Philological Quarterly 96.3 (2017)

Luxury and Political Economy in Estate Poetry, 1670–1750

Clare Bucknell

While working towards his MA at Wadham College, Oxford in 1701, the future Professor of Poetry Joseph Trapp dedicated a poem to Henry Somerset, second Duke of Beaufort. Beaufort, a Tory, was a useful political connection for Trapp in the High-Church career he was planning, and his ancestral seat Badminton House was not far from Trapp's birthplace in Gloucestershire. The panegyric Trapp produced, *Aedes Badmintonianae*, is a portrait of Beaufort's estate, systematically describing Badminton and its grounds and connecting their beauties to the moral virtues of Beaufort and his wife. The praise Trapp gives is lavish and focuses on grandeur and material wealth: the house is described as a "stately Pile," whose "Front Majestick" "ravishes" and "confounds the Sight," while the state rooms inside are admired for their "rich Furniture" and "sumptuous Tapestry," adorned with "all the Pomp of Princely Luxury." In the gardens, Trapp admires the cultivated rows of flowers that "lavishly dispense" their odors, and the profusion of exotic plants expensively imported from abroad: "Both the *Indies* flourish in our Isle."[1] His ideas about the proper running of a country house center on splendor and show, and in his eyes the most praiseworthy thing about Beaufort and his wife is the way they preside over a magnificent display of wealth and fine taste. The poem is an unabashed celebration of the treasures that foreign commerce and the trade in luxury goods have supplied, and beyond these of the economic power and plenty enjoyed by Britain's landed classes during the early eighteenth century.

Poems written in praise of country estates during the early modern period were imbricated in social and economic change. Early seventeenth-century estate poems—Ben Jonson's "To Penshurst" (ca. 1612), Thomas Carew's "To Saxham" (ca. 1620) and Robert Herrick's "A Panegyric to Sir Lewis Pemberton" (1648), among other pieces—articulate an apparently timeless vision of paternalist management, feudal-style hospitality, and

self-sufficient housekeeping, but the genre they belong to flourished during a short historical period and did so for particular historical reasons.[2] The necessary intellectual and historical resources for an epideictic poetry of place were available for writers to draw on in the years before and after the early seventeenth century (Penshurst Place, as Heather Dubrow reminds us, had existed in some form since "around 1350"); but in the Jacobean and early Caroline period a need arose for a specific kind of legitimizing poetic tribute centered on individual houses and their lands.[3] When this need disappeared, as G. R. Hibbard has suggested it did after 1660 in accordance with developments in the social life of the great estates and the relationship between the country house and the court, there was little call for the particular kind of epideictic tribute that Jonson and his imitators were offering.[4]

In the early part of the century the need for a poetic tribute arose because pressing forces of social and economic change—changes in the kinds or classes of men who were wealthy enough to purchase land and build on it; changes in the capitalist mechanisms through which they gained and expressed their wealth—required new cultural narratives and new fictions to mediate and naturalize them.[5] The nostalgic feudal vision of housekeeping and land management articulated in early estate poems is there, as Kari Boyd McBride writes, "in the service of change": it is a piece of narrative writing designed to do real "cultural work," to give the court's new men and their new economic forms "the *imprimatur* of age," and to smooth the way for "the renegotiation of social and economic relationships" on a national scale.[6] The poems themselves, Don E. Wayne has shown, betray the pressures and contradictions of this ideological work by registering—if only below the surface—the radical historical changes that stand behind them. In "To Penshurst," for instance, as Wayne argues, Jonson's verse finds itself celebrating "certain values . . . which are more indicative of the rise of capitalism than the recrudescence of feudalism"—values befitting a family like the Sidneys, whose aristocratic lineage was short and whose wealth came in large part from the new mechanisms of agrarian capitalism.[7]

After the Restoration, though it did not survive in the Jonsonian shape early modern scholars tend to be familiar with, the country house poem persisted as a popular genre of epideictic description.[8] Given its history of "indisputable embeddedness in contemporary political and social tensions," in Dubrow's phrase, it's perhaps unsurprising that over the long eighteenth century it continued to reflect, internalize, and mediate economic change, developing narratives and constructing fictions about wealth and the land in ways comparable to the methods of mediation Wayne and McBride have pointed to in the early modern genre.[9] Trapp's *Aedes Badmintonianae*, en-

thusiastically engaged in celebrating new expressions of material wealth, is typical of a significant number of estate poems published between 1660 and 1750, which seek both to represent the dramatic new changes taking place in the life of the country estate and find ways to construct moral value systems around them. In this article I concentrate on two phases in the later history of the genre: initially, I consider a handful of late seventeenth-century estate poems whose authors (in common with Trapp) praise splendor and magnificence because they are straightforward proxies for power, wealth, and taste; subsequently, I focus on a second group of poems, chiefly dating from the mid-eighteenth century, whose approach is more intellectually ambitious, based on a positive engagement with contemporary political economic defences of luxury and arguments for the social benefits of lavish spending. The authors of both kinds of poems, I suggest, approached their subject matter by modifying or rejecting outright the moral values embodied in the Jacobean and Caroline genre, appropriating and consciously repurposing phrases, images and topoi.

During the 1680s there was a significant increase in the number of lavish new country houses built by the rich and powerful. Buoyed up by the profits of overseas trade and the commercial prosperity of peacetime, more than double the number of builders embarked on ambitious new projects as in the previous decade.[10] The grandest of these projects were commissions from newly powerful Whig peers, including Chatsworth—rebuilt for the Devonshires in the continental Baroque style under the direction of William Talman from 1686—and Castle Howard, an early project of John Vanbrugh's for the third Earl of Carlisle. From 1700, the building of country seats—construction from scratch, or refabrication and extension of now unfashionable Elizabethan manor houses—became an occupation of national importance for the aristocracy and upwardly mobile members of the gentry, to the extent that more than 150 great houses were built before 1740.[11]

Money from all kinds of sources was sunk into buying land and building houses. Old country families upgraded their estates to follow the new architectural fashions or take advantage of mineral opportunities; commoner MPs purchased land and set themselves up in the country; and bankers, industrialists and retired military officers ploughed cash into acquiring the lifestyle of the rural elite.[12] Encouraged by the acceleration of enclosure and the legal security provided by entail settlements, extravagant building was the preferred articulation of political and economic power during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. And it was an increasingly public business. As early as 1685, the builder and speculator Nicholas Barbon

observed that aspiring estate owners kept one eye on rival building projects as they planned their own: "there ariseth an emulation among them to out-live and out-vye one another in Arts."[13] New and rebuilt houses were visible to interested parties through the publication of architectural guides: the first volumes of Jan Kip and Leonard Knyff's *Britannia Illustrata* (1707) and Colen Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus* (1715) presented topographical sketches and architectural elevations of great English houses across the counties, from which the most fashionable designs—the Palladian villa, for instance—could be copied by aspiring builders and arbiters of taste.

