new way of nourishing the kingdoms, one that does not depend on kingly authority or, indeed, on English tradition or precedent. “To ruin the great work of time” (34) may imply that Cromwell is undermining conventional wisdom as well as the institution of monarchy.

Indeed the transition from “private gardens” to state-tending associates Cromwell with horticulturalists and agriculturalists interested in the social applications of the new philosophy. Charles Webster has identified a change in agricultural writing due to the

¹⁷Nicholas McDowell identifies the poem’s “forward youth” to some degree with John Hall of Durham (224-35), who accompanied Cromwell into Scotland in 1650 (225). In particular, McDowell notes that “Marvell’s opening lines echo the opening of Hall’s own (mostly ironic) renunciation of love poetry for public life in ‘The Recantation’” (225), which includes the lines, “I will no more range sullen groves, to lie / Entombèd in a shade . . .” (3-4, qtd. in McDowell in 225). These “groves” were associated with the aims and values of Thomas Stanley’s circle of poets (McDowell 112-13), a circle to which, according to McDowell, both Hall and Marvell belonged (2-3). Ultimately, McDowell argues, “The opening four lines of the ‘Ode’ oppose letters and arms, courtly poetics and public service, but they do so from both a royalist and an anti-royalist perspective . . .” (226). As I have already shown, the poem establishes a parallel between the “forward youth” (1) and Cromwell; indirectly, then, the youth’s “shadows” (Marvell 3) link Cromwell’s “private gardens” (29) with values that Royalists associated with the Caroline court.

influence of Puritans like Samuel Hartlib interested in Bacon's program for reforming natural philosophy (472-73):

After 1640 an increasingly critical attitude was taken to the previous literature. Old-fashioned authors like [Thomas] Tusser continued to be used, and the genteel gardening and domestic handbooks of [Gervase] Markham retained their popularity; in reaction, the Puritans consciously attempted to inculcate a more scientific attitude to husbandry, as well as to relate their work to current social and economic problems. They made virtually no concessions to the taste of the élite by dwelling on entertaining horticultural novelties. Their basic priorities were the increase of agricultural productivity and the amelioration of the condition of the poorer classes. (469)

This shift was part of a larger vision: "On the basis of their scientific ideas the Puritans were more convinced than any previous generation that agriculture could be revolutionized" (Webster 469). These scientists believed that they could—and should—sweep away the accumulated misconceptions about nature that hindered fruitfulness and ultimately the rectification of social problems; they thus emphasized experimentation and experience, "aim[ing] at basing their advice on the widest possible firsthand experience of current practice, assisted by personal trial whenever possible" (Webster 470). They saw this work as part of their Christian obedience to and thus cooperation with God's will (Webster 466, 324-26), and "they expected to exert considerable influence" over "agricultural reform" by means of both legislative and technical advancement (469). Marvell's description of Cromwell's shift from tending the bergamot to cultivating the kingdoms mirrors the change Webster describes, from an emphasis on pleasure-gardening to one on godly agriculture and from tradition to experiment.

This contrast between old myth and new is foreshadowed by Marvell's treatment of the laurel. The speaker, having described Cromwell as "like the three-forked lightning" (13) in his rise to eminence, extends the comparison through metaphor:

Then burning through the air he went,
And palaces and temples rent;
And Caesar's head at last
Did through his laurels blast. (21-24)

Two lines later, the speaker refers to Cromwell's power as "The force of angry heaven's flame" (26). Smith thus glosses the last line of the passage quoted above as an affirmation of Cromwell's role as God's instrument: "Cromwell's divine agency, working over and against nature, is enhanced, since lightning was supposed not to strike laurel trees: see Pliny, *Natural History*, XV.xl" (*Poems* 274 n24). The laurel retained this reputation in many seventeenth-century sources,⁶⁸ and Smith recognizes nothing potentially ironic about this attribution of Cromwell's victory to God's will.

But the power of laurels to ward off lightning was questioned by at least one mid-century writer. In *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* (1646), the second edition of which appeared in 1650, Sir Thomas Browne writes,

That Bayes will protect from the mischief of Lightning and Thunder, is a quality ascribed thereto, common with the Fig-tree, Eagle, and skin of a Seal. Against so famous a quality, Vicomercatus produceth experiment of a Bay-tree blasted in Italy. And therefore although Tiberius for this intent, did wear a Lawrel upon his Temples; yet did Augustus take a more probable course, who fled under arches and hollow vaults for protection. And though Porta conceive, because in a streperous eruption, it riseth against fire, it doth therefore resist lightning, yet is that no emboldening Illation. And if we consider the threefold effect of Jupiter's Trisulk, to burn, discuss, and terebrate; and if that be true which is commonly delivered, that it will melt the blade, yet pass the scabbard; kill the child, yet spare the mother; dry up the wine, yet leave the hogshead entire: though it favour the amulet, it may not spare us; it will be unsure to rely on any preservative, 'tis no security to be dipped in Styx, or clad in the armour of Ceneus. (2: 149-50)

¹⁸See especially Mildmay Fane's "Occasioned by Seeing a Walk of Bay Trees," which begins, "No thunder blasts Jove's plant, nor can / Misfortune warp an honest man" (1-2). The poem appears in the volume *Otia Sacra* (1648), in which, as McDowell points out, "Fane . . . was recommending to royalists retreat from public life into poetry and contemplation" (199). For a discussion of the very different uses to which Fane and Marvell put Horatian verse, see Norbrook (252-71).

Browne not only raises logical questions about lightning's ability to "spare" certain objects while injuring others but also cites an "experiment" in which a bay tree proved susceptible to lightning. He thus calls into question the assertion of Pliny and implicitly criticizes all those later writers who have uncritically perpetuated that assertion; for Browne, after all, "the mortallest enemy unto Knowledge, and that which hath done the greatest execution upon truth, hath been a peremptory adhesion unto Authority, and more especially, the establishing of our belief upon the dictates of Antiquity" (2: 40). And while Browne praises Pliny's "great Eloquence, and industry indefatigable" (2: 55), he lists that author among those whose works have helped to perpetuate "tradition[s] or popular error[s],"

who though excellent and useful Authors, yet being either transcriptive, or following common relations, their accounts are not to be swallowed at large, or entertained without all circumspection. In whom the *ipse dixit*, although it be no powerful argument in any, is yet less authentick then in many other, because they deliver not their own experiences, but others' affirmations, and write from others, as later pens from them. (2: 52)

The emphasis here on authors' "own experiences," as opposed to tradition and received authority, aligns Browne with the ideals of the new philosophy. Indeed, in "To the Reader," he includes among those from whom he expects a friendly reception for his work

those honoured Worthies, who endeavour the advancement of Learning: as being likely to find a clearer progression, when so many rubs are leveled, and many untruths taken off, which passing as principles with common beliefs, disturb the tranquility of Axioms, which otherwise might be raised. And wise men cannot but know, that arts and learning want this expurgation: and if the course of truth be permitted unto its self, like that of time and uncorrected computations, it cannot escape many errors, which duration still enlargeth. (2: 6)

Browne, then, repeatedly presents his project as compatible with, indeed part of, the project of increasing knowledge by means of experience and experiment.

Marvell may or may not have read, or noted, Browne's passage on bay trees' defense against lightning, but at any rate he would have known that such traditions regarding natural phenomena had been coming under closer and closer scrutiny since the publication of Bacon's *New Organon* in 1620. Other poems by Marvell hint at an interest in just this sort of work, or at least in the people involved in it: 1651 saw the publication of two poems in which Marvell commemorated his friend Robert Witty's English translation of James Primrose's *De Vulgi in Medicina Erroribus* (1638) as *Popular Errours. Or the Errours of the People in Physick* (1651).⁶⁹ In defending the *Pseudodoxia* from possible criticism, Browne acknowledges his fellow physician's work: "We hope it will not be unconsidered, that we find no open tract, or constant manuduction in this Labyrinth; but are oft-times fain to wander in the America and untravelled parts of Truth. For though not many years past, Dr. Primrose hath made a learned Discourse of vulgar Errors in Physick, yet have we discussed but two or three thereof" ("To the Reader," 2: 5).

Marvell's use of the image of lightning's striking through laurels, then, has divergent implications: it may support old myths about the natural world and simultaneously acknowledge old myths about kingship, or it may register doubts about such myths, doubts inspired by the new philosophy. The image alludes to a story, cited above by Browne, that Tiberius Caesar wore a laurel coronet in order to ward off lightning. At least partly by way of the association of the emperor with laurel wreaths, one implication of Marvell's lines is that Cromwell's ability to dethrone the king (and have him killed), to

¹⁹Marvell's poems on Witty's translation are "Dignissimo suo amico Doctori Wittie de translatione Vulgi Errorum D. Primrosii" and "To His Worthy Friend Doctor Witty upon His Translation of the Popular Errors" (1651).

strike in spite of the crown, indicates what Smith identifies (*Poems* 274 n24) as Cromwell's participation in the working of divine providence. Indirectly, these lines call up a myth of the king's authority and power and so could enhance Cromwell's even greater qualities. But the fact that Browne allies himself with the new philosophy in emphasizing experiment and rational inquiry suggests that we consider the implications of Marvell's lines more carefully: they may register not an uncritical admiration for Cromwell's status and power but rather a more reserved attitude toward the myths that support monarchy. If laurels do not in fact protect against lightning, then the matter is less one of Cromwell's divine endorsement and more one of superior earthly power—"Though Justice against Fate complain, / And plead the ancient rights in vain; / But those do hold or break, / As men are strong or weak" (37-40)—or of Charles's dependence on the wrong sort of protection, the wrong myth.⁷⁰ The lines that follow the couplet on Charles's laurels provide more cause for questioning the reference to providence: although Marvell's speaker identifies Cromwell's power with "[t]he force of angry heaven's flame" (26), he immediately gives Cromwell credit, asserting that "[m]uch to the man is due" and praising the general's "industrious valour" (33). The speaker thus leaves unresolved the questions whether and to what degree Cromwell's power is earthly or divine.

²⁰Pierre Matthieu, historiographer to Henry IV of France, acknowledges this latter problem in his praise for that king's participation in battle: "But he would shew, that age doth not weaken courage, that the dignity of a Crowne doth not dispence a Prince from dangers, that the Laurel doth not defend him from the lightnings of warre, and that he desired to haue no part in the glory of incounters, vnlesse he had a share in the danger" (86-87). Matthieu later attributes to Henry the notion that risk is a means to laurels rather than laurels constitute a defense from risk: "this Prince thought that there was nothing so great nor so generous, as the contempt of life, and that the *Cæsars* and *Alexanders* would haue neuer bin crowned with so many Lawrells if they had basely retired from dangers" (88).

Marvell's reference to laurels and lightning, then, opposes tradition and received wisdom to doubt and experience. The image of Cromwell's power depends on a correspondence between natural and political phenomena: a king is presumably protected by his position, just as a laurel tree is by its nature or species. Here the poem draws on terms of praise and political mythmaking, but it does so in ways that call attention to the lightning metaphor's artificiality—and at a time when, as in Donne's day, "new philosophy call[ed] all in doubt" (Donne 205). The same is true, I would argue, of the passages that depict Cromwell as a gardener: he begins with a practice, namely "plant[ing] the bergamot" (32), associated with correspondence between the natural and political realms and then turns to a more experimental kind of cultivation. And Marvell's speaker describes this latter cultivation in terms that conflate the organic with the inorganic, the natural ("mould" as earth) with the artificial ("mould" as form for metalworking, for example). The metaphor that describes governmental change in horticultural or agricultural terms, moreover, raises another important question: whether there is any justifiable correspondence between natural philosophy and politics. Through these uncertainties, the metaphor calls into doubt the very viability of the gardener-general trope.

Cromwell as Farmer-General

Later lines of the poem subtly revise that trope, at least as it is applied to Cromwell: the couplet "He to the Commons' feet presents / A kingdom, for his first year's rents" depicts the general as a farmer, more specifically a tenant farmer (85-86). This latter trope develops the allusion to horticultural sophistication or agricultural reform implicit

in the reference to Cromwell's "cast[ing] the kingdoms old / Into another mould" (35-36), and by replacing the gardener-general image it suggests that image's inadequacy.

Moreover, one source that posits a relationship between war and agriculture rather like that in the "Ode" is Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*, a work Marvell's poem apparently echoes twice. Especially in light of Sallust's comments, Marvell's farmer-general trope registers both optimism and caution about Cromwell's potential for cultivating England well.

Nigel Smith identifies two passages from the "Ode" that may echo Sallust's account of Catiline's challenge to the Roman Republic. The first is the evaluation of Cromwell's Irish victory: "So much one man can do, / That does both act and know" (75-76). Smith identifies "act and know" as "qualities attributed to Julius Caesar by Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae*, VIII.v" (*Poems* 277 n76); though the reference here actually occurs in general praise of the ancient Romans, the ideal does appear to derive from Sallust's history.⁷¹ The second possible allusion to Sallust occurs in the closing couplet of the "Ode": "The same arts that did gain / A pow'r must it maintain" (119-20). Smith identifies this statement as "[a] *sententia* which goes back to Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae*, II.iv" (*Poems* 279 n119-20); Sallust's assertion is that "empire is easily retained by the qualities by which it was first won" (2.4). Smith cites numerous other works that use similar statements (*Poems* 279 n119-20), and Christopher Wortham likewise identifies Marvell's statement as "something of a commonplace" that "has been variously attributed to

⁷¹The passage cited by Smith occurs in the context of praise for the valor characteristic of the ancient Romans (6.7-7.7) and Sallust's explanation that the Athenians became more renowned not because their deeds were greater but rather because those deeds were memorialized by "writers of exceptional talent" (8.2-3): "But the Roman people never had that advantage, since their ablest men were always most engaged with affairs; their minds were never employed apart from their bodies; the best citizen preferred action to words, and thought that his own brave deeds should be lauded by others rather than that theirs should be recounted by him" (8.5).

Sallust, Machiavelli and Anthony Ascham” (25), though Wortham argues (25-26) for Thomas Hobbes’s translation of Thucydides’ *History of the Peloponnesian War* as “a precise source” (25). But the proximity of the two potentially relevant passages from Sallust suggest that the early pages of the *Bellum Catilinae* proved an important source for Marvell: despite Smith’s tracing of “act and know” to Sallust’s eighth chapter, Sallust treats this conjunction at far greater length in the first and second chapters (1.1-2.2), a few sentences from the comment about how to keep an empire. Still more significantly, Sallust’s assertions of the primacy of “qualities of mind” or “mental excellence” (2.2, 2.7) bookend the advice about empire (2.4). Given Sallust’s comments about the relationships between thought and action and between peace and war, Marvell’s use of the *Bellum Catilinae* as a source has important implications for his depiction of Cromwell as a farmer-general.

Sallust presents thought and action alike as crucial to human life, but ultimately he emphasizes mental acuity more than physical strength. He exhorts readers desirous of lasting fame to distinguish themselves from animals: “All our power . . . lies in both mind and body; we employ the mind to rule, the body rather to serve; the one we have in common with the Gods, the other with the brutes” (1.2). He then turns almost immediately to the question of war: “Yet for a long time mortal men have discussed the question whether success in arms depends more on strength of body or excellence of mind; for before you begin, deliberation is necessary, when you have deliberated, prompt action. Thus each of these, being incomplete in itself, requires the other’s aid” (1.5-7). In time, he goes on to say, the desire for power caused excellence of mind to emerge as more important than physical strength:

Accordingly in the beginning kings (for that was the first title of sovereignty among men), took different courses, some training their minds and others their bodies. Even at that time men's lives were still free from covetousness; each was quite content with his own possessions. But when Cyrus in Asia and in Greece the Athenians and Lacedaemonians began to subdue cities and nations, to make the lust for dominion a pretext for war, to consider the greatest empire the greatest glory, then at last men learned from perilous enterprises that qualities of mind availed most in war. (2.1-2)

For Sallust, then, forethought takes precedence over physical force, in all human pursuits and specifically in waging war.

In this context, the praise for Cromwell in Marvell's "Ode" has complex implications. The astonishing speed of the Irish victory, the poem implies, was due to Cromwell's combination of military force and careful thought: "And now the Irish are ashamed / To see themselves in one year tamed. / So much one man can do, / That does both act and know" (73-76). But the appearance of "act" before "know" complicates the praise. On the one hand, perhaps "know" follows "act" in order to emphasize Cromwell's reliance not simply on brute strength but also on the kind of "mental excellence" Sallust praises (2.3); the use of "know" as a rhyme-word arguably gives it particular emphasis in the line.⁷² On the other hand, the phrasing seems odd given Sallust's description of how to succeed in battle: "before you begin, deliberation is necessary, when you have deliberated, prompt action" (1.6). From this perspective, one might expect "know" to precede "act." As it stands, Marvell's phrasing appears to give primacy to action rather than to knowledge.

The latter reading, in turn, may imply that Cromwell's knowledge lagged behind his action or that he demonstrated more of the latter than of the former. John Morrill offers

⁷²This sense sorts well with the speaker's admiration first of Cromwell's physical force and then of his "wiser art" (45-48).

this judgment: “Cromwell was not a great thinker. . . . He was not especially intelligent, and was quite unintellectual, lacking a deep understanding of law, of the classics, of theology.” Lest we attribute this assessment purely to hindsight, we might consider the complaints made in satires against him from the years leading up to the composition of Marvell’s “Ode.” Mercurius Melancholicus, in *Craftie Cromwell* (1648), has the Chorus complain of the times, “*Learning thrust out, Ignorance in*” (6). And the anonymous author of *A Case for Nol Cromwells Nose, and the Cure of Tom Fairfax’s Gout* (1648), characterizing the name Cromwell as one “that hath been ever omminous [*sic*] to the Church” (4), first recalls Thomas Cromwell’s destruction of “the monasteries, and religious Houses” (5) and then states of Oliver that “this Cromwell hath been chiefly active in defacing, demolishing, and levelling Churches, in persecuting, robbing and imprisoning all learned and knowing men . . .” (5). These authors’ royalist bias cannot be trusted to yield an impartial assessment of Cromwell’s intellect. But they do exemplify criticisms of his attitude toward education and of pervasive stereotypes of Cromwell and his soldiers as lacking wit. McDowell writes that Alexander Brome’s broadsheet *Cromwells Panegyrick* (1647) “associates the Army with iconoclasm and the neglect of literary culture, mocking the uncultured soldiers as ‘Poet Laureats’ who derive their inspiration from Cromwell’s beer” (99). Brome, McDowell goes on to say, “finds himself forced to commemorate an iconoclastic enemy whose military power has at once rid London of Presbyterian domination and shattered the beauties of Stuart culture” (100).

A very different implication of the order of “act and know,” however, is that for Cromwell action is a means to knowledge. As we have seen, the early lines of the poem

depict “The forward youth” (1) and the young Cromwell alike as needing to leave behind a life of privacy, study, and contemplation in order to devote themselves to military fame (1-12). Their early pursuits of certain kinds of knowledge, those associated with “the inglorious arts of peace” (10), give way to the influence, and the “[u]rg[ing],” of the “active star” (12). But the poem later implies that other kinds of knowledge can occur in tandem with—or perhaps after, and possibly as a consequence of—military action: “What field of all the civil wars / Where his were not the deepest scars? / And Hampton shows what part / He had of wiser art” (45-48). Perhaps, then, Cromwell’s “cast[ing] the kingdoms old / Into another mould” (35-36), like the possibility of his “scar[ring]” the nation’s “field[s]” (46, 45; Greene 393), is indeed an experiment, one fraught with danger as well as the promise of possible advantages. Cromwell appears in part as a gardener-general—or, more precisely, a farmer-general—testing out possibilities and then refining his approach.⁷³

This reading again associates Cromwell with experimental agriculturalists and thus with the ideals of men like John Hall and Samuel Hartlib.⁷⁴ For them, as we have seen,

²³The context of the lines “And cast the kingdoms old / Into another mould” (35-36), with references to Charles’s execution appearing shortly before and after them (23-24, 53-64), suggests that the couplet refers to the regicide, which left England and Ireland without a monarch, though as Smith notes (*Poems* 275 n35), Charles II had by this time been made king of Scotland. If the regicide was a kind of experiment, then it may have provided the knowledge that aided Cromwell in achieving a swift, decisive Irish victory. The phrase “act and know” may assert the providential interpretation of Cromwell’s project in that the success of his action would confirm the outcome as God’s will: “’Tis madness to resist or blame / The force of angry heaven’s flame” (25-26).

²⁴McDowell examines Hall’s *An Humble Motion to the Parliament of England Concerning the Advancement of Learning: And Reformation of the Universities* (1649) in the contexts of “Hartlib’s vision of the reformation of education and intellectual communication” (204; 204-206) and of concerns about Presbyterian “obstruction of

experimentation would lead to true knowledge (Webster 469); they relied upon Bacon's model (469), which was intended to correct "sceptical negativism" as well as the deductive errors of the scholastics (336). And this reading thus diminishes the potential irony of Marvell's line: "know" may appear after "act" in order to reflect the Baconian emphasis on induction but also to emphasize the significance of that knowledge as true, universal, and accessible to the public, a major goal, again, of Hartlib's circle (Webster 469-77). This last point is suggested partly by the poem's emphasis on Cromwell's public-spiritedness, associated with his figurative status as tenant farmer:

He to the Commons' feet presents
A kingdom, for his first year's rents.
And, what he may, forbears
His fame, to make it theirs.

And has his sword and spoils ungirt
To lay them at the public's skirt. (85-90)

Cromwell's sacrificing his "fame" on behalf of the Commons and "the public[]" echoes the aims of agricultural writers such as Hartlib and Plattes who, as Webster notes, opposed keeping secrets about agricultural improvement to the neglect of the greater good (472-73, 474-76). Cromwell thus appears here as a figurative ideal of the public-minded agriculturalists: he cultivates the land, thus working from personal experience, and then passes on the benefits of that experience for the good of the state.

Marvell's farmer-general trope takes on added significance in light of the likeness Sallust finds between war and agriculture. Just after his assertion that "at last men learned from perilous enterprises"—another instance of action that leads to knowledge—

learning" (208; 204-209). McDowell goes on to discuss Marvell's "Ode" in terms of these concerns (235-58).

“that qualities of mind availed most in war” (2.2), Sallust links mental strength with peace and power:

Now if the mental excellence with which kings and rulers are endowed were as potent in peace as in war, human affairs would run an evener and steadier course, and you would not see power passing from hand to hand and everything in turmoil and confusion; for empire is easily retained by the qualities by which it was first won. But when sloth has usurped the place of industry, and lawlessness and insolence have superseded self-restraint and justice, the fortune of princes changes with their character[.] Thus the sway is always passing to the best man from the hands of his inferior.

Success in agriculture, navigation, and architecture depends invariably upon mental excellence. Yet many men, being slaves to appetite and sleep, have passed through life untaught and untrained, like mere wayfarers; in these men we see, contrary to Nature’s intent, the body a source of pleasure, the soul a burden. For my own part, I consider the lives and deaths of such men as about alike, since no record is made of either. In very truth that man alone lives and makes the most of life, as it seems to me, who devotes himself to some occupation, courting the fame of a glorious deed or a noble career. (2.3-9)

Thus in farming, as in war, “mental excellence” is key. Cromwell, as farmer-general, has successfully exercised his “wiser art” (48) in defeating Charles and then the Irish, and he has reaped the rewards of doing so: “He to the Commons’ feet presents / A kingdom, for his first year’s rents” (85-86). The poem’s praise of his “industrious valour” makes clear that he is not a “slave[] to appetite and sleep”; his discipline signals his “mental excellence.” And figuring him as a farmer-general may thus be Marvell’s way of implying that Cromwell will distinguish himself as well in peacetime (after the Scottish expedition, presumably) as he has in war. In these ways, the poem’s apparent responses to Sallust present Cromwell as an admirable farmer-general.⁷⁵

²⁵ Compare Marvell’s reference, in *The First Anniversary*, to Cromwell’s earlier years as a farmer, experience that Marvell cites as an instance of the Lord Protector’s lack of ambition to rule: “For, neither didst thou from the first apply / Thy sober spirit unto things too high, / But in thine own fields exercised’st long, / An healthful mind within a body strong” (229-32). In the same poem, Marvell compares Cromwell to Gideon for refusing the crown (Marvell 249-56; see Judges 8:1-23, and Smith, *Poems* 294 n249-56).

Yet, again, Sallust's comments also leave room for seeing this trope as ambiguous. Sallust's attitude toward farming is less positive than the remarks quoted above suggest: he writes of his withdrawal from "public affairs" (4.1), "[I]t was not my intention to waste my precious leisure in indolence and sloth, nor yet by turning to farming or the chase, to lead a life devoted to slavish employments" (4.1). Translator and editor J.C. Rolfe glosses "slavish employments" as referring to "purely corporeal" activities, and he refers the reader to an earlier passage: "we employ the mind to rule, the body rather to serve" (n1; 1.2). This remark of Sallust's seems curious given his earlier assertion that "[s]uccess in agriculture, navigation, and architecture depends invariably upon mental excellence" (2.7). Such a discrepancy would hardly seem worth noting in a study of Marvell's poem, except for the final farmer-general image, the one in which Cromwell offers "his first year's rents" to the House of Commons (86). On the one hand, paying those rents with "[a] kingdom" (86) hardly makes him seem servile; on the other, representing the general as a tenant farmer is rather inglorious. Most likely the tenant-farmer image serves to emphasize Cromwell's ability to "obey" (84), a point also suggested by the comparison of him to a falcon (91-96).⁷⁶ But as some critics have observed (e.g., Greene 388-89; Smith, *Poems* 277 n81), the poem also hints that

Gideon also worked the land; in Judges 6:11 an angel appears to him while he is threshing wheat on his father's land. John Morrill writes that Cromwell "yearned to 'keep a flock of sheep under a woodside,' to emulate Gideon who led the armies of Israel and then returned to his farm."

²⁶More specifically, Wilding asserts that "the impression of the controllable falcon is there to counter the memory of the army resisting Parliament's orders to disband, and ultimately marching on London and occupying it" in 1647, a move that resulted in the Presbyterians' fall from power in the House of Commons (8-9).

Cromwell may not always be subservient. In the context of these other ambiguities, then, the tenant-farmer image may imply wariness of the Commons' authority.

The "Horatian Ode" modulates from an image of Cromwell as a gardener before his military career to a gardener-general or farmer-general—either is possible in the "cast"- "mould" couplet—and finally to a tenant-farmer-general who lives on the Commons' land. The ambiguities involved in all these tropes communicate concerns about Cromwell's motivations and aims, about the future of the English state, and about ways of imagining England after the turmoil of the wars. The tropes discussed here depend on analogies between cultivation and warring; they may put a better face on war and the subjugation of rebels to the new order, but they also risk associating essentially peaceful, productive activities with destructive, deadly ones, of making gardening and farming irrevocably arts of war. If, moreover, England and Ireland are now imagined in terms of farms rather than of gardens, as they seem by the poem's end to be, then the implication is that the myth of England as a garden or paradise is gone—an implication that recurs, as we shall see, in "Upon Appleton House, To My Lord Fairfax," which Marvell, according to a convincing argument by Derek Hirst and Steven Zwicker ("High Summer" 249-57), wrote in the summer of 1651, about a year after the "Ode."

II. Gardener and Forester in "Upon Appleton House"

"Upon Appleton House," like the "Horatian Ode," examines the relationship of the "arts of peace," both literary and horticultural, to war. These arts, as in the "Ode," can survive war but may face correction or threat; this poem, too, then, recognizes the possibility that gardens can no longer serve as a symbol for England and thus that the

gardener-general trope is inherently flawed. Yet the poem, even as it questions England's status as a garden, does not wholly reject the nation's past; instead, in evoking Caroline myths and then revising them as Fairfacian ones, it maintains a continuity with Charles's rule—and the aesthetic interests and peace that had characterized it, at least early on—while correcting the errors associated with the court. Out of these strategies emerges an alternative to the gardener-general trope, one that accounts for Fairfax's retirement and emphasizes the longevity of his influence: namely, the forester-father.

The Recuperation of the Arts of Peace: Poetry and Drama at Nun Appleton

Like the "Horatian Ode," "Upon Appleton House" ostensibly presents literary arts as arts of peace but also examines their value in time of war. "Upon Appleton House" memorializes the Fairfax family's, and especially the former Lord General's, devotion to study and poetry in terms that emphasize Fairfax's identity as retired estate-owner, the poet's patron, and Maria's father.⁷⁷ The poem's references to learning, languages, and literary art are closely connected to its images of land, virtue, and family. Study and philosophy—inseparable, in Maria's education, from her family's Protestant faith—become more than a fitting occupation for the Lord General in retirement; they also offer, when his military leadership is temporarily if not finally over, an alternative means of recuperating, insofar as he can, what England has lost.⁷⁸ The estate's nourishment of

²⁷Lord Fairfax's daughter was actually named Mary; the significance of Marvell's use of the name "Maria" instead will be discussed later in this chapter.

²⁸Hirst and Zwicker argue convincingly that the poem responds to Fairfax's choice, in the summer of 1651, as to whether to serve under Cromwell's military leadership in defending England from Scottish-Royalist forces ("High Summer" 255).

poetry and drama signal continuity with Caroline culture and the peace that contributed to it.

The speaker's account of his interests and activities reflect the Fairfax family's interest in study, philosophy, and more specifically literature. His "studies" of nature, history, and divinity (586, 561-92), for example, recall Fairfax's interest in hermeticism. The poet emphasizes the possibility for recovery of lost understanding of and harmony with the natural world:

Thus I, easy philosopher,
Among the birds and trees confer:
And little now to make me, wants
Or of the fowls, or of the plants.
Give me but wings as they, and I
Straight floating on the air shall fly:
Or turn me but, and you shall see
I was but an inverted tree.

Already I begin to call
In their most learned original:
And where I language want, my signs
The bird upon the bough divines;
And more attentive there doth sit
Than if she were with lime-twigs knit.
No leaf does tremble in the wind
Which I returning cannot find. (561-76)

As Smith notes, the "most learned original" (570) language of the birds evokes attempts to recover Adamic knowledge of nature (*Poems* 233 n570). The attempt continues in the next stanza, in which the speaker declares, "Thrice happy he who, not mistook, / Hath read in Nature's mystic book" (583-84): this passage, Smith points out, alludes to the *Corpus Hermeticum* attributed to Hermes Trismegistus, who supposedly helped to preserve the prelapsarian "wisdom given to Adam" (*Poems* 234 n582-4). This kind of study is a response to England's fallenness, lamented in the poem's garden passage (321-

44), but it is also a memorial to Fairfax's commentary on, and translation from French of, portions of the *Corpus Hermeticum* (Hodge 135-36; Legouis 18).

As the passages quoted here indicate, language is central to the speaker's concerns and interests: he communicates with the birds and "read[s]" the Book of Nature, in particular the "light mosaic" formed by the "scattered sibyl's leaves" of the trees (584, 582, 577). This attention to language, reading, and translation commemorates a family tradition of linguistic and literary endeavors, especially translation and versifying. In addition to his work with hermetic texts, Fairfax's intellectual projects, according to Ian Gentles, included "translating Vegetius from the Latin . . . and producing a metrical version of the Psalms, as well as translating the Song of Solomon and other books of the Bible" ("Fairfax, Thomas" *ODNB*). L.G. Kelly writes that the works of Edward Fairfax (1568?-1632 or 1635), the former Lord General's great-uncle, include "twelve eclogues imitating Virgil and Theocritus" and a translation of Torquato Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata* under the title *Godfrey of Bulloigne, or, The Recoverie of Jerusalem* (1600) ("Fairfax, Edward" *ODNB*). The latter work "is supposed to have been a solace to Charles I during his time in prison," and it "strongly influenced the development of English poetry from Webster to Dryden," including notably the verse of Edmund Waller (Kelly, "Fairfax"). Moreover, Edward Fairfax's son William was Thomas Stanley's tutor and later a member of Stanley's literary circle (Revard 148, 149); he contributed a commendatory poem to Stanley's *Poems* (1647) and an epithalamium in honor of Stanley's marriage (Revard 158).⁷⁹ These interests in composing and translating verse

⁷⁹The marriage poem appears at the end of Stanley's *Poems* in the Huntington Library's copy (Revard 158).

and engaging with classical and hermetic writings establish a family tradition of commitment to learning, literature, and especially poetry.

Curiously, the poem never directly presents Fairfax himself as an intellectual or a poet. But I would argue that the change in focus from Fairfax to the speaker and Maria memorializes the former Lord General's intellectual interests nonetheless. This indirection may serve a specific purpose: given that Fairfax's intellectual interests and activities, and those of his extended and immediate family, involved preserving the kinds of accomplishments often associated with the Caroline court, displacing those interests onto other figures in the poem might avoid the awkwardness of linking Fairfax too directly with royalist values, especially at a time when, as Hirst and Zwicker propose (254-55), he was likely considering a return to republican military service.⁸⁰

The river passage associates the speaker with poetry in several ways. Nigel Smith, for example, notes that the image of the speaker "crowned" (Smith, *Poems* 237 n641-2) "with heavy sedge" (642) resembles Milton's description, in *Lycidas* (1637), of Camus, "usually identified," Smith points out, "as Milton's tutor Joseph Mede" (Smith, *Poems* 237 n641-2): "Next Camus, reverend sire, went footing slow, / His mantle hairy, and his bonnet sedge" (104-5, qtd. in Smith 237 n641-2). The resemblance is suggestive of

³⁰Hirst and Zwicker have called attention to the receding figure of Fairfax and the prominence of the speaker and Maria toward the poem's end ("High Summer" 262-3); rightly, I think, they nonetheless regard Fairfax as the poem's main focus (263). But they see "the exclusion of Lord Fairfax from the last third of the poem" as "a matter of tactics" for a poet responding, as they argue Marvell does, to Fairfax's choice as to whether to return to military life in order to defend England from Charles Stuart's Scottish forces (255): "The concentration on dependent characters argues away from the cruel necessity of choice facing Fairfax that summer. How much easier to contemplate the future if making your destiny your choice in a political crisis involves nothing further than contemplating the future marriage of your daughter" ("High Summer" 263).

Marvell's own status as Mary Fairfax's tutor and of the speaker's portrayal of himself as a poet at leisure.⁸¹ The rest of the stanza intensifies this latter suggestion:

Oh what a pleasure 'tis to hedge
My temples here with heavy sedge;
Abandoning my lazy side,
Stretched as a bank unto the tide;
Or to suspend my sliding foot
On th'osier's underminèd root,
And in its branches tough to hang,
While at my lines the fishes twang! (641-48)

The phrase "sliding foot," followed by the elision in the next line, alludes to the poetic unit of measure; the last line of the stanza refers to taut fishing-lines but also allows us to imagine fish "twang[ing]" those fishing-lines in response to, or in time with, the speaker's recitation of verse (*OED* "twang," v.¹, 3). Likewise, although the speaker's mention of "idle utensils" in the next stanza ostensibly refers to fishing implements (650), "quills" can also mean "pens" (*OED* "quill," n.¹, 1.b), and "hooks" has meanings related to written language and printing (*OED* "hook," n.¹, 10.a, 10.b). In addition to representing the speaker as a poet, the passage, by depicting his leisure, also recognizes Fairfax as patron of poetic art.

The poem's focus on Maria's intellectual pursuits, and on the virtues that her studies both reflect and shape, again reiterates her family's and especially her father's legacy. Having praised her virtues, which combat vanity and thus set her apart from the "fond sex" (729), the speaker declares, "Hence she with graces more divine / Supplies beyond her sex the line" (737-38). "Line" here has multiple meanings. Two relate specifically to virtue: "standard of life or practice" (*OED* "line," n.², 5) and "Course of action,

³¹Rosalie L. Colie finds "two selves in the figure, the languid fisherman and the poet noting him, commenting on his pleasure in the libertine formula: 'Oh what a Pleasure 'tis . . .'" (269).

procedure, life, thought, or conduct” (27).⁸² Also important are “Lineage, stock, race” (25) and more particularly “family descent” (24.a); the latter meaning is perhaps foremost in the stanza, given that the speaker then turns to the expectation that Maria will carry on the family line through marriage (739-44). Finally, “line” can refer to a line of poetry (23.e), a sense that reflects Mary Fairfax’s study of language with Marvell as her tutor.⁸³

A few stanzas earlier, the speaker praises Mary’s divine motivations for learning languages:

She counts her beauty to converse
In all the languages as hers;
Nor yet in those herself employs

³²“Line,” as it refers to “A furrow or seam in the face or hands” (8.b), also points back to the foregoing stanza, which contemns women who care more about avoiding wrinkles than giving expression to moral standards (729-36). Maria, unafraid to frown at vice, “Supplies . . . the line” in a way that vainer women do not.

³³This sense is strengthened by the musical references implicit in “graces” and “line”: the former can mean “embellishment[s] consisting of additional notes introduced into vocal or instrumental music, not essential to the harmony or melody” (*OED* “grace,” n., 3), and the latter, “ledger lines” in musical notation (*OED* “line,” n.², 7.b). Because poetry and music are so closely related, these meanings could also imply poetic pursuits rather than music strictly speaking. Also relevant here are lines 17-26 of Marvell’s “To His Worthy Friend Doctor Witty upon His Translation of the Popular Errors,” which praise “Celia”—often understood to be Mary Fairfax, though Smith points out that the lines may refer to Frances Strickland, the dedicatee of Witty’s translation (Smith, *Poems* 178)—for remaining very much herself, and English, while learning Italian and French: “Her native beauty’s note Italianated, / Nor her chaste mind into the French translated: / Her thoughts are English, though her sparkling wit / With other language doth them fitly fit” (23-26). Smith finds in the second line quoted here “possibly a reference to the more sexually explicit *libertin* poetry (including some of Saint Amant’s verse) being read at Appleton House” (Smith, *Poems* 179 n24). And “Epigramma in duos montes Amosclivum et Bilboreum. Farfacio” ends with this description of the two heights: “An potius, longe sic prona cacumina nutant, / Parnassus cupiant esse Maria tuus” (23-24), translated by Smith as “or rather thus do the peaks bow down from a distance; they wish to be your Parnassus, Mary” (Smith, *Poems* 202). Michael Craze views this ending as “a smiling invitation to young Mary to try writing poetry” (143); he points out that “Mount Parnassus, the classical haunt of the Muses, was often said to have two heights. Mary could only gain a Parnassus by loving the Muses and worshipping them, either by studying the classics or writing English poems of her own” (144).

But for the wisdom, not the noise;
Nor yet that wisdom would affect,
But as 'tis heaven's dialect. (707-12)

This single word thus draws together notions of virtue, family, and art, particularly literary study; in doing so, it implicitly recognizes Lord Fairfax's poetic pursuits and those of the family more generally.

The speaker reiterates this convergence of familial and literary lines in the next stanza: "Meantime, ye fields, springs, bushes, flowers, / Where yet she leads her studious hours, / (Till Fate her worthily translates, / And find a Fairfax for our Thwaites)" (745-48). Here, "translates," meaning "bear[s], convey[s], or remove[s] from one person, place or condition to another . . ." (*OED* "translate," v., 1.a), can anticipate a future change in Maria's location: upon marriage, she will presumably leave, if not the "fields, springs, bushes, flowers" of the estate, then at least the "studious hours" spent in them, in order to focus on her domestic duties as wife, mother, and mistress of a household. But "translates" can also mean "turns from one language into another . . ." (2.a) or "interpret[s], explain[s]," and "expound[s] the significance of (conduct, gestures, etc.)" (3). Here, then, she is analogous to the literary works that her father and other family members have translated; Fate will operate on her as those readers have upon texts and as she has upon the languages she studies. One implication is that in providing her a marriage, Fate will make her intelligible in a new way or to a wider audience, revealing her significance more fully or clearly. Thus, the speaker suggests, her importance will become most evident as she carries on the Fairfax line, with its attendant literary traditions and Protestant virtues. As she "[s]upplies . . . the line" and is "translate[d]" in marriage (738, 747), Maria becomes in some ways analogous to her father's intellectual

work; the praises of her constitute a tribute to Lord Fairfax as both father and poet-scholar, and they bind these two identities together in ways that emphasize longevity and constancy in a time of uncertainty and danger.⁸⁴

While the poem treats poetry in terms of private study, the references to the masque necessarily involve the consequences of war more directly. The masque had been an important form of entertainment as well as political statement under James, and it remained so under Charles (Corns, “Duke” 2-3; Peacock 231). But after *Salmacida Spolia* in 1640, masques ceased to be performed at court, and with the regicide, these performances might well have been thought entirely a thing of the past.⁸⁵ Marvell invokes these entertainments several times in “Upon Appleton House,” suggesting their status as arts of peace but also the survival of their influence, in different forms and images, during and after the civil wars.

The most closely linked references to masques, which occur in the meadow passage, simultaneously register an awareness of war and establish harmony between human action and natural cycles. They thus link art—both the technical skills required in mowing and the literary and visual arts that contributed to the masque—with destruction as well as with creation, and with the land, both the English terrain and the Fairfax estate.

³⁴Here I follow Derek Hirst and Steven Zwicker’s explanation of Maria’s and Lord Fairfax’s relative importance in the poem. For Hirst and Zwicker, Fairfax “is the present, the figure through whom so much of the history recorded in the poem is transmitted to the future. Though Marvell gracefully allows Mary a role in that transmission, he effectually writes her out of it, and in doing so delicately glosses over the implications for the Fairfax line of a female descent: ‘While her *glad Parents* most rejoice, / And make their *Destiny* their *Choice*’ (743-4)” (“High Summer” 263). My emphasis differs from theirs, but I agree that the praise of Maria has much to do with Fairfax and his family’s legacies.

³⁵Actually, however, the Portuguese ambassador was entertained with a state performance of James Shirley’s masque *Cupid and Death* in 1653 (McDowell 240).

So much is clear from the introduction of the mowers: “No scene that turns with engines
 strange / Does oft’ner than these meadows change. / For when the sun the grass hath
 vexed, / The tawny mowers enter next” (385-88). Here the scene change is imagined as a
 change from the sun’s action to the mowers’; the change depends upon the cooperation
 between nature and humans, but both of these cause destruction. Masques are invoked
 again in the “new traverse” once the hay is mown (419; Smith, *Poems* 228 n419, citing
OED “traverse,” n., 13.a), when “[t]he women that with forks it fling / Do represent the
 pillaging” (423-24), and in the description of the dancing (425-32). Another scene
 change occurs with the removal of the haycocks: “This scene again withdrawing brings /
 A new and empty face of things” (441-42). Here, the change again involves cooperation
 between humans and nature and, again, movement from one kind of destruction to
 another; the mowers having exited, “The villagers in common chase / Their cattle, which
 it closer rase; / And what below the scythe increased / Is pinched yet nearer by the beast”
 (451-54). Finally, one more type of destruction occurs, this one too caused by human
 ingenuity’s acting on nature: “Then, to conclude these pleasant acts, / Denton sets ope its
 cataracts” (465-66).⁸⁶

³⁶The meadow passage also emphasizes forms of art associated with the masque:
 dancing, as has been noted above, but also painting and writing. The poem invokes
 painting in numerous passages: the “new traverse” of the mown field may be meant to
 resemble a painting of a battlefield (419-24; Smith, *Poems* 228 n419); the speaker
 compares the empty meadow to “cloths for Lely stretched to stain” (444); and Marvell
 alludes to Davenant’s “painted world” (455-56), the painted scenes decorating Astragon’s
 palace in *Gondibert* (Smith, *Poems* 230 n455-56). The references to the “table rase and
 pure” (446) and “the painted world” also involve writing: Smith glosses the former as “a
 blank writing tablet” but also “one on which the writing has been erased” (*Poems* 229
 n446), and Marvell’s phrase “Dav’nant with th’universal herd” (455-56) implies that “the
 painted world” is as much Davenant’s poem as it is the world created by visual art.

That these references to the masque are linked with court culture and with study becomes especially clear in later descriptions of the speaker and Maria. In the forest passage, the speaker, having explained his study of “Nature’s mystic book” (584), exclaims, “And see how Chance’s better wit / Could with a masque my studies hit!” (585-86). Smith points out that “masque” here can mean both dramatic performance and “disguise” (*Poems* 234 n586); the phrase “antic cope,” the comparison to a “great prelate of the grove,” and the mention of “embroider[y]” (587) all suggest that the forest outfits the speaker with a costume, but they also reflect debates about the externals of worship, debates that became central to the civil wars. The speaker is not aligning himself with the court or the Laudian church but rather is recalling values associated with Charles and Laud.⁸⁷ Similarly, the figure of Maria is associated with the masque and with Caroline symbolism. In describing the halcyon’s flight, a symbol of the peace under Charles in the years before the wars (Smith, *Poems* 238 n669-72), the speaker imagines the bird’s quieting effect on humans as well as nature: “And men with silent scene assist, / Charmed with the sapphire-wingèd mist” (679-80). In turn, the speaker compares Maria to this bird: “Maria such, and so doth hush / The world, and through the ev’ning rush” (681-82). Thus Maria is imagined, like the halcyon, as a performer in a masque in which, as in the meadow scenes, nature and humans cooperate. The difference is that here the masque is peaceful and stilling rather than reflective of strife and cycles of destruction and renewal.

By writing of the meadows, forest, and river in terms of court masque, Marvell emphasizes the difference between actual masques, with their magnificent costumes and scenery, and the activities of the mowers and their womenfolk, the wildlife found on the

³⁷Smith’s notes imply distance between the speaker and Laudian ideals (*Poems* 234 n591).

estate, and the speaker and Maria. The masque scenes on the estate follow natural—if, in the case of the meadows, violent or extreme—cycles, even though these cycles are defined in part by human activities meant to take advantage of them. Court masques, on the other hand, were highly and obviously artificial; indeed part of their glamour came from the beauty and intricacy of their scenery and costumes.

Here, then, the imagery of the masque persists after the end of Charles's reign and his life, and it does so in a poem dedicated to a man who had served as Lord General of the Army that fought the king. But the imagery is less incongruous than the context suggests. Nicholas McDowell has argued convincingly that Marvell's poetic responses to England's shifting political status were based on loyalty to "the cause of wit"; family traditions of Protestant service and literary endeavors make Fairfax and his descendants excellent candidates for bearing the legacy of English wit in the absence of court patronage—particularly because Lord Fairfax was Marvell's patron.⁸⁸ Whereas court masques depended upon the artifice of costumes and scenery, the masquelike elements of the Fairfax estate arise from natural processes and from productive human responses to these cycles. And as the last reference to the masque implies, Maria's beauty and virtue also inspire the speaker to imagine the masque in these ways. The estate, then, resembles Charles's court in offering variety, beauty and art, and moral instruction. But, as we shall see, it does so in ways that avoid or correct that court's errors.

In fact, the poem once again uses a literary reference to evoke criticisms of Charles's court as well as debates about the origin of political power and authority. Marvell's

⁸⁸See especially chapters 1, 4, and 5 of McDowell's *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars*. McDowell's analysis ends with the "Horatian Ode" and "Tom May's Death" and thus does not include extended discussion of "Upon Appleton House" or Fairfax's significance in, to borrow a phrase from McDowell's title, "the cause of wit."

echoes of Shakespeare's *Richard II* commemorate the flourishing of the English theatre under Elizabeth I, Charles's appreciation for dramatic art, and the loss of that art with the closing of the theatres. These echoes thus remind us that drama is in some ways an art of peace, but one with important and sometimes unsettling implications for rulers and subjects alike.

Stanza 41 of Marvell's poem, which begins the lament for England's descent into civil war, resembles key passages of Shakespeare's play in both phrasing and imagery.⁸⁹ Nigel Smith has noted (*Poems* 225 n322-3) that the lines "The garden of the world ere while, / Thou Paradise of four seas" (322-23) recall two passages from the play: John of Gaunt's reference to "This other Eden, demi-paradise" and an under-gardener's assertion that "our sea-walled garden, the whole land, / Is full of weeds, her fairest flowers chok'd up" (2.1.42, 3.4.43-44). But the similarities are even stronger. Marvell's phrase "that dear and happy isle" (321) echoes John of Gaunt's "This land of such dear souls, this dear dear land, / Dear for her reputation through the world" (2.1.57-58). And Marvell's description of England as "Thou Paradise of four seas, / Which heaven planted us to please, / But to exclude the world, did guard / With wat'ry if not flaming sword" (323-26) recalls Gaunt's image of England as

This fortress built by Nature for herself
Against infection and the hand of war,
This happy breed of men, this little world,
This precious stone set in the silver sea,
Which serves it in the office of a wall,
Or as a moat defensive to a house,
Against the envy of less happier lands[.] (2.1.43-49)

³⁹The stanza number may reflect the beginning of outright conflict between Charles and his subjects in 1641, which saw several Irish rebellions and the abolition of the episcopate in Scotland.

Like the Fall in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 3:1-6), England's falls under Richard II and Charles I originated from internal weakness, not from external force; Shakespeare's play and Marvell's poem sound the same tragic note.

These resemblances of Marvell's poem to Shakespeare's play suggest the continuing influence of drama on art and political discourse alike even after the closure of the theatres. More specifically, they serve as reminders of how dramatic art could be appropriated by political discourse.⁴⁰ Marvell's echoing of a play that represents the history of a rebellion, deposition, and regicide clearly registers a relationship between Shakespeare's work and the events of the 1640s, particularly Charles's execution. And the poem—like the play before it, as we shall see—uses garden imagery and especially references to Paradise to depict political unrest in terms of the Fall (321-28). In the play, Richard is repeatedly accused of frivolous and corrupt pursuits (2.1.17-30) and of mismanagement of land and finances (2.1.95-114, 2.1.189-208, 2.1.246-69). Likewise Charles faced public suspicion of Henrietta Maria and strong criticism of his attempts to tax his subjects, notably through ship money. The play also represents through Bolingbroke and his supporters—including the reluctant York (2.3.152-70)—the notion that a bad king requires a corrective from his subjects. In these ways, a play associated with times of peace—both in its Elizabethan origin and in its performance before England's civil wars—resonates with questions of war and regicide. Echoes of *Richard II* in the Interregnum might have had divergent—though, as Fairfax's position proves,

⁴⁰Some critics, according to Peter Ure's introduction to *Richard II*, have argued that the play was used by Sir John Hayward as a source for *The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII* (1599), actually a history of Richard II's final years of rule (lviii); Hayward and his book ran afoul of the authorities by supporting Essex when the latter's reputation with Elizabeth was in decline (lviii). See Peter Ure's discussion of possible relationships between Hayward's work and Shakespeare's (lviii-lxii).

reconcilable—effects: on the one hand, reminding readers of reasons for and defenses of rebellion against a king, and on the other, exciting sympathy for Charles.

“Upon Appleton House” registers the complex relationship between the poetic and dramatic “arts of peace” and Marvell’s war-torn England. These literary arts are linked with England’s peace and prosperity under Elizabeth and especially James I and Charles—but they recall too the problems of Charles’s reign. Fairfax’s estate and family represent ways of recuperating these arts and the virtues they represent and even, perhaps, inculcate. Marvell’s poem thus establishes a close relationship between these arts and the land itself, a relationship that proves crucial for understanding gardening’s significance in the poem.

Fairfax and “The garden of the world”

Marvell’s poem represents the relationship between gardening and war as a vexed one. Gardens are contrasted with the turmoil of war, yet the poem describes Fairfax’s gardens in terms of military organization. Because the poem depicts gardening as a military but not necessarily a “warlike” art, the gardens can thus commemorate Fairfax’s values as Lord General and subtly question the assumption that good military leadership is proven primarily in fighting. Yet this meaning suggests a larger point about the speaker’s attitude toward gardens’ symbolism. For him, the nation and the gardens often invoked as symbols of it are threatened by war and also by Fairfax’s retirement from the army. One way or the other, gardens, the speaker seems to fear, can never have quite the same meaning for England again, even though private gardens like Fairfax’s can still body forth the order, beauty, and peacefulness once associated with England itself. The

poem laments not the death of gardens but instead the possible death of gardens' symbolic potential for the nation.

The poem twice describes gardens in military terms, but it does so in ways that call this practice into question. An extended conceit figures the Fairfax gardens as a fort and their denizens as soldiers (285-320). The speaker then laments the loss of the "sweet militia" (330) that represented England before the descent into civil war, a time when military images were only ways of representing horticulture (331-42). But the poem repeatedly acknowledges the incongruity between gardens and war. The opening lines of the garden passage, for example, describe the horticultural work of one of Fairfax's famous soldier-ancestors—"probably," according to Smith, "Sir Thomas Fairfax, son of William Fairfax and Isabel Thwaites" (*Poems* 223 n281)—

Who, when retirèd here to peace,
His warlike studies could not cease;
But laid these gardens out in sport
In the just figure of a fort;
And with five bastions it did fence,
As aiming one for ev'ry sense. (283-88)

Though the second line of this passage suggests continuity between "warlike studies" and garden design, that continuity is asserted with tongue firmly in cheek, as the phrase "in sport" indicates. The gardens' design is striking not only because of its accuracy but also because of its incongruity. The adjective "just" neatly encapsulates these two senses: it means "[e]xact" or "accurate," or "[c]haracterized by or involving exact correspondence" (*OED*, "just," *a.*, 6.b; 10.b), but also "[c]onformable to the standard, or to what is fitting or requisite . . ." (5), and "[a]dapted to something else, or to an end or purpose; appropriate, suitable" (7). The design is "sport[ive]" precisely insofar as its accuracy heightens the contrast of the beautiful and peaceful with the ugly and traumatic and also

insofar as its purpose is at odds with its form: a fort usually serves “defensive or protective purposes . . .” (*OED*, “fort” *n.*¹, 1), not offensive ones, but even though the speaker thus imagines the gardens as defending themselves against attack by the senses, the supposed defense is actually meant to attract and delight its targets, not to repulse them.⁹¹ Finally, then, both the senses’ assault and the defense against it involve pleasure, not pain, and so in this way too the gardens depart from as well as continue their designer’s “warlike studies.”

The later lines of the garden passage reiterate these differences between the gardens and military experiences. The flowers’ shots are meant only “to salute” the Lord and Lady Fairfax (299, 297-300), not to ward off anyone. In fact the only reference to an unpleasant attack is the possibility of a bee sting: “if once stirred, / She runs you through, nor asks the word” (319-20). And even then the attack is defensive rather than offensive.⁹² Moreover, this couplet accentuates the difference between the Fairfax estate’s peacefulness and the nation’s turmoil; the seemingly trivial threat of the bee-sting sharpens our awareness of fatal runnings-through on England’s battlegrounds and of the possibility of more deaths in Leveller riots, activity among millenarian soldiers, or a

⁴¹Stanzas 37-40 describe the gardens’ assaults on the senses of sight and smell (289-308). The same passage also acknowledges the bee’s effects on the senses of hearing and touch (291-92, 320). These stanzas describe only flowers, not fruits; the lone reference to taste occurs in the speaker’s lament for England’s lost Edenic status: “What luckless apple did we taste, / To make us mortal, and thee waste?” (327-28). The omission may imply that Fairfax’s gardens defend against temptation better than most, or it may silently acknowledge that this garden bears an inescapable comparison to and contrast with the Garden of Eden. (Alternatively, perhaps the Fairfax gardens included no fruit-bearing plants or trees.)

⁹²On traditions of writing about bees as political and social animals, see Chapter 4 of Claire Preston’s *Bee* (53-75).

Scottish-Royalist bid for power.⁹³ In all these ways, then, the poem emphasizes the difference between military aggression and the peace and harmony of the Nun Appleton gardens.

And yet in some ways the gardens fairly represent Fairfax's military career. The speaker's description of them emphasizes discipline, order, and security (289-320)—markers of good military leadership, and features, he implies, of Fairfax's tenure as Lord General.⁹⁴ Likewise, the bee's purely defensive function (319-20) pays tribute to Fairfax's unwillingness to initiate battle with the Scots in 1650, the matter that prompted his retirement from the Army. Thus although the poem foregrounds incongruities between war and gardens, it allows for analogies between military life and gardens; one implication is that good military leadership consists of more than—and perhaps, when possible, alternatives to—fighting.⁹⁵

In this context, then, it is perhaps unsurprising that the speaker attributes to Fairfax the position that gardens, and garden images, are better suited to self-cultivation than to cultivation of the state. The speaker sees Fairfax as having had the potential to restore

⁴³Hirst and Zwicker, as part of their argument dating "Upon Appleton House" to the summer of 1651, identify these threats as part of the context for the poem's many references to war ("High Summer" 252-4, 250).

⁴⁴Ian J. Gentles offers a helpful brief overview of Fairfax's stunning military successes in the first civil war as well as his declining influence in the second ("Fairfax, Thomas" *ODNB*).

⁴⁵I am not implying that Marvell necessarily took this view of war; a safer reading is that the passage compliments Fairfax on his reason for resigning from the Army: namely his refusal to attack Scotland without provocation. Marvell did write, years later in *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* (1672), "I think the Cause was too good to have been fought for" (192), but what Marvell meant by that statement has been debated. Christopher Hill writes, for example, "If the cause was too good to have been fought *for*, *a fortiori* it was too good to fight *against*—as Charles I had done" ("Milton" 16).

England to peace and plenty, to “have made our gardens spring / Fresh as his own and flourishing” (347-48), but as having chosen instead to limit his “Power” and retire to “These five imaginary forts” (351-52, 350). The reason, the speaker tells us, involved self-cultivation: “For he did, with his utmost skill, / Ambition weed, but conscience till” (353-54). These passages compliment Fairfax’s virtue while asserting England’s continuing status as “waste” land (328). They also reveal that Marvell’s speaker is constructing a narrative in which Fairfax associates gardening with self-improvement more than with improvement of the nation. Fairfax’s withdrawal from war, for the speaker, means abandonment of English gardens. But continued military service might have meant, in the speaker’s argument, compromising the cultivation of the soul as well as contributing to the figurative threat to gardens.

Ultimately, the speaker’s use of garden imagery reveals the fear that the garden can no longer serve as an apt symbol for England. This fear is evident in the speaker’s lament for England as a paradise lost, possibly forever:

What luckless apple did we taste,
To make us mortal, and thee waste?

Unhappy! Shall we never more
That sweet militia restore,
When gardens only had their towers,
And all the garrisons were flowers,
When roses only arms might bear,
And men did rosy garlands wear? (327-34)

The same fear emerges in his assertion that war infects not only the emphasis on gardening that marked England’s peaceful years, but even the language itself:

The gard’ner had the soldier’s place,
And his more gentle forts did trace.
The nursery of all things green
Was then the only magazine.

