



Linnéuniversitetet
Kalmar Vaxjö

Master's Thesis

Utopia Between Ciceronian Humanism and Imperialism



Author: Mohamad Almokhlali
Supervisor: Per Sivefors
Examinator: Niklas Salmose
Date: HT21
Subject: English
Level: Advanced Level, 30 Credits
Course code: 5EN30E



Abstract

The premise of this thesis is to show how imperialism is an extension of Ciceronian humanism in More's *Utopia*. Core Ciceronian premises, such as rhetoric and the *vita activa* in relation to imperialism are explored. Cicero called for liberating the barbarians from their savage state by dint of turning them into civic agents that enjoy their legal rights in a civil society by virtue of using rhetoric. Cicero's *vita activa* is implemented by practicing philosophy of the *vita activa* and being active to serve the commonwealth outwardly (other commonwealths). This thesis shows that More's *Utopia* is constructed upon Cicero's ethical man; the Utopians are presented as the best people, for they are morally superior. Consequently, they are the best people to rule other commonwealths (imperialism).

This thesis will also show that the ecology in *Utopia* is colonized and cultivated by the Utopians. The process of cultivation is implemented by virtue of the *studia humanitatis* and, the ecology is subordinated to the conquerors' reason, which will be illustrated in this thesis. In addition, this thesis will highlight the similarities between the account of Cicero and More in relation to imperialism and chauvinism. Cicero's discourse has chauvinism in his depiction of the Gauls and imperialism in his account of Romulus. Similarly, Hythloday's account of Utopus and the Utopians is imperialistic; *Utopia* valorizes imperialist rhetoric by justifying seizing the lands of the barbarians under the pretext of civilizing them. This thesis also illustrates how More's and Cicero's rhetoric of imperialism corresponds to Herlihy-Mera's three phases of cultural conquest, namely merchants, military, and politicians.

Keywords

Imperialism, Humanism, Cicero, More, *Utopia*



Thanks

I would like to thank Per Sivefors, my Virgil, for his guidance through my intellectual journey. Without his help, I would not be able to make it to *Paradiso*. His comments and suggestions have been always to the point. He is a true mentor. Also, I would like to thank Margareta Karlsson and Maher Almubaiyed for the support and the encouragement they have given to me.



Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Rhetoric, the <i>Vita Activa</i>, and Imperialism: Cicero and Fitzmaurice	10
Ciceronian Humanism	14
Imperialism or <i>Imperium</i>	17
Chauvinism	25
Humanistic Imperialism	32
Rhetoric, the <i>Vita Activa</i>, and Imperialism in <i>Utopia</i>	47
Humanistic Cultivation of Ecology and Imperialism	54
Conclusion	62
Works Cited	65

Introduction

Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516-18) is divided into two books. The first book consists of a rhetorical exchange between More and the other characters, while the second book consists of the account of Utopia by Hythloday. This essay explores how the Ciceronian rhetoric, that is imperialistic, is extended in More's *Utopia*. In the first book More meets his friend Peter Giles and Hythloday who uses his rhetorical exchanges in order to convince his interlocutors of his best commonwealth (Utopia). Hythloday uses also rhetoric to convince cardinal Morton that Utopia is the best polis, unlike Europe and England where unjust capital punishment, poverty, wars, idleness, and theft thrive. But Hythloday implements rhetoric to give an imperialistic account of Utopia in the second book. The imperialistic genesis is made by king Utopus who vanquishes the (uncivilized) people of the Abraxas and creates Utopia by cataclysmically severing Utopia from the mainland. The Utopians know how to cultivate their gardens and ecology by dint of utilizing the Ciceronian *studia humanitatis* and focusing on science in their active life (The Ciceronian *vita activa*). But they use science in their active life to imperialize other commonwealths. At the end of the second book, Hythloday finishes his account of the Utopians. More comments that some of the laws and customs of the Utopians are absurd, but he likes to see some of them applied in society though some are hard to apply; he does not expect to see them in reality.

Following summarizing the plot, the premises of this thesis will be introduced. The focus will be on the conquest of natives and their lands. Utopia's genesis is based on imperialistic practices, for it is based on a form of aggression (seizing lands by force). In *on the Commonwealth*, Cicero narrates the genesis of Rome at the hands of Romulus, but the genesis is based on conquering the lands and the natives. The rhetoric of Utopus and Romulus is equally imperial in its form; the ontology of Rome and Utopia is based on

conquering the natives and their lands (territorial expansion). Both Utopus and Romulus create an imperium that corresponds in its fundamentals to Jeffrey Herlihy-Mera's 'cultural conquest'. Herlihy-Mera says:

It is the cultural conquest and its codification that has, since its inception as a political entity, strived to transition the image of cultural symbols of the invading communities from 'foreign' to 'natural,' 'domestic,' and ostensibly exportable, in the spaces in question. In practical terms, cultural myths (and, thus, manifestations of material culture) function as power ancillaries that accompany and follow the military conquest of a region. (23)

Here, the territorial invasion is followed by cultural and political subordination; the epistemology of the invader replaces the epistemological background of the natives. Utopus and Romulus impose their own vision of jurisdiction on the barbarians.

Furthermore, this thesis will examine how Ciceronian chauvinism is extended in More's Utopia and how chauvinism is related to imperialism. More and Cicero mention that there is a natural bond of fraternity that links humans of different commonwealths, which seems at odds with the chauvinistic nature of the Morean and Ciceronian account. For example, Cicero, in *De Officiis*,¹ says that human races are naturally linked through use of reason and discussion (53-55). The same holistic universalism is detected in the Utopians' account of universal humanism. Hythloday mentions that the bond that links the Utopians to other fellow men in other nations is natural. Cicero's and More's approach to universal humanism creates a normative image of the alterity. According to the Roman law, there are Roman citizens (the *homo romanus*) or noncitizens (the *homo humanus*). But there is also another classification in the Roman system, the *homo barbarus*. The word barbarian is rife

¹ Some of the Ciceronian works used in this thesis have English titles while others have the original titles in Latin.

with normative connotations of inferiority. This chauvinistic approach to alterity justifies imposing imperialism. Chauvinism can be also detected in the Ciceronian discourse.

According to Nancy Bisaha, Cicero creates an image of the Gauls as inferior to the Romans in moral characteristics and external attire (48). By the same token, Hythloday creates a priori of the Zapoletes as inferior in morals. Hythloday notes, “Forgetful of kinship and comradeship alike, they furiously run each other through, driven to mutual destruction for no other reason than that they were hired for a paltry sum” (93). So, the Zapoletes kill their comrades and kinsmen of the same tribe for money.

Moreover, this thesis explores the Ciceronian moral structure in *relation to* imperialism. The perfect people (the Utopians) have the right to establish their version of the best commonwealth on other lands. In *On the Commonwealth*, Marcus notes, “Furthermore, as to those praiseworthy qualities on account of which ascent into heaven is granted to humans—Intelligence, Virtue, Piety, Faith – let there be sanctuaries for them, but none for vices” (136). Some concepts, such as virtue and faith are of high status, for they are sent from the heaven to humans. Everything that is good can be *honestum*, such as virtue. Orderliness (*decorum*) and discipline are of great importance to Cicero. Scipio is also one of the interlocutors, as his counterpart, Marcus. He elaborates on the importance of well-ordered state. He notes that, “that there is no possibility of living well in the absence of a good commonwealth, nor is anything more blessed than a well-ordered state” (89). Cicero has also his theory about money. In *De Officiis*, he notes that “there is nothing more honourable and noble than to be indifferent to money. if one does not possess it, and to devote it to beneficence and liberality, if one does possess it” (71). So, money is beneficial (*utile*); man can utilize money to achieve beneficial ends.

For Alonzo Harmon, “Utopia maintains its decorum by seeking *honestum* and *utile* by various means” (107). Accordingly, the mediation of *honestum* and *utile* in Utopia creates an

ordered commonwealth. Virtue is essential to the moral construction of the Utopians. In order to guarantee a virtuous commonwealth, the Utopians are indoctrinated in virtue even at their leisure time. Hythloday says that the Utopians play “a game in which the vices fight a battle against the virtues” (53). Such a game would make it easier for Utopians to differentiate between vices and virtue in their civic life. Thus, they live a virtuous life (*honestum*). They live also a decent and moderate life without profusion. Hythloday says that the Utopians “produce much more grain and cattle than they need for themselves, and share the surplus with their neighbours” (46). They have a plenty (*utile*) of things which can be used in a good manner. Living a virtuous life with *Utile* results in having decorum and order in society. The structure of the commonwealth, according to Hythloday is “not only the best but indeed the only one that can rightfully claim that name” (109), and this best structure is achieved in Utopia because “there is no private business” (109). The order is maintained by abolishing money and private ownership, not just *honestum* and *utile*. The elimination of money contributes to decorum. This presentation cements the image of the Utopians as the best people who have the best commonwealth. Applying this model of the commonwealth is problematic when it is enforced externally on other commonwealths (imperialism).

Fundamental Ciceronian staples, such as the *vita activa*, the focus on man’s reason, and rhetoric drive forward the imperialistic enterprise, which is manifested in More’s *Utopia*. According to Peter Ackroyd, Sir Thomas More studied Cicero’s *Nova Rhetorica* (38). Hythloday’s rhetoric is implemented to showcase the *vita activa* of the Utopians who utilize knowledge and reason in praxis. Both More and Cicero were believers in man’s will to drive the dynamics of the commonwealth by relying on man as the core of the commonwealth. In *On the Commonwealth and On the Law*, Cicero notes that reason is the essence of justice (117). Consequently, justice leads to happy commonwealth life, and civic relationships (120). All reforms are carried out by applying the gained knowledge in the intellectual life (*vita*

contemplativa) to the dynamics of the mundane life (the *vita activa*). In his *De Officiis*, Cicero notes, “Every duty, therefore, that tends effectively to maintain and safeguard human society should be given the preference over that duty which arises from speculation and science alone” (163). Here, Cicero stresses that the best knowledge is the knowledge that is serviceable to the society in praxis, which means that the *studia humanitatis* is not valuable unless it is applied to the dynamics of the mundane and everyday life (the *vita activa*).

All the knowledge that is acquired during the *vita contemplativa* should be applied in practice to benefit the commonwealth and its members. Similarly, the Utopians give importance to the active life in case any conflict arises between their active and intellectual life. The *vita activa* and rhetoric are staples of the *studia humanitatis*, and they are related to the imperialist enterprise. The application of virtue in the *vita activa* was extended by force to other colonies and commonwealths (Fitzmaurice 6). So, the rhetoric of humanists is employed by practicing their version of virtue in the *vita activa* through conquering new lands.

In *De Oratore*, Cicero stresses the importance of oration, which is the theoretical part of rhetoric as a creative tool for commonwealths and civilizations. He notes:

For who is going to grant you, that in shutting themselves up in walled cities, human beings, who had been scattered originally over mountain and forest, were not so much convinced by the reasoning of the wise as snared by the speeches of the eloquent, or again that the other beneficial arrangements involved in the establishment or the preservation of States were not shaped by the wise and valiant but by men of eloquence and fine diction? (27)

Here, Cicero is showcasing the power of oration (speeches of the eloquent) of bringing people, who are scattered in the wilderness, to the civic realm of states and commonwealths.

In this regard, the same rhetoric can be used outwardly to impose civilization on other commonwealths.

Ecology in *Utopia* will be also examined in relation to imperialism. Turning the seized lands into gardens in *Utopia* is related to imperialism. Establishing new colonies denotes land annexation and cultivation of the seized lands. The humanist application of man's science (the *studia humanitatis*) in the *vita activa* is applied in *Utopia* to ecology. Ecology in *Utopia* is part of imperialist discourse; it is subordinated to the imperialist's reason and mindset. The flora in *Utopia* is subjected to the engineering of man; the commonwealth is a locale of a *hortus conclusus* (walled garden) where trees are trimmed by Utopians. The Utopians take pride in their trimmed gardens, and they look down upon the Zapoletes who do not cultivate their lands; this pride is similar to the pride of colonizing the botany of the inferior other. There is the humanist desire to turn wild nature into domesticated nature. Obviously, the shortage of lands and overpopulation propel the Utopians into acquiring new lands, which is also problematic and imperialistic. In this sense, the rhetoric of imperialism is applied to the barbarians and their uncultivated lands.

The mediation of imperialism in *Utopia* has been explored in academia. A plethora of scholars have explored the manifestation of imperialism in More's *Utopia*, such as Susan Bruce in her "Utopian Justifications: More's *Utopia*, Settler Colonialism, and Contemporary Ecocritical Concerns". Bruce views *Utopia* from an imperialistic and colonial perspective. She touches upon how *Utopia* is created by the process of land annexation with no regards for the history of the country. She notes that *Utopia* "is founded by a markedly geo-political intervention, emerging complete, whole, and immediately independent of its motherland. It loses its (pre-)history in one fell swoop" (25-26). She equates *Utopia* to settler colonialism by juxtaposing *Utopia* with the Zionist movie, *The Promise*. Bruce notes, "I invoke The Promise because its articulation of the stories we tell to justify to ourselves our appropriations

of the lands of others is so pithy and so acute” (24). She compares the imperialistic practice (seizure of lands) that is applied to the natives in *Utopia* to the ongoing situation of the Palestinians in modern day.

Bruce sheds light on the imperialistic rhetoric of seizing the land of the other under the pretext that the other is inferior. In this regard, Bruce explains, “In *The Promise* we can observe a similar move, where local agricultural failure is equated with the failure to be properly human and thence the implication that Palestinian irrationality is the originary cause of political conflict” (28). Bruce elaborates on the trope of seizing the land of the natives, for they fail to cultivate it. In this context, the natives are devoid of rationality, so it is incumbent on the imperialists to seize the uncultivated lands. The rhetoric of Bruce does not mention the *vita activa* in relation to the mediation of imperialism in *Utopia*. For Bruce, there is moral censure in *Utopia*, such as the condemnation of sloth (28). Although Bruce mentions sloth, she does not mention that the *vita activa* is the antithesis of sloth which is condemned in the first and second book of *Utopia*. The Ciceronian influence is absent from Bruce’s imperialistic approach to *Utopia*. This thesis will explore how the Utopians, who abhor sloth, implement the Ciceronian *vita activa* in their imperialistic enterprise, which has not been mediated by literary scholars who studied *Utopia*.

