

**Finding Fynes: Moryson's Biography and the  
Latin Manuscript of Part One of the  
*Itinerary* (1617)**

**Tom Parkinson**

**Thesis submitted for the degree of Ph.D. Queen Mary, University of London,  
Department of English**

## PhD Abstract

### **Finding Fynes: Moryson's Biography and the Latin Manuscript of Part One of the *Itenerary* (1617)**

Fynes Moryson's *Itenerary* (1617) is an important source work which is used to substantiate studies in a range of different fields. Despite its wide reception, little is known of either Moryson or the intended purpose of his work. There are a number of unexplored sources which can add to academic understanding of the *Itenerary*, and contribute new insights which will add to Moryson's life history. Amongst these are letters, documents, archival material and two extant Latin manuscripts that represent versions of parts one and two of the *Itenerary*.

I examine the Latin manuscript version of part one to the *Itenerary*, the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. This takes the form of a preliminary investigation, which will make the manuscript accessible for future scholarship. I compare the sections of the manuscript to parallel content in the printed *Itenerary*, and investigate differences between them. This investigation of the manuscript is supported and contextualised by a biographical study, which examines new sources for Fynes Moryson's life history. This study explores archival records, letters and documents in combination with the printed *Itenerary* in order to revise elements of Moryson's biography. Together the two parts of the thesis contribute analyses of new documents to the study of Moryson and the *Itenerary*, and take a preliminary step towards making the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* accessible to scholars.

# CONTENTS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Conventions and Abbreviations   | i   |
| Transcription Policy  | ii  |
| Acknowledgments   | iii |
| <br>  |     |
| INTRODUCTION  | 1   |
| <br>  |     |
| Critical Reception  | 5   |
| The <i>Itenerary</i> and the <i>Itinerarium Pars Prima</i>                    | 21  |
| Summary   | 30  |
| <br>  |     |
| Part 1: BIOGRAPHICAL INVESTIGATION  | 32  |
| <br>  |     |
| Introduction  | 32  |
| Early Years: Family Life & Education 1565-1592                                | 34  |
| Travels 1591-1599   | 56  |
| The Early Modern Secretary: Moryson, Mountjoy and the Irish War:<br>1599-1606 | 80  |
| The Moryson Letters: 1606-1617  | 100 |
| <i>En verite vous estes fin: Later Life, Publication and Death 1617-1630</i>  | 124 |
| <br>  |     |
| Part 2: ANALYSIS OF <i>ITINERARIUM PARS PRIMA</i>                             | 145 |
| <br>  |     |
| Introduction to the Analysis  | 145 |
| Hands Present in the Manuscript   | 162 |
| The Pagination and Order of the Manuscript                                    | 170 |
| Exposition of the Contents of the Manuscript                                  | 177 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Case Studies   | 205 |
| 1. The Introduction and the Dunkirk Pirates Insertion                                      | 206 |
| 2. The Letter to 'M.T'   | 214 |
| 3. The Anabaptists Excision  | 227 |
| 4. The Dedication  | 236 |
| 5. The Table of Contents   | 252 |
| 6. The 'Address to the Reader'   | 266 |
| <br>   |     |
| CONCLUSION   | 283 |
| <br>   |     |
| Appendix A: Latin Transcriptions and Parallel Content from the printed<br><i>Itinerary</i> | 291 |
| <br>   |     |
| Item 1: Case Study 1   | 291 |
| Item 2: Case Study 2   | 293 |
| Item 3: Case Study 3   | 294 |
| Item 4: Case Study 4   | 296 |
| Item 5: Case Study 5   | 299 |
| Item 6: Case Study 6   | 321 |
| <br>   |     |
| Appendix B: Appendix B: Letters and Documents used in the<br>Biographical Investigation    | 328 |
| <br>   |     |
| 1606-1607 Correspondence   | 329 |
| 1606-1607 Correspondence   | 334 |
| Will of Thomas Moryson   | 338 |

|                       |     |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Will of Fynes Moryson | 345 |
| Bibliography          | 346 |
| Primary               | 346 |
| Printed               | 346 |
| Manuscript            | 350 |
| Secondary             | 352 |
| Reference             | 359 |

## CONVENTIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

The following statement defines the relationship between the various texts referenced in this study, and explains terminology and abbreviations that will be used throughout. The title of the 1617 *Itinerary* is *An Itinerary written by Fynes Moryson, Gent. First in the Latine Tongue, and then translated by him into English. (Containing his ten yeeres travell through the twelve dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turky, France, England, Scotland, and Ireland* (London: J.Beale, 1617). This work will be referred to as the *Itinerary* throughout. It was published as a single folio volume, divided into three parts. References will therefore take the following form: '*Itinerary*, Part I, p.19'.

The Latin manuscript that is to be studied represents a version of part one of the *Itinerary*. It is catalogued as British Library Harley MS. 5133, '*Itinerarium Quod Fynes Moryson Anglus Scripsit*'. As it represents part one of the work in Latin, it will be referred to as *Itinerarium Pars Prima* throughout. There is also an extant Latin manuscript to part two of the work. This manuscript is catalogued as British Library Additional MS. 36706, '*Fynes Moryson's Itinerary in Ireland*'. As this manuscript represents part two of the work in Latin, it will be referred to as *Itinerarium Pars Secunda* throughout.

References to the entire Latin work as a whole will use the term *Itinerarium*. Occasionally, when considering the origins of the work, it has been impossible to separate the Latin genesis of the work from its English descendant. Therefore, any references to the conception of the entire work, in either Latin or English, will use the term '*Itinerary*' in inverted commas.

This system of referencing is summarised below:

***Itinerary***: the English printed edition

***Itinerarium Pars Prima***: The first part to the Latin '*Itinerary*'

***Itinerarium Pars Secunda***: the second part to the Latin '*Itinerary*'

***Itinerarium***: The entire Latin version

**'*Itinerary*'**: The conception of the work overall

### Abbreviations:

Charles Hughes, *Shakespeare's Europe* (London: Sherratt & Hughes, 1903) Hughes

Graham Kew, '*Shakespeare's Europe revisited : the unpublished "Itinerary" of Fynes Moryson (1566 - 1630)*' (Birmingham) Kew

University PhD Thesis, 1998)

Edward H. Thompson, 'Moryson, Fynes'  
(1565/6–1630) *Oxford Dictionary of  
National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford  
University Press, 2004)

Thompson

## TRANSCRIPTION & TRANSLATION POLICY

### English

Semi-diplomatic transcription. Scribal contractions have been expanded, and given in italics. No alterations to capitalisation or punctuation. Original line breaks have been preserved in the appendix, but not in the main body of the text. Line numbers are given in references to letters, wills and documents. Paragraph breaks have been preserved. Catchwords have not been included, but they have been indicated, where relevant. Original spellings have been preserved, although long 'S' has been incorporated.

#### Transcription conventions:

Illegible text given within brackets { }. Suggestions supplied, or dots given for each illegible character, i.e four illegible characters {...}.

Deleted text recorded in square brackets [ ]. Suggestions supplied, or dots given for each illegible character, i.e four illegible characters [...].

Insertions between lines are indicated with angled brackets < >.

### Latin

Contracted inflections have been expanded when possible. Original line breaks not preserved. Paragraph breaks observed. Latin quoted in the main text has been translated in full, either in the text itself or in accompanying footnotes. Where there is uncertainty about the translation (for example, in the case of illegible characters, or unknown scribal convention) this has been indicated.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank those who have helped, supported and encouraged me during the researching and writing of this thesis. In particular I want to thank my supervisor Dr Warren Boutcher for his patience, guidance and advice, without which I would have struggled to complete the thesis. I would also like to thank the academic staff at Queen Mary and the Centre for Editing Lives and Letters who have provided help and advice, in particular Dr Robyn Adams, who provided a grounding in palaeography which has proved invaluable.

I would also like to extend my thanks to Dr Elizabeth Heale, who spurred my interest in early modern travel writing. I am also grateful to the support of my undergraduate supervisor Dr John Holmes, who first encouraged me to apply to Queen Mary. I would also like to show my gratitude to the staff of the many academic departments, research libraries and archives who took time to assist me. In particular I owe thanks to the British Library, Peterhouse College Library and the English Department at Queen Mary.

Finally, I would like to thank Jade Everingham for her patience, support and endless goodwill. Without her it would have been impossible to complete the thesis. I would also like to extend my thanks to my friends and family, who have been very understanding. In particular, I would like to thank my mother.

## Introduction

The focus of my study is the life and works of Fynes Moryson, a traveller, intelligencer, soldier and secretary to the Lord Deputy of Ireland, Charles Blount, Baron Mountjoy. Moryson travelled widely across early modern Europe and the Levant in the last decade of the sixteenth century.<sup>1</sup> He published an account of his travels and service in Ireland in *An Itenerary*, printed in 1617.<sup>2</sup> This influential work comprises a history of Moryson's travels and social observations, divided into three parts. The first comprises an account of his travels, the second a history of his service in Ireland, and the third a combination of travel advice and cultural observations. This work has since become a valuable resource for scholars and historians, frequently cited and drawn upon to substantiate studies in a wide range of fields.<sup>3</sup> However, although the *Itenerary* has become an indispensable historical source, little is known about Moryson himself, or the intended purpose of his 'magnum opus'.<sup>4</sup>

Despite the lasting influence of the *Itenerary*, Moryson himself has never been the subject of a dedicated biography.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the *Itenerary* has never been

---

<sup>1</sup> In his first journey, commencing 1 May, 1591, Moryson travelled from London to Stode, from there proceeding through Germany, the Low Countries, Poland and Italy, before returning via France, arriving back in London on 13 May, 1594. Moryson and his brother Henry set off on the second journey on 29 November, 1595, travelling through central Europe to Venice, and from there took ship to the Levant region. Henry died in transit, and Fynes returned alone, arriving back in London on July 10, 1597. See Thompson.

<sup>2</sup> Fynes Moryson, *An Itenerary written by Fynes Moryson, Gent. First in the Latine Tongue, and then translated by him into English. (Containing his ten yeeres travell through the twelve dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turky, France, England, Scotland, and Ireland.)* (London: J.Beale, 1617) British Library Pressmark: 241.e.16.

<sup>3</sup> See the following 'Critical Reception' section.

<sup>4</sup> Hughes, p. xxxvi.

<sup>5</sup> No dedicated published work examines either Moryson or the *Itenerary* in detail. His current entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* is written by an economic

studied in any depth, despite comprising nearly 1000 folio pages of carefully compiled historical and social observations. It is difficult to understand why both Moryson and his *Itenerary* have been neglected, given the wealth of extant primary material. The *Itenerary* was originally envisioned as a four part work, although only the first three parts were actually printed in 1617. Three of the four planned sections to the work exist in manuscript. Both the first and second parts to the *Itenerary*, Harl. MS. 5133 and Add. MS. 36706 respectively, are held at the British Library.<sup>6</sup> Both manuscripts are written in Latin, with autograph sections and annotations. Neither text has yet been translated, assessed, or compared to the printed *Itenerary*. There is no extant manuscript of the third part of the work. There is, however, a manuscript version of the unpublished fourth part to the work. This manuscript is in English, and is held at Corpus Christi College in Oxford. The English manuscript has been the subject of previous study, with much of it printed by Charles Hughes in 1903, under the title *Shakespeare's Europe*.<sup>7</sup> The English manuscript was also the subject of a 1998 thesis by Graham Kew, who transcribed sections omitted by Hughes.<sup>8</sup>

However, other than Hughes' *Shakespeare's Europe* and Kew's thesis, both of which are largely works of transcription, no other significant scholarship exists in the field. The two Latin manuscripts have never been studied, and remain untapped resources. Very little is known about the intended purpose of the *Itenerary*, the transition from manuscript to print, and the relationship between

---

historian, who published a short pamphlet on the *Itenerary* in 1995: E. H. Thompson, 'Elizabethan economic analysis: Fynes Moryson's account of the economics of Europe', *History of Economic Ideas*, 3/1 (1995), pp. 1-25.

<sup>6</sup> BL Harl. MS. 5133 is catalogued in a printed work, but not as yet online. See *Catalogue of the Harleian Collection of Manuscripts preserved in the British Museum*, H. Wanley, D. Casley, W. Hocker, and C. Morton, with an index by T. Astle (London: 1759), Vol. II, p.248.

<sup>7</sup> Hughes.

<sup>8</sup> Kew offers a full transcription in his thesis.

the content of the Latin manuscripts and of the English printed parallel. This dearth of knowledge is compounded by confusion over Moryson's circumstances and life history. There does not appear to be a clear critical consensus on why he devoted his life to travel and the writing of the *Itinerary*, an enterprise that lasted almost thirty years, and consumed his material and physical resources in the process.<sup>9</sup> The lasting influence and critical importance of the *Itinerary* demands a more rigorous approach to the study of Moryson's life and works.

The thesis will focus on the study of the Latin manuscript of the first part to Moryson's *Itinerary*, BL Harl. MS. 5133, *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. It represents the first attempt to engage with this work, and to investigate it in any detail. This Latin manuscript is written entirely in dense, self-referential neo-Latin, complicated by idiosyncratic inflection and a number of variant hands. The manuscript has been heavily edited and annotated in Moryson's hand, further obscuring the text. In addition, the numbering and ordering of elements of the text do not correspond to the printed *Itinerary*. The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* represents an important unexplored source, and one aim of the thesis is to render it accessible for future scholarship.

The task of unlocking such a complex work required training in both Latin and Latin palaeography, undertaken during the first two years of the thesis, but it also involved learning Moryson's system of annotations, abbreviations and other editorial conventions. In the first part of the thesis I will first draw upon the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and other unexplored archival sources to construct a biographical investigation which aims to revise Moryson's existing life history. This

---

<sup>9</sup> Moryson leaves a very modest will, bequeathing no capital and few personal possessions, even by the standards of the age. See Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, PROB 11/157, Will of Fines or Fynes Morison, 18 March 1630.

study will present a number of new insights into Moryson's biography, and contribute to a fuller appreciation of his life and works. The first part will support and contextualise the second part to the thesis, which will focus on the analysis of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. This second part will begin with an analytical section, which aims to present a full exposition of the contents of this manuscript. It will investigate the hands present, the numbering and ordering of elements of the text, and offer a detailed description of the contents of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. This exposition will in turn inform and support a sequence of six case studies. The case studies will compare sections of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* with parallel content from the English printed *Itinerary*, presenting and considering major differences between the two.

In what follows here, I introduce the study of the *Itinerary* and *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. I will first review the current perception of the *Itinerary* and the modern and early modern critical reception. I will then offer a brief introduction to the English and Latin works before describing in detail how I approach the text, and justifying my methodology.

## Critical Reception

The *Itinerary* has an extensive critical reception, reflecting its status as an important historical source. It is widely accepted as a reliable, accurate account of travel in early modern Europe. For example, Andrew Hadfield includes excerpts from the *Itinerary* in his anthology of early modern travel writing, *Amazons Savages and Machiavels: Travel and Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630*.<sup>10</sup> Hadfield describes Moryson's account of his travels as 'the most comprehensive by an early modern English writer'.<sup>11</sup> His understanding of the *Itinerary* as a 'comprehensive' source represents an important aspect of its modern reception. The work is seen as a vast repository of facts and information on conditions across early modern Europe, and as a consequence it is used to substantiate studies in a number of quite different fields.

The influential historian David B. Quinn considers the *Itinerary* to be a detailed and accurate source, describing Moryson as 'the most experienced observer of the late Tudor period' writing on Ireland.<sup>12</sup> Quinn favourably compares Moryson's Irish writings to those of Camden, contending that the former's experience of continental travel allowed him a more 'penetrating' range of insights. Quinn's opinion is complemented by that of Antoni Maczak, who dedicates his text, *Travels in Early Modern Europe*, to Fynes Moryson, whom he considers an 'expert'

---

<sup>10</sup> Andrew Hadfield, *Amazons, Savages, and Machiavels: Travel and Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630: An Anthology* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2001).

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*, p. 81.

<sup>12</sup> David B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1966, p. 28.

traveller.<sup>13</sup> Maczak is thorough in his use of the *Itinerary*, and offers a thoughtful summary of Moryson's writing: 'precise in his details, modern in his attitudes towards working with numbers, he knew better than anyone else how to draw conclusions from them'.<sup>14</sup> To Maczak, Moryson is a careful, 'objective' observer, reliable, 'factual' and an 'irreplaceable' source.<sup>15</sup>

The assessments of Maczak, Quinn and Hadfield attest to a widely accepted critical perception of the *Itinerary* as an important source text, a comprehensive survey of conditions in early modern Europe, distinguished by its accuracy and attention to detail. This opinion is reflected in a number of other studies that draw heavily on the *Itinerary*. As a result the *Itinerary* is almost ubiquitous in studies of early modern travel, and features broadly in works on the Elizabethan plantation of Ireland, early modern society and early modern constructions of self.<sup>16</sup> As one would expect in the case of a text that has been used to substantiate a diverse range of studies, a number of competing interpretations are evident.

A common interpretation of the *Itinerary* is that Moryson's travels may be seen as an expression of the nascent imperial mindset, of an inherent desire to colonise and subjugate others. In particular, Moryson's writing on Ireland comes under close scrutiny, as he is perceived to be an important 'exponent' of the Mountjoy administration that crushed Tyrone's rebellion and pacified the state.<sup>17</sup> For Bruce

---

<sup>13</sup> Antoni Maczak, *Travels In Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), p. 1.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid*, p. 8.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid*, p. 190.

<sup>16</sup> A wide range of studies draw on the text. For examples, see A.J Hoenselaars, *Images of Englishmen and Foreigners in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Associated University Press: London, 1992), p. 23 ; Michael Hattaway, *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture, Vol I* (Chichester: Blackwell, 2010), pp. 343-344; Thomas Bettridge, *Borders and Travellers in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 39-40 and Michael J. Redmond, *Shakespeare, Politics and Italy: Intertextuality on the Jacobean Stage* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), p. 45.

<sup>17</sup> *Sources for Early Modern Irish History 1534-1641*, Dudley Edwards and Mary O'Dowd (ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p.104.

McLeod, author of *The Geography of Empire in English Literature 1580-1745*, Moryson manifests an ‘absurd...imperial imagination’ in his writing.<sup>18</sup> McLeod draws this inference from a statement Moryson makes in Part II of the *Itinerary*, in which Moryson refers to Ireland as ‘but an Island in this Virginian sea’.<sup>19</sup> This quotation has attracted much debate, and has been used to confirm an opinion of Moryson as a proto-colonialist author, a committed ‘Atlantist’ like his contemporaries Hakluyt and Purchas.<sup>20</sup> A recent study has confirmed that Moryson drew ‘Virginia Sea’ from a misreading of Camden, who classified the sea as the ‘Vergivian’, a term that derives from ancient British and Irish sources.<sup>21</sup>

Along with other Elizabethan authorities on Ireland, Moryson has attracted criticism for his treatment of the indigenous people.<sup>22</sup> Moryson’s account of the ‘meere’ Irish, is said to comprise an ‘index of barbarism’, with only the Turks receiving a ‘worst press...in the *Itinerary*’.<sup>23</sup> In particular, his theorising on the racial ‘degeneration’ of English settlers has attracted attention.<sup>24</sup> Other less condemnatory studies attempt to understand Moryson’s Irish writing in the context of its production. Hiram Moran notes that Moryson drew extensively on state papers when composing the *Itinerary*, and as a consequence produces a balanced account, ‘which gave far greater credence to the complaints of the Irish

---

<sup>18</sup> Bruce McLeod, *The Geography of Empire in English Literature 1580-1745* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999), p. 65.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid*, p. 65.

<sup>20</sup> David J. Baker, Willey Maley, *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 28.

<sup>21</sup> Rebecca Ann Bach, *Colonial transformations: the cultural production of the New Atlantic World 1580-1640* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), p. 73.

<sup>22</sup> Moryson and Spencer are said to share a ‘confirmed hatred’ of the Irish. See Rebecca Ann Bach, *Colonial transformations: the cultural production of the New Atlantic World 1580-1640* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), p. 71.

<sup>23</sup> Andrew Hadfield, John McVeagh, *Strangers to that land: British perceptions of Ireland from the Reformation to the Famine* (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1994), p. 54.

<sup>24</sup> See Mary Floyd-Wilson, Garrett A. Sullivan, *Embodiment and environment in early modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007) p. 33 and Patricia A. Cahill, *Unto the breach: martial formation, historical trauma and the early modern stage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 111.

against the English administration' than many other contemporary sources.<sup>25</sup> This thorough, detached approach to the *Itinerary* is followed in Patricia Palmer's *Language and Conquest in Early Modern Ireland*. Palmer's work focuses on the absence of Gaelic place names and translations in the *Itinerary*, which she contends Moryson has excised from the work.<sup>26</sup> Moryson also features heavily in *Sources for Early Modern Irish History, 1534-1641*.<sup>27</sup> Again, the *Itinerary* is considered in context, with Edwards and O'Dowd contributing the opinion that the Irish sections to the work were in part intended to represent and defend Mountjoy's administration.<sup>28</sup> This understanding represents an important critical contribution to the study of the Irish sections of the *Itinerary*, as Moryson's authorship of the text and interpretation of events are not often considered.

In addition to these two common approaches to the text, there is a third which sees it as a work influenced and driven by Moryson's Protestant beliefs. This critical reading is quite pervasive, and has an influence on how the work is received. For Clifford Bosworth, a recent scholar of Lithgow's travels, Moryson is a 'convinced protestant'.<sup>29</sup> He is said to be 'typical of English Protestant travellers', and furthermore 'blinkered' in his Protestant beliefs.<sup>30</sup> The almost hyperbolic expression of these sentiments underlines the critical perception that Moryson's beliefs permeate his work, and are a key influence on it. His work is said to be coloured by 'protestant bias', and scholars have even contended that his

---

<sup>25</sup> Hiram Morgan, *Tyrone's Rebellion: The outbreak of the nine years war in Tudor Ireland* (Boydell Press: Suffolk, 1993), p. 3.

<sup>26</sup> Patricia Palmer, *Language and conquest in early modern Ireland: English Renaissance literature and Imperial expansion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 68

<sup>27</sup> *Sources for Early Modern Irish History 1534-1641*, Dudley Edwards and Mary O'Dowd (ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 104.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid*, p. 104

<sup>29</sup> Clifford Edmund Bosworth, *An intrepid Scot: William Lithgow of Lanark's travels in the Ottoman lands, North Africa and Central Europe, 1609-21* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 30.

<sup>30</sup> James Ellison, *George Sandys: travel, colonialism and tolerance in the seventeenth century* (Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2002), p. 52

motivation for travel may have been religious; a form of pilgrimage.<sup>31</sup> There is no evidence for this in Moryson's writing, and his Protestantism is in fact tempered by an open minded attitude towards other religions.<sup>32</sup>

These common perceptions of the *Itinerary* are principally informed by engagement with the Irish sections of the text which tend to define how the entire work is received. But they represent only the most common of the many and varied scholarly approaches to the *Itinerary*. In addition to the main strands of critical thought, focusing on Ireland, Protestantism and colonial mentalities, the *Itinerary* has been subject to a diverse range of interpretations. Often, it is viewed simply as a straightforward 'travel narrative'.<sup>33</sup> This is a common perception of the text, and is unfortunately misinformed. It is dependent on the notion that the work is meant to be read in linear fashion, as a single narrative. This perception of the text may be influenced by the 1907 Glasgow edition of the *Itinerary*, which is the most common point of reference for scholars.<sup>34</sup> This edition publishes the work as a continuous text running across four volumes. As a result, Moryson's intention, which was to divide the *Itinerary* into three distinct

---

<sup>31</sup> Andrew Hadfield, *Amazons, Savages, and Machiavles; Travel and Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630: An Anthology* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2001) p. 64 and Anna Suranyi, *The Genius of the English Nation: Travel Writing and National Identity in Early Modern England* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998), p. 28.

<sup>32</sup> For example, see Moryson's open minded discussion of the Greek Orthodox religion on pp. 232-234 of Part I to the *Itinerary*.

<sup>33</sup> This is a common perception. This view is put forward in the following works: Jyotsna G. Singh, *A companion to the global Renaissance: English literature and culture in the age of expansion* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), p. 102; Ivo Kamps, Jyotsna G. Singh, *Travel Knowledge: European 'discoveries' in the early modern period* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), p.32; Kate Loveman, *Reading Fictions 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), p. 52; Helen Ostrovich, *The mysterious and the foreign in early modern England* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), p.270.

<sup>34</sup> Fynes Moryson, *An Itinerary Containing His Ten Yeeres Travell through the Twelve Dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turkey, France, England, Scotland & Ireland, Vol I-IV* (Glasgow: Glasgow University Press, 1907). Graham Kew uses this edition throughout his thesis, as it is 'the most accessible'. Kew, p. cclxxvii.

parts, is disregarded, and so scholars are encouraged to treat the work as a continuous linear narrative.

Similar interpretations of the work as travel narrative link the *Itenerary* with the Grand Tour. It has been said to represent an early account of a Grand Tour, a privileged journey which acted as a 'prototype' for later European travels.<sup>35</sup>

Another common understanding of the work is that it represents a chorographical text, similar to Camden's *Britannia*.<sup>36</sup> There may be more credence in this theory, and a number of encouraging studies have successfully linked sections of the *Itenerary* with source material or earlier travel accounts.<sup>37</sup> One of the most influential and perceptive opinions is contributed by Charles Hughes, who understands the work to represent a 'sociological survey of the peoples and places of Europe'.<sup>38</sup> In truth, there is no one fixed understanding of the intended function of the text, or a consensus on how it should be approached.

Some critics locate this indeterminacy in the text itself. Hadfield contends that the *Itenerary* represents a unique publication, for which no set model exists. He argues that the *Itenerary* represents a departure in the genre, a new type of travel writing that had its genesis in works by Moryson, Coryat and Lithgow: 'the first significant works by travel writers-Fynes Moryson, Thomas Coryat, William Lithgow-betray signs of anxiety and confusion concerning their exact purpose and

---

<sup>35</sup> See Barbara Korte, *English travel writing from pilgrimages to postcolonial explorations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000), p. 40. Moryson also features heavily in the two following works on the Grand Tour: Edward Chaney, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour: Anglo-Italian cultural relations in the Renaissance* (London: Frank Cass, 1998) and Chloe Chard, *Pleasure and Guilt on the Grand Tour: Travel Writing and Imaginative Geography 1600-1830* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).

<sup>36</sup> Kew, p. xc.

<sup>37</sup> Anders Ingam, 'English literature on the Ottoman Turks in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', PhD thesis, Durham University (2009), p. 202.

<sup>38</sup> Hughes, p. iii.

generic identity.<sup>39</sup> Hadfield contends that this form of travel writing was an inceptive genre, and that the texts produced by Moryson and his contemporaries are distinct from preceding travel works.<sup>40</sup> Thus, the critical confusion may echo that of Moryson himself, as he struggled to fit his text to purpose, and define a clear model and market for his work.

Hadfield's opinion is influential, and many of the contentions he makes about Moryson's work have been repeated by other scholars.<sup>41</sup> However, it is reductive to treat the works of Moryson, Lithgow and Coryat as a single entity. Hadfield labels them as 'eccentrics', and attempts to project this perception onto the texts they contribute.<sup>42</sup> In fact, each work is distinct, and each should be understood as an individual body of work, and considered within the context of its production. For example, although both Moryson and Coryat produce accounts of travel in early modern Europe, there are few other similarities between the two. Moryson differs in terms of education, preparation, funding, social status and authorial intents. His work is scholarly, heavily researched, and presented as a reference work. In contrast Coryat self-consciously presents himself as an eccentric, and invites criticism and approbation in an attempt to win fame.<sup>43</sup> A number of

---

<sup>39</sup> Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Travel and Colonial Writing in the English Renaissance, 1545-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 4.

<sup>40</sup> 'Travel had become less a means to an end and more of an end itself for writers such as Fynes Moryson, Thomas Coryat, William Lithgow, George Sandys and Peter Munday'. Andrew Hadfield, *Amazons, Savages, and Machiavels; Travel and Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630: An Anthology* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2001), p. 14.

<sup>41</sup> This opinion is repeated in the *Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*. Moryson is dismissed, and relegated to the status of 'the most important' of Coryat's peers, along with William Lithgow and George Sandys. *The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing* Peter Hulme and Tom Youngs (ed.) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 21.

<sup>42</sup> Andrew Hadfield, *Amazons, Savages, and Machiavels; Travel and Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630: An Anthology* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2001), p. 14.

<sup>43</sup> This perception of Coryat is informed by a reading of the introduction to Michael Strachan's *The Life and Adventures of Thomas Coryate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).

modern studies have highlighted the differences between the two, and it seems illogical to consider the *Itenerary* and the *Crudities* together.<sup>44</sup>

Instead, the current difficulties scholars encounter when attempting to encapsulate the purpose and value of the *Itenerary* may be linked to the lack of a dedicated work that focuses on Moryson. When Moryson is described, or introduced in print, much of the biographical data presented is drawn from one of three sources: Charles Hughes' *Shakespeare's Europe* (1903), Edward H. Thompson's *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry, and, less frequently, Graham Kew's doctoral thesis 'Shakespeare's Europe Revisited' (1995). All three contribute biographical introductions to Moryson's life, with Hughes offering perhaps the most comprehensive analysis.

Hughes' work takes the form of an exposition of material drawn from the English manuscript of the unpublished fourth part to the *Itenerary*. He introduces the work with a short chronological biography of Moryson, before presenting an edited transcript of sections of the manuscript. Although published at the very beginning of the twentieth century, the introduction to *Shakespeare's Europe* offers a relatively sober and thorough account of Moryson's life history, which uses primary sources in combination with material taken from the *Itenerary*. As the title indicates, Hughes' work is complicated by the need to relate Moryson's life history to that of Shakespeare. For example, the opening sentence begins 'Fynes Moryson was born in 1566, two years after the birth of Shakespeare'.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Melanie Ord, for example, notes that Coryat had much lower social status than Moryson, and Clifford Bosworth notes that Moryson and Sandys were from the 'upper ranks' of society, quite unlike Coryat and Lithgow. See Melanie Ord, *Travel and Experience in Early Modern English Literature* (Palgrave: Basingstoke, 2008), p. 145 and Clifford Edmund Bosworth, *An intrepid Scot: William Lithgow of Lanark's travels in the Ottoman lands, North Africa and Central Europe, 1609-21* (Aldershot,: Ashgate, 2006), p. 4.

<sup>45</sup> Hughes, p. i. See also 'These three lost years bring him to 1609, the year of the first edition of Shakespeare's Sonnets', p. xxxvi.

Although Hughes' work forms an important contribution, which remains the first point of reference for scholars interested in Moryson's life history, it offers only a short biographical introduction, and does not draw on the Latin manuscripts or other extant primary material.

*Shakespeare's Europe* is seen as an authoritative source for Moryson's life history, and as such many of the theories that Hughes presents as conjecture are repeated verbatim by modern scholars.<sup>46</sup> Hughes' opinion of Moryson is balanced and uncritical, but selective or partial readings of the biographical introduction have spread the opinion that he is a dull and methodical writer. Hughes does state that sections of the *Itinerary* are 'dull and commonplace', and voices a fear that an unexpurgated publication of the fourth part may be deemed a rendering of 'useless' ballast.<sup>47</sup> However, the latter judgment represents Hughes' perception of the fourth part, not the entire text, and specifically, of the sections of the fourth part in which Moryson works from 'other men's books'.<sup>48</sup> Hughes describes Moryson's own first hand rendition of experience as 'vivacious and masculine', a stylistic appreciation that is rarely repeated in modern academic interaction with the text.<sup>49</sup>

Hughes' approach is reproduced by the economic historian Edward H. Thompson, who follows the prevailing opinion, describing Moryson as a 'careful and accurate observer, without much literary skill'.<sup>50</sup> Thompson's opinion is influential as he contributes the current entry for Fynes Moryson in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. He provides an accurate and succinct biography, largely

---

<sup>46</sup> For example, on p. xxxliii Hughes suggests that Moryson may have turned his 'small patrimony' into an annuity; this is then repeated in his current *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid*, p. xlv.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid*, p. xlv.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid*, p. xlv.

<sup>50</sup> Thompson.

composed of insights drawn from Hughes. Thompson first contributed a short pamphlet which debated facts and figures presented in the *Itenerary*: 'Elizabethan Economic Analysis: Fynes Moryson's Account of the Economics of Europe'. He describes and presents the *Itenerary* as an early work of social science:

He made a valuable attempt to explain the differences in wealth and poverty in the nations of Europe, identifying and analysing the role of market forces, the importance of an adequate supply of currency, the development of labour-saving technology, and the significance of social and economic attitudes.<sup>51</sup>

Thompson's biography correctly identifies one of the main features and values of the *Itenerary*; Moryson's careful methodology and eye for detail. Moryson alludes to this empirical methodology in his precepts for travel, when he describes how the traveller's experiences should be quickly and accurately transcribed into notes at the end of each day: 'let him constantly observe, that whatsoever he sees or heares he apply it to his use'.<sup>52</sup> Moryson had a specific concern that his work would be a true relation of experience, and this understanding should influence how the work is assessed and considered as a historical source. Whilst Thompson's perception of the *Itenerary* is well informed, his biography is of less value. He is not able to represent the last 24 years of Moryson's life in any detail, and refers only to the *Itenerary* and Moryson's brief will in his account of this time. Thompson does not draw on the range of primary sources that could be considered, and does not use material from either extant Latin manuscript to substantiate his biography.

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> *Itenerary*, Part III, Book 1, p. 12.

Hughes' work and Thompson's biography are complemented by the PhD thesis of Graham Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe Revisited'. As the title indicates, Kew follows on from Hughes' study, returning to the English manuscript and transcribing it in its entirety, incorporating the material that Hughes chose to omit.<sup>53</sup> The function and methodology of Kew's study is similar to that of Hughes. The study presents an unpublished manuscript, which is prefaced by a short biographical introduction which sketches out Moryson's life history. Kew's study represents a step forward in making the unpublished fourth part to the *Itinerary* accessible to scholars. However, some of the conclusions presented in the introduction may have to be reconsidered, as they are drawn from close readings of the English manuscript, and are not supported by analysis of the other two sections of the work in manuscript, BL Harl. MS. 5133 and BL Add. MS. 36706.

The biographical introductions that Kew, Hughes and Thompson contribute represent the most thorough studies of the *Itinerary* to date. Existing critical understanding of the *Itinerary* is largely based on these short introductions to the work. As there is no clear understanding of how the text is intended to function, scholars and historians are free to utilise the work as they see fit. They draw forth facts and information without true consideration of the context. Scholars speak of the 'rambling copia of Moryson's 'excursus', and are content to source the *Itinerary* without considering its context and purpose.<sup>54</sup>

The work is furthermore often denigrated by the very scholars who draw on it to substantiate their studies. The foundation for this hostility may be found in Hughes' study, which as mentioned earlier, described sections of Moryson's work

---

<sup>53</sup> In his thesis, Kew contends that Charles Hughes published only 40% of the total content of the English manuscript. Kew, p. ii.

<sup>54</sup> Andrew Hadfield, John McVeagh, *Strangers to that land: British perceptions of Ireland from the Reformation to the Famine* (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1994), p. 54.

as 'dull' and 'commonplace'.<sup>55</sup> Hughes' judgment is based on Moryson's own contention in his 'Address to the Reader', that the work may be in part 'barren and unpleasant'.<sup>56</sup> Both Hughes and Moryson are referring to the first part to the work, a methodical travel journal. However, this does not seem to have been appreciated by many scholars, who have since repeated this as an estimation of the work as a whole. Kew, for example, labels the *Itinerary* a 'failed' text, and criticises Moryson's writing style.<sup>57</sup> In his introduction to the *Hakluyt Handbook* George B Parks states that 'his quantity does not add up to his quality'. Moryson has even received criticism in a recent PhD thesis which draws heavily on his work, the *Itinerary* said to be 'greyer' than *Coryat's Crudities*, and 'generally unsuccessful'.<sup>58</sup> This perception is repeated in the current *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry that Thompson contributes: 'Moryson was a careful and accurate observer, without much literary skill'.<sup>59</sup>

Together, Moryson's and Hughes' comments on the quality of the text have shaped its interpretation, and they appear to have permanently affected how the text has been received. In recent years, the lack of respect that the work is afforded has resulted in aggressive denunciations of the text. Jyotsna Singh contends that Moryson 'devoted his three volume travel narrative to venting his spleen upon the world', a contention that is not supported by reference to the text.<sup>60</sup> In a similar diatribe, Ulrike Tancke advances the opinion that 'any present day reader' would be horrified by Moryson's cynicism when describing women,

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid, p. xliv.