The winter quarters were the stoves,
Where he the tender plants removes.
But war all this doth overgrow:
We ordnance plant and powder sow. (337-44)⁹⁶

Private gardens like Fairfax's, the speaker implies, can continue to thrive in the face of war, but these gardens can no longer truly represent the nation: the symbol is threatened by both the continuation of war and Fairfax's retirement from it.

Although the speaker insists on a close relationship between military activity and gardens, then, the ultimate effect is to foreground his concern that England can no longer be appropriately symbolized by gardens, either because war will figuratively taint the image beyond recovery or because the literal gardens on which the symbol depended, out of which it grew, will suffer the continued effects of war. As we shall see, this concern casts doubt not only on the image of Fairfax as gardener-general but on the viability of that trope itself.

The Gardener-General Trope: "Against Infection and the Hand of War"

The speaker seems reluctant to give up the notion of Fairfax as gardener-general. Yet, by emphasizing the incongruities more than the similarities between military activity and gardens, the poem reveals a problem of the postlapsarian imagination: to describe gardens in terms of war is to attempt to redeem both horticulture and military experience, but it is also to recognize gardens' exposure to the taint of war. The speaker implies that Fairfax is praiseworthy for maintaining a clear distinction between gardening and military activity: from the turmoil of the wars he can perhaps recover, if not England's

⁴⁶The *Oxford English Dictionary* records specifically military uses of "plant" from this period (v., 4.b) but not of "sow."

peace, then at least her gardens' significance. Fairfax's conduct and motives, as they are described in the poem, rectify two possible difficulties with the gardener-general trope: the identification of gardening with war and the potential for obscuring God's authority. These difficulties appear to receive limited, and in the latter's case oblique, attention in the poem, but Marvell's allusions to *Richard II* give them more emphasis: the play deals extensively with both matters. Indeed, I would argue that Marvell's treatment of the gardener-general trope responds to Shakespeare's treatment of the gardener-king trope in such ways that by the end of the garden passage in "Upon Appleton House," the gardener-general trope's status remains in doubt.

As we have already seen, the speaker twice invokes the image of the gardener-general: once when he calls Fairfax the flowers' "Governor" (297), and again when he says of England that Fairfax "Might once have made our gardens spring / Fresh as his own and flourishing" (347-48). Yet, as we have also seen, his other statements call our attention to the differences between gardens and military life more consistently than to the similarities. That emphasis reveals an important problem with the speaker's imagination, which is postlapsarian in two senses: after the Fall in the Garden of Eden, but also after England's fall into civil war. That imagination collapses some crucial distinctions between garden life, which is usually troped as innocent and peaceful, and military life, which arises from and perhaps also perpetuates discord and turmoil even as it attempts, at least in the best circumstances, to institute order and peace.⁹⁷

⁴⁷ According to the speaker, the horticultural metaphors applied to war do violence to gardens. These metaphors thus perhaps do the same thing as military operations: in establishing correspondence or harmony they evoke an awareness of discord. To the degree that the same is true of other metaphors, this point relates to Samuel Johnson's proclamation that "Wit . . . may be more rigorously and philosophically considered as a

The speaker—whose consciousness, after the wars, is fallen but who can still speak of an unfallen time—both commits and describes this error of ignoring the distinctions between the horticultural and military realms of experience. In describing Fairfax’s gardens in military terms, the speaker seems for Fairfax’s sake to try to redeem military life in some way: if gardens are like forts, then surely forts are in some ways like gardens. Indeed the speaker implies as much in his description of Fairfax himself. Having identified the former general as the gardens’ “Governor” (297), he now tropes the former general as a gardener:

And yet there walks one on the sod
Who, had it pleased him and God,
Might once have made our gardens spring
Fresh as his own and flourishing. (345-48)

These lines depict Fairfax’s military career as a kind of national cultivation. They thus constitute a compliment to, or redeeming of, that career. But they also recall the speaker’s depiction of prewar England’s gardening as a natural analogue for military activity (329-42)—a figure that gives an odd priority or emphasis to military life even as it purports to do the opposite. The trickiness of this figure is not, I think, an indication of the speaker’s disingenuousness but rather an index of civil war’s damaging effects on the land and on human imagination and language alike.

The speaker himself points out this latter kind of damage in terms of analogies between gardening and military power: having grieved the loss of a time when martial activity was purely horticultural and innocent (329-42), he remarks, “But war all this doth

kind of *discordia concors*; a combination of dissimilar images, or discovery of occult resemblances in things apparently unlike. Of wit, thus defined,” he goes on to say of the metaphysical poets, “they have more than enough. The most heterogeneous ideas are yoked by violence together . . .” (14).

overgrow: / We ordnance plant and powder sow” (343-44). This assertion registers the war’s injuries to vegetation, as does the description of the estate’s trees, “Of whom . . . many fell in war” (493).⁹⁸ But it also implies that war infects the very language of horticulture; the speaker himself allows the language of war to “overgrow” that of gardening in his descriptions of Fairfax’s gardens and of England before the wars.⁹⁹ The complaint is recorded even in the line’s structure, where the word order is inverted to subject-object-verb, and in its prosody, where the monosyllabic verbs of gardening receive powerful stresses ending each half of the line:

~ / ~ / ~ / ~ /
 We ordnance plant and powder sow. (344)

This infection informs the speaker’s assertion that Fairfax “Might once have made our gardens spring / Fresh as his own and flourishing” (347-48); whatever improvements for the land and the people could have been depicted in horticultural terms, Fairfax would presumably have achieved them through military power.¹⁰⁰ The fact that the speaker describes Fairfax’s military potential in terms of gardens characterizes his imagination as infected in precisely the way about which he complains.¹⁰¹

⁴⁸Keith Thomas, in *Man and the Natural World*, also notes “[t]he depredations wrought in the 1650s upon the estates of the Crown, Church and supporters of Charles I,” though he observes that “Royalist propagandists” like John Evelyn “exaggerated” these cases for political reasons (209).

⁴⁹In those descriptions, however, the focus is still on gardens depicted in military terms rather than on military events depicted in horticultural terms.

⁵⁰There may, however, also be an oblique reference here to Fairfax’s 1649 proclamation commanding soldiers to stop trespassing on and stealing from private gardens—an instance of his protecting gardens by means of his military position.

⁵¹Marvell uses a similar technique in “The Mower against Gardens.” Nigel Smith, citing Frank Kermode’s argument that this poem engages Thomas Randolph’s “Upon Love

Indeed, the speaker appears, in his example of how “war all this doth overgrow” (343), to recognize his own postlapsarian condition. Moreover, he implicitly contrasts it with what he represents as Fairfax’s redeemed and redemptive imagination, which maintains important distinctions between gardening and military experience. The speaker’s explanation of Fairfax’s retirement, the Lord General’s refusal to fulfill his potential as the nation’s gardener, centers on conscience. At first this explanation appears critical, as if Fairfax retired in order to gratify his imagination: “But he preferred to the Cinque Ports / These five imaginary forts: / And, in those half-dry trenches, spanned / Power which the ocean might command” (349-52). These lines register suspicion of the imaginative faculty and of the leisure and pleasure associated with private gardens.¹⁰²

fondly refus’d for Conscience sake” (1647) and Blatt’s reading of Marvell’s poem as a response to Henry Vaughan’s “Corruption” (1650) (*Poems* 131-32), observes, “Although M[arvell]’s mower is against grafting, the poem is, in effect, a verbal grafting of two different poems to form a hybrid: it therefore imitates in its form the subject of its complaint” (*Poems* 132).

⁵²For sources on suspicious attitudes toward poetry and retirement as context for Marvell’s “Horatian Ode,” see Smith’s headnote to the poem (*Poems* 268). And for an Elizabethan depiction of the dangerous garden, see Spenser’s description of the Bower of Bliss in *The Faerie Queene* (2.12.42-83). There Sir Guyon finds a knight led astray by arts badly used:

His warlike armes, the idle instruments
Of sleeping praise, were hong vpon a tree,
And his braue shield, full of gold moniments,
Was fowly ra’st, that none the signes might see;
Ne for them, ne for honour cared hee,
Ne ought, that did to his aduancement tend,
But in lewd loues, and wastfull luxuree,
His dayes, his goods, his bodie he did spend:

O horrible enchantment, that him so did blend. (2.12.80)

Smith writes that Fairfax “liked *The Faerie Queene* and had a horse called Brigadore, named after the steed stolen by Braggadochio from Guyon (V.ii.29)” (*Poems* 224 n288; see also E.E. Duncan-Jones 193).

The next stanza, however, puts Fairfax's retirement in a better light:

For he did, with his utmost skill,
Ambition weed, but conscience till.
Conscience, that heaven-nursèd plant,
Which most our earthly gardens want.
A prickling leaf it bears, and such
As that which shrinks at every touch;
But flowers eternal, and divine,
That in the crowns of saints do shine. (353-60)

The "five imaginary forts" of the estate gardens thus become emblematic of Fairfax's spiritual development: he aspires to cultivate his soul more than the nation; he will forgo the civic crown for one of "the crowns of saints."¹⁰³ The gardening image here defends him against the accusation that he retired from the Army to live in leisurely contemplation: "weed" and "till" suggest hard work. But it also reveals the speaker praising Fairfax for choosing cultivation of the soul over cultivation of England—for, as the speaker imagines it, relinquishing the ideal of the gardener-general in favor of that of the gardener-saint.

The passage quoted above, furthermore, complicates the gardener image by describing Fairfax, or at least his soul, as a garden. Representing Fairfax as both gardener and garden has profound implications for the gardener-general trope even as it offers a subtle tribute to his virtue and ethics as a general. The earlier image of Fairfax as the "Governor" of his gardens (297) invests him with authority, but figuring the soul as a garden suggests that no position of human authority involves (or ought to involve)

⁵³ Compare William Marshall's frontispiece to *Eikon Basilike* (1649), which depicts Charles I kneeling before the Bible, with his crown of state cast down at his feet, grasping a crown of thorns and looking up at a heavenly crown. Outside, in an image that also suggests the cultivation of the soul, is a field planted with two trees and with rows of smaller plants; one of the trees bears a banner that reads, "CRESCIT SUB PONDERE VIRTUS" ("Virtue Grows under Weight") (S4v-S5r).

absolute power. The image of the sensitive plant, moreover, responds to the potential for dehumanization implicit in gardener-king and gardener-general imagery: one implication of that imagery is that humans are as plants to be judged by the gardener, their king (or general), and to be shaped, nourished, or eradicated as that gardener sees fit. But Marvell's invoking the sensitive plant has a humanizing effect, alluding as it does to a likeness of sensation between a certain kind of plant—"herba mimosa, at least one kind of which is prickly" (Smith, *Poems* 226 n358)—and humans. Even as the image confirms Fairfax's sensitivity of conscience, then, it also suggests that the image of a plant, applied to a human, does not deny or diminish human qualities. Here, Fairfax is not so much lord of his gardens as like them.

This comparison participates in the Christian tradition of the soul as garden. In this tradition, which, as Stanley Stewart demonstrates (124-26), appears in both Catholic and Protestant works, each person is responsible for cultivating his or her own soul, but God is ultimately Lord of all these gardens: "By becoming the gardener of his soul, man profitably imitates Christ, who is the gardener supreme" (Stewart 124). If Fairfax's soul is a garden, then presumably there is a Gardener superior to him. That Gardener, the poem implies, is God; so much is clear from the speaker's notion that Fairfax might have cultivated all of England "had it pleased him and God" (346). Fairfax's decision to retire, then, is attributed to his cooperation with God's will. Fairfax, according to the speaker, felt that the care of his soul required him to limit his power, to be lord of private gardens rather than Lord General of the garden of England: "For he did, with his utmost skill, / Ambition weed, but conscience till" (353-54). The speaker's account of Fairfax's submission to God suggests that the speaker finds the gardener-general trope to be

potentially flawed insofar as it allows God's role as master Gardener to be obscured. The speaker thus imagines Fairfax as avoiding the pitfall of relying naively on this trope; though the speaker invokes this trope, he seems suspicious of his own imagination and admiring of Fairfax's decision, which the speaker understands in terms of a separation of gardening from war. And in addition to attributing such a perspective to Fairfax himself, the speaker also implies that it is a quality of Fairfax's ancestor, and thus a part of his legacy, along with Protestant virtue and military service: the speaker uses the phrase "in sport" as he describes the creation of gardens "In the just figure of a fort" (286); the "sport," as we have noticed already, consists partly in the recognition of how different the two realms of experience actually are.¹⁰⁴

This scrutiny of the gardener-general trope is partly a response to Shakespeare's treatment of the gardener-king trope tainted by civil war. Allusions to *Richard II* occur in stanza 41, between the initial identification of Lord Fairfax as the Nun Appleton gardens' "Governor" (297) and the assertion that Fairfax "Might once have made our gardens spring / Fresh as his own and flourishing" (347-48). The placement and nature of these allusions hint at the significance, for Marvell's poem, of the play's images of national leaders and subjects as both gardeners and plants; I would argue that the play's complications of the gardener-king trope inform Marvell's application of the gardener image to Fairfax. In *Richard II*, images of subjects as gardeners refer to rebellion and usurpation; images of the king as a plant refer to God's authority as Gardener. In the

⁵⁴The speaker's wordplay, by contrast, claims a figuratively horticultural source for the family's legacy of military service: he opens the description of the gardens' origin in "warlike studies" (284) with the couplet "From that blest bed the hero came, / Whom France and Poland yet does fame" (281-82). The word "bed" here signals both the Thwaites-Fairfax marriage bed and the image of the family, and its estate, as a garden or nursery (see *OED* "bed," n., 2.b, 8).

context of the play's gardening imagery, the speaker's figuring Fairfax as a gardener of his soul in "Upon Appleton House" distances the former Lord General from corrupt rebellion and thus serves as both compliment and protection from criticism.¹⁰⁵

In its most sustained engagement with the gardener-king trope—the center of Act 3, Scene 4, in which a gardener and his helper debate the relationship of their work to the nation's condition (3.4.29-66)—the play examines the notion that a good king ought to be like a good gardener. The gardener commands, "Go thou, and like an executioner / Cut off the heads of too fast growing sprays, / That look too lofty in our commonwealth: / All must be even in our government" (3.4.33-36). But the servant objects to what he sees as a futile enterprise:

Why should we, in the compass of a pale,
Keep law and form and due proportion,
Showing, as in a model, our firm estate,
When our sea-walled garden, the whole land,
Is full of weeds, her fairest flowers chok'd up,
Her fruit-trees all unprun'd, her hedges ruin'd,
Her knots disordered, and her wholesome herbs
Swarming with caterpillars? (3.4.40-47a)

For him, horticulture is meaningless if the garden of England remains in disarray. For his master, however, the nation's pitiful condition invests their work with all the more meaning; it not only seems "a model" but actually is one:

Bolingbroke
Hath seiz'd the wasteful king. O, what pity is it
That he had not so trimm'd and dress'd his land

⁵⁵Hirst and Zwicker identify a different way in which Marvell defends his patron from criticism. They argue that Marvell distances Fairfax from "the moral dangers of retirement": "The forest episode acts to diffuse self-accusation, to acknowledge criticisms—the moral and spiritual dangers so vividly signaled in the luxuriance of the forest—but to demur: the idle poet serves as surrogate, scapegoat for charges that might have been laid to the patron's account, laid by himself as well as others" ("High Summer" 257).

As we this garden! We at time of year
Do wound the bark, the skin of our fruit-trees,
Lest, being over-proud in sap and blood,
With too much riches it confound itself;
Had he done so to great and growing men,
They might have liv'd to bear, and he to taste
Their fruits of duty. Superfluous branches
We lop away, that bearing boughs may live;
Had he done so, himself had borne the crown,
Which waste of idle hours hath quite thrown down. (3.4.54b-66)

The gardener thus likens the king to a gardener and subjects to trees, and he emphasizes discipline and order as means to prosperity and peace.

But the play also uses garden imagery to posit civil war's endangerment of good cultivation of England. When Richard refers to his power in terms of cultivation, for example, he focuses on danger and deadliness rather than health and nourishment. As the threat from Bolingbroke intensifies, Richard shows himself more interested in poisons than beautiful, healthful plants and animals:

Feed not thy sovereign's foe, my gentle earth,
Nor with thy sweets comfort his ravenous sense,
But let thy spiders that suck up thy venom
And heavy-gaited toads lie in their way,
Doing annoyance to the treacherous feet,
Which with usurping steps do trample thee;
Yield stinging nettles to mine enemies;
And when they from thy bosom pluck a flower,
Guard it, I pray thee, with a lurking adder,
Whose double tongue may with a mortal touch
Throw death upon thy sovereign's enemies. (3.2.12-22)

Likewise, in the first confrontation between the two enemies, Richard, lamenting his inevitable deposition, envisions his grief and that of his ally Aumerle as causes of sterility: "We'll make foul weather with despised tears; / Our sighs and they shall lodge the summer corn, / And make a dearth in this revolting land" (3.3.161-63). This empty curse is matched in the next scene by that of Richard's queen; Isabel responds to the

gardener's revelation of Richard's defeat by cursing the garden: "Gard'ner, for telling me these news of woe, / Pray God the plants thou graft'st may never grow" (3.4.100-101).

All these passages confirm for the audience the other characters' representations of Richard's rule as a failure to cultivate England properly.¹⁰⁶ But they also imply that rebellion injures prosperity, as power that might be turned to cultivation (literal and figurative) is used instead for making war.

Indeed, Bolingbroke, even as he undertakes to right the wrongs of Richard's court, represents similar dangers. He threatens not fertile rains but a bloody storm: unless, he proclaims, "my banishment repeal'd / And lands restor'd again be freely granted" (3.3.40-41),

I'll use the advantage of my power
And lay the summer's dust with showers of blood
Rain'd from the wounds of slaughtered Englishmen—
The which, how far off from the mind of Bolingbroke
It is such crimson tempest should bedrench
The fresh green lap of fair King Richard's land,
My stooping duty tenderly shall show. (3.3.42-48)

Anticipating the confrontation's outcome, Richard complains against Bolingbroke's ambition for the crown; wounds incurred in an English civil war will "bedew / Her pastures' grass with faithful English blood" (3.3.95-100). And once Bolingbroke takes the throne as Henry IV, York voices more fears about the new king's dangerousness, warning his son Aumerle, "Well, bear you well in this new spring of time, / Lest you be cropp'd before you come to prime" (5.2.50-51). This advice recalls for the audience the gardener's critique of Richard's rule, in particular the king's failure to discipline subjects who showed promise but who threatened to overgrow their positions; Henry IV, in

⁵⁶Bolingbroke accuses Bushy and Greene of having "[d]ispark'd [his] parks and fell'd [his] forest woods" (3.1.23).

York's view, is unlikely to make that mistake. But the phrase "before you come to prime" implies that York fears the king as an impetuous or at least impatient gardener, one ready to keep unruly subjects in line but perhaps too shortsighted or suspicious to nourish and shape them into fruitful supporters.¹⁰⁷ Bolingbroke's threats, voiced and implied, are in his view a necessity of civil war, a part of the violence committed in the name of setting right the king's wrongs. Yet Bolingbroke and Richard, each struggling for control and imagining horrors visited upon his enemy by way of the land itself, have more in common than either might like to think.

If the play questions the gardener-king ideal by showing how kings cultivate their lands wrongly, it does so again by acknowledging that civil war gives subjects a hand in tending the state. Earlier in the play, Bolingbroke depicts himself as a caretaker of the national garden, though at that point he is not king and denies any ambition to become so (2.3.147-48): he calls Richard's favorites and allies "The caterpillars of the commonwealth, / Which I have sworn to weed and pluck away" (2.3.165-66). He voices another version of the trope of the national gardener, one in which, if the king fails to cultivate the nation and his subjects' livelihoods appropriately, subjects—"rebels" (2.3.146), if it comes to that—may do so. And ominously, the deposed Richard warns Northumberland of the kingmaker's problem: "He shall think that thou, which knowest the way / To plant unrightful kings, wilt know again, / Being ne'er so little urg'd, another way / To pluck him headlong from the usurped throne" (5.1.62-65). It might be objected that Richard wants to deny rulers the responsibility he had shirked or that he is incapable of imagining his enemy as self-sufficient and independent of his courtiers' approval,

⁵⁷ Actually, however, the new king pardons Aumerle for involvement in an assassination plot (5.3.129).

especially given Richard's susceptibility to Bushy, Bagot, and Greene. Yet the new king also imagines himself as a plant under his subjects' care: upon hearing that Exton has murdered Richard, Henry responds, "Lords, I protest my soul is full of woe / That blood should sprinkle me to make me grow" (5.6.45-46). For both Richard and Henry, then, kings are plants as well as gardeners; the same is true, the play implies, of powerful subjects.

If both rulers and subjects, as plants and gardeners, have limited agency over the land, then if there is to be a master gardener, it must be God. In the play, Richard claims as much, describing himself as "the figure of God's majesty, / His captain, steward, deputy elect, / Anointed, crowned, planted many years" (4.1.125-27). A belief in God's omnipotence and providence necessitates circumscribing the gardener-king trope in some way, but that circumscription lends itself to arguments about subjects' rights or even duties to offer correctives when a ruler goes astray: if earthly authority is not absolute, it may well be fallible. These issues—the extent and nature a king's power over his subjects, and the subjects' rights and duties when a king has gone astray, especially with regard to God's will and matters of worship—returned to haunt England in Marvell's day, as tensions mounted over Charles's exercise of his personal rule and over the Laudian policies that governed worship.

This context, I think, amplifies Marvell's echoes of the play in "Upon Appleton House." Although *Richard II* repeatedly compares government to gardening, it depicts civil war as very much at odds with cultivating England well. It also, as we have just seen, raises thorny questions about the relative powers of subjects and rulers under God's authority. Both issues are important for Marvell's speaker, torn between a vision of

Fairfax as the ideal gardener-general and an emphasis on gardening as instead an image for privacy and personal spiritual improvement. That speaker's postlapsarian imagination, to his thinking, taints gardening, and implicitly the gardener-general trope is a sign of, perhaps even a perpetuation of, that problem. The poem interrogates the gardener-general trope in a variety of ways, implying finally that heavy qualification, if not rejection, of that trope is required. As we shall now see, the poem moves away from depictions of Fairfax as a general; instead it draws parallels between Charles's court and Fairfax's family. But as it does so, it replaces certain myths of the Caroline court with new myths that represent the Fairfax legacy as both a continuation of and a corrective to the values of that court.

The Transformation of Caroline Myths

A number of Marvell's descriptions of Fairfax's family and estate allude to images and values associated, for better or worse, with Charles's reign: the focus on gardening; the imagery of the masque, especially with an emphasis on pastoral; the importance of the figure of Maria; the images of the oak and the halcyon; and the appreciation for modesty and the avoidance of luxury. The point of these allusions, I believe, is not to show that Marvell idealized Charles's reign but rather to acknowledge such idealizations, to pay homage to the years of peace that preceded the kingdoms' embattlement, and to depict the Fairfax family as having the virtues and interests needed to carry on the best values of Charles's reign and to correct the court's errors. Nicholas McDowell has argued convincingly that Marvell's early, seemingly Cavalier values and later support of Cromwell and the republic are reconciled by the poet's overarching loyalty to "the cause

of wit,” a concern with the encouragement of poetry and, by extension, other kinds of advancement of learning.¹⁰⁸ My argument extends McDowell’s discussion by analyzing the relationship Marvell posits between Charles’s court and Fairfax’s estate.

The image of Fairfax as potential gardener extraordinaire reiterates the poem’s references to prewar England as a “Paradise” and to postwar England as a “waste” (347-8, 323, 328). These descriptions and the allusions to *Richard II* invoke the gardener-king trope, though the poem makes no clear gesture as to whether Charles was a good gardener-king before war broke out. As we have seen, however, Marvell’s speaker scrutinizes the gardener-general trope in ways that suggest its problems; we shall see later that the poem posits an alternative trope that affirms Fairfax’s virtuous influence.

The description of Fairfax’s gardens also engages Caroline myths in more particular ways. Having praised the orderliness of the flowers—“Each regiment in order grows, / That of the tulip, pink, and rose” (311-12)—the speaker recalls two of these three kinds as he laments England’s former paradisaal peace:

Unhappy! Shall we never more
That sweet militia restore,
When gardens only had their towers,
And all the garrisons were flowers,
When roses only arms might bear,
And men did rosy garlands wear?
Tulips, in several colours barred,
Were then the Switzers of our guard. (329-36)

The mention of roses and tulips in connection with the peace that preceded civil war recalls Charles’s court in multiple ways. John Peacock notes the use of rose motifs as decoration on a 1631 bust of the king by Hubert Le Sueur and on “a costume based on antique armour” in the 1634 masque *The Triumph of Peace*. Peacock supposes that the

⁵⁸See especially chapters 4 and 5.

flowers on the latter are “Tudor roses, paying a compliment to the King”; he notes that “both Stuart monarchs, following their predecessors from Henry VII onwards, had used the Tudor rose on their coinage” (212). Marvell’s lines invoke Charles’s power (“When roses only arms might bear”) but also the peacefulness of his reign, before his subjects wielded arms against him. The rose also invokes Charles’s marriage to Henrietta Maria; Ben Jonson’s “An Epigram on the Princes Birth” (poem 65 in *The Vnder-wood*) “styles newborn Charles as the ‘Prince of flowers’ [8: 237, line 5], who has sprung from ‘The bed of the chast *Lilly*, and the *Rose*’ [8: 237, line 3]” (Coiro 32, editorial insertions added).

The closing couplet of the above stanza, moreover, subtly invokes the gardener-king trope and links it with England’s peace under Charles. Smith writes that this couplet’s metaphor of tulips as “Switzers” “rais[es] the profile of enemies to Fairfax’s cause in the poem (Charles I was a connoisseur of tulips; the real ‘Switzers’ guarded the head of the Roman Catholic church)” (*Poems* 225 n336). The poem thus records one of Charles’s horticultural interests and simultaneously emphasizes the nation’s former internal and international peace: Charles—unlike the Pope, Marvell’s speaker implies—needed no other “guard” besides tulips. Yet this implied contrast also suggests a parallel between the Pope and Charles as heads of the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England respectively. The second half of the stanza thus recalls associations of Charles’s reign with horticulture, literary art, peace, and finally the king’s role in relation to the state Church, a matter that prompted much debate leading up to and persisting throughout the wars. Ultimately, Smith’s comment that the tulip couplet “rais[es] the profile of enemies to Fairfax’s cause in the poem” oversimplifies matters somewhat; though Charles and

Fairfax opposed each other, Marvell's speaker links Fairfax's gardens with Charles's reign in more complex ways as well, implying that Fairfax, at least on his estate, puts right what Charles had gotten wrong. The references to roses and tulips, for example, may recognize associations of the court with luxury as well as aesthetic sensibility.¹⁰⁹ Similarly, the parallel between Charles and the Pope may allude to concerns about Charles's papist sympathies and Laud's often-criticized emphasis on ritual and the externals of worship, whereas the "order" evident in Fairfax's gardens suggests his moderation and discernment of what Charles's opponents would have seen as proper priorities. As I have suggested earlier in this chapter, Marvell's references to the masque perform a similar function, linking Fairfax's estate with the Caroline court while demonstrating the superiority of the former over the latter: the masque scenes in "Upon Appleton House" show humans cooperating with nature (385-88, 418-32, 465-68, 585-92, 679-80), and they thus contrast with the artificiality and expense of the court masques.

The poem's last mention of the masque—"And men with silent scene assist, / Charmed with the sapphire-wingèd mist" (679-80)—also refers to court masques' representations of Charles and Henrietta Maria's virtuous influence on England. It does in two related ways: by invoking the image of the halcyon and by preparing the reader for the lines praising Maria Fairfax's virtues, intellectual acumen, and beauty (681-744).

⁵⁹In his notes to Marvell's "The Mower against Gardens," Smith observes that "tulips were associated with artificial gardens, and were regarded as a kind of fallen plant, being valued only for their beauty since they had no medicinal application . . ." (*Poems* 134 n13) and that "extremely high prices [were] paid for bulbs during the largely Dutch tulip mania of the 1630s" (134 n15-16).

The description of Maria's influence on "loose Nature" (657-64, 673-80) is compared to the halcyon's:

So when the shadows laid asleep
From underneath these banks do creep,
And on the river as it flows
With ebon shuts begin to close;
The modest halcyon comes in sight,
Flying betwixt the day and night;
And such an horror calm and dumb,
Admiring Nature does benumb. (665-72)

Smith admirably sums up this image's significance: "Royalist poets looked back from the turmoil of civil war and defeat to the 'halcyon days' of the 1630s. Emblematically, the halcyon represented the good king who brings peace and prosperity. M[arvell] relocates the halcyon's association with Fairfax, and more importantly, Mary Fairfax" (*Poems* 238 n669-72). In this context, the name Maria—the poet's substitution for the daughter's actual name, Mary—takes on special meaning: it recalls the recent queen, Henrietta Maria, whom Charles liked to call simply Maria (Wainwright 169). Maria Fairfax inspires the natural world to beauty and virtue (657-64, 687-96, 745-52) and stands as both a pattern—"the law / Of all her sex" (655-56)—and a *nonpareil* (729-38) of virtue in women.

In these ways she resembles the representations of Henrietta Maria in the court masques. The opening scene of *Coelum Britannicum* (1634) includes "this *impresa* to the Queen's majesty, a lily growing with branches and leaves, and three lesser lilies springing out of the stem; the word, *Semper inclita virtus* [virtue always celebrated]" (Carew 25-28). Later, the chorus sings to Henrietta Maria, "[L]et thy divine / Aspects,

bright deity, with fair / And halcyon beams becalm the air” (1027-29).¹¹⁰ Similar praises occur in other masques as celebrations of the royal marriage; a song to Henrietta Maria in *Albion’s Triumph* (1632), for example, describes Charles’s love for her as a testament to her excellence: “The virtues and the graces all / Must meet in one when such stars fall” (Townshend 334-35). And in *The Triumph of Peace* (1634), the king and queen’s love makes the nation preeminent:

To you great King and Queen, whose smile
Doth scatter blessings through this isle,
To make it best
And wonder of the rest,
We pay the duty of our birth,
Proud to wait upon that earth
Whereon you move,
Which shall be named,
And by your chaste embraces framed,
The paradise of love. (Shirley 608-617)

Similarly, Marvell’s speaker claims that other pleasant landscapes will be superseded by Fairfax’s estate—which he later identifies as “Paradise’s only map” (768)—thanks to Maria’s influence (745-60).

But if the poem’s masque imagery implicitly likens Fairfax’s estate to Charles’s court, the description of Maria Fairfax ultimately shows how her virtues and her family’s Protestant legacy correct the perceived errors for which Charles, his queen, and his court were often criticized. The Catholic Henrietta Maria enabled a kind of Marian revival: her Somerset House chapel proved “an embarrassingly public magnet for Roman Catholics and a large number of converts,” and Marian statues became more popular in public spaces (Wainwright 169). Moreover, the queen came to be identified in some ways with

⁶⁰The scene for this part of the masque depicts “a princely villa” furnished with “a delicious garden,” “walks and parterras,” “fountains and grots,” and trees (1021, 1016, 1016-17, 1018, 1017, 1020).

the Blessed Virgin. Ben Jonson's "An Epigram to the Queene, then lying in," which celebrates Prince Charles's birth, recalls Gabriel's salutation to the Virgin (8: 238, line 1) and then offers a parallel: "why may not I / (Without prophaneness) yet, a Poët, cry, / Haile Mary, full of honours, to my Queene, / The mother of our Prince?" (8: 238, lines 3-6).¹¹¹ Jonathan P. Wainwright notes a similar identification:

in 1635 a discourse, "wherein . . . the *B. Virgin Mary* Mother of God, is defended, and vindicated," was published under the title *Maria Triumphans*. The anonymous author dedicated the book to Henrietta Maria and in the dedication he explicitly associated the queen's name with that of the Virgin. Indeed there can be little doubt that the author was intending the "Maria" in his title to be dually interpreted as the Blessed Virgin Mary in Heaven and Queen Henrietta Maria, the Virgin's champion and representative on earth. (169)

Many English subjects were troubled by the queen's Catholicism and its implications for England's national Church. The claim that Charles had approved the 1641 Ulster rebellion, for example, was, according to Mark Kishlansky and John Morrill, "all too readily believed" by "[a]ll those who already believed him to be the dupe of papists and the agent of a conspiracy against the church of Christ" ("Charles I," *ODNB*).

The figure of Maria Fairfax in Marvell's poem evokes these associations, but to the opposite effect. The poem depicts the Fairfax heiress as a Protestant equivalent to the Blessed Virgin in a number of ways. Aside from name, age, and virginity, the poem hints at other comparisons: the speaker repeatedly emphasizes her preeminence among women, pronouncing her "the law / Of all her sex, her age's awe" (655-56) and asserting that "all virgins she precedes" (751). Moreover, the descriptions of her power over

⁶¹Thomas N. Corns remarks in passing that this "poem . . . flirted with a Catholic inflection" (21); Ann Baynes Coiro, asserting that "Most of the poem is concerned with its own blasphemy" (32), analyzes the poem's repeated comparisons of the queen to the Blessed Virgin: in addition to the near-quotation of the Ave Maria (32), the implication that the queen too is "still a virgin" and the depiction of her as "mediatrix" (33).

nature—"But by her flames, in heaven tried, / Nature is wholly vitrified" (687-88)—and of her strict, virtuous, studious upbringing (705-28) sound much like Henry Hawkins's description of the Virgin Mary's birth, infancy, and childhood in his Catholic devotional *Partheneia Sacra* (1633):

Then, after SHE (that golden issue of her Mother) was borne and brought forth to light, I easily beleuee, that Nature recreated and refreshed from the daylie miserie it lay in, euen laughed to behold her, supposing the light was newly risen to her, when first she fixt her eyes on her, from whose precious and Virginal womb, was the Fountain of light itself to spring. The Virgin-infant heervpon was nursed-vp and trayned between chast walls, in a most holie discipline of Patrial lawes, and instructed with those studies of arts, that might addresse her as a noble Sacrarie of God. (sig. Avr)¹¹²

Even Maria's relationship to the land can be read as a Marian analogue. The Blessed Virgin is traditionally identified, as in Hawkins's devotional (11, 12-13, 15), with the *hortus conclusus* of the Song of Solomon: "A garden inclosed *is* my sister, *my* spouse; a spring shut up, a fountain sealed" (4:12).¹¹³ And Marvell associates Maria with the estate lands and with the gardens in particular. She both excels the grounds and imbues them with their best qualities (689-94): "She yet more pure, sweet, straight, and fair, / Than gardens, woods, meads, rivers are" (695-96). The speaker exhorts the estate to follow her example: "Employ the means you have by her, / And in your kind yourselves prefer; / That, as all virgins she precedes, / So you all woods, streams, gardens, meads" (749-52).

Maria's relationship to the gardens in particular is implied even by the poem's much earlier stanzas. Procreation in the nunnery is imagined in horticultural terms: "I know

⁶²On the likelihood that Marvell knew Hawkins's work, see R.I.V. Hodge (36-37, 39-42). Rosalie L. Colie discusses the relationship between Hawkins's book and Marvell's poetry (115-17; see also 187, 232).

⁶³See Stanley Stewart's excellent study *The Enclosed Garden*, in which Hawkins's book figures prominently.

what fruit their gardens yield, / When they it think by night concealed” (219-20). Smith quotes David Ormerod and Christopher Wortham: “It was a commonplace of scurrilous anti-Catholic propaganda that nuns buried their illegitimate babies at midnight in the nunnery’s grounds” (qtd. in Smith, *Poems* 222 n219-20).¹¹⁴ The same association of womb with garden is made, in a much more positive way, for the Fairfax line; in the first line of the stanza that introduces the estate gardens, the “blest bed” of William and Isabel involves a horticultural image as well as a nuptial one (281; *OED* “bed,” n., 2.b, 8). The emphasis on Maria’s future as a wife and mother who will continue the Fairfax bloodline implies that she too can be described in horticultural terms; so much is evident from the potential association of her with Paradise, which arises from the speaker’s change from addressing the land in stanzas 94-95 to addressing someone else, presumably the reader, in the final stanza: “Let’s in” (775). Some critics have read the penultimate stanza as an address to Maria rather than to the estate grounds: “Your lesser world contains the same, / But in more decent order tame; / You, heaven’s centre, Nature’s lap. / And Paradise’s only map” (765-68). Such a reading would identify Maria to some degree with Mary, Queen of Heaven, and with the *hortus conclusus*.¹¹⁵

Yet as the association of Maria with the open landscape of the estate rather than with an enclosed flower-garden alone suggests, there are important distinctions between the

⁶⁴Noting the “impl[ication]” in lines 191 and 200 “that the nuns engage in Lesbian sexual practices,” Smith writes, “The records show impropriety of an entirely heterosexual kind. Of the nineteen nuns in the Priory when it was surrendered in December 1539, three are noted as having borne children (presumably while under vows) . . .” (Smith, *Poems* 222 n191).

⁶⁵Marvell would have been familiar with Marian imagery and devotions not only because of Henrietta Maria’s influence at court but also, probably, because of his brief conversion to Catholicism during his years at Cambridge (Legouis 4).

Fairfax heiress and the Blessed Virgin. Maria's excellences are praised in the context of her family's strong tradition of Protestant virtue, a tradition she was clearly expected to carry on. The poem thus depicts her as a Protestant equivalent to the Virgin, one who will instantiate and inspire virtue and devotion but who will do so in the context of Protestant marriage and motherhood rather than perpetual virginity.¹¹⁶ She is in this sense too "our Thwaites" (748), the descendant of Isabel Thwaites Fairfax, who, as the poem tells us, was rescued from the nunnery, with its supposed devotion to virginity, and who then became the ancestress of numerous Protestant military heroes (265-82). Barbara Kiefer Lewalski sees Maria's "power to enhance the order of nature itself" (367) as the result of her spiritual status: "as regenerate Christian bearing the image of God she recapitulates that first ordering power which man in his pristine innocence had in relation to nature" (367). Likewise, Lewalski explains, "Maria not only accepts the human responsibility to enhance the order of nature, but also to order corrupt society" and thus resembles the Virgin Mary in another way:

An antitype of the Virgin Thwaites, she is not seduced as that Eve-figure was by false or perverted views of nature and religion, but awaits instead the natural unfolding of "Destiny" which will "find a *Fairfax* for our *Thwaites*," and so entail the estate in a continuing line of goodness. Accordingly, as antitype and fulfillment of the seduced Thwaites, Maria recapitulates the role of Mary, the Virgin-Mother who was the antitype of the seduced Eve, and who was in a unique sense the bearer of the Image of God, the supreme creative and restorative force. (369)

By evoking praises of the Blessed Virgin and yet emphasizing marriage and childbearing, Marvell pays high compliments to Maria Fairfax without impugning her family's

⁶⁶In explicating Maria's significance in this poem, Don Cameron Allen refers readers to Milton's "Ode on the Morning of Christ's Nativity" (220), but he does not pursue the idea that Marvell's Maria is closely associated with the Blessed Virgin. Instead, he identifies her as Athena or, in the Christian tradition, Sophia (222-25).

Protestant heritage.¹¹⁷ In all these ways, Maria is depicted as a kind of Protestant analogue to the Virgin Mary, one who redeems nature by her exceptional virtue and who promises the continuation of a line of virtuous and militarily skilled descendants.

One implication of this praise for Maria is that a pattern of virtue and a redemptive presence are needed; the height of the praise indicates the degree of England's fallenness. If Nun Appleton is "Paradise's only map" (768), it teaches something about the lost Garden of Eden but also about the lost English "Paradise of four seas" (323). We have already seen that the speaker's lament for this latter Paradise (321-28) echoes key passages from Shakespeare's *Richard II*. But in alluding to this play, Marvell, I would argue, is also responding to the political uses to which histories of Richard's reign were turned during and after the civil wars. In depicting the Fairfax family and estate as offering a stay against the disorder of fallenness, Marvell's speaker creates a myth that responds to myths, positive and negative, of Charles as a latter-day Richard II.

Royalists and Parliamentarians alike turned to histories of and documents from Richard's reign to support their positions on rebellion and obedience and thus to create myths that explained the civil wars' origins and nature. For Royalists, the Peasants' Revolt of 1381, the fourth year of Richard's reign, became a source of admonition and lament. The anonymous author of *The Iust Reward of Rebels* (1642) criticizes and tries to discourage rebellion against Charles by showing the bad ends of the Peasants' Revolt leaders, Jack Straw and Wat Tyler. As the rest of the work's title indicates, the author applies the lesson particularly to the recent Irish revolts: *The Life and Death of Jack*

⁶⁷There may also be an implicit acknowledgment here that Fairfax had Catholic family; theirs were among the royalist estates he defended from unruly soldiers during the wars (Hopper 182).

Straw, and Wat Tyler, Who for Their Rebellion and Disobedience to Their King and Country, Were Suddenly Slaine, and All Their Tumultuous Rout Overcome and Put to Flight. Whereunto Is Added the Ghost of Jack Straw, as He Lately Appeared to the Rebels in Ireland, Wishing Them to Forbeare and Repent of Their Divellish and Inhumane Actions against Their Lawfull King and Country. This comparison is invoked again at the end of the work, where the author writes,

Here I might enter into a large discourse of the horridnesse of Rebellion; as that of Ireland, whose distressed estate is very lamentable, whose rebellion and outrages I hope will be considered, and they speedily (by the permission of the Almighty) receive their just rewards. Rebellion can no way be better illustrated then by the sad and lamentable effects expressed in the premises: I will therefore conclude with that of the Prophet Samuel, Rebellion is as the sin of Witchcraft, and Transgression is wickedness and Idolatry. (sig. B4r)

These are the work's only explicit parallels between Richard's reign and Charles's. But the author does write, in what reads like a thinly veiled comment about his own day, that "the Mechanicks and meanest sort of people . . . alwayes are apt to envie their superiours, and are therefore prone to any Innovation, favouring the cause of the seditious Commons . . ." (sig. A3r). And more pointedly, his remark about the rebels' professed intentions implicitly questions the similarly expressed aims of the Parliamentarians in 1642: "the Rebels . . . stirred up the Commons of the City [of London], as Artificers, Labourers, and Apprentises to take part with them, and joyne to their faction, making a faire pretence, that their purpose was onely to search out such as were traytors to the King and his Realme, and they being cut off, to make a cessation of Armes, and every one peaceably to retyre himselfe into his owne Country" (sig. A3r).¹¹⁸

⁶⁸Parliamentarians often characterized their motives in similar ways. In a 1641 antiprelatical tract, for example, William Prynne writes in his dedicatory epistle to Parliament,

But the deteriorating political conditions in England led also to the publication of works condemning the successful revolt of 1399, which ended Richard's reign and ultimately his life. One such piece is a speech, the publication of which is tentatively dated in *Early English Books Online* to 1642, given by Thomas Merke, Bishop of Carlisle under Richard II. *A Pious and Learned Speech Delivered in the High Court of Parliament, 1.H.4* never refers to the events of Charles's reign. Yet the anonymity of those responsible for its publication, identified on the title page simply as "N.V. and J.B.," suggests that the work constituted an implicit criticism of the rebellions of the early 1640s and the threats to Charles's authority. Merke condemns deposition of an anointed king by either violence or coercion. He asserts that "the Church hath declared it to be an Heresie, to hold, that a Prince may be slaine, or deposed by his Subjects, for any default or disorder of life, or default in Government" (sig. A3v). And he objects further, in words that could also apply to the disputes about taxes and religion that plagued Charles's reign,

Oh! how should the world be pestered with tyrants, if Subjects might be permitted to rebell, upon pretence of tyranny; how many good Princes should often be suppressed by those by whom they ought to be supported? if they but levie a Subsidie, or any other taxation, it shall be judged oppression; if they put any to death for traitorous attempts against their persons, it shall be exclaimed at for cruelty; if they shall doe any thing against the good liking of their people, it shall bee proclaimed Tyrannie. (sig. A3v)

IT is a received principle in Law, that there are no Accessories in Treason; whence to conceale a Notorious Traytor, is really to be one. The consideration of the Capitalnesse of such a Concealement in these proditorious times, and the discharge of my bounden Duty to my Sovereigne Lord the King, this Church and Kingdome, . . . and to this Honourable Court, . . . hath induced me by way of Gratitude, to present your Honours with this large Discovery, not of one or two, but of an whole Tribe and succession of notable Arch-Traytors, Rebels, Conspirators, and desperate Enemies to our Kings, Kingdomes, Lawes, Liberties, (to say nothing of our Church and Religion) masked under the innocent disguise of an Episcopall white Rotchet, and the specious much abused Title of, The Church . . . (Antipathie sig. ¶3r-v)

Finally, having rejected the notion that Henry, Duke of Lancaster, could claim the throne by hereditary succession, he also refutes any claim “by right of Conquest, and the Kings resignation and grant, and the consent of the many”:

what conquest can a Subject make against a Sovereigne, where the warre is insurrection, and the victory high Treason? King *Richards* resignation, being in prison, is an act of exaction by force and therefore of no force to bind him; And by the Lawes of this Realme, the King by himselfe cannot alienate, the ancient Jewels and ornaments of the Crowne, much lesse give away his Crowne and Kingdome. And custome wee have none, for the vulgar to elect their King, but they are alwayes tyde to accept of him, whom the right of succession enables to the Crowne, much lesse can they make good that Title, which is by violence usurped; For nothing can be said to be freely done, when liberty is restrained by feare . . . (sig. A4r)

Despite the fact that the speech is published without any comments about conflicts between king and Parliament in the 1640s, the timing and nature of this work identify it as a response to the rebellion against Charles and imply that those responsible for its publication saw specific parallels between Richard’s and Charles’s revolted subjects.

Years later, when Charles had been imprisoned and the November 1648 *Remonstrance of the Army* had called for his death, William Prynne invoked and dismissed the example of Richard II as a possible justification for the Army’s “propos[al] . . . to Depose and Execute him [Charles] as the greatest capital Malefactor in the Kingdom” (*Part 1*). In a speech in the House of Commons, Prynne draws on a variety of arguments to show that deposition and regicide would destroy any chance for, rather than enable, “a speedy Peace and Settlement” (1).¹¹⁹ Ultimately he turns to the question of domestic examples; considering the cases of Edward II and Richard II as the only possible precedents, he discounts them both (7). In particular, he notes that Richard’s

⁶⁹The date and occasion of the speech are given in the title of the full printed account published in 1649 (Prynne, *Substance*).

“Deposition was after his resignation only, not before it: and without any Formal *tryal* or *arraignment*, or any Capital *Judgment* of Death against him; for which I find no president in any *Parliament* of *England*, *Scotland*, *France*, nor yet in *Denmark* itself, though an Elective Kingdom . . .” (8).¹²⁰ Prynne’s speech, responding to a very specific threat to the king, differs from the other two examples discussed above in that, rather than compare the rebels of Charles’s reign to those of Richard’s, it uses the difference between the two cases to counter any claim of precedent—an indication, perhaps, of Prynne’s awareness of how the king’s enemies might try to use Ricardian history to their advantage.

Indeed, Parliamentary sources tend to treat the history of Richard II’s reign as a cautionary tale about the bad ends to which a king’s bad advisors, and perhaps the king himself, are apt to come.¹²¹ In 1641 appeared *A Trve Relation of That Memorable Parliament, which Wrought Wonders*, the author of which is given as Thomas Fannant but which was actually written by Thomas Fovent or Favent, perhaps a Salisbury clerk

⁷⁰According to William Lamont, Prynne’s loyalties prior to and during the Civil Wars were complex (“Prynne, William” *ODNB*). He had twice been convicted of sedition in the 1630s, once for implicit criticism, in *Histriomastix* (1633), of Henrietta Maria’s acting in court masques (Lamont). From the early 1640s, he supported resistance to the king, whose decisions, Prynne believed, endangered England’s sovereignty, but later “[h]e emerged as the great champion of a negotiated settlement with Charles I . . .” (Lamont). Despite his disappointment in Charles’s choices, Prynne never really abandoned his monarchist principles, and the regicide left him sympathetic to the dead king (Lamont).

⁷¹“The blaming of evil counsel,” Joad Raymond points out, “could operate either as a means of restraining criticism by making it anodyne, or as a platform for expressing it” (55). Raymond discusses this issue in terms of the charge that Charles was “pursuing an absolute prerogative” (54; see 54-56); the discussion mentions comparisons of Charles to Richard II (54), and Raymond notes *The Life and Death of King Richard the Second, A mis-led King* (essentially the translated text of Favent’s work), and *The People Informed of Their Oppressors and Oppressions* as examples (69 n30).

(Oliver, “Chaucer’s London” 2; John Taylor, “Favent, Thomas” *ODNB*).¹²² The work recounts, firstly, the actions taken by the Wonderful Parliament in 1386 to control Richard’s spending and to remove Michael de la Pole and other of the king’s favorites from their offices, and, secondly, the trials conducted by the Merciless Parliament in 1388, which resulted in the execution of several of Richard’s supporters. The history’s publication in 1641 implies a comparison between Charles’s reigns and Richard’s, on the basis of the kings’ tensions with their respective Parliaments over financial problems and the power accorded to clergy and courtiers who were viewed by many subjects as bad influences. Favent’s introduction of his history as a warning to the corrupt would likely have been endorsed by parliamentarians as entirely fitting for the early 1640s:

THis present occasion so opportunely befitting me, I am resolved to treat of that which hath beene omitted, and slipped out of memory long since, concerning divers and sundry changes and alterations in *England*, in former times : Nor will it be any way burthensome to write of that, whereby every good and carefull Reader may learne to avoid diversities of miseries, and the danger and feare of cruell death. I will therefore speake of that which hath laine hid in the darksome shade of forgetfulnesse, concerning men who have been led away by the deceitfull path of Covetousnesse, and have come to a most shamefull and ignominious death: a famous example, to deter all men from practising those or the like courses. (1-2)¹²³

⁷²John Taylor mentions this work in his *ODNB* entry for Thomas Favent. For more information on Favent and the *Historia*, see May McKisack’s preface to her edition of the *Historia*, Andrew Galloway’s translation, and recent work by Clementine Oliver.

⁷³The Latin reads,

Ex quo more diurnitates longue a labili humanorum memoria presencia fataliter absorbeant, de quibusdam dudum fortuniis in Anglia de miro motis posteribus scripto redigere instans me ratio monet, licet pueriliter, aggrediar in processu. Nec meminisse pigeat talia memorie committere que quisquis si diligens perlector animaduerterit speculum in parte habere poterit aduersitates et scandala, mortisque pericula et torrida cruciacula facilius euitandi. Igitur quomodo huiusmodi enorme nephas ex quibusdam proueniens personis auaricie fomite submerses et mole scelerum oppressis dudum in Anglia corruit, sub clandestino taciturnitatis latibulo delitescere non paciar. (Favent, *Historia* 1)

Andrew Galloway translates the passage as follows:

The parallel between Richard's reign and Charles's becomes explicit, however, only in the material appended to Favent's work. Along with "An Abstract of Many Memorable Matters Done by Parliaments in This Kingdome of England" (35-40) and "The Character," a biographical sketch of Richard (41-42), there appears a short addendum titled "More Memorable Things Done by Parliaments" (42-44), which comments on events of 1641 in ways that recall the criticisms of Richard's rule:

*And seeing th'other day, viz. 22. of February, there was that correspondence, and happy agreement betwixt his sacred Majesty, and both the houses of Parliament now sitting, which made the Evening of that Day, crowned with Bone-fires [sic] and Bells-ringing for joy. Let us not cease to pray and beseech the Lord of Hosts, still so to unite the heart of the Kings Majesty to the Parliament (his great Counsell) that the Upper and Lower Houses may unanimously agree, and be reciprocally united to the King, that many matters now much amisse in Church and Common-wealth may be reformed, and this Yeare may be accounted *Annus Aureus*, and that this present Parliament begun this Yeare may be inscribed and engraven in Marble and in Letters of Gold;*

By Parliament the Earle of Strafford Deputy of Ireland, grievous to the Commonwealth, was discovered, and after an Honourable Tryal, was attainted of high Treason, for which hee suffered death, May the twelfth, 1641. (43-44)

This passage celebrates Charles's signing of the Triennial Act, which ensured Parliament's right to assemble at least every three years; the reference to Parliament as the king's "great Counsell" suggests that the act was seen as a corrective to the corrupt advice given to Charles, like Richard, by favored courtiers. The glorification of

Since, by custom, ancient and long durations fatally seep away from human beings' fleeting present memories, urgent reason has admonished me that, in however childishly inept a way, I should undertake to compose for posterity an account in formal written proceedings of certain extraordinary events that not long ago transpired in England. Let it not be disgusting to bring to mind and commit to memory such things which, if every diligent reader would heed, he would have a mirror, in part, for more easily avoiding adversities, scandals, and the dangers and burning torments of death. I will not therefore allow it to remain delighting in the secret den of silence, how a monstrous sin of this sort, starting from certain people who were smothered in the embers of avarice and burdened by the weight of crimes, thereafter raced through England. (Favent, History 231 par. 1)

Strafford's execution likewise implicitly compares Parliament's removal of bad advisors in Charles's reign to that in Richard's.

The Kings Articles and the Parliaments Honovr, dated August 1, 1642, once the king and Parliament were at war, draws similar, if more belligerently expressed, parallels between Richard and Charles. In it, John Browne, who, according to J.C. Sainty, in 1638 had become clerk of the parliaments and who "was a firm adherent of the parliamentary cause" ("Browne, John" *ODNB*), compiled "certain Articles of the then King out of the Rolles of the Parliament, held at *Westminster* 11.R.2" (John Browne 3). These articles, which Browne says he reproduces *verbatim* (3), do not deal with the Merciless Parliament's trials of Richard's favorites, but they do emphasize the dangers posed by "false Councels" ([5]) and the king's dealings with France and the Duke of Ireland ([5]-6, 6-8). Browne's introductory comments, his only remarks on the articles he has selected, offer a staunchly Parliamentary comparison of Charles's mistakes to Richard's:

THE King seduced by wicked Counsellours, and deluded by the cruell suggestions of a malignant party, have been (according to the palpable exposition of all his Majesties Actions) resolved to make warre against the Parliament which consequently will tend to the utter dissolution of this government, the subversion of all the Subjects liberties, & the irrecoverable ruine of the whole Kingdome. But not to make a needlesse expansion of the subsequent perils, that might, and will undoubtedly follow his Maiesties resolution, I conceive it not impertinent to compare these præposterous times, to ancient: and scanning the same actions of other Kings, when they were also deluded by wicked Councill, and what successe happened in that temerarious resolution: We may aptly apply the mythologie unto our present distractions . . . (3)

Indeed, the title page refers to Richard's reign in almost the same phrasing used in the passage above to condemn Charles's conduct:

The Kings Articles and the Parliaments Honovr. Declaring how the Archbishop of Yorke, the Duke of Ireland, the Earle of Suffolke, and some false Knights and Justices, have seduced his Majestie by wicked Counsell to make suddain Warre against the Parliament. And how all the aforesaid persons were appealed of Treason

by the Duke of Glocester, the Earle of Arundell and Surrey, the Earle of Warwicke, and others threatned to be all destroyed by these aforesaid. Also a Relation of a great number of men at Armes, and Archers assembled in the Counties of Lancaster, Chester, and Wales.

The title page refers to Richard only as “his Majestie”; uses the present perfect tense in describing events of Richard’s reign; and gives no marker of time—other than perhaps the mention of “Archers”—for the gathering of forces mentioned last. The title thus conflates Charles’s actions and Richard’s, in much the same way as Browne’s introductory paragraph but with the additional effect of making it sound as though the events named in the title page were recent rather than two-and-a-half centuries old. Presumably readers would have recognized the references to Richard’s reign from the mentions of the noblemen involved, but the phrasing insists on the identification of Charles’s poor choices with the earlier king’s.

Yet another work emphasizes not Richard’s earlier problems but instead the end of his reign and even of his life. The full title of *The Life and Death of King Richard the Second* (1642), the author of which is identified only as “a Well-wisher to the Commonwealth,” blames Richard’s deposition on “His not regarding the Councell of the Sage and Wise of His Kingdom” and instead having “followed the advice of of [*sic*] wicked and lewd Councell, and sought as farre as in him lay, to deprive many good English Subjects of their lives and estates, who stood wholly for the good of the Commonalty . . .”. The work never explicitly compares Charles to Richard, but the title page’s claim that the work is “worthy the observation of all men in these times of Distractions” clearly signals that the criticism of Richard and his advisors was directed at Charles and his court.¹²⁴

⁷⁴The anticlericalism that marked many of Charles’s opponents is evident here too; the “Well-wisher to the Commonwealth” includes, at the end of the work, a short poem in

Although the narrative of the end of Richard's reign and the beginning of Henry IV's omits the manner of Richard's death, the title's mention of the king's deposition and demise, combined with the reference to "these times of Distractions," has an ominous ring with regard to Charles and his supporters.¹²⁵

These comparisons, both Royalist and Parliamentarian, of Charles to Richard inform Marvell's description of Fairfax and the estate in "Upon Appleton House." One criticism of Richard II that appears in both Shakespeare's play and *A True Relation* is the financial irresponsibility that he displayed and that he also enabled among his favorites at court (*RII* 2.1.100-114; Fannant 2-3). Likewise Charles's demands for ship money and his response to Scottish resistance to the revised Book of Common Prayer drew criticism from subjects suspicious of his financial and religious motives. Marvell's poem directly acknowledges none of these tensions. But in applying *Richard II*'s garden imagery to

Latin titled simply "Verses made then against the Bishops and Clergy" (*Life* 8). And the work's praise of Henry IV—as having "raigned many yeers vvith much peace and tranquility, and banisht all King Richards favourites, so that he brought this Nation to so happy a Vnion, that the vvhole Realm enjoyed many graces of his favour in his Raign, of vvhich many good Acts are still in force" (8)—implies that ridding the land of a bad king, or at least a bad king's supporters, can produce more good than ill.

