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Introduction

By Carla Zecher

Although this online publication of selected conference proceedings is number seven in a series, the history of the Newberry Center for Renaissance Studies annual graduate student conference goes back much further. Fran Dolan (then a graduate student at the University of Chicago, now on the faculty of the University of California, Davis) established the conference in the 1980s, to provide a venue in which graduate students could present scholarly papers to an audience of their peers, before venturing into the more intimidating arena of major national and international conferences. When Megan Moore (then Assistant Director of the Newberry Center for Renaissance Studies, now Assistant Professor of French at the University of Missouri) inaugurated the series of online proceedings in 2007, the conference had been held regularly for more than twenty years. Like Fran, Megan sought to create a unique opportunity for graduate students: an online forum in which they could make the preliminary results of their research widely available, while still retaining the right to use their work in future publications, whether digital or printed. Subsequent Center for Renaissance Studies staff members—Karen Christianson (the current Associate Director of the Center), and Laura Aydelotte (former Interim Assistant Director, who recently completed her PhD at the University of Chicago)—have ensured the continuation of the online proceedings.

The conference itself has grown from a small annual event to quite a large one, as more institutions have joined the Newberry Center for Renaissance Studies consortium, but a team of advanced graduate students still serves as the program committee each year, to vet submissions for presentation at the conference. The program committee members also chair the conference sessions, select papers for the online proceedings, and edit them. The papers included in this year’s proceedings address topics ranging chronologically from the Anglo-Normans to the late Stuart courts, geographically from France to northwest Ireland to Jamaica, and thematically from gender studies to legal history to religious history. The authors and editors of the papers represent a cross-section of the fifty institutions that currently belong to the Newberry Center for Renaissance Studies, including universities located in Texas, Pennsylvania, the Midwest, Canada, and the United Kingdom.

Carla Zecher is Director of the Newberry Center for Renaissance Studies and Newberry Curator of Music.
The Transmutation of Corpse to Landscape in Laȝamon’s Brut

By Erin Kissick

Laȝamon’s Brut is one of several twelfth-century and thirteenth-century retellings of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Latin history of Britain, De gestis Britonum/Historia Regum Britannie.¹ Geoffrey’s text is the oldest extant source not only for many of the legends of King Arthur and Merlin, but also the stories of other famous Briton kings such as Leir, who conquered the area now known as England as well as the surrounding nations, even extending their influence as far as Rome. The history begins with the settlement of Britain by Brutus, the father of the Britons and a descendant of Aeneas, the mythical Trojan founder of Rome, and ends with the conquest of the island by the Angles. Written by one of the later Norman colonizers, Geoffrey’s text creates a narrative exploring the complexities of colonizing a nation of former colonizers.² Laȝamon’s text continues this exploration in the vernacular, using the shared landscape to shape a closer relationship between the Anglo-Norman audience and their Briton predecessors by giving their names and stories to the countryside.³

Kings and heroes rise swiftly and fall even faster, buried and absorbed into the land they once ruled, their names and stories permanently inscribed on the landscape. Their corpses, the “boundary that encroaches upon everything,” become part of the reshaping of boundaries in the colonized England.⁴ This is a history created by Geoffrey and his successors for, rather than by, the Britons. Therefore, while the corpses shape Briton history within the text, this process is directed by

¹ Sir Frederic Madden, K.H., ed. and trans., Laȝamon’s Brut, or Chronicle of Britain. (London: Society of Antiquaries of London, 1847; republished New York: AMS Press, 1970). All translated quotes are from Sir Frederic Madden’s 1847 translation of Laȝamon’s Brut, because it remains the most useful for scholarly purposes. The translation is careful and accurate, although some of the punctuation is problematic, and the edition itself also contains parallel transcriptions of the two primary manuscript versions—Cotton Caligula A.ix and Cotton Otho C. xiii. Because Otho is missing a number of fragments in key places, the quotations I have chosen are from the Caligula version, and the endnotes contain Madden’s diplomatic transcriptions from that same manuscript. Many of the line breaks in the translation are approximate, given the nature of translation.


³ While I term Laȝamon’s audience as a group “Anglo-Norman,” in reality the Anglo-Saxons themselves had been colonized by the Normans, and the term Anglo-Norman obscures an entire level of colonial complexity that had to be omitted from this discussion, which focuses exclusively on the relationship between the relative newcomers (the Anglo-Saxons and -Normans) and those they displaced (the Britons, later known as the Welsh).

Laȝamon to reshape the landscape outside the text with room for the Anglo-Norman colonizers. This process of shaping the geographic and chronological boundaries that divide and bind the colonized Britons of the text and colonizing Anglo-Norman audience is inherently violent, and this violence is reflected in the history the text creates for the Britons. As an account of the conflicts between the original residents of the landscape, often Briton versus Briton, Laȝamon’s text is strewn with corpses. These corpses are not merely collateral damage in a tale of conquest and colonization, but are key elements in Laȝamon’s construction of his audience’s landscape.

The landscape forms a stable matrix into which Laȝamon can write these corpses, and thus their stories, for future readers of the land. As Christopher Cannon notes, “the land’s stability through time comes to be its most important characteristic, as if its principal use and interest to people was its capacity to remain unchanged through continuous waves of human happening.” In fact, Cannon suggests that the real hero of the text is the island itself rather than the Britons who rule it and whose actions dominate the story. After all, by the time Laȝamon is writing, even the Angles who evicted the Britons from the landscape have themselves been pushed out of power by the Normans, and his Anglo-Norman audience could claim no direct descent from the heroes of the narrative. Yet the landscape Laȝamon shapes in his text is still a familiar one to his audience, and it is through the names dotting this familiar landscape and the bodies that Laȝamon creates in the text to accompany those names that the Britons are made present to the Anglo-Norman audience.

Many medieval English texts treated the English landscape as a neatly enclosed and easily-defined space, a sort of new Garden of Eden functioning as an idealized “point of origin” that “binds together Christian resonance and privilege, ideals of cultivation and pleasure, and colonialist fantasies of a national identity and unity created and endorsed by the island’s bounds.” Certainly the landscape does function as the primary ground for English identity in many of these texts. Yet as Catherine Clarke points out, Laȝamon’s text does not describe an idealistic garden space, but instead the negotiation of the multiple warring identities that have been built upon it. The focus on the landscape and the violence that has filled it with corpses recognizes the hybridity of the island and its history, instead of presupposing edenic unity, with gestures towards making a clearer space for the Anglo-Normans within the hubbub.

After all, Laȝamon himself is something of a hybrid figure, situated on the Severn River between England and Wales, and revealing mixed feelings toward the Normans as conquerors. He acknowledges, and even celebrates, the natural shifts of language through his recognition of the diverse ways names are given and his use of the vernacular to construct his text. Yet he also scolds the Anglo-Normans for their appropriation of the British landscape and obliteration of the British identity of the island by changing many Briton place names, as discussed below. This ambivalence toward the linguistic changes made over the years is especially clear when he tells his chosen version of the

---

5 Warren, History, 1.
8 Clarke, Landscapes, 132.
naming of London, supposedly first named Trinovant, then renamed Kaerlud by the Briton King Lud. As the city is conquered and populated by different cultural groups, the name changes from Lundin to Lundene to Lundres. Laȝamon grieves that

    thus has this burgh fared,
since it was first reared;
thus has this island
passed from hand to hand,
so that all the burghs
that Brutus wrought,
and their good names,
that in Brutus day stood,
are greatly destroyed,
through change of the people!9

The names of these locations are associated with the identity of the people, and the loss of the name is not just the name but the character of the people. In fact, the change of name from Kaerlud to Lundres disturbs Laȝamon enough that he returns to it about five thousand lines later, passing even stronger judgment on this change. King Lud had named the city after himself, Laȝamon explains, so that “afterwards many a man,/when the king were dead,/should judge of his works.”10 The name is inextricably bound with Lud’s identity, intended to preserve his story even after his death. Once again Laȝamon recounts the series of changes in the name, from the “foreign folk” who called it Lundin, to the Saxons who called it Lundene, concluding when “came Normans/with their evil crafts,/and named it Lundres;/this people they destroyed.”11 The loss of name and the story of the national figure attached to it is associated not only with loss of national identity, but also with craftiness and destruction.

They are “foreign people,/that this land hath conquered,” not only through military force but through erasure of the original identities incorporated in the landscape, when

    after their will
put down the old names
of the good burghs
and changed their names,
so that there is no burgh
here in this Britain,

---

9 2061-67: “Þuſ iſ þaſ burh i-uaren/ſedðen heo æreft wes areræad/þus is þis eit-lond/i-gon from honde to hond/þet alle þa burhþes/þe Brutuſ ʃwrohte/& heora noma gode/þa on Bruts dæi ʃtode/beoð ʃwiðe afelled/þurh warf of þon folke.”
10 7104-07: “Dat he duden al for þon/pat ðescudðen ſecluden moni mon/þe king weoren dæd/ demen of hiſ weorken.”
11 7115-18: “Seoððen come(n) Normanſ/mid heore nið crafe(n)/and nemneden heo Lundres/ þeof leodeſ heo amærden.”
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that hath its old names,
that men erst to it fixed.12

Yet Laȝamon simultaneously leaves space for these identity-destroying conquerors in the topography of the text by not only acknowledging their presence and the changes they have made since the time of the events in the text, but also through his scolding throughout the text demanding that they recognize and value the British identities bound to the landscape.

It may be observed that many of the names to be discussed below are a bit of a linguistic stretch. However, the text is compelled to generate these physical connections between the bodies of his audience’s predecessors and the land which they share, even if it means writing corpses into the landscape in order to force-fit together two names that have no real relationship. This urge for connection between body and landscape through names is bound up in the impulse to connect the audience with the story, as Laȝamon tries to similarly fit the identity of the Anglo-Normans with that of the Britons by means of their shared landscape. The reshaping of boundaries upon colonization sometimes requires a bit of pulling and wrenching to try to make the pieces fit, and the struggle to force story and identity onto a pre-existing name and piece of landscape is itself a kind of colonization.

Laȝamon gives the bodies of the Britons within his text a tremendous amount of influence over his audience, because these bodies and the stories and identities attached to them are what shape and name the landscape in which the audience lives. The bodies of the dead incorporate not only their physical matter, but also their very identities into the landscape. This incorporation of name and story into the land can sometimes happen deliberately, as in the case of graves and other memorials, but can also be entirely spontaneous, sometimes seeming to happen even against the will of the living. These corpses shape their surroundings to preserve their own names and stories for future inhabitants of the landscape in which they died, and in so doing create a common narrative thread running from Briton to Norman, and from colonized to colonizer.

To ensure that the readers see these bodies as part of the shape of the landscape they live in, Laȝamon often punctuates his narrative with the phrase, “now and evermore/the name standeth there,” linking the stories of the past to the present known by his readers.13 Sometimes he is even more specific, noting with regard to a particular stream that “at Christchurch it falleth in the sea.”14 As Warren argues, his use of the present tense to refer to these corpses and their locations “impl[ies] that any thirteenth-century Englishman can see what historical persons saw, that any reader can experience the continuing presence of the past.”15 While, as Warren has noted, the existence of the

---

12 7119-21, 7126-32: “Swa is al þiſ lond iuaren/for uncuðe leoden/þeo þiſ londe habbeð bi-wunnen”; “æfter heore wille/of gode þe burȝen/& wnden heore nomen/þwa þat nið her burh nan/i(n) þisſere Bruttene/þat habbe hire nome æld/þe me ærþ hire on-falde.”
13 For examples of the use of the present tense to assure readers that these names and locations are still available to them, see lines 1926-27, 7133-40, 9380-81, and 27924-25, which are also discussed elsewhere in this paper.
14 2507: “at Criſtes chirche heo falleð i(n) þare ſæ.”
15 Warren, History, 117.
Britons as a powerful and independent nation had been all but forgotten by Laȝamon’s audience, through his text the presence of these bodies, and by extension their stories, is rendered tangible to the readers, a presence they can walk over or swim through as part of their ordinary existence. In Laȝamon’s text, the dead shape the landscape in two primary ways—the incorporation of the physical matter of the body into the earth, and the incorporation of the body’s name and history into the geographical feature or region. These two ways are not mutually exclusive—in fact, they often occur together—but they are two distinct processes in Laȝamon’s text performing different functions, and one can happen without the other.

On the battlefield, bodies dismembered in combat often anonymously disintegrate into the landscape, their names and stories left untold. In these cases, it is not the stories of individuals that are absorbed, but the broader account of boundary-shaping. As the conquering army takes control of the landscape, the defeated become the landscape itself, both body and land dominated simultaneously. In several striking battlefield scenes the bodies begin as living warriors, then, as the text progresses, gradually become less and less individuated, until they finally merge entirely with the field on which they have fallen and disappear. In Arthur’s battle against the Roman emperor Luces, what begins as two distinct armies quickly becomes chaos:

Then cracked spears; shivered spears;  
—helms rolled;  
noble men fell;  
—burnies there brake in pieces  
blood out flowed;  
— the fields were discolored;  
standards fell!  
Wounded knights over all  
wandered over the weald;  
sixty hundred there were  
trodden to death by horses. . . .
so that at the last  
no warrior knew  
on whom he should smite,  
and whom he should spare,  
for no man knew other there,  
for the quantity of blood.

---

16 Warren, History, 83.  
17 27462-73, 27484-86: “ſeoððen ſperen chrakeden/ſceldeſ braſtleden/helmes to-helden/heȝe men uellen/burnen to-  
braken/blod ut þeoten/uldefe falewe wrude(n)/feollen here þe-mærken/Wondrede þeond þat wald/iwundede enihtefofer  
al/ſixti hũdred þar weoran/to-tredene mid horſen”; “þeo at þan laſte/nuſte na man kempe/wha(n) he ſeulde ſlan on/and  
wha(n) he ſeulde ſparien/for no icneou na man oðer þe/for vnimete blode.”
What had been a battlefield becomes a dark pastoral scene as “flowed by paths/bloody streams.” The anonymous blood is no longer associated with human bodies and merges seamlessly with the landscape in a parody of clear wayside brooks.

The equation of domination of the body with domination of the landscape is made even clearer in the Britons’ assault on Ireland, when they explicitly intend to possess and relocate a prominent feature of the Irish landscape—the Giants’ Ring, renamed Stonehenge by the Britons. After the Britons defeat the Irish army, the corpses of the Irish “covered all the fields.” Later, the Irish bodies become further subjected to the Britons, who “beheld/the dead over the fields,” dominating both the bodies and the landscape with their gaze. After subjugating the Irish visually, “the Britons went over/the fields to their tents,” the bodies no longer distinct from the fields but entirely absorbed into them, together subjected to the tromping feet of the colonizing Britons who can no longer see the bodies for the land that they now possess. They follow up this victory by claiming the Giants’ Ring and placing it in their own landscape, where it appears multiple times throughout the text as a potent symbol of their own power over the landscape as colonizers.

But while bodies without names can be physically absorbed into the landscape, the names of the dead whose bodies have been lost can also become incorporated into the identity of the landscape, as long as the landscape retains some close association with the absent corpse. The shape of a body is so significant that its removal, like those of Rodric and Hamun discussed below, leaves something like a scar on the landscape, including the name and identity that had been bound to the body. Now adrift and without a body, the identity anchors itself to the body-shaped scar left behind.

On multiple occasions in this text, a defeated enemy is pulled apart by horses—a well-known form of execution for traitors, as readers of Foucault may recall—and then the spot upon which the body was destroyed is marked in memory of the dead one, even though there is apparently no body left to be buried there. Arviragus has his brother Hamun torn apart, then on that same spot he founds a town, “for Hamuns death/Hamton he named it;/now and evermore/the name standeth there.” A few hundred lines later, on the spot on which King Maurius has Rodric pulled apart,

he caused anon to be reared
a most wonderful stone pillar;
he caused thereon to be graven
strange characters,
how he slew Rodric, and
which horses drew him in pieces. . . .
Up he set the stone;

---

18 27476-77: “ſtrahten after ſtreteأشخاص/blodie ſtremeأشخاص.”
19 17349 “& wriȝen al þa feledf.”
20 17362-63 “Pa Bruttes biheolden/þa dede þeond þan valden.”
21 7366-67 “Bruttes þeond þan uælden/ferde(n) to heore telden.”
22 9378-81 “for Hamundes dæðe/Hamton heo hit hæhte/nu and auere mare/þe nome ftoned þere.”
yet it there standeth;
so it will do as long
as the world standeth.  

Even without a corpse present, Rodric and Hamun’s bodies and their destruction are still inscribed on the landscape of the text, which cannot forget that a body was once there, and now is not.

Most commonly, however, the incorporation of the corpse and the identity happen concurrently. This can be most easily seen in the many memorials and graves established throughout the text, which Laȝamon frequently describes in terms that suggest that he assumes his readers are familiar with these locations, as he does with the rest of the bodies here. Many, many graves appear in this text, and often the mourners who inter the deceased deliberately make these graves public, so that the body of the dead will be as present to the living as possible. When King Dunwale dies, his earls have him buried in a temple of gold in London, constructing a public space of worship around the corpse.  

When Dunwale’s son Belin dies, his grieving people place his corpse in a golden tomb in a tower “so that men might him behold/wide over the land.” And both the aforementioned King Lud and his son Nennius are buried beside different city gates of London, so that all who enter or exit must pass their bodies and be reminded of them. The gate beside which Lud is buried is later known as Ludes-gate, a name which Laȝamon claims it still holds, making this grave present to the audience as well.

The most famous burial site in the text, though, is the Giants’ Ring mentioned above, Stonehenge, set up on the plain of Ambresbury. On that plain the Saxon invader Hengest slaughtered a large group of British nobles, and there they were buried. Their relative Aurelius wants “with surprising works/to honor the dead,/that there shall stand,/to the worlds end,” and calls on Merlin for advice. Merlin tells Aurelius about a circle of massive stones in Ireland called the Giants’ Ring, originally lifted from the African landscape by some now-forgotten ancient colonizer. He uses his magic to transport the entire ring to Ambresbury plain. Once there, the circle is referred to as Stonehenge, the name Laȝamon’s audience knew it by. This site becomes such a significant landmark that later Aurelius and his younger brother Uther are also buried there, to be with their murdered relatives. When much later King Constantine joins them, he is referred to as being buried with his ancestors, with no mention of the massacre there. These kings choose to have themselves incorporated into a highly visible area of the landscape—a portion of the landscape

---

23 9954-63, 66-69 “Þer dude Maurius þe king/a wel ðwœð ðæleð þing/uppen þen ilke ðlude/þer he Rodric uor-dude/he lette a-ræren anan/enne swuðe ðæleð ðian/he lette þer on grauen/þælcuð run-træhe/hu he Rodric of-floh/& hine mid horfen to-droh . . . . Vp he lette þæne ða(n)/þet he þer þa(n)deð/swa he deð al ðwa longe/swa þa worlde þa(n)deð.”
24 4282-87.
25 6086-87 “þat me mihte hine bi-halden/wide þæon þeo(n) londe.”
26 7133-40, 7618-21.
27 7142-44.
28 17164-67 “mid ðælæððæ þære wæreken/wurðien þa dæðe/þat þer þæal þa(n)deþ/to þær worlde longe.”
29 17832-47, 19816-25.
30 28762-67.
originally stolen away from another landscape and colonized into their own as a symbol of power. In so doing they shift the focus of the story attached to that landmark from the massacre to the broader narrative of their own family, a story about the line of great kings who unified Britain and dominated the surrounding nations for a time.

Another compelling memorial is that which King Arthur establishes for Sir Kay:

He was buried there
beside the castle,
among hermits,
Kay who was the noble man.
Kay hight the earl,
Kinun the castle;
Arthur gave him the town,
and he thereat was entombed,
set there the name after himself;
for Kays death
he named it Kain;
now and evermore
so it hight there.31

As has become a common practice in this text, the town in which Sir Kay is buried is named after him and called Kain, and Laȝamon notes that this is the name that the town still holds. Significantly, this town was given to Kay by King Arthur while he was still living, and after his burial there is no indication that it ever ceases to be Kay’s town. In fact, by having his name and body incorporated into the town, it is more closely associated with him than before. Kay’s corpse resides in his town, he possesses the town, and so in theory he has the agency to preserve his memory among the inhabitants. For the living Anglo-Normans in that town which still bears his name, the dead Briton Sir Kay is both their neighbor and their landlord. Not only has Laȝamon transformed the corpse into landscape, but through this transformation Kay continues to participate in the England of the Anglo-Norman audience, shaping the audience’s own identity as residents of this town as well. Kay’s town provides one of the most explicit examples of how Laȝamon, through the living Britons, shapes the landscape around the corpse, preserving the name and story of the dead and providing a point at which the living and the dead continue to interface.

Yet many of the dead whose bodies and identities jointly form the fabric of the landscape were not incorporated by the Britons in such a deliberate way. Instead of the landscape being consciously shaped around their bodies in such a way as to preserve the stories, many of them had such compelling stories that their identities simply could not be separated from the landscape into which

---

31 27912-25 “bi-bured he wes þere/bi-halue þe caſtle/imong heremiten/þat waæ þe riche mon/Kæi hehte þe eorl/Kinun þe caſtle./Arður þæf him þene tun/and he þer to tumbe/and fette þere þene nome/after him þeoluen/for Keifes daœðe/Kain he hit hehte/nu and auere mare/þwa hit hehte þere.”
their bodies were absorbed. For example, after Morgan, the ruler of Wales, is defeated and decapitated by his cousin, Cunedagis, the few survivors from his campaign return secretly to recover his body:

They took Morgans body,  
and laid it in earth;  
well they him buried,  
who was of Wales the lord.  
The land was through Morgan  
named Margan.32

Similarly, the Humber River was named after king Humber, who drowned in that river along with his entire army.  
33 These namings, unlike many of those discussed earlier, seem to erupt spontaneously out of the presence of the body and the story. At least the text is uninterested in how the name comes to be popularized, demonstrating that the corpse’s power to maintain identity is more significant than the power of the living to define their landscape.

And finally, while the text is most concerned with the bodies of the colonized Britons, they are not the only ones whose stories become part of the fabric of the countryside. The landscape of the text is shaped by outsiders as well. When, early in the conquest of Britain, Corineus wrestles the giant Geomagog at the top of a cliff:

he to the ground came;  
and thus the mighty wretch  
going to hell!  
Now and evermore hath the cliff there  
a name in each people  
that that was Geomagoges Leap.34

The text even allows the corpse of a monstrous giant, the ultimate Other, to shape the landscape, and again this corpse gains power over the landscape, regardless of whether or not the humans living in the landscape choose to allow it.35

Surprisingly enough, sometimes the living do allow other outsiders, such as would-be colonizers, to have a hand in the formation of their landscape. For example, “Gallus,” that is, a Roman leader:

---
32 3862-67 “Heo nomen Morganuſ liche/& leide hit on vrþen/wel heo hine buriden/þe wes þel Walef lauerd./Wef þet lond þurh Morgan/Margan ihæte(n).”
33 2198-08.
34 1917-1928 “Corineuſ hine fælde/& hine fælude mid maene/aduneward þa clude/þat his ban to-cluuen/þat al þe féond to-barft/þæ he to folde come;/þe þe hæ þe fæde/ferde to helle/Nu & æuer mare/haueð þat clif þære/nome on ælche leode/þat þære Geomagoges lupe.”
35 For a more thorough discussion of giants as classic Briton monsters, see Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, Of Giants: Sex, Monsters, and the Middle Ages (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).
they captured,
and smote off from him the head,
and cast him in a brook
that there by them stood,
and all the dead they brought
into the brook;
—there Gallus in the brook
at the bottom was buried.  

Livius Gallus’s body is discarded in a brook like trash, and Laȝamon immediately follows this account by declaring that “[t]hen was this nation/cleansed from the Rome-folk,” denouncing Gallus and his soldiers as a contaminant that must be purged. However, he adds:

the Britons gave a name
to the brook;
because Gallus was slain thereby,
bade it be named Galli,
and in the English books
it is named Wal-brook.

A Roman, from whom the country was “cleansed” becomes part of the identity of the landscape. He was a villain by the standards of the text and unlike many of the other defeated enemies who are usually Britons themselves, is an outsider. But his body and his identity are integrated the landscape right alongside the heroes. In fact, the Briton victors deliberately incorporate his name into their landscape, and while their goal may have been to commemorate their own victory, the fact is that like the monstrous Geomagog, it is his body and his name, and not the name of the Briton winner, that are permanently joined to the brook.

This incorporation of outsiders and attempted colonizers into the landscape hold out a promise to the Normans as well—while Laȝamon’s text is focused on the Britons, they are not the only ones whose bodies and identities shape the landscape. At the same time, it reminds the audience that even though they are now the victors who dominate the landscape, space still remains for those they have defeated. Here in this enclosed island space, in which disparate national identities wrestle and in which the colonizers struggle to find their place in a landscape originally defined by the colonized, these examples of non-Briton bodies shaping the landscape begin the process of carving out space in the text for future outsiders, such as the Anglo-Normans, to inhabit while simultaneously leaving room for the subjugated.

36 10826-33 “Gallus heo nomē/ & pat hafld him of-floȝen/& wurpen hine in ænne broc/þe þer heom bi ðtód/& al þat wal heo brohten/in to þan broke/þer Gallus i þan broke/at grunde waf bi-buried.”
37 10834-5. “Þa wes þas þeode/þclaned of Rom-leode”
38 10834-41: “and Bruttes þan broke/nome bi-tæhte(n)/for Gallus wes iſlaȝen þer bi/þæhte hine nemni Galli/þa þere /Ænglifte boe/he is ihat(n) Wale broc.”
These bodies lie at the intersection of two distinct desires on the part of the audience—the desire for a sense of unity and community with the other groups who have shared the same space, and the desire to dominate these other groups and define the stories themselves. One final corpse illustrates this tension and the negotiation between unity and dominance. When King Locrin rejects his Briton queen Gwendoleine and their son in favor of his foreign lover Æstrild and their daughter Abren, Gwendoleine leads an army against him, and he dies in battle. Not content with this, however, she then:

went to the castle
wherein Æstrild was;
she took Æstrild and Abren,
and caused them to be bound,
and caused them to be cast
into a deep water;
there were they drowned,
and there they suffered death.\(^3^9\)

The corpses are lost in the water, but Gwendoleine knows the power of an absent body, and once the sole ruler of the landscape that she and Locrin once ruled together, she:

commanded a command,
with deep wit,
that men should the same water,
where Abren was drowned,
call it Auren,
for the maiden Abren,
and for Locrines love.\(^4^0\)

While other lost corpses, such as those of Rodric and Hamun, are commemorated by their killers without comment, here Laȝamon gives a clue as to why the victor would memorialize the victim. Gwendoleine is explicitly motivated by love of Locrin. Yet instead of naming a portion of the landscape after him, she instead selects his daughter’s name. Through her “deep wit,” she is able to control the narrative, connecting herself to her beloved through story, while simultaneously denying him his own memorial, giving it instead to Abren.

Just as Gwendoleine balances her desire to be connected to Locrin with her desire to dominate the narrative and the landscape by shaping their story through Abren’s corpse, so Laȝamon shapes the story of the Britons though the bodies of the dead for his Anglo-Norman audience. The corpses

\(^3^9\) 2484-90: “& heo ferde to þan caſtle/þer Æstrild wes inne./heo nome Æstrild & Abren/& lette heom ibinden./& lette heom worpen/in ane deope watere/þer heo adronken/& þer heo deað boldeden.”

\(^4^0\) 2494-2500: “þa hehte heo ane heſte/mid haiȝere witte/þat me ſeu̇lde þat ilke wat(er/ þer Abren wes adrunken/elepian hit Auren/for þane maidene Abren/& for Locrines lufe.”
in his text are given such power that they seize control of the landscape, whether the living within the text intend them to or not. At the same time, he shows how the living are able to use this power to inscribe their history on the landscape through the ways they bury and commemorate the dead. Their use of corpses to inscribe their history reflects Laȝamon’s own process of creating and planting corpses within the text to invent a backstory for the names inscribed on his readers’ landscape. In spite of the cultural and linguistic differences, Laȝamon’s text attempts to create continuity between these groups by shaping a landscape with room for all, while preserving the power differential between the Britons and the Anglo-Norman audience. This incorporation of corpse into landscape turns the Britons into almost-ancestors of the Anglo-Normans, whose lives continue to be influenced by the names and stories of the corpses Laȝamon uses to shape the land in which they now live.
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Saints in the Seascape: Interconnection, Competition, and Cultural Reproduction at Medieval Ecclesiastical Communities in Northwestern Connemara

By Ryan Lash

This paper focuses on some of the “peripheral” settlements that have long been central to popular and scholarly views of the church in early medieval Ireland (400-1200 CE). Traditional accounts depicted this church as particularly monastic in character and organization. The archaeological remains of ecclesiastical settlements on small and difficult-to-access islands have been taken as expressions of a particularly enthusiastic asceticism, inspired by the hagiographies of early Christian hermits like Saint Anthony. Though a strong ascetic current in early medieval Christianity can hardly be denied, recent archaeological studies suggest that as pilgrimage destinations and as the final resting places of lay people, island monasteries could actually have functioned as important scenes of interaction between lay and ecclesiastical communities. Such perspectives echo broader reconsiderations of the organizational structure of early medieval Irish church and its relation to a later medieval parish system.

Ongoing fieldwork by the Cultural Landscapes of the Irish Coast (CLIC) project on the northwestern coast of Connemara provides a new opportunity to refine our understanding of the church and its place within the broader cultural system of medieval Ireland. I have been a member of the CLIC project since 2007, and what I present here builds upon many discussions with fellow CLIC collaborators, both professional scholars and local enthusiasts. Six years of research on the island of Inishark has brought to light a substantial and multiphased—if otherwise little known—

These new findings force us to reconsider the place of Inishark and the cult of Saint Leo amid a seascape of diverse ecclesiastical settlements and saint cults.

Following a brief presentation of the evidence for monasticism and pilgrimage on Inishark, I will lay out a broad theoretical framework for addressing these two phenomena and their cultural, political, and economic implications. I will argue that medieval ecclesiastical sites are usefully envisioned as oriented and orientating places, implicated in the constitution and renegotiation of communities, their notions of social order, and potentially even their allegiances to contemporary currents of church reform. Applying this framework to ecclesiastical communities in northwestern Connemara, I suggest that these seemingly peripheral and “insulated” settlements were actually highly engaged with one another, with lay communities, and with larger debates. In all, this case-study highlights the multiple scales—geographic, historiographical, and cosmological—to which ecclesiastical communities orientated themselves and argues for their role as important centers of cultural and political reproduction.

Inishark—Setting and New Findings

Located about eight kilometers off the coast of northwestern Connemara, Inishark is a distinctive geological and cultural region in western Ireland characterized by abundant mountains and bogland. Inishark is surrounded by a series of islands with varying degrees of documentary, archaeological, and folkloric evidence for early medieval ecclesiastical settlement and pilgrimage (see Figure 1 for those mentioned prominently in the text). To the north is Caher Island, locally associated with Saint Patrick. To the south are two islands associated with Saint Féchin—Omey Island and High Island—mentioned in medieval annals and hagiographies. Immediately east lies Inishbofin, associated with Saint Colman. Two of these islands in particular—High Island and Caher Island—contain the remains of extensive ecclesiastical complexes that exhibit the standard features associated with early medieval island monasticism. These include a centrally located and enclosed church and burial ground surrounded, at High Island, by another larger enclosure and, at Caher Island, a series of satellite monuments, including what are known as leacht, rectangular stone cairns used as nodal points in traditional pilgrimage processions (Figure 2). Such pilgrimage “rounds” practiced in the nineteenth century may have developed ultimately from medieval patterns of ritual movement, albeit manifest in a very different cultural context. Recent fieldwork suggests this was the case with Saint

---

Molaise’s establishment on the island of Inishmurray, County Sligo, where excavations revealed that the system of *leachta* were built as part of a single initiative around 1000 CE.⁶

Given the relative dearth of early documentation relating to early ecclesiastical sites in this part of Ireland, much of our knowledge of these sites and their associations emanates from these practices and their surrounding folklore. Guided only by such folklore, until recently, the ecclesiastical remains on Inishark seemed rather less extensive and less coherent than either Caher or High Island. Prior to the island’s abandonment in 1960, local tradition revered only a few features dispersed across the main village area: a ruined church, a stone cell within a small enclosure near the coast, known as Clochán Leo; and a number of other monuments, including *leachta*, dispersed across the village area (Figure 3).⁷

CLIC’s research has elucidated the history of some of these features and identified others. In 2008, dry conditions and heavy grazing by sheep minimized grass cover on Inishark. This much

---

increased the visibility of certain features usually more obscured by vegetation. Re-examination of two sub-rectangular enclosures east of the modern port in 2008 suggests that they possibly represent early medieval or later medieval burial grounds or penitential stations. The easternmost enclosure includes along the course of one of its walls a deflated stone cell, not unlike that at Clochán Leo. A shouldered cross-slab identified in the modern cemetery just east of the port suggests that this too may have been an area of activity in the medieval period. Architectural analysis and excavation near the church in 2010 and 2012 revealed that the extant structure was preceded by a likely thirteenth-century church. Trenches were placed on the west, south, and east sides of the church, each of which uncovered evidence of burials aligned to the perimeter of the church. These had been completely obscured by later activity and were not reflected in local oral history.

---

The folklore collector Brian MacLoughan (MacLoughan, “Antiquities of Inish Airc”) recorded that the islanders in 1942 could relate nothing of the history of these features.
In contrast, Clochán Leo (Figure 4) loomed large in local nineteenth-century traditions. The ethnographer Charles Browne wrote in 1893:

There is yet shown a ruin called Cloghan Leo, in which he (Saint Leo) is said to have dwelt; also fourteen stations, to each of which on certain days these people make a holiday, and pray there for the day. . . . and after praying during the day, they go and sleep in the place mentioned above (Cloghan Leo), but it is almost to the ground.  

Recent investigation of Clochán Leo suggests that this area was also used as a focus of ritual in the medieval period. Preliminary excavations within the enclosure surrounding the clochán uncovered a paved area, multiple stone platforms, hundreds of quartz cobbles, and two cross-slab fragments. The use of quartz in ritual and mortuary contexts in the early medieval period is well attested in both literature and archaeology. This alone cannot be used to establish a date for the origin of the site; however, the incised designs on the two recovered cross-slabs is very similar to examples from

---

High Island thought to date to near the turn of the first millennium (Figure 5). Further investigation is required to ascertain the chronology of the site, but it seems probable that the complex had already taken shape by the time Saint Leo’s church was constructed. In all, CLIC’s recent investigations suggest that a possibly long-lived and certainly multiperiod ecclesiastical establishment existed on Inishark. Though of course direct continuity cannot be assumed, nineteenth-century traditions of pilgrimage could distantly reflect the existence of earlier medieval practices.

How would this establishment have interacted with other communities—both lay and ecclesiastical—in both its immediate seascape and within wider geographic and discursive domains? Before tackling these questions, it is necessary to examine ecclesiastical establishments in general as the centers of particular political economies in the early and later medieval periods. This requires asking some more fundamental questions: What was the relationship between the ritual activities practiced at ecclesiastical sites and the social relations and power structures necessary to maintain them? And, how might the built and natural environments of ritual practice at ecclesiastical sites help answer this question? The next two sections address these issues in turn.

Models of Pastoral Care and Church Organization

Much recent work among scholars of early medieval Ireland has centered on the organization of the church and the administration of pastoral care from the era of monastic missionaries, beginning in the fifth century, to the formulation of a parish system, beginning during the twelfth-century reform movement driven largely by the introduction of continental religious houses and Anglo-Norman colonialism. The general trend in scholarship of late has been the repudiation of an orthodox position that the early medieval Irish church was primarily monastic, largely uninvolved in pastoral care, and organized into federations of monastic communities united by shared founders-saints but dispersed over wide geographic areas. To the contrary, historian Colmán Etchingham has insisted that Irish textual evidence “reveals no systematic distinction between monastic and non-monastic churches” and recent discussions have envisaged a functionally diverse church more fundamentally interdigitated with secular society and its territorial structures.  

---

As documentary historians point out, contemporary hagiography and prescriptive texts like *Rígal Phátraic* and *Córus Bégnai* indicate that the administration of sacraments—especially baptism and last rites—to lay people was considered an important service, though they disagree on how often or broadly it was carried out. Pastoral care is usually conceived as one half of reciprocal if not entirely equal relationship between church establishments and lay people. In the later medieval and early modern parish model, those people living within the territorial extent of a parish paid a tithe to their parish church in return for spiritual care. This included most crucially access to the sacraments necessary for salvation that, according to orthodox ideology, could only effectively be administered by the ordained clergy. The Synod of Cashel in 1172, one of a series of reforming synods in the twelfth century, called for all of the faithful to pay tithes to their churches, but it is unclear what kind of system of extraction may have existed before—and even after—that proclamation.

Aside from the sacraments, lay pilgrimage to saints’ shrines on important feast days is well attested and may have been related to extractions of dues from lay people to churches. Though more often associated with the *peregrini*, holy men who undertook exile as a form of aimless pilgrimage for the love of God, island monasteries, as suggested by both Inishmurray and Inishark, could also attract lay pilgrims.

Most likely, this flow of lay pilgrims would have provided monastic communities with an important source of revenue in the form of incidental donations if not formalized extractive practices. Early medieval churches often relied on secular authorities for patronage and protection, and indeed Etchingham and Mac Shamhrain among others have proposed an alternative model of church organization that envisions ecclesiastical communities latching onto existing secular territorial structures. In this “territorial model,” principal churches were affiliated with subordinate churches within a spatial domain commonly more or less commensurate with that of secular kingdoms. The degree to which affiliations within this territorial model were institutionalized, with renders from sub-churches to principle churches, is uncertain, and Etchingham’s analysis of contemporary textual evidence suggests that autonomy and subservience could exist on a wide spectrum of possibilities. In any case, it has been hypothesized that these patterns of territorial organization would have constituted the basic framework around which parochial territories were eventually formalized.

Only a few regional case studies have put these new models to test. Ó Carragáin’s examination of the landscape of ecclesiastical communities on the Dingle and Inveragh peninsulas in County Kerry
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generally affirms this territorial model and illustrates some of the dynamics implicit in the negotiation of ecclesiastical hierarchies. Based partially on their appearance in contemporary annals, Ó Carragáin posits three principal churches in the area—Kilmalkedar, Inis Uasal, and Skellig Michael—and musters archaeological and toponymic evidence suggesting that each held sway over minor churches within territorial domains—or termon lands—whose boundaries were in some cases demarcated by wayside cross-slabs.

The evidence of the cult of relics and saint dedications in the region buttressed this claim. An eighth-century legal text known as the Cōrus Bésgnai defines a principle church as one “in which there are relics of the founder,” and the distribution of relics by principle establishments is thought to have been an important strategy for forging links and maintaining authority over subsidiary churches. Hence, the concentrated distribution of possible reliquary shrines at ecclesiastical sites north of Skellig Michael’s and Inish Uasal’s hypothesized termon lands might indicate a converse process: an effort to express local identity and autonomy. Though the cults of principle churches need not have totally subsumed others within their territorial sway, the relatively high frequency of ecclesiastical place-names deriving from local saints or from family groups in north Inveragh fits neatly with the hypothesis of a greater number of independent establishments in this area.