<sup>56</sup> *Itinerary*, 'Address to the Reader', unmarked leaf.

<sup>57</sup> Kew, p. xcvi.

<sup>58</sup> See George B Parks, 'Tudor Travel Literature; A Brief History', in *The Hakluyt Handbook*, D.B Quinn (ed.) (London: Hakluyt Society, 1974) p. 12 and Anders Ingam, 'English literature on the Ottoman Turks in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', PhD thesis, Durham University (2009), p. 202.

<sup>59</sup> Thompson.

<sup>60</sup> Jyotsna G. Singh, *A companion to the global Renaissance: English literature and culture in the age of expansion* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), p.102.

stating that this ‘ultimately cements patriarchal bias’, which is perceived to permeate the text.<sup>61</sup> Nor does Moryson escape censure from Andrew Hadfield, who has made extensive use of the *Itenerary* to support a number of his studies. Hadfield’s judgement is inexplicably vitriolic, and deserves to be repeated in full:

Moryson, like many other travellers, appears to have used his wide experience to denigrate virtually all the cultures and peoples with which he came into contact. Throughout his travels he preserves his sense of English Protestantism and classically educated gentility. In many ways it is hardly surprising that his book found no ready publisher or audience, given not only his belief that he was writing in a ‘Crittick Age’ with little respect for true scholarship like his, but also his bigotry and inability to be succinct. The suspicion will always remain that Moryson did not really understand the medium of print or the audience of printed books.<sup>62</sup>

Misinformed modern appreciations of the text, which focus on ‘bigotry’ and prejudice, are based upon selective readings of the work.<sup>63</sup> Hadfield’s judgment of the text illustrates how the *Itenerary* has been understood in recent years. It has increasingly been drawn upon to substantiate studies that present and analyse negative early modern behaviours; racism, gender discrimination, religious intolerance and misogyny.

---

<sup>61</sup>Ulrike Tancke, *Bethinke thy selfe, Writing Women’s Identities in Early Modern England* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010), pp. 8-9.

<sup>62</sup> Andrew Hadfield, *Amazons, Savages, and Machiavles; Travel and Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630: An Anthology* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2001), p. 82.

<sup>63</sup> Moryson, for example is in fact a remarkably tolerant writer, and is only openly prejudiced against the Turks and the Irish. As Quinn remarks, Moryson fought against the Irish, and was a key part of an administration that had to believe it had a moral right to assert its authority over the Island. Moryson’s antipathy towards the Turks has its foundation in the death of his brother Henry, who died in his arms whilst watching Janissaries mocked and jeered. At the instant he expired, his clothes and belongings were stripped from him as the helpless Moryson watched, judged to now be the property of ‘The Great Turke’. See David B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1966), p. 28 and the *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 246.

In contrast, the contemporary reaction to the work, which was largely positive, is ignored. The earliest contemporary response can be traced to Samuel Purchas, who published sections of the *Itenerary* in 1625. Purchas wrote that the prospective reader could ‘feast himself with the rarities and varities of many Kingdomes’ in the *Itenerary*.<sup>64</sup> This positive appreciation of the text is continued in Thomas Powell’s 1661 publication, *Humane Industry*, a text which purported to express the ‘excellency of humane wit’.<sup>65</sup> In his collection of examples of human innovation Powell describes Moryson as an ‘ingenious traveller of this Nation’.<sup>66</sup> Moryson’s text was also well received towards the end of the seventeenth century. In Fuller’s *Worthies* of 1684, ‘Fines Morison’ is listed in the entry for Lincolnshire.<sup>67</sup> He is said to have ‘printed his observations in a large book, which contains no stretched reports’, a judgment that indicates the text was perceived as Moryson intended i.e. as a reliable collection of various empirical observations.<sup>68</sup> The sense that the *Itenerary* was well respected is confirmed by Moryson’s mention in a ‘geographicall compendium’, published in 1691, as one of the most important travel writers of the preceding century.<sup>69</sup> Interestingly, Moryson is listed, alongside Sandys, but Coryat and Lithgow are not, even though they are often bracketed together in modern studies. A similar text, published five

---

<sup>64</sup> Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his Pilgrimes. In five bookes. The first, contayning the voyages made by ancient kings and others, to and thorow the remoter parts of the knowne world, etc* (London: William Stansby, 1625), p. 258.

<sup>65</sup> Thomas Powell, *Humane Industry, or, A history of most manual arts deducing the original, process and improvement of them: furnished with a variety of instances and examples, showing forth the excellency of humane wit* (London, Henry Herringman, 1661), p. 36.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid*, p. 36.

<sup>67</sup> Which was first printed in 1662 as *The Histories of the Worthies of England* (London: John Grismond, 1662).

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid*, p. 467.

<sup>69</sup> Laurence Echard, *A most compleat compendium of geography* (London: Thomas Salisbury, 1691), p. 168.

‘The chief Travellers are *Morison, Sandys, Herbert, Tavenor, Thevenot, Charden, Brown*, with several others of less note, as *Lassels, Blunt, Ray, Burnet, Magallans, &c.*’

years later, also mentions Moryson. His worth as a source for Elizabeth's reign is debated. The author suggests that 'some good materials may be had from the Itinerary of F.Moryson...they are given us in that useful method, which is now generally allow'd to be the most pleasing and instructive, giving us at large all those Original Evidences, whereby the Author justifies his Narrative'.<sup>70</sup>

In this estimation, the *Itinerary* is a work of empirical observation, a rigorous, almost scientific piece of writing. The author is impressed with Moryson's use of primary sources, commenting on the 'original evidences' that 'justify' or support the narrative. The empirical approach seems also to have been noticed and drawn upon by the Royal Society, who present evidence from the *Itinerary* in a letter sent concerning the conduction of electricity, in 1754.<sup>71</sup> In the letter, the *Itinerary* is used as a source for an account Moryson gives of 'lamps burning' at the end of the 'staves and spears' of infantry and cavalry soldiers in Ireland in 1601. Moryson seems to be describing St. Elmo's fire, a meteorological phenomenon which was of great interest to the Royal Society at the time. Notably, the letter describes Moryson as a 'writer of unquestionable authority, and eminent in his learning and curiosity'.<sup>72</sup> This is an apt judgment, but a perception that seems far removed from modern attitudes towards Moryson and the *Itinerary*.

There is a clear difference between the contemporary reception of the *Itinerary* and the modern critical understanding of the work. It is unsettling that a text with the intellectual weight and depth of the *Itinerary* can have shed so much of its

---

<sup>70</sup> William Nicholson, *The English historical library, or, A short view and character of most of the writers now extant, either in print or manuscript which may be serviceable to the undertakers of a general history of this kingdom* (London, 1696).

<sup>71</sup> 'An Additional Remark to One of Mr. William Watson, F. R. S. in His Account of the Abbe Nollet's Letter concerning Electricity'. By Thomas Birch, D. D. Secr. R. S. Author(s): Abbé Nollet and Thomas Birch, Source: *Philosophical Transactions* (1683-1775), Vol. 48 (1753 - 1754), pp. 484-486.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid*, p. 485.

authority in recent years.<sup>73</sup> Much of what is known or assumed about Moryson is drawn from evidence that is printed in English, principally the first three parts of the *Itenerary*, and more rarely, the fourth part reproduced by Charles Hughes in *Shakespeare's Europe*. A comprehensive approach to the *Itenerary*, incorporating material both printed and in manuscript, in English and in Latin, will allow scholars to come to a fuller understanding of the work for the first time. This thesis takes a preliminary step towards such an approach.

---

<sup>73</sup> In addition to the contemporary reception discussed above, the *Itenerary* is also cited as a source or used as a point of reference in the following texts: Samuel Purchas, *A Theatre of politicall flying insects*, 1657 (T. Parkhurst: London, 1657), p. 9; John Spencer, *Things Old and New* (London, 1658) listed in preface as source, unmarked leaf; Thomas Browne, *Religio Medici*, (Tho. Milbourn for Andrew Cook: 1659), pp. 291-292; Richard Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana* (H. Clark for Joseph Watss: London, 1689) referenced throughout, 12 mentions in total; Thomas Fuller, *The Historie of the Holy War* (1647) (Glasgow: Glasgow University Press, 1883) mentioned in sources in appendix; Peter Heylyn, *France Painted To The Life* (London: William Leake, 1656), p. 93; Richard Hooker, *The Worke of Richard Hooker* (London: 1666), p. 6; John Aubrey, *Miscellanies Upon The Following Subjects* (London: 1696), p. 60; Peter Pett, *The Happy Future State of England* (London: 1688), p. 165 and Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses* (London: Thomas Bennet, 1691), p. 766.

### The *Itinerary* and the Manuscript

The four parts to the *Itinerary* are often considered as a single entity, but they are in fact, as Edward H. Thompson points out, 'distinct works', and should be appreciated as such.<sup>74</sup> Although they have the potential to be read in linear order, or in combination with each other, each part functions as an independent text, and has a separate and unique purpose. The first part of the *Itinerary* is described by Moryson as a 'journall' of his travels.<sup>75</sup> It comprises a detailed account of his travels in Europe between 1591 and 1595, and his later period of travel to the Levant Region, between 1595 and 1597. Moryson indicates in his 'Address to the Reader' that he intends this section of the work to be appreciated by the 'unexperienced' traveller, and therefore presents information that he perceives to be useful. He records 'the number of miles, the soyle of the country, the situation of them...the rates of hiring Coaches, or Horses from place to place, with each daies expences for diet, horsemeat and the like'.<sup>76</sup> The first part is therefore not intended as travel narrative in the modern sense, but as a methodical and thorough account of continental travel which would be of practical use to future travellers.

The second part to the *Itinerary* is often considered to be a history of the Nine Years War, and indeed is described as such in Moryson's entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.<sup>77</sup> Moryson himself describes the second part as 'my Irish Journall'. It should be reconsidered as a personal account of the conflict,

---

<sup>74</sup> 'The three folios of An Itinerary form what are really three distinct works.' Thompson.

<sup>75</sup> *Itinerary*, 'Address to the Reader', unmarked leaf.

<sup>76</sup> *Itinerary*, 'Address to the Reader', unmarked leaf.

<sup>77</sup> 'Part two centres on a history of the Nine Years' War'. Thompson.

and one highly coloured by Moryson's relationship with his patron Charles Blount, Baron Mountjoy. He describes it as 'a compendious narration of how Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy (my Lord and Master of happy memorie) was chosen Lord Deputy of Ireland; and of this worthy Lords qualitie...by which he broke the rebel's hearts, and gave peace to that troubled state'.<sup>78</sup> Moryson reconstructs the conflict from this perspective, and in part intended the second part to function as a paean to his former patron.<sup>79</sup> The second part to the *Itinerary* contains a wealth of historical data and primary sources, drawn from state papers and from documents Moryson had access to as Mountjoy's secretary.

The third part to the *Itinerary* was not complete by the time the text went to press in 1617, but was nonetheless published along with the fully realised first and second parts. Perhaps because of this, the third part does not have a truly distinct function like the preceding sections, and instead results from an amalgamation of two different elements. It begins with a standard defence of travel, which is followed by a comprehensive set of instructions or 'precepts' for prospective travellers, a useful text which explains, amongst other things, the methodology and thinking behind Moryson's periods of travel.<sup>80</sup> The first section of the third part also contains learned opinion on travel, suggestions for modes and means of travel, and a seemingly irrelevant discourse on 'sepulchers, monuments and

---

<sup>78</sup> *Itinerary*, Part 2, Book 1, Chapter 1, p. 1.

<sup>79</sup> *Sources for Early Modern Irish History 1534-1641* (ed.) Dudley Edwards and Mary O'Dowd (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 104.

<sup>80</sup> Moryson's intents are usually accessed and figured by reference to the printed 'Address to the Reader', but this section describes the method of his travel in detail. It provides a useful insight into the methodology of early modern travel, and is drawn upon by Peter C. Mancall in the Introduction to the 10<sup>th</sup> volume of *The Journal of Early Modern History*, and Peter Stallybrass in his study of Hamlet's 'tables of memorie'. See Peter C. Mancall, 'Introduction: What Fynes Moryson Knew', *The Journal of Early Modern History*, Vol. 10, (2006) Issue 1/2, pp. 1-9 and Peter Stallybrass, Roger Chartier, J. Franklin Mowery, Heather Wolfe, 'Hamlet's Tables and the Technologies of Writing in Renaissance England', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 55.4 (The Folger Shakespeare Library: Washington, 2004), pp. 379-419.

buildings'.<sup>81</sup> This section seems distinct from that which follows, a series of national biographies which examine a number of the nations Moryson visited under a series of set 'heads' or titles.

This section of the third part appears to be incomplete, as the national biographies that comprise the latter half of this text only cover a small fraction of the peoples and places visited by Moryson. This endeavour was intended to be completed in full in the planned fourth part, and the anticipated contents are set out in the printed *Itinerary*, at the end of the Table of Contents, under the heading: 'the rest of this VVorke, not yet as fully finished, treateth under the following heads'.<sup>82</sup> It may be inferred that the national biographies and comparisons that make up the planned fourth part and the latter half of the third were intended to make up a distinct 'part' to the text, but clearly the material was not fit to be published at the time of going to print. Instead, those elements of the text that were ready to print were included, with the remainder, comprising several hundred folios of material, deferred for publication at a later date.<sup>83</sup> This material was in fact never printed, and remained in manuscript until the beginning of the twentieth century. Kew contends that Moryson had prepared this material for print by 1626, but was unable to find a printer willing to publish the text.<sup>84</sup>

Moryson seems to have devoted a number of years to this enterprise, and the national biographies that were intended to form the fourth part may have had their genesis in the abandoned work Moryson describes in the printed 'Address to

---

<sup>81</sup> *Itinerary*, Part III, p. 63.

<sup>82</sup> *Itinerary*, Table of Contents, unmarked Leaf. The 'Heads' described are a list of 25 anticipated chapters.

<sup>83</sup> 'There are 344 Folios written on both sides'. Kew, p. lv.

<sup>84</sup> Kew, p. xxxv.

the Reader': 'the histories of these 12 Dominions thorow which I passed'. This study was written in the three years following Mountjoy's death, 1606-1609. If this study did indeed later become the fourth part, and Kew is not mistaken, the writing and compilation of this unpublished material consumed over twenty years of Moryson's life. It is unfortunate, therefore, that the fourth part was never printed, as it was intended to provide detailed contextual information, which would bring life to the functional descriptions of the first part.

Moryson seems to have understood that publication without the integral fourth section would damage the reception of the work, and seems to have anticipated criticism, writing of 'carpers consumed with envie, who barke objections at travellers as dogs at the Moone'.<sup>85</sup> Moryson is also conscious of criticism in his 'Address to the Reader', where he expresses a particular concern that his work would be misinterpreted. Without these detailed national biographies, Moryson seems aware that his work may be perceived to be 'barren and unpleasant'. As such Moryson is sufficiently concerned about the reception of the work to instruct the reader how to make the best use of the text:

Againe, for the worke in generall, I professe not to write it to any curious wits, who can indure nothing but extractions and quintessences: nor yet to great States- men, of whose reading I confesse it is unworthy: but only unto the unexperienced, who shall desire to view forraign kingdomes. And these may, the rather by this direction, make better use of what they see, heare, and reade, then my selfe did. If actiue men neuer reade it, I shall wish them no lesse good successe in their affaires. If contemplative men shall reade it at leasure, making good choice of the subjects fitting their humours, by the

---

<sup>85</sup> *Itinerary*, Part III, p. 8.

Table of Contents, and casting away the booke when they are weary of reading, perhaps they may finde some delight: only in case of distaste, I pray them remember, to and for whom it was written.<sup>86</sup>

Moryson instructs the reader that there are two possible approaches to the text. The 'active' man, or 'unexperienced' prospective traveller, may make use of the text to help him plan or inform his period of travel. The text will take the form of a 'direction', enabling the reader to find and appreciate whatever they may 'see, heare, and reade' through reference to the *Itenerary*. The second reader that Moryson identifies is the 'contemplative man'. This reader is instructed to browse the *Itenerary* at 'leasure', using the Table of Contents to find some 'delight' within.

Moryson's guidelines are instructive, and should inform how modern readers interact with and understand the text. In Moryson's conception, for both the active and contemplative man, the *Itenerary* is to be understood as a reference work, a compilation of facts and information which can be drawn upon through the Table of Contents. The text is heavily partitioned in order to facilitate this form of interaction. Each separate 'part' of the *Itenerary* is meticulously divided into individual books, each of which is further divided into chapters. Each chapter may be further broken down through a series of subheadings, running titles and printed marginal insertions, which draw attention to a description of a particular place, person or concept. The *Itenerary* was clearly intended to function as a work of reference, of practical use to the scholar or traveller, and not as a light, eccentric travel narrative, as it has been received. The fourth part was intended to

---

<sup>86</sup> *Itenerary*, 'Address to the Reader', unmarked leaf.

draw the material together in a different way, and to give it the intellectual authority of a work akin to Camden's *Britannia*.

The three sections of the *Itinerary* that Moryson had completed to his satisfaction were printed in 1617, compiled into a single large folio.<sup>87</sup> The work was printed by John Beale, entered in the records of the Stationer's Company as 'An Itinerary written by Fines Morison Gent, contayning his Travailes through divers dominions'.<sup>88</sup> Notably, the work was granted licence to print in both English and Latin in the privilege. Moryson and his executors are granted the freedom 'to sell, assigne and dispose to his or their best benefits, this Booke and Bookes as well in the English as in the Latin tongue'.<sup>89</sup> This strongly suggests that the Latin *Itinerarium* was intended for publication. The title page is keen to highlight the Latin origins of the work, noting that the work comprises 'An Itinerary written by Fynes Moryson, English Gent, first in the Latine tongue, and then translated by him into English'.<sup>90</sup> This 'first' Latin work seems to have comprised the origins of the work in manuscript.

Of the three parts printed in English, Latin manuscript versions of two parts remain. The first and second parts to the Latin *Itinerarium* are still extant in manuscript, both held at the British Library. The latter is catalogued as 'Fynes Moryson's Itinerary in Ireland', BL. Add. MS. 36706, and the former listed as BL.

---

<sup>87</sup> The print history of the *Itinerary* will be described in more detail in the Biographical Investigation. The printed *Itinerary* is large, unwieldy and surprisingly heavy. In size and form, it has close parallels with Camden's *Brittania*, which was first printed in English in 1610, when Moryson was finishing his manuscript. See William Rockett, 'The Structural Plan of Camden's *Britannia*', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (Winter, 1995) pp. 829-841, p. 830.

<sup>88</sup> W.W Greg and E. Boswell, *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company*, (Bibliographical Society: London, 1955), p. 606, under date 4 April, 1617. "John Beale Entred for his Copie under the handes of Master Docter Westfield and both Wardens. An Itinerary written by Fines Morison Gent, contayning his Travailes through divers dominions, vizi Germany Bohmerland &c".

<sup>89</sup> *Itinerary*, prefatory material, privilege, signed ¶14v.

<sup>90</sup> *Itinerary*, prefatory material, title page, signed ¶14.

Harl. MS. 5133. 'Itinerarium quod Fynes Moryson Anglus scripsit, Decenalis suae peregrinationis observationes continens, per Germaniam, Bohemiam, Helvetiam, Belgiae Prouincias unitas, Daniam, Poloniam, Italiam, Turciam, Galliam, Angliam, Scotiam, et Hiberniam'. BL. Harl. MS. 5133 is the Latin manuscript to the first part of Moryson's *Itinerary*, and forms the basis for this study. This Latin manuscript is divided into two volumes in the British Library's collection. Moryson did not intend to divide the manuscript, and the decision to do so was taken on behalf of the British Library when the manuscript was rebound in 1964.<sup>91</sup> The decision to divide the manuscript has made accessing the full Latin text problematic. The catalogue entry for the manuscript does not specify that the manuscript is divided into two volumes. As a consequence, when a reader requests BL. Harl. MS. 5133 in the British Library manuscripts reading room, only the first volume is brought. No mention is made of the second volume, and readers wishing to access it have to request a second volume that is not listed in the catalogue.

When the entire manuscript is reviewed, the scale of Moryson's ambitions becomes apparent. BL Harl. MS. 5133 is a large manuscript, comprised of 546 folios of material, 357 bound within Volume One, and 189 contained in Volume Two. The greater part of the manuscript represents a draft version of the first part to the *Itinerary*, Moryson's 'journal' of his travels. However, the manuscript also contains draft versions of the prefatory material to the *Itinerary*, comprising early outlines of the Dedication, 'Address to the Reader', Table of Contents and Introduction. In the Latin Table of Contents this manuscript is described as *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, the first part to the 'Itinerary'.

---

<sup>91</sup> In the inside cover second part to BL. Harl. MS. 5133 there is a re-binding sticker which confirms the manuscript was rebound in its current two-volume form in 1964. See BL. Harl. MS. 5133 *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, Vol. II.

There are two readily identifiable hands in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, that of Fynes Moryson, and his servant and scribe, Isaac Pywall.<sup>92</sup> Of the two, the latter contributes the greater part of the writing, with Moryson being responsible for less than 10% of the total.<sup>93</sup> Although Moryson does not write the majority of the text in his own hand, the entire manuscript is heavily edited by him. Almost every page features authorial corrections, alterations or amendments. These alterations contribute significantly to the content.<sup>94</sup> *Itinerarium Pars Prima* is written, edited and annotated in eloquent neo-Latin. There are very occasional corrections and amendments in English, although these often reprise or paraphrase Latin annotations.<sup>95</sup>

It is not certain exactly how far removed from the printed version *Itinerarium Pars Prima* is, although there is circumstantial evidence that suggests it was composed a number of years before the *Itinerary* came to print.<sup>96</sup> This may be assumed from the many alterations, amendments and annotations in *Itinerarium Pars Prima* that are transposed into the printed English *Itinerary*. This is of interest to scholars, as the differences between the texts can be easily appreciated by comparing the two. The differences, however, are not limited to minor

---

<sup>92</sup> Pywall is a beneficiary in Moryson's will. He is left all Moryson's 'apparel', his bed and the furnishings of his chamber.

<sup>93</sup> Discounting editing, just 7.5% of BL. Harl. MS. 5133 is autograph. For further information, see the following description of the manuscript.

<sup>94</sup> In total, around 10 folios of material have been excised, a further 5 folios inserted. Around 25% of the manuscript has been altered in total, with significant changes on almost every page.

<sup>95</sup> For example on f.294v, 'putt the Second in the first place as it was written', prefacing the introduction of autograph copies of letters in Latin and Italian. Elements of these instructions are repeated in Latin. At points Moryson conflates Latin and English into a single sentence or construction, for example 'all illustre' on f. 294v.

<sup>96</sup> A hand drawn monetary conversion table on f. 473 of *Itinerarium Pars Prima* has been dated '1609' in Moryson's hand. Corrections to f. 41v of the manuscript suggest that it was edited around 1612-13.

amendments and changes. The prefatory material of *Itinerarium Pars Prima* is completely different to that of the English, suggesting that it was intended to introduce a quite distinct version in Latin. There are appreciable differences in terms of style. The Latin incorporates a much more florid, discursive style, whereas in contrast the English prose is functional and pragmatic. The process of translation seems to have robbed the text of much of its vigour and vitality, leaving a somewhat tired, threadbare text.

The eventual expression of the work in print is quite different to the 'magnum opus' that Moryson envisioned when the 'Itinerary' was first conceptualised. The fact that the printed *Itinerary* was published incomplete, not adequately introduced as a reference work, and hampered by an intentionally pragmatic, functional style has significantly altered the reception and understanding of the work. Study of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* will allow for a more comprehensive understanding of the original conception of the 'Itinerary' that will allow for a reevaluation of the work.

## Summary

The thesis will be subdivided into two parts. The first comprises a biographical investigation of unexplored sources that have the potential to add significantly to Moryson's life history. This study will provide new information about his life, work, and his circumstances during the writing of the Latin and English version of the 'Itinerary'. It will draw on letters and documents which offer a firsthand account of Moryson's life history, which has not yet been fully appreciated or appraised.

This introductory biography will support the second part, which is a preliminary study which investigates the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. The study will be founded in a description of the manuscript. This will provide an introduction to the manuscript, detailing the status and provenance of the work, and setting out the numbering and ordering of the text and the hands present. Following this, the contents of the manuscript will be described, in order, and significant points of divergence from the printed *Itinerary* will be outlined. This analytical section of the study will provide context for the following case studies, and also help make a confusing and in parts unintelligible work accessible for future scholarship.

This will be followed by a series of case studies, which will focus on differences between the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and the printed *Itinerary*. In each case study sections of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* will be considered alongside the printed parallel and differences will be analysed. These studies will consider the extent of the difference between the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and the printed version, and if possible suggest reasons for them. The study of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* will

provide valuable new information about the relationship of the manuscript to the printed edition and contribute to understanding of the intended purpose of the *Itinerary*.

## Part 1: Biographical Investigation

*New sources for Fynes Moryson's history, drawn from archival records, letters, documents and study of the Itenerary.*

### Introduction

The *Itenerary* is still considered the principal source for Moryson's life, and to some extent it is treated almost as an autobiography. The contention here is that it must instead be considered as a literary construction, a highly structured text, the product of a long editorial process. The *Itenerary* is a curious, composite work, originating in Moryson's travel diaries and journals, written in cipher whilst Moryson travelled on the continent and posted back to England.<sup>1</sup> Moryson then gathered these notes in manuscript form, writing first in Latin and then translating the draft into English in anticipation of publication.<sup>2</sup> The extended, long-term editorial process not only spanned over a decade, but took place twenty years after Moryson first began his sequence of travels.

Such a highly constructed work cannot be used as a straightforward document of Moryson's life. Instead, the biographer must turn to the archives, to other evidence of Moryson's life and movements. When used in conjunction with Moryson's conception, or presentation of events in the *Itenerary*, a more comprehensive biography can begin to evolve. Even this biographical methodology is not infallible, but it is impossible to reconstruct life history

---

<sup>1</sup>*Itenerary*, Part III, pp. 12-13.

<sup>2</sup> With the exception of the fourth part, which was first written in English. See BL. Harl. MS. 5133. f. 2.

without some conjecture, or estimations of circumstance based on informed readings of documents, and life events catalogued in the pages of the *Itinerary*.

This form of biography is necessarily interpretive, but it can also throw new light on neglected areas of Moryson's life. Rather than following existing studies, which simply recount Moryson's life with reference to dates, places and times, the following biographical investigation will draw upon unexplored archival material to investigate the significance of events hinted at, or intimated in the pages of the *Itinerary*. The order of the study is necessarily chronological, for reasons of logic and accessibility, but the structure of the biography will be investigative, its aim to open up new areas of study, and to facilitate future exploration of Moryson's life and works.

### Early Years: Family Life & Education 1565-1592

Fynes Moryson was born in the Manor of Cadeby in Lincolnshire, deep in the winter of 1565.<sup>3</sup> Fynes was the third son of Thomas Moryson and Elizabeth Moigne, and was raised in Cadeby, a Moryson family estate, alongside six other surviving children, Edward, Thomas, Henry, Richard, Faith and Jane.<sup>4</sup> In existing biographical studies, Moryson's early years have been brought to life through genealogical histories detailing the lives and achievements of his parents. Using local records, Charles Hughes has established that Fynes was born into an affluent, respected Lincolnshire family.<sup>5</sup> His mother Elizabeth was a distinguished member of the Lincolnshire gentry, the daughter of Thomas Moigne, a substantial landowner who took a leading role in the 1537 Pilgrimage of Grace. Elizabeth was one of the main beneficiaries of her father's will, which allowed her partial parity with her wealthy and successful husband.

Fynes Moryson's father, Thomas Moryson, was a regional magnate of some influence, holding office as Clerk of the Pipe and being returned M.P for Great Grimsby in the Parliaments of 1572, 1584, 1586 and 1588-9.<sup>6</sup> He was a man of significant personal wealth, a fortune accumulated via the opportunities

---

<sup>3</sup> In the *Itinerary*, Moryson claims to be 18 when he proceeds fellow commoner at Peterhouse. The Peterhouse College Records give this date as 8 Feb 1583/4. This would place his date of birth in January/early February 1565/66. Using the Julian Calendar, as Fynes does in all his documentation and correspondence, I have fixed his date of birth as mid-winter 1565. See *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 1, and Peterhouse, Cambridge, Archives, Buttery Books, M.3.6, 8 Feb 1583.

<sup>4</sup> For details, see Surrey History Centre, Losely MSS, Copy of inquisition post mortem on Thomas Moryson [Morrison], esq, who died 19 Feb 1592. Edward is his son and heir, LM/1083/5 21 Nov 1592.

<sup>5</sup> Existing biographers have tended to construct Moryson's early years through the pages of the *Itinerary*, and generic, genealogical histories of the county of Lincoln. See Hughes, p. i.

<sup>6</sup> Thompson. Thompson condenses the first twenty six years of Fynes Moryson's life into a single paragraph.

presented as Clerk of the Pipe. Within the bounds of this office, Thomas Moryson would be accountable for the registration of the revenues of the crown, and responsible for the administration of the land taxes. As Hughes makes clear 'The persons connected with this office must have had ample opportunities, more or less legitimate, of enriching themselves'.<sup>7</sup>

Fynes Moryson's only other noteworthy biographer, Edward Thompson, cannot add to the limited corpus of information Hughes imparts, and both scholars construct Moryson's childhood through reference to the only existing information: the achievements and personal wealth of his parents.<sup>8</sup> As a result, the contemporary academic perception of Moryson has suffered. Critical interpretations have focused on the wealth and affluence of the Moryson family, contrasting Moryson's childhood prosperity with the parsimony of his later years. It has been assumed that in later life Moryson became embittered at his own personal failure, lost in the shadow of his parents' achievements.<sup>9</sup> There is no evidence for this, and it is illustrative of the problems inherent to the construction of a biography by reference to life histories of satellite figures. Naturally, Moryson's family had a great influence on his early life, and attending to their lives and achievements is necessary. However, it is important that this information is not projected onto Moryson's life in ways that eclipse his own life-writing.

Whilst living in Prague, Fynes was disturbed by a premonition of his Father's death:

---

<sup>7</sup> Hughes, p. ii.

<sup>8</sup> Thompson.

<sup>9</sup> Hadfield contends that Moryson, in common with his Scottish contemporary William Lithgow, became disillusioned following the commercial failure of the *Itenerary*. Andrew Hadfield, *Amazons, Savages and Machiavels, An Anthology of Travel and Colonial Writing in England, 1550-1630* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), p. 14.

Whilst I lived at Prage and one night had set up very late drinking at a feast, early in the morning the Sunne beames glancing on my face, as I lay in bed, I dreamed that a shadow passing by told me that my father was dead; at which awaking all in a sweat and affected with this dreame, I rose and wrote the day and houre and all circumstances thereof in a paper booke, which Booke, with many other things I put into a barrel and sent it from Prage to Stode thence to be conveied into England.

(*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 19).<sup>10</sup>

Fynes Moryson is typically a self-effacing, circumspect narrator. He rarely imparts private emotion in the text. The detailed, disturbing account of his supernatural visitation represents a significant departure from his usual narrative style. Fynes awakes 'all in a sweat and affected', and is left so disturbed by the dream he is driven to record his feelings in a book, which is then sealed within a barrel and conveyed to England. He follows this account by contending that the date of his dream coincided exactly with the date of his father's death, something he insists was confirmed when he returned to England and opened the 'barrel' in the presence of his sisters. There is no way to assess the validity of this claim.<sup>11</sup>

However, what this unverifiable, uncharacteristic assertion and the accompanying passage do attest to is the powerful psychological hold Thomas Moryson exerts over his son. Although separated from his home and family by thousands of miles,

---

<sup>10</sup> This story is repeated on p.292 of Sir Thomas Brown's, *Religio medici*. Sir Thomas Brown, *Religio Medici* (London: Andrew Crooke, 1643).

<sup>11</sup> In addition, Fynes contends that he foretold his mother's death in the form of a premonitory dream, whilst lodging with his brother Henry at Peterhouse. Again, whilst there is no benefit in assessing the validity of this claim, it is possible to use Moryson's contention to assign a definite date to his mother's death-currently lacking in her existing, limited biography. In his narrative, he states his mother died five months before he proceeded Master of Arts at Peterhouse, which places her date of death in the month of October, 1586. See *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 19. See also Peterhouse, Cambridge, Archives, Buttery Books, M.3.6, March 13 1586.

Fynes is still consumed by the preoccupations of his early life. Moryson's concern, or anxiety over matters of family is not a recurrent theme in the pages of the *Itinerary*, but this example points to an interesting, if troubled relationship with his father, a powerful man whose life is minutely catalogued in an immensely detailed, meticulous will.

The will is a rambling, lengthy document, which provides a good deal of information about Fynes Moryson's early family life, and circumstances.<sup>12</sup>

Furthermore, the will is exacting, and punctuated by unusual conditions which later manifest themselves in the pages of the *Itinerary*, and Fynes Moryson's later correspondence.<sup>13</sup> Initially, the will furnishes the biographer with significant information pertaining to Thomas Moryson's wealth and circumstances. In terms of raw capital, Thomas Moryson leaves almost a thousand pounds, along with hundreds of pounds of material legacies-furnishings, plate, horses, cattle and jewellery.<sup>14</sup> Thomas Moryson was also a substantial landowner. The property catalogued in the will is concentrated in Lincolnshire, but includes lands in Hertfordshire, the lease of a house in Aldersgate, London and the ownership of the lease of a chamber in the legal enclave of Gray's Inn. A considerable portion of

---

<sup>12</sup> Surrey History Centre, Losely MSS, Copy of inquisition post mortem on Thomas Moryson [Morrison], esq, who died 19 Feb 1592. Edward is his son and heir LM/1083/5 21 Nov 1592. The will is nearly 2500 words in length, covering 4 folio pages in a controlled, diminutive hand. The hand is unidentified, although it does bear significant stylistic similarities with the hand of Fynes Moryson-in particular the construction of the 'r', lower case 't', 'x' and 's' characters. Possibly one of the three clerks mentioned in the will who may have helped educate the Moryson children. See Appendix B for transcription.

<sup>13</sup> See later section, *The Moryson Letters 1606-1617*, also the Lacon correspondence, Surrey History Centre, Losely MSS, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters Z/407/Lb. 621-623 (Appendix B).