Sarah Hogan is also another literary scholar who examines *Utopia* from an imperialistic perspective. She adds a capitalistic dimension to her approach to *Utopia* in *Other Englands: Utopia, Capital, and Empire in an Age of Transition*. For her, Utopia is an epistemological shift from feudalism to capitalism, which has resulted in the discovery of the New World (33). Unlike Bruce, Sarah acknowledges the influence of Cicero and other antiquities in *Utopia*. She notes that “More’s use of the dialogue form, in fact, is almost always treated as an adaptation of classical sources. Plato, Lucian, Cicero, and Quintilian are the usual suspects in the search for antecedents” (39). Of course, ‘dialogue’ in this context is

rhetoric, which is implemented by Hythloday. Hogan does not establish the link between the Ciceronian rhetoric and imperialism in *Utopia*, which will be established in this thesis. Her approach is also devoid of the *vita activa*. Instead, Hogan elaborates on labour. She says that “the Utopian island is a coeval territory where mankind is flawed and desiring, requiring labor and the regulating institutions of society in order to meet human needs” (32). So, labour is essential to the dynamism of *Utopia*. Labour, here, is the equivalent to the *vita activa*, for labour is applied in the Utopians active life. Hogan views *Utopia* as a nascent capitalistic entity, but she overlooks the *vita activa* and its relation to imperialism.

It is vital to clarify in this introduction the primary and secondary sources. It is also essential to delineate the scope of the Morean work in this thesis. The focus of this thesis is mainly *Utopia*, not other works by More. More was a Renaissance statesman and a man of letters who wrote a plethora of letters and books, such as *The History of King Richard III*. He also wrote books on theology. The focus will be on how More envisions a commonwealth that practices imperialism, and the imperialism in *Utopia* is an extension of the Ciceronian rhetoric, *vita activa*, *studia humanitatis*. In other words, rhetoric, the *vita activa* and the *studia humanitatis* are implemented in the imperial enterprise of *Utopia*.

More’s *Utopia* and six Ciceronian books will be used as the primary sources in this thesis. The Ciceronian works are *De Inventione*, *De Natura Deorum Academica*, *De Officiis*, *On Moral Ends*, *De Oratore*, and *On the Commonwealth*. As for the secondary sources, Eric Hobsbawm’s *The Age of Empire* is used to shed some light on the difference between early and late imperialism, with its focus on exploitation. Hobsbawm is a Marxist historian who wrote on the marriage between imperialism and capitalism. He also touches upon how the imperialists view the conquered as exotic and inferior, which will be discussed in this thesis. Edward Said’s *Culture and Imperialism* is used to highlight territorial and cultural dominance that is practiced by the imperialists. Said is a renowned scholarly critic and a philosopher who



wrote on the relation between the East and the West in respect to cultural dominance. Andrew Fitzmaurice's *Humanism and America: An Intellectual History of English Colonialism 1500-1625* is of key importance to this thesis. Fitzmaurice is a historian of political thoughts who writes on the political ideologies of imperialism in Europe and America. He links the Ciceronian *vita activa*, rhetoric, and *studia humanitatis* to the imperialist ideologies that is practiced by the British and American imperialism.

Dipesh Chakrabarty's *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* is used to show how the history of the conquered is obliterated by the conqueror. Chakrabarty is a postcolonial theorist who writes on subaltern studies. Alonzo Harmon's "Sacrifice in the Public Square: Ciceronian Rhetoric in More's *Utopia* and the Ultimate Ends of Counsel" highlights rhetoric in *Utopia* and how *Utopia* is based upon Cicero's ethical man in relation to the form of rule in *Utopia*. Harmon is a scholar in law and literature.

It is important to comment on the eclectic approach to choosing postcolonial and historical secondary sources. Secondary sources, such as the said works by Hobsbawm, said and Chakrabarty are chosen, for they highlight the similarities of the imperialistic discourse of Cicero and More. Although the time is different, the next section will deal with the scope of humanism in this thesis and the methodology of the chosen primary and secondary sources. It is also essential to highlight the outline of the chapters in this thesis. The upcoming chapter will set the theoretical background by showcasing how the Ciceronian rhetoric and the *vita activa* are linked to imperialism by Fitzmaurice. Then, the next two chapters will delineate the Ciceronian philosophy and the scope of imperialism in this thesis. Following that, there is a chapter that is dedicated to Morean and Ciceronian chauvinism and how chauvinism justifies the imperial agenda by assumptions of superiority. The chapter on humanistic imperialism deals with notions of the model commonwealths to imperialize and rule over other commonwealths. Of course, *Utopia* and the Roman Empire are viewed as the

best commonwealths to rule over other commonwealths (imperialism). There is the chapter that touches upon applying the theoretical chapter (Rhetoric, the *Vita Activa*, and Imperialism: Cicero and Fitzmaurice) to *Utopia* textually. The last chapter before the conclusion associates cultivating the land in *Utopia* with imperialism by dint of implementing the *studia humanitatis*.

Rhetoric, the *Vita Activa*, and Imperialism: Cicero and Fitzmaurice

This theory section will explore the link between Cicero and Imperialism with regards to rhetoric and the *vita activa*. This section also examines how Andrew Fitzmaurice explores in his *Humanism and America: An Intellectual History of English Colonisation, 1500-1625* the impact of the Ciceronian rhetoric and the *vita activa* on imperialism. Imperialism in Cicero's mindset can be detected in rhetoric and the *vita activa*. In other words, rhetoric (oratory) was used to gain resources for the imperialistic enterprise, and the *vita activa* was implemented by extended being active in one commonwealth to others by force. In *De Oratore*, Cicero stresses the importance of oration, which is the practical part of rhetoric, as a tool for creating commonwealths and civilizations. He notes:

For who is going to grant you, that in shutting themselves up in walled cities, human beings, who had been scattered originally over mountain and forest, were not so much convinced by the reasoning of the wise as snared by the speeches of the eloquent, or again that the other beneficial arrangements involved in the establishment or the preservation of States were not shaped by the wise and valiant but by men of eloquence and fine diction? (27)

Here, Cicero is showcasing the power of oration ‘speeches of the eloquent’ of bringing people, who are scattered in the wilderness, to the civic realm of states and commonwealths. So, Oration creates civilizations and cities by persuasion and appealing to the mass of people.

Cicero’s exaltation of rhetoric seems innocuous at first glance; rhetoric is beneficial in creating civilization and building states. But notions of utilizing rhetoric to civilize the people within one commonwealth were implemented outwardly on other commonwealths (imperialism). In *De Oratore*, Cicero mentions that rhetoric is implemented to bring the barbarians into the civic realm. He explains:

To come, however at length to the highest achievements of eloquence, what other power could have been strong enough either to gather scattered humanity into one place, or to lead it out of its brutish existence in the wilderness up to our present condition of civilization as men and citizens, or, after the establishment of social communities, to give shape to laws, tribunals, and civic rights? (25)

Here, it is an invitation to bring the barbarians to the same civilized state as the Romans.

Andrew Fitzmaurice links Cicero’s rhetoric to imperialism; he explores how Cicero’s rhetoric (oratory) was used to colonize other lands. Fitzmaurice notes, “Humanists attempting to establish colonies seized upon the idea that oratory was necessary to establish new commonwealths; indeed it is through this idea that they understood the process of gaining support for their projects” (9). The premise of rhetoric is to persuade people or people of authorities in order to reach desirable ends. Imperialists needed to gain support for their imperialistic projects by virtue of using rhetoric. Fitzmaurice elaborates on how rhetoric was used in praxis to get support for materializing imperialistic expansions. He says:

Classical rhetoric, which embodied Ciceronian moral philosophy², was to be used to that end. The moral content of sermons shifted away from abstract doctrine to the praise of God's actions and his works, especially man, in a humanist moral vocabulary. Merely through weekly attendance at church, all orders could find themselves exposed to humanist moral values. Moreover, the reform of the sermon had particular importance for the introduction of humanist values into the discussion of the New World because the sermon, as we shall see, was one of the favoured instruments for promoting the voyages. (17)

Here, rhetoric is used in sermons to promote the colonial voyages to the new world. So, Fitzmaurice links Cicero's call for civilizing the barbarians by implementing rhetoric to imperialism.

The Ciceronian *vita activa* is examined in relation to imperialism, and how being active in a given civic life was applied to be active in other commonwealths. In *De Officiis* Cicero stresses the importance of serving the civic sphere in a given commonwealth. He notes that civic and military duties should be prioritize if citizens have no excuse to be exempted from serving the commonwealth (85). In other words, citizens that belong to the commonwealth should contribute to their commonwealth in an active way (the *vita activa*). Cicero notes that "I for my own improvement have always combined Greek and Latin studies—and I have done this not only in the study of philosophy but also in the practice of oratory" (*De Officiis* 3). Here, the more theoretical discipline (philosophy) is combined with the beneficial in praxis (oration). In his introduction to *De Officiis*, Walter Miller comments on Cicero's view on philosophy. He notes, "To him the goal of philosophy was not primarily to know but to do" (X). Here, Cicero was keen on appropriating the theoretical Greek

² Such as the *vita activa* and the focus on man and the *studia humanitatis*. See the next section.

philosophy to the Roman pragmatism. Undoubtedly, Cicero admired Greek philosophy, but he was a statesman who wanted to apply the theoretical to the dynamics of the state.

Philosophy, which is part of the *vita contemplativa*, should lead eventually to tangible and practical improvements in the civic body of the commonwealth, not mere theories without practice. Also, the *vita activa* is prioritize at the expense of divinity, which is part also of the *vita contemplativa*. In *De Natura Deorum Academica*, Cicero notes that “mankind must continue to labour under the profoundest uncertainty, and to be in ignorance about matters of the highest moment” (5). It is the will of man; man must “labour” regardless of “highest moment” (divinity). Cicero places much importance on man, for his vision is practical. Divinity is ambiguous, so the focus should be on man and what can be achieved in the *vita activa*.

At first glance, the *vita activa* and its application seem innocuous: it centers around the premise that all individuals should be active and contribute to the welfare of the civic body in the state. Fitzmaurice elaborates on the ubiquitous implementation of the *vita activa* by Renaissance Europe. He states, “Thus according to the humanistic understanding of the relation between the contemplative and active life, the study of the classical disciplines was to be employed, for example, in political life, military affairs, the law courts, in commerce and in religion” (5). The Ciceronian impact penetrated the dynamics of life. The *studia humanitatis* was employed in the *vita activa* in all domains of life, but the employment of the *vita activa* was not restricted to a single commonwealth. Fitzmaurice adds, “Our knowledge of the use of classical learning to understand the colonisation of the New World, which was perceived as an extension of the civic sphere, has likewise been anecdotal and yet, as I argue, the *studia humanitatis* was fundamental to that understanding” (5). The *vita activa* provided imperialistic justifications in the Renaissance; the Renaissance *vita activa* was applied outwardly to other commonwealths. In other words, the *vita activa* was applied by force by

imperialists. Of course, rhetoric and the *vita activa* will be examined in *Utopia* from an imperialistic perspective.³

Ciceronian Humanism

Since this thesis pivots on how imperialism in the Ciceronian humanism is extended in More's *Utopia*, it is of utmost importance to delineate the framework of humanism in this thesis. Actually, definitions of humanism are varied, elastic, and different. For example, Anthony Pinn frames modern and contemporary humanism with the attempt to find a hopeful ontological meaning for humans in the light of societal problems, such as sexism and racism (35). This modern humanism is not the focus of this essay; this thesis is not about the philosophical ontology of man in relation to his societal context. Although this thesis elaborates on chauvinism, racism and sexism are modern coinages that cannot be applied in the Morean and Ciceronian context. To Pinn, humanism "involves an arrangement and interpretation of life with a grammar drawn from and reflective of the 'stuff' of our historically situated lives. It offers a perspective on the challenges that humans face that grounds on earth our best chances to thrive. No heaven to comfort the weary" (34). So, humanism in this context is about the challenges man faces in life and how to overcome them. It is notable that the focus is on man as the sole agent that is capable of finding solutions to the challenges. Divinity still exists, but the solutions lie in the hand of man, not the divine. The implementation of man's reason is also implied here; man needs reason to overcome challenges, not offering a supplication to the divine.

³ See "Rhetoric, the Vita Activa, and Imperialism in *Utopia*".

In order to delineate Ciceronian humanism, Renaissance Humanism will be framed in relation to the impact of Cicero on Renaissance humanists, particularly More. This distinction of focusing on man's effort to overcome problems is central to humanism. Modern humanism borrows a lot of elements from Renaissance humanism, especially the focus on man and man's science. Renaissance humanism, as a movement, is the shift of the focus from religious studies to humanities and liberal arts. It is, basically, the revival of interest in the works of Greco-Roman antiquities with their focus on man as the essence of life. The focus is on man as an active agent in life, not divinity. Walter Ullmann elaborates on the origin of Humanism as follows:

Here indeed could be found the working of the *humanitas* which the thirteenth century rebirth had revived or restored. That the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries reverberated therefore with the appeal to the *studia humanitatis* can hardly cause much surprise. The study of humanity, understood as the essential being of man himself, became self-propelling. And this was not, as it is commonly understood, the study of letters, of grammar, and the like, or so-called cultivated pursuits, but the study of the natural essence of man himself, of his 'mere' humanity – in contradistinction to the study of divinity, a distinction indeed to which Cicero had clearly pointed. (108)

Cicero called for the focus on man and the branches of knowledge that focus solely on man, such as, language, literature, rhetoric, and philosophy. During the Renaissance, the focus shifted from *the studia divinitatis* to the *studia humanitatis* by reviving works by Cicero and Greco-Roman antiquities. Cicero, himself, focused on man as an essential member of society.

Although the gap in time is huge, Cicero had a huge impact on Renaissance humanists. For instance, Petrarch admired Cicero's rhetoric and philosophy that can be used to create virtuous man (Skinner 87). Cicero also influenced More who was also a

Renaissance humanist. In this thesis, three direct influences of Cicero on More's *Utopia* will be examined, particularly rhetoric and the *vita activa* in relation to imperialism. Also, the Ciceronian ethical man will be examined from an imperialistic perspective. It is of high importance to clarify the impact of Cicero on More's *Utopia*. The second book of *Utopia* was written before the first book that contains a rhetorical debate. The first part was added while More was with Erasmus, who admired Cicero and wrote *Ciceronianus* (Harmon 79-98). So, it is most likely that Erasmus had a role in adding an entire part that is written as a rhetorical debate. As for the *vita activa*, *Utopia* is brimming with direct allusions to Cicero's *vita activa*.⁴ The Utopians are actively engaged in their civic duty to serve their commonwealth. With regards to the Ciceronian Ethical man, the Utopian commonwealth is built upon the Ciceronian *honestum*, *utile* and *decorum*.