Ó Carragáin’s regional study hints at the degree of complexity, dynamism, and local variation that might have prevailed in medieval Ireland. Even if a territorial model of church organization was predominant, the authority of principle churches—or indeed, the autonomy of minor churches—had to be actively constituted and spatialized. Recent anthropological considerations of the production of power envision political authority as something that must be constantly constituted and renegotiated within and through the landscape, not something simply imposed over clearly demarcated territorial domains. In their consideration of the modes through which the authority of states is internalized and reproduced, Ferguson and Gupta claim that states are “constructed entities that are conceptualized and made socially effective through particular imaginative and symbolic devices.” The territorial domains of early medieval churches cannot be taken any more for granted. Even if spatial proximity and contiguity were more important than institutional genealogy in

---

19 Ó Carragáin, “Landscape Converted,” 141. Termon is used in contemporary sources to refer the area of sanctuary defined by an ecclesiastical enclosure, as well as sometimes to the lands over which a church claimed direct jurisdiction; see quote translated by Doherty below.
22 Ó Carragáin, “Landscape Converted,” 146.
structuring patterns of interconnectivity, saints and their cults played a major role in the negotiation of hierarchies and affiliations. The leader of an ecclesiastical community was known in Old Irish as *comarbae*, “the successor” of the establishment’s founding saint. Either through hagiographical accounts or the movement of relics, locating a saint in particular places could work to legitimate his or her successor’s territorial claims. The miraculous capacities of relics and the role of saints as intercessors was also part of the ideological structure supporting the church’s value to secular society. Conceived of as imbued with the potent spiritual presence of saints, relics were especially valuable symbolic devices with which the authority of churches could be spatialized.

Hence, I suggest that the cult of saints provides a crucial link between the questions of church organization and pastoral activity. Relics constituted the primary motivation for lay pilgrimage and helped justify the economic maintenance of ecclesiastical communities in the form of elite patronage and systems of extraction. Meanwhile, the creation and maintenance, as well as the possible obliteration and imposition, of saint cults were strategies deployed to negotiate power relations between ecclesiastical communities. Pilgrimage liturgies then may be considered one of the primary modes through which the institutional orientations of ecclesiastical communities were represented and operationalized.

**Ecclesiastical Sites as Orientated and Orientating Spaces**

Saint cults and pilgrimage rituals thus played an important role in negotiating the power relations of medieval communities. This acknowledgment forces us to consider the role that the natural and built settings of ecclesiastical settlements may have played in this process. I contend that the ritual operationalization of ecclesiastical land and seascapes worked as an important means of cultural and political reproduction in medieval Ireland, orientating both lay and clerical communities in relation to wider spheres, ranging from the regional, to the national, to the cosmological and historiographic.

The material culture of Christian worship across the world has of course been informed by a series of broadly shared theological and cosmological ideas, but these are often differentially emphasized to articulate the identities and aspirations of particular communities. In medieval Ireland, Ó Carragáin has argued that the contradictory political aspirations of the major ecclesiastical sites of Armagh and Clonmacnoise were articulated in part through the material citation of the paradigmatic sacred landscapes of Rome and Jerusalem. While Armagh’s citation of Rome, the principle see of Christendom, was designed to advance its claim to the principle see of Ireland, Clonmacnoise contested this hegemonic agenda by citing Jerusalem, the only location more sacred than Rome. Propagated in hagiography and through the architectural imitation of the holy sepulcher,

---

27 Ó Carragáin, *Churches*, 80-82.
this affiliation with Jerusalem may also have been inspired by Clonmacnoise’s location at the center of Ireland. In his description of Jerusalem in the seventh-century *De Locis Sanctis*, Adomnán proclaims that the city is the central point of the earth, a belief reflected in later medieval *mappa mundi*. This cosmological schema, or to use Henri Lefebvre’s terminology, “representation of space,” may also have informed the phenomena of asceticism and the built environment of ecclesiastical communities more generally.

Jerusalem was the center point of the world in terms of both geography and sanctity. The site of Jesus’s death and resurrection, it was the epicenter from which Christianity was to spread throughout the world. This representation of space goes some way to explaining the symbolic value of Atlantic islands for medieval ascetics—what is more peripheral than the islands on the extreme periphery of an island on the extreme periphery of the world? Even if this cosmological schema was to some extent exclusive or esoteric knowledge, I would argue that the idea of orientation was still fundamental to eremetic monasticism: ascetic retreat is necessarily retreat from something.

In this case, the essential boundedness of islands, their demarcation from the surrounding terrestrial world by an expanse of water requiring specialized knowledge and favorable conditions to traverse, may also partially account for their allure. Boundaries were in fact a defining component of ecclesiastical sites. The early eighth-century law tract, *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis*, prescribes the following:

There ought to be two or three *termini* (enclosures) around a holy place: the first in which we allow no one at all to enter except priests, because laymen do not come near it, nor women unless they are clerics; the second, into the streets the crowds of common people, not much given to wickedness, we allow to enter; the third, in which men who have been guilty of homicide, adulterers and prostitutes, with permission according to custom, we do not prevent from going within. Whence they are called, the first *sanctissimus*, the second *sanctior*, the third *sanctus*, bearing honour according to their differences.

The hierarchy of sanctity apparent here, usually attributed to a combination of indigenous and biblical precedents, might also be seen as a micro-scale reiteration of the cosmological scheme of the *mappa mundi* with the holy of holiest Jerusalem at the center. The material reiteration of this cosmological notion of hierarchic sanctity in the built environment of medieval ecclesiastical communities made them both *orientated* and *orientating* spaces. To again adopt Lefebvre’s terminology, as reifications of dominant cosmological schemas (“representations of space”) they functioned as “representational spaces,” the perception of which worked to naturalize a culturally specific and
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sharply iniquitous normative order as an inevitable reality. In this case, the normative order is one in which individuals are differentiated according to gender, class—lay or cleric—and habitual behavior.

Materializations of a particular view of social order are evident in the archaeological record. Just as ecclesiastical sites may have been orientated in relation to Jerusalem as the sacred center of the world, the restriction of access through the *termini* of ecclesiastical sites orientated pilgrims moving through it in relation to its own sacred core; that is, the relics of its saint cult. The excavations on Inishmurray identified a lay cemetery incorporated into the pilgrimage circuit, but set outside the monastary’s principle stone enclosure and far removed from the sacred core of the shrine chapel dedicated to Saint Molaise.\(^{31}\) Across Ireland, more privileged burial locations nearer the relics of saints were reserved for the ecclesiastical and royal elite.\(^{32}\) One’s access and proximity to sacred foci in both life and death was determined by the fundamental categories of difference upon which the medieval Irish social order was based. The channeling of pilgrim’s bodies through built environments that reified categories of difference in relation to sacred foci may actually have worked to sacralize those categories themselves. Hence, as “representational spaces,” the material and symbolic orientation of pilgrimage landscapes could work to orientate both ecclesiastical establishments in relation to their political rivals or affiliates and also communities of worshipers in relation to wider ideological perspectives.

**The Seascape of Northwestern Connemara: Orientations at Multiple Scales**

With this framework in mind, we can now return to the island establishments of northwestern Connemara and address some of the questions postponed earlier. As illustrated above by the citation of Jerusalem at Clonmacnoise and of Rome at Armagh, major ecclesiastical communities could engage in political competition by orientating themselves in relation to wider representations of space. Likewise, evidence suggests that the relatively minor settlements around Inishark negotiated divergent identities by orientating themselves toward much wider geographic and discursive spheres through the seascape settings of their saint cults.

A useful example of the capacity of saint cults to evoke wider geographic spheres is provided by an anecdote in the fourteenth-century Irish *Life of Saint Féchín*, a work possibly based on an earlier Latin version written on Omey Island itself:\(^{33}\)

> On a certain day, when Féchín was with his monks in Imaid Féchín [Omey Island] in the west of Connaught, on a Sunday evening, a little before vespers, he was seized by a desire to go to Fore, and he earnestly entreated God to help him in that difficulty.

---

\(^{31}\) O'Sullivan and Ó Carragáin, *Inishmurray*, 293-98. The sub-rectangular enclosures near the port on Inishark could possibly represent lay burial grounds similarly spatially separated from the principle cult focus and ecclesiastical burial ground on Inishark. More work is required to test this hypothesis.

\(^{32}\) Ó Carragáin, *Churches*, 82-85.

\(^{33}\) A. Breen, “Féchín (Mo-Ecca),” in *Dictionary of Irish Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 117.
An angel of God comes to him and told him to enter the chariot at hand. So Féchín with his monks entered the chariot, and they came before vespers to Fore; and God's name and Féchín's were magnified thereby.\(^{34}\)

Though the immediate purpose of this story within the hagiography is to express the sanctity of Féchín, the miraculously celeritous chariot might also have been meant to elide the significance of the great distance separating Omey and Féchín's more famous establishment at Fore in County Westmeath. There is no other reason to link Omey with Fore, but the circulation of a story like this suggests that the cult of Féchín on Omey could have evoked connections running much further afield than High Island.\(^{35}\)

A somewhat similar piece of folklore from Caher Island suggests how the built and natural settings of ecclesiastical sites were implicated in the orientation of minor island communities to important mainland sites. The distinctive mountain top of Croagh Patrick is visible on a clear day from many areas on Caher Island, and a tradition recorded in the nineteenth century held that an old trackway once taken by Patrick led under the sea to the mountain pilgrimage site dedicated in his name.\(^{36}\) Caher Island is also dedicated to Saint Patrick, and this piece of folklore may represent a reflex of the medieval community's perceived affinity with one of the famous Patrician sites in Ireland.

These two examples suggest that island communities were able to define themselves in relation to places far beyond their immediate local contexts, even if this was only a strategy to distinguish themselves from competitors within that local context. Caher Island remains a destination of pilgrims today, and nineteenth-century documentation of a traditional pilgrimage circuit that incorporated the many leachta surrounding the church may reflect a long history of such traditions extending into the medieval period.\(^{37}\) Likewise, Omey Island remained a destination of pilgrimage into the modern era, and though only scant evidence of a tradition of pilgrimage remains for High Island, the particularly rich assortment of inscribed cross slabs suggests it was receiving considerable patronage from some source.\(^{38}\) In fact, the excavators suggested that the two limestone cross-slabs in the cemetery behind the church may have come from the Aran Islands, the nearest limestone source.\(^ {39}\) Whatever the case, the assortment of incised cross-slabs on High Island is stylistically very different from the similarly rich collection on Caher Island (Figure 6).\(^{40}\) These distinctive cross designs, and potentially the areas from which they were sourced, may also have been implicated along with their respective saint cults in orientating High and Caher Island in relation to one another.

\(^{35}\) Omey Island and Fore Abbey are nearly one hundred fifty miles apart, an approximately three and one half hour drive in a modern chariot.  
\(^{40}\) Herity, “Two Island Hermitages,” 110-19.
and to wider spheres of interactivity and allegiance. Attracting pilgrims likely meant having an attractive saint, and both Patrick, as the national saint, and Féchín, as an important regional saint, would have conferred considerable prestige. These opposing orientations may be seen as competitive strategies enacted to attract pilgrims, but this does not mean there could be no relationship between the two communities at all. To the contrary, recent fieldwork identified a cross-slab on Caher Island as a non-local garnet schist that is very similar to geological sources on High Island, hinting at the possible provision of cross-slab source material from Saint Féchín’s community on High Island.41

Fig. 6: Distinctive cross slab designs from the area east of the church on Caher Island. Note the conical peak of Croagh Patrick in the background of each image.

In the case of Inishark and Inishbofin, on the other hand, the opposition of saint cults may reflect a deeper ideological divergence between competing ecclesiastical communities. Ironically, the origins of Saint Colman’s community on Inishbofin is the best documented in the area, while virtually nothing is known about the foundation of the community dedicated to Saint Leo on Inishark. Yet, the resonances possibly evoked by the names of these saint figures warrant consideration.

As recorded by the eighth-century Anglo-Saxon historian Bede, Saint Colman established his community of monks on Inishbofin after having been defeated at the Synod of Whitby, a church council held in 664 to determine the correct method of calculating the date of Easter. Colman defended the custom that had emerged among monastic communities in Ireland, but the Roman method, sanctioned by the papacy, was deemed to have greater precedent. In contrast, nothing is known of Leo of Inishark. The name cannot be taken as an indication of allegiance to any particular establishment near or far, but it arguably would have had decided papal connotations, being the name of multiple early medieval popes, including most famously Leo the Great. The only other hint of his associations comes from the reported existence of a medallion uncovered in the nineteenth century that depicted Leo alongside Saint Lawrence O'Toole, a papal legate and one of the premiere figures of the twelfth century reform movement that aimed to incorporate the Irish church into an organizational hierarchy administered ultimately from Rome. Thus, the possible resonances of Colman's cult on Inishbofin and Leo's on Inishark presents a sharp juxtaposition of, on the one hand, defiant indigenous tradition, and on the other, the papacy and universalizing church reform.

It is entirely unclear whether the community of Inishark was supported by or affiliated at all with any mainland community. The only other hint of a connection is the similar “expansional” cross design found on slabs recently discovered on Inishark and those excavated from High Island, plus one other example, now lost, from Omey Island (see Figure 6). Though it lies in the civil parish of Inishbofin, the diametric opposition of the saints associated with each community is puzzling. Does the contrast between Leo and Colman suggest two rival communities sharply divided in their allegiance to contemporary church reform, or perhaps close affiliates attempting to strike a balance between reverence for an indigenous past and enthusiasm for a reforming future? The extent to which the communities on Inishark and Inishbofin were active contemporaneously is yet unclear. References to a community of Inishbofin cease after the ninth century and the extant church probably dates from the fourteenth century at the earliest. The chronology of ecclesiastical occupation on Inishark is likewise yet uncertain. The relative dispersal of ecclesiastical features on Inishark and the relatively late date of its principal church raises the possibility that the remains of a small monastic community from the early part of the early medieval period was later appropriated by a new community that developed the site into a pilgrimage attraction. The cult of Leo then potentially represents the re-ascription of a dormant cult by a new community dedicated to reform. In any case, channeling pilgrims through a landscape supposedly encrusted with the relics of a papal saint may have worked to legitimate the reform movement by providing a precedent for the “spatialization” of Roman authority. Leo speaks not necessarily of affiliation, but of allegiance to an initiative that placed the Irish more firmly within the community of Christendom administered from Rome.

42 Gibbons and Higgins, “Three Western Islands,” 22.
43 The connection to Lawrence comes from the chance find of a medallion depicting two figures labeled Leo and Lawrence. The find is known only from a newspaper editorial from P. O Ceallaigh, who was inquiring after similar pieces. The reported date of the find matches closely with period in the nineteenth-century when the medieval church on Inishark was renovated. It is tempting to associate the find with the evidence from excavation that the renovators did some digging around the perimeter of the church. S. P. O Ceallaigh, “SS. Laurence and Leo,” letter to editor, Irish Independent, July 13, 1943.
A close consideration of the landscape/seascape settings and folklore related to the saint cults of these five settlements suggests how each community orientated itself on multiple geographic and discursive scales (Figure 7). These communities cannot be seen strictly as ascetic settlements, “insulated” from their surroundings. Instead, local competition for pilgrims and patronage on the micro-scale may have played out in terms of orientation on the macro-scale. In the case of Inishark, the flow of pilgrims through the built environment of Saint Leo’s cult may even have been implicated in conveying aspects of contemporary theological reform to lay communities. Perhaps the gravitation of pilgrims toward Saint Leo’s relics also entailed reorientation toward a new vision of the social and ecclesiastical order.

Conclusion

This study has argued for the utility of conceptualizing ecclesiastical communities in medieval Ireland as orientated and orientating places. Such an approach pinpoints the crucial link between the questions of church organization and pastoral care—namely the importance of pilgrimage rituals in
the constitution of institutional and communal relations—and suggests alternative questions that data from an area of lesser documentary coverage might be better suited to answer. In the case of northwestern Connemara, I have suggested that saint cults and pilgrimage landscapes were implicated in orientating communities, both lay and ecclesiastical, to a wider world at a variety of scales. What emerges is a seascape of competing cults, sharing certain ritual and material patterns, but expressing in some cases very distinct identities. Saint affiliations not only linked ecclesiastical establishments to neighboring communities with which they were likely institutionally affiliated, they could simultaneously index their orientation toward establishments further afield and even their allegiances in wider discursive debates concerning the orientation of Ireland in relation to Christendom as a whole. Like other ecclesiastical sites, these island establishments remained integrated into a wider cultural system in which theoretically peripheral sites could function as centers of contestation for competing discourses and scenes of cultural and political reproduction.  

Ryan Lash is in the PhD program in Anthropology at Northwestern University. Megan Gregory, a PhD candidate in the English department at Illinois State University, edited this paper.
"These Divine Animals": Physicality of the Stars in Platonic and Aristotelian Thought

By Stephen Case

In Peter Beagle’s modern classic of fantasy, *The Last Unicorn*, the author describes our heroes observing a distant unicorn: “far and faint, a tuft of white water on the wind, nearly invisible . . . moving the way stars and stones move through space: forever falling, forever following, forever alone.”1 Besides the poetry here, what is interesting is the easy representation—even in a work of fantasy—of the stars as lifeless things, falling through space like stones. In a paper by Richard Dales on “The De-Animation of the Heavens in the Middle Ages,” he notes that, “the heavenly bodies were the last parts of the cosmos to lose their souls.”2 It is this loss of life that I want to explore, the way that stars went from being Proclus’s “divine animals” to objects that could fall through space like stones.

To a historian of science in general and astronomy in particular, the stars offer perhaps an unparalleled means of investigating changing views of the cosmos and our place within it throughout history. For anyone of sufficient visual acuity, the stars are there: easily visible by night, they are also omnipresent in the art and literature of any period. Yet the idea of what they physically are—and the bearing this has had on theories of the universe—has changed drastically throughout history. It would take a career to answer the question of what people of different backgrounds, cultures, and periods saw when they looked at the stars, so in this paper I will confine myself to the question of what Western natural philosophers saw. Specifically, what did Platonists and Aristotelians see, or at least what did they write about the physical nature of the stars?

My thesis is fairly simple: I argue that the followers of Plato and Aristotle respectively reached very different conclusions regarding what the stars physically were, and that these conclusions shaped debates on the nature of the heavens throughout late antiquity and again in the late Italian Renaissance. In particular, in the Renaissance, neo-Platonic authors were rediscovered and were read contemporaneously with the work of Copernicus, Galileo, and Kepler. Distinctly Platonic notions of the stars, I would like to suggest, played a role in the eventual identification of the stars as sun-like

---

objects: spherical, rotating, fiery, but ultimately nonliving. This is a narrative that remains largely unexplored.

I will begin by examining briefly what Plato and Aristotle themselves have to say regarding the stars. As Plato outlines in the Timaeus, the stars are living things, fiery gods, who have two distinct motions: the diurnal revolution through which they participate in the motion of the cosmos itself in addition to an axial rotation—stars spinning on their axes—“an unvarying movement in the same place, by which the god [star] would always think the same thoughts about the same things.” Here we see Plato’s familiar association of rotational movement with thought: just as the universe as a whole is alive, conscious, and rotating, so the stars both participate in and imitate this motion.4

Aristotle ultimately reaches a very different conclusion on the character of the stars. As he argues in De caelo, while the stars are spherical, they cannot rotate in the way that Plato claims. Besides arguments from analogy—e.g., the Moon clearly does not rotate and thus none of the celestial objects do—Aristotle examines Plato’s claim that the stars are made of fire. Because fire’s natural motion is not circular, not the daily path of the stars across the sky, Aristotle posits a fifth element, the natural motion of which is circular. This element is the famous aether, and as “the most logical and consistent hypothesis . . . is to make each star consist of the body in which it moves,” the stars are thus not fire but are themselves composed of aether.5 “The stars,” he says, “are neither made of fire nor move in fire.”6 While for Plato, the luminosity of the stars indicated their fiery composition, for Aristotle the motion of the stars implies their aetherial character. Indeed, Aristotle takes steps toward doing away with their living nature, as well: made redundant by the natural motion of the aether, the stars’ motion is not conscious, not “the motion of life.”7

Aristotle is left with several problems though, and these have direct bearing on considerations regarding the character of the heavens in late antiquity. For one thing, why should the aether be differentiated? Why concentrated and luminous in certain spots and not others? Aristotle claimed that the stars were aether glowing from friction generated as the celestial spheres rotated, but why only in certain regions? Opponents of Aristotle, such as the Alexandrian philosopher John

5 De Caelo II.VII, 289a 15-20.
7 W. K. C. Guthrie, “Introduction,” in Aristotle’s On the Heavens (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960): xxxv. Aristotle sets out his argument for the motion of the stars not being self-caused in De Caelo II.VIII. He returns to this premise in II.XIX as well, where he argues against the Pythagorean theory of the harmony of the spheres. Because the heavenly bodies do not make a great rushing noise as they travel around the Earth, this shows that the motion of the heavens carries the stars along as a boat is carried in a stream instead of moving through them. For a detailed comparison of the relative cosmologies of Plato and Aristotle, see the introduction to James Wilberding, Plotinus’ Cosmology: A Study of Ennead II.1(40): Text, Translation, and Commentary (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006): 6-41.
Philoponus (490 – 570), writing in the sixth century, would push these points to argue for a complete identification of celestial and terrestrial regions against the Aristotelians’ claims for the eternity and changeless nature of the heavens.⁸

The idea that questions of the nature of the stars had a direct bearing on considerations regarding the eternity of the heavens or the distinction between terrestrial and celestial regions—as well as questions regarding the ensouled nature of these objects—is most clearly illustrated by the ways in which neo-Platonists such as Plotinus (205 – 270) and Proclus (412 – 485) went to great lengths to reconcile the divine Plato’s claim that the stars are fiery with the accepted view after Aristotle that the heavenly realms were not composed of earthly elements. For all the neo-Platonists though, the stars were still very much alive. Examining these neo-Platonic notions of the stars provides a link to stellar conceptions of the Renaissance.

In his *Enneads*, written in the third century and the work in which much of what would become the neo-Platonic school of thought was first outlined, Plotinus differentiates between the pure *celestial* fire of which the stars are composed and common *terrestrial* fire, and the way that this celestial fire imparts solidity and brilliance to certain regions of the heavens.⁹ Considerations of the stars’ lives, though, are never far behind: besides a detailed speculation on what the mind of a star must be like, Plotinus examines their blissful, changeless nature and their role in foretelling events on the Earth:

[W]e cannot think of them as grieving at all or as being cheerful upon occasions: they must be continuously serene, happy in the good they enjoy and the Vision before them. Each lives its own free life... Like the birds of augury, the living beings of the heavens, having no lot or part with us, may serve incidentally to foreshow the future.¹⁰

Clearly for Plotinus, the stars are alive, intelligent, conscious, and integral parts of the holism that characterizes neo-Platonic thought.¹¹

---


¹¹ This is poetically summarized by the conclusion of *Ennead* IV.4.8: “If the stars live a blessed life in their vision of the life inherent in their souls, and if... by the light they cast from themselves upon the entire heavens, they are like the strings of a lyre which, being struck in tune, sing a melody in some natural scale... if this is the way the heavens, as one, are moved, and the component parts in their relation to the whole—the sidereal system moving as one, and each part in its own way, to the same purpose, though each, too, hold its own place—then our doctrine is all the more surely established; the life of the heavenly bodies is the more clearly an unbroken unity.”
These considerations are extended and further codified by Proclus, writing two centuries later. Proclus’s extensive commentary on Plato’s *Timaeus* is generally acknowledged to be the culmination and most systematic exposition of neo-Platonic thought. In his work, Proclus continues discussion regarding the fiery character of the stars, like Plotinus differentiating between terrestrial *enmattered* fire and celestial *immaterial* fire. He also refutes the necessity of the aether by adding a property of “being easily moved” to that of fire. This property, he argues, means that once fire has obtained its natural place it is not unnatural for it to experience circular motion *in that place.*

It is in his discussion of the axial rotations of stars that Proclus returns to the question of their living nature. With Plato, he maintains that the stars are “divine animals” and that the “soul of the stars . . . is moved in a two-fold respect,” diurnal motion and axial rotation. For Proclus, this dual motion is in keeping with the position of the stars in the chain of being. The universe as a whole has a single diurnal motion, while objects on the Earth below have varied, multiple motions. The stars, stationed between the two, have a mixed motion befitting their position.

Neo-Platonic tradition, then, preserved conceptions of the physical nature of the stars that were very distinct from prevailing Aristotelian notions. Far from concentrations of *aether* embedded in the revolving heavens, stars were living, rotating objects. And while neo-Platonists had to labor to reconcile their elemental nature with the presumed distinction and eternity of the heavenly regions, they were nonetheless fiery objects. In the narrative of the history of astronomy, however, this distinct conception of the stars went more or less underground as the latter days of antiquity gave way to the Middle Ages. What stellar speculations we do find during this period are generally in an Aristotelian vein. Some early Christian Fathers, including Saint Basil and Saint John of Damascus, maintained that the celestial objects were not intelligent or animated, and various authors debated whether their motion should be understood as proceeding from conscious impetus, as derived from the Prime Mover, or as impelled by God or angels. While the heavens were still seen by many as alive and intelligent, the nature of the stars themselves became less defined. Indeed, as early as the seventh century, Isidore of Seville argued that the stars shined with reflected light from the sun, and Edward Grant in his comprehensive survey of medieval astronomy posits this as the most common belief regarding their nature during the Middle Ages.

---

15 Dales, “De-Animation of the Heavens,” 532-33. Aquinas discusses whether the celestial bodies are alive in the *Summa Theologica*, noting that Origen and Jerome believed them living beings while Augustine remained neutral. *Summa Theologica* I.70.3.
Yet neo-Platonic conceptions emerged again in the century preceding the work of Copernicus, Kepler, and Galileo. At the end of the fifteenth century, the Florentine humanist Marsilio Ficino (1433-1499) brought the work of Plato and the neo-Platonists into the Italian intellectual milieu with his translations and commentaries.\(^\text{17}\) In his own writings as well, Ficino reaffirmed the stars’ living, fiery nature. “Every star,” he writes in his commentary on the *Timaeus*, “through its rotation about its own center, imitates the action of its soul around its own mind.”\(^\text{18}\) Much has been made of possible neo-Platonic influences on Copernicus’s thought, and he is known to have read Ficino’s *De sole*, in which Ficino refers to the sun as the “greatest of stars” and the spiritual center of the universe.\(^\text{19}\) Regarding the stars themselves, though, Copernicus seems to have had a more Aristotelian conception; even though he made the sun the center of the universe, it resided at the center of a fixed shell of immensely distant stars.

Neo-Platonic influences regarding the nature of the stars are easier to see in the work of Kepler. In his work on the appearance of the new star in 1604, Kepler speculates on its elemental nature, claiming that its scintillation hints at the presence of water or fire. The star was definitely new, though, and in a departure from Proclus or Plotinus, Kepler’s speculations on its elemental origins included the assumption that objects in the heavens could be formed in the same manner as objects on the Earth.\(^\text{20}\) In addition, Kepler followed the neo-Platonists in making the sun the true source of life and force in the cosmos, specifically the center of force for the motion of the planets.

If the beginnings of modern astronomy are seen to have arisen with a healthy infusion of neo-Platonic concepts, how do we get to Beagle’s lifeless stars falling like stones through space? I have argued that Platonic ideas of living stars provided a distinct intellectual tradition from the *aetherial* bodies of Aristotle. But our modern conception of the stars came about largely through their identification with the sun: a universe filled with sun-like spheres of burning gas. This identity—unknown to Copernicus, unarticulated by Kepler, but famously expounded by Bruno—seems to have found its first systematic exposition in the work of Descartes in the mid-1600s. Yet it found fertile ground for acceptance in a blending of Platonic heritage and revived Epicurean speculations on an infinite universe. The Cambridge Platonist Henry More, for instance, in 1646, published an *Essay on the Infinity of Worlds out of Platonick Principles*, in which the identification of stars as suns is

---


\(^{20}\) Kepler sets out these views in his 1606 *De stella nova*, and they are discussed in Steven J. Dick, *Plurality of Worlds: The Origins of the Extraterrestrial Life Debate from Democritus to Kant* (Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 1982), 72-73. Dick also quotes a letter of Kepler in which the astronomer writes, “You think the stellar globes are pure and simple . . . they seem to me to be similar to our Earth. As a philosopher you quote a philosopher [likely Aristotle]: if he is asked, he will point to experience. but experience is silent, since no one has been there. . . . I myself argue the probability by analogy. . . . Therefore I attribute [elemental] humors to the stars.” Kepler to Brennger, November 30, 1607, *Gesammelte Werke*, XVI, 86, quoted in Dick, *Plurality of Worlds*, 73.
urged throughout. By the late 1600s, it was commonplace to refer to the stars as suns: the Platonic conception of the stars had won out. They were indeed spherical, rotating, and fiery, but in a brave, new Newtonian universe they could not be said to be alive.

Much remains to be explored in the continuing transition from a Platonic to a Newtonian cosmos, but I conclude here with a restatement of my main point: that there persisted throughout antiquity to resurface in the late Renaissance a conception of the stars quite distinct from that of Aristotle. A complete narrative of the story of the stars—how they have been perceived throughout history and reflected in art and literature—and how these conceptions influenced the shaping of modern astronomy, must be a narrative that takes these “divine animals” into account.

Stephen Case is in the PhD program in the department of History and Philosophy of Science at the University of Notre Dame. Christopher V’an Den Berge, a PhD candidate in the department of History at the University of Illinois at Chicago, edited this paper.

21 Dick, Plurality of Worlds, 50-3.
Kissing Cousins: Incest and Sex Change in Tristan de Nanteuil

By Karen Adams

How can a Saracen woman become a Christian man? The anonymous author of the late chanson de geste Tristan de Nanteuil depicts just such an imaginary situation through the character Blanchandin(e), who begins as a young Saracen princess and ends as Blanchandin, a Christian man. In this text, Blanchandine's sex change does not simply alter gender and sexual identity, but is closely intertwined with religious and family identity. Tristan de Nanteuil and the cycle of poems to which it belongs place great importance on a genealogical narrative and the idea of an identity based on family, and each successive generation is featured in installments of the geste de Nanteuil. The expansive plot of Tristan de Nanteuil (over 23,000 lines of verse) details the family's trials and tribulations and manages to cover the adventures of four generations living at the time of Charlemagne. Family members constantly disperse, reunite, and disperse again, all the while fighting Saracens, with whom they sometimes intermarrry as well.

Given that the text depicts two instances of cross dressing and one miraculous female-to-male sex change (Tristan's grandmother, Aye d'Avignon, also cross dresses), Tristan de Nanteuil has particularly interested scholars of French and gender studies since the 1980s. While numerous scholars have interrogated the text's representation of sex, gender, and same-sex desire, few have studied the sections of the narrative that depict cross dressing and sex change in relation to the themes that populate the text as a whole, and the further plot developments that follow after the sex change. In this paper I re-examine Blanchandine’s sex change in light of its relation to the issue of

---

1 The name and gender of the author are unknown, but I will refer to the author as “he” simply because the majority of medieval authors were men.
2 The other chansons are Doon de Nanteuil, Aye d’Avignon, Gui de Nanteuil, and Parise la Duchesse, which were composed much earlier than Tristan de Nanteuil, between the late twelfth and the thirteenth century. Tristan de Nanteuil has been dated to the mid-fourteenth century by Keith Sinclair.
incest; as I will show, incest is directly related to the sex change and also punctuates the narrative at other points. *Tristan de Nanteuil* depicts two sexual and/or romantic relationships between cousins: Blanchandine/Blanchandin marries her first cousin once removed, Clarinde, when she is still female but cross dressing as a man. After their marriage, Blanchandine miraculously becomes male through God’s intervention. The second couple is Tristan and Clarisse, first cousins who had never before met and who have sex before realizing they are related. In both cases a child is born of the couple—Blanchandin and Clarinde’s son is Gilles, who goes on to become a saint, and Tristan and Clarisse’s son is Garçion, who is raised by a pagan stepfather and unknowingly wages war on his Christian biological family. Here I primarily focus on Blanchandine and Clarinde’s relationship, which undergoes many changes from beginning to end. Although they start out as two female, Saracen cousins, they end as one male and one female, both Christian, and seemingly no longer related to each other.  

All references to their family relationship, which was previously emphasized by the author, are simply dropped from the text by the time the sex change occurs. The effacement of their blood tie thus ensures that their relationship is not considered incestuous and further legitimizes it. However, the trajectory of Blanchandin and Clarinde’s son Gilles indicates that the notion of incest has not completely disappeared from their family unit. Gilles becomes a saint who, like the Saint Giles of hagiography, confesses and absolves those guilty of the sin of incest; in this way his sanctity reveals yet simultaneously absolves any incest that may have been present in this couple.

As Elizabeth Archibald explains in *Incest and the Medieval Imagination*, according to canon law from the tenth through the twelfth century, marriage and intercourse were banned between people related by blood or by affinity (that is, relationships created by marriage) up to the seventh degree. After the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, the restriction was reduced to a ban up to the fourth degree. In this schema, first cousins are considered related to each other in the second degree, and first cousins once removed are related in the third degree. The ban to the seventh degree, extending to very distant cousins, was quite difficult to enforce, and reducing it to the fourth degree made the prohibition more reasonable. Nonetheless, the idea that second cousins or first cousins once removed might inadvertently marry each other or simply ignore the law seems to be a more plausible literary depiction of the problem of consanguineous marriage in the Middle Ages than the sensational stories of incest between parents and children and brothers and sisters that populate other medieval texts. In the anonymous author’s universe, either of these relationships between cousins would have been considered incestuous and an impediment to marriage on a legal level. While Tristan and Clarisse’s relationship produces consternation and the punishment of their child,

---

4 In medieval French literature the word “Saracen” (*Sarrasin/Sarrasine*) is a generic term for Muslims and is usually interchangeable with “pagan.”


7 See Archibald, *Incest*; for example, Judas, who killed his father and married his mother, and St. Gregorius, the child of a brother and sister, who then married his mother.
Blanchandin and Clarinde’s takes a different route, attenuated by the presence of their saintly child, but also complicated by their brief same-sex marriage. In this paper, I show that although Blanchandin and Clarinde’s relationship is depicted in conflicting and ambiguous ways, it is clear that the author believed it was important to eliminate their blood relationship, and that he believed it was possible for this blood tie to be eliminated through Blanchandine’s sex change.

The story of the sex change does not actually occur until about line 16,000 in the poem, but the narrator prefigures this event throughout the text, emphasizing that it is exclusively ordained for the purpose of engendering Saint Gilles. Already in line 375, we are introduced to Blanchandine by way of the appearance of the sultan, one of the main Saracen enemies of Tristan and his family. The narrator informs us that the sultaness had a daughter, Clarinde, whom

Jesus held most dear. From her was born Saint Gilles who was in Provence, he was engendered by a king whom Jesus wanted to change into a man, because she was a woman before. She was the good wife of Tristan le Sauvage, she used to be Blanchandine of Arménie, but by a great miracle God wanted to shape her into a man to glorify his name, and he [Blanchandin] engendered Saint Gilles when he married Clarinde, who was baptized in the holy waters and along with 60,000 others.⁸

The reader thus learns from the beginning of the poem that the sex change is divinely sanctioned, and that conversion to Christianity will be necessary for Saint Gilles to be produced: both of his parents were born Saracens, but for an unexplained reason, Jesus has chosen these two women to eventually become his parents. What this quote does not reveal is that Blanchandine and her future wife Clarinde are cousins, and that in fact mentioning Blanchandine at this point in the narrative is relevant for two reasons: she is Clarinde’s future husband, but she is also already related to her by blood—Blanchandine is the sultan’s first cousin.

To briefly summarize the events preceding the cross-dressing episode, the plot pits the Christian Nanteuil family against the Saracens: Blanchandine’s father Galaffre, his nephew the sultan, and Murgaffier, another pagan king. In the first few laisses, the infant Tristan is separated from his parents, Gui and Aiglentine, and spends the first sixteen years of his life in the woods being cared for by a giant, magical doe; this doe is also responsible for vicious attacks on Saracens. Although

⁸ All translations are my own unless otherwise noted and are translated from the Old French text edited in Tristan de Nanteuil: chanson de geste inédite, ed. Keith Sinclair (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1971).

La dame ot une fille que Jhesus ot plus cher,
De luy yssy saint Gille qui en Prouvencë yert,
Sy l'engendra ung roy que Jhesus voult changer
En figure d'un home, car devant femmë yert;
A Tristan le Sauvaige fut sa bonne mouller,
Celle fut Blanchandine d'Ermenie arrier,
Mais par grande miracle la voult Dieu figurer
En figure d'un home pour son non essaucer,
Et engendra saint Gille quant il voult noçoier
Clarinde qui se fit es sains fons baptisier,
Et avecques lui bien lx millier. (375-386)
angels educate him until the age of seven, he is referred to as “Tristan le Sauvage” throughout this section because he is unaware of his family origins, and has no notion of appropriate behavior in society. (In fact, he doesn’t even know his name is Tristan, and just refers to himself as “Sauvage.”) When he reaches puberty, he kidnaps the Saracen princess Blanchandine while she is on her way to be married to another man. He rapes her in his woodland lair and they conceive their son Raimon; however, as the narrator explains, Blanchandine falls in love with Tristan nonetheless and their relationship continues as one of mutual love. In this scene, the author employs another preview to remind the reader of the impending sex change. This time, he also mentions that Blanchandine will later marry her cousin:

By this union love developed there to such an extent that the lady never again loved anyone but Tristan, and never fornicated with another man, nor did any other man fornicate with her, as we well know, because Jesus changed her into the wonderful shape of a man, true and noble, and he consequently engendered Saint Gilles of Provence in Morinde the Blonde; and she was her first cousin, as we know, but she [Blanchandine] took her as a wife as Jesus desired, and she [Morinde] was baptized and took the name Clarinde.9

Although initially the couple in question is Tristan and the Saracen princess Blanchandine, the author quickly switches to a description of Blanchandine’s second iteration as a Christian man, and his/her wife Morinde, whose name will change to Clarinde. (Even though it is indicated that she will be baptized Clarinde, she is actually called Clarinde starting with the cross-dressing episode, well before she is baptized.) The author may have meant to praise Blanchandine’s virtue, but ironically this statement appears to indicate that Blanchandine did not fornicate with another man less because of her virtue than because she became a man herself. The description emphasizes that this change is clearly a move upward for Blanchandine, from a (Saracen) woman to a true and noble (Christian) man, who was then capable of engendering a saint. However, after this description of Blanchandine’s future manhood, the author switches back to the feminine pronoun to describe her marriage to her cousin: “She [Morinde] was her first cousin, as we know, but she [Blanchandine] took her as a wife as Jesus desired, and she [Morinde] was baptized and took the name Clarinde.”10

---

9 La se nourrit amour par tel conjonctïon
Conques puis la danzelle n’ama se Tristan non,
N’onceques a homë autre n’ot fornicacïon,
Në home nul a lui, que moult bien le scet on,
Car Jhesus le mua en tres belle façon
D’omme vray et nobille, s’engendra par raison
Saint Gille de Prouvence en Morinde au crin blon;
Et s’estoit sa cousine germaine, se scet on,
Mais elle l’ot a femme au vouloir de Jhesum,
Et se fut baptisee et Clarinde ot a non. (4552-4561)

10 It is not entirely clear in the Old French to whom each “elle” refers, but I read the second “elle” in “elle l’ot a femme” as referring to Blanchandine. Although both parties were female at the time of marriage, the author later refers to Clarinde as the wife (femme) and Blanchandin(e) as the husband. Therefore this clearly refers to Blanchandine taking Clarinde as a wife, and not vice versa.
With the “but,” the author seems to acknowledge that the marriage of two female cousins would be considered wrong in some way, and he tempers it by adding that Jesus desired this marriage despite the evident impediments. Although the issue of their blood tie will be resolved by the sex change, I will show further in this paper that for the narrator, the brief same-sex marriage remains problematic.

