

*Moreana*, nos.55-56 (Dec 1977): 5-22

THE KINGDOM WITHIN MORE'S *UTOPIA*.

The title page states that *Utopia* shows forth "the best state of a commonwealth," but the book is much less concerned with an ideal political state than with the state of the human spirit -- the kingdom within that Jesus proclaimed as a central article of the New Covenant (Luke 17:21).

Explicating Christ's metaphor, More wrote in 1523 that "The kingdom of God... within you... undoubtedly refers to any good and genuinely Christian heart."<sup>1</sup> It is this -- the "genuinely Christian heart" -- that is the real subject of More's *Utopia*, not "the best ordering of a civil society or commonwealth."<sup>2</sup> More knew that the fortunes of a nation ultimately depend more on the interior condition of its citizens than on the political superstructure built around them. Great movements and golden ages create an ethos in which human progress is made easier and in which good men and women can unite to form a society which actualizes their individual ideals. But each person must begin with himself if the earth is to be renewed.

After examining the social experiments of the last one hundred years, a great twentieth-century humanist spoke insistently to this point :

What is the good of drawing up, on paper, rules for social behaviour, if we know that, in fact, our greed, cowardice, ill temper, and self-conceit are going to prevent us from keeping them ? I do not mean for a moment that we ought not to think, and think hard, about improvements in our social and economic system. What I do mean is that all thinking will be mere moonshine unless we realise that nothing but the courage and unselfishness of individuals is ever going to make any system work properly. It is easy enough to remove the particular kinds of graft or bullying that go on under the present system : but as long as men are twisters or bullies they will find some new way of carrying on the old game under the new system. You cannot make men good by law: and without good men you cannot have a good society.

That is why we must go on to think of the second thing : of morality inside the individual.<sup>3</sup>

It is this morality inside the individual -- not syplogrants, phylarchs, tranibors, and other attributes of Utopian communism -- that More was ultimately concerned with. Intending *Utopia* to hold a mirror up to the moral condition of sixteenth-century Europe, More expected the reader to respond to questions that the book persistently raises : What is the nature of true happiness? of virtue? of authority? What constitutes a well-ordered society? What are the proper aims of education? What are the responsibilities of the clergy? Are we the masters or the stewards of the earth? Does political power and grandeur enlarge the eye of the Biblical needle? Are we dissembling all the doctrines of Christ? Are the kingdoms of this world more precious than the kingdom within? Finally and fundamentally, the Erasman question : what is it to be a Christian?<sup>4</sup> These interwoven questions, which make up the sum and substance of *Utopia*, demand more than an academic response. They insist that the reader *do* what the word -- both *Utopia* and the Bible in which much of the book is rooted -- tells him, not just listen to it and deceive himself as so many of More's contemporaries were doing.

What *Utopia* tells us is debatable, of course. Some readers see Hythlodacus' island paradise as a camouflaged dictatorship, "a detestable state," calling for the annihilation of individual freedom and personality.<sup>5</sup> Others consider it a political model of rare device -- a genuine *de optimo reipublicae statu*.

As the metaphor in my title indicates, I do not agree that Utopia is a detestable state. Nor, as I shall explain below, do I think that it is More's vision of a perfect commonwealth. Obviously, there is much about Utopia that More commends to his audience. One would have to go very far indeed to overestimate the importance of Utopian virtues. "Christian values thinly veiled,"<sup>6</sup> they are the foundation of all that is truly good in Utopia and, for that matter, of the brave new world that humanists have always longed for. Corresponding to every good institution and impulse in Utopia are the virtues of Christ's kingdom ; and

opposing them are all of the vices rampant in Europe, as Hythlodacus points out (61f.).

Communism and patriarchal familism, for example, twin pillars of the Utopian social system, are a logical response to the Scriptural injunctions to "love one's neighbor as oneself" and to regard all God's people as members of a single household (Eph. 2:19). By making communism the philosophical basis of the Utopian state, More cleverly recasts the fundamental Christian imperative to love "not in word or speech but in deed and in truth" (1 John 3:18). Communism in *Utopia* is crucial because in communism More finds a perfect analogy to distill Christian teaching on love and self-sacrifice ("Nobody should be looking for his own advantage but everybody for the other man's," 1 Cor 10:24) and to denounce consuming self-interest, poverty, hunger for money and power, the ungodly acquisitiveness of European princes, and warmongering.