<sup>14</sup> Financial bequests in the will total £886 (Thomas Moryson provides a year's wages for all his servants. As he is disposing of three manorial estates, I have estimated 30 servants. Servants in Early Modern England were paid little-their board and lodgings was factored into their wage. Average wage for male servants was £5-6 per annum, so I have estimated 30 servants at £5, or £150 of wages) See Ann Kussmaul, *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1981), pp. 25-40. Material bequests, including plate, beds, furnishings, jewellery total estimated £400.

this land is sold to discharge debts outstanding at death, but the remaining bequests of land and estates still total around five thousand pounds.<sup>15</sup> A number of hereditary leases and tenancies are also bequeathed, along with tenant farms which carry an ‘annuitie or rente charge’ (Will:30).<sup>16</sup>

Even taking into account the acquittance of debts, and the uncertain worth of leased property or other associated land rights, Thomas Moryson’s worth at death may be estimated to have been in the region of ten thousand pounds.<sup>17</sup> This ranks him amongst the most significant landowners in the country, and a major force within Lincolnshire circles.<sup>18</sup> This information can be applied directly to what is known of Fynes Moryson’s early life. It may be assumed Fynes would have been raised in an environment of easy affluence and power, located within the higher echelons of the gentry, in an emergent and powerful family. This has an impact on how Moryson’s travels are to be perceived. For example, Melanie Ord notes that

---

<sup>15</sup> Together, the estates of Cadeby and Tetney are worth £3500. Fynes is left the rectory of Louth Church, which Charles Hughes values at £500. Flusowe manor is not included in the calculation as it is sold to cover debts and financial legacies. See Hughes, p. viii. For values of estates, see Surrey History Centre, Losely MSS, LM/1083/8/1 20 Nov 1596 Certified copy of bargain and sale 1) Edward Morison [Morrison] of Cadeby, Lincs, esq 2) Sir Thomas Cecil [Cecil], son and heir apparent of William, Lord Burghley. Manor of Cadeby, which Edward's father Thomas Morison had by purchase. Consideration: £1500.

<sup>16</sup> The lands carry what the will describes as ‘herdetaries’, which I have taken to mean hereditary tenancies-defined by the OED as ‘any kind of property that can be inherited, deriving from the Latin *hereditamentum*. Oxford English Dictionary online, [http://0-dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query\\_type=word&queryword=hereditatment](http://0-dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query_type=word&queryword=hereditatment), accessed 05/12/08.

<sup>17</sup> Certain ‘uessages’ also form part of Thomas Moryson’s legacy. The term, archaic by 1592, refers to an ancient land right, similar to common land privileges, to collect wood, water, nut and berries on the property bequeathed. Oxford English Dictionary online, [http://0-dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query\\_type=word&queryword=usage](http://0-dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query_type=word&queryword=usage), accessed 05/12/08.

<sup>18</sup> For example, at the height of his power in 1583 Lord William Burghley owned lands worth £12 300. Wallace T. MacCaffrey, ‘Cecil, William, first Baron Burghley’ (1520/21–1598) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk:80/view/article/4983>, accessed 03 Dec 2008]. In terms of land, Shakespeare’s wealth at death was not dissimilar to that of Thomas Moryson. See Peter Holland, ‘Shakespeare, William’ (1564–1616) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Oct 2008 [<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk:80/view/article/25200>, accessed 03 Dec 2008].

Moryson had the requisite social gravitas to view the armoury at Venice, and a number of relics and treasures, whilst Coryate, in contrast, did not.<sup>19</sup>

Detailing the more significant bequests allows estimation of the relative worth, and regional influence of the Moryson family, but it is in the fine detail of the will that a more complete picture of Fynes Moryson's early family life emerges.

Thomas Moryson's will is exacting in its attention to detail. Everyone associated with the wider Moryson circle is thought of, including servants, clerks, cousins, nephews, nieces, their own children and even Godchildren:

I give to my goddaughters Katherine Rimmer and Katherine Ganderton, and to my Goddsonns Anthonie williams and Thomas Palmer, to everie of them, a ringe of the value of Twentie shillinges' (Will: line 77-78)

As in the above example, almost every item bequeathed is given an estimated value, in many cases in pounds, shilling and pence. Items are carefully described, and the care used in the assignation of individual objects is painstaking:

I give and bequathe unto my sonn Edwarde Morison all my plate in my house at caderby aforesaid Excepte the lesser double gilte bowle, or standing cup theare the which I give to my daughter morison, his wife (Will: 84)

Within the family, each bequest is carefully made, so that every child favoured is given material provision to last the rest of their lives. Henry, Fynes and Richard are considered a collective entity by their Father, described as the 'younger sonns' (Will: 139). This is not a term which has direct relation to their age, as in the year the will was tendered Fynes turned 27, Henry 25, and Richard 23. Instead, the

---

<sup>19</sup> See Melanie Ord, *Travel and Experience in Early Modern English Literature* (Palgrave, Basingstoke, 2008), p. 145.

term denotes financial dependence on the family. Perhaps this consideration has an impact on the meticulous terms of Henry's bequest:

to my sonn henrie Morison... the lease of his chamber in Graies Inn, in the countie of midlesex. And the lease of the thirde parte of the graunge of Waythall and the fifthe parte of the saide Graunge in the countie of Lincoln.  
(Will: 87-91)

Henry is provided with accommodation in the form of direct ownership of the lease of his chamber, a material foundation in the form of direct ownership of a fifth of the manor lands, and an income through the right to lease a third of the Waythall manor estate. He retains the right to lease a third of the manor lands even if he sells the fifth he directly owns, ensuring he sustains an income.<sup>20</sup> The bequest is designed to secure Henry a living, no matter what his intents may be. Grants to the family also carried cautiously worded terms and conditions to prevent any misinterpretation of Thomas Moryson's intents:

Item my will and minde is, That if my sonnes Edward Morison and Thomas Morison, or either of them, or anie other, by theare asserted meanes or procurement doe lett or interupte the exequitors of this my last will and testamente, or anie thing thearin contained, accordinge to my first meaninge and to them or either of them given by me in this my last will and testamente, shallbe to them or either of them for interuptinge utterlie voide and of noe effecte (Will: 143-147)

---

<sup>20</sup> Indeed, in his *Itenerary* Moryson notes Henry laid out £400 in travel bets. There is no monetary element to his bequest, so he must have raised this sum by selling or mortgaging the lands he inherits. Moryson himself notes that he used his own 'patrimony' to fund this, his second journey. *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 198.

The terms are absolute: any attempt to alter the provision of the will voids all bequests, disinheriting the beneficiary. Throughout the will, when any grant of land or provision of annuity is described, carefully worded conditions of inheritance are inserted, preventing the sale, bargaining or exchange of the bequest. Writing a will represents the last temporal act of the testator, his or her last impact on the physical world, and so it is natural that anxiety over the interpretations of specific intents resonates in the terms of bequests and demands made on beneficiaries. Even so, the will of Thomas Moryson is permeated by a hyperbolic intensity of control. He disposes of land and goods worth ten thousand pounds, yet specifies the value in pence of individual bequests. Relative to the good and land disbursed, his will is vast, stretching to two and a half thousand carefully chosen words.<sup>21</sup> When deciding legacies to his immediate family, he expends considerable effort ensuring his words cannot be misinterpreted, or manipulated. His intent is to provide for his children, but also to exert control over their lives, even after death.

This urge, or need to control and influence others seems to have led to an impasse in relations with his middle son, Fynes, when the latter first proposed or made public his intent to travel on the continent. Thomas Moryson, along with unspecified friends, attempted to hinder Fynes' intended journey, preventing him from leaving the country in 1591: 'some....new deliberation made by my father and friends against my journey, detained me longer in those parts then I purposed' (*Itinerary*, Part 1, p. 1).

---

<sup>21</sup> For example, Shakespeare's will is a thousand words shorter, although a similar range of goods and properties are bequeathed. See National Archives, Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, PRO 1 /4 *Will of William Shakespeare 25 March 1616*. Proved 22 June 1616.

Later in the *Itenerary*, Moryson explains that his main motivation for travel was to gain experience, to encounter and interact with foreign cultures on his own terms, not mediated through the words or opinions of others:

From my tender youth, I had a great desire to see forraine Countries, not to get libertie (which I had in Cambridge to such measure as I could not well desire more) but to enable my understanding, which I thought could not be done so well by contemplating as experience, nor by the ears or any sense so well, as by the eyes (*Itenerary*, Part I, p. 198)

Whilst Moryson maintains he did not travel solely to gain 'libertie', it is clear that he embraced this concept whilst at Cambridge 'to such measure as I could not well desire more'.<sup>22</sup> Fynes Moryson entered Peterhouse College when he was 14, on May 14, 1580.<sup>23</sup> The college archives show Moryson was resident at Peterhouse for the next ten years, not returning home for any extended period of time. Indeed, in his first two years at Peterhouse, Fynes and his brother Henry, with whom he roomed, only return home for two weeks, and are sufficiently distant from their family to be unaware of the sickness that preceded their mother's death.<sup>24</sup>

This is not to suggest a family estrangement, but perhaps a welcome period of freedom from the stifling control of his father. To return once again to the

---

<sup>22</sup> It is clear here that Moryson speaks in relation to intellectual liberty, the freedom to craft and form his own opinions, and to explore and question those of others. Given his relationship with his father, the contemporary meaning; exemption or freedom from arbitrary, despotic, or autocratic rule or control, may also be significant.[http://0-dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query\\_type=word&queryword=liberty](http://0-dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query_type=word&queryword=liberty), accessed 05/12/08.

<sup>23</sup> Peterhouse, Cambridge, Archives, Buttery Books, M.3.6, May 14<sup>th</sup> 1580.

<sup>24</sup> 'We (*Fynes and Henry*) had not the least knowledge of our mother's sicknesse'. *Itenerary*, Part I, pp. 19. Also see Peterhouse College Archives, *Buttery Books*, 1581-1581.

*Itenerary*, Moryson's discussion of his episode of liberty at Cambridge is directly followed by a vitriolic attack on the process of primogeniture:

The English law most unmeasurably favouring older brothers (or let me boldly say it) for the ignorant pride of fathers, who to advance their eldest sonnes, leave the rest to desperate causes, and make them unable to live, or to spend any money in getting understanding and experience, so as they being in wants, and yet more miserable by their gentrie and plentiful education, must needs rush into all vices (*Itenerary*, Part 1, p. 198)

Moryson's anger is personal, focused directly on the provision of the will, and on his father's intent, which he labels 'ignorant pride'. Although he claims his father's governing intent was to 'advance...eldest sonnes', all of the Moryson children are provided for in the will. The terms of Fyne's Moryson's own personal bequest are generous:

I give and biquathe to my sonn Ffines Morison Three hundred poundes of good and lawfull money of Englande To be paide unto him when he shall come and be of the age of twentie eighte yeeres, And in the meane time I will that my Exequitors shall paie unto him Tenn poundes yeerlie unto Suche time as he shall come and be of the said age of twentie eighte yeeres. Item I give unto my said sonn Ffines Morison, the (advowson) of the whole gifte of the prebende or rectorie of Louthe in the Said towne (Will: 19-23)

Fynes Moryson is left three hundred pounds, the rectory at Louth, in Lincolnshire, valued at five hundred pounds, and a small annuity of ten pounds a year.<sup>25</sup> The

---

<sup>25</sup> In addition Fynes, Henry and Richard are left the 'usage', tenancies and 'hereditament' of the lands at Tetney after debts and other legacies had been discharged-possibly this

net value of the bequests is considerable; not in the order of the bequests to the eldest son, Edward, but sufficient to invest in property or to convert into an annuity. However, as with other bequests, the will is structured to prevent the assets being converted into immediate, ready funds.

The will of Thomas Moryson comes into effect on the 21 November, 1592. At this point, Fynes was on the continent, and had been travelling for a year and a half.<sup>26</sup> To dispose of the rectory, or access the money bequeathed, Fynes would need to return to England. This immediately places an obstacle in the way of any immediate realisation of the capital tied up in the bequest. However, there are additional conditions present in the will, which complicate the legacy. The bequest of three hundred pounds is not activated until Moryson is 28. This is unusual, and atypical of the will, as all other land and property held in trust in the will is activated when the beneficiary reaches 21. This would seem to indicate Fynes has been singled out for special treatment. Moryson will not reach 28 until the following year, two and a half years after he first began to travel. It would seem that the land and capital bequeathed are intended to pass to Fynes upon his return to England, and not before. The terms of the will are designed to frustrate or hinder any further travel, extending Moryson's dispute with his father beyond the grave.

The terms of the legacy also seem designed specifically to propel Moryson towards a career within the church. All the bequests which the younger sons receive are similarly structured. Each inheritance is designed to furnish the

---

equated to a small income, split between the three of them. However this estate was owned by the oldest son, Edward, so it is possible this income was disbursed through him. See Surrey History Centre, Losely MSS, Copy of inquisition post mortem on Thomas Moryson [Morrison], esq, who died 19 Feb 1592. Edward is his son and heir LM/1083/5 21 Nov 1592.

<sup>26</sup> Moryson departed May 1, 1591. *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 1.

beneficiary with sufficient funds to provide the foundation for the career path their father had intended for them. Henry is provided with a modest income, and a chamber at Gray's Inn, providing him with a foundation for a legal career in the Inns of Court. Richard receives an annuity of twenty pounds a year. This seems negligible in relation to the bequests of the other sons, but by this time Richard was already a seasoned career soldier.<sup>27</sup>

The structure of Fynes' bequest is informed by the nature of the buildings and lands he is in receipt of. He is not merely left a church building, but a 'prebend', or an estate or land tax which supports a church or ecclesiastical building.<sup>28</sup> As well as an income, the bequest also provides accommodation, in the form of the rectory building. The rectory has been described as an 'imposing and beautiful building', and it is possible Thomas Moryson hoped his fiercely independent son would be encouraged to abandon his travels, and settle down in the quiet country parsonage of Louth.<sup>29</sup>

The terms of Fynes Moryson's bequest also occur at a very unusual juncture within the structure of the will. The other sons, with the exception of Richard, are rewarded with lands and property towards the end of the will, after minor bequests have been made. Henry's disbursement is recorded in line 87, Edward's on line 120. In contrast, Fynes Moryson's legacy is set out in lines 18-23. Although he is the third son, Fynes is positioned at the very front of the will, and his inheritance is the first disposed of. Whilst it is unlikely that this is intended to convey negative respect, it is perhaps significant that the terms of his bequest

---

<sup>27</sup> At the time the will was tendered, he was serving as a captain in the Low Countries. Thompson.

<sup>28</sup> Oxford English Dictionary online, [http://0dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query\\_type=word&queryword=prebend](http://0dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query_type=word&queryword=prebend), accessed 05/12/08.

<sup>29</sup> Hughes, p. ii.

come immediately after the standard disbursement of alms money to the ‘poore people’ (Will: 13) within Thomas Moryson’s sphere of influence. It is almost as if Thomas, a godly man, has made an offer of his rebellious son to the Church in the hope reforming his behaviour.<sup>30</sup>

Irrespective of the specific intent of Thomas Moryson, it is clear that Fynes Moryson’s bequest was structured to frustrate his travel ambitions. This explains his anger at the ‘ignorant pride’ of fathers. Both within the pages of the *Itinerary*, and in later documentary evidence of his life, Fynes remains trapped in the tangled web of Thomas Moryson’s legacy. For the rest of his life, Fynes struggles against the terms of the will, and the will of his father.<sup>31</sup> The will is a record of not just the material wealth of the Moryson family, but of the web of interpersonal connections, and a map of the tensions between patriarchal control and the urge to autonomy, the ultimate expression of which was Moryson’s travels, articulated in his own legacy, the *Itinerary*. Thomas Moryson’s bequest thus provides a useful insight into Fynes’ early family life. It is important not to assume too much from a single document, but the resonance of the will in the pages of the *Itinerary*, and in Fynes’ later correspondence, suggests an impact on Moryson’s thinking, and life.

What little is known of Moryson’s early life is also informed by his educational history, of which there are traces in the Peterhouse College archives. Fynes, and his younger brother Henry, first enter the college in the early summer of 1580.

The two brothers were close, travelling together to Constantinople, Jerusalem and

---

<sup>30</sup> The will opens with a 200 word religious preamble. My understanding of this address is informed by the following text. See Leslie Moscow McGranahan, ‘Charity and the Bequest Motive: Evidence from Seventeenth-Century Wills’, *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 108 (University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 2000) pp. 1270-1291, p. 1273.

<sup>31</sup> See Section 2: On *Travels, 1591-1583*, and Section 4: *The Moryson Letters, 1606-1617*.

the Levant region in 1596. This familiarity had its foundation in their time together at Cambridge, rooming together at Peterhouse from their entry into the college. The progress and attendance of the two brothers at Peterhouse may be tracked by records of payments made to the college, summarised in the form of the 'Buttery Books'. In May 14, 1580, two 'Morysons' appear together at the very foot of the books.<sup>32</sup> Although their forenames are not specified, Richard did not proceed to Peterhouse until the spring of 1585, so it may be assumed the two brothers are Henry and Fynes.<sup>33</sup> The Buttery Books are ordered in terms of seniority within the college, and the Moryson name slowly progresses up the rolls as the two brothers advance within the college. On 20 January 1585 Moryson became a fellow of Peterhouse, and instead of paying for his food and lodgings, received a small stipend from the college.<sup>34</sup> Four years later, he becomes the college bursar, and another previously uncatalogued example of his hand remains preserved in the flowing script of the college account rolls.<sup>35</sup>

The program of study which Fynes embarked upon at Peterhouse is not recorded in the College archives, although Moryson in his *Itinerary* contends that he studied the 'Civill Lawes' (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 1).<sup>36</sup> Moryson's education seems to have had a lasting effect upon him, and it is a refrain he returns to often in the *Itinerary*. In his precepts for travel, he compares the gift of reason to the instruction of a 'stern schoolemaster' who deserves respect, and is thus attributed

---

<sup>32</sup> Peterhouse, Cambridge, Archives, Buttery Books, M.3.6, May 14 1580.

<sup>33</sup> Richard entered Peterhouse College in 1585. See Peterhouse, Cambridge, Archives, Buttery Books, M.3.7, March 20 1585.

<sup>34</sup> Peterhouse Cambridge, Archives, Buttery Books, M.3.7 entry of 20<sup>th</sup> of January, 1585.

<sup>35</sup> Peterhouse, Cambridge, Archives, Computus Roll, 1589-90, Fynes Moryson is bursar.

<sup>36</sup> Moryson's program of study was specialised –Northern European universities conferred very few legal degrees at this time. See Paul F. Grendler, 'The Universities of the Renaissance and Reformation', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 57, No. 1 (Spring, 2004) pp. 1-42, p. 9.

‘authority in directing the behaviour’ of others.<sup>37</sup> Moryson’s respect for pedagogical figures does not seem to extend to his university tuition, however. Later in the *Itinerary* he criticises ‘grave university men’, contrasting their learning with the value of practical experience, judging them to be ‘men reputed idiots in the practice of worldly affaires’.<sup>38</sup> This lack of respect for authority may in part stem from his difficult relationship with his father. Although naturally headstrong, Moryson would have been only fourteen years old when he entered the college, and still very much subject to his father’s will. It is probable that Thomas Moryson sent his troublesome middle son to Peterhouse to receive an education which would allow him to proceed to the church.

Contrary to the designs of his Father, Fynes was resolved to travel from a very early age. ‘From my tender youth, I had a great desire to see forraine Countries’ (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 197). This craving for travel, or direct experience, is a recurring theme in the *Itinerary*, and at times Moryson attempts to justify, or explain his need. He does not relate a litany of practical purposes or motivations, but instead writes of his travels in terms of desire, or longing. Fynes tries to define this urge or yearning as an ‘innated desire’ (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 1). Although the word ‘desire’ has connotations of fleeting passion, or sensory gratification, Fynes weds it to the term ‘innated’ almost as if the urge to travel was an intrinsic part of his psychology.<sup>39</sup> He had what he terms ‘libertie’ (*Itinerary*, Volume I, p. 198) at Cambridge, but this intellectual awakening only served to fuel his need for travel, for experience. Once he begins his travels, his description of this need to collect experience is striking:

---

<sup>37</sup> *Itinerary*, Part III, p. 6.

<sup>38</sup> *Itinerary*, Part III, p. 3.

<sup>39</sup> Moryson often uses the word ‘desire’ to express his inclination to travel to new places, to gain new experience. For example, he states that he had an ‘itching desire’ to see Jerusalem on p. 198 of the first Part to the *Itinerary*.

And having once begun this course I could not see any man without emulation and a kind of vertuous envy, who had seene more Cities, Kingdomes and Provinces, or more Courts of Princes, Kings and Emperours, then myselfe. (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 198)

In Fynes Moryson's description, the urge to travel is a deeply rooted yearning, not a simple act of rebellion against the suffocating influence of his father, or the confines of his bucolic upbringing in rural Lincolnshire. Whilst at Peterhouse, Fynes was free to act on this impulse, and in the summer of 1590 the college records show he was granted license to begin his lifetime of travels.

To officially leave the country, all travellers had to obtain written authorisation from the Privy Council, and the records of Peterhouse college show that the license was granted August 3, 1590, under the supervision of the master of Peterhouse, Robert Soames.<sup>40</sup> The license was witnessed by Moryson's closest companions at Peterhouse, John Mussenden and Thomas Moigne.<sup>41</sup> Mussenden was related to the Moryson family by marriage, and Moigne was a distant relative, the son of Moryson's mother's cousin, Francis Moigne.<sup>42</sup> The license gives Moryson 'leave to discontinue', or to abandon his studies and begin his intended travels.<sup>43</sup> Moryson notes that the 'priviledge of our Statutes permit two of the

---

<sup>40</sup> The document would note the period of absence granted, amount of money taken, size of entourage (tutors, servants and travelling companions) and places forbidden to travel. Andrew Hadfield, *Amazons, Savages and Machiavels-Travel and Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630: An Anthology* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2001), p. 12.

<sup>41</sup> Peterhouse Cambridge Archives, Peterhouse College Records, 3 August 1590, f. 377.

<sup>42</sup> It is likely that John Mussenden is related to the Francis Mussenden who marries Fynes' sister, Faith. There is very little biographical information for either figure. When Moryson begins his period of travel, Thomas Moigne is given power of attorney in his absence. See Hughes, p.xxi.

<sup>43</sup> Peterhouse, Cambridge, Archives, Peterhouse College Records, 3 August 1590, f. 377.

Society to travell' (*Itenerary*, Part 1, p. 1) and this provision came in the form of a small travel stipend of 50 shillings a year whilst he remained overseas.<sup>44</sup>

This small, seemingly insignificant annotation is in fact an important addition to Moryson's life history. The documented travel allowance was considerably smaller than previous biographers have assumed, estimated at twenty pounds a year.<sup>45</sup>

This raises the question of how Moryson's early travels were funded, given that he left the country in May 1591, a year and a half before his legacy was disbursed, and almost three years before the three hundred pounds bequeathed to him could have been accessed. In the *Itenerary*, Moryson contends that his travels cost him 'fifty or sixty pounds sterling yeerely', a significant sum.<sup>46</sup> Considering his father's opposition to his proposed venture, it is unlikely Fynes would have received financial support from home. Further, he contends later in the *Itenerary* that he uses his 'patrimony' to fund his second period of travels, not his first.<sup>47</sup>

The license may provide a hint, in that it is extended by a further year on January 17 1594 'in regarde of the travaile and servis in countries beyond ye seas'.<sup>48</sup> Again, this annotation provides a significant insight into Moryson's life at this time. He was not travelling the continent idly, a 'prototype Grand Tourist' as he has been represented, but instead engaged in the 'servis' of his nation.<sup>49</sup> Further, the term 'travaile' carries with it the trappings of its contemporary meaning, hard work and

---

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 377.

<sup>45</sup> The estimates of Kew and Hadfield are based on Moryson's own assertion within the *Itenerary* that his Fellowship had been worth twenty pounds a year. It is likely the discrepancy results from Moryson's inclusion of the cost of board and lodging in this calculation, See *Itenerary*, Part II, p. 84.

<sup>46</sup> *Itenerary*, Part III, p. 13.

<sup>47</sup> *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 198.

<sup>48</sup> Peterhouse, Cambridge, Archives, *Peterhouse College Records*, 17 January, 1594, f. 378.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 378

labour, suggesting that Moryson was working hard on the continent, providing an important, if unspecified, service.<sup>50</sup>

Who exactly he is serving is not specified, but given that his license is personally authorised by the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift, it is possible Fynes was doing his country some service, possibly in the transmission of intelligence from the continent.<sup>51</sup> Shortly after his license was extended, Moryson travelled to Rome in the Spring of 1594, where he proceeded to visit the English College and meet Cardinal Allen, the head of the English College.<sup>52</sup> The license was extended further in 1595 and 1599, giving Fynes eight years' grace to travel the continent.<sup>53</sup>

At the foot of the document, a small amendment to the terms of the travel allowance grants Moryson a dividend of five pounds, four shillings a year whilst he is resident in an Oxford College. Following his time at Cambridge, Moryson had

---

<sup>50</sup> For example, see the use of 'travail' in Northbrooke, John *A treatise wherein dicing, dauncing etc. are reprov'd 1577* (1579; Shaks. Soc. 1843) 'As Iob sayeth, a man is borne to trauel as the sparkes flee vpward' Oxford English Dictionary online, [http://0dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.urls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query\\_type=word&queryword=travail](http://0dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.urls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query_type=word&queryword=travail), accessed 05/12/08.

Further, Elizabeth Heale notes that at this time the distinction between 'travail' and 'travel' was not at all clear. Simply to risk one's life, and fortune in travelling involved a good deal of hard work, and was often contrasted with the 'effeminacy and sloth' of staying at home. To travel at all, and to transmit information about one's surroundings back to England, was to render a service. See *Travels and translations in the sixteenth century: selected papers from the Second International Conference of the Tudor Symposium*, Mike Pincombe (ed.), E. Heale; 'Travelling Abroad: The Poet as Adventurer' (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), p.3.

<sup>51</sup> It is possible Whitgift's involvement was a result of a previous affiliation with the college. Although later connected to Trinity, Whitgift did matriculate from Peterhouse, proceeding Fellow of the college in 1555. William Joseph Sheils, 'Whitgift, John (1530/31?-1604)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.urls.lon.ac.uk:80/view/article/29311>, accessed 4 Dec 2008.

<sup>52</sup> In the same journey, Fynes also managed to meet and 'interview' Cardinal Bellarmine, posing as an English Catholic. This will be covered more fully in the following section, *Travels 1591-1598*. See also *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 142.

<sup>53</sup> There is another extension on 27 October 1595, and a further extension until 4 September 1599. The second extension also records that Moryson's travel stipend is to be cut to 40 shillings. See Peterhouse Cambridge Archives, *Peterhouse College Records*, entries of 27 October 1595, and 4 September 1599, ff. 238 & 270.

proceeded to Oxford, intending to have his MA incorporated there.<sup>54</sup> Hughes in *Shakespeare's Europe* identifies Moryson's inclination towards the institution to be rooted in Oxford's greater fame upon the continent, citing his award of an *ad eundem* degree to be 'a purely University function'.<sup>55</sup> Although the award of the degree itself may have been a formality, Moryson may be assumed to have spent some time at the university, as he is in receipt of an allowance whilst resident there. This suggests that the award of the *ad eundem* degree was not in fact arbitrary, and that Moryson may have taken the time to further his studies whilst at Oxford. This is implied in Moryson's 'Address to the Reader' in the printed *Itinerary*, in which Moryson states that he pursued a holistic education after leaving Cambridge, basing himself at Oxford but travelling to London to 'follow some studies fit to inable' him to travel:

And presently leaving the University (Cambridge) I went to London, there to follow some studies fit to inable me in this course; and there better taught, and these studies, the visiting of my friends in the Country, my going to Oxford to take the same degree I had in Cambridge, and some oppositions upon new deliberation made by my father and friends against my journey, detained me longer in those parts then I purposed. (*Itinerary*, Part 1, p. 1)

The studies that Moryson describes in the *Itinerary* are intended to prepare him for his journey across Europe, enabling him to record and appreciate his travels 'into forraigne parts' (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 198). It is interesting, and perhaps significant that Moryson spent time at Oxford whilst seeking a practical travel

---

<sup>54</sup> Bennet's *Athenae* places Moryson at Oxford on March 22, 1590, when he had his MA 'incorporated' at an unspecified college. See Thomas Bennet, *Athenae Oxonienses, An exact History of all the Writers and Bishops who have had their education in the most famous University of Oxford* (London: Thomas Bennett, 1691), p. 765.

<sup>55</sup> Hughes, pp. iii-iv.

education. The university had a growing reputation as a centre of study associated with the practical application of the discipline of Geography. As early as 1576, the Earl of Cumberland proceeded to Oxford to study geography, with a specific interest in the 'ancient maps and divers papers' held by the University.<sup>56</sup>

During the years preceding Moryson's arrival, English geographical study was undergoing an abrupt transition. The discipline had been mired in classical tradition, adhering to a Ptolemaic understanding of world geography. However, with the 1553 translation of the Spanish *Arte of Navigation*, and the influx of 'real world' maps drawn by the likes of Mercator, Ortelius and Anthony Jenkinson a process of change was instigated. Once maps of approximate scale and navigational treatises appeared, the art of geography took on a practical, economic function as its use to merchants and traders became apparent.<sup>57</sup>

The writer and propagandist Richard Hakluyt was drawn to the university for this reason, interested in the dialogue between theorists of the new art of applied geography and travelers, and their rough-hewn, first hand accounts, which he recognised had great practical import. He culled his information from 'the chiefest captains at seas, the greatest merchants, and the best mariners of our nation: by which means having gotten somewhat more than common knowledge.'<sup>58</sup> Hakluyt disseminated this material in the form of innovative public orations, 'and in my public lectures was the first, that produced and showed both the old imperfectly

---

<sup>56</sup> George.B Parks, *Richard Hakluyt and The English Voyages* (New York: The American Geographical society, 1936), p. 67.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid. pp. 16-20.

<sup>58</sup> *Voyages and Discoveries, The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*, Jack Beeching (ed.) (London: Penguin, 1972), p. 26.

composed, and the new lately reformed maps, globes, spheres and other instruments of the art'.<sup>59</sup>

Oxford was the site of Hakluyt's public lectures, and it is possible Fynes may have been drawn to the university through its association with the travel anthologist. Hakluyt represented a key figure within the nascent genre of travel writing, and popularised a pragmatic, unadorned style grounded in fact.<sup>60</sup> This seems to resonate within Moryson's work, consciously composed with an emphasis on integrity: 'I professe not to write it to any curious wits' (*Itenerary*, 'Address to the Reader'). This aspect of his writing was highlighted by Thomas Fuller, amongst others, who noted in 1684 that Moryson 'printed his observations in a large book, which contains no stretched reports'.<sup>61</sup>

This unusual focus on fact, methodical documentation of travel expenses, distance travelled, available accommodation and even local environmental conditions detracts from the narrative flow of the *Itenerary*. Moryson is aware of this, and in the printed 'Address to the Reader' is driven to apologise, or account for the flat style and excess of practical information which burdens the first part to the work:

Of the First Part of this Worke, it containes only a briefe narration of daily journies, with the rates of Coaches or Horses hired, the expences for horses....which Treatise in some obscure places is barren and unpleasant (*Itenerary*, 'Address to the Reader')

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid. p. 26.

<sup>60</sup> N.E Osselton, 'Hakluyt's Language', in *The Hakluyt Handbook*, D.B Quinn (ed.) (London: Hakluyt Society, 1974), p. 26.

<sup>61</sup> Thomas Fuller, *English Worthies in Church and State, Alphabetically digested into the severall shires and countries therein contained* (London: William Thackeray 1684), p. 466.

Although conscious of the detrimental effect of his factual interpolations, Moryson does not attempt to suppress them, and peppers his text with rates, measurements and even a novel exchange table.<sup>62</sup> He relates his experiences in a functional, accessible way, so that they might have a direct, practical application. His relation of the length and cost of journeys is of no interest to the casual reader, but may prove vital for the dedicated traveller. This desire to document and record information which may be of utility to travellers is perhaps informed by the Oxford movement and in his work he becomes an advocate of the new art of practical geography. The *Itinerary*, for all its stylistic failings, remains 'the most comprehensive account of early modern Europe' by a contemporary author.<sup>63</sup> It is not the result of a fleeting interest in travel, or the fruits of a youthful rebellion, but a calling for which Fynes Moryson prepared as assiduously as any profession. After leaving Peterhouse, the program of study Moryson embarked on was designed to prepare him for his European travels, and for the eventual publication of his memoirs in the form of the *Itinerary*.

---

<sup>62</sup> For a discussion of Moryson's worth to the economic historian, see E. H. Thompson, 'Elizabethan economic analysis: Fynes Moryson's account of the economics of Europe', *History of Economic Ideas*, 3/1 (1995), pp. 1-25.

<sup>63</sup> Andrew Hadfield, *Amazons, Savages and Machiavels, An Anthology of Travel and Colonial Writing in England, 1550-1630* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001) p.81.

## Travels 1591-1599

On 1 May 1591, Fynes Moryson set sail for the continent, leaving England for the first time and beginning the series of travels that defined his life, and provided the foundation for his principal legacy, the *Itinerary*. While Moryson confirms he left the country at this date, there is no other independent evidence to verify his claim. He does not provide the name of the ship he travelled on, his exact destination, names of his travelling companions or any other data of possible utility to the biographer. In modern biographies, this date has been taken from the *Itinerary*. Indeed, all the evidence for Moryson's travels and life history in the years 1591-1600 comes directly from the pages of the *Itinerary*. Peterhouse College Records confirm that Moryson was granted license to travel on August 30, 1590, with periodic extensions to the terms of the document giving him leave to travel until May 1599.<sup>1</sup> However, other than the College records, there is no other information for this period, other than what Moryson recounts in the pages of the *Itinerary*.

Although the biographer has no other recourse than the *Itinerary* for these missing years, it is important to treat the work as a literary construction, and not an accurate representation of Moryson's life, duties and movements at this time. As Moryson was employed in the 'servis' of his nation at the time, it would not be in his interests to disclose exactly and candidly what he was doing on the continent during his two periods of travel. Further, as Moryson himself notes in his 'Address to the Reader', the *Itinerary* went through 'divers copies' before it was first committed to print, suggesting a long and involved editing process,

---

<sup>1</sup> Peterhouse, Cambridge, Archives, *Peterhouse College Records*, 3 August 1590, f. 377.

evidenced by the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* which is to be studied in part two of the thesis. Many biographers have attempted to circumvent this by presenting the *Itenerary* as a reliable, factual text, which Moryson produced directly from his original travel diaries, or journals.<sup>2</sup> Whilst the *Itenerary* itself supports this opinion, there is no independent evidence in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* to corroborate it. The *Itenerary*, therefore, should be recognised as an important biographical source text, but one permeated by Moryson's narrative designs.

While it is important to recognise Moryson's narrative conceit, many of the observations in the *Itenerary* are instructive, and can be used to reconstruct elements of Moryson's travels. His desire to represent the text as factual and verifiable is further evident when, at a number of points, he recounts how his travels were recorded. He specifically refers to early modern writing technologies which could be used to document travel events. He carries what he terms a 'stemme-booke' (*Itenerary*, Part I, p. 38) used to record the sayings of famous theologians and thinkers.<sup>3</sup> In addition, Moryson is familiar with 'writing tables' (*Itenerary*, Part 1, p. 21) which he encounters whilst travelling in Ulm, a city famed for their production.<sup>4</sup> The writing tables Moryson mentions are perhaps similar to the 'tables' described in *Hamlet*, wax treated paper bound into portable (quarto or smaller) notebooks.<sup>5</sup> The advantage of this method of annotation is that the writing tables were designed to be erasable, and were written with a stylus. These

---

<sup>2</sup> Hughes, xxxvii.

<sup>3</sup> For example, Moryson is keen to record the words of the theologian Theodore Beza. This is partially intended as an antidote to his meeting with Bellarmine. See *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 18.

<sup>4</sup> 'The writing tables, made in this City, are famous for their goodnesse, and are thence carried into forraine parts', *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 21.

<sup>5</sup> William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, 1:5, 95-104, The Norton Shakespeare, Stephen Greenblatt (ed.) (Norton & Company: London, 2005), p. 1714. This reading is informed by the following: Peter Stallybrass, Roger Chartier, J. Franklin Mowery, Heather Wolfe, 'Hamlet's Tables and the Technologies of Writing in Renaissance England', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 55.4 (The Folger Shakespeare Library: Washington, 2004), pp. 379-419.