⁷⁵In addition to Royalist and Parliamentarian comparisons of Charles to Richard II, at least one writer sympathetic to the Army's position invoked such comparisons, though in a more complex way. The author of *The People Informed of Their Oppressors and Oppressions* (1648), who criticizes Parliament heavily for treating Charles too well and praises the Army for holding the king accountable for his behavior (3, 4), argues that Charles should be deposed and executed (8, 6). He bases this argument on "Custom" (8; see also 3-4) and invokes Edward II and Richard as examples of how "Oppressors of the People were secured from doing further mischief by deposing, after which death followed immediately . . ." (4). But this writer advances his argument partly by drawing distinctions between Charles on the one hand and Edward II and Richard II on the other: he claims that Charles's wickedness is far greater than both these other kings' "evils" combined (4), and he refutes Parliament's claim that Charles's mistakes resulted from "evil Councel," whereas, he protests, such counsel really was the origin of Edward's and Richard's poor choices (4).

England after the civil wars, Marvell does engage questions of corruption and virtue in both the monarch and his subjects: “What luckless apple did we taste, / To make us mortal, and thee waste?” (327-28).

If Charles, like Richard, was unable to function as a gardener-king, Fairfax, the poem suggests, could have cultivated the nation well: he, the speaker claims, “[m]ight once have made our gardens spring / Fresh as his own and flourishing” (347-48). These gardening images posit Fairfax as having had the potential to correct the errors made in Charles’s reign. Having given up his military command, Fairfax’s public influence is mitigated. But his private virtues allow him to cultivate his estate and family in the same ways he might have done for England as a whole. We have already seen that the poem praises his cultivation of “conscience” (354) as the reason for his leaving the Army (349-54). Elsewhere the poem responds to the myths of Charles as, like Richard II, grasping, extravagant, and susceptible to wicked counsel. In the description of the house, the poem emphasizes Fairfax’s modesty and aversion to luxury:

But all things are composèd here
Like Nature, orderly and near:
In which we the dimensions find
Of that more sober age and mind,
When larger-sizèd men did stoop
To enter at a narrow loop;
As practising, in doors so strait,
To strain themselves through heaven’s gate. (25-32)

Similarly the speaker’s praise for the “stately frontispiece of poor” (65) communicates regard for Fairfax’s charity and thus, implicitly, his freedom from the vice of greed.

Finally, the description of Fairfax’s “domestic heaven,” “Where not one object can come nigh / But pure, and spotless as the eye” (722, 725-26), distances not only his daughter but also Fairfax himself from the influence of the wicked.

In all of these ways, then, the poem takes up myths of Charles and his court and creates Fairfacian parallels. It can thereby serve as a tribute to Fairfax's military and moral virtues without representing his conduct as wholly separate from the peace and order that had marked the earlier years of Charles's reign. Indirectly, then, the poem responds sensitively to Fairfax's former dual role as Charles's military enemy and opponent of the regicide. The implicit comparisons of the two men also suggest Fairfax's continuing greatness even after his retirement from public life—a greatness, I want to argue, depicted in the poem's movement away from the trope of the gardener-general and toward that of the forester-father.¹²⁶

Fairfax as Forester-Father

As Hirst and Zwicker argue ("High Summer" 262-63), Marvell's focus on the speaker and especially on Maria toward the end of the poem emphasizes Fairfax's role as father, a seemingly comforting move given the tensions of Fairfax's past and potential military careers. But the praise for Maria is not simply a transition from Fairfax's military greatness to his life in retirement; instead, that praise casts Fairfax's fatherhood as in some ways analogous to his military career. Fatherhood is thus figured not, as Hirst and

⁷⁶This greatness is suggested by the poet's invoking the oak as a Royalist symbol (Smith, *Poems* 233 n551-2) in the story of the hewer's felling of the "tainted" tree (550; 547-52) and then using the oak much differently when he writes that Maria, "like a sprig of mistletoe, / On the Fairfacian oak does grow" (739-40). Smith points out the reference in this latter passage to a Druidic fertility rite, and he acknowledges Charles Larson's observation "that Druids were associated with royal culture." But he asserts that "M[arvell]'s reference here is exclusively concerned with the Fairfaxes" (*Poems* 240 n739-40). Smith is right, I think, in one sense; Marvell's point seems to be the greatness and virtue of the Fairfax family. But using an image with such strong Royalist associations implies a comparison; more specifically, it suggests that Fairfax is like Charles in greatness but is stronger than the king in his virtue and in the potential of his legacy through Maria.

Zwicker imply (“High Summer” 263), as a convenient retreat from difficult public matters, but rather as a way of combating, in the microcosm of the Nun Appleton estate, the fallenness plaguing England as a nation. The poem obliquely argues that Fairfax’s family legacy, his care for the family tree, guarantees his influence at a time when, according to Hirst and Zwicker (“High Summer” 254-55), his future military role remains in doubt. The trope of the forester-father thus supplements, if not supplants, that of the gardener-general.¹²⁷

Maria’s relationship to nature and the land links the image of Fairfax as gardener-general with his role as father. In the stanza that names him the flowers’ “Governor” (297), the speaker observes that the flowers give no “salute” to “the virgin Nymph; for she / Seems with the flowers a flower to be” (299, 301-2). The poem even implicitly identifies her with “Conscience, that heaven-nursèd plant, / Which most our earthly gardens want” (355-56):

This ’tis to have been from the first
In a domestic heaven nursed,
Under the discipline severe
Of Fairfax, and the starry Vere;
Where not one object can come nigh
But pure, and spotless as the eye;
And goodness doth itself entail
On females, if there want a male. (721-28)

This passage echoes the description of “Conscience” as “heaven-nursèd” (355) and also reiterates the earlier passage’s concern with righteousness and with intolerance of vice (357-58). The language of the lines above recalls other parts of the poem’s garden passage as well. “[T]he discipline severe” that characterizes Maria’s upbringing is

⁷⁷For a discussion of fatherhood in several of Marvell’s poems, including “Upon Appleton House,” see Hirst and Zwicker’s “Andrew Marvell and the Toils of Patriarchy.”

evident in the flower gardens, where “[e]ach regiment in order grows” (311). And the reference to “the starry Vere” alludes to “the vigilant patrol / Of stars” (313-14); these stars, Smith points out, “correspond to the ‘mullet of five points argent’ of the first quarter of the Vere arms” (225 n309-16). In all these ways, then, Fairfax’s role as gardener-general is closely associated with his parental care for Maria.

Yet the poem associates not only her father but also Maria, in her studies as well as her virtue, with the land. The estate’s “fields, springs, bushes, flowers” are the setting for her intellectual endeavors (745). Maria’s studies are also contrasted with vain women’s “useless study” (730) of preventing wrinkles, “When knowledge only could have filled / And virtue all those furrows tilled” (735-36). In these lines, virtue provides the cultivation necessary to bring knowledge to fruition. Thus Maria’s upbringing, grounded in study and virtue, allows her to cultivate a beauty more lasting than any merely superficial youthfulness.¹²⁸ In this regard, she is the daughter of the gardener-general.

She is so, too, in her discipline and her reforming influence on the speaker and nature alike. We have already seen how the speaker resolves to “Hide . . . [his] pleasures slight” (652) in her presence; similarly, when the sun becomes dangerously self-involved in the river passage—“And for his shade which therein shines, / Narcissus-like, the sun too pines” (639-40)—Maria inspires him to modesty: “The sun himself, of her aware, / Seems to descend with greater care; / And lest she see him go to bed, / In blushing clouds conceals his head” (661-64). Likewise, “loose Nature, in respect / To her, itself doth

⁷⁸The same values are implicit in the name “Bel-Retiro” (756). Smith writes, “‘Bel-retiro is properly *Buen Retiro*, so M[arvell] makes a Protestant and anti-Catholic joke (‘Bel’ is from ‘Bell [*sic*] and the Dragon’ in the Apocrypha)” (241 n755-6). But the joke also registers the concern with beauty more than virtue (punning on *bell*-, “beautiful”) and the notion of war and retirement (from Latin *bellum*).

recollect; / And everything so whisht and fine, / Starts forthwith to its *bonne mine*” (657-60). Smith notes that this last phrase is “another military term,” meaning “shown to good advantage” (Smith, *Poems* 238 n660). The military images (her presence in the garden passage, nature’s “*bonne mine*”), in combination with her reforming influence on the land—e.g., “’Tis she that to these gardens gave / That wondrous beauty which they have” (689-90)—connect her with a national and especially a familial legacy of Protestant virtue.

The constellation of horticultural and military images that describe Maria’s virtue reinforces the application of the gardener-general trope to her father. But her imagined future as a wife and mother define for Fairfax alternative role: that of forester-father. The latter trope honors the Fairfax family and estate with less emphasis on the military imagery than in the garden passage; thus the poem, as Hirst and Zwicker note (“High Summer” 263-64), avoids advising Fairfax as to whether to return to military service. The implication is that Fairfax’s virtue and discipline will have some influence regardless of whether he reenters the Army.

The speaker associates Maria’s family with the forest in an image of the family tree made literal.⁷⁹ At first it seems that family members are imagined as individual trees rather than branches:

The double wood of ancient stocks
Linked in so thick, an union locks,
It like two pedigrees appears,
On one hand Fairfax, th’other Vere’s:
Of whom though many fell in war,
Yet more to heaven shooting are:

⁷⁹The use of *tree* to refer to a genealogical diagram or a family itself is attested from the Middle Ages (*OED* “tree,” n., 6.a).

And, as they Nature's cradle decked,
Will in green age her hearse expect. (489-96)

As Smith points out (*Poems* 231 n493), the stanza records both the deforestation that resulted from the need for “weapons and ships” and the families’ sacrifices of life for political and religious causes. But in the later reference to Maria as the daughter who, “like a sprig of mistletoe, / On the Fairfacian oak does grow” (739-40), it is unclear whether the tree represents the former Lord General in particular, as Smith supposes (*Poems* 240 n739-42), or the family as a whole. The speaker’s description of the forest could well support this latter reading: “When first the eye this forest sees / It seems indeed as wood not trees: / As if their neighbourhood so old / To one great trunk them all did mould” (497-500).

But if Lord Fairfax is imagined as a tree, or a branch of one, he is also depicted as a forester, tending the family tree in general and Maria in particular. These related occupations are implied by the stanza that explains Maria’s ability to “scape[]” “Those trains by youth against [her] meant” (720, 714):

This 'tis to have been from the first
In a domestic heaven nursed,
Under the discipline severe
Of Fairfax, and the starry Vere;
Where not one object can come nigh
But pure, and spotless as the eye;
And goodness doth itself entail
On females, if there want a male. (721-28)

The first four of these lines, as we have seen, link Maria with conscience and Lord and Lady Fairfax’s parenting with gardening; they thus associate the conduct of the household with Fairfax’s former potential as gardener-general. Yet the second half of this stanza recalls instead part of the forest passage, specifically the description of the

hewel's precision and cleanliness and his ability to discriminate between "good" and "hollow" (545, 548):

He walks still upright from the root,
Meas'ring the timber with his foot;
And all the way, to keep it clean,
Doth from the bark the woodmoths glean.
He, with his beak, examines well
Which fit to stand and which to fell. (537-44)

This connection between the Fairfaxes' emphasis on virtue and the hewel's activities in the forest becomes clearer a few lines later, when the speaker draws an analogy between the oak's inner weakness, namely the nourishment of the "traitor-worm" (554), and human moral frailty: "As first our flesh corrupt within / Tempts ignorant and bashful Sin" (555-56). In a way, then, Lord Fairfax too "has the holt-felster's care" (538),¹³⁰ as he and his wife ensure their daughter's purity and the preservation of their family legacy of study, Protestant service, and virtue.

Although this reading appears to relegate Fairfax to a much smaller sphere of influence than the one he had had as Lord General, the poem suggests otherwise.¹³¹ The

⁸⁰Smith notes that, while H.M. Margoliouth takes this phrase to mean "holt-feller," i.e., "woodcutter," E.E. Duncan-Jones interprets it as "hout-vester" ("forester" or "keeper of the woods") (232 n538).

⁸¹John Rogers likewise sees the hewel passage as depicting in Fairfax's fatherhood and life in retirement the potential for national redemption ("Great Work" 215-16). But Rogers emphasizes what he understands to be a passive "participation in the real movement of history" (216), grounded in "natural progress" rather than "public acts of human assertion" (216); he characterizes Fairfax's life at Nun Appleton in terms of "necessary labor associated with the household" and "a simple domestic retirement" (215, 216). He also opposes these values to the poem's anticipation of Maria's marriage, which he reads in terms of a "human prodding" for redemption that he associates with chiliasm (216, 219). I disagree with his oversimplification of Fairfax's retirement, which as Hirst and Zwicker show was actually quite complicated ("High Summer" 254-55). I also find his account of Maria's significance reductive: he emphasizes the sacrificial violence of her loss of virginity (219-22) to such an extent that he neglects the poem's

description of the woodpecker's activities subtly connects moral vigilance with Fairfax's former military career: Michael Craze writes that the bird "becomes a siege engineer. For with the word 'mines' in line 550 the image changes to the siege of a walled town" (234).¹³² The passage thus draws an analogy between moral virtue and military action, but it presents the maintenance of virtue as an attack on vice rather than as a passive defense against it.¹³³ Fairfax's role as virtuous father, then, comes to resemble more closely his military experience. The poem also expands the field of Fairfax's influence in its description of the far-reaching significance of the Fairfax line's continuation: Maria, "like a sprig of mistletoe, / On the Fairfacian oak does grow; / Whence, for some *universal good*, / The priest shall cut the sacred bud" (739-42, emphasis added). Maria's future marriage acquires "universal" importance; her parents' virtues in childrearing, then, must fit her for such a life. In this way Fairfax and his estate can be seen as rectifying something of the world's, and England's, fallenness, even without his resuming his military career. In this way, the estate, and implicitly the family who have informed that estate's meaning, model a kind of redemption:

praise of her intellectual capacity and moral virtues. But these are important qualities: after all, the poem commends her parents not simply for having produced her but for having raised her with "discipline severe" (723).

⁸²Douglas Chambers writes, "Fairfax was . . . involved in the strategy of 'slighting' castles—of destroying their military advantage by blowing up one wall of the fortifications. Is not this point underlined by the very vulnerability of 'proud *Cawood Castle*' to the mental and visual '*Battery*' of the '*Bastions*' of Appleton House?" ("To the Abbyss" 152).

⁸³In *The Faerie Queene*, Spenser depicts Alma's Castle of Temperance as an instance of virtue under siege: the guard complains, "But thousand enemies about vs raue, / And with long siege vs in this castle hould" (2.9.12.6-7). E.E. Duncan-Jones comments on a web of relationships among *The Faerie Queene*, Marvell's poetry, and the Fairfax family and gardens (193; cited in Smith, *Poems* 224 n288).

'Tis not, what once it was, the world;
But a rude heap together hurled;
All negligently overthrown,
Gulfs, deserts, precipices, stone.
Your lesser world contains the same,
But in more decent order tame;
You, heaven's centre, Nature's lap.
And Paradise's only map. (761-68)

For the same reasons, presumably, the speaker can anticipate a time “when the after age / Shall hither come in pilgrimage, / These sacred places to adore, / By Vere and Fairfax trod before” (33-36). Fairfax becomes a paragon of fatherly virtue, not only for his family but also for all of England.

This image of the former Lord General once again recalls the replacement of Caroline myths with Fairfacian ones. Ann Baynes Coiro has noted that James I “styled himself publicly and explicitly as the father and husband of his people” and that in “his first published poem” Marvell figured Charles as the father of the country (27, 39). “Ad Regem Carolum Parodia” (1637) is a *parodia* of Horace’s *Carmina* 1.2 that appears in *Συνᾠδία Sive Musarum Cantabrigiensium Conventus et Congratulatio* (1637), a volume of poems written in honor of Charles and Henrietta Maria’s daughter Anne (Smith, *Poems* 5). Marvell’s poem portrays Charles’s fatherhood as a cure for the plague-ridden nation:

Sola tam longam removebere pestem,
Quam juvat luctus facièsque tristis,
Prolis optata reparare mole
Sola potésque.

.....

Hic magnos potiùs triumphos,
Hic ames dici pater atque princeps,
Et nova mortes reparato prole
Te patre, Caesar. (37-40, 49-52)

(You alone have the power to take away a plague so long, which is pleased by our grief and sad countenance; you alone have the power to renew through the longed for delivery of your offspring. . . . Here rather celebrate mighty triumphs, here may you love to be called father and prince, and make amends for death through new birth and with you, Caesar, as father.) (Smith, *Poems* 9)

In “Upon Appleton House,” Marvell likewise—though more vaguely and thus, perhaps, more cautiously—implies that Maria will benefit the nation as well as her future family; in carrying on the Fairfax legacy, even without a male line of descent, she will help to effect some “universal good” (741). Her father, then, who has given her not only life but also a virtuous upbringing, parallels in some ways the king of whom Marvell had written nearly fifteen years earlier.¹³⁴

⁸⁴In the letter Charles left as he escaped imprisonment at Hampton Court in November 1647, he repeatedly refers to his intended plan of “retirement” (80, 81), though he makes clear that he will not be idle: “Nor would I have this my retirement mis-interpreted; for I shall earnestly and uncessantly endeavour the setting of a safe and well-grounded Peace, where ever I am or shall be; and that (as much as may be) without the effusion of more Christian blood . . .” (80). He ends with the promise, “To conclude, let me be heard with Freedome, Honour and Safety, and I shall instantly breake through this Cloud of Retirement, and shew my selfe really to be *Pater Patriae*” (81). These passages reveal Charles’s reconciliation of retirement with his role as father of his people, a reconciliation at which I think Marvell hints, with regard to Fairfax, in “Upon Appleton House.”

The Idol of the Clowvnes (1654), purportedly written by the Royalist John Cleveland, links forest images with the *pater patriae* trope as applied to an English king:

Tyler (who could not but have known that nothing can be so destructive to Government, as the licentiousnesse of the base Commons) would doubtlesse (when his owne work had been done) quickly have chained up the Monster; he would have perched in the Kings sacred Oake; all the Forrest should have beene his, Bishopricks, Earledomes, nay the Kingdomes had been swallowed by him; instead of a just legall power by which the Kings acted, an arbitrary, boundlesse, unlimited power must have beene set up; instead of a fatherly royall Monarchy, a Tyrannie after the Turkish mode, a Monarchy seignoiral . . . (148-49)

Though the work is presented as a commentary on Richard’s reign and on the Masaniello revolt in Naples in 1647 (sig. A3r-v), it seems likely that the book also responds to Cromwell’s ascendancy: the end of the work condemns the English people for supporting the “usurper” Henry IV (154). The work appeared again, under Cleveland’s name, in 1658 as *The Rustick Rampant* and in 1660 as *The Rebellion of the Rude Multitude*; the latter’s full title mentions “the late rebellion in 1640, against King Charles I of ever blessed memory.”

The poem's movement away from the image of the gardener-general and toward that of the forester-father argues for virtuous domesticity as a fitting complement to military service. This trope, then, unites the most prominent elements of the Fairfaxes' legacy in such a way as to commemorate Fairfax's army career while complimenting his alternative to it. The poem makes no promise as to whether England will again become a "Paradise," but it does affirm the profound, if partial, redemptive value of individual and familial commitments to virtue.

Conclusion

The "Horatian Ode" and "Upon Appleton House" show their author's responses in 1650 and 1651 to the shifts in power that followed King Charles's imprisonment and execution. Marvell's scrutiny, in each poem, of the gardener-general trope registers not only the loss of England's putative gardener-king but also the questionable status of England as a garden. This latter issue is related to the poems' interrogation of myths associated with the court: both poems contemplate the status of literary art under the new regime, and both engage questions of hierarchy, correspondence, and analogy in ways that call into doubt the garden's viability as a symbol for England and thus the gardener-general trope's viability as well.

Marvell's scrutiny of that trope also involves questions about the distribution and retention of power. Figuring Cromwell as a farmer-general links his military successes with agricultural improvement, but specifying that he works for the state as does a tenant farmer for a landholder leaves uncertain the question of whether his power would, could, or should be limited. Similarly, although depicting Fairfax as a forester-father emphasizes his virtue, the focus on domesticity leaves unclear the precise nature and

extent of his family's redemptive power for the nation. Marvell's testing and revising of the gardener-general trope, and his replacement of it by others that pose rather than resolve questions of power, reflect the military and political uncertainties of 1650 and 1651.

CHAPTER 3

THE QUINCUNX, MEDIOCRITY, AND GARDENER-PRINCES IN BROWNE'S *THE GARDEN OF CYRUS*

Sir Thomas Browne's essay *The Garden of Cyrus* (1658) uses garden imagery more obliquely than do Marvell's poems to examine the relationship among rebellion, power, and virtue. Indeed, most critics who have considered this work's political significance deny that it responds to England's mid-century strife at all (Gosse 102; Dunn 126; Singer 86) or assert that it does so only by exemplifying retirement from political debate (Finch, *STB* 185-86; Post, *STB* 143). Such arguments are understandable given the essay's subtitle—*The Quincunciall, Lozenge, or Net-Work Plantations of the Ancients, Artificially, Naturally, Mystically Considered*—and the fact that Browne draws on political and military references only from long ago and far away (1: 180-81). But a few scholars see the work as offering more complex commentary on the upheavals to England's government and national Church (Huntley, "The Garden" 134-42; Preston, "Of Cyder" 879-80).

My reading of *The Garden of Cyrus* extends this second line of argument by examining Browne's use of the gardener-prince trope. Admittedly, the essay does not mention even one English ruler or, for that matter, anything English other than plants.¹³⁵

¹Even of Browne's references to English plants, Claire Preston writes that "one way of understanding *Cyrus* is to recognise it as . . . a vegetable chorography of the English countryside which is a prelude to that great English work of plant classification, Ray's *Catalogus Plantarum Angliae* (1670)" (*TB* 202).

The dedicatory epistle and the first chapter focus primarily on gardens, identifying the quincunx—the crisscross pattern in which four objects appear at the corners of a square or rectangle, and one at the intersection of the diagonals—as an ideal arrangement of trees; the following chapters invest that arrangement with universal significance by tracing the quincunx in works human and divine. But in the middle ground between private garden and created world lies England. Browne seemingly never explores this middle ground, yet his works encourage us to see his discussions of gardens as discussions also of England: in the dedicatory epistle to *The Garden of Cyrus*, he announces that “the Earth is the Garden of Nature, and each fruitfull Countrey a Paradise” (1: 175), and in *Religio Medici* he proclaims, “I was borne in the eighth Climate, but seeme to bee framed, and constellated unto all; I am no Plant that will not prosper out of a Garden. All places, all ayres make unto me one Countrey; I am in *England*, every where, and under any meridian . . .” (1: 70). More to the point, *The Garden of Cyrus* raises questions about moral virtue, the relation between physical and spiritual experiences, and the nature and origins of political power and revolt—questions central to England’s internal conflicts in the 1640s and 1650s.

The quincunx has been profitably interpreted in various ways—for example, as representing salvation and resurrection through Christ (Singer 90-91, 94, 99-102); “the systasis of the main opposition between ‘death’ and ‘life’” (Huntley, “Sir Thomas . . . Relationship” 207); and “certainty” and potentially “the order of all things” (Halley 102, 110). But I argue, firstly, that for Browne it also symbolizes mediocrity in the physical, intellectual, moral, and religious realms and, secondly, that it thus memorializes the

Church of England's *via media* in faith and worship.¹³⁶ The third part of my argument examines Browne's brief but crucial remarks, in the essay's opening pages, about several ancient rulers and princes who tended or appreciated gardens. Browne's variations on the gardener-king trope, I think, shape the essay's subtle responses to the nation's political and religious strife: namely its consoling English readers and encouraging the kinds of moderation represented by the quincunx.¹³⁷

I. Mediocrity and the Quincunx

For Browne, as for many other writers, gardens constitute and employ delicate balances—art and nature, openness and enclosure, the spiritual and the secular, aristocracy and the lower classes, leisure and labor, fallenness and perfection, humans and the lower creatures, contemplation and action, the peaceful and the problematic, relaxation and startlement. Even this necessarily incomplete list suggests the richness of real gardens and of the literary images that derive from and help to shape them. Yet in *The Garden of Cyrus* Browne rarely considers gardens in any holistic way. Instead he directs our attention to the figure that, for him, best expresses such complexity: the quincunx. Other shapes are indispensable, certainly; the circle and the square, for

²I am not arguing, however, that Browne's position on any of these matters is in fact moderate; as Joshua Scodel's excellent study of the subject has shown, classical and early modern authors alike demonstrate an awareness of how subjectivity and rhetorical aims influence definitions of the mean (3-4).

³In this regard, my argument expands on that of R.H. Robbins. Robbins has proposed that Browne intended *The Garden of Cyrus* and its companion piece, *Hydriotaphia*, as consolation essays for their respective dedicatees, who had recently suffered the deaths of close family members ("Browne, Sir Thomas," *ODNB*). More generally, my claims about the political resonance of *The Garden of Cyrus* resemble Achsah Guibbory's for *Hydriotaphia*. Guibbory concludes that in *Hydriotaphia*, "Browne is political though not quite polemical; he engages with politically controversial issues, yet is detached in his paradoxical, skeptical approach" (229).

example, have sometimes been understood as conveying gardens' heavenly and earthly associations respectively.¹³⁸ But the repeating, crisscross design of the quincunx offers a more complete, and also a more challenging, understanding of gardens' importance than simpler geometrical figures can provide. The quincunx represents ideals dear to Browne: order, correspondency, analogy, metaphor, and—most significant for my project—the avoidance of extremes.

Mediocrity had considerably more positive connotations in Browne's day than it usually has in ours. When the word refers to proficiency in a performance or skill, we tend to associate it with a "disparaging" tone (*OED* "mediocrity," 4). But in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, mediocrity instead often indicated an admirable or beneficial state: the meaning "an intermediate state or condition" has remained stable from at least the 1500s to the present (1.b), and the now-obsolete meaning "moderation" or "temperance," as applied to behavior, is evident in Elizabethan and Stuart works (2). These positive associations probably arise out of Aristotle's philosophy (*OED* "mediocrity," 1.b; "mean," n.³, 6.a); he asserts in the *Nicomachean Ethics* that moral virtue "is a mean state between two vices, one of excess and one of defect" (2.6.16).

If moderation is an exalted ideal, however, it is by no means a clear one. Joshua Scodel has noted that "[t]he mean is indeed a quintessential example of what post-Wittgensteinian philosophers call a 'fuzzy' concept, whose borders are hard to define" (3); Scodel's description of this lack of clarity takes into account both the challenges involved in comparing various behaviors and discerning which are truly moderate and the

⁴But Browne, following Scripture, also associates the square with the perfection of the "new heaven" and the "new earth" (Rev. 21:1), noting that "the form of *Babylon* the first City was square, and so shall also be the last, according to the description of the holy City in the *Apocalyps*" (1: 190). See Rev. 21:10-17 for the design of the New Jerusalem.

“polemical manipulation” by which writers exploited “the mean’s imprecision” to suit their own ends (3, 4). My study demonstrates Browne’s awareness of these challenges, though it does not claim that he overcomes or avoids them.

The Garden of Cyrus’s first mention of mediocrity signals both the desirability and the difficulty of holding to the mean in matters of gardening. In the dedicatory epistle, Browne praises his friend Nicholas Bacon’s horticultural moderation: “You have wisely ordered your vegetable delights, beyond the reach of exception. . . . In Garden Delights ’tis not easie to hold a Mediocrity; that insinuating pleasure is seldome without some extremity” (1: 176). It could be argued, however, that Browne indulges in the very “extremity” he criticizes, given that his entire essay ostensibly centers on the quincunx.¹³⁹

Indeed, Samuel Johnson writes in his *Life of Sir Thomas Browne* that

he considers every production of art and nature, in which he could find any decussation or approaches to the form of a Quincunx; and as a man once resolved upon ideal discoveries, seldom searches long in vain, he finds his favourite figure in almost every thing, whether natural or invented, antient or modern, rude or artificial, sacred and civil; so that a reader, not watchful against the power of his infusions, would imagine that decussation was the great business of the world, and that nature and art had no other purpose than to exemplify and imitate a Quincunx. (494)

Similarly, in a March 10, 1804, inscription to his beloved Sara Hutchinson, Samuel Taylor Coleridge exclaims, “Quincunxes in Heaven above, Quincunxes in Earth below, & Quincunxes in the water beneath the Earth; Quincunxes in Deity, Quincunxes in the mind of man; Quincunxes in bones, in optic nerves, in Roots of Trees, in leaves, in petals, in every thing!” (449). But Browne’s fascination with this figure can be read as a strong commitment to mediocrity rather than an indulgence in a pleasurable but morally problematic extreme. Browne does not abandon this ideal of moderation in the essay

⁵Claire Preston counters this impression by directing attention to the subject of generation (*TB* 182, 203-210).

proper; instead he depicts it over and over in ways that reiterate its importance and illustrate its range of applications—horticultural, physical, intellectual, moral, spiritual, and political.

The Quincunx and Physical Mediocrity

Browne describes the quincunx's physical properties as moderate and moderating. The pattern gives trees stability and equilibrium: Browne notes that the ancients' use of this planting design yielded "a just proportion of Earth, to supply an equality of nourishment" (1: 209), and he inquires "Whether in this order . . . trees will not better maintain their inward circles, and either escape or moderate their excentricities . . ." so as to keep the growth rings inside their trunks more nearly perfect (1: 212). Such moderation also extends to human experience. The quincunx provides a middle way for the sense of sight, imposing beneficial limits on our vision:

in this kinde of aspect the sight being not diffused but circumscribed between long parallels and the επισκιασμοζ and adumbration from the branches, it frameth a penthouse over the eye, and maketh a quiet vision: And therefore in diffused and open aspects, men hollow their hand above their eye, and make an artificiall brow, whereby they direct the dispersed rayes of sight, and by this shade preserve a moderate light in the chamber of the eye; keeping the *pupilla* plump and fair, and not contracted or shrunk as in light and vagrant vision.

And therefore providence hath arched and paved the great house of the world, with colours of mediocrity, that is, blew and green, above and below the sight, moderately terminating the *acies* of the eye. (1: 216-17)

Too much openness in the field of vision produces too much contraction in the pupil, so that one extreme leads to another. Browne's adjectives convey the undesirability of this kind of vision: *light* and *vagrant* link unenclosed, completely unhindered prospects with morally questionable and socially undesirable qualities (*OED* "light," a.¹, 14, 16, 22; "vagrant," n. and a., B.1-4). And while the quincunx limits sight, it does not produce too

much darkness.¹⁴⁰ In all these ways, then, Browne associates the quincunx with productive, desirable mediocrity.

This correspondence between shape and symbolic function grows more elaborate as Browne explores the quincunx's relation to the eye and the intellect. The quincuncial grove improves but also signifies vision: "It is no wonder that this Quincunciall order was first and still affected as gratefull unto the Eye: For all things are seen Quincuncially; For at the eye the Pyramidal rayes from the object, receive a decussation, and so strike a second base upon the *Retina* or hinder coat, the proper organ of Vision . . ." (1: 218-19).¹⁴¹ For Browne, this double function is appropriate because it exemplifies the universe's orderliness and correspondency. Furthermore, the eyes' communications with the brain have been said to follow a quincuncial pattern: "if ancient Anatomy would hold, a like disposure there was of the optick or visual nerves in the brain, wherein Antiquity conceived a concurrence by decussation" (1: 219). And the same figure maps out "animall and intellectuall receptions" (1: 219)—perhaps, Browne conjectures, meaning that mental disorders correspond to and arise from irregularities or extremes in this quincunx:

⁶The quincunx thus shows one way in which gardens and groves improve us: in it, art and nature converge to sharpen the sense of sight and so to allow for better perception of the natural world. The quincunx's regulation of sight also mediates between physical and spiritual experiences. Browne's description of the quincunx's optical benefits recalls his discussion of "the Creation of the Sunne and Moon, in the work of the fourth day; When the *diffused* light *contracted* into Orbes, and *shooting rayes*, of those Luminaries" (1: 179, emphasis added). The two passages invite us to compare the quincunx's effect on sight to God's institution of order and form in the heavens: the quincunx thus mediates not only between garden and gardener but also, by analogy, between divine and human work and between unfallen and fallen worlds.

⁷While Browne focuses primarily on the sense of sight, he also finds "the law of reflexion in moved bodies and sounds" reminiscent of the quincunx (1: 219).

Things entring upon the intellect by a Pyramid from without, and thence into the memory by another from within, the common decussation being in the understanding as is delivered by *Bovillus*. Whether the intellectual and phantastical lines be not thus rightly disposed, but magnified, diminished, distorted, and ill placed in the Mathematicks of some brains, whereby they have irregular apprehensions of things, perverted notions, conceptions, and incurable hallucinations, were no unpleasant speculation. (1: 219-20)

The quincunx thus signifies both the analogical and the causal relationship between sight and mental activity. Moderation means health not only for trees but for human eyes and brains, and that moderation is both attained through and represented by the quincunx.

Quincunx and Field: Mediocrity in Intellectual Exploration

These associations among the quincunx, beneficial mediocrity, and correspondency threaten to fall apart, however, when we turn to Browne's comments on knowledge and inquiry. Because the latter rely heavily on images of openness, they seem to call into question both the quincunx's appropriateness as a symbol for thought and the intellectual value of mediocrity. These implications, in turn, cast doubt on the notion that the essay promotes mediocrity as a wise response to political and religious upheaval. Yet Browne subtly tempers metaphors of open fields with an awareness of temporal and spatial boundaries that, for him, define intellectual experience. In *The Garden of Cyrus*, then, the quincunx constitutes a fitting symbol for moderate mental activity on a large scale, offering additional grounds for seeing mediocrity as central to the essay.¹⁴²

Browne's repeated comparisons of thought to wide-ranging movement initially suggest that intellectual vigor, like the bodily kind, demands vast open space. In the dedicatory epistle, when he modestly describes his difficulty in contributing to human

⁸Laurence Breiner writes of the quincunx as a symbol of limited "human vision" in matters "physical and metaphysical" and associates that circumscribed view with Browne's notion of humanity as occupying "the middle state" (271, 272).

learning, he depicts the realm of the knowable as a hunting field, albeit one so well worn as to offer little game: “The Field of knowledge hath been so traced, it is hard to spring any thing new” (1: 175).¹⁴³ And he returns to the image near the essay’s end, assuring readers that his work preserves “[a] large field” for others to investigate (1: 225). More tellingly, Browne’s argument for his subject’s value privileges openness over confinement. Claiming that the quincunx allows a creative freedom impossible for more popular topics, Browne concludes that too much circumscription inhibits rather than enhances intellectual pursuits:

In this multiplicity of writing, bye and barren Themes are best fitted for invention; Subjects so often discoursed *confine* the Imagination, and *fix* our conceptions unto the notions of fore-writers. Beside, such Discourses allow *excursions*, and venially admit of collateral truths, though *at some distance* from their principals. Wherein if we sometimes take *wide liberty*, we are not single, but *erre* by great example. (1: 175-76, emphasis added)¹⁴⁴

The italicized words and phrases represent freedom as desirable and restraint as detrimental: “invention” can make “bye and barren Themes” productive, much as land unenclosed for cultivation might support livestock. And Browne’s consideration of “collateral truths” seems to have the same effect of prizing freedom above a stricter discipline.¹⁴⁵

⁹Preston associates this field not with hunting but with horticulture (“Of Cyder” 879), proposing that the verb *trace* as Browne uses it here has to do with tilling the ground (882 n28).

¹⁰John R. Knott, Jr., recognizes a similar impulse toward mental freedom, writing that Browne’s criticism of “persistent literal-mindedness” (22) in Scriptural interpretation included “his questioning [in *RM* 1: 59-61, 62-63] of the physical representations of heaven and hell popularized by the Bible. At bottom, Browne appears to have been reacting to the constraints imposed upon the imagination by the need to render these places concretely” (22-23).

¹¹Likewise, Browne writes in *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, “[A]lthough in this long journey we miss the intended end, yet are there many things of truth disclosed by the way; and the

Yet discovering truths involves both freedom and restraint; as Browne's strong support for systematic investigation of the natural world suggests (1: 225-26), trial is often necessary to determine what is true. Thus while intellectual, and especially creative, freedom is important, it is not all-sufficient. And such freedom in one line of inquiry may involve stricture in another:

A large field is yet left unto sharper discerners to enlarge upon this order, to search out the *quaternio's* and figured draughts of this nature, and moderating the study of names, and meet nomenclature of plants, to erect generalities, disclose unobserved proprieties, not only in the vegetable shop, but the whole volume of nature; affording delightful Truths, confirmable by sense and ocular Observation, which seems to me the surest path, to trace the Labyrinth of Truth. (1: 225-6)

"[M]oderating the study of names" might involve overseeing nomenclature (*OED* "moderate," v., 3.a), but it might also involve "restrain[ing]" it (2.b) in favor of pursuing "generalities" that will lead to "delightful Truths." And so, even as Browne defends the value of a wide arena for the imagination, he remains aware of and committed to the discovery of truth, thus promoting both unfettered creativity and rigorous intellectual examination.

Moreover, if intellectual activity needs metaphorical open space and the time required to traverse that space, it also, Browne suggests, needs limits on both its duration and its scope. The question of duration is easily settled: as the closing paragraphs of *The Garden of Cyrus* make clear (1: 226), the mind requires well-defined periods of rest.¹⁴⁶ The question of scope, however, receives subtler treatment. On the one hand, Browne

collaterall verity may unto reasonable speculations some what requite the capital indiscovery" (Browne 2: 481).

¹²By turning to the possibility, and the difficulty, of sleep (1: 226), Browne ends the essay as he introduces it, with the tension between zeal and moderation, having characterized sleep, in *Religio Medici*, as "a death whereby we live a middle and moderating point between life and death . . ." (1: 89).

juxtaposes observations from various realms of study and experience in order to demonstrate a pervasive pattern, and occasionally he acknowledges the essay's expansiveness, as when he introduces Chapter IV: "As for the delights, commodities, mysteries, with other concernments of this order, we are unwilling to fly them over, in the short deliveries of *Virgil*, *Varro*, or others, and shall therefore enlarge with additional ampliations" (1: 209). On the other hand, although he often mentions points that seem far afield of his main purposes and interests, he does "decline" to explore a number of these in detail (1: 182).¹⁴⁷ And Preston argues cogently that his biggest supposed digression, the one on seeds that occurs partway through Chapter III (1: 196-200), actually contributes directly to his true subject, fecundity (*TB* 207-210), and constitutes the "primary theme" of the essay (*TB* 208). By combining a regard for limits with a wide scope of inquiry, then, *The Garden of Cyrus* models intellectual activity that is not only orderly (Huntley, *STB* 216)¹⁴⁸ but moderate as well.

Ultimately, Browne's metaphors of fields and hunting support such a reading, albeit indirectly. Their implications can be traced more clearly in the light of Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621), in which similar metaphors affirm both the value of mental freedom and the need for limits on that freedom. Like Browne, Burton's hunter is

¹³Huntley argues that Browne's paralipses contribute to the essay's "[e]xcess" ("*The Garden*" 141), a feature he identifies as typical of the prophetic writing with which he classes *The Garden of Cyrus* (140). But Preston, who finds thirty-five instances of paralipsis in the work, asserts that "an essay which seems litotically to highlight all the digressions it is not making creates by this means a rhythm, almost from the outset, of deferred or resisted by-ways which immediately become central and notable . . ." (*TB* 208). Her argument, with which I am inclined to agree, implies that Browne's freedom does not lead to wandering.

¹⁴Huntley writes that "Browne's knowing as well as his knowledge are of 'well-contrived order' [Browne 1: 183]. . . . The process of cognition in *The Garden of Cyrus* is one of 'regular ordination' [Browne 1: 181], like the quincunx itself" (*STB* 216).

bound by both time and the objective of the hunt. The “Digression of Air” begins with Democritus Junior’s resolution to allow his thoughts to roam untethered, like “a long-winged hawk” (2: 34): “so will I, having now come at last into these ample fields of air, wherein I may freely expatiate and exercise myself for my recreation, awhile rove, wander round about the world, mount aloft to those ethereal orbs and celestial spheres, and so descend to my former elements again” (2: 34-35).¹⁴⁹ He revels in total but temporary freedom. At the digression’s end, Burton returns to images of hunting animals in pursuit, this time the earthbound dog as well as the soaring hawk: “But my melancholy spaniel’s quest, my game, is sprung, and I must suddenly come down and follow” (2: 61). Hunting has a goal, Burton reminds us, and as pleasurable as “wander[ing]” may be, eventually the hunter must choose a path or else give up the chase. Moreover, Democritus Junior concludes, we are subject to the limitations of human nature and of earthly experience determined by God:

But hoo! I am now gone quite out of sight, I am almost giddy with roving about: I could have ranged farther yet, but I am an infant, and not able to dive into these profundities or sound these depths, not able to understand, much less to discuss. I leave the contemplation of these things to stronger wits, that have better ability and happier leisure to wade into such philosophical mysteries; for put case I were as able as willing, yet what can one man do?. . . Besides (as Nazianzen hath it) *Deus latere nos multa voluit* [God willed that much should remain hidden from us]. . . when God sees His time, He will reveal these mysteries to mortal men, and show that to some few at last, which He hath concealed so long. (2: 60)

¹⁵In his epistle to the reader, Democritus Junior uses similar language in his discussion of Plato’s and Lipsius’s praise of the inclination to learn about many subjects (17-18). On the relation between intellectual activity and hunting, see also Maryanne Cline Horowitz’s discussion of the symbolic relation of hunting and fishing frescoes in the *Chambre du Cerf*, Palais des Popes, Avignon, to the study and reading for which the room was used (123-28).

Browne, pondering the “mysticall” significance of the number five in Scripture, ends his series of questions with a similar comment, writing simply, “We leave it unto Arithmetically Divinity, and Theologically explanation” (1: 224).

Finally, then, Burton’s and Browne’s hunting metaphors suggest that the spaniel, or the hawk, of human thought is not meant merely to range widely in “[t]he Field of knowledge” (Browne 1: 175) or that of air (Burton 2: 34). Burton’s hawk “must suddenly come down and follow” (2: 61); Browne’s hunter must likewise move from the field into the garden, from searching that wide ground for bounty to cultivating a piece of it—perhaps especially a “bye and barren” piece—methodically (1: 175).¹⁵⁰ The quincunx, with its various paths and sight-lines but also the opportunity for changing directions, represents the ordered version of “the Labyrinth of Truth.” The design’s combination of freedom and limits makes it a good symbol for intellectual activity.

Quincunx and Field Revisited: The Cultivation of Moral Virtue

That movement from field into garden has important moral implications as well; as Leonard Nathanson observes, “Browne is aware that certain aesthetic and moral tensions

¹⁶This move simultaneously recalls prelapsarian life and acknowledges our distance from it: the Garden of Eden produced everything humankind needed before the Fall, and caring for a garden reinstates part of that goodness; at the same time, the need for labor and the potential for barrenness remind us of the consequences of the Fall. In this way, the process of investigating or expounding on a topic resembles Edenic experience and humankind’s best efforts to recover it.

The change from hunting game to tilling a garden is emphasized in the final paragraph of Browne’s essay: “To keep our eyes open longer were but to act our *Antipodes*. The Huntsmen are up in *America*, and they are already past their first sleep in *Persia*” (1: 226). This comment implicitly opposes the American “huntmen” to the renowned gardeners of ancient Persia. It also echoes the different reasons for the fame of two rulers mentioned early in the essay (1: 180): Nimrod is identified in Scripture as “a mighty hunter before the LORD” (Gen. 10:9), but according to Browne, Semiramis, “the third or fourth from Nimrod” (1: 180), may have created the Hanging Gardens of Babylon.

between nature and art are epitomized in the garden” (207). In *The Garden of Cyrus*, the quincunx symbolizes a way of meeting the challenges of living virtuously. Browne recognizes that gardens have the potential to incite moral corruption and that they thus require but simultaneously discourage moderate responses from owners and viewers; the quincunx, as he describes it, is the ultimate horticultural instantiation of mediocrity, which contrasts sharply with the “extremity” for which he faults some gardeners (1: 176).¹⁵¹ Both the dedicatory epistle and the essay proper reveal his approval of moral moderation and his disapproval of extremes.

The tension between the need for moderation and the difficulties of achieving it emerges in the dedicatory epistle, where Browne praises the middle way in garden appreciation and cultivation. The compliment to Bacon’s gardening practice and the attitude that governs it modulates quickly into playful criticism of people who abuse their love of gardens:

You have wisely ordered your vegetable delights, beyond the reach of exception. The Turks who passt their dayes in Gardens here, will have Gardens also hereafter, and delighting in Flowers on earth, must have Lillies and Roses in Heaven. In Garden Delights ’tis not easie to hold a Mediocrity; that insinuating pleasure is seldome without some extremity. The Antients venially delighted in flourishing Gardens; Many were Florists that knew not the true use of a Flower; And in *Plinies* dayes none had directly treated of that Subject. Some commendably affected Plantations of venemous Vegetables, some confined their delights unto single plants, and *Cato* seemed to dote upon Cabbage; While the Ingenuous delight of Tulipists stands saluted with hard language, even by their own Professors. (1: 176)

Browne’s description of Bacon’s gardens as “wisely ordered” suggests that not just any organizing principle will do: the gardens lightly satirized here are ordered, but they are not moderate. Browne’s criticism, however, is highly nuanced. Though committed to

¹⁷Browne had a personal stake in the question of moral gardening. Preston, characterizing the dedicatory epistle’s “abasement and effacement” as “almost comically disingenuous” (*TB* 203), notes that “Browne had at least one large arable plot in Norwich under cultivation, not to mention the gardens at his various Norwich houses” (204).

usefulness and moderation, features he finds wanting in the gardens in question, he sympathizes with gardeners who violate the golden mean: the sextuple repetition of *delight* acknowledges both the attractiveness of gardens and the problematic responses this attractiveness can stimulate, and these six instances—exceeding by one the quincuncial number—powerfully express the strength of the emotion and the tendency to indulge it immoderately. Moreover, the four different forms of the word that occur here reflect the variety of delight’s sources and manifestations as indicated by Browne’s examples.¹⁵²

These descriptions of delight, by expressing simultaneously the seeming triviality and the more serious ramifications of horticultural excess, further complicate any attempt to characterize Browne’s response as harsh or gentle. Except for the word *dote*, which almost certainly connotes an extremity of affection (*OED* v.¹, 3), Browne’s diction emphasizes both the potential innocence and the possible dangers of delighting in gardens. *Insinuating* may suggest merely a “subtl[ety]” of operation on the emotions (ppl. a., 1; “insinuate,” v., 3.a), but that very subtlety, analogous to physical “sinuous windings” (“insinuating,” ppl. a., 1), calls to mind the deceptive serpent in the Garden of Eden—all the more so because this word also contains the word *sin*.¹⁵³ *Venially* can

¹⁸The repeated emphasis on delight also recalls the Garden of Eden and the Fall, in which “Garden Delights” were abused: the place-name *Eden* comes from the Hebrew word for “delight” or “pleasure” (*OED*, “Eden”).

¹⁹Stanley Fish argues that Milton’s description of the animals playing near Adam and Eve before the temptation and Fall hints at fallenness not because the inhabitants of Paradise are other than innocent, but because we are (150-57). Though not used by Fish, the following example demonstrates how innocent “insinuating” appears threatening given the serpent’s later role in Adam and Eve’s first sin: “close the Serpent sly / Insinuating, wove with Gordian twine / His braided train, and of his fatal guile / Gave proof unheeded

mean “pardonably, excusably” (*OED* adv.), but it also registers some degree of “sin” (adv.; “venial,” a.¹ and n., 1.a) or “fault” (“venial,” a.¹ and n., 2.a). *Ingenuous* seems more simply positive, meaning “[n]oble in nature . . .” (a., 2); “high-class” (3); “[h]onourably straightforward . . .” (4); or “[i]nnocently frank or open; . . . artless” (4.b). Yet in the context of the criticisms Browne levels at similar offenses, and particularly after his description of “that insinuating pleasure,” the affection for tulips seems at best naïve. His respect for moderate gardens and his nuanced criticism of extreme ones imply that gardens yield signs of their owners’ or designers’ moral conditions and that control over the self and the garden is required for protecting each from objection. But in the light touch of his censure he shows restraint, thereby modeling once again the moderation he praises. The cultivation of a plot of ground is closely linked to the cultivation of virtue; the complexity of Browne’s writing about this relationship instantiates the challenges inherent to each pursuit.¹⁵⁴

The letter’s closing compliments to Nicholas Bacon and his family explicitly relate virtue to horticulture and reaffirm the importance of mediocrity: “But unto this ill-judging age, we charitably desire a portion of your equity, judgement, candour, and ingenuity; wherein you are so rich, as not to lose by diffusion. And being a flourishing branch of that Noble Family, unto which we owe so much observance, you are not new set, but

. . .” (*PL* 4.347-50). The word *Insinuating* presumably alludes to the serpent’s movements but, for us, is associated with “guile.”

²⁰The association of gardening with moral development and vice versa is common in the period. For an extensive discussion of seed and planting imagery as applied to the human mind and soul in ancient, medieval, and Renaissance debates about reason and virtue, see Maryanne Cline Horowitz’s *Seeds of Virtue and Knowledge* (1998). Chapter 3 of Rebecca W. Bushnell’s *A Culture of Teaching* (1996) “examin[es] how educational and gardening theory and practice intersected in the gardening tropes that were used to describe a child’s development and training” in early modern Britain (75).

long rooted in such perfection . . .” (1: 177). Bacon is not only a virtuous gardener but also part of the virtuous garden of his family; the language of planting here compares figurative cultivation to the literal kind, tracing the passing on of virtues from generation to generation.¹⁵⁵ And one of these virtues constitutes a kind of moderation. *Equity* involves “fairness” or “impartiality” (*OED* “equity,” 1). But more specifically, “many of the earlier Eng[lish] examples” of this usage are colored by the meaning of *επιεικεια*—in the *OED*’s words, “reasonableness and moderation in the exercise of one’s rights, and the disposition to avoid insisting on them too rigorously”—via *aequitas*, typically used for translating the Greek term into Latin (“equity,” 1).¹⁵⁶

²¹Preston suspects a “mischievous” reference, in this compliment, to the newness of the family’s baronetcies (*TB* 203 n114); although her reading’s sly humor is attractive, it depends on a narrow interpretation of the word *noble*. Browne writes in *Religio*,

Let us speake like Politicians; there is a Nobility without Heraldry, a naturall dignity, whereby one man is ranked with another, another Filed before him, according to the quality of his desert, and preheminance of his good parts. Though the corruption of these times, and the byas of present practice wheele another way, thus it was in the first and primitive Commonwealths, and is yet in the integrity and Cradle of well-ordered polities, till corruption getteth ground, ruder desires labouring after that which wiser considerations contemn, every one having a liberty to amasse & heape up riches, and they a licence or faculty to doe or purchase any thing. (1: 71)

The Bacon family was well known from the time of Sir Nicholas Bacon (1510-1579), Lord Keeper under Elizabeth I, father of Sir Francis, and great-grandfather of the dedicatee of Browne’s essay. This elder Sir Nicholas’s father, Robert, came from a family of yeomen (Tittler, *NB* 16) and was a farmer turned sheep-reeve (17); Sir Nicholas’s rise from these modest beginnings to social and political prominence, according to his biographer Robert Tittler, “portrays the ascendancy of a broader concept of aristocracy: one based on gentility as well as birth, and training as well as power” (*NB* 194).

²²Although “earlier” is a vague term, it appears that this meaning still influenced the usage of *equity* as late as 1660. The *OED* examples include the following comment from Jeremy Taylor’s *Ductor Dubitantium; or the Rule of Conscience in All Her Generall Measures*: “Not to punish any man more than the law compels us; that’s equity” (3.6.§1.399, qtd. in *OED* “equity,” 1).

Although Browne glosses this compliment with a marginal reference to “the most worthy Sr. Edmund Bacon prime Baronet, my true and noble Friend” (1: 177), the remark also points back to Nicholas Bacon’s great-grandfather Sir Nicholas Bacon (1510-1579), whose epitaph in St. Paul’s Cathedral credited his status in part to his “*Æquitas*” or “Justice” (P. Fisher 91, 92).¹⁵⁷ Sir Nicholas, who became Lord Keeper of the Great Seal in 1558, was explicitly committed to mediocrity in its most positive senses: his biographer Robert Tittler repeatedly characterizes his handling of political and religious matters as moderate (“Bacon, Nicholas” *ODNB*; NB 54-55, 70, 86, 168-69, 177, 195, 196-97), and of Sir Nicholas’s first country house, Redgrave Hall, Tittler writes, “Bacon’s motto, *Mediocria Firma* (‘Safety in Moderation’), carved above the main door as it would later appear over the Gorhambury mantle, is a fitting commentary on the home as well as the man” (NB 35).¹⁵⁸ This reputation is also evident in a work contemporary with Browne’s: Thomas Fuller’s *History of the Worthies of England* (1662) praises Bacon for having held true to the first word of his motto, “[n]ever *attaining*, because never *affecting*, any great Estate. He was not for *Invidious Structures* (as some of his Contemporaries) but delighted in *Domo Domino pari*. Such as was his house at *Gorhambury in Hartfordshire*” (3: 63).

²³Much of the monument has been destroyed (Tittler, NB 189), but Tittler reproduces an engraving of it (Plate 4) from Sir William Dugdale’s *The History of St. Paul’s Cathedral* (London, 1818).

²⁴For more information on Bacon’s estate homes, see Tittler’s descriptions of the “modest[]” (NB 35) Redgrave Hall (NB 34-35) and the more elaborate Gorhambury house (NB 66-67). Tittler’s main sources, both by Ernest Sandeen, are “The Building Activities of Sir Nicholas Bacon” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1959) and “The Building of Redgrave Hall, 1545-1554” (*Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology* 29 (1961):[1-33]) (Tittler, NB 215 n43, 207 n37).

Browne's praise of his friend Nicholas, then, also memorializes the Lord Keeper's values.¹⁵⁹ In this regard, the epistle follows through on one of Browne's purposes for writing *Hydriotaphia*; in the epistle to that work, he writes,

'Tis opportune to look back upon old times, and contemplate our Forefathers.
Great examples grow thin, and to be fetched from the passed world. Simplicity flies away, and iniquity comes at long strides upon us. We have enough to do to make up our selves from present and passed times, and the whole stage of things scarce serveth for our instruction. A compleat peece of vertue must be made up from the *Centos* of all ages, as all the beauties of *Greece* could make but one handsome *Venus*. (1: 132)

This reading aligns nicely with R.H. Robbins's suggestion that Browne intended *The Garden of Cyrus* and its companion essay, *Hydriotaphia*, as "works of consolation, exercises in the genre of Seneca's *Moral Essays*" ("Browne, Sir Thomas" *ODNB*).¹⁶⁰ Robbins's comparison is particularly apt given the affinity between Sir Nicholas Bacon's motto and Seneca's philosophy. Tittler, citing the Lord Keeper's "admiration for the ideas and style of Seneca," identifies the latter's *Oedipus* as the likely source of Bacon's motto; he also notes Elizabeth McCutcheon's conclusion that "the Latin *sententiae* which Bacon chose to adorn his gallery walls at Gorhambury were largely Senecan in composition and substance" (Tittler, *NB* 57).¹⁶¹ Likewise, Tittler finds "an underlying

²⁵Preston, observing that "Browne's prefatory remarks . . . are often among his most revealing," deems the dedication of the essay to Nicholas Bacon "highly appropriate" for a different reason: identifying Nicholas as "a collateral descendant of the great Francis," she writes that "of all his formal, published works, *The Garden of Cyrus* is Browne's most purely Baconian undertaking" (*TB* 203; see also Huntley, *STB* 215).

²⁶Robbins points out that Sir Charles Le Gros, the father of *Hydriotaphia*'s dedicatee, Thomas Le Gros, died in 1656 and that "Nicholas Bacon, too, had recently been bereaved, in his case of successive heads of the family, his uncles Sir Edmund Bacon (Browne's 'true and noble friend') and Sir Robert Bacon, premier baronets, in 1649 and 1655" ("Browne").

²⁷McCutcheon's paper is printed as "The Great House *Sententiae* of Sir Nicholas Bacon" in *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies, Amsterdam*,

Stoic cast” in the first nineteen poems of Bacon’s *The Recreations of His Age* (NB 63).¹⁶²

Browne’s promotion of mediocrity thus honors a virtue that undergirded many of the Lord Keeper’s private and public ideals.

Like the dedicatory epistle, the essay advocates the cultivation of virtue, but the latter depicts both the risks of neglecting this cultivation and the rewards of attending to it. The story of Nebuchadnezzar’s lack of restraint and the resulting punishment vividly illustrates the need for self-control in gardens. From the Hanging Gardens of Babylon, Browne writes, the king surveyed the lands around him, with disastrous results: “over-looking *Babylon*, and all the Region about it, he found no circumscription to the eye of his ambition; till over-delighted with the bravery of this Paradise, in his melancholy metamorphosis, he found the folly of that delight, and a proper punishment, in the contrary habitation, in wilde plantations and wandrings of the fields” (1: 180). In at least three ways, Browne’s account foregrounds the moral dangers encountered in gardens. The shift from literal vision (“over-looking”) to figurative (“the eye of his ambition”) suggests that seeing the lands tempted Nebuchadnezzar to boundless “ambition,” so that a sensory pleasure created a moral problem, just as for the gardeners Browne criticizes in the dedicatory epistle (1: 176).¹⁶³ Moreover, the phrase “this Paradise” refers to the

1973 (1979): 747-57. See also her volume of the *sententiae* with English translations and a critical introduction.

²⁸Bacon’s Stoicism even has a geometrical component related to the quincunx: Elizabeth McCutcheon writes that “Sir Nicholas prized the classical ideal Erasmus called the ‘*quadratus homo*,’ the ‘square man,’ a metaphor borrowed from Aristotle to describe someone who does not place the happiness of man in external goods and who seeks to maintain an even aspect regardless of fortune” (*Sir Nicholas* 58).

²⁹It is tempting to think that Browne’s emphasis on vision was influenced by the Scriptural account of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of the great tree. Of this tree the king

Hanging Gardens but perhaps also to the entire territory; this ambiguity implies that disordered horticultural passion can represent but also cause excessive political “ambition.” Finally, Browne’s version of the story, which implicates the land in Nebuchadnezzar’s wrong-headed joy and pridefulness, differs considerably from the Scriptural version, which instead emphasizes the king’s pride in his palace and position: “At the end of twelve months he walked in the palace of the kingdom of Babylon. The king spake, and said, Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power, and for the honour of my majesty?” (4:29-30). Browne, then, accuses Nebuchadnezzar of wanting to cultivate too much of the world, to bring within the bounds of his gardens and his power all that he saw. This criticism echoes the assertion in the dedicatory epistle that “Garden Delights” usually produce “some extremity” (1: 176)—especially given that *delight* appears twice in Browne’s summary of Nebuchadnezzar’s fall.¹⁶⁴

reports that “the height thereof reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth” (Dan. 4:11).