More's explicit approval of private property, and his attacks on communism<sup>7</sup> make it clear that he was calling for love, justice, and generosity -- for restoration of the interior kingdom--not for complete demolition of the existing social order. First, the kingdom within ; next, Christian revival -- the combined efforts of many people growing together into God (Eph. 4:15) ; then, as a corollary, the renewal of society.

In paragraph after paragraph, More attempts to recreate the conscience of his age. When he writes that vainglory and pride "can have no place at all in the Utopian scheme of things" (139/8-10), he is reminding his readers that they have been enjoined to clothe themselves in righteousness and to serve one another in works of love (1 Pet. 5:5; Gal. 5:13). In language reminiscent of Genesis, More describes pride as a "serpent from hell" which "entwines itself around the hearts of men... hindering them from entering on a better way of life" (243/39-245/2). This language combines the Old Testament account of the Fall with the New Testament revelation of the kingdom within. The serpent that destroyed the original garden seeks relentlessly to destroy the new Eden that flourishes in the hearts of God's people.

The conflict between vice and Christian virtue underlies *Utopia* from first to last. When Hythlodæus commends the common toil of the Utopians, More is commending charity and obedience, and simultaneously condemning cruelty, avarice, and sloth, characteristic vices of the oligopolies and the rack-renting gentry of Tudor England (62-66).<sup>8</sup> Once again, Utopian virtue has its roots in the Bible: "Idleness causes need and poverty, for the mother of famine is idleness" (Tobit 4:14)... "He who is slack in his work is a brother to him who destroys" (Prov. 18:9)...<sup>9</sup> Work is not an end in itself nor a means of accumulating wealth, but a way of making love real and active. In the Europe of Hythlodæus -- and More -- too many let their neighbors forage for themselves: "Outside Utopia, to be sure, men talk freely of the public welfare -- but look after their private interests only" (237/39-239/3) neglecting the kingdom within, making their bodies their sepulchres. In contrast, Utopians "seriously concern themselves with public affairs" (239/3).

\*\*\*\*\*

Hythlodæus' admiration for Utopian society reflects More's conviction that man is his brother's keeper. Being genuinely patriarchal, Utopian society is not bound together by coercion and fear, but by wisdom, mutual concern, and, it must be observed, willingness to subordinate individuality and freedom to the general good.

The family is the foundation of the state (a radical departure from the structure of Plato's republic). The cities consist of households, and "the whole island is like a single family" (149/3-4), the rulers playing the part of parents. (Officials "are called fathers and show that character" 195/1-2). No Utopian fantasy here. More says the same thing in his book of epigrams published in 1518. "The Good King... is a father to the whole kingdom... blessed in having as many children as he has subjects."<sup>10</sup>

Mutual concern is especially evident in the generous provisions made for superannuated laborers (239-241) and in the protection given Utopian wives: "They cannot endure the repudiation of an unwilling wife who is in no way to blame because some bodily calamity has befallen her. They judge it cruel that a

person should be abandoned when most in need of comfort" (189/34-37).

With little difficulty one recognizes other Christian ideals in *Utopia*. Most striking, perhaps, is indifference to the world's riches and splendor. Gold and silver have little value, not because they are easily obtainable but because "they are far inferior to iron in usefulness" (151/21-22). This echoes Erasmus' question: "What are gold and silver but red and white earth?"<sup>11</sup> Utopian neglect of fashion, in striking contrast to Tudor England's notorious weakness for clothes, calls to mind Jesus' words about the lilies of the field (Matt. 6:28-33). The birds of the air (*ib.* 6:26) may be relevant to the fact that the vestments of Utopian priests are made from the feathers of birds instead of resplendent fabrics (235/27-29). Utopian indifference to luxury links with Christian teaching about the kingdom of God through exhortations such as: "Do not dress up for show... wearing gold bracelets and fine clothes; all this should be inside, in a person's heart, imperishable: the ornament of a sweet and quiet spirit -- this is what is precious in the sight of God" (1 Peter 3:5).

More is surely speaking his own mind when Raphaël describes Utopian astonishment at "the madness of persons who pay almost divine honors to the rich," value commodity above virtue praise material, grandeur while ignoring greatness of spirit, and thereby condone what for Utopians would be insufferable absurdity: "a blockhead who has no more intelligence than a log and who is as dishonest as he is foolish keeps in bondage many wise men and good men merely for the reason that a great heap of gold coins happen to be his" (157/25-28).

