



Cleveland State University
EngagedScholarship@CSU

ETD Archive

Winter 1-1-2020

Negative Representation And the Germination of English Identity In Medieval And Early Modern Travel Narratives

Kelly R. Unterborn
Cleveland State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/etdarchive>
How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Recommended Citation

Unterborn, Kelly R., "Negative Representation And the Germination of English Identity In Medieval And Early Modern Travel Narratives" (2020). *ETD Archive*. 1231.
<https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/etdarchive/1231>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in ETD Archive by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.

NEGATIVE REPRESENTATION AND THE GERMINATION OF ENGLISH
IDENTITY IN MEDIEVAL AND EARLY MODERN TRAVEL NARRATIVES

KELLY R. UNTERBORN

Bachelor of Arts in English

The University of Dayton

May 2013

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ENGLISH

at the

CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

December 2020

© COPYRIGHT BY KELLY R. UNTERBORN 2020

We hereby approve this thesis for

KELLY R. UNTERBORN

Candidate for the Master's degree for the

Department of English

and the CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY'S

College of Graduate Studies by

Committee Chairperson, Dr. Brooke Conti

Department & Date

Committee Member, Dr. Rachel Carnell

Department & Date

Committee Member, Dr. James Marino

Department & Date

Student's Date of Defense: December 10, 2020

DEDICATION

To my mother, Vicki Unterborn, and to my late grandmother, Norma Harris, whose boundless belief in me is the reason I am able to produce this work: I dedicate this project to you. This project is the result of your many sacrifices, the least of which being the purchase of the many novels I digested as a child, as an adolescent, and now, as an adult. The gift of language that you shared with me is a priceless treasure the likes of which I can only hope to repay in the culmination of this work. I miss you, Grandma, and I love you, Mom. This is for you.

NEGATIVE REPRESENTATION AND THE GERMINATION OF ENGLISH
IDENTITY IN MEDIEVAL AND EARLY MODERN TRAVEL NARRATIVES

KELLY R. UNTERBORN

ABSTRACT

Critics have debated the use of post-colonial analysis to treat travel texts prior to the colonial period, often categorizing such representations of peoples and cultures through either intellectual curiosity or material necessity, with necessity as the deciding factor in whether or not a text “others” in its representation. An investigation of medieval and early modern English travel narratives challenges this idea, as writers from the fourteenth through the early seventeenth century establish a discourse of superiority regardless of whether their texts depict curiosity or necessity. Recognizing that negative representations of others are not exclusive to travel texts that favor necessity over curiosity, I explore three travel texts: *Mandeville’s Travels* (c. 1357), *Hakluyt’s Voyages (or The Principal Navigations)* (1589, 1599-1600), and *Coryat’s Crudities* (1611), whose representations of cultures and peoples certainly differ; yet these works are also profoundly similar. These texts, which span nearly four centuries of English literary history, reflect the English representation of a non-English Other during an era when the nation’s own identity was coalescing. Moreover, they demonstrate that, curiosity or necessity aside, this representation of cultural others promotes the development of a discourse of superiority. Furthermore, these writers’ depictions illustrate how early the ideas and attitudes of English superiority began to develop and how travel narratives contributed to this rise. The representation of difference gleaned from these texts

illuminates future attitudes toward the colonization and exploitation that mark English history in the centuries that follow.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE PLANTING OF SUPERIORITY IN <i>MANDEVILLE'S TRAVELS</i>	11
III. THE WATERING OF SUPERIORITY IN <i>HAKLUYT'S VOYAGES</i>	24
IV. THE SPROUTING OF SUPERIORITY IN <i>CORYAT'S CRUDITIES</i>	39
V. CONCLUSION.....	52
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	54

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

“My analysis of the Orientalist text therefore places emphasis on evidence, which is by no means invisible, for such representations *as representations*, not as ‘natural’ depictions of the Orient. This evidence is found just as prominently in the so-called truthful text (histories, philological analyses, political treatises) as in the avowedly artistic (i.e., openly imaginative) text.”

-Edward Said, *Orientalism*

Edward Said’s *Orientalism* profoundly changed the way literary scholars relate to representations of other cultures, and in particular, cultures historically associated with the “East.” Within the last 30 years, scholars have begun to re-examine travel narratives which chronicle experience of new lands for such representations of the “Other” in texts. In particular, scholars of medieval and early modern literature have applied post-colonial readings to pre-colonial and early colonial texts; but this action has not been without its detractors. For instance, Montserrat Piera argues in *Remapping Travel Narratives (1000-1700)* that the exchange between East and West in the medieval and early modern period

constituted a more mutual relationship than postcolonialism indicates (5). Piera identifies two impulses in travel narratives, “curiosity” and “necessity,” the first associated with knowledge and the second with the desire to acquire goods. He describes these impulses as “intertwined . . . at the root of every instance of travel” (7). Yet, Piera suggests that in the medieval period, what drives the relations between travelers and those they encounter is far more knowledge-based than need-based. He attests that “These exchanges, stimulated more by curiosity than necessity, brought about a reciprocal transfer of cultural values and artistic and scientific practices” (12). While these mutual relationships did exist at times, the question remaining is whether “curiosity” rather than “necessity” truly resulted in a difference in descriptive representations in travel narratives, and if so, why negative representations of other cultures exist in both texts of curiosity and texts of necessity of the medieval to early modern period. Despite differences of form that perhaps limit travel narratives from, as Paul Zumthor and Catherine Peebles assert, “[being] taken together as a discreet genre,” travel narratives generally contain “a double account, narrative and descriptive” (812, 813). Therefore, negative representation exists in travel texts despite the purpose of the work and despite the label of curiosity or necessity.

Considering that negative representations are not exclusive to travel texts that favor necessity over curiosity into account, then, leads me toward an exploration of three travel texts: *Mandeville’s Travels* (c. 1357), *Hakluyt’s Voyages (or The Principal Navigations)* (1589, 1599-1600), and *Coryat’s Crudities* (1611), whose representations of cultures and peoples may differ, yet offer profound similarities upon close examination. These texts, which span nearly four centuries of English literary history, reflect the

English representation of a non-English Other as the nation's own identity coalesced and demonstrate that, curiosity or necessity aside, this representation promotes the development of a discourse of superiority. In addition, these texts inform a broader understanding of writing about difference in travel texts that bring together East, West, and the European domestic, much in the way that Zumthor and Peebles write that in travel narratives, "Nevertheless, a unity does exist: . . . the fascination, in other words, of a spatial order, the understanding of which is an experience of otherness, for better or for worse" (812). As we will see from these three texts, that "experience of otherness" remains mostly for the worse, as all three texts promote the idea of an English identity that is superior to all others as well as the potential for future domination.

Of these three texts, *Mandeville's Travels* (c. 1357), has received the most critical attention from medieval and early modern scholars. Written in the mid-fourteenth century, the text, known widely as *The Book of John Mandeville*, depicts its presumed author's journey to the Holy Land and the lands east of it. While the authorship of the original copy has never been determined conclusively, the *Travels* originally appeared in French (Higgins 6). Despite its French origins, Mandeville describes himself as ". . . I John Maundevylle knight all be it I not worthi þat was born in Englond, in the town of seynt Albones . . .," an English knight from St. Albans (3). Furthermore, by the late fourteenth century, the *Travels* could be read in at least eight languages, including English (Higgins 6). The far-reaching nature of Mandeville's text mirrored the desires of its readers, as Iain Higgins suggests: "its potential readers and hearers were doubtless ready for a work that offered them, among other things, an entertaining inventory of eastern 'choses estranges' mixed with a celebration of 'universal' religious devotion, a

critique of contemporary Christian failings, and intermittent prophecies of Christian world domination” (6). Therefore, it is not surprising, given the multi-faceted subject matter of the *Travels* as well as its many translations and extant manuscripts, that scholars gravitate toward this text.

In the last twenty years, critics tend toward one of two ways of looking at Mandeville. Either they agree with critics like Lisa Verner, Sebastian Sobocki, or Theresa Tinkle that Mandeville’s text “did not . . . indulge in the prejudices of medieval Europe” and is an example of tolerance among his contemporaries (Verner), or as Andrew Fleck and Lisa Lampert-Weissig argue, that Mandeville emphasizes difference and “is a true precursor to the more commonly acknowledged markers of colonialism’s beginnings” (Lampert-Weissig 86). Despite the different positions these scholars hold of Mandeville, both sides agree that Mandeville’s text presents a complicated outlook. Theresa Tinkle, for example, examines Mandeville’s representation of Jews in the *Travels*. While Tinkle asserts Mandeville’s fluctuation between what she calls “dependence on and separation from Judaism,” she indicates that Mandeville complicates his own arguments for Christian superiority through his inconsistency (444). Yet, Tinkle recognizes the limitations of calling Mandeville’s view “tolerant”; she suggests that Mandeville’s “acceptance of divine mystery, a willingness to admit epistemological uncertainty about God’s purposes” (469) complicates the full-on tolerance envisioned in other Mandeville scholarship. Similarly, Andrew Fleck, while arguing for a Mandeville who emphasizes difference, understands some of Mandeville’s more ambivalent moments (383). These ambivalent moments, I argue, combine with overt representations of other peoples and cultures that place Mandeville not as one who is tolerant of global diversity, but rather,

whose work plants the foundational seed of an identity that sees itself as superior to all others.

Ideas of empire combined with expressions of spirituality, therefore, connect the seed of Mandeville to an emerging colonialist ideology, an ideology developed further by Richard Hakluyt. In *Renaissance Literature and Postcolonial Studies*, Shankar Raman contextualizes the early modern history of England's claim to empire. He offers insight into the European adoption of the Classical idea of *translatio imperii*, that is, the legacy of power transferred from one to another power (14). Raman cites David Armitage's three legacies of Roman *imperium: imperium* "denoted independent authority; it described a territorial unit; and it offered an historical foundation for claims to both the authority and the territory ruled by Roman emperors" (qtd. in Raman 17). Europeans, Raman asserts, adopted these Roman imperial ideas into their colonial projects (18). Along with the ideas of empire, early modern travel writers linked their discourse with emerging "science," which Judy Hayden indicates "referred largely to a wider body of knowledge rather than specific disciplines" (1). Yet, as Beatrice Graves suggests, early modern travel writers, often despite being viewed as more secular, commercially minded, and imperially minded than their medieval counterparts, also focused on the spiritual and moral in their travels (682). Claims to colonial, and later, imperial power, then, depended on an intersection of spirituality and a belief in a cultural inheritance of authority, both of which are evident in Hakluyt's text.

Published first in 1589, the *Voyages*, more commonly known as *The Principal Navigations*, documents English explorations from the medieval period until Hakluyt's own day and includes translations of foreign sources that described English exploration

efforts (Blacker 9). While Hakluyt did not participate in active exploration himself, his text compiles eyewitness accounts of travel narratives recorded in government documents, letters, private travel logs, reports, official correspondence, and at times, narratives dictated to Hakluyt himself in the presence of another witness (Blacker 9-10). By his second edition in 1600, Hakluyt included narratives of sea battles in order to advance England's naval glories (12). In addition to the aspirations of the *Voyages* to promote England's naval reputation, Hakluyt's text, as Daniel Carey and Claire Jowitt relate, depicts "some of . . . the most eminent and influential individuals of the period associated with English exploration, travel, and colonial settlement . . . together with many more who would otherwise have disappeared" (Carey and Jowitt 1). The *Voyages*, then, promote colonization, exploration, and overall, the potential for English dominance.