³⁰The resemblances between Browne’s account of Nebuchadnezzar’s transformation and the Genesis story of the Fall enhance this caution about gardens’ dangers. Browne’s remark that the Hanging Gardens “[s]omewhat answer[] or hint[] the old Opinion concerning Paradise it self, with many conceptions elevated above the plane of the Earth” (1: 180) helps to justify the comparison, but there are other similarities too. Adam and Eve were, like Nebuchadnezzar, expelled from a lovely garden to unbounded “wandrings”; Milton imagines the pair as leaving the garden “with wand’ring steps and slow” (12.648). Moreover, Arnold Williams cites ambition as one among “seventeen ‘antecedents’ to Eve’s sin” given in David Pareus’s commentary on Genesis (121); the serpent’s assertion that the forbidden fruit will give Adam and Eve godlike knowledge (Gen. 3:5) is his last argument before Eve yields to the double temptation of pleasure and ambition (Gen. 3:6). Just as Eve is induced by means of a garden delight to overstep the bounds of propriety by seeking godlike abilities, Nebuchadnezzar takes too much pride in his power, mistaking God’s blessings for his own successes.

Yet Browne's account of Nebuchadnezzar's punishment supports his earlier depiction of gardens as desirable in spite of the risks they incur. Characterizing loss of the gardens—life in “wilde plantations and wandrings of the fields”—as a fitting consequence for the king's transgression (1: 180), Browne stresses not the diminishment of Nebuchadnezzar's humanity, which is emphasized in the Scriptural account, but the change in “habitation” from cultivated to uncultivated land.¹⁶⁵ Even as Browne establishes this distinction between gardens and fields and between art and nature, however, he complicates it: the phrase “wilde plantations” posits the king's temporary home as a garden made by God rather than by humans, and it recalls the dedicatory epistle's praise of “Plantations” that represent the earth's abundant variety such that art mimics nature (1: 176).¹⁶⁶ The phrase's paradoxical turn also echoes Browne's assertion in *Religio Medici* that “Nature is the Art of God” (1: 26). This reconciling of two very different landscapes implies that Nebuchadnezzar held an extremely strict definition of and appreciation for gardens, for which moderation was a much-needed corrective. The

³¹The passage in Daniel, by contrast, hardly mentions the land: “and he was driven from men, and did eat grass as oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till his hairs were grown like eagles' *feathers*, and his nails like birds' *claws*” (4:33). Browne's different emphasis may arise from his adamancy that Nebuchadnezzar's beastliness was figurative: “of all Metamorphoses and transformations,” he writes in *Religio Medici*, “I beleeve onely one, that is of *Lots* wife, for that of *Nabuchodonosor* proceeded not so farre; In all others I conceive there is no further verity then is contained in their implicate sense and morality . . .” (1: 48).

³²This phrase seems comparable to the term *wilderness*, which can refer to “uncultivated land” (*OED* 1.a) but also to “[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” (1.c). This word's ambiguity complicates Browne's mention, near the end of *The Garden of Cyrus*, of sleep's tendency to confuse thought, “making . . . Wildernesses of handsome Groves” (1: 226).

point is not that gardens result only in temptation and moral corruption but rather that they require of their owners discerning judgments and moderated passions.

If gardens pose a moral danger, then, the example of Cyrus the Great shows that they also provide a place for exercising virtue. Browne writes admiringly that “*Cyrus* the elder, brought up in Woods and Mountains, when time and power enabled, pursued the dictate of his education, and brought the treasures of the field into rule and circumscription. So nobly beautifying the hanging Gardens of *Babylon*, that he was also thought to be the authour thereof” (1: 180). Cyrus’s “circumscription” of nature, which improves the gardens implicated in Nebuchadnezzar’s fall, proves praiseworthy; indeed Browne implicitly aligns Cyrus’s treatment of nature with Adam and Eve’s God-given “dominion” over the animals and their use of seed-bearing plants and trees (Gen. 1:28-29). Cyrus, in Browne’s eyes, is a good gardener because, unlike Nebuchadnezzar, he masters his gardens rather than allowing them to master him. And although Browne does not directly associate Cyrus the Great’s moderation of nature and of passion with the quincunx, the king is a prototype of “our magnified *Cyrus*,” Cyrus the Younger: Cyrus the Great imposed “rule and circumscription” (1: 180) on nature, just as the younger Cyrus, renowned “as the splendid and regular planter” for his use of the quincunx, “dispos[ed] his trees like his armies in regular ordination” (1: 181).¹⁶⁷ And Xenophon makes the latter Cyrus’s planting skill a sign of his virtue: in the *Oeconomicus*, Lysander, having learned of the prince’s dedication to both agricultural and martial pursuits,

³³Moreover, in the *Anabasis*, Xenophon calls the younger Cyrus “the most kingly and the most worthy to rule of all the Persians who have been born since Cyrus the Elder . . .” (1.9.1).

remarks, “I think you deserve your happiness, Cyrus, for you earn it by your virtues” (4.25).

While Browne’s dedicatory epistle emphasizes private virtue, the essay’s attention to the trope of the gardener-king and in particular to Nebuchadnezzar’s and Cyrus the Great’s tremendous military power foregrounds the relation between private virtue and its public ramifications. Browne’s phrasing suggests that Cyrus’s ordering of nature reflected his own orderly moral condition, while Nebuchadnezzar, in looking at his gardens, indulged a disordered passion; Nebuchadnezzar’s excess contrasts sharply with Cyrus’s moderation.¹⁶⁸ The repetition of the word *circumscription* in the passages about these two kings heightens the contrast between the men’s projects and attitudes. Particularly insofar as this word—from *circum*, “around,” and *scribere*, “to make lines, write” (*OED* “circumscribe”)—links the concepts of limits and limitations with both gardening and writing, it expresses the double effect of gardens both to confine and to free us: just as the quincunx’s boundaries can improve the sense of sight (1: 216), the garden’s limits can bring order to nature in a way that represents, encourages, and, ideally, regulates human creative and political power.¹⁶⁹ Good gardening, as Browne

³⁴Madeleine de Scudéry’s romance *Artamenes, or The Grand Cyrus* (1649-53; English translation, 1653-55) emphasizes just such a difference: when King Ciaxares suspects Cyrus of betrayal (1.207), the “Venerable old man” Thiamis (2.4) defends the young prince’s reputation by recalling that “the proud City of *Babylon* which aspired unto universal Monarchie, hath been subdued by his valour . . .” and that “in the midst of all his victories and Conquests he is absolute Master of his Ambition, and prostrates all his Triumphs, and all his Glory at your feet . . .” (2.5).

³⁵Browne praises the quincunx in part for “circumscrib[ing]” sight (1: 216) and diagnoses Nebuchadnezzar as having “no circumscription to the eye of his ambition” from the vantage point of his gardens (1: 180). The quincunx improves sight but also stands for the achievement of clear moral vision.

understands it, requires circumscription, and it thereby operates on both nature and humans, shaping us even as we shape the land.

Browne's Model of Virtue: Garden, World, and Book

As important as circumscription is, however, it needs to be applied reasonably; just as a wide but finite scope for exploration entertains and enlightens the mind, an inclusive but carefully designed garden proves both pleasurable and useful. For Browne, a garden shaped by moderate rather than excessive limits follows the example of God's ordering of the universe and thus profits the mind and the soul as well as the body. Yet, Browne also suggests, these advantages can be gained not only from the best literal gardens but from *The Garden of Cyrus* too: while the essay instructs readers in judging the intellectual, moral, and spiritual benefits of superior gardens, it also implicitly claims to provide readers with those benefits.¹⁷⁰ This feature encourages us to see in the work a concern with human thought, conduct, and belief; such a reading helps us to understand how the essay responds to England's religious and political problems.

³⁶In this regard, Browne's essay resembles "the extensive genre of treatises on fruit-trees, practical guides in the georgic mode very often enriched with metaphorical, Christian readings of the garden and orchard . . ." (Preston, *TB* 177); Preston cites as examples Samuel Hartlib's pairing of the *Designe for Plentie* with *The Reformed Spirituall Husbandman* (1652) and Ralph Austen's 1653 publication of *A Treatise of Fruit-Trees* with *The Spirituall Use of an Orchard* (*TB* 177). Preston writes that such works' "binding together of the practical and the emblematic to yield Edenic conceptions of individual and communal welfare is also a process which informs *The Garden of Cyrus*, where the elementary structural unit (the quincunx) refers both to a pragmatic arboricultural technique and to a reproduction of the orderliness of the divine model" (*TB* 178-9).

Preston also sees the essay's form and functions as intimately related to gardens and the world, but her discussion of this relationship centers on the fertile digressiveness of the third chapter (*TB* 204-5).

Browne commits to moderate rather than extreme restraint, for gardens and his essay alike, in his dedicatory epistle, which, after criticizing overly specialized gardens, champions a very different kind developed from very different values:

That in this Garden Discourse we range into extraneous things, and many parts of Art and Nature, we follow herein the example of old and new Plantations, wherein noble spirits contented not themselves with Trees, but by the attendance of Aviaries, Fish Ponds, and all variety of Animals, they made their gardens the Epitome of the Earth, and some resemblance of the secular shows of old. (1: 176)

The term *secular shows* refers to certain Roman celebrations, “games continuing three days and three nights celebrated once in an ‘age’ or period of 120 years” (*OED* “secular,” a. and n., 5). John Evelyn’s *Numismata* (1697) clarifies the relation between these games and the “variety of Animals” described by Browne. Among the images depicted on the reverses of ancient medals, “[t]he true Figures of the *Hippopotamus*, *Crocodile*, *Rhinoceros*, *Elephant*, *Cameleopard*, *Panther*, and other rare and exotic Animals, usually led, and exhibited in Triumph, or prepared for Combat and the *Amphitheater*, are expressed to gratifie and divert the People, especially during the *Secular Shews*” (Evelyn 62).¹⁷¹ Browne here prefers gardens that mimic the created world’s diversity to those arising from monomania. That he associates this “variety” with moderation rather than extremity is suggested by the balancing of freedom and control in the phrases “we range” and “we follow.”

In addition to reiterating the importance of horticultural moderation, the above passage establishes an explicit analogy between these admirable “Plantations” and *The Garden of Cyrus*. Because, for Browne, the created world is both garden (1: 175) and

³⁷Perhaps serendipitously, Evelyn’s long list of images places the passage quoted above between “*Nymphs*, *Naiads*, *Syrens*, *Satyrs* and *Sylvan Deities*” and “divers Flowers, Fruits and Plants, &c.” (62).

book (1: 206, 1: 217, 1: 24-25), his work as a writer is bound up with both gardeners' labors and God's.¹⁷² Browne's description of the best gardens as "the Epitome of the earth"—the "abstract" (*OED* "epitome," n., 1), "summary" (1.b), or "compendium" (1.b) of the Book of Nature—likewise links gardening with writing, much as does *circumscription* in the account of Cyrus the Great's horticultural achievements (1: 180). And Browne's remark about cultivating "barren Themes" (1: 175) invites us to compare his project to Cyrus's cultivation of the fields and to conclude that Browne's *Garden* imitates the work done by the best gardeners. *The Garden of Cyrus*, then, is a literary analogue for the activities for which Browne commends Nicholas Bacon and the elder and younger Cyruses. The analogy implies that the essay instantiates the moral as well as the intellectual virtues Browne promotes and that if gardens, read aright, can serve as microcosms that teach us about the world, then so can the essay. Both Browne's *Garden* and the praiseworthy "Plantations" that he uses as models follow patterns created by God, thereby replicating the divine order predicated on mediocrity.¹⁷³

³⁸Browne writes in *Religio*, "God . . . contemplates as fully his workes in their Epitome, as in their full volume, and beheld as amply the whole world in that little compendium of the sixth day, as in the scattered and dilated pieces of those five before" (1: 62). C.A. Patrides notes that "the implicit parallel between the creator of *Religio Medici* and the Creator of the world—himself 'an excellent Artist' [Browne, *RM* 1: 25]—involves also relationships between the book that is *Religio Medici* and the books of nature and of God . . ." ("Best Part" 46). And Thomas Singer writes of the garden image in Browne's essay, "Following a common Renaissance *topos*, it is the world itself—the world where our first parents were created, where they fell from grace into nature, and where they will find regeneration" (91 n10).

³⁹Browne's conception of this divine order is particularly clear in two passages from *Religio*. He believes that "there is in this Universe a Staire, or manifest Scale of creatures, rising not disorderly, or in confusion, but with a comely method and proportion . . ." (1: 43). A little farther on, he describes humans as "that amphibious piece betweene a corporall and spirituell essence, that middle frame that linkes those two together, and

Perhaps because comparing *The Garden of Cyrus* to real gardens exposes the essay to the same moral objections that the latter can inspire, Browne handles the likenesses carefully. Having identified the problems of horticultural and moral “extremity,” Browne hastens to protect his work, focused as it is on a particular pattern of planting, from similar criticisms. In the passage quoted above, he not only demonstrates how he avoids indulging a too-particular passion, like Nebuchadnezzar’s or those mentioned in the epistle to Nicholas Bacon, but also defends his work’s inclusiveness from charges of the opposite extreme, arbitrary accumulation¹⁷⁴: he insists that the “extraneous things” his readers will encounter signal not disorder but an attempt to represent more fully truths about the world, just as the gardens he describes represent the world’s variety and abundance.¹⁷⁵ The difference he finds between his approach and those for which he criticizes some gardeners is that he is attempting to produce an accurate reflection of the

makes good the method of God and nature, that jumps not from extreames, but unites the incompatible distances by some middle and participating natures . . .” (1: 44).

⁴⁰Patrides finds a similar concern in *Musæum Clausum* (published in *Miscellany Tracts*, 1683), asserting that in it Browne meant “to parody the indiscriminate collecting of ‘rarities’ by scientists in the seventeenth century . . .” (“Best Part” 33). Incidentally, John Evelyn identifies Nicholas Bacon as the addressee of “[m]ost of” the *Miscellany Tracts* (qtd. in Browne 3: 5).

⁴¹Preston, examining these “digressive tendencies,” calls attention to the seemingly opposing impulses toward confinement and expansiveness (*TB* 204). She sees Browne’s “extreme latitude of enquiry” as instantiating the “verdancy” that is the essay’s main topic (*TB* 204). Her claim for fecundity’s centrality is convincing, but her characterization of the essay as “wild” does not account for how Browne’s concern with mediocrity distinguishes his project from morally problematic gardens.

Janet Halley, arguing that the essay’s digressiveness imitates “nature in its irreducible plenitude” (101), writes of the third chapter’s attention to seeds that “a self-described digression . . . is ironically the centerpiece of the central chapter, a formal paradox uniting disorder with decussation. . . . Finally, by pursuing infinitesimal orderliness directly to the vanishing point, to an ordered but unknown locus in the seed from which life and speciation itself emerge, it articulates a relation between literary disorder and natural order, human and divine creativity” (119).

world, for investigation and for praise of God,¹⁷⁶ rather than indulging a private, particular passion that is either too narrow or too expansive.

This difference emerges most clearly in the dedicatory letter's implicit distinctions between the gardens Browne criticizes and the ones he sees as "the Epitome of the earth" (1: 176). He objects to several kinds of excess: demands that Heaven be a garden; obsessive love for a particular kind of plant, potentially to the exclusion of others; and care only for beautiful or fascinating plants with unknown, few, or no physical benefits (1: 176). The gardens he praises display the opposite virtues: a focus on earthly joys, with no claims about the nature of Heaven; a commitment to variety rather than homogeneity; and a combination of productive and beautiful features, representing the world's bounty (1: 176).

How closely, then, does Browne's essay align with this latter kind of garden? At first glance, much less so than we might expect. He explicitly frames his subject in terms of the nature of Heaven, justifying *The Garden of Cyrus*'s placement immediately after *Hydriotaphia* with the comment that "the delightfull World comes after death, and Paradise succeeds the Grave" (1: 176-77). And he limits himself to well-known plant species, noting that "we have . . . industriously declined illustrations from rare and unknown plants" (1: 176) and confining his discussion to "common English specimen[s]" (Preston, *TB* 202); his essay is therefore neither as specialized as the gardens he criticizes

⁴²Preston also recognizes this purpose, writing that Browne treats the quincunx "as a harbinger . . . of the natural fecundity that signifies God's grace" (*TB* 205). Our arguments diverge in our points of emphasis: unfettered abundance in her case, moderation in mine.

nor as comprehensive as those of which he approves.¹⁷⁷ Yet his work resembles the latter more closely than it does the former. *The Garden of Cyrus* focuses on earthly phenomena that have religious significance, but it does so without insisting on any particular heavenly joys. And while Browne pays special attention to the quincunx and, as Preston argues (*TB* 205-210), to generation, his discussion ranges among plants, animals, and humans and between art and nature. Finally, Browne aims to please Bacon with “these low delights” (1: 177) but also to discover “collaterall truths” (1: 176); he wants his essay to combine pleasure and usefulness.

Browne’s epigraph, from Quintilian’s remarks on “Ornament” in *The Orator’s Education*, strengthens this last similarity between *The Garden of Cyrus* and the best gardens. In the first edition of the essay, the quotation is prominently positioned between the end of *Hydriotaphia* and the title page of *The Garden* (86), beneath the work’s first illustration of a quincunx.¹⁷⁸ The epigraph’s appropriateness stems partly from its praise for the quincunx’s orderliness and symmetry and partly from its source’s comparison of rhetorical strategies to gardening. Quintilian, distinguishing virtue in ornamented

⁴³According to Preston, *The Garden of Cyrus* mentions “130 useless, spontaneous, non-arable, misbehaving trees, weeds and hedgerow sports, vegetation obeying no gardener and no demand for utility. Against this 130, only six cultivable fruit or nut trees, and under twenty garden flowers, kitchen-garden plants or arable grains are even named in *Cyrus*, which is otherwise notably free of apples, pears, quinces or sallets, free of any of the carefully tended species which so delight the grafters, planters and inoculators of the English New Elysium” (“Of Cyder” 880).

⁴⁴Keynes instead places it between the dedicatory epistle and the essay proper (Browne 1: 178).

language from the vice with which it is often confused (8.3.6b-7a),¹⁷⁹ asserts that the former depends upon an eloquence that enhances, rather than competes with or detracts from, the subject (8.3.5-14). He marshals horticultural, agricultural, and arboricultural analogies to defend the value of combining beauty and use in this way. The passage quoted by Browne appears in italics below:

I do not want any of our decadents to say that I am against elegant speakers. I do not deny that elegance is a virtue; but I do not find it in them. Am I to regard a farm where I am shown lilies and violets and anemones freely springing up as better cultivated than one where there is a full harvest and vines laden with fruit? Am I to prefer the barren plane and clipped myrtle to the vine-supporting elm and the fruitful olive? Rich men may be allowed these luxuries; but what would they be if they had nothing else? “Are we not then to lend beauty to the fruit trees also?” Of course. I shall plant my trees in order and at fixed distances apart. *What can be more handsome than the quincunx, which presents straight lines whichever way you look?* But it also has the immediate advantage that it draws the moisture from the ground evenly. (8.3.7b-9, emphasis added)

Just as Quintilian points out the limited value of mere “luxuries,” Browne rejects gardens created to indulge an obsession or to gratify an urge for novelty. And while Browne’s epigraph emphasizes the quincunx’s beauty, his concern for truth (1: 226), like the context for that epigraph, indicates that usefulness is important for him in much the same way as for Quintilian.

The reference to Quintilian also strengthens the essay’s connection to the Bacon family. Lord Keeper Bacon, by George Puttenham’s account, was quite fond of the rhetorician’s work: “I haue come to the Lord Keeper Sir *Nicholas Bacon*, & found him sitting in his gallery alone with the works of *Quintilian* before him . . .” (117). According to Patrick Collinson, Quintilian provided Bacon with a “rhetorical *via media* somewhere

⁴⁵Quintilian’s project has an unmistakable moral component: “The rhetoric which I am trying to establish, . . . the rhetoric which befits a good man and really *is* rhetoric, will be a virtue” (2.20.4b).

between Cicero and Seneca. . . . For Quintilian shared Seneca's moral values but in prose style veered away from his artificial figures and far-fetched conceits towards a preference for Cicero . . ." ("Sir Nicholas" 259). But Bacon's affinity for Quintilian, like that for Seneca, arose also from these writers' "moral discipline" as Stoics, which "a sententious rhetoric" communicated particularly well (Collinson, "Sir Nicholas" 259). Thus Browne's prominent use of a passage from Quintilian links the quincunx with both a prose style and a moral philosophy favored by Nicholas Bacon's revered great-grandfather.¹⁸⁰

Particularly in its balancing of beauty and use and of narrow and broad scopes, *The Garden of Cyrus* exemplifies the moderation that Browne associates with the best gardens. The explicit and implicit analogies between garden and essay encourage us to read the latter as another source for the kinds of intellectual, moral, and spiritual development enabled by the former: if real gardens can benefit the owner or viewer, then so can Browne's *Garden*. Just as the world provides a pattern for the gardens, and the gardens for the essay, the essay gives readers a model in moral matters as well as intellectual inquiries, a model firmly grounded in the virtue of mediocrity signified by the quincunx.

⁴⁶This reading could be challenged by the fact that the passage from Quintilian also appears in two sources for parts of *The Garden of Cyrus*: Benedictus Curtius's *Hortorum Libri Triginta* (1560) and Giambattista Della Porta's *Villæ* (1592) (Patrides, *Major Works* 320 n9; Finch, "Sir Thomas" 278 n17). But Browne's use of the passage is perhaps less derivative than it seems: Curtius does not use the quotation as an epigraph but instead includes it in the chapter "De arborum ordinibus," in which he discusses the quincunx (Finch *STB* 267); likewise, the range of Della Porta's work, as its title suggests, is much wider than that of Browne's essay.

II. Mediocrity and Faith

Thus far, Browne's *Garden* appears to offer private intellectual and moral instruction, mimicking the seclusion of a well-kept estate garden or the educational benefits of an extensive physic garden.¹⁸¹ But as its references to ancient military events and religious spaces suggest, the essay is concerned with more than the improvement of the individual. Mediocrity is for Browne an important virtue, and one perhaps best cultivated in a garden. But if, like charity, it begins at home, it extends to public matters, just as the essay opens outward from particular gardens to the whole world.¹⁸² Preston acknowledges the work's relationship to discussions of public as well as private virtue (*TB* 177-82), yet she foregrounds natural philosophy and private devotion in particular (*TB* 203-10). And while her reading directs us to the crucial themes of regeneration and resurrection (*TB* 175-210), it risks trivializing the essay's mentions of public worship.

The essay bears a twofold relevance for theology and ecclesiology. Firstly, it focuses on gardens, which in early modern England encouraged private devotion and meditation on God's mercy and glory among various groups of believers. Indeed, studying gardens in order to advance natural philosophy accorded perfectly with Browne's ideals of faith and worship, which he drew, as Donald Rauber has shown (249-86), from the Church as well as from Scripture. Secondly, Browne associates the quincunx not only with

⁴⁷"Except for Oxford, whose Physic Garden (1621) had been endowed but not created when he matriculated there as an undergraduate," Preston observes, "each of Browne's universities [Padua, Montpellier, and Leiden] possessed . . . a fully functioning and long-established encyclopaedic garden" (196).

⁴⁸In *Religio Medici*, Browne, meditating on sin, asks, "But how shall we expect charity towards others, when we are uncharitable to our selves? Charity begins at home, is the voyce of the world; yet is every man his greatest enemy, and as it were, his owne executioner" (1: 77). For a brief but astute discussion of the importance of charity in *Religio*, see Huntley's critical biography of Browne (*STB* 114-17).

mediocrity but also with devotional symbols and ceremonies as well as temples. And this fact implies that the figure is an emblem for the Church of England's *via media*.

Ultimately, in these various connections between gardens and religious debates, *The Garden of Cyrus* memorializes the exiled English Church.

Gardens and Worship in the Mid-Seventeenth Century

Seventeenth-century gardens could express the aesthetic and ecclesiological ideals figured forth in churches and worship services, but they could also offer refuge to nonconformists. David R. Coffin, contrasting the largely social role of French gardens in the 1600s and 1700s with the much more solitary, meditative attractions of gardens for the English, writes, "In the Catholic countries of France and Italy contemplation and meditation were the functions of the church and the confessional, not the garden, whereas nonconformists like Mary Rich, countess of Warwick, or much later John Wesley would turn to gardens or wildernesses as their confessional where they personally sought their deity without the intervention of a priest in a Catholic or Anglican confessional" (2). The example of Mary Rich tells us much about the spiritual use of gardens after the Restoration and the reestablishment of the state Church, but I want to show that gardens served similar purposes for displaced conformists in the nearly two decades of that Church's exile.¹⁸³

⁴⁹In non-ecclesiological terms, Preston has recognized gardens' importance to worship across denominational lines: she writes that in the middle of the seventeenth century, a "rich blend of millenarian, physico-theological, georgic and politico-economic thinking informed almost every writer on fruit. For all of them, the labour and industry of planting and tending is explicitly or latently an act of worship, the respectful, stewardly task of tending God's creation, bringing it into a perfection it might not achieve unaided" ("Of Cyder" 872).

The likeness between gardens and churches acquired special significance in the mid-seventeenth century, when the Church of England fell victim to persecution and suppression, and the internal wars and Cromwell's subsequent military initiatives endangered gardens and groves as well as the peace and prosperity these spaces symbolized. In short, ecclesiastical and horticultural destruction ran parallel. But whereas the attacks on the Church sought to extinguish forms of worship deemed popish and thus both offensive and dangerous, the damage to gardens was more restrained, having been driven more by material needs than by ideological differences.¹⁸⁴ As *The Garden of Cyrus* implies, the gardens that outlasted the period's conflicts represented survivals of as well as losses to the ravages of war, and so they could comfort believers mourning the Church's exile as well as horticultural and arboricultural enthusiasts saddened by the damage to gardens and groves.

Of course, not all gardens in the 1640s and 1650s were intended or used for consoling English Church believers. Other groups found other kinds of value in these spaces: Charles Webster, for example, discusses Puritan views of the social and economic improvements available through agriculture and horticulture (469-83). And despite their

⁵⁰John Dixon Hunt, citing Roy Strong's account of the Parliamentarians' damage to royal gardens (Hunt 143), gives political significance as a reason for the destruction of some "royalist" gardens, but he also notes that "many gentry and lesser nobility" employed Italianate designs in their gardens in the 1650s (144). Hunt suggests, moreover, that these gardens were politically meaningful: "Perhaps the antique Roman associations of Italian gardens even authorized this style for England's republican attitude: Pembroke, whose hillside at Wilton was decorated with a statue of Marcus Aurelius, was to side with Parliament when civil war broke out in 1642" (143-4). In *Sylva* (1664), John Evelyn inveighs against the Puritans' damage to England's forests (Evelyn, *Writings* 187-90); Charles Larson remarks that although "[Evelyn's] distress is that of any member of the *ancien régime* in a revolution who has had to watch the iconography of his cause subjected to purposeful destruction," immediate economic benefits might well explain the Puritans' deforestation (27). Graham Parry attributes the destruction to the need for "ships, fuel and the making of iron" (142).

differences over the role of sensory experience in worship, Puritans and conformists agreed that gardens provided spiritual benefits. On the one hand, then, gardens were widely viewed as displaying God's majesty and reminding visitors of central tenets of the Christian faith, like the reality of corruption, the importance of sacrifice, and the promise of resurrection. On the other hand, manmade decorations, some of which were based on religious and even specifically Christian objects and symbols, made gardens vulnerable to accusations of idolatry.

Gardens' place in Christian spiritual life derived partly from their natural elements, passages from the Book of Nature written by God and meant to be read and used by humans. As David Coffin demonstrates (57-86), in the seventeenth century the view of gardens as useful for religious instruction and contemplation cut across theological and ecclesiological differences between English Church conformists and dissenters. A typical example of how garden plants and phenomena were interpreted—found in John Evelyn's *Elysium Britannicum* (335) and William Prynne's *Mount-Orgueil* (138-42), among many other works—treats the blossoming, withering, and seeding of flowers as representations of death and resurrection, so that the garden reminds visitors of the brevity of life but also of God's promise of salvation.¹⁸⁵

Indeed, some writers regarded nature as providing all the visual helps needed for religious experience or meditation. For example, in *Mount-Orgueil* (1641), Prynne argues that church decorations and other devotional aids are unnecessary because every garden shows us Christ:

⁵¹Coffin also finds this example in works by politician John Melton, herbalist John Parkinson, and poet and pastor George Herbert (7-8).

What neede of Popish Pictures then to bring
Christ to our Eyes, minds, thoughts? sith every thing,
Plant, Herbe that in our Gardens sprouts, lives, growes,
His life, Death, rising, farre more clearely shewes?
Away then with these Cursed Idolls; we
Christ no where else will ever seeke, view, see
But in his Word, Workes, Sacraments, wherein
We onely can behold him, without sinne;
And when we long him, or his Acts to Eye,
If Bibles faile, each Garden will descry
Them to us, in more sweete and lively wise,
Than all the Pictures Papists can devise. (126)

Stanley Stewart rightly finds here a view of the garden as “a surrogate Bible” (116). But the phrase “If Bibles faile” also suggests an important difference, namely that gardens may represent Christ “in more sweete and lively wise” than either Bibles or “Popish Pictures”: Prynne allows for the possibility that Bibles may fail to depict Christ to us, not that gardens may. Gardens differ from Scripture, moreover, in that their effects arise largely from visual images rather than from words; as Stewart observes, “The obvious analogue here would be the Catholic use of icons” (116). A garden’s “natural” features such as flowers and trees, Prynne asserts, serve the same purpose as crucifixes, stained-glass windows, and painted icons—and for Prynne, the former are preferable because, having been created by God rather than by humans, they do not offer occasions for idolatry. Thus although Prynne does not explicitly compare gardens to churches, he does maintain that the spiritual benefits of a garden surpass those of Catholic, and presumably also Laudian, images.

But even as gardens could be used to justify reforming the English Church, they could also be said to support certain of its values and practices. Amy Hope Dudley Sweitzer has shown that Henry Vaughan (1621-1695) in his poetry looks to nature for a proper response to the Interregnum’s ecclesiastical and social upheavals. Citing several

poems that depict plants and animals as offering appropriate praise to God (106-110), Sweitzer asserts that for Vaughan “the natural world is the ideal Church, characterized by joyful worship and active virtue, holy beauty and perfect unity, heartfelt devotion and peaceful stability” (106). Vaughan sees “externals” as unnecessary (Sweitzer 138), and he more than once “suggests that the feasts and ceremonies of the English Church are celebrated by nature” (107; see also 107-110). Sweitzer argues that Vaughan’s poetry, like Izaak Walton’s *Compleat Angler*, offers comfort to English Church believers bereft of a visible, socially sanctioned community of faith:

The identification of the Church with gardens, forests, and rural landscapes, attempts to console Church members for loss of political power by implying a church that exists as part of God’s creation rather than only as part of human society. In their Christian and ecclesiastical version of the pastoral world, Vaughan and Walton offer their readers a holy community independent of the broken and corrupted society that rejected their religious practices. This community contains the promise of peace, though it is not the peace of the Church Militant and Triumphant. It is instead the peace offered by Christ to the meek, who inherit the earth. (123)

Sweitzer’s analysis tells us much about how Vaughan’s garden imagery exemplifies the attempt “to re-imagine or redefine [the] Church” (122). But this consolatory impulse was not limited to literary gardens; it extended to real ones as well.

John Evelyn proposes just such an idea to Browne in a letter dated January 28, 1659/60, in which he describes his plans for the *Elysium Britannicum*, his lengthy and ultimately unfinished work on gardens:

We will endeavour to shew how the aire and genious of Gardens operat upon humane spirits towards virtue and sanctitie, I meane in a remote, preparatory and instrumentall working. How Caves, Grotts, Mounts, and irregular ornaments of Gardens do contribute to contemplative and philosophicall Enthusiasme; how *Elysium, Antrum, Nemus, Paradysus, Hortus, Lucus, &c.*, signifie all of them *rem sacram et divinam*; for these expedients do influence the soule and spirits of man, and prepare them for converse with good Angells; besides which, they contribute to the lesse abstracted pleasures, philosophy naturall and longevitie: and I would have not onely the elogies and effigie of the antient and famous Garden Heroes, but a society of the *Paradisi Cultores*, persons of antient simplicity, paradisean and hortulan saints, to be a society

of learned and ingenuous men, such as Dr Browne, by whome we might hope to redeeme the tyme that has bin lost, in pursuing vulgar errorrs, and still propagating them, as so many bold men do yet presume to do. Were it to be hoped, *inter hos armorum strepitus*, in so generall a Catalysis of integrity, interruption of peace and propriety, the hortulane pleasures, these innocent, pure, and usefull diversions might enjoy the least encouragement, whilst brutish and ambitious persons seeke themselves in the ruines of our miserable yet dearest country, *quis talia fando* . . . (in Browne 4: 275)

Although the second half of this passage, which describes the “society of learned and ingenuous men” that Evelyn envisions, focuses primarily on natural philosophy, the diction of the first half puts this study in the context of religious experience, as do the later phrases “paradisean and hortulan *saints*,” which recuperates a title often claimed by the Puritans, and “redeeme the tyme,” which echoes Ephesians 5:16 and thus fuses the project of natural philosophy with St. Paul’s description of Christian life.¹⁸⁶

English Church conformists and Puritans, then, agreed that gardens’ natural features could encourage right worship much as Scripture did. Manmade additions’ significance for the analogy between gardens and churches proves more difficult to assess. The groups tended to differ in their attitudes toward material “images”: whereas conforming worshippers accepted crosses, crucifixes, and other such ornaments as expressions and reinforcements of beliefs central to the Church’s faith, Puritans, as the example of William Prynne’s *Mount-Orgueil* demonstrates, viewed these objects as occasions for idolatry.¹⁸⁷

⁵²Graham Parry discusses these phrases’ religious significance in terms of Baconian and millenarian values (136-38).

⁵³John Phillips sees the Puritan reaction against Christian art—“the Protestant insistence on Scripture as a restraint to artistic imagination or the ‘safe’ kind of decorative art that offends no one, least of all instructs”—as an influence in “the move from art as a handmaiden of religion to its conception as an autonomous activity in the seventeenth century” (209). The example he cites of this privileging of Scripture and “the most beautiful forms of nature” over “art as a means of expressing the mysteries of faith and

John Phillips provides a telling summary of the Long Parliament's original ordinance of August 1643 mandating the destruction of images (184): "all altars and tables of stone were to be taken away and demolished, all tapers, candlesticks, crucifixes, crosses, images and pictures, all inscriptions should be destroyed. Rails were to be broken. Communion tables were to be taken from the east and placed in 'some other fit convenient place'" (185). A 1644 "supplement[]" to this ordinance also "authorized the removal of copes, surplices, fonts, screens and organs" (Phillips 185).¹⁸⁸ And lest we think that what was unacceptable in churches was permissible elsewhere, Phillips cites the earlier example of London's West Cheap Cross, which dated from 1486 and which had displayed "a large crucifix crowned by a dove, supplemented by sculptures of the Resurrection, Virgin and Child, and Edward the Confessor" (144). The sculptures survived an attempt to destroy them in 1581, but the monument's renovation in 1600 included replacing the cross with a pyramid, and the statue of Mary with a "semi-nude" one of Diana, in response to "Puritan objections" (144). Similar problems arose with the Cheapside Cross in the early 1640s: Phillips writes, "Along with Laud, Cosin and others, this old market cross was accused of seducing good Englishmen to Rome . . ." (181). Thus for some Puritans, at least, idolatry was idolatry, whether inside or outside a

art" (209) is taken from the 1551-52 "Injunctions for Gloucester and Worcester Dioceses" by John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, who forbade the painting of saints' likenesses on windows and commanded instead that "if they will have anything painted, that it be either branches, flowers or posies ["[m]ottoes" (289 n1)] taken out of Holy Scripture" (289 item 28).

⁵⁴Phillips notes, however, that although the Parliament's intentions were clear, the actual destruction was characterized by "latitude and widespread confusion" (185).

church.¹⁸⁹ And if both churches and public squares were unacceptable sites for religious images, then gardens containing crosses, altars, and other such ornaments would presumably have met with the same objections.¹⁹⁰

A number of analogies can be drawn between church and garden ornaments. Roy Strong, writing about how early Stuart gardens encouraged contemplation, suggests that “Thomas Bushell’s weird hermitage grotto and gardens at Enstone become a kind of Protestant equivalent of Catholic Counter-Reformation piety,” serving a function much like the cloister’s (211). But he does not explore whether or how other kinds of garden ornaments imitated the elaborate ecclesiology and ceremonies of the Laudian Church. Yet plans and recommendations for the most ornate gardens call for a wide variety of objects, many of which have a spiritual, and some of which a religious or specifically Christian, significance. John Evelyn’s *Elysium Britannicum*, for example, recommends statues (204-210); fountains (169, 176-81); architectural topiary such as “Nieches, Skreenes & Triumphall Arches . . .” (145); music, including organs (231-43); and mosaic, which he specifically associates with churches (191; 192 n11).¹⁹¹ He also describes without censure having seen waterworks with “Crownes, balls and Crosses throwne up &

⁵⁵John Phillips writes that “for the Puritan, no church or place signified special holiness . . .” (159); thus presumably the same injunctions against idolatry would apply in secular spaces as in churches.

⁵⁶Phillips notes the Puritans’ “ultimate desire to transform all aspects of society” (205-206). He also quotes a letter to Cromwell from Mary Netheway, who objected to and requested the destruction of “the naked antique marbles in the Privy Garden at Hampton Court” (Phillips 200). This example shows a concern even with garden ornaments that have no association with Christian images.

⁵⁷Evelyn reports of “the goodly *Citron*” that “neere *Valentia* in *Spaine*, they have bin planted & maintaine in forme of a spacious ~~shape~~ {Cathedrall} ~~church~~ with its chapells, cloisters, Altars, the stales for the *Canons* etc: after an admirable order of Architecture, cutt & maintaine” (317).

playing in the aire { & water} *tanquam Ludibria Elementorum*” (184). Although such furnishings can be interpreted merely as accoutrements of retirement and pleasure-seeking, they can also be seen as ways of reconstituting the aesthetic and spiritual ideals of the vanished Church of England. So much is suggested by Evelyn’s liking for “*Grotts*” that “wind or circle into various *Meanders & Dædales* . . . as most disposed {fitt} for retirement & {holy} solitude, to which a lampe hanging in the farthest & darkest part, will *greately* {much} contribute, as greatly disposed{ing} ~~for~~ {to} devotion & profound contemplation: For ~~thus~~ {so} the holy *Hermites* lived in {the} tymes of Persecution . . .” (193).¹⁹² Many of the ornaments featured in or desired for the more elaborate gardens, after all, closely resemble those Parliament wished to see removed from churches.

The implications of comparing garden decorations to church ornaments are twofold. On one hand, the destruction of gardens can be seen as analogous to that of ornately furnished churches or of the images and practices that marked those churches out for Puritan attack. On the other, the gardens that survived—or the plans laid for those anticipated or simply imagined as ideals—may have consoled believers deprived of their visible national Church.

⁵⁸This passage appears in Book II, Chapter X, and thus was perhaps written before the Restoration: in his letter of January 28, 1659/60, Evelyn tells Browne, in reference to his progress on the *Elysium*, “I cannot say to have finished any thing tollerably, farther than chap: XI. lib. 2, and those which are so completed are yet so written that I can at pleasure inserte whatsoever shall come to hand to obelize, correct, improve, and adorne it” (in Browne 4: 276).

Browne's Garden and the Church of England's Middle Way

The Garden of Cyrus hints at this consolation in numerous ways, thus offering a kind of consolation of its own. Browne's examination of nature always had spiritual ends, so he could continue to seek and to honor God even when he could not attend the Church services he loved. Moreover, his comparisons of the quincuncial pattern to religious and especially Christian crosses, and of the arboreal quincunx to ancient pagan and Hebrew temples, reinforce the associations between the subject of his essay and the religious tradition to which, in *Religio Medici*, he had declared his devotion (1: 14).

The Garden of Cyrus never actually draws an analogy between England's gardens and churches; in fact, it never directly mentions the mid-century suppression of the Church.¹⁹³ But it does acknowledge, early on, war's potential effects on horticulture.¹⁹⁴ In his discussion of Nebuchadnezzar's and Cyrus the Great's care of the Hanging Gardens of Babylon, Browne praises Cyrus's forces, who subjugated the Babylonians, for preventing military opposition from disrupting horticulture: "The *Persian* Gallants who destroyed this Monarchy, maintained their Botanicall bravery" (1: 180). His diction juxtaposes horticulture and military aggression: *bravery* means "[d]isplay," "ostentation," or "splendour" but also "courage" and even "[a] gallant" or a group of them (*OED* 3, 2, 5); *gallants*, in turn, can mean "fine gentlem[e]n" or [o]ne's (military) followers" (*OED* "gallant," a. and n., B.1.a, 2.b), but in Gerard's *Herbal*, the term *Gallant* refers to "a kind of Anemone" (B.4). The statement shows how the horticultural and martial meanings of

⁵⁹ Achsah Guibbory argues convincingly, however, that *The Garden of Cyrus's* companion essay *Hydriotaphia* registers the loss of the Church of England's ceremonies (231-41).

⁶⁰ This relation forms the basis for Preston's analysis of the essay in terms of the two "garden-writing" traditions discussed above (*TB* 180).

these words intertwine, yet it does not make these meanings interchangeable. Browne's wordplay thus emphasizes the Persians' distinction between military and horticultural matters.¹⁹⁵

In his admiration for this distinction, Browne implicitly criticizes the Army's and Parliament's abuses of English gardens. The destruction ranged from the restrained to the dramatic. A proclamation dated July 24, 1649, from Sir Thomas Fairfax, commander of the New Model Army, threatens court martial in response to

Complaints . . . that divers souldiers most unconscionably have broken into mens Gardens, Orchards, and grounds in the Counties of *Middlesex, Surrey, Kent*, and have thence stolne great store of fruit, Turnippes, and other Roots, which if not prevented, will endanger the undoing of many Gardiners, and for time to come obstruct their industry in Planting and sowing of Roots and other provisions, which have heretofore afforded great relief, especially to the poor.¹⁹⁶

And more broadly, Roy Strong, explaining how political pruning led to horticultural pruning on a massive scale, vividly describes how war and its consequences injured royal gardening:

Gardening is essentially one of the arts of peace. It was born in the aftermath of the Tudor pax and was destroyed by the Civil War. It is not until the 1650s that gardens once more become the subject of lively debate and of construction. This revival was prefaced, however, by a gigantic act of rejection. After the execution of Charles I in 1649 not only were the contents of the royal palaces dispersed and sold but also those of the gardens. In one gesture of stupendous barbarism the statuary and fountains

⁶¹This distinction between military prowess and "Botanicall bravery" is echoed, for Browne, in "the very name of Paradise: wherewith we meet not in Scripture before the time of *Solomon*, and conceived originally *Persian*. The word for that disputed Garden expressing in the Hebrew no more than a Field enclosed, which from the same Root is content to derive a garden and a Buckler" (1: 180). The less specific, Hebrew term, Browne implies, does not sufficiently distinguish between innocent and violent realms of experience, whereas *paradise* gives writers a way to refer to parks and gardens in particular and to the prelapsarian and heavenly existences associated with these landscapes. A. Bartlett Giamatti's *The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic* has an excellent discussion of the various meanings of *paradise* (11-15).

⁶²Compare Jack Cade's trespass onto Alexander Iden's property in search of food in *King Henry VI, Part Two* (4.10).

were dismantled and auctioned off, the avenues of trees felled and disposed of as timber and the gardens abandoned. . . . When Charles II returned in 1660, royal gardening had to begin again. (197)

Browne, writing in the wake of the rebellion and regicide, had witnessed the very destruction he commends the Persian forces for avoiding.

And the damage went deeper than insult, carelessness, or poor stewardship: it meant a loss of order but also a loss of meaning. Garden structures were often designed with specific meanings or symbolic values in mind; for example, Strong notes that an early-seventeenth-century mount at Theobalds “ha[d] . . . a symbolic function, a maze leading to the goddess Venus” (53). If, then, a labyrinth represents disorder but also an order that a visitor can discern only with time and effort, then to destroy the structure is to destroy meaning, to erase an important if mysterious sign. The same principle applies to other symbolic features, alone or in combination. And ultimately, if “the Earth is the Garden of Nature . . .” (Browne 1: 175), and if a garden can represent the whole world in its variety and organization (1: 176), then to destroy a garden is to obfuscate if not to deny the relationships among humans, the world, and the Garden of Eden—between humans’ work and rest and God’s.

Indeed, Browne’s views of the relation between nature and faith implicitly endorse a comparison between gardens and churches. For him, natural philosophy could illuminate religious truths: “in this masse of nature,” he contends in *Religio Medici*, “there is a set of things that carry in their front, though not in capitall letters, yet in stenography, and short Characters, something of Divinitie, which to wiser reasons serve as Luminaries in the abysses of knowledge, and to judicious beliefes, as scales and roundles to mount the pinnacles and highest pieces of Divinity” (1: 21). It could also constitute a kind of

worship: “The wisdom of God receives small honour from those vulgar heads, that rudely stare about, and with a grosse rusticity admire his workes; those highly magnifie him whose judicious enquiry into his acts, and deliberate research of his creatures, returne the duty of a devout and learned admiration” (1: 22). *The Garden of Cyrus* has often been regarded as an instance of such investigation: Nigel Smith, for example, writes that the “world of privatised public devotion is evidence of an Episcopal and ceremonial church in existence but without its external structure. . . . Sir Thomas Browne’s intricately patterned prose writings also search for the shapes of divinity in the natural world . . .” (*Literature* 128). But the question of the established Church’s place in this search has engendered competing interpretations. Smith regards the inquiry Browne conducts in his essays as a “set of Anglican gestures” (128); Preston rejects this view on the grounds that “the reconvening of fragments is . . . a primary impulse in the practices of curiosity and especially of the wider ‘Baconian’ programme of the advancement of learning and the resurrection of knowledge, and not especially Anglican or restrictive” (*TB* 197). Her claim rightly defines the common ground held by Browne and other thinkers intent on re-establishing Edenic knowledge. It does not, however, account for Browne’s integration of natural philosophy with his belief in the Church of England’s teachings.

The fact that “the reconvening of fragments” was shared by natural philosophers outside the English Church does not distance Browne’s part in this project from his faith or from his conformity to that Church. The attempt to recover truth by studying nature complements the Church’s goal of teaching religious truth, a goal that Browne saw

fulfilled better in that Church than in any other. The *Religio* clearly affirms Browne's commitment:

There is no Church wherein every point so squares unto my conscience, whose articles, constitutions, and customes seeme so consonant unto reason, and as it were framed to my particular devotion, as this whereof I hold my beliefe, the Church of *England*; to whose faith I am a sworne subject, and therefore in a double obligation subscribe unto her Articles, and endeavour to observe her Constitutions . . . (1: 14)

Indeed, for Browne the Church's authority is second only to Scripture's: "where the Scripture is silent, the Church is my Text; where that speakes, 'tis but my Comment . . ."

(1: 14). A few pages later, however, he identifies nature as a source of spiritual wisdom and truth parallel to Scripture: "there are two bookes from whence I collect my Divinity; besides that written one of God, another of his servant Nature; . . . those that never saw him in the one, have discovered him in the other . . ." (1: 24-25). This statement implies that nature and Scripture never contradict each other. Because Browne believes that the English Church follows Scripture, nature and the Church must also teach complementary lessons. And because nature survived the Church, presumably it could comfort bereft conformists.¹⁹⁷ To divorce Browne's approach to natural philosophy from his beliefs as a member of the English Church, then, is to ignore an important facet of his thought.¹⁹⁸

⁶³Amy Hope Dudley Sweitzer's doctoral dissertation makes a similar point, focusing as it does on "The Natural Church," but considers the Cambridge Platonists, Henry Vaughan, and Izaak Walton in addition to Browne.

⁶⁴But although nature and Scripture are for Browne fully compatible, he does not regard natural philosophy as a means of attaining to complete religious truth, because he sees reason as a "fallible" and limited faculty (Rauber 91). Thus while the Book of Nature never contradicts that of Scripture, it may seem to do so because reason is capable of interpreting either erroneously (Rauber 91, 280). Of the faith-reason-nature triad, Browne finds reason the weak and suspect term: when observing nature challenges his faith, he blames reason, not a disparity between nature and faith (1: 19). Even in "wingy mysteries in Divinity and ayery subtilties in Religion" (1: 18), nature provides a means of disciplining reason to obey faith: "where there is an obscurity too deepe for our reason, 'tis good to sit downe with a description, periphrasis, or adumbration; for by acquainting

Given nature's religious significance, gardens, like the Church, provide ways of appreciating God's wisdom and of drawing closer to Him through worship. They do so in two seemingly opposite—but for Browne, completely reconcilable—ways. Worship, he claims in *Religio*, should be informed by “judicious enquiry into his [God's] acts, and deliberate research of his creatures” (1: 22). Gardens advance this kind of knowledge by giving viewers the opportunity to observe a wide variety of plants, and sometimes even animals, in a relatively small space (Prest 54-56). Botanical gardens like those Browne would have seen at the European universities he attended, for example, attempted to replicate the bounty of the Garden of Eden (Prest 6, 9-10, 38-56); they displayed plants rare in England and Western Europe and enabled physicians to study various plants' potential for healing the human body (Prest 10, 57-65).¹⁹⁹ Yet like other natural features, gardens encourage worship in a second, very different way as well, by prompting meditation on spiritual mysteries and the nature of God.

That Browne treasured this latter potential in the quincunx especially is clear from the significance he finds in “adumbration.” Two meanings of the word, figurative and literal, are crucial for understanding this significance. When Browne recommends “a

our reason how unable it is to display the visible and obvious effects of nature, it becomes more humble and submissive unto the subtilties of faith: and thus I teach my haggard and unreclaimed reason to stoop unto the lure of faith” (1: 19). The language of hawking (see *OED* “haggard,” a., 1, 2; “unreclaimed,” ppl. a., 3; “stoop,” v.¹, 6.a; “lure,” n.², 1.c, 5) returns to the association between hunting and limitations on humans' intellectual faculties; Browne's comment here also implies that faith can nourish reason (*OED* “lure,” n.², 1). If the Book of Nature and the Book of Scripture agree, then any apparent contradictions originate from reason.

¹⁹⁹John Prest points out that “other gardens of the period—not least the gardens of Renaissance princes”—were also influenced by the desire for Edenic completeness (47); he cites John Evelyn's *Kalendarium* and *Elysium Britannicum* as examples of this impulse (47-48).

description, periphrasis, or adumbration” for “an obscurity too deepe for our reason” (*RM*, 1: 19), he refers to a “[s]ymbolic representation typifying . . . the reality” (*OED* “adumbration,” 3). But when, in *The Garden of Cyrus*, he attributes to the quincunx an “adumbration from the branches” that “maketh a quiet vision” (1: 216), he means “shade” (*OED* 5). This second passage, part of the discussion of how the quincunx “delight[s]” viewers (1: 216), introduces a brief meditation on optical “mediocrity” (1.216-17) and the advantages of shade (1: 216-18). This latter point culminates in a paragraph, rich with Brownean paradox, that interweaves *adumbration*’s physical and figurative meanings in an example of divine symbolism:

Light that makes things seen, makes some things invisible: were it nor [*sic*] for darknesse and the shadow of the earth, the noblest part of the Creation had remained unseen, and the Stars in heaven as invisible as on the fourth day, when they were created above the Horizon, with the Sun, or there was not an eye to behold them. The greatest mystery of Religion is expressed by adumbration,²⁰⁰ and in the noblest part of Jewish Types, we finde the Cherubims shadowing the Mercy-seat . . . (1: 218)

Although the paragraph seems digressive, it actually strengthens the relation between the quincunx and adumbration in two ways. If physical adumbration reminds us of religious mysteries, then the soft light in a quincuncial grove, like that inside a church with candles and stained-glass windows, can encourage not only physical sight but meditation as well. More subtly, Browne invokes the quincunx through the structure of one of the paragraph’s later clauses: “Life it self is but the shadow of death, and souls departed but the shadows of the living . . .” (1: 218). Formally, the sentence is quincuncial, setting up a chiasmic relation between life and death; substantially, in its use of metaphor, it employs

²⁰⁰This allusion to the Incarnation of Christ in the Virgin Mary’s womb offers a human-divine analogy to the discussion of seeds and “seminall *Idæa*’s” (1: 218): in Luke’s Gospel, the angel Gabriel tells the Virgin, “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee . . .” (1:35; see Patrides, ed., *Works*, 376 n61).

as well as describes adumbration. This complementarity of form and substance establishes important links between the quincunx and religious mystery.

The Garden of Cyrus, however, never directly compares garden ornaments to church furnishings or relates the quincunx to conformist worship. Indeed, early in the essay, Browne takes pains to avoid seeming to focus on the quincunx's potential significance in Judeo-Christian beliefs and ceremonies, writing that he finds only a tenuous connection between Christ and the supposed Hebrew tradition of anointing high priests "decussatively," and refusing to discuss "the Hebrew *Tenupha*, or ceremony of their Oblations, waved by the Priest unto the four quarters of the world, after the form of a cross . . ." (1: 183). He also resolves to "decline the old Theme, so traced by antiquity, of crosses and crucifixion: Whereof some being right, and of one single peece without transversion or transome, do little advantage our subject . . ." and to omit discussion of Christ's or St. Andrew's cross (1: 182).

Nonetheless Browne does repeatedly link the figure with Christian beliefs and practices. For example, he includes "the crossed Crowns of Christian Princes" among his examples of quincuncial patterns in crowns, thus linking the quincunx with rule but also with priestly service to God: "even Diadems themselves were but fasciations, and handsome ligatures, about the heads of Princes; nor wholly omitted in the mitrall Crown, which common picture seems to set too upright and forward upon the head of *Aaron* . . ." (1: 186). And he entertains the possibility that the quincuncial χ represented Christ:

And if that were clearly made out which *Justin Martyr* took for granted, this figure hath had the honour to characterize and notifie our blessed Saviour, as he delivereth in that borrowed expression from *Plato*; *Decussavit eum in universo*, the hint whereof he would have *Plato* derive from the figure of the brazen Serpent, and to

have mistaken the Letter X for T, whereas it is not improbable, he learned these and other mystical expressions in his Learned Observations of Ægypt . . . (1: 220)²⁰¹

On their own, these passages do not prove definitively that for Browne the quincunx holds special significance as a religious symbol, much less as a symbol of episcopacy or apostolic succession. Yet the number and variety of his references to Judeo-Christian beliefs and ceremonies are striking. And even though these points are often couched in the language of doubt and paralipsis, they allow for the quincunx's connection to religious ceremony and even, indirectly, to English Church hierarchy.

These implications emerge more clearly as Browne associates the quincunx with Hebrew and pagan temples. He identifies several quincuncial features of the Temple of Solomon: the latticework windows, the "network" pattern on the column capitals, and the altar grate for the ashes that fell from burnt offerings (1: 187). Of course, Browne finds quincuncial patterns in many other places and materials, including cut gemstones (1: 188) and the supporting cords of the ancients' beds (1: 186-87). But, tellingly, he also compares quincuncial groves to ancient temple architecture:

Whether the groves and sacred Plantations of Antiquity were not thus orderly placed, either by *quaternio*'s, or quintuple ordinations, may favourably be doubted. For since they were so methodicall in the constitutions of their temples, as to observe the due situation, aspect, manner, form, and order in Architectonicall relations, whether they were not as distinct in their groves and Plantations about them, in form and *species* respectively unto their Deities, is not without probability of conjecture. (1: 185)

²⁰¹Thomas C. Singer makes much of this relation between the quincunx and Christ (90-91, 99). He also notes a sixteenth-century precedent: "In 1573 the English neo-Latin poet, Richard Willis, uses it following the dedicatory poem to introduce his *Poematum Liber*. . . . Willis' companion poems show that the quincunx was clearly associated with Christ . . . almost a full century before the appearance of the *Garden of Cyrus*. Furthermore, the two-part structure, the first a meditation on death, the second on rebirth, mirrors both in form and theme Browne's two prose poems [*Hydriotaphia* and *The Garden of Cyrus*]" (91).

His opinion depends upon a parallel between temples and groves—both “sacred” spaces—as well as the proximity of the two, so “groves and Plantations” function similarly to temples and also form part of the property dedicated to a god.

Browne later expounds on this relation between quincuncial groves and temples, this time elaborating on an analogy between trees and architectural columns:

Nor can the rows in this order want delight, as carrying an aspect answerable unto the *dipteros hypæthros*, or double order of columns open above; the opposite ranks of Trees standing like pillars in the *Cavedia* of the Courts of famous buildings, and the *Portico's* of the *Templa subdialia* of old; Somewhat imitating the *Peristylia* or Cloyster buildings, and the *Exedræ* of the Ancients, wherein men discoursed, walked and exercised; For that they derived the rule of Columnes from Trees, especially in their proportionall diminutions, is illustrated by *Vitruvius* from the shafts of Firre and Pine. And though the interarborations do imitate the *Areostylos*, or thin order, not strictly answering the proportion of intercolumniations; yet in many Trees they will not exceed the intermission of the Columnes in the Court of the Tabernacle; which being an hundred cubits long, and made up by twenty pillars, will afford no less than intervals of five cubits. (1: 216)²⁰²

For Browne, arboreal quincunxes resemble parts of ancient temples and the Hebrew Tabernacle; the proportions of pagan columns, moreover, derive from the tapered shapes of tree trunks. He thus emphasizes both a “natural” basis for architectural columns and an “artificial” aspect of quincuncial groves, perhaps suggesting, against Puritan protestations, that artifice in religious buildings is not far removed from the artistry of God evident in the created world. Moreover, Browne characterizes orderly rows of trees as “delight[ful]” partly because they resemble classical architecture; order and artifice in gardens and buildings alike give him unproblematic pleasure. These close associations of the quincunx with worship spaces—and especially with religious traditions that emphasize ceremony, sacred ground, and dedication of land and architectural spaces to

²⁰²See Exodus 27:9-13 for these measurements. In *Acetaria, or a Discourse of Sallets* (2nd ed., 1706), John Evelyn calls trees “a Tabernacle in the wilderness” (sig. A3v, qtd. in Preston, “Of Cyder” 871).

the divine—imply that quincuncial groves could serve as reminders of temples and the lands around them.