A number of major estates were available to view in person, opened up to the public as tourist attractions. Showpiece houses from the rural counties (Norfolk and Derbyshire were particular favorites) were available to viewing parties on a pre organized or ad hoc basis, sometimes on the payment of a fee. Guests were shown into reception rooms and bedrooms, kitchen gardens and hothouses, and talked through the provenance of the pictures and sculptures on display. Some houses offered published guides describing the history of the estate and its notable architectural features and great treasures, which encouraged comparative discussions about the relative merits of each establishment.[14] In its early days country house visiting was the preserve of the aristocracy, but by the mid-eighteenth century the tourist class included members of the middling orders as well as the gentry; what was most important, as Carole Fabricant has shown, was that the individual house was made visible to a larger cross section of society than might be expected to come across it circumstantially.[15] The value of estates, Fabricant writes, rested "on their ability to outshine rival estates and project an appropriate visual symbol of status—hence social and economic power—and taste."[16] This projection took place on a global scale. Houses were admired as lucrative attractions for international visitors and great stimulants to the trade in luxury goods. In his popular guide to the Stowe estate, *The Beauties of Stow* (1750), the engraver George Bickham noted one important reason why country house building was an enterprise of national importance. "I might still add another Advantage of a public Nature, derived from these elegant Productions of Art; and that is, their Tendency to raise us in the Opinion of Foreigners," he wrote. "If our Nation had nothing of this Kind to boast of, all our Neighbours would look upon us as a stupid tasteless Set of People, and not worth visiting."[17] Bickham had no local connections to Stowe but he understood that its cultural pull translated into commercial opportunities for print entrepreneurs, tour guides, jobbing architects, local publicans, and many others. Its wealth and magnificence sustained an economic network that reached far beyond the confines of its own walls.

Given these changes in the economic life of the country estate, it was difficult—though not impossible—for late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poets to produce estate panegyrics that shared some of the same moralized prescriptions about country house ownership as the Caroline genre. To praise houses such as Stowe, Castle Howard, or Blenheim as models of economic self-sufficiency and local hospitality required a degree of idealization and selectivity that was hard to sustain, and there was always the risk of failing to compliment landowners on what made them most proud, their lavish displays of wealth and connoisseurship. Images and moral ideas reminiscent of the seventeenth-century estate poem survived in some nostalgic pieces: in *Petworth* (1739), for instance, the poet Thomas Cooke is complimentary about the paternalist generosity of the seventh Duke of Somerset at Petworth House ("open stands the Hospitable Door"); while in the anonymous "Boughton, Sept. 24, 1748," a description of a visit to the estate of the Montagu family in Northamptonshire, the poet's delight to "breathe again in Northantonian air" looks very similar to the opening lines of Carew's "To My Friend G.N. from Wrest" (1640): "I Breathe . . . the temperate ayre of *Wrest*."[18] Mary Leapor's *Crumble-Hall* (1751), a playful mixture of country house poem and mock pastoral, makes nostalgic reference to the traditions of hospitality alive during the Elizabethan period at Edgcote House: "*Crumble-Hall*, whose hospitable Door / Has fed the Stranger, and reliev'd the Poor."[19]

There are particular continuities between the ideals of the seventeenth-century genre and satire of the period. Leapor's "hospitable Door" recalls Pope's use of the same phrase in his *Second Satire of Dr. John Donne Versifyed* (1735), where he sets up a bitter contrast between the absenteeism of his own generation of landowners (represented by an image of their kitchens without smoking fires) and the generous hospitality "of yore":

> We see no new-built Palaces aspire,
> No Kitchens emulate the Vestal Fire.
> Where are those Troops of poor, that throng'd of yore
> The good old Landlord's hospitable door?[20]

The same satiric contrast is present in the *Epistle to Bathurst* (1733), where, as Maynard Mack has shown, Pope attacks the merchant John Cutler's parsimonious housekeeping by contrasting it with the kinds of values found in the Renaissance estate poem.[21] The inhospitable "unop'ning door" to Cutler's house, for instance, is the opposite of the welcoming gates Carew praises in "To Saxham," which are described as being "Untaught to shut" and "stand wide open all the yeare" to admit all comers.[22] Likewise, while Herrick notes admiringly in his "Panegyrick to Sir Lewis Pemberton" that

"no black-bearded *Vigil* from thy doore / Beats with a button'd-staffe the poore," in Pope's poem Cutler is shown making a positive point of warding away the destitute: "the gaunt mastiff growling at the gate, / Affrights the beggar whom he longs to eat" (197–98).[23] As Heather Dubrow has pointed out, seventeenth-century estate poems contain in their negative avowals ("*Un*taught to shut"; "*no* black-bearded *Vigil*") a ghosted possibility of the deficient housekeeping they seek to bar from their gates; what Pope is doing, I would suggest, by transforming these ghosted negatives into satiric positives is claiming that in the intervening decades the decline of hospitality has worsened, and that what might in the past have been a faint concern is now an unignorable reality.[24] The gap between epideictic and satirical uses of the same image, in other words, is a way of pointing out historical difference: if, Pope seems to be saying, seventeenth-century country house values are to survive in his own time, they have to be articulated in satire rather than panegyric.

What Mack calls Pope's "notably seventeenth-century English sense of proprietorship and place" has dominated modern scholarly work on eighteenth-century country house poetry.[25] Critical accounts of the afterlife of the Renaissance genre tend to focus on forms of continuity, pointing to places in Pope's poetry and that of his contemporaries where the key values of the Jacobean and Caroline estate genre seem to survive intact.[26] William McClung, for instance, takes Pope's *Epistle to Bathurst* and Donne imitation to be representative of the direction taken by estate poetry after the Restoration, concluding that the "reappearance in Pope's Epistles" of Renaissance motifs "suggests that the historical changes in English country-house life throughout the seventeenth century have been less influential upon country-house poetry than the moral tradition . . . that insistently opposes moderation and charity to ostentation and pride."[27] Virginia Kenny's full-length study of early eighteenth-century estate literature makes a similar claim, arguing for the survival of a relatively constant ethos of estate life throughout the period. "Most writers had in mind a conservative image of the correct attitudes to and right use of life, knowledge, power and wealth which conformed pretty closely to the ethos expounded in the country-house poem of the seventeenth century," she writes. "Faced with change, the imagination adopted the models of the past."[28]

I want to argue a different case. A significant group of poets of the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, I suggest, responded progressively rather than conservatively to the dramatic economic changes taking place in the life of the country estate, producing estate panegyrics in praise of wealth and display rather than modest self-sufficiency. The most important feature

of the early modern genre they rejected or sought to challenge was its aversion to luxury. During the early modern period the idea of luxury—that is, the indulgence of oneself in the purchase of costly and unnecessary material goods—had almost universally negative implications: it was vilified in classical and Christian intellectual traditions alike for what were believed to be its deleterious effects on the morality of individuals and the health of the body politic.[29] A number of early modern estate poets attacked it directly, contrasting the modest, lived-in houses of their patrons (or would-be patrons) with building projects motivated by vanity, greed, or a love of fine things for their own sake. Jonson, for instance, begins his poem on the Sidney estate with a careful statement of moral distinction ("Thou art not, Penshurst, built to envious show"), while Carew's "To My Friend G.N. from Wrest" describes Wrest Park in Bedfordshire as being "blesse[d]" with "an usefull comelinesse" (20), full of "things not fine, / But fit for service" (56–57), and superior in every way to "prouder Piles, where the vaine builder spent / More cost in outward gay Embellishment / Then reall use" (53–55).[30]