As for the indirect influence of Cicero on More, the thesis explores the mediation of man's rationality, reason and the *studia humanitatis* in *Utopia* in relation to imperialism. More, as other Renaissance humanists, was influenced by Cicero's call for shifting the focus to man, man's reason (rationality) and the *studia humanitatis*, which are indirect influences but evident in More's *Utopia*. Also, tropes of imperialism in the Ciceronian discourses will be compared with tropes of imperialism in *Utopia* to show similarities.⁵ Of course, direct and indirect influences will be examined in relation to imperialism. So, this thesis will explore direct Ciceronian influences (rhetoric, the *vita activa*, and the Ciceronian ethical man) and indirect influences (the focus on man, man's reason and the *studia humanitatis*). In addition, the mediation of imperialism in the Ciceronian discourse will be compared to the mediation of imperialism in the Morean discourse.

⁴ See "Rhetoric, the *Vita Activa*, and Imperialism".

⁵ The tropes of imperialism are delineated in this thesis as the conquest of the natives and their lands. See the next section "Imperialism or *Imperium*".

Imperialism or *Imperium*

Before delving into imperialism and humanism, it is necessary to elaborate on imperialism with its connotations and historicity, for the Roman imperialism is different from modern and early modern imperialism. If the premise of this thesis is to demonstrate that Ciceronian humanism, which cherishes imperialism, is extended in the discourse of More in *Utopia*, it is of high importance to elucidate the term, imperialism, in order to avoid any conundrums and misunderstandings given the fact that the gap between More's time and Cicero's time is huge. *Utopia* stands at the threshold to early and modern imperialism. Yet, *Utopia* exhibits patterns of dominance over the land and the natives that are similar to the patterns in the Ciceronian discourse, which will be explored.

Imperialism from a terminological point of view was not used during the Roman Empire; the term, which is rather modern, was used later. In *The Roman Empire: Roots of Imperialism*, Neville Morley touches upon the nomenclature of imperialism. He explains:

There is no Latin equivalent of 'imperialism'. The word *imperium*, from which both 'imperialism' and 'empire' derive, referred originally to the power possessed by a Roman magistrate to command and expect obedience ... However, the development of ideas about the nature of Rome's overseas dominions followed long after they had actually been acquired, rather than preceding or influencing the process of conquest and annexation. (17)

Here, *Imperium* in Latin denotes discharging commands and orders. Later, it was used by the Romans to denote Roman dominion overseas, which took the form of conquest and annexation. The Roman Empire waged wars for expansion (annexation) by 'conquest'.

Territorial expansion and annexation of lands are practiced in early imperialism that started in the fifteenth century and modern capitalistic imperialism.⁶ For example, according to Paul Burton in “Roman Imperialism”, the annexation of lands was practised by the British Empire in the Victorian era for gaining wealth (11). So, there are similar characteristics between Roman Imperialism and early modern imperialism, particularly the strategy of annexing new territories. *Utopia* reflects the common denominators of imperialism because the same patterns of dominance in the humanistic discourses of Cicero and More are exhibited. *Utopia* was first published in 1516, but it marks a continuation of the Roman Imperial mindset that is reflected in Cicero’s works.

The Imperial mindset persists in modern imperialism in the general conquest and land acquisition, but there are stark differences between early and modern imperialism, let alone Roman Imperialism. In *Imperialism: From the Colonial Age to the Present*, Harry Magdoff draws a line between early and later imperialism economically. Early imperialists conquered and plundered the lands while later imperialists exploited the conquered lands due to capitalism and the industrial revolution (3). For Hobsbawm, later Imperialism “was the child of an era of competition between rival industrial-capitalist national economies which was new and which was intensified by the pressure to secure and safeguard markets in a period of business uncertainty” (72-73). So, later imperialism was a new era, for Hobsbawm, due to the marriage between capitalism and imperialism. Land annexation was still practiced, but the focus was on exploitation to serve the industrial needs. Economic factors played a major role in early and modern imperialism. Roman Imperialism had a totally different socioeconomic context; there was neither capitalism nor the Industrial Revolution. Economic reasons precipitated early and later imperialism. They also played a role in Roman imperialism.

⁶ Some forms of imperialism do not require territorial aggression. See Harry Magdoff’s *Imperialism: From the Colonial Age to the Present*.

However, for Cicero, The Roman Empire is the ultimate cosmological model that should rule other commonwealths as will be discussed thoroughly in this thesis; the Ciceronian discourse is not about expansion for gaining wealth.

In *Utopia*, the Utopians accumulate the surplus and buy silver and gold. Hythlodai describes their trade deals and how they exchange what they produce for gold, silver, and iron. He says that the Utopians “have accumulated a greater supply of the precious metals than you would believe possible” (62). The silver and gold are used also in the Utopian warfare. But the Utopians, who claim that they disdain worldly riches, do not state that they seize other lands for worldly riches; they suffer from overpopulation, which propels land annexation. However, they have colonies which suggests exploitation. The economic factors are not the focus of this thesis.⁷ This thesis will focus on the imperialistic conquering of the lands and the natives, not the Marxist context or the Roman economics. The focus is on how the humanistic discourse of Cicero is continued in *Utopia* with regards to conquering the natives and their lands.

In order to showcase that the Morean and Ciceronian discourses are similar in relation to imperialism, Morean/Ciceronian discourses will be juxtaposed against Herlihy-Mera’s ‘cultural conquest’. Herlihy-Mera illustrates how the imperial practices of the United States of America are implemented to achieve ‘cultural conquest’. The process of imperialism, according to Herlihy-Mera, has three phases, namely merchants, military, and politicians (24). The three phases will be juxtaposed against the Ciceronian and Morean rhetoric of imperialism in order to show how the dynamics of the imperialist enterprise in the Ciceronian discourse are present in *Utopia*. Although the American ‘cultural conquest’ is different in

⁷ Exploitation of resources will be mentioned as part of the second phase of Herlihy-Mera’s cultural conquest, but the focus of this thesis is the conquest of lands and the natives.

time, it is applied here; it has the same imperialist mechanics as its Ciceronian and Morean counterparts.

It is notable that the three phases are realized in the Morean and Ciceronian vision of their commonwealth; the genesis of both Rome and Utopia is imperialistic. Herlihy-Mera elaborates on the first two phases (merchants and military). He explains, “Once a region has been invaded or annexed and the resources therein seized, in traditional colonial complexes, martial law is implemented as a measure to stabilize the occupation” (24). Utopus and Romulus (in *On the Commonwealth*) have a huge differential in warfare that has ensured them a victory over the barbarians (military). As for first phase, it includes “encounter sources” and “strategic geography” (24), which are actualized in the genesis of both metropolises (Rome and Utopia). The category of ‘strategic geography’ denotes a sense of reconnaissance and territorial explorations prior to the military operation. Utopus chooses the geographical locale before the separating Utopia from the main land for defense purposes, and Romulus opts for “the benefits of the coast while avoiding its vices by placing his city on the bank of a large river a coastal area as a strategic location for his new polis” (36).

The second phase (military) is also realized in Utopia. Utopus’ military invasion is followed by establishing a metropolis of defense. The coast of Utopia is “well fortified that a few defenders could beat off the attack of a strong force” (44). Utopia is a fortified place. Hythloday explains, “Near mid-channel, there is one reef that rises above the water, and so presents no danger in itself; a tower has been built on top of it, and a garrison is kept there. Since the other rocks lie under the water, they are very dangerous” (43). Utopia is hard to navigate through due to the rocks under the channel. Only Utopian pilots know how to navigate through Utopia, which makes the polis impervious to alien invasions. Even Amaurot, which is the biggest city in Utopia, is easily defended. It has a walled stream, so enemies would “not be able to cut off and divert the stream, or poison it” (47). By the same

token, in *On the Commonwealth*, Romulus and other kings opt for building a citadel that “was well fortified with a steep circuit and rested on an almost sheer rock, so that even on the terrible occasion of the Gallic attack it remained safe and unconquered” (36). By analogy, the phase of ‘Military’ is also evident in the imperial account of establishing the commonwealth of Rome.

The second phase (military) has another connotation; it is, according to Herlihy-Mera, about “resources therein seized” (23). This is, of course, actualized through cultivation of the ecology which will be examined in this thesis. The first two phases of ‘cultural conquest’ (Merchants and Military) propose spatial reconnaissance and invasion of the barbarian lands. Since the mapping of the invaded land is based on the colonial mindset of the invader with its assumptions of the inferiority of the other, the third phase (Politicians) is ‘complemented’ according to Herlihy-Mera with culture. He notes, “This phase of conquest is complemented by a construction of the metropolitan aesthetic in the new area; the saturation of cultural material is accompanied by the prohibition of a previous or another symbol, and the celebration of new myths through monuments and other state commissions” (24). Here, the third phase is mainly about obliterating the cultural and epistemological structure of the barbarians by imposing the conqueror’s version of epistemological reality (new cultural symbols).

The imperialistic mindset created the perfect commonwealth as a social construct in conformity with its new vision of the commonwealth. Romulus’s vision of the *commonwealth* includes realizing the third phase by means of intermarriage. The third phase is, of course, related to conquering the natives culturally. According to Herlihy-Mera, the third phase is about social engineering of the conquered space (24). In *On the Commonwealth*, Scipio explains:



All this he accomplished with great speed: he established a city, which he ordered to be named Rome after his own name; and in order to strengthen his new state he adopted a new and somewhat crude plan, but one that, in terms of bolstering the resources of his kingdom and people, shows the mark of a great man who looked far into the future: he ordered Sabine girls of good family, who had come to Rome for the first annual celebration of the Consualia in the circus, to be seized, and he placed them in marriages with the most important families. This led the Sabines to wage war against the Romans; and when the battle was indecisive, he made a treaty with Titus the Sabine king at the urging of the women who had been seized. By that treaty he admitted the Sabines to citizenship and joint religious rituals, and he shared his rule with their king. (36-37)

The first sign of Romulus' cultural and social engineering is manifested in obliterating the name of the locale by naming the metropolis after Romulus (Rome).

This social engineering is similar to the intermarriages in the account of Romulus; by dint of intermarriages, Sabines girls are forced into marrying highly regarded Roman families. This is also a tool for achieving cultural dominance. Most of the societies were androcentric in nature, so it is most likely that such forced intermarriages will produce a posterity that is subjugated to the patriarchal norms of the Roman fathers, not the Sabine mothers. This sexual violence by male invaders is part of the colonial canon according to Gerda Lerner in *The Creation of Patriarchy* (215). For Lerner "The sexual exploitation of lower-class women by upper-class men can be shown in antiquity" (214). The Sabine girls are given to Roman Families of high ranks, which is a form of male dominance. It is dominance in gender (male over female) and in rank; the Roman men are higher in rank than the Sabine women.

The Roman culture will dominate the domestic sphere of the familial life at the expense of the Sabines' epistemological background; the value system of the colonizer prevails. To cement the dominance of the Roman culture, Romulus grants citizenships to the Sabine women, which is also the premise of the third phase of Herlihy-Mera's cultural conquest. In *On the Commonwealth*, Scipio states, "After Tatius died, the entire power returned to Romulus" (37). This is an affirmation of utter colonial dominance, a colonial vision of social reality. The third phase is also concerned with creating myths or legends, which is manifested in Scipio's account of Romulus. Scipio notes that "he was thought to have become a god; no mortal could ever have achieved that without an extraordinary" (38). Romulus has become an icon, a myth in the Roman discourse of nationalism because he established a commonwealth that is presumably founded on virtue. The Ciceronian's humanistic mind exhibits the application of the *vita activa* by actualizing the values of the dominant structure in the civic realm of the metropolis Rome. It is notable that androcentrism and male dominance are employed by Romulus to create his own vision of the civic realm. His creation of the civic realm resembles the third phase of 'politicians'.

The third phase is also manifested in the humanistic and colonial discourse in *Utopia* through creating a legend; Utopus has become a legend as Romulus. He is hailed as the commander who has established a commonwealth that is based on philosophy. The translation of the Utopian alphabet states, "The commander Utopus made me, who was once not an island, into an island. I alone of all nations, without philosophy, have portrayed for mortals the philosophical city. Freely I impart my benefits; not unwillingly I accept whatever is better" (125). For Bruce, "Both the Utopian alphabet and the poem and its transliteration are saturated with nationalist and colonialist discourses" (26). Bruce's comment on the verse is justifiable. Some translations use conqueror instead of 'commander', which denotes a

typical colonial and imperialistic discourse.⁸ Regardless of the translation, the verse is brimming with colonial nationalism given that the island is made and shaped by the conqueror. The verse is a synopsis of how a conqueror creates a nation that is better than all nation; it is both nationalistic and colonial.

The social engineering (politicians) of the spatial locale is also done by imposing the new laws of utopia. If the indigenous people are reluctant to abide by the laws of the invaders (Utopians), a war is declared on the natives by the Utopians. The social aspect (politicians) is deeply associated with other social problems in Utopia. Overpopulation drives the imperialist expansion forward and creates notions of forced epistemology. Hythloday notes, “Those natives who want to live with the Utopians are adopted by them. When such a merger occurs, the two peoples gradually and easily blend together, sharing the same way of life and customs, much to the advantage of both” (57).

Herlihy-Mera’s colonial phases for establishing cultural conquest are fully realized in the Morean and Ciceronian narratives. It is notable also that the imperialist and humanistic practices are enmeshed together; humanism laid the ground for imperialism and colonialism. Edward Said notes that both imperialism and colonialism “are supported and perhaps even impelled by impressive ideological formations which include notions that certain territories and people *require* and beseech domination, as well as forms of knowledge affiliated with that domination” (8). Thus, the ideology of the imperialist assumes that certain people need to be dominated. The people of the Abraxa cannot cultivate their lands, so they need to be dominated from an imperialistic perspective. The territorial domination is followed by ideological dominance (politicians). Although the gap in time between Said and More is huge, the mechanism of imperialism is extended. The humanistic Utopia is founded on

⁸ See More, Thomas. *Utopia. In Three Early Modern Utopias*. Edited by Susan Bruce. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999, p.127.

applying humanistic vision to the civic realm of the others who are viewed as an inferior entity. Colonialists sailed the sea searching for new lands and people to apply their own humanistic approach. Fitzmaurice notes, “The highest aim of humanism was glory, and what better way to achieve glory, promoters of colonies asked, than to conquer barbarian lands” (2). Glory is achieved by creating colonies that correspond to the vision of the conquerors, such as in the case with Romulus and Utopus. Fitzmaurice says, “The appeal of colonies, to his humanistic reasoning, was the opportunity they provided for a man to exercise his higher faculties in service for the commonwealth, and to be rewarded with honour and glory” (34). Utopus and Romulus have been glorified after their death, for they have created their honorable commonwealths after civilizing the natives as mentioned earlier in this section.