This combination of virtue and reason had led the Utopians to adopt many of the fundamental beliefs and practices that form a major part of Christian doctrine (and lay the foundation of the kingdom within), beginning with the two great commandments which sum up the whole of God's law: "Reason first of all inflames men to a love and veneration of divine majesty, to whom we owe both our existence and our capacity for happiness. Secondly, it admonishes and urges us to lead a life as free

from care and as full of joy as possible, and, because of our natural fellowship, to help all other men, too, to attain that end" (163/26-31).<sup>12</sup> By holding it "sacrilegious" to attend religious ceremonies "with a troubled conscience," and by exchanging forgiveness at the end of each month, no less for hidden resentment than for offenses actually committed (233/24-26), they implement New Testament teaching on Christian love: "So if you are offering your gift at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift" (Matt. 5:23-24).

There is an unmistakable resemblance between the spiritual discipline of Utopia and that of the Christian monasticism. The Buthrescae act on the conviction that *laborare est orare* (225/29-39). As is the custom in cloisters -- as it was in More's own household -- Utopian families "begin every dinner and supper with some reading which is conducive to morality" (145/6-8).

The Utopians admit that they cannot understand harsh forms of mortification "to no man's profit" (177/38-179/11), yet their religion is "serious and strict" (161/31). Recognizing great virtue in self-sacrifice that ministers to others and pleases God (179/2-5), Utopians honor the ascetics who adopt a hard life the better to merit eternal happiness (225/26-227/25): "The more that these men put themselves in the position of slaves the more are they honored by all" (227/2-3). Where, in Christian Europe, was the Lord's promise "to exalt the humble" (Luke 1:52, 14:11) thus fulfilled? Who, among the princes and prelates of Christendom, cast a cold eye on this life for the sake of life everlasting? (John 12:24-25).

We wonder, of course, why all Utopians do not follow the lead of those whom they honor as "religious par excellence." Perhaps because they instinctively know the difference between imitation and inspiration. One must await God's call to radical acts of piety, and in the meantime rest happily in His gifts. As things stand, they are "ready to follow in whatever path He may lead" (237/20-21).

At first glance Utopia seems to be a paradise of pleasure. Hythlodæus, who has scarcely a single reservation about anything in Utopia, comments that the people "are somewhat more inclined to this attitude of mind: that no kind of pleasure is forbidden, provided that no harm comes of it" (145/24-26). Yet the Utopians are hardly libertines, and much of their Epicureanism would not have offended the moral sensibilities of More's audience. On the contrary, the section on their "soft doctrine" serves to remind us that "the soul is immortal and by the goodness of God born for happiness" (161/38-163/1). This conclusion is the one that we should not forget when examining the pleasure principle of the Utopians. The discussion on "true happiness" which it ushers in contains much orthodox Christian doctrine and Morean good sense. Far from conflicting with what God has revealed, Utopian "hedonism" tallies with Christ's promise that those who obey the two great commandments will have abundant life and happiness (John 10:10; 15:11)<sup>13</sup>. More is saying that Christianity would be a pre-eminently joyful experience if Christians took Christ's teachings seriously<sup>14</sup>, and that the kingdom within is another Eden, a garden of virtues where God and man delight in each other's presence.

The servant is not greater than the master, so every Christian must be prepared "To bear the cross with Christ," as More wrote in a famous prayer.<sup>15</sup> Yet the fruit of the Spirit -- love, joy, peace, kindness, goodness, etc. -- bespeaks happiness, as does the very name of the beatitudes. Even in our "bodily pain"; More writes in the 1529 *Dialogue*, "we feel... a pleasant taste of heaven."<sup>16</sup>

It is this kind of reasoning that generates what Jacques Maritain called "the moral forces of 'the naturally Christian soul'" -- forces which put all things in readiness for building the kingdom within.<sup>17</sup> The unbaptized Utopians make much of the natural virtues that God has bestowed upon them (especially the cardinal virtues: prudence, fortitude, temperance, justice). As their way of life shows, they stand at the threshold of God's promise -- the full life of grace, or the spiritual kingdom epitomized by the theological virtues: faith, hope, and charity. More's original

audience would have recognized the similarity between the Utopians and the early Gentile converts, the household of Cornelius, to whom Peter said : "I see very clearly that the Jews are not God's only favorites ! In every nation He has those who worship Him and do good deeds and are acceptable to Him." (Acts 10:34-35).

Utopia was certainly acceptable to More's humanist audience. Budé calls it *Hagnopolis*, the city of saints.<sup>18</sup> Granting that he was in on More's witty game -- "manage well the jest" -- Budé was too serious a man to write a preface unless the work truly appealed to him. Compared with what could be seen on every side, he saw Utopia as a "nursery of correct and useful institutions." (15/23).