In estate poems of the Restoration and early eighteenth century, by contrast, the moral preferences for use value over showiness are dropped. In their place, there is a straightforward fascination with "gay Embellishment," in Carew's phrase, a preoccupation with fine things and decorative words. "Belvoir: A Pindarick Ode" (1679), for instance, is an anonymous panegyric on Belvoir Castle, the seat of the Earls of Rutland that had been expensively rebuilt for the family shortly after the Civil War. Describing the interior of the castle, the poet admires the "Order, Proportion, Riches, Greatness, State" of the rooms, and the way they are decorated with art objects, "*China*," "rich Porcelane" and "Earth's purest Metals." In this setting, he claims, such "Treasure" is not a sinful indulgence but "hath the right Use, and serves for Show."[31] In the context of the generic tradition this poem belongs to the connection between "right Use" and "Show" is extraordinary: the idea that something intended to "serve for Show" might *also* be useful in a practical way runs counter to the fundamental opposition in Jonson, Carew and their contemporaries between "envious show" and "reall use." Treasure, the "Belvoir" poet argues, reveals itself to be useful *because* it is showy—useful, that is, because it makes the right sort of vivid statement about the power and magnificence of the Manners family. In poems like this, as Alastair Fowler has shown, "admiration is intimately related to aesthetic admiration of the 'glittering pile' . . . No longer is display always inferior to use, frugality preferable to stateliness."[32]

The new attitude towards wealth and finery comes through clearly in Charles Cotton's *The Wonders of the Peake* (1681), a loco-descriptive poem

on Derbyshire whose portrait of Chatsworth is dominated by references to the "Beauty, Art, and State" of the house and its grounds. Describing the interior, Cotton launches into a breathless recapitulation of its best features, which transforms the list form favored by early modern estate poets to describe livestock, fruits, and crops into something like an auction catalogue of material luxuries:

> And should I be so mad to go about
> To give account of ev'ry thing throughout,
> The *Rooms* of *State, Stair cases, Galleries,*
> *Lodgings, Apartments, Closets, Offices;*
> . . . .
> The *Picture, Sculpture, Carving, Graving, Guilding,*
> T'would be as long in Writing as Building. (79–80)

Chatsworth is so magnificent, Cotton argues, that the estate poet's task has become impossible. Taking the reader on a step-by-step tour of the house and its treasures would take so long that another Chatsworth could be constructed in the time. But since, in Cotton's eyes, the scale and lavishness of the place are the things that make it worthy of panegyric, the way it seems to resist being pinned down on the page is also the source of its appeal as a subject for verse. It invites a particular kind of poetry, one that is attuned to excess and extravagance, capable of playing fast and loose with the formal limits of metre and line length. In this passage, for instance, Cotton's list of "*Rooms* of *State, Stair cases, Galleries, / Lodgings, Apartments, Closets, Offices*" spills richly over the line break as if it might go on forever, and the inconclusive feminine rhymes of "*Galleries / Offices*" and "*Guilding* / Building" back up the exaggerated claim that "T'would be as long in Writing as Building" by proving that the subject as at least too large for the conventional limits of iambic pentameter.

This apophatic way of handling the topic—getting across the magnitude of the country house by declaring the impossibility of doing so—features in several other estate poems of the period. The poet Edward Stephens, for instance, writing of Lord Bathurst's estate Cirencester Park in the Cotswolds, praises the wooded landscape for its "pleasing Greatness," "Too vast in feeble Numbers to be told," whilst in the anonymous poem *Castle-Howard* (1732), the author despairs of being able to cover all the remarkable things about the Carlisle family estate in one place: "such unnumber'd Beauties bless this Seat, / 'Twere endless on each diff'rent Charm to treat."[33] In *A Poem Occasioned by a View of Powers-court House* (1741), another anonymous piece written to celebrate the newly renovated Powerscourt estate in Ireland, the writer throws down his pen dramatically to communicate the enormity of

his task: "Description flags—let Thought the rest express."[34] At Badminton, likewise, Trapp describes how "Expression fails us, where we need it most, / And faint Description is in Wonder lost," adding that the magnitude of the subject creates technical difficulties for poetic composition, "so scanty are the Bounds of Verse" (3). And Cotton, noting that a thorough description of Chatsworth's beauties would be "sure a vain, and endless work," prefaces his portrait of the interior of the house with a request that the reader should take an active part in the attempt to communicate its magnificence: "the *Reader* we entreat will please / By the large *Foot*, to measure *Hercules*" (80). Poetic description, no matter how extravagant or hyperbolic, is unable on its own to get the measure of Chatsworth, so it is up to the reader to help by extrapolating from the part to the whole.

Size, as Fowler notes, matters in these poems much more than the virtue historically attached to modest or frugal living. "By Cotton's time," he writes, "the stateliness once praised in Kalendar's modest house has become linked with grand extent."[35] Chatsworth, for Cotton, is a "stately, and stupendious *Pile*," or a "glittering *Pile*" (72, 76); Belvoir Castle, Thomas Shipman writes in 1679, is one of the country's "Vast stately Pyles"; Trapp calls Badminton a "stately Pile"; even the greenhouse at Wanstead House in Essex, according to the anonymous poet of *Flora Triumphans: Wanstead Garden* (1712), is big enough to warrant being called a "stately PILE."[36] Self-consciously, each of these phrases picks up on Jonson's familiar description of Penshurst as an "ancient pile," but in such a way as to shake off the associations it comes with: for Jonson's "ancient," they substitute new modifying adjectives that privilege physical magnitude and grandeur above the old values of venerability and modesty, using allusion to establish distance rather than recall similarity.

Size preferences condition the approach taken to form and structure. Later estate panegyrics tend towards length and effusiveness, filled out with digressions, elaborations, repetitions, and instances of throat-clearing paralipsis of the kind discussed above ("should I be so mad to go about / To give account of ev'ry thing throughout . . . "). A number of them make a connection between the magnitude of the estate they are describing and the size of the poetic space they have to work with. In *Castle-Howard*, for instance, the poet seeks to convey something of the size of the estate's gardens by allowing his description to take up more room than it seems to require:

> The Garden now demands my humble Lays,
> Which merits a more worthy Pen shou'd praise.
> So far extended, and so great the Space,
> Magnificence in ev'ry Part we trace. (13)

The acknowledgment of limitations in the first two lines is knowingly redundant, as the poet declares himself unfit for a subject he proceeds to pursue anyway. In the following couplet, the repetition of "So far extended, and so great the Space" is redundant in a different way, expanding in a leisurely fashion on an idea that was clear to begin with ("so great the Space" provides us with no information that "So far extended" does not). "Magnificence" in these verses is closely connected with the idea and experience of spaciousness, and the indulgence of the writing—the way it takes up space to say something that might be communicated economically—scales up the poetry to something like parity with the extravagance of its subject.