Scholars treat Hakluyt's *Voyages* as a vital text of England's imperial ambitions. As a result, most of the scholarship on Hakluyt focuses on his construction of the *Voyages* and its relation to English colonial ambitions in the early modern period. Nandini Das, for instance, considers *The Principal Navigations* as both "unifying" and "fragmenting and fragmentary" in its construction; Das points to the editorial changes found in narratives of India from the first to the second edition of Hakluyt's text to indicate how Hakluyt's revisions fragment the idea of a strictly collective voice in his work (119). Das connects the reason for this fragmentation to the idea of *sparagmos*, or the tearing apart of limbs and the colonial mission to restore the "body of Christian truth" (123, 125). Das suggests that Hakluyt's individual voice, one beholden to the emerging East India Company, penetrates the collectiveness of the text in order to prioritize private investment in colonization (127). In essence, Das views the individual parts of Hakluyt's

text as complicating to the whole, but not as completely destructive to it. While Colm MacCrossan agrees that Hakluyt's work is disjointed, he argues against reading *The Principal Navigations* as a unified text, disputing a long-standing claim that Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations* is “the Prose epic of the modern English nation”—a moniker given to Hakluyt's work by J.A. Fronde in the 1850s (139). He argues that looking at the paratexts of Hakluyt's work, that is, the dedications, intertitles, and marginal notes, obscures the differences between the travel narratives present (MacCrossan 151). Yet, despite these differences, the multiplicity of travel narratives in Hakluyt's work combined with paratextual elements nevertheless creates a work that consistently articulates an attitude of English dominance. A closer examination of the *Voyages*, I contend, illuminates Hakluyt's presentation of the desire for the emergence of English supremacy as it depends on establishing an idea of English superiority by which everything non-English compares, first abroad and then, as evidenced in *Coryat's Crudities*, in the domestic backdrop of Europe.

Coryat's Crudities, a two-volume work published in 1611, combines elements of the marvels that characterize Mandeville and the documentation of Hakluyt into a personal travel account of Thomas Coryate's five-month journey through Europe. Scholars note Coryate's unique narrative style in light of his contemporaries; for example, Kirsten Sandrock relates that “. . . Coryat's style of narration departs from the classic *ars apodemica* literature of his days in a manner that was to become instructive for the development of the travel writing genre” (“Venice” 151). For Sandrock, Coryate breaks with his contemporaries' style of travel writing that emphasizes historical and scientific observations in order to instruct and instead, presents “a personalized,

subjective mode of narration that stresses the episodic and unconventional over the standardised and scientific mode of narration” (151). Coryate’s first volume, for instance, includes a dedication to the Prince of Wales, an Epistle to the Reader, and nearly 100 pages of “Pangyricke Verses” about Coryate and his text (Coryate 1:1,7,22). After this introductory material, Coryate narrates his journey through France and Italy, continuing into the second volume toward Switzerland, Germany, and the Netherlands. Throughout his journey, Coryate comments on cathedrals, public buildings, important places, and people who he encounters or of whom he hears. While perhaps not specifically a work of scholarship, Coryate’s work, as Barbara Benedict asserts, resembles a “printed museum” (201), in other words, a place of presentation and display of the items that most interest him.

Included in this museum-like presentation, as I will show, are Coryate’s representations of a Europe that, for all of its fascinating buildings, art, and architecture, is populated by non-English people whom Coryate views as inferior. Of these, existing scholarship focuses primarily on Coryate’s entry on Venice and his encounter with a Venetian courtesan. Kirsten Sandrock points to this scene to argue for Coryate’s “ambiguous position between piety and depravity” in his interactions with Italy (“Venice” 164). Rosalind Jones, however, views the *Crudities*’ courtesan episode as Coryate’s attempt to provide “a credible itinerary of seduction and correction” particularly for male readers (116). In fact, Coryate spends much of the *Crudities* emphasizing and exoticizing European peoples, cultures, and customs. An examination beyond his Italian episodes reveals a Coryate who consistently focuses on negative or

limiting representations of the non-English peoples and customs which he encounters within the confines of Europe.

Few critics have considered the insight we gain by considering how these three texts across four centuries define superiority and reinforce it through representation of peoples and cultures. Although Mandeville, Hakluyt, and Coryate's works vary in their target audience and focus, these texts all rhetorically establish English superiority in a time period where England was not known for its power nor its status on the world stage. For Mandeville, the use of fantasy and marvel sprinkled with Catholicism bolster his intended purpose of conquering the world. Hakluyt, while decidedly more practical in his approach, compiles and contributes to documentation that asserts the beginnings of English colonization and offers a mindset of perceived superiority. Finally, in Coryate we find a personal travel narrative meant to entice the reader to see Europe through the lens of English identity via a combination of the marvels of Mandeville and the practicality of Hakluyt. Despite these differences, these three writers mythologize the idea of English superiority and demonstrate that thoughts and attitudes of superiority developed earlier in time than some current scholars would like to admit.

In considering *Mandeville's Travels*, *Hakluyt's Voyages*, and *Coryat's Crudities*, travel texts that span four centuries of English literary history, I will investigate these writers' representation of cultural and physical difference, paying particular attention to how these medieval and early modern travel narratives signal and promote the rise of English national identity through the ways they represent other peoples and cultures. Ultimately, I will demonstrate how through the late medieval and early modern period, these English travel writers, despite their varied purposes, express ideas of English

superiority that depend on negative representation of those who are not English. Furthermore, I will dispel the notion that negative expressions of difference in early travel narratives may be excused or dismissed by mutual relationships or a dichotomy between curiosity and necessity. In addition, the ideas of difference gleaned from these texts illuminate future attitudes towards the colonization and exploitation that mark English history in the centuries that follow.

CHAPTER II

THE PLANTING OF SUPERIORITY IN *MANDEVILLE'S TRAVELS*

Exploring the world was not a phenomena that only began in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Medieval travel literature suggests that European people traveled the known world, and in particular, the lands known as the Holy Land, for many years before the Age of Exploration. One such text, *Mandeville's Travels* (also sometimes known as *The Book of Sir John Mandeville*) provides a glimpse into medieval travel of lands known and unknown. For the author, Sir John Mandeville, an English knight, the *Travels* serve a two-fold purpose: to show readers “dyuerse folk þ of dyuerse maneres þ lawes and of dyuerse schappes of men” (3), and to encourage Christians “to conquere oure right heritage þ chacen out all the mysbeleenuyng men” (2). Mandeville describes his text as a guide to the world, a world with diverse manners, laws, and peoples, but it is also a world of “misbelieving men” who need to be “chased out” in order for the “right heritage” of Christianity to thrive (2). This two-fold purpose permeates Mandeville’s text in both overt and covert ways. When it comes to the Holy Land, Mandeville sees it as a land to be conquered for Christendom from “the mysbelleenuyng men” (2), but of other parts of the world, Mandeville covertly undermines the cultures he encounters. By utilizing vivid

description, comparison, allusion, embedded narrative, elements of marvel, and the natural science of his time, Mandeville paints the world as ripe for Christian colonization and conversion. An investigation of Mandeville's language, as presented here from the MS. Cotton Titus C.xvi, demonstrates how Mandeville's two-fold purpose contributes to the construction of an identity separate and superior from those perceived as different.

Although Mandeville works to construct such an identity, there are hints at some anxiety underlying his text. Even as he suggests Christianity as the superior religion with the "right heritage" to inherit the Holy Land, Mandeville cites the current difficulties in achieving this goal (2-3). Despite his social status as a knight, Mandeville calls out the ills of the aristocracy which he believes are inhibiting the progression of this ultimate "heritage":

But now pryde couetyse þ̄ envye han so enflawmed the hertes of lordes of the world þ̄at þ̄ei are more besy for to disherite here neyghbores more þ̄an for to challenge or to conquere oure heritage before seyð. And the comoun peple þ̄at wolde putte here bodyes þ̄ here catell for to conquere oure heritage þ̄ei may not don it withouten the lordes. (2-3)

Mandeville suggests that the current state of his society is in disorder, that a unified Christian front could happen, if only the lords focused on a crusade rather than disinheriting their neighbors. The people, Mandeville relates, need a leader, and if all parties came together, "I trowe wel þ̄at within a lityl tyme oure right heritage scholde be reconsyled þ̄ put in the hondes of the right heires of jhesu crist" (3). Mandeville, then, acts as a unifier through his text; he demonstrates the diversity of the world in order to promote the potential that a united, Christian, English front might have on restoring the

world to the “right heires” (3). His text, therefore, attempts to unify readers, regardless of status, to see themselves as superior to the people he encounters.

At times, Mandeville depicts appearance in comparisons that undermine the people he describes. For example, Mandeville speaks of the men of Nubia by explaining that “men of Nubye ben cristen *but* þei ben blake as the Mowres for gret hete of the sonne” (29; emphasis mine). The use of the conjunction “but” here pits the Nubians’ Christianity and the color of their skin as opposites; they have “ben cristen,” but have also “ben blake” (Mandeville 29). Mandeville sees this statement as a comparison to the “Mowres,” who, like the Nubians, are from Africa, but if that is the intention, it only furthers the difference that Mandeville indicates in his use of the conjunction, “but” (29). The Moors (“Mowres”) are Muslim; therefore, Mandeville’s placement of the Nubians and the Moors in comparison, then, could negate the Nubians’ Christianity in the eyes of the reader or, at least, indicate a difference between the Nubian’s Christian faith and Mandeville’s own (29). Furthermore, the use of this comparison, while subtle, uncovers Mandeville’s views about the Nubians, to whom he devotes only this sentence to in the entirety of his text, a sentence which emphasizes their blackness rather than their faith. Moreover, Mandeville’s use of comparison positions Mandeville as an expert, an authority on what does or does not constitute a “Christian,” thus excluding the Nubians from the community of believers, from an English perspective.

Mandeville’s comparisons, however, are not limited to those between varied groups of people. In his depiction of travel to the “kyngdom of Caldee,” Mandeville encounters both men and women of the land and comments on their dress. Of the men, Mandeville notes that they dress “full nobely arrayed in clothes of gold orfrayed t

apparayed with grete perles þ precyous stones” (101). Yet, of the women, Mandeville indicates that they “ben right foule þ euyll arrayed . . . gon all bare fote þ euyll garnementes” (101). Here, the differences between the apparel of men and women might be cultural, a difference in style or in traditional fashion. Yet, Mandeville complicates his comparison by the use of the adjective “euyll” (101). While the spelling varies in its next usage in the *Travels*, Mandeville continues his description of Chaldean women to include their skin tone: “And þei ben blake women, foule þ hideouse; And truely as foule as þei ben als *euele* þei ben” (102, emphasis mine). Mandeville’s usage of the adjective “evil,” then, illuminates not only the obvious difference in the look of the clothing, but depicts Chaldean women as unlike Chaldean men.