After living together happily for a year, Tristan and Blanchandine are separated when Galaffre’s men attack their woodland home. They also lose sight of their son, who ends up being raised unbeknownst to them by his grandmother Aiglentine. After various other plot twists, Tristan and Blanchandine are finally reunited at the sultan’s court. (Although it is not clear exactly how much time has passed, there are about 6,000 lines between the initial separation and reunion, and during this time Tristan meets his cousin Clarisse and Garçion is conceived.) Tristan and his half brother Doon have managed to infiltrate the sultan’s court and are serving him, without letting him know their true identities as members of the Nanteuil family. Although Blanchandine has just converted to Christianity and finally married Tristan, this is the beginning of the end of their relationship. Since they are at the sultan’s court, Blanchandine particularly fears that her cousins, the sultan and his daughter Clarinde, will recognize her and she will be punished for marrying a Christian. At Tristan’s suggestion, therefore, Blanchandine puts on men’s clothes and calls herself Blanchandin. Although this disguise may sound ineffective, she succeeds in fooling her relatives all too well: when Clarinde sees “Blanchandin” one night at a feast, she immediately falls in love with him, and she has no idea that this knight is in fact her female cousin. Even though this misunderstanding is necessary for the cross-dressing plotline to advance, Clarinde’s ignorance is perhaps more striking when one considers that Blanchandine put on male dress specifically because she says that Clarinde knows her very well and is bound to recognize her: “‘Alas,’ said Blanchandine, ‘that would be madness, [going into the sultan’s tents]; my father is the uncle of the savage sultan of Babylon, as you know, Clarinde knows me better than any mortal man, and so does her faithless father the sultan.’”

There is no doubt, then, that the narrator wishes to draw attention to the fact that the two women are related, and that, by all accounts, Clarinde should recognize her cousin. As the cross-dressing plot continues, however, it becomes evident that their relationship is slowly being erased by Blanchandin’s change in gender identity. This distinction begins to appear in the first scene where Clarinde sees Blanchandin at the feast: “The sultan’s daughter Clarinde was looking tenderly above all the other knights at the beautiful Blanchandine, who was her cousin, the first cousin of her father the king, but she didn’t recognize her. Rather, she thought he was a good knight.”

---

11 “Helas!” dist Blanchandine, “se seroit folletès:
Soudant de Babilone qui tant est desraés,
Mon perë en est oncles, ainsy que vous savés;
Bien me congnoist Clarinde mieulx que nulz homs mortelz
Et le soudant son pere qui tant est defaés.” (12751-12755)

12 La fille du soudant que Clarinde on nommait
Sur tous les chevaliers tengrement regardoit
Blanchandine la belle qui sa cousine estoit
Germaine au roy son pere, mais ne la congnoissoit,
this quote establishes that Blanchandin(e) is now to be viewed as one knight among a group of knights. Simultaneously, however, she is still Blanchandine, Clarinde’s cousin. In the next line we see an opposition: “mais ne la congoissoit” (but she didn’t recognize her); “ainçois pour chevalier moulte bien el le tenoit” (rather, she thought he was a good knight). I read this scene as distinguishing between the female cousin, Blanchandine, and Blanchandin, a male knight who is not a cousin.

Indeed, Blanchandin has already gone through a number of transformative steps: Blanchandine recently converted to Christianity, which already separates her from her Saracen cousin. Moving on then to the new male persona of Blanchandin, he becomes a Christian knight with an imaginary past—it must be emphasized that the cross-dressed persona “Blanchandin” is not simply the masculine version of Blanchandine, but that a successful disguise depends on the effacement of Blanchandine’s entire history and connection to her Saracen family, and the creation of a new identity. The very fact that the disguise succeeds so well, at least when it comes to Clarinde, implies that the change in religion, the change in gender identity, and even the (so far) imaginary change in family history, all combine to create a disguise that is more complete than “simply” cross dressing.

The fact that Clarinde fails to recognize her cousin begins to appear an increasingly strange oversight after they are married, as Blanchandine approaches the sex change. Blanchandin and Clarinde see each other frequently throughout this courtship, Clarinde often calling Blanchandin to her tent for a tête-à-tête, much to Blanchandine’s dismay. When Clarinde’s father the sultan dies in battle, she is not very upset, because this means that she is now free to choose her own husband, and at this point Blanchandin can no longer delay and she submits to the marriage. Blanchandine avoids sexual contact the first few nights of their marriage by sleeping on her stomach, which angers and insults Clarinde, but Clarinde does not yet express any doubts about her husband’s sex. At this point, the narrator inserts a new character to provoke the “bath scene” and thus the turning point of the sex change. (A scene in which a public bath is proposed in order to find out whether a character is really male also occurs in Yde et Olive, another medieval text that portrays a woman cross dressing and undergoing a sex change.) A messenger from Blanchandine’s brother (a brother who was never before mentioned in the narrative) appears at court and recognizes Blanchandin despite her disguise. He tips off Clarinde, telling her that her husband is a woman, but without mentioning who Blanchandine really is or how he knows her. Clarinde does not confront Blanchandin, but decides to ask him to bathe in order to see if he is really male. The insertion of the characters of the brother and the messenger, since they appear nowhere else, is evidently purely to provoke the bath scene, and therefore it is necessary to the plot that the messenger recognize Blanchandin. While clearly the narrator is manipulating the plot to his convenience, the stark difference between the messenger’s easy recognition of Blanchandin and Clarinde’s ignorance is striking. The messenger only has to look at her once: “And when the messenger saw the queen, although she had changed, he recognized her easily”; he looks a second time to make sure: “Then he looked at her again, and the

Ainçois pour chevalier moulte bien el le tenoit. (12939-12943)
more he looked at her the more he recognized her.”13 On the contrary, even after Clarinde receives this information and begins to suspect that Blanchandin is not male, her speculations do not extend beyond, “is my husband a woman or a man?”—she does not ask “who is she or he?” So while the messenger’s easy recognition of Blanchandine serves the plot, it also makes clearer that Clarinde’s ignorance is unusual or extreme in its extent. If others have an easy time recognizing Blanchandine, Clarinde’s ignorance is nonetheless “correct” in some sense, since within the logic of the narrative, her belief about Blanchandin shapes his identity. She believes he is a Christian knight that she did not previously know, and that belief makes it impossible for her to recognize her cousin.

After Clarinde has had the bath drawn and Blanchandine, resigned, is about to undress, a wild stag runs into the palace and begins attacking Saracens. The stag then runs out of the palace and Blanchandine runs after it, taking this opportunity to avoid the bath. Blanchandine is led into the woods, where she is greeted by an angel who offers her the choice to remain female or become male.14 Since Blanchandine believes at this point that Tristan is dead (he had left for a battle shortly before and had not returned), she chooses to become male in order to more easily avenge his death (through physical power). After hearing this, but before effecting the actual sex change, the angel tells Blanchandine that God wants her/him to return to her/his wife, who will have found someone to baptize her, and to “sleep with her as much as you like, because the first night that you lie with her, you will be able to engender an heir.”15 Then the sex change occurs, which is described as follows: “New flesh came to him, she changed into another and became a real man, for God sent to her everything of a manly nature which she needs to be a man and he granted her everything, but did not change her appearance which she had before.”16 Although Blanchandine is changed into an “aultre,” it is specified that God did not change her appearance, implying that other than the genitals, nothing else had changed physically.17

Directly following the sex change, the new Blanchandin meets Doon in the woods; this playful scene reveals further what effect the sex change has had on Blanchandin’s connections to his past as Blanchandine. The fact that his outer appearance has not changed is confirmed when Doon,

13 “Et quant le messager la roÿne advisa/Quoy qu’elle feust changee, bien recongneue l’a” (15589-15590); “Adone le regarda,/Et con plus la regarde et plus la ravisa” (15618-15619).
14 Paula Leverage points out that the deer is associated with the sacrament of baptism and with the personhood of Christ in Christian iconography and Biblical exegesis, and that this scene in combination with the bath scene demonstrate that Blanchandine’s sex change can be seen as a second baptism. Paula Leverage, “Sex and the Sacraments in Tristan de Nanteuil,” in Sexuality in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times, ed. Albrecht Classen (New York: De Gruyter, 2008), 523.
15 “Et se couches o lui tant quë il te plaira,/Car la premiere nuyt que ton corps y gerra,/Y pourras engendrer ung hoir . . .” (16187-16189).
16 Translation by Paula Leverage, “Sex and the Sacraments,” 518. “Nouvelle char lui vint, en aultre se mua/Et devvint ung vrais homs, car Dieu lui envoyva/Toute nature de home tant que besoing en a/En manière d’un home et tout lui ottroya,/Mais onques son semblant qu’ot devant ne changa” (16196-16200).
17 “Mais onques son semblant qu’ot devant ne changa” (16200). There is one odd contradiction to this statement – when Doon first sees Blanchandin post-sex change he recognizes him as Blanchandine but is apparently confused by the appearance of his chest, which the narrator says appears different to him in some way. This would imply that his chest had flattened, since Doon thinks he is seeing a woman and finds something different about her. This is odd considering that Blanchandine was presumably either flat-chested or had bound her breasts as part of her disguise; therefore the appearance of her/his chest post-sex change should not have been significantly different.
believing that he has found Blanchandine, calls out to her as “dame.” Blanchandin, however, takes his new role so seriously that he does not even acknowledge Doon’s presence or being hailed as a lady, and continues walking. When Doon persists, Blanchandin informs him that he is mistaken and shows him his genitals to prove it. Interestingly, at this point Doon believes that he has indeed made a mistake and apologizes to the “stranger.” Blanchandin decides to play along for a moment and makes Doon believe that he is indeed someone else entirely, saying that he has killed the stag and that he is on his way to bring its head to “good king Blanchandin.” Doon then asks the stranger whether he has seen this Blanchandin anywhere in the woods. Blanchandin finally drops the charade and berates Doon, saying, “You’re talking nonsense; you have already seen Blanchandin many times, now I marvel that you do not recognize him.”18 When Doon still doesn’t catch on, Blanchandin explains, “my name was Blanchandine, you know well, I was the daughter of the powerful king Galaffre who lost his life. I was the wife and lover of Tristan le Sauvage. Now be certain, friend, that I have changed, and become a man, do not doubt it, by the will of God the son of holy Mary.”19

Blanchandin himself appears to believe that by becoming a man, his connections to his previous family life have effectively ended. This is especially evident when, first, he ignores Doon as if he had never known him, and, second, when he uses the past tense to describe his former ties of blood and affinity to Galaffre and Tristan. However, it is also evident that Blanchandin is playing a joke on Doon, and that, although at first he plays the role of a spontaneously created male stranger, he does expect Doon to eventually understand that he in fact knew him as Blanchandine, and that some semblance of that former identity remains. He also evokes the pre-sex change but post cross-dressed Blanchandin by saying, “you have already seen Blanchandin many times.” Thus, Blanchandin delineates a clear separation between his new male identity and his former female one, while at the same time he acknowledges that the cross-dressed Blanchandin already approximated the “real” Blanchandin—he was only missing male genitals. Comparing Doon’s recognition of Blanchandin(e) to Clarinde’s lack thereof, we see that in Doon’s case the presence of male genitals that are not “supposed” to be there actually confuses him to the point that he doubts his recognition of Blanchandine, which was clear to him a minute before. However, because of their close friendly tie previous to the sex change, and Doon’s knowledge of Blanchandine’s history, they are able to overcome this obstacle and arrive at a common understanding of who Blanchandin now is. To Doon, Aiglentine, and as we will see, to Tristan, Blanchandin retains the history of Blanchandine, despite having become an “aultre.” For Clarinde, however, her husband’s history is not even a question; only his maleness matters.

18 “Vous dites diablerie;/Ja avés vous veü Blanchandin mainte ffie,/Or me vois merveillant que nel congnoissés mye” (16254-16256).
19 Blanchandine eus a non, sachés, par mainte fye,
Fille au fort roy Galaffre qui a perdu la vie.
A Tristan le Sauvage feus espeuse et amye.
Or soyés bien certains, amis, que suis changie,
Et devenus uns homs, nel tenés a faillie,
Par le vouloir de Dieu le filz sainte Marie. (16259-16264)
When Blanchandin returns to the court after the sex change, everything occurs as the angel had said it would. He undresses and takes a bath in front of his wife as well as many other young women of the court. Clarinde, satisfied with this turn of events, also happens to find a priest who can baptize her that day. Now that Blanchandin has become male and Clarinde has become Christian, their sexual relationship becomes possible and Blanchandin engenders Gilles that night. However, the sex change and the consummation of the marriage do not lead to a life of pure happiness for Blanchandin and Clarinde. In fact, with the arrival of Tristan back on the scene, things become more complicated.

Shortly after the marriage, Tristan, who of course is not in fact dead, returns to the palace in Arménie and sees Blanchandin. Because the last time he saw her she was dressed in men’s clothes, and because his outward appearance has not changed, Tristan does not realize that anything is amiss, and runs to Blanchandin’s arms. Blanchandin is embarrassed and must explain to Tristan that they can no longer be lovers because he is now a man. Tristan believes this all a joke at first, but as the realization dawns on him, he becomes very angry—not at Blanchandin, but at Clarinde. He perceives the sex change, and thus his loss of Blanchandine, as being entirely Clarinde’s fault, and begins insulting her and brandishes a sword at her. Clarinde, meanwhile, has just found out about the sex change only by overhearing Blanchandin speak to Tristan. Her reaction is very mild; she explains to Tristan, in order to appease him, that it was not her fault and that Blanchandin had tricked her:

But may God save and protect me if I ever knew anything about what I heard you talk about, by faith. He really knew how to hide it from me. But the first night that he came to rest with me, the fact that he didn’t kiss or embrace me made me think about his condition much of the night; but because I saw him enter that tub, and I was able to see that he was a real man, that’s what kept me quiet, it’s easy to prove. 

Clarinde, therefore, is clearly focused on her husband’s maleness, and that is all that interests her. Significantly, she never speculates at all, even after hearing that her husband used to be female, on the actual identity of the person whom she just married. It does not lead her to question Blanchandin further or to ask him about his history. There is certainly never a moment in the narration at this point or afterwards in which either Blanchandin or Clarinde acknowledge that they were cousins or that they even knew each other at all, prior to the cross-dressing incident. At the same time, in Blanchandin’s post sex-change interactions with Tristan, Doon, and Aiglentine, there

---

20 Mais sy me veulle Dieu secourir et tensser,
Oncques mes de tout ce que je vous oy parler,
Je ne sceus riens, par foy. Bien le m’a seu celler.
Mais la premiere nuyt qu’o moy vint reposer,
Pourant qu’i ne me vint baiser né acoller,
Me fist moult l’anuytee a son estat penser;
Mais pourtant que le vi en celle cuve entrer,
Et que le pos droit home congoistre et adviser,
C’est ce qui m’a fait taire, c’est leger a prouver. (17605-17613)
is an explicit acknowledgment of their past history and connection to one another—now irrevocably changed, but that history exists nonetheless. For the purpose of his marriage and in regard to his relations with his Saracen family, Blanchandin is clearly a new person who no longer has those ties. Indeed, Clarinde and the subjects of Arménie have changed as well. Upon Clarinde’s baptism, all her subjects converted, and her father the sultan had died even before her marriage. In some sense, there is no Saracen left to whom Blanchandin and Clarinde could be related. So although Blanchandin still acknowledges that he knew Tristan and other members of the Nanteuil family, all other signs indicate that the combination of religious conversion and sex change has effectively ended all blood ties with Saracens.

In order to contextualize the issue of incest in the text as a whole, I will now briefly examine the other couple of incestuous cousins in the poem, Tristan and Clarisse. During the period in which Tristan and Blanchandine are separated (after their year together but before their reunion and marriage), Tristan finds out that he is a member of the Nanteuil family and decides to go back to his home city. There, he meets Clarisse, who is about to be married to Persant, a man who has been appointed by Charlemagne to administer the city in the absence of its rightful lords. The night before her marriage to Persant, Clarisse falls in love with Tristan and creates a ruse to get him into her bedroom, and Tristan obliges. When they wake up together in the morning and Clarisse decides to ask the name of the man she just slept with, they are horrified to discover that their mothers are sisters, and they immediately put an end to their sexual relationship. In this case, their relationship is clearly labeled as sinful because of their close blood tie. Clarisse exclaims upon hearing Tristan’s name and history, “Young man, I am forsaken, because your mother Aiglentine is my aunt. You have violated your first cousin today.” Tristan responds by acknowledging that “the sin is great” and asking for Jesus’s forgiveness. Clarisse goes on to marry a pagan man two months later and manages to convince him that the child is his. Garçion is therefore raised pagan and has no idea until the very end of the poem that Tristan is his biological father.

In opposition to the pagan Garçion, Blanchandin and Clarinde’s child Gilles goes on to become a saint. This fictional Saint Gilles corresponds in many ways to the hagiographical Saint Giles. In both the tenth-century Life and in Tristan de Nanteuil, Gilles is associated with Charlemagne’s sin of incest, that is, the story that circulated in the Middle Ages that he had sex with his sister and that Roland was the product of this union. In Tristan de Nanteuil, when Gilles reaches adulthood he retreats to the woods to live as a hermit, and his reputation as a holy man brings Charlemagne to him. It is through Gilles’s intervention that Charlemagne finally confesses this sin and is granted absolution; Gilles later also hears Clarisse’s confession about her incest with Tristan. Gilles’s itinerary seems to indicate that his ability to redeem others from incest is somehow built into his genes. While Blanchandin and Clarinde are not directly perceived as having committed incest because of the sex change, Gilles’s particular saintly association with incest makes it appear that he has inherited that sin in a different, positive way, allowing him to intervene on behalf of others.

21 “Et dist: ‘Damoiseaulx, je suis moult esgaree,/Car vo mere Aiglentine est mon ante clamee./Vo cousine germaine avés huy violee’” (10324-10326).
Gilles’ redemptory powers extend even to his relationship with Garçion. At the end of the poem, there is a final battle between the pagans (led by Garçion and his family) and the Christians (led by Tristan and his sons Raimon and Beuves, his third son, by another wife). Garçion mortally wounds Tristan, who then reveals that he is his father and exhorts him to take vengeance on those who killed his grandfather and great-grandparents. After this incident, it is Gilles who baptizes Garçion and gives him the new Christian name Grevesson. This name is chosen because one of their pagan enemies had been told by an oracle that he could only be killed by a man named Grevesson. In this way, Gilles also redeems Garçion/Grevesson from his parents’ incest and allows him to fully enter the family by becoming Christian and carrying out the vengeance that his father expects of him.

Although Gilles “inherits” an association with incest from his parents, it is nonetheless clear that Blanchandin and Clarinde’s relationship is treated completely differently from that of Tristan and Clarisse, in that they personally escape opprobrium for incest though the sex change. Blanchandin and Clarinde are punished for another reason, however, linked to their same-sex marriage. We have seen that the overall sentiment of the narrator towards the sex change is very positive, because it produced Saint Gilles. While the sex change itself generally meets approval, the brief period in which Clarinde pursues Blanchandin does seem to create anxiety for the narrator. Throughout the cross-dressing episode, a few male characters make jokes about the inappropriateness of a sexual relationship between women; for example, one of Tristan’s uncles says that he would rather have Clarinde for himself, because “a hen doesn’t get much from a hen.” The narrator also makes one very clear statement that a woman marrying another woman is wrong. In a scene shortly after Clarinde falls in love with the disguised Blanchandin, she has just declared that she is devoted to him, that she is ready to be baptized, and that she will soon have him as a husband. The narrator then comments: “Know that the queen said nothing but the truth, because such a thing did happen shortly afterwards; it occurred by force, beyond right and reason, that she had Blanchandine of whom I make mention, and she married the beautiful lady according to Mohammed’s law, and lay with her in her tent, from which great perdition befell her afterward.”

This statement is anomalous in the text and does not seem to fit with the overall judgment that the narrator makes about this relationship, but it is revealing that the author felt it necessary to say this, perhaps to protect himself from any criticism. According to this statement, then, only Clarinde in particular was punished, presumably since she was the one who desired and pursued Blanchardin(e). Since they married under “Mohammed’s law,” their marriage was illegitimate in more than one way, but it is unclear whether the fact that the marriage was not Christian renders

---

22 “Maisement est aidee poule de la geline” (13391).
23 Sachés que la roỳne ne disoit se voir non,
   Car il advint tel chose a bien brefve saison
   Que par force convint outtre droit et raison
   Qu’elle eüst Blanchandine dont je fais mencïon,
   Et espousa la belle a la loy de Mahon,
   Et geust avecques lui dedens son pavillon,
   De quoy il lui advint puis grant perdicïon. (13055-13061)
Clarinde more or less guilty. The direct punishment seems to come from the fact that she lay with another woman, even though, as we have seen, there was no sexual contact between them at that time. Supposedly this perdition only befalls Clarinde, but the events that follow show that their whole family is affected. As we saw in the above scene when Tristan returns, Clarinde tries to excuse herself to Tristan regarding the sex change; she then does something rather unexpected. In order to make up for the loss of his wife, Clarinde offers to give Tristan their land. She gives up Babylone and Arménie to him, and says that from now on, in order for them to have any kingdom at all, her husband will have to conquer it by his own power. Blanchandin agrees to this and the next day, Blanchandin and Clarinde head towards Greece, which Blanchandin indeed conquers and converts, and where Clarinde gives birth to Gilles. However, a few months after Gilles’ birth, a traitor turns against Blanchandin and sets his palace on fire. In the ensuing confusion, Blanchandin’s left arm is cut off and he is separated from Clarinde and Gilles. Clarinde will die before seeing Blanchandin again, and Gilles and Blanchandin are only reunited at the very end of the poem when Gilles uses his saintly powers to reattach his father’s severed arm.

Although Blanchandin’s sex is not overtly questioned by anyone after the sex change, it seems that his masculinity is called into question by the nature of these many troubles. Blanchandin and Clarinde may escape punishment for incest, but Clarinde’s lust for a cross-dressed woman, which Tristan in his anger refers to as “ribaudie,” or debauchery, ends up plaguing them nonetheless. One then wonders why Blanchandin has to suffer, since the sex change and the child with Clarinde were clearly God’s will. It seems that all of this was designed simply to create Saint Gilles; when his mother tells him the miraculous story of his father’s sex change, Gilles is amazed at this miracle and it inspires him even more to devote himself to God.

As the dying Clarinde reveals this story to her now fifteen-year-old son, who has never met his father, we are reminded of that previous moment when Clarinde found out that Blanchandin had had a sex change. While at that time she seemed to be completely ignorant of her husband’s origins, when explaining this story to her son, Clarinde has knowledge of some of Blanchandin(e)’s history. She explains that when Blanchandin was a woman, she was married to Tristan and had a son Raimon with him, whom she characterizes as Gilles’s brother. (They share the same father/mother.) This inspires Gilles to find Raimon and creates a clear link between him and the Nanteuil family. Clarinde’s knowledge about Blanchandine prior to that relationship with Tristan, when she was a Saracen princess and her cousin, however, still remains obscured and apparently unknown to her, as she makes no mention of it.

There seem therefore to be two different versions of Blanchandin(e): one whose history is whole and includes her beginnings as a Saracen princess all the way up to his new male identity, first as King Blanchandin of Greece and then as a wandering beggar after his downfall; this version is

24 There is no indication, however, that a second Christian marriage is performed after Clarinde is baptized.
25 “Le miracle son pere le va enluminant/Tellement qu’a Jhesus, le pere tout poissant,/Mist entente et courage et tout son essient” (19768-19770).
available to the privileged reader of the text. The other extreme is Clarinde’s vision of Blanchandin: he is at first new acquaintance, a handsome knight whom she has never met before, and no number of clues can ever convince her that this man used to be her female cousin. Interestingly, Tristan also shares the privileged view of the reader: he knew Blanchandine as the Saracen princess he kidnapped, as his Christian wife, and also as a friend after the sex change. In fact, the two of them are quickly separated from their wives (Tristan having almost immediately obtained a new one) and spend fifteen years looking for each other and another ten together before finally finding Gilles so that Blanchandin can have his arm reattached.

In these two scenarios, the question of Blanchandin(e)’s blood relations is never addressed directly, but as I have shown, the author implies that Blanchandin(e) is no longer related to his/her cousin or other Saracen relatives, a process which began with her conversion and was completed by the sex change. Tristan has a privileged view of Blanchandin(e), and is able to compute all the changes that she and then he experiences. However, it is Clarinde’s beliefs that Blanchandin is a man, is male, and is not related to her that eventually become the “truth” about Blanchandin’s identity. Although the representation of sex and gender in the narrative is nuanced, overall in the text Blanchandin(e) is considered to have the sex that corresponds to his or her biological (genital) sex before or after the sex change. That is, in my estimation the text represents Blanchandin(e) as either female, as a cross-dressed female, or as male. As a female, she is Saracen by blood; as a cross-dressed female, this link begins to be erased; and as a Christian male, he has created new blood ties with his now Christian wife and his saintly son. The “truth” of sex in this text is also linked to the notion of family and blood relations, and sex change works along with religious conversion to create a new family identity; those elements taken together constitute the whole “truth” about Blanchandin(e).
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Kissing Cousins: Incest and Sex Change in Tristan de Nanteuil
Martial Maternity and a Trajectory Out-of-Joint

Much has been made of the bloodthirsty, war-mongering mothers in Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus* and *Titus Andronicus*. Similarly, Queen Elizabeth I, as both monarch and literary subject, has been represented (and represented herself) as a ruthless warrior and a devoted mother. Though many scholars have taken up this dual mode of representation (i.e., the martial mother, or warrior woman in a broader idiom), most considerations of martial maternity—or women’s political power in the Renaissance in general—focus on the degree to which female characters subvert or comply with patriarchal structures.\(^1\) Though illuminating, this approach nevertheless yields to these structures, privileging the discourse of male political superiority. The present argument rejects the model of reading women against men and patriarchal power and explores instead the diverse political potential of motherhood in three different senses. To this end, I read Volumnia, Tamora, and Elizabeth I together as related but distinct modes of martial motherhood that constitute a revealing trajectory of intertextuality in the rhetoric they employ. Volumnia’s particular iteration of martial motherhood derives its authority from her womb as the site of warrior-production. Tamora also embraces motherhood as a means to political power, using the sons she has produced in a similar fashion to secure political advantages. Where Tamora’s articulation of martial maternity differs from Volumnia’s is in her abstraction of motherhood, cutting its explicit ties to the womb and imposing it on non-maternal relationships. This move relocates motherhood and its consequent political potential from the physical womb to the realm of rhetoric. Finally, the trajectory of martial motherhood I propose culminates in Elizabeth, whose own self-fashioning spawned a uniquely abstracted (i.e., childless) model of martial maternity in the political arena. What emerges from reading Volumnia, Tamora, and Elizabeth, in a trajectory reaching from the womb through abstraction to the realm of rhetoric, is an intertextual inroad into the complex potential of staging

\(^1\) See, for example, Jennifer Heller’s chapter on “Generating Maternal Authority,” in which she writes that in order for early modern mothers to affect their children, “they need to assume a position of authority, negotiating the social structures that align power with masculinity in general and with patriarchy in particular.” Jennifer Heller, *The Mother’s Legacy in Early Modern England* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2011), 38. Coppélia Kahn’s “Mother of Battles: Volumnia and Her Son in Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus*” takes a similar route, reading maternal power as something “assigned . . . by the state.” Coppélia Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women* (London: Routledge, 1997), 158.
maternity as an early modern political state and into early modern politics in the context of motherhood.

The obvious liability of the proposed trajectory from Volumnia’s warrior-building womb to Tamora’s maternal abstraction, ending with Elizabeth’s childless martial motherhood, is the anachronism of such a reading. Before arguing for the trajectory, then, I must clarify my intentions in mixing *dramatis personae* and historical persons. Throughout her reign, Elizabeth acted as an author and a subject, cultivating a public persona and a dynamic world of panegyric court literature. In both her writing and the writing she patronized, she was active in a large-scale project of self-representation. In this way, we may read Elizabeth—in the literature she produced and in that which was produced about her—as a text. Treating Elizabeth as a text rather than a person situated in an exact historical framework alleviates the anachronistic tension of the reading by putting her on a par with other texts, namely *Coriolanus* and *Titus*. Therefore, Elizabeth becomes, like Volumnia and Tamora, a character: written, staged, and analyzed here for her engagement with the rhetoric of martial motherhood as part of an intertextual rather than a chronological trajectory.

**Volumnia: The War-Making Womb**

Of the three figures of martial motherhood discussed here, Volumnia is the clearest articulation of a mother who uses maternity and maternal language to advance a martial agenda. Volumnia distinguishes herself early on in the play with such statements as “had I a dozen sons . . . I had rather had eleven die nobly for their country than one/voluptuously surfeit out of action” and “O, [Coriolanus] is wounded; I thank the gods for’t.” 2 These and other violent utterances have spurred critics to treat Volumnia as a failed mother who “has violated her maternal, nurturing qualities.” 3 In her overview of the critical reception of Volumnia, Theodora A. Jankowski highlights and then complicates the view that Volumnia is “the sole cause of her son’s inadequacies and his ultimate death.” 4 Jankowski’s rejection of the failed mother paradigm has enabled a number of critical reevaluations of Volumnia’s role, encouraging critics to read her in the context of martial success instead of maternal failure. As Jonathan Dollimore points out about Volumnia’s alleged bloodlust in raising her son: “it would be wrong to see [Volumnia’s above-quoted statements] only as grotesque inversion of normal maternal care.” 5 Rather, Dollimore recognizes the political awareness and martial charge of Volumnia’s statements, deeming them “a rational estimate of the political capital of a wounded hero.” 6 This view reconciles the tension between a nurturing, apolitical mother and a
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ruthless war-mongering politician in that it links Volumnia’s maternal care to her political intelligence and allegiance to the Roman State.

Volumnia’s political acumen and desire for military victory rival that of her male counterparts, and, indeed, she often succeeds where they do not. It is at Volumnia’s insistence that Coriolanus concedes to go to the marketplace and display his wounds to the people as a sign of his service to the state in scene 3.2. Though both Cominius and Menenius appeal to Coriolanus, neither senator is able to convince him to seek the approval of the Roman people. Volumnia’s maternity does not simply distinguish her from her Coriolanus’s other advisors, it makes her foremost among them. Throughout the play, she urges Coriolanus to temper his violence and intolerance with diplomacy and tact, most notably in 3.2 when she chastises him for being “too absolute” in his refusal to accommodate the desires of the people and submit to what he views as a degrading ritual. Volumnia recognizes the political and symbolic significance of displaying wounds, even if Rome’s greatest warrior does not. She is also able to communicate to her son the importance of submitting to the ritual, which Cominius and Menenius cannot. Volumnia shares both Coriolanus’s enthusiasm for military victory and the senators’ knowledge of Roman political culture, but unlike her son and his advisors, she inhabits both realms and exercises persuasive power in each.

Volumnia’s second and still more effective diplomatic plea on behalf of the Roman State via motherhood occurs in 5.3 when she, Virgilia, Martius, and Valeria leave Rome to meet Coriolanus at the Volscian camp. Once again, where Cominius and Menenius have failed, Volumnia prevails. James Kuzner argues that Coriolanus’s capitulation to Volumnia’s appeal is nothing more than “heeding the call of family.”7 This view neglects the complexity of Volumnia’s approach, however, conflating her with the other three supplicants and ignoring the political charge which she alone commands. Notably, and contrary to Kuzner’s argument, Volumnia’s appeal is not simply to Coriolanus’s sense of duty to or love for his family but rather to a complex understanding of family and State as intrinsically linked. She likens his pending invasion of Rome to treading “on thy mother’s womb/That brought thee to this world.”8 Here Volumnia’s womb-based rhetoric is most apparent. She positions Coriolanus’s conquest of his motherland as a conquest of his mother, revealing the brutality, unnaturalness, and undesirability of the former through the connection she forges with the latter. The seat of the Roman Empire is conflated, therein, with Volumnia’s warrior-producing womb. Volumnia represents her authority in this formulation as both a mother and a figure of martial potency, bringing warriors into the world and then protecting that world from them as only she is able. About to abandon her entreaty, Volumnia declares that Coriolanus “had a Volscian to his mother.”9 In this continuation of the aforementioned rhetorical framework, Coriolanus’s disavowal of his motherland is equally a disavowal of his mother, linking Volumnia firmly to the Roman State in her political capacity. Ultimately, it is this and only this notion of
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8 Shakespeare, Coriolanus, 5.3.123-25.  
9 Shakespeare, Coriolanus, 5.3.178.
mother as motherland (and vice versa) that commands Coriolanus’s actions and renewed allegiance to the Roman Republic, demonstrating the effectiveness of Volumnia’s womb-based rhetoric of martial maternity.

**Tamora: Transitioning from Womb to Rhetoric**

Like Volumnia, Tamora exploits her maternity to political ends; unlike Volumnia, however, Tamora’s motherhood transcends the womb via maternal discourse directed at her husband Saturninus. Scholarly readings of Tamora tend to focus on her “rampant, uncontrollable sexuality.”¹⁰ Reading Tamora’s sexuality in the context of early modern anxieties about queenship, Susan Dunn-Hensley juxtaposes Tamora’s “chaotic world of nature and sexuality” with “the ordered world of politics” that “it threatens to disrupt.”¹¹ This claim is somewhat problematic in its suggestion that either Titus’s Rome or Shakespeare’s England constitutes an “ordered world of politics”; in both contexts, Tamora’s political ambitions echo the “chaotic” worlds in question. Though Tamora is brought to victorious Rome as a conquered queen, she is hardly entering a stable political situation. Rome’s recent conquest of the Goths does little to diffuse the troubled succession of the recently-deceased ruler. The audience’s first glimpse of Rome, in fact, takes the form of elder son Saturninus’s call to arms: “[n]oble patricians, patrons of my right, / Defend the justice of my cause with arms.”¹² Rome’s political instability is apparent even before Tamora’s entrance and is well-established by the time her “evil schemes” come to fruition.¹³ The problematic succession dramatized in Titus would have resonated with early modern audiences viewing the play at the twilight of Elizabeth’s reign and anticipating a similarly troublesome political inheritance due to the lack of an heir apparent.¹⁴ Spectators present at performances of Titus might well remember the violent political and religious transitions that occurred at the end of Edward VI’s and Mary I’s reigns. Accusing Tamora of disrupting a stable situation and precipitating the “destruction of [the] kingdom” with her “rampant sexuality” smacks of a patriarchal discourse that not only condemns female sexuality and desire but also denies women political agency and ability.¹⁵

Though much of Tamora’s action is indeed motivated by desire, this desire is not strictly sexual. On the contrary, throughout the play, Tamora exhibits a drive that is distinctly political and sets

---

¹⁴ It is worth mentioning, however, that despite Titus’s resonance with a late Elizabethan audience, the play stages an altogether different problem than that faced in early modern England. Whereas the late king of Shakespeare’s Rome in Titus has two sons, the aging Elizabeth has no heirs, male or female. Thus, the problem of succession represented in the play is one of excess, while the reality faced at the end of the sixteenth century is one of lack. This means that we cannot treat Titus’s representation of troubled succession as anything but evocative of Elizabeth’s situation.
about achieving her aims in a way that is explicitly maternal. The first conflation of the martial and the maternal occurs soon after Tamora and her sons are brought to Rome as prisoners of war. In a gesture of Roman imperial dominance, Titus’s son Lucius suggests that her eldest son Alarbus, “the proudest prisoner of the Goths” be sacrificed to appease the “shadows” and avert ill omens. Murdering the eldest son of a newly-deposed enemy is more politically significant than Lucius perhaps lets on; killing Alarbus disrupts the line of succession and helps diminish the possibility of a resurgence of Goth power. In a play that opens with a battle for succession and an emphasis on primogeniture, the political implications of dispatching Alarbus can hardly be overlooked.

In her plea for Alarbus’s life, Tamora first employs maternal discourse, exhorting onlookers, “rue the tears I shed,/ A mother’s tears in passion for her son; And if thy sons were ever dear to thee,/O, think my son to be as dear to me.” In the latter part of this plea, when she appeals to Titus as a parent, she seeks his empathy, asking him to consider her relationship with her son to be as important as his relationship with his. Aware of the political potential of maternal rhetoric, Tamora shifts her appeal from her personal relationship with her son to her son’s relationship with the State, marrying the ideas of the martial and the maternal more firmly. She implores Titus to consider that “if to fight for king and commonweal/Were piety in thine, it is in these,” placing her son’s and Titus’s sons’ warlike efforts in the same realm of political duty. Just as Titus locates his pride in his sons and their military victory, so does Tamora believe that a son’s duty is not simply to a parent but to the State (and the State-as-parent/parent-as-State). The climax of her speech is in her final supplication, “Thrice-noble Titus, spare my first-born son!” She is negotiating not just for the life of her son, but for the life of her first-born son, and, by extension, the possibility of the resurgence and proliferation of the Goths. Her emphasis on Alarbus’s status as her first-born, read in connection with the previous two examples of martial-maternal rhetoric, illuminates Tamora’s conflation of motherhood and martial potency. Like Volumnia, her rhetoric is employed in service to the State, hoping to secure the life of her first-born son and heir Alarbus and the potential for a Goth resurgence that he represents.

Tamora’s martial motherhood is very much in tune with Volumnia’s strategies; both women marry martial and maternal language in their pursuit of political power. However, Tamora’s subsequent abstraction of motherhood in which she takes maternity out of the womb and pushes it into the realm of rhetoric distinguishes her mode of martial maternity from Volumnia’s. Unlike Volumnia, Tamora employs martial-maternal discourse in her non-maternal relationships. Whereas Volumnia reserves the language of motherhood for and in reference to her son, Tamora includes her husband Saturninus in this rhetoric of martial motherhood as well. Immediately after Saturninus’s proposal of marriage, which would make her queen of the Roman Empire, Tamora accepts and

17 Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, 1.1.105-08.
19 Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, 1.1.120.
20 To clarify, Tamora’s actions are in service to the Goth kingdom, not the Roman State.
offers to be not only “a handmaid to [Saturninus’s] desires” but “a loving nurse, a mother to his youth.”21 The image of the mother-queen and her son-king invokes an imbalance of power, in favor of the former who is, presumably, older, wiser, and in a position to teach and guide the latter. Thus, Tamora envisions her political power as queen as inseparable from her position as mother. Notably, Tamora and Saturninus are not bound by a maternal-filial relationship. Unlike Coriolanus who lives and dies by the dictates of Volumnia’s womb-based rhetoric, Saturninus owes nothing to Tamora as his mother, yet he embraces her maternal rhetoric and allows himself to be “rul’ed by [her]” and “won at last.”22 In accepting Tamora as a political adviser and “mother”, at least by Tamora’s estimation, Saturninus is at once personally infantilized and politically conquered, attached by a rhetorical umbilical cord.

Elizabeth: Childless Mother of a Nation

From Volumnia’s womb-based martial motherhood through Tamora’s abstracted political advancement via maternal discourse, we arrive at Elizabeth’s uniquely-configured childless maternity. That Elizabeth would die unmarried and without an heir was a cause of great anxiety for early modern British subjects and remains an object of fascination for scholars four hundred years later. Many Elizabethan and early Jacobean dramas staged this tension generated by Elizabeth’s lack of an heir, while court literature translated anxiety about Elizabeth’s succession into praise for her chastity. Whatever public theatre and court poetry presented as central concerns, anxieties, or virtues, Elizabeth took an active role in self-fashioning, rejecting the imperative to marry and produce heirs and, at times, the image of impenetrable Virgin Queen, in favor of the far more politically advantageous conflation of warrior-mother of the early modern English nation.