Elsewhere in the poem, similar techniques are used to describe the house's grand lawn:

> East from the House a beaut'ous Down there lies,
> Where Art with Nature emulating vyes:
> Not smoother Surface boast the *Tempean* Plains,
> Tho' sung by Poets in immortal Strains:
> Not finer Verdure can young *Flora* bring,
> Tho' she commands an ever blooming Spring. (11)

Here, the repeated negative comparisons (the lawn is *not* less smooth than the green vale of Tempe, and *not* less fine than the best efforts of the goddess Flora either) are deliberately circumlocutionary, and the matching subordinate clauses that follow them ("Tho' sung"; "Tho' she commands") are leisurely elaborations, redoubling the space the verse takes up without adding anything substantive to our picture of what the lawn looks like. The hyperbole involved in comparing even the most "beaut'ous Down" favorably to Tempe or an "ever blooming Spring" is extravagant, while the use of two comparative images where one would do points to a disdain for poetic economy. The overall effect is to create a kind of poetic correlative for Castle Howard's scale and magnificence, much as Cotton's irregular lines on Chatsworth are designed to say something about its indescribability.

Cotton and the rest make no apology for admiring architectural ambition and fine things as much as they do, and are uninterested in trying to claim that there might be an intellectual connection to make between aesthetic taste and moral virtue. Where, in a handful instances, they do seek to bring in the question of the estate owner's personal virtues, the discussion of character is closely connected to the magnificence of the house and considered as a kind of embellishment of its splendor. Trapp, for instance, describes the Duke of Beaufort as being "rais'd / T'adorn that Pile, which we have feebly prais'd," and hopes that for "Long Ages" he and his actions will "amidst this Grandeur shine" (7). Here, the dominant category of value is aesthetic, and

other measures of value—ethical and social—are seen only incidentally through its lens. Beautiful buildings and lavish displays of wealth are admired *because* they are beautiful and lavish, and because beauty and lavishness are proxies for envy-inducing qualities of power, wealth, and taste; they are not conceived as having a place within a larger moral-philosophical scheme.

Seventeenth-century poets such as Cotton lacked a philosophical language in which they could contextualize, theorize, and defend the pleasure in luxury and extravagance they described. Towards the end of the century, however, the traditions of moral thought (both civic humanist and Christian) that condemned luxury as a personal vice and a socially corrupting force began to be countered by a new conversation about its public benefits. Philosophers such as David Hume, James Steuart, and Adam Smith pioneered what Christopher Berry describes as an intellectual "utilitarian strategy," designed to dissociate the idea of luxury from the sphere of moral intentionality (with its concerns over public-spirited behavior and the active virtue of individual citizens) and relocate it to one of social consequences. Instead of focusing on the sinful desires and drives presumed to stand behind luxurious tastes, they sought to view luxury "positively, *because* of its effects, as an ingredient in a civilised society," tracing the political and economic benefits that issued—often unforeseen—from expenditure on apparently frivolous luxury goods.[37] In this new debate about the social uses of self-interest and greed, country estates were held up as working models of the political economic consequences that might come about if individuals spent selfishly on vanity projects and beautiful objects. "One important focus for [the] luxury debate in the early eighteenth century," Jules Lubbock writes, "was the building, furnishing and equipping of aristocratic country houses."[38] Aristocrats, industrialists, and bankers who built and furnished large country piles, the argument ran, would stimulate the trade in building materials and luxury goods and create a local industry around tourism; they would sustain and generate jobs in sectors as diverse as construction, gardening, inn-keeping, and bookselling. "The accumulation of land and wealth in the hands of a few," as Fabricant summarizes the argument, was "to be welcomed even by those who [had] neither," since all would "indirectly benefit from the revenues generated by the grand estates."[39]

Barbon, in his pamphlet *A Discourse of Trade* (1690), argued decisively that the building of a "Magnificent" house must count as the "chiefest Promoter of *Trade*," ranking above all other kinds of private economic outlay in its significance for the economy at large. "The Artificers that belong to Building, such as *Bricklayers, Carpenters, Plaisterers,* &c. imploy many Hands,"

he noted: "and with those that Furnish the Houses, such as *Upholsterers, Pewterers,* &c. they are almost Innumerable."[40] Versions of his argument appeared in a number of places during the early eighteenth century. In the *Spectator*, Addison argued for the wide-ranging social benefits that could come from indulging personal taste, using the example of his long-running merchant character Sir Andrew Freeport's plans to purchase and retire to a country estate. In no. 549 (1712) he described Freeport's intention to improve the estate by redesigning it, and suggested that these projects would have the additional good effect of putting the merchant's "poor Neighbours to Work." "My Garden, my Fishponds, my Arable and Pasture Ground shall be my several Hospitals, or rather Work-houses," he wrote as Freeport, "in which I propose to maintain a great many indigent Persons, who are now starving in my Neighbourhood."[41] For Mandeville in his controversial *Fable of the Bees* (1724), likewise, there was a clear connection between extravagant house building and the provision of employment for many hands. A deleterious consequence of the bees' decision to adopt a newly virtuous and frugal way of life, he showed, was the decline of the construction trade: "The building Trade is quite destroy'd, / Artificers are not employ'd."[42]

In *The Wealth of Nations* (1776), Smith elaborated on this point about country-house management and labor, using the household economics of the great estate as an illustration of the effects of the rise of commerce. The availability of luxury goods and other purchasable objects, he argued, had provided a marketplace for the surplus capital of great estates, which previously landowners would have had to sink in "rustick hospitality at home" by "maintaining a hundred or a thousand men" as retainers. This new purchasing power meant the end of the old feudal model, since for a single "pair of diamond buckles," as Smith wrote, landowners in effect "exchanged the maintenance . . . of a thousand men for a year," swapping their hospitality for self-interest. But as Barbon, Mandeville, and others had done before him, Smith showed that this selfish expenditure had unintended beneficial social consequences. The landowner who dismissed a thousand retainers and bought himself a pair of diamond buckles actually maintained "as great or even a greater number of people than he could have done by the antient method of expence," since by indulging in a luxury item he was paying for the labor of workmen, artificers, shopkeepers, and merchants.[43] In "adorning his house or his country villa," he made both his fellow citizens and his nation richer.[44]