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, by the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, the word “evil” had several meanings. To be “euyll arrayed” with “euyll garnementes,” for instance, might indicate that the Chaldean women’s clothing is “inferior in quality, constitution, condition or appearance” (Mandeville 101; *OED* 8a). On the surface, then, Mandeville’s observation emphasizes the visual disparity between men’s and women’s dress. However, a deeper look at the connection between the “euyll” dress and the “euele” of the women reveals that Mandeville’s use of “euyll” suggests another traditional definition of evil in the period (101). The word “evil” also denotes one who is “Morally depraved, bad, wicked, or vicious” (*OED* 1). Considering that in the phrase prior to Mandeville’s characterization of the Chaldean women as “als euele,” Mandeville calls them “foule þ hideouse,” an inference can be made that links the two (101). To Mandeville, the Chaldean women do not only dress poorly, but they are also poor in a moral sense as well.

Furthermore, Mandeville, through Biblical allusion, marks differences in physical appearance and nature. When discussing the power of Genghis Khan, Mandeville notes that the title of “gret Chane,” or Great Khan, derives from Noah’s son, Ham, who “was he þat saugh his fadres preuy membres naked whan he slepte þ̄ scorned hem þ̄ schewed hem with his finger to his bretheren in scornynge wise þ̄ þ̄fore he was cursed of god . . .” (145). While Mandeville spends the preceeding chapter displaying the wonders of the Great Khan’s court, here he links the Khan with a person “cursed of god” (145). This curse, he continues, affects all who abide under the Khan as well, as they are descended from “dyuerse folk as MONSTRES þ̄ folk disfigured, Summe withouten hedes, summe with grete eres, summe with on eye, summe geauntes, sum with hors feet þ̄ many oþer of dyuerse schapp azenst kynde” (Mandeville 146). Despite the greatness of the Khan’s kingdom, he and his peoples suffer from an ancient curse, a curse that sets them apart from the descendants of Noah’s other sons, Shem and Japheth. Mandeville takes great care to illuminate the specific populations that originate from Ham, Shem, and Japheth: “. . . And this CHAM for his crueltee toke the gretter þ̄ the beste partie toward the est, þ̄at I clept ASYE And SEM toke AFFRYK And IAPHETH toke EUROPE, And þ̄fore is all the erthe departed in theise .iiij. parties be þ̄eise .iiij. bretheren” (145). Ham’s province is Asia, so all the peoples of Asia descend from him; those of Africa descend from Shem, and those from Europe (Mandeville also later includes the Israelites) come from Japheth.

This act of attributing peoples with Noah’s sons, however, is not exclusive to Mandeville, as Benjamin Braude indicates. Braude suggests that medieval and early modern people ascribed to the “logic of common descent” in order to understand a world broadening through exploration (105). This logic continued to exist into the modern

period, where the idea of “curse of Ham” became a common justification of slavery (Braude 103). Yet, Braude cautions against racializing medieval uses of the curse, citing multiple medieval texts, including Mandeville, to show that the designations of Ham’s sons with particular areas of the world were inconsistent in the late medieval and early modern period (110). Even without the later racial implications of the curse, Mandeville depicts the curse’s power on the appearance of the peoples of the Indian islands whom he describes in depth earlier in the *Travels*. For example, Mandeville points out the “houndes hedes” of the Cynocephali of Nacumera, the giants of Dondun that “han but on eye þat is in the myddyll of the front,” the southerners that “han non hedes þ here eyen ben in there scholdres,” and the “folk of foul fasceoun þ schapp þat han the lippe aboue the mouth so gret þat whan þei slepen in the sonne þei keueren all the face with þat lippe” with more descriptions that follow (130, 133, 134). Even when Mandeville highlights a positive trait, such as when he praises the Cynocephali for being “reasonable þ of gode vnderstondyng,” in his view, the Cynocephali and various islanders remain cursed, a part of an ancestry of men separated by the sinfulness of someone they have never met (130).

As Mandeville moves further east, his depictions of the people he encounters moves from mere comparison to dehumanization. For Christian Nubians, Mandeville emphasizes their blackness in a way that calls their Christianity into possible question. Chaldean women, Mandeville relates, wear clothes that emphasize their already “evil” character. Finally, the people under the Great Khan possess a curse connected with an ancient sinfulness that disfigures them and makes them appear as less than human.

Mandeville, then, portrays the character of people of other cultures as a reflection of the way they appear.

In order to assert superiority, Mandeville emphasizes a distrust of different belief systems. Mandeville sometimes justifies his assertions of difference by citing the views of others he encounters in his travels. While the *Travels* tend to be in first person, Mandeville includes in his narration what other people have told him as well. Two related examples occur early in the *Travels*, when Mandeville walks the pilgrim through Cairo, divulging to the reader the wondrous commodities of the land. When Mandeville points to a special balm that is made only in the city, he states, “And men maken all weys þat bawme to ben tyled of the cristen men or elles it wolde not fructyfye As the Sarazins seyn himself for it hath ben oftentye preued” (Mandeville 32). Only men who are Christians may make the balm, Mandeville relates, because he heard it from the “Sarazins” and because “it hath ben oftentye preued” (32). The authority of Mandeville’s voice comes only when he covers his voice with the purported evidence of others, yet the question still remaining is whether Mandeville truly knows this “fact” by sight or not. He attempts to answer this question when he explains how men counterfeit the balm: “For the Sarazines countrefeten it be sotyltee of craft for to disceyuen the cristene men as I haue seen full many a tyme” (Mandeville 33). Mandeville specifically uses “I” in this instance to increase the authority of his past statement. Whether or not Mandeville has truly “seen full many a tyme” that the Saracens of Cairo distort the balm is not as important as the perception the “I” gives to Mandeville’s authority as narrator (33). By offering his eyewitness account, Mandeville’s authority grows, and to the reader, paints the Saracens in a negative light, as potential sellers of false products.

A similar, though far more insidious, instance of Mandeville's negative depiction of non-Christian believers occurs when Mandeville describes the Jewish people. Mandeville mentions Judaism and the Jewish people multiple times in the *Travels*, but surprisingly, Mandeville inserts an aside about Jewish people into his narratives of places not specifically linked to Judaism. While discussing the commodities of the island of Pathen, Mandeville describes a poison that grows there "a3enst the whiche þere is no medicyne but [on]" (126). Here, Mandeville's description of the poison presents no issue, but a few lines after this description, he points out a use for the poison that engages with a common attitude and belief about the Jewish community in the medieval period. Mandeville explains:

Of this venym the Iewes had let sechen of on of here frendes for to enpoysonne all cristiantee as I haue herd hem seye in here confessioun before here dyenge. But thanked be all myghty god þei fayleden of hire purpos but allweys þei maken gret mortalitee of people. (126)

Similar to the anecdote of the balm of Cairo, here Mandeville utilizes the poison of Pathen to iterate the anti-Semitic belief in a Jewish plot to "enpoysonne all cristiantee" (126). Furthermore, he demonstrates this misconception once again through what is said to him and his eyewitness account of "here confessioun before here dyenge" (Mandeville 126). Here, Mandeville derives his authority from his supposed aural encounter with many confessions and relates it to the reader. By doing so, Mandeville perpetuates the belief in the Jewish people as evil, as those who would do harm to "all cristiantee" (126).

Moreover, Mandeville repeats these ideas toward the end of the *Travels* when he discusses the ten lost tribes. According to Mandeville, Alexander the Great tried

to trap the Jews between some mountains, but he could not do it without the power of a god. God, Mandeville narrates, “. . . closed the mountaynes togydre, so þat þei [the Jews] dwellen þere all faste ylokked † enclosed with high mountaynes all aboute, saf only on o syde, And on þat syde is the see of CASPYE” (176). Kept in by the mountains and the Caspian Sea, Mandeville continues, the Jews in this boundary, along with Jews that have “gon vp the mountaynes And aualed down to the valeyes,” will plot and scheme until the Antichrist comes (177). At this time, Mandeville relates, “. . . þei schull maken gret slaughter of cristene men. . .” (177). Through this use of embedded narrative, Mandeville reasserts the threat of Jewish harm; he even goes as far as to indicate how this “plan” will manifest through language. He indicates that the Hebrew language binds the Jews inside the boundary and those outside:

And þefore all the Iewes þat dwellen in all londes lernen all weys to speken EBREW, in hope þat whan the oþer Iewes schull gon out, þat þei may vnderstonden hire speche † to leden hem in to cristendom for to destroye thecristene peple. For the Iewes seyn þat þei of CASPYE schull gon out † spreden þorgh out all the world And þat the cristene men schull ben vnder hire subieccioun als longe as þei hand ben in subieccioun of hem. (Mandeville 177-178).

Mandeville indicates that the endgame of the enclosed tribes will be escape and subsequent “subieccioun” of Christian people, and that this subjection will be accomplished through Jewish knowledge of their language, Hebrew (178). This subjection, Mandeville relates, will be as long as the subjection of the Jews under Christianity (178). While Mandeville astutely recognizes the marginalization of the

Jewish people that has occurred, he also relates an anxiety over the potential for the same marginalization happening to Christians.

In *Crafting Jewishness in Medieval England: Legally Absent, Virtually Present*, Miriamne Krummel explores the expulsion of Jewish people from England in 1290 and the impact of this expulsion on English literature in the late medieval period. Her chapter on Mandeville considers the implications of the Jewish absence on Mandeville's representation of Judaism in his text and his choice to keep the Jewish people "entombed" and away from Englishness (72). Krummel argues that Mandeville employs both "paranoia and comradery" as tools to assuage guilt, not recognize it (85). Mandeville's acknowledgement of the marginalization of the Jewish people only serves to pit the Christian subjection of the Jews as equal to the imagined Jewish subjection of Christians (85-86). By doing so, Krummel asserts, "The fable 'obscures' the mistreatment of the Jewish community and translates the relationship between Jew and Christian as one with a 'genesis in equality,' which is ultimately an invention" (86). Mandeville creates the fantasy that the Jewish people will act just as Christians do; therefore, the Jewish language and the Jewish identity threaten Mandeville's world, and for Mandeville, need to be tamed and locked away. Even if Englishness is only a "fantasy" that Mandeville maintains, it is a fantasy that the language of his text helps to perpetuate.

Besides calling attention to differences in appearance and religion, Mandeville proposes that exploration of the world belongs exclusively to Christians. He does so by engaging in extended comparison while using the natural science of his time as a further way of subtly identifying difference. In chapter 19 of the *Travels*, Mandeville journeys through India and discusses the many isles that compose it. While India may not truly be

made up of isles, Mandeville's observation is specifically about the people. Of them, he writes:

For men of ynde han this condicioun of kynde, pat pei neuere gon out of here owne contree þ perfore is per gret multitude of people, but pei ben not sterynge ne mevable be cause pat pei ben in the firste clymat, pat is of SATURNE þ SATURNE is slough þ litill mevyng. . . . And for because pat Saturne is of so late sterynge perfore the folk of pat contree pat ben vnder his clymat han of kynde no will for to meve ne stere to seche strange places. (Mandeville 108)

Note that Mandeville diagnoses the people of India with "this condicioun of kynde," that is, a condition of nature that presumably results in the people being unable to move or steer (108). The phrase "pei ben not sterynge ne mevable" places an expectation on the people, limiting their agency by negating their abilities (Mandeville 108).