Surely those contradictions and "weaknesses" which distress twentieth-century readers did not escape More's primary audience. If they did not raise the same hue and cry, it is because they remembered that Utopia was nowhere -- *Nusquam*. Also they had less appetite for complete personal freedom. Few among them would have been disturbed by the regulatory limits on freedom : uniform clothing (127), compulsory labor (127), forced migration (137), restrictions on travel (147), harsh penalties for adultery (189-191), and the dictatorial stand whereby "each one is free to choose what he should believe" (221), but no one is allowed the opinion -- the Latin text reads *putet* -- that there is no God (220).

Even colonization, a despised concept in our time, could be defended because the Utopians, unlike European colonizers of the New World, appropriate only uninhabited land which is absolutely necessary for survival : "They consider it a most just cause for war when a people which does not use its soil but keeps it idle and waste nevertheless forbids the use and possession of it to others who by the rule of nature ought to be maintained by it" (137/19-22). Construing this as a transparent attempt to conceal imperialism behind the mask of necessity ("the tyrant's plea") is refusing to distinguish between wanton expansion to accumulate wealth and power -- "the Curse of All Commonwealths" (margin of 113/38-39) -- and annexation to sustain life. Unless Hythlo-

daeus was deceived, everyone prospers : "By their procedures they make the land sufficient for both, which previously seemed poor and barren to the natives" (137/15-16). The argument that Utopian virtue prevailed only so long as it was convenient misses the point. In refusing to admit that national frontiers take precedence over human lives, the Utopians were saying to their age what Faulkner said to ours : "God created man to be His overseer on the earth and to hold suzerainty over the earth and the animals on it in His name, not to hold for himself and his descendants inviolable title forever, generation after generation, to the oblongs and squares of the earth, but to hold the earth mutual and intact in the communal anonymity of brotherhood."<sup>19</sup>

There is something to be said for the Utopians even where they are most vulnerable. Their wars to redress financial damage suffered by friendly nations (201/11-12) conflict with modern ideas about "non-intervention" but not with the traditional theory of just wars. Both Aquinas and Antiquity "usually described a just war as one that avenges wrongs, that is, when a nation or state has to be punished either for refusing to make amends for outrages done by its subjects, or to restore what it has seized injuriously."<sup>20</sup> To their credit, the Utopians "punish wrongs done to their friends... but not wrongs done to themselves" (201/34-35). They see injustice as a violation of reason, integrity, and brotherhood (the three-fold basis of social order), and an intolerable crime not only against the victims but against the very nature of mankind.

In battle, they are not only loyal (211/6-7), courageous (211/13-15), and disciplined (213/5-7), but merciful (211/39, 215/11-16). Far more prevalent in the armies of More's day were the vices -- vindictiveness, blood lust, avarice, rapacity, treachery, and cowardice -- epitomized in the Zapoletans. "Born for warfare," these sell themselves to the highest bidder. They have reduced life itself to the absurd : "The only trade they know in life is that by which they seek their death" (207/22-23). Yet the Utopians do not hesitate to employ these mercenaries ; and there's the rub, one of several obstacles that More puts in our way so that we must look more carefully at Raphael's "wise and holy" commonwealth, not only at particular policies but at the very foundation of the

Utopian state -- human reason.

Can one defend assassination (203/39-205/21), head-hunting (211/29-33), incitement to treason (205/33-35), such contrivances as encouraging women to fight alongside their husbands and children in the front lines so that soldiers will stay at their posts (209/38-211/3), and fanatical tenacity ("Their spirit is so stubborn that they would rather be cut to pieces than give way," 211/17-18)? The Utopians could have borrowed these tactics from the most "reasonable" of all Renaissance texts, Machiavelli's *Discourses* (Chapters XII, XXVIII, and especially XL), a handbook for the children of this world but dubious instruction for children of God's kingdom. Can one rest confident in the sensibility of people who progress from Sunday morning worship to Sunday afternoon military exercises (234-237)? Would More have been as quick as Hythlodæus to commend the logical pragmatism of the Utopians? He knew that all the reason and virtue in Utopia could not humanize, let alone sanctify war. The medieval Christian in the hairshirt, who "would hear Mass and be housled" before making any important decision, expected his audience to remember that man does not live by reason alone. "The philosophy of Christ belongs to the heart not to the head," certainly not to the head alone.<sup>21</sup>

