

Subjects in Space: The Politics of Travel in Early Modern England

by

Jennifer Anne Turner

**A thesis submitted to the Department of English
in conformity with the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

Queen's University

Kingston, Ontario, Canada

September, 2000

Copyright © Jennifer Anne Turner, 2000



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-63464-7

Canada

Abstract

This project explores the connection between subjects in space and versions of agency. It formulates a politics of early modern travel and sets up, as a topic for literary study, the politics of spatial practice.

I start by examining encounters between mutually defining spatial actors and dynamics in fifteenth-century Alexander narratives and early modern histories of Venice. I delineate an early modern politics of travel and demonstrate its reproduction in accounts of personal and political formation by Richard Helgerson and Stephen Greenblatt.

Subsequent chapters focus on individual works by Spenser, Shakespeare, Nashe and Jonson. I situate these works at different moments of early modern cultural contact and I read them as cultural frontiers where two spatial stories touch.

Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland* is, I suggest, a text caught between two kinds of early modern writing on nationalism, each informed by different spatial practices. Mixed messages of ethnic and civic sovereignty are generated by an overlap between the travel relation, concerned with European civic statehood, and the antiquarian, anthropological investigation of national origin.

In the next chapter, I link *Macbeth* to the debate about governance that was sparked by James VI/I's imperial vision of Great Britain as a single political unit. I argue that the core values of rival regimes--kingdom and state--are mediated in *Macbeth* by an interactive clash between different spatial actors.

The last two chapters focus on aberrant reproductions of heroic and humanist

travel. My reading of Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller* shows how opposed styles of travel reconstruct the authorial agent in a contractual cosmos. In the final chapter, I suggest that a collation of contrary traveller types in Jonson's "The Famous Voyage", constructs a segregated, hellish urban enclave beyond civic power as the matrix of literary production.

I conclude by returning to contemporary intellectual self-fashioning. I question the figure of the intellectual as a mobile, transcendent subject by suggesting that the politics of the intellectual and the politics of travel coincide.

Acknowledgments

I am indebted to a number of individuals who have contributed to the research and writing of this dissertation. I owe much to Dr. Elizabeth Hanson's energizing and supportive supervision. I will always appreciate her commitment to the project and her vision of the undertaking, both of which helped to sustain and advance the writing process. I am also grateful to Dr. Paul Stevens for his guidance at a critical turning point in the design of the dissertation and throughout the course of this endeavour. This project has benefited enormously from the stewardship of Dr. Hanson and Dr. Stevens and I extend my sincere thanks to them.

In addition I offer my thanks to my fellow graduate students at Queen's University, especially Irene Bom and Mark Stephenson, with whom I have enjoyed a stimulating and instructive dialogue, and to colleagues who have kindly read and commented on portions of an earlier version of the dissertation. I am also grateful to Dr. Don Beecher of Carleton University for his advice and assistance in preparing an earlier part of the dissertation for publication.

I would like to acknowledge the services of the staff at the Joseph S. Stauffer Library, especially Ms. Bonnie Cuddon, who provided me with resources necessary to the completion of this project. I was supported during my fifth year of writing with the award of an Ontario Graduate Scholarship, for which I would also like to register my thanks.

I cannot speak enough of what I owe Richard, my husband, and our children, Jane and Paul. It stops me here; it is too much. I dedicate this work to them.

Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	iv
Chapter one: Subjects in Space	1
Chapter two: "Making a famine where abundance lies"	36
Chapter three: "Unbless some mother"	92
Chapter four: "Chronicle of wasted time"	150
Chapter five: "Thy mother's glass"	191
Conclusion: "All space is place"	220
Notes	223
<i>Selected bibliography</i>	263
<i>Vita</i>	282

Subjects in Space

"He that wyl travell," wrote Andrew Boorde in 1542, "the truthe he shall fynd."¹ Boorde made this statement in an account of his travels in Europe called *The fyrst Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge*. Boorde's brevity here encapsulates two ways of looking at the idea of travel. If travel may be thought of generally as a "search for difference", then Boorde's claim fashions travel as a metaphor for discovery through the experience of difference.² Travel is linked to detection, to revelation and to disclosure; it is related or keyed to a process of seeking out knowledge and searching for meaning through cultural contact.³ Travel is tied to a process that leads, finally, to a powerful explanation, to truth.

Boorde's own travels seem consonant with this conception of travel. Boorde was a student of medicine who journeyed to learn more about his subject, and he wrote about ways in which medicine was practised abroad. Boorde may also have travelled as one of Thomas Cromwell's intelligencers, looking into foreign feeling on the actions of Henry VIII.⁴ In line with his own experience perhaps, Boorde's remark connects travel to a process of infiltration, culminating in the discovery of knowledge, which depends on a capacity to engage, or to merge, with difference. Boorde's focus on the end result of travel here assumes a certain cultural competence on the part of the agent, who appears already able to commute with another social cosmos.

He that will travel, then, presses forward, possessed of manoeuvring skill and an ability to negotiate the barriers to understanding, towards an explanation. Like a pilgrim who journeys to a holy place for a touch of the shrine and a connection to the power of its

saint, this traveller looks for something powerful that lies beyond the order of his everyday world, in the belief that he will find it.⁵ Travel as a metaphor for discovery is also a model of experience; it is a model of belief.

The second possibility encapsulated in Boorde's suggestive brevity is that truth inheres in the process of travel itself. In other words, he that will travel will find truth, that is something of value, because the experience of travel is meaningful in itself. Boorde's appeal to truth may be understood as pointing to something culturally significant in the idea of travel as action that produces its own valuable knowledge, independently of departures and arrivals. Cultural competence is not a given in this instance. This knowledge of how space is occupied, knowledge that is produced in the interface between agent and alien context, may be what is culturally significant about travel. I am suggesting that subjects in space may be fashioned or imagined through travel that is understood as a sequence of consecutive actions through time and space. In other words, travel may be understood as a spatial practice, which produces knowledge about human agency by showing how the subject inhabits space.⁶

This study is concerned, largely, with the spatialized character of the early modern subject. By reading mobile subjects--notably travellers--as spatial actors, I aim to trace the cultural significance of the agent oriented to space. I am suggesting that the idea of travel may be understood as a way of organising experience and generating agency that pertains to personal and political formation in early modern England. My inquiry differs from others concerned with travel in the field of literary studies in that I see travel as something other than a set of concrete experiences, experiences that may be seen as source material for literary works, or as contexts for reading them. This is not to

deny the value of this kind of literary and cultural research, but to re-draw its boundaries a little. By reading travel as signalling a theory of agency *as well as* a set of concrete experiences and practices, a sense of spatiality may be brought to literary and cultural analysis of early modern personal and political formation.

When Boorde was travelling, travellers were often strangers in a strange place. The specifics of human interaction with social structure are defamiliarized in this scenario. We can see travel, therefore, as a way to elaborate a relation between individual agency and structure, or context. In describing the flow of conduct in time and space, travel narratives fashion versions of human agency. This idea of travel offers a dynamic conception of the subject; it mediates an active and interactive model of self-fashioning based on a relation to difference.

Travel, as movement, brings the world into being; it is a way of constructing space and spatial relations. This is a fundamental premise of geography.⁷ Travel also constructs subjective space and this, in turn, relates to political space. In breaking the flow of everyday, customary interaction with context, travel involves willed associations with strangers and the strange. Both subjects and polities founded upon willed association can be constructed or imagined through the process or idea of travel. This willed association, which may be either a voluntary, civic contract or a conquest, often wears the moral mask of civility.

Civil conversation, as a beneficial form of voluntary contact, legitimises forms of

willed association in the early modern era. *Not* to engage in civil conversation with a view to socially desirable increase of some kind was often seen as evidence of a base mind. To reject this beneficial form of willed association was to confirm one's intractable rudeness. Such recalcitrance might justify the use of force in bringing the misguided to see the error of their ways. Incurable barbarity might even justify extermination. Imperial enterprise was often authorised as a civilising mission. By the same token, there was a tendency to regard civic association, underwritten by the values attached to civility and civil conversation, as superior to involuntary ethnic, racial or tribal groupings.

I can begin to show how travel as a spatial process generates knowledge about agency by looking at travel in relation to another spatial function--the process of dwelling.⁸ Travel narratives, factual and fictional, sometimes include a traveller's encounter with an isolated community that seems to offer a better way to live.⁹ More's *Utopia* is a case in point. The social criticism that emerges from these encounters often draws on an age-old hierarchy, or snobbery, that interprets travel as a mark of moral fall and dwelling as proof of innocence. What I want to suggest, however, is that these encounters demonstrate with particular clarity how the functions of travel and dwelling mutually generate their meanings. I propose that these moments of contact signal an apprehension of personal, political and, ultimately, cultural difference. I start, though, by examining an incident from fifteenth-century Alexander romances, and its provenance, which crystallises this moment of cultural contact and mutual definition.

In the *Greek Alexander Romance*, a work of late classical Greek literature that reached Europe in the Middle Ages and proved enormously influential, Alexander,

founder of twelve cities, advances Hellenic civility against the monstrous races and savage nations of Asia.¹⁰ The god of the universe decrees that Alexander's cities will thrive and that he will subdue, despite his youth, all the races of the barbarians. Furthermore, in each of his encounters with Asian rulers it is Alexander's stated intention to show the difference between a Greek and a barbarian king. Alexander kills no messengers, he offers no violence to hostage women, his battles are preceded by offers of clemency to those who submit to his terms, and he keeps his word. At the temple of Orpheus, Alexander is told that just as Orpheus tamed beasts and men, so Alexander will make all men his subjects by his skill at war. Alexander's genius for conquest is compared to Orpheus' mastery of music and song. Thus, Alexander and his empire take on the mantle of the civilising mission. There is one Asian encounter, however, that reverses the values of civility attached to Alexander and his empire. When Alexander makes contact with the Brahmans, the naked philosophers, Alexander is revealed as the barbarian. This meeting highlights the meaning produced in travel by pitting it against that generated by dwelling.

The Brahmans dwell in a vale of plenty, girdled by a ring of bright water. Untroubled by private property, they depend on the naturally provided bounty of nature, and devote themselves to the pursuit of wisdom. They tell Alexander that he is a wild beast, leading a pack of many other beasts that take the lives of creatures they find in their path. They expose his style of kingship as "unjust power used to the disadvantage of others; insolence supported by opportunity" (132).

Versions of Alexander's meeting with the Brahmans appear in a number of classical, Medieval and Renaissance texts, including *Mandeville's Travels* and Sir

Thomas North's *Plutarch's Lives*. This incident from the fabulous history of Alexander's advance into the vast space of Asia shows how the agency generated by travel is associated with a heroic, progressive subjectivity, and an expansionist polity. It also shows how these personal and political forms are legitimised by the values attached to civil conversation. This nexus of ideas emerges dialectically in relation to the contemplative Brahman subject, the closed, spatially fixed Brahman polity, and an involuntary sense of political belonging that is linked to the function of dwelling. In this moment of cultural contact between west and east the significance of travel as a discrete process emerges dialectically in relation to its counterpart, the process of dwelling.

In two Medieval accounts--the prose *Life of Alexander* and the alliterative poem entitled *The Letters of Alexander to Dindimus, King of the Brahmans*--Alexander, having conquered his way to India, the land of wonders, arrives at the land of the Brahmans.¹¹ His way forward is blocked by the Ganges, which swarms with crocodiles, hippopotami and scorpions. Alexander sends a knight across in a boat with a letter to Dindimus, the King of the Brahmans, because he has heard of the Brahmans' wisdom and would learn of their life, their manners and their doctrine. This is the beginning of a dialogue in letters between a great travelling Greek, and a people who abide the confines of their own isle.

Dindimus makes it clear from the start that there is no profit to be gained, for either side, from this encounter. He reasons that they cannot learn from each other because their ways are so different. Dindimus' response here appears to disallow the possibility of any cultural exchange--in this instance at least--that is not conquest.

Dindimus' reaction suggests that interaction is not the only effect when cultures meet

through the activity of travel. Such encounters may be experienced as the physical and metaphysical points that mark the limit of a cultural domain. As Alexander sees it, however, such meetings constitute an opportunity for redrawing the boundaries of his intellectual, if not his physical, territory. His overture to Dindimus figures this moment of cultural contact as a way of adding value to both sides without loss to either people. He says to Dindimus that their congress will be as one flaming torch igniting another, a general increase of illumination that entails no diminution of brightness at the source. This appeal to civil conversation that advances the general welfare promotes cultural contact on the basis that it can be only beneficial. What it does not promote is, in Randy E. Barnett's (1998) phrase, "freedom *from* contact" or protection from a transfer of knowledge that breaks down boundaries.¹²

Dindimus' borders mark Alexander's personal and political limits. The Greek cannot cross the river with his army, for it seethes with dreadful dragons. The kingdom of the Brahmans, therefore, marks the edge of Alexander's empire, a border that Alexander commemorates by raising up a pillar upon which are inscribed his victories in various languages. The Brahmans also mark the limits of Alexander's way of thinking, being and ruling. They do not impose their will on the land. They do not till, fish, or hunt; nor do they exert any individual authority over property, holding their bountiful resources in common. The Brahmans are a community held in place by the historical experience of dwelling as one on their isle, untouched by migration, immigration or by conquest. They counter Alexander's appeal to civil conversation with an uncompromising rejection that marks the limit of Alexander's heroic subjectivity and expansionist state.

The Brahmans oppose Alexander's empire with what amounts to ethnic nationhood. The Brahmans are a cohesive group, who occupy a defended territory and exercise their own government, free from foreign intervention. They express their right to independent governance in resisting Alexander, and this expression of right, according to Paul Gilbert in *The Philosophy of Nationalism* (1998), constitutes a nation.¹³ In occupying their own territory and exercising their own government as a group they are a nation. As a closed polity and homogeneous nation, they both counter and define Alexander's expansionist polity and his ideal of civic association between ethnically and culturally diverse peoples.

Despite Dindimus' conviction that the warlike Greeks can glean no wisdom from Brahman ways, the king responds to Alexander's request for knowledge of their customs, lest he be thought guilty of tantalising the Greek with an unspecified superiority. In the course of their ensuing dialogue Alexander and Dindimus emerge as animations of political abstractions, or *prosopopoeia*, and their conversation fashions a dialectic between closed and expansionist polities.

Dindimus' relation of Brahman life describes a closed, communistic society that posits an ideal of social wholeness and unity. The mighty, but not impregnable, boundary of the wild river teeming with ferocious creatures encloses, defends and fixes a territory and a community that is conterminous with a closed style of nationhood, such as ethnic nationhood. In other words, Dindimus' model of social wholeness and unity depends on a closed conception of cultural consciousness that is tied to a particular locale. Ethnic, or tribal, identity is based on just such a closed principle of unity. This closed group attains nationhood because it maintains its own territory and government,

even if that independence relies on naturally provided defences. Dindimus speaks for a closed, timeless form of nationhood that is antithetical to Alexander's notion of willed political association and imperial progress. Alexander travels and the Brahmans dwell, but both ways of being in the world involve social processes through which agency is produced.

In the letter that Dindimus sends to Alexander, it is clear that the Brahmans do not travel. They also eschew most recognised forms of civilised life. They do not till, fish or hunt; nor do they cook their food, which they take as the earth offers. They drink water or milk and they eat temperately. They dress in leaves, live in caves and sleep on the earth.

The Brahmans, however, do not regard their lives as uncivilised. Their customs constitute an austere way of life that is seen as healthy, virtuous and just. They do not fall sick, nor do other afflictions like avarice, adultery, lechery, or mendacity trouble them. No man serves another by force or necessity. Men stay fixed to their line of work, untroubled by change. They favour speech that is brief and to the point, and they have no need of mercy because they do not offend. They are all of equal might and riches, and they bear no weapons. In their schools, the Brahmans learn wisdom and righteousness. They worship one god, desire eternal life and live a fixed term. They look to conquer themselves rather than their world, and they live in peace.

After describing the Brahman culture thus, Dindimus goes on to accuse the Greeks of every vice the Brahmans lack. He criticises Alexander's restless desire for ever more territory, and he blames him for sowing discord between kings. Dindimus chides the Greeks because they are changeable with regard to their laws, and he accuses them of

sacrificing their children. He censures them because they hold with fine speech and rich goods, and because they are given to gluttony, drunkenness, lechery and sickness.

Dindimus rebukes the Greeks for serving many mischievous gods instead of worshipping the one Creator, and he calls them errant fools and slaves for doing so. While the Brahmins, says Dindimus, communicate with God through prayer and good works, the Greeks defile themselves by slaying beasts and offering gold and silver and precious goods in idolatrous fashion to their gods. The Greeks, he claims, suffer the torments of hell through their vices; indeed, he adds, the very bodies of the Greeks are a living hell.

Alexander replies, with muted fury, that if all that Dindimus has said were true, then it would seem that the only good men in the world are the Brahmins.¹⁴ Yet how can this be so, Alexander counters, when the Brahmins live like beasts? Furthermore, he says, they do not mingle with other men; they live as prisoners on their land, to which no strangers come. He criticises Brahmin life as the product of unthinking custom, rather than virtue. Their poverty is not that of temperance among riches but a consequence of their own backwardness. From Alexander's point of view, the Brahmins inhabit the space of the stupid: they sulk on their rocks, stagnating blankly in a half-savage torpor when they could, if they were not so dull, merge and learn from others and fashion a superior culture.¹⁵ Alexander does not see the Brahmins as having achieved simplicity with their autarky; he sees them as locked into provincial rustication. Even were the Brahmins to come to Greece, claims Alexander, they would learn nothing, so they should stay at home. Their insularity and absence of referentiality he reads as blockish intransigence, rather than as a form of virtuous retirement from a corrupt and corrupting world. To the Greek, the reductive monotony of Brahmin life manifests a foolish and

wayward impoverishment of the world's wonderful variety; they seem blind to the dignity of free will. Their way of life represents irredeemable incivility to Alexander, not laudable retreat to virtuous simplicity. Infuriated with Dindimus' smug superiority, Alexander tells him that if it were not for the monster-infested river he would march into their midst and force them to leave their miserable lives and become warriors. As it is, all he can do is send his letter and raise up a marble pillar, on which he engraves his victories in Greek, Latin and the language of India. Not long after this incident Alexander turns west, towards Macedonia.

Seeing himself in the critical mirror of Brahman culture confirms Alexander's belief in his destiny as a heroic traveller and conquering warrior. Seeing himself in the critical mirror of Alexander's scorn confirms Dindimus in his belief that only the Brahmans are good, who conquer themselves and keep themselves to themselves. There is no relativizing reflection taking place here, no open acceptance of co-existing beliefs or mutually illuminating contact. There is no opportunity for hospitality and no possibility of reform. Nevertheless, Alexander's journey has made this revelation of his own limits possible. Travel acts here, incidentally, as a metaphor for discovery, in that Alexander has uncovered this shocking truth.

The Brahman's isle where no strangers come is no cosmopolitan seat of empire, and that is no bad thing as far as they are concerned. The Brahmans share a common language, a common faith and common values; they keep alive a common history and abide by fixed laws. They live within a demarcated, uncontested geographical space with a very distinct boundary, and they govern themselves while resisting foreign intervention. They are a close-knit community, whose sense of political belonging does not depend on

civic, or willed, association. The Brahmans' insularity and isolation behind a nearly insurmountable border emphasise the involuntary association that comes from dwelling, day after day, in one, enclosed space. Their energies are directed towards *maintaining* a chosen way of life, and they emerge as subjects in space through the daily processes of dwelling. The Brahmans, who elevate the values attached to dwelling, mark the limit of Alexander's glorification of travel and conquest.

Alexander and Dindimus contest each other's mode of being and governing. They represent rival communities of opinion as to how to organise personal and political space. Alexander would make the world his personal property, while the Brahmans hold things in common. The beatific insularity of the Brahmans is conducive to a contemplative life that retreats before experience and contaminating engagement with the world. To Alexander this cloistered virtue is no virtue at all; the Brahmans, sunk into self-love, untested by active participation with others, are miserable wretches who must be taught a lesson with the sword. Dindimus' preference for purity, understood in opposition to Alexander's longing for experiential plurality, signifies the internal homogeneity of a closed polity. Dindimus sees Alexander's integrative, expansionist and consumptionist ethos as corrupt and wicked. Alexander's glorification of travel, change and diversity fashions a civic polity and a propelled, progressive self. Dindimus' elevation of dwelling, immutability and homogeneity fashions a closed, autarkic polity and a contemplative subject. Travel emerges here as an expression of the will that produces a vast empire and a demonic paganism, against the action of dwelling, which produces autarky and an almost Christian asceticism.¹⁶

As might be expected in the context of a history of Alexander the Great, the life

of the Brahmans, despite its spiritual authority, comes across as opposed, but not quite equal in honour, to Alexander's trajectory. With all its wickedness, cruelty and desperate energies, the way of the Greeks appears throughout the rest of the text as vital, heroic and brimming with new possibilities. He that will travel redraws boundaries, enlarges his domain, and opts for renewal and growth through interaction with the foreign and the diverse. The community of the Brahmans, in activating its freedom *from* cultural contact, appears impoverished by comparison. By excluding the world's variety and complexity in favour of austerity, the Brahmans seem to Alexander dull, absurd and doomed. Dull and absurd, as perhaps any community of the good and the wise appears to the fallen-- what would they share with each other but praise for the maker?--but also doomed because they exclude so much of the real diversity in the human community. This closed form of nationhood is predicated not so much on an imagined community of the real as on an exclusion of the real through affirmation of an imaginary, unreal world. It cannot be too long before the barricade of the river is broken. The globalizing Alexander has, after all, already conquered the fierce currents of the Euphrates by building a bridge of boats on his way to conquer the Persians, and it follows that the river defending the Brahmans' freedom from contact and difference must also, one day, be breached.

Even though it might seem as if Alexander and Dindimus are not quite equal in honour, their dialogue sets up contestatory systems of legitimising ideology that both regimes need in order to attract and interpret the loyalties of their adherents, and thus to survive. Civility and the freedom to cultural contact justify Alexander's expansionist empire. Austerity and freedom from cultural contact justify Dindimus' style of closed nationhood. Alexander is embarked on a trajectory of growth while Dindimus is

committed to conservation. The dialogue between Alexander and Dindimus offers an apology for each antithetical form of political fashioning.

This opposition between closed and open polities is replayed in the political theorising of the Renaissance. Machiavelli's political theories are informed by the idea that political space may be organised and governed in one of two possible ways. These models are analogous to those represented by Alexander and Dindimus, but with one important difference: Machiavelli insists on the importance of the polity being armed. In Machiavelli's view, governance could either pursue greatness and glory by following, for example, the path of imperial Rome, or it could aim for longevity by seclusion from the world, like ancient Sparta.¹⁷ In *The Prince*, Machiavelli argues that principalities can organise themselves for either attack or defence, but that the foundations of every polity are good laws and good arms, and that good arms come first.¹⁸ For Machiavelli, there is no avoiding war. Contempt, as he stresses throughout *The Prince*, is reserved for those who neglect the art of war.¹⁹

From Machiavelli's--and Alexander's--way of thinking, Dindimus is doomed because he leaves himself open to this contempt. Machiavelli's attitude here may be summed up by what he says in a letter to Francesco Vettori (1514). In this letter he states categorically that nothing is more necessary to a prince than that he govern himself in relation to his subjects, his allies and his neighbours in such a way that he does not become despised. Hatred, Machiavelli says, is preferable to contempt, because hatred does not preclude fear and respect.²⁰

Machiavelli's order of two--the options of dwelling secure, like Sparta, or expanding and conquering, like Rome--is weighted in favour of Rome. Machiavelli's

view is that the self-centred Spartan model, despite its armed defensive stance, fails to offer a tenable policy for durability, and that the only real option for the state is to push for civic greatness and empire.²¹

Sixteenth-century tracts in praise of Venice offer another text in which governance is theorised in an implicit relation to a spatial dynamic. The debate here does not devolve upon a simple opposition between dwelling and travelling, or conservation and expansion, but rather superimposes the values attendant on the functions of dwelling and travelling onto the opposed dynamics of commerce and conquest. The values attached to self-involved insularity inform ideas of commercial enterprise, and the values attached to travel and willed association remain tied to martial conquest.

The celebration of Venetian mixed government, plurality and international engagement was a topos for political durability. The longevity of the Venetian State, the mixed constitution of the Venetian government, and the wonderful, cosmopolitan tolerance that Venice extended to the strangers that flocked there were three characteristic features of this topos. William Thomas, for example, in *The History of Italy* (1549) remarks at length upon the throng of strangers that gather there and upon the liberty they enjoy in Venice. He concludes that, "so thou offend no man privately, no man shall offend thee, which undoubtedly is one principal cause that draweth so many strangers thither" (83).²² Lewes Lewkenor's *The Commonwealth and Government of Venice* (1599), a translation of Gasparo Contarini's *De magistratibus et republica Venetorum* (1543), may be added to William Thomas' *History* as a work that typifies praise for the robust diversity that was characteristic and constitutive of Venice's enduring greatness.²³

William Thomas describes in detail the three Aristotelian categories of government--Monarchy, Aristocracy and Democracy--that coexisted in the Venetian Great Council. Thomas likens "their Great Council, which seemeth to be the whole stay of their commonwealth" to the English Parliament. This comment is symptomatic of the increasing sense, in both political and literary works of the sixteenth century, that a parallel existed between the states of Venice and England, both of which enjoyed a mixed government. Exactly the same point is made in Thomas Starkey's *Dialogue* between Cardinal Pole and Thomas Lupset (written after 1536). In praising the noble city of Venice, Pole implicitly attributes the longevity of that state--over one thousand years--to the "conservatyon of the commyn wele in the polytyke body" and the consequent absence of tyranny.²⁴ Pole goes on to expand upon the moderation of the prince's authority in England by long-standing laws and by Parliament, and the wisdom therein of mixed government as a means to avoid tyranny and the ruin of the polity. This almost automatic link between the mixed governments of England and Venice indicates that talking about Venice constituted a way of talking about the organisation of the English polity. To praise Venice was, in part, to advocate an aggressive commercial expansionist trajectory for England, and to criticise Venice was to advocate a more martial character for England's foreign policy.

As I have suggested, the values attendant upon insular and expansionist polities are, in the case of the discourse on Venice, transposed to forms of commercial and martial activity. Both Lewkenor and Thomas remark on the apparently non-heroic aspects of Venetian imperialism, and contrast it with the character of Roman imperialism. Lewkenor collapses the distinction between commerce and war, and develops Venice's

imperial character in the process, while Thomas maintains this distinction and questions that imperial character.

Lewkenor defends the Venetian decision, undertaken long ago by "our auncesters", to "defend their dominions uppon the continent, with forreyn mercenarie souldiers," rather "than with homeborn citizens" (131). He justifies their action by pointing to the tyranny that Julius Caesar was able to effect over the Senate in Rome with his military expertise and following. The fact that Venice engages in imperial activity using mercenaries does not mean, necessarily, that Venice is deprived of martial honour. Lewkenor cites the case of a Venetian adopted son, one Bartholomeo Coglione, who serves as an exemplar of those military "associates", who have "attained to the highest degree of commandment in our army, & for the exceedingnes of their deserts been enabled, with the title of citizens & gentlemen of Venice" (131). This Coglione, "who after many great exploits & prosperous successes being captaine general of our army, & having amplified & enlarged the boundes of the Venetian empire," was accorded a statue of himself on horseback. This statue, as if he were some Marcus Aurelius, was "erected in the fayrest and goodliest place in our City" (131-2).

By way of contrast, Shakespeare's *Othello* seems to criticise the Venetian practice of assimilating mercenaries. It stands, perhaps, as a warning to England not to follow the Venetian way and risk tragic loss by transferring military leadership to strangers.²⁵ Shakespeare reverses the traditional praise and wonder accorded to Venetian toleration of strangers. *Othello* and *The Merchant of Venice* show outsiders as disruptive. At the same time, these plays are also critical of the easy, unreflective exploitation of such strangers by the Venetians.

Lewkenor, on the other hand, minimises the deleterious effect of employing mercenaries on the authority of the monarchy and aristocracy by stressing that "the Captaine Generall of our Armie, who is alwaies a straunger," has "no authority to doe or deliberate any thing without the advice of the Legates," who, he explains, are "our Gentlemen sent into the Armie, who therein doe beare office and authority" (132). These "Treasurers, and Legates," reports Lewkenor, "never stirre from the side of the Captaine General" (132). Lewkenor goes on to add that many Venetian gentlemen complete their education, and are encouraged to do so by the provision of government pensions and stipends, by taking a place in "the gallies of warre" to learn "the excellent arte of Navall discipline" (133).

Lewkenor points to a split between land and sea practices, with Venetian nobility concerned primarily and directly with activities at sea. The art of war overlaps the art of trade: young Venetian noblemen commonly spend allocated time on galleys that "are destinated eyther to the warres or marchandise," and this, "to no other end," says Lewkenor, "but onely to accustome them to sea services" (134). The point seems to be that Venetian greatness is attached to international mobility and interaction, and that the imperial dynamic articulated thus is relatively unaffected by whether this international transaction is martial or commercial. Commerce can supplant armed conflict as a means to make Venice a seat of expansionist empire. Lewkenor remarks on "the wonderful concourse of strange and forraine people" including even "the farthest and remotest nations, as though the City of Venice onely were a common and general market to the whole world" (1). This mobility of peoples is matched by a mobility of goods; Lewkenor marvels at "so unmeasurable a quantity of all sorts of marchandise to be brought out of

all realmes and countries into this Citie," which is "hence again to be conveyed into so many strange and far distant nations, both by land and sea" (1).

William Thomas maintains more of a distinction between commercial and martial activities and networks. He sees Venetian abdication from direct involvement in military action on land in a detrimental light. He remarks that, "if the Venetians had been men as the Romans were, given as well unto chivalry by land as unto the exercise on the water," then, he continues, they would doubtless "many years ago have subdued the world" (67). He goes on to say that Venetian power "hath been more warily governed than valiantly enlarged" and that "their dominion hath decreased" because, "as the fame goeth," they "practice with money to buy and sell countries, peace, and war" rather than "exercise deeds of arms" (67). He concludes by remarking "that most Venetians are these days become better merchants than men of war" (67).

Thomas sees commercial activity as antithetical to imperial expansion. In stressing that mercantile Venice has "more warily governed than valiantly enlarged," he identifies commerce with the non-heroic action of dwelling. Francis Bacon, half a century later, is similarly critical of commercial imperialism. Bacon's argument, in his tracts on the true greatness of states, emphasises the corrupting nature of riches and the consequent decline of the art of war which, in accordance with Machiavelli's political doctrine, is necessary for the maintenance of liberty and peace. Both Thomas and Bacon associate international commerce with the decline of imperial dominion; commercial activities and mobilities are coupled with the self-centred, inglorious politics of the closed polity, while martial activities are connected to the ambitious and heroic politics of expansionist empire. Put another way, the incivility associated with piling up money for

its own sake is tied to insularity here, while the civility that accrues to a willed association with others underpins martial expansion.

What Lewkenor does for Venice, Richard Helgerson, in *Forms of Nationhood* (1992), sees Hakluyt doing for early modern England in the *Principal Navigations*.²⁶ Lewkenor collapses the distinction between commercial and martial activity as forms of political, expansionist enterprise that have made and make Venice great. Helgerson points to a blurring of similar boundaries in the *Principal Navigations* as a work that “brings merchants into the nation and brings gentry into trade” (176). He focuses on the reconciliation between the genres of epic and voyage; if *The Lusians* of Camoens may be understood as a disguised voyage, then the predominantly commercial voyages collected by Hakluyt may, by the same logic, add up to an epic that celebrates England’s honour.²⁷ In Helgerson’s view “Hakluyt’s *Voyages* manages to slip past the conceptual barriers...that could make him prefer ‘glory’ to ‘gain’” (170). In Hakluyt’s reconciliation of commerce and conquest, Helgerson sees England emerging as “an aggressive commercial entity” (171) powered by heroic merchants as well as by the traditional ruling class.

For Helgerson, Hakluyt is one of a generation of men who “significantly redrew the parameters of social consciousness” (176) by becoming spokesmen for their communities to the detriment of the monarch’s power.²⁸ Helgerson sees this historical collective—a generation that includes Edward Coke, Christopher Saxton, William Camden, John Norden, Michael Drayton and John Foxe—facilitating a “passage from dynasty to nation” through their books and “the discursive practices assumed by those books” (10). They liberate the polity from the despotism of being identified solely with

the sovereign. Helgerson's idea of "the Elizabethan writing" of the nation elaborates a system of diverse and contradictory "ways of being English" (300). If men like Hakluyt increase the degree of inclusivity of people and practices that may identify England's honour, then the other "Englands" Helgerson describes--those invented by Shakespeare, Bacon, Hooker and Hobbes--restore or enlarge the status of the monarch and write the polity as glorious in the sovereign's image.

Helgerson's historical collective, "men of middling status and humanist education, men born at or shortly following the mid-century" (299), despite their different ways of going about it, all wanted "to have the kingdom" of their own various languages. They wanted, in other words, sovereignty, or political authority for their practices. They would, as a generation, variously write England, and this England, in turn, enhanced their cultural authority. They were men who, in one way or another, were caught up in "a unique set of conditions" that alienated them from the practices of the past (299). This generation of "transitional men", the "men who wrote England," all shared "an unusual social, economic, and psychic mobility"(13), and this mobility "put a heavy burden on identity" (14). In Helgerson's account, this generation of mobile men were all heroic makers of their own personal and political identities. These transposed, self-alienated men manifest what Helgerson calls a progressive "reintegrated identity" (301). The mobility that distances these men from themselves, rather than bringing them directly to civil conversation with others, constructs a subjectivity that inheres in a spatial relation to itself. What I am suggesting is that Helgerson's narrative of English self-making and national self-fashioning depends on a process of motion, but that this involuntary grouping of men travel while still dwelling within themselves.

“For all these Elizabethans,” concludes Helgerson, “the way to an acceptable national self led through self-alienation” (243). Thus “these culturally uprooted young men” (301) helped “solidify and thicken the lines that separate one nation from another” (300). A generation of mobile mentalities fashions a nation by building up barriers. The discrete insularity of this nation is offset by the idea of its internal diversity and complexity, in that the authority of many different figures who arbitrate over national practices is recognised. This generation of men, this historical collective, make history by building, section by section, a great wall that distinguishes one nation from another.

Like Lewkenor and Hakluyt, Helgerson seems to blur distinctions between heroic expansion and self-involved insularity. Indeed, the object of Helgerson’s analysis here—early modern English self-making and the interplay between cosmopolitan, civic mobility and national insularity—seems to be an informing principle of Helgerson’s own lens on this world. In other words the interplay between the spatial stories of travel and dwelling not only occupies a position in Helgerson’s account of self-making, it also structures it. As I will argue throughout the rest of this chapter, this is also the case with another modern critic concerned with self-making, Stephen Greenblatt. Both these modern critics, each concerned with early modern personal and political formation and the subject in space, reproduce early modern spatial politics as a structuring or an informing principle of their scrutiny.

In Helgerson’s account, a generation of men fashions a nation conceived of as bounded and free from foreign intervention. This idea of a national polity does not seem expansionist, although an expansionist mentality was involved in making it. Lesley Cormack (1994) claims that the first step to an expansionist empire was “the creation of

an imperial mentality--a sense of independence, separateness, and superiority, which would then allow the English to expand outwards."²⁹ She claims that "the home country is thus the source of empire" and posits a kind of micro-macro relationship between closed and expansionist polities. It does not necessarily follow, however, that a closed polity is an open one writ small. I am suggesting that these antithetical mentalities, informed by versions of agency associated with travel and with dwelling, may be reconciled, as demonstrated by Lewkenor and Helgerson, but that they still, ultimately, constitute two opposed modes of personal and political self-fashioning.

In offering a powerful explanation of the Elizabethan writing of England Helgerson describes and reproduces early modern formulations that blur the distinction between open or cosmopolitan, and closed or insular mentalities. Stephen Greenblatt, on the other hand, in telling the story of early modern writing of expansionist empire, and the story of his own profession as a literary critic in the last decades of the twentieth century, maintains the distinction between ideas of dwelling and travel. As a critic concerned with early modern personal and political formation he reproduces, perhaps unconsciously, the politics of early modern travel.

In *Marvelous Possessions* (1991), Greenblatt treats of two worlds meeting and puts their interaction at the centre of representational practices in the early modern era. The generation of added energy when two worlds touch--imagined by Alexander as a blaze of light when one torch fires another--Greenblatt calls "the marvellous". "The marvellous," says Greenblatt, "is a central feature" in "the whole complex system of representation...through which people in the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance apprehended, and thence possessed or discarded, the unfamiliar" (22-3). Greenblatt's

conception of the marvellous privileges the freedom *to* assimilative contact with difference by charging this moment with added value.

Greenblatt ties this charged moment of assimilative contact explicitly to mimesis, and implicitly to economic imperialism. He associates an interactive, inter-subjective and energy-creating mobility with mimesis and capitalism; "I want to insist," he says, "on the crucial connection between mimesis and capitalism," because, he continues, "it is with capitalism that the proliferation and circulation of representations achieved a spectacular and virtually inescapable global magnitude" (6). Greenblatt says he is "adapting Marx" in this formulation, but his conception of what he calls "mimetic capital" seems to be predicated on a conception of global capital, divorced from production (6). Marx's conception of capital was crucially connected to production and the site of production. Greenblatt's model of capital seems closer to that of a de-territorialized finance capital, as described by Frederic Jameson (1997), rather than something adapted from Marx's view of capital.³⁰ Nevertheless, mobility in this instance leads to an illuminating and assimilative interaction with difference that constitutes an expansionist dynamic for representation. Greenblatt, I suggest, glorifies an inter-worldly expansionist dynamic for representational practices and for the professional who works with these practices.

Greenblatt's conception of his own profession, as literary and cultural critic and historian, is informed by the same expansionist dynamic that informs his picture of representational practices in the Renaissance. In *Redrawing the Boundaries* (1992) he claims an interactive, inter-subjective, interdisciplinary capacity for literature and literary study that enables it to "infiltrate any speech and writing, transforming what seems

outside itself into something else, into its own odd being" (11). In line with Machiavelli's preferred strategy for political durability, Greenblatt would renew and reinvigorate the profession of literary studies by expansion beyond its boundaries. In Greenblatt's view, boundaries have to be redrawn all the time--and frontiers exist only to be crossed--because whatever has ceased to grow has begun to decline. His claim is that revisionist energy and new interrogative strategies contribute to the creation of "regulated thresholds" and "controlled passageways" between the literary and the non-literary (8). These new passages, undertaken for a variety of reasons, mean that the map of the literary is continually being redrawn.

Greenblatt represents his career as having been concerned with the expansion of literary studies through interaction with other worlds. In "The Touch of the Real" (1997), Greenblatt conjures up a decisive encounter from his professional past and juxtaposes this recollection with seventeenth century instances of literary and non-literary encounters with ghosts.³¹ Shakespeare's Hamlet is here a rhetorical bridge between the past and the present, and the imaginary and the real. This essay opens with Greenblatt's recollection of himself twenty years before as a critic "longing" to "justify the academic analysis of literature" and "to find in it a radical politics" (14). He goes on to describe his electrifying encounter with the work of Clifford Geertz. "The effect," recalls Greenblatt, "was like touching one wire to another: literary criticism made contact with reality" (14). This contact with "a sophisticated, intellectually powerful, and wonderfully eloquent anthropologist" who could "make use of the tools in my disciplinary kit" renews in the young critic "a sense of their value"(14) and provides "an impetus for recovering what had been lost" (20). Thus re-united with the real, literary criticism springs into new,

political life for Greenblatt as viable, cultural critique. The key assumption upon which this narrative about the origins of Greenblatt's critical program rests is that a powerful connection between the real and the imaginary is there for discovery. Civil conversation with Geertz's work lights Greenblatt's fire; he is at once an Alexander with his torch looking to make more light, *and* a pilgrim toiling toward an explanation.

Greenblatt's professional subjectivity emerges in this piece from an encounter with authority. Geertz's work has a "liberating effect" on Greenblatt and he reconceptualizes his professional practice as a movement into the unknown. "Literary criticism could venture out to unfamiliar cultural texts," says Greenblatt, and then return to "the intimately familiar works of the literary canon" (20) to foment an interaction between the two that would "recover" for the practice a "confident conviction of reality" (22). This back and forth movement--*tamquam explorator*--between foreign and familiar texts denotes an unhoused and mobile subjective condition for the practitioner of cultural poetics. Venturing into texts that are "often marginal, odd, fragmentary, unexpected and crude" (20), the literary critic is activated by opportunities for conquest as well as by an ethic of recovery. Greenblatt acknowledges that exploring these other texts offers "an agreeably imperial expansion of literary criticism beyond its borders" (22). More importantly, however, Greenblatt wants to recover a lost connection between the imaginary and the real; he wants to make "the literary and the non-literary seem to be each other's thick description" (22). "I wanted," says Greenblatt, "a touch of the real in the way that in an earlier period people wanted the touch of the transcendent" (22).

Something of a pilgrim, then, but also a traveller finding meaning in the act of travel itself, Greenblatt's professional subjectivity is realised through the process of

intellectual travel and inflected by the expansionist dynamic of empire. As envisioned by Greenblatt, the literary critic appears a very Aeneas who, displaced from the ivory towers of "sophisticated literary studies", embraces the venture into "lived life" (20). This new world is "at once raw and subtle, coarse and complex" (20), and it offers the possibility of winning new, intellectual territory for the profession. At the same time, the literary critic travels, like Ulysses, in the spirit of recovery. Ulysses went to Troy, of course, to restore Helen, and he undertook an epic voyage to recover Penelope and his kingdom.

Greenblatt would repossess a powerful link between the imaginary and the real, and he would restore political agency and urgency to his profession. He would also journey like a pilgrim venturing, as an act of faith, into foreign territory for an explanation, a revelation, an empowering touch of the place where the supernatural meets the real.

Given that the refashioned literary critic in this essay travels in the spirit of an Aeneas and a Ulysses, it is not surprising to find the critic, like Ulysses and Aeneas, engaged in a journey to the underworld. "I wanted," says Greenblatt, "to find in the past real bodies and living voices," despite knowing that these bodies had "long moldered away and the voices fallen silent" (21). Nevertheless Greenblatt lays claim as a scholar to an ability to speak with ghosts and "seize upon those traces that seemed to be close to actual experience" (21). If Greenblatt figures himself in his profession as akin to Horatio and Hamlet, he is also, like Ulysses and Aeneas, a traveller who interacts, in some real fashion, with ghosts.

In another essay that tells the story of his literary career, "What Is the History of Literature?" (1997), Greenblatt's professional subjectivity emerges yet again from an encounter with an authority figure.³² The essay opens with Greenblatt's recollection of

himself--this time nearly thirty years before--and, once more, he is in a state of professional longing. He describes himself checking his mail at the departmental office, "several times a day in the vague hope that something, as Mr. Micawber was fond of saying, would 'turn up'" (460). An encounter with a senior professor, who affected "the brusque manner of address of the Oxford Senior Common Room" (460), leaves the young Greenblatt lost for words. The brush with authority in this instance renders him lifeless rather than dynamically re-charged. The deadening effect of this encounter ensues because the authority here represents a closed, territorial paradigm for literary history. The senior professor might be here a Dindimus, disdainfully rejecting the cultural treasure a young Alexander carries in his arms.

Greenblatt recalls that this professor spoke to him about the copy of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* that he happened to be carrying at the time. The professor is reported as objecting to Kant, on the basis that Kant had "a Jewish mind." By this the professor means that it was a mind, "clever, sterile, absorbed in endless hair-splitting subtleties - a mind without true culture" (460). Greenblatt's interpretation of this outburst affords his colleague some benefit of the doubt. Despite the ostensibly anti-Semitic character of the remark, Greenblatt allows that it could, "in the context of an English department," point to an Arnoldian dialectic of Hellenism and Hebraism. Greenblatt disdains the "garden variety anti-Semitism" of the professor's "weird remark" on the spot. Twenty-five years later, any implicit Arnoldianism is dismissed too. "My profession" says Greenblatt, has "eagerly divested itself of the resources of Hebraism and Hellenism" and "has done its best to dismantle Kantian imperatives" (461). Greenblatt's story about the origin of a new conception for literary history starts with a dialogue that demonstrates

a dead-end for the modern literary critic unless he breaks new ground.

With no surge of power ensuing from this encounter with an authority *in his own* field, Greenblatt issues a challenge. "The time has come," he says, in the face of "an insurgent fin-de-siecle Philistinism" and "a world-wide drift toward anarchy," to "renew on our own terms...the reason, if we have one, to study literature" (461-2). Historicizing conceptions of literary history with a touch of the real--a personal anecdote from his first year of teaching at Berkeley--Greenblatt claims that the model of "literary nationalism", represented in the attitude of this Oxford-styled professor, "seems increasingly irrelevant" (462). For someone like himself, "a professor of English literature teaching Shakespeare in the late twentieth century at a state university by the waters of the Pacific" (462), the time had come to recover a sense of literature's "deep functional utility" (462) or else risk ending up isolated and absurd, like the Oxford-mannered professor of his anecdote. In pondering the issue of a *vita activa* for the literary critic and historian, Greenblatt renders this figure of the Oxford-styled professor, and his contemplations, ridiculous. As if he were a Philip Sidney, poking fun at some Pugliano, Greenblatt sets out to discover a sense of "literature's implication in institutional structures" (462), from whence "its deep functional utility" derives.

Traversing the early modern overlap between learning, literature and literacy in this essay, Greenblatt arrives at a Baconian-inflected, cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural project of literary history that offers "a vision of learning as the instrument of cultural advancement and ultimately of cultural redemption" (473). In this conception of literary history, says Greenblatt, "there is nothing to be gained by staying within one's own national boundaries because a culture's fitness for a particular discursive practice can

only be grasped by setting it against another's" (472). Again, the literary critic emerges as an intellectual traveller. Like Alexander, who would learn wisdom from the Brahmins, Greenblatt's literary critic wears the moral mask of civility and travels ever onward in the spirit of discovery, intent on re-drawing boundaries.

As the essay proceeds, Greenblatt branches out from this particular Baconian trajectory to refashion literary history along the lines of what he identifies as another Baconian directive. Greenblatt sees Bacon as "the godfather" for a view of history "that takes for its potential subject the entire field of world-made objects" and one "that understands that all literary creativity involves a complex global circulation of energies" (476). What Greenblatt finds compelling about Bacon's lead here is his trafficking with the dead. Greenblatt's desire to re-formulate a *vita activa* for the modern literary critic and recover a liberating dimension for literary history involves a restitution of Bacon's vision of history with its "queasy relation to reality" and "its trafficking in spectres" (476).³³

Greenblatt's disagreeable professor of the opening anecdote, in his very Englishness--Oxfordness even--exemplifies the nationalist and fixed, territorial paradigm for literary studies that Greenblatt has left behind. Oxford philosophers come in for some disparagement in "The Touch of the Real" too. Echoing Geertz's formulation, Greenblatt counters the empirical, that is the trace of actual experience, with the artificial, that is "the little stories Oxford philosophers make up for themselves" (15). He uses this formulation again when he contrasts the anecdote--which conjures up the real world--with "a little philosopher's tale," that affirms an imaginary one (21). Greenblatt's Oxford philosophers in these instances derive their identity and authority from their dwelling within the

confines of Oxford University. Like the land of the Brahmans, enclosed by a stream alive with ferocious amphibians, or possibly Helgerson's English nation with its thickened outline, Oxford, the citadel of philosophers, represents a closed political and personal space. These Oxford philosophers crystallise for Greenblatt the irrelevance and absurdity of a national and parochial paradigm for literary studies in the last decades of the twentieth century.

Greenblatt's refashioning of his profession, memorialised in these two essays, figures the modern career in literary studies as an exercise in expansionism. Greenblatt would cross and re-cross the borders between the real and the imaginary, the living and the dead; he would go back and forth between learning and lived life, and pass and re-pass the boundaries that divide academic disciplines. He recovers political agency for the profession by implicating the literary scholar in a situation of intellectual mobility that deregulates, de-territorializes and expansively re-territorializes critical practice. In displacing a national, parochial and partisan model for conceptualising the literary with a dynamic, inter-disciplinary, inter-subjective and interactive model, Greenblatt links literary study to a travelled mentality and a global domain. Furthermore, in deploying the rhetoric of travel to represent literary careers, early modern and contemporary, Greenblatt inscribes the literary scholar with an imperialist dynamic. Driven by desire for civil conversation with the foreign and by faith in the possibility of some electrifying revelation, the borders of the literary are re-drawn.

Alexander, desiring to learn wisdom of the Brahmans, wants a touch of the transcendent as a traveller in the real, and Greenblatt, as a traveller in the imagination, wants a touch of the empirical, or the real. Both travellers fashion empires and heroic,

progressive selves. In Helgerson's account, authorial and national identity is constructed through a process of self-distancing, or self-alienation. Greenblatt, however, travels between worlds--the imaginary and the real, the living and the dead--and between disciplines.

Alexander wears the moral mask of civility in the creation of his vast empire. He does, of course, as the Brahmans point out, kill thousands and consume many nations and their territories into his empire, until he comes to a border he cannot cross. Greenblatt's post-structuralist defense of literary study has depended on redrawing, or blurring, the boundaries between imagined and lived life. By unearthing literature's historical situation, and history's literary parameters, and by destabilizing distinctions between the aesthetic sphere and the zone of the real, he has challenged "the cult of autonomy" that has attached to each.³⁴ Given such a porous divide between art and life, who can say that literary scholars work simply with fictions?

Greenblatt's trans-disciplinary dynamic has stimulated the growth of literary studies and enlarged its domain. The forces of production in this field have been deregulated, intellectually globalized. No longer tied to the self-enclosed particularity of a specific literary work, or to a nationalist paradigm for literary history, footloose professional critics have left their over-populated, over-cultivated, aesthetic locale and ventured into brave new intellectual territory. They have expanded the frontiers of the literary and returned heroically laden with exotic plunder. Literary adventurers have consumed strange fruit and reproduced themselves professionally as cultural critics.

But how has Greenblatt's integrative approach contributed to the knowledge production and accumulation processes of those disciplines he "touches"? Dindimus sees

nothing to be gained by contact with Alexander, other than corruption and the destabilization of his kingdom. A furious Alexander drops his mask of civility, and says that, were it not for those crocodiles, he would invade their kingdom and teach the Brahmans the lesson of the sword. Greenblatt's "longing" to "justify the academic analysis of literature" and "to find in it a radical politics" involves crossing the real with the imaginary, and civil conversation between the study of literature and other disciplines. This civil conversation, however, does nothing to advance these other worlds on their own terms.

This freedom *to* stimulating contact with new worlds appears to have eroded the "negative" liberty of non-interference, or freedom *from* contact. This has worked, so far, to the benefit of the intellectually mobile, interdisciplinary adventurer. If the worlds of the imaginary and the real bleed into each other, globalizing text, then the function of reading, of cultural literacy, gains ground. With no freedom from the circulation of text, the stock of the professional reader, the literary critic, rises accordingly. Greenblatt's focus on the crossing of boundaries and the circulation of social energy promotes integration before regulation. It promotes an imperial dynamic for the literary scholar, as traveller. Thus, in fashioning a textual empire from what were independent domains of meaning, Greenblatt privileges the prerogative of the literary scholar over other intellectual domains. Greenblatt's focus on the circulation of social energy, his border crossings, his inter-disciplinary dynamic, his desire to speak with the dead and straddle two worlds, mark him as a traveller, while his acts of naming--"New Historicism", "Cultural Poetics"--show him as something of a conqueror.

There might be something quixotic too in all this venturing. Don Quixote, of

course, indiscriminately appropriates any droll or domestic item for his heroic endeavor. To the mad, imperious knight of La Mancha, nothing appears to be exempt from transfer to his world, or to possess any unalienable function or identity that might constitute a public domain.³⁵ As Nigel Thrift (1996) points out, “One of the blights of the recent rise of cultural studies has been the paper which is founded on the principle of ‘if you can say it, it’s so’” (33).

Finally, the sense of emotional release and mental rapture Greenblatt experiences when two worlds touch marks him as something of a pilgrim, toiling toward the point where two worlds touch. In an essay about Macbeth’s inter-worldly pursuit of power, “Shakespeare Bewitched” (1993), Greenblatt puts Shakespeare and his theater at the charged point where two worlds, the fantastic and the actual, meet. They are both, he says, in the inter-worldly position of the witch.³⁶ Johann Weyer (1515-1588) in his *De praestigiis daemonum* (1583), an exhaustive treatment of the subject of witchcraft from theological, philosophical, medical and legal perspectives, maintains that a witch is possessed by the demon who works through her.³⁷ King James’ *Daemonologie* (1597) makes this same distinction: “the Witches ar servantes onlie, and slaves to the Devil.”³⁸ Greenblatt adds the agency of the magician to his witch; Shakespeare is “someone who conjured spirits” (120). Like an early modern scholar traveling to exotic Italy for a touch of fertile Italian wit, Greenblatt seems continually drawn to this moment of meeting with difference as to a solution. He that will travel may find an explanation. He may also find that in changing worlds and shifting contexts he makes knowledge for himself. Greenblatt’s language of travel destabilizes the fixed categories of literary history and criticism, as well as the supposed superiority of a fixed disciplinary paradigm. His focus

on the idea of travel justifies connections between texts and disciplines on the basis of discovery and civility. There seems to be no apparent limit to the knowledge these connections can produce. For the cultural critic, a subject in space looking for different spaces and contexts as an analytical device, this unboundedness is perhaps the new problem.

“Making a famine where abundance lies”

Edmund Spenser’s *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (c. 1596) reports on how the English colonization of Ireland has been thwarted by wily Irish natives and the degenerate descendants of Anglo-Norman settlers. It describes how English law, custom and religion have failed to take root in Ireland, and it condemns the domain as a breeding ground for sedition, a landfall for foreign invasion and a bottomless pit for money and men. Provoking consternation about an unruly possession, and playing to ambitious Englishmen’s exasperation with a peace-loving Queen, the *View* urges a war of annihilation against disloyal subjects.¹

The *View* adds little to conventional wisdom on the subjugation of Ireland. Ciaran Brady (Coughlan, 1989) points out that Spenser’s work reproduces solutions to Irish belligerence that had been put forward since the 1530’s.² Nicholas Canny (Armitage, 1998) refers to the *View* as an elaboration and a summary of “an outpouring of justifications for colonization and conquest” produced by a decade of English enterprise in Ireland.³ Practically every modern commentator on this treatise has noted how Spenser has replayed received wisdom on Ireland in the *View*. Why, then, did Spenser go ahead with this rather conventional proposal for the extermination of hostile native populations?

The *View* is, to some extent, an occasional piece prompted by Spenser’s alarm at the hostilities following Tyrone’s open rebellion in 1594. Events proved his fears of chaos to be justified. In 1598 the Irish of Munster joined Tyrone’s rebellion and rose up against the English. Spenser’s house was burnt down and he fled for his life, first to Cork

and then to England. He delivered a plea to the court called “A Brief Note of Ireland” in which he describes in harrowing detail the miserable fate of Her Majesty’s English subjects there.⁴ Acute alarm in the face of deadly turmoil and an overwhelming desire for right supremacy and order must have played some part in prompting the *View*⁵

But if the *View* is a work tuned to the exigencies of a desperate situation, it is also a work that fathoms Spenser’s Irish experience more generally. What I want to show in this chapter is how Spenser’s *View* articulates contestatory nationalisms that deaden the *View*’s strident call for imperial government in Ireland in the manner, say, of an Alexander or a Tamburlaine. These oppositional forms of nationhood are related to agencies derived from the spatial dynamics of travel and dwelling. I read the *View* as a work implicated with and caught between two contemporary kinds of writing on nationalism. The *View* is, first of all, a travel relation that offers an outsider’s account of the state. The version of modern history represented by this type of travel relation articulates a civic nationalism that is irredeemably expansionist. But the *View* is also an antiquarian investigation into national origins that offers an insider’s account of history. This kind of history, concentrating, as it does, on etymologies, customs of dress, food production, and the details of communal life generally, records the community moving through time from the perspective of dwelling together, and articulates an ethnic nationalism that tends to be insular and exclusionary. The *View*, caught up with and between these two forms of history, signals Spenser’s experience as a resident alien.

Profoundly mixed messages emerge from the interactive clash between these two kinds of writing on nationalism. In tracing these mixed messages and the genres that give rise to them, I see the *View* as straddling the core values of different cultural domains or

fields. This crossover, and this apprehension of two cultural and political fields, emerges despite the call for a war of annihilation. This deeper debate, stirred by Spenser's moment of cultural contact as a resident alien in Ireland, points to Spenser's apprehension of cultural and political difference, and to a sense that the meaning of the conflict in hand is not exhausted by the idea of a struggle between right government and anarchy.⁶

Neither of these two forms of history--the antiquarian investigation into national origins and the travel relation describing European state systems--is pure; there is a certain amount of overlap in the matter and manner of these accounts. Moreover, both genres articulate nationalisms that are focused on a specifically early modern concept of civility. This civility, as I shall go on to show, is always measured in terms of increase, profit and improvement. Spenser's text exploits this overlap, but in doing so is also caught between the opposed nationalisms created by these two types of history. The traveller's diagnostic account of the polity and its corrupt constitutional structures promotes the systematic conquest of Ireland in Spenser's treatise. This conquest is authorized by civility. The traveller's, or outsider's, relation is supported, but also interrupted, by an insider's perspective on the Irish polity afforded by the *View's* antiquarian focus on Irish institutions. It is this insider's account of the nation that articulates an ethnic, Irish nationalism, complicating the *View's* political picture.

This is not to say that I am arguing for a specifically pro-Gaelic position on Spenser's part in the *View*. Spenser's colonial situation was highly conflicted, but his Irish sympathies were probably strictly limited in the political sense.⁷ The articulation of an ethnic Irish nationalism in the *View* may well be inadvertent, a by-product of the work's antiquarian interests and Spenser's experience of cultural contact. What I am

proposing is that the *View*, as an occasional piece prompted by fear and loathing of the Irish uprising, is a text caught up in the intersection between two contemporary kinds of writing on nationalism. The mixed messages thus produced appear to undermine the *View*'s call for a war of annihilation, and to suggest a pro-Gaelic Irish position for Spenser. These mixed messages may be linked to Spenser's response to the terrible impact of colonization on Irish culture--an impact powerfully registered in the bardic poetry Spenser had read--rather than by any political sympathy for Irish sovereignty, as such. Any expression of sympathy for an Irish nationalism, as opposed to Irish culture, is unlikely to be deliberate on Spenser's part; it is more likely to be a consequence of the focus on civility that these different forms of writing on history and nationalism share.

Spenser's traveller and speaker in the *View*, Irenius, in the course of offering his outsider's diagnostic account of the corrupt condition of Ireland's institutions as justification for conquest, endorses a specifically early modern idea of civility that is always measured in terms of adding value to naturally provided resources. Such civility, as I will go on to show in detail, is connected to an aggressive political dynamic. This civility, of course, is often the moral mask that re-invents a political policy of aggression as a moral, even spiritual, phenomenon. Irenius' travel relation supports an expansionist, civic nationalism for England. Antiquarian narratives *also* evince an emphasis on civility that authorizes an aggressive political dynamic. The ethnic nationalism articulated by these narratives, however, tends to be insular and exclusionary. Spenser's focus on civility, as conducive to English rule by the sword in Ireland, and his deployment of two types of history that privilege this value, produces, probably unintentionally, a counter-narrative of ethnic nationalism in the *View*.

In tracing these mixed messages about nationalism in Spenser's *View* and describing the kinds of writing that produce them, I examine their relationship to the different versions of agency that I have suggested are imagined and constructed through the ideas and functions of travel and dwelling. I suggest that the two styles of history informing the *View* are symptomatic of Spenser's experience in Ireland of a radically different society. This different social structure and cultural cosmos emerge in the *View* as founded on ideas of *dominium*, or authority over property, that are foreign to English society. Spenser's experience as a resident alien provided him with a framework of cultural difference and an apprehension of two versions of political and social agency. The *View* fathoms this conflicted experience and cultural debate even as it calls for a war of annihilation, a war that would make a famine where abundance lies.

The *View* opens with the issue of waste. "I wonder," says Eudoxus, that "so goodlie and Comodious a soyle as yee reporte" be not turned to good use, and "that salvage nacion" be not brought to "better goverment and Cyvilitye" (43).⁸ Why is the valuable but cursed realm of Ireland untarned? How comes it that Ireland's rich soil lies unbroken, and her treasure unearthed? Why does Ireland still lack civic values and the benefits of English statehood? How is it that this jewel lies in the dust, and a rude, contending rebel nation thrives, unemasculated? Where is the machinery of state power that should drive its tentacles deep down into the soil, into the core of the people's life? Why no penetration of society by the state, why no colonization? These unspoken

questions cluster about Eudoxus' opening remarks in the *View*, and they all relate to the issue of *dominium*, or authority over the disposal of property.

Tenure, or *dominium*, over property has long been regarded in the west as the basis for civil society and the rule of law, because ideas of ownership offer a foundation for agreement with respect to a system of justice. Forms of tenure have also been regarded as providing a basis for consensus as to how a community may share resources to its advantage.⁹ Tom Bethell (1998), reiterating these claims in the course of arguing the case for private rather than communal ownership, sees property and modes of tenure as the foundation for all cultural domains.¹⁰ Eudoxus' complaint about the waste of resources in Ireland induces anxiety about England's tenure of Ireland. His query invites Irenius to comment on Ireland's colonial status from a cultural perspective, in which English ownership of Ireland is tied to utility.

Eudoxus' opening remarks require Irenius to comment on the status of Ireland as a possession in relation to a form of tenure that depends on adding value to abundant, naturally provided resources. Rich black soil is for tilling, like the minds and bodies of a "salvage nacion" are for shaping and controlling, so that a moral directive for Ireland, tending to the greater good of the commonwealth, may justify English sovereignty there.¹¹ The kind of tenure Eudoxus appears to advocate here depends on using the soil and the people for production.