Political economic discussion even went on in the emerging genre of tourist literature. A handful of descriptions of well-known country estates used economic arguments to defend the extravagance of what visitors had come to see. One of William Gilpin's earliest publications, for instance, was

his *Dialogue upon the Gardens of the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Cobham* (1748), written shortly after a first visit to Stowe. The *Dialogue* is an imagined conversation between two figures touring the grounds: Polypthon, a businessman who has never been to Stowe before, and Callophilus, a local who knows the estate well. Polypthon is skeptical about the value of Stowe to the wider community. "Instead of useless Temples, I would build Farm-houses; and instead of cutting out unmeaning Vistas, I would beautify and mend Highways," he argues. "What signifies all this ostentatious Work? Is any Man the better for it? Is it not Money most vilely squandered away?" Callophilus replies that far from being squandered, the money Lord Cobham has spent on Stowe is "an Expence that may very properly be said to be sanctified by Use": "it is laid out," he says, "in a very laudable Manner, when it is spent . . . in circulating thro' a Variety of Trades, in supporting a Number of poor Families, and in the Encouragement of Art and Industry."[45] Bickham's tourist guide *The Beauties of Stow* makes the same point, arguing that Stowe and other such "Productions of Art" ought to be "considered as a very great Advantage to every Neighbourhood, that enjoys the lucky Situation of being placed near them."[46]

These were arguments that worked in verse as well as prose. Estate poets of the early seventeenth century had sought as far as possible to obscure the fact that country houses were places where capitalist relationships developed and people worked contractually to earn their keep.[47] In the eighteenth century, by contrast—and at mid-century in particular—a number of poets wrote about estates in terms that made it clear they had understood the connections made in political economic arguments between luxury, self-interest, and the provision of labor. What made landowners virtuous members of their community, these later poets argued, was not the charity or hospitality they could offer but instead their willingness to provide the poor with the means to help themselves. They praised landowners who acted (they argued) like public-spirited capitalists, setting the lower orders to work by indulging their own desires for a redesigned wing or a newly landscaped garden. William Shenstone, for instance, wrote an ode lavishing praise on the improvements made by his would-be patron Frances Seymour, the Duchess of Somerset, to her gardens at Petworth House in Sussex. "Rural Elegance" (1750) shows her making "Arcadia bloom around" by planting new trees, introducing wild roses, and diverting rivers into water features, and describes these as aesthetic touches intended for leisurely enjoyment, "beauties" from which "every *gentle* breast partakes the joy."[48] Shenstone points out, though, that such projects have a social utility quite apart from their ability to give pleasure to the leisured observer:

> *Charity* at eve surveys the swain,
> Enabled by these toils to chear
> A train of helpless infants dear,
> Speed whistling home across the plain;
> Sees vagrant *Luxury*, her hand-maid grown,
> For half her graceless deeds attone,
> And hails the bounteous work, and ranks it with her own. (5:7)

Here, the "swain" who in previous centuries might have been supported by informal acts of generosity on the part of the estate owner is "enabled" to flourish independently through "these toils," the work projects instigated by the Duchess's taste for modern landscaping.[49] Personified "*Charity*" does make an appearance to oversee his progress, but this is charity of a different sort to the old paternalist benevolence. Shenstone's notion of what "*Charity*" involves is broad, encompassing the Duchess's "bounteous work" of enabling the circulation of capital as well as more traditional conceptions of aristocratic munificence. "*Luxury*," also personified, has undergone a similar transformation: no longer the self-interested enemy of charitable giving, here she has become Charity's "hand-maid," helping her to perform her benevolent offices by channelling wealth into the local economy. Previously "vagrant"—anti-social, sapping the health of the body politic, leaning on the weakness of others—Luxury now has a defined social role and a way of giving back. Shenstone's lines radically reevaluate her "bounteous work" as Charity's too, arguing that the "graceless deeds" that self-interest inspires may be redeemed by the contribution they make (though inadvertently) to the public good.

This passage makes no claims as to the moral character of the Duchess's garden improvements. Shenstone is clear that they are first and foremost "*amusive* tasks" designed to give aesthetic pleasure, and in the lines that follow he defends the desire for beautiful things that have no obvious "needful use" (5:8). The benefits for society at large that may arise from cultivating a taste for such things are additional points in their favor, but social utility is not presumed to be the driving force of the Duchess's interest. Shenstone, a keen landscape gardener himself, would in any case have selected the addressee of his poem on the basis of an admiration for her elegant taste. But other writers of the period were less reticent about attaching virtuous motives to what might otherwise have seemed purely self-interested economic undertakings. A handful of estate poems surveying the political economic consequences of country house wealth attributed landowners' private acts of extravagance to a far-sighted solicitude for the public good. *Flora Triumphans: Wanstead Garden*, for instance, addresses the Tory MP Sir Richard Child, praising his gardens and manor house. The poet observes

that Wanstead looks considerably more impressive now than it had when it was first built in the Elizabethan period, presenting a large and "dazling Prospect" that would far outshine the old "Less costly Roofs and homelier Bowrs" (15). Child's father Sir Josiah, a successful merchant and Governor of the East India Company, had purchased the estate in 1673 and laid out considerable sums of money on improving its grounds according to French gardening fashions. But Wanstead's glittering new look, the poet argues, is not just a reflection of Josiah Child's aspirational continental taste or the depth of his pockets. It is also an expression of his social conscience and fierce "Aversion" to seeing men reduced to "Vagrance and Idleness": "What Mouths have ev'n his humbler Outworks fed, / Hunger and Sloth uprowzd to Work and Bread!" (16).

The current owner of Wanstead, the poet continues, has inherited his father's public spirit in addition to his money and extravagant tastes. The lavish improvements made to Wanstead's garden since Richard Child came into the estate in 1704—an orchard, an ornamental canal, a hothouse for oranges and limes—are argued to be the expression of "Inborn VIRTUE," the same solicitude for the welfare of the many that once prompted Josiah Child's improvements:

> As Heav'n so gave, how'st Thou return'd the Gift?
> Let Misers in close Heaps their Curse possess:
> Tis circulating GOLD can only bless.
> In Works like these the CHRISTIAN WORTHY shine
> The Lab'rers here dig their own Silver Mines. (16)

Rather than hoarding his wealth in a miserly fashion, the poet explains, Sir Richard has channelled it back into the community as "circulating GOLD." Since his money has come to him as a "Gift," it is his duty to lay it out again in a manner that benefits as many people as possible, and this means that spending lavishly on beautiful things is the fulfillment of a moral obligation or entailed responsibility rather than an act of self-interest. Moreover, this obligation is a specifically "CHRISTIAN" one. Where, in the early seventeenth-century estate poem, Christian goodness means the charitable munificence of the landlord who provides food for his neighbour and shelter for the poor, in this later version of the genre the "CHRISTIAN WORTHY" are rich protocapitalists like Child who act benevolently from a distance to allow the poor to help themselves. In a neat formula, "Lab'rers" at Wanstead are said to "dig their own Silver Mines": they are prompted to support their families sustainably through work rather than relying on charity from above.