More and Cicero base the genesis of their perfect commonwealths on imperialism as a foundation for forming a good commonwealth. The same colonial thought has seeped into the framework of humanist More. The two models of Cicero and More conform to the imperialist ‘Cultural Conquest’ of Herlihy-Mera, which includes territorial and epistemological invasions.

Chauvinism

This thesis will show how chauvinism justifies imperial and colonial agendas. Historically, the Roman Empire was built on law and order; the Roman law and discipline was essential to the foundation of the Roman Empire. Roman laws regulated the relationships between the Roman citizens and the foreigners. Of course, law was applied according to the status of the people (citizens or not citizens). Cicero acknowledges, in his *De Officiis*, the differential in the Roman laws between citizens and foreigners. Cicero says, “It may not be right, of course, for one who is not a citizen to exercise the rights and privileges of citizenship; and the law on

this point was secured by two of our wisest consuls, Crassus and Scaevola. Still, to debar foreigners from enjoying the advantages of the city is altogether contrary to the laws of humanity” (315). In this context, the law that is enjoyed by the ones who hold Roman citizenship is applied only to citizens who belong to the same civic sphere in the Roman Empire. For Cicero, foreigners should not be allowed to enjoy the same level of civic privileges. Yet, the foreigners should be allowed to enjoy the benefits of the civic realm to a certain extent because of the shared values as fellow humans.

The classification of people in the Roman Empire is far more complicated than dualism of the citizens and the noncitizens. There are the foreigners and the barbarians. The Greek were the first to use this word. Bisaha notes:

Originally the term ‘barbarian’ was linguistic, referring to peoples who spoke not Greek but unintelligible ‘bar- bar.’ ... In the fifth century B.C.E. a mixture of xenophobia and stereotyping took hold in Greek society as a result of the Persian Wars; during this time *barbaros* came to be used as a noun denoting the entire non-Greek world. (45)

Speakers of unintelligible languages were deemed barbarians. The word *barbaros* acquired a normative connotation of inferiority due to the wars and the state of antagonism.

The Romans borrowed the term *barbaros* and used it in the Latin language as *homo barbarus*. According to Bisaha, some of the barbarians, such as the Italians, were granted citizenship and integrated into the military and administrative polity of Rome (47). The barbarians attained the Roman civic rights. The Latin *barbarus* and the Greek *barbaros* carry the same normative meaning of inferiority. Although Cicero called for universal humanism that unites all the peoples of the world, chauvinism can be detected in his discourse. In his description of the Gauls, he “mocks their cloaks and breeches, their proud walks, and

gestures, not to mention their coarse language” (Bisaha 48). Here, Cicero creates a fixed image of the Gauls (alterity). He views the Gauls as inferior to the Romans which contradicts his call for wholistic fraternity.

The Utopians claim that they like to help the other people who are fellowmen by nature, but their discourse of universal humanism is marred by apparent chauvinism.

Hythloday’s travelogue mentions the Zapoletes. He says:

These people live five hundred miles to the east of Utopia, and are rough, rude and fierce. The forests and mountains where they are bred are the kind of country they like: tough and rugged. They are a hard race, capable of standing heat, cold and drudgery, unacquainted with any luxuries, careless about their houses and their clothes; they don’t till the fields but raise cattle instead. Most survive by hunting and stealing. These people are born for battle, which they seek out at every opportunity and eagerly embrace when they have found it. Leaving their own country in great numbers, they offer themselves for cheap hire to anyone in need of warriors. The only art they know for earning a living is the art which aims at death. (93)

Hythloday creates a biased ethnographical account of the Zapoletes. The Zapoletes only hunt and steal. They only know the ‘art which aims at death’. This account creates a fixed image (a priori) of a certain ethnic race. The Zapoletes’ normative description corresponds to their environment that is sketched as wild and uncivilized in contrast to the Utopians’ neat gardens that are malleable to the human mind and will. The Zapoletes live in rugged mountains and forests, unlike the domesticated Utopians’ topography. They have no Utopus to create a proper civilization by appropriating the wild geology to the will of man.

In *De Officiis*, Cicero mentions that men were scattered in mountains and forests before the power of oration brings them to walled cities (27). The barbaric state is associated

with nature (forests and mountains) while the civic state is associated with cities. Both humanistic discourses of Sir Thomas More and Cicero create a normative depiction of alterity. This is evident also in the mapping of the other by More and Cicero. The dynamics of power means the dominance of the civilized over the uncivilized.

The same chauvinism is extended in temporality, from the Greco-Roman time to the Renaissance. Bisaha explains this chauvinism. She writes, “This sad tradition is as much a part of our inheritance from the Renaissance as is republican thought or the celebration of individuality and free will. Humanist rhetoric, then, in many ways contains the seeds of cultural chauvinism in its very celebration of Western civilization” (187). The discourse of humanism is about man and man’s will to make changes, but chauvinism is a downside of the humanist rhetoric. More was a Renaissance humanist who envisioned a commonwealth that is based on the will of man. Yet, his vision is marked by chauvinism as in the Ciceronian discourse and the Greco-Roman antiquity. The Greek *barbaros* and the Roman *barbarus* are extended in temporality; they are manifested in the Utopians’ discourse of the savage alterity bordering Utopia or the race of the Zapoletes. This rhetoric of the savage other is also manifested in *On the Commonwealth*, in Scipio’s account of king Romulus who has civilised the barbarians. Romulus “restored to humane and gentle behavior the minds of men who had become savage and inhuman through their love of war” (41). Romulus’ Barbarians are as bellicose as the Zapoletes.

The Utopians’ chauvinism justifies genocide; in their strategic warfare, it is a commendable act, for the Utopians, to place their mercenaries of Zapoletes on the frontline to “sweep from the face of the earth all the dregs of that vicious and disgusting race” (94). The Zapoletes are depicted as inherently inferior in race, so they are to be used and sacrificed in the Utopian wars.

Hythloday's account of the people, who inhabit the geographical area under the equator, is not different than the depiction of the Zapoletes; it is also chauvinistic. He describes the equatorial regions as "desolate and squalid, grim and uncultivated, inhabited by wild beasts and serpents, and by men no less wild and dangerous than the beasts themselves" (12). Here, there is another biased piece of ethnography by Hythloday. This Morean Depiction of the natives as 'wild beasts' is "a vague echo of Vespucci in his description of the equatorial regions of the New World" (Cave 216). Of course, Amerigo Vespucci was famous, for he made several journeys to the New World. Vespucci is mentioned in *Utopia*. The chauvinistic assimilation of the natives in equatorial areas reflects a colonial mindset. It is still unknown if More read the letters of Vespucci, but More was familiar with Vespucci, for Giles tells More that Hythloday "got Amerigo's permission to be one of the twenty-four men who were left in a garrison at the farthest point of the last voyage" (10).

The epistemic mapping of the Zapoletes and the barbarian people of the equator creates an antithesis to the Utopian model; the Zapoletes epitomize all the normative qualities that the Utopians abhor. In other words, they have the traits that the Utopians detest, such as sloth, propensity to lasciviousness, and immorality. In this context, More creates a mapping of the other in relation to the assumptions of the perfect Utopian race. His humanist mind envisions binary oppositions where the ontology of the savage other is dependent on the civilised one. Abdul JanMohamed elaborates on the dualism in the colonial discourse. He states:

The dominant model of power- and interest-relations in all colonial societies is the Manichean opposition between the putative superiority of the European and the supposed inferiority of the native. This axis in turn provides the central feature of the colonialist cognitive framework and colonialist literary representation: the Manichean allegory-a field of diverse yet inter- changeable oppositions between white and black,

good and evil, superiority and inferiority, civilization and savagery, intelligence and emotion, rationality and sensuality, self and Other. (63)

The cognitive projection of the Zapoletes by More's humanist mind cements a pattern of a 'Manichean allegory' that is colonial. In *Culture and Imperialism*, Said elaborates on the relation between spatial expansion and the justification of any imperial expansion. He states, "But the reverse is true, too, as experience in the dominant society comes to depend uncritically on natives and their territories perceived as in need of *la mission civilisatrice*" (xix).⁹ The others are viewed as inferior and in need of civilizing, so it is justifiable from the perspective of the imperialist to occupy the lands of the others.

The Zapoletes are a metonym for a normative value (moral inferiority) that is opposite to their Utopian counterparts; the Utopians disdain money while the Zapoletes "have quickly picked up the habit of avarice" (93), and they steal. The Utopians are neat, and they trim their gardens. The Zapoletes, on the other hand, "do not till the fields" (93). There is a perfect fusion between the morally debased Zapoletes and their correspondent physical environment; they live in undomesticated lands and rugged mountains. By contrast, the Utopians render their environment malleable to their will. Therefore, they are more civilised, rational, and superior to the savage Zapoletes who are prone to "squander on debauchery of the most squalid sort" (93). In this framework of mapping, the Zapoletes are incapable of rationality, so their environment is badly managed; they hunt, but they do not cultivate their lands. Assumptions of superiority are evident in the mental frame of More through his image of the debased Zapoletes. Assumptions of the inferior others are also manifested in the rendering of the other 'savages' in *Utopia*. Basically, the discourse of the savage alterity in *Utopia* is

⁹ Here, Said discusses Joseph Conrad's *Nostromo*. The quote is used in this context, for it touches upon the same imperialistic practice of civilizing the other, which Utopus implements.

similar, in its nature, to typical tropes of imperialism. Chauvinism, in this sense, is part of the imperialist mindset.

Similarly, Cicero's mapping of the other had the same normative approach to the Gauls. The Romans are superior to the Gauls, and the Utopian are superior to their neighbors. The Ciceronian and Morean notions of superiority are not different from any colonial or imperialistic discourse. Both the Gauls and the Zapoletes are sketched as morally debased. In *The Age of Empire: 1875-1914*, Hobsbawm elaborates on how the expansionist Europe depicted an image of the conquered that is both exotic and subjective. He explains, "What of the opposite effect of the dependent world on the dominant? Exoticism had been a by-product of European expansion since the sixteenth century" (160). It is the discourse of the self in its creation of an exoticized image of the conquered other. For Hobsbawm, the conquered were viewed as good and civilized or bad (noble savages), which donates exoticism. But at a later stage, they "were increasingly, and generally, treated as inferior, undesirable, feeble and backward, even infantile. They were fit subjects for conquest, or at least for conversion to the values of the only real civilization" (160). Hobsbawm's analysis corresponds to JanMohamed's Mainchain allegory; the normative 'backward' and 'infantile', for example, are the opposite of the values of the 'real civilization'. Hobsbawm's 'real civilization' also corresponds to Said's '*la mission civilisatrice*'; they both denote the imperialistic trope of civilizing the inferior other. The trope of the superior other in the imperialism of Utopia is merely an extension of the chauvinistic approach to the alterity in the Ciceronian discourse. *Utopia* has an imperialist discourse that is based on chauvinism. The Morean and Ciceronian mindset has created a perfect vision of what a commonwealth should be (Hobsbawm's 'real civilization') based on assumptions of superiority.

Humanistic Imperialism

Utopia was written at the age of territorial discoveries. More, the character, is presented as eager to know about the unexplored lands and the native. Earlier, Giles tells More that ““there is no mortal alive today can tell you so much about unknown peoples and unexplored lands; and I know that you’re always greedy for such information”” (9). Here, Giles wants to introduce Hythloday to More who is eager to know about ‘unexplored lands’. Hythloday is the mortal who knows about such lands and people. More’s curiosity about the natives and their lands reflects the imperialistic spirit of the era. As mentioned earlier, Hythloday is presented as a companion of Vespucci. Giles tells More that Hythloday “was Vespucci’s constant companion on the last three of his four voyages” (10). Hythloday discovers the land of Utopia on one of his voyages in search of new lands.

John Gillis elaborates on the colonizers’ search for new lands that are insular in geography. He writes:

Europe’s internal colonizers brought with them notions of shape and scale that no nature feature, whether it be a dense forest or swamp, was allowed to interfere with. In a manner that was to be repeated in overseas colonization in later centuries, the first acts of settlers was to mark out an island of space with clearly defined boundaries. Only then could the business of settling begin in earnest. The result was that by the thirteenth century Europe comprised thousands of discrete insular territories, all bearing a resemblance to one another but in no way contiguous. The Roman term, *insula*, which meant a jurisdiction as well as a physical place, was commonly used to describe all kinds of medieval tenancies. (15)

It is no wonder that More opts for an island to sketch his imaginative commonwealth. Utopus needs a place to settle, so he insulates his geological creation by separating it from the

mainland. The aggressive act of cutting off Utopia from the mainland is associated with the Roman term, *Insula*. Actually, Utopus implements the two premises of the Roman *Insula*, i.e., the topographical insulation of Utopia as a separated insular entity and the imposition of his new jurisdiction.

As for the spatial insulation of topographies, the act of territorial expansion is part of any classical tactics of imperialism and colonialism. Conquering new lands is prompted and justified by the need to civilize the other primitive alterity. Obviously, the power dynamics are in favor of the victorious conqueror (Utopus). The first insular connotation of *insula* is realized, namely the insulation of a geographical entity.

The seizing of extra lands (insulation) is followed by changing the natives. Hythloday elaborates on the incident when king Utopus creates Utopia. He notes, “Utopus, who conquered the country and gave it his name (for it had previously been called Abraxa), and who brought its rude, uncouth inhabitants to such a high level of culture and humanity that they now surpass almost every other people” (44). Here, Utopus forcefully imposes his own vision of civilization after conquering the new land and subjugating its people. Utopia has become a new land. Utopus treats the newly conquered land as case of *terra nullius*. In other words, he has no regards for the geological damage he has caused to the layers of the earth though the damage is seismic in proportions; the coast is rugged. Hythloday notes that Utopus “had a channel cut fifteen miles wide where the land joined the continent, and thus caused the sea to flow around the country” (44). Utopus has also no regards for the cultural background of the native inhabitants of the Abraxa.