Like the appeals of Volumnia and Tamora, Elizabeth’s employment of maternal rhetoric to martial or political ends comes not merely from others’ evaluations of her but from her own words. Many scholars have recognized the extent to which Elizabeth crafted a highly effective public image, focusing on the various archetypes she evoked and how they worked together to form a complex portrait of a capable leader. For the purposes of this argument, I will concentrate not on panegyrical poetry or drama produced at court and in the public theatre, but on her self-representation in speeches and correspondence as a protective mother who was willing to go to war for the safety of her subjects/children.23

Because of her monarchical status, Elizabeth’s lack of children was not merely a personal but a political matter; as a result of the frequent criticisms, government petitions, and official speeches directed at her in the hope of encouraging her to marry and produce an heir, Elizabeth could hardly ignore the issue of offspring. As Christine Coch puts it, “politically, Elizabeth’s was the most

21 Shakespeare, Titus Andronicus, 1.1.331-32.
22 Shakespeare, Titus Andronicus, 1.1.442.
23 Jankowski, Women in Power, 60.
important womb in Christian Europe for more than twenty years.”

In response to this social and political pressure, Elizabeth began to employ maternal rhetoric early in her reign and continued to link it to her political potency, fashioning herself as both mother and martial protectress of the State. Coch’s article on Elizabeth’s use of maternal rhetoric focuses on her first speech to Parliament (1559) in which she rejects their entreaty that she marry until such time as “yt shall pleyse god to enclyne my hart to that kynde of lyf.”

Elizabeth assures Parliament that if and when she receives a divine mandate to marry, as she has to rule, she will consider it. In the meantime, she is adamant about her role as “a good mother to my Contreye.” Like her divine right to queenship, which she asserts repeatedly in her speeches to Parliament, Elizabeth’s role as the mother of her nation is sanctioned by God, whose will it is for her to “lyve out of the state of marriage.”

Elizabeth’s reasoning that God has not sent her an acceptable spouse or instilled in her a desire to marry anyone in particular allows her to replace physical heirs with metaphorical ones, namely the subjects of her kingdom.

Though some critics dismiss Elizabeth’s assumption of the role of “mother” to the English nation as an attempt to “divert attention from the very real problem of the lack of an heir of the queen’s body,” the extent to which Elizabeth links the images of mother and military protectress suggests that her rhetorical motherhood was much more than a distraction. In a memorable and much-quoted response to a Commons petition that she marry and produce an heir (1563), Elizabeth rebukes the assembly, reminding them of her divine mandate to rule and asserting her metaphorical motherhood: “And so I assure you all that, though after my death you may have many stepdames, yet shall you never have any a more mother than I mean to be unto you all.” That she calls herself a “mother” in an official speech to Parliament necessarily politicizes the term; furthermore, the certainty with which she uses it here, in conjunction with the mention of her death, not only addresses but supplants biological succession. Contrary to the belief that Elizabeth’s rhetoric of metaphorical motherhood distracts from her childlessness, her speeches consistently call attention to the issue of succession and assure her critics of her martial-maternal capabilities as mother and protectress. Her assertion that England will “never have any a more mother than I” recalls and reverses Volumnia’s claim that “There’s no man in the world / More bound to ‘s mother [than

25 It would be irresponsible to assume that Elizabeth’s use of maternal rhetoric issues directly and/or exclusively from sociopolitical pressure, but it is fair to say that this pressure is a determining factor in her strategies of self-representation, particularly in that she first employs maternal rhetorical publically as a response to it.
26 Elizabeth I, quoted in Coch, “‘Mother of my contreye,” 426.
27 Coch, “‘Mother of my contreye,” 423.
28 Coch, “‘Mother of my contreye,” 423.
29 I owe the term “metaphorical” in connection to Elizabeth’s construction of her motherhood to Christine Coch’s article, “Mother of my contreye.”
30 Jankowski, Women in Power, 71.
31 Susan M. Felch and Donald Stump, eds., Elizabeth I and Her Age: Authoritative Texts, Commentary and Criticism (New York: W. W. Norton & Co. Inc., 2009), 128.
Coriolanus].”

Like Volumnia, Elizabeth exploits the unique bond of mothers and children to assert political authority and turn a hazardous situation, expertly, to her advantage.

Perhaps the most potent example of Elizabeth’s martial-maternal rhetoric is her conflation of martial victory and maternal care in her 1601 speech to Parliament, later known as “The Golden Speech.” In it, she offers, as Louis Montrose points out, “a summation of the problems and achievements of her foreign policy.” Throughout the speech, she links moments of military victory to feelings of maternal care for her subjects. Her assertion in her 1563 speech that her subjects “never have any a more mother than I mean to be unto you all” is here transformed into a confident statement of achievement that “never will queen sit in [her] seat with more zeal to [her] country, [and] care for [her] people.”

This conflation of zeal for a country and love for a people supports her image as a martial mother, willing to “venture [her] life for their good safety” just as a mother would for her children. She insists on her unparalleled love for her subjects more than once and prides herself on protecting them from “envy, peril, dishonor, shame, tyranny, and oppression.”

Looking back on her military career and metaphorical motherhood, united poignantly in this speech, Elizabeth is certain that she has excelled in the roles of political leader and mother to her people.

**Conclusion: Martial Maternity in Its Own Words**

A new relationship of intertextuality has emerged in this consideration of the shared martial-maternal rhetoric of Coriolanus’s Volumnia, Titus Andronicus’s Tamora, and early modern England’s Queen Elizabeth I. By reading Elizabeth as a text, my argument positions her at the end of a literary trajectory instead of the beginning of a historical one. My treatment of the three characters reveals the diverse potential of early modern motherhood in literature, tracing the achievement of female political power through three distinct modes of maternal rhetoric.

Beginning with Volumnia, whose rhetoric sprung from the womb and asserted her authority through physical motherhood, I transitioned through Tamora’s abstraction of motherhood beyond maternal-filial bonds, to the childless mother of a nation, Elizabeth, whose womb guaranteed her authority only in the most abstract and metaphorical sense. All three women held considerable political sway through some form of maternity, whether physical or metaphorical. They challenged and even reshaped the power structures to which they belonged. Ultimately, the ways in which Volumnia, Tamora, and Elizabeth achieved this political power need not be read in the context of patriarchy. The question about whether or not or to what extent female characters and historical
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34 Felch and Stump, *Elizabeth I and Her Age*, 505.
35 Felch and Stump, *Elizabeth I and Her Age*, 505.
36 Felch and Stump, *Elizabeth I and Her Age*, 503.
figures subvert or conform to patriarchal structures is a somewhat tired one. It is time to put aside that question and allow the issue of early modern motherhood to speak for itself in the self-sustaining rhetoric of martial maternity it produces.

Lauren J. Rogener is in the PhD program in English at the University of North Texas. Michelle L. Beer, a PhD candidate in History at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, edited this paper.
From Libertine to Femme Fatale: The Fallen Woman in Thomas Southerne’s Sir Anthony Love

By Kirsten Mendoza

The intimate Restoration Theater has often been described as an actor’s theater. Playwrights wrote their plays with a specific company in mind, tailoring the characters to the strengths of the company’s leads. Since the number of men in acting companies often outnumbered women at least two to one, typecasting frequently occurred with actresses. According to Joseph Roach, playwrights would sometimes include lines that praise the anatomical attributes specific to the physique of an intended actress. In many instances, playwrights would pair the same actors and actresses for the roles of the witty couple whose blossoming love would dictate the actions of the plot and would almost always conclude with marriage. Whenever specific actors and actresses such as Charles Hart and the talented and infamous mistress of King Charles II, Nell Gwyn, graced the stage together as the “gay couple,” audiences celebrated these liaisons and anticipated certain plots and conclusions based on the casting decisions. By the 1680s, Mr. William Mountfort and his wife, Mrs. Susanna Mountfort, had replaced Hart and Gwyn as the reigning gay couple. Audiences fully expected the Mountforts to woo and wed each other on stage, a performance mirroring their status as a married couple. Hoping for success, playwrights such as Thomas Southerne used the Mountforts to create delightful comedies sure to entertain audiences.

Thomas Southerne’s most successful comedy, *Sir Anthony Love; or, The Rambling Lady*, was first produced in November of 1690 and performed by the United Company. In his dedicatory epistle, Southerne commends Mrs. Susanna Mountfort who performed the titular role of Sir Anthony or Lucia as the muse for his play, stating: “I am pleased, by way of Thanks, to do her [Susanna Mountfort] that publick Justice in Print . . . as I made every Line for her, she has mended every
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1 I would like to thank Geoffrey A. Johns, Megan Gregory, Karen Christianson of the Newberry Library, and William M. Storm for his feedback and direction on this paper. My thanks, too, to Paul Jay for helping me focus my ideas as I began my research for this project. I owe my sincere gratitude to Robert Markley for introducing me to the fascinating world of Restoration Theater, and to Lori Newcomb and James Knapp for their encouragement.


Word for me; and by a Gaiety and Air, particular to her Action, turn’d every thing into the Genius of the Character." Southerne clearly chose Susanna for her reputation as an actress most acclaimed for her vivacity and variety of humor; however, her unique artistry was not the only inspiration for the breeches role of Sir Anthony. Susanna bewitched audiences with her aptitudes as a performer and with her more voluptuous visual assets. Fellow actor Anthony Aston describes Susanna as a beautiful plump woman “having thick Legs and Thighs, [with] corpulent and large Posterious.”

Rather than hide Susanna’s femininity, the male disguise she donned as the cross-dressed Sir Anthony constantly accentuated her curves, making it impossible for Restoration audiences to forget that they were ogling the legs and shapely behind of a woman. In the Epilogue spoken by Mrs. Buttler, Southerne emphasizes how “The Female Mountfort bare above the knee” teased audiences by making visual female body parts often covered by heavy fabric and long skirts.

Audiences expected more from the popular breeches tradition than a good vantage point from which to admire Susanna’s assets. With Mrs. Susanna Mountfort playing the role of Sir Anthony, and her husband, Mr. William Mountfort, as her romantic counterpart, Valentine, playgoers had every reason to expect that Susanna would seduce her husband on stage as she had done in previous roles, leading to a conventional union. Similar to the performance of other breeches roles such as Rosalind and Viola from Shakespeare’s *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night*, the cross-dressed Sir Anthony assumes male garb, reveling in the freedoms her masculine dress provides. Traditionally, the comedic heroine eventually discards her male attire, revealing her natural identity as a woman while securing marriage to the male lead. Southerne plays with audience expectations, for although Sir Anthony does flee to France in pursuit of Valentine, this notorious character surprises audiences by designing a marriage that is anything but typical.

The cross-dressed Sir Anthony out-mans the men in the play, portraying an insatiable appetite for pleasure and representing the hypermasculinized Hobbesian libertine. Critics such as Elizabeth Howe, Harold Weber, and Warren Chernaik insist that “for all her radicalism, Sir Anthony offers no real threat to the established [patriarchal] social order” but represents an anomaly, the atypical woman with the nature of a man. Warren Chernaik further explains that the male garb Sir Anthony assumes best “expresses her [androgynous] inward nature, with all its contradictions, freeing capacities and feelings which in other circumstances would have remained hidden.”
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4 Elizabeth Howe quotes Thomas Southerne’s dedicatory epistle which praises the artistry of Mrs. Susanna Mountfort. She further details how breeches roles functioned as a way to sexually excite audiences, particularly playgoers of the opposite sex. Howe cites Pat Rogers who notes that “it was central to the effect [of breeches roles] that the actress’s femininity showed through” (56). For an in-depth analysis of the rise of the English actress and an overview of Mrs. Susanna Mountfort’s career, see Elizabeth Howe, *The First English Actresses: Women and Drama 1660-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 56-65, 82-84.


6 Howe, *The First English Actresses*, 60.

7 Warren Chernaik, *Sexual Freedom in Restoration Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 195. Chernaik views Sir Anthony as inherently masculine. Therefore, her refusal to marry Valentine stems from her desire to retain the freedoms she enjoys dressed as a man. Although I agree that Sir Anthony exhibits masculine aggression and accurately
Restoration Rake-Hero, Harold Weber nuances this interpretation by emphasizing how Sir Anthony’s male disguise overwhelms her identity as a woman and eventually dominates her personality. As the deviant woman with the psychology of a man, Sir Anthony thrives upon the double standards of a patriarchal society. Sir Anthony’s masculine aggression greatly contrasts the conventional feminine passivity displayed by other female characters in the play. According to Weber, the drastic difference between the androgynous Sir Anthony and the submissive and obedient virgins accentuates the limitations imposed upon the female sex in a male dominated society.

Although I agree that Sir Anthony represents a hypermasculinized version of the Hobbesian libertine whose pursuit of pleasure is the ultimate goal, I contend that Sir Anthony fuses the identity of the rake with the female identities of both the libertine’s female counterpart, the witty heroine, and with his victim, the fallen woman. Contrary to the insistence that Sir Anthony dons male attire, celebrating the emancipatory disguise that most accurately reflects her interiority, I argue that Sir Anthony’s source of empowerment, motivations, and threat to male domination are inextricably bound to her sensual femininity and her marginalized status as a woman. Although Sir Anthony acquires financial security and autonomy by the end of the play, there is also a resignation to the limitation of what she deserves that resonates with the role of a woman outside the bounds of patriarchal acceptance. In fact, it is in Sir Anthony’s successful ability to perform various identities, and not in the conventional portrayals of the submissive female, that a woman’s limitations in a patriarchal society are most emphasized as inescapably self-alienating.

Critics such as Anita Pacheco insist that in a world of masculine supremacy that views a woman’s intact hymen as plunder, virginity becomes the ultimate deciding factor with respect to a woman’s marriageable worth and her potential for overall happiness. This interpretation, however, relies on the conception that marriage brings security to a woman and that the status of a wife is always the ultimate goal. In Sir Anthony Love, a woman’s real fall is not the act of indulging her sexual desires outside of wedlock, but falling in love, and allowing herself to believe in the feigned constancy of the inconstant libertine. Sir Anthony’s ability to cross gender boundaries, secure financial autonomy, and become the mistress of a man she desires is due to her necessarily self-alienating self-possession and her rational dealings in a world where a woman’s romantic love has no place in the double standards of male patriarchy.

This essay first analyzes Sir Anthony’s successful performance of the libertine and the witty heroine. Through playing with gender boundaries, Sir Anthony emphasizes the inescapable marginalization of a woman, which limits her happiness in a male dominated society. I will then show how Sir Anthony, despite possessing typical characteristics of the tragic heroine, is able to maintain both financial and sexual control by preventing her emotions from dictating her actions.

performs the role of wit and rake, it is important to note that audiences constantly perceived Sir Anthony’s femininity accentuated by breeches. Sir Anthony’s status as a sexually compromised woman and her ability to accurately perform various identities reinforce misogynistic conceptions of women as fallen and duplicitous by nature.

8 Anita Pacheco, “Rape and the Female Subject in Aphra Behn’s The Rover,” in English Literary History 65, no. 2 (1998): 323-345.
Through Sir Anthony’s treatment of her relationships with men as cold transactions to be manipulated for her gain, the plight of a sexually compromised woman is no longer a tragedy but a fetish that eroticizes the character of the fallen woman turned femme fatale.

Every day Sir Anthony Love has “a new mistress and a new quarrel” (1.1.21). She thrusts men off the stage, speaks like a rake, wins sword fights, and has the reputation of satisfying women in bed. Perfectly playing the part of the libertine, Sir Anthony sexually objectifies women while supposedly “prostituting” herself to the woman with the largest dowry. She states, “In short, this is the English lady you have/heard me speak of: I allow her the favor of /my person, and she allows me the freedom of her purse” (1.1.521-523). It is important to note that in the late seventeenth century, the word, “person” was interchangeable with the word, “body.” She teasingly declares that she has sexually gratified this woman of noble birth while at the same time taking advantage of the woman’s wealth. Dressed as a man, Sir Anthony has the liberty to exchange sex for money, an act resembling male prostitution that is accepted by society and applauded by Valentine and Ilford as a successful venture. Of course, Sir Anthony does not actually consummate any of the exploits she boasts of, but she does engage in misogynistic male discourse as part of the performance of the valorized figure of the libertine. Men experiment with sex before marriage and determine marriageable partners based on the wealth a woman will provide. This, of course, emphasizes the double standard in which prostitutes and women who engage in sexual gratification outside of marriage suffer a debilitating loss of reputation.

The libertine is characterized as a figure driven by his unbridled desire for pleasure. In Thomas Shadwell’s tragedy, The Libertine, Don John, a man guilty of all vice, explains most accurately the philosophy of a true libertine hero: “My business is my pleasure, that end I will always compass/without scrupling the means; there is no right or wrong,/but what conducts to, or hinders pleasure.” Laughing about beating wives into submission, Sir Anthony certainly does not praise or defend a woman’s worth but rather leads men in the objectification and ridicule of her own sex as part of the performance of the rake. She understands the violence of heterosexual power dynamics where men gain their reputations “out of the ruin of the women’s” (4.4.67). Through her speeches and actions, Sir Anthony performs the role of an insensitive rake whose sole objective is the acquisition of pleasure. She sees other women and men as objects to serve the gratification of her desires and does not care for the consequences of her actions. Sir Anthony further epitomizes the insatiable appetite of a libertine when she declares, “I am for Universal Empire and would not be stinted to one province” (1.1.14). She thirsts for complete control and to be subject to no one. Sir Anthony accurately portrays the rapacious desire to do whatever the rake pleases without the fear of repercussions. The libertine is characterized by this exact demonstration of selfishness and disregard.

---


for other human beings, which reflects the tensions between the constraints of society and the Hobbesian individual’s self-serving nature.

The Hobbesian libertine shares his pleasurable tales of numerous romps and romantic trysts with a group of his closest men, who celebrate his exploits and are willing to fight alongside him. In Restoration comedies, the libertine and his wingmen insist on the superiority of heroic male friendships to heterosexual relationships. Sir Anthony’s successful disguise as a libertine and inclusion within male circles emphasize the necessary marginalization and exclusion of women in a male-dominated society. In *Men in Love: Masculinity and Sexuality in the Eighteenth Century*, George E. Haggerty explains how homosocial bonds did function as a means of solidifying patriarchal dominance while appropriating same-sex male desire in the cultural status quo. Haggerty fundamentally argues that the representations of heroic male friendships, instead of functioning as mere homosocial ties securing male superiority, are nothing less than love between men. Sir Anthony validates the idealization of male camaraderie as more virtuous than the calculating and oftentimes loveless relationships between men and women when he states, “Now I am sure he likes me, and likes me/ so well in a man, he’ll love me in a woman” (1.66-67). The bond between men and women made primarily for financial gain and momentary sexual gratification is often characterized by frustrating desires and as a bond inferior to the homosocial relationship between men. In *All for Love* by John Dryden, Antony describes his dear friend and Roman general, Dolabella, as his soul: “We were one mass; we could not give or take, /But from the same; for he was I, I he” (3.1.95-96).11 The intense friendship and intimacy between men is a marriage of both body and soul, a physical and spiritual unity predicated upon a shared male identity. As a woman, Lucia cannot be looked upon as Valentine’s equal. Therefore, her secondary status as his beloved will always be insecure, but as Sir Anthony, she is now certain that he loves her because he loves her as a man. Her belief is further credited when Valentine sincerely tells Sir Anthony that he is “nobody without you [Anthony]” (1.1.285). Such language of ardent devotion and esteem exemplified by the relationships between Dryden’s Antony and Dolabella and Southerne’s Valentine and Sir Anthony is not evident between Valentine and Floriante, the future husband and wife. Valentine’s soul is attached to Sir Anthony, a woman who secured her position in his heart through first securing his friendship in the disguise of a man.12

The cross-dressed Sir Anthony, however, does add nuances to this popular role of the libertine. Unlike the narrow-minded rake, Sir Anthony is more like a sportsman, enjoying the pursuit of pleasure just as much as she enjoys the pleasure itself. She is “better pleased with the accidents of/the chase, the hedges, and the ditches, than the close/ pursuit of the game” (1.1.44-46). Unlike the traditional hypermasculinized male whose aim is fixed on one point, Sir Anthony is driven by the excitement of manipulation and the thrill of overcoming the obstacles she faces more than the fruits

---


of her labors. Since she cannot bed these women, it is the opportunity to deceive and the titillation of fooling those around her, that Sir Anthony most enjoys. In *The Man of Mode; or, Sir Fopling Flutter* by George Etherege, his witty heroine and young heiress, Harriet, agrees to scheme “for the dear pleasure of dissembling” (3.2.123). The witty heroines of the Restoration Theater have a natural proclivity towards acting, towards misleading and toying with those unfortunate pawns around them.

While dressed as a man, Sir Anthony captivates Valentine and playfully banters with him, turning Ilford into the unfortunate third wheel, the romantic idealist trying to interject his unimportant thoughts. The jealous Ilford tries to regain his masculinity by bringing attention to Sir Anthony’s feminine features, stating:

**ILFORD:** He’s a pretty woman’s man, indeed.

**VALENTINE:** And a merry man’s man too, sir, for you must own
He has a great deal of wit. (1.1.404-406)

Sir Anthony is the stereotypical witty heroine encountered in Restoration plays, who charms Valentine with her quick tongue. In *Perspectives on Restoration Drama*, Susan J. Owen explains that such female characters are “empowered at least verbally through wit, and it is wit which allows [them] to express desire.” Wit gives these heroines the ability to safely explore their sensualities and to play with the ephemeral power that comes from the position of the seductress. The brief duration of courtship, however, is the only time wherein the witty heroine may exercise some sort of autonomy. Her wit is the barrier between a man and her body, preventing unwanted pregnancies and a fallen reputation, while securing marriage.

In Restoration comedies, witty heroines win the prize—marriage. However, audiences knew full well that the Restoration libertine could not be tamed and that his superficial conversion to virtue was merely momentary. In fact, playwrights capitalized upon the presumed eventual failure of the rake’s reform. John Vanbrugh’s *The Relapse* is the sequel to Colley Cibber’s *Love’s Last Shift*. As Vanbrugh’s title suggests, the plot of this play revolves around a repentant rake who succumbs to temptation and commits adultery. Harriet, the young and attractive witty heroine from Etherege’s *Man of Mode* does not even reach the marriage ceremony before her libertine, Dorimant, pulls another woman aside to plan an intimate rendezvous. In Aphra Behn’s *The Rover; or The Banished Cavaliers*, Hellena, another witty heroine who cross-dresses like Sir Anthony, successfully marries the rake, Willmore. Although she escapes from the stifling life of a nun and is no longer subject to her father’s and brother’s wills, she is transferred like property to her husband. Owen accurately explains that although Hellena has won the game, the game is now over for the “fate of a lady of quality is

---


always confining." During courtship, the witty heroine relishes her brief moments of power, but upon marriage, she relinquishes the control she once enjoyed.

It is a typical ploy for witty heroines to play coy at first, declaring that they do not wish to marry, although they actually do marry in the final act. As with other witty heroines encountered in Restoration plays, Sir Anthony scorns marriage, knowing full well that it ends the flaming passion of a sexual love. Unlike the stereotypical witty heroine, however, Sir Anthony does not recant her previous vows to not marry the man she desires. During the grand revelation scene that occurs in the fourth act rather than the fifth, Valentine is most charmed with knowledge that Sir Anthony is actually Lucia in disguise:

VALENTINE: Had I known it before, it had been in my power—
SIR ANTHONY: Not to marry me, I hope, Valentine! But if you could be in that mind (which I neither desire nor deserve), I know you too well to think of securing you that way . . .

I know your engagements to Floriante, and you shall marry her. That will disengage you, I warrant you.
VALENTINE: You continue your opinion of marriage.
SIR ANTHONY: Floriante, I grant you, would be a dangerous rival in a mistress—
VALENTINE: Nothing can rival thee.
SIR ANTHONY: And you might linger out a long liking of her to my uneasiness and your own, but matrimony, that’s her security, is mine: I can’t apprehend her in a wife. (4.2.102-106, 109-117)

Although matrimony may offer Floriante the security of her reputation, marriage most certainly does not secure Valentine’s affections. Sir Anthony posits that marriage negates sexual attraction. Should Floriante be Valentine’s mistress, then Sir Anthony would have reason to perceive Floriante as a competitor. As a wife, however, Floriante loses the seductive allure she possessed before marriage. Valentine may have a “liking” towards Floriante, but his attraction towards her cannot rival his desires for Sir Anthony, a woman who will never be fully in his possession. Although Sir Anthony attracts Valentine with her clever banter and witty retorts, she comprehends that in a patriarchal society, even the witty heroine cannot truly win. Marriage takes away any agency a woman may possess and transfers her property and body to her husband. As a wife, the witty heroine can do

---

15 Owen, *Perspectives on Restoration Drama*, 71.
little to exercise authority and must be content to remain in an uncertain secondary position, completely reliant on the wavering attention of her libertine spouse.\(^{16}\)

Weber views this revelation scene to be indicative of Sir Anthony’s “unwillingness to discard her male disguise,”\(^ {17}\) and her decision to forgo marriage as this female rake’s preference to continue the playful “holiday” and sexual fervor of their relationship. However, there is another reason why Sir Anthony renounces marriage to Valentine. Marriage is something she “neither desire[s] nor deserve[s]” (4.2.104). This self-effacement emphasizes her understanding that she occupies a status unworthy of conventional marriage. She fully comprehends the restrictions of this male dominated society, where a loss of physical virtue means that she is no longer marriageable material. Sir Anthony’s concession is echoed by the poignant soliloquy of Aphra Behn’s tragic heroine, Angellica Bianca:

\[\begin{align*}
I \text{ had forgot my name, my infamy,} \\
\text{And the reproach that honor lays on those} \\
\text{That dare pretend a sober passion here.} \\
\text{Nice reputation, though it leave behind} \\
\text{More virtues than inhabit where that dwells,} \\
\text{Yet that once gone, those virtues shine no more.} \\
\text{Then since I am not fit to be beloved,} \\
\text{I am resolved to think on a revenge} \\
\text{On him that soothed me thus to my undoing. (4.3.428-436)\(^ {18}\)}
\end{align*}\]

Before having met the rake, Willmore, Angellica Bianca approached sex as cold transactions and reveled in her position as a highly desired and sought after courtesan. Content in her autonomy and the commodification of her body, Angellica separated her emotions from her relationships with men, remaining self-possessed through self-alienation. In the midst of passion, she constructs herself as a kind of emotional virgin who falls in love for the first time, forgetting the way of the world in which she lives. After Willmore uses Angellica’s body for his sexual gratification and receives five-hundred crowns from her, he deserts the once proud courtesan in pursuit of the young and witty heiress, Hellena. This immediate disillusion bears detrimental effects on the abject and forsaken Angellica Bianca. She is forced to confront the fact that in a patriarchal society of double standards, she, like Sir Anthony Love, is “not fit to be beloved,” a truth she had known but had foolishly

---

\(^{16}\) Margaret Lamb McDonald, *The Independent Woman in the Restoration Comedy of Manners* (Salzburg: Salzburg Studies in English Literature, 1976). McDonald’s study explains that the Restoration stage often served as social commentary that emphasized the fragility and ephemeral quality of love in marriage.

\(^{17}\) Weber, *The Restoration Rake-Hero*, 168. Harold Weber contends that Sir Anthony’s refusal to marry Valentine during the romantic climax of the play demonstrates her desire to maintain the sexual passion of her relationship with Valentine. Although this certainly motivates Sir Anthony’s decision, I would add that while romantic love may be the goal for most witty heroines depicted in Restoration comedies, hers is to remain outside the bounds of male domination and female subjugation. For further analysis of the female rake, see his chapter, “The Female Libertine on the Restoration Stage,”162-78.

believed she could be the one exception.\textsuperscript{19} Both Sir Anthony and Angellica Bianca are fallen women outside the protection of male patriarchy. Sir Anthony’s comment illustrates an understanding of her unworthiness for marriage, but unlike Angellica, she is not fooled into thinking that she could be both fallen and virtuous, dark and fair.

Angellica Bianca declares that she would have gladly been a slave to love had Willmore not broken his vows, for “Twas then I [she] was undone” (5.1.285). Angellica reiterates that her perceived “undoing” is different from the conventional belief that a woman is undone upon losing her virginity, her chastity. As a businesswoman, Angellica exploited her sexuality as her means of gaining financial independence. She does not regret her profession as an expensive prostitute, but instead scorns the day she fell in love with Willmore. Sir Anthony Love is Angellica Bianca, the fallen woman who commodifies her body, using her sexuality for economic stability. Although Sir Anthony finds herself to be unworthy of marriage, the preservation of her self-possession is her utmost priority, and while Angellica succumbs to the illusory promises of a libertine’s devotion, Sir Anthony refuses to become a victim, remaining self-possessed through alienating romantic desires. Sir Anthony understands that falling in love places women in a vulnerable position regardless of birth and intact hymen, a vulnerable position that threatens their emotional stability and financial autonomy.

Sir Anthony is a fallen woman, but she is not a tragic character. She accepts her limited position and uses it to her advantage. Her sexuality is an instrument of power as long as she remains indifferent toward love. By constructing Sir Anthony as a fallen woman who does not wallow in self-pity and does not seek revenge for an unrequited love, Southerne’s treatment of this generally tragic character turns her into a femme fatale, a threat to men that is dangerous and attractive, repelling and titillating. Sir Anthony’s erotic sexuality is intertwined with the stereotypically perceived feminine trait of duplicity, a characteristic that threatens to subvert male hegemony, and an attribute that she indubitably possesses, as evidenced by her performance of numerous identities. In \textit{The Faerie Queene} by Edmund Spenser, Duessa, disguised as the beautiful Fidessa, deceives Redcrosse Knight and deprives him of his manhood. Through indulging in carnal pleasures, Redcrosse Knight “eftsoones his manly forces gan to faile, / And mightie strong was turned to feeble fraile” (7:49-50).\textsuperscript{20} A femme fatale threatens a man’s life, but the danger she represents is specifically bound to her sexual nature and to a man’s potency. Like Duessa, Sir Anthony confronts her victim, the unwitting Sir Gentle, under a disguise. Sir Gentle believes he will soon be enjoying pleasures in bed with a

\textsuperscript{19} Dolors Altaba-Artal draws attention to the perception of female actresses and playwrights as sexually available, a reputation that combines a woman’s visual availability on stage with her private off-stage personal life. Unlike most critics, Altaba-Artal interestingly argues that the prostitutes in Aphra Behn’s plays were not just used as a representation of her marginalization as a female writer but to cater to “whores” who formed a large portion of the audience. For more on prostitution and its relation to actresses and female writers, see Dolors Altaba-Artal, \textit{Aphra Behn’s English Feminism: Wit and Satire} (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1999), 89-109.

Frenchwoman who barely speaks English. Instead, his Frenchwoman of Languedoc is none other than the conniving Sir Anthony.

In the pistol scene, the disguised Sir Anthony lures Sir Gentle into a compromising situation and robs him of his purse just as Sir Gentle had previously robbed Sir Anthony of her virginity:

SIR ANTHONY: I have almost spent the five hundred pounds I borrowed of you.
SIR GENTLE: I’m glad I had it for you, madam.
SIR ANTHONY: And faith, ‘tis very kind in an old acquaintance to follow me into France to supply me again. I know you came a-purpose—
SIR GENTLE: Not quite a-purpose—
SIR ANTHONY: No, not quite a-purpose, some little business by the by of your own might have, I grant you. But this purse you never designed for me—
SIR GENTLE: I’ll force nothing upon you, madam; you may give it me again, if you don’t like it. (4.2.198-209)

In this exchange, Sir Anthony emasculates Sir Gentle, making him almost complicit in his victimization. The five hundred pounds she had “borrowed” of him was actually money she had stolen before traveling to France in pursuit of Valentine. Sir Gentle not only agrees that he had given her the money but goes so far as to state that he was “glad” to have been able to provide her with it. His manliness is overcome by her control over him, and he is forced to take on the stereotypically submissive role of the vacillating woman. Sir Anthony’s language is tactful and direct whereas Sir Gentle’s responses are passive and cowardly. He can do nothing but agree to whatever she commands, and pretends that he is more than willing to be used by her.

Empowered by Sir Gentle’s timidity, Sir Anthony alters the tone of this seductive and playful encounter by unleashing her capacity for violence as a femme fatale. She takes out a pistol, a phallic object, and holds it to his breast, indicating her masculinity and emphasizing Sir Gentle’s status as an effeminate man:

SIR ANTHONY: Yes, yes, the purse is an amiable purse and very well to be liked, only the sum does not amount to my occasions. There’s no retreating, Sir Gentle, you are in my power and, without a ransom, must continue my prisoner. You know I never want a pistol upon these Occasions; ‘tis not the first time I have robbed you. (4.2.210-215)

Sir Anthony is a repeat offender, and Sir Gentle, a constant victim. It is important to remember that in this scene Sir Anthony is groping around Sir Gentle’s genital area, attempting to grab his purse while holding a pistol to his breast. She manipulates Sir Gentle verbally and physically, possessing
and overwhelming him entirely. This pistol scene intimates the power dynamics at the base of libertine seduction scenes. As Sir Gentle’s life and manhood are threatened by Sir Anthony’s manipulative ability to place him in a vulnerable position, similarly, the rake’s victim risks social ruin by succumbing to the libertine’s sexual advances and by placing herself in an equally destructive and vulnerable position. Sir Anthony’s hold on Sir Gentle as her victim combines a masculine phallic energy with the duplicity of feminine sensuality. The sexual allure that Sir Anthony exudes entraps men, and just like the libertine, she has more to gain from the exchange than her unfortunate seduced subject. It is this subversion of masculine power to feminine prowess that makes the femme fatale both dangerous and attractive to male audiences.

In his construction of the cross-dressed fallen woman turned femme fatale, Southerne does not conclude the final act of the play with the romance between Sir Anthony and Valentine but with the grand manipulation that secures Sir Anthony’s economic stability and independence. Once again, her success comes at the public humiliation of the witless Sir Gentle:

VALENTINE: Why, you see your old Mrs. Lucy in your new lady-wife. We are all witnesses of your owning your marriage.
SIR GENTLE: I do not own it! I’ll hang like a dog, drown like a blind puppy, die and be damned, but I’ll be divorced from her.
VALENTINE: That’s your nearest way to divorce

Out of your two thousand pounds a year, give her a rent-charge of five hundred, and she shall never trouble you more, not so much as to be a godfather to another man’s child upon her body, which may otherwise inherit your acres. (5.7.146-152, 160-164)

The other characters witness Sir Anthony’s dominance over Sir Gentle. Men watch as he is out-manned by the woman he initially ruined. Indeed, he is a “blind puppy,” a helpless and spineless victim who cannot escape Sir Anthony’s tactical maneuvers and orchestrations. In the closing act, Sir Gentle agrees to pay Sir Anthony five hundred pounds a year to keep her away from him. In his utter demoralization, he acquiesces to this arrangement, which gives Sir Anthony the financial autonomy she desires most. As his wife and a woman capable of producing sons, Sir Anthony threatens Sir Gentle’s vast estate, indicating that a woman’s sexual and reproductive body poses the greatest threat to male dominance. Through Sir Anthony’s scheming and sensuality, she ensnares the credulous Sir Gentle, publicly humiliates him, and acquires a marriage in which she has all the power.

Indeed, Sir Anthony does marry at the end of the play, but her marriage is a cold transaction not based on the romantic and passionate attraction witnessed in conventional marriages. While
traditional witty virgins win the libertine but relinquish control over their bodies and their property, Sir Anthony marries and furthers her self-aggrandizement by securing her status as a liberated woman with a constant source of income unburdened by the duties of a wife. Unlike the tragic heroines who mourn the loss of the libertine’s affections, Sir Anthony dissociates her emotions from her actions. With her mind governing her decisions, Sir Anthony successfully maneuvers her position as a fallen woman in a patriarchal society to her advantage.

In Thomas Southerne’s Sir Anthony Love, Lucia, a woman in breeches, entertains and titillates audiences with the hypermasculinized performance of the libertine. Through her cross-gendering ventures, she reveals the necessary exclusion of women from male heroic friendships, which solidifies a superior male identity. Even the witty heroine’s agency is limited to the brief duration of courtship. In marriage, a noble woman inhabits an insecure secondary status dependent on her husband’s wavering affections. As a fallen woman, Lucia demonstrates that the real “fall” of a woman is not the act of losing her virginity but in allowing herself to become vulnerable through loving the philandering and misogynistic libertine. In a patriarchal society of double standards and male chauvinism that commodifies a woman’s body, the only way for Sir Anthony to achieve autonomy is by dealing with men with the same cold calculation used to objectify her. Love has no currency in this sexual marketplace, and through her ability to separate her emotions from sex, Sir Anthony becomes the femme fatale, the dangerous and powerful woman who remains in complete control while seducing her male victim.

Kirsten Mendoza is an MA candidate in English at Loyola University Chicago. William M. Storm, a PhD candidate in English at Marquette University, edited this paper.
Joseph Mead and the “Battle of the Starlings”

By Kirsty Rolfe

Nearly every week between about 1620 and 1631, Joseph Mead wrote a letter to his friend Sir Martin Stuteville. Mead was a fellow of Christ’s College, Cambridge, best known for his work on Biblical eschatology. The older Stuteville was a gentleman living in Dalham in Suffolk. The two men had been friends for some years—Stuteville’s connection to the Master of Christ’s was probably instrumental in getting Mead the fellowship there in 1613. Mead kept Stuteville up to date with the latest news from Cambridge, from London, from the court, and beyond. Mead’s letters to Stuteville, held in the Harley Collection at the British Library, provide a remarkable record of the news available to interested and well-connected readers in this period. He gleaned this news from a wide range of sources—personal letters, manuscript newsletters, printed pamphlets and broadsheets, sermons, gossip, and rumour.

The packets dispatched from Mead to Stuteville were usually made up of several different documents. First, each included a personal letter addressed to Stuteville. Most of the news communicated in this way was domestic, and most appears to have been taken from personal letters or oral communication. Second, enclosed within each letter were usually one or more separate sheets containing news transcribed from professional manuscript newsletters, or from printed news. Third, Mead also often sent Stuteville his own copies of texts that he deemed of particular interest. These are not usually included in the Harley volumes, and Mead did not always indicate them in the letters with which they were sent. This essay examines Mead’s interactions with two extant printed news pamphlets—one that he bought and forwarded to Stuteville in Dalham, and one that he did not acquire, but which was described to him—dealing with “wonderfull” events in Cork in 1621 and 1622. For Mead, these incidents and the texts that reported them raised key questions about the nature of news—what it is, how one should write it, and what uses one should put it to.

Mead received the great majority of the news he sent on to Dalham from professional and personal contacts in London—especially his frequent correspondent Dr. Meddus, the rector of the church of Saint Gabriel Fenchurch—and from booksellers who dealt in imported and domestically-produced news texts. London was central to England’s news economy: manuscript, printed, and oral news arrived in the capital via postal and mercantile networks, and was reshaped and retailed by newsletter writers, printers, and booksellers. Mead was writing during a

period in which Europe's news economy was changing rapidly; printed news in particular was being produced and marketed in increasingly innovative ways. In response to worsening conflict on the continent, printers in the Netherlands began producing “corantos” (broadsheets of foreign news) in English, which they exported to London. We know that Mead bought these during 1621, because he included several in his letters to Stuteville, complete with explanatory annotations. He also makes one of the earliest and most famous references to printed news production in England, in a postscript to a letter dated September 22, 1621: “My Corrantoer Archer was layd by the heeles [imprisoned] for making or adding to Corrantoes &c as they say.” As Joad Raymond writes, Mead’s “use of the possessive pronoun suggests that Meade had grown to prefer, or found easier access to, London-printed translations of Dutch news.”