This link between tenure and use, as John H. Elliot (Armitage, 1998) has noted, also rationalized Spanish and British possessions in the New World.¹² "Indian concepts of property related not to the land, but to what was on the land at different seasons of the year," he says, and adds that British settlers "occupied land which in their eyes, but not in

Indian eyes, was being left shamefully unused' (148). Ireland's clan-like, or tribal, forms of social organization, and the nomadic life of the people, depended on insecure systems of tenure. A communal system of tenure, in which naturally provided goods were held in common, supported a way of life built around the tending of herds. Limited tenancies, in which land was held from a landlord for no longer than a year, also encouraged a nomadic and tumultuous life.

For Ireland to continue thus comes across in Eudoxus' opening remarks as a wasteful and potentially harmful misuse of resources. To let such valuable resources stand idle, not to employ what invites use, is to hoard, and to hoard is to live in fear of predators, which is to live low, dull and brutish. Indeed, England's lack of moral purpose in Ireland, apparent in the shameful abandonment of such rich resources to idleness, *invites* invasion. Thus Irenius alludes to "the daiely daunger" of Spanish invasion.

But Ireland is also faeryland, a mythic place, where the earth is spared the curse of work. For Spenser to figure Ireland as faeryland, as most modern commentators on the *Faerie Queene* insist is the case, the way of life must have claimed him in some way. Willy Maley (1997) has said that Ireland had an "an intensely personal effect" on the poet (89). Perhaps it had filched his heart and mind, like a Siren's song, or maybe it beckoned, like the fair country of Phaeacians, as a haven of rest. But Spenser was not quite the humanist traveller, a Ulysses, reading manners and men on his way back home, and a *return* to power.¹³ Spenser *discovered* power abroad, and this was how Ireland claimed him.

Ireland, was, in effect, an alternative court that had smiled on Spenser. Spenser gained land and position there, as did other able men who flocked to Ireland,

disappointed in finding patronage at Elizabeth's court. What Spenser needed to maintain his position there was a public order, or state power, that was distinct from the whims of a capricious monarch and the tumults of tribal infighting and uprisings. Without a military conquest in Ireland, as an immediate defense against Tyrone's rebellion *and* as the quickest way to effect the radical social intervention that constitutes state power, Ireland was a new home and haven lost to Spenser.

Liah Greenfeld (1992) and Christopher W. Morris (1998) have pointed to the emergence of a public order in England, or "depersonalized polity", that was distinct from the will of the monarch.¹⁴ There was no comparable public order operative in Spenser's Ireland, no systematic intervention by the state that afforded New English residents there some security from attack by Gaelic overlords, or defense from the caprice of a dilatory and close-pursed Queen. Imperial conquest would have broken the back of Gaelic society and cleared the way for an independent public order, or state power, in the shape of an imposed law, administration and religion, to take hold. Spenser envisages statehood for Ireland coming at the expense of Gaelic power but also, less explicitly, at the expense of the monarch's power.

Irenius' plan in the *View* is to stub out the traditional Gaelic way of life. His strategy for radical social restructuring in Ireland plays to the fault lines of this way of life. These internal weaknesses include chronic tribal infighting and cattle thieving, as well as an ever-present danger of starvation from population pressure upon under-cultivated natural resources. These problems tend, as Tom Bethell (1998) has pointed out, to be inherent in societies that lack a secure system of tenure and are over-dependent on foraging herds or naturally provided materials.¹⁵ Irenius would relieve the Irish of

their chronic social torment *and* secure the realm for statehood, civil society and the commonwealth by breaking the Irish polity along its own internal fault-lines.

It is an elegant strategy--too elegant--requiring minimal outlay and promising large returns that would have appealed to a close-pursed Queen. Irenius presents a picture of a colonized Ireland as a jewel in the crown that yields money and more. Not only does a subdued Ireland's wealth of fighting men defend England from "the dailye daunger" of Spanish invasion; the colony also becomes a breadbasket for England. It becomes one of those "magazines of victells" (197) that other countries have for their security but whose "wante is muche to be Complained of in England" (197). Once "plantation" has been effected, and "all thinges put into a right waye, I doubte not but they will run on fairelye"(198). The Queen can skim off profits or plow them back in. Either way, the project will practically run itself. Utilizing standard ploys to entice investors to risk, Spenser's vision for statehood in Ireland is pushed in the manner of an under-costing projector's scheme. Eudoxus practically calls it so when, making a little merry with Irenius' design, he calls it a "plott of greate reasone and small difficultie which promisethe hope of a short ende" (174).

Spenser's argument here--that statehood and secure, productive ownership of Ireland ensue rapidly from minimal military and financial outlay--marks him as an under-costing projector. But he was also a traveller of his age. In crafting a "View"--a description of state power commonly composed by English governors, or would-be governors, abroad--Spenser bore witness to a state system that, when in place, effectively limited the monarch's personal sway. In composing this travel relation he also promoted the expansionist civic nationalism encoded in this genre. Both the promotion of state

identity and the articulation of an imperial dynamic for English nationalism would have spoken to the immediate peril of Spenser's situation in Ireland, and to its chronic insecurities.

Treatises called "views" or "observations" on named European states offered descriptions of the features of state systems. They were considered verifiable, and therefore "objective", travel relations that conceived of the foreign as a political verity. The brisk survey of stereotypical wonders and monstrosities that marked the foreign in earlier forms of travel writing such as wonder books, pilgrimage accounts, arm-chair journeys like *Mandeville's Travels*, and romance-inflected accounts such as *The Travels of Marco Polo*, was abjured. Eye-witnessed reports on foreign states verified a system of European statehood. Wonder books and pilgrimage accounts, with their very different emphases, verified the fact of Christian belief.

The very term--'view'--denoted a serious, diligent, and penetrating study of phenomena. In George Pettie's translation of *The Civile Conversation of M. Steeven Guazzo* (1586), viewing is associated with a slow and careful progress. Guazzo chides his interlocutor in the following manner:

Seeing you are so desirous to rydde your selfe of this matter in
so short time, you doe as those whiche runn poste, who desirous
to go much ground, do not view, but only travers the Countries. (II, 168)¹⁶

The emphasis on direct observation in these accounts of state brought a new realism to travel relations that mediated and supported a new secular vision of history and

geography. Offering easily corroborated information, these travel relations constituted, as Denver Ewing Baughan has indicated, a form of modern history not offered at the English universities.¹⁷ These relations also constituted a branch of descriptive geography that, along with sixteenth-century cartography, contributed to a new, human and political geography for Europe and the world.¹⁸

Such travel relations also constituted a discourse of state. In giving an account of European political, economic and social systems that operated more or less independently of particular rulers, these treatises justified one state to another in a field of international relations and, in the process, elaborated state identity.¹⁹ Describing the state's constitution, its institutions, its agricultural, manufacturing, and mining enterprises, its towns, markets, fortresses, antiquities, curious artifacts and inventions, and offering comment on any or all of the above categories, these works ascribed statehood to a public order that was distinct from the monarch's individual will. They also ascribed statehood to a civil society and culture that was always measured in terms of the extent to which resources were governed in such a way as to yield a profit. In establishing norms of conduct and of justice that were conducive to the benefit of individual commonwealths, and to the commonwealth of an emerging society of nations, they also posited a moral determination for the state that authorized both sovereignty and imperial expansion. These travel relations, authored by governors or would-be governors looking to enhance their knowledge by European experience, signaled the advent of the sovereign state in the context of an emerging international community that had begun to formalize international relations between states.²⁰ They represented state systems coexisting in an interactive, yet competitive, political arena. Generally, these relations articulated an inherently

expansionist civic nationalism, legitimized by the moral imperative of adding value to naturally provided resources.

Educated young men, who aspired to some kind of government service, could show their mettle at home and abroad by crafting reports on the constitution of European states. Thomas Wilson wrote a description of England called *The State of England, Anno Dom. 1600*.²¹ Sir Thomas Overbury wrote “Observations” (1609) and Robert Dallington (1604) wrote a “View”, both on the state of France. A generation before, both Roger Ascham and Sir Thomas Hoby composed similar relations of their travels in Europe. Indeed, educated men spending time abroad in Europe were *expected* to report on the cultural condition of the places they visited.

Thus, these reports not only identified states and justified one state to another, they also identified the moral character of the author who traveled for the sake of his own and his commonwealth’s profit. They were proof of time well spent in travel, judiciously experiencing the different modes and manners of men.²² They revealed the humanist credentials of the author by indicating that he had not been idle and open to contamination by super-subtle foreign women, over-sophisticated manners and fashions, or suspect religion. They were an indication that the traveller had not been incorporated by a foreign culture, or that foreign experience or residence had had no intensely personal effect.

Spenser’s *View* conforms to the genre of socio-political description that I have just outlined. Spenser had read *The Traveiler of Jerome Turler* (1575), one of the earliest books of precepts for such travel writing, before he passed it on to his friend Gabriel Harvey, in 1578, on the eve of Harvey’s proposed trip abroad in the service of the Earl of

Leicester.²³ If the trip had taken place, Harvey himself might well have composed a “View” or a “Relation” on the state of France, for example, or Germany or some Italian city-state, like so many other humanist travellers did in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Spenser’s *View* opens with Eudoxus, a politically interested interlocutor, questioning Irenius in the latter’s capacity as a traveller but “latelye come” from “that Countrie of Ireland”(43).

Eudoxus commends Irenius on his report. Following Irenius’ summary of the “inconveniencies” of the Common Law in Ireland, Eudoxus says to his informant that he has “very well handled this point...by youe observed, and it semeth that youe have had a mindefull regarde unto the thinges that maye Concerne the good of that realme” (75). Eudoxus goes on to say that, “ if yee Can as well goe thorough with the Statute lawes of that lande I will thinke youe have not loste all your time theare” (75). Later, after warning Irenius not to rely too heavily on Irish Chronicles, he is mollified by the traveller’s judicious balancing of authority by experience: “I see hearebye how profitable travell and experience of forren nacions is to him that will applie them to good purpose” (95). So impressed is he by this account that it “makethe me the more to longe to see some other of your observacions which ye have gathered out of the Countreye” (95).

Spenser’s *View*, Wilson’s *State*, and other such works articulated cultivated, authorial subjectivities. They also ascribed statehood to a particular kind of cultural domain, wherein responsible and secure ownership is tied to utility. The idea of statehood is *not* present, for example, in the title of Sir Thomas Sherley’s travel relation, *Discours of the Turkes* (1607-8).²⁴ Sherley’s treatise was one of those that documented the habits of a race or a people rather than a state. Joannes Boemus’ description of the

peoples of Africa and Asia, translated as *The Fardel of facions* (London, 1555), is an earlier example of the genre. Boemus' description of the Scythians is, in fact, referred to by Irenius in the *View*.

Sherley treats the Turks as the worst of barbarians, and argues, in effect, for “a generall warre made by all Christian princes upon the Turke” (8). Lacking civility, that is, a culture of improving and adding value, the Turks are an ungoverned and ungovernable ungodly multitude, spoilers, who lack statehood. Lacking statehood, derived from the Latin *stare*, to stand, the Turks lack solidity and stability. Sherley describes them overrunning Europe, “with a greate & disordred violens” (1) in the ninth century, as if they were some kind of savage flood. In their present occupation of Europe “they ruine all places where they cum, & the best townes they have are not half of what they have bynne” (8). With too much land and not enough people who care to nurture it, “the lande, houses, & trees doe suffer his tyrannye as well as the poore people” (8).

Christian Europe, however, is described by Sherley in terms of its fair harbours and castles, its mining enterprises and crops, its bustling markets and cities. In this part of Sherley's treatise the word “state” is encountered in nearly every paragraph. Sherley ascribes statehood to Christian cultures that improve and add value to the environment's resources; statehood is denied the Turks, who simply flow into the spaces they find leaving them unimproved and the worse for wear. Sherley's Turks are like Thomas Lodge's usurers in this respect. In Lodge's *Alarum against Usurers* (1584), the “ungodly and dishonest” (I, 15) and “corrupt gaines” of usury are “the capytall emimie of a well ordered state” (I, 39), and usurers and hoarders are “those that are no wayes profitable for themselves,” and are thus “not worthy the names of citizens in a state” (I, 41).²⁵

Hoarding, usury and barbarian invasions are all forms of profitless activity inimical to an ideal of civil society and the state. The ideal citizen of the state in Lodge's *Alarum* is the embodiment of human cultivation through willed association and civil conversation with others, the studious humanist, who uses his time profitably and eschews those activities that lead to decline and decay.

Thomas Wilson's relation reveals a similar bias. "[M]y purpose is not to praise this Country," says Wilson of his *State of England*, "but onely to report the benefits of the Country, which is a speciall matter to the understanding of the state thereof, which is the end of this Treatise" (10). The commodities, "which this Country aboundeth in and wherewith it helpeth its neyhbours" are those that are produced, in the main, by turning resources to good use. They include: "iron, steele, tynn, lead, copper and all other kind of mineralls...leather, cloath, salt, butter, cheese, beere, fruits and herbes of all kindes wholsom and medicinable zaffran" (10).

The fortunate isle of Ireland, though, remains untamed. "The soile of Ireland is fertile and fruitfull," he says, "but badly manured" (11). The Irish "regard not either to build houses or till their ground, by which meanes it groweth marrish" (11). Wilson adds that "there are also mynes of iron, lead, and copper and (as some report) gold and silver, but little profit is made of any by reason the people be not industrious to find them out and work them" (11). In fact, Ireland is *so* lacking the kind of cultivation England boasts, *so* much the curst and shrewish sister, that it is all Wilson can do to extend to it the same careful, descriptive treatment he affords England. Having listed the divisions of England he says, "I must goe on in the same method with Ireland as I doe with England, being a speciall part, yett almost a halfe part, though broken and lame, of the Teretorye

and dominion which I undertoke to describe" (15).

Wilson's method in describing Ireland thereafter is self-admittedly desultory. His disinclination for the task indicates his dismissive view of Ireland as lacking the cultural conditions for statehood with England. When it comes to the dividing and numbering of subjects he maintains, "It were too impossible to goe about to observe the methode in this to tell how many subiects these Kingdomes containe, albeit I could make a reasonable coniecture" (16). This is not to say that he stoops "to rove at this matter as Botero, a stranger, hath done who never came within 1000 mile of these Countryes and yett doth take upon him to sett downe how many soules there be in this Kingdome, as he doth of many others, by hearesay" (16). Wilson will not lie by authority, as he claims Giovanni Botcro (1544-1617) did in his *Relationi Universali* (1591), but his fastidiousness does not go any further than that. "In Ireland," he concludes, "I cannot say what number of persons there be, but by report and uncertayne coniecture unsure" (16).

What Wilson *does* allow is Ireland's "great store of beasts and porke, excellent horses, and hawkes, fish and foule, in great aboundance, some store of sheepe bearing a corse long wooll, whereof they make their rugges, and a great aboundance of wood" (11). But these are not seen as benefits conducive to statehood because they are not husbanded in such a way as to promote increase. Later in the same treatise, speaking of laws that fall to the monarch's prerogative, Wilson points to policies elsewhere that benefit the state, such as "divers streight Lawes for the mayntainance of Tillage throughout the land, which otherwise would be converted to sheepe pasture" (38). Tillage "increseth men for defence where as by sheepe pasture a whole country may be kept by 2 or 3 shepheards without more men" (38).²⁶ Increase, or profit, is the yardstick for civil culture and

statehood. Similarly “Lawes for the preservacion of fishing and keeping of 3 dayes in the weeke in eating fish” entail that by this “sparing of fleshe the sayd 3 daies flesh may also abound asmuch” (38). By eating fish, stocks of flesh increase, and by tilling the soil the reserve of potential soldiers grows.

Wilson seems to be suggesting here an association between war, the economy and the state. An economy devoted to adding value to resources, the efficient production of collective goods, and unlimited increase, is linked to the production of soldiers and the emergence of the state’s monopoly of legitimate violence. This potential for war may extend to hostile designs on the territory of others. War is, in effect, as Christopher Morris (1998) has suggested, “the great state-building activity” (15). Spenser’s call to arms in the *View* is a plea for immediate succor, but it is also a call for statehood.

The link between war and the economy is made explicit later in Wilson’s treatise. As well as laws requiring the eating of fish, there are also restrictions on buying fish from foreign fishermen. This allows, amongst other things, for the “encrease of fishermen, which may after, if occasion serve, be employed in the Queenes ships in time of war” (40). One thing leads to another, and this profusion of sailors fuels a policy of aggression by the Prince. Wilson refers to a policy of desiring “to continue in warres with Spayne, and Enmity with some other Countryes,” because of “haveing so great store of shipping mariners and force by sea which otherwise would ly idle and decay” (40). “[B]y this in robbing and takeing purchase by sea they doe greatly enrich the Queen, the Admirall and themselves...and also doe thereby encrease both in skill and in number” (40). “It is incredible,” he says, “what treasure hath been brought into England by prize and from the Indyas with in this 12 or 16 yeares” (40).

Wilson ascribes statehood to an economy that assumes men exist for production, not production for men. States, therefore, are invented or achieved; they are not born. An economy that trusts to the unimproved blessings of the earth for the satisfaction of basic needs does not appear to offer the cultural conditions for statehood in Wilson's tract. Dwelling in copious sufficiency, without making more of it, is not regarded as a determining strategy for statehood.

Spenser's "salvage" Irish, dwelling in an undeveloped landscape, at home in the forests, block Ireland's assimilation into England's civic nation state by resisting the construction of statehood. Without productive ownership, England's tenure of the colony is implicitly called into question. Irenius' reads the failure of statehood in Ireland as a rejection of civility, civic values and cultural advance through willed association, and therefore, according to his imperial logic, as evidence of Irish depravity.²⁷ This failure of civil conversation and of statehood, not counting the insecurity of tenure it points to, has led to a lowliness, a barbarism, that appears to justify strong measures for the good of the Irish themselves. In order that the Irish may rise from the primitive form of life afforded by a subsistence culture and progress to the moral life associated with the developed community of the state, Irenius counsels Elizabeth to stop pouring good money and men after bad. Since the generous and extravagant policy of accommodation has so pointedly and repeatedly failed, and the option of ignoring the problem is unacceptable, then some radical reversal is in order. He is quite explicit on this: "[S]ithens we Cannot now applie Lawes fitt to the people as in the firste instiucion of Comon wealthes it oughte to be we will applie the people and fitt them to the laws" (199). By pressing for military intervention and an absolutist policy as the right system and effective physic for a

properly thriving society in Ireland, he also appeals to her vanity as a ruler. Paradoxical as it may seem, the adoption of absolutism and military coercion in Ireland would turn her from the mistress of unruly, slavish barbarians into a nurturing ruler and a wise physician, concerned with the good of her subjects.

Eudoxus' opening remarks, then, establish increase or profit as the yardstick for civil culture and statehood. These remarks call into question Ireland's colonial status and invite Irenius to expatiate on *why* Ireland's resources have been left to languish. This is, of course, a difficult issue for Irenius to address without launching into an account of English mismanagement that would immediately alienate those whom Spenser sought to influence. Irenius responds to Eudoxus' opening sally with a fatalistic conception of social development. He refers to "the fatall destinie of that Lande" that blocks the many "good plottes" and "wise Counsellis" that have been put forward for the "reformation of that rcalme" (43). He offers up the hoary old idea, older than Tacitus and Seneca who both espoused it, as old as the story of the flood and the tower of Babel, that governments, commonwealths and peoples have their revolutions and fatal periods. Typically it was the burden of sin that caused these revolutions. Typically too, those sins that could not be cured by persuasion were cut back by the power of the sword, with the result that one regime was founded on the ruins of another.

Eudoxus dismisses this old-fashioned view of the ethical significance of events. Irenius' reference to a belief in the inevitability of things suggests a system of unalterable process in which men cannot arbitrarily interfere. According to Eudoxus, to believe in the determinism of events thus is to limit, unnecessarily, the remedies at one's disposal and to fall into political apathy or desperation. Why kill the "diseased patient dead"

rather than “Apply the beste endeavours of his skill for his recoverye”? (44). Eudoxus would rather trust to the unsound application of the plots and counsels so far conceived, than that men could do nothing to break this cycle of events. He is all for the patient investigation of origins, for finding out how things started and stood before they turned bad, so that a restitution of decayed cultural health can be effected. Irenius, though, is all for piling up abuses, for sparking anger, to provoke a war of annihilation. Each impulse artfully fuels the other, so that Spenser can make the case for radical, military intervention without appearing to sacrifice too much loyalty to Elizabeth’s habitual policy of accommodation.

Spenser plays one interlocutor off against the other. Already the lines are drawn between Eudoxus, who argues the claims of justice, and Irenius, who pursues expediency and advantage in the name of public security. Irenius’ talk of crisis, of brewing rebellion, of enemies that could step to England from Irish shores, of a veritable Pandora’s box of teeming evils, creates a need for expediency, for screwing up one’s courage to the sticking place, and grasping a radical, new cure-all involving death. He is of that school of physicians who believe, with Thomas Lodge, a physician in truth, that “the sharper the medycine the better it cures.”²⁸ Eudoxus, though, would ponder the case, rehearse the symptoms in orderly fashion, play the wise physician, and note the course of the disease before commencing the cure. His probing inquiries serve to support Irenius’ drastic remedy, but they also maintain a semblance of a concern with human rights, or natural justice, as it was called in early modern terms. Irenius’ talk of public security, and his emphasis on civil justice—which, as Malcolm Schofield (1999) has noted, pertains to the question of legality in a particular, given situation and society—eventually override the

universal issue of natural justice.²⁹ Eudoxus' concerns, however, enable Spenser to fashion an authorial *ethos* more acceptable to the Queen as the dialogue unfolds.

In these early encounters, Irenius and Eudoxus take up rival positions as to the best way to achieve civil communion and avoid confusion.³⁰ Irenius is for public security and peace, and Eudoxus is for public equity, or justice. Irenius insists upon a crisis, a crisis that demands ingenuity, innovation, courage and resolution. Eudoxus looks to the common law, "ordeyned for the good and safety of all" (45), as the means to restore the body politic to health. Irenius' response to this is that "it falleth out in Lawes no otherwise than it dothe in Phisicke...insteade of good it worketh hurte" (46). Irenius argues for "the inconveniaunce and unfittnes which I suppose to be in the lawes of the Lande" (60). Irish Brehon law and the practice of elective inheritance known as tanistry subvert English title and the effective operation of English common law there. The uneasy mix leads to civil injustice and loss of advantage to the Queen. Irenius submits that "theare are more attainted Landes concealed from her maiestie then shee now hath the possessions in all Irelande" (67). She loses revenue thus, and also loyal subjects who otherwise, "might be assured to her as those landes would yealde Inhabitaunce and livinge unto" (67).

Irenius goes on to provide yet more examples that point up the defective operation of English Common law in Ireland. Trial by jury becomes a travesty when the Irish freeholders who make up that jury "make no more scruple to passe againste the Englishman or the Quene though it be to straine their oathes then to drinke milke unstrained" (66). When it comes to witnesses "the base Irishe people" care little about perjuring themselves because "theire Lordes maye Compell them to saie anye thinge"

(68). Nor can receivers of stolen goods be prosecuted, because the thief, who must be brought to trial before the case against the accessory can proceed, is either hiding out in the woods, or a dead rebel. Thus “Theves are greatly encouraged to steale and their mayntainers emboldened to receive theare stealthes knowinge how hardely they Cane be broughte to anye triall of lawe” (70). The crime of treason too has lost its sting. “[W]hen one of them mindeth to goe into rebellion he will Convaye awaye all his Landes and Lordshipps to feffees in truste wheareby,” says Irenius, “he reserveth to himselfe but a state for terme of liffe which beinge determined either by the sworde or by the halter their Lande streight Cometh to their heire and the Quene is defrauded” (71).

When Fudoxus suggests that such defective operation of the common law may be rectified by its yet stricter application, Irenius is dismissive. His point is that the application of law in general has failed to achieve statehood in Ireland. Having run through ways in which Common law has failed in Ireland, and the ills that this failure has led to, Irenius does the same with regard to the Statute laws of that land. He goes on to show the harm that ensues from statutes that, once upon a time, “weare verye nedefull” yet now “are Cleane antiquated and alltogeather idle” (75). His argument, in both cases, is that these systems are not working in Ireland now, whatever their efficacy in another time or place. “[L]awes oughte to be fashioned unto the manners and Condicion of the people to whom they are mente,” says Irenius categorically, “and not to be imposed accordinge to the simple rule of righte for then as I saie insteade of good they maie worke ill, and perverte iustice to extreame uniustice” (54). These Statute laws have failed to progress with time and example and the changing nature of the population of Ireland itself. The Irish are locked into a past that contaminates the present. Before state power

can take root in Ireland, the weeds that choke it have to be identified and cut out.

Having described how the laws, both common and statute, have failed to thrive, Irenius goes on to describe how custom, too, has gone to seed. It appears that the Irish fight like Sherley's Turks, "breakinge forthe like a sodaine Tempest" (59), rushing down from the mountains, wasting all in their path, scouring the land of buildings and people. They fight like the Goths, the Huns, the Vandals and the Scythians too, who, according to Irenius, storm territory "like a mountaine floudd," washing away and drowning "what ever relickes there weare lefte of the land bred people" (91). They live like they fight, "pasturinge uppon the mountaine and waste wilde places and removing still to freshe lande as they have depastured the former" (97). According to an authority on barbarian peoples, Joannes Boemus, the Irish live like "the Tartarians and the people aboute the *Caspian* sea which are naturallie Scithians," for they all live in and with herds, "drivinge theire Cattell Continuallye with them and fedinge onely on theire milke and white meates" (98). The Irish also dress like Scythians in "the wearinge of mantells and long glibbes which is a thicke Curled bushe of haire hanginge downe over theire eyes" (99). They mourn like Scythians (105), sacrifice (107), swear (109) and turn werewolf like Scythians (109). The list of communal practices and routines that bind the Irish nation continues. Irenius concludes that there are "manie suche Customes I Could recounte unto youe as of theire olde manner of marryinge of buryinge of dauncinge of singinge of feastinge of Cursinge," that "by resemblaunce wheareof it might plainelye appeare to youe that the nacions are the same" (109).

It is not, as both Eudoxus and Irenius consistently point out, that these customs are intrinsically bad practices. Transhumance, for example, is "very behoofull in this

Countrye of Irleande wheare theare are greate mountaines and waste desertes full of grasse that the same shoulde be eaten downe and norishe manye thowsandes of Cattell” (98). The mantle is both necessary and “Commodious” for it serves “in steadeof howsinge beddinge and Cloathing” (100). Irenius does not deny the courage shown by Scythian and Spanish fighting men. Nor does he condemn the practice of poets singing the praises of worthy men at feasts and gatherings. His point, after allowing that the Irish ride well, fight bravely and compose verse “sprinkled with some prettie flowers” (127), is that such customs have *failed* to move with the times. They have failed to develop through imitation of superior English models, they have failed to change and adapt with respect to incoming populations, and thus these antiquated customs have poisoned attempts at fashioning the developed community associated with statehood. Irish practices and skills, passed down through generations, have not progressed through contact with other, more advanced, cultures. These unreformed practices constitute a canker, a deep running sore in the body politic that has led to abuses, inconvenience and the infection of previously sound members. If “such Customes as the Irishe have derived from the firste olde nacions which inhabited that Lande”(113) have proved so resistant to reform, they must be cut out before healthy statehood can be achieved. When the “good use” of ancient custom “is now turned to abuse” (129), the time has come to purge them clean away.

In terms of law and custom the Irish have failed to benefit from civil conversation with the English. Moreover, the “Civill fashions” of the descendants of the Anglo-Norman settlers known in the 1590’s as the “olde English” have also failed, and failed spectacularly, to withstand the cultural risks of contact with the Gaelic Irish. Irenius tells

Eudoxus that “the Chiefest abuses which are now in that realme are growen from the Englishe,” who “are now much more Lawles and Licentious then the verie wilde Irishe” (113). These old English are, in truth, those forlorn and unfortunate travellers, who have taken up with foreign habits and customs, gone to seed, and lost themselves to “theire firste natures” (114). “Soe muche,” says Irenius, “Can libertie and ill example doe” (114). But more than this they have grown “insolente and bente bothe that regall Auctoritye And allsoe their private powers one against another to the utter subversion of themselves and strengtheninge of the Irishe againe” (114). Yet worse, having dropped their English names and their native tongue, they have shown themselves unnatural sons by taking up arms against “theire owne naturall Contries as that they woulde be ashamed of her name and bite at the dug from which they sucked liffe” (116). The contamination of the old English has led to the infection raging with even greater virulence.

Irenius concludes his account of custom in Ireland by acknowledging that many more abuses of custom exist in private practice, “infinite manye more,” but that what he has offered thus far “are moste generall and tendinge to the hurte of the Comon wealthe” (136). This failure of custom to advance, and the harm that comes to the commonwealth from such autism, constitute the value of Irenius’ on-the-spot observations as a traveller. Eudoxus already knows a lot about the antiquarian material and method Irenius has introduced to their discussion. As an antiquarian enthusiast, Eudoxus knows enough to be able to corroborate or evaluate the value of the etymologies, genealogies, histories and practices Irenius has brought to bear on his subject. He does just that on numerous occasions. Irenius himself acknowledges that “theare be manye greate auctorities I assure youe to prove the same” (131). Eudoxus evaluates Irenius’ historical approach,

but he can say nothing about Irenius' first-hand observations of law and custom gone bad in Ireland. This is the news that Irenius brings, as a traveller, to the dialogue.

Irenius uses the cultural memory activated by antiquarian researches to prove his point. The primal, Scythian nature of Irish society renders it autistic, and inimical to reform. Irenius' thrust is to employ antiquarian research to show how law, custom and religion have *failed* to achieve more perfect forms in Ireland, despite the example of England and the English. Irenius' contribution to knowledge here is not so much the intelligence he bears about Ireland's cultural history, but rather it is his news of Ireland's present, unreformed condition--represented as an incurable cultural infection within the body politic--that justifies his relation.³¹

Eudoxus is finally persuaded by Irenius' report. He acknowledges "what evill Comethe theareby to the Common wealthe" (134) from this ethnic thorn in Albion's flesh and consents to Irenius' lead. Irenius pushes his victory home by offering a similar account of an unreformed religion. As Catholics, the Irish are not pagan, but they are still diseased. "I doe not blame the Christeninge of them" (137), he says, notwithstanding they are all Papists, but "the sinne or ignoraunce of the Priestes shall not excuse the people" (138). His purpose with regard to religion, as with custom and law, "is to laye open the generall evils of that realme which do hinder the good reformation theareof" (142). The failure of religion to reform in Ireland is one more telling symptom of "the wretchednes of that fatall kingedome" (145).

Following his record of failures and abuses in religion, Irenius waxes bold and accuses the Queen's own captains and governors, "speciallye employed to make peace thorough stronge execusion of warr," of prolonging the troubles there, "for feare lest

afterwarde they shoulde nede ymployment' (143). His heart bleeds "to see her maiestie so abused by some whom they put in speciall truste of those greate affaires" (143). "[W]ith greate hartes grieffe and inwarde trouble of minde," he sees the Queen defrauded.

Irenius' cure for "all the abuses and inconveniences of that governmente which was our firste parte" (146) is more government. Such government must be perilously different, indeed, to prove the rest wanting, and it must "be with the strength of a greate power" (147). Eudoxus is obtuse; he would continue "with makinge of good lawes and establishinge of newe statutes with sharpe penalties and punishmentes for amendinge of all that is presentlye amisse" (147). "[I]novacion is perillous," he counters, "in so muche as thoughe it be meante for the better yeat soe manye accidentes and fearefull eventes maye Come betwene as that it maye hazzarde the losse of the wholle" (147). Irenius pleads urgency; even as they speak, troubles breed in Ireland's every pore; the risen population's ear is cocked for the signal to stir. Indeed, "I thinke the worde be alreadie given and theare wantethe nothings but oportunitye" (147). Having brought Eudoxus to the question of how to effect change, Irenius' answer is curt: "Even by the sworde". This does not mean, Irenius hastens to add, killing the patient. It does not entail "The Cuttinge of all that nacion with the sworde," but the "Cuttinge of all those evills which I before blamed" (148). Minimizing death, Irenius' cure brings life more perfect. What Lady Macbeth might call "the ornament of life" (I. 7. 42).

Yet, if we should fail? Eudoxus frets over such "harde Councell", for it may end with "the Quenes treasure spente her people wasted the pore Countrie trobled and the enemye nevertheles broughte into no more subiction than he was" (149). Irenius' contorted answer is a declaration of certain success packed with negatives: "the

Certeintye of the effecte hearof shalbe so infallible as that no reasone can gainsaye it' (149). Practical details and difficulties remain. How much, how long, how many men, how and where they are to be deployed, how they are to be clothed and fed, and how exactly they are to engage with the enemy are the matter of Irenius' discourse now.

Irenius promises a quick end to an efficient military enterprise in which none of the Irish should "fall by the sworde nor be slaine by the soldiour" (158). Irenius explains how the Irish would slay themselves. Prevented from tending their herds, "they woulde quicklye Consume themselves and devour one another" (158). He knows because he has seen it done before, in Munster. Irenius' description of the suffering there has been often quoted. It offers a view, an eyewitness account, which proves the strategy's effectiveness. It is also, in its passion, his "I have given suck" speech, proof of native tenderness overcome when the work of the world is at stake.

Ruining herds, though, is like poisoning the water--not much of a famous victory. Spenser knows this. It is a military policy that requires little skill and less courage. Making a famine where abundance lies is not hard when the foe makes "no spare of anie thinge" but lives on "spoil" (158). Famine is almost a natural consequence of a culture in which private ownership is insecure. It happened time and time again in British America, until a system of private tenure prevailed. Irenius represents this course as the wise and the resolute thing to do. The "necessitye of that present state of things," says Irenius, forces such a "sharpe course" now, as it did in Lord Grey's time. Not bloody and cruel, but swift and sure, it offers a final solution to Ireland's troubles.³²

Mercy is weakness. Nor is "the Arch-Rebell himselfe...the Earle of Tyrone" nor any of the Irish rebel leaders to be spared or countenanced. To do so, as Irenius proves

by offering case studies from the past, is to perpetuate the conflict. Just as Turnus, in submission, is cut down by Aeneas' sword, so are these Irish and their foreign confederates to be resolutely "cutt of," however abject their surrender might be.

Irenius goes on to explain the shortest way to statehood. The rebel Irish are to be so harried "that he shall never rest at home nor sturr forthe abroade but he shalbe had" (174). "[T]he governement and Cheife magistracie I wishe to Continewe as it doethe" (228), but the Lord Deputy's authority is to be "more ample and absolute then it is and that he shoulde have uncomptrolled power to doe anie thinge" (229). Irenius' plan is to put the garrisons in place and to maintain them directly upon "the Rent of that Countrie" rather than through "paye at her [Majesty's] pleasure" (181). This military government is to follow a strategy that has become legendary in the history of British imperialism: they are to employ a policy of divide and rule. Irenius explains how this works. Irish outlaws who give themselves in rather than face starvation are first gathered, then scattered across the land as tenants to English-owned estates. They are "dispersed wide from their Acquaintances and scattered farr abroad thorough all the Countrye" (179). By breaking up their dwelling "alltogeather by their septes and severall nacions" conspiracies are broken. Then, by offering them land to occupy and work as tenants they "shall become good subjects to labour" (178), as well as to the Queen. Thus, in Eudoxus' incredulous words, is the "lande theareby so strengthened that it shalle neither feare anye forrein invacion nor practize which the Irishe shall ever attempte" (177). Thomas Wilson said the same in his *The State of England*; the planting of warlike men as husbands to the soil brings forth an increase of soldiers for the country's defense. Breaking the social fabric of the rebels by the sword, privatizing property, adding value to resources, building for

public security and trade; all these factors reinforce each other to secure Ireland for Britain by establishing statehood. A traditional way of life is to be infiltrated and broken up by the operation of state machinery. Thus statehood functions as a mode of colonization.

But before this can happen there is the problem of the old English, and the rebelliously independent, quasi-Irish feudal aristocracy that they have turned into, to be dealt with. Irenius would first investigate how those noblemen, who received “those great Seigniories and Lordshipps” from the king “at the firste Conquest of that Realme” (206) have abused their liberty. He wants a “Comission graunted forthe under the greate Seale” (207), that will appoint persons of “speciall truste and iudgement to enquire thoroughe out all Irelande” to find out “how everye man houldethe his landes” (208). Irenius is not shy about naming the abuses that will be uncovered thus. They would soon see “what seigniories they usurpe what wardshippes they take from the Quene what Landes of hers they Conceale” (208). They would also discover “howe those Irishe Captaines of Countries have encroched uppon the Quenes freholders and Tenantes” and “how they have translated the Tenures of them from Englishe houldinge unto Irishe *Tanistrye*” (208). All would be revealed about those “greate men which had suche grauntes made them at first by the Kinges of England,” for the purpose of keeping out the Irish and defending “the kinges righte and his subiects,” who now “Robb and spoile them” by taking up with Irish ways, Irish tenants and Irish wives “Combyninge with them againste the Quene” (209).

Irenius’ solution to the problem is not to withdraw lands and titles, he says, but to fashion the Queen as presiding head of state there. He would “reduce thinges into order

of Englishe Lawe and make them houlde their Landes of her" (208). Furthermore, he would prevent such abuses from happening again by returning to Saxon forms of social organization, whereby the people are "withdrawne from their Lordes and subiected to the prince" (214).

In fact, a renaissance of Saxon ways generally offers a conversion model for social reproduction that is predicated on cultivating and adding value to naturally provided resources. Richard Verstegen's investigation into Britain's Saxon's heritage in *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* (1605) is illuminating here.³³ Verstegen says of the Saxon's "ancient condition & manner of lyf" that they were "a people very active and industrious, utterly detesting idleness & sloth" (55). This is exactly the kind of attitude Irenius thinks the Irish need to adopt. In good humanist fashion, Irenius links their low condition, time and time again, to "lewd libertie" and idleness. "[B]einge (as theye all be)," he says, "broughte up idlye without awe of parentes without preceptes of masters without feare of offence not beinge directed nor ymployed in anye Course of life," they "will easelye be drawen to followe suche, as anye shall set before them" (126). This includes lying poets, "these Bardes and rymers" who will praise and encourage them to "lewde deds" for "a share of a stollen Cowe" (126).

Verstegen says that Saxon children "were comonly nursed by their own mothers, and it was accompted a great shame for a mother to put her chyld fourth to nurse, unlesse it were upon some necessitie" (57). Furthermore they "suffred not their landes to descend to the eldest sonne only, but unto all their male children...which is asmuch to say, as give each chyld his parte" (57). Irenius criticizes the practices of fostering out children and the use of Irish wet nurses. He also finds fault with the custom that younger

sons are left to fend for themselves. What is more, he is all for giving each child his part in terms of a trade or an education, so that they will not grow up abandoned to idleness. He would enforce an existing statute in Ireland “which Comaundeth that all the sonns of husbandmen shalbe trained up in their fathers Trade” (217). He would also have it that “everye parishe shoulde be forced to kepe one pettie schollmaster” and every county or “baronye shoulde kepe another able Scholemaster ...to whom they shoulde be Compelled to sende their youthe to be disciplined” (218).

These good humanist principles of self-cultivation and the crafted child add value to the natural child. “But learninge and bringinge up in liberall sciences will not Come of itselfe,” Irenius says, it must be carefully worked and applied to the child in question. Irenius would colonize Irish minds with structures from humanist and Saxon culture. Similarly, he would control their bodies by removing them from the idle life and internecine strife associated with cattle and pastoral society, by planting them across Ireland as husbands and soldiers of the state.

Without the cultivation of natural resources, without trades and industry, without “husbandrye labor,” “there is no Comon wealthe can allmoste Consiste or at leaste be perfecte” (216). Irenius and Thomas Wilson are in agreement on that score. Both Wilson and Irenius are also opposed to “pasturadge”. Wilson’s objection was that “a whole country may be kept by 2 or 3 shepheards without more men” (38). Irenius does “not meane to allowe anye of those able bodies which are able to use bodelye labour to followe a fewe Cowes grazinge” (217). “[F]or this kepinge of Cowes is of it selfe a verye idle liffe and a fitt nurserye for a thiefe” (217). Irenius would have it that any man who keeps twenty cows should also “kepe a ploughe goinge” (217). Loiterers and idle

wanderers upon the land are to be whipped or punished, even unto death. Towns, castles and bridges are to be built. Churches are to be repaired and market privileges granted. Ireland is to be tamed and a new human geography is to be installed. Once in place the new order, “mighte afterwarde be verye easelye kepte and mayntayned” and should “in shorte space yeald A plentifull revenewe to the Crowne of England which now doethe bothe sucke and Consume the treasure” (227-8).

Thomas Wilson’s unredeemed Ireland is also a drain on the state’s resources, a drain that threatens the English state’s aggressive and expansionist civic nationalism. After listing the Queen’s expenses, Wilson concludes that “the greatest of all is this last warr with Ireland, whereof the Establishment of the money which the Queen payes yeerly for the maytenance thereof is as follows” (33), and he tells out sums that add up to nearly three hundred thousand pounds. “This charge,” he says, “if it should continue, would soone make her a poore Prince and a miserable Country” (33).

There is something about Ireland that is inimical to England.³⁴ Irenius, pondering her troubles, wonders if God “reserveth her in this unquiet state still, for some secrete skourge, which shall by her Come unto Englande” (44). Eudoxus refers to those who wish “the utter ruine of that which they Cannot redresse” and would that “all that Lande weare a sea poole” (44).³⁵ Later he notes the “infinite” and “huge Chardges” incurred with regard to Ireland. “[T]he Quenes treasure spente her people wasted the pore Countrie trobled,” (149) all to no avail; Ireland is bleeding England dry.

Irenius’ stated aim is “to settle an eternall peace in that Countrie and allsoe to make it verie profitable to her majestie” (197). There is only one way for this to happen. It “must be broughte in by a stronge hande and so Continewed till it run into a stedfaste

Course of government” (197). He promises money in her purse, a new economic order, a general reformation, peace and prosperity, safety from brewing rebellion and the “dailye daunger which is threatned to this realme by the kinge of Spaine” (198), and it could all be hers for the taking, in the “space of one year” (174). All she has to do is exercise “the Royall power of the Prince” (148), which is the power of the sword. Irenius is adamant. Just as “the Corrupte braunches and unholosome boughes are firste to be pruned and the foule mosse clenched and scraped away before the tree can bringe forth anye good fruite,” so the causes of constitutional corruption in Ireland, so diligently collated and relayed to his English audience, “must first be Cutt awaie by a stronge hande before anye good Cane be planted” (148).³⁶ And if Elizabeth is no Henry, and cannot wield the sword herself, then she should allow this royal power to “stretche it selfe forth in her Chiefe strengthe to the redressinge and Cuttinge of all those evils which I before blamed” (148).

The Crown turned a deaf ear to this fantasy of social transformation and the *View* was denied publication. Indeed, Spenser himself may not have pressed the projector’s rhetoric thus far, were it not for the turmoil created by Tyrone’s uprising. Spenser was, even so, committed to the project of colonization and to formulating a civic English nationalism that would drive it. His anatomy of Irish abuses in law, custom and religion, and their failure to attain statehood through civic association with the English, supports his call for invasion. Both Irenius and Thomas Wilson suggest that the rejection of statehood and civic association with the English by the Irish is proof of their incorrigible degeneracy and cultural autism.

Yet in the course of this anatomy of abuse that justifies conquest, Spenser

inadvertently articulates an ethnic Irish nationalism. This contestatory form of nationalism ultimately explains the Irish resistance to assimilation. It constitutes the ground of what Irenius sees as Ireland's affliction, which is, in the end, the Irish nation's claim to sovereignty. This articulation of nationalism emerges from a type of history, other than the "View" genre or relation of state, that records social production from a different perspective. This style of history is the antiquarian study into ethnic origins and it is, like the travel relation I have outlined thus far, also focused on a civility that is measured in terms of increase and improvement. The *View's* antiquarian focus delivers an insider's account of history, and a version of cultural agency generated or imagined through the process of dwelling, that constitutes the foundation for an ethnic Irish nationalism.

Eudoxus' opening remarks, as I have explained, invite Irenius to comment on the state or condition of Ireland in relation to a system of tenure that adds value to native gifts and resources. His "better government and Civilitie" depends on a *dominium* set by an improving relation to the physical world. But it is also, as manifested in the "view" genre, a civility tuned to progress through embassy, through cultural contact, civil conversation and civic, or willed, association. The antiquarian account of ethnic origins is also focused on civility. This kind of history, however, promotes an ethnic nationalism that tends to be insular and exclusionary. In making civility a source of moral authority in the *View*, Spenser employs *both* kinds of contemporary writing about nationalism and, as a result, his text catches at, and is caught between, the two.

Richard Verstegen's *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence*, published in 1605 and dedicated to King James, but in the process of being written from as early as the 1570s,

and available, in all likelihood, to Spenser in manuscript, is an antiquarian history that traces the Saxon ancestry of “The Most Noble and Renowned English Nation”. It is, as I have already outlined, an investigation into ethnic descent that measures “civillitie” in terms of a culture that adds value to naturally provided resources. What it also does is to promote an ethnic civilization and nationalism that is independent of cultural contact with others.

Graham Parry (1995), in his valuable study of English Antiquarians, makes a case for the *Restitution* taking shape from the earlier part of Elizabeth’s reign.³⁷ He cites Verstegen’s mid-century sources and influences, Verstegen’s enthusiasm in the 1560s for Anglo-Saxon studies at Oxford, and his publication of a book on the origins and antiquities of famous European cities in 1576, as indicators that the *Restitution* was in progress long before its publication date. Parry also points to the general practice of recusant antiquarians, of whom Verstegen was one, which was to keep their work in manuscript for some time before publication, as proof that the *Restitution* is a text of the sixteenth century. Parry’s dating of the *Restitution* means that this text would have been available to Spenser.

There is, furthermore, a commendatory Latin verse prefacing Verstegen’s work by “Ricardi Stanihursti.”³⁸ This means that Spenser may have been led to a direct knowledge of Verstegen’s project through his interest in Richard Stanyhurst’s work. Willy Maley (1997) has commented at length on Richard Stanyhurst’s influence--as the principal author of the Irish section of Holinshed’s *Chronicles*--on Spenser’s poetic language. Maley sees Stanyhurst’s concern for an undefiled English language--a language he saw preserved in the vernacular of the Pale--as informing Spenser’s

“nationalistic literary revivalism” (34).³⁹ Indeed, long before he wrote the *View*, Spenser was involved in a discourse of etymological study and linguistic integrity that Verstegen formalized into an enterprise of ethnic nationalism in *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence*.

Verstegen singles out language as the key to discovering the nation. His focus on language, and on English as a Teutonic language, allows him to purify the English as an entirely Germanic nation, descended from the Saxons. Furthermore, his celebration of Saxon warrior culture precludes any necessity of contact with a “superior”, classical society for the achievement of civilization. Graham Parry observes that Verstegen “was a proponent of linguistic purity, as he was of racial purity. He never entertained the prospect that the Saxons might have intermarried with the Britons” (66).⁴⁰ Verstegen’s antiquarian study offered a model for the kind of ethnic nationalism that boasts its detachment from other cultures. It articulates an ethnic nationalism, predicated on the involuntary association associated with blood, soil and dwelling, that could explain and justify Irish resistance to civic association *without* forfeiting the moral value of civility.

Verstegen’s *Restitution* traces the ancestry of “The Most Noble and Renowned English Nation”. Like the modern history associated with the travel relation, Verstegen’s antiquarian study articulates a nationalism focused on a civility that is measured in terms of adding value to naturally provided resources. Speaking of the Saxon ancestors to the English, Verstegen offers them as “a great example of civillitie, to all the rest of the barbarous nations of the world” (50). He praises them for manuring the soil for tillage that “yieldeth also great store of good wyne, and is replenished with numbers of most faire & flowrishing cities (51). Furthermore, “The mynes...do deliver *Gold, Silver,*

Copper, and all other metalles” (51). “And as touching the knowledge of the people,” he adds, “what learning or skil is there among men that they exceed not in?” (51). They even produce their share of Byzantinian “rare inventions”: curious artifacts and ingenious mechanisms that prove the “learning and cunning” of a people. Verstegen cites “a most rare and wonderful piece of work,” a model of the heavens in motion, made in silver and needing twelve men to carry it, that comes complete with “a book conteyning the manner how to keep the same in due order” (52). There is also “an eagle made of wood, with such wunderful arte, that flying out of the hand of the maker thereof, it flew after the Emperor a long way” (52-3).

The Saxons’ improving relation to the physical world, a world which includes their minds and bodies, translates into an augmentation of prosperity that involves conquest and the enlargement of territory. “They were a people very active and industrious,” Verstegen tells us, “utterly detesting idleness & sloth, stil seeking by warres to enlarge the bounds of their own territories” (55). They were “fers against their enimyes,” yet given to civil conversation, “conversing together among themselves in great love and freindlynesse, an essential cause of the augmentation of their prosperitie” (55). In fighting the Danes, “albeit they were not then equall unto them either in force of fortune, they did neverthelesse so dispose of their uttermost abillitie, that even by meer valour and main force of arms they atteyned unto their desyred habitation.” (56). There is a nexus here between disposing “of their uttermost abillitie” with regard to their native resources, and civility, as “an essential cause of the augmentation of their prosperitie”.

Civility here denotes an organizing principle for personal, social and political behaviour. It is not, in this instance, an attribute tied to the manners of a particular person

or group of people, nor, despite the fact that civil life, derived from the Latin *civitas*, had urban associations, is it linked to a particular place. This early modern conception of civility as a determining strategy that transcends a given situation is illustrated, for example, in *The Civile Conversation of M. Steeven Guazzo*, translated by George Pettie in 1586. Guazzo points out to his interlocutor that civility is a matter of mind, not of place. He says “civile conversation is an honest commendable and vertuous kinde of living in the world” (I, 56); it involves “beeing experienced by meanes of conversation, in the natures, manners, and dooings of others” (I, 113). “The solitary person is sicke”(I, 119), according to Guazzo.

Civility appears here in Pettie’s text as an ambassadorial project of the intellect, a traversing of the minds of others and learning by the experience of foreign contact. It is the medicine for melancholy, the way to attain the golden mean, and a source of moral authority. In sum, civility denotes a theory of agency to do with the organization of personal and political space. It signifies an attitude of being in the world; a willfully engaged relation to the world, that is tuned to increase, improvement, limitless learning, and to progress.⁴¹ In Verstegen’s antiquarian study, Wilson’s *State*, and Spenser’s *View*, civility is linked to an aggressive and expansionist political dynamic. Civility re-invents an aggressive, expansionist dynamic as a moral mission.

Before Irenius’ Ireland can achieve statehood in the terms of tracts like Wilson’s, or aspire to what Verstegen calls civility and “the honor of nations” (54), a system of tenure that is pegged to utility and to adding value to resources must be implemented. Legitimized by the idea of civility, the replacement of a clannish, pastoral society with a way of life that is committed to adding value to resources constitutes a process of

massive social intervention that signals emerging statehood *and* colonization. Unless colonization is more complete, the irony of the *present* state of Ireland is that there *is* no state. But what is interesting about Verstegen's account of civility and national honour, and what separates it from Wilson's and Spenser's accounts of the same, is that Verstegen attributes civility directly to a Germanic tribe, to a society that does not rely on civil conversation or civic association with others. His version of civility promotes an ethnic rather than a civic national identity. Verstegen's Saxons are given to "conversing *together among themselves* in great love and freindlynesse," (italics mine) which is "an essential cause of the augmentation of their prosperitie" (55). Unlike William Camden in his *Britannnia* (1586), Verstegen promotes an ethnic civilization that is independent of contact with the civilizing touch of imperial Rome.⁴²

Verstegen offers an ethnic basis for English nationalism that confutes what Donald R. Kelley (1998) calls the Tudor "cult of British history".⁴³ It complicates the nation-building work of other antiquarians like John Leland, John Bale, Raphael Holinshed, William Harrison and William Camden by emphasizing an ethnic nationalism for England founded on Saxon virtues. Possibly, this move complements Verstegen's recusant status in some way, but I do not attempt to explore that connection here. What I want to suggest is that Verstegen's *Restitution* offers an insider's account of history, one attuned to the process of dwelling, which articulates an insular and exclusionary ethnic nationalism. Spenser's *View*, with its focus on civility, is caught up with, and between, this insider's account of history and the traveller's diagnostic account of modern history. The knowledge produced by one kind of history counters that produced by the other. Thus the text's profoundly mixed messages. Inadvertently, the *View*'s antiquarian

account of the Irish nation articulates an ethnic Irish nationalism that undermines the relation's very deliberate imperial thrust.

Eudoxus delights in the kind of antiquarian research he calls "the discentes of nacions" (105). He concludes the dialogue by reminding Irenius of his vague promise, the next time they meet, that "ye will declare unto us those your observacions which ye have gathered of the Antiquities of Ireland" (231). He finds the "rippinge up of Ancestries...verye pleasinge" (95). He regrets "that ye have passed through those Antiquities which I Could have wished not so sone ended" (97), and, on another occasion, when he listens to Irenius refer to such antiquarian authorities as George Buchanan, Richard Stanyhurst and William Camden, he is transported with pleasure. He says:

I have in these fewe wordes hearde that from youe which I woulde have thoughte had bene ympossible to have bene spoken of times so remote and Customes soe anciente with delighte, wheare of I was all that while as it were entranced and Carried so far from my selfe as that I ame now righte sorie that yee ended so sone. (109)

Eudoxus is interested in the origins of Irish institutions because of his delight in antiquarian study. Irenius' interest in origins derives from his desire to pinpoint corruption and eradicate it. Irenius' meticulous inquiry into the origins of Irish institutions serves to justify conquest, even while it delights and surprises his interlocutor. Eudoxus is enthralled. He had not thought "that any suche Antiquities could have bene avowched for the Irishe," and this discovery "makethe me the more to longe to see some of your observacions which yee have gathered" (95). Irenius, though, is vexed at

Eudoxus' interest. Eudoxus would hear more about the "stormes" of Ireland's regional past for "the pleasure which shoulde redounde out of your Historye" (64), but Irenius is impatient at the request to expand on the particulars of history. He would move away from such an account, "All which to reherse shoulde rather be to Cronicle times then to searche into the reformacions of abuses" (65). Eudoxus reluctantly concedes: "Goe to then in godes name and followe the Course" (65).

Irenius checks Eudoxus' antiquarian enthusiasm again when it comes to setting out the ancient origins of Irish custom. Eudoxus sees "a faire Champian laide open unto youe, in which yee maye at lardge stretche out your discourse unto manye swete remembraunces of Antiquities from whence it semeth that the Customes of that nacion proceeded" (81). Irenius initially concurs, tantalizingly, with Eudoxus. Their conversation does indeed "minister occacion of a moste ample discourse of the firste originall of them and the Antiquitye of that people which in trueth I doe thinke to be more antiente then moste that I Knowe in this eande of the worlde" (82). Handled by "some man of sounde judgement and plentifull readinge," such a history would surely "be moste pleasante and profitable," Irenius concedes; then he puts off recounting this history until, "some other time" (82). Eudoxus laments that he must "forbeare my desire now in hope that yee will as youe saie soem other time more aboundantlye satisfie it" (82), but Irenius is always wary of being "drawen from this that we have in hand namelye the handlinge of Abuses" (97). Irenius is for radical reformation of a society riddled with intolerable abuses deriving from an unimproved, backward, culturally invincible way of life that locks Ireland into a barbaric past. Eudoxus is for the restitution of a past that has been obscured by the rust of accumulated ages. Investigation into the descent of a nation

is the crux of the matter for both speakers. Eudoxus' interest in antiquarian studies, his delight in etymologies, "the discentes of nations," and the "ripping up" of the "original" of Ireland, however, affirm an Irish ethnic nationalism even as these same antiquarian inquiries support Irenius' argument for systematic conquest conducive to statehood.

There has already been some critical discussion of the antiquarian focus of Spenser's *View*, and of the sources informing that focus. Andrew Hadfield's *Spenser's Irish Experience: Wilde Fruit and Salvage Soyl* (1997) offers a summary of some of the histories from which Spenser drew. As well as pointing up Camden's *Britannia* as a major influence on the *View*, Hadfield emphasizes Spenser's indebtedness to the narrative of Gerald of Wales and Richard Stanyhurst's "Description of Ireland" (1577). These latter antiquarian studies attribute Ireland's failure to move forward as a nation and a culture to an under-utilization of natural resources. These studies contribute to what Hadfield calls "a picture of the Irish which was echoed throughout sixteenth-century chronicles, accounts, political analyses, and government reports on the Irish" (26). It was generally, as the *View* sets out, a picture of a culture's failure to advance.

Hadfield also cites William Herbert's Latin treatise, *Croftus Sive De Hibernia Liber* (circa 1591), as influencing Irenius' plan for the transplantation of the Irish population, and Richard Beacon's *Solon his Follie, or a political discourse touching the reformation of commonweals conquered, declined or corrupted* (1594), a Machiavellian dialogue on statecraft that informed Spenser's recommendation for root and branch intervention in the Irish polity. Hadfield sees these texts as shaping Spenser's judgement of the Irish as so degenerate that only a brutal, central power can tame them (59).

Camden's *Britannnia* (1586), as well as its predecessor John Leland's *Itinerary*

(*circa* 1540), offer laboriously compiled “right descriptions” of Britain and England respectively. Both authors claimed to restore antiquity to their native land. Camden’s aim was to “give antient affairs a new air, throw light upon obscure points.”⁴⁴ Leyland’s project was to bring “manye thynges to clere knowledge, whyche have longe remayned in horrible darknesse”.⁴⁵ Irenius, using antiquarian figures of speech, maintains that Stanyhurst “Coulede see in the darke” (104). Eudoxus, however, disagrees. He views this historian as operating in the “darknes which hath not let him see the lighte of the truethe” (104). He cites Stanyhurst’s “blinde Conceipte” that the Irish were descended from the “*Aegiptians* which Came into that Iland firste under the leadinge of one *Scota* the daughter of *Pharao*” (104). His mistake, claims Eudoxus, stems from an erroneous etymology that derives that Irish war cry “Ferragh” from the word “Pharao”. Instead of being “Carried awaie with olde wyves tales” he should have searched “more nerely into the secrete of these thinges” (104). In other words, if a man like Stanyhurst aspires to discover the nation--as both Camden and Leland did, who both declared that they undertook their prodigious labours out of love to their native land and offered restitution, the return of cultural treasures, as an act of patriotism--then he must reject popular mythology and look to a more rigorous methodology. Above all, he must get his etymologies right.

As we have seen, Eudoxus enthuses generally over Irenius’ “discourse into the manye swete remembraunces of Antiquities” (81), and his bent is always to seek out the “firste beginninge” (50) in all points of law, custom and religion, but his first love is etymology. Eudoxus eagerly inquires into the derivation of words. He wants to know about the term “Brehon” (47), he launches into his own derivation for “Tanist” (51), and

he ‘woulde gladlie knowe what ye Call a Countye Pallantine’ (74). He urges Irenius to digress upon the terms “Coigny” and “Livery” (78), and to expound upon the words “kincongish” and “cesse” (131). Throughout the dialogue Eudoxus lights upon strange words. Etymology, a highly regarded and important means of antiquarian investigation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, is the ultimate authority for Eudoxus. It is what Andrew Hadfield calls his “final frontier” (108). This form of scholastic inquiry, by which proper names offered up the secret of identity and origins, is central to Verstegen’s *Restitution*.

Verstegen’s *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* turns etymology into English national history.⁴⁶ Verstegen singles out language as the key to discovering the nation. His focus on language, and on English as a Teutonic language, allows him to purify the English as an entirely Germanic nation, descended from the Saxons. Furthermore, his celebration of Saxon warrior culture precludes any necessity of contact with a “superior”, classical society for the achievement of civilization. What I want to suggest is that Verstegen’s antiquarian study offers a kind of writing on nationalism that celebrates an ethnic detachment from other cultures even as it authorizes that ethnic nationalism by focusing it on civility.

Verstegen’s research into the descent of the English nation is offered, more or less explicitly, as an enterprise of such nationalism. In “The Epistle To Our Nation” Verstegen makes it clear that he distinguishes Englishmen from Britons, and that he seeks to restore that famous nation’s rich antiquity. He reverses Camden’s position on the relation of Saxons to Britons. “[H]ow ridiculous it must seem,” he says, “unto the posteritie of the Britans, for Englishmen to borrow honor from them, not needing to

borrow it of any in the world".⁴⁷ The prefatory verses commend his endeavour "T'explayne the noble race of *Englishmen*" and "Raise up thy nations ancient woorthy fame". Thomas Shelton celebrates his friend's careful noting of "The ancient records of thy native Ile/ Where fame such actes and monuments did cote/ As few their lyke are found in forrain soile".

Shelton's poem of praise places *A Restitution* within a field of other nationalist enterprises, and Verstegen confirms this idea in his own verses concerning his work. "[A]ll men seek all what they may to know" he says, and claims that "This desyre hath lastly moved mee". Comparing his labours to a pilgrimage, "The relykes of his ruines for to see," he declares that "for the love to my deer nation due, / The things concerning them which I did view, / Tending to English honor earst concealed, / Heer in my travails map I have revealed." Verstegen concludes his verses by designating the English nation as one of four under James Stuart: "Fowre nations now are subject to his might, / Though each to other strange accompeded bee, / Strange unto them none can him deem of right, / Of royall blood of each of these is hee". Verstegen's *English* nation is thus rendered in contradistinction to the other nations that make up imperial Britain under a king whom Verstegen calls "Jacobus Magnus".

Verstegen offers the Tower of Babel as the point of origin for the plurality of nations generally.⁴⁸ The Babel story provides what George Steiner (1992) has called a "dispersal myth", and a framework of national difference, that is founded on language. "[A]fter the great and general Deluge, there was," Verstegen says, "but one language, and consequently but one nation in the whole world; until the tyme of the frustrate attempt of the towre of *Babel*" (2). To this universal language is added a universal labour under the

rule of one man, Nemroth, who took upon him “the first domination over others” (4). “[A]ll men of the world” were employed “in this first & greatest woork of the world” (3), begun in mistrust of God. The high tower was “to provyde a remedy for their safety, yf God should once againe drown the world” (4). As a punishment, God bereft them of “their own natural and general speech,” and gave them instead “seaventie & twoo different tounes or languages” (5).