Obviously, Utopia's social philosophers think otherwise. For them as for Socrates, Plato, and the wisdom writers of the Old Testament, sin is ignorance and virtue knowledge. Train the mind sufficiently and a person will always choose what is right. Unquestionably, such thinking had created a successful state, a "pattern of the good life" in Budé's words (13/21), but Utopia for all its accomplishments is still incomplete. Relying exclusively on their own genius for direction, they lack what Milton's Adam calls "higher reason," spiritual light that goes beyond human knowledge, reveals the will of God, and nurtures within the soul the orient life and beauty of the kingdom within.<sup>22</sup> An ideal commonwealth is beyond the grasp of any people who put their trust in the formulations of "sharp-witted men" rather than the teachings of Christ and the Apostles applied uncompromisingly to human conduct.<sup>23</sup> Ernst Cassirer puts it just right: "What man

could never know until he was enlightened with a special divine revelation is that reason itself is one of the most questionable and ambiguous things in the world. Reason cannot show us the way to clarity, to truth, and wisdom. For it is itself obscure in its meaning, and its origin is wrapped in mystery -- in a mystery soluble only by Christian revelation."<sup>24</sup>

A combination of sound reasoning and intuitive goodness has been the key to Utopia's material and moral achievements, but it can unlock no more doors. Nor has it always led the Utopians to the right conclusions. There is much to take issue with in the last part of Book II; enough, indeed, to convince me that More intends his audience to realize that the inadequacies of Utopia are as important as its virtues and the evils of contemporary Europe. In essence, the foundation of Utopian success -- systematic human reasoning -- is the object both of More's praise and of his satire.

*Pace* Hythlodæus, Utopia is not right simply because it is reasonable. Its institutions cease to be virtuous when human reason, contradicting itself, leads to immoral and depersonalizing conclusions.<sup>25</sup> Reluctance to declare war is reasonable and good; the exploitation of mercenaries is perhaps reasonable but not good. Tender care of the dying is praiseworthy, but the next logical step, euthanasia, conflicts with Christendom's "art or craft of dying well."<sup>26</sup> In writing on slavery, More expects the reader to give and withdraw approval as moral sensibility directs. To redeem condemned criminals from the gallows is good but nothing at all is said about rehabilitation. Apparently reason decrees that Utopians who take to crime are incorrigible and have no value beyond the calculable benefits of their labor, which, we are told, "is more profitable than their death" (191/32).

With R.S. Sylvester we must finally ask "whether the price which Hythlodæus asks us to pay is too high. Given Hythlodæus' isolation from the rest of humanity, can we really trust him to lead us into the promised land?"<sup>27</sup> More likely he would lead us to the land of the Houyhnhnms, whose "grand Maxim is to cultivate *Reason* and to be wholly governed by it".<sup>28</sup>

Taken all in all, then, Utopia is not an ideal state. Precisely, More never intended his readers to take it all in all, even if Hyth-

Iodaeus did. More has Utopian reason go awry in certain crucial instances to press his point that genius and natural virtue cannot provide lasting peace, justice, and happiness. Only Christianity can -- and would if Christians were as conscientious in their faith as Utopians are in their logic. More is not saying that Utopia is basically "absurd or vicious",<sup>29</sup> but that true virtue is "absolutely unattainable except by the grace of God" and that the most reasonable of human beings can be wrong, because man is not the measure of all things, not even of true humanity. Utopia must learn what Europe kept forgetting: "the wisdom of this world is foolishness afore God."<sup>30</sup> A fool in name and finally in deed, More knew that men would continue struggling against themselves until they sought their solutions in divine paradox rather than in human reason. Unlike his fictional speaker of nonsense -- a person "obsessed with his own insights"<sup>31</sup> -- More could not propose Utopia as an unimpeachable alternative to the evils of society. The main alternative that he offers is an awakening of the reader's mind and spirit, with a commitment to live out the teachings of the New Testament -- in essence, what the *devotio moderna* stressed, a restoration of the interior kingdom that is beyond the reach of Utopian inspiration and good will,<sup>32</sup> beyond the skills of any human architect. "Unless the Lord build the house, he who builds will have toiled in vain" (Ps. 127:1). It is to this *eutopia* that *lector viator* is led, not to the insular society--unalterable even "by a hair's breadth" -- which Hythlodaeus proposes as the mark and glass, copy and book for European social reform.