Mead refers here to Thomas Archer, a bookseller who was imprisoned (along with the printer Edward Allde) in August 1621 for printing a pamphlet about the war in Bohemia. Whether or not Archer also produced broadsheet corantos is unclear, because none attributed to him survive. However, soon after this, English-printed corantos began to appear, attributed to one “N. B.”—probably Nathaniel Butter or Nicholas Bourne. At some point during the spring of 1622, both men started to publish news in pamphlet form instead of broadsheet.

The importance of London to Mead’s newsgathering activities is illustrated in his letters from the summer of 1625, when London was crippled by the plague, and carriers were forbidden to travel between the capital and Cambridge. On July 17, 1625, Mead reported Meddus’s opinion that “it is no time now to enquire of forraine occurrents.” Occasional dispatches did reach Cambridge, and Mead appears to have been able to receive, or at least catch sight of, the bills of mortality throughout the epidemic. However, for the most part Mead found himself cut off from his usual sources of news about what was happening beyond England’s borders; he was constrained to report local events and, occasionally, feverish rumours of foreign invasion.

Christ’s College, however, was more than a staging post for news traveling from London to Dalham. Mead took an active role in selecting and framing the news he sent to Stuteville: as well as acting as Stuteville’s agent, he was in effect his gatekeeper. He collated the news he could from the sources available to him, selected the reports that seemed reliable, interesting or important, and forwarded these on to Stuteville. Mead’s newsgathering process resembles what David Randall calls “extensive” newsreading: the process by which one might attempt to establish the credibility of a report through careful “examination and comparison of multiple, presumptively dishonourable texts.”

---

3 See BL Harleian MS 389, f. 84, which is an annotated copy of Broer Jansz’s coranto for July 9, 1621, and f. 105r-7v, in which Abraham Veseler’s coranto for June 20, 1621 is bound enclosed within a letter dated July 7, 1621.
4 BL Harleian MS 389, f. 122r.
6 Mead to Stuteville, July 17, 1625, BL Harleian MS 389, f. 476r.
7 See Mead to Stuteville, September 10, 1625, in which Mead reports two related rumours: that Charles I was sick of the plague, and that a Spanish fleet commanded by the feared general Spinola had been sighted near the English coast, presumably waiting to intercept Charles’s successor; BL Harleian MS 389, f. 487r-v.
Furthermore, Mead frequently reflects upon the value and reliability of the news he reports, and his own process in gathering and evaluating it. Although Mead's letters can be read very fruitfully as records of events, or rumours, or the movements of texts, they are also records of how Mead presented his own role as Stuteville's “faithfull Novellante,” as he signed himself on May 4, 1622. “Novellante,” meaning “newsmonger,” may be intended as a joke: Mead only uses the word on this occasion, and signs most of his other letters to Stuteville with some variation on “Yours most ready to be commanded.” Mead usually presents himself as Stuteville's loyal servant, rather than his newsmonger. However, he does seem to have taken pride in his ability to gather news. Following his return from a journey in January 1623, he began a letter by jokingly asserting his skill in gathering news: “You will perceive by the enclosed, That when I am from home my freinds have no success in purveying for newes. For they told me, they had send every whither & could heare of no lettres, & complained they were almost starved, though it were Christmas time. But they had not the trick of it. As soone as ever I gott of my bootes you see what I found.” However, elsewhere Mead's references to his newsgathering activities tend to be focused on its difficulties—particularly the paucity and unreliability of the materials with which he had to work. There was never, it seems, enough news, and the news that Mead did acquire was often of problematic credibility.

The difficulty of ascertaining the reliability or unreliability of a news report was compounded by the fact that, by its very nature, “news” needs to be “new.” Mead refers to this issue at the start of a letter dated April 6, 1622. “Though pickle be sweet while it is fresh,” he writes (presumably referring to a sweet sauce or relish), “yet time will make it sowre: & though there be no danger in my letters whilst report is so rife, yet when it is forgotten they will not be so safe: but your danger is as great as mine.” Mead's words are whimsical, but they read a little like a threat. His letters are safe, for now, because they express news that is being widely reported. However, once this news has passed out of general discussion, texts that deal with it may become unsafe—both for the writer and for the reader. This news is unstable and time-bound, prone to “go bad” like old pickle. The passage of time turns “fresh” news into something not just inedible or unsatisfying, but downright dangerous.

Many news stories circulating in the spring of 1622 were potentially “dangerous” to write and read about. English forces were at war with Spanish and Bavarian troops in the Rhineland, over the patrimony of James's exiled son-in-law, the erstwhile Elector Frederick V. Meanwhile negotiations for a marriage between Prince Charles and the Spanish Infanta Maria continued apace. Rumours of Catholic threats to England—both foreign and domestic—were rife. In his previous letter to Stuteville, dated March 30, 1622, Mead describes “very suspicious talke of the Huge Spanish Armado . . . intended either for England or Ireland,” and notes that “They talk also that our Catholicks in England, are strangely provided of armour, no man knowes to what purpose.” Perhaps it is rumors like these that threaten to go sour should they prove to be untrue, thus making the letter that carried them to Stuteville a dangerous document.

9 Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville, May 4, 1622, BL Harleian MS 389, f. 184r.
10 Mead to Stuteville, January 18, 1622/3, BL Harleian MS 389, f. 272r.
11 Mead to Stuteville, April 6, 1622, BL Harleian MS 389, f. 166r.
12 Mead to Stuteville, March 30, 1622, BL Harleian MS 389, f. 164v.
However, Mead goes on to discuss another news story in his letter of April 6, 1622. Following his pickle analogy, Mead writes, “If the wonder of Starlings be a fable, my greatest losse, is but 3d which I payd for the book I sent you.”13 The book in question was probably a short quarto pamphlet, THE WONDERFULL Battell of Starelings: Fought at the Citie of Corke in Irelanld, the 12. and 14. of October last past. 1621. 14 It was one of two printed news publications to report a remarkable incident that apparently took place the previous autumn, around and over the city of Cork. There was also a broadside ballad entitled A battell of Birds most strangely fought in Ireland, upon the eighth day of September last, 1621, which gives a different date for the “battell.”15 However, it is likely that Mead sent Stuteville the pamphlet rather than the ballad, given that he describes it as a “book,” and I have found no references to ballads in his correspondence with Stuteville.16 The Wonderfull Battell of Starelings was printed for one “N. B.” This was probably, for reasons that we will see later, Nicholas Bourne, and thus the pamphlet presumably made its way to Cambridge via the same channels by which Mead received printed foreign news. We know from the reference in the April 6 letter that Mead sent The Wonderful Battell of Starlings to Stuteville sometime before then, but there are no references in earlier letters to indicate when this was.

According to the pamphlet, around the seventh of October “there gathered together by degrees, an unusual multitude of birds called Stares.” These birds appeared to act unnervingly like a human army, mustering at the east and west of the city.17 The birds even, we are told, sent ambassadors from each camp to the other. This culminated on the morning of the twelfth of October, when “upon a strange sound and noise made as well on the one side as on the other, they forthwith at one instant tooke wing, and so mounting up into the skyes, encountered one another, with such a terrible shocke, as the sound amazed the whole city and all the beholders.”18 This “sodaine and fierce encounter” was shockingly violent: “There fell downe into the citie, and into the Rivers, multitudes of Starlings or Stares, some with wings broken, some with legs and necks broken, some with eies pickt out, some their bils thrust into the brests & sides of their adversaries, in so strange a manner, that it were incredible except it were confirmed by letters of credit, and by eye-witnesses, with that assurance which is without all exception.”19 The birds then vanished from the area, and were not seen again until the fourteenth, when they staged another “battell.” In the interim, however, another such fight was reported—this time in England. A battle between two flocks of starlings was spotted near Woolwich by some travelers on the Gravesend ferry. “For more assured proove of this fight,” the reader is told, “there are at this time in London divers persons of worth and very honest reputation, whom the Printer of this Pamphlet can produce to justifie what they saw, as cause shall require, upon their oaths.”20 This echoes a similar claim in the address to the reader, in which the writer stresses that his account

---

13 Mead to Stuteville, April 6, 1622, BL Harleian MS 389, f. 166r.
14 The Wonderfull Battell of Starlings: Fought at the Citie of Corke in Ireland, the 12. and 14. of October last past. 1621. As it hath been credibly enformed by divers noble-men, and others of the said kindome, &c. (London, 1622), STC. 5767.
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can be proved “by certificate of Letters, from Right Honorable persons in Ireland where the accident fell out, to Right Honourable persons at Court, and divers in London at this present,” as well as “the testimony of Right Honourable and Worshipfull persons, & others of good reputation now in London, who were eye-witnesses.”

As this indicates, the writer of the pamphlet is careful to frame this remarkable sequence of events within a framework of credibility. The accounts of the battles in Cork have been obtained from “divers Noblemen,” and only printed once they had been thoroughly checked for accuracy: “These strange newes out of Ireland had beene printed before this time, but that it hath beene stayed till the truth were fully certified and examined.” Meanwhile readers in London can, if they choose, corroborate the stories of both the battle over Cork and of that over Woolwich by making contact with eyewitnesses.

However, the reported events require more than a natural explanation. After describing how the starlings apparently traveled from Cork to Woolwich and back again, the writer notes: “It may bee held in respect of the distance of the place by sea and land improbable: but this improbability is soone answered, for as the fight at Corke may seeme strange and improbable, yet being most assured that such a battle was fought, it may be as probable in the wonderfull worke of Almighty God, that notwithstanding the distance of place, these may be the same Stares.”

Ascribing these “strange and admirable events” to God solves one issue—that of the starlings’ “improbable” travels—but it raises another one. If this is one of “the wonderfull worke of Almighty God,” might they reveal something of God’s intentions—and therefore should one use them in order to forecast future events? The problems of doing this are manifold, as explained at the start of the address to the reader: “To report strange and admirable accidents, is subject both to danger and disgrace: to danger, in that they may bee held as prodigious, or ominous: to disgrace, in that they may be reputed fabulous. There can be no danger in reporting, so that there bee no prognosticating, which by all meanes I doe forbeare: onely I will say with the Royall Prophet, . . . God is wonderfull in all his worke.”

The writer identifies two criticisms that might be leveled against the text—first, that discussion of events might lead to dangerous discussion of what they might portend, and second, that the “battell of starelings” never happened. The writer attempts to forestall the second criticism by describing the credibility of his sources—the “battle” is reported in “letters of credit” from “divers Noblemen.” However, the first criticism is rather more difficult to stem. Can reporting such “works of God” be separated from “prognosticating”—and should it be? The Wonderfull Battell of Starelings concludes with a generalized warning: “We should not be curious to search out reasons for the wonderfull worke of Almighty God.” Nonetheless, one should use the news of the “battell” as a prompt to reform and repentance: “It doth import all Christians not to bee careless, but that they must know and consider there is no wonderfull or miraculous worke, but it doth prognosticate either Gods mercy to draw us to repentance, or his
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justice to punish our sinnes and wickednesse, if we doe not make haste to repent in due time, 
when his mercy is offered, or his justice threatened.”25 In other words, one should not use the 
“battell” to speculate about specific future events, but rather apply it to current “sinnes and 
wickednesse” in order to avoid future punishment. Such interpretation skirts accusations of 
“prognostication” by deferring meaning, refusing to state what form such punishment will take 
or when it may strike.

Mead seems to echo the pamphlet’s language when he refers to the “danger in [his] letters.” 
For Mead, as for the pamphlet’s writer, the “battell of starlings” raises the issue of how news 
writers and readers should react to the uncanny and the ominous. Are things like the “battell of 
starlings” really “news,” fit to be reported alongside battles and Cambridge gossip? As Mead’s 
“pickle” analogy expresses, news that is dislocated in time can become problematic; given that 
old news referring to past events can be “dangerous,” what happens if one uses news to 
extrapolate the future?

Mead’s discussion of the text in the April 6 letter appears to be in response to some criticism 
of the story in a letter from Stuteville (which is, unfortunately, no longer extant). Mead writes: “I 
heard as much before [i.e., that the story was a “fable”], but not as peremptorie as yours.”26 Mead 
here appears to be justifying his skill as a “novellante,” by claiming to have discussed the matter 
with others before forwarding the pamphlet on. Yet his ability to filter out unreliable news has, 
we infer, been found lacking by the “peremptorie” Stuteville. In response, Mead compares the 
pamphlet to some news from court, which suggests an alternative, less miraculous explanation 
for the “battell”:

For the Prince enquiring of a Knight out of Ireland concerning the truth of it, 
He assured him that as for any wonder or miracle it was a meere tale but there is 
in the suburbs of Cork an old house or Abbey where Starlings in time of yeare 
use to build, & whether they flocked (as their wont is) at the time mentioned, & 
being many together fell to fighting so that some were taken up upon the ground 
either hurt or wearied; & this he affirmed was all & the ground of that report.27

Thus Mead demonstrates that he is able to access privileged oral information, and to compare it 
to that he receives from elsewhere. However, he doesn’t present this as the last word on the 
subject:

But howsoever the very report {of strange things} though false, in some mens 
judgment is not to be contemned because it hath beene observed, that prodigious 
reports are some times as ominous, [as] the truthes if they were reall. it is 
sampled by the late King of France of whose death there was a report upon no 
ground some 2 yeares before his death, whereof Owen hath an Epigramme 
telling him that it was a warning of his end not farre of.28
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Here Mead suggests an astonishing theory. Even things that didn’t actually happen can be valuable to the “Novellante,” because the reports in themselves might “prognosticate” future events. The very fact that “prodigious reports” circulate is enough for “some men” to judge this worth recording and communicating. The “battell of starelings” has a value separate, or at least different, to its value as “news;” credible or otherwise, it may foretell the future. This casts the rumours in Mead’s previous letter, about a Spanish invasion force and the “strange provision” of armour to English Catholics, in a different light: they may not be true reports, but they illustrate current fears. Perhaps one of the reasons why Mead transmits them to Stuteville—and perhaps one of the reasons why they might be “dangerous”—is the possibility that they may be “as ominous, [as] the truthes if they were reall.” Reports of further events in Cork prompted Mead to return to the “battell of starelings” in a letter dated June 29, 1622. Mead writes: “There is a book of this strange burning of Cork. but it came not yet to my hands; but those that read it, say that in it, the truth of the Battail of Starlings is againe avouched.”

The fire in Cork happened on the last day of May, 1622. An electrical storm followed a spell of dry weather; lightning struck simultaneously at opposite ends of the town, and the blaze quickly spread. In his history of fire services in Cork, Pat Poland describes it as “the greatest fire disaster ever to befal this city,” and compares it to the firestorm when Hamburg was bombed in 1943. Over 1,500 buildings were apparently destroyed, and Poland suggests that over 600 people may have died.

The book that Mead heard about in June 1622 was probably A Relation of the Most lamentable Burning of the Cittie of Corke, in the West of Ireland, in the Province of Monster, by Thunder and Lightning. With other most dolefull and miserable accidents, which fell out the last of May 1622 after the prodigious battell of the birds called Stares, which fought strangely over and neare the Citie the 12. & 14. of May 1621 (May is presumably an error). It was printed in London on the twentieth of June, for Nicholas Bourne and Thomas Archer, nine days before Mead’s letter.

As this title suggests, this account of the disaster places the “battell of starelings” front and center. This pamphlet starts with a reference to the earlier pamphlet (unsurprising, if both were printed for Bourne), and an emphatic interpretation of what the “battell of starlings” meant:

This report being so strange, was of some censured as an untrue and idle invention; Of others, which understood, and by enquirie were resolved of the truth, it was imagined to prognosticate some strange and dreadful accident to follow, as warres, plagues or pestilence, with such like conjectures. Sithence which time, namely, this last of May 1622. the Omnipotent Majestie of heaven hath not onely reprooved their vanitie, who would not beleev so strange a Relation, but hath further by a most dreadful and lamentable demonstration of his power and Justice, resolved what that battell of Birds might or did prognosticate, wherein
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his Justice in one respect may be feared, and his mercy by so exemplar a manifestation may be sought after in another.31

“In what manner this battell of Birds was performed, is needles in this place to be repeated,” the writer adds, “because the relation is extant in Print.” This suggests that the “N. B.” for whom The Wonderfull Battell of Starlings was printed was indeed Bourne, and that the earlier pamphlet remained available for sale in Bourne’s shop. Similarly, a broadside ballad about the fire was printed by “E. A.,” almost certainly Edward Allde, the printer who had been imprisoned at the same time as Archer in 1621.32

The ballad has a very similar title to Bourne and Archer’s pamphlet, complete with the same error in dating: The lamentable Burning of the City of Corke (in the Province of Munster in Ireland) by Lightning: which happened the Last of May, 1622. After the prodigious Battell of the Stares, which Fought most strangely over and neere that City, the 12. and 14. of May. 1621. The ballad mentions the pamphlet about the fire: “You shall see the full Relation at large in the Booke newly Printed,” suggesting that this publication was also associated with Bourne.33 Again, it seems likely from Mead’s use of the word “book” that he heard about the pamphlet rather than the ballad.

The reader need not read the earlier pamphlet, however, as the salient points are summarized emphatically in the address to the reader of A Relation of the Most lamentable Burning of the Cittie of Corke. It is “fitting for the Reader to know, because he shall thereby understand, how directly this dreadfull, and most terrible late Accident in Corke, was prognosticated in the clamorous and cruell fight of the Stares, at and neare unto Corke.” These direct parallels are chiefly geographical: “Where the Stares began their fiery and furious fight at the East end of the Cittie; there began the first originall of the ruine of Corke: And as the Birds proceeded in their fight, so did the Cittie of Corke consume by fire from heaven. . . . Thus what the battell and fight of the birds did presage and prognosticate, fell out too true and dolefull, in the utter ruine & consumption of a rich & wealthy Cittie,” and thus, “Upon this so grievous an accident, it is absolutely necessary, that all the Citties and Townes of England and Ireland, should make speedie Use of so dreadfull an example.” The writer heavily implies that English readers should beware the same punishment, or even a worse one: the people of Cork have committed usury “to exceed any

31 A Relation of the Most lamentable Burning of the Cittie of Corke, in the West of Ireland, in the Province of Munster, by Thunder and Lightning. With other most doleful and miserable accidents, which fell out the last of May 1622 after the prodigious battell of the birds called Stares, which fought strangely over and neere the Citte the 12. & 14. of May 1621. As it hath beene reported to divers right honourable persons (London, 1622), STC. 5766, sig. A3r.
32 I. Gadd, “Allde, Edward (1555-1627),” Oxford Dictionary of National Biography; http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/363, accessed April 16, 2012; William A. Jackson, ed., Records of the Court of the Stationers’ Company 1602 to 1640 (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1957), 138 (E70a). Allde’s livery membership was suspended at a meeting of the court of the Stationers’ Company on October 8, 1621, and he was not readmitted until he submitted to the court on July 5, 1623. However, this does not seem to have adversely affected his ability to print news pamphlets – often with falsified foreign imprints – and, it appears, ballads. Two examples of Allde’s “foreign” output are The Hollanders declaration of the affaires of the East Indies (1622, STC. 13598), a pamphlet of Dutch news purporting to be from Amsterdam, and two pamphlets supposedly printed in The Hague: News from Turkie and Poland (1622), STC. 18507.36; and News from the Palatinate. A true and comfortable relation of the wonderfull proceedings of Count Mansfield, from his first comming into the Palatinate, untill this present moneth (1622), STC. 18507.37.
33 The lamentable Burning of the City of Corke (in the Province of Munster in Ireland) by Lightning: which happened the Last of May, 1622. After the prodigious Battell of the Stares, which Fought most strangely over and neere that Citty, the 12. and 14. of May. 1621 (London, 1622), STC. 5765.
Cittie in the Kings Dominions, except some Citties in *England*, which as they are farre greater in quantitie, so I feare they doe as much exceed in qualitie of the same sinne.*34 The “battell” over Woolwich is not mentioned, but perhaps it lies behind this appeal to English consciences. England—specifically, an area near London—has received the same warning as Cork, and the inhabitants should amend their lives before they suffer the same fate.

While the earlier pamphlet claims that “prognostication” is dangerous and should be avoided, this effectively argues that everyone who did predict terrible things for Cork was right to do so. The fire confirms an interpretation of the “battell of starelings” as ominous, a warning from God. Both this pamphlet and the ballad place the “battell of starelings” and the fire in a clear narrative—the battle predicts the fire, and the fire confirms the truth of the battle. “Old news” has become news again through its perceived connection to recent events; reports of the battle are (literally, in the case of *The Wonderfull Battell of Starelings*) a saleable commodity.

Mead, however, does not provide Stuteville with a clear response to the events in Cork, but rather with a sense of confusion. “Lord what should a man beleive,” he exclaims. “It is not yet 5 weeks since a gentleman told me, that he had newly spoken with a gentleman living in Ireland, who avouched the same [i.e., that the “battell of starelings” was true]. & withall, as he told me shook his head, wherefore, he knew not.”35 Mead here describes himself as part of a chain of oral news, one that allows him to compare and contrast the reports he receives. However, this oral news is in itself rather difficult to interpret: the meaning of the head-shaking is frustratingly elusive. Mead’s ability to interpret the news stories he receives founders with an ambiguous gesture.

In this letter, Mead does not return to the notion that “the very report ^of strange things^ though false” may have value for predicting future events, but rather concerns himself with the impossibility of proving exactly what happened over Cork in October 1621. For Mead, the news of the fire does not prove the truth of the battle: rather, it highlights the impossibility of such proof through contrast. The news of the fire can be verified, but it serves to underscore Mead’s frustrating inability to prove whether the “battle” happened or not: “But if this last of Cork be true, it will soone appeare, if the Citty be found no more: whereas that of the battaile did depend but on one days testimonie, & perhaps not of many mens sight: if so be it be yet possible to beleive it: which I know not.”36

Here Mead reaches ahead to future news reports that may confirm whether the fire indeed took place. The destruction of Cork is not as deeply time-bound as the “battell of starelings”: presumably, if the city has been destroyed, people will be able to witness this fact, and other reports of the devastation will arrive in Cambridge. The traces of the “battle,” on the other hand, would not have lasted in the same way. Although the carnage following the “battell of starelings” was readable on the landscape—as the ballad reporting on it describes, “all the fields were overspread,/with mangled starlings that lay dead”—such evidence was comparatively short-
lived. By the time of the fire, the bodies would have either been removed (the ballad reports that “people tooke them up in feare”) or decayed. Ultimately, any text that deals with the “battell” will need to rely upon the memories of those who saw it happen, and no new evidence will be found that might swing one towards a particular interpretation.

Perhaps this is one way of reading Mead’s “pickle” analogy. “Time will make [such ephemeral news] sowre,” as memories of it fade, and as the possibility of actual verification recedes. Establishing the credibility or otherwise of the reports of the “battell” cannot be done through “extensive” newsreading: Mead is unlikely to acquire any further information about the events in October—and even if he does such news will not be “fresh.” Perhaps for Mead “danger” lies not necessarily in prognosticating possible futures, but in claiming certain and incontrovertible interpretations of the past—especially of past events that one cannot be absolutely certain took place.

Kirsty Rolfe is an MA candidate in English at Queen Mary, University of London. Geoffrey A. Johns, a PhD candidate in English at Michigan State University, edited this paper.
On April 23, 1661, King Charles II of England, Scotland, and Ireland processed through the streets of London with his royal entourage to Westminster Abbey for his coronation. James Heath, a Royalist historian of the late seventeenth century, recorded the magnificence of the spectacle:

It is incredible to think what costly clothes were worn that day: the cloaks could hardly be seen what silk or satin they were made of, for the gold and silver laces and embroidery that were laid upon them: besides the inestimable value and treasures of diamonds, pearls, and other jewels, worn upon their backs and in their hats: to omit the sumptuous and rich liveries of their pages and footmen; the numerousness of these liveries, and their orderly march; as also the stately equipage of the esquires attending each earl by his horse’s side: so that all the world saw it.

A pauper and exile only a year earlier, Charles II began his reign with all the splendid pomp and ceremony that had been absent during the preceding years of the Interregnum. The Restoration of this sovereign, in drastic contrast to the puritanical style of Oliver Cromwell, reinitiated a cultural shift to the absolutist opulence of the Continent. Heath further wrote of the coronation of Charles II that “much wonder it caused to outlandish persons, who were acquainted with our late troubles and confusions, how it was possible for the English to appear in so rich and stately a manner.”

Trimmed with gold and silver lace, the English king’s rich coronation suits were, as Jane Ashelford notes, “of course, in the French style.” Such a royal garb projected a majestic image of kingly power modeled after his cousin, the Catholic monarch Louis XIV of France. Indeed, the regal dress of Charles II conveyed to the English people that their glorious king had returned after decades of tumultuous civil war and staunch parliamentary rule. Samuel Pepys concluded his observations of the day with this comment: “Now after all this, I can say that besides the pleasure of the sight of these glorious things, I may now shut my eyes against any other objects, or for the future trouble
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myself to see things of state and shewe, as being sure never to see the like again in this world.”

This sumptuous display of Continental culture at the commencement of the Restoration set the tone for the entangled nature of material culture and court politics throughout the reigns of Charles II (1660–1685) and his brother James II (1685–1688).

In the Carolean and Jacobean courts of the late seventeenth century, dress reflected social, political, and cultural ties. In some instances it was also utilized as a mode of communication by male and female courtiers: what was worn and displayed held unique significance within the system of court politics. In Dressing the Elite: Clothes in Early Modern England, Susan Vincent emphasizes that material or physical properties, including fabric, color, and style, are fundamental to understanding the language of clothing during the early modern period. Indeed, Vincent argues that these characteristics were “inalienable, inherent qualities, and they affect[ed] the meaning that cultures then ascribe[d] to others.” Thus, fashionable garments cut in the French style and luxury goods from the Continent maintained a greater political significance in the English royal courts of the late seventeenth century. From approximately 1660 to 1700, a rich literary dialogue circulated that vehemently debated the English adoption of Continental culture in the royal court and on the streets of London. The appropriation of French court culture by Charles II, in addition to England’s expansion of international trade, caused anxiety among a portion of the English population, regarding what was deemed “English” in a realm flooded with foreign goods. By using the courtly costume of both great men and ladies as a lens to view the intersection of dress and nation, several principal tensions of the late Stuart period can be glimpsed, specifically issues of national character, political loyalty, and religious affiliation.

Under Charles II and James II, the ambiguity concerning Englishness was particularly facilitated by the permanence of French culture within the English royal court and early modern London. As noted by British historian Arthur Bryant, “everything new came from Paris, the Mecca of the
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Indeed, Bryant explains that the English king’s embrace of the French style achieved “a change in taste far greater than any transient turn of fashion. For it affected everything, our architecture, our dress, food and manners, our books, our whole attitude of life.”

Charles II himself mimicked French fashion with his adoption of the “decadent doublet” popular among male royals and courtiers of Versailles, but decided to abandon this Continental attire a month after the Great Fire of London, while England was at war with France and still recovering from the Great Plague of 1665-1666.

On October 8, 1666, Pepys recorded that “the King hath yesterday in Council declared his resolution of setting a fashion for clothes, which he will never alter. It will be a vest, I know not well how; but it is to teach the nobility thrift, and will do good.” A week later, Pepys stated that Charles II and several “great courtiers” donned the new vest, and he described it as “a long cassocke close to the body, of black cloth, and pinked with white silke under it, and a coat over it, and the legs ruffled with black riband like a pigeon’s leg.” This style differed from the French fashion not simply in terms of cut, shape, or length, but also for the initial modesty of the garment. The Carolean vest rejected flamboyant shades and rich fabrics for more somber tones, such as the black and white color scheme of Pepys’s description, and for simple cloth. Yet, while the garment was intended to be “anti-extravagance,” de Beer indicates that this fashion was far from drab and inexpensive, as several contemporary accounts described opulent renditions of the vest of Charles II. Thus, as several costume historians have noted, the vest’s emphatic rejection of French style enabled it to function primarily as a political tool against France.

When Charles II retired his Continental menswear in 1666, many courtiers at home and abroad viewed this act as a political statement against French interests. John Evelyn had previously solicited the king in his 1661 pamphlet, *Tyrannus, or: The Mode*, to reject foreign fashions in order to bolster domestic textile production and create an English national dress. Evelyn’s comments regarding French cultural imperialism in England indicated the importance of clothing for national sentiment: “I love the French well (and have many reasons for it) yet I would be glad to pay my respects in any thing rather then my Clothes because I conceive it so great diminution to our Native Country, and to the discretion of it.” Evelyn further pondered the benefits of uniting the entire English population in a shared, domestic-made dress: “How glorious to our Prince, when he should behold all his Subjects clad with the Production of his own Country, and the People Universally inrich’d, whilst the Species that we now consume in Lace or export for foreign Silks, and more unserviceable Stuffs would by this means be all fav’d, and the whole Nation knit as one to the heart of their
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Sovereign, as to a Provident and Indulgent Father?”

With the creation of the vest, Evelyn, as well as other Englishmen and women, delighted in the visual rejection of French culture. Indeed, an account of the French reaction to the vest of Charles II indicated that even Louis XIV interpreted the action as such.

Pepys commented on November 22, 1666 that Louis XIV had retaliated to the vestmentary attack of Charles II, with the following anecdote: “The King of France hath, in defiance to the King of England, caused all his footmen to be put into vests, and that the noblemen of France will do the like; which, if true, is the greatest indignity ever done by one Prince to another, and would incite a stone to be revenged.” Pepys was clearly inflamed by the thought of French servants as well as noblemen in an “English,” or distinctly non-Continental, garb. Although several historians, including de Beer, question the accuracy of this account, Pepys’s statement revealed that European powers practiced, or at least recognized, diplomacy through dress. Indeed, the vest of Charles II reflected the tense nature of Anglo-French relations from the late 1660s to the early 1670s. The vest fad declined “with a fresh surrender to France,” as the English king consigned the garment to the back of his wardrobe upon the renewal of friendly relations with the French by 1672.

In an addendum to his memoirs, Evelyn lamented: “It was a comely and manly habit, too good to hold, it being impossible for us in good earnest to leave ye Monsieurs vanities long.”

While male royals and courtiers frequently utilized clothing as a political tool, material culture also provided elite women with a mode to participate in the wider, masculine discourse of politics. Despite their exclusion from official governmental posts, female courtiers consistently acted to promote their own personal or familial interests by establishing factional alliances within the court and gaining the king’s favor. For these ladies, fashion and physical appearance served as a form of self-expression as well as an emblem of power. Elite women often utilized their costume to illustrate and communicate political statements, such as factional or party affiliation and dominant status, within the hierarchical structure of the Restoration court.

A woman’s material wealth, her gowns, jewels, and apartments were symbolic of her station in the court. Although Vincent emphasizes the importance of a garment’s physical properties in the politics of display, she states that equally significant was “the manner in which these garments were borne, displayed and manipulated.” Factors such as space played a vital role in the politics of display by royal women during the late Stuart era. The plentiful and competitive array of mistresses of Charles II utilized their material wealth in various ways to demonstrate their position over one another. Indeed, material goods served as a mode for social competition among the mistresses of the Restoration court.
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In her article, “The Mistresses of Charles II and Restoration Court Politics,” Sonya Wynne describes how courtiers often measured a mistress’s power by the opulence of the gifts given to her by the king. She comments that, “when challenged by courtiers, the mistresses’ best answer was to draw attention to Charles’s esteem for them.” Such a visual display of good favor often included gem-encrusted gowns, luxurious apartments, modish equipages, and jewels, regarded by Patricia Cholakian as “traditionally a woman’s most sacrosanct property.” The recipients of considerable annuities from the Crown, Barbara Palmer, the Countess of Castlemaine and Duchess of Cleveland, and Louise de Kéroualle, the Duchess of Portsmouth, broadcasted their influence over the king through their clothes and possessions. Indeed, the notorious rivalry between the French-born Duchess of Portsmouth and the English actress Nell Gwyn escalated when Louise continually rode past Nell’s comparatively humble abode in her extravagant coach, as a visual reminder to her competition of how much better Charles II kept his noble mistresses. Such displays stimulated discussions within early modern print culture regarding the dominance and emasculation of the king by women such as Portsmouth and her predecessor Lady Castlemaine.

Clothing was another means of asserting supremacy over adversaries within the Restoration court. Lady Castlemaine, the principal mistress of Charles II during his twenty-five year reign, conveyed a powerful message to her latest rival on the morning of the English king’s wedding to the Portuguese princess, Catherine of Braganza. Lady Castlemaine instructed that her petticoats from the previous evening, once freshly laundered, be hung in the royal gardens where every courtier could witness her luxurious undergarments. As Pepys observed, “And in the Privy-garden saw the finest smocks and linnen petticoats of my Lady Castlemaine’s, laced with rich lace at the bottom, that ever I saw; and did me good to look upon them.” These fine petticoats informed the entire court, including the sovereign’s new foreign bride, that the homegrown Lady Castlemaine dominated the space of the English royal court. Therefore, this spectacle was not simply a demonstration of who owned more extravagant garments, but an expression of personal power in Restoration court politics.

The material possessions of the Duchess of Portsmouth functioned as another example of the power of space and political significance of dress during the late seventeenth century. Throughout her fifteen years as courtesan of Charles II, the Catholic Duchess of Portsmouth consistently flaunted her French nationality. By the climax of the Popish Plot in 1680, she had gained intense notoriety as a destructive agent of vice, fornication, and espionage against the Crown. Charges of treason were brought against her for promoting the Papist and French interests by facilitating and
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23 See The Life, Amours, and Secret History of Francelia, Late Duchess of Portsmouth, Favourite Mistress to King Charles II (London, 1734); and Gabriel de Brémond, Hattige: or The Amours of the King of Tamaran, A Novel (Amsterdam, 1683).
24 Pepys, Diary, 62–63.
engaging in clandestine meetings between the king and French ambassadors. One article even cited her role as an intermediary of French culture as being criminal; Portsmouth introduced a French confectioner to the Restoration court who allegedly attempted to poison Charles II with sweetmeats.25

Although several of the numerous charges against her were superfluous, the Duchess of Portsmouth, like Lady Castlemaine, was indeed a central figure in the intricacies of court politics. Both Evelyn’s and Pepys’s diaries revealed that Portsmouth’s Whitehall apartments were often the meeting center for the most prominent ministers and courtiers of Charles II. Evelyn noted that the rooms were “luxuriously furnished, and with ten times the richnesse and glory beyond the Queenes.”26 The intimate nature of the space revealed that Portsmouth maintained a considerably significant position in the Restoration court and further indicated that the objects located within these rooms mattered for how the court determined such a status.

Moreover, the Duchess of Portsmouth’s apartments were utilized to communicate her political position or allegiance. As Evelyn observed in his diary entries, Portsmouth’s décor reflected the politicized nature of French culture. In her rooms, Evelyn glimpsed “the new fabrique of French Tapistry, for designe, tendernesse of worke, and incomparable imitation of the best paintings; beyond anything, I had ever beheld: some pieces had Versailles, St. Germans and other Palaces of the French King . . . all to the life rarely don.”27 These furnishings from Portsmouth’s native France informed the governmental ministers who gathered in her apartments of her political loyalties.

The French mistress’s dress also operated as a mode for displaying her political affiliation in the English royal court. When a notable French personage died, Portsmouth, whose own noble lineage was often questioned by English courtiers, donned mourning wear in order to visibly and publicly reinforce her personal connections to the aristocracy of France. Nell Gwyn, the famed English-born “Protestant Whore,” once remarked, “She claims that everyone in France is her relation; the moment some great one dies she puts on mourning.”28 In response to one occasion, Nell herself wore black the next day, “claiming that she was mourning for the recently deceased Cham of Tartary,” because she was as intimately related to this Mongol prince as Portsmouth was to a French duke.29 As a former French courtier who communicated often with Louis XIV’s ministers, the Duchess of Portsmouth, through her display, indicated her political inclinations towards France and thus incited sardonic responses that addressed domestic and foreign politics.

Further such examinations of dress and material culture in the late Stuart courts, particularly during the reign of James II, would greatly contribute to multiple scholarly fields. Similar studies have already been conducted on other eras within early modern English history, including

25 For a complete list of charges, see Articles of high-treason and other high crimes and misdemeanours against the Dutchess of Portsmouth (London, 1680).
27 Evelyn, Diary, 308.
29 Wilson, Nell Gwyn, 154–55.
examinations of Elizabethan portraiture and the self-fashioning of the Virgin Queen. Additionally, the theme of representation through clothing as a form of political rhetoric is evident throughout other English royal courts. The women of Henry VIII’s court practiced a form of “hood politics” wherein powerful courtiers such as Anne Boleyn and Jane Seymour utilized the national style of their headwear to visually indicate their political loyalties. Yet the Restoration court of Charles II and the subsequent reign of James II offer a unique case study. An analysis of the language of dress in the late Stuart court does not simply offer an ornamented picture of squabbles between courtiers, such as occurred within numerous royal courts throughout history. Court dress reflected the Restoration period itself, as the principal tensions between English and French, Protestant and Catholic, masculine and feminine, as well as Whig and Tory were interwoven with the threads of vests and gowns. An analysis of dress in the Restoration era is significant for the development of English national identity on the eve of the Glorious Revolution and for the establishment of Britain in the early eighteenth century. Indeed, clothes do not simply “make the man,” or woman, but history.

Emilie M. Brinkman is an MA candidate in History at Miami University. Melanie Zefferino, PhD candidate in Theatre Studies and Art History at the University of Warwick, edited this paper.
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30 I use the term “hood politics” in this sense to describe a trend that I have noticed while conducting research on dress in English royal courts.
Projectors and Polders: Patenting Trends in England and the Dutch Republic during the 1690s

By Steven Schrum

England and the Dutch Republic shared much in common in the 1690s—war with France, coinage crises, harvest failures, and even for a brief period of time the same head of state—but despite these similarities, their economies had different shapes. Economic activity in each country took a unique form which can best be seen in the different ways patents were used. In England, this decade was part of the period Daniel Defoe called, “The Projecting Age.” London was buzzing with entrepreneurs hawking the latest get-rich-quick scheme to anyone with money in his pocket. Patents gave an air of legitimacy to many projects including new inventions, miracle cures, lotteries, and hunts for sunken treasure. New financial schemes, most notably the Bank of England and the Land Bank, were also chartered through letters patent. Investors who preferred something more conventional could even buy shares in the New East India Company with its patented monopoly on trade. The 1690s were an age of rampant self interest and individual profit seeking driven by men whom Defoe and his contemporaries called projectors. Defoe claimed that “the past Ages have never come up to the degree of Projecting and Inventing . . . which we see this Age arriv’d to.” The Dutch Republic was also a beehive of projecting, but of a different sort. While there was no shortage of projects, the scheming projector was a much rarer breed in the United Provinces. Patents for lotteries were granted not to courtiers, but to almshouses, orphanages, and religious groups. Likewise, communities engaged in land reclamation often received patents providing them with tax exemptions. The chief agents and beneficiaries of Dutch economic activity were more often corporate groups than individuals. Far fewer Dutch patents were issued for individual gain and even those that were tended to be for legitimate undertakings rather than the unscrupulous and frivolous schemes so often favored by English projectors.