This is the point at which Verstegen erects his own monument to the English nation. He says:

And heer leaving this towre, by these new languaged masons thus left unfinished, I must among them begin to lay the foundation of another buylding, upon which the noble & honorable English name and nation must afterward bee erected. (5)

Verstegen begins his investigation into the Saxon heritage of the English with the people of the “ample and spacious countrey of Germanie” who are distinguished from each other “upon divisions of governments among themselves, upon the nature & condition of the soile...of the names of such great men or comaunders as some might leane unto” (13-4), as well as by their habits, their manner of beards, and by the weapons the men bear. Etymology is the key to the restitution of decayed intelligence here, and the place to start is with the mother tongue. After dismissing classical authorities on the origin of the Saxon name, he says: “I leave the reader to judge: as also whether the mother tongue of every nation, is not the greatest and best conserver of such originall

names, as properly appertain to the said tounge and nation” (19). By this method Verstegen comes to the conclusion that the Saxon name “undoubtedly” derives from “their use and wearing of a certaine kynd of sword or weapon invented and made bowing crooked, much after the fassion of a sythe, in imitation whereof it should seem to have first bin made” (21).

The Scythians are also named as weapon-bearers. They “gat and remayned with that name because of there great use of shooting” (23). Given what Verstegen says about the Saxon name, “which proceeding of the bearing of armes can no way bee dishonorable, but in deed very honorable” (24), the Scythian name, too, must be a badge of courage.

Eudoxus sees the Scythian ancestors of the Irish, along with the Gaules, as “two as mightye nacions as eer the worlde broughte forthe” (92). Furthermore, there are monuments left behind them that point the way back to the restitution of that cultural heritage. The custom of “Bolloyinge”, or transhumance, for example, and the custom of wearing mantles and “gibbes”, a hank of hair over their faces, are tokens of that proud, native past. Irenius recounts this past, it seems, only to show how it has failed to change and adapt to modern conditions, and how it poisons initiatives for progress.⁴⁹ Yet, given Eudoxus’ steady pressure to rescue such cultural treasure from oblivion, the *View*’s ethnographic inquiry also inadvertently salutes, in the manner of Verstegen, the resolute and hardy cattle-rearing roots of a brave, warrior culture as a foundation for Irish sovereignty. Authorized thus, the patchwork regionalism of clan culture might seem to possess its own horizontal principals of national unity through Brehon law, tanistry, gravelkind, and the Gaelic language, a unity that opposes vertical cohesion with the rest

of Britain under Elizabeth. The articulation of Irish nationalism that emerges from the reinstatement of these Scythian monuments in the *View* is not, as I have already suggested, deliberate on Spenser's part. What the inadvertent articulation of these contestatory nationalisms points to is Spenser's apprehension of another version of cultural agency, another form of communal *dominium* providing the basis for social life and for justice, as well as another idea of national independence, or sovereignty, *separate* from statehood.⁵⁰ Spenser's experience of cultural contact and his apprehension of cultural difference inform the interactive clash of histories, nationalisms and personalities in this dialogue.

Spenser had access to a formal literature that celebrated the values that emerged from communal ownership. He read Gaelic poems in translation. This poetry glorified feuding and cattle raiding as proof of valour.⁵¹ This glorification of tribal infighting ultimately affirms a concept of *dominium* that is not tied to utility or to adding value to resources. Feuding is a consequence of the Irish method of inheritance known as tanistry. Thomas Campion observes in his *Historie of Ireland* (1571) of this manner of inheritance, in which property "descendeth not to the Sonne, but to the Brother, Nephew, or Cousin germaine eldest and most valient," that it is a custom which "breedeth among them continuall Warres and treasons" (28).⁵² It supports a Gaelic culture geared to constant displays of daring that deplete the population. This chronic self-persecution helps to preserve a society in which property is held in common. It does this by keeping the population down to what the undeveloped land can carry. Irenius is therefore correct in seeing cattle stealing and feuding as the very nurse and teat of Irish enormities generally, for they lead back to cultural difference and to an ethnic nationalism that

resists assimilation into civic statehood.

But it is language, before literature, that holds the key to national identity for both Eudoxus and Verstegen. When Verstegen goes into “the ancient manner of lyving of our Saxon ancestors,” describing in detail their laws, their customs and their religion, his method is, as before, to stick with the mother tongue.⁵³ His information is “Partly gathered, out of the writings of sundry learned German authors: partly out of old books and records in the *Teutonic-toung*, and supplied by observation of sundrie things, which long tradition hath reserved in their posteritie” (55). The etymology of native words delivers up the secret of national identity from an insider’s perspective, and connects this national honour to the process and/or the idea of dwelling. Verstegen offers lengthy derivations for Saxon legal terms, their days of the week, and their gods. Half the book is devoted specifically to the derivation of words. One chapter is devoted to “The Great Antiquitie Of Our Ancient English Toung...With an explanation of sundry our moste ancient English words”. Another chapter is given over to “The Etymologies of the Ancient Saxon Proper Names”, yet another to the surnames of the ancients, and another to “Our Ancient English Tytles of Honor Dignities, and Offices”. He even includes a short section on “The Etymologies of Our english names of contempt”.

As part of his restitution of decayed intelligence Verstegen also offers etymologies for the Saxon names for the twelve months of the year, because the names “wee now call them by, wee have in aftertyme borrowed from the french and Latin, they having bin unto our anceters wholly unknowne” (59). The Saxon names for the months have “such names, as the nature of their seasons did aptest requyre” (58). Thus January was called “wolf-moneth” because at that time people were more apt to be devoured by

wolves than at any other time of the year. “Sprout-kele”, or February, was known for the first edible plants that “yield out wholesome yong sprouts...Both for sustenance & helth” (59). March was known as “Length-moneth” because that was when the days outlasted the nights, and April as “Oster-moneth” for the winds that blew from the “ost” or east. May was “Trimilk” because “they milked their cattle three times a day, and June was “Weyd-moneth” because the cattle “did then weyd in the meddowes” (61). July was “Hey-moneth” because then they mowed, and August “Arn-moneth”, or “barn-moneth” for the barns filled with corn. September was called “Gerst-moneth” on account of the barley (“gerst”) harvest that went into their beer, and October had the name “Wyn-moneth” for the wines that came in from abroad. November was known as “Wynd-moneth” because of the blustering Boreas that caused “ship-men to shrowd themselves at home” (62), and December was given the name “Winter-moneth”.

According to Benedict Anderson (1983), “the idea of a sociological organism moving calendrically through homogeneous, empty time is a precise analogue of the idea of the nation” (31).³⁴ Verstegen’s calendar highlights the process and the idea of dwelling that Anderson implicitly invokes here. Anderson’s idea of the nation, “conceived as a solid community moving steadily down (or up) history” (31), emerges in Verstegen’s calendar. Spenser’s *The Shepheardes Calendar* (1579) confirms Spenser’s participation in the modern discourse of nationalism that Verstegen’s text exemplifies. The unforeseen effect of this participation in the *View* is the expression of an ethnic Irish nationalism.

We have already seen how Eudoxus scoffed at Richard Stanyhurst’s claim of Egyptian ancestry for the Irish. Verstegen feels the same way about “the folly of men”

that have “given the glorie” of “almoste all that is excellent in all *Europa*” to that “fugitive people”, the Trojans (92). He attributes this blind conceit to “lack of lerning in former ages” and “the lack of letters” (93). This is not said in blame, but by way of explanation. Not even the “Druydes themselves” had any knowledge of letters, and thus wanted the “best meanes to conserve their true antiquities” (93). The onus, therefore, is on “their posteritie” having come to the knowledge of letters, that had “both this & other things belonging to their antiquities, long before bin worn out of remembrance” to rescue the truth from oblivion.

This is exactly what Verstegen does, to England’s and Englishmen’s repute, with his *Restitution*. Even “the general name of Englishmen,” which he derives from the ancient Teutonic word for narrow, denoting the narrowness of the country, and also from the angelic brightness of their Saxon countenances, becomes in his hands “a name of such glorie as the derivation sheweth it” (149).

Irenius digs up antiquities that have “long before bin worn out of remembrance” for the sake of *discrediting* the Irish nation. He demonizes the Irish common law, Brehon law, *because* of its indigenous base. He tells Eudoxus that Brehon law arose “out of the manners of the people and abuses of the Countrey” (65), but he derides its ethnic limitations by pointing to Lycurgus who, if he had “made it deathe for the Lacedemonioans to steale, they being a people which naturallye delighte in stealthe...theare shoulde have bene fewe Lacedemonians lefte” (69). He adds a scoffing modern analogy too. “[I]f it shoulde be made a Capitall Cryme for the Fflemminges to be taken in drunkenesse,” he adds, there would be even “fewer fflennynges” left than Lacedemonians (69). An ethnic base to law, custom or religion keeps a culture down to

the involuntary aspects of human life that are linked to the accidents of birth. It blocks a society tuned to voluntary accomplishment and willed association. Unlike the English under William the Conqueror, who, from being a “stoute and warlike” people, are “now broughte unto that Civilytie that no nacion in the worlde excelleth them”(54), the Irish reject the benefits of foreign contact and civil conversation. They prefer to stick stubbornly to their own primal institutions. Thus he argues for breaking their Irish polity that “doe kepe the woodes spoilinge and infestinge the good subiecte” (149). “[A]ll the Realme is first to be reformed and lawes are afterwarde to be made for the kepinge and Continewinge in that reformed estate” (147).

Irenius has to battle Eudoxus’ keen interest in decayed intelligence about Ireland to push this plan to the forefront of their conversation. He also has to speak over the impact of Ireland’s ethnic heritage, or what Eudoxus calls “the manye swete remembraunces of Antiquities” that Eudoxus points up with his enthusiastic reception of this material. Words, artifacts and practices are monuments to Ireland’s ethnic heritage that have endured long--too long, according to Irenius--unchanged by cultural contact with other nations. Irenius has to speak over Verstegen’s Saxons too, who were given to “conversing together among themselves in great love and freindlynesse,” as “an essential cause of the augmentation of their prosperitie” (55), with his Irish who are “Augmented with their owne lewde lives and filthie Conversation” (137). What is healthy for the Saxons is diseased for the Irish. It is the “filthie Conversation” of the Irish amongst themselves that has “bred in them this generall disease that Cannot but onelye with verye stronge purgations be Clensed and Carryed awaie” (137-8). This pernicious culture is also an enduring ethnic culture with the potential for nationalist claims all its own. To

Irenius this society appears culturally invincible, and he sees extermination and emasculation as the only sure solution to Gaelic resistance.

Irenius, focused on discrediting the Irish, and Eudoxus, keen on discovering the nation, trace Irish ethnic origin back to the Scythians in the north. The Irish, concludes Irenius. “are verye Scottes or Scythes originallye though sithens intermingled with manye other nacions repayringe and ioyninge unto them” (197). The Spaniards arrived in the west, the Gauls in the south and old Britons in the East. The Saxons and the English followed them, but no in-coming nation has managed to avoid the contagion that was mixed in “the firste evill ordinaunce and institution of that Comon wealthe” (96), says Irenius. Those who dwell in Ireland suck into their licentious, ethnic circle those who travel there. “[T]he Butlers the dempsies the ketins the Connours/ Ocarroll Omoloy and all that heape of Irishe nacions which lie hundreds together without anie to overawe them” (189) self-pullulate and poison whatever they touch. They are unvanquished by conquest, immigration, embassy and education, and invincible to reform.

Irenius tells the same story when it comes to religion. The “firste Institucion and plantinge of religion in all that realm” is to blame for the fact that, as Eudoxus puts it, the Irish still “lye weltering” in “spirituall darkenes”, despite the civil conversation and example of “so manye nacions” (137). A narcissistic Irish nationhood is to blame for the festering malaise that blocks Ireland’s reformation and incorporation into the imperial state. Their cultural invincibility marks their barbarism. “[G]reatlye given to warre” (217), and the “desire of warrs and tumults” (218), as befits their barbarous nature, the bellicose Irish are “ever Acquainted with warrs though but Amongest themselves” (47). Inbred to violence, they are also trained up to their own, unmixed common law that is

protected from the adulteration of conquest by the system of lateral inheritance known as tanistry. From one generation to the next, they are freed from a conquered mentality by an idea of inheritance that blocks the goods, or the sins, of the father from being passed automatically to the son. Brehon law, tanistry and feudal in-fighting, all bred from the same cultural mother--in Eudoxus' etymology the term tanistry derives from "those Barbarous nacions that overranne the worlde" (51)--fructify each other. This inbred barbarity is, in turn, nurtured by a system of insecure tenure that requires regular blood-letting of the population *and* leaves tenants free to be at the landlord's command and ready to "followe him into what accion soever hc shall enter" (134).

But if the Irish are barbarous in being undefeated by cultural communion, they yet endure. The flower of Irish nationhood, inbred from the first plantings of national self-consciousness, may be sick, but it seems strong. Spenser's Irish are not Sherley's Turks, barbaric to the core.⁵⁵ Irenius maintains that Ireland *had* the cultural requirements for statehood--law, custom and Christian religion--but that the nation has failed to develop these resources through imitation of a superior, Protestant, English model. In other words, a policy of love and accommodation has failed to bring harmony to this political marriage, and a strong hand is called for to restore right supremacy and peace. Irenius' diagnosis as to why Ireland has failed to thrive frames his projected program for ethnic cleansing authorized by civility and the claims of statehood. Powerfully over-determined, this visualized program, or "play within a play", leaves Eudoxus with a picture of "a people so humbled and prepared...I see yee maie doe what youe please" (198). No doubt this vision of rebels so "humbled and prepared" was designed to motivate Spenser's audience to adopt this taming program and begin a war of

annihilation. But the restitution of decayed intelligence that fires imperial conquest also reveals the reason for resistance. According to Charles Taylor (1999), the “reason why some minorities assimilate and others fight back has to be referred to the nationalism of the latter” (223).⁵⁶ Spenser’s *View*, imbricated between two kinds of contemporary writing on nationalism, both focused on a civility that redeems aggression, declares for brutal imperial conquest, but in the process discovers the ground for imperial resistance. This cross marks the spot where the Janus-faced cultural knowledge of a traveller who chose to dwell lies buried. I say buried because, ultimately, what does a traveller, who would dwell displaced from home, do with such knowledge? It is, to some extent, the problem of the intellectual in society, as well as the predicament of the poet who writes on politics.

“Unbless some mother”

David McCrone, in *The Sociology of Nationalism* (1998), has noted that “the ‘past’ is a powerful source of legitimacy for those who would change the present for the new future” (52).¹ Spenser’s modern and antiquarian history of Ireland attempted to persuade Elizabeth to make a famine where abundance lies, that is, to exercise arbitrary government in Ireland rather than continue with an accommodating regime. I have argued that early modern statehood, understood as a public order distinct from the monarch’s will, was tied to an expansionist and imperial political dynamic in the *View*. Statehood becomes a form of colonization and cultural obliteration in Spenser’s travel relation. In this chapter, I will argue that statehood is *opposed* to an absolutist, imperial order in *Macbeth*.² National statehood, as an institutional limit on the monarch’s power that constitutes national identity, emerges as an anti-imperial and anti-absolutist account of government in this text.

Macbeth sets two forms of governance against each other: absolutism and mixed government. To be more specific, the play pits an imperial order, from which absolutism emerges as a logical consequence of integration and standardization, against a national state system presided over by a hereditary monarch. This is the kind of political conflict that emerged in the early years of Stuart rule, from 1604 to 1607. *Macbeth* is laden with anxiety over cultural and political vulnerability and charged with a dark, bloody and dreadful sense of obliteration. Like Spenser’s *View*, *Macbeth* is concerned with extermination. I read the play here as another turn in the story of the dialectical, and disjunctive, production of different personal, political and cultural domains that are

related to, and characterized by, the spatial practices and dynamics of travelling and dwelling.

Macbeth mythologizes the Stuart line and invokes a new Stuart monarchy for England “imaginable throughout the past.”³ It also anatomizes the absolutism inherent in James’ project for encompassing political, legal and commercial union between Scotland and England and their rationalization into a single polity of Great Britain following the union of Crowns in 1603.⁴ The play mobilizes history for James at the point of political change created by the union of Crowns, but it also registers the cultural and political anxieties exacerbated by James’ proposals for “perfect union” and a standardized government for Great Britain as a single political unit.⁵ *Macbeth* is granted a vision of a line of kings from Banquo’s line, some of which carry “twofold balls and treble sceptres” (4.1.121). This denotes the regalia of a multiple monarchy. “Britain” is not mentioned once in the play. Scotland and England, however, are invoked repeatedly.

By the seventeenth century, both Scotland and England possessed a constitution that limited the power of the monarchy. National identity and interests were tied to the institutions of this constitution. James’ imperial project of union would have allowed a monopoly of power that was centered on the monarch to arise. Many observers foresaw this consequence at the time; they saw in the creation of a single, new polity the end of all existing laws. The fear of political and cultural cancellation fueled objection to “perfect union” on the part of both Scottish and English governments. *Macbeth* is driven by a dread of individual, social and national annihilation. What I want to suggest is that *Macbeth* gives its voice to James as head of an ultimately Anglocentric mosaic state, that is to a story of mixed government, but takes it back, like a witch, when it comes to James

as an imperial, absolutist ruler of Great Britain.

I plan to trace the interactive clash between these two accounts of government by showing how *Macbeth* condenses political dynamics into contestatory masculinities. Oppositional forms of manhood, as Mark E. Kann (1998) has shown, do the work of gender opposition in male-centered political discourse.⁶ In *Macbeth*, different styles of manhood articulate the core values of rival political systems through agencies that are linked to the themes of travel and dwelling. Itinerants in time and space, preeminently Macbeth, oppose more settled men with a dynastic stake in the future, like Banquo and Duncan, who take on something of women's role and enjoy a nurturing, tender relationship with their children.

As a corollary to this approach, I situate the play in the immediate context of the debate surrounding the question of political union as well as a more general context of some early modern formulations on the relationship between the governing and the governed and the origins of resistance theory. I include an analysis of James' political rhetoric as part of this historical context. I argue that the play, as well as being an overtly political play that speaks to Stuart politics, also offers a general lesson in politics to the *polis*. The tragedy affords a lesson in the relentless and inevitable working through of political systems at the same time as it supports a Stuart monarchy for England.⁷ *Macbeth* offers up an age-old cyclic explanation of political change, like that offered by Irenius in the early part of Spenser's *View*. The play shows how governments and commonwealths all have their fatal periods. Change and revolution are brought about by structural weaknesses--what might be called "sin" in early modern terms--in a governing order's core value system, even before the regime is broken down by "liberators" or a

rival system from the outside. *Macbeth* shows how political systems advance, but also subvert themselves, resulting in one regime being founded, usually by the power of the sword, on the ruins of another. The play foments an atmosphere of general paranoia as rival forms of personal and political fashioning emerge from each other's internal breakdown.⁸ This paranoia in the play may well accord with the apprehension and distrust generated by James' vision of Great Britain and political amalgamation, a vision that set absolute rule against the nation and statehood.

The idea of union between England and Scotland had been a possibility on the horizon since the marriage in 1503 of James IV of Scotland and Margaret Tudor, daughter of Henry VII. It had been supported through subsequent decades by arguments that enlisted a common geography, language, ethnicity and religion to promote the idea of Britain as a bastion of the True Church against the forces of Antichrist. These Providentialist arguments for a manifest destiny of union--a Great Britain--resurfaced with increased vigour as Elizabeth ailed. *A Tract on the Succession to the Crown* (1602), very probably by Sir John Harington of *Orlando Furioso* fame, runs through these traditional arguments for political union by reviving the Duke of Somerset's written oration, *To the Nobles and Commonaltie of Scotland*, penned during Edward VI's reign.⁹ Harington's desire to please the monarch-in-waiting aside, the idea of such union appealed to those in favour of a Protestant England and to those who yearned for political reformation of almost any kind.¹⁰ Harington concludes the tract with *An Epigram*

Shewing How England Might Be Reformed. After itemizing the corruption of England's officers, he prays that "some new Officer mend old disorder/ Yes, one good *Stewart* might sett all in order".

The project of union also spoke to the issue of England's continued sovereignty. Thomas Wilson, in his *State of England* (1600), notes that "this Kingdome is an absolute Imperiall Monarchy held nether of Pope, Emperor, nor any but [of] God alone" (1). In using the term "imperial" here, Wilson means that the monarchy is not subject to the jurisdiction of some higher terrestrial power. It was Henry VIII who first employed the term "imperial" in this sense, when he claimed that he, and not the pope, was the Supreme Head of the Church in England. This sovereignty, in the last years of Elizabeth's reign, appears threatened. There are, notes Wilson, "12 Competitors that gape for the death of that good old Princess the now Queen, the Eldest Prince in yeares and raygne throughout Europe or our knowne World" (2). Listing these twelve, which include the King of Spain, the Infanta of Spain, the Duke of Parma, the King of Portugal's son and the King of France, as well as the King of Scotland, Wilson observes: "Thus you see this Crowne is not like to fall to the ground for want of heads that claime to weare it" (5). Wilson allays the anxieties this list stirs up a little by concluding: "I doe assure myselfe that the King of Scotland will carry it, as very many Englishmen doe know assuredly, but to determyne thereof is to all English capitally forbidden" (5). Wilson almost seems to be stirring up anxiety about the continuity of England's sovereignty here. Equally, it would seem that a union with Scotland would have had an appeal to all those who supported the continuation of English sovereignty.

These are just a few of the prompts behind England's ready acceptance of James

VI and I. There would be no reason *not* to welcome James, unless one was an enemy to England's sovereignty and peace. Even Roman Catholic agitators like Richard Verstegen bowed to James' accession. Verstegen's antiquarian history of the English nation, *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* (1605), is dedicated to King James VI and I.

Shakespeare had no reason not to give his voice to the throng of poets who welcomed the new king. It is a critical commonplace that *Macbeth* is a compliment to James. Alvin Kernan (1995) calls the play "a Stuart performance"; "basic patronage work" that must have left James Stuart feeling "enormously pleased".¹¹ There is no reason to disagree with this assessment. The play's mobilization of history invents a tradition of Stuart monarchy imaginable for England that facilitates the change in dynasty following the union of Crowns.

The play also upholds the institutional continuity of Scots sovereignty by invoking Scotland's ethnic past. According to Colin Kidd's (1999) study of ethnicity and nationhood in early modern Scotland, the history of the Gaelic Scots became the national history of all Scotland because "the Lowlands lacked a convincing or usable identity in which to construct a non-Gaelic version of Scottishness" (144). Therefore "this particular ethnic past justified the sovereignty of the whole" (124).¹² Like a palimpsest, Kidd notes, the institutional basis—that is, statehood—for limiting Scottish monarchy is written over "the ancient Gaelic assembly of clan chiefs" (142). Kidd sees a process in which ethnic history is exploited to "define Scotland's identity and the historical legitimacy of its institutions" (127) while "the subversive side of ethnic culture was at the same time attacked" (141). Thus this exploitation of ethnic history does not, as Kidd points out, preclude an anti-Gaelic cultural policy.

In describing the pacification of the borders in the first act, then, *Macbeth* invokes an ethnic past even as it describes how that ethnic culture was subdued. Indeed, the fabled MacBeth of the chronicle histories, upon whom Shakespeare drew for character and plot, was famous for having pacified the warring clans and the borders, and for maintaining peace in Scotland for ten years.¹³ Thus the play's mobilization of history legitimates James as monarch of *two* sovereign realms, Scotland and England. It would have been surprising if James were *not* enormously pleased. Nevertheless, in confirming James as a multiple monarch, *Macbeth's* mobilization of history relies on the institutional character of national identity and sovereignty; indeed, the play insists upon this corporate identity as the foundation for opposing tyranny.

If there were plenty of reasons to give one's voice to the union of Crowns, there were also good reasons, as many historians of the union have noted, to take it back when it came to James' plan for a more complete, or "perfect union" between the two sovereign states. Scotland and England had different systems of law and ecclesiastical government, different parliamentary procedures and different commercial strengths and interests. Despite the relief from political anxiety that James' accession brought, and despite threats, real and perceived, from Catholic Europe, the proposals for comprehensive union put forward by the king's Commissioners for Union were controversial because, notwithstanding bonds of language, religion and geography, the Scottish and English polities had developed as distinct states and stood to lose discrete identity and agency in the merging of their Parliaments and legal systems.

Modern commentators on the union, like Bruce Galloway (1986), Brian Levack (1987), Keith Brown (1992), Claire McEachern (1996) and Theodore Rabb (1998), have

noted that the attempt to rationalize the government of the two states by political integration prompted fears of royal aggrandizement and stimulated a debate about precedence.¹⁴ How could the states be united thus unless one gave way to the other? And what precedents existed for the creation of a new name arising from political union? Both states feared that the fashioning of a new, integrated empire of Great Britain would enhance royal prerogative and personal rule at the expense of a system of government based on consent between the monarch and existing institutions of state. If James were to rule the British Isles as a single political unit it would mean the dissolution of all kinds of existing laws and political identities. Andrew D. Nicholls (1999), in a recent reconsideration of the Jacobean Union, has noted that the “union of the crowns was vested in the person of James VI/I himself and was not indicative of any new formal relationship between his two sovereign states” (12).¹⁵ Yet it seemed that this “new formal relationship” between these two states was exactly what the king was trying to push through with the plan for amalgamating union.

Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* goes with the flow of tracts, poems, sermons, addresses, and panegyrics that celebrated the Union of Crowns. It also caters to James’ Scottishness by offering a *Scottish*-centered view of the dynastic union’s origin. But as a work laden with anxiety over impending dissolution, the play also registers the danger for national identity posed by the new regal union; it questions the positive moral value attributed to a new, imperial order by the Stuart king.

Spenser’s traveller in the *View*, Irenius, argues for assimilating Ireland into statehood with England. The political consequence of this over-arching conception of peaceful and prosperous civic unity is absolute rule in Ireland and extermination of the

rebel Irish. The exercise of royal prerogative emerges as a logical way of cutting through the confusion created by the operation of two systems of law in Ireland. James' vision of imperial integration is also legitimized by the idea of liberating his subjects from tumult and bringing peace, prosperity and unity to a troubled realm. The logical political consequence of this union, as objectors to the project realized, was the exercise of royal prerogative and personal rule. James' imperial project implicitly supports absolutist government at the expense of monarchical coexistence with an institutional order. By analogy, Macbeth's pacification of warring factions, the order and unity he imposes on a Scotland divided by faction, underwrite his overthrow of existing norms. Absolute rule emerges as a logical political consequence of union in *Macbeth*, just as it did in the *View*. (Macbeth's inter-world subjectivity, his trafficking between the real and the imaginary, offer another kind of union that also promotes absolute rule.) In the *View*, the imposition of statehood affords the means of imperial incorporation. *Macbeth*, I suggest, reformulates the relation of empire to the state and points up the threat of cultural and political obliteration as the price of imperial assimilation.

Objectors in the House of Commons to James' idea of "perfect union" saw the institutions of state and national identity threatened by James' vision of imperial order. Sir Edwin Sandys, described by Bruce Galloway (1986) as "an enigmatic figure whose precipitate rise in the Commons came in these debates" (21), pointed out that "perfect" political union, entailing union in laws, offices and styles, only occurred in union by conquest and not in that of marriage or election.¹⁶ From this perspective, James' soothing and mystifying political rhetoric of marriage masks the design of conquest.¹⁷ As Galloway (1986) has noted, Sandys went on to point out that the creation of a complete

or “perfect union”, a Great Britain, would not only cancel existing laws, it would also prevent legislation by either national parliament.¹⁸ James alone would have constitutional authority. Sandys gave voice to a general concern that incorporation and supranational, encompassing imperial government suppressed the community’s participation in power. Perfect union would strengthen royal prerogative at the expense of state power.

Sandys’ intervention was decisive. His biographer Theodore Rabb (1998) notes that in 1604 Sandys made a speech on James’ project of union that marked the emergence “not just of an unexpected advocate of consultation and consent in English politics, but of a momentous new stage in the relations between Crown and subject” (57).¹⁹ Sandys seized the opportunity for leadership “and a major conflict between Crown and subject was born” (61). Sandys exploited and widened the gap between king and state to pit an imperial order against a state system, that is, one form of government against another. Ultimately, the debate was not about which form of government was most *effective*, but about which style of governance best suited the British Isles as a political entity.

Galloway points out that pamphleteers took up Sandys’ important distinctions and insights on the subject of union. Sandys’ points were also included in a list of objections to political union that was compiled by a committee under Sir Francis Bacon. This list circulated widely in manuscript form. Under objections pertaining to “the matter of generality or common reason” the committee makes clear that

We find no precedent, at home or abroad, of uniting or contracting of the names of two several kingdoms into one name, where the union hath grown by marriage or blood; and that those examples which may be alleged,

as far as we can find, are but in the case of conquest.²⁰

The committee also points out, under the matter of “estate inward”, that “acts instruments, and forms of policy and government, with a multitude of other forms of Records, Writs, Pleadings and Instruments,” all “run now in the name of England...upon the change would be drawn into uncertainty and question.”²¹ The imperial project of a Great Britain was understood as playing to James’ well-known penchant for absolute rule. Both nation states, Scotland and England, feared a conquest under pretense of a match.

So, for many in England, James’ talk of peaceful integration, of pacific empire, constituted a suppression of the English community’s involvement with power. Claire McEachern (1996), in her overview of the English debate over the proposed union of England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland into the one polity of Great Britain, says that “the greatest objection to the union lay in the perception of it as the vehicle of an unrestrained monarchic will” (146).²² McEachern claims, as she plots the course of the debate, that “James’ engulfing vision of national consolidation” was “the chief threat to the traditional shape of English identity” (158).

There were many in Scotland too that feared for their political status and identity within such encompassing union. George Buchanan, James’ own tutor, as well as the Presbyterian Church, from which the crown was excluded, and members of the legal profession, were opposed to the idea of perfect union.²³ The objectors to integration in both England and Scotland were advocates for, and participants in, the state as a depersonalized public order that was distinct from the will of the monarch. Even those

Scots and English who wrote treatises in favour of union stressed their shared institutions and promoted the concept of a new British state rather than the idea of an imperial monarchy.

Objectors to James' vision of perfect union were accused by the King's supporters of unnatural self-love, that is, of incivility. What James himself does in his political rhetoric generally is to appropriate values attached to civility for his own vision of unity; he legitimizes this integrated, imperial order by appealing to social harmony, prosperity and peace. Harping on the realm's long history of warfare, he stresses the material and spiritual benefits that attend his accession to the English throne. The political consequence that flows from this vision of peace and prosperity throughout the united kingdoms is, however, a program of centralized rule that is concentrated in his person. In other words, the very delivery of this public good permits a monopoly of power to arise that can maintain public order and prevent chaos.

In his first speech to Parliament, published soon after it was delivered in March 1603, James ties the coming of peace, both at home and abroad, to the singular authority of his corporeal person.²⁴ James informs his audience that he has always kept "peace and amitie with all," and that this ability to effect harmony and order has been "tyed to my person" (270). He calls Parliament as witnesses to this fact. He says that "I found the State embarqued in a great and tedious warre," and that "onely by mine arrivall here, and by the Peace in my Person, is now amite kept, where warre was before, which is no smal blessing to a Christian Common-wealth" (270). James goes on to say that such peace "abroad with their neighbours" enables towns to flourish, merchants to grow rich and trade to increase, to the end that "the people of all sorts of the Land enjoy free libertie to

exercise themselves in their severall vocations without perill or disturbance" (270).

James represents himself here as the guardian of the public weal and nurturer of the people's capacity to develop as economic and moral agents.

In addition to this "great blessing" of "outward peace", James also claims, through the singular power of his corporeal person, to have conferred the yet greater good of "peace within". Pointing to his descent from Henry VII, James observes that in his person he confirms the union of Lancaster and York founded by "that King of happy memorie". His remark, that "the lamentable and miserable events by the Civill and bloody dissension betwixt these two Houses," that was "so great and so late, as it need not be renewed unto your memories" (271), serves to emphasize the pacific effect that accrues to his singular physical presence as ruler.

The *copia* of peaceful blessings conferred by James' own body grows as the speech continues. "But the Union of these two princely Houses," he declares, "is nothing comparable to the Union of two ancient and famous Kingdomes, which is the other inward Peace annexed to my Person" (271). This union between Scotland, England and Wales, "which is made in my blood," also brings peace on the basis that the powerful monarchy thus created from smaller, weaker kingdoms deters foes from both home and abroad. For, as "Nature teacheth us, that Mountaines are made of Motes," so, in the fullness of time, by virtue of the king's person, "little Kingdomes" are now "ioyned into great Monarchies, whereby they are become powerfull within themselves to defend themselves from all outward invasions" (271). Not only this, but the kingdom rendered thus powerful, says James, may also "punish private transgressions within" (271).

James practices here what Mark E. Kann (1998) has called "symbolic politics".

James summons, as Irenius does in the *View*, “the spectre of past, present, and future crises to arouse public anxiety” which justifies “powerful political leadership to assuage it” (147).²⁵ James’ concern here is with real and imaginary tumults; he blurs boundaries, fomenting an interlinked economy of appearance and reality to support the necessity of strong, unconstrained rule. The delivery of peace as the public weal’s most vital good, and the circulation of energies between real and imaginary zones, plays to the hand of royal prerogative.

By stressing the discord that prevailed before his accession, James accentuates the peaceful order that ensues from the power of his person as king, and by emphasizing the peace that attends his royal person, he implicitly advocates the rule of a single power.²⁶ James’ rhetoric here accords with scholastic political theorists who placed the good and safety of the community in the preservation of peace, and who saw civil discord, especially internal faction, as a threat to the continued existence of a polity.²⁷ The simplest way to avoid such discord was to confine the legitimate use of power to a single, central institution, to place a plenitude of power in the hands of one body.

James’ political rhetoric generally seems to have been informed by this principle. To this end he had always represented himself in his political works as the loving husband or father to his people. He insists, as a corollary to this, that the ruler should consult the common good before his own private pleasure. James emphasizes his own fatherly *pietas*--his responsibility to others in preference to his personal desires--and he maintains that the ruler should fashion laws and government according to what he sees as pertaining to the common good. In James’ view, the common good is best served by peace. The politics of peace promote centralized control of an entire, heterogeneous

society. James' emphasis on peace as the basis of the common good, as well as his design for political integration, plays to his penchant for absolutist government.²⁸

So, by placing so much emphasis on peace and tying it to his royal person, James paves the way for the exercise of royal prerogative. Calling up long-standing fears of Catholic and Spanish invasion, and old anxieties over internal discord, James stimulates a desire for peace.²⁹ His rhetoric here is directed, ultimately, towards fashioning an authoritarian regime that overrides the existing state systems in both Scotland and England.³⁰ His *defensive* union, predicated on the idea of internal and external peace, masks the amplification of his authority that only comes with conquest; it does not, as James claimed it would in his first speech to Parliament, constitute an amicable *alternative* to conquest. "[S]ince the success was happie of the *Saxons* Kingdomes being conquered by the speare of *Bellona*," he argues, "How much greater reason have wee to expect a happie issue of this greater Union, which is only fastened and bound up by the wedding Ring of *Astrea*?" (273).

James' emphasis on peace extended to denouncing war as a policy tool in this speech to Parliament. He promised, as a king, that he would never be the first to break "this outward Peace so inseparably tyed to my person" (270). He swore "to interrupt your publique Peace" for no "private passion of mind," but only for an honourable or a just cause. James said he would embark upon "a secure and honourable warre" for the "reparation of the honour of the Kingdom, or else by necessitie for the weale and preservation of the same" (270). James concedes the possibility of a just war despite desiring peace. Thus James lays claim to be the sole authorizer of war and peace for the polity. With all this capacity for war and peace tied to his person, James himself

becomes the dominant protective agency in the realm. As the instrument of inward and outward peace and sole arbiter over the permissibility of violence in this newly joined territory, James' very person embodies what Max Weber calls "the single power principle", or rule by one body.³¹

For James to come to the English throne calling for "perfect union", emphasizing peace as the basis of the common good while claiming that the common good is tied to his person, was to suppress the community's existing involvement with power. Parliamentary objectors to political union understood this. James had to give up the idea of "perfect union". The English didn't want it. The Scots didn't want it. Not yet. Not there. "Opposition to virtually every aspect of his project," observes Brian Levack (1987), "arose either in Scotland, or in England, or in both kingdoms"(8).³² Andrew D. Nicholls (1999) concludes: "Once amalgamation had been staved off in 1607, comprehensive union ceased to be an *expressed* Stuart initiative until 1669" (17).

In fact, long before he came to the English throne, James VI was known for having successfully suppressed the chronic feuding that had characterized Scotland's political scene for generations.³³ He had a reputation for bringing the kind of peace that strengthened his own authority, as did the fabled MacBeth of the chronicle histories, upon whom Shakespeare drew for character and plot.

Shakespeare's "Bellona's bridegroom", too, by the singular power of his extraordinary person, brings peace to the realm. Single-handedly, it seems, Shakespeare's Macbeth quells the rebellion of Macdonwald and Cawdor and pacifies the troubled kingdom. This same peace ushers in Macbeth's tyranny. In Macbeth's world, peace means death. The dead are those whom Macbeth, "to gain our peace, have sent to

peace" (3.3.20). According to Macbeth, Duncan sleeps well in his grave. Nothing can disturb him there, neither "steel, nor poison, /Malice domestic, foreign levy, nothing/ Can touch him further" (3.2.23-6). Rosse tells Macduff, in the knowledge that Macduff's wife and children are dead, that "they were well at peace when I did leave 'em" (4.3.178). Macduff's comfort is that "Heaven rest them now" (4.3.227).

The kind of peace Macbeth brings points up the danger he represents to the state. Despite the traditional stoic association between peace and death, whereby death beckons as a form of happy ease after the bitter toils of life, it seems clear that tyranny, terror and extermination emerge as a consequence of Macbeth's pacification of Scotland. His bloody peace involves the systematic elimination of resistance to his rule and the virtual destruction of Scotland.

Macbeth resents power passing to Duncan's son. In killing Duncan, he takes the crown with an "unlineal hand." What activates Macbeth to murder is power that flows along family lines.³⁴ His bloody peace involves an endless rooting-out procedure along these hereditary paths. The play distinguishes between two modes of power transfer, and two styles of government, right from the start. A witch greets one returning warrior thus: "All hail, Macbeth, that shalt be King hereafter!" (1.3.50). To the other hero the witch says, "Thou shalt get kings, though thou be none" (1.3.67). Macbeth's kingship constitutes a new beginning imposed by his compact with disorderly women. Banquo's kingship involves a cycle of inheritance whereby power passes from father to son.

These rival versions of governance are compacted into opposed forms of manhood in *Macbeth*.³⁵ Both masculinities depend on civil conversation, on willed association or compact with others, for their political character. The difference between

these political systems rests on whether this compact is made with those who are the same, or with those who are different. Generative, procreative men, like Banquo and Duncan, are communitarian in outlook and form a corporate political entity, a fraternity of the same and a style of manhood founded ultimately, as Kann (1998) notes, on their jurisdiction over women. Their compact is with men who, presumably, govern their women. The fathers Duncan and Banquo, as self-perpetuating powers, signal governance that is a continuation of what passed before. They preside over a community actively involved with power. Thus they are mediators of an idea of mixed government--a form of government extolled as tending to unbroken longevity--and they are associated in *Macbeth* with cycles of natural growth. They manifest a version of collective agency operating in due course and season that is generated by the ongoing, uninterrupted, process of dwelling.

Duncan is a benignly paternalistic ruler, who promotes fellowship among political agents. This kind of concord involves respecting the office of the poet who celebrates the deeds of chronic, factional strife. Duncan pays courteous attention to the unnamed, bleeding sergeant as he sings of arms and the man--Macbeth--who took the field against the rebels and invaders. Duncan honours the bleeding soldier-poet, praises his words and applauds the hero of his song. Duncan's son, Malcolm, honours the soldier too. He makes known the sergeant's worthy deeds to the king, and addresses the "good and hardy soldier" as "brave friend". As the soldier-poet speaks, he bleeds. Both his spilling blood, that waters Scottish soil, and his torrent of words, that germinate in Duncan's thoughts, earn him paternal regard and honourable membership in their fraternity. Duncan orders surgeons for the "bloody man" whose words, he says, "have become thee as thy wounds,

/ They smack of honor both" (1.2.42-3). A bard of battle, the bleeding poet embodies and glorifies the bloody tumult of factional strife. As do the Gaelic bards in Spenser's *View*, the soldier-poet elevates the violence endemic to chronic feuding into cultural heroism.

After poets, loyal servants have their due. Father and son persistently address their loyal thanes as "worthy". Furthermore, Duncan is properly cognizant and grateful toward his warriors. The pains of Macbeth and Banquo are rewarded with gifts of grateful affection and noble title. Manifesting a developed sense of social justice and an appreciation of worth, Duncan proceeds to attend to the needs of the war-torn state by naming his successor. In doing so Duncan not only fosters political and inter-generational concord by renouncing patriarchal authority over his son, he also promotes fellowship among sons, kinsmen and thanes by promising to honour "all deservers" (1.4.42). Duncan's recognition of hereditary *and* legitimate right here signal him as a marker for mixed government.

Banquo is a generative, paternal and liberal figure after the manner of Duncan. He shall "be the root and father / Of many kings" (3.1.5-6). He is a figure who, in particular, mediates cultural production as a process of natural growth. When he speaks to the witches, he asks if they "can look into the seeds of time, / And say which grain will grow, and which will not" (1.3.58-9). As he approaches Inverness with Duncan he proves the castle a pleasant seat by noting that it is a place of procreation for the house martin; "no jutty, frieze, / Buttress, nor coign of vantage," he says, "but this bird, / Hath made his pendent bed and procreant cradle" (1.6.6-8). Later, in conversation with his son, when the stars are hidden at night he calls this "husbandry in heaven" (2.1.4).

Banquo and Duncan are liberal towards men but both are dismissive, disdainful

even, of the women they encounter, because their fraternity as political agents rests, ultimately, on their government of women, even to the point of expropriating their roles as nurturers, dwellers and lovers of men. Banquo makes a little merry with the witches and Duncan toys with Lady Macbeth. Malcolm claims to be “Unknown to woman”. Where they plant in their *political* family, or fraternity, however, they tend more courteously, and husband their seedlings. Duncan’s last words to Lady Macbeth are that he loves Macbeth “highly, / And shall continue our graces towards him” (1.6.30).

Duncan encourages fraternity and liberty in his political family by recognizing and rewarding valour. Of course, the more valour is rewarded the more fighting is generated. Political tumult is at full tilt in Duncan’s Scotland as the play opens. Such strife, from an authoritarian perspective, might seem to invite the appearance of a strong ruler who could impose order and peace and strengthen the polity rendered thus vulnerable to foreign and internal challenge. But Macdonwald’s and Cawdor’s revolt, and Norway’s hostile engagement, are not *simply* undesirable forms of strife, nor are they necessarily destructive of the state. Fair is foul, and foul is fair. All the butchery of battle accrues to Macbeth’s sword. The generous and gallant gestures of the conflict fall to Duncan and to Duncan’s enemies. While the lively horrors of war appear to make peace an imperative, when the man who rescues the state from bloody turmoil epitomizes all that is gruesome about such strife, it complicates the idea that armed conflict and discords are necessarily the worst threat to the commonwealth.

Notwithstanding the epic similes that aestheticize his violence in the battles of the first scene, all the manslaughter of battle comes from Macbeth’s strong arm. It is Macbeth’s sword that “smok’d with bloody execution” and “carv’d out his passage”

through a mass of men until he tracks down Macdonwald, slits open his body and takes his head off, all without a word, as if he were an assassin. Macbeth appears as a silent dedicated killer, a ferociously efficient engine of war who would “bathe in reeking wounds, / Or memorize another Golgotha” (1.3.39-41). As, or more, barbarous than any fabled Scythian, he is another Coriolanus, or an invincible and brutal Achilles.³⁶ He is sung as a hero, without whom the battle could not be won. Achilles, of course, fought for the promise of his own undying fame and not for the Greeks’ or Agammemnon’s benefit. He was a socially uncommitted warrior who adventured for his own glory, not for a community.³⁷

The restless adventurers of this play are Macbeth and, to a lesser extent, Cawdor. These figures mediate a politics of new beginnings, of willed and repeated rather than transmitted titles to power. Their compacts are made not with those within a self-same group, but with outsiders. Cawdor is believed to have “combin’d / With those of Norway” (1.3.111) or with the rebel Macdonwald and his forces from the Western Isles. Macbeth makes no compact with men at all. He joins forces with women.

Macbeth kills mothers, who make men fathers and sons, and he kills children, who are men’s posterity. Macbeth is some mother’s son, of course, but that is not the axis of his masculinity. It seems he might have been a father once, and Lady Macbeth a mother, but their impulse is not primarily intergenerational. Macbeth is no bachelor, but his bond to a fraternity, or *familia*, of men, is suspect because of his parochial bond to his wife.³⁸ Macbeth emancipates himself from his obligations to men for the sake of gains he stands to make through compact with his lady. As a killer bonded to his mistress above all others, Macbeth is a perverted chivalric adventurer. His castle at Inverness, as

described by Duncan and Banquo, conforms to the ideal fortress described by Christine de Pizan in *The Book of Deeds of Arms and of Chivalry*.³⁹ Elevated, with water nearby, situated in a fertile productive spot with good, healthful air away from swamps and marshes, Macbeth's castle "hath a pleasant seat, the air / Nimbly and sweetly recommends itself / Unto our gentle senses" (1.6.1-2), observes Duncan. Banquo adds that "heaven's breath / Smells wooingly here" (1.6.5), filling in, poetically, the details of elevation and fertility required of the ideal chivalric fortress. Macbeth, as a valiant, bold, strong and constant killer, parodies the chivalric warrior. Furthermore, as a pair, the champion and his consort pervert the loving couple of chivalric romance.

Macduff, in contrast, does not put his parochial family interests before his duty to men. Thus he leaves his shrewish wife and his children in Scotland and joins Malcolm. His sense of obligation towards women and the parochial appears minimal. He was not even born of woman. Does he expropriate even natality from women thus? Or is it that his authority over disorderly women and their chaotic wombs rests on his freedom *from* their influence.⁴⁰ Macduff, detached from women, appears to have more children than anyone else in the play. Must he rip himself away from women in order to break the spell they have over him? His confidence in the perpetuity of his bloodline rests in their numbers, not in his nurturing of them. His offspring are always referred to as a plurality, a small throng of "babes". His dead children are as a herd of "muther'd deer" or a slaughtered flock of "pretty chickens". Macduff's mistake is to leave them all in one spot. Macduff's brood are sitting ducks and Macbeth grabs his chance to "Seize upon Fife, give to th'edge o' th' sword / His wife, his babes, and all unfortunate souls / That trace him in his line" (4.1.151-3). After having let Duncan's and Banquo's children slip

away when he had them all within his grasp, Macbeth dispatches Macduff's progeny within the instant; "The firstlings of my hand", following "The very firstlings of my heart" (4.1.146-7). What appalls Macduff is that *all* his children are dead. He disputes his worst woe thus: "All my pretty ones? / Did you say all? O hell-kite! All?" (4.3.216-7). Not one lives, not even one yet unborn in his wife's womb: "What, all my pretty chickens, and their dam, / At one fell swoop?" (4.3.217-8).

Macduff manages the memory and mourning of his children, and the suffering of his emasculation, by channeling his sense of loss and sacrifice into a public spectacle, into single combat with Macbeth. His prayer is to get "Front to front," within "my sword's length," to "this fiend of Scotland" (4.3.233-4). Macbeth's projected deposition becomes thus an act of public mourning, an expression of individual *and* national outrage at Macbeth's trampling on "our mother" Scotland. Macduff here becomes the fulcrum of a national consciousness that faces extinction. Rosse's news of a "poor country" rent by "sighs, and groans, and shrieks" and of Macduff's wife and babes "Savagely slaughter'd" promotes solidarity between a national community and their ancestral land; both are victims of the predator Macbeth. Following the news of Macduff's loss, the bond between Macduff, Malcolm and the English forces is stronger than ever. Their collective remembering of the dead connects the past to the present and spurs their march upon Macbeth, who "Is ripe for shaking" (4.3.238). This nationalist uprising against a duly constituted king is a way of understanding suffering, remembering the fallen and resisting political extermination.

Macduff's commitment to a mixed government in which hereditary monarchs co-exist with a political community is total. It is a supra-local commitment that overrides all

other parochial interests, and survives the loss of family and even his native land. Macduff's "hope ends" when Malcolm gives him no incentive to transpose kings; he is brought to the brink of despair when Malcolm declares himself a tyrant too. Yet Macduff is for regicide, for the death of Macbeth and even Malcolm, rather than that the bleeding state of Scotland should be left to expire. When regicide is rendered ineffectual by the repetition of tyrants, Macduff initiates a separatist movement. "These evils thou repeat'st upon thyself," he says to Malcolm, "Hath banish'd me from Scotland" (4.3.112-3). Malcolm's histrionic display of "Boundless intemperance" reflects Macduff's "noble passion" that proves him the "child of integrity". This is, of course, a test, a moment of definition in which the traveller, the tyrant of borderless mind, confronts the dweller, the man explained as a child.⁴¹

Having verified Macduff's loyalty to an order in which power flows along family lines, Malcolm turns on Macbeth, who is busy rooting out this very system. Emancipated from this homosocial order through his compact with women, Macbeth integrates two worlds, male and female, the real and the imaginary, and acts to cancel the existing structure of power. Propelled by his own sense of personal merit, and lost to a sense of socially determined moral purpose, Macbeth exemplifies the other side of Achilles' shield and the open manslaughter of chivalry. Macbeth is for moving forward, for casting off "Golden opinions from all sorts of people" (1.7.33), to achieve "the ornament of life" (1.7.4). He is a restless adventurer, motivated by a civility that would add value to a sufficient and naturally provided resource, to life.

When Macbeth meets the weird sisters, insubstantial as shades, in the transitional underworld of the heath, he takes on the role of an Odysseus or an Aeneas. He also

merges into the chivalric wanderer. Grail legends, as Jennifer Goodman (1998) notes, commonly depicted a wasteland through which questing knights passed in order to apprehend the gift of grace that lifted them out of their ordinary world.⁴² Macbeth meets the witches on a desolate heath, and they surprise him with news of a glorious life to come. Banquo and Macbeth are merry and toy with the witches a little at first, but when Macbeth becomes Cawdor in truth he is persuaded that fantasy can indeed translate into reality. He is taken with their “supernatural soliciting” and agrees to act in accordance with their “sight”: “If chance will have me king, why, / chance may crown me” (1.3.142). Macbeth is an adventurer, a bold agent who mixes conquering power with lucky chances to achieve greatness. Macbeth needs no “stir”, or revolutionary project to take the crown; he simply dares to take his opportunities as they arise.

Macbeth’s compact with women and the drastic change in circumstances that is forecast for Macbeth is, in itself, as Goodman (1998) points out in her study of the links between chivalric fiction and exploration narratives, “the stuff of romance, a genre much preoccupied with the business of social climbing” (196). The witches foretell room at the top for Macbeth and Macbeth is moved. Confirmed as Cawdor by Rosse, his wonder grows. Macbeth, rapt, crosses into the world of the witches’ words. Amazed at the shimmering expanse before him, Macbeth shades into that familiar figure from the age of discovery, the chivalric-styled adventurer with a New World in his sights. He looks to win it all with grit, luck and faith in the power of his own arm and sword.⁴³

If Macbeth appears on the heath as a parodic version of the heroic adventurer who meets with wonders in wild places and glimpses what the heart desires, he conforms to type by writing a report of his marvelous encounters. In the manner of a Cortes or a

Raleigh, he composes a missive designed to set his readers at home alight with acquisitive desire.⁴⁴ To Lady Macbeth, “my dearest partner of greatness”, he sends a letter, crammed with news and choked with excitement. It has the desired effect; she is ready to give him what he needs to grasp “the golden round”. She is part sponsor and part muse. She becomes what Goodman (1998) describes as “an inciter to violence” (142).

Lady Macbeth prompts her husband to do what morality forbids by holding him to the performance of a vow. “Had I so sworn as you/ Have done to this,” she says, even while her own beloved child “was smiling in my face”, she would have “pluck’d my nipple from his boneless gums, / And dash’d the brains out” (1.7.56-8). Lady Macbeth, a disorderly woman, a possible baby-killer and potential witch--infant mortality had long been associated with witchcraft--turns Macbeth into a killer of helpless innocents by insisting that the warrior keep his promise to her.⁴⁵ She perverts the chivalric vow by transforming the murder of a sleeping innocent into an act of courage, while at the same time showing how chivalry can make monsters. The chivalric vow’s usual function was to enforce virtuous conduct. The vow prompted and legitimized bloody action on the part of the knight, so that those under the yoke of evil custom could be liberated. Michael Frassetto (1998) says of the sacred oath of knights, “it was a ritual of great religious power because it invoked divine intervention” (20).⁴⁶ He goes on to say that “violators of the oath were guilty of the grave sins of sacrilege and perjury and were promised terrible punishments for those sins” (20). Insofar as the knightly vow “was a common means of establishing ties within the warrior elite” (20), in making that vow to his *wife* Macbeth rejects fraternity among men in favour of compact with women. She places right conduct, the keeping of one’s promise, however rashly made or destructive,

over social morality and justice.⁴⁷ She offers with this compact a new beginning and a new kingship that cuts through a self-perpetuating transmission of power that plays to a continuation of the same.

Lady Macbeth, as a warped version of a knight's lady, not only incites her lord to violence by goading him with his oath, she also presents him with his weapon. She lays out the daggers with which Macbeth will slay the sleeping men.⁴⁸ She also, of course, urges Macbeth to draw that "dagger of the mind" (2.1.37) which was planted there first by the weird sisters. Furthermore, she perverts the part of loving consort who advises self-restraint to her erring knight.⁴⁹ What she urges in her champion is the ruthless strength of mind to abandon the real, to turn his back on all normative social relations and responsibilities, on his very humanity, and to damn up "th' milk of human kindness". She counsels her lord to steel himself against every human feeling, to "bear welcome in your eye" and "look like th' innocent flower" while he contemplates murder, to clear his mind of "brain-sickly things" after he has killed his king, to "sleek o'er your rugged looks" while his mind is "full of scorpions", and to be a man before Banquo's ghost "Which might appall the devil."

In fulfilling his vow, Macbeth sacrifices socially determined morality and justice to chivalric law. That Duncan's conduct has been saintly, his trust child-like, only points up Macbeth's arbitrary exercise of individual will. Lady Macbeth holds reason prisoner by bleeding chivalric fantasy into the real, fictionalizing the real, to turn murder into the act of courage required for personal liberation. The crime of killing a guest, a sleeping innocent, is justified as an act of chivalric liberation. Thus it is, as a twisted version of the pious warrior, determined and quietly formal in the spirit of submission to duty, that

Macbeth will “bend up/ Each corporeal agent to this terrible feat” (1.7.79-80). In the name of liberty, courage, self-determination and self-realization, but against his better judgment, Macbeth emancipates himself from the existing social and political order by giving himself over to compact with disorderly women who promise a new beginning. As soon as Macbeth makes his bargain with his key supporters, his social base shrinks. He rules as an isolated, arbitrary and absolute monarch, free from a fraternity of nobles and any involvement with an institutional order that could restrict his rule by the need for consent.

Circulating between the imaginary and the real, Macbeth frees himself from the constraints of mundane manhood as it operates in Duncan’s political order. He destabilizes the cultural authority of normative, social relations by bleeding fantasy into fact. By such traffic with fiction, Macbeth fashions his decision to murder Macduff’s wife, his children and all his line as an act of bold resolution: “No boasting like a fool,” he says, “This deed I’ll do before this purpose cool” (5.1.153-4). Similarly, his order to “Hang those that talk of fear” inflects a rule of terror with a respect for courage. Self-interested, not responsible to those he rules, with no commitment to the public weal, Macbeth demonstrates the unrestrained appropriative potential of a borderless mind.

The story of Macbeth’s moral corruption, and the aura of personal and political obliteration, of genocide, that pervades the play, points up the cultural anxieties attending James’ rationalization of government that makes the king *sole* guardian of peace and order. Certainly the play mobilizes history for James at the point of new political direction constituted by the union of Crowns, but the play also interrogates James’ new imperial order of an integrated realm in which the people’s existing involvement with

power could be suppressed. Banquo, of course, plays to the invention of a Stuart tradition for England. Moreover, the familial flow of power that marks his masculinity legitimates centralized, unchallenged domination by the father, and supports James' idealizing rhetoric of fictive kinship among his subjects. The play endorses James' notion of himself as sovereign father or husband to a vastly extended family, but only to the extent that the monarch acts as *presiding head* of an ultimately Anglocentric state system created by the union of Crowns.

Machiavelli's *Discourses On Livy*, a work on every undergraduate's bookshelf according to Gabriel Harvey, offered a cogent defense of a non-rationalized, apparently chaotic style of mixed government. This work defends internal tumult on the basis that "it is not the particular good but the common good that makes cities great" (II.2).⁵⁰ Internal civil discord manifested a people's intense political involvement and their attachment to a free way of life. Such discord hindered the ability of powerful groups to impose their private interests over those of the people at large. Thus Machiavelli can say, "those who damn the tumults between the nobles and the plebs blame those things that were the first cause of keeping Rome free" (I.4.1). Those who decry such discord, he says, "consider the noises and the cries that would arise in such tumults more than the good effects that they engendered" (I.4.1). "They do not consider," he continues, "that in every republic are two diverse humors, that of the people and that of the great, and that all laws that are made in favour of freedom arise from their disunion". Internal clashes were understood as a mechanism by which the interests that were common to each side were promoted, the idea being that what passed without tumult was presumably to the benefit of all those with the capacity to gainsay it. Tumults in the state were both a sign

of civil liberty and the means to maintain it; thus it was “that the infinite tumults in Rome did not hurt and indeed helped the Republic” (I.17.3).

Neither Cawdor nor Macdonwald are “plebs”, or course. Nevertheless, they constitute one of the two “humors” of the polity that may defend its free way of life. “For those who have prudently constituted a republic,” says Machiavelli, “among the most necessary things ordered by them has been to constitute a guard for freedom” (I.5.1). It is a moot point into whose hands, the nobles or the commoners, it is better to place the said guard. “With the Lacedemonians, and in our times with the Venetians,” explains Machiavelli, “it has been put in the hands of the nobles; but with the Romans it was put in the hands of the plebs” (I.5.1). In Scotland, the nobility had long stood as an institution that tested and limited the authority of the Scottish monarchy. The revolt of Cawdor and Macdonwald against Duncan may be interpreted as a form of public politics. Their rebellion constitutes a forum for debate between different conceptions of the good life or right conduct or government. This violent debate is the ground of the political community’s involvement with power.

Internal clashes, then, create a public space for competing conceptions of right rule and conduct; they tie the idea of the common good to what John O’Neill (1998) calls “the function of preferences”.⁵¹ The values that inform law become, in this scenario, a matter of debate and consensus rather than the single judgment of the ruling body. Machiavelli advises that enmities that arise between either of the two humors of the polity on the one hand, and the ruling body on the other, should be tolerated as an inconvenience necessary to arrive at greatness. What he calls “the authority to accuse” (I.6.4), insofar as it constitutes a desire to defend freedom, safeguards not only the

internal freedom of the polity but also maintains the collective entity in a state of tempered readiness against foreign predators. Thus Duncan's Scotland, despite its internal divisions, and yet *because* of its competitive power structure that prevents servile effeminacy, repels the Norwegians when they see a chance to invade.⁵²

This tumult, this toleration of competitive identities, then, is at once the difficulty and the achievement of the liberal state.⁵³ Internal division, or faction, could be seen as a source of strength from a Machiavellian perspective. Turmoil and bloodshed follow from armed strife, but so does political involvement. Internal discord also, somewhat paradoxically, strengthens the polity. Thus it is that Duncan, despite internal divisions, defeats the outlying and notoriously fractious Western Isles and resists foreign invasion.⁵⁴

The revolt, or factional bloodletting, seems not to incapacitate Duncan's polity but rather to enrich and strengthen it. Traitors are flushed out and "ten thousand dollars to our general use" are to be paid by the king of Norway as ransom for his dead. Internal and international relations continue rather than fall apart after the Scots test their liberty in rebellion and the foreigners test their advantage by invasion. The defeated show a willingness to accept the conditions of the victors. A consensus, of sorts, has been brought about through the free choices of the various parties. This consensus depends upon the fundamental liberties of the defeated political subject--and this includes the dead political subject--not being constrained.

In accordance with the culture of death cultivated by the ancients, the king of Norway "craves composition" and requests that he be allowed to bury his dead. The victors will respect the rights of the fallen by accepting the ransom and allowing the dead to receive the burial proper to their soul's rest.⁵⁵ Such formal burial procedures

authenticate the slain as political subjects and glorify a warring culture. They constitute a form of recognition that the battle fallen have earned merit by death. They are not heaped in a common tomb, as were the vulgar poor, or, like the murdered Banquo, left to rot, uncelebrated, on the open ground.⁵⁶ The decently buried dead do not straddle two worlds and mix with the living, like the ghost of Banquo.

The manner of the defeated Cawdor's death also confers a form of social and political identification. In yielding, Cawdor is not deprived of his freedom and his manhood by being put on humiliating public show, as a traitor would be. He is, instead, offered capital punishment, and this gives him an opportunity to redeem himself. In a display of courage on the scaffold, Cawdor earns merit by death. About to die and not, it would seem, in hopes of a reprieve, he extenuates nothing. He confesses his fault frankly, implores pardon, and expresses a "deep repentance". Malcolm, his erstwhile enemy, accords Cawdor's behavior its due respect and monumentalizes his death through praise. He reports of Cawdor that "Nothing in his life/ Became him like the leaving it" (1.4.7-8). His death showed the serious, contemplative quality of his life that had "been studied in his death" (1.4.9). Displaying stoic patience, he threw away "the dearest thing he ow'd/ As 'twere a careless trifle" (1.4. 10-11).