In his poem on Cirencester Park, Stephens writes similarly about the benevolence Lord Bathurst displays in spending and hiring on a lavish

scale. The "golden Streams of Plenty" (148) that have gone into building and maintaining the estate's artificial lake, temple, statues, and lawns may seem mere indulgences of taste, but for Stephens there are stronger moral motives behind them. Bathurst's liberal spending, he writes, is like the Nile river overflowing its banks in the middle of the desert: it is superfluous and excessive, but its overspill quenches the parched country around. "You," he addresses Bathurst directly,

> like th'Oerflowing of redundant *Nile*,
> Make the Distress'd thro' ev'ry Season smile;
> Your lib'ral Bounty num'rous Poor confess,
> By Labour best preserv'd from Wretchedness. (140–43)

"This," Stephens writes in a note to the third line here, "alludes to the great Number of Hands constantly employ'd on this noble Plan" (142n). Cirencester Park, like the paternalist estates of old, provides relief to the "Distress'd" and aid to "num'rous Poor," but it does so through political economic rather than charitable mechanisms. In isolation, the third line here ("Your lib'ral Bounty num'rous Poor confess") could be mistaken for the sort of compliment given by Jonson or Carew to the landowners they address, but the second half of the couplet swerves away from the traditional formula. Cirencester's poor are preserved by Bathurst's liberality, but this liberality comes in the form of conspicuous consumption rather than local acts of generosity. Through a kind of far-sighted "social Virtue" (138), as the poet argues, Bathurst spends to provide "Labour" for those who would otherwise be wretched.

In contemporary philosophical treatises on luxury, little weight was placed on the intentions—virtuous or otherwise—behind the appetite to spend. As John Sekora has shown, commentators worked hard to transform the problem of luxury "from an essential, general element of moral theory to a minor, technical element of economic theory," aiming to dissociate the traditional discussion of the motives behind a desire for fine things from the new conversation about political economic effects.[50] Poets who wanted to praise the virtues of a particular estate owner, by contrast, preferred to retain this association, seeking (as in the examples above) to find a way of connecting the observable social benefits that arose as consequences of private extravagance to influential moral agency on the part of the landowner. But presenting a credible argument about virtuous intention and widespread social effects was a difficult thing to do. During the mid-eighteenth century in particular, a handful of poets chose instead to downplay the question of agency, shifting their focus subtly from landowners' intentions to the broader public benefits that came incidentally from the wealth of great estates.

The poet and clergyman John Dalton's epistle to his patroness the Countess of Hertford (1745), for instance, limits its discussion of the improvements she has made to her gardens at Percy Lodge to a description of the social benefits they will bring. The Countess, he writes, presides over

> Each level walk, each shelving glade,
> Whate'er employs the labourer's spade,
> Whate'er rewards his patient toil,
> And makes the barren desart smile.[51]

Here, the Countess is acknowledged as being behind the plans for the garden's "level walk" and "shelving glade," but both the precise nature of her improvements and the motives behind them are left unspecified. Dalton is less interested in the shape and look of the "level walk" than in the laboring opportunities it will support, and less interested in the Countess's tastes or virtuous intentions than in the effects of the redesign she proposes. The repetition of "Whate'er" ("Whate'er employs the labourer's spade, / Whate'er rewards his patient toil") argues that there does not have to be a conscious correspondence between what landowners intend to do when they spend their money and the useful things it does as circulating capital. What matters is that the laborer has a use for his spade, regardless of whether the work he undertakes has its origins in self-interest or public spirit.

This emphasis on political economic outcomes rather than individual moral agency comes across most clearly in *Powers-Court House*, a longer work that contains a substantial and admiring description of the landscape gardens created by Richard Wingfield as part of his extensive modernization of the family estate near Dublin. The garden, the anonymous poet writes, is a "Romantick Region" composed of "Elyzian walks" and "classick Landskips"; it is a tasteful mixture of wildness and artifice, where natural undulations in the land ("The swelling *Vista*, and the sinking Plain") are set off against "Views more regular," "the verdant Slope, and rais'd Parterre" (46–59). But though they are designed to be beautiful and give pleasure to the leisured observer, Wingfield's gardens do much more than that. In the following verse paragraph, the poet describes the additional (and unintended) virtues they have:

> Hence, from this *Taste*, are Numbers pleas'd and fed,
> The Wise have Pleasure, the Distress'd have Bread,
> This Taste brings Profit, and improves with Sense,
> And through a thousand Channels turns Expence,
> Benevolence in num'rous Streams imparts,
> And ends in Virtue what began in Arts,
> Removes sharp Famine, Sickness, and Despair,
> Relieves the asking Eye, the rising Tear,

> Such Woe, as late o'er pale *Hibernia* past,
> —And such (ye Guardian Powers) we wish the last.
> If publick Spirit shines, 'tis just at least
> To give some Glory too, to *publick Taste*. (60–71)

This is a more intellectually ambitious version of the argument about political economic consequences we have seen before. Aesthetic taste, the poet argues, has a "*publick*" value, because its benefits extend far beyond the momentary "Pleasure" it brings to connoisseurs and tourists who visit the estate in a private capacity. Wingfield's tasteful improvements provide relief and employment for the poor, the sick, and the hungry by creating wealth: the "Profit" they generate ripples through "a thousand Channels" of economic activity, snowballing as it goes and working itself out as "Benevolence" that flows through "num'rous Streams." The wealth that lavish private expenditure brings is such that it is enough to redress even national ills, helping to relieve the "Woe" that "late o'er pale *Hibernia* past" during the devastating Irish famine of 1740–41. In a neat final turn to the argument, the poet suggests that "*Publick Taste*" ought to be lauded just as much as "publick Spirit" as a worthy solution to economic ills. Rich men like Wingfield who spend in a self-interested fashion on decorating their houses and gardens provide—though inadvertently—economic relief on a grander scale than individual acts of public-spirited benevolence ever could.

What makes this version of the argument interesting and ambitious, though, is the way it leaves Wingfield himself behind. In a similar fashion to Dalton in his lines on the Countess of Hertford, the poet acknowledges Wingfield's initial significance as the driving force behind the improvements to Powerscourt's grounds, but almost immediately he zooms out to concentrate on the ripple effects Wingfield's wealth makes in society at large. What interests him here is not the household economy of Powerscourt estate but Powerscourt's place in the political economy of the nation: how the estate generates revenue, how this revenue trickles down through multiple channels of activity and interest, how it comes to reach those with little or no connection to its source. Between Wingfield's gardens and the nationwide "Woe" of Ireland there is a lot of ground to cover, but the poem manages this by proceeding in a gradual and cumulative fashion, widening its focus steadily as it moves from line to line. Its syntax is repetitive (six of the lines here, from "This Taste brings Profit" down to "Relieves the asking Eye," are verbal clauses whose grammatical subject is Wingfield's "Taste"), and this allows them to build on one another as the poet's vision expands to take in the national picture. By the end of the verse paragraph it is a stretch to remember exactly *what* is being credited with supplying relief to the Irish

poor, because the word "Taste" has been left far behind in the third line: what matters is what money does when it leaves one's pocket, not the local detail of why it has been spent and by whom. Rather than being presented as the moral center of the poem, Wingfield here is merely shown supplying the initial prompt to a vast economic machine that seems otherwise to run itself, generating "Channels" and "Streams" of profit that branch out into finer and finer divisions of activity and benefit ever greater numbers of Ireland's poor. "Virtue" is borne out of "Arts" in a marvelous and unknowable process that no landowner, however wealthy and influential, could ever have designed.