Patenting trends in the 1690s highlight the differences between English and Dutch political economy. As a result of focusing only on one nation, historians have misjudged the significance of patents in explaining the uniqueness of each country’s economy. By placing patents in a comparative context, I will reveal the more nuanced inflections of national economic activity which are not readily apparent when the two countries are examined separately. Patenting, I argue, demonstrates the self-interested and individualistic nature of an English economy catalyzed by changes in national

politics, and marks it out as different from the more corporative and fragmented world of Dutch activity.

Both English and Dutch historians have devoted insufficient attention to the subject of patents, particularly during the late seventeenth century. English scholars, with a few notable exceptions, have concentrated either on sixteenth and early seventeenth-century monopolies or on inventions from the Industrial Revolution onwards. Far less has been written about patents in the intervening years, despite their unprecedented numbers in the 1690s. W. R. Scott touched briefly on the surge in his work on joint-stock companies. He noted an increase in companies founded during the early years of the decade to exploit patented inventions, which he attributed to the disruption of foreign trade by war with France. Scott's interest, however, was in the new companies rather than the patents they held. He made no attempt to explain the popularity of patenting. More recently, in her work on patents for invention, Christine MacLeod has also tackled the issue of the 1690s surge. She rejects Defoe's claim of unprecedented inventing, and, in a similar vein to Scott, argues "the remarkable surge in patenting of the early 1690s . . . was not a manifestation of new-found inventiveness but a product of financial markets distorted by war on an unprecedented scale." While it is true that war played a role in the increase in patenting, both Scott and MacLeod attribute too much importance to it. They fail to take into account the ongoing revolution in political economy, a result of the Glorious Revolution, which changed the way entrepreneurs interacted with the government. More importantly, Scott and MacLeod, as well as their colleagues working on different time periods, fail to adequately consider the versatility of patents which in the late seventeenth century were used for far more than just inventions.

Dutch historians, too, have focused narrowly on inventions. Karel Davids argues that a long-term decline in patenting began in 1640, from which the Dutch were unable to recover. However, he concludes that the decline in patenting occurred too early in the seventeenth century to have been a precursor of the broader Dutch economic decline of the eighteenth century. Instead, he argues fewer patents were sought by inventors because changing government policies decreased their value. While it is true that the number of patents for invention was significantly lower in the second half of the seventeenth century, Davids paints an overly bleak picture. There were still many patents for economic projects other than inventions, and the increasing role of corporations was not
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5 Christine MacLeod, "The 1690s Patents Boom: Invention or Stock-Jobbing?," The Economic History Review 39, no. 4, New Series (November 1, 1986): 557.
6 The classic work is Gerard Doorman's Patents for Inventions, but Doorman's study is more of an annotated bibliography than a detailed analysis. It was originally published in Dutch in 1940 and was followed by an abridged English edition in 1942; G. Doorman, Octrooien voor uitvindingen in de Nederlanden uit de 16e-18e eeuw: met bespreking van enkele onderwerpen uit de geschiedenis der techniek (The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1940), and G. Doorman, Patents for Inventions in the Netherlands During the 16th, 17th and 18th Centuries: With Notes on the Historical Development of Technics, trans. Joh. Meijer (The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1942).
necessarily negative. While English scholars tend to fixate on the Industrial Revolution as an important moment in the history of invention, the Dutch instead privilege their Golden Age. Harm Pieters, in his survey of four hundred years of patents, argues that the first half of the seventeenth century was one of the greatest moments in the history of Dutch invention. In addition to the quantitative reasons given by Davids, Pieters emphasizes the importance of advances in water management, such as the invention of new types of windmills during the early seventeenth century. Furthermore, he notes that one third of all patented inventions between 1588 and 1720 concerned water. While Pieters does not explicitly describe the second half of the seventeenth century as a period of decline, his argument does imply that patenting peaked in the Golden Age. Like Scott and MacLeod, he believes that wars, such as the Nine Years War, promoted inventive activity, but not because they redirected capital to domestic projects. Instead, Pieters argues, in times of war the government encouraged the development of new technologies. Willem Meester, for example, began his career as a clockmaker, but after being hired by the States General developed numerous military inventions in the late seventeenth century, one of which, a method for more accurately firing cannons, he patented in 1695. Neither Davids nor Pieters examines patents other than inventions.

Because earlier scholars have focused so heavily on inventions, we have very good long-term data for them in the early modern period. In England there was an unprecedented surge in patents during the 1690s. There were twenty patents awarded in 1690, twenty-five the following year, and nineteen in 1693. During the 1680s, there had never been more than thirteen patents granted in a single year. The 1690s were truly exceptional in their numbers. On average, from 1660 to 1760, there were only about six patents per year; however during the 1690s, there were on average nearly eleven. Such quantities of patents would not be seen again until the Industrial Revolution, lending credence to Defoe’s assertion that the 1690s were a moment of hitherto unmatched inventiveness.

In the Dutch Republic, it was a very different story. The States General granted relatively few patents in the late seventeenth century and even fewer in the eighteenth century. There was a slight increase in the number of patents at the beginning of the 1690s when the English were experiencing their surge, but the decade was much less exceptional than in England. In 1690, the States General granted just two patents. The following year, they granted six. For the remainder of the decade, however, there were only between one and three patents each year, with the exception of 1696 when
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8 Harm Pieters, Uitvinders in Nederland: Vier Eeuwen Octrooien, Quest Historie (Diemen, NL: Quest/G+J Uitgevers CV, 2009), 131.
9 Pieters, Uitvinders in Nederland, 16–17; Nationaal Archief, Den Haag (NL-HaNA), Staten van Holland na 1572, nummer toegang 3.01.04.01, inventarisnummer 1646 62
10 This is in large part thanks to the work of Bennet Woodcroft on the English patents and Gerard Doorman on the Dutch patents; see Bennet Woodcroft, Titles of Patents of Invention, Chronologically Arranged From March 2, 1617 (14 James I) to October 1, 1852 (16 Victoria), Part I (London: George Edward Eyre and William Spottiswoode, 1854); Doorman, Octrooien Voor Uitvindingen.
11 For the numbers of English inventions I have used the lists found in Woodcroft, Titles of Patents of Invention, and A. A. Gomme, “Date Corrections of English Patents, 1617-1752,” Transactions of the Newcomen Society 13 (1934): 159–64.
12 For the numbers of Dutch inventions, I have used the lists found in Doorman, Patents for Inventions.
there were none at all. During the eighteenth century, patents became increasingly rare. Between 1720 and 1760, the States General granted only six patents.

In the Dutch Republic, the provinces also had the authority to grant patents. Although collectively they granted greater numbers than the States General, patenting was still in decline. Of the seven provinces that made up the Republic, only four awarded any patents during the 1690s, and only one, Holland and West Friesland, awarded more than one patent in any given year. Still, even Holland was not granting many patents. From 1690 to 1700, there were on average three new patents a year. The years with the most patents came not at the beginning, but at the middle and end of the decade. There were five patents from Holland in 1694 and in 1698, and six patents in 1700. Overall the number of inventions being patented in the provinces was declining. With the exception of 1696, Holland issued at least one patent and usually two or more every year between 1660 and 1700. However, after the first decade of the eighteenth century, there were many years when none of the provinces granted any patents. The long-term decline at both the national and provincial levels fits well with Pieters’ argument that the Golden Age was the climax of Dutch inventiveness. Looking only at inventions, it is tempting to conclude that the Dutch were lacking in creativity when compared with the English. The number of patented inventions during this period supports the traditional narrative of English growth and Dutch decline during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

Looking only at inventions, however, provides us with an incomplete and biased view of the English and Dutch economies in the 1690s. Patents had a much wider range of uses and projectors sought out patents to secure a wide variety of economic privileges ranging from incorporating businesses to securing salvage rights. These other types of economic patents have been largely ignored by scholars, in part because unlike the inventions, they have not been extensively indexed. During the 1690s in England, inventions accounted for a sizeable amount of all economic patents. In all but two years of the decade they accounted for fifty percent or more of economic patents and in 1695 they even accounted for more than eight-three percent. However, in the Dutch Republic after 1692, inventions never made up more than thirteen percent of each year’s patents. The full range of patents highlights the fundamental differences between the English and the Dutch economies.13

In England, the broader range of economic patents points to the influence of individualistic profit seeking in the economy. These patents follow a similar pattern to the English patents for inventions, with a spike in their numbers between 1691 and 1694 and a peak of twenty-two patents in 1692. During the second half of the decade patenting sharply declined, with only 1698 having more than five patents. The 1690s, particularly the early years of the decade, were characterized by a
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13 For documentation of these calculations and my subsequent claims about the economic patents see my forthcoming 2013 Washington University dissertation “Regulation and the Economic Development of England and the Dutch Republic in the 1690s.” I intend to further develop these points elsewhere. The calculations are based off of the following: The National Archives of the UK (TNA): Public Record Office (PRO) Manuscript indices to patent rolls; NL-HaNA, Staten-Generaal, nummer toegang 1.01.02, inventarisnummers 12321-12325; NL-HaNA, Staten Holland na 1572, nummer toegang 3.01.04.01, inventarisnummers 1641-1652, 5689-5691.
plentiful of new ventures. In 1692 alone, there were companies founded to produce saltpeter, smelt lead, weave tapestries, and fish English and Irish rivers. Additionally, many projectors secured exclusive privileges for their trades through patents for monopolies. In 1696, Rowland Woodyear was granted the sole right to transport living lampreys, effectively giving him control over their sale. Similarly, in 1690, Henry Harris secured for himself the exclusive right to make engravings of the King and Queen. Other types of monopolies included grants for hidden treasures, such as salvage rights to sunken ships or mining rights to dig for precious metals. Salvaging ships was an enormously popular scheme with projectors. After William Phipps made a fortune off of sunken Spanish treasure in 1688, projectors were quick to get into the salvage business. Many of the patents in 1692 were for sunken treasure and a disproportionately large number of this type of patent belonged to Thomas Neale. Neale was the projector par excellence, having been granted eighteen patents, including those for inventions, all between 1690 and 1693. Despite his position as Groom of the Bedchamber, Neale was more than just a passive courtier profiting from the schemes of others. He himself concocted a number of the projects he patented, including the Million Adventure Lottery. It is important to note, however, that not all of the monopoly patents were as self-serving as those held by Neale. A small group of monopolies, such as Trinity House’s on the duty paid by ships passing the Eddystone lighthouse, were for the financial support of a corporate group rather than the profit of individuals. These patents though were in the minority, and patents for men like Neale were far more common.

Lotteries were another common project during the 1690s, but the number of patents for them understates their popularity. Lotteries offered projectors, and the “investors” who bought tickets, a promise of easy money similar to that of the salvage schemes. The handful of patents concerning lotteries, however, represents only those lotteries which secured the government’s blessing. It is likely that many more were held without patents. The same holds true for the other economic schemes covered by the patents. The numbers only represent those projectors’ schemes which could be passed off as remotely plausible. Since not every London con artist left a paper trail, the patents are still one of the best indicators of economic activity, both foul and fair. The image which the patents present is, by and large, one of a “projecting age” akin to that described by Defoe. The patents paint a picture of a vibrant and bustling economy dominated by speculative profit-seeking.

The Dutch economic patents, on the other hand, present an entirely different image. Although the number of Dutch inventions was steadily declining at the end of the decade, other national
economic patents were actually on the rise. The States General granted the most patents at beginning and end of the decade with seventeen in the first two years and twenty-two in the last two years. On average, there were about four patents per year during the rest of the decade. These numbers challenge the traditional narrative of Dutch decline. The kind of economic activity in which the Dutch were engaging was much more corporatist than that of the English. At the national level, the largest single category of patents granted were those relating to taxes. These comprised about half of the total patents in 1690 and 1691 and about seventy percent in 1698 and 1699. The tax patents either granted exemptions from taxes or assigned a portion of tax revenue to a group such as a municipal poor house. They were all granted to municipalities or religious groups and not to private individuals. Many of the exemptions were granted to areas identified as polders, areas of land reclaimed from the water. The exemptions subsidized the cost of land reclamation and encouraged development in these areas. Instead of benefiting private individuals, they benefited the communities that constructed the polders. In this respect they resemble the small subset of English monopoly patents, which included the Trinity House patent for the Eddystone lighthouse. While few and far between in England, these patents were common in the Dutch Republic.

A more stable pattern emerges in the patents from Holland and West Friesland, one of the richest and most commercial provinces in the Republic. Although Holland granted about the same number of patents for invention as the States General, the province granted many more economic patents than the national government. On average there were around twenty-seven patents a year. The States of Holland only radically deviated from this average in 1690, when it granted just nine patents, and in 1695, when it granted a decennial high of forty-four. Overall, the provincial government was much more important as a source of economic privileges than the national government. As at the national level, the tax patents again comprised a significant portion of each year’s totals and were similar to those granted by the States General. The largest group of patents granted by the province, however, was for printed works. Most years, this type of patent accounted for between 40 to 60% of patents. These patents acted as a kind of copyright, except that instead of protecting the author’s rights, they protected the printer’s or bookseller’s rights. Printers and booksellers took out patents to secure the exclusive right to print and sell copies of books, maps, and sermons. The States of Holland required that all patented publications be finished works at the time of patenting and would not grant a patent until it had received a copy of the completed manuscript. This policy was enacted in 1686 specifically to curb the speculation of booksellers who had made a habit of patenting unfinished works. Despite the large number of patents for publications, they represent only a fraction of the total output of the Dutch press. In any given year, patented texts never amounted to more than 2.5% of all printed works. The vast majority of
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22 Since Holland and West Friesland issued the lion’s share of provincial patents and the other provinces issued much smaller numbers, only the patents from this province are being considered here.
24 This calculation is based on the number of patents, not the number of patented works. The actual percentage is slightly higher since a number of the patents were for multiple works. For the total number of printed works, I have used data from the *Short Title Catalogue Netherlands* (http://www.kb.nl/stcn/index.html).
publications were never patented. Unlike in England, where projectors routinely patented half-baked schemes and inventions, the Dutch printers had to fully develop their texts.

The most telling difference between English and Dutch patenting can be seen in the usage of lotteries. As in England, lotteries were very popular in the Dutch Republic, and the States of Holland granted twenty-one patents for them in 1695 alone. However, unlike the English lottery patents, which were granted to courtiers and speculators like Thomas Neale, the Dutch patents were granted to towns, churches, and charitable organizations much in the same way that the tax patents were. Among the patentees in 1695 were orphanages in Schiedam and Delft, the Walloon Church in Amsterdam, the French Reformed Church in Haarlem, an almshouse and hospital in Gouda, and the Old Women’s and Children’s House in The Hague. These patents appear to be wholly legitimate and not the machinations of projectors. Lotteries for charitable causes were not unique to the province of Holland and West Friesland either. For example, in 1695 the burgomasters of Utrecht also authorized a lottery to benefit their own city’s almshouse. Despite the good intentions of such lotteries, the States of Holland was concerned with the great number of patents it was granting, fearing that the lotteries were being abused. In December of 1695, the States decided to no longer grant such patents except under extenuating circumstances. It also forbade all private and unpatented lotteries, indicating that Holland was not wholly without English-style projectors attempting to make a quick profit. Not only did the States attempt to curb the use of lotteries within their jurisdiction, but it went even further, banning residents of the province from participating in lotteries in other territories since by their temptations they “draw ready money and stock out of this Province.” It is clear that the deputies of the States saw unregulated lotteries as a threat to the province’s economy. They played a much more active role in regulation than their English counterparts.

Lotteries were simply understood differently in England and the Dutch Republic. This is best illustrated by the publication of Jean le Clerc’s treatise on luck. In the treatise, Le Clerc, a Swiss cleric living in Amsterdam, attempted to reconcile the charitable benefits of the Dutch lotteries with their temptations to greed. “Few men put into them out of a principle of charity and it is clear, as is said, that men should do nothing out of avarice,” he wrote. Nevertheless, Le Clerc concluded that lotteries benefiting the poor were to be encouraged. As long as the rich abstained from buying tickets and the poor were careful not to wager more than they could afford to lose, Le Clerc believed that the lotteries were not sinful.

25 NL-HaNA, Staten van Holland na 1572, 3.01.04.01, inv. nr. 1646, 8/3/1695, 9/3/1695, 29/7/1695, 247/9/1695, 24/12/1695.
26 See *Loterye Binnen De Stadt Utrecht, Voor De Aelmoeseniers Camer* (Utrecht, 1695).
27 NL-HaNA, Staten van Holland na 1572, 3.01.04.01, inv. nr. 5127 610-611.
28 “De gereede Gelden ende Effecten uyt de Provincie getrocken;” NL-HaNA, Staten van Holland na 1572, 3.01.04.01, inv. nr. 5127, 610.
29 “Dat’er weynig menschen zijn, die daar in seggen uyt een grondregel van liefdaadigheid; en’t is zeker, zal men zeggen, dat men niets uyt gierighed behoort te doen;” Jean le Clerc, *Aanmerkingen over ’t Geen Men Geluk En Ongeluk Noemt in ’t Stuk Der Loteryen* (Rotterdam, 1696), 142–43.
In 1696, following the surge in lotteries, Barent Bos printed a Dutch edition of the treatise and dedicated it to the regents of Schiedam, one of the towns with a patented lottery. Bos claimed, “because of many objections concerning an acceptable way to deal with Lots and Lotteries, I thought to do my Countrymen no disservice by making the same . . . public by printing it.” In his introduction, he set up the treatise as a defense of the regents’ lottery. Three years later, Le Clerc’s treatise was translated into English and printed in London. Although lotteries were prominently mentioned on the title page, the author of the English preface barely mentioned them. Instead, he emphasized the importance of Le Clerc’s work on superstition and providence. The author did briefly note that the possibility of encouraging charity through lotteries was “no less seasonable” a subject, but only after discussing superstition for more than a dozen pages. Lotteries as a boon to charity were an afterthought. Mentioning them on the title page certainly would have helped sales of the treatise, but what Le Clerc actually had to say about lotteries was of less interest to an English audience than a Dutch one. Despite the fact that lotteries were prevalent in both countries, they were a subject which resonated differently with the reading public in each country.

The split between self-serving and charitable lotteries highlights the structural difference between the English and Dutch economies. Even when similar types of economic activity, such as the lotteries, were popular in both countries, these activities took different forms. The English economy was highly competitive and driven by individual profit whereas corporations and civic needs were at the center of the Dutch economy. This does not, however, mean that the Dutch economy was necessarily stagnating. It is clear that the Dutch were using economic patents other than inventions far more aggressively than the English. If we exclude patents for invention, the number of patents granted by the Dutch consistently surpasses the number of English patents. Only in 1692 did the number of English patents come close to the Dutch number, with the English granting twenty-two and the Dutch twenty-eight. Even if we include inventions, the Dutch were still just as productive, if not more, than the English for most of the 1690s. The English numbers only surpassed the Dutch in 1692 when the English granted forty-seven patents and the Dutch thirty-two. In the second half of the decade the Dutch patents far exceeded the English ones and by 1699 the Dutch were granting seven times as many patents as the English.

What is surprising, given the conventional narrative of English growth and Dutch decline, is that the number of Dutch patents is so high and the number of English patents so low in the latter part of the decade. While the Dutch were not patenting new inventions or even chartering new companies in great numbers during the last years of the decade, the number of patents granted indicates that some sectors of the Dutch economy, particularly land reclamation, were still thriving. Because of the more corporative structure of Dutch society, economic activity simply took a different form than in England. Dutch patents were much more frequently used by municipalities and organizations than English ones. The tax and lottery patents which comprise such a large

31 “Rakende het Looten en de Loterijen op een aangename wijze te handelen, soo dagt ik mijn Lantsgenoten geen ondienst te zullen doen, ‘t zelve…door den druk gemeen te maaken;” Clerc, Aanmerkingen, preface.
32 Jean le Clerc, Reflections Upon What the World Commonly Call Good-Luck and Ill-Luck With Regard to Lotteries And of the Good Use Which May Be Made of Them (London, 1699), preface.
portion of the Dutch patents are prime examples of this. Even the patents for publications oddly mirror this trend, since it was not individual authors who took out patents for their works, but publishers and booksellers. Additionally, the Dutch economy was much more fragmented than the English one. Because of the decentralized nature of the Dutch Republic, the provinces, particularly Holland, played a larger role in patenting than the national government. Scholars have been too quick to brand the lack of English-style results in the Dutch Republic as a sign of stagnation.

The high number of Dutch patents throughout the 1690s also calls into question the standard explanation for the English Projecting Age and its accompanying surge of patents. While the effects of the Nine Years War could explain the initial high number of patents in both countries, warfare does not explain why only the English experienced a sharp decline in patenting after the war’s conclusion. The causes of the English surge are more complex and more the result of political conditions unique to England than of a wider European war shared with the Dutch. Both the political context of the Glorious Revolution and the broader uses of patenting as a form of economic regulation need to be considered in order to understand Defoe’s “Projecting Age.” As Steven Pincus has argued, 1688 saw not only a revolution in politics, but also a revolution in political economy. He argues that James II’s land-based agricultural vision of the economy stood in stark contrast to his opponents’ labor-based manufacturing vision. The Revolution then marked not only a shift from arbitrary rule to constitutional monarchy, but a shift in political economy towards the labor-based model. While Pincus acknowledges that the struggle between agricultural Tories and manufacturing Whigs carried on throughout much of the 1690s, he oversimplifies the story. Nevertheless, Pincus is right to emphasize a change in people’s conceptions of political economy, brought about by the Revolution.

The revolution in political economy changed the way that patents were used, though not quite in the way Pincus argues. Patents were an instrument of royal prerogative, and before 1688 the government used them reactively to intervene in the economy. As Michael Hawkins and R. W. K. Hinton have noted, whether for an invention or a bank, patents were granted in response to demands by private citizens. In the late seventeenth century, patents were the accepted route for securing economic privileges. When the Glorious Revolution swept James II from power, the effectiveness of this route began to decrease. Over the course of the next two decades, Parliament,


35 Pincus’s use of the labels “Whig” and “Tory” is problematic. Supporters of his so-called Whig model were not necessarily Whigs nor were supporters of the opposing model necessarily Tories. However, since he and subsequent scholars have adopted these titles, I have used them here to avoid confusion.


rather than the sovereign, became the fount of economic privilege. As William Pettigrew argues, after the Revolution, statutes, rather than proclamations and patents, began to be more frequently used as a means of obtaining economic preferment. Petitions which would have once been sent to the king were now sent to the House of Commons. Pettigrew claims that in 1660, seventy-seven percent of economic petitions were addressed to the king, but in 1696, that number had decreased to just twelve percent. Similarly, by 1713, ninety-two percent of economic petitions were addressed not to the sovereign, but to the House of Commons. The shift in power from the royal prerogative to Parliament meant that companies that had once sought legitimacy and security through patents now turned to parliamentary statutes. In practical terms, this was the result of the revolution in political economy and this shift must be taken into consideration if the usage of English patents is to be understood during this period.

Though the Glorious Revolution had settled William and Mary on the throne, post-Revolution political economy was far from settled in the early years of the 1690s. A new model of political economy, like the Whig one Pincus proposes, had not yet triumphed over the older model. This unsettled atmosphere, more than the Nine Years War, helped to produce the Projecting Age and the surge in patents. The ambivalent spirit of the age was best embodied by Daniel Defoe in his Essay on Projects printed in 1697. In the Essay, he simultaneously condemned the schemes of projectors and proposed projects of his own. Projectors, who were in Defoe’s opinion the chief abusers of the patent system, had no other goal than making themselves rich. They “do really every day produce new Contrivances, Engines, and Projects to get Money, never before thought of.” Defoe saw this inventiveness not as a positive quality, but rather the result of the projectors’ corrupt character:

A meer Projector then is a Contemptible thing, driven by his own desperate Fortune to such a Streight, that he must be deliver’d by a Miracle, or Starve; and when he has beat his Brains for some such Miracle in vain, he finds no remedy but to paint up, some Bauble or other, as Players make Puppets talk big, to show like a strange thing, and then cry it up for a New Invention, gets a Patent for it, divides it into Shares, and they must be Sold; ways and means are not wanting to Swell the new Whim to a vast Magnitude . . . till the Ambition of the Coxcomb is wheedl’d to part with his Money for it.

Defoe was not alone in criticizing projectors. The author of Angliae Tutamen was also quick to criticize the rage for projects, attacking the Bank of England, the lotteries, and even the manufacturers of London’s new streetlamps. He argued that for the public good a registry of the projectors needed to be maintained since they were “Camelions, who know no end of Projects, for
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what they get by one they lay out in another.” Projectors, both the unscrupulous and those with well meant schemes that failed, gave patentees a bad name, and it is not surprising that the number of patents declined as the decade progressed.

Projecting, however, remained all the rage in the early part of the decade, and despite his harsh words on the subject, Defoe was forced to admit that some schemes could be good. Kimberly Latta argues that in the Essay Defoe is trapped between the Tory and the Whig models of economic growth, even though his political interests lay with the Whigs. In his writing, the Tory Defoe abhors the frivolous nature of the projects, with their promise of the generation of wealth ex nihilo, as this was contrary to the Tory view of trade as a zero sum game. The Whig Defoe is, on the other hand, optimistic about the possibility for improvement and new wealth.

Maximillian Novak argues that Defoe’s Essay is characterized by “a mixture of hope and optimism with an expectation of failure.” This seems, too, to be the character of the 1690s, caught between the optimistic and pessimistic models of political economy. What this meant practically is that projectors, who in theory should have espoused the Whig model, sought patents, a well established tool of the older Tory model, to legitimize their projects. The projectors, like Defoe, were trapped between these two models. As the decade progressed and the battle lines between Whig and Tory political economies sharpened, becoming much more akin to the division Pincus describes, patenting fell out of favor. Since there was no equivalent revolution in political economy in the Dutch Republic during the 1690s, this shift, rather than the Nine Years War, appears to be the chief cause of the English Projecting Age.

Based on the trends in English and Dutch patenting during the 1690s, it is clear that scholars’ earlier assumptions about both countries’ economies need to be reevaluated. It is true that the Dutch did not experience a “projecting age” such as the one Defoe described, and also that by English standards of individual profit seeking, the Dutch economy was in decline. However, this is not an appropriate metric for evaluating economic development in the Dutch Republic. Scholars have been too quick to brand the lack of English-style results in the Dutch Republic as a sign of stagnation. The Republic’s economy was fundamentally different from England’s. Because of the decentralized nature of the Republic, local corporations, particularly cities and towns, had more power than their English counterparts. These groups were one of the chief sources of economic activity, whether it was ambitious polder projects or more mundane tasks such as caring for the poor. In England, projectors played a more prominent role in the economy because the conditions were reversed. Centralization meant that power was concentrated at the national level, resulting in weaker

local institutions. In the absence of strong corporations, individuals were the dominant actors. Projectors were also spurred on by the political uncertainties that followed in the wake of the Glorious Revolution. The change in regime both sparked the imagination of projectors and drove them to patents, a tried and true source of special privileges. Patenting in both England and the Dutch Republic was more complex than has been previously thought; however, these complexities are not apparent when focusing only on one country. Only by focusing more closely on political economy and on the role of the state in both countries can their economic development be properly understood.

Steven Schrum is in the PhD program in History at Washington University in Saint Louis. Christopher Van Den Berge, a PhD candidate in History at the University of Illinois at Chicago, edited this paper.
An Island Home: Jamaican Local Leaders in the English Imperial World

By John A. Coakley

Rising out of the middle of the Caribbean Sea, south of Cuba and west of Haiti, is the lush and mountainous island of Jamaica, known during the late seventeenth century for its pirates, sugar planters, and the bustling city of Port Royal. Famously conquered by English soldiers and sailors as part of Oliver Cromwell’s Western Design military campaign in 1655, Jamaica quickly became the jewel in the crown of the English empire in the Caribbean. Given its significance, one would think that early English Jamaica would have been closely controlled by the state. In truth, however, though King Charles II and his advisors frequently ordered ennobled gentlemen out to govern the island, within a decade and a half of its founding the colony’s politics became dominated by a small group of local leaders. This paper examines the two most prominent local politicians to lead Jamaica’s second generation of pirates, planters, merchants, and slaves: Thomas Lynch and Henry Morgan. For thirteen consecutive years in the 1670s and 1680s, one of the two always held the position of Lieutenant-Governor or Governor, and each led the island on his own—although sometimes quite briefly—on three separate occasions. The two men opposed each another politically, but they led remarkably similar, Jamaican, lives.

By describing their intimate connections with the colony and with each other, this paper argues that Lynch and Morgan became the first two truly Jamaican political leaders, by building lives and careers in Jamaica and by consistently advocating for the colony’s interests even over the crown’s. The other men appointed to manage the island government in this time closely followed either imperial edicts or personal material interests, and most were noblemen sent to rule the small colony for only a few years at a time. Lynch and Morgan stand in contrast—living and dying in their island home, these men helped grow Jamaica’s economy at a very sensitive stage of its development, and they successfully navigated the murky waters of an inter-imperial Caribbean political sphere. Lynch and Morgan were the first to run Jamaica as Jamaicans, and after they died, the island’s government occasionally fell to other local leaders who had learned the craft from them.

Seventeenth-century Jamaican politics have been of interest to historians and observers since at least the eighteenth century.¹ Modern histories continued to describe the Jamaican governorship of

that time in great detail. In the 1930s, A. P. Newton portrayed much of West Indian political tension in terms of two forces constantly at odds with each other: planters (settled white Europeans running sugar plantations on the islands) and buccaneers (lower-class Europeans from all nations conducting privateering raids around the region). In the 1970s, however, Richard Dunn made these forces into Jamaican political parties, noting that from 1671 “the colony plunged into factional strife: buccaneers versus planters,” and evaluated each successive governor in those terms. According to Dunn’s schema, planter politicians supported plantation owners by encouraging the importation of enslaved Africans and maintaining good relations with Spanish colonies. Buccaneer politicians believed that commissioning privateers to raid the Spanish and bring back prize goods was the best way to grow the economy and prevent foreign attack. Since Dunn’s influential work, most authors have utilized this framework in one form or another when discussing late seventeenth century Jamaican politics. In almost all cases, Thomas Lynch sits squarely in the planter camp, whilst Henry Morgan is the leader of the buccaneers.

The planter/buccanneer framework highlights the differences between Lynch and Morgan, linking them to powerful political forces in England. This paper aims to challenge this dichotomy, and suggests instead that by examining Jamaica’s early local leaders we may find them to be more alike than different. The 1670s and 1680s brought the rise of a uniquely Jamaican politics, of which Lynch and Morgan were the central figures. Their lives and political careers in Jamaica will be outlined here, highlighting the many points of contact between them as well as the similarities in their characters, outlooks, and policies. Indeed, both men were involved from an early age in the politics of the island, where they returned knighted and with crown support in the years of their maturity, during which they fought for the colony’s interests against all others until they died, wealthy and popular, in their island home.

Arrivals

For Thomas Lynch and Henry Morgan the island of Jamaica offered a better home than Britain. Having few apparent prospects in England, Lynch joined Cromwell’s Western Design army as a young man and, in 1654, stepped aboard a warship departing Plymouth with no knowledge of his destination. After a stop on Barbados and a failed attack on Santo Domingo, the fleet conquered sparsely-populated Jamaica: Lynch was lucky, for many of those conquerors died in the young colony. He returned to England, but aimed to go back to Jamaica and find a position there, as he was already planning to settle in the island. On his travels, he may have met the young Welshman

---

Henry Morgan, who had sought adventure overseas in the 1650s and had landed in Jamaica shortly after. Morgan was happy in his new home, but, unlike Lynch, never planned a life of planting. Rather, being “much more used to the pike than the book,” he quickly found an occupation in sea raiding.

Jamaican lives

Both Lynch and Morgan started their Jamaican lives in the 1660s, and soon made clear their intentions to stay. While serving as a Lieutenant Colonel and a member of the governor’s council, the young Lynch put down roots: he acquired his first piece of land on Port Royal in 1662, and within two years would begin a plantation in a nearby parish. In 1664 the governor and deputy governor returned to England, and the council vaulted Lynch into the position of President, making him the highest-ranking official on the island. His service was cut short when Sir Thomas Modyford, a planter from Barbados, arrived a few months later to serve as governor. Although the relations between Modyford and Lynch seemed civil at first, by early 1665 the new governor had pushed Lynch out of the island’s leadership, inducing the latter to vow rashly “never to return” to Jamaica despite his initial commitment to “make this his England.”

Just as Lynch’s star temporarily set, Morgan’s rose. The new deputy governor, Edward Morgan, was Henry’s uncle: once the former arrived on the island, the latter’s political status soared, and was to further glide high following Edward’s death in 1665 as Henry took his place and married his oldest living daughter, Mary Elizabeth. Thereafter, Henry slowly became indispensable to Governor Modyford as a sea commander and the Admiral of the island. Although he was a poor sailor, with a knack for sinking ships, in fact, he did possess the practicality, ambition, and arrogance of a good privateer commander. On his four famous raids on Spanish American colonies, he was able to convince his unpaid men to attack, capture, and hold seemingly impregnable cities like Porto Bello and Panama. Moreover, Henry Morgan received a hero’s welcome after each raid, as the islanders believed that each time he had prevented devastating Spanish attacks.

6 Public Record Office, Calendar of State Papers-Colonial (CSPC), America and West Indies: 1677-1680 (London, 1860), 1304.
8 CSPC 1661-68, 697.
9 CSPC 1661-68, 934.
10 William Beeston, “Journal,” Interesting Tracts, Relating to the Island of Jamaica (Saint Jago de la Vega, 1800), 285; Cruikshank, 65. For the Panama expedition, Morgan’s official commission was as “commander-in-chief of all the ships fitted or to be fitted for defense of this island,” but he was commonly referred to as “Admiral Morgan,” CSPC 1669-74, 211.
Jamaican interests

After Morgan’s final raid on Panama in 1671, Lynch, now knighted and regularly being consulted on Jamaican matters, found a way to keep his resolution to make Jamaica his England. As Modyford and Morgan had breached the newly-signed Treaty of Madrid, Charles II of England ordered Lynch to get them out of the Caribbean and send them back to London as prisoners. Lynch got the opportunity to return to Jamaica, where he was to command for four years as Lieutenant-Governor. During those years there was no governor of Jamaica, as the king held the office vacant after revoking Modyford’s commission, a snub that Lynch took personally, although he could rule without a higher-ranking official countermanding him. During these years Sir Thomas Lynch and his wife Vere (whom he had married in England before sailing to the colony) added to their plantations, building a sprawling estate of over 20,000 acres. With a family, a post, and deep financial ties, Lynch did make Jamaica his England for the early 1670s.

Lynch obeyed the king’s orders to dispatch Modyford and Morgan. Morgan at least may have welcomed his involuntary shipment to England, which Lynch delayed for nearly one year in an attempt to damage Morgan’s reputation by keeping him close to his loudest critics. The Admiral’s exploits were well-known throughout the empire, and, although the Panama mission had been made illegal by the Treaty of Madrid, the news of the destruction of the famed Spanish city had been very well-received in England. In Jamaica, however, the story was very different: many men who had sailed with the Admiral believed he had cheated them out of a significant fortune when he snuck off the isthmus with a fast ship before the loot could be disbursed. Lynch “favored” the disgruntled sailors as they murmured about Morgan and the other “commanders about the plunder,” hoping thereby to diminish the Admiral’s reputation. As a consequence, complaints, law suits, council actions, and angry looks in Port Royal’s taverns all became commonplace for Morgan until he finally left for England in 1672. If Morgan and Lynch had not had much experience with each other earlier, that year undoubtedly bred the enmity between them that would become famous.

With his political enemies gone, Lynch led Jamaica as a Jamaican. He disregarded the Crown’s commands by continuing to hire Morgan’s privateers in other capacities, he acted against the Treaty of Madrid by encouraging a trade between Jamaicans and Spanish-American colonists, and he overstepped his authority by encouraging islanders to cut and transport logwood against Spanish wishes. The king instructed him to call in Morgan’s former privateers by offering them a pardon, but many old raiders preferred to stay at sea. This unexpected problem prompted Lynch to adopt an expedient that imperial leaders had not foreseen: enlisting the services of the few unemployed
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13 CSPC 1669-74, 542.
14 This story became part of the traditional narrative of the Panama mission when it appeared in Exquemelin’s memoir in 1678, but Lynch would have heard the tales as soon as he arrived, especially from the annoyed Richard Browne who had sailed with the fleet and complained bitterly about Morgan; see CSPC 1669-74, 608.
15 CSPC 1669-74, 604.
16 CSPC 1669-74, 580, 608, 633, 729, 777.
privateers who had come in to hunt and capture the “pirates” that remained active. Used in conjunction with the naval forces, such private sailors proved very effective. When the captain of the navy frigate *Assistance* started burning Spanish huts near Campeche, Lynch fired him and replaced him with William Beeston, who promptly made a lieutenant out of a man named Prynce, “one of the most famous of the privateers.”17 Furthermore, the Council of Jamaica all but begged Lynch to hire a private man of war to “undertake the reducing of the privateers”—both French and English—on the Isla de Vaca just south of Hispaniola.18 Lynch soon found a convenient vessel at his disposal, the *Lilly*, which had been sitting in the harbor since its captain, Morris, had been imprisoned for committing piracy. The Lieutenant-Governor pardoned Morris, put him in command of his old ship, and sent him out in consort with a navy frigate to hunt down his former fellows.19 This practice of engaging a reserve force of privateers to hunt down those who continued raiding was one of the legacies that Thomas Lynch left to Jamaica. Successive island leaders, including Henry Morgan, employed this tactic for the rest of the century, and Lynch himself used it again when he returned to government ten years later.

Thomas Lynch initiated two illegal trades with Spanish-American colonists. The first was a private trade re-selling enslaved Africans from Jamaica to Spanish-American cities in the region. Though some imperial officials, especially those with interests in the Royal African Company or its predecessor, had long wanted to sell slaves to Spanish colonists, Lynch’s trade did not involve them: his trade remained a Jamaican concern, and its proceeds remained on the island. At first, he sent the naval frigates on preliminary trading missions into Spanish territory, and most ended successfully.20 The governor of Cartagena even agreed to purchase several hundred African men and women whom Henry Morgan and his men had captured during the Panama raid.21 Such success was not duplicated, however: the island imported very few slaves in the early 1670s, and Jamaicans could not re-sell captive Africans they did not have.22 The re-chartered Royal African Company did not begin making regular shipments of human cargo until 1674, the year Lynch lost his position on the island. Still, the Lieutenant-Governor remained hopeful that increased deliveries and a shift in Spanish slave-buying policy would serve to revive the trade and further enrich the island.23
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17 CSPC 1669-74, 697.
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The second illegal Spanish trade initiated by Lynch came in the form of encouraging private traders to sell small batches of cattle, hides, and dry goods in and around Cuba’s numerous southern cays. These cays were ideal for smuggling because they were relatively un-policed and lay near Jamaica’s newly-populated northern side. Indeed, the cays saw so little official shipping from either empire that they became a common rendezvous for still-active privateers quietly hoping to collect more men for their missions.  

Navy ships entered the area occasionally: when Lynch noted that the Assistance frigate had “gone to Cuba to buy flesh” in 1672 he was probably obliquely referring to the trade in the cays. Lynch confirmed the illegal trade in 1673 when he wrote to the entire Council of Trade and Plantations that the poor people of Cuba wanted a trade with Jamaica, and that the Jamaicans fulfilled this desire with “small vessels bringing hides and cattle.” Only a few weeks later, he admitted a sharp rise in this cattle trade, stating that the traders had come to prefer this route to the dangerous logwood-fetching voyages.