In this way, quincunxes could memorialize the English Church and the orderly, beauteous worship it encouraged. Browne's comparisons of groves to temples imply disagreement with Puritan views of religious art as tending to idolatry: if the art of God can be compared to that of humans, then it can be argued that human art is inspired by, and is not meant to distract worshippers from, God's power and glory. Such a reading of Browne's remarks is supported by the fact that Browne omits Benedictus Curtius's mention of Nebuchadnezzar's ordering the destruction of his enemies' sacred groves in order that he might replace the deities (Curtius 92; see Book of Judith 3:12-13, in *Holy Bible, Translated* [Douay]). By steering clear of the allusion, Browne avoids impugning groves, and he simultaneously skirts the question of idolatry. Instead he redeems groves and, by extension, the temples they resemble.

Both Church conformists and their opponents saw their religious traditions as analogous to the Jews', so both groups laid claim to the figurative importance of the Jewish temple. Some Independents, for example, saw their ascendancy in terms of the freeing of the Jewish captives to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem—their rise to power, they thought, was an instance of God's true Church prevailing over false worship.²⁰³ But the Church of England was also associated with the temple. George Herbert, for example, titled his volume of religious poetry *The Temple* (1633). And in his preface to *A Collection of Offices or Forms of Prayer in Cases Ordinary and Extraordinary* (1657), Jeremy Taylor writes of the outlawed Church, "I shall onely crave leave that I may

²⁰³See, for examples, Henry Burton's *Christ on His Throne* (1640) (sigs. A2v-A3r) and Jeremiah Burroughs's *The Glorious Name of God, The Lord of Hosts* (1643) (3).

remember *Jerusalem* and call to minde the pleasures of the Temple, the order of her services, the beauty of her buildings, the sweetness of her songs, the decency of her Ministrations, the assiduity and Oeconomy of her Priests and Levites, the daily sacrifice, and that eternal fire of devotion that went not out by day nor by night . . .” (sig. A4r).²⁰⁴ Browne clearly appreciated “the order of her services”: he writes in the *Religio*, “I am, I confesse, naturally inclined to that, which misguided zeale termes superstition; . . . at my devotion I love to use the civility of my knee, my hat, and hands, with all those outward and sensible motions, which may express or promote my invisible devotion” (1: 12-13).

Browne’s son Tom, describing one instance of Puritan defacement of a church, compares the struggle to restore Church of England dignity and ornamentation with the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem:

The next morning wee rose early and rode to Lichfield, where wee had a sight of an incomparably neat church, which although it has been horribly defac’d and a great deal beaten down in these wars, yet the very ruines are so curious, that they caused in us no smal admiration. As there is three steeples in Lincoln, so there were here three pinacles or spires very neat, large and finely carved, in most places; but the largest which stood over the crosse was beaten downe with a granado in the late wars, when as they fortified the church and held out a hot siege for their soveraigne. . . . There is such a vast deal of carvd work in all places, both on the inside and outside of this church, though most now is either defaced or quite ruin’d, and such a number of statua some wereof have been gilt, that wee could not well conceive the splendour of these things when they were at their glory, but did exceedingly admire even *et Curios jam dimidios, nasumq. minorem Corvini et Galbam auriculis nasosq. carentem*.

Wee were glad to see them teach a reparation, and wish them many a Cyrus for their benefactor. (38-39)

The final reference in this passage is to Cyrus the Great, the Persian king praised in Scripture for allowing Jewish captives taken by Nebuchadnezzar to return to Jerusalem and rebuild the destroyed temple (Ezra 1:1-3; Isa. 44:28).

²⁰⁴Rauber discusses this passage in relation to the Anglican “love of beauty” and the Puritan disregard for it (218).

Just as groves, and more specifically the quincunx, could support the English Church's aesthetic and ecclesiological ideals, so too could *The Garden of Cyrus*. Like the well-ordered groves that inspired it, the work has a quincuncial structure.²⁰⁵ In addition, it records some important metaphoric and symbolic meanings of quincunxes; thus if gardens were threatened, Browne's essay would preserve their religious significance. Moreover, although the essay appears to be informed primarily by natural philosophy, this study of the world advances Browne's examination of spiritual truth: his *Garden* not only answers and poses questions about nature but also pursues the theme of resurrection (Preston, *TB* 194-203; see Browne 1: 176-77) and promotes the notion of an orderly, correspondent, hierarchical universe. And most tellingly, the essay's emphasis on mediocrity reflects the national Church's commitment to moderate theology and worship.

This last assertion depends on showing that Browne regarded his faith, and his Church's, as moderate, a task that Donald Rauber's doctoral thesis on *Religio Medici* accomplishes impressively.²⁰⁶ Rauber argues that Browne is strongly committed to the Church of England (248-86) and that he values the same kinds of moderation and balance as do Archbishop Laud, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, and theologian William Chillingworth, whom Rauber sees as "demonstrat[ing] a certain homogeneity in the Anglican thought of

²⁰⁵The essay's five chapters obviously link the work with the quincunx; Huntley (*Browne* 206-7) and Preston (207) illuminate more specifically quincuncial features of Browne's *Garden*.

²⁰⁶Marjorie Swann has noted Michael Wilding's and Achsah Guibbory's agreement that *Religio Medici* is far from moderate (121, 229 n112), a view that stands counter to that of Jonathan F.S. Post, for whom Browne is a 'moderate Protestant' (qtd. in Swann 229 n112). My concern is not with whether Browne can fairly be regarded as moderate but instead whether and how he represents himself as such.

the 1630's and '40's . . ." (138). Rauber offers abundant examples of these men's moderation in ecclesiology and theology as well as their wariness of what they saw as Catholic dogmatism and Puritan zeal (146-222). My analysis applies Rauber's conclusions about Browne's intellectual, moral, and spiritual moderation (13-124; 248-86) to the quincunx's representations of mediocrity in *The Garden of Cyrus*.

The English Church had established its moderate position long before. It had from its early days followed the *via media* in defining "certain liturgical, ethical, and doctrinal matters" as adiaphora (Verkamp xiv), a tradition maintained in the Elizabethan Settlement and, as Rauber's work shows (146-222), in the first half of the seventeenth century. Like the apologists studied by Rauber, Browne writes of his faith, and thus that of the Church of England, as positively moderate (Rauber 256-86), in part by contrasting it with other traditions. Although he finds Catholics doctrinally immoderate, calling them "those *desperate* Resolutions, who had rather venture at large their decaied bottome, then bring her in to be new trim'd in the dock; who had rather *promiscuously* retaine *all*, then abridge *any* . . ." (*RM* 1: 12, emphasis added), he characterizes his attitude toward them, and his understanding of the English Reformation, as appropriately balanced: "Yet have I not so shaken hands with [them] . . . as to stand in diameter and swords point with them: we have reformed from them, not against them . . ." (1: 12). But Browne also recognizes the ways in which reformation ranges from moderate to extreme:

AS there were many Reformers, so likewise many reformations; every Countrey proceeding in a peculiar Method according as their nationall interest together with their constitution and clime inclined them; some angrily and with extremitie, others calmly, and with mediocrity; not rending, but easily dividing the community, and leaving an honest possibility of a reconciliation . . . (1: 13)²⁰⁷

²⁰⁷Compare Hooker's view of what would "tend to the best reestablishment of the whole Church of Iesus Christ": "it cannot but serue as a profitable direction, to teach men what

Having established his own position as a moderate one, he professes his allegiance to the English Church (1.14), thus implying that it is likewise moderate. He denies wholesale allegiance to Catholic, Calvinist, and Lutheran teachings alike, writing that matters not decided by the Church,

as points indifferent, I observe according to the rules of my private reason, or the humour and fashion of my devotion, neither believing this, because *Luther* affirmed it, nor disapproving that, because *Calvin* hath disavouched it. I condemne not all things in the Councell of *Trent*, nor approve all in the Synod of *Dort*. In briefe, . . . where there is a joynt silence of both [Scripture and Church of England], I borrow not the rules of my Religion from *Rome* or *Geneva*, but the dictates of my owne reason. (1: 14)

Rauber cites all these passages as evidence that Browne participates in the “Anglican” tradition of moderation between Catholic and Protestant, especially Calvinist, extremes (256, 259-61).

The English Church’s middle way was often at odds with Puritan zeal (Rauber 149, 155, 162, 203, 223, 263-64). The association of extreme zeal with Puritans antedated the tensions of the 1640s, as is evident, for example, from the Puritan character Zeal-of-the-Land-Busy in Ben Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair* (1614; 1631). The play’s prologue, addressed to James I, criticizes

the zealous noyse
Of your lands Faction, scandaliz’d at toyes,
As Babies, Hobby-horses, Puppet-playes,
And such like rage, whereof the petulant wayes
Your selfe haue knowne, and haue bin vext with long. (6: 11, lines 3-7)²⁰⁸

is most likely to proue auailable, when they shall quietly consider the triall that hath bene thus long had of both kinds of reformation, as well this moderate kind which the Church of England hath taken, as that other more extreme and rigorous which certaine Churches elsewhere haue better liked” (206). Like Browne, Hooker associates moderation with charity.

²⁰⁸Hall’s *Via Media* shares this suspicion of contentious zeal, recognizing that fervor can prove divisive unless it is tempered by the desire for peace and a corresponding

Browne too recognizes the dangers of unmediated zeal (Rauber 252-59, 262-64). In

Religio Medici, for example, he writes of “disputes in Religion” that

[e]very man is not a proper Champion for Truth, nor fit to take up the Gantlet in the cause of Veritie: Many from the ignorance of these Maximes, and an inconsiderate zeale unto Truth, have too rashly charged the troopes of error, and remaine as Trophees unto the enemies of Truth: A man may be in as just possession of Truth as of a City, and yet bee forced to surrender; tis therefore farre better to enioy her with peace, then to hazzard her on a battell . . . (1: 15)

Later in the same essay, he associates zeal particularly with the Lutheran and Calvinist doctrine of *sola fide*: “INSOLENT zeales that doe decry good workes and rely onely upon faith, take not away merits: for depending upon the efficacy of their faith, they enforce the condition of God, and in a more sophisticall way doe seeme to challenge Heaven” (1: 68-69; see Rauber 284-85). And of his “love” of “outward and sensible motions” in worship, he remarks, “I am, I confesse, naturally inclined to that, which misguided zeale termes superstition . . .” (1: 12; see Rauber 257). Browne thus frequently finds zeal’s dangerous or divisive forms in Puritans’ attitudes toward worship and soteriology.²⁰⁹ In contrast, he uses the term “wiser zeales” to describe members of “Greek, Roman, and African Churches” who “make a Christian use” of “solemnities, and ceremonies” regarded by some Protestants as spiritually dangerous (1: 13; see Rauber 258-59). And not surprisingly, he considers his own zeal temperate: “neither doth . . . my zeale so farre make me forget the generall charitie I owe unto humanity, as rather to hate

commitment to mediocrity: “Now the God of peace encline the hearts of men, as to zeal of truth, so to love of peace: And . . . the same God compose the minds of men to a wise moderation . . .” (388).

²⁰⁹Likewise, Joseph Hall writes that the Puritans who destroyed what they considered “monuments of Idolatry” in Norwich Cathedral did so with “much Ostentation of a zealous joy . . .” (*Observations* 63).

then pity Turkes, Infidels, and (what is worse) [the] Jewes . . .” (1: 11, insertion Keynes’s; see Rauber 254-55).

Browne’s view of the Church of England’s mediocrity is evident not only in the *Religio* but also in his *Repertorium* (1680), which identifies a number of tombs in Norwich Cathedral whose “brasse Incriptions [were] torne and taken away . . .” during the Civil Wars (3: 123). The project attempts to right the disorder caused by the wartime need for metal as well as by Puritan and sectarian willingness to destroy church furniture. What might well be considered the extremity of this destruction is implicitly contrasted with Browne’s diligence: “Hereby the distinct places of buryall of many noble and considerable persons, becomes now unknowne. I shall therefore sett downe only these following according to my best search, enquiry and information both before and since those unhappy times” (3: 123).

It is also contrasted with the characters of Browne’s friends Joseph Hall and Edward Reynolds, both memorialized in *Repertorium*. Browne writes that Hall, “in the Rebellious times, when the Revenues of the church were alienated, retired unto that suburban parish [of Heigham] and there ended his dayes . . .” (3: 134). Hall, who was Bishop of Norwich from 1642 to 1647 (McCabe, “Hall, Joseph,” *ODNB*), is thus remembered in part as an exile of the wars. He is also remembered by Browne as “[a] person of singular humillity, patience and pietie,” whose “owne works are the best monument, and character of himself . . .” (3: 134). Indeed, Hall’s treatise *Via Media*, which, though composed in 1626, went unpublished for years thanks to censorship (McCabe, “Hall,” *ODNB*), seeks to reconcile Arminian and Calvinist positions on five articles of faith, and it repeatedly casts this reconciliation in terms of the Church of

England's "mid-way" (374) and "moderat[ion]" (380, 383, 385). Browne likewise praises Reynolds, "the first Bishop of Norwich after the Kings Restauration," as "[a] person much of the temper of his prædecessor, of singular affabillity, meekenesse and humillity . . ." (3: 134). The Presbyterian Reynolds's career is characterized by a commitment to moderation. In the 1630s he "was . . . recognized as one of the leading moderates among the godly in Northamptonshire . . ." (Atherton, "Reynolds, Edward," *ODNB*). Later he worked for Church harmony, advocating in 1659 and 1660 for "peace, unity, and moderation, codes for the restoration of the monarchy and accommodation with episcopalians" (Atherton, "Reynolds," *ODNB*). Given Hall's and Reynolds's values, it is easy to see why Browne, in *Repertorium*, refers to each as "[m]y Honord freind" (3: 134).

We have already seen that Browne refuses to divorce natural philosophy from religious faith. The quincunx, then, is more than a means to good eyesight or a sign of moderate, reasoned gardening choices. It is also, I propose, an emblem for the mediocrity that characterizes Browne's faith and that of his Church; if the quincunx is both beautiful and useful, as Quintilian and Browne alike contend, then it has much in common with the English Church's order of worship, which, as Rauber points out (214-22), was meant to combine these two qualities. Browne's quincuncial essay commemorates the Church's ecclesiological and theological mediocrity, much as the dedicatory epistle memorializes the moderation and "equity" of the Bacon family, whose patriarch had been a "principal sponsor[]" of the 1559 Book of Common Prayer, the "all but final recension of the Anglican liturgy" that expressed the moderation of the Elizabethan settlement (Collinson, "Sir Nicholas" 255).

III. Browne's Gardener-Princes

Browne's discussion of gardens in relation to worship responds indirectly to England's mid-century turmoil. And his remarks about Dioscorides's study of plants "in his march about with *Antonius*" and about the horticultural implications of military conflict acknowledge a general relationship between gardening and war (1: 175, 1: 180). But the quincunx in particular, as we shall see, also has political importance. Furthermore, the very title of Browne's essay—*The Garden of Cyrus or, The Quincunciall, Lozenge, or Net-Work Plantations of the Ancients, Artificially, Naturally, Mystically Considered*—yokes the figure of the quincunx with the trope of the gardener-prince. This trope seems peripheral to the essay: it emerges briefly in the first chapter (1: 180) and then, much farther on, only in passing (1: 212, 1: 214). And once again, Browne declines to draw any parallels with English rulers. Yet the gardener-prince motif is important, for it engages the mythology of the Caroline court that depicted the king as the benevolent cultivator of religion, peace, and plenty in the garden of England.

The trope first appears in Browne's examination of pagan and Judeo-Christian myths about gardens' origins (1: 179). Because "the primitive garden," the Garden of Eden, was "without much controversie seated in the East," he writes, "it is more than probable the first curiosity, and cultivation of plants, most flourished in those quarters" (1: 179). For the bulk of his examples of the early excellence of Eastern horticulture, he relies on gardens' importance to five ancient royals: Semiramis, Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus the Great, Ahasuerus, and Cyrus the Younger (1: 180-81). Given his subject, the fact that Browne chooses five figures is significant. Yet four of these stand out as especially important: whereas he mentions Semiramis only as the possible creator of the Hanging Gardens,

Browne focuses on Nebuchadnezzar's, Cyrus the Great's, and Cyrus the Younger's gardening achievements, and on Ahasuerus's use of his gardens for entertaining his subjects. These examples direct our attention to princes who appreciate gardens and more specifically, in the cases of Nebuchadnezzar and the Cyruses, to those who create and maintain them.

Because the series of rulers ends with Cyrus the Younger, the first of these princes explicitly associated with the quincunx, it is tempting to see that series simply as part of the introduction to the main topic. But classical, Scriptural, and early modern treatments of Ahasuerus, Nebuchadnezzar, and the elder Cyrus have independent significance.²¹⁰ Their stories, like the younger Cyrus's, raise questions about the nature and basis of kingship and rebellion, the limits of human power, and the contingency that attends individual endeavors as well as national histories. While these matters had been debated in England long before Charles's reign, they acquired particular urgency between 1640 and 1660, as England faced rebellion, full-fledged civil war, and the destruction and eventual restoration of the monarchy. Moreover, these princes' experiences illustrate the value of moderation in governmental and military policy, and horticulture's complex influence on perceptions of rule. Recalling these rulers, Browne establishes a brief history not only of gardening but also of the gardener-prince. And although Browne's essay presents these men primarily as noteworthy gardeners, to overlook their status as political leaders and military strategists is to miss some important implications of *The Garden of Cyrus*.

²¹⁰Even though, of these five rulers, the younger Cyrus is the only one to whom Browne attributes quincuncial plantations, he also observes that longstanding tradition associates the figure with the Hanging Gardens: "In the hanging Gardens of *Babylon*, from *Abydenus*, *Eusebius*, and others, *Curtius* describeth this Rule of decussation" (1: 183).

Recently, Claire Preston has revisited the question of whether *The Garden of Cyrus* has a political thrust. In examining the essay's relation to two kinds of mid-century "garden-writing" (TB 180) and to the political positions with which these are associated, her chapter illuminates the essay's literary and historical contexts. But it obscures some vital elements of Browne's thought: by considering the essay's politics only in light of two categories of writing (TB 177-82), and by concluding that its political implications are far less certain than its focus on fecundity (TB 181-82), Preston prioritizes Browne's horticultural and spiritual interests virtually to the exclusion of his concern with humans' social attitudes and behaviors. Yet this latter concern is important for two reasons: it more clearly registers the political and social disorder that attends civil war, thus providing the better testing ground for determining how political the essay is, and it derives from Browne's regard for charity.²¹¹ Whereas Preston finds traces of each garden-writing tradition subjugated to Browne's overarching theme of generation, then, I read his essay as a way of mediating between the two traditions, between private and public virtue.

Preston's discussion of the two types of "garden-writing" foregrounds the potential tension between private and public gardening but ultimately denies this tension's importance in *The Garden of Cyrus*. The first tradition she identifies consists in "practical guides" on orchards, which sometimes also include religious content (TB 177) and which promote the public usefulness of horticultural and arboricultural techniques

²¹¹See, for example, Browne's comments about charity in the early sections of *Religio*, Part II (1.70-83). For the relationship between Browne's charity and his participation in the English Church's *via media*, see Leonard Nathanson's *The Strategy of Truth* (128-41).

chosen to help reinstate “the original bounty of the unrestricted Edenic paradise” (*TB* 181). The second tradition, exemplified by Marvell’s and Cowley’s poetry, centers on “an Epicurean trope of retirement from the fray, of nostalgia for a lost (pre-regicidal) innocence” (*TB* 179) and “substitutes the disorder of the unmanageable public, political sphere with the carefully disposed and managed green-world of Appleton House and other highly controlled and retired landscapes, where the natural effulgence of the plant kingdom, under strict maintenance and design, yields profitable mental peace and a microcosmic social order, as well as the usual agricultural products” (*TB* 180-81).²¹² Preston acknowledges the features that Browne’s *Garden* shares with each kind of writing, but she emphasizes the differences more than the similarities (178-82).

Preston’s reluctance to associate *The Garden of Cyrus* closely with either tradition arises partly from the dearth of information about Browne’s politics; she cites “the almost total absence of personal data and correspondence from the pre-1660 period of his life” and the fact that his essay barely acknowledges the political and religious upheavals of his day (*TB* 181).²¹³ She thus concludes that “both [traditions] are at least residually

²¹²While the former tradition is represented especially strongly in Puritan horticultural treatises, and the latter in Royalist poetry (Preston, *TB* 180), Preston cautions us against assuming that these alignments always held (181). For more information on the Puritans’ participation in the first of the two traditions Preston discusses, see Chapter 5 (324-483) of Charles Webster’s *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform, 1626-1660*. The final section, “The Garden of Eden” (465-83), is particularly helpful.

²¹³I agree with Preston that reading Browne’s essay “as an intellectual retreat” poses problems. To her objections, I would add that such a reading implies passivity and inaction, theory to the exclusion of practice. To see in the work a retreat from disorder to order is to ignore Browne’s attempts to resolve or balance the two: the final paragraphs, for example, recommend submitting to sleep, and thus to disorder, as a means of perpetuating order (1: 226). If we read the essay as an example of the retirement tradition, we must recognize that the work neither advocates nor models a simple retreat from disorder and also that retirement need not be apolitical: just as consciously giving in

present” in *The Garden of Cyrus* (TB 181) but that the essay engages far more with natural philosophy and the search for spiritual truth than with worldly politics. Arguing convincingly that Browne’s *Garden* constantly overleaps its own “ostensible” (TB 176) bounds in order to represent the fecundity in which its author saw the promise of resurrection (TB 203-10), Preston characterizes the essay as “rhetorically pretending order while being essentially wild, or at least unmanaged, a botanical lesson in unregulated, spontaneous, rampant procreativity that resists any hortulan or horticultural ideology of cultivation” (TB 182).

While I agree that verdure is an important focus of Browne’s work, I question Preston’s description of *The Garden of Cyrus* as “wild” and her description of cultivation as “the artificial counterpart of natural generation” (TB 180). As Polixenes’s answer to Perdita’s criticism of “streak’d gillyvors” in *The Winter’s Tale* demonstrates (Shakespeare 4.4.82), the kind of distinction Preston makes is difficult to defend: “Yet nature is made better by no mean / But nature makes that mean: so, over that art / Which you say adds to nature, is an art / That nature makes. . . .” (4.4.89-92). Browne’s comment about Nebuchadnezzar’s living among “wilde plantations” (1: 180), moreover, makes it difficult to believe that he would have endorsed such a strict distinction. Finally, although Preston’s emphasis on “unregulated, spontaneous, rampant procreativity” recognizes an important feature of the essay, it requires qualification. *The Garden of Cyrus* is about not only prolific plant growth but also how humans do (and should) think and act: in his dedicatory epistle, Browne introduces matters of planting and generation as well as questions of how humans respond to this world and prepare for

to disorder can maintain order, choosing not to engage overtly with political questions constitutes a political decision.

the next, and he presents “[m]ediocrity” as an ideal he wants to promote (1: 176). As I have been suggesting, he fulfills this desire in numerous ways, and so, while he writes of plants in terms of “rampant procreativity,” he writes of humans’ responses to them in terms of regulation, circumspection, and circumscription. His intellectual, moral, and spiritual advice evinces a concern with the public good, a concern that emerges more fully from his figurative uses of gardens than from his literal statements about them.²¹⁴ In these ways, then, Browne’s essay does not simply blend features of the two “garden-writing” traditions described by Preston; it actually modulates between the more private tradition and the more public one. It thus both communicates and imitates the significance of gardens themselves.

In a more recent article, Preston fruitfully reconsiders *The Garden of Cyrus*’s relationship to the political strife of the 1650s and to the two veins of garden-writing described above. Noting the dedicatory epistle’s date of May 1, 1658, she suggests that the essay developed partly from the debates over May Day festivities:

If the May theme of *Cyrus* responds latently to the rebarbative and disorderly political atmosphere of England by alluding to folkloric and communal continuity, it may also be responding to the strictures of the Protectorate and its social and religious proscriptions by delineating a natural energy immune to control. Browne’s verdure, like May rites themselves, represents both order and disorder, propriety and wantonness. (“Of Cyder” 880)

She concludes that although Browne’s essay is “an explicit paradise tract,” it differs substantially from others: “if the orchardists and gardenists believe themselves to be repairing by *scientia* the brokenness of fallen nature, or at least husbanding it as part of the duty of fallenness, Browne replies that nature is too powerful for our interventions”

²¹⁴I disagree here with Leonard Nathanson’s assertion that “[w]here Browne is exploring the world of nature, his mind, and his books, he seeks truth primarily as something affording pleasure to man while offering greater glory to God, and only secondarily, and in some areas, to be valued for its power to improve the human condition” (4).

("Of Cyder" 879-80). This reading elegantly resolves the essay's apparent digressions and its political context. But I do not think it accounts for the focus on rulers and princes in the essay's opening pages, for the essay's title, or for what seems to be a real interest in decussation and the quincunx. Browne's emphasis on mediocrity, however, conjoins these various facets of the work. If the quincunx is a symbol for moderation, then it is easier to understand why Browne chose this figure in particular as his supposed subject if, as Preston contends, his real interest lay in the significance of "natural" generation; the quincunx is then not just a cipher for order but a meaningful symbol in its own right. And Browne's concern with the relationship between state rule and gardening manifests itself in the trope of the gardener-prince, which reconciles Preston's point about unregulated fecundity under Puritan rule with the dedicatory epistle's emphasis on virtue and with the opening pages' focus on Eastern royal gardens. My argument, then, synthesizes Browne's responses to signaturism and natural philosophy, religious debates, and politics.

Political Implications of the Quincunx

Browne's essay treats the quincunx as an important, complex political symbol, one that derives its meaning partly from natural phenomena. By associating the quincunx with mediocrity, Browne redeems the symbol and simultaneously hints at the importance of moderation in political matters, a crucial point given that the essay's title focuses attention on a prince renowned for both his use of the quincunx and the failed rebellion against his brother in which he lost his life.

The quincunx was politically significant well before Browne wrote about gardener-princes. In *The Six Bookes of a Common-Weale* (1576; English translation, 1606), Jean

Bodin defines “the flourishing estate of a Commonweale” as the time “when it hath attained vnto the highest degree of the perfection and beautie thereof; or to say better, then when it is least imperfect, and farthest from all kind of vice” (411C). Rome, for example, reached its “flourishing estate” “in the time of *Papirius Cursor*,” a time of “Popular” rule, when, according to Livy, virtue was at its peak (Bodin 411D). As Bodin defends the example against the criticism that Rome lacked the wealth and power it achieved later (411E), he invokes the figure of the quincunx:

I say againe, That vertue is not to be measured by the foot of wealth and riches; neither the excellencie and perfection of a Commonweale, by the largenesse of the bounds thereof, but by the bounds of vertue it selfe. So that I deeme those their vntrimmed and rough shades and groues, to haue had in them more maiestie and honor, than had afterwards their pleasant greene woods, with the trees most artificially planted in order of the curious Quincunx, and reckon Rome homely and vntrimmed, more stately and replenished with maiestie, than when it was neuer so well deckt, and with precious ointments perfumed. For neuer was the power of the Romans greater than in the time of *Traian* the emperour, . . . when as the citie of Rome it selfe, being head of the whole empire, did so abound and flow with ambition, couetousnesse, pleasures and delights, as that it seemed to retaine no more but the shadow of the auntient vertue thereof. (411E-412G)

Bodin thus associates the quincunx with increasing luxury and might and with declining virtue. The adjective *curious* contributes to this effect by emphasizing the planters’ skill (*OED* “curious” 7.a) but also the city’s taste for the “[e]xquisite” (*OED* 14).

Browne’s essay, then, recuperates the quincunx—probably consciously, given that Browne owned the 1606 English translation of Bodin’s work (Ballard 68/44, item 31). Although Browne’s opening pages link the figure to prosperous, sometimes ambitious Eastern princes who enjoyed fine arboriculture, his reference to Cyrus the Younger, especially in the essay’s title, associates the quincunx with virtue and hard work. And these associations are supported not only by the epigraph from Quintilian but also by Browne’s observations about the natural world, which emphasize the pattern’s

naturalness and counter Bodin's use of it as a marker of luxury. Browne's statement that quincunxes give trees proper space and air (1: 210) represents the arrangement as useful, not merely decorative. But even more importantly, his comments about honeycombs depict a monarchical, cooperative society. He explains that a honeycomb employs the figure of the quincunx in the way in which the "sexangular" cells fit together: "their mutual intersections make three Lozenges at the bottome of every Cell; which severally regarded make three Rows of neat Rhomboidall Figures . . . and so continue three several chains throughout the whole comb" (1: 202). Browne then links this quincuncial home with monarchy and orderliness as he contrasts bees with ants in overtly political terms: "Much there is not of wonder in the confused Houses of Pismires, though much in their busie life and actions; more in the edificial Palaces of Bees and Monarchical spirits; who make their combs six-corner'd, . . . affecting a six-sided figure, whereby every cell affords a common side unto six more, and also a fit receptacle for the Bee it self . . ." (1: 202). The passage communicates Browne's appreciation for the natural world and for the correspondences between animal and human societies, but it also privileges the order observable among bees above the disorder found in anthills. The adjective *busie*, moreover, seems to compliment ants' industriousness (*OED* "busy" a., 4), yet because it also means "meddlesome" (*OED* 5), it calls to mind troublesome tendencies, especially following so closely on the phrase "confused Houses." This suggestion appears more clearly in the "Elysium Britannicum," in which Evelyn remarks, "The *Ant* indeede for ~~others~~ {themselves}, but the Bee for others *Sic vos non vobis*—, so far excells their Government that of the Republique, & so ought we ~~direct all~~ direct all our labours for the publique benefit" (274).

Although *The Garden of Cyrus* offers few specific clues as to Browne's political stance, other works suggest his attraction to a mediocrity that encourages peace and reconciliation. For example, he may, as Frank L. Huntley conjectures, have recommended moderation in political matters in *A Letter to a Friend* (Huntley, *STB* 202), which was not published until 1690 but which, Huntley follows Walter Pater in arguing, actually dates from about 1656 (185-203). Browne writes near the end of the *Letter*,

Tho humane Infirmary may betray thy heedless days into the popular ways of Extravagancy, yet let not thine own depravity, or the torrent of vicious Times, carry thee into desperate Enormities in Opinions, Manners, or Actions: if thou hast dip'd thy foot in the River, yet venture not over *Rubicon*; run not into Extremities from whence there is no Regression, nor be ever so closely shut up within the holds of Vice and Iniquity, as not to find some Escape by a Postern of Resipiscency. (1: 116)

Huntley infers that the addressee was “a man of apparently hot temper” and surmises that this detail would fit what is known of Sir John Pettus, a Royalist whom Huntley proposes as the addressee of the letter for several reasons (*STB* 201-2, 198-202). Huntley points out that Pettus regretted some remarks about “certain matters of state” in his letters to Robert Loveday (*STB* 199), whom Huntley believes to be the patient described in Browne's *Letter* (*STB* 188-97). Huntley even suggests that one reason for Browne's concealing the identities of the patient and the letter's addressee is the men's Royalist sympathies (187).

But as Browne's reference to “the holds of Vice and Iniquity” implies, his invocation of mediocrity may arise from other motivations in addition to Royalist protection and self-preservation narrowly considered. If Huntley's interpretation of *A Letter to a Friend* is right, the passage quoted above demonstrates Browne's willingness to acknowledge faults among those of his own party. Even if it is argued, however, that the *Letter* is less political than Huntley takes it to be, another letter by Browne, this one to his son Edward,

clearly shows its author's desire for peace and harmony within England. The letter, of February 28, 1680/1, responds to Charles's ongoing financial difficulties and recent developments in the Exclusion Crisis. After reporting on some of the parliamentary elections (4: 184-85), Browne ruminates on the relationship between Charles II and his subjects:

I am sorry to find that the King of England is fayne to reduce his howse-hold expences to twelve thousand pounds p. annum, especially hee haveing a farre greater revennue then any of his predecessors. God keepe all honest men from pinching want: men can bee honest no longer then they can give every one his due: *in fundo parsimonia* seldome recovers or restores a man. This Rule is to bee learn'd by all

*utere divitiis tanquam moriturus, et idem
Tanquam victurus parcito divitiis.*

So may be avoyded sordid avarice & improvident prodigallity, so shall not a man defraud him self of gods blessings, nor throwe away gods mercies; so may hee bee able to do good & not suffer the worst of evells. Two earthen bottles floating upon the sea with this motto, *si collidimur, frangimur*, is applyeable unto any 2 concernes whose interest is united & is to conserve on[e] another, which makes mee sorry for this dissention between the King & the people, that is, the major part of them, as the elections declare. God send us a happy conclusion & bee reconciled unto us & give us grace to forsake our sinnes, the *boutefeus* & Incendiaries of all. (4: 185)

This passage employs the notion of the mean, the ideal between the extremes of "sordid avarice & improvident prodigallity"; it then turns immediately to the image of the bottles labeled, "If we collide, we break," meant here to represent "the King & the people." The letter thus offers moderation as the answer to the financial problems that had repeatedly found Charles II and Parliament at odds in the late 1670s and 1680 (Seaward). But that moderation, Browne stipulates, is a "Rule . . . to bee learn'd by all," i.e., by both Crown and Parliament.

Browne's vision of mutual support and preservation resembles the Constitutional Royalism of the 1640s as described by David L. Smith. Smith finds the "assump[ti]on" that politics was an harmonious process in which different sources of authority

complemented and reinforced each other” to have been “among the principal hallmarks of the Constitutional Royalists of the 1640s . . .”(6). Thus “[a]fter the outbreak of the Civil War, the Constitutional Royalists are best defined as those among the King’s followers who consistently sought to further peace negotiations with Parliament” (Smith 7). And Browne’s comments on the troubles of the late 1670s and early 1680s participate in a recollection of the ideals of the 1640s: “The Tory cry of ‘1641 is come again’ is here highly revealing, for that year had witnessed the parting of the ways for Constitutional Royalist members of the Long Parliament. Like 1641, 1680-81 marked a watershed at which the demands made upon the Crown ceased to be either constitutional or reasonable” (Smith 306).

Of course, Browne’s views on political moderation in 1681 offer no guarantee as to his ideals in 1658, when *The Garden of Cyrus* was published. But I want to suggest that the essay espouses values consonant with his later emphasis on mediocrity and that the quincunx’s political significance for Browne thus lies in the figure’s ability to symbolize princely cultivation of the land but also the moderation that balances power and uses it in the service of peace and improvement. In the latter regard, Browne’s essay has much in common with John Denham’s poem *Coopers Hill*, published in 1642 and, revised, in 1655 and 1668. The 1642 edition ends with the moderate’s hope, “And may that Law, which teaches Kings to sway / Their Scepters, teach their Subjects to obey” (134, lines 353-54). And in both the earlier and later editions, Denham faults extremism on both sides:

The Subjects arm’d, the more their Princes gave,
Th’advantage only took the more to crave:
Till Kings by giving, give themselves away,
And even that power that should deny, betray.

“Who gives constrain’d, but his own fear reviles,
“Not thank’t, but scorn’d; nor are they gifts, but spoils.
Thus Kings, by grasping more than they could hold,
First made their Subjects by oppression bold:
And popular sway, by forcing Kings to give
More than was fit for Subjects to receive,
Ran to the same extreams; and one excess
Made both, by striving to be greater, less. (160-61, lines 337-48)²¹⁵

John M. Wallace, in the title of his study of the 1642 version, deems the work “The Manifesto of Parliamentary Royalism.” And Jay Russell Curlin writes, “In the revised draft, we find not only the early statements of the *via media* by which war might have been avoided but new passages noting the results of England’s not having followed such counsel” (122). In this later version, Curlin finds, Denham “speak[s] of the evils of arbitrary power—and indicate[s] how the victors had imitated the very abuses they had sought to reform” (122).

Similarly, Browne, I think, writes about moderation as a way not only of diagnosing what went wrong during Charles’s reign but also of considering the governments of the 1650s. His essay’s complexity lies partly in the network of associations it creates among mediocrity, the quincunx, and gardener-princes. But we can appreciate this complexity more fully only by examining the meanings those princes held for other writers of Browne’s time.

Some Seventeenth-Century Uses of Browne’s Gardener-Princes

Of the four gardener-princes most praised by Browne, the three kings figure prominently in political debates of the 1640s and 1650s: Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus the Great, and Ahasuerus. Writers with widely divergent values and aims employ these

²¹⁵The quoted passage is taken from the 1655 edition; comparable lines in the 1642 edition are 321-26 and 343-48.

kings as examples of good or bad rule, godly or ungodly kingship, and the appropriate relationship between moral virtue and political power. Cyrus the Younger is a much less prominent figure, but his story most directly invokes discussions of the causes and prevention of rebellion. All of these gardener-princes, then, are associated with problems, questions, and arguments that proved vital not only in the midst of the Civil Wars but in the years that followed, as England tested out new options for government and repeatedly confronted the threat of new insurrections.

Nebuchadnezzar's reputation gave him great flexibility as an example in mid-century political debates, thanks partly to his role in Scripture. For some writers, Nebuchadnezzar's story exemplifies the obedience commanded in the opening verses of Romans 13: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation" (1-2). The Book of Daniel supports the example by reiterating the providential source of the Chaldean king's power (2:21, 37, 47; 4:24-37). And key passages from Jeremiah represent Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Judah and other nations as part of God's plan (Jer. 25:9-11, 27:5-6); the prophet proclaims, "For thus saith the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel; I have put a yoke of iron upon the neck of all these nations, that they may serve Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon; and they shall serve him: and I have given him the beasts of the field also" (Jer. 28:14).

Such passages lend themselves to Royalist arguments. Peter Heylyn's *The Rebels Catechism* (1643) relies on Scripture to condemn all revolts against kings as reprehensible in God's sight. Answering the objection that tyranny makes disobedience

permissible (11), Heylyn notes that St. Paul addressed his injunction against rebellion in Romans 13:1-3 to Nero's subjects (11-12) and then turns to the example of Nebuchadnezzar:

And doubtless *Nebuchadnezzar* was a mighty *Tyrant*, one who had taken from the *Jews*, their *Laws*, their *Liberty*, their *Religion*, and whatsoever else was most dear unto them. Yet were the *Jews* commanded to submit unto him, and patiently to bear the yoke which was laid upon them; and *not to hearken to their Prophets, nor to their Diviners, nor unto their Dreamers* (mark it, for this is just your case) *which speak unto you, saying, ye shall not serve the King of Babylon, for they Prophesie a lye unto you that ye should perish*, Jerem. 27. v. 9. (12)

With an eye toward the nonconformists' arguments, Heylyn uses the same example to condemn revolt for religion's sake (12): "The *Jews* might well have pleaded this against *Nebuchadnezzar* when he destroyed their *Temple*, and forbad their *sacrifices* . . ." (12). Likewise, in *Of Government and Obedience* (1654), John Hall of Richmond responds to England's "past and feared desolations" by teaching "posterity" how to guard against "disrespect and contempt of the present Sovereign power" (sig. A2r). He quotes from Romans 13:1 and Daniel 2:47 and 5:21, with this last proclaiming that "[God] himself by paramount right, *beareth rule over the kingdoms of men, and giveth them to whom he will*. The which to deny . . . is with *Nebuchadnezzar* to have the heart and understanding of a beast onely, not of a reasonable creature" (43).

Even writers with quite different political or religious goals cite Nebuchadnezzar's case to uphold Providence as the source of political supremacy. In *Aarons Rod Blossoming* (1646), for example, Presbyterian minister George Gillespie professes loyalty to rulers, attributing to God their power in civil matters (184, 185). Arguing for a distinction between church government and state hierarchies, he asserts that "the heathen Magistrate and his Government," and not only godly ones, are sanctioned by Scripture

(244). For support, Gillespie juxtaposes quotations from Romans 13:1 and Daniel 2:37 and also refers to Jeremiah 27:6 for good measure (244).

Nebuchadnezzar's example, however, was not used only to support obedience. The author of *A Prospective Glasse* (1649), who calls himself simply "a Lover of *Englishmens* Freedomes," argues for the reform of England's Norman laws and, protesting the legal system's injustices, urges the common people to "look for customes of liberty and freedome . . ." (19). He acknowledges that power comes from God: "It must be agreed on by all parties, that God gives the Kingdoms of the Earth to whomsoever he will: *Dan.* 4. 32. 35. So God gave all Kingdoms of the Earth unto *Nebuchadnezzar* . . ." (2). Yet he uses this example to authorize revolt against tyranny: "but if *Nebuchadnezzar* tyrannise over the people, then great Kings should serve themselves of him: *Ier.* 25. 13, 14. . . . Even so though God did give this land into the hand of *William* the Conqueror, yet . . . it is just with God to take the Government out of the hands of his posterity, who uphold, and maintain those Laws that were made to inslave the Commoners of *England*" (2). This example appears to suit the writer's purpose only by sleight of hand, as the relevant verses from Jeremiah offer no conditional support for rebellion. Instead, they record God's resolution to punish Nebuchadnezzar's people "for their iniquity" (Jer. 25:12) by means of "many nations and great kings [who] shall serve themselves of them . . ." (Jer. 25:14). The point seems to be that God, having already decided to punish the king and his people, will use human force to carry out His will, in His time: God stipulates that no rebellion take place for seventy years and that only then will the Chaldeans be defeated (Jer. 25:12). Nonetheless, using Nebuchadnezzar's story to justify revolt implicitly raises

the question of how seventeenth-century Englishmen might know whether or when rebellion is God's will, a question the author of *A Prospective Glasse* evades.

The intertwined legacies of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus the Great—the former king having defeated Judah and ransacked the Temple at Jerusalem, the latter having released captive Jews so that the Temple might be rebuilt (2 Chron. 36:18-23, Ezra 1:1-3)—led in at least one case to an English writer's using the two rulers to characterize the opposing sides in England's wars. In *The Labyrinth the Kingdom's In* (1649), Robert Bacon, identified on the title page of his *A Taste of the Spirit of God* as a preacher at New Windsor, reviews the Royalists' and Parliamentarians' respective failings and then warns the Army to change its ways before it and the country fall completely into ruin. Bacon presents Cyrus as an ideal for the New Model Army to follow in its participation in England's government, and Nebuchadnezzar as Charles's counterpart in religious oppression, corruption, and pride.

The treatise's sole reference to Cyrus appears in the dedicatory epistle, which challenges the High Court of Justice to make its actions commensurate with its faith in itself and God: "*Let your rain of goodness descend, and your Sun of righteousness shine, upon the Just, for their Justification, and the unjust, for their Clarification, and Restoration: Then shall we set to our seal, that you are that you expect to be, The Christ of God, the anointed of the Lord, for the saving, healing, and restoring of the Land . . .*"

(4). The marginal gloss for the phrase "The Christ of God" is "As Cyrus was said to be"

(4). It derives from a passage in Isaiah that presents Cyrus as a beneficiary and an instrument of God's providential care for his people:

He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shall be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid.

THUS saith the LORD to his anointed, To Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut; I will go before thee, and make the crooked places straight: I will break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron: (44:28-45:2)²¹⁶

Bacon's tentative comparison of the High Court to Cyrus, then, suggests that the Army has the opportunity to rectify England's religious abuses.

Bacon attributes the perversion of true worship partly to Charles's support for the Laudian Church. He thus casts Charles first as King Sennacherib of Assyria (see 2 Kings 19) and then, in an analogy implied by the comparison of the Army to Cyrus, as Nebuchadnezzar:

he said in his heart, and all that were heightened by, and took up their rest in, this great and tall Cedar, as some[t]ime the King of Assyria did, *I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most high*: that is, as wise, as strong, as great as he: Or as did that other great and mighty Potentate, we read of in *Daniel*, reflecting upon his own glory, and the works of his own hands, boasted himself before God and men, saying interpretatively, and in the account of both, *Is not this great Babel, which I have built, for the honor of my Majesty? for the spreading of my glory, and for a lasting rest, and tabernacle to m[e], and mine to all future ages?* (5-6)

This passage refers first to Ezekiel 31:3, which describes the Assyrian king's temporary glory, and then to Isaiah 14:12-14, which prophesies his defeat. But the last part of the passage quotes Daniel 4:30, which recounts the occasion of Nebuchadnezzar's fall.

According to Bacon, Charles was "through Flattery, Oppression, Superstition, Ignorance, and the like, lifted up in himself and over the Nation, and all orders and estates of men, and consciences therein . . ." (5). His fettering of religious conscience, Bacon implies, resembles Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of the Jewish temple; the Army, Bacon hopes, will reestablish a right relationship between God and England, just as Cyrus enabled the

²¹⁶The phrase "*He is my shepherd*" and the echo of Isaiah 40:3—"The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God"—show that Cyrus is a type of Christ. See John 10:11 as well as Matthew 3:3, Mark 1:3, Luke 3:4, and John 1:23.

rebuilding of the temple: “If any rest or recovering be brought to King, Parliament, and all others in the Land, it must be by them, for the annoynting of God is upon them, and them alone to that end” (25).²¹⁷

In the first *Defence of the People of England* (1651), Milton’s response to Salmasius, Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus are put to uses similar to those discussed above, but here we find, as Jonathan Post shows (*STB* 174 n24), more emphasis on the legitimacy of rebellion. The two writers have radically different interpretations of Nebuchadnezzar’s fall from power, as Milton’s rebuttal of Salmasius shows:

You come next to the Assyrians and to the Medes and Persians who were most attentive to their kings, maintaining that “the right of kings there was combined with a complete freedom to do what they would,” thus contradicting the word of all historians. In particular Daniel tells us that when king Nebuchadnezzar ruled too haughtily men drove him from their society and left him to the beasts. (435)

In the same paragraph Milton uses the example of Cyrus the Great to refute Salmasius’s claim that the Assyrian, Median, and Persian kingdoms were overthrown by outsiders rather than by disobedient subjects: “You admit yourself ‘that Cyrus rebelled and despots seized power in various parts of the realm.’ Is this the way you carry out your plan of asserting the rights of kings among the Medes and Persians, and the reverence of these people for the kings?” (436). But Milton does acknowledge Cyrus’s God-given authority as a ruler “named for a specific purpose” (402). Jonathan Post glosses Milton’s comments as follows: “Cyrus’s ‘annointment’ by God was seen by Milton, for one, as a significant, biblically sanctioned, exception to the general Royalist assumption of the divine right of kings theory, while the special calling Cyrus received to liberate the Jews

²¹⁷Of his inconsistent references to the king, “sometimes as *living*, and sometimes as *dead* and *gone*,” Bacon writes that he had hoped to have the work published “before the fall of the *late Great KING*; yea, purposed . . . to stand in the way of that *spirit* that consented to the putting him to death . . .” (46).

suffering captivity in Babylon was interpreted as giving authority to the whole notion of subjects rebelling against their king” (*STB* 174 n24). In this way, Cyrus came to be associated in some quarters with Cromwell (Post, *STB* 174 n24).

As Salmasius’s arguments and Milton’s refutations suggest, however, Cyrus the Great was also important to the Royalist cause. Jonathan Post writes that Cyrus was linked with support for Charles I as early as the publication in 1632 of *Cyrupædia, or the Institution and Life of Cyrus King of Persians*, Xenophon’s highly idealized biography of Cyrus as translated by Philemon Holland and dedicated to the English king (*STB* 174 n24). But even more significant, I think, for studying Browne is the fact that the translation was reprinted in 1654, five years after Charles’s death and four years before *The Garden of Cyrus*’s publication. The reprint includes the 1632 dedicatory epistle to Charles, written by Philemon Holland’s son Henry, but it identifies the translator simply as “a Person of Quality” and changes the title to *Cyrus Le Grand The Entire Story Done into English by a Person of Quality and Dedicated to the Late King*. These differences, from a compliment for a living king to a memorial for a dead one, reflect England’s changed political situation while encouraging readers to compare the fallen Charles to Cyrus.

If anything, the second version is more Royalist than the first. The 1632 publication compliments both Charles I and the future Charles II. The frontispiece depicts Cyrus and the elder Charles, one on each side of the work’s title; the symmetry implies balance and thus invites us to compare the two rulers. And Henry Holland’s dedicatory epistle expresses the hope that the work “may . . . be held worthy the view and imitation of your right Roial Son, our most hopeful Prince *Charles*: whom I cañot name but with this

zealous and devout prayer, *That he may grow up in stature and in favour with God and Man*” (Holland np).²¹⁸ Nonetheless, these compliments may be seen as conventional, especially because, as Henry Holland writes in the dedicatory epistle, the translation had originally been intended for Prince Henry at King James’s request (np).²¹⁹ The Royalist sympathies of the 1654 reprint, however, are clear. The changes register the conflicts that had developed during Charles’s reign and that culminated in the wars and the abolishing of monarchy. One seemingly small change, from the translator’s name to simply “a Person of Quality,” directs our attention away from the translator and toward the subject and dedicatee, but it also prioritizes social status (*OED* “quality,” n. 4.a) over personal identity. Although this latter identification may have been intended to emphasize the translator’s education and thus his credibility, as with some other translations from the period, several overtly Royalist works use the same phrase, presumably to protect their authors’ identities.²²⁰ The reprinting of the 1632 dedicatory epistle is also significant: not only was its addressee now dead, but the son for whom the letter expresses high hopes was in exile.

²¹⁸The last part of the passage echoes 1 Samuel 2:26 and Luke 2:52, which refer to Samuel and Jesus respectively.

²¹⁹Prince Henry died in 1612, and a draft of the work was not completed until 1621 (Considine, “Holland, Philemon,” *ODNB*).

²²⁰Translations by “person[s] of quality” include *A Discourse of the Knowledg of Beasts* (1658) and *A Physical Discourse Touching the Nature and Effects of the Courageous Passions* (1658), both from works by Marin Cureau de La Chambre, and *The History of That Great and Renowned Monarchy of China* (1655), from a work by Alvaro Semedo. Royalist works whose authors went unidentified include *Cromwell’s Conspiracy* (1660), *The Faithful, yet Imperfect, Character of a Glorious King* (1660), and T.H.’s *Iter Boreale, the Second Part* (1660). But it must be noted that a pro-Army work from the same period uses the same phrase to disguise its author: *A Letter From a Person of Quality* ([1659]).

The reprint's new title, moreover, makes the work an explicit memorial to Charles. Proclaiming the work "*Dedicated to the Late King*," for example, it foregrounds the regicide; in the earlier version, the phrase "Dedicated to his most Excellent MAIESTY" appears in a relatively small font, on the title page but not the frontispiece, while the reprint's frontispiece, which serves as the title page, has "LATE KING" in relatively large print. Finally, the change from *Cyrupædia* to the French *Cyrus Le Grand* recalls Charles's often-criticized connections with France, including his marriage to Henrietta Maria.²²¹ In the 1654 version, then, Cyrus becomes a reminder of Charles's strengths as king and of the disobedience and betrayal for which Royalists faulted the Parliament and Army.²²²

The title *Cyrus Le Grand* may also constitute an attempt to capitalize on the Royalist associations of another work that links Charles with Cyrus: *Artamenes, or The Grand Cyrus* (1653-55), the English translation by one "F.G. Gent." of Madeleine de Scudéry's

²²¹The king also looked to France for unofficial support in the wars: Parliament's 1645 printing of Charles's and Henrietta Maria's letters brought to public scrutiny plans to build up the forces with Catholic Irish and French mercenary soldiers (Kishlansky 166-167).

²²²The body of the work, however, may be read as calling into question the comparison of Charles to Cyrus. Xenophon begins his proem by considering humans' tendency toward rebellion (1) and claims that animals are superior to humans in their responses to those who rule them (1-2). But although he at first attributes rulers' difficulties to their subjects' faults, he ends the proem by concluding, given Cyrus's example, "[t]hat it is neither impossible, nor yet a matter of difficulty, to governe men, in case one have the skill thereof, and goe about it with dexterity" (2). In the context of the Interregnum, this remark and the description of subjects' great love for Cyrus (2) might have cast doubt on Charles's skills as king, in spite of the translation's complimentary front matter. Nonetheless, it can be argued that after the regicide and the publication of *Eikon Basilike* (1649), the dedication of an ideal ruler's story to a king regarded by his supporters as a martyr is a Royalist move.

romance *Artamène, ou le Grand Cyrus* (1649-53).²²³ The work is a *roman à clef* written, as the identification of Cyrus with the Prince de Condé (Drujon col. 90) suggests, in response to the Fronde (Ranum 813), the revolts from 1649 to 1653 against the French court's bids to increase royal power. Scudéry's correspondence reveals her sympathy for Condé and his sister Madame de Longueville (Aronson 35), but biographer Nicole Aronson maintains that Scudéry nonetheless "was always loyal" to Louis XIV (36).

One scene from the romance is enough to illustrate the simultaneous concerns to vindicate Condé and to encourage obedience to the crown. Ciaxares, the Median king, wrongfully imprisons Cyrus, intending to execute him because of the prince's suspected affronts to Ciaxares and his daughter and because of the prophecy that Cyrus would rule all Asia (1.19-20, 1.30-31, 2.94-95, 2.202, 2.207).²²⁴ Two kings who wish to free Cyrus encourage the Persian troops to stand against the threat (3.2-3), but they find this plan regrettable, "since there is nothing in the world more to be avoided, then the Rebellion of the people . . ." (3.6). The narrator, noting that most of the soldiers whose unrest endangered Ciaxares were not his subjects, condemns threats even to foreign kings: "They cast off that Reverend respect unto Kings, which ought to be imprinted in the souls of Subjects, insomuch as they were ready to act any violence" (3.6). Finally, Scudéry has Cyrus himself ready to sacrifice his freedom and his life in order to uphold the king's authority:

²²³W.H. Coupland supposes that Browne's title *The Garden of Cyrus* "[d]oubtless . . . came from an English translation of" the romance (382), although he does not substantiate the claim. Jeremiah S. Finch dismisses this opinion out of hand: "Aside from the *Cyrus* in the title, I can think of nothing more remote from Browne's essay on the quincunx than *Artamène*" ("Sir Thomas Browne" 277 n11).

²²⁴Unless otherwise indicated, citations of *Artamenes* give part and page numbers.

Do not think . . . that I will accept of any liberty which shall be imployed against the King; No, no, I do not value Glory at so poor a rate, as to prefer my life before it: If I did come out of prison, it was only . . . to come and teach you that reverend respect which you ow unto your Master: Force me not to turn this sword against you which heretofore has rendered you victorious: Obey, obey the Kings Commands, without the least contradiction: and if he demand my head of you, you ought to give it him without resistance: Did I ever teach you (said he, and doubled the fervency of his speech) to rebel against your King? Did you ever perceive by any of my actions, that I would allow of what you have done? No, no, deceive not your selves, I can never be woon unto an act so criminal, which makes me culpable as well as you. For after all this which you have done, I am not a whit more innocent then I was before, but I rather find, that the King without any injustice, and [*sic*] may chop off that mans head, who hath raised all his Subjects against him: Lay down your Arms then; and if you desire to serve me, cause all the souldiers to return unto the Camp, and all the inhabitants to their houses, whilst I, after I have begged your pardon from the King, will return unto my fetters. (3.6-7)

Cyrus here faces death even as he tries to protect Ciaxares from the same danger. The pathos of the situation is calculated to win sympathy for Cyrus (Condé) while maintaining support for monarchic rule and for Louis XIV in particular: Cyrus is ready to die, so important to him is the principle of subjects' obedience even to what they see as a king's errors. This depiction of Condé perhaps reflects typical reactions of the Frondeurs to the worry that they sought to dethrone Louis and to install a republican government as the English had done; in general, according to Philip Knachel, the Frondeurs protested that they meant no disrespect to Louis or to the notion of monarchy but rather hoped only to correct Cardinal Mazarin's abuses of authority (87-106).

Indeed, it is easy to believe that the book also responds to England's troubles; Scudéry's representation of Cyrus provided English Royalists with a sympathetic picture of Charles I.²²⁵ The English translation, moreover, is clearly meant to serve the Royalists. It is dedicated to Anne Lucas, the wife of John Lucas, whose support for

²²⁵Philip A. Knachel has a brilliant discussion of how the French compared, and sometimes avoided comparing, England's Civil Wars to the upheavals of the Fronde (78-111).

Charles prompted the 1642 looting of his home in Essex, a county with strong Puritan and Parliamentary sympathies, who in 1645 was created Baron Lucas of Shenfield, at least partly “as compensation for his sufferings” (Walter, “Lucas, John,” *ODNB*). John Lucas joined the king’s forces (Walter, “Lucas”), but the family also had other Royalist ties: John’s brother Sir Charles Lucas was executed for his defense of Colchester against Fairfax’s forces in 1648, “bec[oming], after Charles I, the pre-eminent royalist martyr of the civil wars” (Donagan, “Lucas, Sir Charles,” *ODNB*). Moreover, the stationer, Humphrey Moseley, linked himself especially with Royalist works (Wilcher, “Moseley, Humphrey,” *ODNB*), as his comment about *Artamenes* suggests:

If you ask why this should have any Precedence before other *Romances*, ’tis soon answer’d, that our *Author* in this hath so laid his Sceans, as to touch upon the greatest Affairs of our Times: for, Designs of War and Peace are better hinted and cut open by a *Romance*, than by down-right Histories; which, being barefac’d, are forc’d to be often too modest and sparing; when these disguiz’d Discourses, freely personating every man and no man, have liberty to speak out. (Vol. 1, “The Stationer to the Reader,” sig. A2v)

More pointedly, in the dedicatory epistle for the second volume, Moseley introduces the plot with a reminder of Charles I’s fate: “The former Volume left *CYRUS* at the Block; This shews what means were us’d to preserve him, a Felicity which all good Princes have not enjoy’d” (sig. A2r).