Yet in tossing away his life "As 'twere a careless trifle," in Cawdor's Jack Wiltoning it at the scaffold, is there not also something of the childish, depraved gallant? In his aristocratic manners at death, in his insinuation of himself into Duncan's "bosom interest", in his failure to join the liberty allowed him by saintly Duncan to responsibility, and in fostering disorder without apparent just cause, does Cawdor verge upon the figure of a disorderly gentleman bachelor, a figure linked to unnatural desires, promiscuity and

prodigality?⁵⁷ The stock figure of the bachelor, according to Kann (1998), “symbolized the dangers of democracy and the corruption of patriarchy” (52). In transforming liberty to license, Cawdor is implicated in the transition to Macbeth’s authoritarian regime, which emerges as an unintended consequence of Duncan’s liberal rule. As Kann points out, the bachelor rejects male fellowship that is based on the government of women. Thus it is that disorderly women--witches, inceptors to violence and shrews--emerge in this play at the point where fraternity based on the jurisdiction of women starts to split apart. The intrusion of disorderly women into politics spells the internal breakdown of a political system founded on male fellowship.

What I am suggesting here is that Cawdor, who follows his own desires, slips into the character of an aristocratic adventurer and Macduff, who may fall too much under woman’s spell, are transitional figures who mediate the shift from one regime to another. They are part of the process by which political systems work themselves through. Cawdor becomes Macbeth, of course, and the mild, nurturing fathers Duncan and Banquo are replaced by the childless Malcolm and Macduff, who seem to need to steel themselves against women’s powerful influence either by distancing themselves from them or by seeming to take over women’s function altogether. Duncan’s system of government generates that which subverts it in Cawdor and Macbeth *and* that which advances it again in Macduff. In the interactive clash between masculinities--masculinities that correspond to rival forms of cultural and political production--*Macbeth* examines an accelerated cultural breakdown in which rival political systems can, with sickening speed, spring from each other’s combined interests.

Why would Duncan expose himself to treachery by *another* trusted Thane of

Cawdor, and why would Banquo return when he has guessed Macbeth a murderer, unless they were, in some way, complicit in their own demise? Both Duncan and Banquo, in “seeing” their sons as kings in the future, see their own death. They have, in fact, already acknowledged their own dispensability in having replicated themselves through their children. So long as their posterity survives, their government, in a manner of speaking, lives. Banquo, on the heath, does not necessarily flinch at the possibility of Macbeth’s possession of the crown; he simply warns him to beware the witches’ words. Nor does Duncan sit down and tell sad stories of the fall of kings when his enemies swarm. Duncan and Banquo present easy targets to Macbeth because their deaths are not conclusive. Macbeth cannot rest with these murders; he must root out the entire *bloodline*.

Duncan and Banquo represent a monarchy authorized by inheritance in which kingship is transmitted through the act of begetting rather than through compact. This kind of political order offers a continuation of what passed before; it does not consist of a repeatable regime with a specific beginning and particular end. It is a regime which, as Valeria Wagner (1999) puts it, “empowers the father” in that “the son points to his father as his origin”; the “power conferred by paternity...functions ‘backward’(103).⁵⁸ It is a system of inherited government that supports an unchanging, “timeless” polity. This kind of polity is linked in *Macbeth* to natural cycles of production.

Revolutionary projects and individual candidates for rule threaten Duncan’s self-perpetuating cycle of inheritance from within, because Duncan also supports a political system based on legitimacy and election rather than on hereditary right. He rewards Macbeth’s merit with the title of Cawdor. Macbeth, as Cawdor, is not simply a function

of his father, as he is as Glamis. Macbeth emphasizes this difference between transmission and election when he says to the witches, "By Sinel's death I know I am Thane of Glamis, / But how of Cawdor? The Thane of Cawdor lives" (1.3.71-2). Cycles of inheritance and a system of elective power coexist in Duncan's self-perpetuating regime. Duncan's support for an elective and liberal regime legitimizes resistance. Cawdor, who is not referred to as a father, was to Duncan "a gentleman on whom I built/ An absolute trust" (1.4.13-14). Undeterred, Duncan looks to "plant" his valiant captain, Macbeth, intending to "labor/To make thee full of growing" (1.4.28-9).

Duncan's system of government is open to subversion from within on another count. In a system of hereditary right, gaps can appear in the succession, giving rise to the possibility of usurpation by individual candidates for rule. These gaps occur when children accede to power or, as in Duncan's case, when a ruler unexpectedly dies. Macbeth, of course, engineers that gap and moves in to take the crown. As husbands and fathers to a hereditary regime that also practices election and tolerates the persistent tumults that produce consent, Duncan and Banquo cannot *but* expose themselves to the likes of Cawdor and Macbeth. A sense of personal, political and cultural vulnerability attends this relentless lesson in self-subverted breakdown.

This mood of alarm speaks to a historically specific political situation. The play sets up a situation in which absolutism emerges from a political order which values consent. *Macbeth*, I suggest, registers Scottish and English fears of cultural and political dissolution as the specter of James' absolutism emerges from his kingship of two states, each with its own active political communities, that have agreed to his rule. *Macbeth* alerts its audience to the viper of tyranny lurking in the flowers of James' rhetoric and his

brave new imperial order. Furthermore, the play supports a relationship between the ruler and ruled whereby the civil power granted to the monarch by agreement of the political community does not mean an unlimited surrender of that power. James and Macbeth, however, assume a supernatural mandate that abrogates the community's involvement with power.

Both James and Macbeth manifest a liberationist stance. James' project of peace, prosperity and Protestantism for the united kingdoms of a Great Britain would free his English subjects from their long bondage to religious and civil tumults. His liberationist politics here mask the violence done to the institutions of state in the names of peace and prosperity, traditionally associated with integration and a strong, centralized program of rule.⁵⁹ Macbeth, of course, frees Scotland from turmoil. The witches' "great prediction / Of noble having and royal hope" coincides with Duncan's recognition and reward of Macbeth's great merit, which in the Scotland of the day constituted a claim to the crown. Holinshed's *Description of Scotland* describes a system of elected kings operating at that time.⁶⁰ Kings were chosen from a small group of families and ruled alternately, as was usual in a political situation dominated by clan membership. It is a system that avoids the problems caused by children or inept rulers acceding to the throne. Merit based on strength of arms was highly regarded and was often a decisive factor. Macbeth, a contender for the throne in his own mind, sees Duncan's appointment of Malcolm as Prince of Cumberland as an act of hereditary oppression; it is "a step/ On which I must fall down, or else o'erleap" (1.4.49).

Moreover, the witches have given Macbeth their voice as king. He seems to have some kind of supernatural mandate for stepping up to take the crown. This mandate is

withdrawn when Macbeth is no longer acceptable to his subjects, when they fail to prosper and when Macbeth's *pax* poses a mortal threat to national society.

When Macbeth dismantles the customs of the people, he attacks the community's involvement in power. Furthermore, when he attacks women and children, he attacks an order in which power runs through family lines. On both counts Macbeth aims at the vitals, the belly, of a national political order that rivals his absolutist rule. When Macbeth attacks that which sustains the body politic in life, the polity is justified in turning against him, despite the fact that Macbeth is a duly constituted monarch.⁶¹ An unnamed lord hopes for Macbeth's overthrow so they may once again hold their customary feasts, free their banquets from "bloody knives" and "Do faithful homage and receive free honours;/ All which we pine for now" (3.6.35-7).

In leaving his wife and children at Fife, Macduff presents his own underbelly, and the belly of Scotland, to the tyrant. Racing with his destiny, Macbeth strikes and proceeds to the next victim, for there is no end to the killing once bloodlines decide death. Scotland bleeds and "good men's lives / Expire before the flowers in their caps" (4.3.171-2). Nowhere else in the play is "Scotland" and her sufferings invoked as often as in Act 4 Scene 3, the scene in which Macduff receives the terrible news of his family's fate. Spurred, united, and justified by this mortal attack upon "our mother" Scotland, Macduff and Malcolm begin their advance upon the duly constituted ruler, invested at Scone, who is bleeding Scotland to death. The polity is justified, by the authority of its natural right to life, to do that which is necessary for its own conservation, even, as James' own tutor George Buchanan suggested in his most shocking assertion, if that means killing the king.

A long line of political philosophers before Buchanan made similar claims. When the polity faces a lethal threat from its ruler the people are justified in deposing that ruler. The freedom to conserve oneself in existence had long been recognised as authorising a people's resistance to a constituted ruler. The people's liberty to withdraw their mandate when they fail to thrive, not their weight in numbers as such, forms the legitimate foundation of their political power. Were it simply a case of numbers, then Macduff's canny son would be right, that in letting themselves be hanged by the honest men "the liars and swearers are fools; for there are liars and swearers enow to beat the honest men and hang them up" (4.2.56-8). Such liberty, the liberty of a rogue majority to hang their honest rulers, is rather an argument for authoritarian rule.

But the possibilities for government are not exhausted by the options of universal participation, or mob rule, and an authoritarian regime. Macbeth's overthrow represents the withdrawal of the political community's mandate to govern on the basis that Macbeth has obstructed the customs of the nobility, snuffed out their posterity and is bleeding the country to death. In short, Macbeth has breached the political community's natural, God-given right of self-preservation.

The early modern debate about the relationship between the governor and the governed in the polity turns on this question of self-preservation. The European discourse of polity evolved from debate about ecclesiastical and secular polities.⁶² Jean Gerson, a fifteenth-century commentator on ecclesiastical politics, offers a collection of early modern political verities in his treatise *Concerning Ecclesiastical Power* (1417).⁶³ Gerson defines a secular polity, in Catherine Brown's translation of this treatise, as "a community organized with a view to some perfect end" (9). Elaborating on this, he says,

“the community is here called ‘perfect’ to distinguish it from the domestic way of life, which is not perfectly self-sufficient” (10). From this opposition between a public and a private community the secular polity emerges as a politically independent collective entity. Gerson amplifies this point by claiming that this perfect self-sufficiency is consonant with the community’s freedom from foreign constraint. Collective sovereignty, then, is at the core of the secular polity.

Gerson goes on to say that the “perfect”, or politically independent, community may be organized in different ways to create different political orders. Gerson points to Aristotle’s famous threefold distinction of polity types: monarchy, aristocracy and democracy.⁶⁴ He explains that these terms correspond to the rule of one, the few and the many, but that in each case government and laws should be framed with a view to the common good. He points out that custom, again in line with Aristotle’s view, is the most reliable indicator of what best suits the common good, “provided,” Gerson says, “that it is neither contrary to divine nor to natural law” (8). This proviso leaves custom open to disparagement.

Natural law was presumed to be a universal law, constant and immutable, and “should any one neglect it,” warns Bartolomeo Scala (1430-97) in David Marsh’s translation of Scala’s *Dialogue on Laws and Legal Judgements*, and choose “to abandon his human nature, he must fear God, the source of this law” (178).⁶⁵ The invocation of natural law constituted an appeal to transcendence over carnal and contingent custom, as well as over national and civil law. Those who would override custom, or common law, but still maintain that they acted for the common good, appropriated divine and natural law to authorize their own dominion over the polity. The appeal to transcendence, in the

appeal to natural and divine law, bolsters the authority of those who make it, while at the same time it masks a strategy for controlling resources and territory. Rulers invoked “Universal” natural law in order to suppress the community’s involvement with power. By claiming to uphold God-given natural, or universal, law, rulers may dispense with custom which, as a carnal human invention, differs from place to place.

The invocation of natural law by rulers was countered by an appeal to what amounted to God-given natural rights by the ruled. Disobedience against an appointed ruler was authorized on the basis of self-preservation. Those who appealed to transcendence by claiming the authority of natural *law* assumed the authority to command obedience.⁶⁶ Those who resisted this authority legitimized their action by the claim that they were following steps to conserve themselves in existence. Jaques Almain (c.1480-1515), a theorist of ecclesiastical politics at the University of Paris, was one of the first political philosophers of the early modern era to justify a community’s deposition of a duly constituted ruler on the basis that the ruler’s actions posed a mortal threat to the continued existence of the polity. In his *Question at Vespers*, he argues for the right of the general council of the Church to take action against a divinely ordained Pope whose rule proves destructive to the life of the ecclesiastical polity.⁶⁷

If an idea of natural *right* was employed here to resist the Pope’s absolute power, we can see natural *law* being invoked to bolster absolute papal power in Tommaso Campanella’s (1568-1639) *Monarchy of the Messiah* (completed 1605). In this treatise, Campanella invokes natural law to justify the dominion of priestly over princely rule.⁶⁸ Campanella rejects any circumscription of the Pope’s authority by lay dominion. He acknowledges that the idea of lay independence from the Pope has been put forward on

the basis that a lay empire existed *before* the Messiah appeared, but he goes on to reject that argument as fraudulent. Campanella proves this point by saying, in Brian Copenaver's translation (1997), that "the founder of these empires was Christ, the Eternal Wisdom, through whom kings rule...by means of natural law, and that this same Christ later corrected these empires by means of the law of grace" (52).⁶⁹ In other words, lay powers, even if they existed before the time of Christ, still derived from Christ. He concludes that "kings indeed depend on a commonwealth, but it is the commonwealth of Christ, who lived yesterday, lives today and will live forever" (52).

Natural law, in Campanella's hands, becomes a type for the law of grace and the law of reason.⁷⁰ Thus, "to the extent that people conform to reason, they are all Christian, since Christ is the highest Reason" (54). The idea of natural law, identified here with Christianity, justifies priestly over princely authority *as well as* the imposition of what Campanella calls "the law of the Messiah" upon those who lack it. The secular arm of the church was, however, the imperial ruler. Thus the king of Spain, as "the arm of Christ" in the isles of the New World (55), may claim universal authority and justify his dispossession of native peoples by identifying them as barbarians and pagans. Given the overlap of natural law and the law of reason, Campanella can say that those states that do not conform to reason must be prevented from breaking natural law. "One must not push the Gospel by force," he allows, "but one uses force to push out the barbarity of those who eat human flesh and practice sodomy and the most bestial idolatry" (59). He cites the domination of barbarians by Alexander and the Romans as a "happy necessity that compels to the good" (59). "No one denies," he says, "that the pope has the right to do so [too] except those who do not know Christ, the Word and Reason of God" (59). The

whole of Christian society and beyond, therefore, is ceded to Catholic rulership, and empire becomes the vehicle of Christianity.

Ideas of natural right and natural law legitimize contestatory claims to political authority. A ruling body acts unjustly if it poses a mortal threat to the community and is liable, therefore, to deposition by that community. The appeal here, essentially, is to justice. Natural law, however, as the knowledge of and belief in Christ, the Word and divine reason, appeals, ultimately, to conduct.⁷¹ Those who do not conduct themselves in accordance with natural law are liable to learn it from those who do, an Alexander, perhaps, or a chivalric warrior. These contestatory appeals to transcendence inform the debate in early modern political philosophy about the foundations of political power in the polity.

Does political power reside directly with the people, or does the ruler hold a plenitude of power? This relationship between the governing and the governed is central to *Macbeth*, especially in the context of the new Stuart king's controversial imperial design. Sandys' biographer, Theodore Rabb, notes that Sandys broke new ground when he declared to the Commons that natural rights were more fundamental than any laws. Rabb goes on to say that this "advocacy of natural rights thus led Sandys to distinguish between king and state, between government and governed" (118). In a century dominated by the demand for subjects' rights, Sandys did more than anyone else, Rabb claims, to formulate a political position founded on protecting those natural rights through mobilizing resistance to James' imperial project of union. Doubling as a compliment to a Scottish king, *Macbeth* shows the shape of things to come should a ruler act on the assumption that the civil power granted to him by agreement of the community

constitutes an unlimited surrender of that power.⁷² Threatened with extinction, and authorized by a transcendent natural right to self-preservation, the aristocratic political community turns on their duly constituted ruler. The play's defense of double-dealing devolves upon the potentially treasonous division of the political community's loyalty to the body politic and the body royal.

The warring Scottish nobility, from the perspective of Machiavelli's *Discourses*, constitutes only *one* of the humors of the liberal polity that serve as a guard for freedom. They are the *visible* arm of the political community that turns on the ruler out of self-defense. Shakespeare's witches, as the ghostly eruption of a repressed political community in fear of its life, constitute that other Machiavellian humor and guard for freedom, the plebs. Like the tumults of the Scottish nobles, the witches' double-dealing constitutes an involvement with power that appears to create confusion. The witches are the uncanny, unassimilated surplus of a repressed subject group--women in this instance--who return to haunt the present at points of fissure. As disorderly women, the witches conjure up the force of the commoners, the plebs, or multi-headed multitude, for political disturbance.

Stephen Greenblatt, in an essay called "Shakespeare Bewitched" (1993), does not allow that the witch *does*, or *accounts* for anything in *Macbeth*.⁷³ He points out that, "though their malevolent energy is apparently put in action--I'll do, I'll do, and I'll do--it is in fact extremely difficult to specify what, if anything, they do or even what, if anything they are" (123). But in giving their voice to Macbeth as Cawdor and as king, and then taking it back again, the witches evoke something archaic, a primal political scene, in which the mass of people first permit a centralizing power to arise. On the one

hand, their double-dealing coupled with their loathsome aspect might seem to support a proud authoritarian rule that disdains any more involvement with them than is necessary to establish power. On the other hand, they haunt the play as the prospect of an oppositional social movement from below to authoritarian rule. They appear as the ghosts of self-sovereign subjects, in that they demonstrate their freedom to make and break political compact. Hecate chides the witches for dealing with Macbeth without including her, and Macbeth curses them for double-dealing. Their capacity to withhold, give and repossess their voices determines the scope of their freedom in relation to powerful men of violence. What they give, they may also take away; thus the witches appear as the ghosts of repressed subjects who have a stake in the survival of the polity, and who act as a guard for freedom against outrage and tyranny.⁷⁴

A brief contextualization with *Coriolanus* illustrates the witches' character as the return of a repressed Machiavellian political humor. When the weird sisters meet victorious Macbeth and Banquo they are asked for their voice by Macbeth as is customary when meeting spirits or shades. They give him their voice as thane and king, but promptly take it away again by awarding the succession to Banquo's line. As a returning, garlanded warrior Coriolanus, too, stands before a loathsome group, the commoners, and, as was customary, asks for their voice that he may become consul. It is a custom that Coriolanus, in his pride at his own worth and dismissive of the commoners' judgment, suggests "might well/ Be taken from the people" (2.2.145). The tribunes of the people, Sicinius and Brutus, see this as evidence of Coriolanus' absolutist tendencies and set about to work his ruin. These representatives of the people see no room for their authority should Coriolanus assume office. Coriolanus, on the other hand, sees tumult

“when two authorities are up” (3.1.109). The tribunes decide to let the people know “in what hatred” Coriolaunus holds them, and how, were it in his power, he “would have made them mules, silenc’d their pleaders, and/ Disproptied their freedoms” (2.1.247-8).

Despite his aversion to craving “the hire which first we do deserve” (2.3. 114), Coriolanus does submit, stiffly, to the custom of requesting the commoners’ voices. The people give him their voice but without conviction and they are easily provoked by the tribunes to take it back again. Coriolanus, however, acts as if the people’s voices, once solicited and given, can no longer imposition him. The tribunes act on the basis that the people’s voices, despite having made compact with Coriolanus, retain the liberty to break compact with the mighty warrior. Telling the people that Coriolanus “was your enemy,” and “ever spake against/ Your liberties and the charters that you bear/ I’ th’ body of the weal” (2.3.180-1), the tribunes instruct the people to assemble and “on a safer judgment all revoke/ Your ignorant election” (2.3.217-18). Coriolanus is baffled and then enraged that, “being pass’d for consul with full voice, / I am so dishonor’d that the very hour/ You take it off again” (3.3.59-61). Being banished by the tribunes, who speak in “I’th’people’s name”, Coriolanus defies his baiters. “I banish you!” he replies, curses the swaying people, and proceeds to adopt the politics of the loser; that is, he turns his back on Rome to find “a world elsewhere” (3.3.135).

Macbeth is similarly overcome with exasperation when the singular power he had thought absolutely his is revoked by Macduff’s revelation that he was “Untimely ripp’d” away at birth. Like Coriolanus, Macbeth curses the tongues that have reneged on their word and “cow’d my better part of man” (5.8.16). And like Coriolanus too, Macbeth defiantly hurls himself upon his tormentors.

But that which crucially links the Scottish witches with Roman commoners is method of motion, a tumbled, multi-directional dynamic that races, backtracks, and sways to an antic, directionless oscillation. Hovering through the cloak of fog and filthy air, the witches ride the winds, weaving and juddering about the world. Hand in hand, as a three-headed body, the sisters speak of themselves:

Posters of the sea and land,
 Thus do go, about, about,
 Thrice to thine, and thrice to mine,
 And thrice again, to make up nine. (1.3.33-36)

The citizen commoners of Rome refer to themselves as similarly agitated. Acknowledging that many, including Coriolanus, have called them “the many-headed multitude,” they infer that this characterizes them not as multifarious individuals come together as a united front, but rather as a single entity that is wracked by multiple impulses. These multiple impulses are figured in terms of diverse wits, hurtling out of one skull and criss-crossing in all directions of the compass. As the third citizen avers, they have been called the many-headed multitude, “not that our heads are some brown, some black, some abram, some bald, but that our wits are so diversely color’d” (2.3.18-21). The citizen himself thinks that “if all our wits were to issue out of one skull, they would fly east, west, north, south, and their consent of one direct way should be at once to all the points a’ th’compass” (2.3. 21-24).

James himself, addressing grievances of Parliament in 1606, referred to the

Commons as a multitude moved by “diversities of spirits, as there were amongst the very apostles themselves” and observed that some of these voices “were more popular than profitable either for that Council or for the Commonwealth.”⁷⁵ He went on to complain that “there were some tribunes of the people whose mouths could not be stopped” yet “for himself he would never make a separation of the people’s will and the wish of the king.” The motif of the multi-headed multitude demonizes the community involved with power as a wayward rabble who need, for their own good, the supervision of a strong ruler. This might be a Coriolanus, a Macbeth, or a philosopher king, the mature, experienced and scholarly father-husband to the nation, James I.

This skittish, racing motion that characterizes the entity of the demonized common multitude is reworked by Coriolanus as he curses the crowd in leaving Rome. “Let every feeble rumor shake your hearts!” he shouts, and may “Your enemies, with nodding of their plumes, / Fan you into despair” (3.3.125-7). The effect here is of many slack strands shivering and dipping as one with every breath of war. But Coriolanus also calls the multitude “Hydra” (3.1.93), of “multitudinous tongue” (3.1.156). This figure inflects the people’s oscillating dynamic with a darting and deadly potential. Not only does the multitude cringe before the faintest stir, it also writhes and strikes with lethal design. Thus, in banishing Coriolanus, the many-headed monster delivers him a fatal blow.

By calling the sisters “bubbles” of the earth, Banquo describes the mobile evanescence of the witches’ sudden appearance and disappearance. Macbeth sees them melting into the air, “As breath into the wind” (1.3.82). They pass and flow with streams of air, conforming to fantasies of the witch as an agile, airy spirit, able to pass through

solids and dart about the world on the wind. James' *Daemonologie* describes these very same properties of the witch.⁷⁶ They are at once the wispiest of substance, harmless bubbles that melt before moving air, and a lurking threat that may "betray's/ In deepest consequence" (1.3. 125-6).

Intimations of this power emerge as the witches talk amongst themselves while they wait for Macbeth. The witches respond with customary fury to breaches of neighbourly relations. A sailor's wife is punished for withholding basic charity by making the woman's husband a wandering outcast. "He shal live a man forbid," the witch says, "Though his bark cannot be lost, / Yet shall it be tempest-tossed" (1.3. 21-2). While witches were commonly believed to be able to raise storms, in this presumed ability to make a man an outcast the witches display a god-like power to effect justice.⁷⁷ Zeus is described in the *Iliad*, Book XXIV, as having two jars standing on the floor of his palace. In one blessings are kept, and in the other evils. When Zeus serves a man from the jar of evil only, he makes him an outcast, who is chased by the gadfly of despair over the face of the earth. Scotland's weird sisters, though wispy, yet possess, en masse, an expulsive power that links them to the gods. As specters of the realm's lowliest subjects--outcast, old women--they yet evoke what Jaques Almain saw as the community's authority to depose a duly constituted ruler on the basis that the ruler's actions posed a mortal threat to the continued existence of the polity.⁷⁸

Coriolanus opens with Caius Martius, later Coriolanus, refusing corn to the famished poor of Rome, dismissing them crossly with a "Go get you home, you fragments!" (1.2.222). The plump sailor's wife shoos away the hungry weird sister with an "Aroint thee, witch" (1.3.6). Coriolanus disagreed with the distribution of corn from

the city's store to the hungry commoners on the basis that thus the authorities "nourish'd disobedience, fed/ The ruin of the state" (3.1.117-8). Machiavelli noted this very historical incident in his defense of the plebs' political voice in the *Discourses* (I.7.1). These same commoners banished Coriolanus from their state, as the witches banish from port those who deny them hospitality, and when Macbeth makes Scotland a grave for Scots that was a womb, the witches abandon Macbeth to his enemies.⁷⁹

The weird sisters, then, evoke the capacity of even the lowest subjects to give their voice to a centralizing power, and to take back that voice if their fundamental rights are denied. By endorsing the transfer of political power to a ruler, they do not surrender unconditionally the whole power that was in the community.

Notwithstanding his absolutist rhetoric, James was careful to note that the English people had given him their voice, en masse, as king. The first thing James in his first speech to Parliament did was to register his thanks "for your so joyfull and generall applause to the declaring and reciving of mee in this Seate" (269). He waxes eloquent on the subject; in fact, he seems almost entranced by his bewitching reception:

[S]hall it ever bee blotted out of my minde, how, at my first entrie into this Kingdome, the people of all sorts rid and ran, nay rather flew to meet mee? their eyes flaming nothing but sparkles of affection, their mouthes and tongues uttering nothing but sounds of joy, their hands, feete, and all the rest of their members in their gestures discovering a passionate longing, and earnestnesse to meete and embrace their new Sovereaigne. (269)

In his political writings, James denied that the people had any power worth having to give, and that he ruled, on the authority of the law of nature and of reason, because the

people were unfit to govern themselves. Yet, in listening to the people's bewitching voice, James seems to acknowledge that they have something to give other than obedience. In accepting the gift of the people's voice, he acknowledges the act of giving, and what the people give, they may also take away, on the authority of natural right.

The many-headed multitude are evoked as witches in *Macbeth* in response, perhaps, to James' particular prejudices. In *Basilikon Doron*, James equates witchcraft with such "horrible crimes" as willful murder, incest, sodomy, poisoning and false coining (20). Sodomy, cannibalism and willful murder do nothing to *people* the polity, of course, but this is not why they are explicitly denounced as breaches of natural law. They represent objectionable conduct, evil customs, which justify the imposition of natural law by the strong arm of reason. By inferring that the people, *en masse*, have a propensity to break natural law, by demonizing them as, for example, witches, the ruler assumes dominion on the basis that the people are not fit to rule themselves.

This is exactly how James sets out his own rule in *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* (1598). James explicitly refutes the idea that, in his case, *any* power has been *delegated* to the ruler by the community.⁸⁰ Although he acknowledges that, on the authority of "those that pryde themselves to be the scourges of Tyrants," certain commonwealths and societies of men, long ago, *did elect* one man, on the basis of his extraordinary valour and virtue, to "maintaine the weakest in in their right, to throw down oppressours, and to foster and continue the societie among men," that did not happen in "our Kingdome" (61). Calling "our Chronicles" to bear witness, James declares that "the trewth is directly contrarie in our state to the false affirmation of such seditious writers," who, he adds, "would perswade us, that the Lawes and state of our country were

established before the admitting of a king” (62). He cites King Fergus, the first Scottish king, who arrived from Ireland, as “a wise king coming among barbares,” as the originator of “the estate and forme of government,” and who “thereafter made lawes by himselfe, and his successours according thereto” (62).

King Fergus, coming amongst barbarians, and justified by the universal law of reason and nature, imposes law on the lawless. James’ imposition of peace and his project of political union, conveyed as a semi-mystical marriage, an amalgam of hearts and minds, similarly bring order to apparent chaos. Natural law gives them a foundation for making political claims. Accounts of wonders and reports of strange occurrences in which the laws of nature and reason appear to have been broken pervade *Macbeth*. Inversions of nature appear to confirm Macbeth’s kingship over the supposed parricides, Malcolm and Donalbain. Caius Martius accuses the Roman commoners of potential cannibalism. Angry at their uprising, he says, “You cry against the noble Senate, who/ (Under the gods) keep you in awe, which else, / Would feed on one another?” (1.1.186-188). By claiming to uphold God-given natural, or universal, law, rulers may dispense with custom as a carnal human invention. Thus both Coriolanus and Macbeth attempt to dismantle the customs of the people in favour of their own absolute rule.

When Coriolanus and Macbeth *do* bow to custom, and request the people’s loathed voice, it is as if chaos comes again. In making his second, furious appeal to the witches for their voice Macbeth charges them to speak, “Even till destruction sicken” (4.1.60). In admitting their intemperate authority, Macbeth takes on the danger of a world turned upside down. Coriolanus matches this when he is about to make his second, angry appeal to the people for their detested voice, but in Coriolanus’ case it is he

himself, not the world, who risks inversion thus. In requesting the commoners' voice, and humbling himself before their contemptible authority, the great warrior hazards becoming eunuch, knave, and beggar.

For James too, when the governor is ruled by the governed, chaos reigns. In *The Trew Law of Monarchies*, James argues that a ruler may not be displaced, "upon whatsoever pretext," by those he rules. "[E]xcept by inverting the order of all Law and reason," he says, "the commanded may be made to command their commander, the judged to judge their Judge, and they that are governed, to govern their time about their Lord and governor" (64). This inversion of the order of all law and reason is exactly what happens when Birnan wood comes to Dunsinane. When inversions of nature--a moving grove and a man not born of woman--appear before him, Macbeth's courage and crown, the ornaments of life, slip from him. Macduff spearheads one political community; Birnan wood evokes another. Ancient woods were long regarded as the locale of liberty, despite the fact that much of Britain's forests had been cut down by the time of William the Conqueror.⁸¹ The moving wood, like the witches, is another evocation of the uncanny return of the repressed commoners.

But why does Macbeth leave "Great Dunsinane"? "Our castle's strength," says Macbeth, "Will laugh a siege to scorn; here let them lie/ Till famine and the ague eat them up" (5.5.2-4). Macbeth's impulse is to onward motion, not to staying or dwelling; he is driven to action that makes a difference, not to that which perpetuates the same. It is as impossible for him to sit out the siege in his fortress as it is for him to bask as Duncan's champion in "Golden opinions" (1.7.33). His compulsive, feverish motion--putting his armour on, pulling it off, calling for it again as he moves off--and his mental

agitation, from bluster dipping to despair, to hollowing grief, prevent Macbeth putting time on his side. He disjoins time and the hour, twisting it to confusion--“If it were done, when ‘tis done, then ‘twere / well / It were done quickly” (1.7.1-2). He outruns time: “I have in head, that will to hand, / Which must be acted ere they may be scann’d” (3.5.138-9). His medium is space. But Macbeth’s automatic motion, his “pester’d senses” that “recoil and start” (5.2.23), strut and fret, appear as furiously driven. His feverish, oscillating impetus aligns him with the fallen, chaotic motion of the witch.

Restless Macbeth, having murdered sleep, is always en route to some new killing. His *modus operandi* is propulsion. Macbeth’s urge is to spill himself into his world, to make his “peace” the common good and “incarnadine” the “multitudinous seas” with his bloody hand (2.2.59). He charges the doctor to “cast/ The water of my land,” find his wife’s disease, “And purge it to a sound and pristine health” (5.3.51-2) and then wonders, “What rhubarb, cyme, or what purgative drug, / Would scour these English hence?” (5.3.55-6).

Macbeth sees there is no “flying hence, nor tarrying here” (5.5.47) at Dunsinane, yet he can “try the last” and fling himself forward to meet the enemy “dareful, beard to beard” (V.iv.6). “Before my body,” by way of propelling his body on, “I throw my warlike shield” (5.8.32-3). This trajectory of shield then man relays a burst of rectilinear motion. It also distinguishes arms and the man. The archetypal warlike shield, of course, is that of Achilles. In his last battle, and his first, the evocation of the socially uncommitted warrior frames Macbeth’s predatory “hour upon the stage”.

Opposing the restless warrior are the confederate forces of Malcolm and the English army, who gather “To dew the sovereign flower and drown the weeds” (5.2.30).

This organic metaphor identifies them and their mode of cultural production once more as attuned to cycles of natural growth. Their concerted use of patriotic, nationalist discourse grows as they mobilize against Macbeth, the bold adventurer. “Revenues burn” in both the Scottish and English forces massed against Macbeth. The Scots and English here constitute a confederal union, like that of the United Provinces in their war against imperial Spain. They create a non-incorporative union against absolutism, a bounded fraternity of generative, communitarian men whose commitment to each other as an extended family rests upon neglecting their private concerns as particular husbands and fathers. Thus Siward’s management of mourning for his fallen son. Like Macduff, Siward subsumes his parochial function as parent to that of his political function as ally.

Macbeth assists the transition from one regime to another by speaking the language of the enemy. He expresses the decline of “my way of life” in terms of a natural cycle, a falling “into the sear, the yellow leaf” (5.3.22-3). Macbeth turns away from himself, and in that moment finds himself bereft of a life spent dwelling in fellowship with men. “That which should accompany old age, / As honor, love, obedience, troops of friends,” he says, “I must not look to have” (5.3.24-6). “Mouth-honour” is all he may command. It is, as Brian Loveman (1998) says, speaking of Latin American dictatorships and their transition to civilian government, that the longer military officers remain in command, the harder it is to maintain “internal cohesion, verticality of command, and procedure” against political pressures (126).⁸² Macbeth feels the continued, direct exercise of power to be both onerous and futile; his awoken nostalgia for ancestral ways, for the idealized, emotional shape of the past, neutralizes the tyrant. “Sick at heart,” Macbeth’s last “push” is to self-defeat: “I have lived long

enough" (5.3.22). In forsaking power thus, Macbeth effects an "authoritarian withdrawal" that initiates a more liberal regime; he manifests an internal breakage that exalts the tyrant as self-defeated while it looks forward to the new order.⁸³

Like his father before him, Malcolm freely dispenses titles once the battle has been lost and won. To his thanes and kinsmen he says, "Henceforth be earls, the first that ever Scotland/ In such honor nam'd" (V.ix.29-30).⁸⁴ As Duncan did, he enhances the status of his warriors at the expense of his own power. But more than this, his naturalization of the Scottish aristocracy as English earls posits an *Anglocentric* order in which a king presides over the institution of an Anglocentric assembly. Finally, the play confirms the re-emergence of Duncan's style of government through the language and myths of historical continuity. What is still to do after making compact with his key supporters will "be planted newly with the time" (5.9.31), coming to fruition in naturally measured sequence after all have seen "us crown'd at Scone" (5.9.40). A naturalized political order in which self-perpetuating sovereign powers govern in apparently seamless succession, an order in step with nature and the tempo of dwelling, springs from the ruins of the tyrant-adventurer's self-subverted regime.

Macbeth seems to lock the polity into a relentless cycle of deadly change in which rival regimes with combined interests accelerate each other's internal collapse. *Macbeth* focuses on these revolutions and fatal periods. The play mobilizes history for James at the point of political change created by the union of Crowns, and legitimates a Stuart future for England, but it also harps on the bloody, obliterating aspect of political change ushered in by the exterminating blade. This new beginning for a Stuart king involves personal and political cancellation on all sides. It seems that with James' peaceful

accession, the Union of Crowns, and the possible amalgamation of Great Britain into a single political unit, the hurly-burly had just begun.

Postscript

Duncan and Banquo are all those things that the young lord of Shakespeare's sonnets 1 to 17 is urged to become but perversely declines. Declining to breed, the sonneteer's dazzling beloved inflects social self-cancellation with extravagant heroism. Doggedly, the poet voices sensible, incontrovertible arguments as to why the young man should recreate himself in a child. A plodding squire to his fresh knight, the poet afflicts his impervious master with common sense, chiding him with the glum necessities of age, death and sex with women.

The sonneteer assumes a husbanding function on behalf of the willful beloved. As a loving gardener, he "plants" his dear subject in his verses, and thus, he says, "I ingraft you new" (15). The speaker's agency is realized through organic metaphors and through cycles of growth. The beloved's agency is figured through his trajectory as a chivalric figure freed from the obligations of generations of social life. He is "the world's fresh ornament", "only herald to the gaudy spring" (1), resplendent in "youth's proud livery" (2), who plants nothing in time to advance through space. Holding absolute sway over his own beauties, he makes his own law of personal and cultural fashioning. This system of self-government, without a foundation in customary forms, is carried, *ex officio*, on the basis of the beloved's elevated social position and his cultural prestige as a thing of beauty. The beloved cancels his obligations to nature to strut his hour upon the stage and be heard no more. The poet-lover rescues the fair creature from death by expropriating the idea of natality from women and reproducing the beloved's virtue in his verse.

The beloved defies the obligations that bind other men, deprives the community of its due, and exercises an arbitrary prerogative all his own. "Making a famine where abundance lies" (1), the beloved's belligerence evokes Irenius' proposals for creating a famine in Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (1598).⁸⁵ Englishmen were impressed at the time by Ireland's natural resources, the fertility of her soil and its suitability for cultivation and for raising cattle. To make a famine there, to dominate the soil in such a corrupt fashion, would be to rule by terror, as a tyrant. Was this the only way for Elizabeth to impose her authority on Ireland? Would not this shameful misuse of the land work to subvert her authority there?⁸⁶ No wonder the *View* was banned.

The poet ascribes a positive value to the beloved's imperious will by monumentalizing it in the documents of his verse--"my papers (yellowed with their age)" constitute a "tomb/ Which hides your life, and shows not half your parts" (#17). But he also reveals the beloved's tyranny thus by representing his course as a monstrous departure from the law of reason and nature.⁸⁷ The beloved cannibalizes "the world's due" (#1) by refusing to marry and beget. He is a "profitless usurer" (#4), a self-murderer (#9), a man-woman (#20), and a prodigal unthrift (#4,9). It would seem that the poet, Titiania-like, adores a beast. Insofar as a tyrant traditionally took the character of a beast, the poet adores a tyrant. Nevertheless, despite the beautiful beloved's tyranny and his brave advance in the teeth of time to extravagant destruction, the beloved is yet "thy mother's glass" (#3); for all his bold self-fashioning, he is still, like Macbeth, some mother's son.

“Chronicle of wasted time”

What happens to the idea of travel as a way of organising personal and political space if its conceptual opposite is altered? Thus far, I have looked at the boundary between travelling and dwelling as an interface between two systems of public and personal order and agency in early modern England. But what of the subject who discovers little agreement within himself or herself with either of these versions of agency? What would happen to travel as a theory of agency if its opposite were not dwelling, but a kind of unfortunate journeying that did not construct civic space or selfhood?

What happens is that travel remains a factor of personal and political production in early modern England, but in a different way. The focus is now on the *form* of travel, on style, as the means self-differentiation and identity. In other words, the construction of agency through a sequence of action and interaction in space--through travel--combines with a new factor, which is style. This focus on style reconstructs the agent who emerges through the operation of travel.

The early modern subject formed through the action of unfortunate travel emerges as a type figure of the era. This stock character--a social and political renegade, a target for ridicule, and the very picture of warped and wasted human resources--constitutes a humanist anti-type, and was a particular feature of humanistic educational and advice literature. The sorry spectacle cut by this figure directs male pupils and educated men to live a loyal and productive life within the existing social and political order. Thomas Nashe, I suggest, takes up this anti-type as his *persona* in *The Unfortunate Traveller*. As

something of an early modern, corporate cast-off, Nashe developed his career as an author in the print market after failing to thrive in institutions that traditionally provided authorship with its economic material base: the universities and the patronage system. In this chapter, I argue that Nashe registers the disappointments, hardships and possible compensations of social and political detachment as an author in the print market through his unfortunate traveller, Jack Wilton, who functions both as Nashe's *persona*, and as the most fundamental of literary wares, a page.

Nashe's page, as an object, acquires a biography of its own through its capacity to travel. Nashe's loose leaf is a mobile commodity distinguished from those static leaves, anchored in patronage, that "have some branch of nobility whereon to depend and cleave" (252).¹ The career of this page, drawn into commodity exchange and circulating as a travelling object, is an integral part of an authorial career that is not tied to social and political service. Nashe's focus on travel *style* allows him to reconstruct the agent who emerges through the operation of travel as socially and politically detached. In Jack Wilton, *persona* and page, Nashe elaborates a fantasy of authorial agency that springs from his involvement with the print market. This fantasy is not without irony and pathos, of course, given the hardships of his career and the fact that Nashe died young, poor and relatively unknown.

Nashe imagines his career path in relation to a market order. Authorial agency in this picture lies not in the freedom *to* political and social service, but in the freedom *from* traditional political and social affiliations offered by the contractual relations of the market. The contractual order of the market, as John O'Neill (1998) observes, offers a commercial society that "fosters social independence" (77)². Nashe's involvement in the

print market is the enabling condition of an imagined authorial career that is not linked to social and political service and obligation. In fact, Nashe's participation in commercial society is the enabling condition of a fantasy of authorial agency and subjectivity that compensates for the *loss* in status he and other university men actually suffered as authors in the market.

In the figure of Jack Wilton both traveller and travel narrative lose their innocence.³ Nashe's self-observing persona and page produce a consciousness of form that moves the emphasis away from *what* is being observed in the travel relation to *who* is doing the observing and *how*. Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland* stresses the matter of what is seen by the traveller; Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller* regards the travelling observer viewing the world and how these observations are seen by others in turn. Nashe's self-regarding picaro and page produce an awareness and knowledge about form that is independent of the places and people described in the leaves of his "fantastical treatise". *The Unfortunate Traveller* is a history, as Howard Marchitello (1997) puts it, that "never speaks for itself" (108); the anecdote is never offered "as the very mark of fact" (108) because we are always aware of a writer, with a personality and a pronounced attitude, writing this relation.⁴ It is through his focus on style as a factor of production that Nashe fashions a career course that negates the trajectory of the early modern humanistically educated intellectual.

The early modern humanist intellectual and author was often figured as a traveller, Hythoday for example, or was modelled on one, typically Ulysses or Aeneas, or some version of a chivalric wanderer, or even a contemporary adventurer like Drake or Raleigh. Jonson's motto was *tanquam explorator*. A special relationship pertains

between the humanistically educated author and travel because the political authority of this *literatorus* depends on willed rather than involuntary association with the world. Cultivated merit, not birth, determines this kind of author's relationship to the social and political order. The activist, progressive subject, characterised by or formed through travel, who develops by willed association with the world, accords with the crafted humanist agent committed to civil conversation. Nashe's emphasis on the form of travel, on style, however, produces a self-organising system, in which the traveller, as author, derives meaning through a relation to other travellers, rather than from some engagement with the world.

Nashe's traveller's tale, then, turns early modern travel against itself to produce an agent determined by style rather than by interaction with social structure. The very title--*The Unfortunate Traveller*--invites us to differentiate between types of traveller and to focus on form. The ostensible subject of this text, therefore, is a reconsidered model of an on-going system of self-production. Nashe, of course, had had access to traditional intellectual and political worlds--he had his chances to be noticed at Cambridge, and he was employed by patrons--yet he never did satisfactorily toe the political line. The contractual cosmos of the print market enabled Nashe to imagine an authorial career apart from recognised social and political affiliations. The character of Nashe's authorial project emerges, *unlike* Spenser's, as cockily independent of the Elizabethan regime, and its conscious promotion of English nationalism. Nashe imagines a politically detached career as a professional *literatorus* in the burgeoning print market of early modern England.⁵

When old lord Lafew, in *All's Well That Ends Well*, dismisses Parolles, with his fantastic dress and his lying table-talk, as "a vagabond and no true traveller" (2.3.259-60), he makes a distinction between traveller types that points to the form, to the art, of travel. Parolles is of course, the braggart soldier of classical comedy, but he also harks back to a type figure of humanistic educational and advice literature. This type character is a traveller whose political identity is *not* enhanced by travel. He is a traveller who is determined or inscribed by context, a wayfarer who wilts before environmental or social pressure, an unfortunate traveller whose misfortunes are tied to his moral delinquency.⁶ He is, above all, one who travels for fun and sensational distraction, for his own, private pleasure and not for any public profit, either to himself, to his household or to his polity.⁷

The unfortunate traveller is not an accidental tourist like the diligent governor, or would-be governor, for whom travel was a form of socially responsible study, a means to read men and banish bookishness through civil conversation. The unfortunate traveller is one who abandons himself to idle pleasure, falls into evil ways and serves as a salutary lesson against misspent time. The mobile idlers of Erasmus' *Colloquia*--his gadabouts, pilgrims and soldiers--return raddled by deleterious experience, depleted, unrecognizable as their former selves, and loaded with lying tales. Ascham's Italianate Englishman is a moral monster, slopped up from the belly of a swine, the head of an ass, the brain of a fox and the womb of a wolf.⁸ Add to these the figure of the affected traveller--an indeterminate moving mess of outlandish dress and foppish or foolish speech--of countless poems, plays and narratives, and you end up with the stock character of the

unfortunate traveller.

This traveller functions as a humanist anti-type. Corrupted by bad company, colonized by foreign manners, modes or speech, and defiled by foreign disease, the unfortunate traveller defines the *fortunate* traveller, whose political and national identity is *enhanced* by contact with foreign environments. In the manner of the proverbial humanist bee, this fortunate traveller appears able to take the best of foreign cultures and leave the rest in the process of cultivating his political profile and serving the national interest. Jonson's epigram to Sir William Roe offers an example of this traveller type. Roe is described as embarking upon a journey to study "countries, and climes, manners, and men". During his travels he is "T'extract, and choose the best of all these knowne," and then return "untouch'd", although "imbarqu'd for hell".⁹ Jonson's Roe is compared to Aeneas as one who suffers yet triumphs for his people and his homeland. He is also, less directly, something of a Ulysses, the traveller extolled by men of humanistic learning as a linguist and a social observer who *returned* to power once home. Sir Henry Wotton's description of Sir Rowland Lytton underlines just how such travellers could add value to their polity's political profile through travel. In a letter from Italy, Wotton notes that Lytton "is a gentleman that hath brought an excellent good mind into this country...and one that without doubt will carry it home again, and will enrich it abroad with the best observations."¹⁰

Fortunate travellers were those who cultivated individual, civic and national virtues through travel. Such travellers from England included peripatetic scholars and their patrons, students and enthusiasts of the new learning pursuing their studies at universities throughout Europe, antiquarians, ambassadors, cosmographers, expatriate

intellectuals rejecting faction or oppression at home, and aspiring governors and counselors ripening their judgment through foreign experience. There were also secretaries, translators, envoys, intelligence agents, newsletter writers and students of modern languages, all of whom travelled, ostensibly, to serve the commonwealth as well as themselves. There were, in addition, the sons of the great, engaged, with an entourage of tutors and companions, in the final stage of their education, the continental tour, as well as soldiers who showed their willingness to fight for their country on the battlefields of Europe.¹¹ For all these men, travel offered experiential knowledge and authority that promoted England's political, economic and spiritual status and cultivated the nation's human resources and intellectual capital. Such value-adding, fortunate travel was a form of political participation, or at least proof of men's fitness for it.¹² The testimony of such travel might consist of military or intellectual fame; a man might win his spurs with a strike against the Spanish in the Low Countries. Alternatively, intellectual laurels could stem from a translation of a contemporary text from the French or Italian. Intellectual renown might also derive from a relation of state--a "view". Even an account of suffering that demonstrated national stoic fortitude over the accidents that crop up in a hostile environment could serve to promote the protagonist and his *patria*.

What I have called 'fortunate travel' enhanced the political profile of the individual, and that of his polity, because the experiential knowledge and authority it produced supplemented the established socio-political order at home. National identity was tempered in the experiential corridor of the European tour. Experiential authority may also, of course, counter an established order.¹³ We can see the demonized figure of the unfortunate traveller, therefore, as a symptom of political anxiety over those travellers

who fail to internalize and to maintain their social and political identity abroad and thus fail to regulate the destabilizing potential of experiential authority.

The figure of the unfortunate traveller functions as a warning in the early modern genre of advice to travellers. In a number of these works, the man who does not travel well is directly set against the man who does.¹⁴ By deploying this opposition, and by setting out a method for profitable travel and profitable writing about travel, these texts formulate an art of travel that supports existing regimes and hierarchies. Loyal humanistic subjectivities and their disloyal counterparts are manifested in the mastery and non-mastery of this art.¹⁵

The Traveiler of Jerome Turler (1575) was one of the earliest books of explicit precepts for travel.¹⁶ Turler claims in his Preface that he has "comprehended...in one Booke, whatsoever is necessary for any to know concerning the due taking in hand of travaill, and the prosperous performing of the same." This "prosperous performing" of travel includes a written relation of the traveller's studied observations abroad. In promoting this kind of accountability, Turler extends established diplomatic practice to the layman, and makes of each diligent traveller abroad a kind of ambassador for his country.¹⁷ Turler adds, by way of an illustrative example, a travel relation of his own to the body of his precepts. Turler explains that he has "adioyned unto this discourse another booke, wherin I have applied those preceptes of mine, unto such things as seemed worthy the seeing and observing in the Realme of Naples." Thus to *The Traveiller* is attached an account called: *Of Traveill; and of the Realme of Naples*.¹⁸

In *The Traveiller*, Turler sets out a methodology for intellectually profitable travel and travel writing which, he says, "maketh men meete and fit to geve counsell, and to

govern the commonwealth" (60). In representing his project thus, it would appear that Turler appropriates a certain kind of judicious travel and travel writing for the governors of the polity. He devotes a chapter to the description of "Notable men that have traveilled", and lays out guidelines as to the kinds of desirable knowledge and experience to be derived from travel. Turler advocates a form of studious travel, whereby "are knowne," says Turler, "the peculiar behaviours of every cuntrey, their disposition, diet, appareill, maner of buildinge, situation of places, tillage," as well as, "lawes, all doctrines and opinions, holy and profane, and finally the nature of all things" (116). Turler's text makes of such purposive travel something of a philosopher's stone for the kind of contemporary cultural knowledge that informed the discourse of emerging statehood and civic nationalism that I have outlined in Chapter Two. Generally, the judicious and industrious traveller promoted in this treatise "studieth," says Turler, "to do his Cuntrey good" (58).

In the wrong hands, however, for those who are, as Turler puts it, "little provident of their welfare," "not mindfull of their retourning," and "live but for one day," travel is the road to ruin (61). He inveighs against those idle wanderers who neglect their own and their nation's profit and bring home "any vile crime" from abroad. For Turler, idle travel undertaken without some worthy political end is detrimental in both "nourishyng a certen selfe love in all men, and sometime bringing destruction into whole Commonwealthes" (108). The morally delinquent traveller who has elected to be, as Turler puts it, "in evil case" (103), neither studies to his advantage, nor benefits his polity. By setting himself up as "a mocking stocke unto Fortune" (4) the foolhardy, irresponsible wanderer demonstrates his iniquity by abandoning his social and political

values to alien influences instead of exercising his will and defending his political identity against the temptations and encroachments of seemingly desirable, but dangerous foreign experience. The unfortunate traveller who gives himself up to foreign excitements implies his own moral delinquency. In contrast, the traveller who demonstrates mastery over alien influences, or at least a measure of stoic detachment over adversity, and who tempers his political mettle in the fires of foreign hell-holes, is a fortunate traveller who mediates thus his own and his polity's virtue.¹⁹

Turler's defence of travel turns the *form* of travel into a way of expressing agency. "It is not travellings fault," he says, "but the men themselves" that they return worsened by their experience (99). The traveller does not *have* to imitate the vice that he encounters; Turler insists that "there is left unto man a free will in such externall matters" (102). In his *reprehensio*, Turler argues that those who object to travel out of hand are misinformed. He says that those who "holde opinion that the name of Traveillyng is not only infamous, but also the thing it selfe," do so, he claims, because "Tullie compareth banishment with Traveill...terminge it reprochfull, and filthy" and "Ulpian calleth it Deportation, a tearme of the law, being a punishment" (88). Turler confutes classical authority thus:

For that which they call Deportation or exile is one thing, and travell an other, and that by consent of all Grammarianes. And although the antique Writers have frequented one of these words for an other: notwithstanding ech of them have begon now to have their proper and fitting signification which the custome of such as speake properly hath obtayned. (93)

Thus freed from intrinsic taint—but not from difficulty or trial—travel becomes a way for men to demonstrate political agency, and to manifest themselves as loyal and proven political subjects. Travel and travel writing become a medium for civic nationalism and for individual advancement within regimes that promoted civic statehood, as well as a means of shaping government policy. Spenser's *View* illustrates this on all counts. Travelling well demonstrates a man's political character. A written relation of the traveller's judicious observations, compiled in accordance with precepts like those Turler recommends, serves as the measure of a man's political engagement and his fitness to serve, as well as constituting a form of counsel.

The kind of travel relation that Turler recommends, as well as demonstrating a man's political loyalty and his rhetorical skills, also manifests his knowledge and expertise in the field of modern European history and languages. These were fields of knowledge that were given little attention at the Universities, despite the fact that their value to the polity in facilitating new directions for commerce and politics was increasingly recognized. This recognition helped create a vogue for modern language study in Elizabethan England. Many went abroad to learn French, Italian or Spanish, or bought printed grammars, dialogues and dictionaries and learnt at home.²⁰ Elizabeth and her officers of state subsidized the travels of young men who went to Europe to learn modern languages or to acquire knowledge of Continental politics. Thus the Queen and her ministers trained and acquired experienced men for all manner of government business. The secret services of Walsingham and Essex were filled with such men.²¹ Relations of foreign affairs submitted as official reports or as secret intelligence were actively solicited by men of state. In fact, the desire for these foreign relations helped

spark a vogue for news that fueled the career of men like John Pory and led eventually to the establishment of the printed newspaper in England.²² Turler's treatise, and others like it, participated in these emergent trends by systematizing travel as a means of personal and political cultivation, and by making travel writing available to the man of merit as a rhetorical qualification for patronage and government service.²³

Edmund Spenser, as I have already noted, read Turler's *The Traveiller* and then gave it to Gabriel Harvey in 1578, on the eve of his proposed trip abroad in the service of Leicester.²⁴ Harvey's trip fell through, but had he gone he would doubtless have written up his observations as a traveller, as Spenser did in his *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (circa 1596).²⁵ As proof of national character and of time well spent, the relation of foreign travel provided an excellent recommendation for the author as a loyal political participant. What I want to suggest is that relations like Ascham's *A discours and affaires of the state of Germanie* (1552), Sir Thomas Hoby's *A Booke of the Travaille and Lief of Me Thomas Hoby* (1547-64), Edward Webbe's *Travails* (1590), Robert Dallington's *View of France* (1604) and Francis Davison's *Relation of Saxonie* (circa 1597), if they do not constitute a craze for travel reportage, exemplify the kinds of politically involved writing and authorship that Thomas Nashe turns upside down in *The Unfortunate Traveller*.

What Nashe does in *The Unfortunate Traveller* is to repeatedly set up a humanist and politically involved career trajectory for Jack, through the practice of travel, only to truncate it and turn it against itself.²⁶ These career courses, informed by faithful service to a monarch, a mistress, a patron or a nation, and activated or executed through travel, are burlesqued in the hellish, contractual and cut-throat arenas of Nashe's Europe.

Nashe's traveller displaces a studied relation of foreign people, place and politics with sensational news and phantasmagoric history. Nashe's "cankered muse", devoted to style, offers meaning that is independent of the political values constituted by travel relations generally. With his page-persona Jack Wilton, the masterless mind and stylist elaborates a fantasy of authorial detachment in a hellish contractual cosmos--an order that is both enslaving and liberating--by turning political agency against itself at every turn.

The name "Jack" has generic meaning. Nashe's Jack is not a character with a particular identity as such; he is a picaro, a generic and autonomous agent, one fostered by the market, with no specific settled connection to countries, nations, states, or kings.²⁷ Indeed, it may well be that the increasing popularity of the picaro *persona* throughout this era and across Europe becomes a way of elaborating authorship in a market economy as supra-political, or as resistant to the existing social and political order. Nashe announces his authorial independence from nationalist and parochial political programs right from the start of *The Unfortunate Traveller* by having his *persona* play the soldier. Erasmus would have disagreed that the soldier represented a moral political agent in any capacity, but this perspective was countered by the emergence in sixteenth-century England of a political discourse, informed by classical humanism, that represented the soldier as a participant in public business.²⁸ A man of merit, if not fortune, could exercise his virtue and attain to dignity by serving the political collective as a fighting man.²⁹ Military service, glamorized by a chivalric aura and more accessible than civil service, offered men a way of understanding themselves as engaged in honourable political activity for the benefit of the commonwealth. Sir Philip Sidney, for example, took this course and died for it, and Ben Jonson served as a soldier in the Low Countries during the early

1590's, rather than sweat it out as a bricklayer.

Nashe's narrative proper opens with Henry VIII's imperial and chivalric advance into France. It is an exploit that links the Tudor king to Henry V and his triumphs abroad, and would seem a grand enough golden-age situation to promise glorious occupation to "Jack Wilton, a gentleman at least", but no such national service materializes.³⁰ At Terouanne, Jack's trajectory as a national and humanist hero dives to the haphazard trifling of a knavish scourge who tricks tricksters and catches fools. A "demi-soldier in jest" Jack offers a string of pranks as "the stratagemical acts and monuments" (255) and "famous achievements" (262) of his military career. Moreover, as "King of the Cans and Black-jacks, Prince of the Pigmies, County Palatine of Clean Straw" and "Lord High Regent of Rashers of the Coals and Red-herring Cobs", Jack represents his part in Henry VIII's "full-sailed fortune" in France as quotidian, domestic and mercenary.

The occasion of this war and famous victory of memory raises national consciousness and serves to point up Nashe's freewheeling page as an agent with little or no commitment to nations, countries, states or even kings. A whipped trickster in the Plautine comic tradition, Jack plays up the pointlessness of the whole master-servant dialectic right up to the national level, stopping just short at the crown. He trips up a "Lord of Misrule", as well as a "Senior Velvet-cap"--the cider merchant and "ugly mechanical Captain"--in a camp that is likened to the dens of London Bridge, itself a microcosm of underworld London, before skipping out on his grotesquely sick country altogether at the end of this martial episode.

In having Jack play at being a soldier here, Nashe points up the dissolution of

traditional identities constituted through specific affiliations to king and country. Indeed, Nashe gestures throughout this work to the folding of all identities fashioned through obedience to any kind of master whose project departs from the individual's immediate interest. Nashe dwells on the wreckage of these heretofore settled identities, but he also looks past them to a new dynamic for his persona and his page. Jack watches himself putting on and putting off identities as they come within reach and, in doing so, looks to a course beyond attachments to conventional masters and traditional roles. Jack is not necessarily excluded from public affairs, but he prefers to dispose of his own time in his own way. Jack *plays* at participation in the life of the nation and the state; he toys with political roles, moving in and out of commitments and social positions. Sliding out of sticky situations and skipping away from affiliations, attachments and roles seems always an option or a possibility for Jack. This kind of negative freedom from ties and commitments, and even from what appears to be certain death, signals Jack's detachment from the traditional rules of engagement with the world.

Jack plays the soldier again when he makes towards where the "King of France and the Switzers were together by the ears". His hope is to thrust himself into the winning side, but he arrives to "a wonderful spectacle of bloodshed on both sides" and the war blown over (276-7). Jack then turns his attention to the Anabaptist's struggle against the Emperor and the Duke of Saxony. "Like a crow that still follows aloof where there is carrion," Jack says, "I flew me over to Munster," but the pickings are pitiful; the motley crew under John Leiden offers no contest to the Imperial soldiers and the Anabaptists are shredded.³¹ Perplexed unto weariness and disgusted "with talking of cobblers, tinkers, rope-makers, botchers and dirt-daubers," Jack shakes these inglorious

episodes off and cashiers "the new vocation of my cavaliership" after "the tragical catastrophe of this Munsterian conflict" (286).

Denied three times for a soldier, Jack switches to calling himself a "knights-arrant infant" when he meets up with the Earl of Surrey in Middleburg. The naming of this port in Zeeland suggests the possibility of service for Jack as squire to some English gentleman and martial adventurer seeking experience and fame abroad. It was through Middleburg that most of those English adventurers who sought military training and experience in the battles between the Dutch and Spanish passed.³² The example of Sir Oliver St. John, the second son of a Wiltshire knight, shows how political careers followed from this route. After distinguishing himself in the wars in the Netherlands and in Ireland, Sir Oliver rose to become the Lord Deputy of Ireland in 1616 and was created Baron Tregoze in 1626.³³ Jack meets up with the Earl of Surrey, his "late master", at this Continental entrepot for future national heroes and governors. The scene is set for the exercise of national virtue in some fortunate endeavour with a glorious master, and Jack is easily persuaded to "bear half-stakes with Surrey in the lottery of travel" (287). So might Nashe himself have felt when, in 1593, and after his dirty fights with Martin Marprelate and Gabriel Harvey, he found an influential and wealthy benefactor in Sir George Carey. Yet, already, Jack cuts this potentially honourable foreign foray down to size by turning it into a lark, a game of chance.

Nashe sets up an affiliation between Surrey and Jack as master and servant only to dissolve it. Surrey is described initially as a heroic, supremely poised poet, possessed of a "supernatural kind of wit", whose "thoughts are exalted above the world of ignorance and all earthly conceits" (287). But Jack discovers that Surrey has been metamorphosed

from himself since they last met. Surrey is not travelling in exercise of his virtue but as a consequence of misfortune--"love," he tells Jack, has "clean conjured me from my content" (288).³⁴ In travelling thus idly, Surrey is not the grave master that he was. After listening to Surrey's "unexpected love story" Jack feels more at ease. He is delighted to hear frivolous talk "from a mouth out of which was nought wont to march but stern precepts of gravity and modesty" (290). Surrey is now less a figure of respectful awe, a master, and much more a good companion. He is, in fact, not so different from Jack, as their name switch later implies, and Jack is still a loose leaf without "some branch of nobility whereon to cleave" as he drifts from Surrey without leave in Venice (252).