Indeed, just a few years earlier, Thomas Lynch had turned Jamaica into the hub of the English trade in logwood (a Caribbean tree used as a natural source for dye), thereby securing for the island another lucrative business, albeit one that involved a great deal of risk. To encourage the logwood trade, Lynch supported the incursion into Spanish territory of thousands of Englishmen (many of whom were former privateers), aiming to denude the swampish woods of trees that many Spanish governors and colonists viewed as rightfully theirs. Many Jamaicans and some imperial leaders concluded that the English owned the land, because a few woodcutting camps had been set up years earlier. The Spanish governors of Campeche and Havana disagreed, however, and each leader hired his own privateers to attack Jamaican logwood ships. Eager to preserve his island’s place in the logwood trade, Lynch threatenedingly wrote to his superiors that he would “preserve the peace until there is war, but no longer,” and sent home accounts of everything Jamaicans had lost to the Spanish logwood raiders, in hopes that war might come soon. The English king would not authorize a war over the dye resource, and thus chose to recall the Lieutenant-Governor rather than give him more power. In 1675 Lynch sailed to England, glad to be free of the stresses of home for a time.

While Lynch was struggling to lead Jamaica, Morgan was serving an extremely light prison sentence in England, which consisted largely of carousing in London’s taverns and coffeehouses. He
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dined with diarist John Evelyn and befriended the young Duke of Albemarle, Christopher Monck.\(^{31}\) In 1673, King Charles asked Morgan’s advice on how to defend Jamaica, and was so taken with the privateer’s military skill that he offered him a knighthood and the post of Lieutenant-Governor within a year.\(^ {32}\) By 1675, Morgan was back in Jamaica, eagerly forcing Thomas Lynch—“who very much quibbled at and disputed” Morgan’s right to the government—to surrender the great seal to him personally.\(^{33}\)

Lieutenant-Governor Sir Henry Morgan stayed in his post for eight years and outlasted two noble governors sent to serve over him. The first one, John Vaughan, put on trial Morgan and his brother-in-law, Robert Byndloss, before Jamaica’s Council, for supporting illegal raids against the Spanish. He presented several pieces of evidence to demonstrate that they had been “recommending some of our English privateers to the French Government for commissions,” collecting a portion of those raiders’ proceeds and funneling it back to the French governor of Tortuga.\(^ {34}\) Imperial officials, however, decided not to punish Morgan and Byndloss.\(^{35}\) Morgan was popular locally and knew the island much better than the governor. In fact, Charles II and the Lords of Trade and Plantations recalled the unpopular Lord Vaughan in 1678 for having made a mess of colonial law, and left Morgan in charge of the island for a few months while the next governor made sail across the Atlantic.

Henry Morgan’s second supervisor in government was Charles Howard, the Earl of Carlisle, who chose to side with the influential lieutenant-governor on most matters. Carlisle’s tenure was short-lived, however. In light of Vaughan’s failings, imperial officials handed Carlisle a packet of new laws to proclaim in the island. Albeit based on earlier drafts originally written by Jamaica’s Assembly, these new laws differed significantly from the originals, and approving them would have nullified the Assembly’s role in lawmaking altogether. As a result, the legislative body refused to assent to the laws and rebuffed the new governor’s attempts at compromise.\(^ {36}\) After forcing the Assembly leaders to sail to England to work out the matter with the Lords directly, Carlisle had to follow them across the ocean to defend his own actions before the Lords.

With the governor’s surprise departure, Sir Henry had the government all to himself for two years. As Lynch had done, Morgan used his term to privilege what he deemed to be the island’s best interests above the Crown’s concerns: he supported illegal shipments of enslaved Africans to Jamaica, continued the practice of selling those Africans to Spanish neighbors, and showed
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legendary lenience to pirates throughout the region. Since the king had granted the powerful, state-connected Royal African Company a monopoly on delivering enslaved Africans to English planters in the West Indies, all private slave traders in the Caribbean had been deemed illegal “interlopers.” Several Company agents lived in Jamaica and regularly prosecuted interlopers who sold slaves on the island; they had had much success in the prior decade due to Vaughan’s assistance. Morgan chose to welcome the interlopers, however, since the island’s planters clamored loudly for more slaves. In 1681 alone, six non-Company ships brought an estimated 1,100 enslaved Africans to Jamaica and “distribut[ed] them in the plantations near adjacent” to “avoid seizure.”

The Royal African Company had been trying to sell slaves to nearby Spanish colonists from Jamaica for years, just as Lynch had done privately a decade earlier. Morgan made this trade a reality by inviting Spanish ships into port. Although still illegal by the terms of the Treaty of Madrid, the trade was now condoned by the English king and Company. In addition to a few Spanish ships that came in and out of Port Royal on their own throughout 1681, the navy frigate Norwich—on orders from Morgan—sailed a course back and forth between Port Royal and Cartagena. Captain Heywood noted having escorted a Spanish ship to the island in a hard gale and then, while it was still in port refitting, the arrival of a “ship from Guinney,” undoubtedly to sell slaves, some of whom must have gone right to the Carteganian.

Morgan boasted continually that he showed his loyalty to the king by capturing pirates in the region, but once the raiders were in his hands he showed remarkable lenience to them, and he even refused direct orders from England to execute such pirates. The Lieutenant-Governor was especially proud of netting the “notorious pirate” Jacob Everson and his band early in 1681, but Everson’s captivity must have proven very light as he survived to harass the island for the next several years. Morgan also stayed the execution of the captain’s men despite the fact that the king had demanded it. Imperial officials determined that the time for showing restraint with sea raiders had passed, but Morgan still wanted to convince pirates to bring their stolen goods and currency to Jamaica’s ports in an effort to bolster the island economy. To that end, he convinced the Council to pardon “all men serving under foreign commissions” who came in within the year. He even stayed the executions of three men who had served on Bartholomew Sharpe’s “remarkable voyage” to the Pacific, which quickly became famous for its brutality towards the Spanish. Not only was Morgan

---

38 CSPC 1681-85, 13.
39 Peter Heywood, “Journal,” TNA:PRO ADM 51/3296, March 10-20, 1680/1, May 27, 1681.
40 CSPC 1681-85, 13.
41 CSPC 1681-85, 144.
42 CSPC 1681-85, 16, 51, 73, 102.
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lenient with pirates once he caught them, he also used privateers (as Lynch had done) to hunt down more pirates. He roused men from “the point” on Port Royal to take a French privateer that appeared in the night, and he repurposed Captain Everson’s ship as a pirate hunter. Not surprising to him, Morgan’s tenure lasted only until 1682.

Departures

Once imperial officials had settled the matter of the Jamaican constitution, receiving much help from Thomas Lynch, they decided to end Sir Henry Morgan’s time in charge of the island and send out Lynch to replace him. Lynch gladly wrested the government from Morgan’s unwilling hands in May 1682, this time finally having been honored with the title of Governor. He served for less than three years before dying in office, but once again he used his term to support the interests of Jamaica.

Lynch continued his illicit trade with Spanish cities, hired numerous privateers to hunt down pirates, and enthusiastically tracked down pirate plunder with such abandon that he was accused of embezzling “piratical goods.” As soon as he arrived, Lynch set about selling slaves to the Spanish, and in June 1682, reprising his actions of ten years earlier, sent to Cartagena as an initial transaction two “Panama negroes brought by the pirates from the South Sea.” That same year, in November, he hired the famous pirate John Coxon to “convey a Spaniard to Havana” after a slave sale. Lynch complained he could not re-sell as many slaves as he wanted, and he accused the Royal African Company of slowing its deliveries from Africa to the island. Rather than turn away eager buyers, the governor looked the other way as Spanish captains purchased enslaved Africans directly from interlopers anchoring off Jamaica’s coast.

Governor Lynch also hired an occasional pirate hunting force that consisted of a rogue’s gallery of unsavory gentlemen. He praised John Coxon for living honestly, despite the fact that the pirate had just returned from raiding Saint Augustine, and sent him on several missions. Coxon became Lynch’s liaison to other famous raiders of the region: he made overtures to the pirate John Williams (otherwise known as “Yankey”), offering him men, victuals, a pardon, naturalization, and two hundred pounds to hunt down and capture Captain Hamlin, sailing the notorious ship La Trompeuse. Coxon also met with Captain Vanhorn, reporting back to Lynch that his numerous privateers would keep the peace with England, being on their way to sack Vera Cruz. The governor also struck up a relationship with the Dutch-born pirate Laurens de Graaf in 1683, and the two did each other
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favors: Laurens took back an English ship that the Spanish had seized, and Lynch procured the royal assent to pardon the raider. Lynch and Laurens may never have met, but their letters read like those of two comrades: a few days before dying in office, in 1684, the governor wrote to the pirate, “I am always your friend.”

To replenish Jamaica’s—and his own—depleted treasuries, after English and French raiders sacked the rich city of Vera Cruz, Lynch spent his last years trying to get a cut of the loot. He was so successful that, soon after his death, Morgan’s friend and attorney, Roger Elletson, tried to accuse the deceased governor of having illegally kept money and goods which had belonged to captured pirates, which should have been returned to the crown. The issue dragged on for months in the council, where several meetings in a row found Elletson returning with further accusations. It quickly became a witch hunt: houses were ordered searched, threatening letters were sent to captains at sea, high-ranking officials were deposed. Elletson kept expanding the list of items he suspected Lynch of stealing: rich jewels now worn by Lady Lynch, pilfered Spanish currency, cochineal, a diamond ring. The final amount increased with each item, and Elletson sent the accounts dutifully to England, hoping that the Lords would take notice and wrest the island from Lynch’s allies. Although the rumors were never proved, it was clear that Thomas Lynch spent his last years attempting to enrich the island, either eschewing crown commands or reaping the rewards of illegal trade and plunder.

Scrutinizing Lynch’s every move in these years was the increasingly rowdy Sir Henry Morgan. After losing the government, he remained a permanent fixture of the council until he grew so drunk and disorderly in 1684 that Lynch removed him and stripped him of his posts. In retirement, Morgan organized a political opposition which, though highly annoying, Lynch casually dismissed as a “little drunken foolish party.” Loyal supporters, like Elletson and others who attended meetings in Morgan’s favorite taverns on the point, tried to get their leader re-instated, but Lynch and his successor, Hender Molesworth, would not allow it. The remaining four years of Henry Morgan’s life were soaked in memories and alcohol, both sometimes bitter and sometimes sweet.

---

50 CSPC 1681-85, 1210, 1461, 1649, 1718, 1851.
51 CSPC 1681-85, 992, 1163, 1249, 1261, 1563, 1759.
52 Lynch certainly had amassed comparatively great wealth by the time of his death; see Dunn, Sugar and Slaves, 269.
Nothing in Lynch’s secretary’s listing of his accounts in 1684 explicitly mentions pirate goods, but it is tempting to speculate about the origins of “a necklace of Pearle” for Lady Lynch; see Maxwell, Particulars of the Estate of Sir Thomas Lynch, 1684, NLJ MS 982, 1-2. It is possible that these posthumous accounts were drawn up in order to help prove or disprove the embezzlement charges.
54 NLJ MS 387, “Letter from Sir Thomas Lynch,” 6 November 1683.
Concluding remarks

Sir Thomas Lynch died in office on August 24, 1684. According to Molesworth, the “sad occasion” was hastened by the typical sort of intra-Caribbean politics involving small traders and petty pirates that Lynch had built a lifetime managing, while all the while staying above them. 55 Four years and one day later, on August 25, 1688, Sir Henry Morgan passed away. The old admiral’s funeral, celebrated one day after his death in the city that he had most loved, Port Royal, appears to be a fitting end to an era of local leadership. According to the detailed descriptions provided by onlookers, Jamaica’s inhabitants gathered for the burial of Morgan’s body in Port Royal, where a twenty-two-gun salute was fired to honor a man who had seen their colony through infancy and adolescence. 56

Thomas Lynch and Henry Morgan, the two central figures of Jamaica’s local politics, died on the island within half a decade of each other, each having built a new life there since the early 1660s. Each died a wealthy man, each fostered Jamaica’s economy by illegal means despite imperial orders, and each was recalled for disobeying orders, but at last each returned to their island home.

John A. Coakley is in the PhD program in History at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Melanie Zefferino, PhD candidate in Theatre Studies and Art History at the University of Warwick, edited this paper.
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Harmonizing the Auditor Within: Thomas Ford’s Musical Setting of John Donne’s “Lamentations of Jeremy”

By Anna Lewton-Brain

Isaak Walton reported that John Donne, upon hearing a musical setting of his “Hymn to God the Father,” exclaimed:

The words of this Hymn have restored to me the same thoughts of joy that possest my Soul in my sickness when I composed it. And, O the power of Churchmusick! that Harmony added to this Hymn has raised the Affections of my heart, and quickned my graces of zeal and gratitude; and I observe, that I always return from paying this publick duty of Prayer and Praise to God, with an unexpressible tranquillity of mind, and willingness to leave the world.

In this description of the affective power of church music, Walton is both recounting Donne’s particular reaction to hearing his verse sung, and providing evidence in favor of music in liturgy. He is, as Robin Robbins puts it, “scoring points on behalf of Anglican music against Puritan opponents.” The question of the liturgical role of music for Christians was hotly debated in Reformation England, but this debate was not unique to the period: there had been a certain amount

---

1 The author gratefully acknowledges the helpful criticism of Professor Kenneth Borris, Professor Julie Cumming, audiences at the 2013 Newberry Center for Renaissance Studies Graduate Student Conference and the 28th Annual John Donne Society Conference, and Geoffrey A. Johns.


4 Robbins, Poems, 576.
of anxiety about the affective potential of music since the early church.\(^5\) Saint Augustine, for example, questioned whether his enjoyment of music might be a sin when he indulged too deeply in the beauty of music in and of itself:

But my physical delight, which has to be checked from enervating the mind, often deceives me when the perception of the senses is unaccompanied by reason, and is not patiently content to be in a subordinate place. It tries to be first and to be in the leading role, though it deserves to be allowed only as secondary to reason. So in these matters I sin unawares, and only afterwards become aware of it.\(^6\)

Augustine is concerned that music, since it affects the emotions and gives physical delight, might potentially lead to sin if not tempered and ruled by Reason. Of course, Augustine’s apprehensions about music’s sinful capacity necessarily presupposes his belief in its affective power. Indeed, he goes on to argue that “through the delights of the ear the weaker mind may rise up towards the devotion of worship.”\(^7\)

Augustine and even those later Puritan agitators (although they may have been loath to admit it) are thus drawing on the Pythagorean-Platonic tradition that describes musical affect.\(^8\) “Rhythm and harmony permeate the inner part of the soul more than anything else,” writes Plato, “affecting it most strongly and bringing it grace so that if someone is properly educated in music and poetry, it will make him graceful, but if not, then the opposite.”\(^9\) Music affects the emotions in a powerful and transformative way, which might be spiritually dangerous, but when an auditor is “properly educated” in music, hearing it also evokes the contemplation of music’s orderly proportions, and

---


7 Augustine, Confessions, X:xxxiii (50), 208.


9 Plato, The Republic, trans. G. M. Grube and C. D. C Reeve (Indianapolis, Ind: Hackett, 1992), 3.401d-e. For Plato’s discussions of music, see also: Phaedo 86b-d (on the metaphor of “tuning” the soul as if it were a musical instrument); Republic Book III, 398d-399c and 424b-c (on the modes) and Book X, 607a-d (on banishing lyric and epic poetry from the state); Laws Book II, 655a-660a (on good and bad melodies and musical education of youth) and Book III, 700a-701b (on the right standard of judging music, i.e., not according merely to the ears, but according to its numbers and mathematical harmony); Protagoras 347c-d (complaining about second-rate musical entertainment); and Timaeus 47a-e (on a musical cosmology and corresponding psychology). Also see Aristotle’s comments on this tradition in Plato and Pythagoras in Book VIII of his Politics, especially 1340b: “That is why many of the wise say the soul is a harmony [i.e. Pythagoras, see Aristotle De Anima 407b30-408a28], and others that it has a harmony [i.e. Plato, Republic 443c-444a];” cited in Aristotle, Politics, trans. C. D. C. Reeve (Indianapolis, Ind: Hackett Pub, 1998) 236, n. 28. And see H. B. Gottschalk, “Soul as Harmonia,” Phronesis 16.1 (1971): 179-98.
thereby contemplation of the cosmic order that those proportions were thought to reflect. Henry Peacham the Younger, for example, wrote in 1622 of these two virtues of music:

> Infinite is the sweet variety that the theoretique of music exerciseth the mind withal, as the contemplation of proportion, of concords and discords, diversity of moods and tones, infiniteness of invention, &c. But I dare affirm there is no one science in the world that so affecteth the free and generous spirit with a more delightful and inoffensive recreation or better disposeth the mind to what is commendable and virtuous.

The addition of poetry to music adds yet another level of affective potential and of orderliness and proportion, especially when that poetry is the Word of God. Of this sort of music, Thomas East, in his “Dedication and Preface” to *The Whole Book of Psalms* (1592), wrote:

> The heart rejoicing in the word and the ears delighting in the notes and tunes, both these might join together unto the praise of God. Some have pleased themselves with pastoral, others with madrigals, but such as are endued with David’s heart desire with David to sing unto God psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.”

One such “spiritual song” is “How sitts this Citty,” Thomas Ford’s musical setting of the first two stanzas of John Donne’s translation of the *Lamentations of Jeremiah*, “The Lamentations of Jeremy, for the most part according to Tremellius” (transcribed in the Appendix). Ford’s setting offers an example of the kind of music thought capable of reordering the soul; it is the sort of music that might “raise . . . the Affections” of a man’s heart. In this anthem, the listener’s body and soul are penetrated by the words and the music and in effect invited to unite emotionally with the incarnate Christ. Here theology informs emotion; the Biblical and liturgical contexts of the *Lamentations of Jeremiah* shape the anthem, invoking compassion for Christ’s suffering and repentance for sin. Moreover, through their harmonious proportions, this poetry and music produce an order considered correlative to that of the divinely wrought cosmos. Thus they evoke the ordering

---


11 Henry Peacham, “The Complete Gentleman,” in *Source Readings in Music History*, ed. William Oliver Strunk (New York: Norton, 1998), 337. In his *Complete Gentleman*, Peacham also writes of music: “No Rhetoricke more perswadeth, or hath greater power over the mind; nay hath not Musicke her figures, the same which Rhetorique? What is a Revert but her Antistrophe? her reports, but sweet Anaphors? her counterchange of points, Antimetabole’s? her passionate Aires but Prosopopoe’s? with infinite other the same nature” (Strunk, *Source Readings*, 337).

12 Strunk, *Source Readings*, 353. See also Book V of Richard Hooker’s *Of the laws of ecclesiastical politie* (1597): “An admirable faculty which music hath to express and represent to the mind, more inwardly than any other sensible mean, the very standing, rising, and falling, the very steps and inflections every way, the turns and varieties of all passions whereunto the mind is subject;” quoted in Robert Donington, *The Interpretation of Early Music* (London: Faber and Faber, 1989), 111.

capacities of reason in relation to the emotions, in order to harmonize the auditor within, and render him more responsive to the possibilities of Grace.

Music in the Anglican church of Donne’s day ranged from straightforward congregational responsorial singing in parish churches, to the sophisticated polyphony of composers such as William Byrd and Orlando Gibbons heard in London at institutions such as the Chapel Royal, Saint Paul’s Cathedral, and Westminster Abbey.¹⁴ “How sitts this Citty” belongs to the genre of the English Anthem, which was “the counterpart of the Catholic Church’s motet.”¹⁵ Ford’s setting is a late addition (most likely composed in the 1620s) to a rich repertoire of settings of the Lamentations from such excellent English composers as Thomas Tallis (c. 1505-1585), Osbert Parsley (1511-1585), Robert White (c. 1538-1574), William Byrd (1540-1623), Alfonso Ferrabosco (1543-1588), and John Mundy (ca. 1550/1554-1630) who all set Latin translations of the text.¹⁶ Furthermore, William Lawes, a contemporary of Ford’s, set an anonymous English translation of the Lamentations, “How like a Widow,” published posthumously in Choice Psalmes put into musick in 1648 by Lawes’s brother, and George Whither published his own translation and musical setting of the Lamentations, “How sad and solitarie now ( alas)” in his 1623 collection of The hymnes and songs of the church. The Lamentations played a role in Anglican Holy Week liturgies, and a setting such as Ford’s could have been used at evensong or matins or communion.¹⁷

Helen Gardener argues that Donne composed the work “for singing in penitential seasons,” thus suggesting that it saw liturgical or at least paraliturgical use in private devotions.¹⁸ However, more recently, John Klause has argued that Donne did not intend for his translation to be set and sung: “a rendition of the whole book of Lamentations was hardly what was liturgically required. The

---

¹⁵ Atlas, Renaissance Music, 671.
¹⁶ The Christ Church MSS 736-738 are dated mid 1630s; John Milsom, “Mus. 736-8,” Christ Church Library: Music Catalogue (2007), accessed 25 March 2011, http://library.chch.ox.ac.uk. This setting of the “Lamentations” is in the same set of part books as Ford’s setting of Shakespeare’s “Sigh no more Ladies.” Ford’s compositional technique combines elements of earlier part-song and polyphonic styles with later syllabic text setting, and thus makes precise dating difficult. Continental settings of the Lamentations are even more common than English ones (this list is not exhaustive): Lamentationes Jeremiae (Antoine Brumel, c. 1460—1512 or 1513), Lamentationes Jeremiae (Antoine de Févin, ca. 1470—late 1511 or early 1512), Recorde Domine (Carpentras, also Elizéar Genet, Eliziari Geneti, ca. 1470—1548), Lamentationes Jeremiae (Thomas Crecquillon c. 1505—ca. 1557), Lamentationes Jeremiae (Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, 1525 or 1526—1594), Recorde Domine (Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, 1525 or 1526—1594), Sabbato Sancto (Lectio III) (Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, 1525 or 1526—1594), Lamentationes Jeremiae (Tomás Luis de Victoria, 1548—1611), Lamentationes Jeremiae (Estêvão de Brito, ca. 1570—1614), Incipit lamentatio (Gregorio Allegri, 1582—1652), Lamentación de Jeremías (Gerónimo Gonzales, n.d., active in the 1630s), Alph. Ego vir videns (José de Torres, 1665—1738), Leçons de ténèbres (François Couperin, 1668—1733).
¹⁷ In the 1604 prayer book lectionary, the evensong lesson for “Thursday afore Easter” is Jerem. Xxsi. The Lamentations are also traditionally sung during Tenebrae. “And that there be a modest distinct song, so used in all parts of the common prayers in the Church, that the same may be as plainly understood, as if it were read without singing, and nevertheless, for the comforting of such that delight in music, it may be permitted that in the beginning, or in the end of common prayers, either to the praise of Almighty God, in the best sort of melody and music that may be conveniently devised, having respect that the sentence of the Hymn may be understood and perceived;” “Elizabeth’s Injunction of 1559,” in Peter Phillips, English Sacred Music 1549-1649 (Oxford: Gimell, 1991), 7, and Atlas, Renaissance Music, 671.
ceremonial settings by Thomas Tallis, Robert White, and William Byrd, not to mention other sixteenth- and seventeenth-century composers both English and Continental, made use of only a modest number of lines.\(^\text{19}\) Like Tallis, White, Byrd, and Lawes, Ford too sets only a small amount of text: in this case, the first two stanzas of Donne’s poem. Certainly, Donne might not have initially intended for his translation to be set to music, but he would not have been surprised to find that if it came into the hands of a composer, one or two verses might be set, given the popularity of settings of laments in general, and settings of verses from _Lamentations_ in particular.\(^\text{20}\) As Brian Morris has pointed out, “Since Ford was a Court musician and so were most of the others who set poems by Donne, it may have been in the Court musical circle that Ford became acquainted with Donne’s work.”\(^\text{21}\)

Donne was not unique in translating the _Lamentations_ into English, which he did, as his title suggests, “for the most part” from Tremellius’s Latin translation of the Hebrew; it was a popular book amongst biblical translators both in England and on the continent.\(^\text{22}\) There are at least eight published English translations of this text that precede Donne’s translation.\(^\text{23}\) While we may speculate about whether or not Donne had a musical setting in mind for his verse when he wrote his translation, the fact remains that this piece belongs to a genre that would have had at least a semi-public reception: when musically set, these verses of Donne’s translation had a reception necessarily shaped by their musical setting and by all of the cosmological and theological implications that accompanied performance (especially liturgical) of the music of Donne’s day.

It is perhaps because Donne’s translation of the _Lamentations_ is not particularly innovative that it has received so little critical attention.\(^\text{24}\) As William Hunter has explained, “Among all of John

\(^{19}\) Klause, “Two Occasions,” 338.
\(^{20}\) The Lament genre was extremely popular in both sacred and secular music of the early seventeenth century: e.g., William Knight’s _The tears or lamentations of a sorrowfull soule_, which had two print runs in 1613 and 1614.
\(^{24}\) Donne’s translation is close to Tremellius’s, which begins: “QUOMODO desidet solitaria, civitas amplissima populo, similis est vidicet amplissima inter gentes, principis inter provincias quomodo est tributaria ?” See Immanuel Tremellius, “Lamentationes Jirmejae.” _Testamenti Vetrici Bibliis Sacra, Sive Liber Canonici Priscoe Judaorum Ecclesiae a Deo Traditi_ (Hanover, 1602), 756. Donne’s translation is also related to the translations of the _Geneva Bible and Authorized Version_ (Klause “Two Occasions,” 340). Also, Ted-Larry Pebworth has recently argued that Donne
Donne's major poems, 'The Lamentations of Jeremy' has been almost completely ignored. Critics have found little to write about it except as it seems to depend on other versions of the biblical text—primarily on the Vulgate, the Geneva, the Tremellius, . . . and the Authorized—or as it relates to some contemporary calamity.”25 However, the poetry is not without merit. The first two stanzas of Donne's translation, which Ford sets, offer an image of the desolation of Jerusalem:

How sitts this Citty, Late most populous    [1]
now solitarie and like a widdow thus,
Amplest of Nations, Queene of prouinces
Shee was who now thus Tributarie is.

Still in the night shee weeps and her teares fall    [2]
downe by her Cheeks along, and none of all
her Lovers Comfort her[] perfidiously
Her friends haue dealt, and now are enemyes.

Donne's translation has poetic movement and energy. The lines are straightforward in their meaning, yet there is a deft rhetorical movement in the first stanza as it shifts quickly from literal representation, to simile, and then to a fully formed metaphor. In the very first line the scene is set: Jerusalem, the city, is desolate. At line two, the city is likened to a widow. By line three, metaphor has taken over; the city that was a “queen” is now a subject. The description of the personified Jerusalem weeping in stanza two (ll.1-2) is the emotional height of the stanzas, and Donne creates a provocative tension in the poetry of these lines: while the caesuras (after the third foot in each line of 2.1-3) and the inverted first feet (2.1-2) slow the poetry down, the enjambment in the whole of the second stanza quickens the verse.

Still in the night shee weeps // and her teares fall
downe by her Cheeks along, // and none of all
her Lovers Comfort her[] perfidiously (2.1-3)

In the second stanza, the end of line one moves towards its rhyme, “all,” in the proceeding line, and the enjambment of lines one to two is especially energetic because it reflects the meaning of the verb that is enjambed: “fall” literally falls down into the next line; the verb describes the syntactical

______________


movement of the poem even as it performs that movement. Ford, as we shall see, capitalizes on this tension in his musical setting to create musical affect.

In his sermon, “Preached at Saint Dunstan’s” on Lamentations 3.1, “I am the man, that hath seen affliction, by the rod of his wrath,” Donne argues that “Jeremy presents a map, a manifestation of as great affliction, as the rod of God’s wrath could inflict.” Furthermore, the Lamentations offers an image of Christ’s suffering:

When we come to consider who is the person of whom Jeremy says, I am the man, we finde many of the ancient Expositors take these words prophetically of Christ himselfe; and that Christ himselfe who says, Be bold and see if there be any sorrow, like unto my sorrow, says here also, I am the man, that hath seen affliction, by the rod of his wrath.

Most importantly for Donne, Jeremiah is the image of an individual man’s suffering and that man’s compassion for the suffering of others.

The penitential liturgical context for Ford’s setting of Donne’s “Lamentations of Jeremy” sheds light on how this anthem would have been received by its early audience. Since Ford’s setting would most likely have been sung during Holy Week, the orthodox allegorical interpretation of the destruction of the Temple as symbolic of Christ’s death would have held the most immediate resonance for contemporary listeners. Indeed, Donne begins his sermon on the Lamentations: “You remember in the history of the Passion of our Lord and Saviour Christ Jesus.” Hearing the Lamentations, especially with the added affect afforded by musical setting, invites man to pour out grief over Christ’s death. The text and music invite the listener and singer to participate in a tradition of lamentation, to allow the emotions and logic of Jeremiah’s lament to shape their own emotions and repentance. As Donne argues in his sermon on the Lamentations, “To see afflictions, is to feele, to suffer afflictions.” Musical setting aids the listener in an exercise in compassion. If it were possible to take this anthem out of its liturgical context of a penitential season, and out of the biblical context of the Lamentations of Jeremiah (where Jeremiah’s anger and lament leads ultimately to his repentance), the concern expressed by Saint Augustine that music might lead to sin might be justified: the auditor might be tempted to languish in sorrowful emotions. Yet, as Donne preached:

In these words then, (I am the man & c.) these are our two parts; first the Burden, and then the Ease, first the weight, and then the Alleviation, first the Discomfort, and then the

26 Donne, Sermons, 10.193.
27 Donne, Sermons, 10.193.
28 Donne, Sermons, 10.194.
29 John 1.19-22: “Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body. When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said” (King James Bible).
30 Donne, Sermons, 10.192.
31 Donne, Sermons, 10.206.
Refreshing, the sea of afflictions that overflow, and surround us all, and then our emergency and lifting up our head above that sea.\textsuperscript{32}

Ford's anthem is a through-composed (that is, each stanza is set to different music; it is not strophic) part song for three voices: countertenor, tenor, and bass.\textsuperscript{33} The setting is syllabic and displays a thoughtful correspondence between the music and the content of the poetry. Ford strategically employs madrigalesque word painting and graces those words that Thomas Campion calls “eminent and emphaticall.”\textsuperscript{34} The word painting in the setting works along with the sorrowful content of the “Lamentations” to create the affective quality of the piece.

The anthem begins in the Aeolian mode, a mode that Glarean called “serious, forbidding and submissive,” and the slow polyphony with countertenor and tenor in the lower parts of their registers in duet against the bass sets a somber tone.\textsuperscript{35} This is emphasized by Ford's artful use of the descent through a fourth as the opening motif:

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure1.png}
\caption{Measures 1-4. \textcolor{blue}{Click here} for the audio file.}
\end{figure}

The descending tetrachord was a popular emblem of lament in Renaissance music. Dowland called the minor descending tetrachord (with the half step at the bottom) the \textit{lachrimae}, or “tears,” and used it most famously in his air, “Flow my tears” (first published in 1600).\textsuperscript{36} In his opening sequence (Figure 1), Ford uses both the \textit{lachrimae} figure in the descending tetrachords in Countertenor and Tenor, and gives the bass and tenor a further compressed, and thus intensified version of the descending tetrachord: a descent through a diminished fourth. The Countertenor descends through the tetrachord E to B (measures 1-2); the Tenor descends a diminished fourth, C to G\# (measures 1-2) and then through the A to E tetrachord (measures 3-4), and the Bass descends through a diminished fourth, F to C-sharp (measures 3-4). Even Dowland, who popularized the descending

---

\textsuperscript{32} Donne, \textit{Sermons}, 10.194.

\textsuperscript{33} It is possible that there was a basso continuo accompaniment that is now lost. See Spink and Traficante, “Ford, Thomas,” in the \textit{Grove Music Online} “Works” list for Thomas Ford, which notes that the basso continuo of the Oxford, Christ Church Library MSS is missing: “35 part songs, 3vv, GB-Oeh [bc lost].”


tetrachord as an emblem of lament uses the descent through the diminished fourth in his air “Flow my tears” as a means of intensification of the lacrimae figure: “Flow my tears” begins with a descending tetrachord and the second phrase of the air, “fall from your springs,” begins a minor sixth above the end of the previous phrase and descends through a diminished fourth with half-steps at top and bottom. The minor sixth had similar dolorous affective powers for Renaissance composers and audiences. The bass descent in measure fifteen, down a minor sixth (Figure 2), has this effect and contrasts with the chromaticism in measures sixteen and seventeen that sets the text “she weeps,” drawing the listener into the activity of mourning.37

![Figure 2: Measures 15-18. Click here for the audio file.](Image)

Ford’s handling of the text shows a careful sensitivity to the formal properties of the poetry insofar as those structures (having what George Gascoigne calls “depth of device”) increase the meaning, and thereby the potential for affect.38 For example, at measure seven, the declamatory monotone entrance of the Tenor line on “Ampest of Nations” (Figure 3) that reflects rhythmically the trochaic beginning (or reversed first foot) of line three, marks not only the start of a new musical unit that is reflective of the second line break in Donne’s poem, but also the poem’s shift in tone, from describing Jerusalem as like a solitary widow, to describing how she was in her former days of glory, when she was “Queene of prouinces.”

---


Likewise, the caesuras in the poetry at stanza two, lines five to six, are reflected in the musical setting. The first half of lines five and six that precede the caesuras in the poetry are repeated in the music: measures fourteen to seventeen and eighteen to twenty-one repeat the text “Still in the night Shee weeps” (2.1) and measures twenty-one to twenty-five and twenty-five to twenty-nine repeat the phrase “and her teares fall downe by her Cheeks along” (2.1-2). Ford also marks the enjambment of the poetry in lines three to four of the first stanza by first repeating the phrase “queen of provinces” (iterated twice in measures 9-10 and 10-11) and thus setting it apart from what follows, then in measure eleven pushing it quickly into the following line by means of the snappy dotted semiminim + quaver rhythm. Enjambment creates tension between the formal property of line brakes and the syntactical demands of a continuous phrase. This poetic figure of enjambment is thus brilliantly rendered audible in Ford’s music: line three is both separate from line two (set apart by text repetition) and inseparably connected by rhythm and phrasing.

At the very center of the anthem (Figure 4), Ford again employs a series of phrases that descend through the fourth for persuasive musical effect. Diminished fourths and tetrachords cascade over each other as each imitative entry overlaps with the last. Beginning in measure twenty-one, the Bass descends through the tetrachord A to E, then the Tenor descends C to G-sharp in a diminished fourth, followed by the Countertenor in a classic descending tetrachord, E to B, and then A to E (with F#, so the half step is in the middle). The phrase “and her teares fall downe by her Cheeks along” in madrigalesque fashion performs aurally the content of the poetry: the melody is falling as are Jerusalem’s tears. In a sensitive reflection of Donne’s poetic structure, Ford’s setting both stretches and compacts the listener’s experience of time in these phrases. The close imitative entries of Bass-Tenor-Countertenor in measures twenty to twenty-one and twenty-five to twenty-six with the quick declamation on semiminims for “and her” push the music forward, while the slowly descending second half of the phrase, with much longer note values for “teares fall down” and the dissonant tension-filled suspensions on “tears” (Figure 4) retards it:
Jarring dissonances from the very beginning of the piece, with the D over E in bar two, C over D in bar three, F natural against C# in bar four (Figure 1), work to evoke emotional response in the listener. Moreover, these suspensions that resolve most often to sweet thirds correspond to Donne’s own description of the Lamentations as having two parts: “first the Burden, and then the Ease . . . first the Discomfort, and then the Refreshing.”

On a macrocosmic scale, the rich use of dissonance in the piece to resolve to consonance reflects the reciprocity between the nature of the cosmos as a discordia concors and the nature of music itself which requires dissonance to make the consonance more sweet.

Thus, in the auditor who “is properly educated in music and poetry” (Republic, 3.401d-e), the anthem works not only to evoke emotional response, but also contemplation of the cosmic order, or, in Aristotelian and Augustinian terms, recta ratio.

---

39 Donne, Sermons, 10.194.
40 This paradoxical phrase, alternately concordia discors, refers to the ancient idea (dating back to Pythagoras, Heraclitus, and Empedocles) of cosmic harmony: that Love orders the cosmos out of discord into concord. It was a popular idea in seventeenth-century England, especially as a musical or poetic metaphor: that harmony (cosmic, poetic, and musical) is made out of discord within concord.
41 “In the preface to his Commentary on Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics, Aquinas enumerates four distinct ways in which order is related to reason: . . . When reason does not create but simply contemplates (i.e., understands) the order of a thing (res). This is the principal use and is the ‘speculative reason’ of Aristotelian philosophy of mind;” Jonathan A. Jacobs, Reason, Religion, and Natural Law: From Plato to Spinoza (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 164.
Ford’s anthem exemplifies sensitive word setting from the period, and how music was thought to order the human soul by affecting the emotions and bringing them into concord with the Reason that responds to Grace. Most fundamentally, that Reason is awakened by the words of scripture, but it is also aroused by the *discordia concors* in the music that points outside itself to an orderly cosmos, and by the artful marriage of the verse and the music. The words and notes together in this piece not only evoke emotional response in listeners but also awaken Right Reason in the soul so that it can respond to the divinely ordered cosmos that the music and the words together were thought to reflect.

Anna Lewton-Brain is in the PhD program in English at McGill University. Geoffrey A. Johns, a PhD candidate in English at Michigan State University, edited this paper.
Appendix

Recording and Transcription of Thomas Ford’s, “How sitts this Citty”

Audio clips

The clips from “How sitts this Citty” embedded in the illustration captions were recorded December 10, 2012, at The Birks Chapel, McGill University, Montreal, by members of One Equall Musick: Simon Honeyman, countertenor; Phil Dutton, tenor; Dave Benson, bass and recording artist; directed by Anna Lewton-Brain. Click here to listen to the entire recording.

Note on this transcription

The transcription of Ford’s “Lamentations” from Cambridge, Christchurch, MSS 736-8 involved combining the parts from three different part books into one score. The original manuscript parts are not barred; I added bars to facilitate reading the score and to show the underlying mensural organization of the piece: 2-semibreve groupings. I added commas where they were left out of repetitions of phrases, but did not add any other punctuation except the semicolons in measure 33, which seemed to me necessary for the sense. Although the original is in alto, tenor (c-clef), and bass clefs, I have engraved it with modern conventional clefs (for ATB) to facilitate reading for non-specialists. The spelling and capitalization reflect the originals. Where there was simply an indication that the words should be repeated, I did not capitalize, but retained the spelling. In the instance of the very final word, “enemyes,” the final iteration of the word in the bass part is spelled, “enemies,” but since all the other instances of the word throughout the three parts use the “y,” I opted to change the bass final variant spelling to accord with the countertenor and tenor parts.
"None fitter to do the husband’s work":
Women, Domesticity, and the Household in the Transatlantic Quaker Movement

By Naomi Pullin

Following its radical foundations in the 1650s, the Quaker movement, commonly known as the Society of Friends, became a subject of intense focus, not least because the role of women within Quakerism was something that had serious implications for the movement. Drawing upon the Protestant ideology of the “spiritual equality of all believers” and culminating in the universal doctrine of the inward spiritual light, women were able to occupy unusually active and public roles as preachers, missionaries, and evangelizers. Historians are generally in agreement that the numerical significance of women within Quakerism, combined with the prominent roles that they played in the organization’s structure and in evangelizing and missionary service, was unrivaled by any other movement in the seventeenth century. During this period, an extraordinary number of women traveled independently or with female companions throughout England, Europe, and the American colonies, with reports appearing that some women had even traveled as far as Turkey and Rome in attempts to convert their rulers. The rather unusual role of the itinerant female preacher undoubtedly altered her life in substantial ways—impacting upon both her everyday experiences and her position within the family.