In addition, Mandeville places immense value in the idea of "kynde," or nature; he invokes "kynde" by dismissing the people via the "slough þ little mevyng" Saturn (108). Even Mandeville's inhibition of ability through the adjective "mevable" and its negating "ne" proceeding it points directly to the description of Saturn as "little mevyng" (108). Furthermore, Mandeville contrasts this description with a comparison to his own people that highlights how different he purports himself to be from the people of India. Mandeville explains:

And in oure contrey is all the contrarie, For wee ben in the seuenthe clymat pat is of the mone. And the mone is of lyghtly mevyng þ the mone is planete of weye. And for pat skylle it zeueth vs will of kynde for to meve lyghtly þ

for to go dyuerse weyes þ to sechen strange thinges þ oper dyuersitees of the world, For the mone envyrrouneth the erthe more hastily þan ony oper planete. (Mandeville 108)

Here, Mandeville utilizes the possessive adjective “oure,” the subject pronoun “wee,” and the indirect object “vs” as a way to identify himself as a member of this “contrarie” group, a group that can “meve lyghtly,” a group quite unlike the “men of ynde” (108). For Mandeville, people in “oure contrey” possess the “will of kynde” rather than a “condicioun of kynde,” and ostensibly, this permits, rather than inhibits, the ability to move (108). By his insertion into those who are able to move, Mandeville singles out the islanders as those bound by nature to their specified space.

In addition, Mandeville asserts that the ability to travel, to “meve lyghtly,” should be seen as a unique opportunity for people of his kind (108). A few chapters after Mandeville uses this extended comparison, he reiterates three times that exploration of the world is possible for people like him, even so much as indicating that he heard a story where “a worthi man departed somtyme from oure contrees for to serche the world. . .” (122). He suggests a future where whole world is explored:

And men may wel preuen be experience þ sotype compassment of wytt þat 3if a man fond passage be schappes þat wolde go to serchen the world, men myghte go be schappe all aboute the world þ abouen þ benethen, The whiche thing I preue þus, after þat I haue seyn. (Mandeville 120)

While Mandeville envisions this world exploration as a future enterprise, he makes sure for whom that enterprise is meant: those of “oure contrey” who possess the “will of kynde,” the man of his own kind with the driving nature to explore and move (108).

Travel narratives such as *Mandeville's Travels* often rely on description and comparison as a part of the travel experience. What Sir John Mandeville does in his descriptions in the *Travels*, however, reveals much more than the perception by European Christians of the people they encountered on their journeys. Mandeville's attempts at showing the "dyuerse folk" of the known world succeeds in a way; he displays various peoples and lands as he intended (1). Yet, within this attempt a decidedly less visible result—the implications of difference and implicit inferiority to Englishness which appear in Mandeville's language. Furthermore, Mandeville articulates ideas of superiority that have yet to be realized but which already implicitly existed, as his text demonstrates, in the English consciousness. As we move forward to the sixteenth century, we will see the emergence of England's colonial ambitions, ambitions that Richard Hakluyt records, justifies, and thus helps to perpetuate in his *Voyages*.

CHAPTER III

THE WATERING OF SUPERIORITY IN *HAKLUYT'S VOYAGES*

By the sixteenth century, the world that Mandeville imagined himself journeying through in his *Travels* had greatly expanded. Navigators, under the patronage of European nations, began to in greater numbers, as Mandeville once postulated, “serchen the world . . . go be shippe all aboute the world † abouten † benethen” (120). The Spanish and Portuguese dominated fifteenth-century exploration, and as a result, nations such as England shortly followed in what Irwin Blacker calls “the enterprise of the sea” (1). During such travels, these “explorers” acted the part of businessperson, adventurer, and more nefariously, of colonizer. They would record their journeys, including maps, sailing depths, and their encounters, for future use, and in Elizabethan England, Richard Hakluyt compiled their work. According to Blacker’s introduction to Hakluyt’s *Voyages*, “When the merchant venturers formed their companies to trade with Russia, the East Indies, the Levant, or establish the new colonies of North America, they sought the necessary information from the Hakluyts” (2). Taking the primary documents of these “explorers” as well as the documents already in his and his cousin’s (also named Richard) possession, Hakluyt published the *Voyages*, giving voice to the experiences of these so-called

explorers, and, as Blacker indicates, “contributed in no small way to preparing the English—the Queen, her ministers, her merchants, and her captains, as well as the people—psychologically for empire” (4). While Blacker does not elaborate on how Hakluyt’s text psychologically prepares for England’s imperial ambitions, I argue that in both the paratextual elements and in the narratives in his collection, Hakluyt develops a perceived English superiority that contributes to this psychological idea of empire. An examination of these textual elements from Irwin Blacker’s selected and organized version of *Hakluyt’s Voyages* as well as Project Gutenberg’s edition of volume one of *The Principal Navigations* reveal that through his navigation of the individual pieces of his work, Hakluyt weaves together a text that demonstrates the necessity of an English world—a world discovered by, colonized by, and ruled by the English.

Developing and shaping the perception of English superiority begins with Hakluyt’s purpose for his collection of works. In his dedication to the first edition in 1589 addressed to Sir Francis Walsingham, Hakluyt reveals that his own time at sea with Edward Stafford sparked a desire to read about English exploits after reading about other nations, who were “miraculously extolled for their discoveries and notable enterprises by sea, but the English of all others for their sluggish security, and continuall neglect of the like attempts especially in so long and happy a time of peace, either ignominiously reported, or exceedingly condemned . . .” (“Dedication to the First Edition”). At the time of Hakluyt’s voyage with Edward Stafford and through the publication of his *Voyages*, England remained a cultural backwater, far behind the European powers of Spain and Portugal in exploration and behind France and Italy in cultural capital. Blacker suggests that Hakluyt’s own study of the navigational documents of these countries played an

important role in his work, teaching him “that England’s efforts at sea had been slight, her rewards—compared to those of her European neighbors—small, her knowledge of the world neglected, and her own reputation as a world power generally ignored” (8). Hakluyt views his collection, then, as a mission to reclaim and demonstrate England’s long history of navigation as well as promote current ventures. His text fulfills the potential that Mandeville envisions when he considers the possibility of seeking the world via ship in the *Travels* (Mandeville 119-120), yet it does not do so through use of the stars or imagery; rather, Hakluyt utilizes the observations he gathers from others or produces himself to prove English superiority and increase England’s visibility. He achieves this through documents that authorize colonization efforts, instructions for prospective sailors, the dedications, title, and prefaces to his text, and narratives of important English voyages.

Hakluyt includes documents of national authorization within his *Voyages* in order to emphasize the importance of particular journeys. The first letter patent included in the *Voyages* is from a royal, Henry VII, and provides John Cabot “full and free authority, leave, and power to saile to all parts, countreys, and seas of the East, of the West, and of the North, under our banners and ensignes” (Hakluyt 17). The king gives “authority” to Cabot to explore places where neither the king nor Cabot have political authority; furthermore, Cabot may “sail to *all* parts,” regardless of anyone else’s restrictions (Hakluyt 17; emphasis mine). King Henry VII continues:

And that the aforesaid John and his sonnes, or their heires and assignes may subdue, occupy, and possesse all such townes, cities, castles and isles of them found, which they can subdue, occupy and possesse, as our vassals,

and lieutenants, getting unto us the rule, title, and jurisdiction of the same
villages, townes, castles, & firme land so found. (Hakluyt 17).

Not only can Henry extend his authority over the sea, through his language, his authority extends to “such townes, cities, castles and isles of *them*” (Hakluyt 17; emphasis mine). Henry cannot name the owners of such lands yet exerts his power through Cabot on them without their ability to consent or resist.

Furthermore, Henry VII’s letter patent offers two parallelisms which invoke the idea of domination deriving from this supposed authority. The first of these parallelisms occurs when Henry VII indicates that once Cabot and his sailors find the land, that Cabot and his family “can subdue, occupy, and possesse” the new-found land (Hakluyt 17). The three verbs used in succession imply the use of force and do so in a way that emphasizes domination and rule over lands for which even the authority of remains uncertain. In addition to this cadence of dominating verbs, the letter patent suggests that with the subjugation of the land comes “rule, title, and jurisdiction,” a succession of three nouns that signify the result of gained power (Hakluyt 17). These two parallelisms work in tandem to demonstrate how to gain power and how to keep it—by subduing it and ruling it. By doing so, the parallelisms equate the idea of being English with the idea of power, rule, and dominance and open up an acceptance of the psychological idea of empire.

Instructions for sailors of the period also contribute to this idea by preparing agents of dominance. Hakluyt’s *Voyages* includes Sebastian Cabot’s (John Cabot’s son) mid-sixteenth century instructions “for the direction of the intended voyage for Cathay” (46). The directions outline behavior for sailors to be “true, faithfull, and loial subjects, and liege men to the kings most excellent Majestie” as well as “to bee obedient to the

Capitaine generall, and to every Capitaine and master in his ship” (Hakluyt 46, 47).

Among the extensive list of regulations, Cabot instructs sailors in tactics of espionage, teaching them “not to disclose to any nation the state of our religion,” to take a person on board “to the intent that he or she may allure other to draw nigh to shewe the commodities,” and to “in countenance shew not much of to desire the forren commodities” (Hakluyt 52). Even though sailors should show restraint in their “desire,” Cabot indicates that the goal is still in obtaining these items; he orders the sailors to “. . . neverthelesse take them [the commodities] as for friendship, or by the way of permutation” (Hakluyt 52). In other words, Cabot suggests that sailors act as friends or at least in a friendly way to those they encounter while disguising their true intent: the gaining of foreign goods. By being clever, Cabot reckons, the sailors will gain more for England through this “notable enterprise” (Hakluyt 54). The more covert the sailor is, the more enterprising the mission will be, and Cabot’s instructions evince that this is not only the correct way for a sailor to behave on this voyage, but it is the optimal way to further the affairs of state. While this “enterprise” does not specifically speak of colonization but rather an opportunity to amass wealth through trade and later, sale of commodities, its inclusion in Hakluyt’s text provides an example of how the idea of empire is constructed. The subtleties that Cabot suggests for sailors are tied directly to those sailors being “true, faithfull and loial subjects” (Hakluyt 46). In addition, the “forren commodities” that Cabot encourages sailors to feign disinterest in will ultimately benefit future missions through their sale in England. Therefore, in order to be good subjects, one must become an agent of dominance in order to promote the continuance of English supremacy.

Hakluyt's own contributions to the *Voyages*, namely the original title of his text, excerpts from his dedications and prefaces, and his dictation of first-hand accounts emphasize the subtleties that promote overt representations of difference and implicit suggestions of superiority. For example, the frontispiece of the 1600 edition of Hakluyt's *Voyages* outlines how Hakluyt feels about his text and its relevance to English national identity. The title reads: "The Third and Last Volume of the Voyages, Navigations, Traffiques, and Discoveries of the *English Nation*; and in some few places, where they haue not been, of strangers, performed within and before the time of these hundred yeeres" (Frontispiece). The clause "and in some few places, where they haue not been, of strangers" is all lower-cased (Frontispiece). While the existence of this phrase in lower-case may not suggest anything on its own, as typeface standards varied in the early modern period, the phrase suggests a dismissive attitude to foreign contributions and even contributors in Hakluyt's text.