Nashe burlesques Surrey as a "heroical master", just as he sports with Jack as his trusty squire. Nashe's Surrey apes those English aristocrats who broke lances abroad in compensation for being politically sidelined by a bureaucratic hegemony at home.³⁵ English aristocrats, nostalgic for a fading political order, followed the example of rulers like Frederick the Wise, Duke of Saxony and founder of Wittenberg University, who attended banquets and tournaments as a matter of course when they travelled.³⁶ Edward Webbe, in his *Travailes* (1590), describes an English aristocrat challenging all comers in Sicily as a political gesture just as Surrey does in Nashe's work.³⁷ Webbe reports that:

One thing did greatly comfort me which I saw long since in Sicilia, in the city of Palermo, a thing worthy of memoria, where the right honourable the Earle of Oxenford a famous man for Chivalrie at what time he travelled into forraine Countries, being then personally present, made there a challenge against al manner of persons whatsoever, and at all manner of weapons, as Turniments, Barrios with horse and armour, to fight a combat with any whatsoever. In defence of his Prince and country:

for which he was verie highly commended, and yet no man durst be so hardy to encounter with him, so that all Italy over, he is acknowledged the onely Chivallier and Noble man of England. (32)³⁸

No political or poetic master, then, binds freewheeling and generic Jack. His particular nature does not emerge through specific ties to established authorities. As a human resource, he is of limited use-value to his king, his country, and to his glamorous, poetic patron. We must look, therefore, to the "dispositional properties" of Nashe's page to see Jack's value actualized.³⁹ The particular properties of Nashe's page emerge through Jack's exchange value as human "stuff". As a spare page who wanders idly through Europe, falls into bad hands, and is treated as so much scrap flesh, Jack Wilton follows the fate of what he himself calls the "certain pages of his misfortunes" (253). Distributed as "waste paper", these unfortunate sheets are subject to a variety of sordid destinies at the hands of those who take them up. The loose leaves may be used as a "privy token" or as a means of drying and kindling tobacco. They may also end up as wrapping paper for smelly footwear, or as stops for mustard pots. In Erasmus' *Formulae*-short passages used by Tudor school-boys for Latin translation--letters that come without containing money are described as being good only for wiping bums, or for covering mackerel or for wrapping spices.⁴⁰ Living up to what Gabriel Harvey called his grammar school wit, Nashe plays up the pass-along character of his printed pages that have no core of social or intellectual value to them, no political capital, against those that are to be preserved and cherished, as he says in his mocking address to Southampton, for "some little summer fruit" that might be found amongst them.⁴¹

Nashe points up the utility of his printed page as a bit of stuff, as a piece of paper

with a thousand different applications, and his human page as a piece of humanity useful as a sexual, scientific or political plaything. Paper costs accounted for three-quarters of the price of publication and Nashe, a man possessed of literary capital who lands in the print market, plays up the horror of seeing his page's material, not intellectual, value utilized as the sheet is passed from hand to hand. Nashe indicates how appalling this can be for the author too as Jack is thrust from one grubby grip to another. Yet, at the same time, the *literator* who lands in the print market also apprehends a loosening of bonds to a system of patronage and advancement through self-interested service to the commonwealth. This laxity holds new possibilities for authorship. Jack's knack of floating free of involvement is part of Nashe's fantasy about the possibilities of detachment. Jack's perilous predicaments, however, also mediate the unattached author's vulnerability.

As a loose leaf blown about Europe, Jack is prone to wilt. He replays the fall of the unfortunate traveller to any evil circumstance, over and over again. Travel does not augment him in the way that it does, say, Musidorus and Pyrocles of Sidney's *Old Arcadia*, for whom it was an opportunity "to exercise their virtues and increase their experience" (10).⁴² It is even less like Philisides' account (from the same work) of his international experience, which crowned the "untroubled tenor of a well-guided life" and proved "the benefits of a quiet mind" (291). Philisides travelled in order to ripen his judgment. Travel qualified him, as Turler said it would, to serve the commonwealth as a counselor.⁴³

If Jack's travels do not equip him to be a friendly advisor to the great, they serve even less as an occasion for him, as a young man of parts, to gather political intelligence

with which to dazzle a patron. This was the aim of ambitious young men who followed the precepts for what Turler called the "prosperous performing" of travel, and who offered written advice in the form of eye-witnessed reports to prove their capacity.⁴⁴ The example of Robert Dallington, a Norfolk schoolmaster before he rose in the service of the Earl of Rutland, shows how preferment was possible as a result of composing such relations for patrons at home. Dallington's title for his essay was: *A Method For Travel. Shewed By The View Of France* (1604).⁴⁵ In its systematic discussion of the political, military and financial organization of France, with a thumb-nail character sketch of the French nation, it exemplified the kind of "method" for travel and travel writing that preceptors like Jerome Turler had turned into a qualification for serving the commonwealth.⁴⁶

Dallington's treatise is also, like Spenser's *View*, implicated in the discourse of statehood that had emerged in the course of the sixteenth century. This discourse was a product of formalized international relations and associations. Clare Williams (1937), in a survey of some Renaissance writing practices, notes the emergence of a "suave stereotyped cycle of Venetian relations to the Doge" from the fifteenth century on (40).⁴⁷ Andrea Trevisan, a Venetian stationed in England, inaugurates a manner of *relazione* that, according to Williams, "is the pattern of all subsequent reports" (87). Trevisan's personal observations organized into a report of English character, climate, government and institutions created the rubric by which Italians monitored England from 1500 to the accession of Elizabeth I. The idea of an eye-witnessed and formalized report of a depersonalized public order, as outlined in Chapter Two, inaugurated the discourse of statehood in this era.

Francis Davison, like Dallington and Spenser, was another career traveller who aimed to win his political spurs by authoring a relation of state. Davison, of sonnet fame, set off for Europe, armed with a bundle of model treatises and relations, to compose the kind of travel relation that would impress policy-makers at home.⁴⁸ He authored a "Relation of Saxonie" for Essex, which he sent via Antony Bacon, Essex' secretary and brother to Francis.⁴⁹ The manuscript of Davison's *Relation of Saxonie* was either lost or stolen from Essex' possession shortly after it was delivered, but the response of Bacon and Essex to this relation reveals that such reports were understood to be a demonstration of aptitude for government service. Antony Bacon writes to Davison on "the first fruits of your travel, I mean your Relation of Saxony," that "you show no less diligence in observing and collecting than judgement in orderly disposing the same" (xvii). He advises Davison "to proceed and continue" and represents such travel as a cumulative labour of observation and reportage, demanding studious dedication and political acumen. Bacon tells Davison that:

Such a course of study requireth an earnest intention of the mind and a retentive memory, and consequently will cost you no small pain; so after some little practice having brought your mind as it were to a habit of judgement, you shall reap exceeding pleasure and profit answerable to your painful endeavours. (xvii-xviii)

In the letter Essex eventually wrote to Davison, he refers to the Relation as "the proof I have seen of your well spending your time abroad" (xlviii). Despite this "proof" of his worth, Davison did not prosper like Dallington. When his hopes of a career as a foreign agent collapsed, Davison took another route to authorship, and turned sonneteer.⁵⁰

A formalized foreign relation, then, was deemed to augment one's standing among the rest of the educated men who were seeking patronage by demonstrating a measure of political acumen and engagement. The banished Earl thinks that Jack's reason for straying so far from home might have been an ambitious desire "to be better accounted of than other of thy condition" (341). He advises Jack to go home, implying that this course of advancement is doomed to failure in the corrupting context of foreign lands. Speaking as one burnt by the sun, the Earl warns that "these insolent fancies are but Icarus' feathers, whose wanton wax, melted against the sun, will betray thee into a sea of confusion" (341).

Although Jack is taken by the banished Earl for a traveller with aspirations, like a Dallington or a Davison, Jack's relation offers sensational news instead of a studied and formal report on foreign nations and states. To serious-minded travellers like Davison, items of sensational, entertaining news were the incidental froth of foreign travel. When Francis Davison gives in to his father's request for "news" he sends home descriptions of particularly harrowing punishments and executions, loose talk on patently ridiculous conspiracies and details of conspicuous loss of life on the battlefield.⁵¹ Jack's far-fetched chronicle includes a clinical description of precision torture in the executions of Zadoc and Cutwolf, a jest at the expense of a would-be secret agent, Zadoc's preposterous plots against the Christians, and the grisly casualties of war suffered by the French, Switzers and Anabaptists. Jack observes punishment not policy, and instead of a reliable, eye-witnessed account of statehood in Europe he offers far-fetched tales of barbarity that were associated with treatises on race, like those published on the Scythians or the Turks.⁵²

Ascham's *A discours and affaires of the state of Germanie* (1552) offers another example of the kind of foreign relation that Nashe departs from in Jack's outlandish chronicle. Ascham represents his relation as a history that is predicated on truth.⁵³ Offering Livy, Caesar, Thucydides, Homer and even Chaucer as models, Ascham details a method whereby experience abroad may be fashioned into an authoritative history. He who "would well and advisedly write an history", Ascham advises, should, as a first principle, "write nothyng false" (126). Secondly, he should "be bold to say any truth, whereby is avoyded two great faultes, flattery and hatred" (126). Then, he is "to mark diligently the causes, counsels, actes, and issues in all great attemptes" and judge them accordingly, and "of every issue, to note some generall lesson of wisdom and warines" (126). The style "must alwayes be playne and open," and "diligence also must be used in keeping truly the order of time" so that "A man shal thincke not to be readyng but present in doying of the same" (126). This is the kind of history and travel writing that speaks for itself, that offers material "as the very mark of fact".

Nashe's "reasonable conveyance of history" promises only a "variety of mirth" (251). In Jack Wilton, Nashe displaces the truth teller with a self-reflecting, extravagant storyteller, and deliberately collapses, as Robert Wiemann has noted, *fabula* and *historia*.⁵⁴ Nashe, like Ascham, does laud the man who "is bold to say any truth, whereby is avoyded two great faultes, flattery and hatred," but that man is Pietro Aretino, the infamous libeler, pornographer and blackmailer.⁵⁵ Of Aretino, Nashe says that he was "no timorous servile flatterer of the commonwealth wherein he lived. His tongue and his invention were forborne; what they thought, they would confidently utter" (310).

Ascham's conception of history, as a true report that made reading

interchangeable with politically uncompromising experience, is not the only kind of history turned against itself by Nashe. What Nashe calls the "elegiacal history" of Heraclide mocks an older view of history, predicated on the fall of Fortune's favoured and derived from the *Mirror for Magistrates*. In this, Nashe capitalizes on a 1590's vogue for the complaint, stimulated by Samuel Daniel's *The Complaint of Rosamund* (1592).⁵⁶ Rosamund is a ghost, poisoned by a jealous queen. Heraclide is "tyrannously polluted" by Esdras, who is described as a "poison coming towards her" (336). Heraclide rises from her rape like a ghost, "Her eyes were dim, her cheeks bloodless, her breath smelt earthy, her countenance was ghastly. Up she rose...as a reprobate soul rising to the Day of Judgment" (337), and, like Rosamund, Heraclide blames her fall on her beauty and on her nature as a woman that "am predestinate to this horrible abuse" (337). Heraclide's fall is tragic--she is compared to Oedipus as she begins her complaint--but it is also literal and comic. "Throughly stabbed," she falls upon her unconscious husband's body and wakes him up with the impact. He, "feeling something lie heavy on his breast," pushes her off, gets up, and lights a candle (339). Heraclide's tragi-comic fall travesties a view of history predicated on tragic fall, just as it does Ascham's Protestant-inflected model of history as experiential truth.⁵⁷

Not a history in Ascham's sense then, or even a history in the tradition of tragic fall, *The Unfortunate Traveller*, subtitled "The Life of Jack Wilton", claims to be an autobiographical relation that covers a number of journeys. In this particular, it is like Sir Thomas Hoby's account of his life and travels in *A Booke of The Travail and Life of Me Thomas Hoby* (1547-1564).⁵⁸ Hoby's connections and his classical learning are on display in his account. In the company of like-minded English gentlemen, Hoby searches

out antiquities, enjoys the hospitality of local aristocrats, and attends the courts of princes. Although he passes through a thick wood "verie jeopardous to passe" because "banished men of the kingdom lie manie times for their praye" (39), as well as a town which not long since "hathe receaved great damage by Barbarossa" (44), there is no incident with either murdering robber or pirate reported to disturb the summing up of city after city in terms of its wines, its delicate fruits, and other fine wares. Munich, for example, "is a famous towne for the best lutestrings in all Germanie" (112). Hoby has a predilection for noting water cures, and a tendency to mix in a classical reference with his observations of geographical detail.⁵⁹ Generally it might be said that Philisides' "untroubled tenor" describes the tempo of Hoby's travels: he is as a fortunate traveller, maintaining the regularity of his domestic life abroad, exercising his virtues, promoting his hopes, without compromising his political identity as a loyal Englishman.

Hoby was not simply an antiquarian who travelled in Italy in order to "throughlie" search out "suche antiquities as were here to bee seene from place to place" (25) and record them. He also travelled "for the tung's sake" (38). Modern languages were not available as a field of systematic study at Oxford, Cambridge, or at the Inns of court, but expertise in these languages was increasingly required for diplomatic and commercial purposes both at home and abroad. Thomas Hoby translated Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*, of course, but such literary translations have tended to obscure the importance of foreign language acquisition for the purpose of attaining and holding a variety of offices.⁶⁰ The banished Earl thinks Jack might be travelling for this reason. He inquires of Jack "the occasion of thy straying so far out of England", and he tells Jack that "if it be languages, thou may'st learn them at home" (341). Jack, of course, is no student

of languages. He has to depend on Petro de Camp Frego as an interpreter, and ends up languishing in prison as a result. Neither is Jack an antiquarian; he does not much meddle with the trophies of antiquity. He recalls that he "was at Pontius Pilate's house" and that he "pissed against it," but for the rest, he maintains, "it were frivolous to specify, since he that hath but once drunk with a traveller talks of them" (326).⁶¹

Jack's foreign travel exercises his wit--the extemporal, expendable output of precocious youth--and his narrative punishes any expectation of political presumption.⁶² Jack's adventures repeatedly threaten to overwhelm him, plunging him into the kind of crushing experience that enjoins prostrate fear rather than elegant observation. Well-schooled in the poetics of polemic as a player in the Marprelate controversy, Nashe's phantasmagoric history up-ends foreign travel as a means of developing personal and political capital by reformulating such journeying as a comic and futile foray into barbarity. Nor does this journeying into savage climes constitute a trial of national identity in the wilderness of a barbaric world. Jack Wilton is not a traveller, like Edward Webbe for example, who demonstrated English grit in the face of adversity.

Edward Webbe was a master gunner, whose relation of his "troublesome travell and slavish life susteyned in the Gallies, and wars of the great Turk" was offered as a testimonial of national virtue to Queen Elizabeth.⁶³ Webbe concludes his dedication to the queen by saying that "my desire is that I may be imployed in such service and affaires, as may be found pleasing to God, and found profitable to my prince and cuntry" (15). Where more fortunate travellers like Thomas, Ascham, Hoby, and Dallington aimed to impress with their command of foreign culture that did not compromise their national identity, Webbe wants to make his mark by detailing his sufferings, and, by

implication, his English fortitude and steadiness in the midst of crushing experience. Webbe was one of many travellers who published accounts of their captivity and sufferings at the hands of the Turks, hoping for favour at court. A pamphlet entitled *Strange and Wonderful Things happened to Richard Hasleton...in his Ten Years Travels in many foreign countries* (1595) is another example of this kind of relation.⁶⁴ Anthony Munday's account of John Fox's captivity by the Turks in Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* (1589) is yet one more account of suffering that is presented as some kind of victorious trial of national courage and virtue. In this instance, Munday outlines how Fox "went into the Court; and showed all his travel to the Council" who, in turn, "extended to him their liberality" (211).⁶⁵

Jack's exotic tribulations gesture towards those relations called "strange", "rare" or "wonderful" adventures. Jack plunges into one extraordinary peril after another. These adventures hardly show Jack's indomitable English spirit. What they do reveal, however, is Jack's use-value as flesh for consumption of one kind or another. Instead of celebrating Jack's native fortitude, Nashe plays up Jack's fears as he is passed from one set of fearful clutches to another. Sold as a "sound body" for an anatomy, Jack goes into a delirium of comic fright as he helplessly watches himself suffer. Terrified at being cut "like a French summer doublet" Jack dare not so much as pick a pimple, for fear he should bleed to death. Rescued from vivisection by Juliana, one of the Pope's concubines, Jack is terrorized by this woman who wants him for her own deadly pleasure. Being "cloyed" with her company every six hours, Jack is not only exhausted, but horribly afraid because he knows that "when I was consumed and worn to the bones through her abuse" she planned to "give me but a dram too much, and pop me into a

privy" (357). Reduced to scrap flesh, Jack faces a choice of evils, his comic panic adding nothing to his political credit. Nor is this the first time this has happened; as a spare Surrey in Florence, the shock of confrontation with Henry Howard sends him into a bodily tail-spin--Jack is all madly running blood; blood on the brink of a destructive plunge, like the Sabine maids. The shocking flood conspires to burst his body into a mess of "fear-dropped limbs" under the table for the dogs to lick up, save that Surrey "instead of menacing or affrighting me with his sword...burst out into laughter" (313).

Jack watches himself wilt under pressure. Like another Nashe *persona*, "Thomalin", whose "faint-hearted instrument of lust" leaps to a peak of excitement and then repeatedly collapses before the lusty onslaught of "Mistress Francis" in *The Choice of Valentines*, Jack's body figuratively collapses into flaccid flesh or fluid following a sudden peak of fear, right before his very eyes. Jack's body, perpetually prone to fall, matches his mind, which he observes reeling under the pressure of rude experience. Jack's political identity as an Englishman travelling in Italy is tested and found comically lacking in a series of imaginatively contrived catastrophes that foreground his primary utility as malleable, flexible flesh. The rampant, comic barbarity of Nashe's Italy renders men and women as so much meat, blood, sweat or tears, while Jack--a page with no piece of money, no national value, hidden inside--circulates from one grubby application to another. These perilous adventures and their lingering effects register the harrowing aspect of Nashe's vulnerable position as an unattached author in the cutthroat world of the market.

Jack, to his credit, shows nothing of Cutwolfe's fortitude of body and mind. Cutwolfe is a traveller. Cutwolfe tells the crowd waiting to see his execution that he

travelled "above three thousand miles" in quest of Esdras. "Twenty months together I pursued him," he says, "from Rome to Naples, from Naples to Caite, passing over the river, from Caite to Siena, from Siena to Florence, from Florence to Parma," and on and on to Sion, to Geneva, and back again towards Rome, "where in the way it was my chance to meet him in the nick here in Bologna" (364). The dogged persistence of the Italian revenger as he trudges through Europe after his prey, and his psychotic disdain before his torments, burlesque a kind of satanic subjectivity that swells through trial and tribulation in space. "My body is little," he tells the crowd waiting to see his person torn for political consumption, "but my mind is as great as a giant's" (363), just before his limbs are hammered to bloody slush and his "flesh legacied amongst the fowls of the air" (369).

The figure of Cutwolfe plays to the devilish reputation accorded to Italy and Italians by scholars like Ascham and Cheke. Pausing, not retiring, from his "wreakful resolution" as the condemned and cornered Esdras grovels before him, Cutwolfe says that his "thoughts travelled in quest of some notable new Italianism, whose murderous platform might not only extend on his body, but his soul also" (368). For Ascham, Italy could corrupt even the virtuous man's mind and he advises against going to Italy at all in *The Scholemaster* (1570). From Ascham's point of view, the dangers of cloistered bookishness pale before the peril to young Englishmen that lay in actual experience of Italy. In his encounter with the banished Earl, Jack disregards the wisdom of the sage traveller concerned for the native virtue of young Englishmen abroad. The Earl advises Jack to go home before he is lost to his native land, but Jack is grateful only for the gossip the Earl relays.

The Ascham-like, avuncular counselor who advises against unprofitable travel was a feature of prose fiction before *The Unfortunate Traveller*. Lyly's Euphues, who skips serious Athens to study the wanton pleasures of Naples, and Lodge's Philamis, of *Euphues his Shadowe* (1592), who neglects his welfare to concentrate on foreign fun, both receive warnings from such a counselor. The banished Earl who, according to Jack, "examined and schooled me," is akin to Lyly's old gentleman in Naples, who counsels Euphues, and Lodge's Anthenor, the grave and elderly stranger who lectures Philamis. These sage figures warn Euphues and Philamis against travel that is a pursuit of worthless pleasure. Add to these the old hermit Cassander of *Euphues and his England* (1580), who advises Callimachus "to stay him from travel and to take some other course more fit for a gentleman" (215), and the correspondence between these old ambassadors of experience and Nashe's banished Earl is clear.

Unlike Euphues and Philamis, however, Jack does not stop to dispute with his moral advisor. Although a governmental prohibition existed that forbade Englishmen from communicating with disloyal countrymen, Jack's lack of response to the lecturer and the lesson is more than politically correct disdain of the banished Earl as a possible English Catholic.⁶⁶ The Earl's boiled-down wisdom is a tedious digression to Jack. For him this unsolicited moral rescue is superfluous in a way that it is not for the travellers of Lyly and Lodge. Jack is not to be rescued for England, unlike Euphues and Philamis, who, as gentlemen of patrimony and parts, constitute human capital that rightfully belongs to the site of production, that is, to their respective polities. In a thunderous declamation, the Earl counsels Jack to bear the servitude that service may entail, rather than suffer the bondage pursuant to a masterless, unaffiliated state. This is irrelevant to

Jack, for he has already been drawn into commodity exchange and circulates as travelling flesh. For instance, Jack's "French doublet gelt in the belly as though (like a pig ready to be spitted) all my guts had been plucked out," and "a pair of side-paned hose that hung down filled with Holland cheese" proclaim Jack a flamboyant morsel for consumption on his return from his first foreign tour (272).⁶⁷ This page does not need humanist wisdom that pertains to his political and moral profit; with the hangman's rope around his neck, what Jack needs is an alibi. Where the Earl *really* saves Jack--rescuing him from the gallows--is with knowledge that the nobleman picked up in a barber's shop.

Jack Wilton is a protagonist who lacks political urgency. Nashe turns the kind of profitable travel and travel writing that Turler, Thomas, Ascham, Hoby, Davison and Dallimore practiced against itself with Jack's self-advertising picaresque lurch from one degrading adventure to the next and his disorderly relation of news, jests, burlesques and misadventure. Jack is not involved in the representation of national virtue, nor is he a reliable reporter on the state of other nations; he is an "outlandish Chronicler". As a traveller, he functions as an anti-type to the politically and socially grounded soldier, linguist, antiquarian, historian, vigilante and aspiring foreign agent. Jack's conceptual opposite is not some politically embedded *dweller*, but those travellers who were all, in one way or another, implicated in nationalist politics because they had internalized political values. It is important to note that Jack is not excluded from forms of political participation. As he takes up one political trajectory after another only to play with it, drop it or deny it, an awareness of the corruption of the political environment emerges and seems to inform some of Jack's resistance to participate in these affiliations. Instead of tempering his national virtue in a foreign context and returning a man augmented, Jack

is, rather, variously enslaved, overwhelmed, imprisoned and abused as he moves from one inglorious occupation to another.

Jack is a protagonist with *economic* urgency who assumes, then drops, the political and social bonds that shape the narrative order of more fortunate travellers' lives. Jack's lurching, untidy narrative, like his generic name, appears to lack determinate shape. Market relations disrupt the traditional life plans and patterns of the author--and Nashe recognizes the evil case this leads to--but this disruption and the circumstances of life in the market also let Nashe imagine new authorial careers despite the grim material realities of his actual situation. The man in the market, as John O'Neill puts it, "views different commitments and loyalties as constantly open choices from which exit is continuously possible" (78). A way out seems always to be a possibility for Nashe's *persona*, but this exit usually involves going from one set of appalling conditions to another. As the prisoner of Doctor Zacharie, or of Juliana, or as a spectator to state violence in the slaughter of the Anabaptists, the rape of Heraclide by Esdras (who is authorized by the Pope), and the public torture of Cutwolfe, Jack dwells on his experience of alienation and powerlessness as he watches himself move from one set of corrupt clutches to another. Jack does not return intellectually or spiritually enriched from these experiences; rather, he leaves Italy "mortifiedly abjected and daunted" (370). Jack's foreign travel might seem to serve here, as the banished Earl said it would, "to tame and bring men under" (341).

Nashe shows his traveller apparently tamed in a perfunctory retraction of Jack's drifting course at the end of the relation. Nashe has his page turn at the last moment and take what dregs of social and political affiliation he can get rather than wander any more

as a loose leaf. The spare page binds himself in marriage to his courtesan and attaches himself to the King of England's camp. But what kind of redemption is this? What self-respecting Renaissance man would make himself a cuckold and marry a courtesan? And what kind of patriotic nerve does it take to walk back into "the King of England's camp...where he with great triumphs met and entertained the Emperor and the French King and feasted many days" (370)? In this abrupt transformation of Jack into unfortunate husband and battle-shy soldier, Nashe plays with the *forms* of political agency that were available to most men: the bearing of arms on behalf of one's polity, and the production of children for that polity through marriage. In this mocking retraction, and in his mocking address to the Earl of Southampton, Nashe frames his text with a play on form that removes him, as an author, from the constituting terms of political and social engagement generally.

The nation's loss, however, is the print author's gain in Nashe's fantasy of authorial agency. Nashe's persona and page are protagonists not because they demonstrate any spiritual, moral or political urgency but because they profit, in some soiled way, from circulating as a commodity even while all those about Jack dwindle and perish. When, for example, Jack eludes Juliana, he escapes not only with his life but with Juliana's jewels, her plate, her money and her maid. Jack is powerless before the spectacle of broken flesh offered, for example, by the slaughter of the Anabaptists, the rape of Heraclide and the execution of Cutwolfe, but his eagle-eyed passivity is that of the presiding voyeur, not that of the victim. Jack's body is never broken, despite coming close to public execution and bodily dissolution or dismemberment on a number of occasions. Furthermore, Nashe concludes *The Unfortunate Traveller* with a page who

returns not only rich but also sexually refreshed by a Venetian courtesan.

Nashe fortifies his limp traveller by linking him with the infamous Italian, Pietro Aretino. The episode in which Jack Wilton, the Earl of Surrey and a magnifico's wife are imprisoned together and then set free by "Monsieur Petro Aretino" is a case in point. Jack's sexual adventure in prison is a straightforward, almost contractual transaction; it is gratifying and cleanly executed, especially when compared to his unfortunate attempt upon Flavia Aemilia, which landed him in prison, or his abuse at the hands of Juliana, which nearly ended in him being poisoned, or even his cross-dressed dalliance with a Switzer Captain "far gone for want of the wench", an adventure which could only have ended badly one way or another had Jack not "feigned an impregnable excuse to be gone, and never came at him after" (270).

In this prison episode, Jack takes the sexual initiative and makes a quick conquest of the woman, stealing her from underneath Surrey's nose by deploying a little worldly wisdom. He sums up the situation thus: "Her husband had abused her, and it was very necessary she should be revenged" (308). He reasons that "No other apt means had this poor captivated Cicely, to work her hody-peak husband a proportionable plague for his jealousy, but to give his head his full loading of infamy" (308). Jack makes the most of his availability and steps up for the job. This situation has the makings of a lewd tale in the manner of Aretino. Nashe even plays up the scene a little; rather than the nuns and monks of Aretino's *Ragionamenti*, for example, Jack and Diamante play prisoner and keeper: "How I dealt with her, guess, gentle reader, *subaudi* that I was in prison and she my silly jailor" (308).

Aretino, of course, would not have stopped there, but pornography is not what

Nashe is after, at least not here. The sexual transaction is concluded with something like a eulogy to Aretino, and Jack leaves prison, thanks to Aretino's intervention, augmented in all sorts of ways. First of all he is a father, for Diamante, "after my enlargement, proved to be with child" (312). Secondly, he is in possession both of a woman and of her husband's riches: Castaldo dies and Jack appeals to "Master Aretine", who promptly releases the widow from the claims of her husband's kin, so that both Diamante and her riches are available to Jack. Diamante, "being out, and fully possessed of her husband's goods", proceeds to invest Jack "in the state of a monarch" (312). Thirdly, he becomes, in all but blood, the Earl of Surrey. Jack leaves his master without permission, taking the Earl's name that Surrey had earlier thrust upon him, and travels in pomp through Italy like a Lord taking the Tour.

Aretino's connection with the beardless and flimsy page fortifies Jack to the extent that he triumphs sexually, socially and financially. Nashe too, of course, cultivated a connection with the infamous Aretino that must have lent machismo to his rather adolescent and impish authorial image. Thomas Lodge was obliging enough to call Nashe the "true English Aretine," but some at the time must have smiled at Nashe's own claimed kinship with the rich and famous self-proclaimed genius, who wielded such apparent power with his blackmailing pen that his contemporaries called him "Divine" and "Scourge of Princes".⁶⁸ The penniless, hungry stripling, the loose, frail page and unfortunate drifter, the knight's errant infant and sexually exhausted, beardless youth that are Nashe's *personae* pale before the magnificently black-bearded, robust, sleek, luxurious and lusty image of a bon-vivant that Aretino cultivated.⁶⁹

Aretino's major works and probably his imposing, bearded image too, were

available and known to Nashe. If he had not met with Aretino's work as pornographer to Europe in the libraries of patrons like Lord Strange, there were plenty of learned French and Italian religious refugees living in London to translate those works of Aretino that John Wolfe printed in England, or those that were brought into England by travellers from Europe.⁷⁰ Aretino's works were banned by the Inquisition and labeled as forbidden literature, but that did nothing to hinder their availability or Aretino's fame. Aretino's text appeared regularly, in Paris as well as in London, through the 1580s up until 1609, aided and abetted in all likelihood by Protestant defiance of continental censorship.⁷¹

Contemporary images of Aretino's person confirmed the power of his pen. Titian's painting of him boasts a luxuriantly bearded head, framed and buttressed by a vast upper body draped in furs and a heavy gold chain. This image appeared over and over again in sixteenth-century editions of Aretino's work and continued to be used by printers well into the seventeenth century, especially by those connected to the important Venetian production of books.⁷² In addition to portraits by Titian, Aretino's likeness was also executed by Marcantonio Raimondi (1475-1534), the most famous engraver of his time, who paved the way to a new era in art reproduction by developing an etching technique that facilitated the reproduction of accurate copies.⁷³ Reproductions of Marcantonio's worldly image of Aretino, which featured a full, curled beard and splendid dress, were widely circulated. The circulation of these grand and richly bearded images enhanced Aretino's reputation as a powerful sexual and satirical predator.⁷⁴

Charles Nicholl (1984) sees in Nashe's alliance with Aretino an "intuitive enlarging of the satirists' charter."⁷⁵ Nicholl does not elaborate on how Aretino enlarges Nashe as a satirist; perhaps it was by incorporating more systematic invective,

pornography and bullying blackmail than had ever obtained before, or maybe Aretino appealed to Nashe because Aretino was a print author who turned his back on princes. I would also suggest that Aretino was for Nashe a writer who freed authorship from the tentacles of social and political servility and became rich doing so. Nashe in his poverty was no Aretino, nor even a Jack Wilton enriched at Aretino's hands, so it is not without irony that Nashe imagines a connection with the infamous Italian. Aretino's focus on vice played to the market and signaled his authorial autonomy. Liberated from customary morality and author of his own values, Aretino demonstrated the excessive self-conceit of the supra-moral individual. He did this not only by the splendid oriental pomp of his appearance, but also through his audacity in publishing slander, scandal and some of the most candid pornography Europe had yet read, as well as Italy's first-ever printed compilation of familiar letters, all to sensational success. As the founder of modern journalism, Aretino lived, as he himself boasted, by the sweat of his own ink and without a particular patron, and he demonstrated for Nashe that the roads to fortune and to virtue diverge for the author fashioned in a market economy.

Nationalist and humanist virtues do little for Nashe's muse, of course, and he developed his powers in writing for a market economy. The special quality of his page and *persona* are realized and appreciated in the process of a pass-along, exchange dynamic that undermines civil society and cultivates prodigality, as his celebration of Aretino reveals. No moral legacy, no Protestant virtues of industry, discretion, application or frugality, emerge from this economy, and Jack does not need to develop a psychological inner space for national values in the process of travel to achieve financial and sexual success.

Aretino's features and his name were so widely known that they became a kind of trade-mark: he became a brand name. Aretino himself promoted that trend. In a letter to a friend he half-jokes that his image is stamped on comb-cases and the handles of mirrors, and that the river running beside his house is called the Rio Aretino. He also congratulates himself that some kinds of Murano glassware are named Aretini--could these be glass dildos after those featured in the *Ragionamenti*?--and that girls who have left his service call themselves Aretines.⁷⁶

There were no loose nymphs calling themselves "Nashettes" or "Nashelinas" to trumpet Tom's prowess. Nevertheless Nashe seems to mimic Aretino's brand-name status in his titles *Nashe's Lenten Stuff* and *Nashe His Dildo*, the sub-title for his bawdy poem *The Choice of Valentines*. Aretino's phallic potency, his authorial autonomy and his embrace of authorship as an unethical activity are imagined as fortifying and authorizing Nashe's authorial project as something more than an exercise in style. Aretino is behind Nashe turning "mole-hills into mountains" in *Lenten Stuffe* (376).⁷⁷ Nashe figures his mock encomium as a rise to power and he lords it thus in open imitation of Aretino:

Let me speak to you about my huge words which I use
in this book, then you are your own men to do
what you list. Know it is my true vein to be
tragicus Orator, and of all styles I most affect
and strive to imitate Aretine's. (376)

The red herring is "hot stirring meat" (420), a powerful, "choleric parcel of food" (420).

The Aretino that Nashe would imitate is hot, strong and stirring too. He is like "pure

wine...that begets good blood and heats the brain thoroughly" (377), or, as he is described in *The Unfortunate Traveller*, an author whose "pen was like a poiniard; no leaf he wrote on but was like a burning-glass to set on fire all his readers" (309).

In *Lenten Stuff* the red fish is a divine penis. In the creation story that Nashe offers of Yarmouth as an ideal commonwealth--a parallel perhaps to Aretino's refuge by the sea, Venice--the red herring is both the god-like, engendering wand and weal. In the tale of Dionysius and Jupiter the herring is both divine wand and weal again. The "plain golden-coated herring" is "enshrined for a God" (423). As Jupiter, this god metamorphoses into sundry shapes, "raining himself down in gold into a woman's lap" (423). In offering his book as a red herring in the address to Lusty Humphrey, and by claiming to imitate an Aretino who is as potent and stimulating as the salty, red fish itself, Nashe attempts to fortify his cheap and despised meat, the printed product of his "hungerstarved muse" (456), with comic virility.

Aretino's dildos, of the *Ragionamenti*, come to the rescue of Nashe's wilting lover in his "wanton elegy," *The Choice of Valentines*. Aretino's *Ragionamenti* was a work of remarkably frank pornography that was widely popular throughout literate Europe. It was also a work Lord Strange, to whom *The Choise of Valentines* was probably presented in 1592, would have been familiar with.⁷⁸ Nashe's glass dildo "Attired in white velvet or in silk,/And nourish'd with hot water or with milk" is similar to Aretino's glass "fruit" covered over with white linen, which is later filled with hot urine and deployed by the Nanna in the nunnery (31-2).⁷⁹ In Nashe's poem Tomalin's "silly worm," that will not rise after twice wilting too early, is usurped by "my mistress' page," a "youth almost two handfuls high," and a "knave that moves as light as leaves by wind,"

that is, Mistress Francis' "little dildo."

Jack Wilton is a vagabond and no true traveller in the humanist or the nationalist sense. Nashe names this work after the traveller who is the foil, the counterfeit, the decoy, or the red herring to the true, or fortunate, traveller, loyal to his social and political values because he has internalized those values in the process of travel and can fruitfully wander from the site of their production. In sensing the possibilities for authorship in the print market, Nashe promotes a connection with Aretino that empowers his humanist anti-type and foil, Jack Wilton, as a protagonist concerned with unethical activity. This connection with Aretino also registers a change in the nature of literary ambition for the author in a market economy; he seems to admire enduring celebrity over literary laurels. Nashe makes a point of highlighting how his picaro is drawn into commodity exchange and circulates as a travelling object. In *The Unfortunate Traveller*, Nashe says that Aretino is an ornament to Italy beyond Cicero, Virgil, Ovid and Seneca and that he will live "as long as the world lives" (311). With Aretino as his model for authorship that is grounded in a market economy, Nashe refutes the ancients' and the humanists who declared that it was impossible to be a good orator without also being a good man. Taking Aretino as his cue, Nashe fires his sensational narratives into print and imagines himself a winner as Jack Wilton, sexually and financially triumphant. It is, of course, something of a hollow victory, as is any picaro's fortunate finish haunted by the traces of past torment. Nashe knew what it was to slip into danger, poverty and hunger. Jack's cocky brio recoils at the spectacle of state and vigilante violence staged at Cutwolfe's execution. His spirits dashed, Jack grabs his wealthy girl in marriage and hightails it "out of the Sodom of Italy" (370). In this retreat, in the lingering effects of his past ordeals,

and in the discrepancy between Jack's luck and Tom Nashe's troubled life, the irony in this vision of agency is not lost.

“Thy mother’s glass”

Sir Francis Drake’s expedition to “the backside of America” to plunder Spanish gold, and his subsequent circumnavigation of the world, was dubbed “The Famous Voyage” by Richard Hakluyt in the first printed narrative of the journey.¹ This account was inserted into the 1589 edition of *The Principal Navigations*. In 1596 Charles Fitzgeoffrey brought out an epic poem that celebrated Drake’s life and death. Jonson’s “The Famous Voyage” describes a circumnavigation of London’s Fleet ditch as if it were the stuff of epic. Another famous voyage narrative--Sir Walter Raleigh’s *The Discoverie of Guiana* (1596)--describes a hot and torturous route up and down the Oroonoko in a barge and two wherries to find gold.² Jonson’s urban adventurers take hot and narrow passage in a wherry up and down a London sewer in search of a brothel. Neither Raleigh’s rowers, nor Jonson’s, find what they are looking for. On the face of it Jonson’s baffling epigram seems to reverse the values attached to epic, fame and contemporary heroic voyaging. But why would the poet with the motto *tanquam explorator*, the poet whose literary ambition led him to monumentalize his *Workes* in folio format and the poet who wrote *Discoveries* so muddy these values in the last and longest work of his *Epigrammes*?³

The title seems to declare heroic voyaging--and Drake’s voyage in particular--as the subject of Jonson’s poem. But neither Drake’s epic voyage, nor the bold rowers’ “liquid deed”, is the principal phenomenon at issue here. “The Famous Voyage” is a travel-laden poem and voyaging emerges in this work as the context that environs the object of interest. In other words, famous voyaging constitutes the field of meaning from

which the subject of the poem emerges. The space through which the Jonson's rowers are moving is the subject of this poem.

The Fleet ditch, a corrupt cavity in the bowels of the City, a chamber of horrors with a life of its own deep in the body of London, is the matter of this poem.⁴ The "famous road" through which Jonson's lusty rowers labour in their "liquid deed" emerges as a feminized enclave, a segregated, chaotic space beyond the control of civic power. The filthy channel--"Thorough her womb they make their famous road" (66)--thus penetrated by Jonson's bold voyagers is the early modern seat of natality, a long, hollow, tube-like chamber liable to corruption by accumulations of spoiled seed and repressed menstrual matter unless flushed clean by sexual intercourse. This unplowed womb, like Raleigh's unmined Guiana or Spenser's unplanted Ireland, is a resource gone to waste.

The Fleet ditch, as a resource gone very much to waste, is ripe for conquest. In penetrating this horrid internal realm, in possessing this space, Jonson's rowers are agents who throw themselves on the world and seize opportunities for fame as they arise, regardless of whether those opportunities lead to glorious or grubby outcomes. They are adventurers, bold agents like Drake, who mix conquering power with luck to arrive at enduring greatness or transient celebrity.⁵ Jonson's adventure-rich poem explains uncivil metropolitan space as the foundation for fame, and his rowers, named after minor literary figures, link this fame to literary renown. What I want to suggest is that this hideous-kinky urban ghetto, this little world, this seat of filth, this corrupt cavity set in a civic body, this teeming womb of ills, this sewer, this sink, this ditch, is an essential ground for English authorship.

Jonson's voyagers, like Drake, slip in at the backdoor of a strange new world bent

on plunder, sexual plunder, at Madame Caesar's. This kind of stunt takes nerve, and a certain steely resolve, but it is also prompted by curiosity. This desire to know may be heroic, like Drake sailing into uncharted territory in his circumnavigation of the world, or like Ulysses' braving the underworld, but it may also be inglorious, voyeuristic, driven by an impulse to gape on what is best left hid.⁶ By poking their noses into London's back passage, Jonson's "two wights" are privy to the great city's dirty secrets. Yet they also advance, possessed by the divine spirit of Canary wine, boldly into a noisome heart of darkness.

Shelton and Heydon's nasty navigation through London's back region reveals a corrupt core to the city. Jonson's rowers are like Spenser's Knight of the Red Crosse and his dwarf who take a "a privie posterne" (I.6.Lii)—a secret back door—out of the House of Pride to confront the filthy mess behind the glittering show. This passage is so choked with refuse of corpses that "Scarce could he footing find in that fowle way" (I.6.Liii). Picking their way through the "murdred men" as they ride "underneath the castell wall", they pass yet another "donghill of dead carkases...The dreadfull spectacle of that sad house of Pride" (I.6.Liii). Jonson's doughty neo-knights, too, can be seen as threading a narrow passage through piles of human waste and facing a foul hell in the dark core of a dazzling civilized space—the City.

Yet this vile venture at London's back door is also a caper that points up the evils of idle curiosity. It is the mark of the "Curious natured man", according to Queen Elizabeth's Englishing of Plutarch's *De Curiositate* (1598), that he is drawn to illicit exploration.⁷ In this translation Elizabeth compares what is picked up by the ears of a curious man to the scandalous and vile material that flows through the back doors of

towns. There are "Cities," she says, that "have some gates/ Unlucky...throw which they throw that filthy is and fowl, / And naugh by them ther goes that pure or holy is; / So by the eares of Curios man naugh Good or faire doth pass" (128). Shelton and Heydon, as gallants plowing through the muck at London's back door, point up the evil condition of an idle, sensation-seeking and curious mind.

The Fleet ditch, as defined by a context of famous voyaging that is both virtuous and vain, is hell. It is the dark cavity at the center of the city. Jonson deploys with a vengeance the satiric convention that London's corruption out-hells Hell. Nashe, Dekker and William Rowley, as well as Jonson himself in *The Devil is an Ass* (1641), had all elaborated this theme. London's Fleet, as Jonson says in the proem, is the Styx, Acheron, Cocytus and Phlegethon all rolled into one.

Jonson's rowers are in search of sexual satisfaction. They are amorous adventurers who leave the order of their everyday world--of "Bread Street's Mermaid"--and penetrate London's secret parts, her underworld. Adventuring explains this domain as a hellish womb, a chaotic site of production. Famous voyaging, as a collation of contraries, a field of virtuous and vainglorious action, is the frame, the domain of meaning that legitimizes the inner city of London as the mother of invention and the matrix of fame and authorship. I want to suggest that Jonson's discourse of famous voyaging is also a discourse of authorship, and that this context of action and agents interprets uncharted metropolitan ground as, variously, the City's secret, shameful, hellish part, the lap of celebrity and the womb of fame.

Like Nashe, Jonson redefines authorship by linking it to a non-civic order. Jonson legitimizes a barbaric urban ghetto, not a courtly or a pastoral world, as a

foundation for authorship. This teeming, bounded, inner-city world offers a way of imagining the areas of St. Paul's, Fleet St., Holborn and The Strand--a composite area Nigel Wheale (1999) describes as "organized for print and book production" (55)--as a discrete locality.⁸ Wheale notes that the texts produced here were in the vernacular and destined for the home-market, which meant that these publishers were not involved in the European distribution system for books. The London Stationers developed, therefore, as a tightly organized, separate network. The Worshipful Company of Stationers--"a conservative cartel" (57)--controlled book production in London and were responsible for the printing and dissemination of the Elizabethan and Jacobean literary Renaissance. "Around twenty Master Printers, operating thirty-nine presses in all" (57), says Wheale, were publishing up to 200 different titles a year by 1600 for a market stimulated by the success of the commercial theaters. The works of Sidney, Spenser, Marlowe, Shakespeare and the Geneva Bible, as well as innumerable ballads, almanacs, pamphlets, playbooks and works of prose fiction were included in the 7000 titles published between 1558 and 1603.

A dense nexus of writers, publishers, players and patrons clustered around taverns, bookstalls and playhouses, what Cecile Jagodzinski (1999) has called a "new coterie" of printers and paying readers, constituted an urban enclave of literary production.⁹ This contractual, market order is represented in Jonson, as it is in Nashe, as hell on earth. London is obviously implicated in the Fleet Ditch; this London includes, I suggest, a bounded world of literary production disembedded from established social and political ends.

I began by identifying travel as a way of elaborating a relation between individual

agency and context. Travel, as action and interaction in space, is connected to versions of human agency. In concluding this study I invert this concept somewhat by reading defining travel as a context, an analytical device, that gives meaning to space. I also develop the idea of the traveller as a figure for authorship. I suggested in the last chapter that the activist, progressive subject who develops though willed association was an apt and oft-used metaphor for the humanist intellectual and author. Nashe turns the idea of the *litteratus* as traveller against itself with his *picaro persona* to fashion a supra-political, or anti-establishment, form of authorship. With this climactic epigram Jonson creates a collation of contrary forms of traveling that are connected to forms of authorship. This complex domain of authorial agency explains London's dirty ditch as the matrix of authorship, and Jonson himself--the agent responsible for the poem and an author within it--as his "mother's glass".

"A collation of contraries"¹⁰

"It hath been, and yet is," says William Parry, by way of a preamble to the narrative (1601) that describes his travels with the famous adventurer Sir Anthony Sherley, "a proverbial speech amongst us that travellers may lie by authority" (98).¹¹ Parry scorns the presumption of those who call themselves travellers and cross only "the narrow seas, to the neighbour parts of Picardie peradventure, or the Low Countries perhaps" (98). These bogus travellers "from thence take authority to utter lies in England

(at their return) by retail, which they have coined in gross" (98). Yet there are "the many honest and true travellers"--and Parry seems to include himself with these--who are also labeled as liars. These "true travellers", for "speaking truth of their own knowledge" which "exceeds the belief of the unexperienced and homebred vulgars" who, Parry adds, "believe nothing that falls not within their own ocular experience, or probability of truth" (98-9), are rejected as liars by the settled and the dull. In making this preamble, of course, Parry authorizes himself as a *bona fide* traveller and as a truth teller. "I am resolved," he says, "to make a true relation of what mine eyes saw, not respecting the judgment of the vulgars, but contenting myself with the conscience of the truth" (100).

As with Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*, two kinds of traveller are invoked here and each defines the other. In Parry's preamble, the traveller who, "with insearching and well-discerning eyes" toils to bring back delightful and improving knowledge to his "home-bred countrymen" (99), is distinguished by the false traveller, the liar and swaggering channel-hopper, who profits his country nothing. Where Parry differs from Nashe, shifting the focus away from the form of travel, is with his notion of the rusticated dweller who deems all travellers to be liars once they speak of things beyond his ken. The true traveller defines the false traveller, but both are lumped together as liars when another perspective, that of the dull dweller, intrudes.¹² My point here is that Jonson does something similar in "The Famous Voyage". He distinguishes between the forms of famous voyaging--grand and grotesque, epic and absurd--and makes a collation of contraries in order to explain another phenomenon, inner-city space. Famous voyaging, in turn, constitutes a context of authorial agency--admirable and ill-advised--that interprets metropolitan London's darkest and dirtiest space as the ground of authorship.

“No more let Greece her bolder fables tell,” says Jonson in the opening lines of the poem, “We have a Shelton and a Heydon got,” he says, who “had powers to act, what they to feign had not” (l. 5-6). What the speaker means here is that if Shelton and Heydon cannot fashion heroic journey narratives like the ancients they can make up for their creative deficiency by acting out a famous voyage instead of authoring one. Famous voyaging and authorship are thus seen here as interchangeable. The question remains however, *who are* Shelton and Heydon as authors? Critical opinion is split on the identity of Shelton: some think he is the Sir Ralph Shelton whom Jonson addressed in Epigram 119, others that he is Thomas Shelton, poet and translator of *Don Quixote* (1612). As to Heyden, he remains a mystery. Peter E. Medine (1975) notes that he may be Sir Christopher Heydon who published a defence of astrology in 1603, but critics remain baffled. Richard Dutton (1996) concludes that Shelton and Heydon are names that are no-names because they are the names of nonentities (191). What I want to suggest is that they represent, along with Sir John Harington and Jonson himself, a collective, a collation of contraries; they are mainstream practitioners, reputable and disreputable, of English letters.

With his “We have a Shelton and a Heydon got” Jonson mimics a construction that Thomas Nashe used in his Preface to Robert Greene’s *Menaphon* (1589). As part of his Preface, Nashe boasts, “we had a Haddon, whose pen would have challenged the laurel from Homer, together with Carr that came as near him as Virgil to Theocritus” (90). Walter Haddon (1516-72) was an eminent writer of Latin prose and Nicholas Carr (1524-68) a professor of Greek at Cambridge. They are part of a roster of authors who have given “profit to the commonwealth” (88). Nashe makes a point here of naming and

praising Latin translators of recent history like George Turberville, Arthur Golding and Thomas Watson, but he laments that “Gabriel Harvey, with two of three others, is almost all the store that is left us at this hour” (90). In mimicking Nashe’s construction and naming his rower Shelton, the translator of *Don Quixote*, Jonson seems to be gesturing toward a similar body of English authors. If Jonson’s “Shelton” were Thomas Shelton, translator of Cervantes, there would be no reason to think that Jonson did not value this kind of authorship. Jonson wrote a prefatory poem of praise for James Mabbe’s translation of Matheo Aleman’s picaresque novel, *The Rogue or the Life of Guzman de Alfarache* (1623).¹³ This poem opens with the line, “Who tracks this Authors, or Translators Pen”. It seems that for Jonson here, and for Nashe in his Preface to *Menaphon*, authors and translators are interchangeable. By the end of this prefatory poem Jonson wishes himself to be just such a translator as Mabbe. He says:

Faire Aemulation, and no Envy is;
 When you behold me wish my selfe, the man,
 That would have done, that, which you onely can.

Jonson does *not* wish to be an author/translator like Sir John Harington in “The Famous Voyage”. Jonson has a position in this epigram as an author. He is paired with the author of *The Metamorphosis of Ajax* (1596) and translator of *Orlando Furioso* (1591). With this pairing, and that of Shelton and Heydon, Jonson sets up a body of English authors/translators compounded of reputable authors--Jonson and perhaps Shelton--and literary charlatans like Harington and Heydon. Jonson disliked Harington’s

version of Ariosto; he told a friend that “John Harington’s Ariosto under all translations was the worst.”¹⁴ If Sir Christopher Heydon is the other rower then we can be sure that any author who dabbled in popular nonsense like astrology would only have attracted Jonson’s scorn. Indeed, the very names--Shelton and Heydon--meddle rhythmically and phonetically with each other to suggest their intersection as an entity, and it is hard, in the contorted final couplet, to discriminate between Jonson’s and Harington’s muse. What I am suggesting is that Jonson’s agents in this poem constitute a collation of contraries, a collective entity compounded of a number of different authors. This collation may be seen as representing mainstream English authorship that is both learned and lowbrow. I am also suggesting that the activities of this group define the dark, hellish core of the City as a space for an authorial imaginary.

To be famous is not the same as being heroic. Just so, to be an author does not mean that one is a right poet. By the same token, to write a long epigram about a perilous passage through an open sewer is not to write an *Odyssey*. Jonson acknowledges his own complicity in the literary adventuring he would abuse in this collation of contrary forms of authorship by mating his muse, ironically, with that of Sir John Harington. “And I could wish for their eternized sakes,” says the poet, “My Muse had plowed with his that sung A-jax.” After all, if Shelton and Heyden are mock heroic shit-stirrers, a flush toilet fondly named “Ajax” is no less.¹⁵ Jonson seems to ruefully admit here that his poem is so mired in muck that he could be coupled with Harington and thus be deemed guilty of prying into secret places, opening up what should be hid, and catering to the curious. Just as a witless audience could call both true and false travellers liars in Parry’s mind, so Jonson recognized that this poem, and his work generally, was open to misinterpretation.

He must have known that some would see a living author publishing his works in monumental folio format and claiming learned authority for himself, and for such trivia as his plays, as brazen. In addition to the plays, of course, there is also *this poem* for which Jonson remains unforgiven.¹⁶

"The Famous Voyage" may seem just nasty but--and one can almost hear Jonson issuing his habitual defense--to the learned and the good the poem might mean something more than an expense of wit in a waste of shame. It may also seem a little sinister and chilling, like some brush with psychosis. Carl Jung, in his personal myth *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, describes the disturbing dream of a pupil, a physician, who wanted to be an analyst and was undergoing a program of self-analysis as a necessary part of his training.¹⁷ In this dream the subject is traveling by train when the train stops for two hours at a certain city. The subject alights and proceeds, out of curiosity, to the center of the city. There he finds a medieval building, the town hall it seems, and he goes in. The dreamer wanders down long corridors opening out into handsome rooms lined with old paintings and fine tapestries, but he meets no one and grows alarmed as he realizes he is lost and it is growing darker. He quickens his pace and feels panic building until he sees a large door ahead, the exit, he thinks with relief. He opens this door and discovers a large and very dark room. Frightened, the dreamer runs across the empty space, hoping to find a way out at the other end, when he sees, right in the middle of the room, something white on the floor. "As he approached," reports Jung, "he discovered that it was an idiot child of about two years old. It was sitting on a chamber pot and had smeared itself with feces" (135). At that moment the dreamer awoke with a shout, panic-stricken.

The idiot child, Jung tells us, is the dreamer seeing himself as a child. A child may indeed play with his excrement out of curiosity, explains Jung, and this can be seen as relatively normal behavior, but this dreamer, a doctor, is a grown man, and to picture himself thus in a dream bodes ill. “When he told me the dream,” says Jung, “I realized that his normality was a compensation. I had caught him in the nick of time, for the latent psychosis was within a hair’s breadth of breaking out and becoming manifest” (136). Jung “sweated” trying to “gloss over all the perilous details” and lead the subject out of the dream. He does not inform the pupil of his diagnosis, and the pupil, perhaps aware he was “on the verge of a fatal panic” (136), gives up self-analysis, as well as the idea of becoming an analyst, and returns home, never again to stir up the unconscious.

Does Jonson’s excremental vision in a dark chamber at the center of a city reveal something sinister, some loop of madness, like this dream? The poem does reveal something baneful but not, indubitably, a psychotic Jonson. The poem plays, as I have already intimated, on a systematic and entrenched misogyny that represents the unearred womb as a polluted pit. The rowers pass through a channel, a womb, in the core of the city that is choked with filth. Lana Thompson, in her history of the idea of the uterus--*The Wandering Womb* (1999)--observes that “the Renaissance uterus” was a phallic womb, an inverted scrotum attached to a phallic vagina.¹⁸ In this internal channel it was believed that a toxic cocktail of female seed--produced by the ovaries in the manner of testes--and menstrual matter could collect and fester, leading to a number of specifically female illnesses. Thompson notes that the Renaissance remedy for this disease was sexual activity. A male penis, a finger, or hollow instruments shaped like a penis were all deemed to be efficacious in flushing this poison out. Jonson’s lusty rowers, laboring

through the bodily effluent of the dark ditch of the Fleet, discover a cornucopia of monstrous waste and loathsome issue. They find not only nasty accumulations of bodily by-products, but "stench, diseases, and old filth their mother" alongside "famine, wants, and sorrows many a dozen, / The least of which was to the plague a cousin" (70-3). This ditch, then, is the place where London breeds its woes, a hellish cradle of ills and a horrid pit of toxic waste. Jonson's lusty rowers take on the vile labour of tilling London's clogged and noxious unplowed womb and they confront, in the process, hell in the heart of the city.

This navigation of the Fleet is a bold push into the City's polluted womb, but it is also a vile venture that explores what is best kept hid. The rowers are possessed of a certain pluck and grit but they also manifest an over-curious desire to enter the back regions, or closed off spaces, of everyday life. Jonson's purging humour in this poem invokes all sorts of voyaging--reputable and disreputable, ancient and modern, heroic and absurd--to create a chimera of a poem, prolix in venturing, that identifies this metropolitan ditch as a cavity for sexual activity and a site of production for fame.

Drake's bold foray to "the backside of America", as Hakluyt puts it, sets the adventurous tone for this travel-laden poem. Sir Francis Drake's circumnavigation of the globe in 1580 was dubbed "The Famous Voyage" by Richard Hakluyt, who, in the first printed narrative account of the voyage called it "The famous voyage of Sir Francis Drake into the South Sea, and there hence about the whole Globe of the Earth, begun in the yeere of our Lord, 1577". Hakluyt inserted it into the 1589 edition of *The principall navigations, voiages and discoveries of the English Nation* (London).¹⁹ Drake's enduring fame rests on the fact that he was the first Englishman to navigate the Strait of Magellan.

In doing this, and discovering that the land to the south of the strait was a group of islands, he showed that Tierra del Fuego was an archipelago and not part of the southern continent Terra Australis.²⁰ This, together with his discovery of the land beyond California (at 38 degrees North) which he called Nova Albion, were his two outstanding geographical achievements.²¹ In fact, the wide channel between Cape Horn and Antarctica is still called "Drake Passage".

The magnitude of Drake's geographical achievement was not apparent to many at the time. His heroic, humanistic achievement in mapping the world and thus encapsulating it in text, a world understood in humanist metaphor heretofore as a book but not yet in a book, was overshadowed by glorification of his feats of piracy and seamanship. Drake's motive in sailing the world seemed to be to plow the stream of Spanish gold drained from her American possessions. Drake's notable discoveries, where they were publicized at all, appeared as largely incidental to his over-riding purpose, which was for private profit rather than for the general good. Drake, as John Parry (Thrower, 1984) notes, was no Captain Cook; he was "the agent of a private, profit-making syndicate in which he himself was a substantial investor" (4). He sees the re-naming of Drake's ship "The Pelican" to "The Golden Hind" as a "gesture of shrewd bravado" that "gave notice to the world of Drake's intentions" to pursue a "career of plunder" (7). Kenneth Andrews (Thrower, 1984) notes that The Golden Hind "was a ship fit and fitted for privateering, as efficient a predator as any of her size at that time" (54).²² He maintains that Drake's voyage was "incontestably" and deliberately "piratical from beginning to end" (54).

Drake, ironically dubbed the "golden knight", brought home a fortune in

plundered gold and silver.²³ He also brought with him many charts, sketches and pictures from which a new and improved map of the world could be made. It was government policy that suppressed the publication of the nature of Drake's truly remarkable discoveries until the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588. On the loss of Drake's log, David B. Quinn says: "He surrendered his illustrated journal, written by himself and his relative John Drake, to the Queen, who subsequently suppressed it. It is now lost" (38). Quinn speculates that the Queen probably demanded and impounded his log. Although celebratory poems, ballads and pictures quickly announced Drake's feat in general terms, no specific details were forthcoming until Hakluyt's account in 1589.²⁴ Even Hakluyt, in the employ of Walsingham, and thus constrained by government censorship and by limited access to the materials from the voyage, sold Drake short because the map he included with "The Famous Voyage" included none of Drake's discoveries.²⁵ Helen Wallis (1984) claims that Drake "entered the ranks of the great explorers and navigators in a very different way from that of his predecessors"; he was, in contrast to Columbus and Magellan, "a hero without a true history"(137).²⁶ She goes on to say that even when publication of Drake's discoveries was no longer prohibited there were few good maps of his discoveries produced in England because the country was slow in developing its own map trade and relied on foreign engravers for the most part (156).

So, Drake's voyage seems to have been generally understood at the time as a particularly bold plan to outwit the Spaniards and get their gold by slipping in at the backdoor of their colonial possessions rather than as a remarkable voyage of exploration and discovery. In his collection of Drake bibliographic items, Benjamin Draper lists a pamphlet of 1592 that gives a brief account of Drake's marauding expedition to the

"back-syde of America, where no pirates had been before him."²⁷ Hakluyt's account too records that "Sir Francis Drake sailed on the backside of America". George Abbot concludes *A Briefe Description of the Whole Worlde* (1599) by noting that The Magellan Straits are "the wayes whereby, as the Spanyards doe passe to the back-syde of *Perue*, and *Hispana nova*."

The idea of illicit back-door traffic appealed to Jonson; his comedies are full of amorous and economic adventurers who slip in and out the backdoor of a rich man's house. Face helps the rogue Subtle escape "over the wall, o' the backside" in *The Alchemist*. In *The Case is Altered* (1597) Jonson explicitly links the back door, or what he calls the "backside" of a house, with refuse and waste, particularly human waste, and with plunder.²⁸ Onion and Juniper--would be gallants and travellers--plan to surprise a miser's daughter by stealing in at the back door. Onion asks Juniper to "goe with me into her fathers backside, old *Jaques* backside, and speake for me to *Rachel*" while "the old man is abroad and all" (IV, v). But Jaques returns to find intruders: "How, in my back side? where? what come they for?" (IV, viii). He fears the theft of his gold, not his girl. Jaques checks Juniper's hands for dirt because the miser has hidden his gold in a pile of horse dung. Jaques has taken this precaution because he saw Rachel's suitors as predators who smell his money: "My gold is in his nostrels, he has smelt it" (III, ii), Jaques exclaims. Jaques thinks to overcome the scent of his "precious nest", his "deere child", his gold, that "began to have a huge strong smell,/ With lying so long together in one place" (III, v), by covering it with horse dung.²⁹ Onion and Juniper discover "the gold mynerals" in the manure and Jonson pushes the connection home by giving Onion the proverbial line that "gold is but mucke" (IV, ix). Given Jonson's bent for backside

traffic, it is no surprise to find Drake's adventure to the backside of America after Spanish gold tied to Shelton and Heydon's dash to a brothel through London's back-door in "The Famous Voyage". Drake, the "golden knight" in "The Golden Hind", celebrated at the time as an adventurer, skillfully stealing a march on the Spaniards by sailing up the backside of America, offered Jonson an image of back-door marauding that, from the evidence of his comedies, he found irresistible.