‘writing tables’ would have been of great utility to a prospective travel writer, and it is probable that Moryson recorded his thoughts and opinions in the pages of one of these devices.<sup>6</sup>

This concern with keeping accurate records and amassing information is fully presented in the third part of the *Itinerary*, in which Moryson details a number of precepts for travel. Amongst other things, his instructions detail how a traveller should record his journey:

Let him write these notes each day, at morne and at even in his Inne within writing Tables carried about him, and after at leisure into a paper booke, that many yeers after he may looke over them at his pleasure. But great caution must be had, especially in places of danger, how he carry about him these papers, the subject whereof, cannot but in many places be offensive and perhaps dangerous, if once upon suspition he chance to bee searched. Therefore as he sends his bookes and heavy things for carriage, halfe yeerely, either into his owne Country, or to some place in the way by which hee is to returne, there to bee kept for him, so hee shall doe well to send these paper bookes therewith. And for abundant caution, lest any thing he notes by the way, should in any place upon mischance prejudice him, he shall doe well to write such things in Ciphers and unknowne characters, being also ready to give a fained interpretation of them to any Magistrate, if neede be. (*Itinerary*, Part III, p. 12)

---

<sup>6</sup>In his precepts for travel, Moryson recommends travellers carry a ‘writing table’ with them at all times, which may be used to record on the spot thoughts and opinions. Moryson suggests the traveller send completed tables back ‘into his owne country’. However, Moryson twice refers to the writing tables as ‘papers’, or ‘paper bookes’, so it is unclear whether the tables he discusses take the form of the wax tablets discussed in ‘Hamlet’s Tables and the Technologies of Writing in Renaissance England’. It is possible he refers to wax treated papers, which would be erasable, and also have great utility to travellers as presumably they would be waterproof. See *Itinerary*, Part III, p. 12.

Moryson's description is fascinating, particularly as it gives an indication of the original source material for the *Itinerary*. First, 'notes' are made, either written up each day in the morning, or taken down whilst travelling, in the portable 'writing Tables'. The notes are then transcribed into a paper book, no doubt waxed and bound to prevent damage and inhibit damp.<sup>7</sup> Moryson recommends that any papers or journals are carried discreetly, and then transported to England twice a year. Moryson is keen to warn prospective travellers that they must display both 'great' and 'abundant' caution when keeping notes, lest it 'prejudice' him in the eyes of the authorities. To this end, he recommends that travellers not only write their observations in cipher, but also equivocate when questioned, being ready to give a 'fained interpretation' to any magistrate.

Again however, whilst it is possible to delve into Moryson's narrative to retrieve fragments of information which may help reconstruct his actual travel experience, his desire to present in detail how exactly he composed the *Itinerary* suggests that he was attempting to inform the reader's opinion. In his 'Address to the Reader', for example, he contends that the text is hurriedly translated and debased by his personal involvement:

To save expences, I wrote the greatest part with my owne hand....and withall remember, that the worke is first written in Latine, then translated into English....and that in divers Copies, no man being able by the first Copie to put so large a worke in good fashion. (*Itinerary*, 'Address to the Reader')

---

<sup>7</sup> Many of the sections of BL. Add. MS. 36706, 'Fynes Moryson's Itinerary in Ireland' appear to be blotted, and may have been exposed to water or otherwise damaged through travelling with Moryson whilst he was on campaign. Further, letters inserted into the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* seem to have been transcribed on to vellum, which would reduce the chance of environmental damage.

This suggestion is echoed by other apologies, or explanations of stylistic choices in the text. 'I professe not to write it to any curious wits, who can indure nothing but extractions and quintessences' (*Itenerary*, Part I, 'Address to the Reader'). This refrain suggests that Moryson made a conscious choice to represent his text as pragmatic, methodical, and above all, verifiable and honest. This concern with accuracy and truth may have represented a means of distinguishing himself from other contemporary travel writers. Compare the two preceding excerpts from Moryson's 'Address to the Reader' to Coryat's *Epistle To The Reader* in the 1611 printing of the *Crudities*:

I was plunged in an ocean of doubts, whether it were best that my observations gathered in forraine countries should be continually confined within the bounds of my poor studie....but at length post varias cogitationum fluctuationes...[I] determined to expose the abortive fruits of my travels to the sight of the world (after they had for the space of two yeares lurked in a kind of Cimmerian darkenesse).<sup>8</sup>

Coryat was an active self publicist, allowing himself, and his travels to be ridiculed in order to draw attention to himself.<sup>9</sup> In addition, his work, the *Crudities*, was accompanied by panegyric verses, affecting to take the form of a eulogy but in reality savagely satirising the author.<sup>10</sup> In the wake of its publication, the genre of

---

<sup>8</sup> Thomas Coryat, *Coryats Crudities; Hastily gobled vp in five Moneths trauels in France, Sauoy, Italy, Rhetia commonly called the Grisons country, Heluetia aliàs Switzerland, some parts of high Germany, and the Netherlands; newly digested in the hungry aire of Odcombe in the county of Somerset, & now dispersed to the nourishment of the traouelling members of this kingdome* (William Stansby: London, 1611.), Sig. B2 r-v.

<sup>9</sup> See Michael Strachan, 'Coryate, Thomas (1577?–1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Oct 2006, <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.urls.lon.ac.uk:80/view/article/6364>, accessed 4 Dec 2008.

<sup>10</sup> The original printing of the *Crudities* was prefaced by 150 quarto pages of satirical verses. See Thomas Coryat, *Coryats Crudities; Hastily gobled vp in five Moneths trauels in France, Sauoy, Italy, Rhetia commonly called the Grisons country, Heluetia aliàs Switzerland, some parts of high Germany, and the Netherlands; newly digested in the*

travel writing was damaged by Coryat, who was himself considered to be a fool and a fantasist. Moryson seems to have been aware of the inimical influence of Coryat and other similar writers such as Lithgow, and at points in the *Itenerary* expresses anger at this genre of travel writing. For example, he speaks of travels undertaken by ‘bankerouts, and men of base condition’, and later suggests that these journeys have brought travel itself into disrepute, stating that these ‘ridiculous adventurers’ differ little from ‘self-murtherers in undertaking desperate actions for gaine’ (*Itenerary*, Part I, pp. 198-200). This uncharacteristic vitriol suggests that Moryson regarded travellers like Coryat, and texts such as the *Crudities* as unwelcome. It is possible that Moryson was forced to respond to audience preconception by adopting a sober, methodical style, and backing up assertions with reference to sources. This allows him to position himself within the genre, away from trivial works written to entertain, such as the *Crudities*.

At this time, travel writing was still an embryonic genre, and as a result intensely ‘self conscious’.<sup>11</sup> Although the *Itenerary* has been construed as a simple, direct record of events, it was imperative for Moryson to construct his work in this way, to allow his work to flourish within the bounds of a constricted, and post-Coryate tainted, genre. In reality, the *Itenerary* is a highly constructed narrative that has little to do with the immediate recording and documenting of events. In part one of the *Itenerary*, one of the first narrative events readers are exposed to is an attack upon Fynes Moryson’s merchant convoy by a flotilla of Dunkirk Pirates:

---

*hungry aire of Odcombe in the county of Somerset, & now dispersed to the nourishment of the traouelling members of this kingdome* (William Stansby: London, 1611.) The verses proved so popular they were re-printed independently, in the following: *The Odcombian Banquet: dished foorth by Thomas the Coriat, and serued in by a number of noble wits in prayse of his Crudities and Crambe too* (Thomas Thorp: London, 1611).

<sup>11</sup>George B Parks, *Tudor Travel Literature; A Brief History*, in *The Hakluyt Handbook*, David B. Quinn, (ed.) (London: Hakluyt Society, 1974), p. 97.

Thence we set saile into the maine, and the eight day of our sailing, the Merchants Fleet of sixteene ships being dispersed by a fogge and tempest, two *Dunkerke* Pirats followed our ship, till (by Gods mercy) the fog being cleared after some few houres, and two of our ships upon our discharging of a great Peece drawing towards us, the Pirates despairing left to pursue us. That they were Pirates was apparant, since as wee for triall turned our sayles, they likewise fitted themselves to our course so as wee though flying, yet prepared our selves to fight till God thus delivered us....and not daring to enter the River Elbe before the next morning, we fell upon an Island called the Holy-Land (vulgarly *Heiligland*).<sup>12</sup> (*Itenerary*, Part I, p. 2)

Although the account appears to resonate with fear and a sense of immediate threat as the ship is stalked through the fog by the pirate vessel, if read closely it becomes apparent the account is heavily worked.<sup>13</sup> Moryson foregrounds the importance of providence in the survival of the ship, making two references to ‘God’ and noting that the Island at which the ship took harbour was known as Heiligland, which he translates as ‘Holy Land’. In addition, Moryson is reticent when it comes to determining the identity of the pirate vessels, contending ‘that they were Pirates was apparant, since as wee for triall turned our sayles, they likewise fitted themselves to our course’. Moryson’s interjection provides little evidence to advance this suggestion, and it is questionable whether the craft in

---

<sup>12</sup> The ‘maine’ contemporary shorthand for main sea. It is used in this context in a parallel text, Robert Johnson’s *Botero’s (G.) The worlde, or an historicall description of the most famous kingdomes and commonweales therein* tr. I. R. 1601. Oxford English Dictionary online, [http://0-dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query\\_type=word&queryword=main](http://0-dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query_type=word&queryword=main), accessed 05/12/08.

<sup>13</sup> This section is analysed in detail in Case Study 2.

question was a pirate vessel at all.<sup>14</sup> In the wake of the storm, the unidentified craft may have been part of the convoy, or other ships scattered and disorientated in the congested waters of the Channel.<sup>15</sup>

Although it is possible there was a real threat of attack, Moryson has foregrounded this event by positioning it at the beginning of the work. The pirate attack is the very first narrative 'event' in the first part of the *Itinerary*. Moryson is considering the anticipated audience, and shaping his narrative accordingly. He is travelling in the company of a 'merchant fleet' (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 1) as he leaves the Thames and enters the channel, skirting the North Sea to make landfall at the isle of Heiligland. The Island Moryson describes guards the entrance to the River Elbe, a waterway which allowed English merchants shipping access to Hamburg, and the German markets. It is most likely Moryson was aboard a merchant vessel as it represented the most expedient, economic, and secure means of travelling to the continent. Moryson's interaction with merchants and traders is worth considering, as it may also help explain the exposition of so much dull and seemingly trivial detail in the first part to the *Itinerary*. Moryson is aware that this information detracts from the flow and readability of the narrative, and although he apologises for it in his 'Address to the Reader' there is no real justification for his choice of content.

This focus on the economic pragmatics of travel is a strong feature of the first volume of the *Itinerary*, and has been commented on by modern scholars. In 'Elizabethan Economic Analysis', Edward H Thompson makes a study of Moryson's

---

<sup>14</sup> However, Dunkirk Pirates did represent a real threat to shipping at this time. Hence their mention in Karl P. Wentersdorf, 'Hamlet's Encounter With the Pirates', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Winter, 1983), pp. 434-440, p. 435.

<sup>15</sup> Further suspicions about this passage are raised when examining the parallel text in f.13v of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, as this section is written in the form of a marginal insertion.

record of exchange rates, tolls and relative commodity values in different European states.<sup>16</sup> Although Thompson takes his data from the *Itinerary*, and lauds Moryson as an economically astute writer, the structure of his study does not allow for investigation of how Moryson is able to present this data, and why it is such a feature of his work. There are perhaps two ways of approaching the presentation of this information.

Almost all the journeys Fynes Moryson undertakes are made in the company of merchants and traders as they journey between centres of economic activity.<sup>17</sup> In his letter to Francis Markham, he describes his travelling companions as he leaves Frankfurt 'I had for companions of my journey two Flemmings, poore Merchants of Linnen cloth, and a Dutch Rider, and a Booke-binder of Denmarke' (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 36). It is possible that the data is the result of Moryson's constant, close association with European merchants, and comes to permeate the text as an intrinsic feature of the everyday life of his travels, the minutiae of thousands of business conversations and encounters.

However, it is also possible that the prominence of economic matters in the text is a deliberate choice, influenced by Moryson's perception of his anticipated audience. The 'linnen cloth' Moryson describes was the key to English mercantile interaction with the continent in this period, and most likely represented the cargo of the fleet Moryson accompanied to Hegiland. Exports of wool provided the

---

<sup>16</sup> E. H. Thompson, 'Elizabethan economic analysis: Fynes Moryson's account of the economics of Europe', *History of Economic Ideas*, 3/1 (1995) pp. 1-25, p.1.

<sup>17</sup> Moryson is often reluctant to disclose any details about his companions, but when he does mention them they are often identified as 'merchants' or engaged in mercantile activity. Trade represented the primary reason for travel in this era; only those identified as merchants could leave the country without a travel license. Further, 'merchants' is one of the most frequently used nouns in the *Itinerary*, occurring 98 times in the first part alone.

staples of the English export market for centuries, and the vast majority of this trade was carried out with the Northern German states, and the Low Countries.<sup>18</sup>

Moryson travelled extensively in Germany and the Low Countries, returning twice to each area. The economic regions through which Moryson first travelled represented the sole focus of English trade in the late Elizabethan era. Following the collapse of England's Baltic trade with Russia in the late sixteenth century, the overwhelming majority of English mercantile transactions involved Dutch and German shipping.<sup>19</sup> In 1579, over 90% of England's entire exports were channelled through Antwerp and consequently disseminated through Germany and the Low Countries.<sup>20</sup> Moryson was aware of this, and it is possible the focus on trade in the first volume of the *Itinerary* is a result of this national fixation, an attempt to provide useful information to the hundreds of British traders travelling to the region. Indeed, the *Itinerary* has been received as a 'guidebook', specifically designed to guide and instruct prospective travellers.<sup>21</sup>

Even if the *Itinerary* was not intended as a literal guide to merchant travellers in the region, Moryson was intensely aware of the importance of the area to British policy. In a nation which defined itself on the European stage in terms of trade, control of, and access to the markets of the Protestant lowlands was essential.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> 'Elizabethan exports consisted almost exclusively of cloth', Lawrence Stone, 'Elizabethan Overseas Trade', *The Economic History Review*, New Series, Vol. 2, No. 1 (1949), pp. 30-58, p. 37.

<sup>19</sup> George.B Parks, *Richard Hakluyt and The English Voyages* (New York: The American Geographical society, 1936), p. 61.

<sup>20</sup> John Munro, 'Patterns of Trade, Money and Credit', in *The Handbook of European History 1400-1600*, Heiko Oberman and James Tracy (ed.) (E.J Brill: New York, 1994), p. 160.

<sup>21</sup> See Efterpi Misi, 'Painful Pilgrimages: Sixteenth Century Travellers to Greece' in *Travels and translations in the sixteenth century: selected papers from the Second International Conference of the Tudor Symposium*, Mike Pincombe (ed.) (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), p. 24.

<sup>22</sup> Rather than in terms of tyranny and conquest. Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992), p. 185.

The *Itinerary* is an economically aware text, and draws attention to the Spanish threat to English trade in this region. Moryson makes careful notes of the fortifications of Stode, Hamburg and other coastal German cities, with evident concern that the conflict in the Netherlands could spill out to engulf the English 'seat of trafficke' (*Itinerary*, Part I, p.1) in Friesland.

Moryson has a specific concern with the actions of Spanish irregular mercenaries in the Low Countries, a group he defines as 'Freebooters'. It is possible one element of this concern takes its foundation from the negative effect the depredations of the freebooters had on local trade. Writing of Emden, Moryson notes that 'these Free-booters...lie in the country, and spoyle the merchants of that city' (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 40). Whilst the term 'Freebooter' now has another sense, the etymology of the word derives from the German *freibute*, or free exchange. Moryson had fluent German, and seems to apply the term in the local context; that is to denote those who would affect a free exchange, or trade without tariff or reference to the laws of the locality.<sup>23</sup>

Although sensitive to the concerns of English traders throughout his work, the actions of the freebooters open up another element of the *Itinerary* to study: the physical method of Moryson's travel, and the purpose behind it. When describing the threat posed by the freebooters, Moryson highlights the direct threat to himself, as a lone traveller: 'The Chiefe Captaine of the Free-booters then lying at Aurick was Hans Jacob, a notable roge, and very malicious to the English' (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 40). Travel through early modern Europe was both dangerous,

---

<sup>23</sup> The word takes its foundation in the German *Freibute*, although it does seem to have had an early appellation as a pillage, pirate, or plunderer. Oxford English Dictionary online, [http://0-dictionary.oed.com/catalogue.urls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query\\_type=word&queryword=freebooter](http://0-dictionary.oed.com/catalogue.urls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query_type=word&queryword=freebooter), accessed 05/12/08.

and arduous. Although the threat of robbery or attack existed when travelling in lawless or disputed regions, travellers also exposed themselves to disease, and environmental conditions outside the expected parameters of experience. Upon leaving Emden, Moryson and his travelling companions were forced to travel on foot to the nearby village of Aldernsea. Although the distance between Emden and Aldernsea was only a single Dutch mile, the journey took an entire day, as Moryson and his fellow travellers were forced to drag themselves through cloying mud, amidst heavy rainfall:

Within a while, my selfe was wet to the skinne, and my shoes at every step, were almost torne off, so as I was forced to binde them on with foure points (*Itenerary*, Part I, p.40).<sup>24</sup>

The difficulty of travelling in winter, or in inclement weather forced Moryson to base himself in various European cities at the close of every year. During his first period of travel, Moryson wintered at Leipzig, Leiden, Padua and Venice.

Spending months at various cities hundreds of miles apart allowed Moryson to immerse himself in local culture, becoming more a writer in residence than a transient observer. Whilst embedded in host cities, Moryson actively attempted to learn the local tongue. Contemporary travellers, such as Thomas Coryate, relied on their command of the classic languages to facilitate their continental journeys.<sup>25</sup> A familiarity with a broad spectrum of European languages was not usually seen as a prerequisite to travel, but Moryson differs, learning (by his own admission)

---

<sup>24</sup> According to Moryson in his *Itenerary*, one Dutch mile equates to four English. *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 68.

<sup>25</sup> Michael Strachan, 'Coryate, Thomas (1577?–1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Oct 2006, <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk:80/view/article/6364>, accessed 4 Dec 2008.

French, Spanish, German and Italian, plus conversational Dutch.<sup>26</sup> Moryson specifically deviated towards Leipzig to learn a pure form of German, the 'Misen' speech:

I spent this winter at Leipzig, that I might there learne to speake the Dutch tounge (the Grammer wherof I had read at Wittenberg,) because the Misen speech was held the purest of all other parts in Germany. (*Itenerary*, Part I, p. 6)

Moryson mentions studying the rudimentary elements of German grammar whilst at Wittenberg, and a fascinating echo of this language study is still preserved within the pages of a Lutheran Bible held by Peterhouse College library, presented by Moryson to the fellows of the institution in 1612.<sup>27</sup> The work is a contemporary German edition, dated to 1589.<sup>28</sup> Moryson was in Wittenberg shortly after, and it is possible he purchased it whilst in the city, where he researched Luther's life history.<sup>29</sup> In a number of pages of the work, marginal annotations have been made in Moryson's hand in both Latin and English. The English addenda clearly represent an intellectual response to the work, with interjections such as

---

<sup>26</sup> 'He learned German (At Wittenberg, Leipzig, and Heidelberg), Italian (at Padua, Venice and Florence), Dutch (at Leiden), and French, and was fluent in Latin', E. H. Thompson, *'Elizabethan economic analysis: Fynes Moryson's account of the economics of Europe'*, *History of Economic Ideas*, 3/1 (1995), pp. 1-25, p. 2. Thompson overlooks the second part to the *Itenerary*, in which Moryson translates a letter from Spanish. 'And this day his Lordship intercepted this following letter, which he commanded me to translate out of Spanish into English.' *Itenerary*, Part II, p.174. It has also been contended that Moryson had a working knowledge of Gaelic. See Patricia Palmer, *Language and conquest in early modern Ireland: English Renaissance literature and Imperial expansion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 68.

<sup>27</sup> Listed in Peterhouse College Sale Catalogue, *Donations of Books to Peterhouse*, Scott Mandelbrote (ed.) Cambridge: Peterhouse, 2007) listed as lot 20, *Biblia Das ist die gantz Heilige Schrifft*, Translated by Martin Luther, Wittenberg: Charles Lehn, 1589. The date of the bequest is 23rd March 1612-suggesting Moryson was in England then.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, Lot 20.

<sup>29</sup> Moryson had a lifelong fascination with Luther, and the 'reformed religion' and spends a good deal of time reconstructing Luther's life history in Wittenberg in 1592. See *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 7.

'hypocritical' and 'radical'.<sup>30</sup> The Latin terms however, seem to have been inserted for a different purpose, possibly an attempt at translation. For example, the German word 'wode' or woods has been underlined, and directly facing it in the margin the Latin term 'sylvae' has been written. These attempts at translation seem to be a practical manifestation of Fynes Moryson's intellectual development, as he attempted to blend into the local environment.

Moryson's attempts to familiarise himself with local tongues in both written and spoken form suggest a deep interest in the host culture. The *Itinerary* does not read as the mere record of passing observations, but as the relation of direct experience, a form of depth study, or what Charles Hughes calls a 'sociological survey'.<sup>31</sup> Although the *Itinerary* is perhaps not so considered, or empirically structured, Moryson does go far further than other contemporary travellers in attempts to ingratiate himself with local populations. A particular facet of Moryson's travels is his recourse to, and fascination with disguise. When travelling outside areas administered or patrolled by the English garrisons in the Low Countries, Moryson would travel in disguise as a Bohemian servant. Similarly, Moryson adopted the guise of a Pole when travelling in Civil War France, and a Scottish Catholic or Frenchman when in Rome or other Catholic states.<sup>32</sup>

Moryson's range of disguises have a practical function, in facilitating travel through regions of Europe in which English travellers might face persecution, imprisonment or death. However, Moryson's recourse to costume seems to have had another function, important to the construction of the *Itinerary*.

---

<sup>30</sup> *Biblia Das ist die gantze Heilige Schrifft*, Translated by Martin Luther (Wittenberg: Charios Lehn, 1589), Sig. Aar.

<sup>31</sup> Hughes, p. iii.

<sup>32</sup> Thompson.

When travelling in disguise, Moryson not only loses his vulnerability to persecution, but also his identity as an Englishman. Without this cultural self-identification, Moryson is free to use his interaction with other members of the local populace to explore his own culture. Whilst travelling in the vicinity of Bremen, Moryson has a sufficiently compelling disguise, and adequate command of German, to pass himself off as a 'poor Bawre' (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 38) or peasant. Moryson immerses himself deeply in this role, taking the societal role of a peasant and submitting himself to humiliation and indignity to maintain the image:

The waggoner taking me thus disguised (as formerly I have said) for a poore Bawre; deceived said these words to me in Dutch: Du knecht hilff zu tragen die packe hye: that is Ho good fellow, helpe here to carry this pack; I answered, ya gar gern, yea most willingly; and smiling laied my shoulder to the burthen, and groned deeply, but helped him very little...one of my companions after supper, having streight boots, when I had taught him to pull off one by the helpe of a staffe, for recompence of my counsell, desired mee to pull off the other, which being disguised as I was, I could not well refuse. (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 38)

Although Moryson has surrendered his status as an English gentleman, and the bearing and social mobility this affords, he has the freedom within his role to explore the local perception of the English, and indeed Englishness. Initially Fynes limits himself to recording and assessing allusions to English culture:

By the way my companions fell in talke of English affaires, so foolishly, as my laughter, though restrained, had often betraied me; if twilight had not kept mee from being seene. Their ignorance greatly shortned my way, with the

pleasure I took in their answeres to some such questions propounded by me, whereof my selfe had many times beene forced to give an account to others. (*Itenerary*, Part I, p.38)

Moryson proposes questions, or topics of conversation to his travelling companions, that he himself has been asked as an Englishman, a foreigner travelling abroad. Moryson inverts the accepted procedure in order to perceive in context answers he himself has been forced to give. This becomes a form of self-assessment. Through the answers of his German companions Moryson is able to discern how the English are perceived, his own personal representation, and his own standing, and vulnerability, as an Englishman. Moryson's ability to blend into a diverse range of cultures, to adopt not just the dress but the mannerisms and even the tongue of the host population allowed him the freedom to travel at will across the continent, and to explore and interact with host cultures. This particular facet of his identity has not yet been fully explored, and represents a promising avenue for further research.<sup>33</sup>

This ability to travel unhindered in disguise, and to assimilate information from host populations, may have had some utility to the noble factions at court interested in receiving information from the continent. Intelligence work in the early modern era 'necessitated an easy familiarity with the language, and culture of continental Europe', and from what may be discerned from the pages of the *Itenerary*, Moryson was furnished with a range of skills and abilities that would

---

<sup>33</sup> In her paper 'Representing Rome and the Self in Anthony Munday's *The English Roman Life*', Melanie Ord contends that Munday's ability to 'role play', in combination with his second hand reports of anti-English, anti-Elizabethan speeches may have served as a form of advertisement for his suitability as an intelligence operative. It is possible Moryson's record of his discretion and ability to pass unnoticed fulfil a similar function. See *Travels and translations in the sixteenth century: selected papers from the Second International Conference of the Tudor Symposium*, Mike Pincombe (ed.) (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 48-49.

have enabled him to succeed in this function.<sup>34</sup> In Rome, he disguised himself as an Italian, adopting the manners and bearing of a French Catholic to gain an audience with Cardinal Bellarmine, a Jesuit scholar and avowed enemy of the reformed religion.<sup>35</sup>

I followed him into the Colledge (being attired like an Italian and carefull not to use any strange gestures...I told him that I was a Frenchman and came to Rome for performance of some religious vowes, and to see the monuments, especially those which were living, and among them himselfe most especially, earnestly intreating, to the end I might from his side returne better instructed into my Country, that he would admit me at vacant houres to enjoy his graue conversation. (*Itenerary*, Part I, p. 142)

Moryson was taking a huge risk in personally approaching Bellarmine. He was able to survive the encounter and even converse directly with the cardinal, by virtue not of his disguise, or theatrical ability, but linguistic confidence; 'to see the monuments, especially those which were living'. This superior command of language, in conjunction with his naturally circumspect, taciturn nature, intellectual aptitude and observation ability made Moryson a superb candidate for intelligence work.<sup>36</sup>

Early modern intelligencers had a very different function to the modern perception of the agent, or spy. In the late Elizabethan era, English interests on the continent were opposed by Spain, and other Catholic states. With no diplomatic

---

<sup>34</sup>Robert W. Maslen, *Elizabethan Fictions-Espionage, Counter-Espionage and the duplicity of fiction in the Elizabethan Prose Narrative* (Clarendon Press: London, 1997), p. 10.

<sup>35</sup>For a discussion of Bellarmine's contemporary English perception, see Robert W. Richgels, 'The Pattern of Controversy in a Counter-Reformation Classic: The Controversies of Robert Bellarmine', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 2, Catholic Reformation (Summer, 1980), pp. 3-15.

<sup>36</sup>In addition to his linguistic ability, and aptitude for disguise, Moryson was able to both write and decipher ciphered documents. See *Itenerary*, Part III, p. 13.

representation in these countries, or in many other European states, the government relied on the reports of intelligencers to formulate foreign policy.<sup>37</sup> For example, in July 1591, William Cecil, Lord Burghley, employed John Mowbray to travel to Flushing, Antwerp and Brussels ‘to write what news comes out of Spaine, or what was done in those parts, and sometimes to tell the Queen who are the intelligencers from England and Spain’.<sup>38</sup> Although Mowbray had a counter-intelligence function, to assess the reports provided by other intelligence operatives in the region, and their respective loyalties, he was also instructed to provide information concerning ‘what was done in those parts’.

This form of practical information, in reality news or current affairs, was collected by intelligencers, young travellers such as Moryson.<sup>39</sup> Kew notes that Moryson ‘had a potential use as an expert or informer for the country should the need arise’, gathering information regarding ‘warfare, arsenals, castles, armies and fleets assiduously’.<sup>40</sup> Moryson’s travels in the Low Countries have been labelled ‘bewildering’ but it is likely his erratic pattern of movements through the disputed states corresponded to the demands of intelligence work.<sup>41</sup>

Of course, just because Moryson was able to travel unobserved, and gather useful data, did not necessarily mean he transmitted intelligence reports back to England. It is difficult to verify exactly whether Fynes was involved in this murky and shifting world, as early modern intelligence work was ‘an obscure field in the

---

<sup>37</sup> Paul E.J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Essex, 1585-97* (Cambridge University Press: London, 1999), p. 153.

<sup>38</sup> Curtis Bright, *Surveillance, Militarism and Drama in the Elizabethan Era* (Macmillan Press: London, 1996), p. 151.

<sup>39</sup> Paul E.J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Essex, 1585-97* (Cambridge University Press: London, 1999), p. 153.

<sup>40</sup> Kew, p. lxxiv.

<sup>41</sup> Penrose Bois, *The Urbane Traveller, 1591-1635* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1942), p. 37.

culture of patronage', and not centrally organised or administered.<sup>42</sup> Rather than being paid a set wage or officially employed, young gentry involved in intelligence work would instead be cleared of their debts, and given money to facilitate their intended travel.<sup>43</sup> This means of reimbursement is interesting, as there is no record in the *Itinerary* of exactly how Moryson's first period of travel was financed.

In his second period of travel, setting out with his brother Henry on 29 November 1594, Moryson invested £300 of the money released from his patrimony to fund this period of travel, which in the end lasted less than three years.<sup>44</sup> Yet, in his first period of travel, Moryson contends he had sufficient capital to furnish himself with all necessaries, and even extend loans to fellow travellers:

And I, who in my long journey had never wanted money, but had rather furnished others that wanted with no small sums (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 195)

Moryson writes in spring 1594, in the last two months of his travel. At this point he had been on the continent for three years, with no obvious means of funding. It is difficult to see how Moryson could have realised his travel ambitions without some independent means of support. It is possible, though not certain, that Moryson may have received funding through an affiliation, or personal connection, to the patronage network of the Earl of Essex.

In the power vacuum following the death of the secretary of state, Sir Francis Walsingham, in 1591, the earl of Essex began to create an intelligence network, designed to challenge the influence and predominance of the faction opposed to

---

<sup>42</sup> John Michael Archer, *Sovereignty and Intelligence: Spying and Court Culture in the English Renaissance* (Stanford University Press: California, 1993), p. 41.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid*, p. 72.

<sup>44</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 198.

his interests at Court, the Cecils. Essex received ‘encouragement’ from Elizabeth in this aim, and began to aggressively recruit intelligence operatives and agents.<sup>45</sup> It is known that the Earl of Essex sponsored the ‘inablyinge’, or intellectual development of young men destined to travel and transmit information back from the continent, and Moryson was ideally positioned to do so.<sup>46</sup>

Further, the name of Essex, and his close associates, frequently intersects with the life history, career and writing of Fynes Moryson. As previously noted, Moryson met Francis Markham whilst travelling in Germany. Markham was a soldier and traveller whose association with Essex crossed his career, and he followed the Earl into Ireland in 1599.<sup>47</sup> Markham also served in the English garrison at Flushing, commanded by Sir Robert Sidney, who was closely associated with Essex, linked to the Earl by marriage.<sup>48</sup> Moryson was invited to stay with Sidney while visiting Flushing in 1592. As Garrison commander in the city, Sidney would have been the natural point of contact, and conveyance for intelligence reports to England, and Moryson the natural font of such information, as he travelled extensively in the surrounding, contested areas of the Spanish Netherlands.

In Paris, Moryson met the exiled Danvers brothers, lifelong Essex followers.

Charles, the younger, would later be exiled for his part in the Earl’s abortive

---

<sup>45</sup> Paul E.J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Essex, 1585-97* (Cambridge University Press: London, 1999), p. 152.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid*, p. 285.

<sup>47</sup> Markham’s only biographer, D. J.B Trim, confirms that he in Germany at the same time as Fynes Moryson, serving in the army of the militant Calvinist Christian of Anhaus D. J. B. Trim, ‘Markham, Francis (1565–1627)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk:80/view/article/18063>, accessed 3 Dec 2008.

<sup>48</sup> Paul E.J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Essex, 1585-97* (Cambridge University Press: London, 1999), p. 285.

rising.<sup>49</sup> It is notable that, of the few Englishmen Moryson encounters on the continent, a large proportion are confirmed Essex men. Further to this connection, Moryson had a tangible link to the Earl through his own brother, Richard. Richard served with Essex in the 1597 Azores expedition, writing to Sir Charles and Lady Morison of the Earl's 'favourable words' to him.<sup>50</sup> Later in his career Richard followed Essex to Ireland, and was knighted by the Earl in 1599.<sup>51</sup> Kew notes that 'the Morysons were bound up, though far removed from the centre of the faction...of the Earl of Essex', and it is possible Moryson exploited this connection, to finance his longed for travels, and to begin his progression up the patronage ladder.<sup>52</sup>

Moryson mentions few other Englishmen with whom he is associated on the Continent.<sup>53</sup> Although naturally he would have been acquainted with English merchants and travellers, the only figures who feature prominently in the narrative are the young, militaristic men drawn to the faction under the control of the 'powerfull hand of Robert, Earl of Essex' (*Itenerary*, Part II, p. 27). There is further circumstantial evidence to connect Moryson to Essex. This derives from analysis of the Earl's known intelligence objectives relative to Moryson's travels and encounters on the continent. Essex was known to be in communication with

---

<sup>49</sup> Moryson was provided with 'Ten French crownes' by the brothers, after being robbed by disbanded soldiers en route to Paris in 1594, and later stayed with them in Paris. *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 196.

Paul E. J. Hammer, 'Danvers, Sir Charles (c.1568–1601)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk:80/view/article/7132>, accessed 13 Dec 2008.

<sup>50</sup> Kew, p. lxxix, for letter see BL MS 40629, f. 99.

<sup>51</sup> Thompson.

<sup>52</sup> Kew, p. lxxvi.

<sup>53</sup> Moryson mentions meeting 'Master Warmington', a Catholic priest, Jasper Tyant, a merchant, and George Dorington, the English Consul in Aleppo. All the other Englishmen he refers to in the *Itenerary*: Robert Sidney, Francis Markham, Charles Danvers and Henry Danvers: are committed Essex men.

the English College at Rome throughout 1593, and the following spring Fynes Moryson travelled there, ostensibly to stay at the college whilst cataloguing the antiquities of Rome. Moryson requested a direct audience with William Allen:

I presently went to the said Cardinall, and after the fashion, having kissed the hem of his vesture, I humbly desired, that according to this his curtesie, for which hee was much honoured in England, hee would receive mee into his protection...he commanded me rest secure, so long as I could commaund my tongue, and should abstaine from offence. (*Itenerary*, Part I, p. 122)

The visit was prefigured by a policy change spearheaded by Essex, designed to outmanoeuvre his rivals at court. In the spring of 1593 Essex let it be known he was tolerant, or sympathetic towards English Catholics. In April 1593 he secured the release of Sir Thomas Tresham, a prominent recusant, and the same year he began to make overtures to the head of the English College in Rome, Cardinal William Allen, over possible peace talks.<sup>54</sup>

Moryson presents his visit to the English college, and conversation with Cardinal Allen, as a necessary courtesy, a step to avoid persecution whilst he explored Rome. However, Moryson had no direct need to approach the college. He was fluent in Italian, and able to slip unnoticed through Roman society, as his interview

---

<sup>54</sup> Essex began to make overtures towards English Catholic recusants, to exert leverage over his main rival at court, Lord Burghley. A fierce opponent of Catholicism, Burghley would brook no middle ground, and Essex attempted to open up a niche support group, attracting Catholics and other elements sympathetic to the old religion to his faction. Paul E.J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Essex, 1585-97* (Cambridge University Press: London, 1999), p. 171.

with Bellarmine demonstrates.<sup>55</sup> Indeed, Moryson was actively endangering himself through his association with the college, as his next admission proves:

Onely for his duties sake, hee (Allen) said, that he must advise me, and for the love of his Countrey intreate me, that I would be willing to heare those instructions for religion here, which I could not heare in England. I submitted my selfe to these conditions. (*Itenerary*, Part I, p. 122)

Not only does Moryson visit the English college, a refuge for English recusants and host to both Allen and Bellarmine, he agrees to follow Catholic religious practises whilst in residence there, an extraordinary step. It is unthinkable that Moryson would not have faced censure or imprisonment for this when he returned to England, unless he had received some official approbation for his visit in advance. Given the interaction between the English College and Essex in the previous year, it is possible the Earl sanctioned his visit to the college, providing the necessary aegis under which Moryson sought protection following the time he spent there.