This way of thinking has far-reaching implications for the instrumentality of the genre. *Powers-Court House* is addressed to Wingfield but it is not a paean to his virtue: it praises his "Taste," but in such a way as to claim that liking landscaped gardens has nothing particular—unless incidentally—to do with morality. The epideictic function of the genre, so strongly marked in early modern examples, is already on the wane in early eighteenth-century poems (in *Flora Triumphans,* as in Stephens's *Bathurst* poem, there is some intellectual conflict as to whether it is Christian goodness or capitalist self-interest on the part of landowners that helps the poor); by the mid-century, it is only faint, and what seems to matter to the poet is positioning the individual country house as part of a political economic national estate, rather than lionizing an intended patron as the center of his own small moral economy. As R. A. Aubin's comprehensive catalogue of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century estate poems indicates, over the decades fewer and fewer published poems appeared dedicated to particular landowning addressees: in another place, it may warrant investigation whether the turn from virtue to political economy did lasting damage to the genre's viability as a vehicle of patronage.[52]

On this long view, what is remarkable about the later history of the estate poem is the degree of flexibility eighteenth-century writers saw in it as a generic category. Genres, as Fowler has shown, identify themselves over time as espousing particular "value-systems," kinds of moral or intellectual ethos that are embedded historically in their formation and development, and which determine to some degree the scope and meaning of the things they represent.[53] Adopting a genre, on this principle, means more than just revisiting particular topoi or taking up a set of recognizable stylistic features; it means adopting a position on the world, with its attached range of judgments, prejudices, and codes of praise and blame. What is surprising in this context about late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poets' adoption of the estate poem is the freedom they felt *not* to play by the rules: not to adhere to the value systems around housekeeping, land use, and pa-

ternalist management that had made the early modern genre so distinctive. They worked hard to transform it into a form capacious enough to admit new and challenging kinds of economic life, and in some cases they went so far as to think of themselves as engaged in an active (even aggressive) process of generic revisionism. There is, for instance, a huge difference in attitude and approach between "To Penshurst" and the "Belvoir" pindaric ode, but the latter nonetheless conceptualizes itself against the former, taking on Jonson's binary opposition of "use" and "show" and transforming the relationship between its terms. Likewise, when Stephens talks of the "lib'ral Bounty" that, thanks to Bathurst, "num'rous Poor confess," he has the paternalist obligations of the early modern estate poem in mind even as he turns the idea on its head to show the poor benefitting from labor provision rather than charity.

As the place and function of the large country estate changed dramatically over the course of the long eighteenth century, so too did the poetic forms tasked with representing it. Writers who wanted to attack the morality of commercial attitudes amongst landowners or criticize their attraction to luxury goods did so in satire, rather than carrying on the early seventeenth-century tradition of making their critiques covertly under the guise of epideictic writing. (This, for instance, is what we see in Pope's attacks on bad household management in *The Second Satire of Dr. John Donne,* the *Epistle to Bathurst,* and the *Epistle to Burlington*, which announce themselves as belonging to a satiric tradition that encompasses Donne, Joseph Hall, and Juvenal.) The estate panegyric, meanwhile—in common with the formal georgic, another site of radical generic development during the period—became an unexpected home for the expression of new political economic ideas about wealth, labor, and the land. It was a space in which poets could compliment a patron (or intended patron) with admiring descriptions of the scale and grandeur of his household and the luxury goods and fine gardens on which he spent his money. They could flatter by presenting a landowner's estate as an exemplary model for what other estate owners should be doing, or of how the national estate of Britain ought to be organized in the aggregate.[54] And—most unexpectedly of all, given the effort made in early modern poems to mediate or de-emphasize emergent forms of capitalism in estate ownership—they could use the form as a basis for thinking through contemporary arguments about luxury and wealth creation, finding in them enthusiastic endorsements of self-interest and, more subtly, intellectual justifications for presenting even the most commercially minded estate owner as a virtuous contributor to the public good.

All Souls College

NOTES

I would like to thank Professor Colin Burrow and two anonymous readers for detailed and insightful comments on earlier versions of this essay.

1 Joseph Trapp, *Aedes Badmintonianae: A poem most humbly presented to His Grace Henry Duke of Beaufort &c.* (London, 1701), 25, 3, 6.

2 See Alastair Fowler, "Country House Poems: The Politics of a Genre," *Seventeenth Century* 1 (1986): 3–4. Following Fowler, I adopt the term *estate poem* rather than the commonly used *country house poem*, as a means of emphasizing the importance of the wider garden, park, and farmlands to the economy of the country seat.

3 Heather Dubrow, "The Country House Poem: A Study in Generic Development," *Genre* 12 (1979): 153–54.

4 G. R. Hibbard, "The Country House Poem of the Seventeenth Century," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 19 (1956): 159. Elizabeth Scott-Baumann, *Forms of Engagement: Women, Poetry and Culture, 1640–1680* (Oxford U. Press, 2013), 146–69, discusses Lucy Hutchinson's transformation of Jonson's epideictic mode to create an estate poetry of mourning for the loss of her husband and the Puritan Commonwealth.

5 See Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1973; repr. 1993), 27–34, 40–41; William Alexander McClung, *The Country House in English Renaissance Poetry* (U. of California Press, 1977), 182–83.

6 Kari Boyd McBride, *Country House Discourse in Early Modern England: A Cultural Study of Landscape and Legitimacy* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 93, 9. See also Eric B. Song, *Dominion Undeserved: Milton and the Perils of Creation* (Cornell U. Press, 2013), 49.

7 Don E. Wayne, *Penshurst: The Semiotics of Place and the Poetics of History* (London: Methuen, 1984), 19.

8 Robert Arnold Aubin, *Topographical Poetry in XVIII-Century England* (New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1936), 316–33, lists over 130 estate poems written between the Restoration and the early nineteenth century.

9 Heather Dubrow, "Guess Who's Coming to Dinner? Reinterpreting Formalism and the Country House Poem," *MLQ* 61 (2000), 67.

10 Charles Saumarez Smith, "Supply and Demand in English Country House Building, 1660–1740," *Oxford Art Journal* 11 (1988): 4.

11 John Summerson, "The Classical Country House in 18th-Century England," *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* 107 (1959): 540; Christopher Christie, *The British Country House in the Eighteenth Century* (Manchester U. Press, 2000), 4.

12 See Saumarez Smith, "Supply and Demand," 6–8; Richard Wilson and Alan Mackley, *Creating Paradise: The Building of the English Country House, 1660–1880* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2000), 39–40.

13 Nicholas Barbon, *An Apology for the Builder, or, A Discourse Shewing the Cause and Effects of the Increase of Building* (London, 1685), 3.

14 Carole Fabricant, "The Literature of Domestic Tourism and the Public Consumption of Private Property," in *The New Eighteenth Century: Theory, Politics, English Literature*, ed. Felicity Nussbaum and Laura Brown (New York: Methuen, 1987), 259–61; Wilson and Mackley, *Creating Paradise*, 81; Adrian Tinniswood, *A History of Country House Visiting: Four Centuries of Tourism and Taste* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 94.