Jonson seems, then, to have apprehended the representation of Drake as a bold plunderer--the stuff of comedy rather than epic--and incorporated this into his anti-climactic, mock-epic epigram. As well as a clever ruse to get Spanish gold, Drake's voyage was also celebrated as a feat of seamanship. This seamanship was celebrated not so much because of the advances in exploration it enabled, but because it manifested native martial talent. The earliest printed celebration (as opposed to "account", which belongs to Hakluyt) of Drake's voyage is thought to have been Nicholas Breton's *Discourse in commendation of the valient as vertuous minded Gentleman, Maister Frauncis Drake*, written and published sometime before Drake's knighting on April 14th 1581.³⁰ Breton celebrates Drake's famous deed in the Straits of Magellan, referring to it several times as "passing the gulf".³¹ Drake's feat of seamanship in shooting this dread gulf past Tierra del Fuego, famed as a terrifying experience for sailing ships and a hot spot for wrecks, became the subject of many Drake legends.³² Do Jonson's doughty rowers as they shoot the narrow gulf past a broad, shallow bottomed cargo boat figured as a Hydra or Briareus, evoke Drake's bold run, or, more generally, does Drake's feat in shooting the dread gulf of America's nether regions confer some kind of heroic inflection on Jonson's oarsmen in their adventurous passage through London's underworld?³³

Drake's famous voyage offered Jonson that volatile mix of saucy pluck and corruption, conquering vigor and opportunism, boldness and luck that marks the rogue heroes of his comedies. Drake epitomizes the adventurer who throws himself on the world and seizes opportunities as they arise, regardless of whether they lead to greatness or grubbiness. Drake's famous voyage, as heroic, criminal, and fortunate in its outcome, balances conquering power with lucky chances. Adventurous experience is this mix of bold attempting with opportunities seen and taken.

But if Jonson was attuned to the backdoor rhetoric of Drake's pirate voyage he must also have been aware of Drake's glorification as a conquering hero in the last years of the Elizabethan age. Charles Fitzgeoffrey, a Cornishman and Latin epigramist of minor fame, brought out his epic entitled *Sir Francis Drake, His Honourable Lifes commendation, and his Tragicall Deathes lamentation* (1596), shortly after Drake's death. It must have been popular, because it ran to a second edition after only a few months.³⁴ Fitzgeoffrey's poem in rhyme royal eulogizes Drake as a hero, superior to Ulysses, Hector or Achilles.³⁵ Fitzgeoffrey also sings of Drake as "our new *Alcides*" who not only "vanquished/ This Spanish Hydra's ever-growing head" (37) but also provided the city of Plymouth with a new flushing and drainage system in his capacity as mayor of the city. Fitzgeoffrey lauds Drake's promotion of an artificial water channel, running from the river Meavy on Dartmoor to Plymouth. This channel provided the city with a new drainage system.³⁶ The water channel, or leat, completed in 1592 under Drake's direction, may well have netted Drake a fortune through his leasing of mills driven by this leat.³⁷ Fitzgeoffrey compares this civic exploit of Drake's to Hercules' diversion of the waters of the Alpheus to cleanse the Augean stables. With Hercules, Drake garners

“faire fame,” says Fitzgeoffrey, “though by filthy service won” (56). The filthy work of Jonson's rowers in the Fleet ditch, an inlet that runs into the Thames with the City's effluent, may hint at Drake's graft *and* his grit. Both liquid deeds provide, in the words of Fitzgeoffrey, “faire fame (though by filthy service won)”.³⁸

Just as Drake's voyage is not the only famous voyage in Hakluyt--there were narratives of other famous voyages by Thomas Cavendish, for example, and by Richard I of England into Asia for the recovery of Jerusalem--so Drake's is not the only famous voyage alluded to in Jonson's poem.³⁹ This poem, with its jumbled bursts of allusion, crowded with classical, chivalric and contemporary references to famous voyaging, is a voyage-laden poem. It is flooded with adventurous odds and ends that surface briefly then tumble under in the flow. Jonson mixes up epic journeys through the underworld with the sea perils of Ulysses and adds a generalized romance plot wherein isolated deeds of arms leave behind them a trail of marble monuments attesting to the hero's fame. Helen of Corinth in *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* (1593) sums up her beloved Amphialus thus: “Who follows deeds of arms, but everywhere finds monuments of Amphialus?” (122). Deeds of arms in “The Famous Voyage” are tied to rowing. The “liquid deed” of Jonson's “two wights”, celebrated by a pyramid, layers the line of the quest with epic voyages and a series of well-known contemporary travel stunts to create a collation of contrary voyaging as the context for explaining space.

Jonson's rowers, having entered the “dire passage” of the Fleet as if it were the entry to the underworld, make “their famous road, / Between two walls” (66-7). These dire walls, like Prowling Rocks of Book XII in *The Odyssey*, threaten the plucky boatmen. “On one side, to scare men, / Were seen your ugly Centaurs,” as well as

"Gorgonian scolds, and Harpies", that, adds the poet as if he were Don Quixote explaining to a dubious Sancho Panza how figures may be enchanted, "ye call carmen". On the other wall looms "stench, diseases, and old filth," alongside "famine, wants, and sorrows" the least of which "was to plague a cousin" (70-3).

Jonson's adventurers abandon themselves to this alien world, disdaining even the precaution of holding their noses. Unmindful of the danger to their health in breathing in the noxious air, Shelton and Heydon "unfrighted pass" and press forward like "Castor brave and Pollux: Plowing the main" (77-8). Soon they meet a "second prodigy" and they must row for their lives, as Ulysses did, past a Hydra that turns out to be a cargo boat. Later the adventurers arrive at a noxious "Stygian pool" where "several ghosts did flit" of late departed farts. It is here that those who go "Must try the unused valor of a nose" (32). The poet tells us that "no nare was tainted", nor was "thumb, nor finger to the stop acquainted" (133-4) as the rowers pass along these shadowy banks of overpowering odor. Like Ulysses, who dared to pass the overwhelming song of the Sirens without plugging his ears with wax, so the rowers' noses "open, and unarmed encountered all" (135). Jonson spares no detail in recounting the odorous assault. "[H]eaped like an usurer's mass", "precipitated down the jakes", bobbing "abroad in ample flakes", or "languishing stuck upon a wall", a disgusting barrage of waste accompanies the rowers in their stirring labour, gallantly undertaken, it turns out, in the most punishing season for privies, when the "powerful moon" means the stream is in full flood. "[M]any a sink poured out her rage against 'em," the poet says, "But still their valor and their virtue fenced 'em" (75-6).

Jonson's rowers are adventurers who throw themselves unreservedly upon an

alien world yet retain and reinforce their native virtue across contexts. They are, in one sense, like William Roe, celebrated by Jonson in epigram, who, in setting off for Europe is “imbarqu’d for hell” yet returns “untouch’d”. Like Roe, Jonson’s “two wights” do not “go native”; they do not exchange their own cultural attributes for the new forms they encounter in this strange ghetto. Like Spenser’s Redcrosse Knight, too, they confront a hellish underworld they discover in the back regions of a world, and then go on their way. Offensive smell is the marker of hell in the heart of Jonson’s City. It signifies something uncontrolled beyond a civilized zone, a chaotic space, a resource to be cultivated, a womb, through which conquering power is generated.⁴⁰

But if Jonson’s gallants are bold, they are also bored. Their life of gentlemanly leisure involves a languid shift from one activity to another--in this case from the tavern to the brothel--which constituted the daily rat-run of a gentleman's pleasure in London. This routine, conventionalized in verse and on the stage, ran from dinner at some ordinary or inn, to a play or to a brothel, and then back to dine, perhaps to gamble, then to sleep until it all started up again the following day.⁴¹ Shelton’s and Heydon’s voyage, as a search for difference, is motivated more by a desire for contrast, for sensational distraction, than by a chivalric desire for ordeal, trial and self-discovery. They are, in a sense, tourists who take no responsibility for the situation they participate in.

If Jonson’s adventurers are bold and bored they are also brazen and seeking attention; they have a thirst for achieving personal distinction without much caring how they do it. Jonson includes in his gallimaufrey of literary and literal adventurers a rash of those Renaissance stirrers who gained access to the world of fame by staging bizarre travel stunts that brought them celebrity. Jonson's bored gallants set out “in worthy

scorn" of a number of famous feats of pointless passage that they would outdo:

..those, that put out moneys, on return
 From Venice, Paris, or some inland passage
 Of six times to, and for, without embassage,
 Or him that backward went to Berwick, or which
 Did dance the famous Morris, unto Norwich...

(32-6)

A similar list of brash travel stunts crops up in the prefatory material of another futile quest, William Rowley's *A Search for Money* (1609).⁴² In his address, William Rowley speaks "To All Those That Lack Money", and who know the geography of St. Paul's as well as "the longitude and latitude of Morefields" like the back of their hand, that is, penniless poets, and says:

Yee have been either eare-or-eye-witnesses, or both,
 to many madde voiages made of late yeares, both by
 sea and land - as the travell to Rome with the
 return in certain daies, the wild morrise to Norrige,
 the fellowes going back-ward to Barwick, another
 hopping from Yorke to London, and the transforming of
 the top of Paules into a stable. To these, and many
 more, ad one more: what oddes with him now that will
 bring yee to the place where your lost and long wisht
 friend Monsier Money is within two houres? (iv)

Both works invoke urban travel legends that were in common parlance as exemplars of absurd and futile journeying. These eccentrics may be compared to the fame-seekers of today who get into the newspapers and the record books by, for example, recording the fastest mile covered by a pogo stick in Antarctica.⁴³

William Kemp, the famous dancer of jigs on the public stage and traveller to Italy, is one of the absurd voyagers on Jonson's and Rowley's list. His dance to Norwich is described in *Kemp's Nine Daies Wonder* (1600) as a heroic jig.⁴⁴ William Kemp is the speaker in this account. Sounding like Nashe's Jack Wilton, he announces that "I...myself, that's I, otherwise called Cavaliero Kemp, headmaster of morris dancers, high headborough of heights, and only tricker of your trill-lills and best bell-shangles between Syon and Mount Surrey", on the first Monday in Lent, accompanied by his taberer Thomas Slye, "began frolicly to foot it" from the Lord Mayor's residence in London to Master Mayor's of Norwich (177). The dangers, distractions, temptations and triumphs recorded along the way include proffered cups of wine, a bear baiting, a pair of fighting horses in his path, a strained hip, a "lusty country lass" who "garnished her thick short legs" with bells and "footed it merrily to Melford" with him, and the throngs of people who lined his path as he approached Norwich. He dodges the delighted crowd by leaping over a churchyard wall, and provides thus a climactic close to his journey with one last heroic leap. He concludes the narrative by noting that the measure of this jump is to be seen in the Guildhall at Norwich where also "my buskins, that I then wore and danced in from London thither, stand equally divided, nailed on the wall" (181).⁴⁵

Richard Ferris' voyage to Bristol, also listed in Jonson's poem, was memorialized in a pamphlet entitled "The most dangerous and memorable adventure of Richard Ferris...who undertook, in a small wherry boat, to row, by sea, to the city of Bristow." Published by "the said Richard Ferris", and printed by John Wolfe in 1590, it exemplifies the idea, key to Jonson's satiric thrust here, of the small-time adventurer who gains access to fame by pulling off a bold stunt.⁴⁶ Jonson's boatmen set out on a drunken whim: "At

Bread Street's Mermaid, having dined, and merry" they "Proposed to go to Holborn in a wherry" (37-8). A brothel is their nominal target, but this is deemed, in the filthy circumstances, to be a "harder task" than "his to Bristo". With this performance Jonson's bored gallants compound the routine of a gentleman's pleasure in London with the kind of rash and sensational, patriotic stunt pulled by Richard Ferris.

In the account of 1590 Ferris emphasizes the foolhardiness of his unstudied undertaking and promotes himself as a patriotic daredevil. He begins his dedication to Sir Thomas Heneage with, "The late dangerous attempt, rashly by me undertaken, to row a small boat to the city of Bristow," which, he adds, is "the more strange in respect that I was never trained up on the water" (155-6). He offers his voyage as a "just occasion to prick forward others of my native countrymen" that they too may "practise an ordinary passage through the like dangers, in small wherry boats" and serve all the better to daunt the Spaniards "who in such flaws and frets at sea, dare not hazard their galleys to go forth, though they be of far greater force to brook the seas" (156).

In the narrative proper, Ferris replays the gestures of the dedication. He begins by pointing out that he "had rashly determined to pass the seas in a wherry...though with the evil will of sundry of my good friends; and especially full sore against my aged father's consent" and ends by promoting himself as a national hero, feted by the cities of Bristol and London. At Bristol he describes how a crowd had prepared "trumpets, drums, fifes, and ensigns to go before the boat; which was carried upon men's shoulders round about the city", and how afterwards "we were had to Master Mayor's, to the Aldermen's and Sheriffs' houses; where we were feated most royally, and spared no cost" (162).

The story is the same in London, where "our entertainment at our coming was

great and honourable; especially at the Court, and in the cities of London and Westminster" (162). Ferris intends the boat itself to become a moving memorial to his achievement. He concludes by noting that he has given order for the boat to be brought overland from Bristol to London, "where the watermen and sundry others have promised to grace the said boat with great melody and sundry volleys of shot" (163). His voyage to Bristol is feted in this narrative as if it were some historic passage, and the link with Drake is clear from the start, with Ferris' stated intention of affrighting the Spaniards with English rowing prowess. Furthermore, like Drake's feat, Ferris' voyage was also commemorated in poetic song. James Sargent composed "A new Sonnet made upon the arrival and brave entertainment of Richard Ferris with his boat; who arrived in the city of Bristow on the 3rd day of August 1590".⁴⁷

If Jonson's adventurers are brave in that they breathe, Ferris, who "was never trained up upon the water", rows so bravely because he is British. As I have already indicated in relation to Drake, rowing, at this time, was considered something of a native, inborn skill, part of the nation's natural prowess, and responsible, in part, for British naval success.⁴⁸ Ferris, like some lesser Drake, undertakes his adventure "to daunt the enemies of this nation" who dare not undertake so "ordinary a passage through the like dangers" (156). Jonson's rowers show their native skill in simply attempting the Fleet—"a harder task" than "his to Bristo"—but also when their small wherry encounters a threatening lighter, or loading barge, of Spanish galleon proportions that looms "So huge, it seemed, they could by no means quite her" (86). Undaunted, the rowers of the smaller craft seek to outmaneuver the lumbering lighter. Recreating the confused cries, frenzied orders and sudden explosions of battle, Jonson figures the scene like a fighting encounter at sea:

Back, cried their brace of Charons: they cried no,
 No going back; on still you rogues, and row.
 How high the place? a voice was heard, Cocytus.
 Row close then slaves. Alas they will beshite us.
 No matter, stinkards, row. What croaking sound
 Is this we hear? of frogs? No, guts windbound,
 Over your heads: Well, row. At this a loud
 Crack did report itself, as if a cloud
 Had burst with storm, and down fell, ab excelsis,
 Poor Mercury, crying out on Paracelsus...

(87-96)

The "loud crack" above the rowers that rains down enemas and their effects evokes the booming cannon of Spain's famed, unwieldy, towering galleons firing over the smaller and more nimble English ships that slip away, as Jonson says of the "well-greased wherry" stealing by the lighter, "as by Polypheme/ The sly Ulysses stole in a sheepskin" (112-113). Fitzgeoffrey, Drake's eulogist, calls the galleons "gyants graves" that are "Row'd with an hundred *Indian* captive slaves" (42). The defeat of the Armada was attributed to the slowness and size of the lumbering Spanish ships and to native pluck and seamanship, like that assumed by Ferris and celebrated in Drake. The reiteration of the word "row" in this passage invokes English native virtue and skill but it also, as befits a voyage-laden poem, gestures to Ulysses' only defense against Scylla. It is also evocative of Drake and his ship, the "Golden Hind", in that "roe" and "hind" both refer to a female deer. Fitzgeoffrey had already put this connection to poetic use in his epic on Drake; speaking of the circumnavigation, he says:

A GOLDEN-HYNDE, led by his art and might,

Bare him about the earth's sea-walled round,
 With un-resisted Roe-out-running flight. (59)

This circumnavigation of the Fleet ditch, then, mixes the voyages of Kemp, Ferris, Drake and Ulysses with the travails of Hercules and heroes of chivalric romance and drapes them onto the adventure of two parvenu gentlemen, full of food and drunken bravado, who shoot the dread gulf of the Fleet ditch and make their "famous road" by ploughing London's sink, a polluted womb and cradle of corruption. Jonson's rowers pull for the earthly paradise, the Hesperides, of a woman's sexual parts, to be had at Madame Caesar's. As it turns out, that "great Proserpina, / Is now from home" and, unlike the lady of Penshurst, the hospitality she is mistress of does not stay upon her absence. It is no matter to the laughing gallants that they have lost their labor, for the destination was no more than a convenient demarcation for a round-trip, the point of which was simply to hazard the travel, and collect, perhaps, on a bet. Like Don Quixote, who asks a witness to one of his famous acts to "give me a certificate, in the best form that you can, of what you have seen me do here" (II, 300), Shelton and Heyden call on a soap boiler, a blind arrow maker and the landlord of a tavern, each one likened to one of the three judges of hell, "to witness of their action" (191). That done, they go "bravely back, without protraction" (191-2).

Jonson fashions a discourse of famous voyaging in this poem that constitutes a homosocial environment. Adventuring is figured here as a purely masculine enterprise. Shelton and Heydon "make their famous road" through London's hellish womb towards a brothel. Indeed references to prostitutes frame the journey; the gallants start out "the day,

what time the powerful moon/Makes the poor bankside creature wet its shoon" (29-30) and go no further once they find no bawds at home in Holborn.⁴⁹ This back region of the city is a feminine space and, as such, replays the topos of the landscape as a woman's body in exploration literature. Jonson's Fleet Ditch, however, is no "Countrey that hath yet her Maydenhead" as Raleigh says of Guiana. This hot journey down a river by wherry does not pass, as Raleigh's does, beautiful banks of shorn grass and groves where deer come down to feed by the waterside. Jonson's rowers enter an odorous zone that stinks worse than Kate Arden "when she kissed" (118). Instead of a feminine paradise, Jonson fashions a feminine hell.⁵⁰

In the homosocial environment of adventuring, Jonson's Fleet Ditch emerges as the fetid body of a whore, a chaotic womb choked with waste, and a back passage into hell. This climactic epigram by a poet who, according to Robert Wiltenburg (1990), "conceived of himself as a sort of literary Francis Drake" (17), figures the condition of mainstream English authorship--represented by Shelton, Heydon, Harington, and Jonson himself--as that of the adventurer. This adventuring, in which Jonson is involved, explains the dark, dirty backside of the City as a feminine space beyond the power of the state. This zone, signaling the world of a new breed of writer that emerged in the 1590's, becomes an essential ground for authorship. That all this effort spent in the rowing and the writing of this "most liquid deed" is to be associated with misspent *literary* labour may be understood by the mocking allusion to the pyramid in the poem, symbol of lasting literary fame from Horace on. Invention and rhetorical labor stooped to trivial pursuit culminate in the notion of Jonson's rowers toiling up London's famously filthy canal, choked with waste.

In ending his epigrams with this grotesque adventure-laden poem Jonson abides by his habitual poetic practice of flushing to the literal edges of his works a negative value that serves as a foil to the rest. "Liquid deeds"--hurled ink and intemperate wit from "To My Book" and a circumnavigation of the Fleet--blot the boundaries of Jonson's *Epigrams*. Jonson would have it that his muse plows no more with that of his mad, bad rivals of "To My Book" than it does with "his that sung A-jax". But if Jonson's muse does not *join* absolutely with these authors it yet *circulates* with them as part of a collation of contraries whose ground for authorship is a segregated enclave of barbarity, a feminine space beyond the power of the state.

"He that wyl travell," wrote Andrew Boorde in 1542, "the truthe he shall fynd."

The subject of Jonson's hideous travel-laden poem is a hideous feminine space for authorial agency through which Jonson discovers himself as an authorial subject. As both the agent responsible for the text, and positioned within it as an author, Jonson discovers in his muse "the she in thee". Jonson finds that he cannot be the author of his own value, that he is, in the end, in this climactic work, his "mother's glass."

“All space is place”

This study has been concerned with being and becoming as movement, with subjects in space, and with mutually defining versions of human agency related to how space is occupied. In the early modern era, with its greater opportunities for peripatetic, social and psychic mobility after the relative cultural isolation and anchoring of the past, this dynamic conception of the subject as a spatial actor comes to the fore. I have suggested that the figure of the traveller signifies an agent formed through willed association with the world, and that this figure typifies the early modern intellectual and author. “He that wyl travell,” wrote Andrew Boorde, “the truthe he shall fynd.” This intellectual, a crafted man of merit who develops through civil conversation with others, is also a pilgrim, scout, foreign observer, or chivalric adventurer looking to discover a powerful explanation. In fact, this project originated with the idea of the early modern humanist intellectual’s relation to space and how the intellectual’s disappointments informed this relation.

The special relationship of authorship to travel, and the potent formulation of the intellectual as traveler, function today as a sign of intellectual and academic agency and emancipation from the past. This comes through, as I have outlined in Chapter One, in Stephen Greenblatt’s self-fashioning as an intellectual. By formulating a politics of travel, I have suggested that the reformulated literary critic’s liberation from a traditional historical and disciplinary context may also be a form of imperial enterprise; boundaries are crossed and previously distinct intellectual domains are incorporated into the literary. In Edward Said’s published lecture *Identity, Authority and Freedom: The Potentate and*

the Traveller (1991), the connection between the figure of the traveller and the reformulated intellectual is explicit.¹ Said says that he offers two images for inhabiting the cultural space of the university. On the one hand, “Our model for academic freedom should...be the migrant or traveller” (17), who gives up “one identity in the hope of understanding and perhaps even assuming another” (18). On the other hand “the academic professional is king and potentate” (18). Said’s philosopher king, surveying all before him “with detachment and mastery,” is invested with “Western, or African, or Islamic, or American” authority (18). Of the two--“the potentate who must guard only one place and defend its frontiers”, or the traveller who “abandons fixed positions all the time” (18)--the traveller is the more valued form of subjectivity. To travel is to “leave authority and dogma to the potentate” and attain “academic freedom at its highest” (18). The traveller who moves through identities becomes a way of figuring the intellectual as supra-political, emancipated from fixed national and ethnocentric affiliations and the “unthinking attachments that have so disfigured human history” (12). Said’s, and Greenblatt’s, mode of self-fashioning depends on the intellectual’s relation to his or her community *not* being the most important factor shaping identity. This subject position is not as transcendent as it sounds, because the politics of travel are also the politics of the intellectual.

Spatial fixity means more than sluggish enslavement to custom, which is how the arrogant Alexander sees Brahman insularity; it involves active and ongoing moral reasoning and decision-making to maintain a chosen way of life. From Alexander’s point of view, travel is heroic, emancipating, and crucial to the spread of civilization, but it also means disturbing and destroying other people’s reasoned and developed lives, as the

Brahman king makes clear. If Alexander mediates modernity, Dindimus is disenchanted with the future. Defiantly anti-modern, Dindimus makes a case for understanding localization and indigenous values; both systems are recognized in the dialogue between Alexander and Dindimus. I have delineated the personal and political meanings produced by each system and tracked different manifestations of these mutually defining agencies in a number of early modern works, each one mediating a different moment of cultural contact. I have pointed to the consumptionist ethos and to the imperialist, absolutist and civic political values attached to travel. Travel is also sexed male. I have barely touched upon the gendered aspect of travel, an important consideration for future study of the politics of the intellectual as a subject in space.

“In practice,” as Nigel Thrift (1996) says, “all space is anthropological, all space is practised, all space is place” (46). Recognizing the character of space as place, and the politics of place, by describing the subject in space in terms of an encounter between spatial actors--the progressive traveller and the self-involved dweller--has been crucial to this inquiry into the politics of travel. These subjects in space, diversely mobile agents, generate versions of agency that emerge from irreducible cultural difference. Elaborating a politics of travel involves formulating a politics of space. From this perspective, frontiers can be crossed without agency being swallowed up or identity lost.

Notes

 Notes to chapter one, Subjects in Space

¹ *The First Boke of the Introduction to Knowledge*, Early English Text Society, Extra Series 10 (London, 1870) 144. I take Boorde's statement here as an indication of the enhanced ontological status of travel in early modern England. In texts ranging from schoolboy Latin exercises to Hakluyt's *Prinicipal Navigations* travel is implicated in the production of personal and political meanings and elaborated as a spatial practice.

² See *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*, eds. Chris Rojek and John Urry (London: Routledge, 1997). Rojek and Urry note that "travel and tourism can be thought of as a search for difference" (17). Although their general focus is not on early modern travel, I think the general definition is useful here.

³ See Philip Edwards, *Sea-Mark: The Metaphorical Voyage, Spencer to Milton* (Liverpool: UP, 1997) 151-165, for early modern uses of the word "discover". He contrasts its "neutral sense of 'expose' or 'disclose'" (159) with its other meaning of exploration and the finding of wholly new knowledge about the world. Edwards' book is a comparative study concerned with the metaphor of the voyage in six early modern authors, in the tradition of a work like Georges Van den Abbeele's *Travel as Metaphor from Montaigne to Rousseau* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1992). I, too, read travel as a metaphor—I see the traveller as a metaphor for the intellectual, for example—but I also read it as a spatial practice producing human agency.

⁴ See EETS (London, 1870) 53. Cromwell is reported to have lost Boorde's *The Itinerary of Europe*, a work Boorde refers to in the seventh chapter of his *Introduction*.

⁵ Ben Nilson in "The Medieval Experience at the Shrine," *Pilgrimage Explored*, ed. J. Stopford (York Medieval Press, 1999) 95-122, describes the gradual penetration of the pilgrim through the church to the shrine where pilgrims "caressed, kissed and pressed against the stonework" at the base of the shrine (104). Furthermore, "shrine bases were provided with niches in which pilgrims could kneel, an accommodation toward an apparent desire to be virtually *inside* the shrine" (104).

⁶ See Nigel Thrift, *Spatial Formations* (London: Sage Publications, 1996) for a discussion of theories of practice and agency and how the body in motion makes intelligible how subjects inhabit space (147).

⁷ See Edward L. Ullman, *Geography as Spatial Interaction* (Washington: U of Washington P, 1980). Ullman posits a geography of movement, predicated on spatial interaction and the study of flows, in opposition to a static geography that is practised as a descriptive science. See also, Nigel Thrift (1996). Thrift, working in the context of human geography, argues, with a nod to Raymond Williams, that mobilities may constitute "a structure of feeling." Thrift attempts "to describe new orders of experience constructed out of 'machinic' sources and horizons of meaning" (257); his work here is "an attempt to articulate and be articulated by a cyborg culture" (260).

⁸ The relations of travel and dwelling, as Celia Lury in "Objects of Travel" (Rojek and Urry 1997) has noted, are a standard concern of anthropological inquiry, although it was my readings in travel literature that initially drew my attention to them. In using the word "function" I draw on Vladimir Propp's idea of a

function as an act understood in terms of its significance for the whole course of action. I view the spatial practices of travel and dwelling as interpreted events, as expressions of a world-view and attitude of being, and as an integral part of a text's significance as cultural critique.

⁹ For example, see *Safarnamah: Naser-e Khosraw's Book of Travels* (Albany N.Y.: Bibliotheca Persica, 1986). In the account of his travels, Nasere Khosaw, an eleventh-century bureaucrat, describes a small, communistic city-state near Bahrain. This city can only be reached by crossing vast expanses of desert and is enclosed by four strong, concentric walls. There is abundant food and no one suffers unnecessarily from need. They have their own currency, in lead, but no one bothers much about it. Everyone is expected to practice some kind of craft or trade. They live a good life without it being specifically religious. This narrative describes a community that is similar, in many respects, to that of More's *Utopia*.

¹⁰ The text I use here is *The Greek Alexander Romance*, trans. Richard Stoneman (London: Penguin Books, 1991). All subsequent quotations from this text are taken from this edition.

¹¹ See *The Prose Life of Alexander* (Thornton MS.), ed. J.S. Westlake, EETS 143 (London, 1913). See also *Alexander and Dindimus: Or, The Letters of Alexander to Dindimus, King of the Brahmans, with the Replies of Dindimus*, re-edited Walter W. Skeat, EETS 31 (London, 1878). This last is a second fragment of the alliterative romance of Alisander, translated from the Latin about A.D. 1340-50. My description of the encounter between Alexander and Dindimus is taken from both these texts.

¹² I am indebted to Randy E. Barnett's *The Structure of Liberty: Justice and the Rule of Law* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998) for the distinction he makes between freedom from contact with others and freedom to contact.

¹³ See Paul Gilbert, *The Philosophy of Nationalism* (Boulder Colorado: Westview Press, 1998). Gilbert's conception of nationhood depends not on any particular principle of a group's unity, but on a group's expressed right to independent statehood. Insofar as the Brahmans are a closed cultural group, they approximate to a community. They may be thought of as a nation because they have their own defended territory and government and they express their right to continue thus in resisting Alexander.

¹⁴ From the various histories of his life, anger is generally understood as the chief defect in Alexander's character. See J.R. Hamilton, *Plutarch's Alexander: A Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1969).

¹⁵ From Alexander's point of view the Brahmans seem to occupy the space of the stupid rather than that of simplicity. According to Avital Ronell in "The Uninterrogated Question of Stupidity," *Differences* 8.2 (1996), the space of stupidity seems to be occupied, in part, by an unthinking provincialism—an "inaptitude for living" (17)—as well as by a state of plenitude Ronell calls beatitude (8).

¹⁶ In an incident from Sir Thomas North's translation of Plutarch's life of Alexander, we can see a similar opposition between the functions of travel and dwelling emerging between Alexander and Indian philosophers. Alexander sends Onesicritus the Philosopher to the "wise men of the Indians", who "led a solitary and quiet life", to request that they meet with him (102). One of the Indian philosophers, Dandamis, "asked why Alexander had taken so painful a journey in hand, as to come to India" (102). Calanus, another Indian philosopher, is persuaded to meet with Alexander and propounds a parable about government. Calanus throws down on the ground a "dry sere piece of leather, and then put his foot upon one of the ends of it. The leather being trodden down on that side, rose up in all parts else, and going up and down withal still treading upon the sides of the leather" (102-3). In treading the circumference of the dry hide, and demonstrating how it rose up when pressed at the edge, his intent "was to let Alexander understand, that the most part of his time he should keep in the midst of his country, and not to go far from it" (103). Thus, the Indian philosophers question Alexander's whole thrust by positing the benefits of dwelling. See *Plutarch's Lives, Englished by Sir Thomas North, Vol.7* (London: J.M. Dent, 1899).

¹⁷ Thucydides' history of the Peloponnesian War pits a closed polity against that of expansionist state in the conflict between fifth century Sparta—the small, unified isolated polity—and Athens—the powerful,

expansionist but less unified, more diverse, state. Machiavelli's opposition between armed states corresponds to this polarity.

¹⁸ See Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*, Trans. George Bull (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1981) 77.

¹⁹ See *The Prince* (1981): "The first way to lose your state is to neglect the art of war; the first way to win a state is to be skilled in the art of war. You are bound to meet misfortune if you are unarmed because, among other reasons, people despise you" (87-88). Machiavelli also wrote, of course, *The Art of War* (1521), in which he made clear his conviction that armaments and armies were necessary for the survival of the state, and his complete opposition to the mercenary system.

²⁰ See the "Familiar Letters" in *Machiavelli: The Chief Works and Others*, trans. Allan Gilbert (Durham: Duke UP, 1965) 954.

²¹ I am indebted here to Markku Peltonen's discussion of Machiavelli's political preferences. See *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570-1648* (Cambridge UP, 1995) 198.

²² William Thomas, *The History of Italy*, ed. G. Parks, Folger Documents of Tudor and Stuart Civilization (Ithaca N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1963). All quotations are taken from this edition. Thomas also reports that, "If thou be a Jew, a Turk, or believest in the devil (so thou spread not thine opinions abroad), thou art free from all controllment" (83). This freedom from persecution was one of the reasons why the libeller and pornographer, Pietro Aretino, fled to Venice and never left. His praises of the city's cosmopolitanism and tolerance were a feature of his published letters.

²³ See Gasparo Contarini, *The Commonwealth and Government of Venice*, Trans. Lewes Lewkenor 1599 (New York: Da Capo Press, 1969). All subsequent quotations taken from this edition. Robert Finlay, in "The Myth of Venice in Guicciardini's History", *Medieval and Renaissance Venice*, eds. E.E. Kittell and T.F. Madden (Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1999), points out that the notion of an "immortal" Venice was held even by the enemies of Venice. They mistrusted the Venetian style of mixed government, so alien to princely statecraft, even as they acknowledged the durability such plurality gave to the state (300).

²⁴ See Thomas Starkey, *A Dialogue between Cardinal Pole and Thomas Lupset*, ed. J.M. Cowper, EETS, Extra Series 32, London (1878) 178.

²⁵ Lewkenor minimizes the implications of employing mercenaries on land—to the detriment of the aristocracy's traditional power base—by stressing that "the Captaine Generall of our Armie, who is alwaies a stranger" has "no authority to doe or deliberate any thing without the advice of the Legates," who, he explains, are "our Gentlemen sent into the Armie, who therein doe beare office and authority" (132). These "Treasurers, and Legates," reports Lewkenor, "never stirre from the side of the Captaine General" (132). Lewkenor goes on to add that Venetian gentlemen exercise the art of war as it pertains to battles at sea, and derive military honor from this activity rather than exercise their martial capacities on land. So, it may be said that where Shakespeare would conserve the authority of the monarch and the nobles who were his patrons, the Venetians would limit the aristocracy's power in the interests of ensuring a properly mixed government.

²⁶ Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992).

²⁷ Helgerson implies that Camoes is imposing the genre of epic upon what is a commercially motivated voyage when he says that Camoes had to "invent from often resisting and unsuitable material a nation that will justify his heroic literary undertaking—an undertaking defined by the ancient antipathy of the epic to commerce" (159). Longinus maintains a crucial distinction between the genres of epic and voyage in his criticism of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The *Odyssey*, for Longinus, was not an epic. It was more what

may be described as a comedy-of-manners-inflected romance.

²⁸ Helgerson (1992) demonstrates how commercial voyages may be read as epic accomplishments in Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*. Hakluyt's *Voyages*, Helgerson says, represent "a fundamentally new alignment of power in England, one in which merchants and mercantile activity had an everincreasing share" (181). This reconception of voyage and epic as mutualities promotes England's identity as a nation state rather than a kingdom. Helgerson sees this change as a heroic turn.

²⁹ See Lesley B. Cormack, "The Fashioning of an Empire: Geography and the State in Elizabethan England" in *Geography and Empire*, ed. Anne Godlewska, Neil Smith (Oxford: Blackwell P, 1994) 15.

³⁰ For an elaboration of the difference between finance capital and the traditional Marxist analysis of capital in relation to modes of production see Fredric Jameson, "Culture and Finance Capital," *Critical Inquiry* 24 (Autumn 1997): 246-265.

³¹ Stephen Greenblatt, "The Touch of the Real," *Representations* 59 (Summer 1997): 14-29.

³² Stephen Greenblatt, "What is the History of Literature?" *Critical Inquiry* 23 (Spring 1997): 460-482.

³³ Such "trafficking in spectres" is evocative, as I have already indicated, of classical epic. The dialogue with the dead is also evocative of satire, Lucianic satire being just one example. Greenblatt also brings *Hamlet* into his text here. Generally, Greenblatt figures the connection to the past, and to other worlds, as if it were a dialogue with the dead, of one form or another.

³⁴ See Stephen Greenblatt's, "Shakespeare Bewitched" in *New Historical Literary Study: Essays on Reproducing Texts, Representing History*, eds. Jeffrey N. Cox and Larry J. Reynolds (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993). Greenblatt's professional ethos of progress and growth may be implicated in the story of the rise and fall of disciplines. For the story of the rise and fall of history see Carl E. Schorske, *Thinking with History*, (Princeton UP, 1998) 219-232.

³⁵ Greenblatt's drive to dissolve distinctions between the literary and historical texts, to effect a synthesis of Aristotelian incompatibles, has been resisted as a form of cultural homogenization by critics of his work. See James Cunningham's summary of critical responses to Greenblatt's work in *Shakespeare's Tragedies and Modern Critical Theory* (London: Associated UP, 1997). I am suggesting that this cultural homogenization may be tied to an imperial dynamic mediated by Greenblatt's rhetoric of travel.

³⁶ The *position* of the witch, as Greenblatt elaborates it here, is that she has no fixed position; she is mobile, in transit, the whole time. Greenblatt briefly charts the back and forth shifting in her status from a fantastic to a real entity from the tenth century to James I's *Demonologie*. Even within Shakespeare's text, the status of the witch is in transit. In *Henry VI* the demonic "makes history happen" (122), but the witches in *Macbeth*, he says, "account for nothing" (122).

³⁷ On this point see the introduction to *Witches, Devils, and Doctors in the Renaissance*, Johann Weyer, *De praestigiis daemonum*, Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies 73 (Binghampton, New York, 1991) lxii.

³⁸ See *King James the First Demonologie*, ed. G.B. Harrison, Elizabethan and Jacobean Quartos, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1966) 9.

Notes to chapter two, "Making a famine where abundance lies"

¹ The *View*, in fact, leaves Elizabeth open to contempt should she neglect to address this threat to her realm. Everyone who had read their Machiavelli, and most university-educated men had, would have known that nothing is more necessary to a prince than that he govern himself in relation to his subjects, his allies and his neighbours in such a way that he does not become despised. Even hatred, Machiavelli insists, is preferable to contempt, because hatred does not preclude fear and respect. Elizabeth had always preferred love as a means to maintain respect for her fragile authority rather than hatred and fear. The *View*, however, claims that rule through accommodation and love has failed in Ireland and that therefore the Queen must look to rule by the sword. The implication is that she must consent to be hated in Ireland if her authority is not to be despised there, and she must consent to war if she wants to be respected closer to home. Given the Queen's fragile authority during the 1590s, as well as a history of insubordination by her military and naval officers, Elizabeth could brook neither contempt should she avoid war, nor defiance by her officers should she attempt it. Christopher Haigh, in *Elizabeth I* (London: Longman, 1988), has outlined Elizabeth's problems with her military and naval commanders throughout her reign. As Haigh observes, Elizabeth's relations with her military leaders point up the limits of her power. Lord Grey, the Queen's Lord Deputy in Ireland, whom Spenser served, is a case in point. Grey's exercise of military power was a blow to Elizabeth's authority. Grey was recalled and rebuked for excessive cruelty and for dispensing favors too freely.

The simplest solution for the Crown would have been to block the *View*. Spenser's treatise was denied publication in Elizabeth's reign, but I make no claim to have solved the vexed question as to why here. I simply suggest that basic statecraft would have prompted the ban.

² See Ciaran Brady's "The Road to the View: On the Decline of Reform Thought in Tudor Ireland" in *Spenser and Ireland: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*, ed. Patricia Coughlan (Cork UP, 1989).

³ See Nicholas P. Canny, "The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America," *Theories of Empire, 1450-1800*, ed. David Armitage (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998). Canny shows how Spenser's *View* participated in a discourse of European imperialism; he explains that this text offers a summary and elaboration of current arguments for empire, and pretexts for extermination. Spanish colonization of the Americas produced similar arguments. From the early sixteenth century, Spanish conquistadors had been writing home from the Americas with proposals for wars of "fire and blood" against unruly indigenes. See Jerald T. Milanich, *Laboring in the Fields of the Lord* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1999) 38.

⁴ In 1598, after Tyrone's victory at the Yellow Ford in Ulster, the rebellion spread south and Spenser's house was burnt to the ground. Spenser fled to Cork and then to England, where he delivered a plea to the court. He describes the attack by the rebels in this plea thus: "[G]oing straight upon the English as they dwelt dispersed before they could assemble themselves spoiled them all, their houses sacked and themselves forced to flee away for safetye, so many as they could catch they hewed and massacred miserably the rest leaving all behinde them fledd with their wives and Children to such porte townes as were next them where they yet remaine like moste pittiful creatures naked and comfortles lying un^{er} the towne walls and begging aboute all the streets daily expecting when the last extremity shalbe lade upon them." See "A Brief Note of Ireland", *Spenser's Prose Works, The Works of Edmund Spenser* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1949) 238.

⁵ Paul Stevens in "Spenser and Milton on Ireland: Civility, Exclusion, and the Politics of Wisdom" *Ariel* (26:4, 1995) has pointed to how the pressures of a volatile colonial situation provoke an emphasis on civility that inhibits political understanding of individual action in such a context. He intimates that it was this kind of stress that provoked Spenser's call for disciplining the Irish on the basis of civility in the *View*. My point is that despite the turmoil of the immediate conflict that seems to associate anarchy with Irish political assertion, the *View* still articulates the political struggle—perhaps inadvertently—as one between two opposing styles of government, both of which lay claim to civility.

⁶ I am assuming here that nationalism existed in the early modern era. This is, or has been, a matter of some debate. Ernest Gellner's seminal works on the subject of nationalism—*Thought and Change* (London:

Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964) and *Nations and Nationalism* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983)—define nationalism as an invention of modern, industrialized society. This modernist account of nationalism has been roundly challenged. John Armstrong's *Nations before Nationalism* (1982) and Anthony Smith's *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986) argue for the existence of nations and nationalisms long before the modern era by linking them to the global phenomenon of ethnic culture. Liah Greenfeld, in *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard 1992), argues for a sixteenth-century, English genesis for the modern idea of nationhood; she has pointed to Henry VIII's conflict with Rome as an origin for English nationalism. Adrian Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood* (Cambridge UP, 1997), claims a yet earlier origin, suggesting that "English nationalism of a sort was present already in the fourteenth century" (5). Neil MacCormick has pointed to Scottish struggles against English overlordship in the time of Edward I as evidence for a Scottish nationalism. See his "Nation and Nationalism" in *Theorizing Nationalism*, ed. Ronald Beiner (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999) 196. Tom Nairn in *Faces of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1997), summing up the field from a modernist's perspective, describes "the deeper debate about nationalism," as between "the 'moderns'" and the rest of the world, whom he calls "the 'primordials'" (150). According to Nairn, the primordials "think that there just are nations in *Homo sapiens*, which assert and (since 1989) reassert themselves through, across or against other trends like empire, and cosmopolitan or multi-national culture" (150). Nairn counters Gellner's emphasis on industrialization from another angle. While still of the modernist faction, Nairn examines the significance of *rurality* for nationalism. He points to the "peasant chauvinism" and ideologies of anti-modernism mobilizing ethnic nationalism in Pol Pot's Cambodia, and German Aryanism. Gellner's view of the genesis of nationalism as born of industrialization's functional requirement for occupational mobility has also been rejected on the grounds that it pushes political agency out of the picture. For an assessment of Gellner's functionalism from a number of different perspectives see *The State of the Nation: Ernest Gellner and the Theory of Nationalism*, ed. John A. Hall (Cambridge UP, 1998). Gellner's focus on a process of social transformation, what Roman Szporluk (Hall, 1998) has called "the global transition from Agraria to Industria", rather than on the agency and actions of states, has been roundly criticized (35). Brendan O'Leary, from the same collection of essays calls Gellner's functionalism, that transforms modern society's needs into nationalism's causes, "dead".

My argument springs, fundamentally, from an agreement with those who see nationalisms under construction long before the modern era. This is not to say that I disagree, in principle, with Ernest Gellner's emphasis on the relationship between *mobility* (Gellner meant social and economic mobility imposed by industrialization) and the break-up of old identities and the emergence of new ones. My focus on travel that breaks up the involuntary identities associated with dwelling follows a similar pattern. Politics structured by willed association, one could even say mechanistically organized societies, emerge from the version of agency produced by travel in my argument. Organically bonded communities—those Gellner associates with agrarian cultures—develop from the version of agency produced by dwelling. I see these kinds of cultural agency constructing nationalisms before the modern era, which is where I depart from Gellner's paradigm.

⁷ The nature of Spenser's conflicted colonial position has been investigated in a number of recent studies. The general effect of these studies has been to minimize the extent of Spenser's anti-Irish sentiments. Christopher Highley, *Shakespeare, Spenser, and the Crisis in Ireland* (Cambridge UP, 1997), for example, maintains that the *View* is critical of Elizabeth's womanly way with the intractable Irish, and that Spenser's treatise offers a satire on English maladministration in Ireland. Highley argues that Spenser is not necessarily simply anti-Irish in the *View*; he is anti-Elizabeth. Highley sees Spenser as targeting her defects as a weak, palliative woman in Ireland—and as a suffocating mother-monarch in England—to convey his disaffection. Highley says that Spenser "comes to imagine Ireland as a female-free zone, the site of a New English homosocial community" (5). He claims it offered Spenser "an area conducive to the unfettered exhibition of male prowess" (11) away from the queen and woman's rule.

Similarly Willy Maley, *Salvaging Spenser: Colonialism, Culture and Identity* (London: Macmillan Press, 1997), sees Spenser as interested in promoting a particular set of identity values for being English rather than anti-Irish, as such. What Maley calls "Spenser's militant nationalist mythology" (84) found room to grow in the "epic environment" that Ireland offered as the battleground of Old English degeneration and

New English civility (101). Maley does, however, speak of Ireland as “having an intensely personal effect” (89) on the poet, and of Spenser’s envy at the bards’ status as poets in their society (82). Nevertheless Ireland “was not simply an arena of confrontation between readymade English and Irish nations, but, paradoxically, a site of open struggle between competing forms of Englishness” (47). “Metropolitan identity,” he maintains, “could be both questioned and constructed in the colonial margins” (47). Spenser’s project, Maley claims, was to “make this Irish colonial society a valid part of England” (98).

Andrew Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser’s Irish Experience: Wilde Fruit and Salvage Soyl* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1997), also sees Spenser’s Irish experience as instrumental to the elaboration of the author’s English self. Hadfield sees Spenser’s text as an attempt “to articulate a sense of national identity in exile” (3). Hadfield makes sense of Spenser’s hybrid authorial moods as a writer of beautiful poetry and “bloodthirsty prose” by pointing to hybridized English selves. Spenser’s “Englishness in exile” (24) renders “Englishness at odds with itself” (6). Hadfield sees Spenser fashioning “an alternative Englishness in Ireland” (17), one that contests and improves on an existing version.

David J. Baker, *Between Nations: Shakespeare, Spenser, Marvell, and the Question of Britain* (Stanford UP, 1997), sees English nationhood as a plurality too, but in a different way. Baker’s idea of plurality is not expressed as a nexus of competing forms of Englishness. In the British Isles, he says, “the existence of each nation is dependent on the simultaneous existence of other nations, all of which are caught up in a process of mutual definition” (14). He sees England as “the site of intersecting nations, and that England *always* implies Wales and Ireland and Scotland” (14). By showing how these other nations were written *out* of the English national text, he shows how they were written *in*. He reads the silences to demonstrate how nationhood emerges intertextually with others, through a process of exclusion (16). Baker also reads the *View* as Spenser’s “tacit critique of the common law” (93): “the *View* both exemplifies and castigates the confusion of English law in Ireland” (73). With two common laws—Irish Brehon law and English common law—pitted against each other in Ireland, “the law in the Irish kingdom had become so concussed with uncertainty that its authority—the queen’s authority—was effectively destroyed” (74). Baker’s argument is that the *View* puts the case for the imposition of the queen’s absolute prerogative—something that Elizabeth did not want to do—by showing that the common law, in general, did not serve in Ireland. Baker suggests that exile allowed Spenser to say things that could not be said in England. Thus, Baker sees Spenser questioning the validity of the concept of immemorial, organic common law itself. Baker suggests that the *View* was banned because it implied that “in Ireland, if truth is to be valid, it will be so only because it is *enforced*. Thus he [Spenser] wrenches Ireland out of the providential scheme which encompasses the English” (90).

Ciaran Brady’s “The Road to the View: On the Decline of Reform Thought in Tudor Ireland,” *Spenser and Ireland: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*, ed. Patricia Coughlan (Cork UP, 1989) has also argued that Spenser’s dismissal of English common law as an instrument of reform was ill received in England. Brady suggests that this kind of critique of the common law would have been sufficient reason for the *View* to be denied publication.

All these readings downplay Spenser’s anti-Irishness in the *View* by focusing on his conflicted Englishness; they translate Spenser’s anti-Irishness, in various ways, as instrumental to his project of defining a particular set of identity values for being English. This kind of diluted anti-Irishness does not necessarily add up to a pro-Gaelic position.

⁸ All quotations, by page, from Spenser’s *A View of the Present State of Ireland in The Prose Works*, ed. Rudolf Gottfried. Vol. 10 of *The Works of Edmund Spenser, A Variorum Edition*. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1961).

⁹ Western political philosophers since Plato and Aristotle have identified the institution of property rights as the basis for society for just these reasons.

¹⁰ See Tom Bethell, *The Noblest Triumph: Property and Prosperity through the Ages* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998) for a modern restatement of this political claim.

¹¹ See Christian Reus-Smit, *The Moral Purpose of the State: Culture, Social Identity, and Institutional Rationality in International Relations* (Princeton UP, 1999) for the connection between a state's claim to sovereignty and its moral purpose.

¹² See John H. Elliott, "The Seizure of Overseas Territories by the European Powers" (Armitage, 1998). Thomas More's Utopians argued for a just war on the same basis; they claimed that invasion against those who kept their soil idle and tried to prevent others making better use of it was justified.

¹³ The figure of Ulysses, as a wise man of the world, Renaissance ideal and Homeric hero, is underwritten by the traveling god Jupiter. In Thomas Underdowne's translation (1569) of the Greek romance *Heliiodorus, An Aethiopian History*, the figure of Jupiter Hospitalis "leadeth his life in travell, and merchandise, and hath seen many cities, and knoweth the manners and fashions of diversenations" (59). See *Heliiodorus* (London: Chapman and Dodd, 1924).

¹⁴ See Liah Greenfeld (1992) 38, and Christopher Morris, *An Essay on the Modern State* (Cambridge UP, 1998), on the emergence of a public order distinct from the will of the monarch in the early modern era.

¹⁵ Tom Bethell (1998) attributes Ireland's impoverishment to an insecure system of land tenure in a chapter called "Why did Ireland starve?" Bethell's whole thrust, however, is to demonize the idea of holding in common. He sees forms of insecure tenure leading to injustice, and to a "beggar-thy-neighbour", world impoverishing route to tyranny. He criticizes the "delusion of socialism" (11). Pointing to "the relationship between liberty and property" he tells us that "Leon Trotsky long ago pointed out that where there is no private ownership, individuals can be bent to the will of the state, under threat of starvation" (9). He says the utopianism of common ownership masks the injustice known as "free riding", as well as tyranny. "Free-riding" refers to a situation in which those who are industrious and work hard receive as much as those who do not when property is communal. Bethell claims that utopian thinkers did not foresee the problem of "free-riding". Yet Plato's and More's division of labour, according to talents and inclination, would seem to have been a mechanism to minimize this problem. Marxists, of course, would counter his argument by suggesting that secure private ownership also leads to tyranny. Bethell privileges the secure tenure of property that is tied to improvement and increase as the foundation for culture. His stated thesis is that "there are four great blessings that cannot easily be realized in a society that lacks the secure, decentralized, private ownership of goods. These are liberty, justice, peace and prosperity. The argument of this book is that private property is a necessary (but not a sufficient) condition for these highly desirable social outcomes' (9).

¹⁶ See *The Civile Conversation of M. Steeven Guazzo, The First Three Books Trans. by George Pettie, Anno 1581 And The Fourth by Barth. Young, Anno 1586*. The Tudor Translations, 002, 008. (London: Constable and Co. Ltd., 1925).

¹⁷ See Baughan's introduction to the facsimile reprint of *The Traveiler of Jerome Turler* (London, 1575).

¹⁸ There have been a number of recent works outlining the importance of mapmaking to the emergence of the nation state. Richard Helgerson's *Forms of Nationhood* (1992) is a salient example. Swen Voekel gives this idea a Foucauldian twist in "'Upon the Suddaine View': State, Civil Society and Surveillance in Early Modern England", *Early Modern Literary Studies* 4.2/SI 3 (September 1998). In this essay he describes how "centralization and surveillance were intimately woven together" (10) as management tools. He also gives early modern cartography something of a Janus aspect when he describes sixteenth century maps of all kinds as "palimpsests of a new kind of political entity, the nation-state, whose gaze looked outwards, over a firmly demarcated national territory to be described, anatomized and controlled, and outwards towards the Atlantic with an eye to colonial expansion" (1).

¹⁹ On the modern, and early modern, state as an independent, public order, removed from particular rulers see Christopher Morris (1998). Morris says: "The modern use of 'state' to refer to a public order

distinct from both ruled and ruler, with highly centralized institutions wielding power over inhabitants of a defined territory, seems to date back no earlier than the sixteenth century' (37).

²⁰ Sir George Clark, in his survey of the seventeenth century, points to the growth of international business and law between sovereign states in the van of the lost, Medieval dream of a unified Christendom. He notes that "the circle of states which had to be taken into account in political calculations was widening for every statesman, and the amount of business in every way increasing. There were therefore more diplomatists, and they were getting more of a specialized training" (132). The writing of "Views" were part of this training and gave rise to the field of comparative politics and international relations. See *The Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963).

²¹ Wilson may have written it for an Italian friend or patron, as his twentieth century editor F.J. Fisher suggests. Or it may just be that the generic character of Wilson's treatise—a relation consisting of a socio-political description of a modern European state, composed by humanist travelers and observers—implies that kind of politically interested reader, who may be in a position to further the author's career. See Thomas Wilson's *State of England 1600* in Vol. 16 of *The Camden Miscellany*, ed. F.J. Fisher. Camden Third Series Vol. 52 (London: Offices of the Camden Society, 1936) vii. All quotations of Wilson's treatise are taken from this edition.

²² Authors justified themselves to individual patrons in the same manner. The Catholic scholar, Thomas Campion, begins "The Epistle Dedicatory" of his *Historie of Ireland* (1571) to his patron Robert Dudley by offering his relation, "That my travaile into Ireland, might seeme neither causeless, nor fruitlesse, I have thought it expedient...to yeeld you this poore book". See *The Works of Spencer, Campion, Hanmer, and Marleburrough*, Vol. I (New York: Kennikat Press, 1970).

²³ For this point see Denver Ewing Baughan's introduction to a facsimile reprint of Turler's *The Traveiler*.

²⁴ See Vol. 16 in *The Camden Miscellany*. Third Series, Vol. 52 (London, 1936). All quotations of Sherley's treatise taken from this edition. Sherley is not disinterested in his negative representation of the Turks here; he is pushing for an alliance between the English and the Persians against the Turks.

²⁵ All quotations of Lodge taken from *The Complete Works of Thomas Lodge* (1883), reprinted by Johnson Reprint Co. Ltd., 1966.

²⁶ Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* offers a vision of England as requiring only a single shepherd to sustain it after the enclosure laws have run their course. An uncultivated territory is an underpopulated, undefended territory.

²⁷ Failure to cope with change is the mark of the backward society according to imperial logic. As David Spurr notes in *The Rhetoric of Empire* (Durham and London: Duke UP, 1993) the idea goes that tribal systems and Oriental despotisms collapse into tyranny, of the tinpot or murderously lethal kind, when faced with the demand for modernization (72). He traces this line to the Hegelian picture of the Oriental world "which can be conquered and subjugated, but never energized from within" (73).

²⁸ This quotation of Lodge taken from "A Reply to Stephen Gosson's Schoole of Abuse" (1580?). See *Works*, (I, 27).

²⁹ For a discussion on the distinction between concepts of natural and civil justice, see Malcolm Schofield, *Saving The City: Philosopher-Kings and other classical paradigms* (London: Routledge, 1999) 160-177.

³⁰ Spenser's political reasoning, worked out through this debate between Irenius and Eudoxus, would have gone something like this: "All power is from God, granted, therefore, whoever has power must have been given it. Thus all governments are lawful to this extent. Power is obtained by the sword, and titles of

power are transferred by right of war, but it does not follow that rule is subsequently to be effected by the sword. The rule of law may operate through restraint by custom, as is the case with the Common Law of England. An unwritten law, such as the Common Law, tends to follow the dictates of nature, but when confusion arises and nature goes awry, then strong measures are called for to put a stop to this chaos. It is unnatural to desire confusion, therefore, if all else fails, the power of the sword is justified to avoid this unnatural condition."

³¹ It is not the *history* so much as the *present* state of cultural failure in Ireland that is news to Eudoxus. Eudoxus judges Irenius' historical approach, but he can say nothing about Irenius' first-hand observations of culture gone to the bad there. Ciaran Brady (Coughlan, 1989) misses Eudoxus expertise when he expresses the knowledge gap a little differently. Brady says that Spenser employs the dialogue form "because it was imperative for him to show that when confronted with a true interpretation, a view, of the means by which Ireland came to its present condition' the sensitive, informed and critical English intelligence" would concede defeat about the best way to reform Ireland (41).

³² Irenius' tactics here mirror those of Gaius Caesar in Christine de Pizan's *The Book of Deeds of Arms and of Chivalry*. The speaker says that "Caesar used to say that one should use against one's enemy the advice doctors give for illness, which is to say, to use diet and hunger before steel" (99). See *The Book of Deeds of Arms and of Chivalry*, trans. Sumner Willard (Pennsylvania UP, 1999).

³³ Richard Verstegen, *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* (The Scholar Press" Ilkley, 1976). All quotations, by page, of this work taken from this edition.

³⁴ The feeling that Ireland was inimical to England seems to have been present also in Shakespeare's text. Bernhard Klein in "Partial Views: Shakespeare and the Map of Ireland", *Early Modern Literary Studies* 4.2, Special Issue 3, (September 1998), says that "in Shakespeare, Irish space is initially synonymous with a source of political unrest, a place from which rebellion may at any moment spread to England...Ireland is constructed as a metaphorical territory of human and political waste" (9).

³⁵ These two views of Ireland here point to a general, contradictory attitude toward Ireland. Klein (*EMLS*, 1998) points to a general English insistence "on absolute Irish otherness", which would tend to a desire to erase Ireland altogether from English consciousness, or at least merit drowning by the sea for its sins, and "the need to assimilate the island into some sort of national framework on account of the political danger" resulting from its nearness (12). Klein shows how sixteenth-century maps either played to a desire for English incorporation of Ireland or to a diminishment of Ireland's existence as an island. Either way, though, Ireland resists "geographical appropriation" (13).

³⁶ Interestingly Milton's serpent tells Eve how, tempted by hunger and thirst, he wound himself "About the mossy trunk" to reach the desired fruit (IX, 589). The serpent's use of the moss detail points to a sick tree and refines the dramatic irony of the scene. The moss detail offers yet another clue the "yet sinless" Eve cannot fail to miss.

³⁷ See Graham Parry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford UP, 1995).

³⁸ Richard Stanyhurst's involvement with the recusant community—the Jesuit Edmund Campion, executed at Tyburn for treason, was his close friend—and his self-imposed exile in the Netherlands from 1581 led Stanyhurst to Richard Verstegen, who was the chief publisher and distributor of the books of Catholic exiles that were printed in Antwerp. Stanyhurst's own research into Irish antiquities mirrors that of Verstegen's investigations into English origins in the *Restitution*. Both authors were interested in undermining a Protestant imperialism under Elizabeth and James. It is not surprising, therefore, that Stanyhurst should write a commendatory poem in praise of Verstegen's book.

³⁹ Stanyhurst's own preface to his Irish chronicle, entitled "A Plain and Perfect Description of Ireland", reflects this stress on linguistic purity. His biographer, Colm Lennon, in *Richard Stanyhurst the Dubliner*,

1547-1618 (Blackrock, County Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1981), sees in Stanyhurst's writing resentment against English imperialism. Colm points to Stanyhurst's concern that Anglo-Ireland be considered not merely as "a remote outpost of English civilization but a vibrant organism with its own traditions and aspirations" (83). Stanyhurst's interest in Irish antiquities and his concern for linguistic purity spring from a recusant tradition of nationalistic, antiquarian study that opposes, generally, the trans ethnic, civic principles underlying an imperialism that was, in this instance, Protestant and English. Verstegen formalized this impulse toward ethnic and linguistic purity as an enterprise of nationalism in his *Restitution*. Yet at first sight it seems strange, as Graham Parry (1995) says, to find a staunch Catholic like Verstegen, who ran a secret Catholic press in London and was arrested, briefly, in 1583 for anti-English activities, compiling a work on English antiquities and dedicating it to the king. Yet if we see this work as an act of historiographic dissent, an antidote to something like Camden's *Britannia*, which tied Britain's civilization and illustrious past directly to its incorporation in the culturally superior Roman empire, then we can see its construction of ethnic nationalism as subtly undermining the assimilationist project of imperial union under James I and VI.

⁴⁰ Interestingly, Parry reproduces here the early modern trope of marriage as an expression of civic, or willed association. Marriage in the early modern era resonates with the idea of civic or willed association and the idea of cultivation and advance through civil conversation with others. When love and accommodation fail, therefore, to effect such progress, then stern measures are called for to put matters right. Thus Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*, and the subjection of Eve under Adam after the fall, put the case for the husband's strong overlordship of the wife.

⁴¹ Anna Bryson, in *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998), has brought together a number of civility's many values in her study of the transition from courtesy to civility. She does not, however, suggest as I do here, that it denotes a theory of cultural agency.

⁴² Parry (1995) notes that, "The viewpoint Verstegen presents us with is quite exceptional for its time, and important for advancing his case that the Saxons deserve serious attention as the determining factor in the development of the English nation" (57). Parry confutes this claim a little when he suggests that the absence of allusion to Camden's *Britannia* in the *Restitution* may be because Verstegen's book was written in mid- Elizabethan times (67).

⁴³ The phrase "cult of British history" is taken from Donald R. Kelley's discussion of Renaissance historiography in *Faces of History: Historical Inquiry From Herodotus to Herder* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1998) 183.

⁴⁴ See "Mr. Camden's Preface to the Reader", in *William Camden's Britannia*, translated and enlarged by the latest discoveries by Richard Gough, vol. 1 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1974) (xxxv).