Like Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus the Great, Ahasuerus is put to opposing uses by Charles’s enemies and his supporters. Writers sometimes identify the Jews’ persecution, but also their ultimate vindication, with English nonconformists’ experiences: Samuel Fisher argues for toleration even of Catholics, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians, but he compares these groups’ maltreatment of nonconformists to Haman’s speech against the Jews (548). William Prynne’s *Histrio-mastix* (1633) compares the insults to Puritans to Haman’s behavior (821), and his *The Sovereigne Povver* (1643) compares the

Parliamentarians’ “Defensive Warre” to the Jews’ self-protective struggle against the enemies set on by Haman’s plot (Pt. 3.61, 67). Samuel Rutherford, a Presbyterian (Coffey, “Rutherford, Samuel,” *ODNB*), in *The Tryal & Triumph of Faith* (1652), recommends prayer as a means to benefit “War in the Cause of God” (310-11), asserting that it was “the Prayers of Esther and her maids” rather than Ahasuerus’s power that ensured the Jews’ safety (311). William Dewsbury, a Quaker (Gill, “Dewsbury, William,” *ODNB*), pleading against the policy of oath-taking, writes that if the government forces people to violate their consciences, it will suffer the fate of Charles and the bishops—the fate, too, of Haman and Nebuchadnezzar (23). But sometimes the main concern was not religion but economic standing: Gerrard Winstanley, advocating for the landless poor, argues that Esther championed “common Freedom” (23). Likewise Thomas Fuller’s *The Holy State* (1642) likens England’s “punie depopulatours” to Haman: “See how this grand destroyer of a whole Nation pleads the Kings profit. Thus our punie depopulatours alledge for their doings the Kings and countreys good; and we will believe them, when they can perswade us that their private coffers are the Kings exchequer. But never any wounded the Commonwealth, but first they kiss’d it, pretending the publick good” (246).

Ahasuerus’s significance was more forthrightly political as well. Charles’s opponents William Prynne (*The Sovereigne Povver*, App. 121) and Samuel Rutherford (*Lex, Rex* 177) point to Ahasuerus as an example of how even a king’s power is limited by his country’s law or a group of advisors; in 1660, Thomas Tomkins, denying Parliament’s “partitipation [*sic*] of the Sovereignty,” would reject the notion that Ahasuerus’s and Darius’s inability to revoke commands against the Jews indicated “a mixt Monarchy”

(16). But Royalist writers also use the figure of Ahasuerus to support Charles in more positive ways. John Thornborough, Bishop of Worcester, lists Ahasuerus among rulers of many kingdoms or provinces as he argues for the unity of England and Scotland (142). Likewise, James Ussher presents Ahasuerus as a pattern for Charles in *The Rights of Primogeniture, or, The Excellency of Royal Authority* (1648). This sermon, given at the Isle of Wight on the imprisoned king's birthday, presents Ahasuerus's feast as an example of "outward Splendour," which, Ussher says, "is the first part of Majesty" (5).

Cyrus the Younger receives much less attention in mid-century political treatises than the three kings discussed above. His reputation, it seems, is mixed. Humphrey Moseley's epistle to the reader in Scudéry's *Artamenes* says of the elder and younger Cyruses that "our *Author* hath drain'd all the Excellencies of both those Two to fill and accomplish this his *Grand Cyrus*" (Vol. 1, sig. A2v). Yet Sir Walter Raleigh's *The Prince, or, Maxims of State* (1642) mentions the younger Cyrus only as a rebel. Among the "Causes of Sedition," which may in turn lead to "Conversion of State" (35), Raleigh lists "[i]njury, when great Spirits, and of great power are greatly wronged and dishonoured, or take themselves so to bee" (36); Cyrus appears here as an example, along with Coriolanus and the Earl of Warwick (36). Notably, of the entries for sedition, this is the only one for which Raleigh offers advice: "the best way," he writes, "is to decide the wrong" (36). Raleigh invokes Cyrus as an example again near the end of the work, following a list of "Wayes of such as aspire to the Kingdome, and Markes to discern them" (43-44): here Raleigh refers to Cyrus beneath the entry for using spies (44). What is most interesting about Raleigh's mentions of Cyrus, I think, is that they involve problems against which a ruler can take action, by confronting the supposed problem in

one case and for being alert to spies in the other. Moreover, the passage on sedition, which acknowledges that Cyrus was a “great Spirit[], and of great power,” implies that he could have become an asset rather than a liability to his brother’s court, given, perhaps, the right kind of mediation.

The stories of the four gardener-princes discussed here involve disobedience to, or all-out rebellion against, a ruler or God and thus prompt readers to consider the basis of the right to rule. They present us with different ways, firstly, of understanding the relation among rulers, subjects, and the divine and, secondly, of interpreting history. In seventeenth-century England, these matters were seen as directly related: if a ruler derived his power from divine providence, to rebel against him was also to rebel against God’s will; if that power came from mere chance or from a contractual relationship with subjects, rebellion could be justified more easily. But these gardener-princes also provide examples of the potential for a wider range of interactions between rulers and subjects, for options other than all-out rejection of kingly authority on the one hand or unquestioning obedience on the other: *Artamenes*, for instance, complicates the notion of rebellion by reflecting the complex motivations for the Fronde, and Raleigh’s advice for princes, as we have just seen, implies that timely interventions can help keep the peace. The fact that writers with different political and religious commitments can turn these gardener-princes’ stories to such different uses demonstrates the need for moderation in questions of government. Furthermore, as we shall see, these stories all directly or indirectly champion the ability to moderate passion. Thus Browne’s history of Eastern gardens is doubly linked to the quincunx as an emblem of mediocrity.

Browne's Views on Providence and Rebellion

The Garden of Cyrus subtly reflects the political issues discussed above, raising complex questions about providence, rebellion, passion, and virtue. But it does so only in Browne's comments about the gardener-princes, and then only obliquely. Indeed the ambiguities of Browne's prose tend to minimize rebellion and disobedience in his references to the gardener-princes. His language thus instantiates the uncertainties and debates about motivation that, as we have seen, allow other writers to draw quite different lessons from the stories of these princes.

The political ramifications of these early paragraphs are easier to discern by the light of a few key passages from *Religio Medici*, which define Browne's beliefs that providence governs human affairs and that a right understanding of historical events requires moderation of the soul's faculties. In the *Religio*, Browne firmly espouses the view that divine providence guides both private and public life. He proclaims first that "there are in every mans life certaine rubs, doublings and wrenches which pass a while under the effects of chance, but at the last, well examined, prove the meere hand of God" (1: 27). Then, citing the Gunpowder Plot's failure and the Spanish Armada's defeat, he asserts that providence rules national fortunes as well:

Where there is a manifest disproportion between the powers and forces of two severall agents, upon a maxime of reason wee may promise the victory to the superiour; but when unexpected accidents slip in, and unthought of occurrences intervene, these must proceed from a power that owes no obedience to those axioms: where, as in the writing upon the wall, we behold the hand, but see not the spring that moves it. The successe of that pety Province of Holland (of which the Grand Seignieur proudly said, That if they should trouble him as they did the Spaniard, hee would send his men with shovels and pick-axes and throw it into the Sea) I cannot altogether ascribe to the ingenuity and industry of the people, but to the mercy of God, that hath disposed them to such a thriving *Genius*; and to the will of his providence, that dispenseth her favour to each Countrey in their preordinate season. All cannot be happy at once; for, because the glory of one State depends upon the

ruine of another, there is a revolution and vicissitude of their greatnesse, which must obey the swing of that wheele, not moved by intelligences, but by the hand of God, whereby all States arise to their Zenith and verticall points, according to their predestinated periods. (1: 27)

The allusion to “the writing upon the wall,” though it introduces an analogy for our ability to see effects rather than causes, also reinforces Browne’s contention that God governs the mutability of earthly power: according to the Book of Daniel, the writing appears as a warning that God intends to punish Belshazzar’s pride, idolatry, and profanation of the temple vessels (Dan. 5:18-23, 5:2-4, 5:23) by making the Babylonian kingdom fall to Persian and Median forces (5:25-28). The same night, Belshazzar is killed and his domain conquered (5:30-31). Browne’s reference to this story supports his belief in a guiding providence; it also links that notion with the kingdoms of two prominent gardener-princes, Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus the Great.²²⁶

Browne’s reference to the story is also crucial because, in context, it demonstrates how he associates kingship and a providential view of history with the need for moderation—which, as we have seen, is a central concern in his *Garden*. The passage is part of Browne’s argument that what we see as chance or fortune is actually the subtle operation of God’s providence (1: 26-27). The danger of mistaking providence for mere chance, in turn, initiates a discussion of the tensions among faith, reason, and passion: “The bad construction and perverse comment on these paire of second causes, or visible hands of God [i.e., nature and fortune (1: 27)], have perverted the devotion of many unto Atheisme; who forgetting the honest advisoes of faith, have listened unto the conspiracie

²²⁶Belshazzar was descended from Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 5:18, 5:22), whose story Daniel tells before he reads the writing (5:18-21). The conqueror, Darius (5:31), was the father of Cyrus the Great.

of Passion and Reason” (1: 29).²²⁷ Developing the political metaphor implied by “advisees” and “conspiracie,” Browne describes the soul as a state governed by “a kind of Triumvirate, or Triple government of three competitors, which distract the peace of this our Common-wealth, not lesse than did that other the State of Rome” (1: 29). The best way to resolve the strife, Browne maintains, is to exercise mediocrity:

As Reason is a rebell unto Faith, so Passion unto Reason: As the propositions of Faith seeme absurd unto Reason, so the Theorems of Reason unto passion, and both unto Faith; yet a moderate and peaceable discretion may so state and order the matter, that they may bee all Kings, and yet make but one Monarchy, every one exercising his Sovereignty and Prerogative in a due time and place, according to the restraint and limit of circumstance. (1: 29)²²⁸

Moderation, then, leads to a right relationship among faith, reason, and passion, and thus to a right interpretation of personal or national fortune as the working of providence.

Browne never applies this idea directly to England’s woes. But occasionally in *The Garden of Cyrus* he comments on the roles of chance and providence in political and military matters. As we have already seen, Browne’s remarks about Nebuchadnezzar’s fall and restoration are based on the fourth chapter of Daniel, which makes clear that the “ambition” Browne mentions (1: 180) is the king’s refusal to acknowledge the divine source of his power. The vision that precedes Nebuchadnezzar’s fall is meant to illustrate God’s omnipotence, “that the living may know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men” (4:17); the story is thus one of insubordination to God rather than of rebellion against a higher human power. Although Browne’s paragraph on Nebuchadnezzar does not

²²⁷That this point is closely related to the story of Belshazzar is suggested by the reference to the “visible hands of God” (1: 29), a phrase that recalls the disembodied hand visible to the Babylonian prince (Dan. 5:5).

²²⁸*Discretion* here has several related meanings that involve judgment (*OED*, “discretion” 2, 3, 4, 6). But the word also refers to “separation” or “distinction” (1), a key meaning given Browne’s suggestion that faith, reason, and passion each have a sphere of rule.

directly affirm that kings rule by God's providence, it hints at such a belief by characterizing that king's fall as "a proper punishment" for the immoderate delight that accompanied his "ambition" (1: 180).

And in a more complicated example, Browne writes of Cyrus the Younger's suitability for the throne he never won that the prince was "fatally prevented by the harmlesse chance of *post-geniture* . . ." (1: 181). Browne's diction equivocates between seeing historical events as chance occurrences and believing that they are determined by providence. *Fatally* and *chance* have similar and opposing connotations: *fate* may refer to "predetermin[ation]" (*OED* "fate," n., 1.a.) or "destiny" (4.a.; see also 3 and 3.b), while *chance* can mean "a casual or fortuitous circumstance" (*OED* "chance," n. (and a.), A.1.b) or "[a]bsence of design or assignable cause, fortuity; often itself spoken of as the cause or determiner of events, which appear to happen without the intervention of law, ordinary causation, or providence . . ." (A.6). If we take Browne at his word in the *Religio*, however, we know that he regards chance as a form of providence; in that case, the prince's "*post-geniture*" would indeed have been "harmlesse" had Cyrus not attempted to take the throne from his older brother by force.²²⁹

We have seen already that the question of providence's role in human affairs was closely related, for seventeenth-century political theorists, to that of the legitimacy of

²²⁹ Although Browne does not mention this point in *The Garden of Cyrus*, famous stories about the other two gardener-princes also deal with the notion of providence. In Herodotus's account of Cyrus the Great's ascendancy, both the advisor Harpagus and Cyrus himself claim to be cooperating with providence (1.124, 1.126); Scripture likewise describes Cyrus's later victory over Nebuchadnezzar as a fulfillment of the divine will (Isa. 44:28, 45:1-3), although it portrays Cyrus as doing God's will not for personal gain but for love of right (Isa. 45:13). While the Book of Esther never directly ascribes Mordecai's, Esther's, or the Jews' successes to God's will, Mordecai acknowledges the possibility that Esther's position of power is due to, and is meant to serve, providence (4:13-14).

rebellion. Although *The Garden of Cyrus* offers a few clues to Browne's attitudes toward providence, the essay never really mentions rebellion. But the stories of the four gardener-princes all involve disobedience or outright revolt, and Browne's prose suggests that these themes are more important to his essay than they might appear to be. Moreover, it repeatedly juxtaposes these matters with the princes' gardening interests, implying that Browne finds a significant—if not, at first, clear—relationship between political and horticultural matters.

Nebuchadnezzar rebels against God by forgetting the vital lesson that human power originates from God's will (Dan. 4:29-37), and according to Browne, the "Paradise" around the palace nourishes the king's "ambition" (1: 180). Browne's account of the Babylonian gardens also hints at Nebuchadnezzar's prideful ambition in a second way: when Browne writes, "The *Persian* Gallants who destroyed this Monarchy, maintained their Botanicall bravery" (1: 180), he may be referring to Nebuchadnezzar's command in the Book of Judith that his general Holofernes "destroy all the gods of the earth, that he only [Nebuchadnezzar] might be called god by those nations which could be brought under him by the power of Holofernes" (*Holy Bible, Translated* [Douay] 3:13). The troops thus cut down the sacred groves of the lands Nebuchadnezzar wished to dominate (3:12). The story is thus one not only of the king's vengefulness toward those who refused to be his allies (Jud. 1:10-12, 2:1) but also of his attempt to replace the gods worshipped in the area.²³⁰ Yet Browne does no more than hint at this aim.

The stories of the other gardener-princes involve rebellion against human rulers, and if anything Browne's allusions to these instances of revolt are subtler than his comments

²³⁰One of Browne's sources, Benedictus Curtius's *Hortorum Libri Triginta*, refers explicitly to this story (92).

about Nebuchadnezzar. For example, Browne's assertion that "*Cyrus* the elder, brought up in Woods and Mountains, when time and power enabled, pursued the dictate of his education, and brought the treasures of the field into rule and circumscription," seems to refer in particular to the king's adornment of the Hanging Gardens (1: 180) and more generally to the value he placed on cultivation (see Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* 4.16). But the comment subtly gestures toward Herodotus's much less flattering portrait of Cyrus as an opportunistic, dishonest prince (1.124) who uses agricultural toil to convince the Persian troops to rebel against the Median king Astyages. According to Herodotus, Cyrus lies to the Persian troops about his authority from the king (1.125) and commands them to "clear and make serviceable in one day a certain thorny tract of Persia, of eighteen or twenty furlongs each way in extent" (1.126). The next day, he offers them rest and a huge feast and then asks which day proved more enjoyable. When they choose leisure, Cyrus makes an attractive promise: "obey me and you shall have these good things and ten thousand others besides with no toil and slavery; but if you will not obey me you will have labours unnumbered, like to your toil of yesterday. Now, therefore, do as I bid you, and win your freedom. . . . [R]evolt from Astyages with all speed!" (1.126). In Herodotus's account, then, cultivation of the land is a means to obtaining military support for rebellion. (And characteristically, even Cyrus's underhandedness is productive for the land.) Again, however, as in the case of Nebuchadnezzar, Browne does no more than raise the question of motivation by way of a deft, ambiguous phrase.

Ahasuerus is included among the gardener-princes by virtue of his appreciation for gardens rather than his horticultural skill, and in his story, gardens are the setting for rather than a means to disobedience. Browne's single comment on the king, however,

does not mention disobedience directly: “*Ahasuerus* . . . in the Countrey and City of Flowers, and in an open Garden, entertained his Princes and people, while *Vasthi* [*sic*] more modestly treated the Ladies within the Palace thereof” (1: 180). Yet while the phrase “more modestly” records the contrast between the king’s and queen’s feasts, it also acknowledges, and even perhaps provides a reason for, Vashti’s disobedience to Ahasuerus. During the feasting, according to the Book of Esther, Ahasuerus commanded Vashti to come “before the king with the crown royal, to shew the people and the princes her beauty . . .” (1:11), but for unspecified reasons, she refused. Browne’s phrasing, however, hints that the queen’s indoor feast was not only more “moderate” than her husband’s (*OED* “modestly,” 1) but was also grounded in a concern for modesty, for avoiding “impropriety” (2) and “vanity” (3). If so, Vashti may have seen an open display of her beauty as a violation of the modesty she sought to maintain.

Although Browne never acknowledges Vashti’s disobedience to the king, his mention of modesty implies his awareness of it. What his comment also glosses over is the consternation Vashti’s refusal of her husband’s command produces at court. Her behavior, one advisor fears, has the potential to create widespread social disorder:

Vashti the queen hath not done wrong to the king only, but also to all the princes, and to all the people that *are* in all the provinces of the king Ahasuerus.

For *this* deed of the queen shall come abroad unto all women, so that they shall despise their husbands in their eyes, when it shall be reported, The king Ahasuerus commanded Vashti the queen to be brought in before him, but she came not.

Likewise shall the ladies of Persia and Media say this day unto all the king’s princes, which have heard of the deed of the queen. Thus *shall there arise* too much contempt and wrath. (Esth. 1:16-18)

The prince recommends that the king proclaim his intention to put Vashti away from him and take a new wife, with the effect that “all the wives shall give to their husbands honour, both to great and small” (1:20); the king accordingly issues letters to all parts of

his empire commanding “that every man should bear rule in his own house . . .” (1:22). The single phrase “more modestly” in Browne’s reference thus encourages readers to consider the larger political ramifications of Vashti’s modesty, even though it purports to be a comment only on the queen’s entertainment of her subjects.²³¹ The ambiguities here implicitly attribute the fear of ill effects to what may be the queen’s attempt to preserve virtue or to follow her conscience, so that the phrasing urges English readers to think more carefully about the complexity of judging matters of conscience and obedience in their own kingdom.

Finally, Browne’s comments about the younger Cyrus skirt the topic of revolt; his only acknowledgment that Cyrus attempted to take the throne from his brother is his identification of the prince as the man “who gave the occasion of that memorable work, and almost miraculous retrait of *Xenophon*” (1: 180-81). Even in this reference to Xenophon’s *Anabasis*, the account of Cyrus’s failed expedition and of his Greek troops’ dangerous return home, Browne refrains from mentioning revolt directly. Yet he does raise the question of the proper basis for power: Cyrus was, Browne tells us, “[a] person of high spirit and honour, naturally a King, though fatally prevented by the harmlesse chance of *post-geniture* . . .” (1: 181).²³² This clause reflects the complexity of

²³¹Further instances of real or perceived insubordination to the king follow: the new queen Esther’s cousin and adoptive father, Mordecai, discovers a plot against the king (2:21-23); for religious reasons, Mordecai disobeys Ahasuerus’s command that all subjects revere the favored nobleman Haman (3:1-4); the vengeful Haman invokes the Jews’ observance of different laws and non-observance of Ahasuerus’s in order to persuade the king to have them killed (3:8-9); and finally, his machinations discovered, Haman falls on the queen’s bed to beg her for mercy, and the king, finding him thus, assumes that he is attempting rape and orders him killed (7:8-9).

²³²In Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus*, Socrates affirms the prince’s potential: “upon my word, if Cyrus had only lived, it seems that he would have proved an excellent ruler. . . . I think

contemporary debates about kingship, acknowledging that the decrees of “natur[e]” do not always coincide with those of law or custom.

Browne’s remark also demonstrates the difficulty of such debates in a second way, namely by refraining from any judgment about Cyrus’s role in his own fate. Ultimately, Browne refuses to assign blame for Cyrus’s death in battle. The word *fatally*, which refers both to the notion that fate governs human fortunes and to Cyrus’s death in battle against his brother, contrasts sharply with Browne’s characterization of Cyrus’s birth order as “harmlesse chance”: Cyrus’s status as younger son was “harmlesse” in itself, but his attempt to take the throne led to his death. Browne depicts birth order as the blameless happenstance that prevented Cyrus from claiming the throne for which he was well suited, but this position ignores Cyrus’s agency and his brother’s skill in battle. Browne ostensibly faults neither the princes nor the “chance” of birth order for the fact that Cyrus never became king. On the one hand, then, his comment may mean that birth order created an unfortunate set of circumstances in which an excellent ruler was never able to fulfill his potential; on the other hand; it may mean that, thanks to the prince’s position as younger son, Cyrus would not have been a legitimate king even had his rebellion succeeded.

Browne moves directly from Cyrus’s military exploits and fitness for rule to the prince’s gardening skills: “Not only a Lord of Gardens, but a manuall planter thereof: disposing his trees like his armies in regular ordination” (1: 181). The comparison of

you have one clear proof of a ruler’s excellence, when men obey him willingly and choose to stand by him in moments of danger” (4.18-19). Likewise, in the *Anabasis* Xenophon concludes his account of the prince’s death by calling him “the most kingly and the most worthy to rule of all the Persians who have been born since Cyrus the Elder, as all agree who are reputed to have known Cyrus intimately” (1.9.1).

Cyrus's military and horticultural endeavors implies praise for both, praise made explicit at the end of the paragraph: "All stories do look upon *Cyrus*, as the splendid and regular planter" (1: 181). For Browne, moderation, control, and orderliness are virtues in a military leader and in a planter alike. But the significance of this juxtaposition of the martial and the horticultural is, I think, farther-reaching. What Browne leaves unstated, but what is clear from Xenophon's account of Cyrus's last moments in battle against his brother, is that although the prince kept his troops in order (*Anabasis* 1.8.21), he failed to rein in his own passions: "While attended by these ['his so-called table companions'] only, he caught sight of the King and the compact body around him; and on the instant he lost control of himself and, with the cry 'I see the man,' rushed upon him . . ." (*Anabasis* 1.8.26). In this sense, Cyrus's "*post-geniture*" was perhaps "harmlesse," as Browne writes. Perhaps instead the cause of the prince's death was his passion, either in the heat of battle or in choosing to challenge his brother's reign at all.

Over and over, Browne's phrasing obscures even as it describes the princes' responses to their gardens. Although he acknowledges the realities of disobedience and rebellion, he also recognizes the difficulties that can arise in discerning between virtue and passion, mediocrity and extremes.

Kingly Gardens and the Garden of England

Thus far, we have seen gardens as incitements to rebellion, settings for disobedience, and sources of activity comparable to military leadership. But the stories of Browne's gardener-princes also tell us much about the relationships between royal gardens and perceptions of their owners—an important consideration for English readers, who had seen radical changes in the government of their garden-nation. The applicability to

England of Browne's comments is difficult to discern: except for Browne's dedication of the essay to a countryman and his reliance entirely on native plants for his examples (Preston, *TB* 202),²³³ the work seems unconcerned with England. Moreover, Browne's references to specific periods and places involve other parts of the world—ranging from the Americas (1: 175, 1: 226) to India (1: 183) and the Middle East (1: 179-81)—and the cultures, customs, and rulers of times past. Yet the striking omission of English examples implies a response to the country's difficulties that that very omission appears to deny. And Browne's comments about the younger Cyrus, the only gardener-prince of the four not to become king, suggest that England is part of the subject of his essay. Browne implies that Cyrus should serve as a model for the best English gardeners. But I believe that, for Browne, the prince's example is moral as well as horticultural: in some ways, England is the garden named in the work's title, and by implication it, like Cyrus's groves, will flourish if tended with virtue and care. This hortatory function, however, is made explicit only in the dedicatory epistle's compliments to Nicholas Bacon and his family.

Browne alerts us to the fact that elaborate gardens earned two kings in particular respect and renown: "*Nebuchodonosor* . . . so magnificently built his hanging gardens, that from succeeding Writers he had the honour of the first," and Cyrus the Great "[s]o nobly beautif[ied] the hanging Gardens of *Babylon*, that he was also thought to be the authour thereof" (Browne 1: 180). Indeed, Browne attributes Nebuchadnezzar's

²³³Claire Preston ascribes no political significance to Browne's focus on English plants, which, she writes, exemplifies his enjoyment of close observation and participates in "the reconvening of knowledge and the reordering of the world . . ." (*TB* 203).

pridefulness to the king's view of his lands (1: 180). Finally, Ahasuerus, when he feasted his people, displayed his wealth, luxury, and power in a garden setting (Esth. 1:5)

Where were white, green, and blue, *hangings*, fastened with cords of fine linen and purple to silver rings and pillars of marble: the beds *were of* gold and silver, upon a pavement of red, and blue, and white, and black, marble.

And they gave them drink in vessels of gold, (the vessels being diverse one from another,) and royal wine in abundance, according to the state of the king. (Esth. 1:6-7)

Vashti's beauty, of course, was to have been part of this display as well, had she obeyed the king's command (Esth. 1:10-12).

But if gardens could signal a ruler's impressiveness, they could also demonstrate his care for his land and people. Ahasuerus's gardens provide a setting for the king's generosity (Esth. 1:7). And in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, Socrates praises the contemporary Persian king for his personal interest in cultivating the kingdom: "in all the districts he resides in and visits he takes care that there are 'paradises,' as they call them, full of all the good and beautiful things that the soil will produce, and in this he himself spends most of his time, except when the season precludes it" (4.13). The king also greatly esteems both military might and husbandry, and he uses similar means to enforce high standards for each (4.4-11; 4.15). He thus carries on the legacy of Cyrus the Great (so identified in Marchant's annotation, 395 n1), who, Socrates reports, "once said to the company invited to receive his gifts, 'I myself deserve to receive the gifts awarded in both classes; for I am the best at stocking land and the best at protecting the stock'" (4.16). These kings' garden endeavors, then, show not only an interest in pleasure and luxury but also a commitment to care for the lands and people.

Finally, and most importantly for my argument about the applicability to England of Browne's gardener-prince comments, gardens could reveal a prince's personal virtue.

Cyrus the Younger's reputation, as Browne writes, depends partly on his gardening interests: "All stories do look upon *Cyrus*, as the splendid and regular planter" (1: 181). Browne cites Xenophon's description, in the *Oeconomicus*, of Cyrus's grounds at his Sardis estate (Browne 1: 181), but he does not mention the association of Cyrus's planting with virtue:

"What, Cyrus?" exclaimed Lysander, looking at him, and marking the beauty and perfume of his robes, and the splendour of the necklaces and bangles and other jewels that he was wearing; "did you really plant part of this with your own hands?" "Does that surprise you, Lysander?" asked Cyrus in reply. "I swear by the Sun-god that I never yet sat down to dinner when in sound health, without first working hard at some task of war or agriculture, or exerting myself somehow."

Lysander himself declared, I should add, that on hearing this, he congratulated him in these words: "I think you deserve your happiness, Cyrus, for you earn it by your virtues." (4.23-25)

Yet although Browne never mentions moral virtue explicitly, he does imply that Cyrus's tending of his groves is admirable. He does so partly by contrasting the prince's horticultural reputation with those of Laertias, Attalus, and various other "Ancients" who are famous for less spectacular or beneficial—and, in the cases of Attalus's "poisonous plantations" and others' focus on "the single name of Vegetables," also more extreme—achievements (1: 181).

Here we can see more clearly how Browne's comments on the gardener-princes apply to England. By the time the essay was published, the nation's gardener-king had been dead for over nine years. Possibly the gardener-princes are meant to serve as models (or warnings) for Cromwell, but such an argument is tenuous and highly speculative at best. The best clues to the essay's purpose appear in the dedicatory epistle, addressed to an owner and cultivator of private gardens, one with no pretensions to power of state. I want to propose, then, that Browne's comments about the gardener-princes are aimed less at

nostalgia for Charles's rule or advice for the Lord Protector's government than at encouragement and consolation of England's landowners. Furthermore, I would suggest that Browne's silence about Cyrus's virtue has the effect of dissociating the topic from military activity, a wise strategy if, as I have been arguing, he advocates mediocrity as a response to England's problems.

The essay's passage about Cyrus the Younger provides the strongest basis for this reading of the essay's concern with moderation. Browne's most extensive comments about any gardener-prince are those about this second Cyrus, for whom the essay is titled and who, as Browne points out, was never actually king (1: 181). This prince thus represents the application of the gardener-king trope to gardeners who are not kings. His balance of military and horticultural activities, for example, recalls Cyrus the Great's, as the latter is described by Socrates in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* (4.16). Elsewhere, too, Xenophon implies that the younger Cyrus is a counterpart to the elder one, calling the prince "a man who was the most kingly and the most worthy to rule of all the Persians who have been born since Cyrus the Elder . . ." (*Anabasis* 1.9.1). And although in that work Xenophon does not mention the prince's gardening practices, in the *Oeconomicus* he has Socrates follow the discussion of Cyrus the Great's excellence in husbandry and war with praise for the younger Cyrus, first extolling the prince's military leadership (4.18-19) and then recounting the story of Lysander's visit and Cyrus's declaration that he "never yet sat down to dinner when in sound health, without first working hard at some task of war or agriculture, or exerting myself somehow" (4.23-24). Thus the two men are linked in much more than name and nationality: their lives employed the same balance between war and agriculture.

Cyrus the Younger—significantly, the only gardener-prince mentioned in the early paragraphs of the essay to be explicitly associated with the quincunx—serves as a model for English readers in a more explicit way as well. Browne’s praise for the prince as “the splendid and regular planter” whose trees appear in “regular ordination” (1: 181) echoes that for Nicholas Bacon, who, Browne writes, “ha[s] wisely ordered [his] vegetable delights, beyond the reach of exception” (1: 176). And as with Cyrus, Browne contrasts Bacon’s moderation and orderliness with the extremism or monomania of some other gardeners (1: 176). Again, too, there is some indication that moderate gardening involves moral virtue: “In Garden Delights ’tis not easie to hold a Mediocrity . . .” (1: 176). Cyrus the Younger, then, functions not just as another iteration of the gardener-king trope but rather as a variation on it, one that serves as a model for private citizens and not only for rulers or statesmen. Nicholas Bacon is his modern English counterpart, who also becomes a model for English readers.

As the similarities in Browne’s comments about the younger Cyrus and Nicholas Bacon imply, their horticultural “[m]ediocrity” is a crucial virtue. But its implications extend beyond gardening; indeed, what Browne says about horticultural moderation seems like a specific application of a general principle espoused by Cyrus the Great in Xenophon’s *Cyropædia*:

Therefore wee must not in any wise be remisse and take our ease, ne yet abandon our selves to the pleasures and delights presented unto us. For I assure you, in my conceit, howsoever to gaine a kingdome is a great matter, yet a much greater peece of worke it is, when one hath wonne it to hold it. For, oftentimes his fortune is to obtaine it, who sheweth himselfe onely but bold and venterous: but to retaine and keepe still the same which he hath gotten, cannot be effected, without the gift of temperance and of continency, nor without much study and diligence. Vnderstanding therefore all this; we ought now to exercise vertue much more than we did, before we attained to this great estate . . . (174)

Cyrus recognizes the moral dangers of “pleasures and delights” and the necessity of relying on temperance and other virtues. But because temperance involves “moderation” (*OED* “temperance,” 1.a), the king’s remarks sound like a pattern for Browne’s pronouncement that “[i]n Garden Delights ’tis not easie to hold a Mediocrity; that insinuating pleasure is seldome without some extremity” (1: 176). The difference, of course, is that Cyrus is describing what it takes to rule a kingdom well; Browne, to cultivate a garden well. Yet the tradition of comparing England to a garden makes it difficult to divorce Browne’s comments on horticulture from their political context.

Horticulture and Moderation

The close but complex relationship between virtuous gardening and virtuous living is evident in Browne’s treatments of the gardener-princes’ moderate and immoderate behavior. Nebuchadnezzar’s unbridled “ambition” and his excess of delight certainly sound immoderate in Browne’s description (1: 180). By attributing Nebuchadnezzar’s prideful joy to the view of the surrounding “Paradise” (1: 180), Browne makes horticultural immoderation, whether literal or figurative, emblematic of political immoderation. In this regard, the transition from Nebuchadnezzar’s rule to the Persian conquest implies a contrast between Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus the Great. Cyrus’s “rule and circumscription” of nature’s bounty appears ordered and moderate. Yet the latter comment, for readers familiar with Herodotus’s account of the king, carries a second, less flattering implication: Cyrus, Herodotus writes, delayed his march on Babylon by nearly a year because he was bent on redirecting the river Gyndes in order to avenge the loss of a horse (1: 189-90). Although Browne praises Cyrus’s manipulation of nature, Herodotus

depicts an extreme form of such manipulation, one arising from passionate anger (1: 189) rather than from the appreciation of beauty or function.

Browne's remarks about Ahasuerus likewise have complex implications for this king's exercise of moderation. Browne's characterization of Vashti's indoor feast as "more modest[]" than Ahasuerus's garden entertainment (1: 180) might imply that the king reveled in an extreme delight in the beauty of his surroundings and his queen, especially given the Book of Esther's description of the gathering's lavishness. The week-long feast, which featured elaborate furniture and plenty of wine (1:6-7), followed a feast of one hundred eighty days' length "[w]hen he shewed the riches of his glorious kingdom and the honour of his excellent majesty . . ." (1:4). Yet the account of the events that follow present Ahasuerus as moderate in his responses to provocation: though angered by Vashti's disobedience, the king controls his passion and resolves to act according to law (Esth. 1:12-15), and when he understands Haman's role in the threat posed to Esther and her people (Esth. 7:4), Ahasuerus finds a temporary sanctuary in his garden, where he tries to cool his "wrath" (7:7).²³⁴ Thus while Browne's comment may be read as signaling the king's immoderation, the Scriptural source suggests that the king is at heart a moderate man in control of his passions.

Browne's ambiguity about Cyrus the Younger also shows how complex the question of a gardener-prince's mediocrity can be. We have already seen that the prince, although praised by Browne as "a manuall planter . . . disposing his trees like his armies in regular ordination" (1: 181), was not so restrained in his hand-to-hand attack on his brother.

²³⁴Ahasuerus's self-control contrasts sharply with Haman's tempestuous anger at Mordecai's refusal to honor him, a passion that Scripture emphasizes repeatedly (Esth. 3:1-9, 5:9-14, 6:8-12).

Browne, however, assigns the prince's inability to take the throne simply to his having been "fatally prevented by the harmlesse chance of *post-geniture*" (1: 181). By blaming neither Cyrus nor circumstance, Browne appears to exercise mediocrity in his remark on Cyrus's early death. Yet the combination of the words *fatally* and *harmlesse* lends the passage irony in light of what Xenophon describes as Cyrus's loss of self-control in battle against his brother: it can be argued that Cyrus's premature death was a more immediate cause than birth order of his never having the opportunity to rule, and that his passion caused or contributed to his death.²³⁵ In that case, Browne is perhaps using a moderate approach to criticize a kind of immoderation. And Cyrus's horticultural moderation contrasts with his personal conduct at a crucial moment of the war.

One implication of Browne's comments about the gardener-princes' moderation and immoderation is that one's responses to gardens say much about one's overall moral status. But Browne's remarks also foreground the complexity of this relationship, cautioning us that this drawing moral conclusions from horticultural values is always tricky. The point is especially clear in the story of Cyrus the Younger, who in the moments leading up to his death forsook the orderliness and moderation he exercised in

²³⁵ Although Browne never discusses Cyrus's motives for rebelling, Xenophon writes that the revolt was prompted by the king's intention to execute Cyrus for alleged treason (*Anabasis* 1.1.3). The princes' mother intervened on Cyrus's behalf (1.1.3), but "when Cyrus had thus returned, after his danger and disgrace, he set about planning that he might never again be in the power of his brother, but, if possible, might be king in his stead" (1.1.4). Cyrus's motives may thus have included self-preservation or, as Carleton Brownson posits in his introduction to the work, "resentment and humiliation" (233). Brownson goes on to suggest that the prince acted out of ambition: "We learn from other sources that Cyrus had expected to be designated by Darius as heir to the throne, partly because he was the favourite son of the queen, and still more because he was 'born in the purple,' *i.e.* after the accession of Darius, while Artaxerxes was not. In fact, it was for precisely these reasons that Xerxes, eight years before, had been chosen king of Persia to the exclusion of an older brother" (234).

the care of his groves. But Browne never mentions the circumstances of the prince's death, and his comment about the reason for Cyrus's never having taken the throne is equivocal at best.

Judgment and Ambiguity in Browne's Prose

Indeed, the divergent implications of several of Browne's remarks about the gardener-princes reflect the difficulty of discerning moral status from horticultural values. This is not to say that Browne finds such interpretations entirely impossible or unreliable—his praise of Nicholas Bacon (1: 176), I think, makes that position insupportable—but rather that he recognizes the importance of reading gardens, and their gardeners or owners, carefully.²³⁶ At the same time, this feature of Browne's prose mirrors the kind of problem he describes in his discussion of providence in the *Religio*, where again the ability to interpret events correctly depends on the judicious disposal of faith, reason, and the passions.

This way of understanding the multiple implications of Browne's writing is supported by the essay's treatment of historical authorities. Browne explores the notion of representation by writing not only about quincuncial designs and their significance but also about the stories of historical figures. In a striking example, Browne initially identifies Cyrus the Younger as the man "who gave the occasion of that memorable work, and almost miraculous retrait of *Xenophon*" (1: 181). And although Browne acknowledges Cyrus's death, obliquely, in the remark that Cyrus was "fatally prevented"

²³⁶In a moment of concern about how his essay will be received, Browne writes to Bacon, "To wish all Readers of your abilities, were unreasonably to multiply the number of Scholars beyond the temper of these times. But unto this ill-judging age, we charitably desire a portion of your equity, judgement, candour, and ingenuity; wherein you are so rich, as not to lose by diffusion" (1: 177).

from taking the throne (1: 181), the comment about the *Anabasis* prioritizes the historical record of the prince's military activities over the man's life itself: Cyrus's challenge to his brother was "the occasion" for the Greek troops' dramatic escape from Artaxerxes and for the compelling history that made the events known to later generations. This conjunction of life and art is artfully instantiated in Browne's use of the word *retrait*, which can refer to a military retreat (*OED* "retrait," n.1, 3) but also, more rarely, to a "portrait" or "picture" (*OED* n.2). As Browne tells it, Cyrus's death is thus subsumed into the historical account, an instance of nature transformed by art. A similar effect arises from the remark that "[a]ll stories do look upon *Cyrus*, as the splendid and regular planter," which suggests not only the prince's historical prominence but also, again, Browne's concern with representations of royal gardeners, with how our knowledge of the past depends upon authorities like Xenophon (1: 181).

Browne also demonstrates the limitations of such authorities, in a move that makes the agreement of "[a]ll stories" about Cyrus the Younger's groves the more remarkable. Browne's comments about the earlier gardener-kings repeatedly register disagreements and uncertainties among histories. The doubts begin even before he mentions Nebuchadnezzar, with the repetition of the word "if" in suppositions about Zoroaster's identity and whether Semiramis built the Hanging Gardens (1: 179, 1: 180). He returns to the latter question when he records that some authors have attributed these gardens to Nebuchadnezzar, others to Cyrus the Great (1: 180). He also registers doubts about the Paradise in Eden, citing "the old Opinion" about its placement and calling it "that disputed Garden" (1: 180). And Browne records differences in opinion about both Nebuchadnezzar's and Ahasuerus's identities: Nebuchadnezzar is the man "whom some

will have to be the famous *Syrian King of Diodorus*,” and although “many conceive [Ahasuerus] to have been *Artaxerxes Longimanus*,” “some opinion” him to have been Artaxerxes Mnemon instead (1: 180).²³⁷ These passages emphasize limitations on knowledge, in particular knowledge of the past. And this problem exemplifies Browne’s assertion in the *Religio* that faith, not reason, must guide our understanding of history: events are related in ways we cannot perceive; sometimes we know not even the bare facts such as the figures involved, much less the causes behind the events that befall them.

Ultimately, Browne’s treatment of various representations of the gardener-princes reminds us of the necessity of consulting authors for information about the past, but it also cautions us that these authors may be wrong. The larger implication, as we have already seen, is that interpretations of events and actions are quite possibly unreliable. Such a skeptical approach—to the past and, presumably, to the present as well—involves a kind of moderation, a willingness to consider various opinions and interpretations without slavish devotion to any untested ones. And this approach sorts well with Browne’s prose style, which is likewise balanced and moderate. As we have seen, the remarks that allow for two different, if related, interpretations also represent the difficulties we face in interpreting historical accounts and events themselves. Such self-moderating sentences, which prompt questions about their own possible interpretations, show how difficult it is to know the truth or to judge rightly—about a gardener-prince or, by extension, about anyone.

²³⁷This statement also involves another kind of uncertainty; like many of Browne’s sentences, it contains a pun, this one on the word *memory*, which refers both to the mental faculty associated with the name *Mnemon* and to the remembrances and histories of the king (*OED*, “memory” 6.a, 2.b, 9).

The Other Gardens of Cyrus: Essay and Nation

These features of Browne's prose link the essay closely with the quincunx, which, as I have been arguing, represents moderation of various kinds. But the essay resembles quincuncial groves, and Cyrus the Younger's in particular, in a more specific way as well: by moderating between pleasure and use in much the way Cyrus's plantations do. The prince's balance of utility and novelty is clear: "while old *Laertas* hath found a name in *Homer* for pruning hedges, and clearing away thorns and bryars; while King *Attalus* lives for his poysonous plantations of *Aconites*, Henbane, Hellebore, and plants hardly admitted within the walls of Paradise; While many of the Ancients do poorly live in the single name of Vegetables; All stories do look upon *Cyrus*, as the splendid and regular planter" (1: 181). *The Garden of Cyrus* likewise seeks to yield harmonious order in variety: it is partly history, partly natural history, partly meditation on human art, and partly work of art in its own right. And it too mixes utility and novelty: Browne refers to horticultural principles (1: 209-12), particularly in the digression on seeds (1: 196-200), but his dedicatory epistle proclaims his hope to have found a subject never yet encountered by Nicholas Bacon (1: 175). The final phrases of the letter identify this combination of pleasure and usefulness: "with much excuse we bring these low delights, and poor maniples to your Treasure" (1: 177). Whereas Jean Bodin associates the quincunx with degenerate artifice and luxury (411E-412G), then, in various ways Browne redeems it: what matters is not the figure's artificiality but rather its benefits and its symbolic meanings, which are communicated by and instantiated in Browne's prose.

In Browne's essay, Cyrus the Younger's importance lies in his use of the quincunx rather than in his martial skill: the prince exemplifies virtuous, life-giving cultivation and

horticultural temperance, not deadly military action. If praise is meant to inspire imitation, moreover, then Cyrus becomes a model for English Royalists, who have the ability to exercise virtue privately, if not in public office, and to provide irenic, virtuous service to their country by tending their lands carefully and moderately. Browne's early focus on gardener-princes prompts us to examine the analogy between governing a garden and governing a state and to recognize England as a garden whose gardener-king has been pruned away. In the absence of the gardener-king, the responsibility of national cultivation falls to individuals; by providing readers with the example of the younger Cyrus, Browne's essay offers readers some consolation about the merits of cultivating both land and virtue.

Indeed, a few of Browne's comments about the gardener-princes apply indirectly to England's situation. As I have already pointed out, Browne's remark that the Persians preserved the Babylonians' "Botanicall bravery" may subtly cast aspersions on Nebuchadnezzar's attempt to replace other gods by destroying his enemies' sacred groves. Yet this comment is Browne's only acknowledgment of the account in the Book of Judith (3:12-13, *Holy Bible*, Douay)—an omission all the more remarkable because Curtius's *Hortorum Libri Triginta* (92) refers directly to the story. It is possible that Browne omitted the reference because he wished to emphasize only Nebuchadnezzar's contributions to gardening or because his Protestantism made him reluctant to cite an apocryphal book. But perhaps Browne hoped to avoid lending further justification to English sectarians who compared Charles's enforcement of religious conformity to Nebuchadnezzar's. Perhaps, too, his praise of the Persians' horticultural conservation was enough to cast the English rebels in a bad light: as we have seen, the English Army

forces were not nearly as kind to Charles's gardens as the Persians had been to the Babylonians'.

Likewise, Browne's remarks about Cyrus the Younger pertain to England in subtle but significant ways. Browne does not discuss Cyrus's motives for revolt, perhaps because he wishes to maintain his positive depiction of the prince, but perhaps also because he wants to avoid the subject of rebellion, given England's political tensions. What, then, does this prince, renowned for his military leadership and arboricultural skills alike, mean for England, a country often imagined as a garden and especially as the Garden of Eden, in the aftermath of rebellion? Browne's phrase "the harmlesse chance of *post-geniture*" (1: 181) recognizes the Persian king's reliance on primogeniture to determine succession, but it may also suggest conscious support for that custom, followed in England as well. Such a privileging of birthright over merit might imply that the Parliamentarians were wrong to challenge Charles I's rule, regardless of his mistakes as king, and that Prince Charles's claim to the throne should never have been denied by military force. But the story is also a cautionary tale for those who would seize power by force, as the Parliamentarians and the Army had done and as some Royalists wished to do in the years following Charles's execution: the risks of battle cast larger shadows in the light of Cyrus's outstanding military skills and leadership.²³⁸ Of course, my argument

²³⁸John Hall of Richmond, in *Of Government and Obedience* (1654), writes that "the positive right of Dominion in the elder brother was at first grafted upon the natural stock of force, as supposing him ordinarily most able . . ." (2.193) but that because God does not now "openly" choose kings, the matter "is to be determined the secret way of divine Election and Providence, manifested by the common and meer natural rule of force and strength of body . . ." (2.193). He goes on to say, "And as natural Reason will thus finde cause to submit to Gods rule of Providence now used for the establishment of the person of the conquering King, so will the same reason lead them to suffer it to descend to his heir: lest they should again subject themselves to new Civil wars; which is ever incident

that Browne's references to the gardener-princes, especially to the younger Cyrus, are meant to instruct English readers about the value of mediocrity implies a political bias: Browne's use of monarchic rather than republican models. Yet such a bias would be consistent with what we know of Browne's political views; in a letter to his son Thomas, for example, he refers to "an humiliation and fast kept to divert the Judgments of God upon us and our Posteritie for the Abominable murther of King Charles the first . . ." (4: 5).

Within a decade and a half before Browne published *The Garden of Cyrus*, England had been torn apart by religious and political groups with radically different interpretations of the court's and Church's prerogatives, attitudes, and intentions—with opposing claims, in effect, to know and serve truth. Browne's emphasis on the difficulties of interpretation—including his subtle refutation of Bodin's comment about the quincunx's significance and his use of sentences with multiple implications—depicts arriving at truth as an arduous task, fraught with uncertainty. His essay's early focus on the balance and moderation of the quincunx reminds readers of the benefits of mediocrity in matters of public dissension.

Conclusion

For Browne, mediocrity simultaneously confounds facile distinctions—between art and nature, between open and closed spaces, and between private and public matters—and foregrounds the order, hierarchy, and correspondency of the universe. It thus offers

to Elective Monarchies. And therefore this ought to be avoided by the observation of the Law of Primogeniture, in these Offices now succeeding in paternal right of power; upon the same consideration that this fixed Law of birth-right was instituted: namely to avoid the like dissention and quarrel in succession to the heirship of the Family, while this power was formerly seated in the natural Father thereof" (2.194).

English readers a way of confronting the upheavals of the 1640s and 1650s without succumbing to the rashness and extremism against which Scripture, history, and moral philosophy caution. And Browne's allusions to war and rebellion explore the relation between public and private virtue, prompting readers to consider how the values that govern good life in a garden might apply to life in the garden of England. Moreover, the acknowledgments of how public affairs affect supposedly peaceful plots of ground invoke, at least indirectly, the fallout of the Civil Wars. Far from obscuring England's problems, then, the essay's wide scope brings into perspective ways of dealing with those hardships. In its allusions to gardener-princes, *The Garden of Cyrus* serves as a window reflecting England's current condition and framing the possibilities that lie beyond.

Ultimately, the quincunx, as a symbol of mediocrity, becomes in Browne's essay a means of consoling English readers. For those mourning the dismantling of the state Church, the quincunx offers a reminder of that Church's *via media*. But the emphasis on moderation also operates, I believe, in much the same way as in Seneca's *Moral Epistles*. Just as Seneca advises moderation of grief to those mourning dead family members in *De Consolatione ad Marciam* (7.1) and *De Consolatione ad Polybium* (18.4-5), Browne, I think, recommends the virtue of mediocrity to readers mourning the execution of the king, the loss of the state Church and the monarchy, or the other cultural changes that accompanied the rebels' victory. This argument expands R.H. Robbins's suggestion that *The Garden of Cyrus* and *Hydriotaphia* were meant to comfort their respective dedicatees after the loss of close family members ("Browne, Sir Thomas," *ODNB*). But in the light of Achsah Guibbory's argument that *Hydriotaphia* responds to the abolition of Church of

England rites, it seems plausible that *The Garden of Cyrus* also addresses national woes rather than personal ones only.

This interpretation of the latter essay is bolstered by the fact that the work is dedicated to Nicholas Bacon, great-grandson of the Lord Keeper of the same name, whose motto was *Mediocria Firma*. The Bacon patriarch's values come to be explicitly associated, for at least one contemporary of Browne, with the nation's mid-seventeenth-century turmoil. In *The History of the Worthies of England*, published four years after *The Garden of Cyrus*, Thomas Fuller recommends the Lord Keeper's principle as a safe and happy rule of life in tumultuous times:

And here under favour I conceive, that if a strict Enquiry should be made after the Ancient Gentry of *England*, most of them would be found amongst such *middlesized* Persons as are above *two hundred*, and beneath a *Thousand pounds* of Annual Revenue. It was the *Motto* of wise *Sir Nicholas Bacon*, *Mediocria Firma*, Moderate things are most lasting. Men of great Estates in National Broiles have smarted deeply for their Visible Engagements, to the Ruine of their Families, whereof we have had too many sad Experiments, whilst such persons who are moderately mounted above the level of Common people into a Competency, above *want* and beneath *Envy*, have by Gods blessing on their frugality, continued longest in their Conditions, entertaining all alterations in the *State*, with the less destructive change unto themselves. (1.46)

Fuller writes of Bacon's motto in terms of private advantage, but Browne's repeated use of the gardener-prince trope implies that mediocrity is also important at a national level. And whereas Fuller's remark on the dangers of "great Estates" participates in the tradition linking Bacon's motto with his modest homes, Browne's concern with virtue of various kinds intimates that his essay is not merely a recommendation of middling gardens. Yet neither is it a call to any particular political action. It is instead, I believe, an exhortation for English readers to be moderate in their thoughts and endeavors and to cultivate their nation, literally or figuratively, in the absence of the gardener-king. In his role as a gardener, then, the younger Cyrus offers a pattern of virtue in an uncertain time.

CHAPTER 4

THE LEGIBLE GARDEN: MORAL AND POLITICAL LESSONS IN EVELYN'S *ELYSIUM BRITANNICUM*

If for Browne a quincuncial grove served to exhort visitors to virtue, an entire garden, for his friend John Evelyn, could do the same. Evelyn—known for his work with Samuel Hartlib's circle, his membership in the Royal Society, and his publications on topics ranging from children's education (*The Golden Book of St. John Chrysostom*, 1659, in *Writings* 37-68) to medals (*Numismata*, 1697)—had a longstanding interest in landscape (O'Malley 13), and his love of gardens is attested by his improvements of Wotton, Sayes Court, and Albury (Chambers, "Evelyn, John," *ODNB*). But that love is also indicated by his engagement, over more than forty years (Harris 13, 14), with a manuscript that he would never complete and that would remain unpublished until nearly three hundred years after his death. That manuscript is *Elysium Britannicum, or The Royal Gardens*.

Recent scholarship has sought to situate Evelyn's ideas about gardens in the context of mid- to late-seventeenth-century notions about horticultural and agricultural improvement. That task has involved evaluating the degree and nature of Evelyn's commitment to "republican" ideals for such improvement. Hartlib's ascendancy as a public-minded improver and an encourager of like-minded men was linked to his belief in "the godly task of fulfilling the divine purposes of salvation—the salvation of the individual, no doubt, but in a manner more pronounced, the salvation of the godly commonwealth," and it lasted only as long as the Interregnum (Leslie 142, 139). Yet

Douglas Chambers, in a study of Evelyn's exchange of ideas with Hartlib's associate John Beale, concludes that plans for the *Elysium*, and related works by Evelyn, show an increasing republican influence, due largely to Beale, that contrasts with Evelyn's early preoccupations with "princely" ornament ("Wild" 177-84, 175). Though persuasive in its reliance on Evelyn's and his correspondents', especially Beale's, references to Virgil's *Georgics* ("Wild" 175-76, 179-87), Chambers's analysis does not account for the many passages about ornament and aristocratic values that Evelyn allowed to stand. Michael Leslie argues more equitably that the basic inconsistencies in Evelyn's approach—his attempts to engage Hartlibian ideals of public-mindedness while maintaining his social and political ideals—prevented the work's completion and publication (144-52). Both studies offer important insights about how Evelyn's associates helped to shape his horticultural interests and values. But both, I think, underestimate the role of Evelyn's royalism and respect for hierarchy, values that were to be central to the garden design he recommended as well as to the manuscript that described it.

Evelyn's values can in part be traced to, and certainly find expression in, the analogues he uses to describe the relationships among the universe, the garden, the gardener, and the king. Kevin Sharpe elegantly explains the importance of such analogues:

In the early modern period, as we have long known, men idealized a divinely ordained system which, never descriptive of the world, nevertheless presented a powerful normative depiction of it. In that representation, from the highest sphere of the planets, through the arrangements of societies, the composition of the individual and the hierarchy of beasts, a naturally appointed order was replicated. Accordingly, the king of the commonweal corresponded to God in the heavens and the sun in the cosmos or to the father in the family and the lion, ruler of beasts, in the animal kingdom. Within man himself in his divine state the reason or soul was perceived to be the monarch; and by corollary the state was conceived as a human body, consisting of head and members, sinews and humours. These correspondences or analogues ran

in both or several directions; that they were mutually adaptable was one of the ingrained habits of mind of early modern culture.

These analogues cannot be reduced to mere metaphor. Contemporaries were quite able to distinguish metaphor, which was a rhetorical device, from analogical thinking which ‘discovered new truth by arguing from known to unknown’. . . . To be a father, in early modern England, was to be a king, and the reverse was also true. To observe the world of nature with its own hierarchies and laws was also a political experience; to master one’s own unruly appetites and passions, to ride a horse and tame the unruliness of its nature, was to practise government and reconfirm the natural order of divine government. (7)

It is crucial, I believe, to read the *Elysium* with a clear sense of Evelyn’s participation in and commitment to this way of thinking about the world. The manuscript holds in tension two attitudes toward gardeners, proclaiming itself to be directed toward estate owners with the financial and topographical resources for creating “Gardens of Pleasure” but also expressing Evelyn’s hope that it will prove to “be of exceeding use also, and emolument” for readers of far more modest means as well (32). This tension arises, as Chambers and Leslie acknowledge in rather different ways, from the political pressures of the Interregnum.²³⁹ And undoubtedly Evelyn’s desire to promote “Gardens of Pleasure” rather than to commit himself wholeheartedly to Hartlibian public-spiritedness has much to do with qualities and values that, critics have noted, influenced his other projects: e.g., his love of privacy (Hunter 106, Leslie 139), a desire to protect and improve his moral and intellectual status and that of his peers (Hunter 92-95), and a certain fastidiousness about those with whom he associated (Hunter 91). But these political and

²³⁹Chambers writes, “The shattering of the arcadian ideal of Stuart politics inevitably brought with it the destruction of its pastoral mythology and demanded a renegotiation of pastoral within georgic” (““Wild”” 176). Leslie contends that Evelyn’s “dependency on the works of members of the Hartlib circle does indicate a real and significant connection, though it is complex and shifting. Evelyn began composing his treatise at a point when the possible audiences for such a work were fragmented and changing, and his attempts to obtain support show a hesitancy born of determination to gather behind him as many influential people as possible” (143).

social considerations are inextricably linked with Evelyn's understanding of and beliefs about nature and God as well as his concerns about the legibility of the world, of gardens, and of books.

Like his friend Browne, Evelyn believed that gardens could communicate important ideas about the order of the universe. And also like Browne, Evelyn believed that art could help to make those ideas clear. Much as a quincunx, in Browne's view, signaled mediocrity or moderation, a garden that displayed ordered variety would, to Evelyn's way of thinking, relay the integrity of the world: the sense in which all things are both unified and distinguished in a kind of *discordia concors*. The garden would become, in effect, an anthology of the Book of Nature that would allow that book's political, moral, and spiritual lessons to be drawn more easily, partly through the assimilation and arrangement of many different natural features and partly through the judicious use of art. Thus Evelyn, like Browne, saw garden design as a way of encoding values in the landscape.

The *Elysium* is Evelyn's most comprehensive attempt at such a project. It establishes numerous analogies between natural phenomena and human society, using those analogies to promote social values Evelyn holds dear, especially order and hierarchy. His simultaneous impulses toward social unity or inclusiveness and the reinforcement of traditional hierarchy are related to his view of nature; what is less clear is whether his social and political attitudes are determined by his understanding of the natural world or vice versa. Evelyn attempts to argue for his social values as fitting analogues for natural, and thus providential, orders, but the *Elysium* repeatedly demonstrates the difficulties of making such a claim. Indeed, his aim of making the Book of Nature as legible as

possible, his apparent discernment of the need for a compendium of and commentary on that book, suggests his distrust of the human capacity for reading it aright. The *Elysium* repeatedly implies an analogy between itself and the ideal gardens it describes; it therefore offers two kinds of help, by providing instructions on how to create the best gardens and by offering commentary on those gardens. Evelyn's invocation of the gardener-king trope exemplifies this kind of commentary: it foregrounds what is for Evelyn a fundamental lesson about the natural and providential grounding of obedience and social hierarchy, a lesson that Evelyn's own work suggests would not be clear simply from direct observation of nature, without the mediation of metaphor.