The trope of *terra nullius* is recurrent in the rhetoric of imperialism, not to mention its association with territorial expansion. Graham Huggan and Helen Tiffin, in *Postcolonial Ecocriticism*, comment on the trope of *terra nullius* in Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*. They

note that “Conrad, via his narrator Marlow, depicts Africa as a blank, *terra nullius*, not because it was not inhabited, but because such inhabitation was of no consequence to Europeans” (143). The same colonial mindset of Marlow is anticipated in *Utopia*; following territorial conquest, Utopus offers the People of the Abraxas to adapt to his own jurisdiction and laws or face evacuation from their own lands. In other words, Utopus has no regards for the natives, their typography, or their laws, so he treats them as a blank space to write his own imperialist creation on.

The second connotation of *insula* (jurisdiction) is also realized. It functions within the same framework of the *terra nullius*; Utopus has no regards for the jurisdiction in the Abraxa. Hythloday justifies this colonial and imperial dominance. He explains:

But those who refuse to live under their laws they drive out of the land they claim for themselves; and against those who resist them, they wage war. They think it is perfectly justifiable to make war on people who leave their land idle and waste yet forbid the use and possession of it to others who, by the law of nature, ought to be supported from it. (57)

Here, the people of the Abraxa are referred to by ‘those’. This is a case of applying the jurisdictional *insula* to the people of the Abraxa. They are forced to abide by the new laws of Utopus. Otherwise, they will face dire consequences. The people of Abraxa are underdeveloped, so it is rightful by law of nature to seize their lands. In the Cambridge third edition of *Utopia*, which is used in this thesis, George Logan elaborates on the colonizers’ logic of seizing idle lands. He notes:

Such rationalisations have long been among the stock-in-trade of imperialism. For centuries, they found their most respectable underpinnings (as here) in the classical concept of the law of nature – an unchanging, universally valid body of law that

human beings were thought to apprehend through reason and instinct. A fundamental principle of natural law is that ‘everything is common to all’; from this it follows that a nation may appropriate ‘wasteland’ necessary to its survival. (57)

The Abraxa is a ‘wasteland’ from the perspective of imperialism, so the natural law dictates that the imperialists have the right to claim this uncultivated land in their mission of civilizing the other. It is incumbent on the imperialists to apply their reason to the ‘wasteland’ by conquering it.

Cicero describes applying the Roman law and annexation of lands. In *On the Commonwealth*, Lactantius elaborates on how the Romans expanded spatially at the expense of others. He notes, “The Roman people teaches us the distance between utility and justice by declaring war through the fetials¹⁰ and by causing injury under the guise of law, by constantly desiring and seizing others’ property, they obtained possession of the entire world” (66). The same logic is used by the Utopians who seize the lands of the others and impose Utopian laws. Utility dictates that the Romans and the Utopians impose their own vision of laws and conquer other lands.

Cicero provides his own justification of imperialism by claiming that the best should rule. In *On the Commonwealth*, Augustine¹¹ says:

But if an imperial state, a great commonwealth, does not subscribe to that injustice, then it cannot rule over provinces. The answer made by justice is that empire is just because slavery is useful for such men and that when it is rightly done, it is done on their behalf, that is, when the right to do injury is taken away from wicked people: the

¹⁰ A type of priests in ancient Rome.

¹¹ *On the Commonwealth* survived by compiling missing fragments posthumously from different authors who quoted Cicero, such as St. Augustine. Augustine’s comment on Cicero is included. See Augustine’s *City of God* 19.21.

conquered will be better off, because they would be worse off if they had not been conquered. In order to bolster this reasoning, Cicero supplies a noble illustration drawn from nature, and says: ‘Do we not see that the best people are given the right to rule by nature herself, with the greatest benefit to the weak? Why then does god rule over man, the mind over the body, reason over desire, anger, and the other flawed portions of the mind?’ (72-73)

In this context, Augustine elaborates on how imperialism is compared to slavery in Cicero’s *On the Commonwealth*. According to Augustine, Cicero adds that the ‘best are given the right to rule’. Roman imperialism is justified by Cicero who claims that it is natural for the best people to rule over the others.

Humanism is an extension of the Ciceronian mindset that views his commonwealth as the ideal example to be applied to the world. In the introduction to *On the Commonwealth* and *On the Laws*, James Zetzel explains the Ciceronian assumptions of the ideal Roman model of the commonwealth. He notes that “Cicero offers a philosophical justification for Roman imperialism and claims to universal rule” (xviii). Here, Cicero proposes an idealistic model of the commonwealth that is part of the natural order of the cosmos. His universalism is imperialist, for it has assumptions of an absolutist form of a perfect model to be imitated, which means that all other forms of state are not on par with the Roman structure that is ideal and corresponds to the cosmological world and nature; it is natural to impose the Roman law and order on the weaker.

But if the Romans are the best to rule, what are the traits and the characteristics of the best people or the best man in a given commonwealth? Are the required traits related to Utopia and imperialism? Before the word Utopia assumed the connotation of a perfect place in the English language, the English translation of the second book was different. According

to John Rist, the English translation of title of the second book was “*A Truly Golden Account of the Best Place of a Commonwealth and of the New Island of Utopia*” (752). This translation denotes the perfect state or way of rule. The assumption of the best state is based on the Ciceronian moral structure; the commonwealth of Utopia (best place) is constructed upon the Ciceronian characteristics as a perfect model to rule and thus the model to rule other commonwealths. The superior ethical model of Cicero will be examined in this section in relation to *Utopia*.

Cicero does not only consider the Roman Empire as the ultimate model, he also provides the traits of his perfect man. In other words, the traits needed in man to be ethical. Of course if man is ethical, man can establish an exemplary commonwealth. In *De officiis*, Cicero points out that four cardinal virtues can achieve what is morally right or the ethical man. He explains:

(1) with the full perception and intelligent development of the true; or (2) with the conservation of organized society, with rendering to every man his due, and with the faithful discharge of obligations assumed; or (3) with the greatness and strength of a noble and invincible spirit; or (4) with the orderliness and moderation of everything that is said and done, wherein consist temperance and self-control. (17)

So, the morally good is related to truth, duty, orderliness, or noble spirit. A moral society that is a model to rule or to be imitated should have such characteristics. Also, in *De officiis*, Cicero mentions that money, if used in moderation, can produce benefits or utility (71). In addition, Cicero mentions, in the second book of *De Inventione*, that friendship (alliances) preserves what man owns (LVI), and man should embrace honor instead of vices that are not good (LIV). By syllogism, friends can help man preserve the good things in life, and honor can preserve what is good by avoiding vices.

The abovementioned truth, orderliness, friendship, and honor are of key importance here. Harmon mentions that More borrows from the Ciceronian philosophy on truth, orderliness, friendship, and honor in his construction of *Utopia*. He explains:

Much of Utopia, including its idea of the state, is organized around a few basic Ciceronian concepts--*honestum*, *utile*, and *decorum*. In fact, a brief sketch of Cicero's 'ethical man' can help explain the Utopian view of the same...Cicero sets out three types of "good" which man should seek: 1) that which is intrinsically good (*honestum*), such as virtue, knowledge, and truth; 2) that which is productive of good (*utile*), such as money; and 3) that which is preservative of good, such as friendship and honor (*De Inventione*). An individual disposed toward these goods will be well-tempered, properly balanced, etc. (*decorum*). A society consisting of such individuals will itself be ordered. It will not only preserve morality, but will also produce order.

(106)

Here, the utopian commonwealth is well-ordered and moral because of the implementation with the three Ciceronian principles, namely *honestum*, *utile*, and *decorum*. The life of the Utopians is an appropriate life that corresponds to *decorum*. So, the Ciceronian ethical man is the archetype or the prototype upon which More bases his Utopia.

Utopia is brimming with instances that correspond to the Ciceronian ethical man. Hythlodai explains that "the Utopians, who are so well governed with so few laws. Among them virtue has its reward, yet everything is shared equally, and everyone lives in plenty" (39). These lines explain how the Ciceronian moral philosophy is mediated in the mundane life of the Utopians; they live in order with few laws (*decorum*). Utopia is a hierarchy of order. There is the phylarch and the syphogrants who are lower in hierarchy than the Phylarch. There are also the tranibors, who are changed every year (probably to eliminate

corruption), the governor, and the magistrates. This ordered hierarchy is reserved by *honestum* because they live a virtuous life (*honestum*). The Utopians are monitored in order to keep *honestum* at all times. Dining is done inside the city halls where the old and the young sit together. The young have to be monitored by the old at the table. Hythlodai says that “[t]he reason for this, as they explain it, is that the dignity of the aged, and the respect due to them, may restrain the younger people from improper freedom of words” (60). The young, in this context, are indoctrinated at establishing a dialogue that is good (*honestum*) and decorous. For decorum denotes what is in order and proper.

Cicero considers that “[d]esire is insatiable: it destroys not only individuals but whole families; often it can even bring an entire nation to its knees” (*On Moral Ends* 17). So, desire is detrimental to the structure of the commonwealth. Most of The Utopians maintain temperance, especially control over lust. Unlike the Zapoletes who are prone to debauchery, most of the Utopians are in control of their desires for they are monogamous. According to Hythlodai, the Utopians “are the only people who practise monogamy, and because their marriages are seldom terminated except by death – though they do allow divorce for adultery or for intolerably offensive behaviour” (84). Libidinous desires are regulated by the state in Utopia. Man’s desires have to be tamed in *Utopia*. For Wayne Rebhorn, Renaissance humanists and More viewed the natural man as weak and exposed to vice and passion (152). So, law in Utopia is enforced to elevate man above the natural state. In *Utopia*, Monogamy has two functions; it preserves order in society because family constitutes the core of commonwealth, and it establishes the monogamous Utopians as morally superior to other nations that are promiscuous. To achieve and maintain order, marriages are dissolved, and new ones are made if infidelity occurs. Marital fidelity is related to temperance (decorum and order) and to *honestum* (virtue).

The presentation of the Utopians as the morally superior (ethical) to others, is also manifested in the Utopian penal code. The Utopians who commit crimes are punished by slavery, but unlike the non-Utopians, they deserve a harsher treatment. Hythloday notes, “The Utopians, however, deal more harshly with their own people than with the others, feeling that they are worse and deserve stricter punishment because they had an excellent education and the best of moral training, yet still couldn’t be restrained from wrongdoing” (82). It is prohibited for the best people to break the moral code, so harsher laws are applied to the Utopians. It is the commonwealth of the best people, so morality should be maintained. Otherwise, severe laws are applied. Slavery is a subhuman state, a bestial existence. The Utopians reach their perfect state through ‘an excellent education’ (*studia humanitatis*). For Rebhorn, *Utopia* is the educational environment that is a model for a new world (155). The Utopians are ethical and well-ordered; they are the best model for a commonwealth.

The Utopians are morally superior, for they disdain money. They live in plenty (*utile*), but they do not use money. At the end of the first book More comments that “but my chief objection was to the basis of their whole system, that is, their communal living and their moneyless economy. This one thing alone utterly subverts all the nobility, magnificence, splendour and majesty which (in the popular view) are the true ornaments and glory of any commonwealth” (113). Unlike the contemporary world of More, Utopia is not based on money that is in the hand of nobility. Money is elemental to moral construction of Utopia. If Utopia is devoid of greed and money, then it is the antithesis of the corrupted world of the Renaissance. Hythloday explains, “To make this miserable poverty and scarcity worse, they exist side by side with wanton luxury” (21). The nobility encloses their lands for the lucrative business of sheep wool, which has resulted in the displacement of farmers. There is no economic balance in the Renaissance. It is a world where “people of every social rank are

given to ostentatious dress and gourmandizing” (21). Profusion and immoderation in spending money is rampant, unlike Utopia.

Money in Utopia is linked to social ills. By eliminating money, according to Hythloday, “fraud, theft, robbery, quarrels, brawls, altercations, seditions, murders, treasons...would at once die out” (111). John Colet, a Christian humanist, considers that man can transcend his human state and reach the divine state (Godlike) (62). Colet believes in self-improvement by attaining the higher state. It can be inferred that there is a human status and divine status. The man in his human status aspires to attain the divine status. Surtz notes that Colet advocates three states, namely original justice, fallen state, and nature fallen and restored (207). ‘Original Justice’ is the state in heaven while the ‘fallen nature’ is worldly state. The restored nature is when man tries to reach the divine again. For Surtz, ‘original justice’ is related in the discourse of Colet to original justice where everything is shared in a community of Christianity (207). So, the Utopians are in the restoration state; they try to reach the divine ideal by eliminating private property and money.

It is understandable that Christian humanists like Colet and More disdain money. But the humanist influence with regards to the economic system in Utopia is more foregrounded. The Utopians are moral people by dint of education (*studia humanitatis*) and training, not religion. Besides, although Christianity is presented late to the Utopians by Hythloday, the experience is not depicted in a favorable light in Utopia. A newly converted man to Christianity tries zealously to convert people but the experience is problematic. This man, according to Hythloday is accused of “creating a public disorder, convicted, and sentenced to exile” (99). It can be inferred from this incident that Utopia is rather a humanist commonwealth where people are in restoration of the Ideal state by dint of laws, education and knowledge, rather than divinity. They are presented by More as an ethical model, for they

shun money, which represents the root of crimes. Hythloday remarks that “there is not a more excellent people or a happier commonwealth anywhere in the whole world” (78).

Civil order is essential to any commonwealth that assumes its position as a model to be applied to other commonwealths externally. The Romans were puzzled by the divinity; they were unsure about the nature of the divine. According to Wynne, the Romans “did not understand their own religion. They were the heirs to immemorial practices in honor of their gods. But when they paid the gods cult, they did not know the meaning of what they did, nor the nature of the gods they worshipped” (1). Cicero was a polytheist, but he was also skeptical about the nature of gods or divinity. In *De Natura Deorum Academica*, he notes that “mankind must continue to labour under the profoundest uncertainty, and to be in ignorance about matters of the highest moment” (5). It is the will of man; man must “labour” regardless of “highest moment” (divinity). Cicero’s vision of commonwealth is quasi-secular. The divinity is shrouded in ambiguity for Cicero. He elaborates on the debate on providence; some philosophers believe that the gods are in idle inertia after creating the world while others believe that the gods still control everything, including man. (1-7). For Cicero, man should not focus on such debates because finite conclusions are not viable. This quasi-secular keeps the society in order by achieving civil order. Religious debates are to be avoided.