⁴⁵ See John Leland's *New Year's Gift* (1546) in *John Leland's Itinerary: Travels in Tudor England*, ed. John Chandler (Stroud: Alan Sutton Pub. Ltd., 1993) (1). This was a report written to Henry VIII on his account of his travels thus far completed. It constitutes a statement of intent with regard to his explorations. His notes, known as the *Itinerary*, were not published in Leland's lifetime.

⁴⁶ Verstegen mentions in the *Restitution* that he wrote to an acquaintance in Italy, in 1601, on a point of etymology (27). Graham Parry (1995) makes a case for the *Restitution* taking shape from the earlier part of Elizabeth's reign. He cites Verstegen's mid-century sources and influences, his enthusiasm, in the 1560s, for Anglo-Saxon studies at Oxford, and the publication of a book on the origins and antiquities of famous European cities in 1576, as indicators that the *Restitution* was in progress long before its publication date. Parry also points to Verstegen as participating in a tradition of recusant antiquarianism. "Often publishing abroad, or keeping their work in manuscript, these men had as good reason as their Protestant counterparts for exploring the British past; they were proud of the antiquity of their nation and mindful of rich Catholic inheritance" (56). Given this dating of the work, Spenser may well have had access to Verstegen's manuscript.

⁴⁷ As Huw Griffiths in "Translated Geographies: Edmund Spenser's "The Ruines of Time", *EMLS* 4.2/SI 3 (September, 1998) has said, "Early modern antiquarianism, whilst it sets out to discover the truth, to bring the nation's origins to light, is in fact constantly embroiled in refutations and counter refutations of various accounts of the nation's ancient past" (1). He goes on to say that Camden, in delineating English national identity in relation to Britannia, "is itself indicative of the ironies and inconsistencies that are present in the antiquarian project" (1). Verstegen makes much the same point when he resists a British origin for the English people. Griffiths argues that Spenser shares Camden's aim to restore Britain to its antiquities and to rework "contemporary English history in the light of an older Roman-British inheritance" in his poem "The Ruines of Time".

⁴⁸ As George Steiner, in *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (Oxford UP, 1992) has pointed out, there is "No civilization but has its version of Babel, its mythology of the primal scattering of languages" (59). Generally the versions of Babel depend on "an accidental release of linguistic chaos" or the idea that the language condition denoted by Babel is imposed as a kind of punishment (59).

⁴⁹ There were other books published that listed words against another tongue and offered derivations, but these did not have the same nationalistic character that inflected works like Verstegen's. The cant "dictionaries," for example, or works like John Florio's *His First Fruites* (1578) and *A Worlde of Wordes* (1598), may be cited as examples of these non-nationalistic texts. Interestingly Florio's works were seen, in the prefatory material at least, as being an elegant substitute for dangerous travel.

⁵⁰ Sovereignty, as John Hoffman has shown in his book *Sovereignty* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1998), is a deeply contested term, meaning different things to different people, depending on context. In an international frame, as Hoffman has noted, it may mean no more than constitutional independence. I am indebted to Hoffman's idea that sovereignty does not have to be "indissolubly linked to the state" (2).

⁵¹ Bardic poetry from 1200-1600 evinces a tribal rather than a nationalistic Gaelic political consciousness. These poets, according to Nigel Wheale in *Writing and Society: Literacy, print and politics in Britain 1590-1660* (London: Routledge, 1999) 81, responded to the impact of colonization, but they were not necessarily motivated by nationalistic agendas. It is Verstegen who adds a nationalistic agenda to ethnic or tribal consciousness.

⁵² See *The Works of Spenser, Campion, Hanmer, and Marleburrough*, Vol. I (New York: Kennikat Press, 1970).

⁵³ Camden does the same. In his "Preface to the Reader" he says "Accordingly in etymology and conjecture I always recure to the British, or as it is now called the Welsh language, which was used by the original and most antient inhabitants of this country" (xxxvi).

⁵⁴ See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).

⁵⁵ Hadfield (1997) notes, however, that Fynes Morison links the Irish with the Turks in his *Itinerary* (1617) (27).

⁵⁶ See Charles Taylor, "Nationalism and Modernity" in *Theorizing Nationalism*, ed. Ronald Beiner (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999). Within the parameters of the Shakespearean parallel I have implied, the analogue for an ethnic nationalism in *The Taming of the Shrew* is feminism. Bianca evinces the shrewish traits of those who resist assimilation into patriarchal marriage.

Notes to chapter three, "Unless some mother"

¹ See David McCrone, *The Sociology of Nationalism: Tomorrow's Ancestors* (London: Routledge, 1998).

² The early modern state does not *require* a nation, neither does a nation require a state, as the European city states and the ethnic Irish nationhood that I have outlined in the previous chapter demonstrate. However, I understand both Scotland and England as nation states by the time James acceded to the English throne, in that both realms possessed institutional limitations on the monarch's power that constituted national identity.

³ See McCrone (1998) 52.

⁴ I am working with the commonly held opinion of a 1606 date of composition for the play. Arthur Melville Clark (1981), along with Dover Wilson, argues for 1601. Clark sees the play as a response to the attempt on James VI's life by the Gowrie Conspiracy of 1600.

⁵ Surprisingly, no-one seems to have read the play in the context of the debate about forms of union and the threat to national sovereignty posed by incorporating union into Great Britain. There have, of course, been plenty of readings that saw the play as celebrating the "imperial" Stuart dynastic line. Henry N. Paul, in *The Royal Play of Macbeth* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1950) links the imperial theme to lineal succession. Alvin Kernan, in *Shakespeare, the King's Playwright* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1995) offers one of the corresponding later views that sees the play glorifying Stuart mythology and celebrating James' accession. But these readings link the imperial theme to the union of Crowns and to dynastic line, rather than to the new, incorporated polity of Great Britain. My reading of *Macbeth* in relation to James VI's imperial theme depends upon an understanding of empire as a new amalgamation of national state systems that permits a monopoly of power to arise.

⁶ I am indebted here to Mark E. Kann's *A Republic of Men: The American Founders, Gendered Language, and Patriarchal Politics* (New York UP, 1998) for its explanation of "manhood as an oppositional concept" (16-22). I am also indebted to Kann's text as an exemplar of how a "grammar of manhood" may inform politics. My reading of *Macbeth's* men has been influenced by some of Kann's categories of manhood.

⁷ *Macbeth*, of course, has generally been regarded as a play that addresses the political ferment of the early years of James I's reign. One of the more recent critical readings in this line is that of Garry Wills, *Witches and Jesuits* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995) who sees *Macbeth* as one of the "Gunpowder Plays". These plays include Barnabe Barnes' *Sophonisba*, Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon* and Marston's *The Devil's Charter*. Wills also maintains that *Macbeth* is an overtly political play on the basis that there are no sub-plots and there are lots of kings (8). H.R. Coursen, *Macbeth: A Guide to the Play* (London: Greenwood P, 1997) offers a useful summary of criticism that has linked *Macbeth* directly to James VI and the texts and events of the early years of his reign.

Joseph P. Wilson, in *The Hero and the City: An Interpretation of Sophocles' "Oedipus at Colonus"* (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1997), offers a recent formulation of a politically didactic purpose for ancient Greek tragedy. He argues that democracies require an educated citizenry, and that tragedy imparts political wisdom to the masses of such states (187-8). Robert S. Miola, in *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy: The Influence of Seneca* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1992), offers a detailed analysis of *Macbeth* as a tyrant tragedy in the Senecan tradition.

⁸ This cyclic explanation of political change is ancient. I think it plays to Wittgenstein's idea in the *Philosophical Investigations* that actions are just as likely to hinder a system as they are to further it.

⁹ *A Tract on the Succession to the Crown*, ed. Clements R. Markham, Burt Franklin: Research and Source Works Series 584 (New York: Burt Franklin, 1970). All quotations from this tract are taken from

this edition. Harington organizes arguments for union citing material from three very different authorities and perspectives: the Protestant view, as it pertains to the Duke of Somerset's oration; the Puritan view, taken from the arguments of Peter Wentworth, a leader of the Puritan party in the Parliaments of Queen Elizabeth; and the "Papist" view, taken from the writings of the Jesuit Robert Parsons, who published a controversial book about the English succession under the name of Francis Dolman. Of this dialogic form, Harington says in his introduction that "by shewing what hath bene written advisedlie, gravely, and learnedly by one of his own syde...howsoever estraunged or divided in other matters of faith, or prone in disputes," he may avoid partiality and discover what "in this matter of State of all worldie matters most important we may hold together" (5). Consensus is reached through a process of dialogue between contestatory positions.

¹⁰ Brian P. Levack, in *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union 1603-1707* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1987), observes this tendency in the context of the union of laws debate. He says that "Those who wished to simplify, arrange, or change the law of either country in any significant way welcomed the union as a golden opportunity to implement their schemes" (84). But support for the union could also aggravate opposition to the point that it might even constitute a form of resistance itself. The Scottish lawyer, Sir Thomas Craig, whose *De Unione Regnorum Britanniae* (1605) argued for perfect legal union on the basis that the two national legal systems shared a foundation in civil law, offended national sensibilities in England, where an unwritten common law, distinct from civil law, was understood as the foundation of the legal system. As Levack concludes, "The one way to guarantee the continued separation of English and Scottish law was to propose their union on the basis of the civil law" (79). Similarly Sir Edwin Sandys' sometime support for complete fusion between the two states through the requirement that Scotland alone give up its institutions so offended Scottish, and English, sensibilities that it worked to subvert the whole project. Theodore Rabb, Sandys' biographer, notes: "he had struck a mortal blow at the entire proposal by revealing exactly what was involved in a perfect union: total naturalization, forgiveness of the French connection, and freedom of commerce. The English gentry were incapable of accepting such terms" (130). Rabb notes of this tactic that "It would be hard to imagine a more adroit way of sabotaging the entire project" (127). Bruce Galloway, in *The Union Of England and Scotland 1603-1608* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1986), also interprets Sandys' about-turn on union here as a diversionary tactic, designed to thwart the project (117-119). After this ploy, as Rabb says, "James's plan for a merger of the two countries was irretrievable" (132). See Theodore K. Rabb, *Jacobean Gentleman: Sir Edwin Sandys, 1651-1629* (Princeton UP, 1998).

¹¹ See Alvin Kernan, in *Shakespeare, the King's Playwright* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1995). Kernan speculates that James and his guest, King Christian of Denmark, were probably presented with *Macbeth* along with other entertainment, which included a display of running at the ring and tilting. Kernan concludes his discussion of the play by saying "*Macbeth* was the Stuart play, celebrating his ancient lineage, portraying the critical event in it and in Scotland's history, and making divine-right kingship identical with nature and sanity" (88). To this end, he says, "Shakespeare portrayed *Macbeth*, the enemy of divine-right kingship and of the Stuart ancestors, as being controlled by witches and used by forces of darkness" (87).

As to understanding the play as a "Stuart performance", it may certainly be understood as fitting into the flurry of artistic works that stroked James' vision of empire in the early years of his reign. Jonson's masque *Hymenai* (1606), celebratory poems by Thomas Middleton, and later Drayton's *Poly-Olbion* (1612), in addition to integrative and imperial images on coins and flags and imperial iconography embellishing royal occasions, were all part of the culture of empire constructed by artists eager for patronage. Shakespeare participated in this artistic wave and supported dynastic union, but *Macbeth* also registers the fear of national disintegration that attended the idea of union into Great Britain.

¹² See Colin Kidd, *British Identities Before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800* (Cambridge UP, 1999). Kidd argues that the Scots' nation depended on ancient Gaeldom for its notions of political legitimacy.

¹³ Arthur F. Kinney has summarized some important points of Shakespeare's debt to the chronicle

histories in "Imagination and Ideology in Macbeth", *The Witness of Times*, eds. Katherine Z. Keller and Gerald J. Schiffhorst (Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1993). Holinshed's Macbeth reigns for ten years, conferring "the blissefull benefit of good peace and tranquillitie" upon his people.

Of course James VI too was involved in attempts to break the power of the Scottish nobility and assert his own rule from the 1580's on. On this point see Andrew D. Nicholls (1999) 27

¹⁴ See Claire McEachern, *The Poetics of English Nationhood* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996) and Keith Brown, in *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union* (London: Macmillan, 1992). For Galloway (1986), Levack (1987) and Rabb (1998) see n.10.

¹⁵ See Andrew D. Nicholls, *The Jacobean Union: A Reconsideration of British Civil Policies Under the Early Stuarts* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1999).

¹⁶ I am indebted to Galloway's (1986) and Rabb's (1998) outline of Sandys' objections to the union.

¹⁷ James was quite right, in one sense, in seeking a stronger basis than dynastic union for his multinational polity. It was recognized at the time that dynastic unions were unlikely to be perpetual; it was understood that only union provided by conquest, or by the authority of Parliament, was likely to endure. On this point see John Robertson, "Empire and Union: Two Concepts of the early Modern European Political Order" (Armitage, 1998) 24.

As Claire McEachern (1996), explains, James appropriated Elizabeth's vocabulary of marriage to describe his relation to the state (148-9). A conflict emerges when James comes as a husband to a polity already gendered male by Elizabeth. This clash between two "husbands", and two political systems, may inform *Macbeth's* warring masculinities.

¹⁸ Sandys questioned what would happen to England's treaties and the precedence England had enjoyed because of her antiquity, in the event of a new polity--Great Britain--being created through union. Sandys' biographer, Theodore K. Rabb (1998), maintains that Sandys' "vision of a gentry state" and sense of national welfare informed his opposition to political union. It was Sandys, says Rabb, "who had been chiefly responsible for torpedoing the Union" (135). Moreover, adds Rabb, even though Sandys spearheaded the attack on the union more or less single-handedly, "the growing emphasis on the need to consult the Commons' constituents was one of the most remarkable features of the 1604-10 Parliament" (161). In other words Sandys' intervention was symptomatic of a growing general sense of the nation state's institutional sovereignty, as well as a perception that monarch and state operated as more or less equal partners in government.

¹⁹ Rabb (1998) sees Sandys as crucially concerned with the constitutional interests of the gentry as a group. He also sees him as "the first full embodiment of that peculiarly English phenomenon, the "Commons-man" (61).

²⁰ As quoted in Galloway's (1986) reproduction of the list. See appendix to chapter 2 (28-9). The change in name, in particular, was thought to imply conquest, as was decided by English judges in 1604. On this point see Keith Brown (1992) 81.

²¹ Harington (1602) puts the idea of a new name for the polity in a positive light. He acknowledges that Machiavelli notes in his *Discourses on Livy* that "the change of name is a badge of conquest," but he has it that the name of Britain is the "badge of a just, a mylde, and unbloody conquest, in which both nations shall conquer all their old rancor and malice and envy, a conquest in which warre itself shalbe conquered, a conquest that may avert, prevent, and defend all other conquestes" (19). He also offers Somerset's notion that England *renounces* the character of conquest in its offer of union with Scotland by the adoption of a new name. He cites Somerset as saying that "We have offered you not onely to renounce the name, authoritye, title, right, and honor of the victorye, but also to admitt that which is wont to be reputed as the scorne and Ignominie of the conquered, namely, to forsake the name of our nation, to suffer all our former

conquestes and victories to be quite defaced, disannulled and admitt the auncient name of Brittons' (13). Harington, like James, marshals all the traditional arguments for an integrated polity. These were that a shared geography, language, ethnicity and civility all pointed to a manifest destiny of union that promoted both peace and commerce, in that it offered a stronger defense against continental aggressors and competitors. Harington also puts the weight of prophecy behind the idea of empire. He calls to mind "a blynde prophesye that I heard when I was a child, namely: After Hempe is sowen and growen / Kings of England shall be none" (17). He explains that "Hempe" refers to the first letters of the five previous monarchs' names: Henry, Edward, Mary, Philip and Elizabeth. The idea is that future monarchs will be rulers of Britain. And at the end of his treatise Harington offers another prophecy of "those old British Bardes" (121). He paraphrases it from the Welsh thus: "A King of Britnish blood in Cradell crowned,/ With Lyon markt, shall joine all Brutus ground,/ Restore the Crosse, and make this ile renowrid" (121); the idea being that James had a mole shaped like a lion on his body.

²² See Claire McEachern (1996). Andrew D. Nicholls (1999) also emphasizes that objections to political amalgamation were fueled by fears that royal prerogative would increase. See pp. 15-17.

²³ See *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*, ed. Roger A. Mason (Cambridge UP, 1994) for a variety of Scottish positions on the idea of Great Britain.

James VI banned the books of George Buchanan as early as 1584. According to Buchanan the foundation of political power lay with the people and not with the king. The people entrusted the ruler with prescribed authority to rule over them. Buchanan's most shocking statement was that any private individual could kill a legally denounced tyrant. James appears to have been haunted by Buchanan's obstruction of his political stance and projects. Buchanan's ideas influenced Presbyterian ministers who gathered around Andrew Melville in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century. The Presbyterian clergy demanded a church that was separate from and independent of the state.

Colin Kidd (1999) notes that Buchanan claimed in his history of Scotland that the earliest Gaelic kings had been elected and accountable to the notables of the political nation for any deviations into tyranny. According to Buchanan, clan chiefs elected Fergus, the first king of Scotland. James denies this in *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* (1598). He describes King Fergus coming from Ireland as "a wise king comming among barbares," and the originator of "the estate and forme of governement," who "thereafter made lawes by himselfe, and his successours according thereto" (62). Calling "our Chronicles" to bear witness, James declares that "the trewth is directly contrarie in our state to the false affirmation of such seditious writers," who, he adds, "would perswade us, that the Lawes and state of our country were established before the admitting of a king" (62).

Keith Brown, in *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union* (London: Macmillan, 1992), has outlined the history of the Scottish legal profession's antagonism to incorporation with England. The two systems were generally felt to be incompatible. Brown (1992) and Mason (1994) include a number of perspectives on the James-Buchanan opposition.

²⁴ The speech of James' first English Parliament, and the one made to both houses after the Gunpowder Plot, were published soon after they were delivered by Robert Barker, the King's printer, and copies of the first edition of all these speeches survive. On this point see Charles Howard McIlwain's introduction to *The Political Works of James I* (New York: Russell and Russell, Inc., 1965) civ. All quotations of James' political works are taken from this edition.

²⁵ James does something similar in playing up the national danger posed by the Gunpowder Plot. On this see Alvin Kernan, *Shakespeare, the King's Playwright: Theater in the Stuart Court 1603-1613* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1995) 71.

²⁶ I am suggesting that James' emphasis on peace after discord goes beyond that which was traditionally invoked during the transition from one monarch to another. Douglas F. Rutledge, in "The Politics of Disguise: Drama and Political Theory in the Early Seventeenth Century," in *The Witness of Times*, ed.

Katherine Z. Keller and Gerald J. Schiffhorst (Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1993), points out that "social chaos is evoked at the passing of one monarch and can only be settled when a new monarch comes to the throne" (91).

Quentin Skinner in *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1978), has outlined a tradition of political writing that justifies imperial rule by identifying peace as its prime benefit (16-17).

²⁷ Quentin Skinner (1978) offers a summary of some of the individual positions taken by scholastic political philosophers on this point (49-65). James' view of the growth of mercantile wealth as a positive good, rather than as a corrupting political force because it underwrites private luxury, also accords with the view of scholastic theorists (Skinner, 56). When peace is what the community holds in common, then differences in property may obtain without undermining the idea of the commonwealth. But when liberty is what binds the community as a polity, then inordinate private wealth impinges on the liberty of some to follow their natural right to conserve themselves in existence, especially in a postfeudal economy. Land enclosure, as More points out in *Utopia*, makes some men rich at the expense of making criminals out of those who are simply following their natural right to stay alive. "Liberty", as the basis of the commonwealth, interferes with the accumulation of private wealth in a way that "peace", as the basis of the commonwealth, does not. James recognizes this to a degree. In *Basilikon Doron* (1599), he declares that "the Merchants thinke the whole common-weale ordeined for making them up; and accounting it their lawfull faine and trade, to enrich themselves upon the losse of all the rest of the people" (26). James objects to some of their practices--importing shoddy goods, raising prices, corrupting the coin--rather than to the build-up of private wealth itself. Later in the same text he advises his son to "thinke the riches of your people your best treasure available, if necessary, to lift subsidies for war (42).

²⁸ James' emphasis on peace and union accords with the position of those who argued for universal emperorship. The maintenance of universal peace, and the uniting of a disparate mankind as one flock under one shepherd, were the distinguishing marks of Continental imperial propaganda. See Franz Bosbach's (Armitage, 1998) useful summary of the features of informed and popular arguments for and against universal monarchy, or empire.

²⁹ James' peace-keeping mission here is analogous to that of Continental emperors whose special function it was to maintain peace in the Christian community as well as defend Christian states from aggressors from outside. Franz Bosbach (Armitage, 1998) notes that "The war against the Turk was regarded as the special task of the universal ruler" (87). The Catholics, seen as at the root of what was played up as the barbaric and brutal Gunpowder Plot, may easily play as the Turk to James as defender of the Protestant faith. James' interest in promoting himself as a learned and experienced Solomonic ruler offers another analogy with Continental imperial propaganda. The virtues of the emperor Charles V were glorified to justify his superiority to all other authorities. See Bosbach (1998) 88.

³⁰ Claire McEachern (1996) points out that James' call for political union mobilized fears of a threat to native English common law by Scots' law which, she says, "specified the monarch as the source of law, rather than the subject of it" (147). Both Scotland and England, however, possessed institutions that limited the power of the monarchy. Both had Parliaments, and Scotland, in particular, had a powerful ecclesiastical body in the *kirk*. These different social and political traditions divided the two states, but also meant that important elites in both countries had a stake in resisting political union that would suppress their involvement with power. Both national state systems were threatened by James' project for authoritarian rule.

³¹ Skinner (1978) outlines a number of early modern arguments in defense of Empire that rest upon the idea that the peace of the polity is best served by the rule of one (16-17). For "the single power principle" see Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (New York: Free Press, 1964). Robert Nozick in *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968) modifies a Weberian tradition that sees the state as the sole authorizer of violence. He concludes, "the protective association dominant in a territory...is the state" (118).

James' concentration of power in his body did not go unnoticed by other political watchers at the time. Sir Roger Wilbraham, Solicitor-General in Ireland and Master of Requests from 1593 to 1616, was careful to note in his journal this personal foundation of the new realm established under King James I of England and Ireland, and the VI of Scotland. Wilbraham included in his journal the substance of the Lord Chancellor's speech to Parliament, November 5 1605, that followed the discovery of the plot to blow up the Upper House of Parliament. Wilbraham reports that "the lord chancellor made grave spech : of our cause of unspekable alacritie that hath united bothe these imperiall crounes under the soveraintie of his royal person" (71). That the new realm did appear to hang upon the body of the king, and not upon some other cause, Wilbraham's report of the speech makes plain. Wilbraham notes that the Chancellor "compared this tyme with...former tymes when the cruelti of civill warres was extinguished by the union of the howses of Lancaster & York: yet," he says, "that union was clouded with mist & doubt even in the midst of the raigne of H.8" (72). The union under James, however, is different. The chancellor is reported as saying that "the union under the king's succession is perpetuall, by uniting *in his person* two kingdoms (italics mine), wherein the severall monarches have had so long discents in ther bloud as no Christian king hath the like" (72). "This union," he concludes, "is the act of god, not patched by absolutions of popes or parliament to dispenche with doubtful or illegittimate mariages." Quotations from *The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham*, in *The Camden Miscellany*, Vol. 7 (London, 1902).

The idea of a new polity that is conjured in the person, in the very blood, of the Stuart king, appears as a significant point of departure from the past. It marks, I suggest, a sense that an imperial dynamic disrupts rather than develops the nation state in this period. Certainly Macbeth's rule appears as a bloody and tragic interruption to the narrative of mixed government under Duncan and Malcolm.

³² Brian P. Levack. *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union 1603-1707* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1987).

³¹ M. Perceval-Maxwell, *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the reign of James I* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973) summarizes James VI impact thus: "Until James VI began to assert his authority, the country had undergone perpetual internal strife, with foreign invasions from time to time adding to the general instability. The successive minorities of the monarchs had permitted power to be dispersed among the nobles, who all too frequently dissipated their energy in feuds. When James reached his majority, his kingdom's most pressing need was clearly the restoration of a strong central government. For a decade he gradually consolidated his position so that by...1595 he had attained sufficient power and experience to initiate a series of measures towards decisive reform, of which schemes for the settlement of outlying areas were but a part" (19-20).

³⁴ My reading of Macbeth here has been influenced by Tom Nairn's (1997) discussion of Cambodia's Pol Pot.

³⁵ The idea of a correspondence between the personal and the political would have been familiar to Shakespeare's audience. A correspondence between the body and the world existed as a Medieval motif, and the idea of the body politic in the succeeding centuries amplified that configuration. The concept of the body politic figured heavily in James VI and I's political rhetoric. On the basis that a mysterious unity between the body and the world had long been acknowledged, and that Elizabeth and James expressed their ideas about the relationship between the governed and the governing through this figure, it seems likely that a correspondence between forms of personal and political production would also pertain. The early modern subject of history, articulating a version of agency generated either by travel or by dwelling, conveys in "micro" the character of the polity.

³⁶ Coriolanus also epitomizes the physical horrors of war. He is described as "a thing of blood" (2.2.109), covered in wet blood, perpetually letting blood, barely taking time to breathe. Like Macbeth, he is a single-handed engine of bloody war. Yet, like the bleeding sergeant of the same scene, he also spills his blood for the state, and this blood-bond with Rome prevents him, at the end, from joining with the Volsci, whom Machivelli described in the *Discourses* as "perpetual enemies to the Roman name" (I.13.2),

and destroying his city.

³⁷ The links that connect Macbeth with Achilles are numerous. Without Achilles, the Greeks have no hope of Troy. Almost single-handedly Macbeth turns the tide of Cawdor's rebellion in the opening act. He manifests here the bodily invincibility that is accorded him later by the witches. This aura of invincibility, in addition to the epic similes with which he is described in battle, also links him to Achilles. Aeneas says in the *Iliad* (XX) that it is impossible for any man to kill Achilles because he always has a god with him to save him. In Book IX of the *Iliad*, following his argument with Agamemnon, Achilles makes it clear that he has come to the siege of Troy in order to fulfill the destiny of undying fame that his mother told him was promised to him. Achilles' skill and strength are tied to his own concerns and not utilized for the benefit of his community. He is a heroic adventurer, as is Macbeth. Macbeth's miraculous preservation also links him to James, who escaped a number of attempts on his life. Even before the Gunpowder Plot, Harington (1602) remarks upon how James was preserved "from a pistoll bent at him in his mother's wombe...from tempestes, from treasons, from sorceries, from so many evill men and evill Aungels" (47).

³⁸ The distinction between *familia* and family is taken from Roman law. *Familia* was a self-contained, legal construct that provided a framework for governing property; family was a more idiosyncratic and variable form with less clearly defined legal parameters. For an elaboration of this distinction see Jane F. Gardner, *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life* (Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998).

³⁹ See Christine de Pizan, *The Book of Deeds of Arms and of Chivalry*, trans. Sumner Willard, ed. Charity Cannon Willard (The Pennsylvania State UP, 1999). There are five aspects to the ideal fortress. First, the situation should be elevated; the castle should be placed on some height in good country or by water. Secondly, it should be in good air, removed from swamps. Third, it should be situated in a fertile and productive spot. Fourth, it should be safe from attack from nearby hills, and fifth, the surrounding land should be open. See pp. 104-5.

⁴⁰ Scolds were associated with witchcraft, therefore Lady Macduff could be seen, like Lady Macbeth, a possible child-killer, as something of a witch. On the point of scolds and witches see Alan MacFarlane, *Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England* (London: Routledge, 1970, 1999) 178.

⁴¹ It is important to note an overlap between the styles of manhood and agency that I am delineating in this chapter. Duncan, Donalbain, Malcolm and Macduff all undertake journeys. They all travel to Macbeth, even Birnam Wood appears to come to Dunsinane. These travel events gloss with modernity an established, traditional regime. Conversely, Macbeth's role as a dweller develops his primitive, Scythian character. This ethnic inflection registers the new project of absolute rule as a barbaric step backward.

⁴² See Jennifer R. Goodman, *Chivalry and Exploration 1298-1630* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1998). Her analysis of the chivalric motifs that informed exploration initiatives and narratives in the early modern period informs my discussion of Macbeth here.

⁴³ In describing Elizabeth's tacit consent to the privateering expeditions of individual British adventurers Jennifer Goodman (1998) refers to "the familiar image of the individual knight who wins an empire with his sword, as Tirant lo Baluch nearly does, and as so many Spaniards were trying to do" as shaping these adventurers' ambitions and actions (189). The power of the sword includes the authority of the Christian church to impose civility. The sword turned upside down to represent the cross was a motif of conquest narratives. In his very self-reliance, however, Macbeth also takes on the satanic inflection of a Faustian hero who is, of course, damned.

⁴⁴ Columbus too, of course, reported on his voyages in such a manner as to ignite his readers' desires. In the account of his first voyage he reports on the prospect of incalculable gold, rhubarb, cinnamon, spices, cotton and slaves to be taken from the idolaters. Like those who sought to offer positive precedents for James' idea of political union by citing unions in Spain, the Low Countries and Lithuania, Macbeth also seeks to justify his "union" with the witches. "I have learn'd by the perfect'st report," he says, "they have

more in them than mortal knowledge' (I.v.2-3).

⁴⁵ On the link between infant mortality and witchcraft see Alan MacFarlane, *Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England* (London: Routledge, 1970, 1999) 178.

⁴⁶ Michael Frassetto, "Violence, Knightly Piety and the Peace of God Movement in Aquitaine", *The Final Argument: The Imprint of Violence on Society in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Donald J. Kagay, L.J. Andrew Villalon (Rochester, NY: The Boydell Press, 1998) 13-26.

⁴⁷ Rash vows, and the keeping of them in defiance of morality, are the stuff of romance. They serve to privilege law as a way of legitimizing action that morality might forbid.

⁴⁸ The motif of the knight receiving a sword from a lady was a feature of the chivalric genre. On this point see Goodman (1998) 145. Goodman points out that this motif was a particular feature of Arthurian narratives.

⁴⁹ Goodman (1998) offers "the loving couple" as another motif of chivalric narrative (180).

⁵⁰ All quotations of *The Discourses* taken from *Niccolo Machiavelli, Discourses on Livy*, Trans. Harvey C. Mansfield and Nathan Tarcov (Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1996).

⁵¹ John O'Neill, *The Market: Ethics, Knowledge and Politics* (London: Routledge, 1998). O'Neill argues that the market affords a forum for competing conceptions of the good.

⁵² Machiavelli underscores the benefits to be gained from tumult as political engagement: when it comes to driving out corrupt rulers too. So long as the "virtue of the collectivity" is maintained, corrupt rule cannot harm the polity. "So it was to Rome's great happiness," he says, "that those kings became corrupt quickly, so that they were driven out before their corruption passed into the bowels of the city. This lack of corruption—men having a good end—was the cause that the infinite tumults in Rome did nohurt and indeed helped the republic" (I.17.2).

⁵³ Skinner (1978) notes that Machiavelli's defense of tumults "horrified" his contemporaries. He suggests that it constituted a "sneer" at the admiration for the Venetian constitution and the serenity that crowned it. Yet faction would seem to be simply a less orderly form of mixed government than that practiced so famously by the Venetian constitution. Machiavelli's defense of tumults also questioned "one of the most deeply-rooted assumptions in the whole history of Florentine political thought," that faction offered the gravest threat to political liberty (182).

⁵⁴ A parallel can be drawn here between Duncan's paternal masculinity, which legitimizes resistance to a certain extent, and features of Gaelic society in Scotland at the time Shakespeare was writing. Gaelic society was dominated by clanship. Clan leaders, who were both feudal landlords and territorial warlords, engaged in almost constant feuding. Scottish overlords, as Keith Brown (1992), has noted, cultivated paternalistic relationships on their estates because of their need for military service from their tenants. "The ability to summon armed supporters," Brown says, "was crucial in a feuding society" (39). This parallel between the character of Duncan's and Gaelic government bears out Colin Kidd's (1999) argument that Gaelic identity upheld the institutional continuity of Scottish sovereignty.

⁵⁵ Charon will take no soul across the Styx who does not have a tomb. See the *Aeneid* (VI, 427-35). In accepting Priam's ransom for the body of Hector, Achilles shows his civility. See the *Iliad* (XXIV).

⁵⁶ On the burial practices and the culture of death see Armando Petrucci, *Writing the Dead: Death and Writing Strategies in the Western Tradition*, trans. Michael Sullivan (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998).

⁵⁷ There is something of James in most of the male characters of this play. James' French kinsman, Esme Stuart, who arrived at the Scottish court in 1579, was the first in a line of attractive male courtiers

who monopolized James' affection. This dangerous emotional dependence was not only commented upon publicly at the time, it was also later exploited. George Villiers' introduction to the king, for example, was carefully orchestrated. Cawdor's closeness to Duncan is not the only point of similarity between Duncan and James; throughout his reign as King of Scotland, James always had trouble extending royal control over the far north and west of Scotland. The rebellion Duncan is faced with is from the north and the west.

⁵⁸ See Valeria Wagner, *Bound to Act: Models of Action, Dramas of Inaction* (Stanford UP, 1999).

⁵⁹ Ronald Rogowski, in "Democracy, Capital, Skill, and Country Size: Effects of Asset Mobility and Regime Monopoly on the Odds of Democratic Rule" in *The Origins of Liberty*, eds. Paul W. Drake and Mathew D. McCubbins (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1998), notes that "historically, the two chief reasons for large states were defense and a guaranteed home market" (68). James, and the supporters of his accession, and later, supporters of political union with Scotland, make the same argument.

⁶⁰ See Henry N. Paul, in *The Royal Play of Macbeth* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1950), who has noted that this system of kings is described in Holinshed's *Description of Scotland*. "It resulted," says Paul, "that a king usually seized power by the slaughter of a predecessor or rival and held it only so long as he was able to hold it with his sword. Of the ten successive kings of Scotland who preceded Macbeth, all had been slain" (165).

⁶¹ A brief contextualization of *Macbeth* with *Coriolanus* confirms the connection I am making here between the belly of the body politic and mothers and children. In Menenius' famously tedious fable of the belly in the first scene of *Coriolanus*, the senators of Rome are identified as the vitals of the polity; they are "this good belly" without which the body politic would cease to exist. The sheer tedium of Menenius' fable is an indication that he is wrong. When Menenius, spokesman for the senators, goes to plead for Rome before Coriolanus, he fails. But, when Volumnia and Virginia make it clear to Coriolanus that in marching on Rome he treads upon his mother's womb that brought him to life and nature, and upon his wife's, that brought his son to the same, Coriolanus will not act unnaturally and destroy the body politic. He will not behave like the commoners at the beginning of the play, who, according to Menenius, rebel against that which sustains the state, the body politic, in life. When the desperate polity presents its belly to Coriolanus in the shape of wives, mothers and children, he will not trample it.

⁶² Franz Bosbach, in "The European Debate on Universal Monarchy" (Armitage 1998), has traced the shape of informed, popular debate on international politics in Europe during the early modern period. He points to the crucial split between church and world, *sacerdotium* and *imperium*, in the eleventh century as stirring the debate between laymen and clergymen about how separate ecclesiastical and secular polities could be organized.

⁶³ All quotations from Gerson taken from *Cambridge Translations of Renaissance Philosophical Texts, Vol. 2: Political Philosophy*, ed. Jill Kraye (Cambridge UP, 1997).

⁶⁴ In the ancient world the distinction between sacred and secular did not divide state activity. Aristotle notes in the *Politics* (1382b) that the relation between the gods and the community underwrote all others.

⁶⁵ All quotations of Scala taken from Kraye (1997).

⁶⁶ Randy E. Barnett (1998) points to the important distinction to be made between natural law and natural rights. "Unlike natural law ethics," he points out, "natural rights do not proscribe how rights-holders ought to act towards others. Rather they describe how others ought to act towards rights-holders" (14). Natural law "provides guidance for our actions," but "natural rights define a moral space or liberty--as opposed to license--in which we may act free from the interference of other persons" (14-15).

⁶⁷ Machiavelli's *Discourses on Livy* offers another apology for rebellion, as does, for example, John Ponet's *A Short Treatise of Politic Power* (1556). Ponet argues that natural law speaks through the conscience of subjects. George Buchanan, James VI's tutor, also famously defended the idea of regicide

when a tyrant threatened the polity. Almain is an early example of a line of political theorists who saw the foundation of political power residing with the people rather than the potentate. In the process of delimiting the plenitude of power enjoyed by the Papacy, Almain outlines how natural law was appropriated and manipulated as a transcendent, authorizing force by both sides in this political debate.

⁶⁸ Tommaso Campanella, as John Robertson in "Empire and Union: Two Concepts of the Early Modern European Political Order" (Armitage, 1998) points out, was also one of the most aggressive apologists for a universal, Spanish monarchy in Europe. His *Monarchia di Spagna* (composed 1600-1) "was the least inhibited" of proposals for such universal rule. Robertson claims, categorically, that the "political and intellectual horizons of the Jacobean Union debate were those of the era of Spanish hegemony" (25).

⁶⁹ All quotations of Campanella taken from Krayer (1997).

⁷⁰ Classical thinkers also believed that natural law was of divine origin. See Barnett (1998) 8.

⁷¹ I am indebted here to Randy Barnett's (1998) summation of the distinctions between natural right, as defining what is just, and natural law, as defining what is good (301).

⁷² I am not suggesting here, with the benefit of hindsight, that *Macbeth* is involved in what S.J. Houston in *James I: Second Edition* (London: Longman, 1995) has called "a long crescendo of conflict from 1603 to 1642" (30). As Houston points out, revisionist historians have shown that "the connection between James and the causes of the civil war is remote" (31). What I am suggesting is that *Macbeth* anatomizes absolutism as a logical consequence of rationalized rule and integration and as a threat to national identity.

⁷³ See Stephen Greenblatt, "Shakespeare Bewitched," in *New Historical Literary Study: Essays on Reproducing Texts, Representing History*, ed. Jeffrey N. Cox and Larry J. Reynolds (Princeton UP, 1993).

⁷⁴ This construction of witches goes against that of the times. Johann Weyer's (1515-1588) exhaustive study of the subject of witches, *De praestigis daemonum* (1583), consistently distinguishes between the agency of the magician and the enslaved condition of the witch. A magician makes an illicit attempt to summon forth a demon, an invisible spirit of air, so that the demon will reveal himself in some visible form. A witch, however, has contracted her body to the demon; she is possessed by the demon, which works through her. She has lost any inalienable right to her own person that she might have had. She is a slave. James I subscribed to this view in his *Daemonologie*.

⁷⁵ James' comments are quoted here as reported in *A Jacobean Journal*, G.B. Harrison (London: Routledge and Sons Ltd., 1941) 345.

⁷⁶ See *King James I Daemonologie* (Edinburgh UP, 1966) 20-22, 39-9.

⁷⁷ James' *Daemonologie* (1597) notes that, as slaves to the demon, witches can "rayse stormes and tempestes in the aire, either upon Sea or land" (46).

⁷⁸ See Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), on the failure of communities to look after the old and destitute as feudal economies declined. He points out that this propensity was exacerbated in times of civil unrest. Popular malice towards needy, old women led to their depiction as witches, and witches were, in turn, seen as commonly responding with fury when basic charity was refused.

⁷⁹ In each case, those who are banished are representatives of socially rising groups of men: professional soldiers and sailors, respectively. This would seem to accord with Keith Thomas' (1971) argument that capitalist economies, insofar as they were practiced by the new professional classes, posed a mortal threat to those who relied on the charity of more feudal communities, that is, old women.

⁸⁰ Not only does James deny that his people ever possessed political freedom and power in this treatise,

he also denies that they have any authority to protest a legitimate ruler's government, however tyrannical that government might be. James calls any such freedom an "unlawfull libertie" (61). He insists that the people suffer and obey even bloody tyrants like Nabuchadnezzar, king of Babel, because, in that "they had once received and acknowledged him for their king, he not only commandeth them to obey him, but even to pray for his prosperitie," because, "in his prosperitie stood their peace" (60). Even a tyrant like Nero is "God's Lieutenant in earth" (61). A people's only redress are tears and prayers for their ruler's amendment.

⁸¹ See David McCrone (1998), who points out that the greenwood has long been associated with liberty, despite that fact that by 1066 only fifteen percent of England was still wooded (57).

⁸² Brian Loveman, "When you wish upon the Stars: Why the Generals (and Admirals) say Yes to Latin American 'transitions' to Civilian Government" (Drake and McCubbins, 1998) 115-139.

⁸³ The phrase comes from an essay by Stephen Haggard and Robert R. Kaufman, "The Political Economy of Authoritarian Withdrawals" (Drake and McCubbins, 1998).

⁸⁴ This is not actually the case; *The Book of Pluswarden* written in 1461, possibly by Maurice Buchanan, refers to Scottish earls throughout. See *The Book of Pluswarden*, ed. Felix J.H. Skene, *The Historians of Scotland* (Edinburgh: William Paterson, 1880).

⁸⁵ Spenser's *View* circulated in manuscript for thirty-seven years before its publication in 1633. Given that more than twenty copies of the treatise in manuscript form survive, it may be assumed that it must have been popular and widely known long before 1633. On this point see Baker (1997) 116.

⁸⁶ John H. Elliot (Armitage, 1998) has noted that land utility was used to justify land ownership and seizure in Elizabethan Ireland (146), and in sixteenth-century British America (148-9).

⁸⁷ Armando Petrucci, in *Writing the Dead: Death and Writing Strategies in the Western Tradition* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998), has pointed to the various forms in which the dead were celebrated throughout the ages. He has shown how documents serve as monuments, both of which mediate the political and social significance of the dead they document. Such monuments not only articulate the significance of the dead: they also serve to *authenticate* that meaning.

Notes to chapter four, "Chronicle of wasted time"

¹ All quotations of Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller* taken from *The Unfortunate Traveller and Other Works*, ed. J.B. Steane (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1972).

² John O'Niell, *The Market: Ethics, knowledge and politics* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998).

³ My discussion of how a knowledge of form affects subject formation has been influenced here by Milton's *Paradise Lost* and by my reading of the issues raised in *Problems of Form*, ed. Dirk Baeker. Trans. Michael Irmscher with Leah Edwards (Stanford UP, 1999).

⁴ See Howard Marchitello, *Narrative and Meaning in early modern England* (Cambridge UP, 1997).

⁵ Nigel Wheale, *Writing and Society: Literacy, Print and Politics in Britain 1590-1660* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), offers a useful survey of work done on the growth of the literary market in Britain. He notes that the "relative immaturity of the publishing industry in Britain" (55), as compared to that on the Continent, meant that vernacular books outnumbered Latin ones from the beginning, and that

"prose fiction of various kinds" largely accounted for the increase in print productions during Elizabeth's reign (56). He adds that although "two thirds of the population could not read or write in 1590" (134), there is evidence for high literacy rates among certain groups of young men in London, notably apprentices. Such young men, looking for some fashionable pattern, may well have made up a part of Nashe's audience.

The print market initiated a revolution for readers as well as writers see Cecile M. Jagodzinski, *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth Century England* (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1999), for the emergence of reader autonomy in the experience of reading a book. This experience included the intellectual and emotional pleasures of reading, in secret, sensational narratives that awakened a private self, free from the authority of the community.

⁶ I use the masculine pronoun to describe this figure because, in general, it was men who travelled. Women were explicitly advised against travel as being injurious to their bodies and to their reputation. Jerome Turler, for example, in one of the first and most influential guides to travel, *The Traveiler* (1575), offers this argument. It is a point of view that crops up time and again in all sorts of text, and in all sorts of ways, and constitutes a cultural assumption of the times. Women travellers represented in this era tend to be vagrants, prostitutes, or wives or laundresses to an army. Sometimes they are disguised as men, or they travel at one remove, through reading. As Rojek and Urry (1997) note, "the dominant tradition in travel was and is palpably masculine" (16).

⁷ Henry Peacham, in *The Compleat Gentleman* (London, 1622), voices this opposition between travel that is for pleasure and that which is for the public good. In "Of Travaile" he says that if "you intend to travell, you must first propound unto yourselfe; the End, which either is...pleasure or profit." See *The Compleat Gentleman, The English Experience* 59 (New York: Da Capo Press, 1968) 201. This opposition in the aims of travel was implicitly and explicitly operative in humanistic educational literature from at least the time of Erasmus on.

⁸ Ascham's view of Italy's pernicious influence is that it can subvert the young Englishmen by effecting a Circean transformation over the will. Thus Ascham, in *The Scholemaster* (1570), recommends studying the best of Italy through books rather than risking direct experience of the place. Ascham assumes that travel and study are more or less interchangeable, but that in the case of Italy study is preferable to travel.

⁹ See his Jonson's *Works*, ed. C. H. Herford and P. Simpson, 11 vols. (Oxford, 1925-52) viii. 80-1.

Heywood's young Geraldine of *The English Traveller* (1633) offers a more ironic example of the type. Geraldine, who has "sucked/ A breath of every language" (I, i) from France and Spain returns home from his travels so little versed in the corrupt ways of the world that he is duped by both his friend and the woman he loves.

¹⁰ This quotation of Wotton is taken from A. Lytton Sells, *The Paradise of Travellers: The Italian Influence on Englishmen in the Seventeenth Century* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1964) 117.

¹¹ For an account of some of the different kinds of educated, lay traveller from England who travelled to Italy between 1525 and the accession of Elizabeth I, see Kenneth R. Bartlett, *The English in Italy 1525-1558: A Study in Culture and Politics*, Biblioteca Del Viaggio In Italia Ser. 39 (Geneva: Slatkine, 1991). See also Richard Barnett, *Place, Profit, and Power: a Study of the Servants of William Cecil, Elizabethan Statesman* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1969).

¹² Kenneth Bartlett (1991) notes that Thomas Cromwell used Reginald Pole's circle of travelled English students as "a quarry from which to mine publicists and lawyers" (74).

¹³ For a recent study of the destabilizing potential of experiential authority in the early modern era see Jim Egan, *Authorizing Experience: Refigurations of the Body Politic in Seventeenth-Century New England Writing* (Princeton UP, 1999).

¹⁴ See Clare Howard, *English Travellers of the Renaissance* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1968). She offers a chronological table of advice literature written for travellers 1500-1700 (205-223).

¹⁵ On the connection between mastery and particular forms of agency see Dolora A. Wojciehowski, *Old Masters, New Subjects: Early Modern and Poststructuralist Theories of Will* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995). Wojciehowski's thesis is that the concept of mastery constitutes a powerful ideology of human voluntarism and that this sense of freedom and control is central to the humanist paradigm of the dignity of man. My argument here, that mastery of the art of travel articulates a humanist subjectivity, builds on Wojciehowski's thesis.

¹⁶ Denver Ewing Baughan in his introduction to a facsimile reprint of *The Traveler* notes that Jerome Thurler was born in 1550 at Lossnitz in Saxony and first published his text in Latin in 1574. The English translation appeared in 1575. All quotations of Turler offered in this chapter are taken from this reprint. There were other travel guides published before Turler's, of course, but they did not explicitly theorize travel as a means of self-improvement or service to the state to the extent that Turler's does. Andrew Boorde's *The Fyrst Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge*, for example, written during the first half of the sixteenth century, is offered that the reader "maye knowe the usage and fashyon of all maner of countries or regions, and also to know the most parte of all maner of coynes of money, that whych is currant in every province or region". His book also claims to teach "a man to speake a parte of al maner of languages". Boorde's focus, however, is less on the *form* of travel, on the traveller's conduct, motivation or exercise of his will, and more on the practical problems of travel. See Andrew Boorde, *Fyrst Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge*. ed. F.J. Furnivall (London: E.E.T.S., 1870).

¹⁷ See Charlotte Augusta Sneyd's introduction to *A Relation, or rather a True Account, of the Island of England*, trans. Charlotte Augusta Sneyd (The Camden Society: London, 1848). Sneyd includes a list of the various formal "Relations" (those still in existence) that were written by Venetian ambassadors to England. From this list it appears that ambassadors commonly wrote formal "Relations" of the country in which they were stationed for the benefit of their masters at home, and that this practice was operative from at least the beginning of the sixteenth century.

¹⁸ William Thomas' *History of Italy* (1549) also mixes modern history with travel advice. Thomas however, like Ascham, advises Englishmen who would visit Italy to exercise caution in what they choose to learn. Turler focuses much more on general precepts of travel. Kenneth Bartlett (1991) suggests that Thomas' *History of Italy*, together with his *Italian Grammar* (1550), were instrumental in initiating the idea of the Grand Tour.

¹⁹ Not counting the political perils of foreign pollution, travel has always been regarded as dangerous. *The Book of Common Prayer* (1549) links travel with all manner of desperate conditions in this prayer: "That it may please thee to preserve all that travel by land or by water, all women labouring of child, all sick persons, and young children; and to shew thy pity upon all prisoners and captives." Those travellers I have described as fortunate accounted this danger as part of the hazards of service to their commonwealth; unfortunate travellers, intent on their private pleasure, neither reckoned nor respected the danger.

²⁰ William Thomas authored both a modern history and a modern language grammar. His *History of Italy* (1549) and *Italian Grammar* (1550) were pioneering works in these fields. John Florio's dialogue manuals *Firte Fruites* (1578) and *Second Frutes* (1591) as well as his *Worlde of Wordes* (1598) and Queen Anna's *World of Words* (1611) are later examples of works that fueled the fashion for language learning in England. Queen Elizabeth, Sir Thomas Wyatt, the Earl of Surrey, Edmund Spenser, Sir Philip Sidney, John Lyly, Gabriel Harvey and the Earl of Southampton, to name a few, helped popularize language study by their example. French, Italian and Spanish were the languages most studied by Englishmen abroad.

²¹ On this point, see A. Lytton Sells, *The Paradise of Travellers: The Italian Influence on Englishmen in the Seventeenth Century* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1964) 42-3.

²² For John Pory's career as a newsletter writer see William S. Powell, *John Pory 1572-1636: The Life and Letters of a Man of Many Parts* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1977).

²³ More than seventy years after *The Traveller* was published, James Howell, in his *Instructions for Forreine Travell* (1642), is still polarizing what I have called fortunate travellers with those who are not. Howell anatomizes those who "wander from themselves, as well as from their country", returning the worse for wear and striving "to degenerate as much as they can from *Englishmen*" (63). He claims "an ingenious and discerning *Traveller*" will "strive to distinguish 'twixt good and evil...and bring home the best" (68). "The most material use...of *Forraine Travel*," Howell says, "is to find out something that may be applyable to the publique utility of one's own Country" (73). See James Howell, *Instructions for Forreine Travel*, English Reprints Vol. VIII, ed. Edward Arber (Birmingham, 1869) 7-88.

²⁴ For this point, see Denver Ewing Baughan's introduction to a facsimile reprint of *The Traveller*. Sells (1964) comments on the opportunities for advancement that were available to the "household" of staff who accompanied officials abroad (45). Reading *The Traveller* would have helped Harvey capitalize on those opportunities.

²⁵ As recent scholarship on Spenser's *View* has shown, there were many models that Spenser may well have looked to in his relation on Ireland. As well as Turler, I would also point to Sir Thomas Smith's treatise on Ireland. This work, which takes the form of an imaginary dialogue, is entitled: *A letter sent by J.B. Gentleman unto his very friend and master R.C. Esquire, wherein is contained a large discourse of the peopling and inhabiting of the country called the Ardes and other adjacent in the North of Ireland and taken in hand by Sir Thomas Smith, one of the Queen Majesty's Privy Council and Thomas Smith Esquire his son*. It was printed by 'Henry Binnemann for Anthony Kitson' in London in 1571. For Smith's foreign experience, see Mary Dewar, *Sir Thomas Smith: A Tudor Intellectual in Office* (London: The Athlone Press, 1964).

²⁶ That Nashe's focus was on travel as a means of furthering a career rather than travel that was an escape from religious contamination or persecution may be understood by the fact that Jack's relation is set before the reign of Edward VI and before the Marian diaspora. For travellers who went abroad because of religious persecution, see Bartlett (1991).

²⁷ Nashe would have read, in all probability, the English translation (1576) of *Lazarillo de Tormes*; Gabriel Harvey links Lazarillo to Nashe several times throughout his text. Interestingly, the Spanish picaresque was born on water, symbolizing, I suggest, the Spanish picaresque's lack of attachment to a native soil, and thus, by implication, to any kind of particular national or political affiliation. The name of the author who wrote *Lazarillo* is unknown; what is known, however, by the turns of phrase, is that the author was educated in the humanistic tradition. *Lazarillo* was first published in three separate editions in 1554; it played to popular and educated taste and enjoyed spectacular success in the print market. It was also plagiarized; a sign of its popularity and value as literary merchandise. I would suggest that the increasing popularity of the picaresque *persona* may be linked to the emergence of a market order across Europe that appears to contest the existing political and social cosmos.

²⁸ On this point see Markku Peltonen (1995).

²⁹ See Peltonen (1995) 40-1. Peltonen points to classical and contemporary treatises that theorize the soldier as being a servant of the state and a participant in public business.

³⁰ On this point see A. Lytton Sells (1964) 161. Sells notes that the prejudice against a gentleman turning his hand to trade led thousands of Englishmen to serve as soldiers abroad as a means of honourable occupation.

³¹ This episode with the Anabaptists resembles the description of the carnage of the rebel clowns in *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* (1593). Nashe's traveller seems to parody Sidney's travellers at various points.

³² See John Walter Stoye, in *English Travellers Abroad 1604-1667* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1952). Stoye points to this movement of ambitious English gentlemen, advancing a career for themselves in foreign wars, as "one of the strongest traditions in the history of the English people" (259).

³³ For a fuller synopsis of Sir Oliver St. John's career, see *Letters From Sir Robert Cecil To Sir George Carew*, ed. John Maclean (The Camden Society, London, 1864) 52(a).

³⁴ In the manner of the author of *The Travels of Nicander*--a literary curiosity from the mid-sixteenth century offering a "view" of England from the perspective of a pseudo-foreigner--who claims to be driven from his country by the misfortune of love, Surrey may be understood as similarly unfortunate.

³⁵ Nashe, I suggest, is interested in lambasting this *type* of traveller rather than Surrey himself; the actual Henry Howard never went to Italy. Surrey was, however, frustrated at being politically sidelined at home.

³⁶ On this point see Maria Grossmann, *Humanism in Wittenberg 1485-1517* (Nieuwkoop: B. De Graf, 1975) 26. After the absurd tournament at Florence Jack describes Surrey as "feasting and banqueting with the duke of Florence and the princes of Italy there assembled" (324).

³⁷ See *Chronicle of some of the principal events in the Life, Adventures, and Times of Edward Webbe, Master Gunner, sometime Chief Master Gunner of France* (1590), English Reprints, ed. Edward Arber (Birmingham, 1868) 32.

³⁸ There were also European counterparts to these figures in England. Clare Williams (1937) has noted the chivalric exploits and elaborate entertainments of Slavic and Bohemian aristocratic travellers in late sixteenth and early seventeenth century England (82-3).

³⁹ The phrase comes from John O'Neill (1998). I am referring here to the Marxian distinction between the use-value and the exchange-value of commodities. I am indebted to O'Neill's discussion of this distinction as it relates to the concept of the market as an economic order.

⁴⁰ See Erasmus' *Formulae* (1518). These were short dialogues demonstrating phrases and exercises that were to be mastered in the course of speaking and reading Latin. They offered a less developed alternative to the *Colloquia*. All quotations of the *Formulae* taken from *The Colloquies of Erasmus*, trans. Craig R. Thompson (Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1965).

⁴¹ The connection between pages and leaves that I make here is also made explicit by Nashe later in his text when talking of Aretino. There was, he says of Aretino, "no leaf he wrote on but was like a burning glass to set on fire all his readers" (309).

Francois Lebrun in *A History of Private Life*, ed. Roger Chartier (Camb. Mass.: Harvard UP, 1989), notes that printed pages bearing vividly coloured pictures of the saints with the stories of their lives and prayers to be recited were sold by hawkers and called "saint's leaves"(99). These "leaves" were pinned on walls, as were printed broadside ballads. Both were disposable forms of cheap reading matter and as vulnerable as waste paper to a variety of sordid destinies once their message was consumed. Nashe's use of the term "leaves" in his joking dedication to Southampton, and "pages" in "The Induction to the Dapper Pages of the Court," indicate his involvement in the print culture. Nashe is credited as the first user of "page" to refer to a printed sheet. On this point see Jonathan Crewe, *Unredeemed Rhetoric* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1982) 69.

The character of cheap print as scrap paper is attested to by a multitude of contemporary comments referring to such sheets being used as toilet paper, wallpaper, wrapping paper and as lining for baking tins (see Jonson's "Inviting a Friend to Supper"), among other things. Arthur Kinney, in a paper called "Marketing Fiction in the Age of Elizabeth: The Social and Economic Dimensions" delivered at an international conference entitled "Comparative Approaches to English Prose Fiction 1520-1640" held at

Carleton University, Ottawa, in May 1997, has elaborated on the characterization of print as "trash".

See also *Language Machines: Technologies of Literary and Cultural Production*, ed. Jeffrey Masten, Peter Stallybrass and Nancy Vickers (New York, Routledge: 1997). In the introduction to this collection of essays the editors note that "Size has cultural implications: the Bodleian library, when it was set up in the Renaissance, explicitly excluded quartos and the theatrical "trash" published predominately in quarto format. Bodley described such texts as "baggage books", emphasizing their potential for vagrancy, for being carried around in hand or pocket from place to place" (4).

⁴² All quotations taken from *The Countess Of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia)*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985).

⁴³ On this point see also Markku Peltonen (1995). Peltonen notes that the Ciceronian doctrine of the *vita activa* was a hallmark of English humanists. He goes on to say that "the chief ways in which a man could offer his services to the commonwealth were either to act as a counselor or more indirectly to submit written advice" (10).

⁴⁴ See also George B. Parks, "Travel as Education," *The Seventeenth Century: Studies in the History of English Thought and Literature from Bacon to Pope* by Richard Forster Jones and Others Writing in His Honour (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1951) 264-90. Parks notes that "from 1570 to 1620, English theorists and travellers alike expect the view of men and cities to produce a full political knowledge of foreign countries; travel thus becomes a training for public life" (265). In this essay Parks offers a short list of some of the authors who wrote instructions for this kind of profitable travel.

⁴⁵ See Sir Robert Dallington, *The View of France 1604*, Shakespeare Association Facsimiles 13 (Oxford UP, 1936). W.P. Barrett in his introduction to this edition notes that the work was written largely in 1598 and probably circulated fairly widely in manuscript before its unauthorized publication in 1604 (vi).

⁴⁶ Sir Thomas Overbury's *His Observations In His Travailes Upon The State Of The XVII Provinces As They Stood* (1609) offers another example of the "relation" or "view" genre of political observations. He offers a political history in a nutshell, relates the manner of government, the nature of their political assemblies, defense forces, geography, towns, fortifications, character of the people, public works, taxation, revenues of the sovereign etc.

⁴⁷ See *Thomas Platter's Travels in England 1599*, trans. Clare Williams (London: Jonathan Cape, 1937).

⁴⁸ See *Davison's Poetical Rhapsody*, 11 vols., ed. A.H. Bullen (London, 1890). A list of the titles of treatises that Davison carried with him abroad as models is given in Vol. I, p.Li, of the above edition. All quotations relating to Davison are taken from this edition.

⁴⁹ See also Gustav Ungerer, *A Spaniard in Elizabethan England: The Correspondence of Antonio Perez's Exile* (Tamesis Books: London, 1975). He notes of Frances Davison, whom he calls "one of the most brilliant students of Gray's Inn", that "when he set out on his Grand Tour in the company of his tutor Edward Smyth in June 1595, he had obliged himself to Essex to write relations, as was customary, of the countries he was allowed to visit under the travelling license of the Queen" (256).

⁵⁰ For an account of Francis Davison as a failed foreign intelligence agent and his frustrations as a political and diplomatic agent despite his connections, his travels, and his authorial ambitions as a writer of "relations," see Richard McCoy's "Lord of Liberty: Francis Davison and the Cult of Elizabeth," *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*, ed John Guy (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995) 212-228.

⁵¹ See *Davison's Poetical Rhapsody* (Bullen, 1890) in which some of his letters are reproduced. Davison writes to his father in response to his request for "news": "News there is this; this day sennight the father and the eldest son of the Interminelli, of whom I sent you inking before my coming from Florence,

were publically beheaded here in the piazza." Davison goes on to say that the father had "that miserable disadvantage to behold his son dead upon the scaffold when he came to the place of execution." He relates that the father died "much more resolutely" than the son, though he had the view of his son before him (xxxii). Davison goes on to relate other news of "six Englishmen shipped at Leghorn for Spain, lately come from Rome, and all sworn to kill the Queen." Davison says to his father that it is not worth him taking the trouble of even notifying anyone because they will be caught by their own stupidity (xxxiii).

Jack's duping of the captain who would kill the French king "and come back, as to go to Islington and eat a mess of cream and come home," lambastes this kind of self-important folly (269).

"News" is also the divine hearsay, called "inspiration" by Nashe, which he ridicules Puritans as enjoying in their direct, unmediated relation with God. See his treatment of the Anabaptists: "Why, inspiration was their ordinary familiar, and buzzed in their ears like a bee in a box every hour what news from heaven, hell and the land of the whipper-ginnie" (278).

⁵² Both Zadoc and Cutwolfe endure torture that seems to align with early modern conceptions of Turkish cruelty. See James Howell, *An Appendix of Som Directions for travelling into Turkey*, 1642, English Reprints Vol. VIII, ed. E. Arber (Birmingham, 1869). Howell notes of the Turks:

As their justice is more speedy, so it is more severe,
for they have sundry sorts of punishments that torture
the sense a longer time, as drubbing, gunshing,
flaying alive, impaling, and thrusting of lances
through the fundament, Etc. (84)

Poor Zadoc "had his fundament pitched" with a sharp iron stake and is flayed alive, and Cutwolfe's bones are drummed and jarred upon "a great while together". Edward Arber notes that Howell never travelled to Turkey himself, but compiled his brief memorandum from general sources of information. Perhaps Nashe had read some traveller's report of Turkish barbarity, such as Sherley's *Discours of the Turks*; perhaps Howell had read Nashe. Aretino's play *La Cortigiana* (1534) associates the Turkish threat with the fear of being impaled alive. The point is that Nashe does *not* offer a relation of European statehood; he turns this kind of travel writing against itself to offer an account of barbarity associated with treatises on the Scythian or the Turk.