15 Fabricant, "Literature of Domestic Tourism," 256, 259; Tinniswood, *A History*, 89.

16 Fabricant, "Literature of Domestic Tourism," 258.

17 George Bickham, *The Beauties of* Stow*; or, a Description of the Pleasant Seat, and Noble Gardens, of the Right Honourable Lord Viscount Cobham* (London, 1750), 62–63.

18 Thomas Cooke, *Petworth. A Poem. To His Grace the Duke of Somerset* (London, 1739), 5; Anon., "Boughton, Sept. 24, 1748," in *Town and Country Magazine* 7 (1775): 711; Thomas Carew, "To My Friend G.N. from Wrest," line 1, in *The Poems of Thomas Carew, with his Masque Coelum Britannicum*, ed. Rhodes Dunlap (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949), 86.

19 Mary Leapor, *Crumble-Hall*, lines 13–14, in *The Works of Mary Leapor*, ed. Richard Greene and Ann Messenger (Oxford U. Press, 2003), 206.

20 Alexander Pope, *The Second Satire of Dr. John Donne*, lines 111–14, in *The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope*, gen. ed. John Butt, 11 vols. (London: Methuen, 1939–69), 4:143.

21 Maynard Mack, *The Garden and the City: Retirement and Politics in the Later Poetry of Pope, 1731–1743* (U. of Toronto Press, 1969), 98–100.

22 Pope, *Epistle III. To Allen Lord Bathurst*, line 196, in Butt, *Twickenham*, 3.ii:109; Carew, "To Saxham," lines 53–54, in *The Poems of Thomas Carew*, ed. Dunlap, 29.

23 Robert Herrick, "A Panegyrick to Sir Lewis Pemberton," lines 13–14, in *The Complete Poetry of Robert Herrick*, ed. Tom Cain and Ruth Connolly, 2 vols. (Oxford U. Press, 2013), 1:138.

24 Dubrow, "Guess Who's Coming to Dinner?" 70.

25 Mack, *The Garden and the City*, 98. On Pope and the seventeenth-century country house poem, see also Howard Erskine-Hill, *The Social Milieu of Alexander Pope: Lives, Example and the Poetic Response* (Yale U. Press, 1975), 287–317.

26 A notable exception—though focusing on the mid-seventeenth century—is Peter C. Remien's "Importing Ease: Merchant Trade in the Country House Poems of Mildmay Fane," *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 13 (2013): 130–50, which focuses on estate poems written to celebrate mercantile trade and the availability of imported commodities.

27 McClung, *The Country House*, 180.

28 Kenny, *The Country-House Ethos*, 18, 142. For a similar argument about generic continuity, see Hibbard, "The Country House Poem," 159–60.

29 On the history of luxury as an idea, see John Sekora, *Luxury: The Concept in Western Thought, Eden to Smollett* (Johns Hopkins U. Press, 1977); Christopher Berry, *The Idea of Luxury: A Conceptual and Historical Investigation* (Cambridge U. Press, 1994).

30 Ben Jonson, "To Penshurst," line 1, in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. David Bevington, Martin Butler, and Ian Donaldson, 7 vols. (Cambridge U. Press, 2012), 5:209.

31 Anon., "*Belvoir*: Being a *Pindarick* Ode upon *Belvoir* Castle the Seat of the Earls of *Rutland*, made in the Year 1679," in *The Harleian Miscellany: or, a Collection of Scarce, Curious, and Entertaining Pamphlets and Tracts* . . . , 8 vols. (London, 1744–46), 4:540. See Remien, "Importing Ease," 139, on the gradual accommodation within mid-seventeenth-century estate poems of luxurious commodities imported from the colonies.

32 Fowler, *The Country House Poem*, 22–23.

33 Edward Stephens, *A Poem on the Park and Woods of the Right Honourable Allen Lord Bathurst* (Cirencester, 1748), 7, lines 67–68; Anon., *Castle-Howard, the Seat of the Right Honourable Charles Earl of Carlisle. To whom this Poem is humbly inscribed* (London, 1732), 10, 13.

34 Anon., *A Poem Occasioned by a View of Powers-court House, the Improvements, Park, &c. Inscribed to Richard Wingfield, Esq* (Dublin, 1741), 10, line 140.

35 Fowler, *The Country House Poem*, 22.

36 Thomas Shipman, Dedication to "Belvoir," in *Carolina: or, Loyal Poems* (London, 1683), 231; Anon., *Flora Triumphans. Wanstead Garden* (London, 1712), 12.

37 Berry, *The Idea of Luxury*, 145.

38 Jules Lubbock, *The Tyranny of Taste: The Politics of Architecture and Design in Britain, 1550–1960* (Yale U. Press, 1995), xiii.

39 Fabricant, "The Literature of Domestic Tourism," 264.

40 Nicholas Barbon, *A Discourse of Trade*, in Henry C. Clark, ed., *Commerce, Culture, and Liberty: Readings on Capitalism Before Adam Smith* (Liberty Fund: Indianapolis, 2003), 91.

41 *Spectator*, no. 549 (November 29, 1712), 1.

42 Bernard Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees: or, Private Vices, Publick Benefits*, ed. F. B. Kaye, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924; repr. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1988), 1:33.

43 Adam Smith, *The Glasgow Edition of the Works and Correspondence of Adam Smith, Vol. 2: An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, ed. William B. Todd, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 1:413–20.

44 Ibid., 1:346.

45 William Gilpin, *A Dialogue upon the Gardens of the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Cobham, at Stow in Buckinghamshire* (London, 1748), 45–47.

46 Bickham, *The Beauties of Stow*, 61.

47 See Williams, *The Country and the City*, 29–33, on the "magical extraction of the curse of labour" achieved by poetic motifs such as *sponte sua*.

48 William Shenstone, "Rural Elegance: An Ode to the late Duchess of Somerset. Written 1750," in *A Collection of Poems in Six Volumes. By Several Hands*, 6 vols. (London, 1758), 5:7.

49 See David Hill Radcliffe, "Genre and Social Order in Country House Poems of the Eighteenth Century: Four Views of Percy Lodge," *SEL* 30 (1990): 458.

50 Sekora, *Luxury*, 112; see also Berry, *The Idea of Luxury*, 101–25.

51 John Dalton, "To the Right Honourable the Countess of Hartford, at *Percy-Lodge*," lines 175–78, in *Two Epistles . . . By the Rev*$^{d.}$ *Mr. Dalton, A.M. and Fellow of Queen's College in Oxford* (London, 1745), 28.

52 Aubin, *Topographical Poetry*, 316–33. On the implications of the decline of patronage, see Remien, "Importing Ease," 140.

53 Alistair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Harvard U. Press, 1982), 66–67. See also Fowler, "The Formation of Genres in the Renaissance and After," *New Literary History* 34 (2003): 185–200, on the "more or less obligatory topics" belonging to particular genres.

54 On the relationship between the individual estate and the nation, see Kenny, *The Country-House Ethos*, 16–17.