Civil Order in *Utopia* is of high importance. Although More was a religious man, the mediation of Christianity in Utopia is problematic. Some of the Utopians are polytheists; they worship gods and other cosmological bodies, such as the sun and the moon, but the majority of the Utopians believe that “there is one supreme power, the maker and ruler of the universe. In their native tongue they all alike call him Mythra” (98). The Utopians are aware of the dangerous nature of fanaticism, for it creates divisions and clashes within the same society; it destabilizes the order in the commonwealth. The solution is to make such debates public with monitors from the state. Utopus is aware that religious clashes are detrimental to the

civic fabric of the commonwealth; Hythloday mentions that Utopus “prescribed by law that everyone may cultivate the religion of his choice, and strenuously proselytise for it too, provided he does so quietly, modestly, rationally and without insulting others. If persuasion fails, no one may resort to abuse or violence; and anyone who fights wantonly about religion is punished by exile or slavery” (99). Utopus’ approach to pointless religious debates is similar to the quasi-secular approach of Cicero. Cicero’s answer is to ignore such high debates and focus on man’s toil instead. Religious clashes were rampant during More’s time, so More opts for cleansing his cognitive commonwealth from the ills of religious debate by showing that everyone is free to embrace the faith of his choice with state-controlled religious debates. Accordingly, Utopia is a well-ordered commonwealth.

The Ciceronian assumptions of a better cosmological model to imitate can be also detected within the framework of colonialism in *Utopia*, the perfect model. Utopia is Holyday’s account of the best people; *Utopia* is supposedly the model to be imitated; it is ethical and well-ordered. At the end of the first book of *Utopia*, Hythloday stresses that the commonwealth of Utopia is the example to follow. Hythloday explains, “So I am glad that the Utopians at least have been lucky enough to achieve this republic which I wish all mankind would imitate” (112). He also adds that it is incumbent on the whole world to “adopt the laws of this commonwealth” (112). Here, ‘this commonwealth’ is the commonwealth of *Utopia*. The Utopian laws are problematic here for they are imposed by Utopus on the barbarians as previously mentioned. So, the imposed laws imply imperialism. More tries to shape his perfect state by mimicking Cicero’s model of what constitutes a perfect commonwealth. The Morean epitome of the perfect states is applied by force on other commonwealths. Similarly, the Romans applied their perfect version of state by conquering others (imperialism).

The history of the supposedly perfect model of a commonwealth is given the focus at the expense of the natives' history. Hythloday's account of the people of the Abraxa is devoid of any historical or ethnographical details. Even the name Abraxa is mentioned few times in *Utopia* when Utopus makes his territorial invasion. On the other hand, *Utopia* is brimming with detailed historical ethnographical accounts of the Utopians. For example, Hythloday notes, "Yet in music, dialectic, arithmetic and geometry they have found out just about the same things as our great men of the past" (67). So, the Utopians have made the same scientific and artistic discoveries as the people of ancient times. Also, Hythloday says that "male children and grandchildren remain in the family, and are subject to the oldest member, unless his mind has started to fail from old age" (56). Here, Hythloday gives insight on familial relationships in *Utopia*. There is a pattern of marginalizing the history of the conquered and foregrounding the history of the conqueror, for it is the model to imitate.

The mode of ignoring the histories of the conquered and assuming a perfect model of rule is not alien to the colonial framework. In *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical*, Chakrabarty elaborates on minority histories. He says:

The popular meanings of the words 'majority' and 'minority' are statistical. But the semantic fields of the words contain another idea: of being a 'minor' or a 'major' figure in a given context. For example, the Europeans, numerically speaking, are a minority in the total pool of humanity today and have been so for a long while; yet their colonialism in the nineteenth century was based on certain ideas about major and minor. For example, they often assumed that their histories contained the majority instances of norms that every other human society should aspire to; compared to them, others were still the 'minors' for whom they, the 'adults' of the world, had to take charge, and so on. (100)

In this context, minority has a different connotation than the quantity of groups in a given historical context. 'Minorities' belong to the historically ignored groups regardless of quantity of the individuals. In this sense, the minorities are incapable of self-governing, so their histories are insignificant to the imperialist mindset. Chakrabarty adds, "Such 'minor' pasts are those experiences of the past that always have to be assigned to an 'inferior' or 'marginal' position as they are translated into the academic historian's language" (100). The people of the Abraxas are mapped as inferior in the ethnographical account of Hythloday because they are lesser in importance from an imperialistic viewpoint. The perfect model to rule in the Morean context is synonymous to the colonialist rhetoric that belittles the history of the conquered. The imperialist model is a monolithic entity that dictates its version of rule.

Utopus and his Roman counterpart (Romulus) have created their own perfect commonwealth following conquering the lands and subjecting their inhabitants to their own view of rule. They assume the role of the *homo deus* who is the manly God of a humanist creation. Utopus represents an imperialist powerhouse that envisions a new iteration of the land and its people, a combination of the humanist and the imperialist mindset. Utopus has the right to seize the lands because the natives are not cultivating their own lands, so the law of nature dictates that it is justifiable to take the lands by force.

It is important to shed light on warfare in the form the Morean and Ciceronian point of view, for warfare is employed in *On the Commonwealth* and *Utopia* as a tool for conquering the natives and their lands. There are notable disparities in the imperial warfare ethics of More and Cicero. In the first book of *Utopia*, Hythloday mentions that "most princes apply themselves to the arts of war, in which I have neither ability nor interest, instead of to the good arts of peace. They are generally more set on acquiring new kingdoms by hook or crook than on governing well those they already have" (14). In other words, princes should improve the civic sphere within the limit of the commonwealth, not outside

that limit. Hythloday voices his reluctance to be a courtier to a bellicose king. If the first book of *Utopia* tries to eliminate the ills of part one (wars), then the second book should be free from any context of warfare. On the contrary, the second book valorizes the state of warfare as an imperialist method to establish the perfect commonwealth that is based on subjugating the other.

In the second book, Hythloday further explains the odious nature of war for the Utopians. Killing is detestable and not pure; the Utopians do not kill animals in the slaughterhouse. Yet, they participate in wars and conquer new lands. He mentions that the Utopians wage wars “to protect their own land, to drive invading armies from the territories of their friends, or to liberate an oppressed people, in the name of compassion and humanity, from tyranny and servitude. They war not only to protect their friends from present danger, but sometimes to repay and avenge previous injuries” (90). The assumed ethics of warfare in this context is at odds with the imperialist nature of Utopus’ warfare. The phrase ‘to liberate the oppressed people’ is in conflict with their rhetoric of driving away the inferior barbarians who cannot embrace the new Utopian laws. In praxis, the Utopians are involved in warfare, which contradicts Hythloday’s polemic against the wars in Europe.

The same paradoxical rhetoric of the ethics of warfare can be detected in Cicero’s logic though Cicero was not an advocate for war himself. He states that he is against war per se in several of his works. *On the Commonwealth* is comprised of an exchange of rhetoric between different characters as in *De Natura Deorum Academica*, but Cicero’s point of view is more delineated in *On the Commonwealth*; in *De Natura Deorum Academica*, for example, the dialogue is harder to draw a conclusion from at the end of the debate, which is emblematic of the vague nature of the Roman gods and their pantheon.

For Cicero, war is waged only for recovering seized lands. Isidore,¹² in *On the Commonwealth*, expresses his views on war and how any given war should be just. He states:

A just war is one that is first declared and then waged to recover stolen property or to fight off enemies. An unjust war is one that is started out of madness rather than for a legitimate cause. About this Cicero says in *On the Commonwealth*: ‘Those wars are unjust which are undertaken without cause. For aside from vengeance or for the sake of fighting off enemies no just war can be waged.’ And a little later he adds: ‘No war is considered just unless it is announced and declared and unless it involves recovery of property.’ (73)

Both More and Cicero share the same moral ground on warfare; the resemblance of the Morean and Ciceronian rhetoric on warfare is starkly similar. A just war is waged for defense purposes or reclaiming a lost property or money, not to mention helping the neighboring allies. It seems that warfare is indispensable in the second book of *Utopia* though it is uncommendable in the first. If warfare is implemented in the imperialistic annexation of lands, then the next section will examine how the *vita activa* is applied to other commonwealths (outwardly) to justify land annexation.

Rhetoric, the *Vita Activa*, and Imperialism in *Utopia*

The implementation of the Ciceronian *vita activa* was extended externally. To be active in life in order to perform civic duties became being active by colonizing other lands. In other words, the notion of establishing a virtuous commonwealth in the *vita activa* transcended the boundaries of a given civic country to be applied to the other commonwealths of the

¹² Isidore of Seville’s quote from *On the Commonwealth* is also used when compiling the missing fragments from *on the commonwealth*. See Isidore’s *Etymologies* 18.1.2-3

barbarians by virtue of imperialism. Spanish and Portuguese colonization preceded English colonization in time, but the humanist notions of creating virtuous commonwealths were part of the humanist discourse in the Renaissance. Fitzmaurice explains:

Those who did pursue colonisation did so because they found an outlet for the humanist passion for the *vita activa*, a means to exercise virtue in the foundation and conservation of a commonwealth – the highest calling of the active life. Moreover, when the promoters of colonies spoke of the glories of serving the commonwealth they did not always restrict their meaning to the English commonwealth. Their first duty was, of course, to their sovereign and to England. Frequently, however, the understanding of virtuous duties in the service of their sovereign extended to the foundation of new commonwealths. (6)

Historically, Renaissance imperialists tried to apply Cicero's *vita activa* to other commonwealths.

Utopia is founded on the concept of the *vita activa*. The mediation of the *Studia humanitatis* in *Utopia* will be explored in order to show how it is related to the imperialist discourse. The first book of *Utopia* deals with Hythloday's rhetoric and his interactional dialogue with the other characters. In the first book, More elaborates on his meeting with Giles and Hythloday during his diplomatic trip. More presents Hythloday as a humanist rhetorician. Giles tells More that Hythloday is good at Greek, Latin and philosophy (*studia humanitatis*). Giles says that Hythloday acknowledges the value of two Roman authors, namely Cicero and Seneca. Here, Hythloday is presented in the first book as a humanist rhetorician who is influenced by the works of antiquities and a man of knowledge. The Ciceronian rhetoric of Hythloday is evident in the first book, for his ethos, pathos, and logos are well established (Harmon 100). More sets the ground for Hythloday's ethos when he says

that Hythloday seeks “neither wealth nor power” (14). Giles admires Hythloday’s rectitude (logos) and acknowledges that Hythloday’s “advice and supply of examples would be helpful at the counsel abroad” (13). Pathos is also evident when Hythloday notes, “if the rulers were only willing to take their good advice” (29). Here, Hythloday expresses a sense of disappointment in kings who pay no heed to counselors.

Hythloday employs Ciceronian rhetoric which is the theoretical part of oration to convince his interlocutors of the excellence of Utopia. He uses his rhetoric to achieve persuasion, which is the end of rhetoric. A good rhetorician makes his desirable changes by impacting his audience. Hythloday’s speech is performed in the presence of highly influential figures in the world of politics like the cardinal and Giles. Hythloday advocates a commonwealth that is imperialistic in its genesis. He advocates a metropolis that fosters expansionistic imperialism as an extended policy and provides justifications for this policy; the Utopians are short of lands, so it is justifiable to seize other lands. So, Ciceronian rhetoric advocates imperialism in Utopia. According to Fitzmaurice, the colonialists employed Ciceronian rhetoric to get support for their imperialistic projects (9). Rhetoric is employed by the colonialists to persuade influential people for support. Of course, More was not an advocate of imperialism during his time, but his *Utopia* fosters and justifies imperialism. And this is done by employing Ciceronian rhetoric.

In form, Hythloday employs the Ciceronian model of rhetoric, but in content, he shuns the court of the kings who are indifferent to the counselors. Although he employs rhetoric with his interlocutors, Hythloday shows his reluctance to be a counselor. This is a departure from Cicero’s obligation to that state and the civic duty. More, the character, is more in line with Cicero’s civic duty. Wegemer says, “When More identifies Raphael as a scholastic and a gnostic, he continues a traditional attack upon overly simplistic systems of thoughts. The two characters, Morus and Raphael, stand in sharp contrast to one another.

Morus appears as the dedicated father and public servant, who travels and leaves his family only for duty” (304). The interplay between More (the character), Hythloday, and other characters contribute to the radical birth of Utopia. The sharp critique of the status quo is foregrounded by the sharp pathos of Hythloday and his idealistic vision of what a commonwealth should be.

The use of the Ciceronian rhetoric is used for voicing Hythloday’s polemic against the sociopolitical order. He creates a radically different commonwealth that is different from the historicity of the time, and such a radical creation requires a dose of pathos. More, the character, is about discharging civic duties in an established order while Hythloday’s rhetoric is more about creating an entirely new order. Hythloday is still presented as a well-versed humanist who envisions the best model of a commonwealth. Although he shuns the court of the kings, he creates an imaginary commonwealth. At the end of the second book, More says that “in the Utopian commonwealth there are very many features that in our own societies I would wish rather than expect to see” (113). So, the features of *Utopia* are hard to apply in society in praxis.

Sir Thomas More cognitively envisions a social and a political entity and dubs it ‘Utopia’, a no place. Utopia is a construction of a humanist mind that tries to put an end to the ills of the English commonwealth by mapping a commonwealth that is based on human reason and will. In *Islands of the Mind*, Gillis considers that the Utopians “jostled for paradises for a place in the vast *terra incognita*, but they represent a dream not of what had been but what could be...opened up a small space within which to consider alternative ways of organizing society” (73). Similarly, Utopia is an island that is shaped by the human mind, a figment of imagination (dream). Utopia is a reaction to the established social order, a different method of creating social orders. Utopia’s locale is a no-place topography, a *terra incognita*. The motif of Utopia as a *terra incognita* (no place) is stated in the first book. In

More's letter to Giles, More tells Giles that he forgot to ask Hythloday about the location of Utopia. He says, "For it didn't occur to us to ask, nor to him to say, in what part of the New World Utopia is to be found. I would give a sizeable sum of money to remedy this oversight, for I'm rather ashamed not to know the ocean where this island lies about which I've written so much" (5). So, *Utopia* belongs to the human imagination of what could be possible by the human mind.