There is a further, incidental link to Essex and his contemporary political objectives. Shortly before his arrival in Ireland, Moryson took a journey to Berwick, 'upon occasion of businesse' (*Itenerary*, Part I, p. 272). Although vague over the exact nature of his employment, he visited the Scottish court whilst north of the border, leading Charles Hughes to speculate that 'Moryson was at Berwick as a channel of communication with the future king of England', James VI

---

<sup>55</sup> Indeed, Moryson mentioned that he was congratulated on his subterfuge by an English Priest at the college, who had shared inns and even a bed with Moryson whilst travelling to Rome, and had not recognised that he was English. Moryson mentions that this interview took place in the company of 'Master Warmington', quite possibly the prominent recusant William Warmington, who was in Rome at this time. See Peter Holmes, 'Warmington, William (b. c.1556, d. after 1627)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/28750>, accessed 6 Aug 2011].

of Scotland.<sup>56</sup> Hughes goes on to assert that Moryson was acting as an envoy from the Earl of Essex, and whilst he does not substantiate this claim, both Essex and Moryson's future employer, Charles Blount, Baron Mountjoy, were in close contact with King James at this time.<sup>57</sup> Moryson's modern biographer, Edward Thompson offers a more measured evaluation of the journey, but still affirms Moryson's venture had a diplomatic purpose. Moryson himself does not elaborate on the issue, possibly because the account is published in Jacobean England.<sup>58</sup> Nonetheless, it represents another tantalising link with the Essex faction, a connection perhaps better understood through a consideration of the next chapter in Moryson's life, his service in the Irish War, and in particular his function as principal secretary to Charles Blount, Baron Mountjoy.

---

<sup>56</sup> Hughes, p. xx.

<sup>57</sup> Paul E.J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Essex, 1585-97* (Cambridge University Press: London, 1999), p. 172.

<sup>58</sup> W.W Greg and E. Boswell, *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company* (Bibliographical Society: London, 1955) p. 606, under date 4 April, 1617. "John Beale Entred for his Copie under the handes of Master Docter Westfield and both Wardens. An Itinerary written by Fines Morison Gent, contayning his Travailes through divers dominions, vizi Germany Bohmerland &c. "

## The Early Modern Secretary: Moryson, Mountjoy and the Irish War: 1599-1606

In a brief autobiographical interlude between the first and second volumes of the *Itinerary*, Fynes Moryson describes how he retired to the country house of his sister Jane Allington in Lincolnshire in 1598. Although vague over his purposes, Moryson no doubt returned to the quiet of Lincolnshire to recover from his disastrous second period of travel.<sup>1</sup> Following his first continental journey, Moryson travelled to the Levant Region with his brother Henry. Although the trip began well, Henry sickened and died in the vicinity of Aleppo, dying in Fynes' arms as the attendant Janissaries laughed and jeered. Following this, Moryson himself became sick with an unspecified illness, and returned to England to convalesce. At the time of his return Moryson was without a significant income, potential patron or logical career path. However, whilst recovering in Lincolnshire, Fynes received word from his brother Richard that Charles Blount, Baron Mountjoy was interested in employing him as principal secretary in his Irish command.

By my brother Sir Richard Morysons inwardnes with him, I then obtained his Lordships promise to follow him into Ireland in the place of chiefe Secretary. (*Itinerary*, Part II, p.84)

At the time, the autumn of 1598, a military expedition was being put together to oppose Tyrone's rebellion in Ireland, an ambitious and costly venture.<sup>2</sup> Initially, both Mountjoy and Essex had been proposed as potential command figures, but the latter was chosen after intensive lobbying at Court. As a result, the position

---

<sup>1</sup> Moryson may have used this time to begin working on a first draft of the *Itinerary*. See *Itinerary*, Part II, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Moryson gives the figure as £277 000 in his *Itinerary*, Part II, p. 83. The figure is repeated in BL, Stow MS 325, Council of Trade Document, f. 187b.

Moryson had been promised failed to materialise, and his career continued to stagnate as he remained in England for a further two years. It is not known how he occupied himself for this time, though conjecture is possible.

Following Essex's myriad failures in Ireland, and unauthorised return to England, Mountjoy was hastily dispatched to assume the role of Lord Deputy in his place in 1599.<sup>3</sup> Moryson immediately wrote to Mountjoy, to secure the position he had initially been promised, but by the time the letter reached the Lord Deputy he had already received three secretaries into his service. Nonetheless, Mountjoy wrote back, promising to secure him 'some good and fit employment' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 84) and Moryson followed him there in autumn 1600, to be employed 'in the writing of the history or Journall of Irish affaires' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 84). That Moryson became a writer in residence, a historian of Mountjoy's command, strongly suggests he was known to harbor literary pretensions. Indeed, it is even possible he had begun initial work on his *Itinerary* by this point.<sup>4</sup> It is possible that some sections of the Latin manuscripts that survive, in particular elements of *Pars Secunda*, the Irish narrative, stem from this time.<sup>5</sup>

Moryson's appointment represented a small step on the great ladder of aristocratic patronage. Service in Mountjoy's command offered Moryson hope of advancement, and the financial security he had perhaps hoped to secure through the publication of his travel memoirs. Certainly, Moryson deemed his initial employment sufficiently rewarding to surrender his Peterhouse College

---

<sup>3</sup> *Itinerary*, Part II, p. 84.

<sup>4</sup> Moryson notes on p. 1 of Part II of the *Itinerary* that he had begun to gather together his travel observations by this point.

<sup>5</sup> In the Lincolnshire County archives, there is a record of a manuscript fragment of Part II to the *Itinerary*, the Irish narrative. It is described as 'undated'. Although it is a possible later scribal copy of the *Itinerary*, it could also represent an early draft of 'the History of Ireland' Moryson includes in the second Volume of his work. See Suffolk Record Office, Lowestoft, Adair Family Archives, HA12/A2/1/64, 'The Rebellion of the Earl of Desmond' extract from Fynes Moryson's *Itinerary*, Part II, Book I, Chapter 1, p. 3

fellowship, which he had held for the past ten years. However, as Moryson travelled to Ireland he had the good fortune to encounter one of Mountjoy's three secretaries, who had left the service of the latter 'either to avoid the trouble or danger of the warres, or for other reasons best knowne to him' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 84). Moryson read the secretary's return to England in a positive light. For him, it represented a chance to secure employment within The Lord Deputy's secretariat, an elevated position of trust. 'Thus with better hope of preferment, I crossed the sea' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 84). Once in Ireland Moryson immediately travelled to Mountjoy's encampment at Carlingforde. As he lodged in Dundalke, an hour's ride away, he learnt that that in an earlier engagement 'the Lord Deputy his chiefe Secretary George Cranmer was killed...and his Lordship having now but onely one Secretary did receive me the next day at Dundalke into Cranmer's place' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 84).

Commencing his journey as little more than a glorified scribe, Moryson arrived in Ireland as principal secretary to Charles Blount, Baron Mountjoy. Moryson's appointment as Mountjoy's 'chiefe' secretary represented a significant career step. The early modern understanding of the secretary was very different from modern conceptions of the vocation, both in role, status and function. Richard Rambuss notes that 'secretaryship offered outstanding career possibilities in Tudor England', and for Fynes Moryson, blessed with neither titles nor land, elevation to secretary promised future advancement and financial reward.<sup>6</sup>

Moryson's education, his travels and his linguistic ability stood him in good stead for future employment in the administrative service of a great nobleman. The Earl of Essex, for example, worked hard to expand his secretariat in the mid 1590s,

---

<sup>6</sup> Richard Rambuss, 'The Secretary's Study: The Secret Designs of the Sheperdes Calendar', *ELH*, vol. 59, 1992, pp. 313-335, p. 314.

appointing Henry Wotton: 'who was newly returned from several years of travel and study on the continent' in 1594.<sup>7</sup> Scholars such as Wotton and Moryson derived benefit from travel to the continent, increasing their chance of successful employment, 'advancement, intercession and pecuniary reward' in the service of a patron from the ruling classes.<sup>8</sup>

As a secretary, Moryson functioned as the focal point for all his master's epistolary exchanges, writing, signing, sealing and addressing all letters sent, and sorting and storing all incoming correspondence.<sup>9</sup> His epistolary fascination exceeded the terms of his employment. Letters provided the foundation for the Irish sections of his *Itinerary* and Moryson understood that bodies of letters could be retained, functioning as repositories of memory, allowing him to recreate the life and deeds of his former master Mountjoy, who died in 1606.<sup>10</sup> Such letters are also potent objects, with the power to damage the memory and representation of his deceased patron. In writing his own version of events in the *Itinerary*, he shapes their transmission and interpretation.

Moryson's fascination with letters informs the narrative, underpinning the structure and providing the stimulus for all significant events described in the Irish sections of the *Itinerary*. This absorption in the epistolary world of his former

---

<sup>7</sup> Paul E.J. Hammer, 'The Use of Scholarship: The Secretariat of Robert Devereux, Second Earl of Essex, c.1585-1601', *English Historical Review*, 1994, pp. 26-51, p. 28.

<sup>8</sup> Robyn Adams, 'Both diligent and secret: The intelligence letters of William Herle', QMUL PhD thesis, 2004, p. 73.

<sup>9</sup> See Jonathan Goldberg, *Writing Matter: From the hands of the English Renaissance* (Stanford University Press: California, 1990), p. 234.

<sup>10</sup> Hiram Morgan, *Tyrone's Rebellion: The outbreak of the nine years war in Tudor Ireland* (Boydell Press: Suffolk, 1993), p. 3. Moryson had his second book licensed for publication by Sir Thomas Wilson in 1626, although it never came to print. It is likely that he owes his unparalleled access to the state papers to his relationship with Wilson. Wilson was the then head of the state papers office, and a committed archivist. See A. F. Pollard, 'Wilson, Sir Thomas (d. 1629)', rev. Sean Kelsey, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/29690, accessed 27 Aug 2011].

master stems from his everyday function as a secretary. The secretary was not merely assumed, but expected to compose and write letters in the hand of his master.<sup>11</sup> The secretary would sign, seal and address the master's letters, able to accurately forge his hand and even reproduce his signature. After Fynes Moryson assumed the duties of principal secretary in November 1600, his hand is evident in Mountjoy's missives from late December onwards.<sup>12</sup> Moryson even begins to replicate Mountjoy's signature from February onwards, producing an accurate counterfeit in a letter sent to the Privy Council on 6 February 1601.<sup>13</sup> The replication of the signature is of interest as it functions as a highly personalised marker, used to authenticate letters and documentation.

A contemporary writer, Angel Day published a work entitled *The English Secretorie* in 1588, which functions principally as an epistolary manual, but also includes a subsidiary commentary on 'the parts, place, and office of a secretorie'.<sup>14</sup> Day is adamant a secretary must 'write well, and in neate and fine forme...set forth his letters'.<sup>15</sup> Prospective secretaries must also be well educated, and able to proffer practical advice when called upon. However Day exemplifies by far the most important function of this profession through an etymological examination of the appellation 'secretary', 'the name was first given to be called a secretorie...as a keeper or conserver of the secrets unto him committed'.<sup>16</sup> It is important to stress that Day does not merely dissect the term in order to

---

<sup>11</sup> See Jonathan Goldberg, *Writing Matter: From the hands of the English Renaissance* (Stanford University Press: California, 1990), pp. 234-247.

<sup>12</sup> Moryson's hand in a letter sent to the Privy Council on February 6, 1601 matches the hand confirmed as his at the British Library, in BL. Add. MS. 36706, 'Fynes Moryson's Itinerary in Ireland'. National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy to Sir George Carew, February 7 1601, SP 63, 208, I, f. 106.

<sup>13</sup> National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy to Sir George Carew, February 7 1601, SP 63, 208, I, f. 106.

<sup>14</sup> The work was originally published in 1588. Quotations are taken from the revised 1592 edition. Angel Day, *The English Secretorie* (London, Richard Lane: 1592), p. 108.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid*, p. 109.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid*, p. 109.

delineate a single facet of expected secretary behavior. Day is keen to illustrate that 'secret' is the root of the word 'secretorie' as he wishes the reader to perceive how integral the former function is to the latter occupation.

In Day's eyes, the secretary is not merely a secret keeper, or one sworn to silence but in essence a living repository of secrets. 'The closet in every house ... [is as] The secretorie, as he is a keeper and conserver of secrets'.<sup>17</sup> Rambuss notes that Day 'metamorphoses the secretary's body itself as a closet'.<sup>18</sup> In his analysis of the evolution of the early modern closet, Alan Stewart describes the intense connotations of secrecy and clandestine activity associated with this space. Closets were small, utterly private rooms, the only space in the house of a nobleman inadmissible to his servants.<sup>19</sup> Moryson, for example, describes Mountjoy's 'private chamber' as his 'with-drawing roome' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 46). Alan Stewart calls the retreat to the closet a 'public gesture of withdrawal', and the incongruity of a closed area being known to all adds to the exclusivity of the space.<sup>20</sup> Day's metaphor requires the same exclusivity from a secretary. Just as the closet has 'a doore, a locke and a key', the secretary should display 'honestie, truth, and fidelitie'.<sup>21</sup> And just as the closet is under the sole control of the owner of the property, 'so he is by his Lord and master, and by none other to be directed'.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, p. 109.

<sup>18</sup> Richard Rambuss, 'The Secretary's Study: The Secret Designs of the Sheperdes Calendar', *ELH*, vol. 59, 1992, pp. 313-335, p. 314.

<sup>19</sup> Alan Stewart, *Close Readers-Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England* (Princeton: New Jersey, 1997), 'The closet was often itself hidden in another structure such as a chimney shaft...a place for private study, private devotion', pp. 167-186.

<sup>20</sup> Alan Stewart, *Close Readers-Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England* (Princeton: New Jersey, 1997), p. 168.

<sup>21</sup> Angel Day, *The English Secretorie* (London, Richard Lane: 1592), p.109.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid, p. 109.

Throughout the full length of its 34 quarto pages Day's directions for office are unyielding—secrecy is not merely expected, but demanded of a secretary. Indeed, as Day sees it, the secretary's whole being is to be geared towards confidentiality, the 'discreetest governed' making the most apposite secretaries.<sup>23</sup> In Gervase Markham's 1616 work, *Conceyted Letters, Newly Layde Open*, the author gives an example of a letter of recommendation from a knight to a noble, for the 'entertaining of a secretary'.<sup>24</sup> In it, the knight gives assurance that the secretary's 'heart shall be as faire as his hand'.<sup>25</sup> Secretaries were required to display unreserved loyalty towards their masters, 'for how can it be otherwise bee thought but yet our secretorie being one every way so waightylie to be employed'.<sup>26</sup> Because of the information entrusted to them, secretaries were expected to remain constant, yet this obligation surpassed the terms of their employment. In Day's lucid, carefully constructed litany of instructions, the reader is told a secretary must display such 'fidelity... [that] converteth it selfe now into a religious awe and zealous respect of his masters countenance and favour'.<sup>27</sup> Indeed, in an earlier discussion of 'the kind of fidelitie and trust required', Day instructs the reader that this bond must be 'more speciall then that between the sonne and the father'.<sup>28</sup>

Day's directives function as an apt summation of the strength of the association between master and servant. From the perspective of the secretary, the noble he serves must be obeyed with the same reverence given to God, or to the early modern father, both wielding absolute authority. Yet the example of a family

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid, p. 108.

<sup>24</sup> Gervase Markham & Nicholas Banton, *Conceyted Letters, Newly Layde Open* (London, 1616) C3r.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Angel Day, *The English Secretorie* (London, Richard Lane: 1592), p. 119.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, p. 119.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, p. 111.

relationship is also apt, as reciprocity of affection is expected of the master. Alan Stewart gives consideration to this concept, quoting Nicholas Faunt, secretary to Francis Walshingham, writing in 1592, who claims the natural 'love and affection' a secretary bears towards his master is 'grounded likewise upon some testimonie of his more good opinion and recipocall love borne unto him'.<sup>29</sup> Faunt's opinion chimes with that of Day, who in essence suggests that no secretary could ever proceed to such a vaunted and trusted position without some prior amity between himself and his master. Stewart dismisses this argument as 'circular', stressing the insurmountable social inequality of the participants in the relationship.<sup>30</sup> Whilst it would be wrong to say the ruling classes of early modern England ever enjoyed any form of parity with the lower gentry, it would be equally misleading to suggest the bond between master and secretary could easily be severed.<sup>31</sup> Angel Day calls this connection 'the chain of fidelity, and this is an apt metaphor, as the two participants are strongly inter-linked, spending their daylight hours together, sharing the privy spaces of the closet and cabinet, and having shared access to sensitive information restricted to any other.'<sup>32</sup> But the bounds of a secretary relationship may perhaps even exceed this level of familiarity, attaining what Robyn Adams calls an almost 'sensual intimacy'.<sup>33</sup>

Fynes Moryson opens his account of Mountjoy's conduct in the Nine Years' War with what he describes as a 'portraiture' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 46) of the Lord Deputy. The incredible diligence and detail applied to this representation is

---

<sup>29</sup> Alan Stewart, *Close Readers-Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England* (Princeton: New Jersey, 1997), pp. 174-175.

<sup>30</sup> Alan Stewart, *Close Readers-Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England* (Princeton: New Jersey, 1997), p.175.

<sup>31</sup> Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution 1625-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 11 Discussion of the class system in Britain at the end of the 16th Century.

<sup>32</sup> Angel Day, *The English Secretorie* (London, Richard Lane: 1592), p. 111.

<sup>33</sup> Robyn Adams, 'Both diligent and secret: The intelligence letters of William Herle', Queen Mary University of London PhD thesis, 2004, p. 58.

testimony to the strength of the relationship between himself and his master, Mountjoy. Although Moryson's description is described as a 'portraiture', this label detracts from the sheer depth of his exhaustive and comprehensive study. Starting with the body, Moryson attempts to feature every aspect of Mountjoy's physique, personality, intellectual training, private deportment and even eating habits. He opens the description of Mountjoy's 'bodily presence' with a description of his master's hirsute form 'with little haire on his body, which haire was of colour blackish (or inclined to blacke)' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 45). Moryson is not discussing Mountjoy's facial hair; this is covered in the following paragraph. He is describing deeply personal details only admissible to Mountjoy's most trusted servants, or those allowed access to his private closet. Moryson again seeks to air details unknowable to the common observer with his description of the curious hair style Mountjoy adopted whilst serving in Ireland: 'he wore it short, excepte a lock under his left eare, which he nourished the time of this warre, and being woven up, hid it in his neck under his ruffe' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 46). The latter assertion is of particular interest. In this example, Moryson goes beyond personal detail, to reveal an accoutrement of the body that Mountjoy wished concealed. Such admissions function as evidence of Moryson's close relation to Mountjoy, firmly removing himself from his usual guise of disinterested observer, and instead placing himself in the select group of intimates privy to such information.

Although disclosing this information publicly, through the pages of the *Itinerary*, may seem invasive and unpleasant, it is not intended as voyeuristic sensationalism. The disclosure of this information is intended as a demonstration of the inwardness of his relationship with Mountjoy. Indeed, Moryson's relation of Mountjoy's physique is evoked with all the tender detail of an artist at work: 'I

take my pensill in hand to figure this Noble Lords person' (*Itenerary*, Part II, p. 45). Moryson describes the speed at which Mountjoy's hair grows, the exact length he kept the hair on his upper lip, the curling of the forelocks of his hair, his complexion and even the proportions of his hands 'his hands long and white, his fingers greate in the ende' (*Itenerary*, Part II, p. 46). The latter image is particularly striking, an almost unnecessary level of detail, of little interest or relevance to any except the narrator. Moryson is aware his inventory of Mountjoy's characteristics may become tedious, commenting that his later description of Mountjoy's apparel 'may be thought a needlesse curiositie' (*Itenerary*, Part II, pp. 46) but still devotes a full four folio pages to the description of Mountjoy. His account of the Essex rebellion, occupies only a page, despite being composed with the aid of Irish state papers, while he says of his memorial reconstruction of Mountjoy's character that 'I will not omit any thing I remember' (*Itenerary*, Part II, p. 45).<sup>34</sup> This determination to evoke a comprehensive representation of Mountjoy functions not only as a demonstration of intimacy, but also as a tribute to Moryson's 'deceased Lord and Master' (*Itenerary*, Part II, p. 45).<sup>35</sup>

The word tribute, however, is an ambiguous term not truly befitting Moryson's construction of Mountjoy. Moryson's account is completely unrestricted. He is at ease with the disclosure of deeply intimate details of Mountjoy's personal life, and is keen to stress his account 'will be so farre from lying and flattering, as I will rather be bold modestly to mention some of his defects' (*Itenerary*, Part II, p. 45). Whilst this may seem like a rhetorical avowal of honesty, Moryson's account is indeed not uniformly laudatory. He mentions that Mountjoy behaves ill towards

---

<sup>34</sup> Hiram Morgan, *Tyrone's Rebellion: The outbreak of the nine years war in Tudor Ireland* (Boydell Press: Suffolk, 1993), p. 3.

<sup>35</sup> This is very similar to Moryson's conceit in the Dedication to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, in which he contends that he will build the addressee, Pembroke a *mausoleum*, or memorial, with his words.

his servants, and offers a strong condemnation of his later conduct, suggesting that he grew avaricious in later life, 'being also frugall in gathering and saving, which in his latter daies declined to vice, rather in greedy gathering, then in restraining his former bounties of expence' (*Itenerary*, Part II, p. 47). It is important not to take this attack out of context. In his discussion of the relationship between a secretary and master, Day instructs the secretary to extend 'consaile devoyd of flatterie'.<sup>36</sup> He uses this instruction to buttress his claim for reciprocity of affection between the secretary and master, asserting it is the duty of a friend, not a servant to present candid advice.<sup>37</sup>

This contention is important to both Moryson and Day. Each seeks to dismiss the duty of servitude owed to the master and instead focus on the honest devotion of friendship. Throughout his biography of Mountjoy, Moryson offers examples of the concord between him and his late master. He mentions that only himself and Mountjoy's 'most familiar friends' (*Itenerary*, Part II, p. 46) were allowed access to his private chamber, and records discourses and 'private retiredness' (*Itenerary*, Part II, p. 46) to which only Mountjoy's most 'choice' and familiar friends would be invited (*Itenerary*, Part II, p. 46). Such is the strength of the relationship described, Moryson is compelled to record that he was allowed unrestricted access to Mountjoy at all hours, except at 'time of sleep' (*Itenerary*, Part II, p. 46).

On 22 February 1601, this close connection was rent asunder. Moryson was abruptly removed from his position by Mountjoy without warning. Unwittingly, Moryson was witness to a pivotal moment in political history. In the short passage cited below, Moryson offers a seemingly first-hand account of the exact moment

---

<sup>36</sup> Angel Day, *The English Secretorie* (London, Richard Lane: 1592), p. 122.

<sup>37</sup> Again, this evokes the Dedication of the Printed *Itenerary*, in which Moryson states that he has been privy to private conversation between Pembroke and 'the late Earl of Devonshire' (Mountjoy). For further information, see Case Study 4.

when his employer, Mountjoy, first heard of the disastrous outcome of the failed Essex rebellion. On receiving this information Lord Mountjoy immediately severed his ties with the Earl of Essex, bowing to the authority of Sir Robert Cecil, Secretary of State. Using dramatic, highly descriptive language, Moryson equated this political submission to physical subjection: 'he now fell flat to the ground, and insinuated himselfe into inward love, and to an absolute dependancy with the Secretary' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 89).

Moryson himself received a 'blow' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p.89) from which he never recovered whilst serving in Ireland:

The same two & twentieth of February, his Lord received a packet out of England, by which he understood that the Earle of Essex was committed to the Tower for treason, which much dismaied him and his neerest friends, and wrought strange alteration in him: For whereas before he had stood upon termes of honour with the Secretary, he now fell flat to the ground, and insinuated himselfe into inward love, and to an absolute dependancy with the Secretary, so as for a time he estranged himselfe from two of his neerest friends, for the open declaration they had made of dependancy on the Earle of Essex; yet rather covering, then extinguishing his good affection to them. It is not credible that the influence of the Earles malignant star, should worke upon so poor a snake as my selfe, being almost a stranger to him yet my neerenesse in bloud to one of his Lordships above named friends, made it perhaps seeme to his Lordship improper, to use my service in such neerenesse, as his Lordship had promised and begun to doe. So as the next day tooke his most secret papers out of my hand, yet giving them to no other, but keeping them in his owne cabinet: and this blow I never

fully recovered while I staid in Ireland.’ (Fynes Moryson, *Itenerary*, Part II, p.89)

As Moryson implies, his ‘neernesse in bloud’ to one of the distanced friends, his own brother, meant that Mountjoy could no longer trust him.<sup>38</sup> His association with the Essex faction meant Mountjoy had no choice but to take ‘his most secret papers out of my hand’. Mountjoy’s first reaction to the Essex rebellion is to remove his papers from Moryson’s keeping, and bar him his cabinet. The latter action is especially significant. Robert Beale served as principal secretary to Walsingham, and wrote on the purpose of the cabinet : ‘A secretarie must have a speciall cabinet, whereof he is himself to keepe the keye, for his signetts, ciphers and secrett intelligence...keeping that only unto himself’.<sup>39</sup> All the tools of Moryson’s trade- the ciphers used to encrypt letters, the signet used to make a seal, the intelligence with which he was expected to confer with his master- were now forbidden to him. Mountjoy’s confiscation of his ‘secret papers’ added to his redundancy. Without the confidence of his master, Moryson was not deemed fit to bear secrets, and was thus disbarred from the very essence of his role as a secretary. His exclusion from the cabinet restricted his employment to all but the most mundane acts, and inflicted upon him a very public repudiation, the interdiction of the bond of fidelity and trust between master and secretary.

The significance of this rift would not have been lost on an early modern readership, and impacts upon any consideration of the passage. Mountjoy’s treatment of Moryson implies distrust, calling into question the connection between master and secretary. In the *Itenerary*, Moryson makes attempts to

---

<sup>38</sup> The identities of the ‘distanced’ friends will be defined below.

<sup>39</sup> Robert Beale, BL Add MS. 48149, quoted in Robyn Adams, ‘Both diligent and secret: The intelligence letters of William Herle’, Queen Mary University of London PhD thesis, 2004, p. 38.

ameliorate the impact of this scene. He portrays Mountjoy as inherently guarded and even paranoid, calling him a 'close concealer of secrets' and adding 'he made no servant partner of his secrets' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 48). It is significant that the reader is exposed to this perception of Mountjoy so early in the narrative, as it colours the Essex rebellion passage, helping to exonerate Moryson.

Although Moryson was never formally discharged from service, the moment Mountjoy took the papers from his hand, he was in effect dismissed. If a secretary's primary function is the keeping of secrets, not to be trusted with them renders him redundant. Mountjoy's distrust horrified Moryson 'and this blow I never fully recovered while I staid in Ireland' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 89). Moryson rarely allows personal sentiment into his narrative and when this does happen, it is to highlight an event of great significance to him. Similar outbursts of emotion are present at the death of his mother and brother, signifying the terrible effect Mountjoy's act wrought upon him.

Further, to be distrusted or dismissed from service not only sundered the vaunted intimacy and 'chain of fidelity' between master and secretary, but signified an abrupt collapse in fortunes for the latter. When Essex was driven to remove his secretary, Henry Cuffe from his service in 1600, Henry Wooton remarked that Cuffe was 'shaken to the core' by the Earl's actions.<sup>40</sup> Without the support of an aristocratic patron, secretaries lost their living quarters, financial security and hope of advancement. In addition, to be removed from service intimated a serious rupture between secretary and client, restricting any chance of future employment. This type of dismissal was rare, and usually necessitated by a grave

---

<sup>40</sup> Paul E. J. Hammer, 'Cuffe, Henry' (1562/3–1601) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/6865>, accessed 10 Aug 2011].

departure from expected behavior on the part of the secretary. When Essex dissolved his association with Cuffe, it was a reaction to being publicly labelled 'low spirited and faint hearted' by his secretary.<sup>41</sup> Moryson's removal was unusual, in that his fall from grace was dictated by events beyond his control.

Moryson opens his account of the Essex rebellion following Mountjoy's receipt of a packet from England 'by which he understood that the Earle of Essex was committed to the Tower for treason, which much dismaied him and his nearest friends' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 89). The packet to which Moryson refers is presumably the draft letter sent by Cecil on Feb 8, 1601 to the Lord Deputy, Dublin council and to all commanders in the Low Countries. It summarises the attempted rebellion as a 'miserable accident', a fair evaluation.<sup>42</sup> However, as this 'accident' had led to the committal of Essex to the tower to treason, Mountjoy had reason to be fearful. Over the course of the previous year, Mountjoy had received three envoys from Essex, two of whom would later be executed for their part in the rebellion. He also secured the release of Thomas Lea, a man convicted of treason with Tyrone, who would later attempt to violently kidnap the Queen with the hope of forcing the release of Essex. In addition to this he maintained covert lines of communication with James VI of Scotland, and was named in the

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> See National Archives, State Papers Domestic, Sir Robert Cecil to the Lord Deputy, Dublin Council and the commanders in the Low Countries, Feb 10, 1601, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic series, of the reigns of Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth, (James I) 1547-1580 (1581-1625), (1547-1590)* Edited by R. Lemon (Mackie & Co: London, 1872), p. 547 The 'miserable accident' of the Essex rebellion followed the loss of the earl's sweet wines custom lease. As his debts mounted, Essex faced the disintegration of his patronage web. Following his summons to the council on the morning of Feb 8, 1601, Essex led a party of disaffected nobles, soldiers and gentry on a march on the court, attempting to rouse the city along the way. Naturally this ill-planned attempt failed, and he was imprisoned after a brief siege at Essex house. See Paul E. J. Hammer, 'Devereux, Robert, second earl of Essex (1565-1601)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/7565>, accessed 10 Aug 2011].

confessions of four of the most prominent conspirators, who had met covertly to plot their treason at Mountjoy's family home in Holborn.<sup>43</sup>

However, whilst maintaining strong ties with the Essex faction, Mountjoy had in addition opened a secret channel of communication with Cecil. Moryson, constructing his account from state Papers, notes in his *Itinerary* that Mountjoy 'directed his letters thence the eighteenth of Februarie (1600/01) to Sir Robert Sicill Secretarie of State' (*Itinerary*, Part II p. 26), perceiving his master to be in the process of secession from the Essex faction.

Moryson was very alert to the political significance of this contact, delineating its importance in a summation of Mountjoy's opening letter to Cecil. He noted how Mountjoy refused to countenance the abandonment of Essex 'acknowledging him such favour, as he should be pleased to show that distressed Earle, withal protesting, that he should alwaies be a free man, and slave to no mans honour' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 26). The terms on which Mountjoy negotiated this embryonic epistolary relationship were unambiguous. Whilst he would retain an amicable interest in the 'distressed Earle', his primary interest is to inform Cecil he holds no factional loyalty to Essex, he is 'a free man...slave to no mans honour' (*Itinerary*, Part II p. 26). The letter is, therefore, an attempt to demarcate his political relationships. He distances himself from Essex, which greatly heightens the significance of his continued contact with Cecil.

---

<sup>43</sup> Mountjoy received Southampton, Henry Cuffe and Charles Danvers. The latter two would die as a result of their involvement with the Essex conspiracy. Further, he was named in the confessions of Tho. Lea, Henry Cuffe, Danvers and Southampton. See Frederick M. Jones, *Mountjoy 1563-1606, The Last Elizabethan Deputy* (Colman & Reynolds: London, 1958), p. 101.

With the collapse of the Essex faction, Mountjoy was forced to rely on this relationship to insulate himself from the consequences of the failed coup. As Moryson notes, he is driven to abase himself before Cecil:

For whereas before he stood upon termes of honour with the Secretary, now he fell flat to the ground, and insinuated himselfe into inwarde love, and to an absolute dependancy with the Secretary (*Itenerary*, Part II, p. 89).

This relationship preserved Mountjoy in the immediate aftermath of the Essex crisis, and provided the aegis under which the Lord Deputy sought shelter in the following months:

till the fatall death of that noble Earle of Essex hereafter to be mentioned, and the Lord Deputies participation of that ruine, made him change his stile, and never to cease, till hee had confirmed a neere friendship betweene himself and the Secretary (*Itenerary*, Part II p. 26).

In order to preserve his relationship with Cecil, Mountjoy had no option but to publicly disavow Essex men in his service. Moryson records that at the time of the crisis, Mountjoy publicly ‘estranged himselfe’ (*Itenerary*, Part II p. 89) from two of his closest friends ‘for the open declaration they had made of dependancy on the Earl of Essex’ (*Itenerary*, Part II p. 89). Earlier in the narrative, Moryson names Sir William Godolphin, Sir Henry Danvers, and his own brother, Sir Richard Moryson as the Lord Deputy’s closest friends in Ireland.<sup>44</sup> The latter two are almost certainly the dependants of Essex Moryson writes of. The former, Danvers, was already associated with Moryson through their contact when Moryson visited

---

<sup>44</sup> *Itenerary*, Part II, p. 79. Earlier, on p. 63, Moryson notes that Sir Richard Moryson was a friend Mountjoy ‘confessed especially to love’, being a worthy a soldier as ‘any the Queene had’ in Ireland. *Itenerary*, Part II, p. 63.

Paris.<sup>45</sup> Richard Moryson was close to Fynes at this time, and had secured him his position with Mountjoy. As Charles Hughes observes ‘he could not in this crisis overlook the fact that his secretary had been introduced to him by a protégé of the Earl of Essex’.<sup>46</sup>

Moryson feigns confusion when assessing Mountjoy’s reaction to the Essex rebellion: ‘It is not credible that the influence of the Earl’s malignant star, should worke upon so poore a snake as my selfe’. Yet if he had been employed via his brother in any prior capacity by the Earl, particularly as an intelligencer, Mountjoy could not have been sure of his fundamental loyalties. Although Essex suffered a reduction in fortunes following his unsuccessful tenure in Ireland, he still employed a network of informants who filtered information back to him. Sir Robert Lovell served under Mountjoy in Ireland, and upon news of the Earl’s release from house arrest, wrote to him with protestations of fidelity from his Irish supporters ‘The happy news of your Lordships freedom hath made a number of your Lordships frends exceeding joyfull’. The letter also contained a concise report of Irish concerns ‘If your Lordship desyer to understand of present affayers’.<sup>47</sup>

With Essex supporters sequestered throughout the army, Mountjoy could not afford to allow a man with a significant connection to the Earl to remain in his personal service. The unique duties and access afforded to a secretary meant

---

<sup>45</sup> Paul E. J. Hammer, ‘Danvers, Sir Charles (c.1568–1601)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/7132>, accessed 10 Aug 2011]. Danvers, along with his brother, was wanted for murder as a youth, and fled to the continent. He was aided in his bid by Essex.

<sup>46</sup> Hughes, p. xxx.

<sup>47</sup> National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Sir Robert Lovell to Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, October 8 1600, SP 63, 207, V, f. 255. For another account of informants loyal to Essex in Ireland, see *Nugae Antiquae* (London: Verner & Hood, 1804) Vol I, p. 288, quoted in Cyril Falls, *Mountjoy, Elizabethan General* (Odhams Press: London, 1955), p. 107. ‘Essex hath enemies in Ireland. He hath friends to’.