According to Blacker, Hakluyt at times used foreign sources for the "places, where they haue not been" (Frontispiece; Blacker 12). Yet, Hakluyt mentions that he has been selective in his use of these sources; he remarks in his preface to the first edition:

Moreouer, I meddle in this worke with the Nauigations onely of our owne nation: And albeit I alleage in a few places (as the matter and occasion required) some strangers as witnesses of the things done yet are they none but such as either faithfully remember, or sufficiently confirme the trauels of our owne people: of whom (to speake trueth) I haue receiued more light in some respects then all our owne Historians could affoord me in this case, Bale, Foxe, and Eden onely excepted. ("Preface to the First Edition")

While Blacker argues that Hakluyt “did not cut, rewrite, or interpret” his sources, it is clear from this passage that even without revision and editing, Hakluyt sought to lessen the importance of his foreign sources to his readers (14). Hakluyt admits that the “strangers” who he seldom uses as “witnesses” are only those that confirm the truth of English exploits (“Preface to the First Edition”). Rather than a truthful admission that foreign sources made up a considerable amount of his work, Hakluyt points his readers toward his English sources in order to show national pride. By acting as if he is only using English sources, Hakluyt mildly discredits Giovanni Battista Ramusio’s *Navigazioni et Viaggi*, an Italian travel compilation published in the 1550s, one of Hakluyt’s chief sources for his work and perhaps as Margaret Small suggests “his most used source” (49). Furthermore, Hakluyt’s dedication to Sir Francis Walsingham indicates that Hakluyt considered it his duty to rescue English stories from foreign sources: “I call the worke a burden, in consideration that these voyages lay so dispersed, scattered, and hidden in seuerall hucksters hands, that I now woonder at my selfe, to see how I was able to endure the delays, curiosity, and backwardnesse of many from whom I was to receiue my originals. . . .” (“Dedication to the First Edition”). He uses the phrase “hidden in huckster’s hands,” a phrase used in the sixteenth century to indicate when an item was “in a position in which it is likely to be roughly used or lost; beyond the likelihood of recovery” (“Dedication to the First Edition”; *OED* def. 3). In using this phrase, Hakluyt suggests that foreign sources, or at least, those who hold them, intend to do so to keep them hidden or to damage them. Combined with his dismissiveness toward these sources with his audience, Hakluyt asserts the limitation of foreign contributions in order to construct a pro-English narrative: one that glories in England, one that speaks

truth to English navigations, and one that is recovered from those that try to keep it hidden.

Moreover, the cover title *Hakluyt's Voyages: The Principal Navigations Voyages Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation Made by Sea or Over-land to the Remote and Farthest Distant Quarters of the Earth as Any Time within the Compasse of These 1600 Yeeres* adds the idea that these voyages are “principal” (Title). By the sixteenth century, “principal” meant an assortment of things in several different senses according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*; of these, two definitions stand out. “Principal” is an adjective signifying “first, chief, more important” (*OED* def. 2a) as well as the now obsolete “Specially great (in comparison with things of the kind generally); of high degree of importance; special, eminent” (*OED* def. 5). By making the “*Navigations Voyages & Traffiques*” principal, Hakluyt sees his compilation as a definer of English identity, and therefore, what Hakluyt compiles, including “traffiques” which contain actions of kidnapping and enslavement, are seen as “special” and “eminent” (Title; *OED* def. 5).

Not only are *The Principal Navigations* “principal” to Hakluyt, but they are also vital in two ways that shape his work. First, any work the size of Hakluyt’s required patronage to be completed, and for Hakluyt, a preacher, it would have been even more necessary. According to Anthony Payne in “Hakluyt’s London: Discovery and Overseas Trade,” Hakluyt received patronage from the Clothworkers’ Company of London in a time when the cloth trade was on the rise (14, 19). Second, Hakluyt’s prefaces and dedications emphasize how his own profession influences his work. In both the dedication and preface to the second edition of Hakluyt’s text, he frequently utilizes the

metaphor of bringing light into the darkness. He specifically employs light and dark together in his dedication to Lord Charles Howard, the Lord High Admiral:

Which worke of mine I haue not included within the compasse of things onely done in these latter dayes, as though litle, or nothing woorthie of memorie had bene performed in former ages: but mounting aloft by the space of many hundred yeares, *haue brought to light* many very rare and worthy monuments, which long haue ben miserably scattered in mystic corners, & retchlesly *hidden in mistie darkenesse*, and were very like for the greatest part to haue bene buried in perpetual obliuion. (Hakluyt, “Dedication to the Second Edition”, emphases mine)

Here, Hakluyt compares his work of bringing together his compilation of historical sources to the idea of bringing light out of darkness. On the surface, Hakluyt means that he has rescued the documents of English navigations out of obscurity, but his language also follows the some of the standard rhetoric of sixteenth century historiography. As a result, Richard Hakluyt the Preacher inevitably becomes Richard Hakluyt the Historian, and specifically, a historian who shines a light upon a supposedly glorious English past once thought lost in time.

Hakluyt’s preface to the second edition continues in this scholarly frame, even suggesting mythological recovery of the truth of English navigation. Hakluyt begins his preface acknowledging the pains of assembling his work, calling it “travaile,” and inserting yet another reference to light and darkness. However, he shifts to a metaphor of the body reassembled, explaining to the reader the importance of such a collection of English works:

. . . to gather likewise, and as it were to incorporate into one body the torne and scattered limmes of our ancient and late Nauigations by Sea, our voyages by land, and traffiques of merchandise by both: and hauing (so much as in me lieth) restored ech particular member, being before displaced, to their true ioynts and ligaments;. . . (“Preface to the Second Edition”)

Hakluyt suggests that his work brings together the body of English navigations in the same way that dismembered limbs are restored to one body. In this instance, he utilizes mythology, comparing the “scattered limmes of our ancient and late Navigations by Sea” to the scattered limbs of Osiris that need to be rejoined by Isis, Osiris’ wife and sister (Hakluyt “Preface to the Second Edition;” Das 124). In bringing together the “scattered limmes” of English travels, Hakluyt restores the broken body of Englishness to its correct state. He unifies the body through his painful work.

While Nandini Das concludes that individual sections of Hakluyt’s text complicate a fully unified reading of *The Principal Navigations*, she does acknowledge how Hakluyt uses the imagery of the “scattered limmes” to potentially unify when she indicates:

In its foregrounding of texts as fragmented, contested objects, and through its own use of such 'scattered limmes' as the basis of its own overarching production of a *corpus* of knowledge, *The Principal Navigations* demonstrates how such humanist philology could offer a model through which individual mercantile initiative might find a wider validation, using discrete individual investments as constitutive parts of a collective

reconstruction. (Das 128)

Hakluyt, then, acts as a redeemer of sorts, not just in restoring the truth of English navigation, but also, of the potential for further privately funded ventures that still benefit the nation. Therefore, Hakluyt takes an active role in the promotion of the idea of future imperialism as he basks in his self-claimed “restorer” status.

Proof of Hakluyt’s endorsement of his compilation as a principal account comes in his dictation of Edmund Barker’s narrative of his and Master James Lancaster’s voyage around the Cape of Good Hope toward India and the islands of southeast Asia. Hakluyt maintains the first-person narrative of his compiled documents, indicating that his text is “written from the mouth of Edmund Barker of Ipswich, his [Lancaster’s] lieutenant in the sayd voyage” (461). Giving authority to the voice from which he dictates, Hakluyt legitimizes Barker’s account of the encounters within as direct-from-the-source, an eye-witnessed truth. Furthermore, in the writing of the account, Hakluyt includes that his dictation was done in front of a witness, the Master James Lancaster (478), which adds a second dimension of authority to the narrative. It is as if Hakluyt needed to be certain about how this narrative would be viewed in light of the others in his compilation, notably because Barker, as a lieutenant, was not a royal, nor a captain, nor a governor, so Barker’s narrative might have been looked on with some suspicion due to his status, an occurrence that sometimes happened with travel texts (Schleck 56). Therefore, these added elements of authority conceptualize Barker’s narrative and the contents within, giving it Hakluyt’s seal of cultural approval as an authoritative text on this expedition.

What Hakluyt's dictation from Barker displays, then, are representations that demonstrate not just a differentiation between self and those encountered, but also between members of encountered groups. Hakluyt documents Barker's and Lancaster's arrival to the "baie...called Agoada de Saldanha" near the Cape of Good Hope (462): "The first of August being Sunday we came to an anker in the Baie, sending our men on land, and there came unto them certaine blacke Salvages very brutish which would not stay, but retired from them [our men]" (Hakluyt 462). Barker describes the men who meet the sailors on the beach as "certain blacke Salvages very brutish" (Hakluyt 462). Barker does not elaborate further, but his use of the word "Salvages" and the term "brutish" provide a scope by which Barker (and Hakluyt as writer) emphasize difference. Barker calls the men "Salvages," an old spelling of the word "savage," a word that meant "living in a wild state; belonging to a people regarded as primitive and uncivilized" (*OED* def. 3a). He amplifies this term by using the adjective "brutish," which could mean everything from being unintelligent, being overly sensual, or even being like an animal (*OED* def. 1-3).

Barker's description of these men stands out further when compared to some proceeding lines where Hakluyt transcribes the sailors' actions a few weeks later:

After we had bene here some time, we got here a Negro, whom *we compelled* to march into the country with us, making signs to bring us some cattell; but at this time we could come to the sight of none, so *we let the Negro goe with some trifles*. Within 8 dayes after, he with 30 or 40 other Negroes, brought us downe some 40 bullocks and oxen, with as

many sheepe: at which time we bought but few of them. (463; emphases mine)

Here, Barker tells that the men “compelled” someone to bring them goods, bribing him with “trifles” (Hakluyt 463). When the man returns with goods for the sailors, they buy them (463). Note that Barker does not call this group “Salvages” as he does the first; he and Lancaster’s men set to gain from this venture, even if they have to buy the livestock (Hakluyt 462, 463). Despite this, it is clear that the situation still differentiates the “Negroes” because of the force involved in the initial encounter; the men “compelled,” that is, they made, threatened, or coerced the man to give them what they wanted (Hakluyt 463). Therefore, while the second group seems differentiated from the first, the result is a collapse of difference into sameness and an implicit acknowledgement of superiority over both groups.

A similar event occurs a few pages later as the expedition leads Lancaster’s men toward the Island of Comoro. On the island, Barker indicates: “we found exceeding full of people, which are Moores of tawnie colour and good stature, but they be very trecherous and diligently to be taken heed of” (Hakluyt 464). Barker makes a note of the skin color, “tawnie” and compliments the “good stature” of the Moors, yet he describes them as “trecherous” (Hakluyt 464). Perhaps his observation is mere hindsight; the group does suffer a kind of betrayal by the group with whom they encounter (Hakluyt 465). However, in their navigation toward Zanzibar, Barker and Lancaster encounter and take “a Pangaia of the Moores, which had a priest of theirs in it, which in their language they call a Sherife: whom we used very curteously: which the king tooke in very good part, having his priests in good estimation, and for his deliverance furnished us with two

moneths victuals, during all which time we detained him with us” (Hakluyt 465). Due to the compliance of the king and the “Moore,” the crew is able to profit from their piracy: “wee manned out our boat and *tooke* a Pangaia,” their kidnapping of the priest, and their demand for ransom (Hakluyt 465). Here, it seems as if there is a distinction between the negative description of the Comorans and the “very curteous[.]” treatment of the Sherif, but each situation’s description is based on compliance with the English sailors (Hakluyt 465).