Utopia is a piece of speculative imagination. Both More and Cicero were statesmen who discharged their civic duties in their daily life and epistemically in written form; they wrote works on the best form of the commonwealth. This speculative image of what a commonwealth should be is linked to the imperialist discourse. A failed implementation of the *vita activa* by the commonwealth of the barbarians entails enforced implementing of the humanists' version of the *vita activa*; the barbarians do not cultivate their lands in their *vita activa*, so it is justifiable to seize their land and apply a superior version of the *vita activa*.

The dynamism of utopia is concerned with the *vita activa*, which is contrasted to the sloth of the nobility in real-time England. The commonwealth of Utopia is based on labour and hard work. Sloth and idleness are sins that are punishable by the Utopian law with slavery. In the first book, Hythloday elaborates on how idleness is one of the ills that plague feudal England. He says, "Living in idleness and luxury without doing society any good no longer satisfies them; they have to do positive harm" (19). In this passage, Hythloday criticizes holy men and the nobility, for they implement the enclosure of lands in order to focus on the lucrative sheep trade. As a result of their action, their servants are idle as their masters (nobility and holy men). Hythloday's corrective solution to the problem of idleness is the Utopian model of hard work. *Utopia* is the antithesis to the feudal England in terms of work. Utopians work six hours per day, but they are very efficient. Even their leisure time is "devoted to intellectual activity" (52). Idlers have no place in the commonwealth of Utopia.

In this sense, Utopian life is about dynamism and activity. Every citizen has to be productive in order to contribute to the welfare of the commonwealth. Unproductivity and sloth are not tolerated by the Utopians.

The importance of activity and dynamism is also foregrounded in the Ciceronian discourse. Cicero was a proponent of activity and hard work. His discourse of active dynamism in the commonwealth prioritizes praxis over theory. In his *De Officiis*, Cicero elaborates on the importance of the active life to the commonwealth. He explains:

The principal thing done, therefore by those very devotees of the pursuits of learning and science is to apply their own practical wisdom and insight to the service of humanity. And for that reason also much speaking (if only it contain wisdom) is better than speculation never so profound with but speech; for mere speculation is self-centered, while speech extends its benefits to those with whom we are united by the bonds of society. (161)

The *vita activa* is prioritized in the Ciceronian discourse. All the knowledge that man gains from the *studia humanitatis* and the intellectual life (*vita contemplativa*) should be employed in the service of society. Cicero believes that every individual should perform his civic duty in order to contribute to the welfare of the civic community as a whole. In case of any conflict between the *vita activa* and the *vita contemplativa*, the utmost priority is given to the *vita activa*.

Likewise, the polis of *Utopia* is based on the *vita activa*; the individuals should work hard to make their due contribution to the welfare of the commonwealth. Hythlodai explains, “Depending on their interests, some go to one lecture, some to another. But if anyone would rather devote his spare time to his trade, as many do who are not suited to the intellectual life, this is not prohibited; in fact, such persons are commended as specially useful to the

commonwealth” (53). To make sure that every Utopian work hard, the Utopians have established a class of a profession (the syphogrants) whose sole function in society is “to take care and see to it that no one sits around in idleness, and to make sure that everyone works hard at his trade” (52). The resemblance between the Ciceronian civic philosophy and the Utopians’ anti-idleness civic polity is also evident in the *vita contemplativa* of the Utopians. The learning of the magistrates and the people is put to use in the *vita activa*. Hythloday is even described by More, the character, as a man of knowledge and experience (14). Both Hythloday and the Utopians are applying the knowledge they have to their *vita activa*.

In the first book, Hythloday states that the Utopians “learned every single useful art of the Roman empire either directly from their guests or by using the seeds of ideas to discover these arts for themselves” (42). There is an extended emphasis on the excellence of the Roman rule in *Utopia*. Even Hythloday praises the Roman methodology of the Roman Rule when he discusses the penal code with the Cardinal. Hythloday notes that The Romans “were most expert in the arts of government” (23). If the Utopians learned a lot from the Romans, then *Utopia* is founded after the Roman empire model, and this is evident in the Utopian’s implementation of the *vita activa*. In *Utopia*, Utopus and the Utopians apply their rhetoric of land cultivation (man’s reason) in their active live (*vita activa*) to other commonwealths. The barbarians failed to apply reason to their topography, so it is justifiable to conquer their lands. So, *Utopia* is based on the application of man’s reason in the *vita activa*. More creates a different social and political order that is based on reason and the *vita activa*, but that reason is also implemented in the *vita activa* of the Utopians in an imperialistic way. The Ciceronian rhetoric of Hythloday creates a polis that is virtuous and hard working in the *vita activa*, and this polis model is forced on other commonwealths (imperialism).

During the Renaissance, humanists’ *vita activa* was implemented in praxis outside the boundary of one civic sphere. The intellectual logic of civilizing the savages has a wide scope

in temporality; the revival of Ciceronian works resulted in igniting the rhetoric of imperialism. The same humanistic rhetoric of civilizing the inferior alterity is extended in the Morean rhetoric. Utopus, in the genesis of Utopia, has turned the uncivilized natives into people who “surpass almost every other people” (44). The discourse of superiority is evident in imperialistic discourses.

Humanistic Cultivation of Ecology and Imperialism

The imperialistic mindset that tries to subordinate the topography is also humanistic. The imperialistic approach is mediated through applying the mind to the flora. The Utopians live in big houses with spacious gardens that are cared for by human hard work and diligence. Hythloday says, “Utopians are very fond of these gardens of theirs. They raise vines, fruits, herbs and flowers, so well cared for and flourishing that I have never seen any gardens more productive or elegant than theirs” (48). Utopia is a locale of walled gardens, a *hortus conclusus* that is cared for by the Utopians. It is not a natural Eden where trees grow without the toil of the inhabitants. The locale is not a fertile Eden; it is a result of human care and diligence.

The modern ecocritics and environmentalists try to show that dichotomy of culture/nature is totally artificial and manmade; the historicity of man’s culture is not different from the natural history, for man is part of the ecology. For example, Jason Moore notes, “Human/Nature dualisms presume what needs to be explained: How have we reached the point where we assume a separation that so clearly does not exist?” (598). In this sense, Man’s myopic vision has created the nonexistent dualism of culture/nature. The medieval world had in some instances different views of nature that were normative. History is brimming with instances that touch upon the division of nature/culture. Although the

chronology of the instances is different from More's and Cicero's time, the instances show how thinkers conceptualized nature and culture. For example, according to William Smith, Lutherans, Calvinists, and Protestants were excluded from the civic body as they were viewed as part of nature by the bishop of Bamberg (153-155). Here, this view is normative; it associates, Protestants, Lutherans, and Calvinists (heretics) with nature that is out of the civic realm. This normative view foregrounds the inferiority of nature and views it as the antithesis of the civic realm of man. The bishop of Bamberg's normative view is understandable within its historical context; it came at a time when the religious conflicts were raging between Catholicism and unorthodox views of the Christian faith. The inferior nature had to be subdued by the human reason.

History is rife with the theme of nature domesticated by man's reason. In the sixteenth century, the Marian church in Freiberg was created with "a hybrid botanical-architectural structure" (Lamsechi 160). This fusion of the natural and the synthetic is a testament to the medieval will to render nature malleable to the human mind and the civic sphere. More's vision of nature and topography in *Utopia* is equally normative as in the two abovementioned examples. Utopus has to separate Utopia from the lands of the savages in order to bring it to the sphere of humanist civilization. The Utopians "make the land yield an abundance for all, though previously it had seemed too poor and barren even to support the natives" (57). The human reason is needed to turn the land of the savages that is barren and uncouth to the fertile sphere of civilization.

If *Utopia* is not a paradisaical island where gardens are naturally thriving, and the human element is foregrounded in Hythloday's account of *Utopia*, can this human effort be imperial and colonial? The Ciceronian *vita activa* drives the dynamism of the islands and keep the trees trimmed, which is applying Ciceronian humanism in praxis by actively engaging in the commonwealth. But can the act of farming be colonial in More's *Utopia*?

There is an association between colonization and horticulture in *Utopia* according to Wayne Rebhorn. He elaborates on the link between farming and colonizing in:

Colonization, it should be remembered, derives from ‘colo,’ which means ‘to cultivate,’ and by extension, ‘to settle land,’ and those individuals who carry it out are called ‘coloni,’ a word which means both farmers and colonists and which More uses interchangeably with ‘agricolae.’ Thus, since colonization and cultivation are really the same process, it should hardly be surprising that More would praise it through Hythloday’s mouth. (145)

There is a fusion between to farm and to colonize, especially when farming involves occupying other lands by force in order to start the process of cultivation. The ecological system is inferior prior to the process of civilization implemented by the colonists. The rough people of the Abraxas are brought to civilization along with their environment by Utopus. Rebhorn adds, “[T]he humanists felt that before being transformed by man’s art, nature was rough and imperfect, filled with unrealized potentialities, and man as man did not yet exist” (150). So, nature before the colonialist effort is a wild place inhabited by beasts.

Ciceronian humanism revived the interest in liberal arts (*studia humanitatis*) in the renaissance era, so the focus is on man, man’s reason and knowledge. The *studia humanitatis* is elemental. Humanist Education, according to Rebhorn, is that viable way to transform the fallen nature and the brutes inhabiting it into civilized entities (150). More was a Renaissance humanist, and his *Utopia* is sketched within the Renaissance framework of giving the utmost to man’s reason and education. His perfect commonwealth uses human engineering (Cicero’s *studia humanitatis*) in farming. Hythloday notes that Utopians “improve their soil by industry” (78). Toil and industry are archived by dint of the humanist education. Their gardens are also kept clean by inventing an advanced drainage system and

creating special routes for meat or poultry. Hythloday explains, “Fish, meat and poultry are also brought there from designated places not far outside the city, where running water can carry away all the blood and refuse” (58). The Utopians know how to preserve their ecology and keep it clean by assigning special water ways for waste and special routes for animal products. Consequently, pollution is kept at bay in Utopia.

The Utopian colonists are presented as masters of agriculture and horticulture by virtue of man’s reason and the *studia humanitatis*. Similarly, their mastery extends to animal husbandry; the fauna thrives under their rule. The incubation of the hens in utopia is done by the human element, rather than hens. Hythloday elaborates on bizarre incident artificial incubation. He notes, “The farmers, not hens, keep the eggs alive and hatch them, maintaining them at an even, warm temperature. As soon as they come out of the shell, the chicks recognise the humans and follow them around instead of their mothers” (46). This incident of anthropomorphized hens is emblematic of More’s humanist mindset; he tries to create a humanist commonwealth that is based on man’s reason. Here, More stretches the boundaries of what can be possibly achieved in real life. *Utopia*, for Christopher Burlinson, “is so very self-consciously fictional” (30). More was aware of the fictionality, but he mediated the limits of the humanist mind.

The prosperity of the Utopians’ ecology in the second book is antithetical to the ecology of Europe in the first book. The fauna and flora in the first book are depicted as in disarray. The sheep are presented as detrimental to the ecological system due to the human mismanagement of the ecology. Hythloday tells the cardinal about the ecological catastrophe that is caused by the enclosure of lands. The sheep are destroying the arable fields, which endangers the ecosystem. He notes, “They devastate and depopulate fields, houses and towns. For in whatever parts of the land sheep yield the finest and thus the most expensive wool, there the nobility and gentry, yes, and even a good many abbots – holy men – are not content

with the old rents that the land yielded to their predecessors” (19). The bad policies in More’s England led to an ecological disaster. The greedy nobility and holy men focused on grazing the sheep for the wool at the expense of arable lands. Farmers were displaced, and the arable lands were used as pens for the sheep.

The fictional world of Utopia is a world of green gardens and efficient animal husbandry. On the other side of the coin, More’s England is a place of disastrous ecology with respect to the flora and fauna (lands and sheep). There is a territorial degradation in More’s England. Christopher Burlinson comments on the said degradation. He illustrates that “Hythloday sees these changes as tending towards a loss of productive land, a movement from *culti* (human habitations) to *solitudinem* (wilderness)” (27). In this sense, there is a shift from cultivation (civilization) to a savage state ‘wilderness’. The Utopian imperialists have turned their ecology into gardens. England is depicted as relapsing into a precolonial state of untamed wilderness. England is the land of the Abraxas prior to the arrival of Utopus.

This human engineering in the commonwealth Utopia is a product of the revival of the interest in the *studia humanitatis*. Rebhorn elaborates on the influence of the humanist education (the *studia humanitatis*) on *Utopia*. He says that humanist education is central in More’s Utopia (150). The Utopians used their education (*studia humanitatis*) to create their ecology (to colonize). In addition, they use their technology to keep their ecosystem intact. They take preemptive measures to prevent their ecosystem from relapsing into a commonwealth of untamed nature (England). Humanistic rationality and education are utilized in Utopia. Hythloday explains that “[t]here you can not only observe that they do all the things farmers usually do to improve poor soil by hard work and technical knowledge” (78). The Utopian colonists employ technology and reason to turn the wilderness into domestication (civilization).

The Romans had a similar approach to gardens. According to F.M.A Jones, the Romans considered the gardens “as enclosed space maps on to larger sets of inside-outside dyads in the Roman world: the garden is a secluded interior, but on a larger scale Rome is a safe interior surrounded by more perilous environment; again, Italy is a civilised interior surrounded by a more dangerous outer world” (781). So, Roman gardens were microcosmoses that protected the Romans from the savage outside world. The Romans deemed themselves in constant danger of the surrounding ‘barbarians’, so their gardens were the protecting barriers that separate their civilized world from the uncivilized one.

More’s humanist garden is synonymous with the Ciceronian concept of garden in the genesis of Rome. Cicero believes in the ability of the human mind and will to shape beautiful gardens and islands, while the gods sit apathetic after creating the world. In *De Natura Deorum Academica*, Cicero notes:

Then why need I speak of the race of men? who are as it were the appointed tillers of the soil, and who suffer it not to become a savage haunt of monstrous beasts of prey nor a barren waste of thickets and brambles, and whose industry diversifies and adorns the lands and island sand coasts with houses and cities. Could we but behold these things with our eyes as we can picture them in our minds, no one taking in the whole earth at one view could doubt the divine reason. (219)

According to Cicero, both humans and gods share the same reason since the gods have bestowed the faculty of reasoning on mankind. Man uses his logos in toiling the land and turning it into a *hortus conclusus*, for the godly and human mind are in line with the natural law. In both More’s model and the Ciceronian model, Man’s reason and will are synonymous with civilization. It is about creation.