In the last analysis, Utopia is not an ideal society because Utopians are not ideal human beings, although they might be ideal citizens, and because Utopian polity could ultimately erode not only freedom but free will. Cloistered and unexercised virtue easily gives way to the will of the state, and people become slaves of "the collective human machine"<sup>33</sup> instead of "slaves to obedience that leads to righteousness... sanctification" (2 Cor. 3: 18) and, in More's mind, *freedom*. The final stage of Utopia might well be Walden Two or a new world of big brothers proclaiming a gospel that even Hythlodaeus would consider abhorrent.

On the other hand, conditions verged on the abhorrent in More's Europe, which should have been far more enlightened and civilized than Utopia. Aquinas had written that a person who knows God "is able to judge and set in order all things according to Divine rules."<sup>34</sup> Sixteenth-century Christians, for all their exposure to Scripture, to the sacraments, and the teachings of the Church, did not set all things in order. They had abandoned the kingdom of love, grace, and lasting happiness which is the inheritance of Christ's followers. To squander such riches for the ambitions and honors of this world was a "stark madness" repeatedly denounced in More's spiritual writings.

As Chambers said, the extent to which Europeans exceeded Utopians in redemptive grace is the measure by which they should have excelled them in virtue. A modern reader who knows the mind of the Renaissance will not miss the salient rhetorical question asked in *Utopia*: if the citizens of Utopia, without the full measure of God's grace and the living wisdom of the Gospel, can create a "garden island" (Father Surtz' phrase)<sup>35</sup>, should not European man, redeemed, nourished, and instructed by the Son of God, make much more of his world and time? <sup>36</sup> If Utopia, with all its defects, is "ready for triumphant fulfillment in Christ and Christianity,"<sup>37</sup> what is Europe ready for? The answer was evident to Erasmus, Giles, Tunstall, and the rest of More's early audience: not so much a radical change of political structure as a radical change of heart, a new conversion to old ideals that stressed the origin, brotherhood, and goal of all mankind. They would have regarded *Utopia* as a brilliant elaboration of Erasmus' stinging rebuke: "If the example of the saints is too much for us, we should at least have enough pride not to let ourselves be out-distanced by pagans."<sup>38</sup> Put another way, the Utopians embodied a good part of Christian truth but did not know it; Christian Europeans knew that truth but did not embody it. To embody truth would be to repent, seek grace, obey the word of God, and let His kingdom flourish within the heart, as it did in the hearts of men like Thomas More.<sup>39</sup>

More does not anatomize the virtues of Christ's kingdom one after another. Nevertheless, *Utopia* is a spiritual directory of

sorts. More constantly makes an issue of Utopian morality and forces the reader to contemplate the roots of good and evil. His dialogue makes us "experience the great emptiness lying concealed at the heart of things:"<sup>40</sup> concealed, that is, in human hearts and institutions (including those of Utopia).

Although *Utopia* does not offer a complete solution to the world's problems, it does, directly and indirectly exhort us to fill up this great emptiness with goodness and grace, with the Spirit of truth "who brings us to life with Christ" (Eph. 2:5) and creates on the ground of our being a kingdom of "righteousness, peace, and joy" (Rom. 14:17). Upon realizing that it is not political reform "in our countries" that More seeks first and foremost, we may not only wish for the *eutopia* which dwells in the heart, we have every hope of seeing it realized.

Arizona State University, Tempe

John X. Evans

#### NOTES

1. *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More* (henceforth designated *CW*), Vol. 5, *Responsio ad Lutherum*, Part. 1, ed. J. Headley (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1969), 169.

2. Hexter's conclusion. *CW 4, Utopia*, ed. Edward Surtz, S.J. and J.H. Hexter (New Haven and London: 1965)cx. When quoting from *Utopia* itself, I shall cite page and line numbers within my text.

3. C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (New York: MacMillan, 1960), 72.

4. *CW 4*, lxxviii

5. Two essays in *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Utopia*, ed. W. Nelson (Englewood Hills, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1968) summarize modern objections to *Utopia*: G. Ritter, "Utopia and Power Politics," and T.S. Dorsch, "A Detestable State" - the message in miniature.

6. I. Surtz, Introduction to the Yale *Utopia*, popular edition (New Haven, 1964), xxix.

7. In the *Confutation*, More attacks communism as one of the intolerable heresies of the Anabaptists. See the note to 218/5-6 in *CW 4* for additional support of what I wrote above.

8. G.R. Elton sees less rackrenting and enclosing during the period than we might think: *England under the Tudors* (London: 1962), 79. There was enough of both to inspire More with the haunting phrase: "Sheep are eating men": (*oues... tam edaces... ut homines deuorent*, 64/31f.).