The two situations in Hakluyt’s dictation, therefore, depend on English supremacy, whether expressed explicitly in the comparisons in the text or implicitly through comparison with the sailors themselves. Barker may be distinguishing between different groups, seeing one as beneficial and one as unprofitable, and using more overtly othering language when he speaks to Hakluyt about one group over another, but nevertheless, the result is the same. An overt rendering of difference emerges from the covert sanctions of a nation trying to establish their own importance in the world through trade, and as it does so, dehumanization and dominance over other peoples and cultures follows.

Coupled with Hakluyt’s principal and vital mission, national authorizations for colonization, and an aversion to foreign representations of the English nation, narratives such as those of Lieutenant Barker assist in promoting the “psychological” idea of empire. While England’s empire would not be established fully until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, travel narratives and compilations, such as Hakluyt’s *The Principal Navigations*, sought to raise the visibility of England’s exploits to the English people in order to demonstrate a world for their use and for their domination. Hakluyt’s intention to

raise England's glory may not have occurred in his historical moment, but his work watered the seed of superiority already planted by Mandeville and nurtured it with his idea of a visible English nation. Within twenty years of the publication of Hakluyt's second edition, as we move into the seventeenth century, a young man by the name of Thomas Coryate would take the ideas built by Mandeville and fostered by Hakluyt and turn them toward Europe in his *Crudities*.

CHAPTER IV

THE SPROUTING OF SUPERIORITY IN *CORYAT'S CRUDITIES*

As the seventeenth century dawned, England's colonial aspirations began to take shape as realities. In 1607, the Virginia Company, under James I's royal charter, established their colony of Jamestown, Virginia, and it became increasingly popular for English persons to travel and produce texts about their travels—no doubt a testament to the popularity of compilations like Hakluyt's *The Principal Navigations* as well as treatises on emerging geographical study. Judy Hayden, in "Intersections and Cross-Fertilization," explores the impact of the inclusion of the field of geography in science and literature in the seventeenth century, remarking that "Geography, too, became part of the science and literary culture and was, in fact, instrumental in providing a nucleus around which exploration and nation-building might develop" (12). While not strictly focused on worldwide conversion or colonization in the way that his predecessors Mandeville and Hakluyt are, Thomas Coryate echoes their desire to use knowledge of the world to articulate the superiority of Englishness in his work, *Coryat's Crudities* (1611).

His text, a record of a five-months' journey, does not venture into the unknown as Mandeville's does, nor into the newly "discovered" as does Hakluyt's, but takes place in

Europe, a place much more familiar and much closer to home. Despite the close proximity of the countries that Coryate visits to his home, Coryate's language reiterates the monstrous discourse of Mandeville's depiction of non-English others with the meticulousness of recording seen in Hakluyt with the addition, at times, of Coryate's own humor. Coryate's observations, while depicting a Europe rich in history, art, and architecture, also present a Europe fraught with dangers to English morality and religion. Like Mandeville and Hakluyt, Coryate constructs his *Crudities* under a veil of anxiety. Unlike his predecessors, however, Coryate turns his negative representations on his near neighbors despite the fact that Continental Europe possessed a "passing variety of beautifull Cities, Kings and Princes Courts, gorgeous Palaces, . . . a very Cornucopia of all manner of commodities as it were with the horne of Amalthea, tending both to pleasure and profit, that the heart of man can wish for: . . ." (1:8). Coryate, then, constructs a collection of enticements but interlaces this collection with disdain for the customs of Continental European people. Through the use of self-effacing humor while mocking the cultures he encounters, Coryate's *Crudities* portrays a Europe that is inferior to England, but which is necessary as a contrast in order to define Englishness and its superiority to other cultures.

Before Coryate narrates his journey, he first establishes an English royal connection for his work. In his dedication to Henry, Prince of Wales, the son of James I of England, Coryate, though modestly describing himself as "no schollar," explains his purpose for publishing the *Crudities* as potentially important for furthering England's prospects (1:1). Coryate's appeal to Henry, as the Publisher's Note to volume I of *Crudities* suggests, was not because Henry financed his expedition, but rather because

Coryate needed his support to publish his book (iv). Nevertheless, Coryate maintains that his aim is to fashion young English gentlemen into world travelers:

First, that if your Highnesse will deigne to protect them with your favourable and gracious Patronage, . . . it may perhaps yield some little encouragement to many noble and generose yong Gallants . . . to travel into forraine countries, and inrich themselves partly with the observations, and partly with the languages of outlandish regions, . . . seeing thereby they will be made fit to doe your Highnesse and their Country the better service when opportunity shall require (Coryate 1:1-2).

Yet, it is not only for the purpose of travel that Coryate urges Henry to bestow patronage; Coryate sees the potential in raising cosmopolitan men in order “to doe your Highness and their Country the better service when opportunity shall require” (1:2), acknowledging that better knowledge of the world will enable better handling of England’s affairs in it. This is made more explicit as Coryate closes his dedication and indicates that the preparation “shall be an introduction . . . to farre more memorable matters that I determine by God’s gracious indulgence to observe hereafter . . .” followed by a list of cities that include Jerusalem, Jericho and Constantinople (1:6), cities which lie outside of Europe. Travel to Europe, in Coryate’s view, prepares the mind to perform duties to crown and country, and in this way, Coryate demonstrates how travel is about gain, and specifically, gain for the English.

Part of this gain, Coryate relates, comes from understanding and pointing what he considers to be the lax morality of others. In his *Crudities*, he often uses women as the

site of this lax morality, yet he does so in order to mock the culture as a whole. While mocking the cultures he encounters, Coryate simultaneously mocks himself, attempting to justify his own exploits. Yet, even in the humor of Coryate's situation, what stands out is his depiction of non-English Europeans as loose and morally bereft. In Coryate's forays in Italy and Germany, we see how Coryate's attempts to titillate the reader lead to the exoticization of the people he describes.

In the first volume of the *Crudities*, Coryate spends a considerable amount of time, and hence, a considerable amount of space in his volume, on his journey through Venice. While there, Coryate sees the Venetian women's fashion and catalogs it in great detail:

Almost all the wives, widowes, and mayds do walke abroad with their breastes all naked, and many of them have their backes also naked even almost to the middle, . . . a fashion me thinks very uncivill and unseemely, especially if the beholder might plainly see them. For I beleeve unto many that have prurientem libidinem, they would minister a great incentive & fomentations of luxurious desires. (Coryate 1: 399-400)

Coryate's catalog of women's fashion, however, is not objective and contains his impressions; he considers these women's dress as "very uncivill and unseemely," and even goes so far as to suggest that they might cause sinful and "luxurious desires" to develop in those with *prurientum libidinum*, that is, in those who "have sexual craving" and "wantonness" (1:399, 400; Whitaker). Yet, Coryate's words are a bit of tongue-in-cheek; he points out the naked women in order to put them on display for his readers. While he may not be interested in correcting these women, Coryate's depiction of them

creates a scandalous Venice, one where all the women run around half-dressed and no one comments about it.

As Coryate continues his narrative on Venice, he recounts his visit to a local courtesan house, where he meets privately with one of the courtesans. Careful to explain his actions, he injects that he “went to one of their noble houses (I wil confesse) to see the manner of their life, and observe their behaviour, . . .” (Coryate 1:408). He compares his mission to that of Panutius to Thais, a story where Panutius speaks with the prostitute Thais and “tooke occasion to persuade her to the feare of God and religion, and to the reformation of her licentious life, since God was able to prie into the secretest corners of the world” (Coryate 1:408). However, unlike Panutius, Coryate’s mission fails, and he is left to explain his reason for including this episode and his lengthy discussion of courtesans in the *Crudities* for fear of possible backlash:

Neither can I be perswaded that it ought to be esteemed for a staine or blemish to the reputation of an honest and ingenuous man to see a Cortezan in her house, and note her manners and conversation, because according to the old maxime, *Cognitio mali non est mala*, the knowledge of evill is not evill, but the practice and execution thereof. For I thinke that a virtuous man will be the more confirmed and settled in virtue by the observation of some vices, then if he did not at all know what they were. (1:408)

For Coryate, his visit to a courtesan house sets an example to young gentleman back home that even small “vices” should be used as a way to gain knowledge, but in reality, Coryate uses the “correction” of the Courtesan to justify why he went to a brothel. However, as Coryate employs humor, he also offers the courtesan as a gift for his

readership. Ann Rosalind Jones argues that Coryate presents the Venetian Courtesan as he does the city of Venice, “dazzling and frightening,” and as he does so, he paints a Venice where “The splendor of the city is condensed into the exotic costumes and surroundings of its courtesans: magnificence coexists with, indeed is intentionally allied with, temptation” (109). The courtesan, as an example of an “exotic” European product, depicts a Venice that both entices, yet is full of vice.

Italy is not the only country where Coryate comments on the customs of a culture through his depiction of women. While in Germany, or what Coryate calls Germany, he visits the city of Baden and makes observation of the public baths, baths which, Coryate attests, “are of very soveraigne virtue for the curing of these infirmities, viz. the tertian and quartan ague, the itch, the cholicke and the stone . . .” (2:142). As he observes both the men and women bathers, Coryate identifies a “strange thing” or custom—men and women bathing together “naked from the middle upward in one bathe: whereof some of the women were wives (as I was told) and the men partly bachelers, and partly married men, but not the husbands of the same women” (2:141). At this sight, Coryate cannot contain his negative impressions; he worries about jealousy brewing in the husbands, but indicates that even if they are not jealous, that the cultural bathing practice, specifically of “Germanes and Helvetians,” are “wanton” (2:142). Combined with the negative reaction to foreign cultural practices, Coryate continues to focus on the women. He suggests that “. . . for mine owne part were I a married man . . . I should hardly be perswaded to suffer her to bathe her selfe naked in one and selfe same bath with one onely bachelor or married man with her, because if she was faire, and had an attractive countenance, she might perhaps cornifie me” (2:142). Perhaps the possibility of an illicit relationship or

naked women would entice Coryate's readership, but even so, Coryate's observation about the "Germanes and Helvetians" points to a comment on the overall culture of these non-English Europeans, whose customs are "wanton" and therefore, viewed as inferior (2:142).

It is clear that Coryate views non-English, European women as both alluring, yet threatening, and in the *Crudities*, he points to them in order to express his views about the non-English European cultures he encounters. Coryate, unlike Mandeville, does not require use of monstrous imagery to achieve this negative representation; instead, like Hakluyt, he documents what he sees or is told while adding his impressions, suggesting cultural difference in the not-so-subtle nods to moral inferiority and, in his mind, disruptive displays of sexuality. Coryate's glimpses into Italy and Germany paint a Europe with a deprived morality while humorously regaling the English reader with tantalizing tales of naked and scandalous women. The effect, then, of Coryate's enterprise is his English eye as the lens by which the reader sees the moral outlook of Europe.