Moryson was in a position to compromise Mountjoy to supporters of the Earl, at a politically fractious time. More importantly, however, Moryson's connection to a significant figure in the patronage world immediately raised suspicions over his fundamental loyalties. Mountjoy could not afford to extend his trust to anyone at this time. There is archival evidence for this parting of the ways. Moryson's hand features in a number of letters Mountjoy addresses to Cecil prior to the crisis.<sup>48</sup> However, the first letter that Mountjoy sends to Cecil following the Essex rising is in his own hand, indicating that Moryson was not trusted to draft the missive on behalf of his master.<sup>49</sup> Although Moryson considered himself insignificant, describing himself as a 'poor snake', he must have been aware of the accuracy of the analogy. The transmission of any misinformation at this time could have proven lethal to Mountjoy, and therefore he took steps to distance himself from his principal secretary.

Although tainted by his connection to the Essex faction, Moryson remained in Mountjoy's service until 1606, personally taking the surrender of the Earl of Tyrone, and acting as translator in the following peace negotiations.<sup>50</sup> Moryson also personally conveyed news of the death of Elizabeth to Mountjoy. Realising this information would hinder the negotiations, advanced to a critical stage, Moryson told no one but Mountjoy.<sup>51</sup> Perhaps because of this, and other good service, Mountjoy retained Moryson as principal secretary until his death in 1606.

---

<sup>48</sup> National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy to Sir Robert Cecil, February 4 1601, SP 63, 208 ,I, f. 89. His hand is present in the address of a letter sent to Cecil on February 4, 1601, and in all correspondence with the Secretary of State from the date of his employment.

<sup>49</sup> National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy to Sir Robert Cecil, February 24 1601, SP 63, 208, pt.I, ff.138.

<sup>50</sup> The negotiations were conducted in Spanish, and Moryson also translates a letter from this language. See *Itinerary*, Part II, p. 174.

<sup>51</sup> *Itinerary*, Part II, p. 277.

Moryson implies that only Mountjoy's most 'familiar friends' were present at his death, intimating that he was fully reconciled with his master by this point.<sup>52</sup>

Moryson's service with Mountjoy, and his situation at his death, profoundly affected him. In his *Itenerary*, he writes that he had been 'sicke to death' with griefe' at two points in his life. The first was when he lost his 'dearest brother Henry in Asia'. The second time was during his years in England, 'upon a lesse just but like cause'. Surely, Moryson here refers to the death of his master and patron Mountjoy. With his main benefactor dead, Moryson not only found himself without a home, income or vocation, but cut adrift from society, with no hope of introduction or patronage at a relatively advanced age. Moryson would have been 40 years old at this point, with no real hope of embedding himself within a new patronage network. Furthermore, the close secretarial relationship Moryson had enjoyed with Mountjoy was now at an end, and it is clear that he was emotionally wounded from the sundering of this connection. Moryson's time in Ireland, and his association with Mountjoy have not previously been fully explored. They represent an important and underrepresented aspect of his life history

---

<sup>52</sup> *Itenerary*, Part II, p. 296. Moryson records Mountjoy's last words, 'let death never look so ugly, that I would meet it smiling', inferring that he was present at Mountjoy's deathbed.

### The Moryson Letters: 1606-1617

The Losely Manuscript collection is home to six unexplored letters, never before studied.<sup>1</sup> In the manuscript catalogue, the letters are glossed as ‘requests for the King’s rent’ and ‘concerning a suit’.<sup>2</sup> The interpretation suggests dull legal transactions, obscure equity law, little of import or interest. Perhaps this explains why the correspondence has been ignored, or neglected by modern biographers of Fynes Moryson. The content of the letters is, as the catalogue summary suggests, concerned with the administration of legal matters. The tone is formal, and the letters are not, even within this context, particularly discursive.

The letters are, however, very significant as an untapped biographical resource. Close reading of them makes it possible to discern Moryson’s location, social and business interactions, preoccupations and circumstances, at a very specific time and even place. Consideration of his language and tone in his interaction with the various correspondents allows conclusions to be drawn about Moryson the man, about how he transacted his life and business that are different from what we are offered in the heavily worked pages of the *Itinerary*. The physical form of the letter, and in particular the hand, is itself a means through which Moryson’s other writing may be analysed.

Each letter is carefully written in the distinctive hand of Fynes Moryson, signed with his characteristic capitalised italic signature, distinguished by a flamboyant,

---

<sup>1</sup> Surrey History Centre, Losely MSS, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters, Z/407/Lb. 621-623. Gresham letters Z/407/Lb. 628-630 See Appendix B for transcriptions.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. The letters are summarised in the National Archives as: Z/407/Lb. 621-623 Requests for the King’s Rent and personal legal arrangements and Z/407/Lb. 628-630 concerning a suit brought by Sir Richard Moryson against Richard Gresham. Gresham has been misidentified by the archivist, and is almost certainly Thomas Moryson, a landowner closely involved with the Moryson family in Lincolnshire. See later analysis.

tapering flourish. For this reason alone, the letters are of interest. Although manuscript versions of three volumes of the four known sections of the *Itenerary* are extant, Moryson's use of scribes in the transcription and translation process complicates identification of his hand.<sup>3</sup> In the Losely collection, each letter is both written and signed by Moryson, confirming their authorship. Consequently, the six letters are the only unequivocal examples of Moryson's hand in existence, and therefore have a function in identifying and verifying posited examples of Moryson's hand in other letters and documents.<sup>4</sup>

The letters are also unique, in that they represent an unexplored source for a mystifying eleven year gap in Moryson's life history. In modern biographical accounts of Moryson's life, the years following Mountjoy's death in 1606 and the publication of the *Itenerary* in 1617 have proved an unwelcome enigma. Unwilling to delve too deeply into the years which span the death of Moryson's patron and the publication of the *Itenerary*, Edward H. Thompson contends Moryson 'spent three years compiling a history of the countries he had visited, but found it growing to unmanageable dimensions and abandoned it to begin work on a shorter account of his travels'.<sup>5</sup> Thompson's approach is simply to equivocate, to attempt to condense the eleven year intermission into the space of three.

In the absence of any source material for this period, Thompson's recourse is to the printed text of the *Itenerary*. Both he and Graham Kew, who contributes a biography in the introduction to his 1998 transcription project, 'Shakespeare's

---

<sup>3</sup> The majority of BL. Add. MS. 36706 is autograph. Sections of BL. Harl. MS. 5133 are autograph. For more information, see the following analysis section. Kew identifies 4-5 hands in the English manuscript. See Kew, p.iv.

<sup>4</sup> Moryson's will also bears his signature, but it is in the hand of an unknown, unnamed scribe or clerk and merely signed by Moryson-meaning no document bears both his autograph hand and seal, other than these letters. See Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, PROB 11/157, *Will of Fines or Fynes Morison*, 18 March 1630.

<sup>5</sup> Thompson.

Europe revisited', return to the *Itenerary*, reiterating Moryson's own explanation for his absence:

after his deth (Mountjoy) I lost fully three yeers labor in which I abstracted the Histories of these 12 Dominions thorow which I passed.... but when the worke was done, and I found the bulke thereof to swel, then I chose rather to suppress them, then to make my gate bigger than my Citie (*Itenerary*, 'Address to the Reader').

Certainly, Moryson provides for three of the eleven missing years. But neither Moryson, nor Thompson, Kew, or any other modern biographer can impart any further information for this period. With the exception of Kew and Thompson, the only other biography available to scholars who have an interest in Moryson is Charles Hughes' introduction to *Shakespeare's Europe*. In an honest assessment of this time, Hughes terms it the 'lost years', glossing it in just two lines in his otherwise comprehensive, sixty-four page biographical assessment of Moryson.<sup>6</sup>

In his biography, Hughes is able to ascertain Moryson's whereabouts at just two very specific points during the eleven year interlude. Hughes confirms Moryson attended the funeral procession of his sister Jane, in London on 26 February 1612.<sup>7</sup> He also visited Ireland the following year at the bequest of his brother, landing in Youghal on 9 September 1613.<sup>8</sup> Although Moryson confirms he had begun work on the *Itenerary* by this point, there is no other information to pin him to a place, vocation, or social circle in the years preceding its publication. In

---

<sup>6</sup> Hughes, xxxvi.

<sup>7</sup> Hughes, xxxix.

<sup>8</sup> The two inferences Hughes draws about Moryson's movements also recur in Thompson's biography, which is a composite of Hughes text and the *Itenerary*, and should be accredited as such.

existing accounts of his life, all that remains is brief, reported echoes of his resonance across the eleven lost years.

Although the six letters can help provide new information, it is important to tread carefully, as they represent only the fragments of a lost conversation. As no surviving replies from Moryson's correspondents exist, this conversation can only be reconstructed from one perspective. The letters are addressed variously, to Edward Lacon (3), Richard Gresham, Mr Garret, and Mr Curwin. The first three letters, all addressed to Edward Lacon, are written between 21 January 1606 and 6 July 1607 and represent a separate correspondence to the later collection, dating from 7 May 1610 to 19 June 1610.<sup>9</sup> In the interests of constructing a transparent, chronological biography, it is logical to proceed first with the earlier letters, addressed to Mr Lacon.

Moryson first writes to Edward Lacon on the 21 January, 1606. As with the *Itinerary*, and all correspondence dating from his service in Ireland, Moryson dates in the contemporary English fashion.<sup>10</sup> This would locate his first epistolary contact with Lacon after Moryson leaves Mountjoy's service, upon the death of the latter in April 1606.<sup>11</sup> At the date of his first letter to Lacon, Moryson would be in his fortieth year, unemployed, with no patron. He was remunerated for his service in Ireland with a considerable state pension, but there is no record of this

---

<sup>9</sup> Moryson is using the Julian Calendar -so 1st January 1606, would translate to 1<sup>st</sup> January 1607 in the Gregorian Calendar. This is important as it locates the letters immediately after Moryson left Mountjoy's service, upon the latter's death.

<sup>10</sup> Moryson's hand is evident in Mountjoy's missives from December 1600 onwards. For example, see National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy to Sir Robert Cecil, February 24 1601, SP 63, 208, pt. I, f. 138.

<sup>11</sup> Christopher Maginn, *Blount, Charles, eighth Baron Mountjoy and earl of Devonshire (1563-1606)*; *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, Sept 2004) <http://www.oxforddnb.com/catalogue/ulrsl.lon.ac.uk:80/view/article/1859>, accessed 03/07/07.

award surviving the death of his master. Given his parlous circumstances in later life, it is likely this award was discontinued following the death of Mountjoy.<sup>12</sup>

It is no coincidence then, that the first letter is concerned with money, or rather the lack of it. The letter opens with the following, seemingly oblique request:

The tyme of the paying of the Kinges rent being neere I thought it good to remember your promise (when you were with me) to send me xxl out of your [next] michelmas rent for the payment thereof. (L1: 1-3)

To paraphrase, it seems Moryson seeks to pay the Kings Rent from the 'xxl' or £20 used to pay the Michaelmas rent. The 'Kinges rent' (L1:1) to which Moryson refers is not a charge personally levied on him, but a tithe or rent charge exacted by the reigning Monarch on the lands held by the Moryson family in Lincolnshire, part of the Royal Estate of the Duchy of Lancaster.<sup>13</sup> This immediately locates the subject of the letter, Edward Lacon, within Lincolnshire, and within the confines of the Moryson family's sphere of influence. This inference is strengthened by interpersonal connections suggested by Moryson in the valediction:

So with my very hearty commendations praying you upon opportunity to remember my kynde tone to Mr Musseden and my sister I ask to remember me to your neighbour John Chapman and his wife. I bid you a very hasty ffarewell. (L1: 26-30)

---

<sup>12</sup> *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic series, of the reigns of Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth, (James I) 1547-1580 (1581-1625), (1547-1590)* R. Lemon (ed.) (Mackie & Co: London, 1872) 19 June 1604, p. 445. Moryson left a financial bequest of only 20 shillings in his will—the sum of just three days state pension at 1604 levels. Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, PROB 11/157, *Will of Fines or Fynes Morison*, 18 March 1630.

<sup>13</sup> Robert Somerville, *History of the Duchy of Lancaster* (Chancellor and Council of the Duchy of Lancaster: London, 1953), p. 8.

The 'Mr Mussenden' to whom he refers is the husband of his second sister, Faith. In the same letter, Moryson asks that in his absence the money owed be passed to George Allington, a wealthy landowner who married his sister Jane: 'I pray you lett it be delivered to my brother Alington and his aquittance shall be as sufficient as my owne' (L1: 9-10).<sup>14</sup> Both the Moryson sisters married locally, locating Lacon within the very specific part of Lincolnshire within which Moryson's family owned land and had influence.<sup>15</sup> At the time, in the immediate locality, there is a record of the death of an Edward Lacon 'Gentleman of Tetney, Lincolnshire' on 9 May, 1615.<sup>16</sup>

It seems almost certain that Moryson writes to a family friend, someone he knew and had met: 'I thought it good to remember your promise (when you were with me)'. At the time of writing, Lacon is a 'tenant' of lands in Tetney Grange, the family seat in Lincolnshire.<sup>17</sup> It seems probable that Lacon was a tenant farmer connected to the Moryson family, perhaps living on the land at Tetney bequeathed to Thomas Moryson's 'younger sonnes' in his will; Fynes, Henry and Richard.

As Henry died in the Levant in 1597, and Richard was still serving in Ireland at this time, it seems likely that Fynes writes in order to administer lands that he has

---

<sup>14</sup> Allington is an interesting figure. In the second letter, sent 12 February 1606, Moryson is writing in response to Lacon's complaints of harassment by the Sheriff, who he had to 'cast out of the door' (L2:3). He says he will inform both Allington and a Mr Osborne, who will bring in 'personal office' (L2:10) to see the matter resolved. Hughes notes Allington had close personal connection with the Cecil's, major landowners in the area. Indeed, William Cecil, Lord Burghley, purchased the Manor of Cadeby from Fyne's elder brother Edward in 1596. Surrey History Centre, Losely MSS, LM/1083/8/1 20 Nov 1596 Certified copy of bargain and sale 1) Edward Morison [Morrison] of Cadeby, Lincs, esq 2) Sir Thomas Cecill [Cecil], son and heir apparent of William, Lord Burghley. Manor of Cadeby, which Edward's father Thomas Morison had by purchase. Consideration: £1500 .

<sup>15</sup> 'Faith Mussendyne and Jane Allington, both lived near Healing, Lincolnshire'. See both Thompson and Hughes, p. xxi.

<sup>16</sup> National Archives, Records of the Prerogative Court of Cantebury, PROB 11/125, Will of Edward Lacon, Gentleman of Tetney, Lincolnshire, 09 May 1615.

<sup>17</sup> (L1:12).

assumed responsibility for. Indeed, there is a record of land in the area being transferred into the name of Fynes Moryson, two parts of the 'Manor of Tetney', in 1604, in the year following his service in the Irish War.<sup>18</sup> However, close reference to the letter reveals a parallel with a particular bequest made to Richard in the will of Thomas Moryson. Richard is granted an annuity, or rent charge levied against lands held in the family estate in Lincoln. The sum of the charge is £20, the exact rent demanded in the letter, and the date of payment is set at Michaelmas, the feast to which Moryson refers in his letter.<sup>19</sup> It is likely that the lands at Tetney were transferred into Fynes' name so that he could administer them on behalf of his brother Richard, who at this time was serving in Ireland. This practise was fairly commonplace-during his first period of travel, Moryson granted power of attorney to Thomas Moigne, a fellow of Peterhouse, connected by marriage to Moryson's mother.<sup>20</sup>

Further evidence of Moryson's involvement on behalf of Richard is embedded in the letter. In the opening to the letter, he offsets his demand for rent with an explanation of the circumstances that make a ready payment necessary: 'I shall be in Eire most part of Lent and Easter hollydayes' (L1:7). In a later visit to Ireland, he writes that he travels 'by the entreaty of my brother, Sir Richard Moryson (Vice-President of Munster), and out of my desire to see his children God had giuen him in Ireland' (*Itinerary*, Part II, p. 299). It is likely that in the earlier instance, at the

---

<sup>18</sup> Records of the Exchequer, and its related bodies, with those of the Office of First Fruits and Tenths, and the Court of Augmentations, E367 LINCOLNSHIRE, Morison, Fines: Two parts of the manor of Tetney, 1604.

<sup>19</sup> Surrey History Centre, Losely MSS, Copy of inquisition post mortem on Thomas Moryson [Morrison], esq, who died 19 Feb 1592. Edward is his son and heir LM/1083/5 21 Nov 1592 'Item I give and bequeathe to my sonn Richard Morison, one annuitie or rent charge of the Twenty Pounds by yeere out of my grange or capitall village in Tetney and other land theare in the saide Countie yeerlie to be paid at the feaste of Easter and Michalmas by then or within 15 daies'.

<sup>20</sup> Peterhouse Cambridge Archives, Peterhouse College Records, 3 August 1590, f. 377. Thomas Moigne is a witness. For Moigne's genealogical links see Thompson.

time of the Lacon letters, Moryson's trip to 'Eire' is again to see his brother Richard. At this time Moryson was close to his younger brother, serving with him in Ireland and owing his association and employment with Mountjoy to him. It is likely that the Lacon letters are a record of Moryson administering Richard's English affairs, and business interests, whilst he serves in Ireland.<sup>21</sup>

The single letter considered so far, is of course, part of a sequence of letters exchanged. But from this one document, Moryson's intent, motivations, friends, contacts and personal circumstances can be inferred. The letter is also of use though, as it locates not just Lacon and the other figures mentioned, but also Moryson, at a time in his life when his whereabouts were unknown. At the foot of the letter, preceding the date, Moryson closes by revealing his own address: 'I bid you a very hasty ffarewell. from my chamber at Mr Jarvis his house in Redcrosse Street the 21st of January 1606'. There is no similar address in Lincoln, where Moryson is assumed to be at the last record of his whereabouts in England, immediately prior to his Irish venture in 1601.<sup>22</sup>

However, there is a Redcrosse Street, or Red Cross Street in London, on the outskirts of the city, just outside London Wall in the Parish of Cripplegate.<sup>23</sup> Presumably, upon leaving Mountjoy's service Moryson is located in London, renting what he calls a 'chamber', in the house of a Mr Jarvis in Cripplegate.<sup>24</sup> This positions Moryson in the city at a very interesting time in literary history, at the

---

<sup>21</sup> Notably Moryson's later trip to Ireland, in 1613, is also partly motivated by 'some occasions of my private estate'. *Itinerary*, Part II, p. 297.

<sup>22</sup> *Itinerary*, Part II, p. 84.

<sup>23</sup> Thomas Pennant, *Some account of London* (London: printed for Robert Faulder, New Bond-Street, by R. Taylor and Co. 38, Shoe-Lane, Fleet-Street, 1805), p. 335. Red Cross Street is named after a red cross that stood on the site.

<sup>24</sup> There is no Jarvis in any contemporary records of the area (Cripplegate-Parish of St Giles, Cripplegate) however there is an extant will to a Mr Jarvis recorded 60 years later: National Archives, Probate Records, Curtis, Jarvis, of St. Gyles, Cripplegate, London, citizen & borderer, ref. 1669W, August 16 1670.

exact time that he, by his own admission, begins to write his *Itenerary*.<sup>25</sup> Although it is impossible to conjecture anything concerning Moryson's influence upon the London literary scene at this point, it strengthens the case for seeing possible references, or allusions to him in contemporary literature at this point.<sup>26</sup>

In terms of raw biographical data alone, the single letter Fynes Moryson sends to Edward Lacon on 21 January 1606 represents a significant supplement to existing knowledge. It is now possible to discern both his business and travel intents for the first of the lost years, the names of friends, acquaintances, his relationship to his family, his financial circumstances at a very specific time, and furthermore, the very street he was renting accommodation on, and even the name of his landlord. Each of these biographical threads has the potential to be explored further, adding to the slim corpus of knowledge that comprises Moryson's existing biography. Yet this information has been discerned from just a single letter, and it is important first to delve further into the content of the other letters Moryson exchanges with Lacon, and the later sequence of Gresham correspondence.

In the case of the Lacon letters, the theme explicated in the original letter is reiterated in the following two communiqués, yet it is still possible to glean further details of Moryson's movements and circumstances at this time. In the second letter in the sequence, sent 12 February 1606, Moryson is more precise about the exact date of his forthcoming trip to Ireland, saying it will be 'before mid lent' (L2:15). Lent runs for the 40 days preceding Easter, discounting Sundays,

---

<sup>25</sup> Interestingly Sir James Perrot is said to have abandoned his work, 'A Chronicle of Ireland' in 1608, after hearing that another writer was engaged in composing a history of the province. This may well have been Moryson. See Sir James Perrott, *The Chronicle of Ireland 1584-1608*, Herbert Wood (ed.) (Dublin: The Stationery Office, 1933), p. vii.

<sup>26</sup> See H. L. Snuggs, 'Fynes Moryson and Jonson's Puntarvolo', *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 51, No. 4 (Apr., 1936), pp. 230-234. Hughes has argued unconvincingly for a contemporary resonance in the works of Shakespeare, notably *The Tempest*. See Hughes, p. xv.

which are not included in the calculation. Given this information, it would be sensible to assume Moryson left the country 20-25 days before Easter-which in 1607, fell on April 15<sup>th</sup>, giving a possible date of departure as around March 20-25th.

Following the letter of 12 February 1606, Moryson next writes on 6 July 1607.

Given that he writes in request of the same late payment, and that the first two letters addressing the same topic are written within 3 weeks of one another, an educated guess would situate his return to England at approximately mid June, suggesting he spent around 3 months in Ireland during 1606/07. This adds to Moryson's biography, confirming his whereabouts for the first 6 months of the modern 1606 calendar year. In addition, the letter of 6 July 1607 refers to a suggested meeting with Lacon, at Bartholomew's fair. This event was traditionally located in London, at Smithfields, and took place on 24 August each year.<sup>27</sup> This locates Moryson within London till at least August 1607.

The question of the rent also allows more inferences concerning Moryson's finances. It is possible to discern from the letters, and from the minutiae of Richard Moryson's bequest' that the rent is bi-annual, due on 'Easter' (L1:8), and 'Michaelmas' (L1:3) respectively.<sup>28</sup> Therefore in writing to Lacon in July, Moryson writes to remind Lacon of his commitment, to assure payment of the forthcoming Michelmas rent. Moryson is eager to confirm payment, as he, as the landowner in lieu of Richard Moryson, is responsible for the King's Rent: 'send me up at

---

<sup>27</sup> Ben Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair*, Colin Counsell (ed.) (Nick Hern Books: London, 1997) 'The Four-and-Twentieth of August! Barthol'emew Day! Barthol'emew Day! (1:1, 7), p. 9.

<sup>28</sup> Surrey History Centre, Losely MSS, Copy of inquisition post mortem on Thomas Moryson [Morrison], esq, who died 19 Feb 1592. Edward is his son and heir LM/1083/5 21 Nov 1592. 'Item I give and bequeathe to my sonn Richard Morison, one annuitie or rent charge of the Twenty Pounds by yeere out of my grange or capitall village in Tetney and other land theare in the saide Countie yeerlie to be paid at the feaste of Easter and Michalmas by then or within 15 daies.'

michaelmas five poundes for the halfe yeares Rent to the King' (L3: 167). Moryson is unable to meet this sum, and informs Lacon: 'I have borrowd the mony, upon my brother Allingtons being ingaged to see it payed at that tyme'(L3:7). As previously mentioned, £5 was no insignificant fee, perhaps equating to half the annual wage for a common labourer.<sup>29</sup>

However, to see Moryson struggling to meet this sum confirms that his circumstances were drastically reduced following the death of his patron. This obviates the critical perception of him as an early Grand Tourist, living in luxury and revelling in 'excess' as he travels Europe as a member of the 'Anglican Royalist elite'.<sup>30</sup> Casting Moryson as a wealthy degenerate, living out a frivolous youth on the continent is an unfortunate critical perception, and contributes to misrepresentation and misinterpretation of passages taken from the *Itinerary*.<sup>31</sup> It is clear that at the time of the Lacon letters, Moryson is an aspirational writer, hoping to make a name for himself, and perhaps some money, from the publication of his travel diaries. This confirms the view of scholars such as Hadfield, who perceive Moryson as the first of a new generation of professional travel writers, travelling not for personal edification but to found a literary career.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Ann Kussmaul, *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1981) p. 37. £10 is the average for London-£6-£7 for farm labourers.

<sup>30</sup> Chloe Chard, *Pleasure and Guilt on the Grand Tour: Travel Writing and Imaginative Geography* (Manchester University Press: Manchester, 1999), p. 56. See also Christopher D. Gabbard, *Gender Stereotyping in Early Modern Travel Writing on Holland Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 43.1 (2003), pp. 83-100, p.100.

<sup>31</sup> For other exponents of this view, see W.E Mead, *The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century* (Ayer Publishing, London, 1970) p. 154, Barbara Korte, *Early English Travel Writing: from Pilgrimages to Postcolonial Exploration* (St Martin's press: London, 2000) p. 44.

<sup>32</sup> 'Travel became more a means to an end than an end in itself for writers such as Moryson and Lithgow.' Hadfield, Andrew, *Amazons, Savages and Machiavels, An Anthology of Travel and Colonial Writing in England, 1550-1630* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), p. 81.

The Lacon letters are an open and accessible source for Moryson's life, at a time when concrete biographical information is not otherwise available. The later sequences of letters have less in the way of readily explicable information, and require a closer, more interpretative pattern of reading. The first letter in the sequence, addressed to Mr Gresham and sent on 7 May 1610, opens with what seems to be a repudiation of claims made against Moryson:

I pray you to believe me on my honest word, that [which] the sute in Lawe wherof you write is not followed by me, but by a gentleman Sir Richard Moryson hath imployed to that purpose onlye. (L4: 1-3)

Moryson is eager to disassociate himself from his brother in this matter. Later in the letter, he writes that his brother has engaged the legal service of the 'gentleman' referred to above over Fynes, as 'you may heare Sir Richard Moryson hath some jelosy of [my] me' (L4:7-8). It is immediately evident that there has been a change in the family circumstances of Fynes since the earlier Lacon letters. Previously acting on his brother's behalf, he has been moved to publicly disavow this fraternal connection. However, Fynes is keen not to condemn his brother 'I hope you will not think fitt that I should by evasion deliver him whom he hath truste.' (L4: 10-11). It would be simple to ascribe this to filial obligation, to refer to the strong family connections that bind the Moryson family.

However, it is important not to view this excerpt in isolation. There is a strong semantic theme of truth and honesty which permeates the letter. The letter opens 'I pray you to believe me on my honest word' (L4:1), he refers to 'the truth written in more playness' (L4: 11-12), and expresses a wish to make lucid his intents face-to-face 'speache shall offer for making all I say more cleare to you' (L4: 24-25). Moryson is forced to return to the theme, and to saturate the letter

with this implication, as he wishes to make a positive first impression on Gresham. This letter is the first act in the construction of the discourse founded with Gresham, and its interpretation will define Moryson's epistolary representation in future correspondence.

It is clear that Moryson has spent significant time crafting the letter, making six corrections designed to add to the eloquence and flow of the letter, for example substituting 'here' for 'towne' (L4: 15-16), possibly to clarify the location specified, or to alter the syntax slightly to make the sentence more fluid. Moryson's usual salutation has also been altered, the first time in the sequence of three that it differs from 'my lovinge friend' (L5: Address). In the Gresham letter, the address reads 'To My very lovinge and *very respected* (my italics) friend Mr Gresham' (L4: address). The addition of 'very respected' seems consciously deferential, and it is certainly an unusual adornment for Moryson, who does not use this form of address in any of his other autograph correspondence, or letters composed whilst employed in Mountjoy's secretariat.<sup>33</sup>

Analysis of the physical form of the letter also reveals another amendment, capitalising amidst a sentence to add emphasis to the word satisfaction in the following utterance:

but such a good friend as your self, to whom further {I do} give full

Satisfaction of my readyness to doo any curtesy in my power. (L4:13-14)

Again, Moryson defers to Gresham, as with the address ceding to his higher status. Whilst this may seem like a simple, epistolary form of hat-doffing, close

---

<sup>33</sup> For example-see the following letters sent whilst Moryson was employed in Mountjoy's service: National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy to the Privy Council, December 11 1600, SP 63, 207, f. 97, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy, to the Privy Council, February 6 1601, SP 63, 208, f. 97. Both letters are in the hand of Fynes Moryson, including the address and signature.

analysis of the above utterance, and other excerpts, reveal the skill and thought applied to the construction of the letter. As previously mentioned, Moryson had extensive secretarial experience, at the highest level of government. He is a man who thinks, and defines himself, and the lives of others through his correspondence. In the above extract, he refers to Gresham as a 'good friend' (L4:16). This is of course, taken literally, a fallacy. Moryson and Gresham had no prior contact, certainly nothing sufficient to counter the misinformation Moryson writes to quell. Moryson instead applies the term to consciously evoke the idea of a friendship mediated through letters, an epistolary relationship, embedding the genesis of the idea within their discourse. Moryson is very conscious of the nascent relationship, and takes care to nurture it, painstakingly constructing every sentence:

you will please to see me at my lodging ....Or if you please to send me word wher you lodge I will come to you for I desyre to speak with you about a small matter concerning me (L4:16-22)

In the above excerpt, Moryson makes a request. However, whilst his correspondence with Gresham is still in the inceptive stage, he is conscious any refusal will damage the embryonic relationship. By offering an alternative, he pre-empts any refusal, or negotiation, acquiescing in advance. Every sentence in the letter has been thought over with the same close consideration, building a representation designed to effect the following request: 'Ye because I shall have occasion to shoue you many papers' (L4: 23-24). On the letter itself, the word 'papers' has been underlined with a heavy slash. This immediately foregrounds their importance. Since the content of the 'papers' is not defined in the letter,

clearly the information they contain is too important to commit to paper.<sup>34</sup> Thus the imagined act of revealing secret papers to another becomes an evocation of intimacy, an offering designed to seal or bind the budding epistolary relationship.

Moryson has a practical purpose, to arrange and confirm a meeting with Gresham. The Gresham to whom Moryson writes is Thomas Gresham, a landowner who in December 1608 purchased the Moryson family seat at Tetney from Fynes' older brother, Thomas. The terms of the purchase are very unusual, in that they include the absolution of a £900 debt accumulated by Thomas Moryson, and included provisions for a dynastic marriage between the Gresham and Moryson children. In the Lacon letters, Fynes had acted on his brother Richard's behalf, negotiating the payment of the charge Richard holds against Tetney. Presumably, the 'sute' (L4:1) to which Moryson refers in the opening to his letter is a legal action launched by Richard against Gresham, designed to secure his annuity despite the transference of the lands.

However, Moryson distances himself from Richard in his first letter, indicating he has not been instructed to act on his behalf. He assures Gresham he is not interested in the case, nor does he have any intention of luring Gresham to his chamber in order to serve a writ:

'(I) assure you to be free [of any] (to my uttermost power), of any attachment to be served on you at this your coming to me... you shall be free from any trappe so farre as I can possibly prevent it' (L4: 18-27)

At this point, it is worth referring to the other letters, to question or ascertain Moryson's motives.<sup>35</sup> He seems to be acting sincerely in regard of the promises he

---

<sup>34</sup> For a discussion of the value imparted to sensitive papers, and correspondence, see Robyn Jade Adams, 'Both diligent and secret: the intelligence letters of William Herle', Queen Mary University of London PhD thesis, 2004, p. 30.

makes Gresham, writing to Garret, the solicitor employed on behalf of Richard to discourage him from apprehending Gresham at the posited meeting at Moryson's chamber: 'give him assurance, that he shall come ergo away from thear without any trouble from you or by your meanes' (L5: 3-4). Despite this, the letter also invites Garret to the meeting, so it is clear that the legalities of Richard's sute will be debated in Moryson's' presence, despite his earlier disavowal of personal involvement. It is possible that Moryson's intent is somewhat more duplicitous than he makes clear in his letter to Gresham. Whilst not acting directly on Richard's behalf, as his legal representative, he is instructing Garret, his solicitor, in his absence, and in the final letter in the sequence, sent 19 June 1610, Moryson prevents Garret from lodging a bill in Richard's name in the court of the exchequer.<sup>36</sup> It is not clear however, whether Moryson does this to aid Richard's interests, or to further his own.

In the same letter, sent 19 June 1610, Moryson mentions he has lodged a bill of his own, in the 'duchye' (L6:4) or Duchy Chamber. This is 'the Council of the Duchy in its judicial capacity', or the court which administers land and holdings contained within the estate of the Duchy of Lancaster, for example the former Moryson

---

<sup>35</sup> The value of a writ issued directly to the defendant in any given case is that, following this action, they can no longer disclaim knowledge of the matter at hand. A writ is an extension of the monarch's mandate, or authority, and would need to have been purchased from Chancery, or the Court of the Exchequer. This reading is based on Maitland's definition in F. W. Maitland, *The Forms of Action at Common Law* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1962), p. 22-30.

<sup>36</sup> The Exchequer refers to the Exchequer of pleas-one of the three common law courts of early modern England. This court could be used in private litigation if the claimant could claim to be accountable to the crown. In this case, as the revenues of the land at Tetney were paid from land leased from the crown, the 'King's rent', this case could be brought before the court of the Exchequer. See James A. Ballantine *A Law Dictionary of Words, Terms, Abbreviations and Phrases Which are Peculiar to the Law and of Those Which Have a Peculiar Meaning in the Law. Containing Latin Phrases and Maxims With Their Translations and a Table of the Names of the Reports and Their Abbreviations.* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1916), p. 380.

estate at Tetney.<sup>37</sup> This indicates a claim has been made against land contained within the former Moryson holdings, now controlled by Gresham. This may be as the land concerned is the property administered by Fynes in Richard's absence, or it may be an independent claim made now the land has passed into new hands. Whatever the exact content of the suite, it is clearly the 'business affaire' (L6: 7) of which he writes to Gresham in the first letter in the 1610 correspondence.<sup>38</sup>

The letter is addressed to Mr Curwin, the legal representative of Thomas Gresham. As no reply has been forthcoming from Gresham, Moryson's intent is to force Curwin's hand, to discuss the 'papers' referred to in the first letters in person, without resorting to the courts. Just as with his first letter, Moryson attempts to flood the letter with language chosen to serve his intent. In this case, the letter is suffused with the vocabulary of speed, haste, and time. He asks for a 'direct answering (regarding) my owne business affaire' (L6: 6-7) and reiterates his desire at the close to the letter, demanding a 'speedy and direct answer' (L6: 12). He has the ability to 'stay Sir Richard Morysons Suit in the exchequer' (L6: 2-3) yet at the same time the bill he has lodged at the Duchy Court, is itself proceeding apace: 'he promised me Speedy answer.' (L6:5). Even the sign off has an unusual brevity: 'So I take my leave' (L6: 14-15). The language demonstrates the personal agency of the writer over the content of the letter, and the matters transacted, attempting to set, or control the pace of affairs.

Sadly, no reply exists from Curwin, but what may be assumed from the correspondence is that both Moryson brothers have been left substantially disenfranchised following the abrupt sale of their family home. That both

---

<sup>37</sup> Geoffrey Rudolph Elton, *The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1982), p. 142.

<sup>38</sup> Both this suite, and the claim made by Richard Moryson, may remain in the comprehensive records of the exchequer and duchy courts.

Moryson brothers launch legal action against a man whose children are betrothed to that of their elder brother, Thomas, suggests a split, or division in the family, possibly referred to in Moryson's writing. Moryson is hostile towards the idea of primogeniture, writing in bitter terms of his father's will in the first volume of his *Itenerary*:

that in those neere places I might dispose of my small patrimony (for in England gentlemen give their younger sonnes lesse, then in forraine parts they give to their bastards) (*Itenerary*, Part I, p. 19).

As previously mentioned, he returns to the same theme in part II of his *Itenerary*. Whilst it is likely, as previously conjectured, that the terms of Thomas Moryson's will were specifically designed to propel Fynes towards the church, and away from his loudly proclaimed intent to travel, it is also probably that the hasty sale of Tetney Grange had a considerable effect on the personal fortunes of Richard and Fynes, prejudicing them against their elder siblings.