9. In 1518 More told his daughter Margaret that "rather than allow my children to be idle and slothful, I would make a sacrifice of wealth, and bid adieu to other cares and business to attend to my children and family." *St. Thomas More: Selected Letters*, ed. Elizabeth Frances Rogers (New Haven and London: 1961), 109.

Modern psychiatry is in full accord with More about the damaging effects of idleness: "The jobless man experiences the emptiness of his time as inner emptiness, an emptiness of his consciousness." Viktor E. Frankl, *The Doctor and the Soul: from Psychotherapy to Logotherapy*, 2nd ed. (New York: 1971), 97. Compulsive work can be neurotic compensation for an empty life, of course. Significantly, the Utopians devote only six hours of the day to work and leave a good amount of time for recreation and "intellectual pursuits" (127/32-129/2). In *Utopia*, livelihood does not overshadow life.

10. "That the Good King Is a Father Not a Master, Iambics," in *St. Thomas More: The History of King Richard III and Selections from the English and Latin Poems*, ed. Richard S. Sylvester (New Haven and London: 1976), 140.

11. "The Handbook of the Militant Christian," in *The Essential Erasmus*, ed. John P. Dolan (New York: New American Library, 1964), 86.

12. See Acts of the Apostles, 14:16-17.

13. Cp. Erasmus, *The Epicurean*: "Nobody more deserves the name of an Epicurean than that adorable Prince of Christian Philosophers" (Christ). Quoted in Edward Surtz, *Praise of Wisdom* (Chicago: 1957), 14.

14. For a full and definitive discussion of the subject, see Surtz, *Praise of Pleasure* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1957). See also Robbin Johnson's book, *More's Utopia: Ideal and Illusion* (New Haven: 1969), 95-102. St Paul's command (Phil. 4:4) to be "merry in God" is echoed in More's letters: see *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas More*, ed. E.F. Rogers (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947), 423/40 and 544/165.

15. *CW 13, Treatise on the Passion...Instructions and Prayers*, ed. Garry E. Haupt (New Haven and London: 1976), p. 226/29.

16. *The Works of Sir Thomas More in the English Tongue* (London, 1557), 143, which is Book I, Ch. 18 of the *Dialogue Concerning Heresies*.

17. *Christianity and Democracy* (London: 1945), 11.

18. *CW 4*, 13/9, a probable allusion, says the Yale commentary, to Apoc. 21:2.

19. William Faulkner, "The Bear," in *Go Down, Moses* (New York: 1942) p. 257. Cp. Hythlodæus' reassuring comment on the Utopian attitude toward expansion: "They consider themselves the tenants rather than the masters of what they hold" (113/37-39).

20. *Summa Theologiae*, vol. 35, Consequences of Charity (2a 2ae. 34-36), ed. Thomas R. Heath, O.P. (New York; 1972), Q. 40, art. 1, p. 83.

21. Hexter, *CW 4*, lxxi.

22. John 3:3 makes this clear: "But if (unless) a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." (G. Marc'hadour, *The Bible in the Works of St. Thomas More. Part II*, Nieuwkoop:1969, p. 148), Relating this statement to Luke 17: 21, we may add that unless one is born anew, of water and the spirit, God's kingdom cannot grow within him.

23. This is one of the main points that More made in his letter to Dorp. See *Selected Letters*, 35-41, 57-58.

24. *An Essay on Man* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944), 9. Cp. Montaigne, "Je ne crois pas... que la science est mère de toute vertu et que tout vice est produit par l'ignorance." "Apologie de Raimond Sebonde." *Montaigne's Essays and Selected Writings, A Bilingual Edition*, tr. and ed. Donald Frame (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963), 198.

25. R. Johnson sums up the destructive effects of Utopian political science, arguing that it "opens the way to the risk that the individual will be forfeited to the preservation of the institutional ideal originally created by the individual". *More's Utopia: Ideal and Illusion*, 88. Read also Johnson's "Argument for Reform in More's Utopia", in *Moreana*, 31-32 (1971), 123-134, and R.J. Schoeck, "'A Nursery of Correct and Useful Institutions': on Reading More's Utopia as Dialogue," *Moreana*, 22 (1969), 23.

26. See Nancy Lee Beaty, *The Craft of Dying* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970).

27. "Si Hythlodæo Credimus: Vision and Revision in Thomas More's Utopia", *Soundings*, 51 (1968), 284. Reprinted in *Essential Articles for the Study of Thomas More*, ed. R.S. Sylvester and G.P. Marc'hadour (Hamden: 1977), 297.

28. Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels and Other Writings*, ed. R. Quintana (New York; 1958), 218.

29. Dorsch's conclusion, *op. cit.*, 97.

30. I Cor. 3:19, as translated by More himself in his *Life of Pico, Works*, p. 16. See also Wisdom 9:14-16.

31. R.S. Sylvester, *art. cit.*, p. 283. *Essential Articles*, p. 297.

32. Like Erasmus and others whose spirituality was influenced by the *devotio moderna*, More realized that *humanitas* leads to the city of man rather than the city of God -- to a dead end, in other words. *Pietas* puts one in the right way: "Direct thyself to the inward and thou shalt see the kingdom of God come within thee." *Imitation of Christ*, II, i. 5. f. The twentieth-century Russian philosopher, Berdyaev reproduces this argument eloquently. See his *Slavery and Freedom* (New York; 1944), especially 237 f.

33. See Lewis Mumford, "Utopia, the City and the Machine," *Daedalus*, 94 (Spring, 1965), p. 283. On the subject of freedom and religion, Cassirer writes (*op. cit.*, p. 108): "The taboo system threatens to make the life of man a burden that in the end becomes unbearable. It is here that religion intervenes. All the higher ethical religions... set themselves a common task. They relieve the intolerable burden of the taboo system; but they detect, on the other hand, a more profound sense of religious obligation that instead of being a restriction or compulsion is the expression of a new positive ideal of human freedom."

34. *Summa Theologiae*, *ed. cit.*, p. 165.

35. Popular ed., p. xxi. Paul A. Sawada sees Utopia as "a quasi-paradise or pre-paradise." "Toward The Definition of Utopia," *Moreana*, 31-32 (1971), 137.

36. This point, eloquently made by Chambers, rests on the marginal gloss opposite one of Hythlodæus' comments: "How Much Wiser the Utopians Are than the Common Run of Christians!" (157/33-35). Yet they had not attained the wisdom that could make them fully human.

37. Introduction to the popular ed. of *Utopia*, p. xxiii.

38. Erasmus, "Handbook," p. 76.

39. Of modern poets, Auden expresses the idea most memorably: "In the deserts of the heart / Let the healing fountain start." "In Memory of W.B. Yeats," *Collected Shorter Poems, 1927-1957*, (London: Faber and Faber, 1966), 143.

40. The words are those of Cornelis de Schrijver, *CW 4*, 31/15-17.

\*\*\*\*\*

A grant from Arizona State University allowed me to do much of the research that led to the writing of this essay.

I am happy to acknowledge the assistance given me by Abbé Germain Marc'hadour and Professor Richard S. Sylvester, both of whom read earlier versions of this article and made suggestions that I incorporated into the final draft.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Editor's note

Professor Evans was to have read this paper at Angers on 13 April 1977. The Congress missed his smiling presence and that of his wife Rosemary; for the occasion, she painted a large portrait of Thomas More, glowing, almost burning, which reached France, by air, a little too late for exhibition. Participants are welcome back to see it.

## WHO WAS H.W.H. ?

The question was raised by our Japanese amica Yoshiko Watanabe in *Moreana* 54, p. 22. A tentative answer came from Sister Francis Agnes, OSC, in a letter of 7th August :

*I wish I could identify H.W.H., having known Prof. Chambers & Miss Hitchcock. My last year was 1931. On the English staff then, & working closely with the above people, was Miss Husbands. I think she was Winifred, & might have used her 2nd Christian name. But someone else may write in more positively. She would not have parted with such a book, unless she is dead.*

Confirmation of this guess did come in a letter of 15 October from Professor Kathleen Tillotson, the much younger colleague of Chambers at the University of London (you may have noticed her name in the distinguished list of Honorary Members of the Modern Language Association of America, p. 606 of the latest Directory, September 1977). She writes :

*Without any doubt, 'H.W.H.' is Miss H. Winifred Husbands, student and then staff at U.C.L., and very much a member of the circle. Her own publications were not in the medieval or early Renaissance field but on late 18th c. novels and (I think) Jane Austen. I knew her well (She was also long an assistant to the editor of MLR) in the 1930's & 40's, but I lost touch later. May I add (not as criticism but as commentary) that you'll find her name on p. 11 of Sir Thomas More ?*

*Yours sincerely  
Kathleen Tillotson*

Indeed, in his famous preface, signed 6 February, 1935, R.W. Chambers thanks three colleagues, among them "Miss H.W. Husbands, for reading the proofs and for helpful criticism".

U.C.L., in Professor Tillotson's letter, means University College London.