Along with a focus on the lax morality of other European states and people, Coryate spends much of travels visiting churches, and he comments on religion profusely throughout his text. While he takes time to meticulously examine, list, and describe Catholic cathedrals, ceremonies, and items in a way that might spark interest in individual places or things, he does not shy away from inserting anti-Catholic and pro-Protestant rhetoric in his observations. For instance, when in Piedmont, Coryate views a parade on St. John Baptist's Day in the city of Vercellis. While St. John Baptist's Day is a holiday celebrated by both those in the Catholic faith and those in the Church of

England, as Coryate notes, he suggests that the women and children participating in the Catholic ceremony are perhaps unworthy and lacking the morality needed for such a procession. Coryate relates his experience of seeing “a great multitude of women and children behinds, which carried burning tapers also: they went all in couples very orderly. But I never saw in all my life such an ugly company of *truls* and *sluts*, as their women were” (1: 234-235, emphasis mine). It is not certain whether Coryate sees the ceremony itself as immoral, although he declares it “celebrated with very pompous and sumptuous solemnity,” but his inclusion of the final phrase, one that compares women and children to “truls and sluts,” attempts to dirty the ceremony (1:234-235). According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the word “trul” is etymologically linked to “troll” and could indicate “a female prostitute” or a “girl” (*OED* def. 1 and 2), and a “slut” meant “an untidy, dirty, or slovenly woman” (*OED* def. 1). The linkage of the two words together may not mean anything sexual, yet it continues to denigrate the women in the ceremony. Furthermore, Coryate utilizes the possessive “their” before “women” at the end of his statement; however, “their” does not have a specified owner (1:235). It could be the Piedmontese, or more specifically, the people of Vercellis, or considering his juxtaposition of “their women” with the Catholic ceremony, it could be Catholic women to which Coryate refers. If we accept the latter, then the connection Coryate suggests is a negative one. The Catholic Piedmontese, in Coryate’s view, do not worship correctly, and as such, they degrade and pollute the ceremony.

Similar rhetoric colors Coryate’s travels through Germany, where he goes from one city to the next and indicates whether the town adheres to Protestantism or

Catholicism. When visiting a church in Basel, notably the church with the sepulcher of Desiderus Erasmus, Coryate writes of the Protestant congregation:

And I am perswaded that one godly prayer pronounced in this Church by a penitent and contrite-hearted Christian in the holy Congregation of the citizens, to the omnipotent Jehovah through the only mediation of his sonne Jesus Christ, is of more efficacy, and doth sooner penetrate into the eares of the Lord, then a centurie yea a whole myriad of Ave Maries mumbled upon beads in that superstitious manner as I have often seene at the glittering Altars of the Popish Churches. (2: 158)

Here, Coryate more explicitly presents his anti-Catholic sentiments; he depicts the “centurie yea a whole myriad of Ave Maries” as deficient to a single prayer by “a penitent and contrite-hearted Christian” (2:158). In echoes of Mandeville’s encounter with the rituals of the “paynemes” that he diminishes as against Church doctrine, Coryate calls the use of the rosary “superstitious” and argues its effectiveness in the worship of God (2:158). The rosary goes against Protestant doctrine, and therefore, is simply a ritual of a “superstitious” group (2:158). In the Baselian Protestants, Coryate plants his impressions of Catholicism—outdated and outlandish—in comparison to the religious belief most similar to his own Protestant (Church of England) leanings.

Despite his clear anti-Catholic bias, Coryate acknowledges Catholic contributions that encourage domination over non-Christian pagan religions. A moment occurs when Coryate travels to a cathedral in the city of Spire. Throughout the *Crudities*, Coryate catalogs the relics of Catholic churches, but often rails against them, calling them “shels and beads” (1:163) or challenging their validity. At best, Coryate will write down

epitaphs of famous persons in the original Latin or describe the scene, but in Spires, Coryate visits a Catholic church that contains a letter from Bernard of Clairveaux to the Bishop of Spira of his time, urging a that the bishop prompt the princes toward a Crusade. The letter, which spans for several pages, incites soldiers and merchants to “Take the signe of the crosse” and promises that “If it bee taken upon a devout shoulder, without doubt it is worth the Kingdome of God” (2:242). In addition, Bernard states, “Yet it is part of Christian piety as to conquer the proud” as it relates to Jews who resist conversion (2:243). In citing this letter, Coryate emphasizes how spiritual authority may be used for political gain.

Unusually for Coryate, he goes out of his way to translate this letter into English, importantly indicating before he provides this translation that “Surely the sight of the epistle did much comfort my heart, and in a manner refocillate my spirits” (2: 238). The letter gives Coryate “comfort” at “the sight” (2:238). Coryate, in fact, uses the verb “refocillate” to indicate the level of this comfort. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, “refocillate” is a transitive verb which means “to revive, reanimate, or refresh” (*OED*). Even if his interest in this letter reflects his historical interests in observing important documents, statues, and places, Coryate sets aside his anti-Catholic rhetoric at the thought of the Holy Land, a thought that revives his spirit and perhaps places more importance on a sacred space than Protestantism, with its outspokenness against sacred spaces, would traditionally allow (Graves 700). Moreover, this focus on the Holy Land hearkens back to the dedication of *Coryat’s Crudities* and Coryate’s sincere wish that young men would learn lessons in order to “doe your Highness and their Country the better service when opportunity shall require” (1:2). While that service might

not be a Crusade, per se, it is clear that Coryate views the Holy Land as important, even vital, to English interests, as he relates in the Dedication a host of cities in the Holy Land where Coryate “hope(s) to write after a more particular manner then any of our English travellers have done before me” (1:6). It is clear, then, that Coryate will use anything, even a Catholic item of importance, to justify a need to visit and document the Holy Land.

Throughout the *Crudities*, Coryate explores the religious landscape of his Europe: Catholic, Protestant, with minimal focus on Judaism and Islam. Despite this focus on multiple religions, their people, places, and beliefs, Coryate displays a bias toward his English Protestantism. When describing non-Protestant religious ceremonies, he subtly undermines them, calling certain practices “superstitious” and certain prayers ineffective. However, Coryate also is not above appropriating objects he typically sees as useless for his own agenda, particularly when that agenda involves the potential of English affairs. Furthermore, Coryate’s impressions on religion demonstrate a desire to promote English spirituality as superior not only in Europe but abroad even as it co-opts tools to bolster that religious dominance from the religion it shuns.

Yet, commentary on lax morality and religious inferiority are not the only tools that Coryate utilizes to assert English superiority over non-English Europeans in the *Crudities*. Coryate, like Mandeville, refers to appearance and behavior using monstrous, even Biblical imagery. His use of this imagery, however, goes further than Mandeville’s. Coryate employs this imagery not just to emphasize physical difference or behavior, but to demonstrate a Europe that threatens social order. For example, when Coryate travels to Nevers in France, he encounters a people he calls “roguish Egyptians” (Coryate 1: 200).

He describes these people at length in disparaging language: “For both their haire and their faces looked so blacke, as if they were raked out of hel, and sent into the world by great Beelzebub, to terrifie and astonish mortall men: . . .” (Coryate 1: 200). Furthermore, Coryate relates that “there was a great multitude of men, women and children of them, that disguise their faces, as our *counterfet* western *Egyptians* in England” (1:200, emphasis mine). Coryate identifies them as “roguish Egyptians” and compares them to “our counterfet western Egyptians in England” (1:200), a common term in the early modern period often used to identify the Roma, but also one that signified itinerants and sometimes thieves dressed in the appearance of itinerant persons (Morgan 118). Other than the supernatural imagery Coryate uses to describe this group, it is clear that he distinguishes them from the citizens of Nevers, who he disparages as “foolish” for coming out to watch the women of the group dance (1:200). The “roguish Egyptians,” then, make the French act “foolish,” causing even more disorder due to their position as wanderers (Coryate 1:200).

Coryate’s depiction of rural Germans in the second volume of the *Crudities* fits into the narrative that non-English Europeans lack appropriate order. On his journey between Mentz and Colen, Coryate sees “gallowes and wheelles” used for “the rusticall Corydons of the country” that Coryate identifies as “Boores and the Free-booters,” a group of violent robbers (2:309). He goes on to describe them as “such cruell and bloody horseleaches (the very Hyenae & Lycanthropi of Germany)” and as “Cyclopicall Anthropophagi, these Caniball man-eaters” (Coryate 2:308, 309). While the “Free-booters” may be thieves, Coryate steals their humanity, depicting the Free-booters as monstrous creatures and cannibals in a way that harkens back to Mandeville’s treatment

of the cursed people of the Great Khan. In addition, he endorses the heavy punishments given to these wandering thieves, even arguing that “those gallows” were “A punishment too good for these Cyclopicall Anthropophagi, these Caniball man-eaters” (Coryate 2:309). Again, Coryate suggests that these thieves increase disorder in the rural areas where they wander, making the land unsafe.

Coryate’s depiction of the “Egyptians” and the “Free-Booters” offer parallels that expose Coryate’s view of a disordered Europe. Both the “Egyptians” at Nevers and the “Free-Booters” of rural Germany are wanderers, but unlike Coryate, a traveler, they are not permitted to roam without consequences. Instead, society sees them without order, and for Coryate in his *Crudities*, this disorder roams throughout Europe. It appears in the disorder over religious belief, and in the lax morality of non-English European people and customs despite the enticements they offer—all parts of European society which pale in comparison, in Coryate’s view, to his own. Through his rhetoric--a combination of rich, detailed observations which marked Hakluyt’s and his historical period and the curious fascination and imagery-laden description of Mandeville--Coryate presents a Europe in need of order and a new spirituality, all which he implicitly suggests England already possesses. The seeds of English superiority planted in Mandeville and watered in Hakluyt sprout with Coryate’s turn toward Europe.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Through four centuries of English literary history, travel writers featured negative representations of other peoples and cultures that suggested their own, superior identity. From Mandeville's ideas of a world dominated by Christendom to Hakluyt's fostering of the idea of colonialism and imperialism to Coryate's desire for Europe's correction from disorder, the discourses of superiority that would lead to domination grew with the rise of English identity. The thoughts, behaviors, and ideas of superiority came to fruition as dominance in the ensuing centuries as England built its empire around the world, and domestically, as the English pushed for preeminence as a European nation.

Furthermore, these travel writers, regardless of their curiosity (Mandeville), necessity (Hakluyt), or a combination of the two (Coryate), demonstrate that Piera's use of such a dichotomy to address how representation relates to colonial ideas is reductive and misleading. First, it reduces travel narratives into predominantly one or another type of text, and second, and more insidiously, it dismisses negative representations in texts of curiosity as merely curiosities, rather than as legitimately negative and potentially harmful or ominous representations located in text. In addition, critical use of this dichotomy ignores the aftereffects of such representations on history, on the development

and implementation of colonization and exploitation, or in Coryate's case, on the strange relationship between enticement and repulsion of the English eye on Europe.