As with the Lacon letters, it is possible to discern Moryson's location from the later correspondence when close attention is paid to the content. Unlike the earlier exchange of letters, Moryson does not specify his location in his closing address. However, in the undated letter, addressed to 'Mr Garret', Moryson requests that Garret arrange a meeting between the recipient, Gresham, and himself: 'I pray you speak with Mr Curwin in the Ffleete, and apoint with him a tyme for Mr Gresham's meeting you hear in my chamber' (L5: 1-2). The 'Ffleete' to which Moryson refers may refer to a mutually understood address adjoining the small tributary river of the Thames, the Fleet, which is nowadays spanned by

the modern road after which it is named, Fleet Street.<sup>39</sup> However, it is more likely that the 'Ffleete' in question represents an allusion to the Fleet Prison, the institution to which many debtors were sent.<sup>40</sup>

In attempting to facilitate the meeting, Moryson furnishes Garret with specific local information about the area: 'Mr Curwin his lodging is hard by the door on the left hande.' (L5: 8). This strongly suggests local knowledge of the prison. In addition, Moryson arranges a meeting within his 'chamber' (L5:2). It is unlikely that Fynes, writing to three men based in London, would seek to arrange a meeting at a location any significant distance from the city without first specifying his location, or furnishing his correspondents with travel information.<sup>41</sup>

In his first letter to Gresham, Moryson amends the letter to suggest Gresham meet him in 'towne' (L4: 16). This suggests a city, or place common to both writer and recipient. Given that Gresham is located in 'Ffulham' (L4: address), this provides further evidence to place him in London at this time. It is safe to assume Moryson is still living in London at this point, sequestered within his 'chamber'. The inference is that he is still lodging within the city at this point, suggesting continuous residence in London from January 1606-June 1610 at the least.

Whilst this information in its own right can be duly added to Moryson's biography, detailing his location at this point is significant, as it situates Moryson at the time he was beginning to write, and edit his *Itinerary*. The earliest extant manuscript to the first part of this work is BL. Harleian MS. 5133, *Itinerarium Pars Prima*.

---

<sup>39</sup> Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge University Press: London, 1995), p. 88.

<sup>40</sup> Prisoners in the Fleet had a degree of liberty, and were allowed to walk around unsupervised and enjoy access to paper and ink for a fee. See Thomas Dekker, *Lantern and Candlelight*, Ed. Viviana Comensoli (Centre for Renaissance and Reformation Studies: Toronto, 2007), p. 33.

<sup>41</sup> Gresham is at Fulham, Curwin is at the Fleet, Garret is unspecified but is assumed, in the letter, to have local access to both Moryson and Curwin.

Previous scholars have dated this text to 1610.<sup>42</sup> This would position Moryson within London during the composition of the first volume of the *Itenerary*. The provenance of this document however, is uncertain. The date of 1610 which Kew posits is an educated guess, based on analysis of Moryson's own words, in his 'Address to the Reader' in the first part of the *Itenerary*. Moryson confirms he wasted three years' labour between 1606 and 1609, and subsequently began to write in earnest:

in which I abstracted the Histories of these 12 Dominions thorow which I passed, with purpose to joyne them to the Discourses of the severall Common-wealths. And for the rest of the yeers, I wrote at leasure, giving (like a free and unhired workeman) much time to pleasure, to necessary affaires, and to divers and long distractions. (*Itenerary*, 'Address to the Reader')

Moryson later reveals he has destroyed, or cast aside, the histories of the twelve dominions during this time. However, he purposes to join them to 'the discourses of the severall common-wealths'. As the first part of the *Itenerary* is essentially a discourse or commentary on the various commonwealths through which he has travelled, it is possible the extant manuscript was produced significantly before 1610. Considering the whole 'Address to the Reader', as opposed to isolated extracts, supports this opinion. It must be remembered that in the *Itenerary*, the 'Address to the Reader' is an apology, a conceit in which Moryson presents the work as a hasty, rough hewn work, of little literary merit, saying it is:

carelesly and negligently bound together...the trifling away of much time, may bee imputed to my ignorance, dulnes or negligence, if my just excuse

---

<sup>42</sup> Kew, p. xxix.

be not heard: in the rendering whereof I must crave your patience

(*Itinerary*, 'Address to the Reader')

It is in Moryson's interests to suggest he has wasted much time, and labour on the manuscript, excusing any stylistic failings in the *Itinerary*.<sup>43</sup>

To return to the letters, it is possible to draw inferences from their writing which may allow a more dependable date of composition to be hypothesised for the Latin manuscript. The two sequences of letters represent a snapshot of Moryson's hand at two distinct points. Comparing the physical form of the letters, the manner and care with which each individual word and character has been applied to the page reveals significant differences between the two. The earlier sequence of letters has a tight and definite style, rows of condensed minims punctuated by the abrupt spikes of constant characters and capitals. In the later sequence, this style has given way to a looser, irregular style, a fluid, flowing form of writing much less regular and meticulous than that of the Lacon correspondence.

Whilst this is only an initial impression, close analysis of the letters supports this contention. The word 'speedy', an idiosyncratic favourite of Moryson's, occurs in his letter to Mr Curwin on 19 June 1610, and in an earlier letter, sent to Edward Lacon, dated 6 July 1607. In the later letter, the word measures (on average) 22mm. The 'S' measures 3mm across, and on the upstroke reaches 8mm. The tail of the 'y' at the close of the word flicks out across the page to a length of 4mm. In contrast, the word measures just 16mm in the earlier letter, with the 'S' spanning just 2mm, with a vertical height of 8mm. The tail of the 'y' is only reaches 2.5mm. The difference is not restricted to the size, and length of words, perhaps indicative

---

<sup>43</sup> For a critique of Moryson's writing style, see N.E Osselton, 'Hakluyt's Language', in *The Hakluyt Handbook*, D.B Quinn (ed.) (London: Hakluyt Society, 1974), p. 26.

of a more free flowing writing style. The size of characters has also undergone a significant change-not perhaps, in their construction, as for example the 'S' upstroke remains constant, but in how carefully they have been applied to the page, restricted to a more rigid and regular horizontal width.

This contention seems to apply also to the larger body of each letter as a whole. In the earlier letter, the mean distance between words is almost exactly 2mm.<sup>44</sup> In the later sequence, the mean is not much greater, around 2.5mm, but the range is much greater, varying from 2 to 5mm, as opposed to a single millimetre in the first sample.<sup>45</sup> The variable, more chaotic nature of the later writing style is not restricted to spacing, or structure, but also applies to word and character construction. The mean length of the word 'me' in the letter to Edward Lacon on 21 January 1606, is 6.333mm. In the later letter addressed to Mr Gresham, sent May 7 1610, 'me' averages at 9.2mm, as with the earlier comparisons, significantly larger. However, the word, although only composed of two characters, varies by 3mm in the latter example (from 11-8mm) as opposed to just 1mm in the earlier letters.<sup>46</sup>

There is ample evidence for a significant difference between the earlier sequence of letters,<sup>47</sup> written at the beginning of the year 1606/1607, and the later correspondence, written just three years later in the early summer months of 1610. Interpreting this difference is problematic, but it seems appropriate to draw make some inferences based on what is known of Moryson's life. As he writes the

---

<sup>44</sup> Taken from the first line of the letter, mean spacing is 2.15mm.

<sup>45</sup> Taken from the first line of the letter, mean spacing is 2.72mm.

<sup>46</sup> The word 'me' occurs 7 times in the Lacon letter of 21 January 1606, and 5 times in the Gresham letter, sent 7 May 1610.

<sup>47</sup> The signature applied to each letter also varies liberally-the range in the first sequence is 5mm (29-54), and in the second 12mm (58-64). The word 'loving', used in the salutation or the closing address that proceeds the signature is on average, 5mm greater in the second, later sample.

first sequence of letters to Lacon, he is fresh from a five year tenure as Mountjoy's secretary, where his primary function would be to write letters on his master's behalf. Naturally, this contributes to a regular, efficient writing style, clearly formed characters, even spacing and neatness. At the time of the Gresham legal dispute, he has by his own admission been drafting his 'Itinerary' for at least three years, writing in isolation, and drifting into idiosyncrasies of style and language.<sup>48</sup> The chaotic application of characters and long, sprawling words in the later letters are the hallmarks of a writer's solipsistic scrawl.

The significance of this difference is in its relationship to the two differing styles to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, the focus of the second part of this study. As previously noted, it has been assigned to the year 1610 through a reading of Moryson's 'Address to the Reader' in Part I of the *Itinerary*. However, considering the physical form of the manuscript side-by-side with the two sets of letters contradicts this assessment. The measured style evident in the Lacon letters is much closer to the controlled hand evident in the autograph sections of the Latin *Itinerarium Pars Prima* than the fitful, erratic application of words and characters to the page present in the 1610 correspondence. Looking closely at the manuscript in conjunction with the two examples, the mean height of a capital 'S' in autograph sections of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* is 7mm, as it is with the Lacon letters, as opposed to 10mm in the later correspondence.<sup>49</sup> The mean width of 'o', 'e', and other diminutive vowel characters in the manuscript is 2.5 mm, again

---

<sup>48</sup> Moryson inserts the Latinate term 'ergo', 'therefore', in his later correspondence to Garret, Richard Moryson's solicitor. Whether this is as he has been drafting the *Itinerarium* in Latin, and naturally deviates to the language, or because he is writing in a legal context, is a point of contention.

<sup>49</sup> The mean has been calculated by a random sample of the use of the capital 'S' character in the three texts compared. In each case, the mean has been calculated from the summative height of 10 'S' characters, and then rounded down to produce a whole number.

exactly analogous with the Lacon correspondence, as opposed to the slightly larger 3mm in the later letters.<sup>50</sup> The autograph sections of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* bear a much greater physical resemblance to the three Lacon letters than it does to the later series of letters.

Proposing that autograph sections of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* may have been composed around 1606 represents a significant step, as it suggests that this work had its genesis in an early Latin text, composed much earlier than has previously been supposed. Most modern approaches to the existing manuscripts assume that they were composed shortly before publication, and committed via translation straight to print.<sup>51</sup> I instead contend that the Latin manuscript is part of an extended editorial process. The autograph sections seem to stem from a much earlier draft, a contention supported by analysis of marginal annotations in both Latin manuscripts, *Itinerarium Pars Prima & Secunda*. This positions this early Latin work far closer to Moryson's original notes, diaries, thoughts and opinions, a recollection of his travel written ten years before the publication of the text with which the modern reader is familiar, the 1617 *Itinerary*.

---

<sup>50</sup> The same method as above has been applied to this sample.

<sup>51</sup> Graham Kew, for example assumes that the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* is translated and transferred directly into the *Itinerary*. He may draw this inference from Moryson's insinuation in the printed 'Address to the Reader', that the work had its origins in an autograph Latin text. See Kew, p. iv.

***En verite vous estes fin: Later Life, Publication and Death 1617-1630***

In June 1596, Fynes Moryson and his brother Henry left the monastery where they had been staying at Jerusalem and set out to travel together to Joppa, the next stop on their tour of the Levant Region. The two brothers, disguised as ‘Catholiques’ (*Itinerary*, Part II, p.237), travelled in the company of a party of Italian Friars. As they walked together, one of the Friars fell into conversation with Moryson, conversing in French. Upon learning Moryson’s forename, the Friar made a weak pun upon it, saying ‘en verite vous este fin’, or ‘in truth you are fine’ inferring he had seen through the disguise of the two brothers, but would not reveal their identity.<sup>1</sup> However, as Moryson intimates in his narrative, the Friar’s words carried a darker meaning. ‘Fiennes’, the French form of ‘Fynes’ is in fact much closer to ‘finis’. Both Moryson and Henry would indeed have been finished if the Friar had revealed their identity to their travelling companions.<sup>2</sup> As the narrative proceeds, the Friar’s words prove to have prefigured an unfortunate chain of events that occupied Moryson’s life for five years. A month after the conversation, his brother Henry died in his arms just outside Joppa:

While myself and my brother were in our last imbraces, and mournfull speeches, the rascall multitude of Turkes and Moores ceased not to girde and laugh at our sighes and teares; neither know I why my heart-strings brake not in these desperate afflictions; but I am sure from that day to this I

---

<sup>1</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 238. Fynes does not translate the Friar’s expression, which is also similar to ‘in truth you are fine/Fynes’, and depends on pronunciation.

<sup>2</sup> Both Moryson and Henry were obliged to disguise themselves as ‘Papists’ at this time, and were forced to conceal their identity from their Italian and French consorts, claiming to be English recusants. *Itinerary*, Part I, pp. 234-238.

neuer enjoyed my former health, and that this houre was the first of my old age... (*Itenerary*, Part II, pp, 249)

The traumatic effect of Henry's death upon Fynes cannot be overestimated.<sup>3</sup>

After Henry died, Fynes himself became sick, 'pressed with miseries' (*Itenerary*, Part I, p. 251) that he could not subdue. This illness, which may have been depressive in nature, afflicted Moryson until he returned to England. This 'lasting sickness' (*Itenerary*, Part I, p. 250) seems to have had a powerful effect on Moryson's psychology. Consider this description of testimonies which Fynes and Henry had been given in Jerusalem:

I looked vpon the two testimonies, giuen to my brother and my self at *Jerusalem*, of our hauing been there, and I was not a little astonished, to see that they being both at the same time cut out of the same skin of parchment, and written with the same hand and inck, yet that of my brother was in all parts eaten with wormes, when mine was altogether vntouched. And after I did more wonder, that to this day the same Testimonie giuen to my brother is no more eaten with wormes, then at that time it was, and mine still remains vnperished. (*Itenerary*, Part I, pp. 250-151)

Moryson was forced to employ a servant to accompany him to England, a man who himself had fallen on hard times following his 'Master's Death' (*Itenerary*

---

<sup>3</sup> Henry's death affected Fynes for his entire life. He writes of it at points in the *Itenerary* (Part III, p. 22 and Part I, pp. 198 & 209) but does not seem to want to dwell upon the topic. There is an interesting annotation on f.360v of the Latin manuscript which also attests to this. Moryson describes the beginning of his journey with Henry, writing 'setting out merry look my last epistle to Richard Moryson'. This suggests that Moryson had considered including a letter to Richard, describing the two of them setting out together in great spirits. This letter is not included in either the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* or printed *Itenerary*, suggesting that Moryson decided not to include this information, possibly because it was still too traumatic.

Part I, p. 251) and was also travelling to England.<sup>4</sup> Moryson returned to England with his servant, where he lived with his sister Jane until he was well enough to accompany Mountjoy to Ireland, almost five years later. The Friar's words seem to portend a sequence of tragedy and ill luck within the narrative, and yet they also have a strong resonance within the context of Fynes Moryson's later, unwritten life. From the moment the Friar's words appear in print, in the 1617 publication of the *Itenerary*, Moryson's life enters a gradual, but inevitable process of decline that began with the commercial failure of the *Itenerary*, and culminated in his death thirteen years later, dying unmarried and alone, wrapped in his 'best cloake' in which he had travelled the continent nearly forty years earlier.<sup>5</sup> In truth, once his *Itenerary* was published, Fynes was indeed finished.

Although there is no extant information regarding the contemporary sales of the *Itenerary*, modern biographers have assumed the volume was not a 'pecuniary success'.<sup>6</sup> This assertion derives from an assessment of the capital and material goods bequeathed in Moryson's will. This document is the only existing evidence for Moryson's life following the publication of the *Itenerary*, and so naturally it has informed readings of his later life history. In their discussion of Moryson's final years, both Hughes and Thompson contend that Moryson 'sunk his small patrimony in an annuity which, added to his pension, enabled him to support a

---

<sup>4</sup> Although Fynes does not name his servant, it seems possible that he may be the same 'servant' mentioned in Moryson's will and the *Itinerarium Pars Secunda*, Isaac Pywall. Pywall contributes 'Hand 2' in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. Notably Moryson mentions that Isaac had 'not the least skil in any forraine language' in the *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 251. This is reflected in the authorial corrections in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, many of which take the form of corrections to Isaac's Latin.

<sup>5</sup> The cloak is possibly the 'fine cloke' Moryson purchases in Padua, and he wears this travelling 'cloake' when he returns to his sister Jane Allington's house in London. This cloak may be the same one Moryson is wearing in Ireland which is shot through during his first encounter with the rebels in West Meath. See *Itenerary*, Part I, pp. 149 & 423 and Part II, p. 88.

<sup>6</sup> Hughes, p. lxi.

servant and rent suitable rooms'.<sup>7</sup> Although neither biographer corroborates this contention, it is assumed to have sufficient foundation in the humble terms of Moryson's will.

The will, reproduced below, certainly represents the legacy of an unassuming man of modest means. However, it is important that the biographer does not construct Moryson's later life history directly from the terms of the will. It must be considered in conjunction with information drawn from the pages of the *Itinerary*, the physical form of the 1617 publication, the reception and reaction to this text, and the tentative steps taken by Moryson in the preparation of his intended second publication, preserved in manuscript form at Corpus Christi College, Oxford.<sup>8</sup> It is a relatively brief text when compared with his father's will:

Mr Fines Morison his last will and testament bearinge date 15 Sept. 1629  
 To Mrs Elizabeth Dynne his pictures To George Allington Esquire His best  
 night Capp and handkercheife To Mr FFrancis Dynne his bookes and  
 Cabonett. To Mr William Ireland his guilded halberd To Mrs Susan Ireland  
 his wife all his lynnens and the trunke wherein it lyeth To Sarah Ireland two  
 redd chaires and two redd stooles both of cloth To Mr Edward Waterhouse  
 Twentie shillinge To his Servant Isaac Pywall all his wearinge apparel  
 excepte his best cloake Also his bed wherin he lay with the furniture  
 belonging there unto. As alsoe the hanginge of his chamber. And of this his  
 last will he makes Mr Francis Dynne Executor. This is the effect of the will of  
 Mr Ffynes Moryson who died the twelfth of Ffebruary last.

Witnesses FFrancis Dynne Isaak Pywall Susan Ireland

---

<sup>7</sup> Thompson.

<sup>8</sup> Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 'An itinerary', pt 4, MS no. Xciv.

Probatum fuit testamentum suprascript apud London

Decimo octavo die mensii Martii Anno Domini Millimo sexcentesimo

vicesimo nono Juramento Ffrancisei Dynne executoris<sup>9</sup>

The will records a prosaic list of possessions, handkerchiefs, bed linen and even a nightcap being part of his bequest. In contrast, his father Thomas Moryson left £886 of financial bequests, amidst over ten thousand pounds of land and goods disbursed amongst the beneficiaries. Fynes leaves only twenty shillings. Whilst the will does indeed suggest the *Itinerary* did accrue only modest profits, more can be inferred about Moryson's later life from the nature of the material goods listed.

The terms of the will are fastidious, recording every possession Moryson owned at the time of his death. Of the furnishings listed, only two chairs, a cabinet, and a single bed are recorded. This suggests the trappings of a single room, an inference strengthened by the later reference to a 'chamber'. This term denotes a single room, and suggests rented accommodation.<sup>10</sup> Clearly, Moryson holds no property in his own name, living alone as a lodger, perhaps in the household of one of the other beneficiaries of his will.

With regard to the names mentioned in the provisions of the will, very little information is readily available. Of the people listed, only George Allington,

---

<sup>9</sup> National Archives, Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, PROB 11/157, *Will of Fines or Fynes Morison*, 18 March 1630.

<sup>10</sup> The most common early modern understanding of the term was 'Rooms forming part of a house or tenement arranged for occupation by single persons; *esp.* rooms in the Inns of Court occupied by lawyers'. The term is also used in this context in the will of Thomas Moryson-his son Henry is bequeathed the lease of a chamber in Greys Inn. See Oxford English Dictionary online, [http://0-dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query\\_type=word&queryword=chamber](http://0-dictionary.oed.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/cgi/entry/50273865?query_type=word&queryword=chamber), accessed 05/12/08 and Surrey History Centre, Losely MSS, Copy of inquisition post mortem on Thomas Moryson [Morrison], esq, who died 19 Feb 1592. Edward is his son and heir LM/1083/5 21 Nov 1592.

Moryson's brother-in-law, has a known life history.<sup>11</sup> Both the Dynne name, and that of the Irelands feature strongly in the will, so it is impossible to assume which family had the closer connection to Moryson, or which housed him. However, the will does reveal that Isaac Pywall was Moryson's 'servant' at the time of his death, which does elevate him both socially and financially. Although his only monetary bequest is a mere 20 shillings, which would provide for a man of his class for a single month, that he is able to support a servant suggests he was financially solvent. In addition, he leaves a 'gilded halberd', a valuable item which Moryson has not needed to sell to raise capital.

At the foot of the will, Fynes Moryson's date of death is listed as 12 February 1630. However, the will has been drawn up the previous autumn, composed on 15 September 1629. This is strongly suggestive of a long illness, which presaged Moryson's death the following spring. Typically, early modern wills were composed during the time of dying, or when imminent death was assumed, so it is possible Moryson was unwell when the will was drafted.<sup>12</sup> Composing a will when death was impending was a measure intended to prevent the testator from proving spiritually fallible, of betraying their belief system and spiritual adherence in the final, harrowing act of death.<sup>13</sup> It is possible the will was composed six months before Moryson's actual death as its author had little regard, or concern for this convention.

---

<sup>11</sup> George Allington (1550-1632) was a wealthy landowner, who owed his wealth and success to a family connection with the Cecils. He was married to Fynes Moryson's sister Jane, and owned a house in Aldersgate Street, London, near to where Fynes lodged at Redcross Street. See Hughes, p. xxii.

<sup>12</sup> Richard Wunderli and Gerald Brocee, 'The Final Moment before Death in Early Modern England', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (Summer, 1989) pp. 259-275, p. 264.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid* p. 265.

Moryson's will is unusual as it contains no bequests to the poor. At the time the will was committed to paper, philanthropic giving was an increasingly important part of the bequest process.<sup>14</sup> However, Moryson does not even leave a token sum to the local poor, in contrast to the generous terms displayed in his father's will.<sup>15</sup> This does not necessarily mean Moryson had no regard for religious convention. His will is very modest, and it is possible he just did not have the disposable wealth to provide local charity.

However, the will is also couched in unusually secular language. There is no mention of God throughout, and no conventional religious preamble.<sup>16</sup> In addition, Fynes Moryson's soul is not committed to God by the document. In a sample of 1200 wills written in Suffolk in the period 1620-1630, 80% contained a religious preamble.<sup>17</sup> Although the Suffolk wills were composed in a predominantly rural area, and Moryson died in St Botolph's Parish, London, the lack of any religious reference is suggestive. Within the Suffolk sample group, the lack of a religious foreword, or philanthropic bequest, was taken as evidence of the testator's lack of faith. This does not seem to be an absolute argument-it is possible a number of the documents were composed hastily, or committed to paper by writers unschooled in the accepted form.

Nonetheless, whilst this is not incontestable evidence for a lack of faith, it does intimate that Moryson was not consumed by religious ideals, as a number of

---

<sup>14</sup> Ian W. Archer, 'The Charity of Early Modern Londoners', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, Vol. 12 (2002) pp. 223-244, p. 224.

<sup>15</sup> Generous, relatively speaking. He leaves 5 pounds to the poor of each Parish in which he owns property. Surrey History Centre, Losely MSS, Copy of inquisition post mortem on Thomas Moryson [Morrison], esq, who died 19 Feb 1592. Edward is his son and heir LM/1083/5 21 Nov 1592.

<sup>16</sup> The accepted form was to open by pledging one's soul to heaven. See Leslie Moscow McGranahan, 'Charity and the Bequest Motive: Evidence from Seventeenth-Century Wills,' *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 108, University of Chicago Press, 6 (Dec., 2000) pp. 1270-1291, p. 1273.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid*, p. 1272.

scholars have argued.<sup>18</sup> Hughes claims Moryson was a 'sturdy protestant', a term repeated by Hadfield.<sup>19</sup> The latter goes further, contending Moryson's writing is informed, and influenced by his Protestant belief.<sup>20</sup> Later, in the same text, Hadfield maintains that Moryson gave up writing in later life, to concentrate on theology.<sup>21</sup> There is no evidence of this, and it seems unlikely that a man interested in exploring his belief would accept the excision of all references to his faith in the transcript of his dying words. Moryson is in fact remarkably liberal in matters of religion, and devotes considerable time in his 'travel precepts' section to arguing that there is little distinction between the Catholic and Protestant faiths other than matters of 'Ceremony'. He also advises travellers to take the sacrament in Catholic countries, and counsels that it is no sin to do so; even intimating he has taken mass himself, whilst in Rome at the English College.<sup>22</sup>

Even when considered in isolation, the will is a remarkably instructive document, given its brevity. However, the terms of the will also inform other readings of Moryson's later life history. As both Thompson and Hughes note, the will is documentary evidence of Moryson's dying financial circumstances, clearly not those of a successful, well respected author. It is evident that the publication of the *Itinerary* did not meet with the anticipated success. After the publication of the *Itinerary*, Moryson began work on an intended second publication, preserved

---

<sup>18</sup> See Introduction: Critical Reception.

<sup>19</sup> Hughes, p.xiii.

<sup>20</sup> Hadfield speaks of Moryson's 'protestant bias' in *Amazons, Savages, and Machiavels: Travel and Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630: an Anthology* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2001) p.43.

<sup>21</sup> Hadfield draws this inference from Kew's thesis, and Kew himself extrapolates this conjecture from translation of an isolated section of the 'Address to the Reader'. Moryson in fact uses the contention that he is an 'old man, studying theology' to defend himself from expected critical attack, and it should not be taken at face value. Andrew Hadfield, *Amazons, Savages, and Machiavels: Travel and Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630: an Anthology* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2001) p.82. See also the 'Address to the Reader on' ff.4-5 of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*.

<sup>22</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p.236.

in manuscript form at Corpus Christ College, Oxford. The work was finished by 1626, and was licensed for printing the same year by the head of the State Papers Office, Sir Thomas Wilson.<sup>23</sup>

The manuscript, although prepared as copy for printing, with running titles, catchwords and marginal addenda included, was never published.<sup>24</sup> Existing biographies have advanced the opinion that Moryson was unable to find a publisher after his earlier work, the 1617 *Itinerary*, failed to please the anticipated audience.<sup>25</sup> Although the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* contributes evidence that seems to contradict this contention, it remains a possibility.<sup>26</sup> Moryson leaves little of value in his will, and any commercial success would surely have demanded a follow-up volume.<sup>27</sup> However, given that Moryson was driven to compose a will in 1629, it is equally likely that his intended publication three years earlier was put into abeyance through ill health, or infirmity.<sup>28</sup> Neither theory can be firmly substantiated, but it is possible to explore the commercial merits of the 1617 publication through reference to the print history, and physical form of the text.

---

<sup>23</sup> Hughes, xli. At the foot of the document, the date, '14 Junii, 1626' is written in Moryson's hand. Sir Thomas Wilson had been at Cambridge with Fynes Moryson, was in Italy at the same time as Fynes in 1596, and was strongly connected to the Essex faction. It is likely he had some personal connection to Moryson. It may be that he owes his unparalleled access to the state papers to his relationship with Wilson. Wilson was the then head of the state papers office, and a committed archivist. A. F. Pollard, 'Wilson, Sir Thomas (d. 1629)', rev. Sean Kelsey, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/29690, accessed 27 Aug 2011].

<sup>24</sup> For an analysis of the physical form of the English MS, see Graham Kew, p. lxxvii.

<sup>25</sup> Andrew Hadfield, *Amazons, Savages, and Machiavels: Travel and Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630: an Anthology* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2001), p.81.

<sup>26</sup> For further information, see Case Study 5: The Table of Contents.

<sup>27</sup> For example, following the publication of *Coryats Crudities*, a follow up text *Coryats Crambe* appeared in the same year (1611). The satirical verses prefacing the original also appeared in both licensed and unofficial printings, and a further associated text, *Thomas Coriate Traveller for the English Wits* appeared in 1616. See Michael Strachan, 'Coryate, Thomas (1577?-1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Oct 2006, http://0-

www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.urls.lon.ac.uk:80/view/article/6364, accessed 4 Dec 2008.

<sup>28</sup> Moryson was in his sixty second year by this point, very old by early modern standards.

The 1617 *Itinerary* was entered into print under the supervision of John Beale. Beale was a significant figure within the publishing world of Jacobean London. Other contemporary printings issued under Beale's mandate include Speed's *Theatre* in 1611, Bacon's *Essays* the following year, and Jonson's *Bartholomew's Fayre* in 1621.<sup>29</sup> Amidst these publications, in 1617, Beale found time to 'Enter for his Copie under the handes of Master Docter Westfield and both Wardens. An Itinerary written by Fines Morison Gent, contayning his Travailes through divers dominions'.<sup>30</sup> The date of the *Itinerary's* printing is instructive. The work was licensed to print 25 years after the period of travels described within. Hughes contends that Fynes Moryson 'belonged to another era...having been elected a Fellow of Peterhouse before the defeat of the Spanish Armada'.<sup>31</sup> Undoubtedly, many of Moryson's social observations, so keen and relevant at the time of direct experience, had little relevance to the geopolitical world of the 1620s.

In his preface to the *Itinerary*, Moryson is sensitive to the fact the work may appear dated:

You may perhaps judge the writing of my daily expences in my journies to be needles & unprofitable, in respect of the continuall change of prices and rates in all Kingdoms : but they can never be more subject to change, then the affaires of Martiall and civill Policie: In both which, the oldest Histories serve us at this day to good use....So as in this case, onely the trifling away of much time, may bee imputed to my ignorance, dulnes or negligence, if my just excuse be not heard (*Itinerary*, 'Address to the Reader')

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid, p. 272.

<sup>30</sup> W.W Greg and E. Boswell, *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company* (Bibliographical Society: London, 1955), pp. 606, under date 4 April, 1617. "John Beale Entred for his Copie under the handes of Master Docter Westfield and both Wardens. An Itinerary written by Fines Morison Gent, contayning his Travailes through divers dominions, vizi Germany Bohmerland &c. ".

<sup>31</sup> Hughes, p. xliiii.

Moryson is conscious that the length of the transition from manuscript to print has dated many of his observations, and offers both an apology and defence of the writing process in his 'Address to the Reader'. Notably, he attempts to circumvent this problem by positioning his work within the genre of 'Histories'. This seems to be a conscious attempt to situate the work outside the field of travel writing, and closer to contemporary historical works such as Camden's *Britannia* and Barnaby Rich's *A New Description of Ireland*.<sup>32</sup> Moryson utilised both texts in his composition of the *Itinerary*, and makes many references to Camden in his work.<sup>33</sup> Within his history of the Nine Year's War, Moryson reiterates Camden's description of the Earl of Tyrone almost word for word.<sup>34</sup> It is possible that his reading of these texts, and particularly Camden's work, may have influenced the structure of the *Itinerary*. In particular, the example of Camden may well have influenced Moryson to compose parallel Latin and English texts.<sup>35</sup>

In its original form, the *Itinerary* is prefaced by a comprehensive contents page, which provides an effective guide to the contents of each of the three parts. For example, the first part is said to contain:

a journall through all the said twelve dominions: showing particularly the  
 number of miles, the soyle of the country, the situation of Cities, the

---

<sup>32</sup> See Barnaby Rich, *A New Description of Ireland wherein is described the disposition of the Irish, whereunto they are inclined, etc* (London: T. Adams, 1610) and William Camden, *Britannia, Siue florentissimorum regnorum, Angliae, Scotiae, Hiberniae, et Insularum adiacentium ex intima antiquitate Chorographica description, etc* (London: Raplh Newbery, 1586)

<sup>33</sup> Moryson refers to Camden 21 times in the *Itinerary*, far more than any other author.

<sup>34</sup> Hiram Morgan, *Tyrone's Rebellion: The outbreak of the nine years war in Tudor Ireland* (Boydell Press: Suffolk, 1993), p. 3.

<sup>35</sup> Camden first published in Latin, later supervising the translation of his work into English. See following title: William Camden, *Britain, or A chorographically description of the most flourishing kingdoms, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the ilands adioyning, out of the depth of antiquitie: beautified with mappes of the severall shires of England: vwritten first in Latine by William Camden Clarenceux K. of A. Translated newly into English by Philemon Holland Doctour in Physick: finally revised, amended, and enlarged with sundry additions by the said author.* (London: John Bishop & John Norton, 1610).

description of them, with all monuments in each place worth the seeing, an also the rates of hiring Coaches, or Horses from place to place, with each daies expences for diet, horsemeat and the like (*Itenerary*, 'Address to the Reader')

The other two parts are delineated on the contents page, and within each section subheadings, marginal annotations and page numbers have been provided for ease of reference. It is clear that the work was intended to function not as an entertaining, colourful work of travel writing, but as a detailed reference work. Moryson alludes to this in his introduction:

If contemplative men shall reade it at leasure, making choice of the subjects fitting their humours, by the Table of the Contents, and casting away the booke when they are weary of reading, perhaps they may find some delight' (*Itenerary*, 'Address to the Reader')

The reader is not expected to interact with the work in a linear fashion, as one might with a travel narrative, but as a reference tome, a work of practical utility to the prospective traveller. The physical form of the 1617 printing supports the notion that the work was composed, and printed with a serious, perhaps scholarly readership in mind. In the library at Peterhouse, a presentation edition of the *Itenerary* in its original binding has been preserved. The work is bound in leather, embossed with the Moryson family shield.<sup>36</sup> As with all original printings of the *Itenerary*, the work is folio sized, and very heavy and unwieldy. Within the body of

---

<sup>36</sup> Fynes Moryson, *An Itenerary written by Fynes Moryson, Gent. First in the Latine Tongue, and then translated by him into English. (Containing his ten yeeres travell through the twelve dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turky, France, England, Scotland, and Ireland.)*, London: J.Beale, 1617) Peterhouse College, Perne Library, Pressmark B.6.2. On the title page is written THE GIFTE OF THE AUCHTER FYNES MORISON. The volume is bound in leather, and has on both backs the Moryson family coat of arms, a cross sable and five fleur de lys.

the text, chapter headings and introductions to subsections are prefaced with opulent woodcuts. The *Itinerary*, in its original form, is clearly an expensive printing, intended for an exclusive, possibly courtly market. The license to print declares that unlawful printings will forfeit ‘three pounds lawfull English monie’ for every copy sold.<sup>37</sup> Although this levy is likely to be punitive, and intended to prohibit pirated volumes, it is an indication of the investment in this edition. The first Folio of Shakespeare’s works, a document of similar size and length, retailed at one pound, a significant sum.<sup>38</sup>

The *Itinerary* was licensed to print for a period of 21 years. Within the small print of the License, there is provision for the work to be printed in both English and Latin: ‘to sell, assigne and dispose to his or their best benefits, this Booke and Bookes as well in the English as in the Latin tongue’<sup>39</sup>. Within the text itself, and indeed on the title page, Moryson’s process of translation is foregrounded:

AN ITINERARY WRITTEN BY FYNES MORYSON GENT, FIRST IN THE LATINE  
TONGUE, AND THEN TRANSLATED by Him into ENGLISH.<sup>40</sup>

This aspect of the compositional process is then reiterated immediately afterwards in Moryson’s ‘Address to the Reader’: ‘If you consider this, and withall remember, that the worke is first written in Latine, then translated into English’ (*Itinerary*, ‘Address to the Reader’). However, the reiteration of this on both the title page, and in the ‘Address to the Reader’ is puzzling, as the reader is not offered the original, but a dedicated translation. It is possible the Latin origins of

---

<sup>37</sup> *Itinerary*, prefatory material, title page.

<sup>38</sup> The first folio cost one pound with a binding, fifteen shillings (3/4 pound) without. *The Cambridge history of the book in Britain: Volume IV, 1557-1695* Lotte Hellinga, John Barnard, Donald Francis McKenzie, J. B. Trapp, Maureen Bell (ed.) (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2002), p. 373.