Mankind in the Ciceronian model and the Utopians are creators of civilizations by dint of creating cities and turning arid lands into gardens. The human reason rules over man and nature in the discourse of Romulus and Utopus. More's and Cicero's humanist mindsets are valorized in this context, but there is a slight difference; in Utopia and some Ciceronian discourses, nature and gardens have to be subdued and domesticated by man, but in other Ciceronian discourses, nature and its laws are in accordance with man's and gods' reason, so it is not normative as in the genesis of Utopus. Cicero was affluent, and he owned a big garden that he was fond of taking care of (like other Romans). The garden is not only associated with civilization and creation in the Ciceronian context, it has an additional significance. Cicero sees himself as the heir to the long line of Greek philosophers who produced their philosophy in the lovely Greek gardens (Jones 794).

By analogy, Utopians like their gardens, and they are fascinated with their exposure to the works of Greek antiquity (*Studia Humanitatis*). Hythloday says, "Thus they received from me most of Plato's works and more of Aristotle's, as well as Theophrastus' book On Plants, though the latter, I'm sorry to say, was somewhat mutilated" (79). The same humanist mind, that appropriates the normative ecology to his will, uses the same rhetoric to enforce his imperialistic vision to bring civilization to the barbarians and their ecology. The ecology of the barbarians has to be turned into a civic realm by the conquerors.

The Utopians have an ecological problem; the narrative of Hythloday proposes that overpopulation in the Utopian commonwealth justifies colonial invasion of other lands. There is a shortage of lands:

But if a city has too many people, the extra persons serve to make up the shortage of population in other cities. And if the population throughout the entire island exceeds the quota, they enrol citizens out of every city and plant a colony under their own

laws on the mainland near them, wherever the natives have plenty of unoccupied and uncultivated land. (57)

The shortage of space in the island necessitates imperial expansions to the nearby mainland. Lack of lands for accommodation has resulted in territorial expansions and ideological dominance (imposing laws). The imperialistic rhetoric is evident here; land annexation is advantageous to the natives who do not cultivate their lands.

The exploitation of botanical resources is evident in Utopia through cultivating the topographical space of lands. It is hard to dissociate the Utopians' cultivation of their lands and gardens from the imperialistic strategy of creating plantations and planting the floras in the land of the inferior other. Trespassing and subjugating the ecology of the barbarians are integral parts of classical imperialism. In *Imperial Ecology: Environmental Order in the British Empire, 1895–1945*, Peder Anker elaborates on the relation between English imperialism and ecology from the viewpoint of Thomas Chipp who worked for the Royal Botanical Garden. Anker notes, “When he guided his visitors around the garden he emphasized the social history of plants as examples of successful colonization ... He thus took the historical transformation of the literal face of the Earth by human beings as a yardstick for judging achievements of the British imperial mission” (33). Botanical and ecological achievements of the British Empire evoke a sense of imperial nostalgia.

The British colonizers transformed the topography, which triggers feelings of nostalgic pride. Although the temporality is wide between More's and Chipps' time, the same hegemonical pride in botanical engineering is valorized in the Utopians' agricultural rhetoric. They are proud of their beautiful and lush gardens, which is contrasted to the disheveled and barren lands of the barbarians. Utopia is a place of *hortus conclusus* and advanced agriculture, unlike the barren Abraxa of the barbarians or the land where the inferior

Zapoletes live. It is an ecology of imperial pride; the ecology of the Utopians is superior to the wastelands of their neighbors. More wrote *Utopia* at a juncture of time when England was eyeing the Spanish and Portuguese sea ventures. The glory of creating and expanding plantations was not alien to England.

Historically, imperial pride in botany is not alien to the Romans. According to Elizabeth Pollard, Pliny had a collection of floras in the *Templum Pacis* from several Roman colonies, which evoked for him imperial sentiments (325-326). The floras, in this respect, are signifiers of imperial pride, for they are collected from conquered colonies. The sense of awe is magnified due to the differential in dynamics of power. The geopolitical context seeped into botany resulting in creating botanical imperialism. The floras are symbolic of imperial glory; the Romans took pride in the far-stretching Roman colonies and the floras were a metonym for imperial dominance. Pollard adds, “This colonial botany, or even botanical imperialism – in which plantation, natural history writing, and botanical gardening play so central a part in the economy, ideology, and panegyric of a ruling power” (324). As their Roman counterparts, the Utopians are proud of their gardens and cultivated lands. The floras are enmeshed in their narrative of imperial supremacy and panegyric of dominance over the barbarians who have not cultivated their lands.

Conclusion

Imperialism and humanism are intricately linked in the Morean and Ciceronian context. Imperialism in the Ciceronian humanistic discourse is extended in *Utopia* as shown in this thesis. The Morean and Ciceronian practices of imperialism correspond to Herlihy-Mera’s three phases of ‘cultural conquest’. The Merchants include the resources and the strategic geography of the conquered land. The Military is, of course, implemented by Utopus and

Romulus by the territorial invasion of the barbarians' lands. Both the genesis of Rome and Utopia is based on territorial annexation. The Politicians is related to socializing the conquered space by imposing the epistemological values of imperialist powers and this is manifested in the account of Romulus and Utopus; the third phase is applied by enforcing the imperialist's own symbols and culture, which is evident in the imperial account of Romulus and Utopus. The same Ciceronian humanistic/imperialistic discourse of territorial and cultural dominance seeps into *Utopia*.

Chauvinism and viewing the others as inferior barbarians are mediated in the rhetoric of More and Cicero. The Roman *homo barbarus*, with its normative connotation, is synonymous with barbarians in the first book and in the second book of *Utopia*. The other is the very antitheses to the imperial self, which creates a Manichean allegory that is colonial and imperial. The people of the Abraxas are viewed as barbarians (compared to the Utopians) who do not cultivate their lands, which justifies ruling over them and annexing their lands by Utopus.

In *On the commonwealth*, Cicero sketches the Roman commonwealth as the perfect cosmological rule which gives justifications to Roman Imperialism. By the same token, *Utopia* is presented by Hythloday as the perfect commonwealth and the ultimate form of rule to rule other lands. The whole construction of Utopia is based upon the Ciceronian ethical man (*utile, honestum*), which creates order (*decorum*). Part of the Utopian's moral superiority lies in their shunning of money, which is the cause of corruption in England and Europe. The Utopians disdain money and worldly riches, so they are morally superior. The Utopians constitute the antithesis of the immoral world of More's time.

More creates *Utopia* in line with Cicero's *vita activa* while the *vita contemplativa* is downplayed unless it leads to applying civic duties in praxis. The Utopians also abhor sloth,



which is antithetical to the *vita activa*. But the *vita activa* has assumed an imperialistic function; the humanistic *vita activa* is employed outwardly to other commonwealths by force. More' rhetoric is used to create a land that practices imperialism; Hythloday is a humanist who employs rhetoric in the first book to justify the imperialist genesis of Utopia.

The analysis moreover showed that the imperialistic enterprise and the humanistic mind strive to domesticate the ecology. Agriculture and horticulture are synonymous with colonization in *Utopia*. Coloni denotes both colonizing and cultivating lands. Nature is viewed as wild and undomesticated before the arrival of the Utopians. By dint of the *studia humanitatis* and rationality, the Utopians have turned the lands into walled gardens. Unlike the arid lands of the native barbarians. The scope of thesis is *Utopia* from a Ciceronian perspective in relation to Imperialism. But this thesis can open the door to bigger projects that can explore a potential Ciceronian impact on other Renaissance works. Renaissance works have been exhausted by literary scholars. Viewing Renaissance works from a Ciceronian point of view can offer a new perspective.



Works Cited

Ackroyd, Peter. *The Life of Thomas More*. Chatto & Windus, 1998.

Anker, Peder. *Imperial Ecology: Environmental Order in the British Empire, 1895-1945*.
Harvard UP, 2002.

Bisaha, Nancy. *Creating East and West: Renaissance Humanists and the Ottoman Turks*. U
of Pennsylvania P, 2006.

Bruce, Susan. "Utopian Justifications: More's Utopia, Settler Colonialism, and Contemporary
Ecocritical Concerns." *College Literature*, vol. 42 no. 1, 2015, p. 23-43. *Project MUSE*,
doi:10.1353/lit.2015.0009.

Burlinson, Christopher. "Humans and Animals in Thomas More's Utopia." *Utopian Studies*,
vol. 19, no. 1, 2008, pp. 25-47. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20719890. Accessed 28
July 2021.

Burton, Paul J. "Roman Imperialism". *Brill Research Perspectives in Ancient History* 2.2,
2019: 1-114. <https://doi.org/10.1163/25425374-12340004> Web. Accessed 22 May. 2021.

Cave, Alfred A. "Thomas More and the New World." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned
with British Studies*, vol. 23, no. 2, 1991, pp. 209-229. *JSTOR*,
www.jstor.org/stable/4050603. Accessed 23 July 2021.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical
Difference*. Edited by Geoff Eley et al., Princeton UP, 2008.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Inventione. Cicero Complete Works*. Kobo ed. Translated by
Charles Duke Yonge. Delphi Classics, 2014.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. Translated by Harris Rackham. *De Natura Deorum Academica*.

London. W. Heinemann, 1967.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Officiis*. Translated by Walter Miller. London. W. Heinemann, 1928.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *On Moral Ends*. Edited by Julia Annas. Translated by Raphael Woolf, Cambridge UP, 2004.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius, and James E.G. Zetzel. *On the Commonwealth and On the Laws*. Cambridge UP, 2017.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius, et al. *De Oratore in Two Volumes I Books I, II*. London. W. Heinemann, 1967.

Colet, John. *Ioannes Coletus Super Opera Dionysii: Two Treatises on the Hierarchies of Dionysius*. Translated by J. H. Lupton. Whittingham and Wilkins, 1869.

Fitzmaurice, Andrew. *Humanism and America: An Intellectual History of English Colonisation, 1500-1625*. Cambridge UP, 2007.

Gillis, John R. *Islands of the Mind: The Making of the Atlantic World*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Harmon, Alonzo G. "Sacrifice in the Public Square: Ciceronian Rhetoric in More's *Utopia* and the Ultimate Ends of Counsel." *Law and Literature*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2004, pp. 93–125. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/lal.2004.16.1.93. Accessed 22 Feb. 2021.

Herlihy-Mera, Jeffrey. *After American Studies: Rethinking the Legacies of Transnational Exceptionalism*. Routledge, 2018.



Hobsbawm, Eric J. *The Age of Empire, 1875-1914*. Vintage Books, 1989.

Hogan, Sarah. *Other Englands Utopia, Capital, and Empire in an Age of Transition*. Stanford UP, 2018.

JanMohamed, Abdul R. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1985, pp. 59–87. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/1343462. Accessed 10 Mar. 2021.

Jones, F.M.A. "Roman Gardens, Imagination, and Cognitive Structure." *Mnemosyne*, vol. 67, no. 5, 2014, pp. 781–812. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/24522234. Accessed 30 May 2021.

Lamsechi, Guita. "Freiberg's Tulip Pulpit: Hybrid Nature and Civic Politics". *The Book of Nature and Humanity in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Brepols, 2013, pp. 157-179.

Lerner, Gerda. *The Creation of Patriarchy*. Oxford UP, 1987.

Magdoff, Harry. *Imperialism: from the Colonial Age to the Present*. Monthly Review Press, 1978.

Moore, Jason W. "The Capitalocene, Part I: on the Nature and Origins of Our Ecological Crisis", *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 44:3, 2017, 594-630, <https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lnu.se/doi/pdf/10.1080/03066150.2016.1235036?needAccess=true>

More, Saint Thomas. *More: Utopia*. Translated by Robert M. Adams. Edited by Logan, George M. Cambridge UP, 2016.

Morley, Neville. *The Roman Empire: Roots of Imperialism*, Pluto Press, 2010. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.lnu.se/lib/linne-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3386436>. Accessed 9 Apr. 2021.



- Pinn, Anthony B. "Humanism As Guide to Life Meaning". *What Is Humanism and Why Does It Matter?*, Taylor & Francis Group, 2013. *ProQuest Ebook Central*,
<https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.lnu.se/lib/linne-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3061080>.
- Pollard, Elizabeth Ann. "Pliny's Natural History and the Flavian Templum Pacis: Botanical Imperialism in First-Century C. E. Rome." *Journal of World History*, vol. 20, no. 3, 2009, pp. 309–338. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40542802. Accessed 22 Mar. 2021.
- Rebhorn, Wayne A. "Thomas More's Enclosed Garden: 'Utopia' and Renaissance Humanism." *English Literary Renaissance*, vol. 6, no. 2, 1976, pp. 140–155. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/43446868. Accessed 25 July 2021.
- Rist, John M. "From Dreamland 'Humanism to Christian Political Reality or from 'Nusquama' to 'Utopia.'" *The Review of Metaphysics*, vol. 69, no. 4, 2016, pp. 739–785. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/44806868. Accessed 26 July 2021.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage Books, 1994.
- Skinner, Quentin. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought. Volume 1: The Renaissance*. Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Smith, William B. "Crossing the Boundaries of the Civic, the Natural, and the Supernatural in Medieval and Renaissance Europe". *The Book of Nature and Humanity in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Brepols, 2013, pp. 133-156.
- Suartz, Edward L. "From Humanism and Communism: The Background". *Utopia*. W. W. Norton and Company Inc, 2011, pp. 202-213.



- Tiffin, Helen, and Graham Huggan. *Postcolonial Ecocriticism: Literature, Animals, Environment*. Routledge, 2009.
- Ullmann, Walter. *Medieval Foundations of Renaissance Humanism*. Paul Elek, 1977.
- Wegemer, Gerard. "The Rhetoric of Opposition in Thomas More's 'Utopia': Giving Form to Competing Philosophies." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, vol. 23, no. 4, 1990, pp. 288–306. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40237646. Accessed 7 Apr. 2021.
- Wynne, J. P. F. *Cicero on the Philosophy of Religion: On the Nature of the Gods and On Divination*. Cambridge UP, 2019.