Simultaneously, an investigation of travel narratives and representation allows for the examination of legacies of alienation that stem from the seeds of superiority planted, fostered, and sprouted during the late medieval and early modern period, an examination, I argue, that is key to post-colonial criticism of pre-colonial and colonial texts. However, said legacies may not appear in the same pattern as the English texts examined in this project, for as Shankar Raman cautions: "The multiplicity of peoples and places confronting early modern colonial ventures reveals a repeated dispersion and pluralisation of the very idea of the colonial, so that it becomes impossible to assert the sameness of different colonial moments, even as we schematically recognise the ubiquity of a global process" (48). But although we may not be able to arrive at a uniform conclusion about the travel texts of the medieval and early modern period, they provide unique input on the origins of the rhetoric involved and infused in both colonial domination and its aftermath. Furthermore, the investigation of early travel texts allows us to trace the development of a colonial cultural hegemony that has lasted far longer than the pre-colonial and colonial period. For as we move forward several centuries to our current moment, we see that the discourses of superiority grown during this period and mutated into dominance in the centuries of colonization still exist today.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Banerjee, Pompa. "Burning Questions: Widows, Witches, and Early Modern European Travel Narratives of India." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, vol. 29, no. 3, 1999, pp. 529–561. *MLA International Bibliography*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=1999074998&site=ehost-live.
- Benedict, Barbara M. "Spectating Science in the Early Modern Collection." *Travel Narratives, the New Science, and Literary Discourse, 1569-1750*. Edited by Judy A. Hayden, Ashgate, 2012, pp. 197-213.
- Bisson, Lillian M. "The Face in the Mirror: What Manner Woman?" *Chaucer and the Late Medieval World*. St. Martin's Press, 1998, pp. 191-215.
- Blacker, Irwin R. Introduction. *Hakluyt's Voyages*, by Richard Hakluyt, edited by Irwin R. Blacker, The Viking Press, 1965, pp. 1-14.
- Braude, Benjamin. "The Sons of Noah and the Construction of Ethnic and Geographical Identities in the Medieval and Early Modern Periods." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 54, no. 1, 1997, pp. 103–142. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/2953314. Accessed 20 Sept. 2020.
- "brutish, adj." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, September 2020, www.oed.com/view/Entry/24026. Accessed 4 November 2020.
- Carey, Daniel and Claire Jowitt. "Introduction." *Richard Hakluyt and Travel Writing in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Daniel Carey and Claire Jowitt, Ashgate, 2012, pp. 1-10.
- "cornify, v." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, September 2020,

www.oed.com/view/Entry/41685. Accessed 27 October 2020.

Coryate, Thomas. *Coryat's Crudities*, vol. 1, University of Glasgow Press, 1905.

---. *Coryat's Crudities*, vol. 2, University of Glasgow Press, 1905.

Das, Nandini. "Richard Hakluyt's Two Indias: Textual *sparagnos* and Editorial Practice." *Richard Hakluyt and Travel Writing in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Daniel Carey and Clarie Jowitt, Ashgate, 2012, pp. 119-128.

Dimmock, Matthew. "Hakluyt's Multiple Faiths." *Richard Hakluyt and Travel Writing in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Daniel Carey and Claire Jowitt, Ashgate, 2012, pp. 219-228.

"evil, adj. and n.1." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, September 2019,

www.oed.com/view/Entry/65386. Accessed 23 November 2019.

Fleck, Andrew. "Here, There, and In Between: Representing Difference in the Travels of Sir John Mandeville." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 97, no. 4, 2000, pp. 379-400. *MLA International Bibliography*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2001580143&site=ehost-live.

Groves, Beatrice. "'Those Sanctified Places Where Our Sauiors Feete Had Trode': Jerusalem in Early Modern English Travel Narratives." *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol. 43, no. 3, 2012, pp. 681-700. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/24245547.

Hakluyt, Richard. *Hakluyt's Voyages*, edited by Irwin R. Blacker, The Viking Press, 1965.

---. *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English*

Nation, vol. 1, 2005, www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/7182.

Hayden, Judy A. "Intersections and Cross-Fertilization." *Travel Narratives, the New Science, and Literary Discourse, 1569-1750*. Edited by Judy A. Hayden, Ashgate, 2012, pp. 1-21.

Higgins, Iain Macleod. *Writing East: The "Travels" of Sir John Mandeville*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.

"huckster, n." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, September 2020, www.oed.com/view/Entry/89101. Accessed 2 November 2020.

Jones, Rosalind Ann. "Italians and Others: Venice and the Irish in *Coryat's Crudities* and *The White Devil*." *Renaissance Drama*, vol. 18, 1987, pp. 101-119. *MLA International Bibliography*, doi:10.1086/rd.18.41917224.

Krummel, Miriamne Ara. "Encountering Jews Beyond the Kingdom of Cathay: Imagining Nation in Mandeville's Travelogue." *Crafting Jewishness in Medieval England: Legally Absent, Virtually Present*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, pp. 69-88.

Lampert-Weissig, Lisa. *Medieval Literature and Postcolonial Studies*. Edinburgh UP, 2010. *eBook Collection (EBSCOhost)*, proxy.ulib.csuohio.edu:2050/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat02752a&AN=csu.b3350985&site=eds-live&scope=site.

Legassie, Shayne Aaron. *The Medieval Invention of Travel*. University of Chicago Press, 2017.

MacCrossan, Colm. "Framing 'The English Nation': Reading between Text and Paratext in *The Principal Navigations (1598-1600)*." *Richard Hakluyt and Travel Writing in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Daniel Carey and Claire Jowitt, Ashgate, 2012, pp. 139-151.

- Mandeville, John. Early English Text Society. *Mandeville's Travels*. Edited by P. Hamelius, EETS 153, 1919, Oxford UP, 1960.
- Morgan, John. "'Counterfeit Egyptians': The Construction and Implementation of a Criminal Identity in Early Modern England." *Romani Studies: Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2016, pp. 105–128. *MLA International Bibliography*, doi:10.3828/rs.2016.7.
- O'Doherty, Marianne. "Imperial Fantasies: Imagining Christian Empire in Three Fourteenth-Century Versions of The Book of Sir John Mandeville." *Medium Ævum*, vol. 86, no. 2, 2017, pp. 323–349. *MLA International Bibliography*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2018300015&site=ehost-live.
- Payne, Anthony. "Hakluyt's London: Discovery and Overseas Trade." *Richard Hakluyt and Travel Writing in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Daniel Carey and Claire Jowitt, Ashgate, 2012, pp. 13-23.
- Piera, Montserrat. "Introduction: Travel as *Episteme*--An Introductory Journey." *Remapping Travel Narratives (1000-1700): To the East and Back Again*. Edited by Montserrat Piera, ARC Humanities Press, 2018, pp. 1-24.
- "principal, adj., n., and adv." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, September 2019, www.oed.com/view/Entry/151442. Accessed 29 September 2019.
- "refocillate, v." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, September 2020 www.oed.com/view/Entry/160977. Accessed 27 October 2020.

Rubies, Joan-Pau. "From the 'History of Travayle' to the History of Travel Collections: The Rise of an Early Modern Genre." *Richard Hakluyt and Travel Writing in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Daniel Carey and Claire Jowitt, Ashgate, 2012, pp. 25-41.

Said, Edward. "Orientalism." *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. 3rd ed. Edited by Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan, Wiley Blackwell, 2017, pp. 1107-1136.

---. *Orientalism*. Penguin, 2003.

Sandrock, Kirsten and Owain Wright. "Locating Italy: East and West in British-Italian Transactions." *Locating Italy: East and West in British-Italian Transactions*. Edited by Kirsten Sandrock and Owain Wright, Rodopi, 2013, pp. 1-15.

Sandrock, Kirsten. "Truth and Lying in Early Modern Travel Narratives: Coryat's Crudities, Lithgow's Totall Discourse and Generic Change." *European Journal of English Studies*, vol. 19, no. 2, Aug. 2015, pp. 189-203. *MLA International Bibliography*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2015701803&site=ehost-live.

---. "Venice in *Coryat's Crudities* (1611): Between Multicultural Community and Christian Archetype." *Locating Italy: East and West in British-Italian Transactions*. Edited by Kirsten Sandrock and Owain Wright, Rodopi, 2013, pp. 149-167.

"savage, adj. and n.1." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, September 2020, www.oed.com/view/Entry/171433. Accessed 4 November 2020.

Schleck, Julia. "Forming Knowledge: Natural Philosophy and English Travel Writing."

Travel Narratives, the New Science, and Literary Discourse, 1569-1750. Edited

by Judy A. Hayden, Ashgate, 2012, pp. 53-69.

Shankar, Raman. "Exploring the Terrain." *Renaissance Literature and Postcolonial*

Studies. Edited by David Johnson and Ania Loomba, Edinburgh UP, 2011, pp. 1-

50.

"slut, n." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, September 2020,

www.oed.com/view/Entry/182346. Accessed 21 November 2020.

Small, Margaret. "A World Seen through Another's Eyes: Hakluyt, Ramusio, and the

Narratives of the *Navigazioni et Viaggi*." *Richard Hakluyt and Travel Writing in*

Early Modern Europe. Edited by Daniel Carey and Claire Jowitt, Ashgate, 2012,

pp. 45-55.

Sobecki, Sebastian I. "Mandeville's Thought of the Limit: The Discourse of Similarity

And Difference in 'The Travels of Sir John Mandeville.'" *The Review of English*

Studies, vol. 53, no. 211, 2002, pp. 329-343. *JSTOR*,

www.jstor.org/stable/3070642.

Tinkle, Theresa. "God's Chosen Peoples: Christians and Jews in The Book of John

Mandeville." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, vol. 113, no. 4, Oct.

2014, pp. 443-471. *MLA International Bibliography*,

search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2014582732&site=ehost-live.

host-live.

- Trakulhun, Sven. "Three Tales of the New World: Nation, Religion, and Colonialism in Hakluyt, de Bry, and Hulsius." *Richard Hakluyt and Travel Writing in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Daniel Carey and Claire Jowitt, Ashgate, 2012, pp. 57-66.
- "trull, n." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, September 2020, www.oed.com/view/Entry/206916. Accessed 21 November 2020.
- Whitaker, William. "Prurientem Libidinem." *William Whitaker's Words*, The University of Notre Dame, 2007, archives.nd.edu/cgi-bin/wordz.pl?keyword=prurientem+libidinem. Accessed 21 October 2020.
- "wit, n." *OED Online*, Oxford University Press, September 2020, www.oed.com/view/Entry/229567. Accessed 5 October 2020.
- Verner, Lisa. "Mandeville's Travels." *The Epistemology of the Monstrous in the Middle Ages*, Routledge, 2005. ProQuest Ebook Central, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/clevelandstate-ebooks/detail.action?docID=4523674>.
- Young, Sandra. "The 'Secrets of Nature' and Early Modern Constructions of a Global South." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, vol. 15, no. 3, 2015, pp. 5-39. *MLA International Bibliography*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mzh&AN=2015582212&site=ehost-live.
- Zumthor, Paul, and Catherine Peebles. "The Medieval Travel Narrative." *New Literary History*, vol. 25, no. 4, 1994, pp. 809-824. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/469375.