I. The "Universall" Garden and the Book of Nature

Evelyn's ideal garden, as he describes it in the *Elysium*, is a microcosm, reflecting in a manageable space the features of the universe. For Evelyn, that universe is both coherent and various; the seemingly disparate parts fit into a harmonious whole. Thus his manuscript emphasizes analogy and hierarchy, unity as well as distinction: a garden that reflects these values becomes a compendium of the Book of Nature, offering intellectual, political, moral, and spiritual lessons in a relatively confined space. The social lessons that Evelyn most emphasizes involve hierarchy and obedience, although he also gestures toward inclusiveness and unity. But as Evelyn attempts to show how these lessons, and the moral and political values that they promote, are grounded in nature and thus in providence, he also demonstrates the difficulties of making such claims. His reading of the Book of Nature, then, exemplifies the same problems as, for example, the Royalists',

Parliamentarians', and Army's uses of Scripture to justify their respective positions during and after the Civil Wars: different passages may encourage different conclusions.

Analogical Thinking and the Instructive Garden

Evelyn's ideal garden, in its arrangement and inclusiveness, corresponds to the universe itself. Although he frequently couches his emphasis on ordered variety in terms of pleasure, his view of the garden as analogous to the universe, as a compendium or anthology of the Book of Nature, indicates that the garden offers political, moral, and spiritual instruction, just as the whole of nature does. Gardeners thus take on special importance, and face special challenges, in their responsibility for composing gardens' various features in ways that maximize both pleasure and instruction.

The *Elysium* displays Evelyn's predisposition to analogical thinking in ways both simple and profound. In some instances, he seems primarily to engage in a rhetorical flourish, as when he finishes his discussion of the trees appropriate to the coronary garden:

as the greater *Viridaria*, *Vireta*, Mounds, {taller} Groves, prospects & other magnificent *Relievos* be indeede the principles of ~~the~~ our *Elysium*, taking it in the grosse, and the ~~Coronary Garden~~ {thinner} sprinklings or bordures of flowers but accessories & trimmings: so are these to our *Coronary Gardens*, where onely the Flowers are the chiefe; & the ~~Spires~~ Trees, Shribbs Spires, boales & pyramids, of the taller plants, but the lesser Ornaments . . . (392)

But, crucially, this way of thinking also informs Evelyn's concept of the ideal British garden's purposes. In a letter of January 28, 1659/60, to Sir Thomas Browne, Evelyn describes that garden as "a noble, princely, and universall Elysium . . ." (in Browne 4: 275). In the *Elysium* he elaborates upon this ideal in his instructions for "Plotting and disposing of the Ground," in which he praises "Variety" and disparages "an affected

uniformity in greate & noble Gardens” (96). These instructions virtually repeat the phrase used in the letter to Browne: Evelyn refers to “an irregular plot, fit to be made a noble, princely and universall Garden & Elysium indeede . . .” (99). The meaning of “universall” emerges in the *Elysium* as Evelyn recounts a description of a piece of land with, for his purposes, a virtually perfect situation, “a plot of Ground (no phantasticall *Utopia*, but a reall place) & {as} then which, nothing were almost farther to be desired, as to what Nature can contribute, and as it requires little of Art to render it the most accomplished {illustrious}, & proper for a most illustrious {accomplished} Elysium” (97). The salient features of the “plot” include a “mount . . . of a vast and prodigious height” with various approaches, some arduous, some easy (97); “goodly oakes, forming a naturall close walke or Gallery” (97); a “sweete and naturall Garden” (97); “a most horrid and deepe precipice, fitted for Solitary Grotts and Caverns,” and offering a dramatic view of the valley below (97); a hill and a fountain (97); land for “pasture,” crops, and orchards; and good soil and space “for Medicinal Simples” and vineyards as well as evergreens (98). The site thus offers nearly all the major natural features possible for landscapes; it is, as Evelyn implies, “universall.”

But this ideal of universality is achieved more fully by the interplay of art and nature. Recognizing that no site is likely to have all the desirable features of an “Elysium,” he advises readers as to how to use art to enhance nature by “disposing and placing the parterrrs, Relievos, Walls, PaEminencys, Waters, yea even the very Trees, Plants, Flowers and Severall *Areas* to their best advantage; that so the shades and the lights may fall and diversifie in sweete and gracious varieties . . .” (99). While care must be taken to avoid

“starch’t and affected designes” that suffer from too much art, the opposite problem also requires attention:

Howbeit there ought to be very greate reguard had of the Symmetrie and intermixture of these Varieties; least in stead of a Garden we make a Wildernesse onely { & } that it be contrived so as a prospect being had of the *whole* from the first stage of the Mansion. There may result a sweete & agreable correspondency in the parts, though considered by themselves, they ~~are~~ { seeme } altogether irregular & heterogene: Such a plot has a perfect resemblance of the Universe it selfe, of which contemplative [*sic*] men & such as best skill how to enjoy the virtuous delights of Gardens are never sated ~~withall~~, but find always something of new and extraordinary to entertaine their thoughts withall. (99)

The disposing of “irregular & heterogene” parts into “a sweete & agreable correspondency” to form “a perfect resemblance of the Universe it selfe” tells us that Evelyn’s ideal garden is indeed a microcosm, an analogue for the universe such that “correspondency” is evident not only among the garden’s various “parts” but also between the garden and the universe. This point is reinforced by the exhaustiveness of Evelyn’s plan for his work: aside from plants and manmade decorations, he also recommends birds, bees, and other insects (253-312), and he notes gardens’ appeals to each of the five senses as well as their usefulness as places of spiritual refreshment (225, 156, 202-203). These descriptions imply that Evelyn sees the garden in part as a compendium of the Book of Nature: if nature disposes her varieties in ways that resemble “a Wildernesse,” then a garden provides order and plenitude that can guide the viewer’s thoughts more clearly and intensify the virtuous pleasures that nature offers.

This very statement about Evelyn’s goals for the garden, however, prompts an important question: to what degree does he intend the garden for moral and spiritual instruction rather than simply for pleasure? The emphasis in the phrase “virtuous delights” (99) seems to fall on the noun, “delights,” rather than on the adjective, “virtuous.” The verb “to entertaine” is little help, as it can have both serious and lighter

shades of meaning: “[t]o engage, keep occupied” (*OED* “entertain,” v., 9), but also, signaling delight, “[t]o engage agreeably . . . ; to amuse” (10). Evelyn’s first chapter, which addresses the work’s purpose, seems to prioritize pleasure in its references to gardens as necessary for human happiness (29, 31) and especially in the statement that “we intend this Booke chiefly for the divertissement of Princes, noble-men and greate persons, who have the best opportunities and effects to make Gardens of Pleasure, though the *Particulars* therein described, may (we hope) be of exceeding use also, and emolument for persons of all Conditions whatsoever, who are either Masters of, or delight in Gardens” (32). The goal of “divertissement”—“recreation, entertainment” (*OED* “divertisement,” 1)—and the phrase “Gardens of Pleasure” emphasizes amusement far more than instruction.

But such an understanding of the garden misses at least two important points. Firstly, for Evelyn, pleasure is more than pastime; it involves spiritual and intellectual engagement. So much is suggested by his comments, in an August 4, 1690, letter to the Countess of Sunderland, on his writing of *Sylva* (1664): “I cast about . . . by what innocent diversions I might sometime relieve myself without compliance to recreation I took no felicity in, because they did not contribute to any improvement of the mind” (qtd. in Chambers, “Correspondence” 109). This description of his interests is not merely retrospective, however, as his January 28, 1659/60, letter to Sir Thomas Browne, in which he discusses his plans for the *Elysium*, makes clear. There, too, Evelyn indicates that his thinking about gardens involves not only intellectual pleasure of the kind he describes in 1690 but also the promise of a richer spiritual life:

We will endeavour to shew how the aire and genious of Gardens operat upon humane spirits towards virtue and sanctitie, I meane in a remote, preparatory and instrumentall

working. How Caves, Grotts, Mounts, and irregular ornaments of Gardens do contribute to contemplative and philosophicall Enthusiasme; how *Elysium*, *Antrum*, *Nemus*, *Paradysus*, *Hortus*, *Lucus*, &c., signifie all of them *rem sacram et divinam*; for these expedients do influence the soule and spirits of man, and prepare them for converse with good Angells; besides which, they contribute to the lesse abstracted pleasures, philosophy naturall and longevitie . . . (in Browne 4: 275)

Similar remarks appear in the *Elysium* itself: of “inclosed Mountaines, & Solitary Recesses,” for example, Evelyn writes,

Sure we are the holy Hermites chose such places in the primitive ardours, & they are spirituall helps, diffused in the very frame of nature, & of the Creation, & to last as long as the very mountaines themselves: Poets, Orators, and men of the most heavenly and divine Geniuses find in themselves (at lucid intervalls) some raptures & even inspirations, elevation{ing} {them} like the Philosophe mentioned in *Eunapius*, that he was taller in tyme of speculation than at other tymes and so scholar & contemplative men holy & contemplative men are even above the drynesse of their owne reasons & narrower intellect at ~~other {such}~~ {those} Seasons . . . (202-203)

Moreover, Evelyn urges gardeners to supply any deficiency of situation by creating such “spirituall helps” where none are naturally available: having described several mountains, including Olivet, Horeb, and Tabor (199-200), he asserts that art’s “imitation” of these “also will be found extreemely to highten & exhalt our contemplations” (201).

The garden’s capacity to induce spiritual and intellectual improvement leads us to a second important point about Evelyn’s concept of pleasure: that pleasure is not antithetical to, and indeed sometimes arises from, the work of horticulture, especially insofar as that work provides instruction about natural philosophy, moral, and spiritual matters. The pleasures of the garden are, for him, always bound up with the Fall of Man and the curse on Adam. The *Elysium* opens with a recollection of Adam and Eve’s expulsion from the Garden of Eden to the “Wildernesse” of the world outside, and the passage emphasizes the necessity for as well as the benefits of hard work: “Adam instructed his Posteritie how to handle the Spade so dextrously, that in processe of tyme,

men began, with the indulgence of heaven, to recover that by Arte and Industrie, which was before produced to them Spontaneously; and to improve the Fruites of the Earth, to gratifie as well their Pleasures and contemplations, as their necessities and daily foode” (29). Indeed, to Evelyn’s mind, this kind of pleasure suits well with the process of spiritual improvement, as his note to this comment shows: “God had destin’d them this employment for a sweete & most agreable purition of their Sinns” (29 n1). But as this note indicates, the “Industrie” involved in early gardening is linked, for Evelyn, with the need for redemption and purification. And he implies that the same is true for horticulture in his own day. He writes of his expectation of hard work among contemporary outstanding gardeners,

There are so many Accomplishments requisite to the perfection of an excellent Gardiner, that I know not whither the {Orator in Cicero or} very Architect of *Vitruvius* ought to be more universal: For, as *Philo* the *Athenian* Builder, was not more admired for his Worke then for his abilitie to discourse of it; So neither dare we esteeme him an accomplished Gardiner, who is not capable to render an account of his skill, beyond the ordinary Talent of men, who assume and take upon them that glorious name and Profession. (33)

The allusion to Christ’s parable of the talents (Matt. 25:14-30) suggests that Evelyn finds a spiritual dimension in the gardening he recommends in the *Elysium*; horticulture remains, in his view, an undertaking with profound spiritual consequences and is thus linked with the earliest postlapsarian gardening. The gardener who does the kind of work Evelyn envisions has the responsibility of creating a garden that is pleasing and instructive to others as well as to himself.

Social Hierarchy and Natural Philosophy

One of the questions that Evelyn’s work raises, however, is who should be doing the gardening. Evelyn attempts to ennoble gardening, presumably to make it more attractive

to gentlemen and nobles, and he sometimes gestures toward the unifying effect of gardens on people of various educational levels and financial means. But as we have seen already, critics have made much of his shifts between such gestures and much more elitist attitudes. Typically, these shifts are read as responses to the political pressures of the Interregnum, with Evelyn caught between the old order, beloved of Royalists, and the new, celebrated by republicans as more cooperative and public-spirited (Leslie 143; Chambers, ““Wild”” 175-84). But this seeming commitment to both unity and distinction also has complex analogues in the natural world, to which Evelyn repeatedly appeals to justify the values he espouses. Whether his political stance is based on his natural philosophy or vice versa, or whether the relationship is altogether more complicated, Evelyn acknowledges the difficulty of drawing the right lessons from nature.

Believing that a person most fully realizes the instructive and improving qualities of gardens when he or she tends them as well as enjoys them, Evelyn attempts to ennoble gardening and to encourage upper-class landowners to become gardeners. As he introduces the chapter on gardening tools, for example, he seems to try to redeem these implements from derision:

And truely, we are not asham'd to bring them forth, since besides the honour they have derived from antiquitie we reade that princes have borne them in the royall standard as Orosius reports it of the Indian Kings of *Benomotapa* who had for their Imperiall Ensigne a *Spade* above two *darts*, to signifie not onely their preference of peace before warr, but their affection to an Art so useful and divertissant Hesiod and Homer have celebrated them for the same reasons[.] (83)

He advocates garden owners' learning about horticulture so as not to be misled by “ignorant Gardiners” (34), and he hopes “[t]hat the *Gentlemen* of our Nation (for whose sakes we have diverted other studies with this Worke) may not thinke it any dimunition

to the rest of their Education, if to be dignified with the Title of a *Good-Gardiner*, be esteemed none of the least of their *Encomiums*” (35).

Evelyn even appeals to the dignity of gardening in terms of its suitability for kings. He writes, for instance, that the grafting technique of implastration “is the noblest & most princely way for propagation, & fitt for kingly hands . . .” (117). And in notes added to the manuscript, Evelyn, offering the example of Charles II, praises “his Mats: Walkes at in St James’s & Greenwich which may for their Statelinesse & comly dimension compare with any of them we have celebrated” (128 n3) and an alley for pall-mall “which his Ma[jes]ty: has made at St: James park . . .” (138 n22, editorial insertion Ingram’s). He later makes a similar point more explicitly as he advises that a garden owner act as gardener “be he Prince or Subject: for even to this was the onely Monarch of all the World destined ~~in~~ before he lost that Inno~~ce~~ncy. which bereav’d him of so sweete an Employment, & for which Kings have often {ex}changed their Scepters” (336). One implication of this passage is that the garden can prove as spiritually meaningful and as restorative for a king as for anyone else.

At the same time, however, Evelyn seems concerned to maintain distinctions between landowners and laborers. The above reference to Adam as “the onely Monarch of all the World,” for example, far from insisting strongly on likenesses between ruler and subject, argues for a justification of monarchy as the first form of government, the one instituted by God and most closely associated with humankind’s innocence. Moreover, even setting aside the exceptional status of monarchs, Evelyn distinguishes among different kinds of gardeners, identifying three applications of this title: to “the person at whose charge and for whose ~~use~~ {divertissement} the Garden is made” (“*Hortulanus*

Sum{p}tuarius"); to the person responsible for designing and overseeing the garden's development ("*Hortulanus Ingeniarius*"); and to any of "the immediate Labourers" or skilled specialists whose work contributes to certain features of the garden ("*Hortulanus Manuarius*") (35). Thus although Evelyn identifies the landowner as a gardener, he also potentially distinguishes the landowner from the gardeners who do the work of designing and planting the plot of land. He repeatedly insists on distinctions of class and education; we have already seen that he imagines his primary audience to consist of "Princes, noble-men and greate persons, who have the best opportunities and effects to make Gardens of Pleasure . . ." (32). And while he notes that "the *Particulars* . . . may (we hope) be of exceeding use also, and emolument for persons of all Conditions whatsoever, who are either Masters of, or delight in Gardens" (32), in a passage later crossed out, he justifies his lengthy discussion of natural philosophy by declaring, "[W]e pretend not here to write to *Cabbage-planters*; but to the best refined of our Nation who delight in Gardens, and aspire to the perfections of the Arte . . ." (42).²⁴⁰

These distinctions pragmatically recognize differences in financial and topographical resources. But they also suggest an awareness and approval of class differences that is clearer elsewhere in Evelyn's writing. In an August 9, 1659, letter to Robert Boyle, he

²⁴⁰This passage is part of a multi-chapter section (36-64) crossed out by Evelyn; at the beginning of this section, he notes in the margin, "My purpose was quite to alter the philosophical part of this first booke" (37 n1). Presumably, then, the above passage was marked as part of his intention to revise the chapters on natural philosophy and not because his views on class changed.

In a December 13, 1670, letter, according to Douglas Chambers, "he is writing to Sir Thomas Hanmer (the 'Prince of Florists,' as he calls him), not only to thank him for his instructions in planting but to apologize that, as 'a Cabbage planter,' he has 'wholly addicted [himself] to the propagation of Foresters and rusticities of that nature.' He has, he says, 'miserably neglected my little Flower garden,' and he begs one of the tulips, named after Sir Thomas, in order to redress 'a little Parterr neere my House'" (qtd. in Chambers, "Correspondence" 117).

gives up his intended project of a history of trades, citing “my great imperfections for the attempt, and the many subjections, which I cannot support, of conversing with mechanical capricious persons, and several other discouragements . . .” (qtd. in Hunter 91). In *A Character of England* (1659), Evelyn, writing in the persona of a Frenchman, criticizes the English disregard for “sumptuary expenses . . . whereof the Magistrate take so little cognisance, that it is not an easie matter to distinguish the Lady from the Chamber-Maid; Servants being suffered in this brave Country, to go clad like their Mistrisses, a thing neither decent, nor permitted in France, where they may wear neither lace, nor silke” (*Writings* 85). Similarly, in *Tyrannus Or the Mode: In a Discourse of Sumptuary Lawes* (1661), he complains, “How many times have I saluted the fine Man for the Master, and stood with my hat off to the gay Feather, when I found the Bird to be all this while but a Daw?” (*Writings* 168-69). Finally, in the *Elysium*, he traces the growth of silk’s popularity from “princes” to “their Nobles,” thence to “the cleargy,” and finally to “the Seculars even to the most inferiours; { wormes were cloathed with wormes, } so as now there is nothing more common” (296).

The assertions of class difference in the *Elysium*, however, are related to Evelyn’s analogical view of the universe: he finds hierarchy in numerous natural phenomena. One might argue that his attachment to class distinctions makes it possible for him to see analogous distinctions in nature, but the crucial point here is not which hierarchy, natural or social, Evelyn regards as primary; my argument hinges more simply on the fact that he writes about natural and social hierarchies as analogous to each other. Human social order thus provides him with metaphors for explaining natural phenomena, while those phenomena suggest that an analogous social order is somehow natural.

One such instance, combining analogue and hierarchy, appears in his description of the tulip, which, he writes, “is . . . the most considerable of Flowers, for even in all the workes of Nature, has the divine Providence established a certaine order of Superioritie: And therefore well do the rest of the Flowry people, Salute the *Tulip* for their prince & Supream ~~fig~~ since even *Saloman* in all his glory was not cloathed like one of them” (343). This passage asserts the appropriateness of an analogical, hierarchical understanding of the world by invoking Scripture, which according to Evelyn creates the implicit analogy between flowers and people that he makes explicit.²⁴¹ But insofar as this analogy involves judgments about “Superioritie,” and indeed honors the most beautiful flower as more gorgeous than the most beautifully arrayed king, it also involves hierarchy in multiple ways: tulips are to other flowers as Solomon is to other people, but a tulip’s appearance is superior even to Solomon’s.

This example of Evelyn’s analogical thinking also illuminates his understanding of the garden as a pattern for human social life. Implicit in the passage about the tulip is the notion that kingship is natural, which for Evelyn is also to say that it is providential: the “certaine order of Superioritie” mentioned by Evelyn applies to human government as well as to plants. Evelyn’s comments demonstrate how the Books of Scripture and Nature work in tandem: Solomon emerges in Holy Writ as a king among kings; the tulip, in both Scripture and the garden, as a flower among flowers. He makes a similar claim about bees:

They have a Citty, King, Empire, Society. . . . they ~~traine~~ institute martially & live as in a well ~~disci~~ ordered camp, keeping exact discipline, send out Colonies, march

²⁴¹See Matthew 6:28-29 and Luke 12:27. Each has “lilies” rather than “tulips”; in an insertion to the manuscript, Evelyn discusses the possibility that tulips could have been meant (349 n28).

under their leaders at the sound of the Trumpet & are of all the ~~entoma~~ ^{Nature} workes of Nature Creatures, the most affected to Monarchy, & the most Loyall, & reading a Lecture of obedience to Rebells in every {mans} Garden: Solomon knew it ~~when~~ well & sends us to the Bee, *Vade ad Apem et disce quomodo operationem venerabilem facit*. How venerably & mysteriously the workes, for so reades the *Septuagint*. The *Ant* indeede for ~~others~~ {themselves}, but the Bee for others *Sic vos non vobis*—, so far excells their Government that of the Republique, & so ought we ~~direct all~~ direct all our labours for the publike benefit: And all these considered in this one creature is indeede stupendious . . . (274)

The language here implies an analogy between apine and human society, an analogy on which Evelyn insists at the end of this passage. And again he suggests that an “order of Superioritie”—more specifically, here, monarchy—is divinely instituted: his revisions show a progression from “*entoma*” to “workes of Nature” to “Creatures,” the phrasing that most clearly acknowledges God’s creation of living beings as it is described in Genesis 1. He makes this point again a few pages later by quoting “Mr: Mewe of Eastlington in Glocestershire,” whose status as the transparent beehive’s “reviver” Evelyn describes as “the happy product of his [Mewe’s] exile or Eclipse during our unnaturall Wars” (280): “When I saw God make good his Threate (*Salvam Cingula Regum*) and breake the Reines of Government I observed that this pretty Bird was true to that Government wherin God & Nature had set it to Serve” (281).²⁴² Like Evelyn, Mewe invokes the Books of Scripture and Nature together in order to make a political point.

²⁴²Timothy Raylor identifies Mewe as one “William Mewe, a Gloucestershire cleric” (103). On the “Threate” mentioned here, see Job 12:17-25 and William Mewe’s November 29, 1643, sermon before the House of Commons, in which he avers that the nation is troubled by “oppression, the sin most opposite to justice: this sin is a shame to any people, so that when the souldier shall cut the *girdle* of authority, (as God threatens, *solvit cingula regum*) the loines and strength of that State must needs be loose and infeebled” (15). The sermon glosses this passage with a reference to Job 12:17-18: “He leadeth counsellors away spoiled, and maketh the judges fools. He looseth the bond of kings, and girdeth their loins with a girdle.” Notably, this passage follows one that urges the created world as a source of knowledge of God’s omnipotence; earlier in this chapter Job refers to created nature as a source for the “wisdom” (12:2) that his “miserable comforters” offer him (16:2): “But ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee; and the

Yet Evelyn also complicates the question of nature's models for human society. Though for him the ant compares unfavorably with the bee (274), it is nonetheless "a wonderfull Insect," whose "{ . . . Industry, Justice, love & regimen } is admirable . . ." (306, 307). Evelyn also notes ants' orderly society: "They live under a *Democracy*, & observe Lawes . . ." (307). For him, the appropriate lesson to take from ants is the value of hard work: "And if they be the plague & common robbers of our Gardens, ~~for Pliny calls them~~ *Pestes Arborum* as *Pliny* calls them, yet do they not more harme by their depredations, then good by their instruction, silent, & moral examples, & ~~teach since our~~ inciting ~~our~~ {the lesse industrious} Gardiner to Labour & watch against them" (308). But his discussions of the ant and the bee implicitly raise the question of how an observer might determine which lessons are to be drawn from each insect, especially when each is perceived to be virtuous.

The analogies Evelyn finds between the universe and the garden, and between natural phenomena and human society, help him to articulate his ideals for the best British gardens and simultaneously to promote his political, moral, and spiritual values. But his detailed examinations of his subjects and his impressive use of ancient and modern sources reveal the complications involved in drawing analogies between nature and social structures: more detail means more difficulty in making analogies hold, and multiple

fowls of the air, and they shall tell thee: Or speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee: and the fishes of the sea shall declare unto thee. Who knoweth not in all these that the hand of the LORD hath wrought this? In whose hand *is* the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind" (12:7-10).

Raylor offers a stimulating discussion of Samuel Hartlib's *The Reformed Commonwealth of Bees* (1655) in relation to "the traditional discourse of beekeeping and, more generally, the analogical world view of which that discourse was a product" (92, 93); his article has influenced my thinking throughout this chapter.

perspectives lead to potentially competing interpretations of the same phenomenon.²⁴³

Indeed Evelyn, as we shall now see, seems quite aware of the challenges involved in reading the Book of Nature.

II. Problems of Comprehension

One of the problems that Evelyn identifies in the *Elysium* and elsewhere is humans' tendency to misread books, both human and divine, or to misapply the lessons they draw from such reading. The *Elysium* thus addresses epistemological and moral problems by identifying and attempting to correct problems of comprehension, by showing how art can supplement nature in ways both pleasurable and useful. In stipulating that the ideal garden should reflect nature's variety and harmony, Evelyn implies that art, cooperating with nature, can make the Book of Nature more comprehensible: the kind of garden that Evelyn describes can serve as a compendium of and a commentary on that book. But so, as it turns out, can Evelyn's manuscript itself, which ultimately becomes an analogue for as well as a description of the garden.

Challenging Reading: De rerum natura and the Book of Nature

For Evelyn, reading the Book of Nature is vital for human life; that book contributes to our understanding of private and public matters alike, increasing knowledge but also wisdom. Yet Evelyn recognizes the potential for misreading, a concern that shapes his responses to human writing as well as to the Book of Nature. In his comments on his translation of Lucretius, and again in remarks he makes in and about the *Elysium*, he

²⁴³Joseph M. Levine has fruitfully explored Evelyn's attitudes toward ancient and modern authorities.

acknowledges how problems like the reader's moral predisposition or difficulty focusing on intellectual work can interfere with right reading. As the author of the *Elysium*, then, he must overcome his own challenges to reading nature well and also help others to do the same.

Evelyn's concerns about humans' ability to comprehend what they read emerge near the time of his undertaking to write the *Elysium Britannicum*, in his translation of Lucretius's *De rerum natura*.²⁴⁴ Evelyn published the translation of the first book in 1656 as *An Essay on the First Book of T. Lucretius Carus De Rerum Natura*. The title page proclaims the work to have been "Interpreted and Made English Verse by J. Evelyn Esq," phrasing that, like the preface's heading "The Interpreter to Him that Reads" (*John Evelyn's Translation* 1), potentially suggests that Evelyn saw himself as fulfilling a more complex role than that of translator.²⁴⁵ Partly, perhaps, this is because of the challenges posed by Lucretius's elegant poetry and attempts to retain the effects of that verse when translating it to English: "I have yet been as industrious as I could," Evelyn writes in his preface, "to explain the *Poets* sense and meaning in his own natural way; using very little *Paraphrase*, where I could possibly contract him without impeachment of his Argument,

²⁴⁴Frances Harris writes, "The first mention of the 'Elysium Britannicum' by Evelyn comes in the dedicatory epistle to his translation of Nicolas de Bonnefons's *Le jardinier françois*, published in December 1658, although he states there that the design had been conceived 'long since,' perhaps when he first began to lay out his gardens at Sayes Court in 1652" (13).

²⁴⁵The *OED* gives "translator" as one meaning of "interpreter" (2.a), but the word could also mean "[o]ne who . . . explains" and, more specifically, "[o]ne who . . . interprets something in a particular way; one who explains or puts a construction upon the meaning or purposes of a person" (1, 1.b). That Evelyn chose such terms with care is suggested in his translation of Bonnefons's book as *The French Gardiner*; the title page proclaims the work to have been "*Transplanted into English*."

or defacing of the Ornament . . .” (3, lines 19-22). But partly, too, Evelyn’s understanding of his role may have resulted from his awareness of the moral implications of his work: he objected strongly to certain tenets of Epicurean philosophy, as his “Animadversions” on Lucretius’s poem reveal.²⁴⁶

Indeed, in his prefatory remarks, Evelyn attempts to school readers in appropriate responses to the translation and to Lucretius’s work itself. In part he tries to correct readers’ faulty priorities and values. Anticipating criticism from “the *Intelligent*, and those who shall be apt to think, I have levell’d too great a part of *Philosophy*, such as was locked up for them onely, to whom the Keys of her profounder mysteries are due,” Evelyn writes that his “design hath been herein no other, then to make men admirers of the *Rites of Philosophy*, and in love with that knowledge and work, without which (if we dare credit the most Learned) so small a progress can be made in either” (*John Evelyn’s Translation* 1, lines 3-5, 8-11). In response to objections of “the *Scrupulous*,” who “seem greatly to declaim against our *Author*, as altogether *Irreligious* and *Prophane*; and therefore not fit (say they) to be so much as read or entertained amongst *Christians*” (7, lines 8, 9-12), Evelyn shifts the burden of moral and spiritual responsibility away from the poet and back to the reader:

And if our *Poet* have any one passage (as where he prevaricates on *Providence*, the *Immortality of the Soul*, the spontaneous coalition of *Principles*, and some other sublime points of speculative *Theologie*) which seems to concern, or be any whit obnoxious to our *Faith*; he hath a thousand more, where amongst the rest of his most excellent *Precepts*, and rare discourses, he perswades to a life the most exact and *Moral*; and no man, I hope, comes hither as a *Spider*, to swell up his bag with *poyson* onely, when with half that pains, he may with the industrious *Bee*, store and furnish his *Hive* with so much wholesome and delicious Honey. (11, line 8-12, line 5)

²⁴⁶See, for example, Evelyn’s response to the Epicurean denial of divine providence (“Animadversions” 103-108).

These corrections of readers' potential errors involve both public matters, in the advancement of philosophy, and private, in the moral lessons that Lucretius offers individuals.

But Evelyn is also concerned in his preface to address readers' possible lack of focus and the result: poor comprehension. From yet another group of readers, namely "the *Ignorant*" (*John Evelyn's Translation* 1, line 1), Evelyn expects two kinds of criticism, one dealing with his prosody and the other with the intellectual challenges of Lucretius's work (4, line 16-5, line 11, lines 12-22). Of the latter, he writes,

Nor will it concern *Lucretius*, though he be not suddenly understood of all. For if *Memmius* himself, a person of so profound a judgement and excellent parts, needed to be so often reminded seriously to weigh and ponder the subject matter (as you will find in many places of our *Poem* he is) how highly requisite will it be, that even our most confident *Reader* diligently intend to what is here faithfully presented; whilst in the mean time to the rest of the more unsettled spirits that yet delight in books, I may safely affirm what our illustrious *Verulam* hath somewhere pronounced of the study of the *Mathematiques*; they will find this worth an excellent *specifique*, and rare ingredient for unstayed an [*sic*] *Bird-witted men*; since that *here*, as *there*, if the minde be not seriously fixed, the *Demonstration* is ever to begin. (5, lines 12-22, editorial insertion mine)

Evelyn thus recognizes that the poem's challenges for readers may result from readers' faults, especially lack of concentration, or from the difficulty of the material.

His next comments reiterate the work required of the reader, but they also describe the rewards that the poem yields. Crucially for our study of the *Elysium*, they do so in terms that blur the distinctions between land and artistic representations of it:

But to render a perfect and lively Image of this excellent piece, and speak of its colours in the Original, cannot be better accomplished, then in the resembling it to the surprising artifice of some various *Scene*, curious *Landskip*, or delicious prospect; where sometimes from the cragginess of inaccessible Rocks, uneven and horrid precipices (such as are to be found, respecting those admirable plains of *Lombardy*) there breaks and devides (as the meandering *Traveller* approaches) a passage to his eyes down into some goodly and luxurious valley; where the trembling serpentine of some Chrystal rivolet, fringed with the curious diaper of the softer meadows, the umbrage & harmonious warbling of the cooler groves, the frisking and lowing of the

wandering cattle, the exuberant *festoons* of a bountiful *Autumn*, the smiling crops of a hopeful *harvest*, and all the youth and pride of a teeming and cheerful *Spring*, conspire to create a new *Paradise*, and recompense him the pains of so many difficult accesses. For our *Poet* seems here to have been of counsel with *Nature* herself, when she disposed the Principles of things (to speak in the dialect of those times) and framed that beautiful *Machine*, which we daily contemplate with so much variety and admiration. (*John Evelyn's Translation* 5, line 23-6, line 11)

The early lines of this passage repeatedly emphasize the artifice of Lucretius's work:

"this excellent piece," "its colours," and "the surprising artifice of some various *Scene*, curious *Landskip*, or delicious prospect" all compare the poem to a painted view of a dramatic sweep of land. But "scene" can also refer to "[a] view . . . of a place . . ." (*OED* "scene," 9.a); "landskip," to "[a] view . . . of natural inland scenery, such as can be taken in at a glance from one point of view . . ." (*OED* "landscape," n., 2.a); and "prospect," to "[t]he view (of a landscape, etc.) afforded by a particular location or position . . ." (*OED* "prospect," n., 1.b). Evelyn describes an art closely related to, and certainly representative of, nature. He achieves the same effect later in the passage by representing Nature as an artist who "framed that beautiful *Machine*, which we daily contemplate with so much variety and admiration." Evelyn thus praises Lucretius's understanding of nature and his ability to represent it through language; he also establishes a likeness among the poem, land, and the visual artistry that represents a landscape.

This last point gains special force from Evelyn's assertion that the various features of the landscape "conspire to create a new *Paradise*, and recompense him ["the meandering *Traveller*"] the pains of so many difficult accesses." The implications of this comment are profound: Evelyn here compares the poem as a whole not simply to a garden, with its combination of art and nature, but also to the Garden of Eden, the ideal garden of the Christian tradition, particularly insofar as this view of "a new *Paradise*" is made possible by and serves as "recompense" for "the pains" of the reader's hard work. This

description has much in common with Evelyn's ideals for garden design in the *Elysium Britannicum*, which opens with an account of the gardener's art as a response to Adam and Eve's loss of "Paradise" (29): "And though the rest of the World were to them but a Wildernesse, Adam instructed his Posteritie how to handle the Spade so dextrously, that in processe of tyme, men began, with the indulgence of heaven, to recover that by Arte and Industrie, which was before produced to them Spontaneously . . ." (29). The *Elysium*, moreover, recommends many of the features that appear in Evelyn's praise of Lucretius's work: dramatic heights that offer a prospect of the land below (198); flowing water (169); open areas with flowers (336); groves that offer shade and birdsong (158, 254); animals (253-312); fruit trees (317); and evergreens and the manipulation of other plants so as to produce a sense of eternal springtime (313).

The *Elysium* likewise associates gardens with Lucretius's poem and the philosophy that the latter espouses. In contrasting early gardens with more recent developments, Evelyn acknowledges Epicurus's influence: "So frugally did our Fore-fathers live, till the *Horti Urbani* instituted by *Epicurus*, {that {same} Hortorum Magister as Pliny styled him} were by Contemplative men, and *Philosophers* refined to their successive improvement, and present magnificency" (31).²⁴⁷ More to the point, as Evelyn goes on to identify the garden as humans' end and origin, he invokes Lucretius's *De rerum natura*:

It is the common Terme and the pit from whence we were dug; We all came out of this
parsly bed. At least so {according to} the creed of the Poet. For

Hinc ubi quæque loci regio opportuna dabatur
Crescebant uteri terram radicibus apti
Quos ubi tempore maturo patefecerat ætas

²⁴⁷Alastair Small and Carola Small, in a study of Evelyn's interest in and eventual abandonment of Epicureanism, discuss his written works as well as his Wotton and Albury garden designs.

Infantum.

Twas hence, as every place was qualified
The Wombes of Earth were full of rootes, which when
Her Reckning was out, she op'ned then
And tender Babes produc'd[.] (31)

The garden is thus, for Evelyn, the most fitting symbol for the beginning of the human race and the end of each individual human life.²⁴⁸ But it also serves as an image linking various accounts of Creation; Evelyn makes it a site at which Lucretius's poem agrees with the Scriptural account, as his next comments show: "*Olerum more*, as *Censorinus*; or if *Anaximander* were the first that invented the *Genesis* of the fermented Earth, it was not without companie, and a prospect of our originall, analogical to our pedegree out of holy writ. *Nam omnis caro est ut gramen, et omnis gloria hominis, ut flos graminis* etc. {to say nothing of the originall of our common mother, {growing} as a plant ~~growing~~ out of {the side of} Adam" (31). Evelyn's discussion of various creation stories exhibits his concern with agreement about the earth as an origin of human life; he emphasizes pagan and Judeo-Christian sources' common or "analogical" readings of the garden's significance. The word "prospect," furthermore, connects these stories to Lucretius's poem as described in Evelyn's preface to his translation but also to the kind of landscape he recommends in the *Elysium*. Again, then, a cluster of images and ideas argues for a close relationship between Evelyn's translation of Lucretius and his goals for the *Elysium*.

Evelyn's circle of friends and associates clearly included men who recognized both the difficulties and the necessity of reading the Book of Nature aright. Timothy Raylor

²⁴⁸Evelyn had planned to discuss garden burial in Book 3 of the *Elysium* (23); the extant seventh chapter of Book II alludes to "many . . . weighty reasons, which we could produce that there are none so fitt places to bury in, then in our Groves & Gardens . . ." (157). In his dedicatory epistle for *The Garden of Cyrus*, Browne mentions "the ancient practise of Noble Persons, to conclude in Garden-Graves" (1: 177).

explains the ramifications of this kind of reading, and gardens' importance to it, for

Hartlib and his correspondents:

The belief that the divine could be approached through investigation of the natural world was an axiom of the Hartlib circle, forming the basis of the 'syncritic' method of Hartlib's friend and mentor, Jan Amos Comenius. Hartlib and his colleagues were convinced that nature contained undeniable evidence of God's laws: if these could only be understood all religious controversies and disputes would evaporate. . . . one of the central methods by which the Hartlib circle sought to study God in nature was the practice of husbandry, which sought to emulate the activity of Adam in the garden. To Hartlib and his circle, the material profits to be gained from husbandry were inseparable from the spiritual lessons it afforded (a point illustrated emblematically on the engraved title-page of Ralph Austen's *Treatise of Fruit Trees*). Thus Hartlib wrote that husbandry was "*the most profitable Industry unto Humane Society; wherein the Providence, the Power, the Wisdom and the Goodness of God, appears unto man more eminently then in any other way of Industry.*" (105-6)

But implicit in this attitude toward nature is an admission that reading the Book of Nature is far from easy, that it requires cooperation and hard work.

Evelyn, too, seems to have found the Book of Nature difficult reading. Indeed, in one of his additions to the manuscript, he supposes that even in the Garden of Eden, Adam might have discovered some qualities of plants only through study and work:

for ~~even~~ {doubtlesse} even in the most innocent state, ~~thing~~ though ther was no individual {in itselfe} imperfect, yet {~~even~~} these perfections were to be discovered by Industry, & perhaps were not actually existent & exerting their natures, & productions, ~~when~~ {till} by {his ingenuity} ~~culture~~ they should afterwards be cultivated by such ~~combinations~~ & applications, {marriages} & combinations & experiments as his {deepe} knowledge in nature ~~sho~~ should prompt him to[.] (29 n2)

And like Hartlib, Evelyn seems to have regarded striving for a clearer understanding of nature as a good response to the divisions plaguing humankind and especially England.

In the January 28, 1659/60, letter to Sir Thomas Browne, he writes of the *Elysium* and the gardens it describes,

and I would have not onely the elogies and effigie of the antient and famous Garden Heroes, but a society of the *Paradisi Cultores*, persons of antient simplicity, paradisean and hortulan saints, to be a society of learned and ingenuous men, such as

Dr Browne, by whome we might hope to redeeme the tyme that has bin lost, in pursuing vulgar errorrs, and still propagating them, as so many bold men do yet presume to do. Were it to be hoped, *inter hos armorum strepitus*, and in so generall a Catalysis of integrity, interruption of peace and propriety, the hortulane pleasures, these innocent, pure, and usefull diversions might enjoy the least encouragement, whilst brutish and ambitious persons seeke themselves in the ruines of our miserable yet dearest country, *quis talia fando* . . . (in Browne 4: 275)

The reference to Browne's *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* suggests that Evelyn's main point here is the correction of misperceptions in natural philosophy. But the last half of this passage, with its allusions to the fallout of the civil wars and especially the quotation from Virgil's *Aeneid*,²⁴⁹ implies that Evelyn associates erroneous views of nature with the political and social crises of the 1640s and 1650s.²⁵⁰ He sees the wars as having caused "a Catalysis of integrity, interruption of peace and propriety"; political upheaval thus interferes with natural philosophy. But as Raylor notes, Hartlib and his associates saw nature, rightly understood, as revealing God's will in ways that would resolve conflicts about how best to obey that will.

In the passage above, however, Evelyn's phrasing suggests that at least some of those who impede progress in natural philosophy are guilty of pride or willfulness: the "pursuing" and "propagating" of "vulgar errorrs" is associated with "bold[ness]" and

²⁴⁹The reference is to Aeneas's account of the "Heartbreaking things" he witnessed in the destruction of Troy: "Who could tell them, / Even a Myrmidon or Dolopian / Or ruffian of Ulysses, without tears?" (2.7, 2.8-10).

²⁵⁰Similarly, Graham Parry notes this juxtaposition of a reference to Browne's work and the phrase "to redeeme the tyme." For Parry, the latter "has . . . a resonant sound, with a hint of religious mission. [Evelyn] had already used the phrase in his letter to Boyle of 3 September 1659, and it raises questions about what Evelyn thought of his time and why it needed redemption. His frequently expressed opinion, in this letter to Browne and in many other letters of the 1650s, is that he is living in a time of desolation, after the Civil Wars. A usurper holds power, the Church of England that Evelyn loyally supported has been suppressed, many of the best men in the country have had their property sequestered, and have been excluded from public affairs by the Puritan regime. . . . These are fallen times" (136-37). For Parry, Evelyn's use of the phrase is an instance of millenarian tendencies (137).

“presum[ption].” And if gardens, and cultivation more generally, offer the best means for learning more about nature, then the tendency to sin interferes with both the improvement of the land and the study of natural philosophy, activities that would in turn offer spiritual improvement. The point that sinfulness damages both land and humans’ spiritual welfare is made in a slightly different way in Evelyn’s remarks on groves. He attributes to these places a special spiritual power: “For our owne part we find it by experience, & professe it that there is nothing strikes a more awfull {& sollemne} reverence into us, then the gloomy umbrage of some majesticall groves *of goodly & tall trees* of goodly & tall trees . . . extreamely apt to compose the mind, & infuse into it a kind of naturall Devotion, disposing to prayer, and profound meditation” (156). Then, chronicling the belief of “the Antients” that those who damaged groves suffered divine retribution, he writes,

And Appian records that when *Mithridates* intended to cutt downe a Grove neere *Patara* a citty of Lycia, to make warlike Engines with the timber; being strangely terrified in a dreame, he desisted from his resolution {~~not to passe over in silence~~} & spared it: we heartily wish the like might {have} taken effect with all {the} sacriligious Purchasers of the Yron Age amongst us, especiall such as have devowerd {the Sacred} Royall & Ecclesiasticall ~~Proprieties~~ {atrimony} & made such prodigious havoc ~~especiall~~ of those goodly {Groves &} woods to satisfie their impious {& hellish} avarice, which ~~were~~ {being once} the glory and ornament of this Nation. & ~~were~~ {were certainly} reserved for repaire of our ~~Wooden~~ Oaken-Wales the ~~glory~~ {boast} & safeguard of this {noble} Iland, ~~in case~~ when necessity and ~~the~~ some imminent danger should threaten it; & not to be devoured by these insatiable Cormorants, who ~~have eaten up~~ to the eternall ~~scandal~~ {reproch} of Posterities & {sainted to} the Christian name, have swallowed Gods owne Inheritance but whose {sons &} Nephews must certainly disgorge it againe and with it all the rest which they might otherwise have hapily enjoyed. (157-58)

The emphasis on sin, evident in “impious {& hellish} avarice,” is reinforced by Evelyn’s diction: “devowerd,” “devoured,” “insatiable Cormorants,” “~~have eaten up~~,” and “have

swallowed” suggest gluttony. He seems to imply here that the Parliamentarians’ destruction of trees for timber resulted from moral disorder.²⁵¹

For Evelyn, then, a right reading of the Book of Nature, just as of his translation of Lucretius, depends at least partly on the reader’s moral and intellectual status and values. The problem with reading and applying the lessons in the Book of Nature, then, is for Evelyn twofold: further exploration in natural philosophy is required in order to make nature’s operations clear, and humankind’s inclination to sin must be combated in order for those lessons to be rightly used. Yet art, Evelyn suggests more than once in the *Elysium*, holds great promise on both counts.

The Roles of Art in Comprehending Nature

The art of cultivation, in the *Elysium*, offers a means of studying nature more fully because it allows for manipulations of soil, temperature, and even plants. Other kinds of art, those concerned with aesthetic arrangement, can influence a garden’s visitors by promoting certain values and moral standards. The various arts that Evelyn considers necessary for an Elysium, then, might operate together to rectify, in part, the kinds of problems that obscure the lessons of the Book of Nature.

Taken together, these arts enable two kinds of comprehension, a quality that is central to Evelyn’s ideals for the Elysium. Important meanings of *comprehend* that recur often in the manuscript involve the physical—“include,” “enclose” (*OED* “comprehend,” v., 8, 9, 10.b)—and one cognitive—“grasp with the mind, conceive fully or adequately,

²⁵¹Evelyn tempers his language in reworking this passage for the epistle “To the Reader” in *Sylva* (1664); the most dramatic revisions include changing “impious { & hellish } avarice” to “impious and unworthy Avarice” and “insatiable Cormorants” to “Improvident Wretches” (*Writings* 189).

understand . . .” (4). The former usage appears, for example, in Evelyn’s discussion of how to lay out the philosophico-medical garden, when he writes that with the exception of one part, “the divisions . . . may be disposed into bordures & beds, so as may be most comprehensive . . .” (407), and the latter in Evelyn’s comment that the Elysian gardener needs “[t]o comprehend the nature of the *Earth*, and her productions: to be able to discourse of the *Elements* and to penetrate into the ~~nature~~ energie and reason of things with judgment and assurance. In a word, What is our Gardiner to be, but an absolute Philosopher!” (34). These two kinds of comprehension are interdependent: the garden can include all that it should only if the gardener understands nature and art well, a condition that Evelyn believes his work can help to effect, and the gardener’s understanding of nature is in turn enhanced by the garden that includes a wide variety of plants and thus offers more opportunities for gaining knowledge. Art can help by making more plants and techniques available to the gardener but also by influencing his values and those of visitors to the garden. The more fully art allows a garden to correspond to the universe, the more its visitors, freed of distractions, presumably can understand about that universe.

The kinds of art that contribute to natural philosophy and natural history allow the garden to incorporate more kinds of plants with greater success, though experimentation is still necessary in some cases. In his discussion of caring for citrus trees and other foreign species likely to be damaged by the British climate, for example, Evelyn determines “to informe our Gardiner in true experiments” (318), but he also acknowledges that in some matters observation is necessary: “concerning the precise period for the howsing & carring in your {choice} Plants & Cases; it cannot be reduced

to so certaine {a} rule; because of the uncertaintie of the Season” (329). Similarly, in his chapter “Of Wonderfull and Stupendious Plants,” he reports stories about a “Melon or Gourd growing in the Capaseo mountaines in Tartarie which being cutt open & ripe, produces a little creature like a sucking lamb” (414). The possible existence of such a “prodigious *Zoophyte*” (415) elicits from Evelyn a mixture of skepticism and excitement: “But these descriptions are ~~much more~~ {very} uncertaine, ~~then~~ & did give us no smale ~~reason~~ {cause} of suspect upon the whole matter, till we mett with those exact & pleasant relations of *Olearius*, who was late Secretary to that extravagant, though most magnificent Embassy, of the D: of *Holsteine*, into *Persia*: whose enquiries have hitherto afforded us the best satisfaction . . .” (414). Further inquiry into the Book of Nature, especially as enabled by arts that make rare plants more widely available and apt to survive in new environments, would help to resolve doubts in cases like this one and would alert natural philosophers to nature’s more unexpected phenomena.

Much as the introduction of new kinds of plants might seem intended for pleasure, the presence of the other kinds of art that Evelyn recommends might appear primarily decorative. But these latter arts too have more profound effects than such a purpose suggests. Evelyn is particularly clear about the advantages of statuary: “by this it is that we reppresent the figures of ~~Men~~ those {greate} Heros, & Genious’s that have so well deserv’d of Gardens, & so much celebrated by the Antients, affording an ornament not onely of exceeding pleasure to the eye, but to the intellect it selfe, and the furniture of the most profitable discourses . . .” (204). Statues thus please the mind rather than simply the senses, and they improve the quality of conversation. In part, by honoring exceptional

figures, they encourage high standards, both in political matters and in various kinds of work: Evelyn invokes

the relation, those ~~noble~~ {glorious} Monuments and Memories of well deserving & meritorious persons, had to nobler designes; not as a bare & transitory entertainment of the Eyes {onely}, or gentle deception of the tyme; but as it had a seacret & powerfull influence even to {wards} the advancement of *Monarchy*, by their continuall reppresentations of {great &} vertuous Examples; so as in that point, Art became a piece of State; A The same may be applied {also} to the encouragement of Industrious & Ingenious men, when they shall behold the honour which is don to such as by their Art & Science had obliged the World . . . (211).

In addition to the “seacret & powerfull influence” statues exert in politics, then, they also motivate people to contribute something important to “the World,” to advance knowledge or technical skill in some way. Even more to the point, Evelyn cites Sallust’s statement “[t]hat he had frequently heard that *Q: Maximus*, & the greate *Scipio* were wont to say, ~~that~~ when they beheld at any tyme the Images & statues of their Ancestors, that their very soules were as it were inflam’d ~~to~~ with Courage & virtuous desires . . .” (211-12).

Statues, then, by encouraging political stability, hard work, useful knowledge, and moral virtue, can help to correct the kinds of problems that Evelyn sees as interfering with the ability to read the Book of Nature productively.

And yet the efficacy of statues and related forms of art is limited in important ways. In his discussion of statues’ nurturing the desire for fame and glory, Evelyn writes that “doubtlesse, there is nothing dos more stimulate a noble & generous spirit, then a virtuous emulation . . .” (212); this statement, however, says nothing about the effect of “a virtuous emulation” on a lesser spirit (or indeed whether a lesser spirit would be likely to feel such emulation). Furthermore, Evelyn balances his belief in the good effects of art with a recognition of the fact that sometimes art fails to correct moral failings: he remarks of beautifully designed “publique fountain[s]” that

such Elegances do {greatly} not only contribute to pomp & shew, & to celebrate {& encourage} Workmen, but the very sight of them has some effect upon the manners & comity of {the} men who behold them, & dos sweeten & enliven their spirits: as do large streetes, uniforme buildings, & greate & stately Palaces & well Churches decently adorn'd, & I wonder how greate persons who enjoy them can be wicked, & do unworthy things in them. (186 n19)

The plaintive bewilderment with which the sentence ends registers the strength of his conviction that art can have—and certainly should have—an improving effect; it also indicates how inexplicable, for Evelyn, is the failure of that effect.

Ultimately, both nature and art, in Evelyn's view, have significant but limited capacities to correct the problems of comprehension—gardens' and humans'—that interfere with a right understanding of the Book of Nature. The potential for people to misread a garden or any of its features, or to fail to apply what they read, suggests that observation is not enough to change fundamentally how a person understands the world.

Legible Gardens: The Elysium and the Elysium

In this context, Evelyn's manuscript takes on added significance: it becomes not simply a description of how to create the ideal British garden but an analogue for that garden. And that analogue has the advantage of language, the importance of which is suggested by Evelyn's repeated use of bookmaking imagery to refer to the garden itself. The *Elysium* becomes, then, a help to reading and understanding the garden that in turn instructs its visitors in the proper uses of the Book of Nature.

Evelyn recognizes the benefits of the garden's use of language; inscriptions made by humans can contribute to the pleasure, knowledge of natural philosophy, and moral instruction that he believes the best gardens should offer. The carving of "names, sentences, verses, etc," on trees, for example, "do[es] much contribut to the sweete and

melancholy delight of Groves . . .” (144), but it can also provide instruction about natural processes. Evelyn cites an example that supports the idea that trees exhibit “a double motion” in how both the trunks and the branches grow: “This ~~appeared by a~~ might be evinced to much probability by what was shewed King Charles the 1 at Oxon: in a piece of a Tree which being settled before his Mats [Majesty] had names graven upon ~~a piece of~~ ~~barke~~ the very timber where squared, a good depth into the heart of it beneath the barke” (75 n5). Similarly, inscriptions on the more artificial of the garden’s features can encourage good work and promote certain moral values. Evelyn recommends “the statues of our most famous Gardners ~~in pictures or plaster {statue}~~ to adorne the *Pinacothecæ* {Repositories} & *Porticos* with some of their Elegies ~~in short~~: {& to preserve their memories}” (204). These statues have ornamental value—they are “to adorne” certain spaces—but as we have already seen, they also serve as good examples to their viewers (204); in this latter regard, the inscriptions about these figures “preserve their memories” not only by identifying them for viewers but also by commemorating the virtues and hard work that make them worthy of imitation.²⁵² A quotation from Valerius Maximus (211 n21) reiterates this point: “For thus were the Effigies of Greate & excellent persons us’d to be plac’t both in the Gardens & houses, *in prima ædium parte: ut eorum virtutes posterī non solum legerent; sed etiam imitarentur* [in the first part of houses: so that posterity might not only read their virtues but also imitate them]” (211, insertion mine).

Moreover, the garden, containing as it does parts of the Book of Nature, is inscribed not only by human artists but also by the divine Artist: Evelyn sees the garden, and the

²⁵²“Elegies” here seems to mean “elogies,” i.e., “explanatory inscription[s],” probably also with the sense of “expression[s] of praise” (*OED* “eulogy,” 1, 2).

world, as legible and orderly partly in the sense that God has left marks that can advance natural and moral philosophy as well as spiritual development and pleasure. For example, he acknowledges the doctrine of signatures twice. Once, he considers the notion “that every thing hath its star and *Signature*, which being knowingly applied ~~reflect~~ {produce} wonders as the learned Gaffarel {& others} has{ve} shewed in stupendious instances, and effects so considerable, that did men, and especially, Gardiners well examine they would emerge the most accomplished *physitians* in the World” (42). Later, he notes of the “*Fritillaria*, or the variegated Lilly” that its “signature . . . gave light to an knowing Chymistry to find an excellent successe & rare water to take away spots & freckles out of the skin & face & to recover Sunburnt” (365).

Evelyn also conceives of the garden as a potential emblem book offering spiritual, moral, and political instruction. He refers to silkworms’ life cycles as an “Emblem of Immortality” and, citing St. Basil, “a perfect embleme of our Resurrection . . .” (287 n53, 295). Similarly, he supports garden burial with the image of graves “decked with . . . perennial plants the most naturall *Hieroglyphicks* of our future Resurrection and Immortalitie . . .” (157). His discussion of citrus trees implies that such interpretations of natural phenomena are warranted by Scripture: “thus governd, the Orange is of all {other} trees the perfectest Emblem of a good man, according to {as} the Psalmist describeth him . . . for it is never without {ripe} Fruite upon it, and would have avoided the malediction of the *Fig tree*” (325-26).²⁵³ And on moral and political matters, Evelyn cites Solomon’s declaration that insects give us patterns for “wisdome & ~~virtue~~ {prudence

²⁵³Evelyn alludes here to Psalms 1:3 (“And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper”) and, on Christ’s cursing of the fig tree, to Matthew 21:19 and Mark 11:14.

. . .}” and asserts that bees “read[] a Lecture of obedience to Rebels in every {mans} Garden . . .” (311, 274). The garden, by incorporating these natural features, can serve as a compendium of the Book of Nature, reproducing in a small space the lessons written by God into the created world.

Yet even the garden is not perfectly comprehensive or perfectly comprehensible. It is shaped by the choices made by its human gardener, and as Evelyn’s concerns with usefulness and moderation reveal, it involves constraints: of time, in what can be designed, planted, and brought to fruition in a given period (63); of space, in the amount and types of land it includes (93); of natural phenomena beyond human control, in what will and will not grow in a given place, for instance (317-18, 411); and of finances, in the extent of the owner’s resources (93, 94). The gardener can create a compendium from the Book of Nature, but what he chooses to include or leave out affects the visitor’s understanding of nature and thus potentially of God, its Author.

The *Elysium* thus emerges as not only a description of but also a complement to and, in some ways, an analogue for the garden. Evelyn’s language, particularly later in the extant part of the work, suggests as much. His discussion of the plants appropriate for the philosophico-medical garden, for example, implies an analogy between the book and the garden, by turns identifying one with the other and distinguishing between the two:

to discourse of them in particulars . . . or {ever} hope to introduce their innumerable kinds into this ~~compendium~~ {narrow compasse} is not any ~~part~~ {portion} of our designe: It shall suffice that as an ornamentall ~~part~~ addition {to} of these our Royal Gardens, we allow it a chapter in this work, and such an ample plott or division within the precincts of our Wales, as may suffice to comprehend the ~~ehi~~ principall & most usefull plants, {&} ~~and~~ to be as a rich & noble compendium of what the whole Globe of the Earth has ~~growing~~ {flourishing} upon her boosome . . . (403)

The phrase “narrow compasse” appears to refer to Evelyn’s manuscript, whereas “the precincts of our Wales” seems to mean the garden.²⁵⁴ But “these our Royal Gardens” can refer to either, as the subsequent mentions of “a chapter in this work” and “an ample plot or division” imply. Evelyn, like the gardener, must be selective about what he includes, forgoing the “innumerable kinds” available in favor of “the ~~ehi~~ principall & most usefull plants.” The function and scope of the chapter thus correspond to those of the garden plot. Taken together, the crossing out of “compendium” early in the paragraph, where it refers to the manuscript, and the word’s use a few lines later to refer to the garden suggest that Evelyn considers the *Elysium* and the Elysium analogous in form, content, and purpose.