However, the dichotomy between traveling preaching and family life was by no means static. It is my contention that a multiplicity of domestic relationships and ideals were accorded to women, as both travelers and “home-makers,” within the transatlantic Quaker household between 1650 and 1750. Through contemplating the diversity of individual women’s experiences I seek to explore both the paradigmatic relationships between the individual and the community of Quakerism, as well as the fluidity that existed between public identity and the private space of...
the household. As a consequence, priority will be given to “ordinary” women who used Quaker values and beliefs to organise their daily lives and to make their everyday practices within the household meaningful. The focus of this paper is therefore on the more everyday aspects of women’s lives and experiences, where I will argue that the non-itinerant woman, that is to say, an individual who never experienced a divine call to preach, had as much of a crucial role within the developing movement as her traveling counterpart. The peripatetic nature of the movement, combined with the mass migration of Quaker converts to the American colonies from the 1680s, makes an Atlantic perspective a natural focus of this discussion. As Rebecca Larson has suggested, early Quakers “identified themselves globally as members of one community linked by shared beliefs, instead of geographical boundaries.”2 Thus through combining women’s experiences within English and American Quakerism and highlighting that they imagined themselves as part of a unified spiritual community which was not confined to fixed political spaces or geographical boundaries, a more nuanced approach to the study of women and religion within the Atlantic world will be achieved.

Given the rather radical and unconventional quality of women’s transatlantic missionary service, it is perhaps not surprising that several scholars, particularly of the feminist school of thought, have capitalized on the liberation that these women experienced as preachers and missionaries. By viewing their public activities as defiant acts of protest against male power (specifically the patriarchal authority of a husband) it has been argued that this kind of activity marked the origins of the women’s rights movement. Margaret Hope Bacon, in her appropriately titled Mothers of Feminism, cites the struggles of early Quaker women in America in what she describes as “a microcosm of the long struggle for gender equality in society at large.”3 It has even been suggested that through their public roles as preachers, Quaker women were able to achieve social identities that were distinct from their position within families. Hilary Hinds, for example, suggests that these women’s activities posed a threat to the male hierarchy, as domestic concerns are “marginalized” within their writings and family matters are only considered “in an unfavourable comparison with the importance of their spiritual obligations.”4 Thus Joan Brookoskop spoke for many of her Quaker contemporaries when she wrote: “[I have] forsaken all my Relations, Husband & Children, and whatsoever was near and dear unto me, yea & my own Life too, for his own Names sake.”5 As scholars such as Hinds have suggested, the acts of women like Brookoskop juxtaposing the material (their family life) with divine circumstances in their spiritual autobiographies exemplifies the very threat that contemporaries feared most: that an emphasis on spiritual activity and personal callings to ministry would distract women from their proper role within the household.6

2 Rebecca Larson, Daughters of Light: Women Quaker Preaching and Prophesying in the Colonies and Abroad, 1700-1775 (New York: Knopf, 1999), 40.
5 Joan Brookoskop, An invitation of love unto the seed of God, throughout the world, with a word to the wise in heart, and a lamentation for New England (London, 1662), 12.
6 Hinds, God’s Englishwomen, 171.
The spiritual autobiographies or life accounts penned by Quaker women and circulated in print throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries clearly demonstrated that religion was a central feature of these women’s lives. Indeed, these personal histories, which document travels, meetings attended during visits, and spiritual or religious experiences, prioritize this kind of information over that of families or personal relationships. As Hinds argues, it is only when these women compare God’s demands to those of the temporal concerns of household and family that family is mentioned at all. Whilst I would argue that these accounts still offer a range of domestic details and shed new light on the effects of religious affiliation on household relationships, the scholarship on Quaker women has tended to depend on this kind of account as a means of understanding the effects of conversion on these women’s lives. This is problematic, as these autobiographies, through their emphatically “spiritual” nature, consciously removed their focus from the worldly concerns of familiar life or their neighborhoods and communities. Like the spiritual diaries of the Puritan tradition, these women recorded in their journals information that attested to their spiritual progress, periods of doubt, and experiences of providential delivery (both inward and outward), for the benefit of future generations of believers. In this sense, these accounts were envisioned as a confessional tool, as proof that these women’s personal relationships had gained providential significance as a result of their unwavering commitment to God’s work.

Although many accounts of female Friends have touched on the potential conflict and tension that existed between women and their families after their conversion to Quakerism, little has been uncovered about the dynamics of this pressure within families as the movement developed, or indeed, the persistence of affective relationships within families. Very little seems to have been said about how Quakerism affected women’s everyday lives and how this operated in practice. Thus when we turn our attention to the early modern family and the position of women within the Quaker household, we come to a significant void in the literature. There is a tendency to view the more public or dramatic aspects of Quaker women’s experiences as a characteristic feature of their lives within the movement. This, however, is to overlook the centrality of the private world of the household as a formative influence on Quaker women’s experiences and as a site for shaping their public identities as preachers or members of communities. Recent research, particularly from men’s studies, has demonstrated an increasing scholarly awareness of the flexibility of domestic relationships and the operation of patriarchy within the early modern household. Governance involved a “flexible ‘grid of power,’” to quote Karen Harvey, that gave women opportunities to negotiate authority even within patriarchal frameworks of power. Thus, in returning the focus of Quaker women’s lives and experiences to the household and the domestic setting, rather than their public ministerial activities, this survey will mark a departure from traditional views of Quaker women that equate public roles and radical speech with active participation.

Traveling ministry by no means dominated Quaker women’s lives; it fitted into a much broader model of experiences that were informed by their place within households. The
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7 Bacon, Mothers of Feminism, 66.
8 Hinds, God’s Englishwomen, 172.
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household and its setting was where the majority of Quaker women’s lives, activities, and efforts were engaged. In acknowledging that membership to Quakerism clearly affected women’s experiences and world outlook, the first section of this paper will explore the crucial role of the non-itinerant wife and mother in providing a supportive framework for the developing movement, and her impact on its survival for future generations. However, in exploring and restoring the lives of the non-itinerant Quaker woman to the historical record, no account of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Quaker women can fail to overlook the crucial place of the traveling minister within this picture. The second section will therefore turn to this more radical and prominent figure of Quaker womanhood. Yet, its focus will be on the fact that domestic concerns were in no respect “marginal” to the lives of missionary women and instead will show how women’s experiences continued to be defined and shaped by their very presence within the domestic sphere. Through an assessment of itinerant women’s writings, I will explore the experiences, concerns, and sentiments that dominated the thoughts of these women who appeared to have renounced their maternal and wifely obligations in pursuit of their personal calls to ministry.

In focusing on such a broad range of women, who were both travelers and the wives of traveling husbands, many of whom made regular contact with both the British Isles and American Colonies, I will make extensive use of women’s correspondence. Drawing on both personal letters and more official epistles, it is my belief that a long-distance and literate network of writers across the Atlantic emerged, forming what has been described as the very “backbone” of the young Quaker movement. Letters, unlike journals, are explicitly communicative and contain a much freer flow of emotion, information, ideas, and dialogue, than an author would present in a published life account. However, a natural set of concerns arise from any study that utilizes letters as its main source base. In the first instance, the issue of representation arises, in that not all Quakers would have been able to participate in this kind of written dialogue, or what one scholar has aptly termed “community conversations.” Although it is highly probable that Quaker literacy rates were much higher than those of the non-dissenting community, not all members would have been able to attain the capacity to both read and write. This is a particular concern when undertaking a study of female letter-writers, as despite improvements in education and the disproportionately high number of literate Quakers, female literacy is still estimated to have been as low as twenty-five per cent in 1720. Moreover, although the majority of women’s

12 N. H. Keeble suggests that dissenters may have accounted for thirteen to fifteen percent of the literate population, where nonconformist numbers have been estimated to total 330,000 in a nation of around 3.5 million adults, a third of whom were literate; N. H. Keeble, The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England (Avon, UK: Leicester University Press, 1987), 138.
13 Susan Whyman, “‘Paper visits’: The Post-Restoration Letter as Seen Through the Verney Family Archive,” in Epistolary Selves: Letters and Letter-writers, 1600-1945, ed. Rebecca Earle (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 1999), 16. I am not familiar with any study to date that has estimated female Quaker literacy. It may be possible to use David Cressy’s model of “functional illiteracy” to estimate the number of literate Quaker women. This would involve analysing the number of Quaker women who left their marks, rather than signatures, at the bottom of the epistles and petitions that the Women’s Meetings circulated. For Cressy’s methodology, see in particular, David Cressy, Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
familial letters are still in their original manuscript form, they occasionally survive only in the selected correspondence printed in the spiritual testimonies and posthumous autobiographies of influential Quaker women. The content itself — particularly the more “intimate” aspects of the text — may have been edited to portray a particular spiritual message for the Quaker readership. This may therefore lead us to question the degree to which these letters can be considered “personal” or self-reflective, particularly when the writer may have had a broader audience in mind.

However, these caveats should not detract from the value of letters as a useful tool of analysis, particularly in the study of early Quakerism. Recent historiography on letter-writing has suggested that the writing, reading, and dissemination of letters formed part of a broader cultural process. As Susan E. Whyman has demonstrated in her seminal work The Pen and the People, they were all communal practices which involved individuals further down the social scale than previously imagined.

Evidence, for example, from the early Society of Friends suggests the heavy weight that the movement placed on reading the epistles of ministers out loud, particularly in local monthly meetings. A letter from Thomas and Alice Curwen, to “Friends at New York in New-England” highlights the intellectual linkage that epistles could have. “So dear Friends,” the authors wrote, “when you have read this Epistle, which is a Salutation of our Unfeigned Love, you may read it in your Meeting; and let Friends at Gravesend, Long-Island and Oyster-Bay see it, for you are all as one to us, whose Hearts are Upright to God.”

Using letters as a source reveals a much more nuanced perspective about the evolution of relationships and roles of women within the Quaker community. Personal letters, as Clare Brant has recently noted, “articulate in miniature the concerns of a wider society.” Thus, through drawing upon the “private” or “familial” letters of Quaker women, in conjunction with content within their spiritual autobiographies and memorials that explicates the lesser-known aspects of their lives, my discussion will demonstrate that this kind of writing can be used as a “window” into the broader concerns of a developing society which were regularly discussed and reflected upon. Indeed, in breaking down fixed geographical spaces and in placing women, gender, and religion at the center of the discussion, I will reconsider how we use the Atlantic as a model for understanding issues of gender and the family in the Quaker context.

“Her Place as a Wife”: Non-Itinerant Women and the Impact of Conversion

Quaker membership undoubtedly shaped, defined, and distinguished the lives of its female adherents from their early modern counterparts. The effects of conversion, often initiated by a
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14 Although the majority of Quaker women’s letters quoted in the following discussion are still extant as original manuscripts, the familial correspondence of Anne Wright, Alice Ellis, Joan Vokins, and Katharine Evans has only survived as part of printed collections. Other Quaker women’s letters which have only survived in print include Theophila Townsend, Alice Curwen, and Elizabeth Webb.


16 Thomas and Alice Curwen, from Oliver Hutton’s at Barbadoes, to “Friends at New York in New-England” (March 12, 1676), printed in Anne Martindell et al., A relation of the labour, travail and suffering of that faithful servant of the Lord Alice Curwen, who departed this Life the 7th Day of the 6th Month, 1679 (London, 1680), 16-17.

17 Clare Brant, Eighteenth-Century Letters and British Culture (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 5.
husband’s contact with fellow-believers, rippled through households and altered women’s experiences of life within the domestic sphere. The remarkable testimony published by James Taylor, following the death of his wife Mary in 1683, highlights the striking effects of a husband’s religious affiliation on family life. After an initial biography of her early life and upbringing, the testimony turns to the sufferings that Mary experienced as wife to a persecuted husband, as a result of his refusal to pay the church tithe. Thus, in “carefully discharging the duty as her Place as a Wife,” she was faced with the uncommon burden of caring for all her husband’s outward affairs during his incarceration. As James notes, his much-burdened (and pregnant wife) “did manage the same in such care and patience until the time she was grown big with Child . . . she then desired so much Liberty as to have my Company home two Weeks, and went herself to request it, which small matter she could not obtain, but was denied.” Despite being “a Prisoner,” James notes that his wife’s sufferings “were far greater than mine, for the whole time that she became my Wife.” For, as he goes on to explain, “there was never yet man, woman, nor child, could justly say, she had given them any offence . . . yet must . . . unreasonable men cleanse our Fields of Cattle, rummage our House of Goods, and make such havock as that my Dear Wife had not wherewithal to dress or set Food before me and her Children.”

This poignant image of a dutiful wife unwaveringly supporting her husband as a result of his religious testimony is worthy of note. Mary maintained her husband’s business and financially sustained her small family during his incarceration, in addition to traveling many miles on foot whilst heavily pregnant to petition magistrates for his release. Although not a religious radical herself, nor a participant in those activities traditionally associated with female Quaker preachers who radically challenged patriarchal norms, Mary’s commitment to Quakerism nonetheless clearly affected her gendered experiences and world outlook.

The testimony of Mary Taylor (née Batt), along with the experiences of many other “ordinary” Quaker women, was printed in Alice Clark’s seminal text *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century*, first published in 1919. While many of Clark’s conclusions and methodologies fail to stand up to recent historiographical standards, particularly with regard to the pessimistic view that the rise of capitalism eroded women’s economic status and position within society, Clark’s objective to restore common women to the historical record remains valuable. Indeed, *Working Life* provides a comprehensive recognition of women’s everyday lives, and in its examination of the accounts of a variety of women, offers an indication of how “the exacting claims of religion” might give women opportunities for a greater economic role within the household. What is nevertheless striking is that over ninety years after Clark’s initial attempts to uncover the lives of lower-status women, non-itinerant female Friends still largely remain an invisible feature of Quaker history, and women’s history more generally. The clear tenacity that women such as Mary Taylor were able to demonstrate during great adversity shows us that we are still some
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distance away from a full understanding of the lives of Quaker women. These women were remarkable not for their travels, public confrontations, or prophetic gestures, but instead, for their faithful obedience to the cause, loyalty to their husbands, and support of Quakerism through their own positions within families.

Even when female Friends were able to experience liberation from household affairs, this was by no means representative of women’s wider experience within the movement. There were an estimated 750 active female ministers in the British Isles over the eighteenth century, which is fairly small, given that Quaker populations have been estimated to have been as high as 60,000 in 1680s England. Thus even a conservative estimate indicates the low number of active missionary women over this period. This is combined with the fact that missionary service was only temporary, with the majority of women traveling locally to neighboring meetings, rather than undertaking transatlantic voyages. Ministerial service, as Phyllis Mack recognizes, was a “transient experience, where Quaker women had to integrate moments of being ‘in the power’ with other aspects of their social and personal existence.” In an evolving movement, where familial stability was regarded as the basis of communal solidarity and a mechanism for survival, the role of the traveling female prophet became a contested feature of the movement’s history.

Given the unrepresentative and also temporary nature of missionary work, it can therefore be suggested that the non-itinerant mother, whose chief responsibilities as a member to the movement involved attending to the household and to her local meetings, arguably had an even more crucial role in the spiritual preservation of the movement, as the testimony of Mary Taylor demonstrated. The loss of the husband and father as a result of frequent and repeated imprisonments, as well as prolonged missionary service, particularly in the early years of the movement, serves as a crucial reminder of the disturbances within the household which adherence to Quaker doctrines could cause. This meant that much of the day-to-day management of household affairs devolved to the female head of the household. William Ellis in a letter to his wife wrote that “I know none fitter to do the husband’s work than a wife.” It has been noted that the daily life of Anglican households was also dependent on the role of wife and mother in ordering the activities of the household, where the godly wife was required to deputize in her husband’s absence. However, it can be argued that in the wake of brutal persecution, distraint of goods, and the absence of husbands on lengthy ministerial and transatlantic voyages, that Quaker women were faced with an unusual share of physical and material hardship.

While the uncommon burden experienced by English Quaker women eased somewhat in the aftermath of the 1689 Toleration Act, persistent imprisonment on account of tithes and frequent
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22 Rebecca Larson suggests that there were 1,300–1,500 active female ministers. Nearly half of those who “received approval to travel beyond the seas” were from the British Isles, and the remainder from the American colonies; Larson, _Daughters of Light_, 63-64. Barry Reay has estimated that the English Quaker population of the 1680s was anywhere between 35,000 and 60,000; Barry Reay, _The Quakers and the English Revolution_ (Hounslow: Temple Smith, 1985), 26-30.


24 Mack, _Visionary Women_, 214.

25 William Ellis to Alice Ellis from Daiford, Ireland (February 26, 1694), printed in _The Life and Correspondence of William and Alice Ellis, of Airton_, ed. James Backhouse (London: Charles Gilpin, 1849), 12.

absences of husbands as a result of their divine callings meant that this role for women within
the family remained a continuous feature of English Quakerism until the end of our period.
Even in American colonies like Pennsylvania, where religious freedom was enshrined in
the colony’s constitution, women’s experiences were punctuated by the absence of husbands.
However, in contrast to the English setting, this tended to be on account of ministerial work or
business rather than as a result of incarceration, owing to the fact that many Philadelphian
Quakers became prosperous merchants. Regardless of the circumstances, however, one of the
most frequently celebrated subject positions for Quaker women was permitting the absence of a
husband and bearing it faithfully. Anne Gratton, whose husband, John, suffered imprisonment
for five-and-a-half years, was memorialized in her husband’s spiritual autobiography in 1712 for
freely giving him up so that “she never hind[ed] nor discouraged him once from going out in
the Service of the blessed Truth, but was an Encourager of him, and in his Absence very diligent
and careful that nothing might go amiss to make him uneasie at his Return.”

Resignation to the will of the Lord appears to be a common theme in the communication between wives and their
traveling husbands, as the smooth supervision of temporal matters was of paramount
importance to male Friends who could subsequently devote their attention to God’s work.

The crucial and supportive role of Quaker wives is revealed through the letters they sent to
their traveling husbands. The correspondence between William and Alice Ellis, for example,
reveals that she was a powerful influence in his ministry and travel. In a letter sent to William in
1698, Alice makes clear her concerns about a premature reunion: “I have been a little afraid for
some time, lest thou shouldst be drawn homeward over soon, and thou should leave some places
or Islands unvisited, which would cause uneasiness, and deprive us both of the benefit we might
enjoy hereafter.” Although her desire for him to extend his travels was, as she explains in a later
letter, “not for want of love to thee,” Alice makes clear that the temporary suffering they
experienced as a result of their separation was only minor in the context of God’s wider work in
the world.

In an earlier example from the 1650s, the radical early convert Anne Audland
offered her husband a similar type of written encouragement during his various trials and
imprisonments. “Dear heart,” she wrote in one particularly revealing letter, “[w]e are all well &
doe witnes[s] ye Word of ye Lord to be true for he cares for us & his presence is w[i]th us & he
preserves us daily.” She then goes on to explain her reason for writing, which was “as thou saidst
to me . . . take no care for us, but in ye worke of ye Lord stand faithfull, for . . . I have pure unity
w[i]th [thee].”

Thus, through her words of loving encouragement and her prompts for him to
leave behind his concerns for the family’s welfare, it becomes clear that she too was valiantly able
to forgo worldly comforts for the wider Quaker cause. In using the language of “pure unity,”
Anne’s words underscore the fact that both husband and wife were viewed as spiritual equals,
where their labors on behalf of the movement were viewed as correspondingly significant within
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27 Phebe Bateman’s Testimony concerning her Dear Father and Mother (Farnsfield, 1712) printed in John Gratton, A
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the divine scheme. Women’s acceptance of their husbands’ missionary service as a feature of their marriage encapsulates the joint venture with which Quaker couples perceived daily work. This adds substance to the idea that non-itinerant women were also able to recognize the necessity of travel, for both their family’s spiritual preservation and for the cause of the wider community.

Letters, as Claire Brant has suggested, “offered fixed points in that the figure of the addressee was a constant object at least for the duration of the letter.”\(^{31}\) This idea of stability being found within the peripatetic is paramount, as it can be argued that the role of wives as correspondents, combined with their fixed spatial position within the household, helped women to support the movement. The correspondence preserved between James and Anne Harrison, for example, during his imprisonment and missionary work is indicative of the role that Quaker wives were expected to play in the maintenance of the family, where Anne faced the onerous task of continuing her husband’s shoemaking business during their separation. Indeed, one of James’s letters sent from London in 1667 reveals Anne’s central role as a fixed communicant, as it includes instructions about collection and delivery of goods, debts owed, and messages to be delivered to his business associates. “If John Hoult be at towne,” James wrote, “tell him that his brother James have taken up ten shillings more, th[an] the 15s paid by my order.”\(^{32}\) What becomes clear from these letters is the sense of partnership and stability provided by Quaker women’s positions within their households. James Harrison, as this example demonstrates, was just as dependent on his wife as a correspondent and bearer of his messages to local Friends and business associates, as she was on him as the provider of financial and religious instruction. The Philadelphian Quaker, Ann Story, frequently communicated to her husband Thomas information about his business associates and some of the decisions that she had made on his behalf, including the shipping of goods and the disbursement of money whilst he was traveling across the American colonies. In one revealing passage in a letter dated in 1708, Ann even states that “I could acquaint thee with Severall things relating to our [own] affairs but am not willing to trouble thee with them.”\(^{33}\) As both these examples suggest, the work that itinerant husbands asked their wives to complete, attests to the significant weight and responsibility accorded to the non-itinerant wife in ensuring the continuity of matters of business and finance during the patriarch’s absence and thus strengthening the spiritual outlook of their husbands’ ministry.

What is therefore evident is that Quaker doctrine arguably perceived household tasks, as much as preaching, as a calling from God, and consequently venerated duties within and on behalf of the household. The preservation of the movement’s testimonies through the upbringing of children was the focal point of many Quaker women’s experiences. Mothers were deemed to have a particularly critical responsibility in ensuring the correct deportment of their children, as the testimony following the death of the Irish Quaker Mary Greer makes clear: “She . . . laboured much in her own Family in Gospel Love, that her Children and Servants might be preserved out of Pride and Idleness, and live in the Fear of the Lord; so that we fully believe she


\(^{32}\) James Harrison to Anne Harrison, from London (June 9, 1677), *The Historical Society of Pennsylvania*, Collection 484A Pemberton Family Correspondence, Volume 1, contained in folder 61-68.

was faithful in discharging her Duty, according to the Gift bestowed on her.”

As this passage demonstrates, a woman’s spiritual calling could be defined by meeting the needs of her children and family, and not public ministry. Yet, this recognition of domestic labor as a divinely appointed duty was not unique to Quakerism and resonates with the advice given by Puritan moralists. William Gouge, for instance, explained that the public calling of a woman involved “a conscionable performance of household duties,” which he explained “may be accounted a public work.”

It is significant that through the process of memorializing the position of a mother whose ministerial gift did not extend to traveling missionary work, the developing Quaker movement saw these women’s efforts to preserve the family as a unit of piety and to admonish children to not wander into the sins of “Pride” and “Idleness,” as an equally important vocation. Whilst women’s domestic responsibilities through the religious instruction and oversight of their children’s education and spiritual development was not unique to Quakerism, it can nevertheless be argued that through serving the movement in “ordinary” ways, as supporters of their husbands and instructors of their children, these women were to play an essential and formative role in strengthening the religious commitment of the movement’s members for succeeding generations.

In 1911 Rufus Jones confidently declared that “itinerant ministers were without question the makers and builders of the Society of Friends.” Yet it is clear that this view requires significant revision when we turn our focus to the lives and experiences of non-itinerant Quaker women. Some, like Mary Taylor and Ann Harrison, were able to demonstrate great tenacity in adversity, and others like Alice Ellis, Ann Story, or Mary Greer were able to serve and thus preserve the movement through “ordinary” means. Nevertheless, no history of the Society of Friends, and more particularly its female members, can overlook the multiplicity of identities attached to women as wives and mothers. For this reason, in our attempt to rethink the role of domesticity and the household in Quaker women’s lives, we must turn to the traveling prophet whose very position as a female minister seemingly challenged the more “everyday” aspects of her existence.

**Dialogues with the Domestic: Female Itinerancy and the Quaker Household**

Quaker women’s experiences of frequent travel and calls to ministry clearly contradicted the Puritan dictum that the faithful wife should not stray “too much from Home.” As historians have therefore been keen to emphasize, transatlantic traveling and missionary work were not necessarily compatible with maternal and wifely responsibilities, particularly when women had
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37 The Puritan colonist Cotton Mather explained that a virtuous wife should not stray too far from home, so that if her husband was asked where she was, he could answer “as once Abraham did, My wife is in the Tent;” Cotton Mather, *Ornaments for the Daughters of Zion, on the Character and Happiness of a Woman* (London, 1694), 112.
left young families in the care of husbands and relatives.\textsuperscript{38} The non-Quaker William Wright declared in 1670 that he “was not bound by any law of God or man” to give his wife Anne up to the Lord’s service, or to “part with her, upon any such conceits or strong fancy as she was daily conceiving in her melancholy mind.”\textsuperscript{39} This outburst is perhaps not surprising as Anne had recently run through Saint Patrick’s Cathedral in Dublin dressed only in ashes and sackcloth. Yet marital relationships like William and Anne’s, which were characterized by diverging religious opinions, naturally posed a great threat to male authority as individuals were forced to question whether obedience to God should be prioritized above submission to a spouse. Alice Hayes explained that the conflict she and her husband experienced was so great that she was forced to choose “whether I loved Christ Jesus best, or my husband; for now one of the two must have the preheminence in my heart.”\textsuperscript{40} In juxtaposing the demands of the secular and the spiritual, these women’s experiences with the divine undoubtedly altered the expectations of their position within the household and the ties of loyalty that they owed as dutiful wives. In a society where the male head of the household was owed respect and obedience by his subordinates, we should not underestimate the disruptive effect that traveling women, driven by their own personal call to ministry, would have had on the patriarchal household.

However, as more pessimistic accounts of Quaker women’s place within the movement and family have suggested, the kind of liberation experienced by radical female prophets was not characteristic of women’s daily experiences within the movement. Kate Peters, for example, explains that despite the early leadership’s recognition that women were capable of acting as missionaries and preachers, there “was frequently a sense that their presence was also fraught with difficulties.”\textsuperscript{41} Even when Quaker ministers were undertaking public ministerial work, there was never an outright renunciation of spousal responsibility. Anne Wright, for example, despite having secured the consent of her husband to travel, was forced to carry a little notebook of advice that her husband had written, for her “to read and consider thrice over at least, or once every week.”\textsuperscript{42} The advice William Wright gave to his itinerant wife reminded her of her duties and encouraged her that once she had completed God’s will and work she must hasten home: “remember thy family, who will long to know what is become of thee; and know that thou hast some work there, which thou oughtest to look after; which all people . . . know to be thy lawful work, and thy duty.”\textsuperscript{43} Despite consenting to his wife’s Anne’s ministerial work in England, William’s demarcation of her God-given and “lawful” responsibility, suggests something of the
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way in which women’s spiritual callings continued to be perceived by non-Quakers. Here, Anne’s relationship with the divine was viewed as something that lacked natural authority and was thus deemed unlawful. Thus, even when a woman experienced openings of divine revelation, it is evident that a wife’s status within the marital relationship was still very much circumscribed by undertones of patriarchal obedience.

By extension, it can also be argued that the domestic setting as a physical and emotive space had a formative role in shaping the relationships between itinerant women and their families. In this sense we must question why a non-believing husband, such as William Wright, would consent to his wife absenting herself from the family home and her domestic responsibilities in the first place. Here, it can be suggested that it was not the impact of travel or the supposedly divine approval that imbued Anne Wright’s call to travel, but instead, it was how she behaved when she was not traveling or preaching that influenced her husband’s decisions. When Anne first received a call to ministry, her husband noted how “she laboured daily to please me in every thing, hoping thereby to gain my consent and willingness to her new-intended journey.”

Moreover, Anne’s missionary work may have even helped to intensify the marital bond between them, as on her much-anticipated return she was described as being “merry and pleasant . . . and very loving.” That this kind of supportive relationship could develop between spouses of different confessions suggests the important role of the household in fortifying relationships.

Some women took this kind of behavior to extremes. Elizabeth Webb reported in a famous epistolary exchange with Anthony William Boehm, that she would not travel without her husband’s “free consent.” However, when her husband refused to approve her call to travel in America, she described how she was “taken with a violent fever” and said that the only way that she would survive was if she were carried on board a ship bound to America, believing that “if they would but carry me and lay me down in the ship I should be well, for the Lord was gracious to my soul.” As predicted, Elizabeth made a miraculous recovery which served as proof of her divine calling, after which her husband “was made very willing” to give her up, reportedly saying that he would rather give her up “if it were for seven years, rather than to have me taken from him forever.”

Despite the rather melodramatic nature of this account, as both the examples of Elizabeth Webb and Anne Wright indicate, it was the private space of the household and the experience of marital life when both spouses were performing their domestic responsibilities and not the wife’s capacity as a public preacher which determined the potential for concord between husbands and wives of different faiths.

Moreover, it can be argued that patriarchal norms were persistently exerted upon itinerant women, where prompts of their duties and the continued presence of their husbands, or other male Friends, severely restricted the freedom they could experience during their ministerial voyages. The threat posed by female itinerancy can be viewed to have been circumscribed by the consent required from a male household head. Among the manuscript collections of early
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Friends is an unprinted memorandum, left by John Bowne shortly after the death of his wife Hannah in 1678. Both Hannah and John gained reputations as public ministers in New England and traveled widely in the service of the truth. Indeed, the account makes clear the interesting ways in which Hannah was able to go beyond traditional gendered prescriptions, particularly in her decision to undertake ministerial travel in England and the Low Countries and leave her children in the care of her husband at their home in Long Island. However, what is interesting about the testimony is the balance which her radical ministry achieves with the more mundane aspects of her identity. “The resolution of her heart and the Bent of her spirit,” John wrote, “was altogether to be subject unto me in all things, which for conscience sake she could do.” This choice of language reinforces the idea of wifely obedience to the authority of a husband. Even during her travels, her husband continued to exert his influence and at one point on her journey decided to accompany her, so that he could “press her . . . to haste away to her Children.”

In some ways, statements like this undermine the radicalism of women’s activities, by signifying that a woman’s call to ministry was something that was heavily weighed against familial obligation.

An assessment of Quaker women’s spiritual autobiographies also serves to counter the idea put forward by many feminist scholars about our inability to gain a clear picture of the ordinary lives of Quaker women. Indeed, many of the post-Restoration Quaker journals, as Sheila Wright has noted, were consciously written to offer guidance to their readers as to how to deal with the conflicting commitments of the domestic and divine. Alice Curwen explained in her spiritual autobiography that she felt a calling to go to Boston and New-England, “at which,” she explains, “my Heart was exceedingly broken, and I cryed unto the Lord with many Tears, and said, O Lord, what shall become of my little Children, and of my poor Husband?” Her troubles stemmed from the fact that at the time of her calling, her husband Thomas had been imprisoned in London for his testimony against tithes. Alice, the mother of a large family, was consequently the sole provider and caregiver and could not easily justify her absence. In fact, Alice’s self-interrogation lasted many years, and it was not until her family obligations had lessened and her husband was released from prison that she took up the call to travel abroad at God’s command. It is significant that the image that Alice put forward in her spiritual autobiography perpetuated a particular model of domesticity that emphasized waiting patiently for a call to ministry and only undertaking this work when familial circumstances had improved.

Thus a position of spiritual authority within the family served for many traveling women as a counterpart to an influential career as a public preacher. Quaker doctrine (as we have seen) perceived daily work, as much as preaching, as a calling from God and consequently venerated duties within and on behalf of the household. The “Mother in Israel” figure — a name by which many of these itinerant preachers were described — was valued by the movement for initiating the conversion of family members and servants to the religion. In the years after the Restoration (1660), a significant progression occurred, whereby the “Mother in Israel” was celebrated
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through providing a good and circumspect example of living to her children through adherence to Quaker testimonies. Thus, the spiritual autobiography of Joan Vokins, who encouraged the mass conversion of her family, makes clear the religious authority she possessed within the household. “She was a Nursing Mother over the Young convinced,” her biographer wrote, “and in her own Family, her care was great.” It was noted that when she saw that her children were “cumbered, and their Minds hurried with their Worldly Business . . . she would call them together to sit down and wait upon the Lord . . . that he might compose their Minds into an inward Retiredness.” This practical example about the realities of religious instruction suggests something of the authority the mother could hold within the household.

Thus contrary to the assertion often put forward by feminist writers, who have suggested the “marginal” nature of the domestic setting within public women’s texts, what is perhaps more striking is the synthesis that seems to occur within women’s writings and correspondence between spiritual concerns and the affairs of their households and families. In a letter of 1751, Mary Pemberton, an American Quaker preacher, wrote to her husband, Israel, whilst she was undertaking ministerial service in the American colonies. “Assure thy self my Dearest,” she wrote, “it is no Pleasure to me to be absent from thee and our Dear Children Who I sincerely Esteem.” Speaking on behalf of many of her contemporaries, Mary’s words resonate with the conflict and even reluctance that a woman could experience as a result of her spiritual calling, which could often mean prolonged separation from husband and children and frequent disruption to everyday household relations. Despite the rather radical nature of Mary’s absence from her family home in Philadelphia, where her husband Israel was left with the unusual task of caring for their small family, the language with which she frames her absence by no means suggests an overturning of the traditional gendered order. In one letter sent to her brother-in-law John Pemberton in 1750, Mary makes clear that her children and family were still at the forefront of her mind during her ministerial work: “I gladly Imbrace the opportunity to Let thee know the state of our family when I left home, which was Last a week since, when they were indifferent well, except father who was some what Indispose’d with a Cold, but have since heard he is better.” The correspondence that Mary maintained with her relatives therefore attests to the liminality of itinerant women’s positions within the public world of missionary activity. As part of their domestic responsibility, these women were expected to continue and maintain a correspondence with their distant household and relatives, reporting on family news and the well-being of relatives they had visited during their travels, and updating families on their journeys and anticipated return home. As private correspondence such as the letters of Mary and Israel Pemberton reveal, marriage, the home, and the family were by no means marginal matters in the minds of traveling preachers.
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Much of the surviving correspondence within Quaker families also attests to the continued sense of influence that the domestic sphere had in shaping itinerant women’s experiences. A central feature is therefore the concern that they had for the physical and spiritual well-being of their husbands and children whilst they were absent. This is exemplified in a letter sent from Joan Vokins, a mother of seven children, who undertook a voyage lasting almost two years to the American colonies in 1680. “And dear Heart,” she wrote to her husband, “remember to have an Eye over our dear Children, that they lose not the sense of Truth . . . for it is my fear, now that I am from them, that if thou do not supply my place in my absence, that the Spirit of this World will prevail, and hinder the Work of the Lord in their Hearts.” Vokins’s choice of phrase offers an interesting insight into the Quaker ideal of domesticity, as it adds weight to the idea that the promotion of domestic piety was something in which women had the primary role.

The Protestant Reformation enhanced the power of parents within the household, which became a locus of worship through their increased authority in the religious and spiritual instruction of their children and servants. According to the accepted model, it was only when the husband was absent from the family home that the mother would be expected to lead the family prayers. Yet, as Joan Vokins’s independent and authoritative expressions of childrearing suggests, Quaker family government arguably went even further in the authority bestowed upon the wife and mother. The implicit authority of Vokins’s position within the religious life of her household becomes even more apparent from one of her letters, where she reminded her husband and children to “Forget not your Family-Meeting on First Days at Evening.” Given that Vokins’s worries stemmed from the fact that a lack of maternal supervision within the household might encourage her family to be led astray, it is significant that a crucial role-reversal seems to be taking place whereby her husband Richard is offered advice about deputizing in her absence. Perhaps, as Vokins’s spiritual autobiography makes clear, the religious authority she held over husband and children devolved from the fact that she was the first among the family to join the movement. Nevertheless, her written instructions, combined with her husband’s loving care, were able to act as substitutes for her presence within the family.

The letters of other Quaker women also attest to the central role which correspondence had in shaping maternal authority. The letters Katharine Evans sent to her husband and children while she was incarcerated at Malta between 1658 and 1662, reveal the conflict that an itinerant woman could face, as a mother whose natural urge was to be present when her family was in need. Thus in one letter from 1661, she expressed the yearning she had for the preservation and prosperity of her family. “Oh my dear Husband and precious Children,” she wrote, “keep your souls unspotted of the world, and love one another with a pure heart, fervently serve one another in love . . . and bear one another’s burdens for the Seeds sake.” This rather emotive
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passage demonstrates one of the many anxieties that a Quaker woman would have felt during her separation from her family. Indeed, as Susan Whyman has suggested, issues of gender arose from the fact that, because of their spiritual careers, these women were forced to cede maternal duties to their husbands. Letters are therefore a useful medium in revealing the centrality of religious instruction in sustaining the maternal identity of these women. It may even be suggested that without the comfort of letters, the maternal parts of their identities could have been lost. Therefore, through relaying expressions of love and affection, combined with motherly guidance, their correspondence enabled them to retain a sense of maternal authority within the household from which they had withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is often argued that an ideology of separate spheres emerged during the “long-eighteenth century,” involving an increasingly close association between women and their homes and families. The mere existence of a traveling and itinerant body of Quaker ministers makes clear that the experience of women within seventeenth- and eighteenth-century society cannot be reduced to a singular and linear model, ultimately resulting in female domestication. The challenge that female-initiated conversion and itinerancy posed to the “little commonwealth” of the family, which offered no place for the public authority of women, cannot be doubted. However, the on-going and fluid relationship that seemed to exist between women’s positions within the private space of the household and in their public capacity as ministers suggests something of the limits that should be placed on viewing Quaker doctrines as a radical re-envisioning of patriarchal authority.

Barry Levy, in his survey of Quaker families in the American Colonies, noted that “the Quakers were the first to develop a form of domesticity as part of their religion.” The domestic ideals and behaviors of Friends, combined with the practical and varied experiences of both men and women within the household, demonstrate the extent to which the private sphere could be placed at the heart of the Quaker faith. Through an assessment of the experiences and correspondence of both non-itinerant and missionary women, it is clear that the spheres of religion and everyday life were co-extensive and Quaker ideals within both the household and the structure of the movement were mutually reinforcing. Indeed, the domestic setting of Quakerism, combined with women’s positions as wives and mothers, provided a space in which women were both subject to and able to negotiate patriarchal constraints.

Following the poststructuralist turn, historians of gender have come to recognize that we cannot speak of a single history of women in any period. This has resulted in an increased recognition that no study of women’s history can describe the universality of women’s
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experiences and thus a teleological pattern of advance or decline.\textsuperscript{62} The correspondence and printed testimonies of Quaker women reveal a multiplicity of images, ideals, and circumstances which helped to define their places within families, local communities, and the transatlantic movement. The “home-maker,” as much as the traveler, had a crucial role in ensuring the continuity of domestic affairs and the survival of the movement for future generations. This cannot solely be gleaned from the journals and spiritual autobiographies of Quaker women, on which so many accounts of their position have relied, but instead, must also be sought in the correspondence and communication networks that developed between and within families across the Atlantic world of Quakerism.
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