⁵³ All quotations from this text taken from Roger Ascham, *English Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1904). Ascham is keener to know Protestant Germany than he is to embrace knowledge of Catholic Italy; in *The Schoolmaster* (1570) Ascham says that one year spent at home reading Castiglione's *Cortegiano* would do a young gentleman more good than three years' travel in Italy. For Ascham, Italy enacts a kind of Circean transformation on the traveller, who had best, therefore, stay at home and travel through books.

⁵⁴ See Robert Weimann, "Fabula and Historia: The Crisis of the 'Universal Consideration' in *The Unfortunate Traveller*," in *Representing the English Renaissance*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (Berkeley: U of California P, 1988) 181-96.

⁵⁵ Nashe seems here to be responding to Aretino's assessment of himself as a teller of dangerous truths. In a letter to Domenico Bolani, Aretino boasts of the terrible name he has earned for himself by telling the truth. See *The Letters of Aretino*, trans. Thomas Caldecot Chubb (Archon Books, 1967) 85. Aretino's letters were published (1538-1545) in his lifetime to immediate success and were imitated by Niccolo Franco in his *Vulgar Epistles*. In a letter to this same Niccolo Franco, Aretino advises him to imitate nature rather than artifice and to write, as Aretino claims that he himself has done, on the basis of imitating life and truth. This truth, as Aretino points out, is not pretty; in his play *La Cortigiana* (1534) the answer to the question, "How does one slander?" is given to be, "By speaking the truth, by speaking the truth" (Putnam 1933) 185.

⁵⁶ Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece* (1594) is another complaint poem that contributed to this vogue.

⁵⁷ Ascham's Protestant-inflected, true report written in a "playne and open style" is similar to William Thomas' pioneering and influential *History of Italy* (1549). William Thomas' *History of Italy* was the first such relation of Italy published in English. It is probable that Nashe read it. Nashe may even have picked up on Thomas' description of Paul III. Thomas reports that he was said to be "nourished with the suck of a woman's breasts" (62). Jack Wilton tells of a prisoner near St Paul's church who was "kept alive a long space by sucking his daughter's breasts" (325). For quotation of Thomas see *The History of Italy* by William Thomas, ed. G. Parks (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1963).

⁵⁸ All quotations of Hoby's material taken from the printed version of Hoby's manuscript. See *A Booke of The Travail and Life of Me Thomas Hoby* (1547-1564), ed. Edgar Powell, *The Camden Miscellany*, Vol. 10, (London: The Royal Historical Society, 1902).

⁵⁹ For example, between Nol and Naples there is a hill, he reports, "on all sides verae frutfull except it bee in the tope, which is full of great shape burnt stones". Hoby goes on to note that "This hill burnt in Plinie's time, who went abowt to serche owt the cause of yt and was smodred in the smoke" (367).

⁶⁰ Thomas Hoby's career substantiates this point. Hoby studied under John Cheke at Cambridge, but appears not to have taken any degree. He went abroad in 1547 and then entered the service of the Marquis of Northampton in 1551. He continued his travels with his brother, Sir Philip Hoby, during the reign of Mary Tudor, as did a number of other Protestant men associated with the court of Edward VI. Thomas Hoby was knighted and appointed ambassador to France under Elizabeth in 1566. Sir Philip Hoby, ambassador to France and the court of the Emperor and Thomas' elder halfbrother, offers another example of how a man might rise on the basis of a talent for affairs and a fluency in modern languages. There were, however, a host of smaller fry who served as translators at home and abroad in a variety of less spectacular ways. On this point see Richard G. Barnett, *Place, Profit, and Power: A Study of the Servants of William Cecil, Elizabethan Statesman*, The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science Vol. 51 (Chapel Hill: The U of North Carolina P, 1969).

⁶¹ For pissing on walls see Aretino's *Marescalco*, who says, "My lords, a cavalier without an income is like a wall without crosses, it's peed on by everyone." See *The Marescalco* (V, ii). The note to the text suggests that this derives from an old Tuscan proverb that forbids one to soil a wall on which there was a cross. See Pietro Aretino, *The Marescalco*, trans. Leonard G. Sbrocchi and J. Douglas Campbell, *Carleton Renaissance Plays in Translation* (Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1986) 130.

As well as descriptions of antiquities, descriptions of gardens and contemporary architecture were often featured in serious foreign relations. Jacks' description of a merchant's summer banqueting house and his mechanical garden mocks this convention of the genre.

⁶² See Lyly's discussion of wit in *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit*, ed. Morris William Croll and Harry Clemens (New York: Russell and Russell, 1964) 124-5.

⁶³ See "The Epistle to the Reader".

⁶⁴ See *An English Garner* ed. Arber, E. Vol. VIII, (Westminster, 1897).

⁶⁵ Anthony Munday, "Captivity of John Fox of Woodbridge, Gunner of the Three half Moons, by the Turks; and of his wonderful escape from Alexandria," *An English Garner*, Vol. I (Westminster, 1897). All quotations are taken from this edition.

⁶⁶ On this prohibition see E.S. Bates, *Touring in 1600* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1911) 55. One of the perceived, perpetual hazards for young Englishmen travelling in Europe was the danger of Jesuit influence; the banished Earl may represent one of those unfortunates who succumbed to their spell and as a result lost their place in their native culture. Clare Howard (1968) describes the bleak outlook for English Catholics in terms that evoke the banished Earl's situation: a Catholic gentleman, she says, "had no real part in the life

of his generation and no real part in the life of England...Banished from London and the court, shunned by his contemporaries...At last, generally, he went abroad, and wandered out his life, an exile, despised by his countrymen, who met him hanging on at foreign courts" (99).

⁶⁷ As a potential mercenary on his first foreign tour, Jack's return to England in fanciful dress is consonant with the practice of mercenaries of the period. Max Von Boehn, *Modes and Manners*, trans. Joan Joshua, 2 vols. (New York: B. Blom, 1971) notes that although all Germany was subjected to a highly specified sumptuary law, mercenaries alone might dress as they pleased (I, 194). Boehn adds that Swiss mercenaries, in particular, were noted for introducing novelties and new styles. They were responsible for introducing slashed clothing in the late fifteenth century. Slashed clothing then spread from the mercenaries to the fashionable world (I, 118-119). Military expeditions generally had the effect of exposing a large number of men to foreign ways; such expeditions often resulted in the introduction of foreign fashions on the return home (I, 111).

⁶⁸ It was Ariosto who called him *flagellum principum*. See *The Works of Aretino*, trans. Samuel Putnam (New York: Covici, Freide, 1933) 37. It was Ariosto, too, who called him "Divine". On this point see Thomas Caldecot Chubb, *Aretino: Scourge of Princes* (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1940) xviii. The note of irony in this appellation "Divine" should not be underestimated.

On Aretino's wealth see Aretino's *The Marescalco*, trans. L.G. Sbrocchi and J.D. Campbell (Dovehouse Editions Canada, 1986). Sbrocchi and Douglas note that: "He is said to have been one of the richest men in Europe when he died [1556] because of all his pensions and his gifts in gold, porcelain, paintings, and other treasures" (32).

On his fame, see Ralph Roeder *The Man of the Renaissance, Four Lawgivers: Savonarola, Machiavelli, Castiglione, Aretino* (New York: The Viking Press, 1935) 502.

⁶⁹ A beardless man could be taken for a woman. One of George Peele's jests describes an author whose beard is forcibly shaved off to ensure that he stays in his room and finishes his work. The idea is that he would not go out for fear of being taken for a woman. Beardless boys, of course, played women on the public stage. Thus it was too that Pyrocles could be taken for a woman. The various amorous misadventures of twins turn on this gender marker too. See Barnabe Riche's story "Of Apolonius and Silla" in "His Farewell to Military Profession", ed. Donald Beecher, *Medieval and Renaissance texts and Studies* Vol. 91 (Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions Inc., 1992).

See also Riche's second dedicatory epistle to his collection of stories "To the Noble Soldiers both of England and Ireland", in which he describes a person dressed in the latest French fashion and holding "a great fan of feathers, bearing them up very womanly against the side of his face" (129). It is thought to be impossible for a man to "wear so womanish a toy" and the figure is presumed to be "some shameless woman that had disguised herself like a man in our hose and our cloaks—for our doublets, gowns, caps, and hats they had got long ago" (129). Upon close inspection however, "I might see he had a beard, whereby I was assured that he should have been a man" (129). Breasts are markers for femininity, as beards are for masculinity.

⁷⁰ Wolfe's printing of Aretino's *Ragionamenti* appeared in 1584; the *Quattro Commedie* in 1588.

⁷¹ The Council of Trent (1543-1563) led to a more extensive imposition of Catholic orthodoxy through institutions such as the Inquisition and The Index of Prohibited Books. All of Aretino's books were put on the Index in 1558, two years after his death. See Sbrocchi and Campbell (1986) 6. See also *Theatre of the English and Italian Renaissance*, eds. J.R. Mulryne and Margaret Shewring (Basingstock: MacMillan, 1991) 133. Heresy trials in Venice frequently yielded collections of Aretino's works (115).

⁷² See Mulryne and Shewring (1991) 123.

⁷³ See Sbrocchi and Campbell (1986) 131, n.7. Marcanonio Raimondi may have stolen the engraving

process from some followers of Durer and begun his career as a forger of Durer before branching out under his own name as a copier. See Thomas Caldecot Chubb, *Aretino Scourge of Princes* (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1940) 111.

⁷⁴ Marcantonio had also produced etchings of Giuilo Romano's sixteen depictions of lovemaking poses. Aretino wrote sixteen salacious sonnets to go with the already famous etchings to create his *Sonetti lussuriosi*. Romano's pictures disappeared, but Marcantonio's engravings were widely circulated and made him famous. They landed him in prison, and Aretino may have aided his release. See Chubb (1940), who suggests that it was Aretino's going to the Pope on behalf of Marcantonio that secured his release (112).

⁷⁵ See Charles Nicholl, *A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984) 4. The nature of Nashe's relationship to Aretino, advertised so famously by Lodge, has troubled Aretino scholars. Samuel Putnam (1933), in the critical and biographical essay that precedes his translation of Aretino's works, notes that "Nashe, like Aretino, employed the vernacular for comic effect and was given to the coining of 'boisterous' words from other languages. Aside from this, there is not much in common between the two" (51).

Edward Hutton, in *Pietro Aretino: The Scourge of Princes* (London: Constable and Co., 1922), discounts Aretino's influence on English authors generally. He claims that in England Aretino's work "seems to have been altogether ineffective" (264). Hutton does allow that "references to Aretino in English works of the sixteenth century are fairly numerous," but, he goes on to say, "they are all the same; they treat him as the great exemplar of the obscene" (265). Hutton's assessment of Aretino's influence on English authors as negligible does not seem to take into account the intertextual relation between Jonson's *Epicoene* and Aretino's play *The Marescalco*.

⁷⁶ On Aretino congratulating himself thus, see Ralph Roeder, *The Man of the Renaissance* (New York: The Viking Press, 1935) 511. As to the suggestion that the Murano glassware refers to the sexual toys that feature in Aretino's *Ragionamenti*, see Samuel Putnam's (Covici, 1933) translation of the dialogues of Nanna and Antonia in which Nanna refers to the glass dildo employed by the lascivious nuns as "those glass fruits which are made by Murano of Venice, in the likeness of a K, except that they have two little bells which would be an honor to any big cymbal" (68).

⁷⁷ Aretino may be behind Nashe's *Lenten Stuff* in other ways too. Venice was a refuge for Aretino, on the run from powerful men he had offended, in the same way that Yarmouth was for Nashe. Aretino's praise of Venice features throughout his published letters. Aretino was also, as Ralph Roeder (1935) has pointed out, a great praiser and critic of food (504, 506). Nashe's praise of Yarmouth as a maritime refuge with a name for cured fish may be understood, in part, as a response to Aretino as food writer and praiser of Venice.

⁷⁸ Nicholl (1984) has it that "Strange is undoubtedly the 'Lord S' to whom Nashe addressed this bawdy poem" (90). McKerrow, however, offers the Earl of Southampton, Henry Wriothesley, as the probable recipient (IV, 255).

⁷⁹ All references to the *Ragionamenti* are taken from the Brandon House Library Edition (Fulton Ave., North Hollywood: Brandon House, 1966).

See M.L. Stapleton in "Nashe and the Poetics of Obscenity: *The Choise of Valentines*", in *Classical and Modern Literature* 12:1, 29-48. Stapleton points out in a note that both works feature dildos and then leaves it at that to go on to discuss Nashe's parodic imitation of Chaucer and Spenser (32). She does say, however, that Aretino is suspect as a model for *imitatio*: "Obviously, licentious Italian authors cannot serve as fit models for imitation" (30).

Notes to chapter five, "Thy mother's glass"

¹ The phrase "the backside of America" comes from Hakluyt's printed narrative account called "The famous voyage of Sir Francis Drake into the South Sea, and there hence about the whole Globe of the Earth, begun in the yeere of our Lord, 1577". Hakluyt inserted it into the 1589 edition of *The principall navigations, voiajes and discoveries of the English Nation* (London).

² Interestingly rowing boats seem to symbolize the idea of European penetration into unknown land masses. The design of the Company seal for the Guinea Company—a group of gentlemen and merchant promoters of trade in Guinea—showed the African coast and the River Gambia with a ship at anchor and another ship "with many little shallops with oars issuing out and going up the river upon discovery." See *The Discovery of River Gambia (1623) By Richard Jobson*, eds. David P. Gamble and P.E.H. Hair (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1999).

³ Jonson's heroism, or presumption, in publishing his *Workes* in folio format rests, in the main, on two innovations. First of all, by using the folio format—a format associated with the classics and with works of scholarship and learning—Jonson equates his poems, and more shockingly his plays, with works of such standing. Secondly, text was commonly represented in this era as some kind of monument to a dead hero. In publishing his text thus, Jonson took charge of his own monument *while he was still alive*. On these points see Peter Lindenbaum's essay, "Sidney's *Arcadia* as Cultural Monument and Proto-Novel," in *Texts and Cultural Exchange in Early Modern England*, ed. Cedric C. Brown and Arthur F. Marotti (London: Macmillan P, 1997) 80, 82.

⁴ Bruce Thomas Boehrer in *The Fury of Men's Gullets: Ben Jonson and the Digestive Canal* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1997) also argues that "the Fleet Ditch deserves to be regarded as the principal character of Jonson's poem" (161). Boehrer sees the poem in terms of the problem of waste disposal generally; "Jonson writes the epic of a society trying to come to terms with its own sewage" (166).

Andrew McRae in "'On the Famous Voyage': Ben Jonson and Civic Space", *EMLS* 31 (September, 1998): 8. 1-31, also puts the focus on the ditch and sees it as a "feminized body". He contextualizes the poem by situating it within the physical and cultural environment of early modern London and shows how the gendered conception of civic space in Jonson's epigram offers a "vitaly alternative spatiality" (2). I differ from McRae in that I read the ditch as a segregated enclave beyond civic power.

Peter E. Medine in "Object and Intent in Jonson's 'Famous Voyage'", *Studies in English* 15 (1975): 97-110, offers another extended critical engagement with the poem. Medine concludes that Jonson implies that "the theme of his poem, contemporary virtue, actually requires the muse which sings of latrines" (110). Medine makes no mention of Drake or other voyagers. Medine argues that the poem describes modern decline in contrast to ancient virtue, and concludes that "The Famous Voyage" is an example of a modern epigram.

For the rest, the poem has attracted mainly passing comment. Two critical trends have emerged from this older criticism. The first tends to dismiss the poem as a poetic lark. W. David Kay's understanding of it as "a coterie piece of high-spirited joking for his fellow Mermaid wits" (103) in *Ben Jonson: a Literary Life* (London: Macmillan Press, 1995), is a recent example of this tendency. Such an expense of wit in a waste of bawdy laughter alone, though, would seem to go against Jonson's serious poetic bent and habit of judgment. As Rosalind Miles, in *Ben Jonson: His Craft and Art* (1990) has pointed out, the length of this poem, the longest by far in either *Epigrams* or *Forest*, and its climactic position at the end of *Epigrams* would seem to argue a thesis of moment (182-3). Her evaluation, that it sends the "reader away happy" and that it serves as a testament to Jonson's poetic range and to his honesty, would seem not to satisfy the expectation she sets up. Brian Gibbon's (1996) brief summation that the poem is a "mockheroic on the subject of great voyages" is more in tune with my approach here. See his "The wrongend of the telescope" in *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time*, eds. Maquerlot and Willems (Cambridge UP, 1996).

The other trend has been to read "The Famous Voyage" as a comment on what went before. Sara van den

Berg, *The Action of Ben Jonson's Poetry* (Newark, N.J.: U of Delaware P, 1987), takes the view that Jonson's, "mock-epic mocks his own book" (105). Robert Wiltenburg, *Ben Jonson and Self-Love* (Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1990), reads it as a concluding and conclusive "turn" for the book, especially in the sense that, as a mock-epic, "it retrospectively establishes and comments upon the "epic" ambitions of all that has gone before" (85). David Riggs, *Ben Jonson: A Life* (Cambridge UP, 1989), notes that the poem's placement at the conclusion of *Epigrams* "calls into question the upward trajectory of the sequence as a whole" (232). He describes the famous voyagers as "an example of failed transcendence" (232) and comments, a little cryptically, that "the poem raises the issue of Jonson's ability to complete his personal odyssey" (233).

⁵ For a discussion of the figure of the adventurer, see Rojek and Urry (1997) 30-31.

⁶ Helen Wallis, in *Sir Francis Drake and The Famous Voyage, 1577-80*, ed. N.J.W. Thrower (Berkeley: U of California P, 1984), summarizes some of Drake's significant discoveries in the Pacific. One was a correction to the shape of South America. Drake was also the first to discover and navigate the south coast of Java. Altogether, Drake uncovered many errors on the maps and charts that he had with him (130-1).

⁷ See *Queen Elizabeth's Englishings*, ed. Caroline Pemberton (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Turber & CO., 1899). All quotations are taken from this edition.

⁸ See Nigel Wheale, *Writing and Society: Literacy, Print and Politics in Britain 1590-1660* (London: Routledge, 1999).

⁹ See Cecile M. Jagodzinski, *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth-Century England* (Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 1999) 8-9.

¹⁰ The phrase a "collation of contraries" comes from Nashe's Preface to Greene's *Menaphon*. It displays the early modern penchant for thinking of a collection of diverse yet similar things as a unitary item. This mind-set can be illustrated by the common early modern phrases "a temple of praise", "a garland of flowers", and "a palace of pleasure".

¹¹ See "A New and Large Discourse on the Travels of Sir Anthony Sherley, Knight, by Sea, and over Land, to the Persian Empire" (1601) reprinted in *Sir Anthony Sherley and His Persian Adventure*, ed. Sir E. Denison Ross, *The Broadway Travellers* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1933). All quotations from this text are taken from this edition.

¹² By analogy, all poets are liars and travelers too, from the point of view of the rigid philosopher king who dwells in the ideal republic.

¹³ Jonson's poem "On the Author, Worke, and Translator", which appeared in the prefatory material to James Mabbe's *The Rogue, or The Life of Guzman De Alfarache* (1623), a translation of Matheo Aleman's picaresque novel, praises Mabbe as an author. Mabbe's work, according to Jonson, "hath the noblest marke of a goode Booke," because the translator has brought his own genius to the art of the text; Mabbe is thus "more than Foster-father of this Child". Author and translator are interchangeable and one, like books and men, in this happy union of "the worlds wit", as Jonson declares in his opening lines:

Who tracks this Authors, or Translators Pen,
Shall finde, that either hath read Bookes, and Men;
To say but one, were single. Then it chimes,
When the old words doe strike on the new times,
As in this Spanish Proteus; who, though writ
But in one tongue, was form'd with the worlds wit.

Mabbe and Aleman are both fortunate travelers in the world's wit, which comprises both books and men. Interestingly, Jonson equates authors with translators. Indeed, Jonson wishes himself to be just such a

translator as Mabbe in the final lines:

Faire Aemulation, and no Envy is;
 When you behold me wish myselfe, the man,
 That would have done, that, which you onely can.

It would seem that Shelton, as translator of what Jonson appeared to have thought of as a base book, and Harington, judged a poor translator by Jonson, do not attain to the same dignity, as authors and poets, that Mabbe does. At the end of "The Famous Voyage" Jonson almost wishes he were an author like Harington because he is half ashamed of what he has eternized, thus reversing with Harington what he sets up with Mabbe.

¹⁴ See the introduction to *Ariosto's Orlando Furioso: Selections from the Translation of Sir John Harington*, ed. Rudolf Gottfried (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1963) 11.

¹⁵ Peter E. Medine (1975) has it that Jonson "despised Cervantes' novel thinking it simply another example of the popular romances" (102), so Jonson may have felt that Shelton too had betrayed his muse in meddling with romance. Jonson would not that his own muse ploughed with romance, as his fulminations against the mode throughout his works shows. J.J. Jusserand, in *The School for Ambassadors and Other Essays* (New York: The Knickerbocker P, 1925), has traced some of Jonson's stated objections to romance and its motifs in his essay "Ben Jonson's Views on Shakespeare's Art", which starts from the premise that "Jonson was a romantic in his actions, and a classic in his works" (253-288).

¹⁶ Similarly, some might see Jonson as making too much of a short hop to the Low Countries-like Parry's phony traveler--when he volunteered as a soldier against the Spanish rather than sweat it out as a bricklayer in the 1590's. If Drummond's report is correct Jonson seems to have claimed, selfmockingly or no, some kind of heroic warrior status for killing a man there in single combat. But in going to the Low Countries as a soldier, Jonson acted like so many other frustrated Englishmen, including Sir Philip Sidney, who, denied an occupation commensurate with their abilities under Elizabeth, sought heroic endeavor and an opportunity to make their mark in a just war.

¹⁷ See Carl Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Vintage Books, 1963). All quotations are taken from this edition.

¹⁸ See Lana Thompson, *The Wandering Womb: A Cultural History of Outrageous Beliefs About Women* (Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books, 1999).

¹⁹ Hakluyt inserted a six-leaf gathering into the volume after everything had been printed. On this point see David B. Quinn, "Early Accounts of the Famous Voyage," in Thrower (1984) 34. Quinn points out that this account, though largely complete as to major details, is very much Hakluyt's version of what Walsingham allowed him to see, as Drake's log of the circumnavigation was withheld by the Queen (38).

²⁰ Drake claimed these islands for Elizabeth in a dramatic and extravagant gesture. Sir Richard Hawkins reported that Drake went ashore, carrying a compass, and seeking out the southernmost point of the land, he cast himself down on the uttermost point, and groveling, reached his body over it. He later is reported to have told his companions that he had been on the most southerly piece of land in the world, further than any man known had yet been.

²¹ See Helen Wallis "The Cartography of Drake's Voyage" (121-163) in Thrower (1984). Wallis summarizes some of Drake's significant discoveries in the Pacific. One was a correction to the shape of South America. Drake was also the first to discover and navigate the south coast of Java. Altogether Drake uncovered many errors on the maps and charts he had with him. (130-1)

²² See "Drake and South America" (49-59), in Thrower (1984).

²³ See Elizabeth Donno *An Elizabethan in 1582*, 239-40. The municipal records of Plymouth note that he "brought hom great stoore of golde and sylver in blockes." See Gill (Thrower, 1984) 84.

A detailed account, listed in "Draper's Collection of Drake Bibliographic Items" (Thrower 1984), of the exact amount of bullion that Drake brought home as ingots, stored deep in the ship as ballast, records "the silver bullion weighing 22,899 lbs. 5oz., the coarse silver 512 lbs. 6 oz., and the gold bullion 101 lbs. 10 oz." (189). William A. Lessa, in "Drake and the South Seas" (60-77), in Thrower (1984) describes how Drake, run aground on a reef, lightened the ship of spices and supplies but not of precious metals, possibly because the bullion was stored in ballast (74). John Parry (Thrower, 1984) has noted that the profit-making syndicate behind the voyage apparently kept their plundering intentions secret from the Spanish and also from those counselors of the queen, such as Lord Burghley, who feared an open breach with Spain. They did this by giving out a false destination in the eastern Mediterranean for Drake's expedition. Hakluyt opens his account by saying that Drake left Plymouth "giving out his pretended voyage to Alexandria". "Only when they were at sea, in mid-Atlantic," says Parry, "did Drake's companions learn that South America was their destination. Some of them took it ill" (4).

²⁴ On the controls imposed on the discoveries see Wallis (Thrower 1984) 136.

²⁵ On Hakluyt and Walsingham see Quinn (Thrower 1984) 34-5. Helen Wallis (Thrower 1984) reports that the map Hakluyt included in the six unnumbered leaves between pages 643 and 644 of the one-volume collection *The Principall Navigations* (London 1589) reporting Drake's voyage, was a general map of the world that showed none of Drake's discoveries (141).

²⁶ Wallis (Thrower 1984) reports that Columbus' discoveries were quickly published in 1493 and again in 1494 with woodcut illustrations. Magellan's voyage was publicized through printed letters, and printed versions of manuscript accounts. (137)

²⁷ See "A Collection of Drake Bibliographic Items, 1569-1659" (Thrower, 1984) 198, no. 79. *A declaration of the true causes of the great troubles, presupposed to be intended against the realme of England* (1592).

²⁸ Milton's predatory Satan in *Paradise Lost* flies "o'er the backside of the world far off" (III.494), on his way to rob God of his "children", Adam and Eve.

²⁹ This link between children and wealth is a recurrent theme in Jonson's work. Count Ferneze of *The Case is Altered* compares the loss of his children abroad to that of the merchant who loses his venture to the sea, and Jaques, from the same play, loses his daughter with his gold. Jonson himself, there, where he had garnered up his heart, with his first son, describes the loss in terms of an unforeseen and unavoidable payment exacted "on the just day".

³⁰ See Wallis, in Thrower (1984) 136.

³¹ See Wallis (1984) 163, n. 72.

³² On this point see Helen Wallis (Thrower, 1984), in her study of the cartography of Drake's voyage (159).

³³ The Fleet ditch was, by Jonson's day an infamous open sewer choked with filth, despite periodic municipal attempts to clean it up. There had been a time, in the previous century, when fish had been caught in it, but those days were long gone by the time Jonson wrote this poem, thought to be around 1613.

³⁴ This poem appears in *The Poems of The Reverend Charles Fitzgeoffrey (1593-1636)*, ed. Alexander Grosart (Manchester: Charles E. Simms, 1881). All subsequent quotations are taken from this edition. I am indebted to Grosart's introduction to *The Poems of the Reverend Charles Fitzgeoffrey (1593-1636)*, for biographical information on Fitzgeoffrey and the text and translation of his epigrams.

See also Michael J.B. Allen's commentary on the poem, "Charles Fitzgeoffrey's Commendatory Lamentation on the Death of Drake", in Thrower (1984).

Grosart notes that his Latin poems were "evidently flung off at the time of the deaths and other occasions of the persons celebrated". (xiii)

³⁵ Fitzgeoffrey had a poetic knack for replacing the mythologized great of the past with a famed man of the present. Of Drake he sings:

Had he beene borne in *Agamemnons* age,
When stout *Achilles* launce scourg'd *Troies* proud towres:
When men gainst men, and Gods gainst Gods did rage,
Aeneas, *Achilles*, nor *Ulysses* powres,
Had beene so famous in this age of ours:
All poets would have written in his praise
Their *Aeneads*, *Iliads*, and *Odysses*. (23)

Fitzgeoffrey turns the same trick of replacing a fabled name of the past with one from the present in his Latin epigram "To Ben Jonson" in the collection he called "Affaniae", that is, trivial, trashy talk. These epigrams circulated in manuscript until 1601 when they were published as a collection. In "To Ben Jonson", the poet is initially accused before the bar of Phoebus of stealing Plautus' plays and vending them as his own. Phoebus defends Jonson's authorship, claiming he was there assisting Jonson when he composed them. In an over-elaborate turn, it emerges that Mercury has stolen them from Jonson to endow Plautus with. Technically the epigram praises Jonson, equating Plautus with him, but there remains the issue of theft and, outside the scope of the poem, Plautus cannot be charged. Fitzgeoffrey also published a Latin epigram in praise of *The Case is Altered*, so we can assume he got Jonson's attention.

Jonson mocks the conventions of epic by setting up Shelton and Heydon above the poets of old. Fitzgeoffrey privileges the modern adventurer over the hero of old, and so does Geoffrey Whitney in his book of emblems. In *A Choice of Emblems* (1586) Whitney invokes the epic convention that lauds the present hero over those of the past and supports Drake's superiority over Jason thus:

Let *Graecia* then forbear, to praise her *Iason* boulder?
who through the watchfull dragons pass'd, to win the fleece of gould.
Since by *Medeas* helpe, they weare inchaunted all,
And *Iason* without perilles, pass'de: the conquest therefore small?
But hee, of whom I write, this noble minded Drake,
Did bringe away his goulden fleece, when thousand eies did wake.

Jonson's poem opens in a similar vein:

No more let Greece her bolder fables tell
Of Hercules, or Theseus going to hell,
Orpheus, Ulysses: or the Latin Muse,
With tales of Troy's just knight, our faiths abuse:
We have a Shelton and a Heyden got,
Had powers to act, what they to feign had not.

³⁶ See W.T. Jewkes' discussion of the poem in Thrower (1984) 114.

³⁷ See Crispin Gill's discussion of Drake's relation to Plymouth in "Drake and Plymouth" (78-89), in Thrower (1984), p. 87.

³⁸ Drake's civic exploits as a projector of drainage schemes seem to have entered into the popular

imagination. In Francis Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (ca. 1613), when the grocer leaps on stage at the beginning of the play to complain of yet more "girds at citizens" the Speaker of the Prologue archly suggests "The Life and Death of fat Drake, or the Repairing of Fleetprivies" as a title that might honour "the commons of the city" (Ind.).

³⁹ Also in the 1589 edition of Hakluyt's *Voyages* was "The Worthy and famous Voyage of Master Thomas Cavendish, made round about the Globe of the Earth; in the space of two years, and less than two months. Begun in the year 1586". Hakluyt also provides "The Famous expedition of Sir Francis Drake to the West Indies...in the yeares 1585, and 1586". See Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation* (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1903) Vol. 1, xiv. Hakluyt was concerned, as he states in the "Epistle Dedicatorie" to Lord Charles Howard (1598), also to delineate "the beginnings, antiquities, and growth of the classical and warre like shipping of thie island" and thus he offers "The famous voyage of Richard the first, King of England into Asia, for the recovering of Jerusalem out of the hands of the Saracens, Anno 1190" and "the famous expedition of prince Edward, the first king of the Norman race of that name" in the "Epistle Dedicatorie to Sir Robert Cecil" (1599). Hakluyt does employ other descriptive epithets for the voyages and journeys he sets down, epithets like "memorable", "honourable" and "prosperous", but "famous" is used, in particular, to describe the adventures of a warlike nobility. The term "famous voyage" or "famous expedition" carries something of a generic quality, and denotes a partisan celebration of some kind of national adventure and martial victory.

⁴⁰ For a discussion of smell as subversive, see Rojek and Urry (1997) 8-9.

The smell of dead hippo in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* signifies Marlowe's own approach to barbaric horror.

⁴¹ The languid round of a gallant's pleasure in London--from dinner at some ordinary or inn, to a play, or to a brothel and back to dine, perhaps to play, and then to sleep it off until it all begins again the following day--was noted with some asperity at the time (see, for example, the epigrams of Sir John Davies). See also Ann Jennalie Cook's argument in *The Privileged Playgoers of Shakespeare's London, 1576-1642* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1981), which describes a rapidly expanded privileged class of gentlemen concentrated in London as constituting an important and regular feature of London's commercial theater audiences. She depicts play going as part of the process of idling away an afternoon for the leisured elite--Shelton and Heydon's frolic in a wherry to Madame Caesar's, having dined well at The Mermaid, fits right into this pattern of behaviour.

⁴² *A Search for Money*, reprinted in *Early English Poetry, Ballads, and Popular Literature of the Middle Ages*, Vol. II, The Percy Society (London: Johnson Reprint Company Ltd., 1965). All quotations of this text are taken from this edition.

In *A Search for Money* the penniless poets discover that "this wandring Knight, (Monsieur Money)" is held captive in hell, the convoluted reason being that the "Divill had so many children fathered on him that he never begat, and so many of his owne, that hee had not other dowry to bestow on them." The devil holds on to Monsieur Money all the harder because the "earth was daylie more and more taken from him, as India, Virginia, and many continents, that hee should have no lands for them to inherit if doomesday come not quickly" (40-1). The quest is futile; the errant seekers bid "the Divil keepe his saint" declaring that "The next voyage we vowed to make for wisdome" (41).

⁴³ Canada's second national newspaper, *The National Post*, featured the story of Ashrita Furman, who wants to achieve the fastest mile covered by a pogo stick in Antarctica, on May 22, 2000.

⁴⁴ The narrative of William Kemp appropriates the scheme of the royal progress. Alan Somerset, in his paper "Street Theatre and Nation in the heart of England", delivered at the 16th Waterloo International Conference on Elizabethan Theatre, entitled "Theatre and Nation", July 1997, has noted that the visits undertaken by Elizabeth, and to a lesser extent James, to the provinces followed a more or less scripted pattern. These visits entailed detailed preparations and hard work for all (James disliked the undertaking

intensely), although spontaneity was emphasized throughout as the keynote. Staged celebrations at the royal entry, lamentations at the departure, gift-giving, orations, mock fights, fireworks, cannonades and decorations meant that these tours created a punishing schedule for both the royal party and the civil authorities, all in the interests of disseminating the powerful spectacle of the royal court in London to the provinces and scripting the nation into a chivalric narrative of loyalty to an adventurous queen. What could be more arduous, yet apparently spontaneous, than dancing all the way to Norwich? The crowds, celebrations, orations and meetings that line Kemp's path, as well as the final gift-giving all seem to point to Kemp's journey as an appropriation of the manner of the royal progress as a means of promoting Kemp's sovereignty on the London stage to audiences elsewhere.

Nigel Wheale (1999), notes that there was a vogue for travel narrative as self-promotion in the 1590's and early seventeenth century. Wheale describes how the author John Taylor financed journeys to Europe by placing bets on the outcome of his increasingly bizarre stunts and then profited by selling the resulting pamphlets. In 1617 Taylor rowed from Bankside to Queenborough in a paper boat. He achieved cult status with this jape and recorded the stunt in the pamphlet *The Praise of Hemp Seed*.

⁴⁶ Reprinted in *An English Garner*, ed. Edward Arber, VI (London, 1897). 153-163. All quotations are taken from this edition.

⁴⁷ Reprinted in *An English Garner*, ed. Edward Arber, VI, Archibald Constable and Co.: Westminster, 1897, p.164-166. All quotations are taken from this edition. Only mildly satiric, if at all, a stanza gives the flavor of the piece:

O gallant minds and venturous bold!
That took in hand, a thing most rare.
'Twill make the Spaniards' hearts wax cold!
If that this news to them repair,
That three men hath this voyage done,
And thereby wagers great have won.

⁴⁸ See Antoni Maczak's *Travel in Early Modern Europe*, trans. Ursula Phillips (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), in which he recounts an Italian's reaction to the notion that "a young Englishman from a good home could already row when he was but seven yearsold. So it was hardly surprising, Locatelli commented in his notebook, that they were able to 'work such wonders with their men'o wars'" (138). To a significant degree British naval success was attributed to this supposedly native skill.

⁴⁹ Jonson plays here with the convention of naming the date of departure. Richard Ferris sets off "upon Midsummer Day Last", Will Kemp "the first Monday in Lent" and Hakluyt begins the narrative of Drake's famous voyage with "The 15. day of November, in the yeereof our Lord 1577".

⁵⁰ In fact, the feminine and the hellish aspect of Jonson's Fleet may stem from contemporary adventure narratives. Jonson's representation of the back regions of London as a hell may follow contemporary relations that figured a dangerous voyage into the *known* world as a descent into the underworld. Relations of travelers who had journeyed down what William Parry in his account of 1601 had called "the most famous river of Euphrates" often reported a turbulent, dark lake called locally the "Mouth of Hell". Parry mentions it in his *A New and Large Discourse on the Travels of Sir Anthony Sherley, Knight, By Sea, And Over Land, To The Persian Empire* (1601), as does Ralph Fitch, the first Englishman known to have reached Burma. For Parry's account see *Sir Anthony Sherley and his Persian Adventure*, The Broadway Travellers, ed. Sir E. Denison Ross (London: George Routledge and Sons Ltd., 1933). The bubbling pool of bitumen known as the "mouth of hell" or "Hell's mouth" was also mentioned in Abel Pincon's and George Mainwaring's narratives relating to the Sherleys' journey in the same edition (141, 191). Fitch's story, published by Hakluyt, created a sensation in London. Fitch describes the phenomenon of "Helles door" like this:

By the river Euphrates, two dayes journey from
Babylon at a place called Ait, in a fielde near
unto it, is a strange thing to see: a mouth that
doth continually throwe forth against the ayre
boyling pitch with a filthy smoke: which pitch
doth runne abroad into a great field which is
alwayes full thereof. The Moores say that it is
the mouth of hell.

(*The Principal Navigations*, V, 466)

The Sherley brothers' travels were bruted by a play, probably co-written by John Day, William Rowley and George Wilkins, called *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* (1607). Furthermore, four pamphlets about the adventures of the Sherley brothers appeared in 1607. On this point, see *Three Renaissance Travel Plays*, ed. Anthony Parr (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995). These pamphlets were in addition to the "memorable exploitēs" of Anthony Sherley in the West Indies that had been recorded by Hakluyt. Given this kind of exposure it is likely that Jonson would have known of these voyages

Note to conclusion, "All space is place"

¹ Edward Said, *Identity, Authority and Freedom: The Potentate and the Traveller* (Cape Town: U of Cape Town P, 1991).

Selected Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Alexander and Dindimus: Or, The Letters of Alexander to Dindimus, King of the Brahmans, with the Replies of Dindimus.* EETS 31, re-edited Walter W. Skeat. London, 1878.
- Aretino, Pietro. *The Letters of Pietro Aretino.* Trans. Thomas Caldecot Chubb. Archon Books, 1967.
- . *The Works of Aretino.* Trans. Samuel Putnam, in 2 vols. New York: Covici-Friede, 1933.
- . *Ragionamenti.* Brandon House Library Edition. North Hollywood: Brandon House, 1966.
- Ascham, Roger. *Report of the affaires and state of Germany in English Works,* ed. William Aldis Wright. Cambridge English Classics. Cambridge UP, 1904.
- The Book of Pluswarden in The Historians of Scotland,* ed. Felix J.H. Skene, vol 10. Edinburgh: William Paterson, 1880.
- Boorde, Andrew. *The First Boke of the Introduction to Knowledge.* Early English Text Society, Extra Series, no.10. London: Pub. for the EETS by N. Trubner, 1870.
- Cambridge Translations of Renaissance Philosophical Texts, Vol. 2: Political Philosophy.* Ed. Jill Kraye. Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Chronicle of some of the principal events in the Life, Adventures, and Times of Edwarde Webbe, Master Gunner, sometime Chief Master Gunner of France (1590) in English Reprints,* Ed. Edward Arber. Birmingham, 1868.

- The Colloquies of Erasmus.* Trans. Craig R. Thompson. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1965.
- Contarini, Gasparo. *The Commonwealth and Government of Venice.* Trans. Lewes Lewkenor. 1599. New York: Da Capo Press, 1969.
- Dallington, Sir Robert. *The View of France 1604.* Shakespeare Association Facsimiles 13. London: Oxford UP, 1936.
- De Pizan, Christine. *The Book of Deeds of Arms and of Chivalry.* Trans. Sumner Willard. Ed. Charity Cannon Willard. Pennsylvania UP, 1999.
- Queen Elizabeth's Englishings.* Ed. Caroline Pemberton. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Turber & Co., 1899.
- Fitzgeoffrey, Charles. *The Poems of the Reverend Charles Fitzgeoffrey 1593-1636.* Ed. Alexander Grosart. Manchester: Charles E. Simms, 1881.
- The Greek Alexander Romance.* Trans. Richard Stoneman. London: Penguin Books, 1991.
- Guazzo, Steeven. *The Civile Conversation of M. Steeven Guazzo, The First Three Books Trans. By George Pettie, Anno 1581 And The Fourth by Barth. Young, Anno 1586.* The Tudor Translations, 002, 008. London: Constable and Co. Ltd., 1925.
- Hakluyt, Richard. *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation.* 12 vols. Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1903.
- . *The famous voyage of Sir Francis Drake into the South Sea, and Hence about the whole Globe of the Earth, begun in the yere of our Lord, 1577 in The Principal Navigations,* London 1589.
- Harington, Sir John. *A new discourse of a state subject called the metamorphosis of Ajax* (1596). Ed. Elizabeth Story Donno. New York: Columbia UP, 1962.

- . *A Tract on the Succession to the Crown* (1602). Ed. Clements R. Markam. Research and Source Works Series 584. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970.
- Hoby, Thomas. *A Booke of The Travail and Life of Me Thomas Hoby 1547-1654* in *The Camden Miscellany*, ed. Edgar Powell, Vol 10. London: The Camden Society, 1902.
- Howell, James. *Instructions for Forreine Travell*, in *English Reprints*, ed. Edward Arber, vol. 8. English Reprints. Birmingham, 1869.
- Jonson, Ben. "On the Famous Voyage" in *Seventeenth Century English Poetry*, eds. John T. Shawcross and Ronald David Emma. The Lippincott English Series. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1969.
- Jung, Carl. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Trans. Richard and Clara Winston. New York: Vintage Books, 1963.
- Kemp, William. *Kemp's nine daies wonder performed in a duance from London to Norwich*. 1600.
- Khosaw, Nasere. *Safarnamah: Naser-e Khosraw's Book of Travels*. Albany N.Y.: Bibliotheca Persica, 1986.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. *Machiavelli: The Chief Works and Others*, Trans. Ian Gilbert. Durham: Duke UP, 1965.
- The most dangerous and memorable adventure of Richard Ferris...who undertook, in a small wherry boat, to row, by sea, to the city of Bristow* (1590) in *An English Garner*, ed. Edward Arber, Vol. 6. Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co., 1897.
- Nashe, Thomas. *The Unfortunate Traveller*. Ed. J.B. Steane. London: Penguin Books, 1972.

- Overbury, Thomas. *His Observations in His Travailes Upon The State of The XVII Provinces As They Stood* (1609) in *The Miscellaneous Works in Prose and Verse of Sir Thomas Overbury*, ed. Edward F. Rimbault. Library of Old Authors. London: Reeves and Turner, 1890.
- Parry, William. *A New and Large Discourse on the Travels of Sir Anthony Sherley, Knight, by Sea, and over Land, to the Persian Empire* (1601) in *Sir Anthony Sherley and His Persian Adventure*. Ed. Sir Denison Ross, The Broadway Travellers. London: George Routledge and Sons. 1933.
- Peacham, Henry. *The Compleat Gentleman* (1622). The English Experience 59. New York: Da Capo Press, 1968.
- Platter, Thomas. *Thomas Platter's Travels in England 1599*. Trans. Clare Williams. London: Jonathan Cape, 1937.
- The Prose Life of Alexander*. Thornton ms. Ed. J.S. Westlake. EETS 143. London: EETS, 1913.
- A Search for Money in Early English Poetry, Ballads, and Popular Literature of the Middle Ages* in vol. 2, The Percy Society. London: Johnson Reprint Company Ltd., 1965.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of Macbeth*. The Riverside Shakespeare. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974.
- Smith, Sir Thomas. *De Republica Anglorum*. Ed. Mary Dewar. Cambridge UP, 1982.
- Spenser, Edmund. *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, in *The Prose Works*, ed. Rudolf Gottfried. Vol 10 of *The Works of Edmund Spenser, A Variorium Edition*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins P, 1961.

- Starkey, Thomas. *A Dialogue between Cardinal Pole and Thomas Lupset*. Ed. J.M. Cowper, EETS, Extra Series 32. London, 1878.
- Stuart, James. *King James the First Daemonologie* (1597). Ed. G.B. Harrison. Elizabethan and Jacobean Quartos. Edinburgh UP, 1966.
- . *The Political Works of James I*. New York: Russell and Russell Inc., 1965.
- Thomas, William. *The History of Italy by William Thomas* (1549). Ed. G. Parks. Folger Documents of Tudor and Stuart Civilization. Ithaca N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1963.
- Turler, Jerome. *The Traveiler*. 1575.
- Verstegen, Richard. *A Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* (1605). Ilkley: The Scholar Press, 1976.
- Weyer, Johann. *Witches, Devils, and Doctors in the Renaissance, Johann Weyer, De praestigiis daemonum*. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 73. Binghampton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1991.
- Wilson, Thomas. *The State of England, Anno Dom. 1600*. Ed. F.J. Fisher, *The Camden Miscellany*, Vol. 16. Third series Vol. 52. London, 1936.

Secondary Sources

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Armitage, David, ed. *Theories of Empire, 1450-1800*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.

- Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space*. Trans. Maria Jolas. New York: The Orion Press, 1964.
- Baeker, Dirk, ed. *Problems of Form*. Trans. Michael Irmischer with Leah Edwards. Stanford UP, 1999.
- Baker, David J. *Between Nations: Shakespeare, Spenser, Marvell, and the Question of Britain*. Stanford UP, 1997.
- Barbour, Reid. *Deciphering Elizabethan Fiction*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1993.
- Barnett, Randy E. *The Structure of Liberty: Justice and the Rule of Law*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998.
- Barnet, Richard. *Place, Profit, and Power; a Study of the Servants of William Cecil, Elizabethan Statesman*. The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science 51. Chapel Hill: U of N Carolina P, 1969.
- Bartlett, Kenneth R. *The English in Italy 1525-1588: A Study in Culture and Politics*. Ser. Biblioteca del Viaggio in Italia 39. Genève: Slatkine, 1991.
- Bates, E.S. *Touring in 1600*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1911.
- Beiner, Ronald. *Theorizing Nationalism*. New York: State University of New York P, 1999.
- Bethell, Tom. *The Noblest Triumph: Property and Prosperity through the Ages*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.
- Boehrer, Bruce Thomas. *The Fury of Men's Gullets: Ben Jonson and the Digestive Canal*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1997.

- Brown, C. Cedric, and Arthur F. Marotti, eds. *Texts and Cultural Change in Early Modern England*. Early Modern Literature in History. Houndmills: Macmillan P, 1997.
- Brown, Keith. *Kingdom or Province? Scotland and the Regal Union*. London: Macmillan, 1992.
- Bryson, Anna. *From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998.
- Carlson, David. *English Humanist Books: Writers and Patrons, Manuscript and Print, 1475-1525*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1993.
- Chartier, Roger, ed. *A History of Private Life*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1989.
- Chubb, Thomas Caldecot. *Aretino: Scourge of Princes*. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1940.
- Coursen, H.R. *Macbeth: A Guide to the Play*. London: Greenwood P, 1997.
- Clark, Sir George. *The Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1963.
- Clegg, Cyndia Susan. *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*. Cambridge UP: 1997.
- Cleugh, James. *The Divine Aretino: Pietro Aretino of Arezzo, 1492-1556, a Biography*. London: Anthony Blond, 1965.
- Cook, Ann Jennalie. *The Privileged Playgoers of Shakespeare's London, 1576-1642*. Princeton UP, 1981.
- Coughlan, Patricia, ed. *Spenser and Ireland: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Cork UP, 1989.
- Crewe, Jonathan. *Unredeemed Rhetoric: Thomas Nashe and the Scandal of Authorship*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1982.

- Cunningham, James. *Shakespeare's Tragedies and Modern Critical Theory*. London: Associated UP, 1997.
- Deising, Paul. *Hegel's Dialectical Political Economy*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1999.
- Dewar, Mary. *Sir Thomas Smith: A Tudor Intellectual in Office*. London: The Athlone Press, 1964.
- Dilley, Roy, ed. *The Problem of Context. Methodology and History in Anthropology*. New York: Berghahn Books, 1999.
- Drake, Paul W., and Mathew D. McCubbins, eds. *The Origins of Liberty*. Princeton UP, 1998.
- Dutton, Richard. *Ben Jonson, Authority, Criticism*. London: Macmillan, 1996.
- Edwards, Philip. *Sea-Mark: The Metaphorical Voyage, Spencer to Milton*. Liverpool UP, 1997.
- Egan, Jim. *Authorizing Experience: Refigurations of the Body Politic in Seventeenth-Century New England Writing*. Princeton UP, 1999.
- Ferguson, Yale H., and Richard W. Mansbach. *Polities: Authority, Identities, and Change*. Columbia, S.C.: U of S Carolina P, 1996.
- Fideler, Paul A., and T.F. Mayer. *Political Thought and the Tudor Commonwealth: Deep Structure, Discourse and Disguise*. London & New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Frassetto, Michael. "Violence, Knightly Piety and the Peace of God Movement in Aquitaine." *The Final Argument: The Imprint of Violence in Society in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Eds. Donald J. Kagay and L.J. Andrew Villalon. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1998.

- Galloway, Bruce. *The Union of England and Scotland 1603-1608*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1986.
- Gardner, Jane F. *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983
- Gilbert, Paul *The Philosophy of Nationalism*. Boulder Colorado: Westview Press, 1998.
- Godlewska, Anne, and Neil Smith, eds. *Geography and Empire*. Oxford: Blackwell Press, 1994.
- Goodman, Jennifer R. *Chivalry and Exploration 1298-1630*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1998.
- Green, Karen. *The Woman of Reason*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1995.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self- Fashioning: from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.
- . *Shakespearian Negotiations: the Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
- . *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- . *Marvelous Possessions: the Wonder of the New World*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1991.
- , ed. *Redrawing the Boundaries: the Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1992.
- . "Shakespeare Bewitched." *New Historical Literary Study: Essays on Reproducing Texts, Representing History*. Eds. Jeffrey N. Cox and Larry J. Reynolds. Princeton UP, 1993.
- . "What is the History of Literature?" *Critical Inquiry* 23 (Spring 1997): 460-482.

- . "The Touch of the Real." *Representations* 59 (Summer 1997): 14-29.
- Greenfeld, Liah. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1992.
- Griffiths, Huw. "Translated Geographies: Edmund Spenser's 'The Ruines of Time.'" *Early Modern Literary Studies* 4.2 / Special Issue 3 (September, 1998): 7.1-26. 15 June, 1999. <<http://purl.oclc.org/emls/04-2/griffran.htm>>.
- Guy, John, ed. *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*. Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Hadfield, Andrew. *Edmund Spenser's Irish Experience: Wilde Fruit and Salvage Soyl*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1997.
- Hall, John A., ed. *The State of the Nation: Ernest Gellner and the Theory of Nationalism*. Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Hamilton, J.R. *Plutarch's Alexander: A Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1969.
- Harris, Tim, ed. *Popular Culture in England, 1500-1850*. London: Macmillan P, 1995.
- Hastings, Adrian. *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*. Cambridge UP, 1997
- Hayes, Jonathan, ed. *The Humanist as Traveler: George Sandys's Relation of a Journey begun An. Dom. 1610*. London and Toronto: Associated UP, 1986.
- Heater, Derek. *The Theory of Nationhood: A Platonic Symposium*. London: Macmillan, 1998.
- Helgerson, Richard. *The Elizabethan Prodigals*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1976.
- . *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton and the Literary System*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1983.

- . *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.
- Hibbard, G.R. *Thomas Nashe: A Critical Introduction*. London: Routledge and Paul, 1962.
- Highley, Christopher. *Shakespeare, Spenser, and the Crisis in Ireland*. Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Hilliard, Stephen. *The Singularity of Thomas Nashe*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1986.
- Hoak, Dale, ed. *Tudor Political Culture*. Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Hoffman, John. *Sovereignty*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1998.
- Holbrook, Peter. *Literature and Degree in Renaissance England: Nashe, Bourgeois Tragedy, Shakespeare*. Newark: U of Delaware P. 1994.
- Houston, S.J. *James I*. London: Longman, 1995.
- Howard, Clare. *English Travellers of the Renaissance*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1968.
- Hutson, Lorna. *Thomas Nashe in Context*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1989.
- Jagodzinski, Cecile M. *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth-Century England*. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 1999.
- James, Heather. *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire*. Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture. Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Jameson, Fredric. "Culture and Finance Capital." *Critical Inquiry* 24 (Autumn 1997): 246-265.
- Jardine, Lisa. *Worldly Goods*. London: Macmillan, 1996.
- Jeffrey, Violet M. *John Lyly and the Italian Renaissance*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1969.

- Kann, Mark E. *A Republic of Men: The American Fathers, Gendered Language, and Patriarchal Politics*. New York UP, 1998.
- Kay, W. David. *Ben Jonson: a Literary Life*. London: Macmillan Press, 1995.
- Kellers, Katherine Z., and Gerald J. Schiffhorst, eds. *The Witness of the Times*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1993.
- Kelley, Donald R. *Faces of History: Historical Inquiry from Herodotus to Herder*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1998.
- Kernan, Alvin. *Shakespeare, the King's Playwright: Theater in the Stuart Court 1603-1613*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1995.
- Kerrigan, William, and Gordon Braden. *The Idea of the Renaissance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1989.
- Kidd, Colin. *British Identities Before Nationalism: Ethnicity and Nationhood in the Atlantic World, 1600-1800*. Cambridge UP, 1999.
- Kittell, E.E. and T.F. Madden, eds. *Medieval and Renaissance Venice*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1999.
- Klein, Bernhard. "Partial Views: Shakespeare and the Map of Ireland." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 4.2 / Special Issue 3 (September, 1998): 5.1-20 18 June, 1999.
<URL: <http://purl.oclc.org/emls/04-2/kleipart.htm>>.
- Kraye, Jill, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. Cambridge UP, 1986.
- Lennon, Colm. *Richard Stanihurst the Dubliner, 1547-1618*. Blackrock, County Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1981.

- Levack, Brian P. *The Formation of the British State: England, Scotland, and the Union 1603-1707*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1987.
- Lewis, Martin W., and Karen E. Wigan. *The Myth of Continents: A Critique of Metageography*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997.
- Mac Farlane, Alan. *Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Maczak, Antoni. *Travel in Early Modern Europe*. Trans. Ursula Phillips. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1995.
- Maley, Willy. *Salvaging Spenser: Colonialism, Culture and Identity*. London: Macmillan Press, 1997.
- Maquerlot, Jean-Pierre, and Michele Willems, eds. *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time*. Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Marchitello, Howard. *Narrative and Meaning in Early Modern England*. Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Maslan, Robert W. *Elizabethan Fictions: Espionage, Counter-espionage, and the Duplicity of Fiction in Early Elizabethan Prose*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1997.
- Mason, Roger A, ed. *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603*. Cambridge UP, 1994.
- McRae, Andrew. "'On the Famous Voyage': Ben Jonson and Civic Space." *Early Modern Literary Studies* S13 (September 1998): 8.1-31. 16 June, 1999.
<<http://www.shu.ac.uk/emls/04-2/mcraonth.htm>>.
- McCanles, Michael. *Jonsonian Discrimination: the Humanist Poet and the Praise of True Nobility*. U of Toronto P, 1992.

- McCrone, David. *The Sociology of Nationalism: Tomorrow's Ancestors*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- McEachern, Claire. *The Poetics of English Nationhood*. Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Mcleod, Bruce. *The Geography of Empire in English Literature 1580-1745*. Cambridge UP, 1999.
- Medine, Peter E. "Object and Intent in Jonson's 'Famous Voyage.'" *Studies in English* 15 (1975): 97-110.
- Milanich, Jerald T. *Laboring in the Fields of the Lord*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1999.
- Miles, Rosalind. *Ben Jonson: His Craft and Art*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Miola, Robert S. *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy: The Influence of Seneca*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1992.
- Morris, Christopher W. *An Essay on the Modern State*. Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Muldoon, James. *Empire and Order: The Concept of Empire, 800-1800*. Studies in Modern History. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Nairn, Tom. *Faces of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1997.
- Nauert, Charles G. *Humanism and the Culture of Renaissance Europe*. Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Nerlich, Michael. *Ideology of Adventure: Studies in Modern Consciousness*. Trans. Ruth Crowley, in 2 vols. Theory and History of Literature, 042-043. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1987.
- Nicholl, Charles. *A Cup of News: the Life of Thomas Nashe*. London; Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984

- Nicholls, Andrew D. *The Jacobean Union: A Reconsideration of British Civil Policies Under the Early Stuarts*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood P, 1999.
- Nielson, James. *Unread herrings: Thomas Nashe and the prosaics of the real*. New York: P. Lang, 1993.
- Nozick, Robert. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1968.
- O'Neill, John. *The Market: Ethics, Knowledge and Politics*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Parks, George B. "Travel as Education." *The Seventeenth Century: Studies in the History of English Thought and Literature from Bacon to Pope by Richard Forster Jones and Others Writing in His Honour*. Stanford UP, 1951.
- Parry, Graham. *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford UP, 1995.
- Paul, Henry N. *The Royal Play of Macbeth*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1950.
- Peltonen, Markku. *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570-1648*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Perceval-Maxwell, M., *The Scottish Migration to Ulster in the Reign of James I*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.
- Petrucci, Armando. *Writing the Dead: Death and Writing Strategies in the Western Tradition*. Trans. Michael Sullivan. Stanford UP, 1998.
- Pocock, J.G.A. *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century*. A Reissue with a Retrospect. Cambridge UP, 1987.
- Porter, Dennis. *Haunted Journeys: Desire and Transgression in European Travel Writing*. Princeton UP, 1991.

- Powell, William S. *John Pory 1572-1636: The Life and Letters of a Man of Many Parts*. Chapel Hill: U of N Carolina P, 1977.
- Rabb, Theodore. *Jacobean Gentleman: Sir Edwin Sandys, 1651-1629*. Princeton UP, 1998.
- Relihan, Constance. *Fashioning Authority: the Development of Elizabethan Novelistic Discourse*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 1994.
- Reus-Smit, Christian. *The Moral Purpose of the State: Culture, Social Identity, and Institutional Rationality in International Relations*. Princeton UP, 1999.
- Riggs, David. *Ben Jonson: a Life*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1989.
- Robson-Scott, W.D. *German Travellers in England 1400-1800*. Modern Language Studies. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1953.
- Rocker, Rudolf. *Nationalism and Culture*. Trans. Ray E. Chase. Montreal: Black Rose, 1998.
- Roeder, Ralph. *The Man of the Renaissance, Four Lawgivers: Savonarola, Machiavelli, Castiglione, Aretino*. New York: The Viking Press, 1935.
- Rojek, Chris, and John Urry, eds. *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Ronell, Avita. "The Uninterrogated Question of Stupidity." *Differences* 8.2 (1996).
- Ross, Charles. *The Custom of the Castle: From Malory to Macbeth*. Berkeley: U of California P. 1996.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1994.
- Schofield, Malcolm. *Saving the City: Philosopher-Kings and other Classical Paradigms*. London: Routledge, 1999.

- Schorske, Carl E. *Thinking with History*. Princeton UP, 1998.
- Sells, A. Lytton. *The Paradise of Travellers: The Italian Influence on Englishmen in the Seventeenth Century*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1964.
- Skinner, Quentin. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. Cambridge UP, 1978.
- Smith, Anthony. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986
- Sommerville, J.P. *Royalists and Patriots: Politics and Ideology in England*. 2nd edition. New York: Longman, 1999.
- Southern, R.W. *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.
- Spurr, David. *The Rhetoric of Empire*. Durham: Duke UP, 1993.
- Stapleton, M.L. "Nashe and the Poetics of Obscenity: The Choise of Valentines." *Classical and Modern Literature* 12:1: 29-48.
- Steiner, George. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford UP, 1992.
- Stevens, Paul. "Spenser and Milton on Ireland: Civility, Exclusion, and the Politics of Wisdom." *Ariel* 26:4 (1995).
- Stopford, J., ed. *Pilgrimage Explored*. York Medieval Press, 1999
- Stoye, John Walter. *English Travellers Abroad 1604-1667*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1952.
- Thomas, Keith. *Religion and the Decline of Magic*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971
- Thompson, Lana. *The Wandering Womb: A Cultural History Of Outrageous Beliefs About Women*. Amherst: Prometheus Books, 1999.
- Thrift, Nigel. *Spatial Formations*. London: Sage Publications, 1996.

- Thrower, Norman, ed. *Sir Francis Drake and the Famous Voyage, 1577-1580: Essays Commemorating the Quadricentennial of Drake's Circumnavigation of the Earth*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1984.
- Ullman, Edward L. *Geography as Spatial Interaction*. Washington: U of Washington P, 1980.
- Van den Abbeele, Georges. *Travel as Metaphor from Montaigne to Rousseau*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1992.
- Van den Berg, Sara. *The Action of Ben Jonson's Poetry*. Newark, N.J.: U of Delaware P, 1987.
- Voekel, Swen. "Upon the Suddaine View": State, Civil Society and Surveillance in Early Modern England." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 4.2/ Special Issue 3 (September, 1998): 2.1-27. 15 June, 1999. <<http://purl.oclc.org/emls/04-2/voekupon.htm>.>
- Wagner, Valeria. *Bound to Act: Models of Action, Dramas of Inaction*. Stanford UP, 1999.
- Weimann, Robert. "Fabula and Historia: The Crisis of the 'Universal Consideration' in *The Unfortunate Traveller*." *Representing the English Renaissance*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
- Wheale, Nigel. *Writing and Society: Literacy, Print and Politics in Britain 1590-1660*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Wills, Garry. *Witches and Jesuits*. Oxford UP, 1995.
- Wilson, Joseph P. *The Hero and the City: An Interpretation of Sophocles' "Oedipus at Colonus"*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1997.

Wiltenburg, Robert. *Ben Jonson and Self-Love: the Subtlest Maze of All*. Columbia: U
of Missouri P, 1990.

Wojciehowski, Dolora A. *Old Masters, New Subjects: Early Modern and
Poststructuralist Theories of Will*. Stanford UP, 1995.