Indeed, at one point Evelyn comes close to identifying the manuscript as an alternative to or equivalent of the garden in some ways, implying that it can produce the same emotional and intellectual responses that the garden should stimulate. In his chapter “Of Wonderfull and Stupendious Plants,” he writes,

He that shall skillfully { & diligently } examine the admirable natures & properties of the severall plants which we have already enumerated in the two foregoing chapters, will find himselfe sufficiently engaged with wonder and amazement, ~~Since our~~ ~~Elysium~~ & to be so taken up with the { use & } contemplation of what we have there presented him, as not to imagine our Elysium in the least defective; though we should have omitted this Chapter of Prodigies and Stupendious plants[.] (411)

But even though Evelyn supposes that his descriptions of plants for the coronary and medical gardens will lead to “wonder and amazement” as well as “contemplation,” what

²⁵⁴Even the phrase “narrow compasse” becomes a way of comparing the manuscript to this garden plot: two paragraphs later, Evelyn remarks of the appropriate size for the medical garden, “It is almost incredible what ~~an acre or two~~ {smale compasse} will entertaine . . .” (403). Such comparisons also occur earlier: Evelyn repeatedly figures reading the work as analogous to designing and walking through the gardens (52, 123, 139, 187), and he also attributes to readers the possible expectation that such an analogy will hold (102).

he values most is still the garden: he hopes that his words will excite the gardener's "industrie & curiositie" so that the unusual plants Evelyn describes might be sought for and grown in Britain (411).

Finally, then, the *Elysium* demonstrates how language reinforces and clarifies the lessons offered by the garden, the lessons of the Book of Nature. Though writing cannot remove all the obstacles to right reading of nature and good use of that reading, it can, to Evelyn's way of thinking, oppose moral weakness and direct readers' attention to crucial ideas that might otherwise be lost in a wealth of observations and in the distractions of human life, particularly in a tumultuous time. By enabling a better understanding of nature, and by including intellectually and emotionally stimulating descriptions of natural features that might be impossible for a given garden to incorporate, the *Elysium* partly redresses the very problems of comprehension that it identifies.

III. Garden Monarchs

For Evelyn, the preeminent example of how observation of nature alone can fail to lead people to intellectually or morally sound conclusions is the civil strife that led to regicide and the abolition of the monarchy. Though he depicts monarchy as a government grounded in the principles of nature and thus originating in God's providence, he also demonstrates how that origin is obscured by nature's variety as well as by human weakness. The *Elysium* thus depends on metaphor and analogy, by way of the gardener-king trope, to show more clearly how kingship can participate in the ordered, hierarchical unity that characterizes the universe.

We have seen that Evelyn implicitly characterizes monarchy as natural in his references to the tulip as the "prince & Supream" of "the Flowry people" and to bees as

“of all the . . . Creatures, the most affected to Monarchy” (343, 274). But we have also seen how that characterization is complicated by nature’s variety, which Evelyn so often celebrates: his praise for the ant (306, 307, 308) makes it easy to imagine how observers of nature could argue for the naturalness and virtuousness of other forms of government. In addition to misunderstandings of the arguments from nature and providence, moreover, Evelyn recognizes the problem of sin, particularly in his references to the anti-Royalists as willful. He accuses them not only of “impious {& hellish} avarice” in their disposal of land and trees (158) but also of “hav[ing] cheated the {silly} people of ~~this~~ {our} Age miserable Nation” through the “policy,” which he traces back to “*Mahomet*,” Minos, and Numa Pompilius, of “ma[king] the people believe they received new laws, doing in the meane tyme what they pleased . . .” (155). Evelyn thus demonstrates how the inability to perceive, or the unwillingness to live according to, nature’s lessons about monarchy and obedience can damage the honor accorded to kings.

In supporting kingship, then, the *Elysium* employs a more general, and more subtle, argument from nature: namely, that a king’s relationship to his subjects can reconcile unity and hierarchy in ways that reflect the order of the universe. Gardening provides a means of achieving, and a set of terms for describing, this reconciliation. It gives a monarch and his subjects a set of common experiences, which Evelyn associates with a common heritage as descendants of Adam: he recommends that the coronary garden be small enough that “the Master himselfe may take the greatest pleasure to cultivat [it] with his owne hands, be he Prince or Subject: for even to this was the onely Monarch of all the World destined ~~in~~ before he lost that Innocency. which bereav’d him of so sweete an Employment, & for which Kings have often {ex}changed their Scepters” (336).

Similarly, in an insertion meant for the chapter on gardening tools, Evelyn (rather inaccurately) attributes to Abraham Cowley the sentiment that “the plough is of more dignity then the Scepter” (83 n2).²⁵⁵ And just as Evelyn writes of kings as gardeners, he also imagines the gardener as a king of sorts: in recommending an album for keeping track of the coronary garden’s flowers, Evelyn points out “how impossible it were to governe this numerous or rather innumerable people, the glorious inhabitants of our Coronary Garden without a greate deale of dexterity, polity, Art, & particular oeconomie, so that without an accurate ~~Rescension~~ Recension & enroulement, our Gardiner {who is the Monarch & Generall of all this multitude} shall never be able to take a ~~severall~~ just accoumpt of his severall subjects & Souldiers” (397). In all these ways, Evelyn emphasizes gardening’s ability to unite a monarch and his subjects in a common pursuit; the language Evelyn employs for doing so, moreover, makes the gardener’s occupation analogous to the king’s status and at least as noble.

At the same time, Evelyn maintains a strong sense of hierarchy. The monarch, after all, remains the ultimate example of human power in the quotations discussed above. The project of the *Elysium* likewise honors royalty, as the work’s full title—*Elysium Britannicum, or The Royal Gardens*—indicates. And Evelyn compliments Charles II’s improvements, in the form of walks and a pall-mall alley, to St. James’s Park (128 n3, 138 n22). But Evelyn’s dedicatory epistle to the king for *Sylva* best expresses his ideal of kingly hierarchy combined with cooperation between monarch and subjects:

But your Majesty has yet another Title to this Work, and to all it pretends to; as having (like another Cyrus) by your own Royal Example, exceeded all your

²⁵⁵John Ingram, editor of the *Elysium*, quotes Cowley’s *Essays*, 4, as follows: “But if Heraldry were guided by Reason, a Plough in a Field Arable, would be the most Noble and Antient Armes” (in Evelyn, *EB* 83 n2).

Predecessors in the Plantations which you have already made, and now design, beyond (I dare affirm it) all the Monarchs of this Nation since the Conquest of it. And indeed, what is there more August, more worthy of your Majesty, or more becoming our Imitation? then whilst you are thus solicitous for our Instruction, we pursue your Majesties great Example with that Veneration which is due to it? and by cultivating our decaying Woods, contribute to your Power, as to our greatest Wealth and Safety; since, while your Majesty is furnish'd to send forth those Argos, and Trojan Horses, about this your Island, we are to fear nothing from without it; and whilst We remain obedient to your Commands and great Example, nothing from within it . . . (*Writings* 183-84)

Here Charles provides “Instruction” and “Example,” and his people respond with “Imitation” and “Veneration” of his efforts to replenish the nation’s woods. Evelyn thus supports Charles’s power but also describes a reciprocal relationship with the people, one in which monarch and subjects alike cultivate the land.

In this way, *Sylva* develops the promise implicit in the “Elysium” of Britain as a kind of ideal garden. The title *Elysium Britannicum* means “British Elysium,” but that phrase could mean both “an Elysium in Britain” and “the Elysium of Britain.” Most of Evelyn’s manuscript involves the former sense, but occasionally the second sense emerges too, as when Evelyn writes of “such ~~plants~~ wonderfull plants, as, though not all of them denisons in our *Britanque Elysium*, may {yet} . . . be in tyme procured & ~~cultivated~~ {elevated . . .} . . .” (411). Evelyn’s description of the nation in *Sylva* foregrounds the combination of unity and hierarchy that, in the *Elysium*, characterizes the universe, and it credits Charles—and in a more reserved way (“Whilest we remain obedient”), the people—with the kind of national improvement that can make Britain an Elysium. The trope of the gardener-king thus allows Evelyn to locate Charles’s monarchy in the context of universal order.

Conclusion

Finally, then, Evelyn's *Elysium Britannicum* responds to the upheaval of the Civil Wars and their aftermath by representing gardens as compendia of the Book of Nature and then glossing those compendia. For him, nature's variety is glorious and the details of natural phenomena vitally important, but these aspects of the Book of Nature can prove confusing in moral and spiritual matters as much as in questions of natural philosophy. In the *Elysium*, then, he turns to language, and especially to analogy, as a way of emphasizing correspondence and order without ignoring important distinctions; this strategy allows him both to articulate patterns in nature and to assert specific and often complex relationships between the natural world and the human social order.

The trope of the gardener-king illustrates this use of analogy most pointedly precisely because it engages mid-seventeenth-century social turmoil (civil war, regicide, and enormous changes in government and worship) in terms of an art that underwent tremendous changes in the same period.²⁵⁶ By linking the figure of the king with that of the gardener, Evelyn appeals to nature's ordered variety as a model for human society, but he does so abstractly enough to avoid the kinds of details that might interfere with a right reading of the Book of Nature. He also proposes an identification of the king as an improver of the land and thus, given that in the *Elysium* he addresses gardeners, implies that the king and his subjects participate in the same project: cultivating Britain. In this way, the gardener-king trope expresses Evelyn's desire that his nation might reflect, through a peaceful, harmonious hierarchy, the *discordia concors* of the universe itself.

²⁵⁶See Charles Webster's *The Great Instauration* for an illuminating sketch of these horticultural developments (465-83).

EPILOGUE

Like Evelyn's dedicatory epistle for *Sylva* (183-84), poems by Edmund Waller and John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, commemorate Charles II's improvement of land and thus engage the trope of the gardener-king. Waller's "On St. James's Park, As Lately Improved by His Majesty" celebrates Charles's power over both the parkland features and the kingdoms, thereby upholding the analogy between gardening and governing. Rochester's "A Ramble in St. James's Park" recognizes that power, however, only in its reworking of images and rhymes from Waller's poem. The two works thus achieve very different effects: while Waller's represents Charles as a virtuous, authoritative gardener-king, Rochester's depicts him either as no gardener-king at all or as one capable of nurturing little more than vice.

Waller's speaker implicitly compares Charles to God in terms of the king's relation to both his people and the land. Having mentioned Westminster Hall (105, n5), the poet describes Charles in terms that link him to Christ the Good Shepherd while emphasizing his power over his subjects: "Here, like the people's pastor he does go, / His flock subjected to his view below" (109-110). Moreover, Waller invokes "the description" of "the first Paradise" and then refers to St. James's Park as "this paradise" (3, 1, 4), implying an analogy between God, Who planted that first garden, and Charles, who, as the poem's title says, "improved" the other. That analogy is reinforced in the first half of the next verse paragraph: "Instead of rivers rolling by the side / Of Eden's garden, here

flows in the tide; / The sea, which always served his empire, now / Pays tribute to our Prince's pleasure too" (5-8). These lines suggest comparisons of Charles to God even as they distinguish between the two, as in the phrase "Instead of rivers" and the word "now," the latter of which signals the king's manipulation of nature. Ultimately, Charles's authority over his people and that over the land are brought together in the poem's closing lines, which express confidence that Charles will "Reform these nations, and improve them more / Than this fair park, from what it was before" (135-36).

Rochester's poem, in contrast, hints at Charles's status as gardener-king only insofar as it responds to specific passages from Waller's poem. Waller's speaker, praising the plantation of "young trees" beside the park's "new stream" (13, 14), envisions the area's future innocent delightfulness: "Methinks I see the love that shall be made, / The lovers walking in that amorous shade, / The gallants dancing by the river's side; / They bathe in summer, and in winter slide" (21-24). Later in the poem, he associates the "living gallery of aged trees" (68) with contemplation:

Bold sons of earth that thrust their arms so high,
As if once more they would invade the sky.
In such green palaces the first kings reigned,
Slept in their shades, and angels entertained;
With such old counsellors they did advise,
And, by frequenting sacred groves, grew wise.
Free from th'impediments of light and noise,
Man, thus retired, his nobler thoughts employs. (69-76)

For Rochester's speaker, however, the trees form not a "sacred" space but rather an "all-sin-sheltering grove" (25):

There by a most incestuous birth
Strange woods spring from the teeming earth,
For they relate how heretofore,
When ancient Pict began to whore,
Deluded of his assignation
(Jilting it seems was then in fashion),

Poor pensive lover in this place
Would frig upon his mother's face,
Whence rows of mandrakes tall did rise
Whose lewd tops fucked the very skies.
Each imitative branch does twine
In some loved fold of Aretine.
And nightly now beneath their shade
Are buggeries, rapes, and incests made. (11-24)

As editor Frank H. Ellis's annotations to these lines suggest (331 n20, 331 n23-4), Rochester's couplet on the mandrakes contains echoes of Waller's couplet on the "Bold sons of earth," especially given the poets' respective uses of "skies" and "sky" as rhyme words, and Rochester reverses the "made"- "shade" rhyme of Waller's poem in a description of the grove's nurturing not love but lechery. In its responses to Waller's work, then, Rochester's engages the image of Charles II as the park's improver.

Yet Rochester's speaker, emphasizing only the depravities to which the park is home, hardly seems to endorse the notion of improvement. And he never directly acknowledges Charles's redesigning of the park. Thus he undermines the judgments in Waller's poem of Charles as "like the people's pastor" (109) and as the park's good gardener: insofar as Charles can be said to have cultivated anything here, the poem implies, he has cultivated vice. But the stronger implication is that Charles's potential role as gardener-king is simply unimportant. The poem, suggesting as it does that the redesigning of the park has no significance at all for the nation's moral development, rejects a crucial use of the gardener-king trope: to endorse the idea that cultivation of the land is related to moral virtue, whether as an encouragement to it or a sign of it. The poem makes the point all the more wittily by attributing the grove's creation to "a most incestuous" incident and then describing the legacy of depravity that has ensued.

Waller's and Rochester's poems, taken together, show that debates about the nature and the usefulness of the gardener-king trope did not end at the Restoration. Indeed, the reestablishment of the monarchy may have revitalized these debates to some degree, a question that a more exhaustive study of the trope's occurrences in Restoration literature could address. We have seen already that earlier responses to this trope include attempting to limit or reallocate power, as in Winstanley's works; to encourage the cultivation of power for national leaders other than kings, as Marvell's "Horatian Ode" and "Upon Appleton House" do; to create a consolatory ideal for Royalists after Charles I's fall from power, as Browne's *The Garden of Cyrus*; and to imagine a power that might unify and order Britain by means of cooperation between king and people, as in Evelyn's *Elysium Britannicum*. Waller's and Rochester's poetic descriptions of St. James's Park illustrate the Restoration's continuing concerns with the nature and extent of the king's power, the means by which that power is symbolized, and the king's ability to better the nations over whom he reigns.

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources

- Allington, John. *The Grand Conspiracy of the Members against the Mind, of the Jews against Their King. As It Hath Been Delivered in the Four Following Sermons*. 3rd ed. London, 1654. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 10 Dec. 2008.
- Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Trans. H. Rackham. 1934. Rev. ed. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1945. Print. Loeb Classical Library.
- Bacon, Francis. *The New Organon*. 1620. *The Works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Alban, and Lord High Chancellor of England*. Ed. James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath. Vol. 4. London, 1824. Internet Archive. Web. 2 Nov. 2009.
- Bacon, Francis. "Of Gardens." *The Works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Alban, and Lord High Chancellor of England*. Ed. James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath. Vol. 6. London, 1858. 14 vols. 1857-74. Internet Archive. Web. 2 Nov. 2009.
- Bacon, Robert. *The Labyrinth the Kingdom's In: With a Golden Threed to Bring It Forth into Light, Liberty, and Peace Agen*. . . . London, [1649]. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 21 Nov. 2005.
- . *A Taste of the Spirit of God, and of This VVorld, As They Have Appeared in Opposition Heretofore, So Now Latest of All at New-Windsor*. . . . London, 1652. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 21 Nov. 2005.
- Barbe, Simon. *The French Perfumer*. . . . Trans. anon. London, 1696. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 24 Oct. 2009.
- Bodin, Jean. *The Six Bookes of a Commonweale*. Trans. Richard Knolles. London, 1606. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 15 Aug. 2007.
- Bonnefons, Nicolas de. *The French Gardiner: Instructing How to Cultivate All Sorts of Fruit-Trees, and Herbs for the Garden*. . . . Trans. Philocephos [John Evelyn]. London, 1658. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 28 Oct. 2009.
- Browne, John, ed. *The Kings Articles and the Parliaments Honovr*. . . . Anon. [London], 1642. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 23 Mar. 2009.
- Browne, Thomas. *The Works of Sir Thomas Browne*. Ed. Geoffrey Keynes. 4 vols. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1964. Print.

- Browne, Tom. "Journal of Edward and Thomas Browne's Tour into Derbyshire in 1662." *Sir Thomas Browne's Works, Including His Life and Correspondence*. By Thomas Browne. Ed. Simon Wilkin. Vol. 1. London, 1836. 22-42. Print.
- Burroughs, Jeremiah. *The Glorious Name of God, the Lord of Hosts Opened in Two Sermons at Michaels Cornhill, London, Vindicating the Commission from This Lord of Hosts, to Subjects, in Some Case, to Take Up Arms*. . . . London, 1643. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 24 Oct. 2009.
- Burton, Henry. *Christ on His Throne. Or, Christs Church-Government Briefly Laid Downe and How It Ought to Bee Set Up in All Christian Congregations. Resolved in Sundry Cases of Conscience*. [London], 1640. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 24 Oct. 2009.
- Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. 1621. Ed. and introd. Holbrook Jackson. 1932. Introd. William H. Gass. New York: New York Review of Books, 2001. Print.
- Carew, Thomas. *Coelum Britannicum*. 1634. Orgel and Strong 570-80.
- A Case for Nol Cromwells Nose, and the Cure of Tom Fairfax's Gout*. . . . [London], 1648. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 7 June 2009.
- Charles I. *The Kings Most Gracious Messages for Peace*. . . . N.p., 1648. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 29 Sept. 2009.
- Cleveland, John. *The Idol of the Clovvnes, or, Insurrection of Wat the Tyler with His Priests Baal and Straw*. . . . London, 1654. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 23 Mar. 2009.
- . *The Rebellion of the Rude Multitude under Wat Tyler and His Priests Baal and Straw, in the Dayes of King Richard the IId, Anno. 1381. Parallel'd with the Late Rebellion in 1640, against King Charles I of Ever Blessed Memory*. London, [1660]. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 23 Mar. 2009.
- . *The Rustick Rampant or Rurall Anarchy Affronting Monarchy: In the Insurrection of Wat Tiler*. London, 1658. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 23 Mar. 2009.
- Cordier, Mathurin. *Corderius Dialogves Translated Grammatically*. . . . London, 1636. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 15 Sept. 2009.
- Cromwell, Oliver. *Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*. Ed. and introd. Ivan Roots. London: Dent, 1989. Print.
- Cromwell's Conspiracy. A Tragy-Comedy, Relating to Our Latter Times. Beginning at the Death of Charles the First, and Ending with the Happy Restauration of King Charles the Second*. London, 1660. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 2 Dec. 2007.

- Cureau de la Chambre, Marin. *A Discourse of the Knowledg of Beasts, Wherein All That Hath Been Said for, and against Their Ratiocination, Is Examined*. London, 1657 [1658]. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 2 Dec. 2007.
- . *A Physical Discourse Touching the Nature and Effects of the Courageous Passions Viz. Boldness, Constancy, and Anger*. London, 1658. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 2 Dec. 2007.
- Curtius, Benedictus. *Hortorum Libri Triginta. In quibus continetur arborum historia, partim ex probatissimis quibusq; autoribus, partim exipsius autoris obseruatione collecta*. Lugduni, 1560. Microfilm. *French Books Printed Before 1601*. Film 4265, roll 119, item 4. Dist. General Microfilm. Cambridge, MA, 1985.
- d'Andilly, Arnould. *The Manner of Ordering Fruit-Trees*. . . . Trans. anon. London, 1660. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 24 Oct. 2009.
- Davenant, William. *Gondibert*. Ed. David F. Gladish. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971. Print.
- . *The Temple of Love*. 1635. Orgel and Strong 599-604.
- Denham, John. *Coopers Hill*. 1642, 1655. *Expans'd Hieroglyphicks: A Critical Edition of Sir John Denham's Coopers Hill*. Brendan O Hehir. Berkeley: U of California P, 1969. 109-34; 137-62. Print.
- Dewsbury, William. *The Discovery of the Great Enmity of the Serpent against the Seed of the Woman* London, 1655. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 13 Nov. 2007.
- Donne, John. "An Anatomy of the World. The First Anniversary." *John Donne*. Ed. John Carey. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990. Print.
- Evelyn, John. "Animadversions." *An Essay on the First Book of T. Lucretius Carus De rerum natura*. London, 1656. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 12 Oct. 2009.
- . *Elysium Britannicum, or The Royal Gardens*. Ed. John E. Ingram. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2001. Print. Penn Studies in Landscape Architecture.
- . *John Evelyn's Translation of Titus Lucretius Carus De rerum natura: An Old-Spelling Critical Edition*. Ed. Michael M. Repetzki. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000. Print. Münster Monographs on English Literature 22.
- . *Kalendarium Hortense, or, The Gard'ners Almanac Directing What He Is to Do Monethly throughout the Year, and What Fruits and Flowers Are in Prime*. London, 1666. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 24 Oct. 2009.
- . *Numismata, a Discourse of Medals, Ancient and Modern*. . . . London, 1697. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 10 Oct. 2007.

- . *The Writings of John Evelyn*. Ed. Guy de la Bédoyère. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995. Print.
- Fairfax, Thomas. Proclamation. [London], 24 July 1649. *EEBO*. ProQuest. Web. 27 June 2007.
- The Faithful, Yet Imperfect, Character of a Glorious King, King Charles I. His Country's and Religions Martyr*. London, 1660. *EEBO*. ProQuest. Web. 2 Dec. 2007.
- Fane, Mildmay. "Occasioned by Seeing a Walk of Bay Trees." 1648. *Ben Jonson and the Cavalier Poets*. Ed. Hugh Maclean. New York: Norton, 1974. 204. Print.
- Fannant, Thomas. *A Trve Relation of That Memorable Parliament, which Wrought Wonders. Begun at Westminster, in the Tenth Yeare of the Reigne of K. Richard the Second. Whereunto is Added an Abstract of Those Memorable Matters, before and since the Said Kings Reigne, Done by Parliaments. Together with a Character of the Said Amiable, but Unhappy King, and a Briefe Story of His Life and Lamentable Death*. N.p., 1641. *EEBO*. ProQuest. Web. 24 Mar. 2009.
- Favent, Thomas. *Historia siue narracio de modo et forma Mirabilis Parliamenti apud Westmonasterium anno Domini Millesimo CCCLXXXVJ, Regni Vero Regis Ricardi Secundi post Conquestum anno Decimo, per Thomam Fauent clericum indictata*. Ed. May McKisack. Camden Miscellany 14. Camden 3rd ser. 37. London: Offices of the Society, 1926. Print.
- Favent, Thomas. *History or Narration Concerning the Manner and Form of the Miraculous Parliament at Westminster in the Year 1386, in the Tenth Year of the Reign of King Richard the Second after the Conquest, Declared by Thomas Favent, Clerk*. Trans. Andrew Galloway. *The Letter of the Law: Legal Practice and Literary Production in Medieval England*. Ed. Emily Steiner and Candace Barrington. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2002. 231-52. Print.
- F[isher], P[ayne]. *The Tombes, Monuments, And Sepulchral Inscriptions, Lately Visible in St. Pauls Cathedral, And St. Faith's under it. Completely Rendred In Latin and English, With Several Historical Discourses, On Sundry Persons Intombed therein. A Work Never yet Performed by any Author Old or New*. London, [1684?]. *EEBO*. ProQuest. Web. 10 July 2007.
- Fisher, Samuel. *Christianismus redivivus: Christndom Both Un-christ'ned and New-christ'ned*. . . . London, 1655. *EEBO*. ProQuest. Web. 13 Nov. 2007.
- Fuller, Thomas. *The History of the Worthies of England Who for Parts and Learning Have Been Eminent in The Several Counties: Together with an Historical Narrative of the Native Commodities and Rarities in Each County*. London, 1662. *EEBO*. ProQuest. Web. 10 Mar. 2007.

- . *The Holy State*. Cambridge, 1642. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 13 Nov. 2007.
- Gillespie, George. *Aarons Rod Blossoming. Or, The Divine Ordinance of Church-Government Vindicated*. . . . London, 1646. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 16 Apr. 2007.
- H., T. *Iter Boreale, the Second Part, Relating the Progress of the Lord General Monk, Calling in the Secluded Members, their Voting King CHARLS the Second Home, His Joyfull Reception at Dover. And His Glorious Conduct through London, to His Royal Palace at White Hall*. London, 1660. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 2 Dec. 2007.
- Hall, John, of Richmond. *Of Government and Obedience, As they stand Directed and Determined by Scripture and Reason. Four Books*. London, 1654. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 2 July 2007.
- Hall, Joseph. *Observations Of some Specialties of Divine Providence In the Life of Jos. Hall, Bishop of Norwich. Written with his own Hand. In The Shaking of the Olive-Tree. The Remaining Works Of that Incomparable Prelate Joseph Hall, D.D. Late Lord Bishop of Norwich. With Some Specialties of Divine Providence in His Life. Noted by His own Hand. Together with His Hard Measure: Written also by Himself*. London, 1660. 1-44. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 15 Apr. 2007.
- . *Via Media. The way of peace in the Five Busy Articles Commonly known by the Name of Arminius. Touching 1. Predestination. 2. The Extent of Christs Death. 3. Mans Free-will and Corruption. 4. The Manner of Our Conversion to God. 5. Perseverance. In The Shaking of the Olive-Tree. The Remaining Works Of that Incomparable Prelate Joseph Hall, D.D. Late Lord Bishop of Norwich. With Some Specialties of Divine Providence in His Life. Noted by His own Hand. Together with His Hard Measure: Written also by Himself*. London, 1660. 351-88. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 15 Apr. 2007.
- Harris, John. *Englands Out-Cry, for the Sad Distractions Now Lying upon the Church and State*. . . . London, 1644. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 24 Oct. 2009.
- Hawkins, Henry. *Partheneia Sacra. Or the Mysterious and Delicious Garden of the Sacred Parthenes Symbolically Set Forth and Enriched with Pious Deuses and Emblemes for the Entertainment of Deuout Soules*. . . . [Rouen], 1633. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 25 Sept. 2009.
- Herodotus. *Herodotus in Four Volumes*. Trans. A.D. Godley. Vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1966. Print. Loeb Classical Library.
- Heylyn, Peter. *The Rebells Catechism. Composed in an Easy and Familiar Way; To Let Them See, the Heinousness of Their Offence, the Weakness of Their Strongest Subterfuges; and to Recal Them to Their Duties both to God and Man*. [Oxford?], 1643. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 2 Sept. 2007.

- [Holland, Philemon]. *Cyrus Le Grand the Entire Story*. . . . [London], 1654. *EEBO*. ProQuest. Web. 5 Jan. 2006.
- The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments*. Giant Print Ed. Nashville: Holman, 1982. Authorized King James Vers. Print.
- The Holy Bible, Translated from the Latin Vulgate*. . . . New York: Kenedy, 1844. Douay-Rheims Vers. Print.
- Hooker, Richard. *Of the Lavves of Ecclesiasticall Politie Eight Bookes*. London, 1604. *EEBO*. ProQuest. Web. 14 Apr. 2007.
- Hooper, John. "Hooper's Injunctions for Gloucester and Worcester Dioceses. 1551-52." *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*. Ed. and introd. Walter Howard Frere and William McClure Kennedy. Vol. 2. London: Longmans, Green, 1910. 279-90. Print.
- Johnson, Samuel. "Cowley." *Lives of the English Poets*. Vol. 1. Introd. Arthur Waugh. London: Oxford UP, 1942. 1-54. Print.
- . "The Life of Sir Thomas Browne." Patrides, *Major Works* 483-511.
- Jonson, Ben. *Ben Jonson*. Ed. C.H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson. 1947. 11 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954-65. Print.
- The Iust Reward of Rebels, or, The Life and Death of Jack Straw, and Wat Tyler*. . . . London, 1642. *EEBO*. ProQuest. Web. 24 Mar. 2009.
- A Letter from a Person of Quality in Edenburgh to an Officer of the Army, Wherein Is Given a True Accompt of General Moncks Proceedings, Dated the 25th. of October, 1659*. London: [1659]. *EEBO*. ProQuest. Web. 2 Dec. 2007.
- The Life and Death of King Richard the Second*. . . . London, 1642. *EEBO*. ProQuest. Web. 23 Mar. 2009.
- Marshall, William. Frontispiece. *Eikon Basilike. The Pourtraicture of His Sacred Majestie in His Solitudes and Sufferings: Together with His Private Prayers Used in the Time of His Restraint, and Delivered to Dr. Juxon, Bishop of London, Immediately before His Death*. By Charles I. [London?], 1649. S4v-S5r. *EEBO*. Wing E306. ProQuest. Web. 25 Sept. 2009.
- Marvell, Andrew. *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*. Ed. Nigel Smith. 2003. Rev. ed. Harlow: Pearson, 2007. Print.
- . *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. Ed. Martin Dzelzainis. *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*. Ed. Annabel Patterson, Martin Dzelzainis, N.H. Keeble, and Nicholas von Maltzahn. Vol. 1. New Haven: Yale UP, 2003. 41-203. Print. 2 vols.

- Matthieu, Pierre. *The Heroyk Life and Deplorable Death of the Most Christian King Henry the Fourth. Adressed to His Immortal Memory*. Trans. Ed. Grimeston. London, 1612. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 10 Sept. 2009.
- McCutcheon, Elizabeth. *Sir Nicholas Bacon's Great House Sententiae: The Latin Text along with the First English Translation, and Introduction, Notes, and Bibliography*. [Honolulu]: U of Hawaii P, 1977. Print.
- Melancholicus, Mercurius. *Craftie Cromwell: or, Oliver Ordering Our New State. A Tragi-Comedie. Wherein Is Discovered the Trayterous Undertakings and Proceedings of the Said Nol, and His Levelling Crew*. [London], 1648. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 7 June 2009.
- Merke, Thomas. *A Pious and Learned Speech Delivered in the High Court of Parliament, 1. H. 4. by Thomas Mercks Then Bishop of Carlile. . . .* London, [1642?]. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 24 Mar. 2009.
- Mewe, William. *The Robbing and Spoiling of Jacob and Israel Considered and Bewailed, in a Sermon Preached at Westminster before the Honourable House of Commons, at the Late Solemn Fast, Nov. 29, 1643*. London, 1643. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 14 Oct. 2009.
- Milton, John. *A Defence of the People of England*. 1651. Trans. Donald C. Mackenzie. *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*. Vol. 4. Ed. Don M. Wolfe. New Haven: Yale UP, 1966. 298-537. Print.
- . *Paradise Lost. Complete Poems and Major Prose*. Ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1957. 207-469. Print.
- Parkinson, John. *Theatrum Botanicum, the Theater of Plantes. Or, an Universall and Compleate Herball*. London, 1640. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 4 Dec. 2008.
- The People Informed of Their Oppressors and Oppressions. With a Remedy against Both. Unto Which Is Added the Sentence of Deposition against King Richard the Second, and Edward the Second; with the Happiness That Ensued to This Nation Thereupon*. London, [1648]. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 15 Sept. 2009.
- A Prospective Glasse Wherein Englands Bondage under the Normane Yoke, with the Rise, Growth, and Continuation Is Clearly Asserted. . . .* London, 1649. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 16 Apr. 2007.
- Prynne, William. *The Antipathie of the English Lordly Prelacie, Both to Regall Monarchy, and Civill Unity. . . .* London, 1641. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 24 Oct. 2009.

- . *Histrio-Mastix: The Players Scourge, or, Actors Tragaedie*. . . . London, 1633. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 13 Nov. 2007.
- . *Mount-Orgueil: or Divine and Profitable Meditations, Raised from the Contemplation of These Three Leaves of Natures Volume, 1. Rockes, 2. Seas, 3. Gardens, Digested into Three Distinct Poems*. London, 1641. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 23 Jan. 2007.
- . *Part of the Famous Speech of William Prynn Esq, Decemb. 48. Touching K. Charles I.* [London], [1648]. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 24 Mar. 2009.
- . *The Soveraigne Povver of Parliaments and Kingdomes*. . . . London, 1643. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 13 Nov. 2007.
- . *The Substance of a Speech Made in the House of Commons by Wil. Prynn of Lincolns-Inn, Esquire, on Munday the fourth of December, 1648*. . . . London, 1649. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 5 Sept. 2009.
- Puttenham, George. *The Arte of English Poesie Contruiued into Three Bookes: The First of Poets and Poesie, the Second of Proportion, the Third of Ornament*. London, 1589. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 10 Nov. 2006.
- Quintilian. *The Orator's Education*. Ed. and trans. Donald A. Russell. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2001. Print. Loeb Classical Library 126.
- Raleigh, Walter. *The Prince, or, Maxims of State*. London, 1642. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 20 Apr. 2007.
- Rider, John. *Bibliotheca Scholastica. A Double Dictionarie, Penned for All Those That Would Haue within Short Space the Vse of the Latin Tongue, Either to Speake, or Write*. . . . [Oxford,] 1589. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 15 Sept. 2009.
- Rochester, John Wilmot, Earl of. "A Ramble in St. James's Park." *The Complete Works*. Ed. Frank H. Ellis. London: Penguin, 1994. 31-35.
- Rutherford, Samuel. *Lex, Rex: The Law and the Prince: A Dispute for the Just Prerogative of King and People*. . . . London, 1644. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 13 Nov. 2007.
- . *The Tryal & Triumph of Faith: or, An Exposition of the History of Christs Dispossessioning of the Daughter of the Woman of Canaan*. . . . London, 1652. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 24 Oct. 2009.
- Sallust. *Bellum Catilinae*. Sallust. Trans. J.C. Rolfe. 1921. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1965. 1-129. Print. Loeb Classical Library.
- Scudéry, [Madeleine de]. *Artamenes, or The Grand Cyrus an Excellent New Romance*. Trans. F.G. London, 1653-55. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 26 Jan. 2006.

Semedo, Alvaro. *The History of That Great and Renowned Monarchy of China Wherein All the Particular Provinces Are Accurately Described, As Also the Dispositions, Manners, Learning, Lawes, Militia, Government, and Religion of the People: Together with the Traffick and Commodities of That Countrey.* London, 1655. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 2 Dec. 2007.

Seneca. *De Consolatione ad Marciam. Moral Essays.* Trans. John W. Basore. 1932. Vol. 2. London: Heinemann, 1965. 2-97. Print. Loeb Classics Library.

---. *De Consolatione ad Polybium. Moral Essays.* Trans. John W. Basore. 1932. Vol. 2. London: Heinemann, 1965. 356-415. Print. Loeb Classics Library.

Shakespeare, William. *King Henry VI, Part 2.* Ed. Andrew S. Cairncross. London: Routledge, 1995. Print. Arden Shakespeare 3rd Ser.

---. *King Richard II.* Ed. Peter Ure. London: Routledge, 1994. Print. Arden Shakespeare 3rd Ser.

-----. *The Winter's Tale.* Ed. J.H.P. Pafford. London: Routledge, 1996. Arden Shakespeare 3rd Ser.

Shirley, James. *The Triumph of Peace.* 1634. Orgel and Strong 537-53.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene.* 1590, 1596, 1609. Ed. Thomas P. Roche, Jr., and C. Patrick O'Donnell, Jr. London: Penguin, 1978. Rpt. 1987. Print.

[Taylor, Jeremy]. *A Collection of Offices or Forms of Prayer in Cases Ordinary and Extraordinary. Taken out of the Scriptures and the Ancient Liturgies of Several Churches, Especially the Greek. Together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, According to the Kings Translations; with Arguments to the Same.* London, 1658 [1657]. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 26 May 2007.

[Thornborough], Bristol, John. *A Discourse Shewing the Great Happiness That Hath and May Still Accrue to His Majesties Kingdomes of England and Scotland by Re-Uniting Them into One Great Britain in Two Parts.* London, 1641. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 2 Dec. 2007.

Tomkins, Thomas. *The Rebels Plea, or, Mr. Baxters Judgment Concerning the Late Wars. . . .* London, 1660. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 24 Oct. 2009.

Townshend, Aurelian. *Albion's Triumph.* 1632. Orgel and Strong 453-58.

Ussher, James. *The Rights of Primogeniture, or, The Excellency of Royall Authority in a Sermon Preached before His Majesty in the Isle of Wight, upon the Anniversary of His Birth-Day.* London, 1648. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 2 Dec. 2007.

- Vicars, John. *GOD in the Mount. Or, Englands Remembrancer. Being a Panegyrick Piramides, Erected to the Everlasting High Honour of Englands God.* . . . London, 1642. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 26 June 2009.
- Virgil. *The Aeneid*. Trans. Robert Fitzgerald. New York: Vintage, 1990. Print. Vintage Classics.
- Waller, Edmund. "On St. James's Park, As Lately Improved by His Majesty." *Seventeenth-Century Poetry: 1603-1660*. Ed. John P. Rumrich and Gregory Chaplin. New York: Norton, 2006. 370-73. Print.
- Winstanley, Gerrard. *The Works of Gerrard Winstanley with an Appendix of Documents Relating to the Digger Movement*. Ed. George H. Sabine. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1941. Print.
- Xenophon. *The Anabasis of Cyrus, Books 1-3*. Trans. Carleton L. Brownson. *Xenophon in Seven Volumes*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1950. 241-493. Print. Loeb Classical Library.
- . *Cyrupaedia. The Institution and Life of Cyrus, the First of That Name, King of Persians.* . . . Trans. Philemon Holland. London, 1632. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 5 Jan. 2006.
- . *Cyrus le Grand the Entire Story Done into English by a Person of Quality and Dedicated to the Late King*. Trans. [Philemon Holland]. [London], 1654. EEBO. ProQuest. Web. 9 Jan. 2007.
- . *Oeconomicus*. Trans. E.C. Marchant. *Xenophon in Seven Volumes*. Vol. 4. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1968. 361-525. Print. Loeb Classical Library.

Secondary Sources

- Allen, Don Cameron. *Image and Meaning: Metaphoric Traditions in Renaissance Poetry*. 1960. Rev. ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins P, 1968. Print.
- Aronson, Nicole. *Mademoiselle de Scudéry*. Trans. Stuart R. Aronson. Boston: Twayne, 1978. Print.
- Atherton, Ian. "Reynolds, Edward (1599-1676)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004; online, Jan. 2009. Web. 25 Oct. 2009.
- Ballard, Thomas. *A Catalogue of the Libraries of Sir Thomas Browne and Dr. Edward Browne, His Son*. 1710/11. Facsimile ed. Ed. Jeremiah S. Finch. Leiden: Brill / Leiden UP, 1986. Print. Publications of the Sir Thomas Browne Institute, Leiden. New Ser. 7.

- Breiner, Laurence A. "The Generation of Metaphor in Thomas Browne." *Modern Language Quarterly* 38 (1977): 261-75. Print.
- Bushnell, Rebecca W. *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996. Print.
- Cairncross, Andrew S. Introduction. *King Henry VI, Part 2*. By William Shakespeare. Ed. Cairncross. London: Routledge, 1995. xi-liv. Print. Arden Shakespeare 3rd Ser.
- Chambers, Douglas. "'Elysium Britannicum not printed neere ready &c': The 'Elysium Britannicum' in the Correspondence of John Evelyn." O'Malley and Wolschke-Bulmahn 107-130.
- . "Evelyn, John (1620-1706)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004; online, Jan. 2008. Web. 28 Oct. 2009.
- . "'To the Abbyss': Gothic as a Metaphor for the Argument about Art and Nature in 'Upon Appleton House.'" Summers and Pebworth 139-53.
- . "'Wild Pastorall Encounter': John Evelyn, John Beale and the Renegotiation of Pastoral in the Mid-Seventeenth Century." Leslie and Raylor 173-94.
- Coffey, John. "Rutherford, Samuel (c. 1600-1661)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004; online, Oct. 2009. Web. 24 Oct. 2009.
- Coffin, David R. *The English Garden: Meditation and Memorial*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994. Print.
- Coiro, Ann Baynes. "'A ball of strife': Caroline Poetry and Royal Marriage." Corns 26-46.
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. Letter to Sara Hutchinson. 10 March 1804. *Marginalia*. Ed. George Whalley. *Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*. Ed. Kathleen Coburn and Bart Winer. Vol. 12. London: Routledge, 1980. 449. Print. Bollingen Ser. 75.
- Colie, Rosalie L. *"My Ecchoing Song": Andrew Marvell's Poetry of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1970. Print.
- Collinson, Patrick. "Elizabeth I (1533-1603)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004; online, May 2008. Web. 3 Nov. 2009.
- . "Sir Nicholas Bacon and the Elizabethan *Via Media*." *Historical Journal* 23.2 (1980): 255-73. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 June 2007.
- Comito, Terry. *The Idea of the Garden in the Renaissance*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1978. Print.

- Considine, John. "Holland, Philemon (1552-1637)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 20 Oct. 2007.
- Corns, Thomas N. "Duke, Prince and King." Corns, *Royal Image* 1-25.
- Corns, Thomas N., ed. *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.
- Coupland, W.H. "Sir Thomas Browne, Knt." *Edinburgh Medical Journal* 17 (Apr. 1905): 378-89.
- Craze, Michael. *The Life and Lyrics of Andrew Marvell*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1979. Print.
- Curlin, Jay Russell. "'Is There No Temperate Region . . .?': *Coopers Hill* and the Call for Moderation." *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*. Ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1999. 119-29. *Google Books*. Web. 26 Oct. 2009.
- Donagan, Barbara. "Lucas, Sir Charles (1612/13-1648)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 26 April 2007.
- Drujon, Fernand. *Les livres à clef. Etude de bibliographie critique et analytique pour servir à l'histoire littéraire*. Paris, 1888. Print.
- Duncan-Jones, E.E. "Two Notes on Marvell." *Review of English Studies: A Quarterly Journal of English Literature and the English Language* 52.206 (2001): 192-94. New ser. *ProQuest*. Web. 20 Oct. 2009.
- Dunn, William P. *Sir Thomas Browne: A Study in Religious Philosophy*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1950. Print.
- Finch, Jeremiah S. *Sir Thomas Browne: A Doctor's Life of Science & Faith*. New York: Henry Schuman, 1950. Print.
- , "Sir Thomas Browne and the Quincunx." *Studies in Philology* 37 (1940): 274-82. Print.
- Fish, Stanley. *Surprised by Sin: The Reader in Paradise Lost*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1971. Print.
- Gentles, Ian J. "Fairfax, Thomas, third Lord Fairfax of Cameron (1612-1671)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004; online, Jan. 2008. 6 June 2009.
- Giamatti, A. Bartlett. *The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1966. Print.

- Gill, Catie. "Dewsbury, William (c. 1621-1688)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 24 Oct. 2009.
- Gladish, David F. Introduction. *Sir William Davenant's Gondibert*. By Davenant. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971. ix-xlv. Print.
- Gosse, Edmund. *Sir Thomas Browne*. New York: Macmillan, 1905. Print.
- Greene, Thomas M. "The Balance of Power in Marvell's 'Horatian Ode.'" *ELH* 60.2 (1993): 379-96. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 Sept. 2009.
- Guibbory, Achsah. "'A rationall of old Rites': Sir Thomas Browne's *Urn Buriall* and the Conflict over Ceremony." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991): 229-41. Print.
- Gurney, John. *Brave Community: The Digger Movement in the English Revolution*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2007. Print.
- Halley, Janet E. "Sir Thomas Browne's *The Garden of Cyrus* and the Real Character." *English Literary Renaissance* 15.1 (1985): 100-121. Print.
- Harris, Frances. "The Manuscripts of the 'Elysium Britannicum.'" Evelyn, *Elysium* 13-19.
- Hayes, T. Wilson. *Winstanley the Digger: A Literary Analysis of Radical Ideas in the English Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1979. Print.
- Hill, Christopher. "Milton and Marvell." *Approaches to Marvell: The York Tercentenary Lectures*. Ed. C.A. Patrides. London: Routledge, 1978. 1-30. Print.
- . *The Religion of Gerrard Winstanley*. Oxford: Past and Present Society, 1978. Print.
- Hirst, Derek, and Steven Zwicker. "Andrew Marvell and the Toils of Patriarchy: Fatherhood, Longing, and the Body Politic." *ELH* 66.3 (1999): 629-54. *Project MUSE*. Web. 18 June 2009.
- Hirst, Derek, and Steven Zwicker. "High Summer at Nun Appleton, 1651: Andrew Marvell and Lord Fairfax's Occasions." *The Historical Journal* 36.2 (1993): 247-69. *JSTOR*. Web. 2 Mar. 2009.
- Hodge, R.I.V. *Foreshortened Time: Andrew Marvell and Seventeenth Century Revolutions*. Cambridge: Brewer, 1978. Print.
- Holstun, James. "Rational Hunger: Gerrard Winstanley's *Hortus Inconclusus*." *Pamphlet Wars: Prose in the English Revolution*. Ed. James Holstun. London: Frank Cass, 1992. 158-204. Print.
- Hopper, Andrew. *"Black Tom": Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English Revolution*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2007. Print.

- Horowitz, Maryanne Cline. *Seeds of Virtue and Knowledge*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1998. Print.
- Hunt, John Dixon. *Garden and Grove: The Italian Renaissance Garden in the English Imagination, 1600-1750*. 1986. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1996. Print.
- Hunter, Michael. "John Evelyn in the 1650s: A Virtuoso in Quest of a Role." O'Malley and Wolschke-Bulmahn 79-106.
- Huntley, Frank L. "The Garden of Cyrus As Prophecy." Patrides, *Approaches* 132-42.
- . *Sir Thomas Browne: A Biographical and Critical Study*. [Ann Arbor]: U of Michigan P, 1968. Print.
- . "Sir Thomas Browne: The Relationship of *Urn Burial* and *The Garden of Cyrus*." *Studies in Philology* 53 (1956): 204-19. Print.
- Imbesi, Antonio, and Anna De Pasquale. "Citrus Species and Their Essential Oils in Traditional Medicine." *Citrus: The Genus Citrus*. Ed. Giovanni Dugo and Angelo Di Giacomo. London: Taylor & Francis, 2002. 577-601. Print.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst Hartwig. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957. Print.
- Kegl, Rosemary. "'Joyning my Labour to my Pain': The Politics of Labor in Marvell's Mower Poems." *Soliciting Interpretation: Literary Theory and Seventeenth-Century English Poetry*. Ed. Elizabeth D. Harvey and Katharine Eisaman Maus. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990. 89-118. Print.
- Kelly, L.G. "Fairfax, Edward (1568?-1632x5?)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004; online, Jan. 2008. Web. 6 June 2009.
- Kenyon, Timothy. *Utopian Communism and Political Thought in Early Modern England*. London: Pinter, 1989. Print.
- Kishlansky, Mark A. *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*. London: Penguin, 1996. Print.
- Kishlansky, Mark A., and John Morrill. "Charles I (1600-1649)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004; online, Oct. 2008. Web. 20 Aug. 2009.
- Knachel, Philip A. *England and the Fronde: The Impact of the English Civil War and Revolution on France*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1967. Print.
- Knott, John R., Jr. "Sir Thomas Browne and the Labyrinth of Truth." Patrides, *Approaches* 19-30.

- Lake, Peter. "The Moderate and Irenic Case for Religious War: Joseph Hall's *Via Media* in Context." *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England: Essays Presented to David Underdown*. Eds. Susan D. Amussen and Mark A. Kishlansky. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995. 55-83. Print.
- Lamont, William. "Prynne, William (1600-1669)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004; online, Jan. 2008. Web. 10 June 2009.
- Larson, Charles. "Fairfax's Wood: Marvell and Seventeenth-Century Trees." *Durham University Journal* 80 (1987): 27-35. Print.
- Legouis, Pierre. *Andrew Marvell: Poet, Puritan, Patriot*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965. Print.
- Leslie, Michael. "'Bringing Ingenuity into Fashion': The 'Elysium Britannicum' and the Reformation of Husbandry." O'Malley and Wolschke-Bulmahn 131-52.
- Leslie, Michael, and Timothy Raylor. *Culture and Cultivation in Early Modern England: Writing and the Land*. Leicester: Leicester UP, 1992. Print.
- Levine, Joseph M. "John Evelyn: Between the Ancients and the Moderns." O'Malley and Wolschke-Bulmahn 57-78.
- Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. *Donne's Anniversaries and the Poetry of Praise: The Creation of a Symbolic Mode*. [Princeton]: Princeton UP, 1973. Print.
- McCabe, Richard A. "Hall, Joseph (1574-1656)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004. Web. 15 April 2007.
- McDowell, Nicholas. *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars: Marvell and the Cause of Wit*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. Print.
- McKisack, May. Preface. *Historia siue Narracio de Modo et Forma Mirabilis Parlamenti apud Westmonasterium anno Domini Millesimo CCCLXXXVJ, Regni Vero Regis Ricardi Secundi post Conquestum anno Decimo, per Thomam Fauent Clericum Indictata*. By Thomas Favent. Ed. McKisack. London: Offices of the Society, 1926. v-viii. *Camden Miscellany*. Vol. 14. Camden 3rd ser. Vol. 37. Print.
- Morrill, John. "Cromwell, Oliver (1599-1658)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004; online, May 2008. Web. 7 Sept. 2009.
- Mulder, David. *The Alchemy of Revolution: Gerrard Winstanley's Occultism and Seventeenth-Century English Communism*. New York: Peter Lang, 1990. Print. American University Studies 9. Vol. 77.

- Nathanson, Leonard. *The Strategy of Truth: A Study of Sir Thomas Browne*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1967. Print.
- Norbrook, David. *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- OED*. Oxford UP. Web. June 2005-Oct. 2009.
- Oliver, Clementine. "A Political Pamphleteer in Chaucer's London: Thomas Fovent, Geoffrey Chaucer, Thomas Usk, and the Merciless Parliament of 1388." TS. Fifteenth International Congress of the New Chaucer Society. New York City. July 27-31, 2006. *California State U, Northridge*. Web. 10 June 2009. <<http://www.csun.edu/csbs/events/presentations/oliver.pdf>>.
- . "A Political Pamphleteer in Late Medieval England: Thomas Fovent, Geoffrey Chaucer, Thomas Usk, and the Merciless Parliament of 1388." *New Medieval Literatures*. Ed. David Lawton, Rita Copeland, and Wendy Scase. Vol. 6. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003. 167-98. Print.
- O'Malley, Therese. "Introduction to John Evelyn and the 'Elysium Britannicum.'" O'Malley and Wolschke-Bulmahn 9-33.
- O'Malley, Therese, and Joachim Wolschke-Bulmahn, eds. *John Evelyn's "Elysium Britannicum" and European Gardening*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1998. Print.
- Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong. *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court. Including the Complete Designs for Productions at Court for the Most Part in the Collection of the Duke of Devonshire Together with Their Texts and Historical Documentation*. Vol. 2. London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973. Print.
- Orwen, William R. "Marvell's 'Bergamot.'" *Notes and Queries* Aug. 1955: 340-41. *Oxford Journals*. Oxford UP, 2005. Web. 13 Mar. 2009.
- Parry, Graham. "John Evelyn As Hortulan Saint." Leslie and Raylor 130-50.
- Patrides, C.A., ed. *Approaches to Sir Thomas Browne: The Ann Arbor Tercentenary Lectures and Essays*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1982. Print.
- . "'The Best Part of Nothing': Sir Thomas Browne and the Strategy of Indirection." Patrides, *Approaches* 31-48.
- , ed. *The Major Works*. By Sir Thomas Browne. London: Penguin, 1977. Print.
- Peacock, John. "The Visual Image of Charles I." *Corns* 176-239.

- Phillips, John. *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1660*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1973. Print.
- Post, Jonathan F.S. *English Lyric Poetry: The Early Seventeenth Century*. London: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- . *Sir Thomas Browne*. Boston: Twayne, 1987. Print.
- Prest, John. *The Garden of Eden: The Botanic Garden and the Re-Creation of Paradise*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1981. Print.
- Preston, Claire. *Bee*. London: Reaktion, 2006. Print.
- . "Of Cyder and Sallets: The Hortulan Saints and *The Garden of Cyrus*." *Literature Compass* 3.4 (2006): 867-883. Web. 8 Mar. 2007.
- . *Thomas Browne and the Writing of Early Modern Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.
- . "'Unriddling the World': Sir Thomas Browne and the Doctrine of Signatures." *Critical Survey* 5.3 (1993): 263-70. Print.
- Pritchard, Allan. "Marvell's 'The Garden': A Restoration Poem?" *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 23.3 (1983): 371-88. *JSTOR*. Web. 22 Aug. 2009.
- Ranum, Orest. Rev. of *Revising Memory, Women's Fiction and Memoirs in Seventeenth-Century France*, by Faith Beasley, and *Tender Geographies: Women and the Origins of the Novel in France*, by Joan Dejean. French issue of *MLN* 107.4 (1992): 810-16. *JSTOR*. Web. 12 Feb. 2006.
- Rauber, Donald. "Sir Thomas Browne: A Study in the Middle Way." Diss. U of Oregon, 1958. Microfilm. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms. Doctoral Dissertation Ser. 24, 946.
- Raylor, Timothy. "Samuel Hartlib and the Commonwealth of Bees." Leslie and Raylor 91-129.
- Raymond, Joad. "Popular Representations of Charles I." *Corns* 47-73.
- Revard, Stella P. "Thomas Stanley and 'A Register of Friends.'" *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*. Ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 2000. 148-72.
- Robbins, R.H. "Browne, Sir Thomas (1605-1682)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 2 April 2007.
- Rogers, John. "The Great Work of Time: Marvell's Pastoral Historiography." Summers and Pebworth 207-32.

- . *The Matter of Revolution: Science, Poetry, and Politics in the Age of Milton*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1996. Print.
- Ryrie, Alec. "Brinklow, Henry (d. 1545/6)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004; online, Jan. 2008. Web. 24 Oct. 2009.
- Sabine, George H. Introduction. *The Works of Gerrard Winstanley with an Appendix of Documents Relating to the Digger Movement*. By Winstanley. Ed. Sabine. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1941. 1-70. Print.
- Sainty, J.C. "Browne, John (c. 1608-1691)." Rev. ed. *ODNB*. Oxford UP, 2004; online, Jan. 2008. Web. 10 June 2009.
- Scodel, Joshua. *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2002. Print. Literature in History.
- Seaward, Paul. "Charles II (1630-1685)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004; online, Jan. 2008. Web. 25 Oct. 2009.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies*. London: Pinter, 1989. Print.
- Shulman, George M. *Radicalism and Reverence: The Political Thought of Gerrard Winstanley*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1989.
- Singer, Thomas C. "Sir Thomas Browne's 'Emphaticall decussation, or fundamentall figure: Geometrical Hieroglyphs and *The Garden of Cyrus*.'" *English Literary Renaissance* 17.1 (1987): 85-102. Print.
- Small, Alastair, and Carola Small. "John Evelyn and the Garden of Epicurus." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 60 (1997): 194-214. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Oct. 2009.
- Smith, David L. *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c. 1640-1649*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. Print. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History.
- Smith, Nigel. "Gerrard Winstanley and the Literature of Revolution." *Winstanley and the Diggers, 1649-1999*. Ed. Andrew Bradstock. London: Frank Cass, 2000. 47-60. Print.
- . *Literature and Revolution in England, 1640-1660*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1994. Print.
- , ed. *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*. By Marvell. 2003. Rev. ed. Harlow: Pearson, 2007. Print.

- Stewart, Stanley. *The Enclosed Garden: The Tradition and the Image in Seventeenth-Century Poetry*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1966. Print.
- Strong, Roy. *The Renaissance Garden in England*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1998. Print.
- Summers, Claude J., and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds. *On the Celebrated and Neglected Poems of Andrew Marvell*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1992.
- Swann, Marjorie. *Curiosities and Texts: The Culture of Collecting in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2001. Print. Material Texts.
- Sweitzer, Amy Hope Dudley. "The Natural Church: Religion and Community in England, 1640-1660." Diss. U of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2005. *Dissertations & Theses @ University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*. ProQuest. Web. 8 Oct. 2007.
- [Taylor, Jeremy.] *A Collection of offices or Forms of Prayer in Cases Ordinary and Extraordinary. Taken out of the Scriptures and the ancient Liturgies of several Churches, especially the Greek. Together with The Psalter or Psalms of David, according to the Kings Translations; with Arguments to the Same*. London, 1658 [1657]. *EEBO*. ProQuest. Web. 26 May 2007.
- Taylor, John. "Favent, Thomas (fl. 1388-1400)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004. Web. 10 June 2009.
- Thomas, Keith. *Man and the Natural World: A History of the Modern Sensibility*. New York: Pantheon, 1983. Print.
- Tittler, Robert. "Bacon, Sir Nicholas (1510-1579)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004. Web. 18 Nov. 2005.
- . *Nicholas Bacon: The Making of a Tudor Statesman*. Athens: Ohio UP, 1976. Print.
- Ure, Peter. Introduction. *King Richard II*. By William Shakespeare. Ed. Ure. London: Routledge, 1994. xiii-lxxxiii. Print. Arden Shakespeare 3rd Ser.
- Verkamp, Bernard J. *The Indifferent Mean: Adiaphorism in the English Reformation to 1554*. Athens, OH, and Detroit, MI: Ohio UP and Wayne State UP, 1977. Print.
- Wainwright, Jonathan P. "The King's Music." *Corns* 162-75.
- Wallace, John M. "Coopers Hill: The Manifesto of Parliamentary Royalism, 1641." *ELH* 41.4 (1974): 494-540. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Oct. 2009.
- Walter, John. "Lucas, John, first Baron Lucas of Shenfield (1606-1671)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, Sept. 2004. Web. 26 Apr. 2007.

- Webster, Charles. *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform, 1626-1660*. 1975. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1976. Print.
- Wilcher, Robert. "Moseley, Humphrey (b. in or before 1603, d. 1661)." *ODNB*. Oxford UP, 2004. Web. 7 Aug. 2007.
- Wilding, Michael. "Marvell's 'An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland,' the Levellers, and the Junta." *Modern Language Review* 82.1 (1987): 1-14. *JSTOR*. Web. 25 Sept. 2009.
- Williams, Arnold. *The Common Expositor: An Account of the Commentaries on Genesis 1527-1633*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1948. Print.
- Wortham, Christopher. "Marvell's Cromwell Poems: An Accidental Triptych." *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell*. Ed. Conal Condren and A.D. Cousins. Aldershot: Scolar, 1990. 16-52. Print.