<sup>39</sup> *Itinerary*, prefatory material, reverse of title page.

<sup>40</sup> *Itinerary*, prefatory material, reverse of title page.

the work are emphasised in an attempt to present the *Itenerary* as the work of a serious scholar.<sup>41</sup> Camden's *Britannia* was first published in Latin in 1586, and only translated into English in 1610.<sup>42</sup> This is exactly the time that Moryson was composing the Latin *Itinerarium*. It is possible that Camden's decision to publish in English influenced Moryson. Indeed, Camden supervised the translation of his work into English, just as Moryson is identified as having translated the *Itenerary* on the title page.<sup>43</sup> As previously noted, Moryson was familiar with Camden, and had incorporated elements of his study into the pages of the *Itenerary*. It is possible the repeated references to the *Itenerary's* Latin origins are an attempt to associate it with works such as Camden's and to differentiate it from other contemporary travel accounts. It may be that the work is licensed for printing in Latin to open up the *Itenerary* to a potential European market. The pan-continental scope of the writing, and Moryson's familiarity with the European book trade would have made this a logical step.<sup>44</sup>

The text is thus presented as a reference work, intended to function as a parallel text to Camden's *Britannia*, a topographical and historical survey of the peoples

---

<sup>41</sup> This recurs in other contemporary travel volumes. *Coryats Crudities* is prefaced by a note that says the work was first written in the 'Latin Tongue', and translated into English by Coryate. Thomas Coryat, *Coryats Crudities; Hastily gobled vp in five Moneths traueles in France, Sauoy, Italy, Rhetia commonly called the Grisons country, Heluetia aliàs Switzerland, some parts of high Germany, and the Netherlands; newly digested in the hungry aire of Odcombe in the county of Somerset, & now dispersed to the nourishment of the traueelling members of this kingdome* (London: William Stansby, 1611), Title Page.

<sup>42</sup> William Rockett, 'The Structural Plan of Camden's *Britannia*', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (Winter, 1995) pp. 829-84, p. 830. This is exactly when Moryson was composing the *Itinerarium*.

<sup>43</sup> See following title: William Camden, *Britain, or A chorographical description of the most flourishing kingdoms, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the ilands adioyning, out of the depth of antiquitie: beautified with mappes of the severall shires of England: vvritten first in Latine by William Camden Clarenceux K. of A. Translated newly into English by Philemon Holland Doctour in Physick: finally revised, amended, and enlarged with sundry additions by the said author.* (London: John Bishop & John Norton, 1610).

<sup>44</sup> In Zurich Fynes purchases *the booke of Semlerus de Republic, Seralerux Helvetica*, and also buys the two Lutheran Bibles he donates to Peterhouse. In addition, he travels to Frankfurt for the book fair. See *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 25.

and places of Europe. When one examines the English translation of Camden's *Britannia* alongside the *Itenerary*, the similarities between the intended purposes of the works is immediately apparent.<sup>45</sup> Both works are in folio, and contain catchwords, running titles and marginal notes which help the reader identify sections of interest. For example, a reader interested in the life of Martin Luther could scan the margin of part I of the *Itenerary* and identify the relevant paragraph on p.8. Both works also italicise names and places of interest within the main text, allowing readers to quickly scan pages to find relevant information. It is clear that Moryson had ambitions of crafting a work founded in a similar methodology to Camden's *Britannia*, a definitive, factual account of the people and places that mattered in continental Europe.

It is possible that the move towards a serious methodology of travel writing, and European history, was a response to the anticipated literary environment into which the *Itenerary* was to be released. Moryson was forced to contend with the unwelcome influence of Thomas Coryate, who as previously noted had brought the genre into disrepute with the release of his evocatively titled 1611 work, the *Crudities*. The work is prefaced by a suggestive frontispiece, a full, quarto leaf woodcut.<sup>46</sup> The image takes the form of an advertisement, detailing a series of incidents from within the pages of the *Crudities*, with accompanying page numbers for ease of reference. Among the narrative events depicted, Coryate is

---

<sup>45</sup> See William Camden, *Britain, or A chorographicall description of the most flourishing kingdoms, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the ilands adioyning, out of the depth of antiquitie: beautified with mappes of the severall shires of England: vvritten first in Latine by William Camden Clarenceux K. of A. Translated newly into English by Philemon Holland Doctour in Physick: finally revised, amended, and enlarged with sundry additions by the said author.* (London: John Bishop & John Norton, 1610).

<sup>46</sup> Thomas Coryate, *Coryats Crudities; Hastily gobled vp in five Moneths trauels in France, Sauoy, Italy, Rhetia comonly called the Grisons country, Heluetia aliàs Switzerland, some parts of high Germany, and the Netherlands; newly digested in the hungry aire of Odcombe in the county of Somerset, & now dispersed to the nourishment of the traouelling members of this kingdome* (London: William Stansby, 1611) unmarked leaf.

shown vomiting in the sea, being pelted with eggs by a Courtesan, being vomited upon by another unknown figure and being accosted by a German peasant.

In the top right hand corner of the image, the author's travel garments are depicted, infested with vermin and visibly rotting. This representation is related to Coryate's unusual and infamous method of travel. Shunning the usual recourse to horseback and coaches, Coryate completed his circuit of Europe largely on foot.<sup>47</sup> Moryson seems to refer directly to Coryate in the *Itinerary*, criticising the practise in his list of travel precepts:

Neither doe I commend them, who in forraigne parts take journies on foote, especially for any long way. Let them stay at home, and behold the World in a Mappe, who have not meanes for honest expences, for such men, while they basely spare cost, doe so blemish their estimation, as they can enjoy no company but poor fellowes who go on foote with them, who can no way instruct them, or better their understanding (*Itinerary*, Part III, p.17)

Moryson would no doubt have been aware of the influence of the *Crudities* within the field. Coryate's work was a great success, going through several editions.<sup>48</sup> It is possible Moryson's attack, in part, stems from a certain degree of professional jealousy, but it may also represent an exchange of fire within the bounds of a literary quarrel first ignited almost twenty years earlier.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Strachan suggests this may be another facet of Coryate's publicity machine. What can be determined is that it was an aspect of his journey that captured the popular imagination. Michael Strachan, 'Coryate, Thomas (1577?-1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Sept 2004; online edn, Oct 2006, <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk:80/view/article/6364>, accessed 4 Dec 2008.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> Moryson seems to refer to Coryat, or other comparable travellers such as Lithgow at two points in the *Itinerary*. For details, see also the earlier section, Travels 1591-1599.

One of the most prominent names associated with Thomas Coryate in the immediate aftermath of his return from his continental travels in 1608 was Ben Jonson. Both he and Coryate were members of the 'Worshipfull Fraternitie of Sirenical Gentlemen', a circle of intimates dubbed the 'Mermaid Club' for their habit of meeting at the sign of the Mermaid Tavern in Bread Street.<sup>50</sup> Jonson also contributed a number of panegyric verses to the first edition of the *Crudities* in 1611, and remained associated with Coryate until the latter embarked on his final series of travels in 1614.

H.L Snuggs, a scholar writing on Jonson in the early part of the twentieth century, notes that the caricature of 'Puntarvolo' in *Every Man Out Of His Humour*, may well be a satirical representation of Fynes Moryson. Snuggs notes that Puntavarlo has an eccentric tendency to 'deal upon returns', or to bet against anticipated gain:

PUNT. I do intend, this year of jubilee coming on, to travel: and because I will not altogether go upon expense, I am determind to put forth some five thousand pound, to be paid me five for one, upon the return of myself, my wife, and my dog from the Turk's court in Constantinople. If all or either of us miscarry in the journey, 'tis gone: if we be successful, why, there will be five and twenty thousand pound to entertain time withal. Nay, go not, neighbour Sordido; stay to-night, and help to make our society the fuller. Gentlemen, frolic: Carlo! what! dull now?<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> I. A. Shapiro, 'The Mermaid Club', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 45, No. 1 (Jan., 1950), pp. 6-17.

<sup>51</sup> Ben Jonson, *Every Man Out of His Humour*, Helen Ostovich (ed.) (Manchester University Press: Manchester, 2001) line 523, p. 191. Ostovich makes reference to Fynes Moryson's journey in her accompanying notes.

Snuggs contends that Puntarvolo's investment of five thousand pounds is a form of travel betting, a practise he links to a presentation of the topic within the first volume of the *Itenerary*.

Onely I gave out one hundred pound to receive three hundred at my returne among my brethren....and I moreover gave out to five friends, one hundred pound, with condition that they should have it if I died, or after three yeeres should repay it with one hundred and fifty pound gaine if I returned; which I hold a disadvantageous adventure to the giver of the money (*Itenerary*, Part I, p.198).

Snuggs goes on to contend that *Every Man Out of His Humour* was composed in 1597, during which time Fynes Moryson had returned from his second period of travel, and was attempting to collect the fruits of his earlier speculation: 'Neither did I exact this money of any man by sute of Law after my returne, which they willingly and presently paid me, onely some few excepted' (*Itenerary*, Part I, p. 198). Snuggs provides a further link, as both Moryson and Puntarvolo are planning trips to Constantinople, intending to return home and collect on the bets they have laid down.

However, Moryson's discourse on travel betting is not the only contemporary recollection of the practice.<sup>52</sup> In addition, whilst Moryson returned to England in 1597, he did not publish his *Itenerary* until 1617, twenty years after the composition of *Every Man Out Of His Humour*. For Snuggs to be right, Jonson would have had to draw his portrayal not from the words of the *Itenerary*, but from direct interaction with, or experience of, Moryson the man. Snuggs provides

---

<sup>52</sup>According to Ostovich, Nashe refers to travel betting in *his Terrors of the Night* (1.348). See Ben Jonson, *Every Man Out of His Humour*, Helen Ostovich (ed.), Manchester University Press: Manchester, 2001), p. 191.

no further evidence to support his comparison. Nonetheless, exploring the text of Jonson's play yields some surprising results. Puntarvolo is travelling with his wife and dog to Constantinople. All three must arrive safely for the bet to be collected upon his return. However, Puntarvolo leaves the dog in the care of a groom, who grows angry at having received no fee for his services. The groom poisons the animal, which dies, annulling the bet and putting Puntarvolo 'out of his humour'.

Ignoring the plot contortions, the device of a poisoned dog is a strange insertion, but it does provide a further strong connection with Moryson. In his first period of travels, Moryson travelled to Naples, and explored 'a venomous Cave, vulgarly la grotta del' can', that is the Cave of the dogge; the dogge, because they trie the poison by putting dogs into it.' (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 114) Later in the narrative, Moryson himself pays to test the efficacy of this theory, attaching a dog to a stick and thrusting the animal into the poisonous, sulphurous air of the cave.<sup>53</sup>

This provides further circumstantial evidence for a link between Moryson and the character of Puntarvolo.<sup>54</sup> In *Every Man Out Of His Humour* there is no worth in having the dog die by poison, as opposed to other means. To see this strange plot device appear in the play, composed in the same year Moryson returned from Constantinople and began to collect his travel bets, seems more than coincidental. If Puntarvolo is to be seen as a representation of Moryson, this seems a harsh step, even for such a savage satirist as Jonson. Moryson returned from his second journey severely ill, and grief stricken at the loss of his beloved brother:

---

<sup>53</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p.114.

<sup>54</sup> In addition, Florio's 1611 Italian/English Dictionary gives the contemporary meaning of 'Puntarvolo. 'A self conceited fellow, a man that stands upon nice faults, a find-fault, a scrupulous or over weeing man'. This does seem similar to aspects of Moryson's character. See John Florio, *A Worlde of Wordes, Or Most copious, and exact Dictionarie in Italian and English*, (London: Edward Blount, 1611) p. 410.

My selfe have been twice sicke to death in forraigne parts, first when I lost my dearest Brother Henry in Asia (whose death I must ever lament with the same passion, as David did that of Absolon, who wished to redeeme his life with his owne death; and surely I freely professe, his life had been more profitable than mine, both to our friends, and to the Common-wealth (*Itenerary*, Part III, p.22).

To return to England, with the death of his brother on his mind, and then to be immediately caricatured in the theatres as the vainglorious, pompous traveller Puntarvolo, must have been a bitter blow for Moryson to bear.<sup>55</sup> In his delineation of the character of the persons, Jonson defines Puntarvolo as:

PUNTARVOLO, A vain-glorious knight, over-englishing his travels, and wholly consecrated to singularity; the very Jacob's staff of compliment; a sir that hath lived to see the revolution of time in most of his apparel. Of presence good enough, but so palpably affected to his own praise, that for want of flatterers he commends himself, to the floutage of his own family.<sup>56</sup> He deals upon returns, and strange performances, resolving, in despite of public derision, to stick to his own fashion, phrase, and gesture.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> It does seem likely that Moryson was aware that he was satirised on stage, or was at least conscious of the contemporary perception of travel betting: 'And I had now given out upon like condition mony to some few friends, when perceiving the common opinion in this point to be much differing From mine, and thereupon better considering this matter, and observing (as a stranger that had beene long out of my Country) that these kind of adventures were growne very frequent, whereof some were undecent, some ridiculous; and that they were in great part undertaken by bankerouts stage players, and men of base condition, I might easily iudge that in short time they would become disgracefull'. See *Itenerary*, Part I, p.198.

<sup>56</sup>In this 'floutage of family' there is a possible resonance of Moryson's quarrel with Richard, intimated in the *Losely Letters*, in which the latter is said to express a 'jelosy' of Fynes.

<sup>57</sup> Ben Jonson, *Every Man Out of His Humour*, Helen Ostovich (ed.) (Manchester University Press: Manchester, 2001) Characters, lines 13-21, pp. 102-103.

This cruel judgment does not do justice to the life and works of Fynes Moryson, yet it is perhaps his only contemporary representation, in literature, or art.<sup>58</sup> In many ways Jonson is the founding father of a tradition that exists up to today, a tendency to use Moryson's image and words without due respect. In Jonson's case, it is an attempt to secure a cheap laugh at the expense of an easy target, a broken man laid low by the death of his brother. In modern criticism it is Moryson's writing that is manipulated, the pages of the *Itinerary* harvested for ready information, quotations, lines and phrases taken from its pages without reference to context.<sup>59</sup>

To read Moryson's *Itinerary* with greater respect, we must consider it in relation to a biography drawn not solely from the pages of the text, but from primary material, archival sources, and documents which corroborate Moryson's own printed words. Until a comprehensive biography is constructed, critics will continue to interact with Moryson as an ill-defined narrative voice, isolated from his own life history.

---

<sup>58</sup> According to Graham Kew, an image of his brother, Henry exists, alongside an elegiac poem, but there is no extant description or image of Fynes. See Kew, p. lxxiii.

<sup>59</sup> See Introduction: Critical Reception.

## Part 2: Analysis

### Introduction to the Analysis

The following analysis represents the first step in describing and understanding the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, a large and complex work. To render this study as accessible as possible, the analysis will be preceded by a short introduction to the work. I will describe the manuscript's known provenance and physical form, before considering its relationship to the printed *Itinerary*. The analysis which follows is divided into two parts. The first part represents a full description of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, including an analysis of the hands present in the manuscript, a discussion of the numbering and ordering of the text, and lastly, an exposition of the content of the work. This section is necessarily methodical and descriptive, as it is intended to render a difficult manuscript accessible to other scholars.

This description will support the second part to the analysis section, which will comprise a series of six case studies. Each study will compare a short section of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* to the printed *Itinerary*. These studies will help establish the relationship between the two texts, presenting and considering points of divergence. Together, the description and the case studies of the manuscript represent the first scholarly attempt to study the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, a confused, and to the uninformed reader, almost unintelligible text. An intellectual appreciation of the text is impossible without first understanding what exactly is presented, in what order, by whom, and for whom.

The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* has always been understood to represent the direct predecessor of the printed *Itinerary*, and has been described as a 'rough copy' of

the first part to the work.<sup>1</sup> However, no real attempt has ever been made to prove this premise. The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* has never before been described, or indeed, even fully catalogued.<sup>2</sup> The manuscript has not to date been added to the British Library's online catalogue, but it is included in *A Catalogue of the Harleian Collection of Manuscripts preserved in the British Museum*, published in 1759.<sup>3</sup> The manuscript is described in Latin, or rather the text of f.1 has been transposed without translation: 'Itinerarium quod Fynes Moryson Anglus scripsit, Decemalis suae peregrinationis observationes continens, per Germaniam, Bohemiam, Helvetiam, Belgiae Provinceas unitas, Daniam, Poloniam, Italiam, Turciam, Galliam, Angliam, Scotiam, et Hiberniam'.<sup>4</sup> This Latin description, which is not accessible to the majority of readers, may help explain why the manuscript has thus far been neglected.

The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* has no certain provenance before it is first catalogued in the eighteenth century. There are, however, a number of clues in the physical form of the manuscript that provide information about its early history. From an annotation on f.1 it is evident that the text was first assessed, and possibly catalogued by an unknown party on February 23 1719/1720.<sup>5</sup> The full text of the annotation reads '5133 v 23 February 1719/1720'. The inclusion of '5133', the

---

<sup>1</sup> Kew, p. xxvii.

<sup>2</sup> Although not yet catalogued a description of BL Harl. MS. 5133 is included in the online description of BL Add. MS. 36707. The manuscript is described as though it is a direct precursor of the printed version in the British Library manuscripts catalogue: 'The whole work contained four parts, three of which were published, in English, as *An Itinerary*, etc., in 1617.'

<sup>3</sup> *A catalogue of the Harleian Collection of Manuscripts preserved in the British Museum*, H. Wanley, D. Casley, W. Hocker, and C. Morton, with an index by T. Astle (London: 1759), Vol. II, p.248.

<sup>4</sup> The Itinerary which Fynes Moryson has written in English, containing a description of his observations from his ten travels through Germany, Bohemia, Switzerland, The United Provinces, Denmark, Poland, Italy, Turkey, France, England, Scotland and Ireland. Note also that Moryson describes the United Provinces as The United Provinces of the Belgae, the tribe mentioned in Caesar's *Commentarii de Bello Gallico* and later in Tacitus.

<sup>5</sup> The annotation is actually the third folio of the manuscript, although the two leaves preceding it are not paginated.

current Harleian catalogue reference for the manuscript, suggests that the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* had been catalogued and had entered the Harleian collection by this point.<sup>6</sup>

Although the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* has no confirmed provenance before this point, more can be learnt by turning to the other extant Latin manuscript, BL. Add. MS. 36706, 'Fynes Moryson's Itinerary in Ireland'.<sup>7</sup> This text is described as *Pars Secunda*, the second part to the work, in the table of contents in the prefatory material of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. This manuscript is listed in C.E. Wright's *Fontes Harleiani* as belonging to Sir Andrew Fountaine of Narford (1676-1753) who was a collector employed on behalf of Edward Harley.<sup>8</sup> Wright notes that the manuscript was believed to have been purchased in tandem with *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, linking the two through the autograph corrections made to the texts.<sup>9</sup> Wright contends that the text was purchased by the bookseller Nathaniel Noel, a prominent factor who purchased rare and valuable texts for Harley.<sup>10</sup> It was acquired by the British Library in 1902, following the dispersal and sale of the Fountaine collection in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>11</sup> Fountaine has a number of possible, albeit tenuous connections to Moryson. Fountaine was

---

<sup>6</sup> The annotation reads '5133 v 23 February 1719/1720'.

<sup>7</sup> BL Add. MS 367076, *Fynes Moryson's Itinerary in Ireland, 1599-1603*. Described in BL. Harl. MS. 5133 as *Pars Secunda*.

<sup>8</sup> C. E. Wright, *Fontes Harleiani: a study of the sources of the Harleian collection of manuscripts preserved in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1972), pp. 245-253.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid*, p. 250.

<sup>10</sup> There is not an exact date of purchase for BL. Harl. MS. 5133, but seeing as the vast majority of the other manuscripts in the collection were purchased between 1716 and 1724 it seems probable it was acquired around this time. Thus, this suggests the text first entered the collection in 1719/20, in common with the annotation on the first folio of the manuscript. See Wright, pp. 245-253.

<sup>11</sup> See British Library manuscripts online catalogue record. The Irish manuscript belonged to Sir Andrew Fountaine of Narford Hall, co. Norf. (d. 1753); sale-cat. 1902, lot. 454. 7 in.

a great friend to the 8<sup>th</sup> Earl of Pembroke, Thomas Herbert.<sup>12</sup> Thomas Herbert was the grandson of Philip Herbert, brother to William Herbert, 3<sup>rd</sup> Earl of Pembroke, the dedicatee of the 1617 printed *Itinerary*.<sup>13</sup> It is possible the two manuscripts were obtained by William Herbert, or even formed part of the dedication itself. Fountaine also held lands in Norfolk, geographically close to the Moryson family seat in Lincolnshire, and embarked on two grand tours, which may have informed his collecting habits. Fountaine's involvement is significant as he was an active collector at the time the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* was acquired by the British Library.<sup>14</sup>

This information represents what is currently known about the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. A little more may be learnt of the work by considering its more recent history. The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* is divided into two volumes.<sup>15</sup> The decision to divide the text was taken in 1964, when the manuscript was rebound.<sup>16</sup> The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* is finished in light brown board, supported by a column of ochre leather along the spine. The front cover is marked with a design of two female angels holding a shield, crossed through with a diagonal stripe. At the foot of the design is the inscription 'Virtute et Fide'.<sup>17</sup> The design is embossed in gold

---

<sup>12</sup> Andrew W. Moore, 'Fountaine, Sir Andrew' (1676–1753) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004  
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/9994>, accessed 10 Aug 2011].

<sup>13</sup> Fountaine had a role in cataloguing the collection of the 9<sup>th</sup> Earl of Pembroke, Philip Herbert. Andrew W. Moore, 'Fountaine, Sir Andrew' (1676–1753) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004  
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/9994>, accessed 10 Aug 2011].

<sup>14</sup> This suggests that the two manuscripts became available at the same time, opening up the slim but tantalising possibility that the missing third part to the Latin *Itinerarium* may have been extant at this time.

<sup>15</sup> The first, larger part comprises ff. 1-357, the second ff. 358-490.

<sup>16</sup> In the inside cover of the second part to BL Harl. MS. 5133 there is a re-binding sticker which confirms the text was compiled into its current order, and bound in 1964. It confirms that the work was examined after binding on 28<sup>th</sup> November, 1964.

<sup>17</sup> By virtue and fath.

leaf on to the board, and is repeated on the back cover. The spine is subdivided into eight crenulated sections, with the foot and top of the manuscript marked with a detailed filigree design. The middle sections are marked out in red leather, and in descending order, they bear the following inscription in gold leaf 'FYNES MORYSON ITINERARY', 'BRIT. MUS. Harl. Ms. 5133'.

It is likely that the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* has thus far been overlooked as it is difficult to make an initial assessment of the text without investing considerable time in the work. The order of the text is confused, complicated by multiple drafts of prefatory material. This material is itself conflated with the first chapter, which is abruptly abandoned, and then later interrupted by insertions from another text, which are not introduced or explained. This confusion is compounded by a complex, self-referential system of editing. Heavy annotations, deletions and corrections mark much of the work, obscuring large sections of text and rendering straightforward engagement impossible. Furthermore, the content of the text is inaccessible to many readers, as Moryson's elaborate, neo-classical Latin defies simple translation, and requires a significant investment of time and effort to master.

This heavily wrought text supports Moryson's contention in his 'Address to the Reader' that the printed *Itinerary* was the product of much labour and 'divers copies'.<sup>18</sup> The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* is characterised by successive layers of editing that manifest themselves in a number of quite different variants of the primary hand. There are three distinct variations of this hand, attesting to a long and confused chronology of composition. There is further evidence of this throughout the manuscript. The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* contains a number of

---

<sup>18</sup> *Itinerary*, 'Address to the Reader', unmarked leaf.

insertions in Fynes Moryson's hand, discrete bodies of text which seem to have been introduced from a different source. They are transcribed onto quite different paper, and impressed with an unusual, faded green ink. These insertions are interleaved into the manuscript and thus interrupt and confuse the pagination, making it difficult to accurately compare the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* to the English printed *Itenerary*.

This difficulty is compounded by the pagination and ordering of the work, which differs considerably from that of the printed *Itenerary*. Moryson seems to have paginated the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* himself, with each of the 1004 pages numbered in his hand. It has also been separately paginated in pencil, presumably when the text was bound into its present order in 1964. In this case, each folio has been numbered, 490 in total. Although this pencil pagination applies some order to the text it ignores the secondary drafts of the prefatory material, and is occasionally inconsistent when unmarked leaves are introduced.<sup>19</sup> Neither system is reliable, as Moryson's pagination ignores insertions into the manuscript, and also abruptly shifts forward by an increment of 21 on f.189, suggesting that material has either been introduced from a preceding manuscript or excised at this juncture.<sup>20</sup>

The excision of large sections of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* is a feature of the work as a whole. It is extensively edited throughout, and in particular significant passages of texts have been marked for deletion. For example, in the 23 folio pages that make up Chapter 2, a total of 39 lines of text have been deleted, over a

---

<sup>19</sup> The pencil pagination ignores a blank lead inserted between f.23 and f.24, and also does not paginate f.102 and f.189, although they are included in the system of numbering. See the following section on the pagination and order of the manuscript.

<sup>20</sup> This may suggest a conflation of different Latin drafts. For example, the pagination of BL. Harl. MS. 5133 finishes on 1004, whilst BL. Add. MS. 36706 begins on 803, suggesting an earlier draft may have existed, with quite different pagination.

folio page. In total, the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* contains perhaps 10 folios of deleted material which has never been published in any language. Perhaps as much as 25% of the manuscript has been edited or altered in some way.<sup>21</sup> Many of the corrections and insertions are of significant length, perhaps accounting for 5-10 folios of additional material in total. Much of this material was subsequently incorporated in English into the printed work.

The *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, therefore, shows evidence of layers of composition of which there is obviously no sign in the printed *Itinerary*. When one reviews the text, each page is a confusion of scrawled marginal notes, deletions, indecipherable symbols, nascent formatting and blotting, all obscuring and obstructing the interpretation of the erudite, layered Latin prose. This disorder no doubt reflects Moryson's confused composition process, which he is aware proved detrimental to the eventual expression of the work, in the form of the printed *Itinerary*.

In the printed 'Address to the Reader', Moryson discusses the troubled transition from manuscript to print, in part to explain the 25 years that separate his travels, and their eventual expression in the *Itinerary*:

Touching the VVorke in generall, I wil truly saye, that I wrote it swiftly, and yet slowly. This may seeme a strange Riddle, and not to racke your wit with the intepretation, my selfe will expound it: I wrote it swiftly, in that my pen was ready and nothing curious, as may appeare by the matter and stile: and I wrote it slowly, in respect of the long time past since I viewed these Dominions and since I tooke this worke in hand. So as the VVorke may not

---

<sup>21</sup> For example, of the first 24 Folios of text (comprising the prefatory material) 6 have been extensively edited in Hand 2.

uniuſtly bee compared to a noſe-gay of flowers, haſtily ſnatched in many gardens, and with much leaſure, yet careleſſly and negligently bound together. The ſnatching is excuſed by the haſte, neceſſary to Travellers, deſiring to ſee much in ſhort time. And the negligent binding, in true iudgment needs no excuſe, affected curioſitie in poor ſubiects, being like rich imbroidery laid vpon a frize jerkin; ſo as in this caſe, onely the trifling away of much time, may bee imputed to my ignorance, dulneſſe or negligence, if my iuſt excuſe be not heard: in the rendering whereof I muſt craue your patience. During the life of the worthy *Earl of Devonſhire*, my deceased Lord, I had little or no time to beſtow in this kind: after his deth, I loſt fully three yeers labor ( in which I abſtracted the Hiſtories of theſe 12 Dominions thorow which I paſed, with purpoſe to ioyne them to the Diſcourſes of the ſeueral Commonwealths, for illuſtration and ornament: but when the worke was done, and I found the bulke thereof to ſwel, then I choſe rather to ſupreſſe them, then to make my gate bigger then my Citie.) And for the reſt of the yeers, I wrote at leaſure, giuing (like a free and vn hired workman) much time to pleaſure, to neceſſary affaires, and to diuers and long diſtractions. If you conſider this, and withall remember, that the worke is firſt written in Latine, then translated into Engliſh, and that in diuers Copies, no man being able by the firſt Copie to put ſo large a worke in good faſhion. And if you will pleaſe alſo to take knowledge from me, that to ſaue expences, I wrote the greateſt part with my owne hand, and almoſt all the reſt with the ſlowe pen of my ſeruant: then I hope the loſſe of time ſhall not be imputed vnto me. (*Itinerary*, 'Address to the Reader')

In the quoted passage, Moryson outlines this extended editorial process. It seems that Moryson first intended to publish a different version of the work. This version of the text was to be founded in the 'Discourses of the severall Commonwealths', which would seem to represent an account of his travels, similar to that recorded in part one of the *Itinerary*. This work was to be joined to a historical study, of the '12 Dominions thorow which I passed'. Although Moryson does not go into detail over the intended function of this study, he states that it was intended to provide 'illustration and ornament', contextualising the travels described in part one. Moryson uses the analogy of a 'gate' which allows one to enter a city, suggesting that the historical study he drafted may have been intended to preface his travel account. This historical study was abandoned, as it threatened to overwhelm the text. Moryson describes how the 'bulke' of the work began to 'swel', and as a result he was forced to 'suppress' it after it became unmanageable.

Moryson contends that this process consumed three years of his time following the death of his patron, in 1606. However, this does not necessarily mean that the work was first drafted in 1609.<sup>22</sup> Moryson maintains that he intended to 'join' the historical material he suppressed to the discourse of the several commonwealths, which are described as though they are extant. This suggests that an early form of the work may have existed before Moryson returned to his writing in earnest, following Mountjoy's death. Notably, at the very beginning of part II of the *Itinerary*, Moryson describes his return to Lincolnshire in 1598, where he lived in his sister Faith's house for a year. During this time, he had the 'pleasing

---

<sup>22</sup> On f. 473 of *Itinerarium Pars Prima* a monetary table has been dated 'Anno Jacobus Rex 1609'. Notably this section of the manuscript is autograph, possibly stemming from an earlier copy. This may suggest that Moryson began to draft a Latin version of his 'Itinerary' at around this time.

opportunity to gather into some order out of confused and torne writings, the particular observations of my former Travels, to bee after more deliberately digested at leasure'.<sup>23</sup> Moryson is clearly describing the genesis of Part I of the *Itinerary*, a work drawn from the 'confused and torne' notes that he took whilst travelling in Europe.

Returning once again to the evidence of the printed *Itinerary*, it seems that this early work may have been augmented by notes and observations Moryson took whilst serving in Ireland. In Part II of the *Itinerary*, Moryson mentions that Mountjoy initially intended to employ him not as a secretary, but as a campaign writer who would compose a 'History or Journall of Irish affaires'.<sup>24</sup> Having already begun work on an account of his travels by this point, it is likely that Moryson began to consciously compile his Irish observations into a text that would in time become the second part of the work. Together, this writing, and the 'confused and torne' notes that Moryson revised whilst living in Lincolnshire, suggest that elements of the work could have been written 15 to 20 years before it first came to print.

Moryson is acutely conscious of this in the printed 'Address to the Reader', and asks that this 'losse of time shall not be imputed vnto me'. Moryson explains that the many years that separate the original conception of the work and its eventual expression in print stem from both the three years lost after Mountjoy's death, and the demands of his previous role as secretary, which left 'little time to bestow' on writing. Additional time was expended on the editorial process, which Moryson describes in detail. He asks the reader to take this into consideration, and to remember 'that the worke is first written in Latine, then translated into

---

<sup>23</sup> *Itinerary*, Part II, p. 1.

<sup>24</sup> *Itinerary*, Part II, p. 84.

English, and that in divers Copies, no man being able by the first Copie to put so large a worke in good fashion.’ In the process that Moryson describes, the ‘worke’ was originally drafted in Latin, and then translated into English. This translation is itself proliferated over what Moryson calls ‘divers copies’, a loose term which may refer to entire drafts of each individual part or short sections of the work.

There is manuscript evidence for this difficult, disordered process. In *Itinerarium Pars Secunda*, there is a significant marginal annotation on f.92 which provides an insight into this procedure:

The front begins with Constantinople and is at end at Irelandes warr ended shall contayne 82 sheetes <and a half> in Latyn with in [.....] Ireland in Latin hath much written on a syde I think, <the tome> being in English willbe as much as the first Tome for howsoever Ireland already in English be but 65 sheetes wheare the Latin is 71 sheetes. yet as I think that comes by Isakkes close writing of that part thereof which must be remembered when you number the English leaves of this second with those of the first. But if you fynde fitter to add the tables of monies and make it out with that, it shall then contayne 88 sheetes.<sup>25</sup>

The annotation, in Moryson’s hand, is confused and is either self-referential or addressed to an unknown party. Moryson begins by describing a section of the work that he defines as the ‘front’. Moryson states that this section begins at ‘Constantinople’ and ends at ‘Irelandes warr’. This means that Moryson is discussing a section of Part I of the work, which runs from his description of Constantinople in Part 1, Book 3, Chapter 4, and ends at the beginning of Part II,

---

<sup>25</sup> BL Add. MS. 367076, ‘Fynes Moryson’s Itinerary in Ireland’, 1599-1603, f.92

which comprises an account of the Irish War.<sup>26</sup> Moryson notes that this particular section will contain '82 sheetes and a half in Latyn'. Notably, Moryson uses the future tense, stating that it 'shall' be finished, indicating that it is incomplete.

Moryson is comparing this 'front' with material which has been written on 'Ireland'. As with the 'front' that Moryson describes, this section also seems to be incomplete. Moryson states that this Irish material comprises 65 'sheetes' in Latin, and 71 in English. He explains that this disparity may be located in the 'close writing' of 'Isakke'.<sup>27</sup> Moryson also notes that the Latin has 'much written on a syde'. By this he may be referring to 'asides', or annotations, which are presumably being incorporated into the English, adding to its eventual length.

Moryson is eager that this is considered when the overall work is numbered: 'which must be remembered when you number the leaves of this second part, with those of the first part'. By 'second part', Moryson almost certainly refers to the second part to the work, the *Itinerarium Pars Secunda*, in which the annotation is written. This explains why Moryson terms the second part 'this', referring to the manuscript itself. By the 'first part', Moryson must refer to the first part to the work. Neither part has been numbered, and both sections of the work Moryson describes are incomplete, in both Latin and English.

The process Moryson describes provides evidence of the composition of parallel Latin and English manuscripts. The two manuscripts Moryson describes are being composed simultaneously, and notably Moryson is using another 'tome' or

---

<sup>26</sup> The section described as the 'front' in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* runs from ff. 441-490, 49 folios. This does not correspond to the figure of 82.5 that Moryson gives in the annotation. This section, however, is largely autograph, unlike the greater part of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*.

<sup>27</sup> This is almost certainly Isaac Pywall, mentioned in Moryson's will, who contributes the primary hand in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*-which is written in Latin, as with the material Moryson describes.

manuscript as a point of reference, indicating that this text may already have been completed. Notably Moryson uses this term again in another editorial annotation on f. 1 of the *Itinerarium Pars Secunda*, comparing the pagination of a Latin manuscript with that of an English work: ‘first tome Latin to (esential) sides 762 [788] English 5[8]68 568’. The figures given do not match either the pagination or folio numbers of either the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* or *Secunda*, indicating that Moryson is describing a further, unknown manuscript.

Although it is difficult to define the exact status of the ‘tomes’ Moryson compares in the editorial annotations in *Itinerarium Pars Secunda*, he does state that the *Itenerary* has its genesis in an autograph Latin manuscript in the English ‘Address to the Reader’. Moryson writes that the work was ‘first written in Latin’, in his hand. Notably, Moryson uses this exact term in an editorial annotation on f. 412 of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, writing that ‘this leefe was 784 in the first copy that is written it is less by 16 leefes than my copy.’ This note provides further evidence for the existence of a ‘first copy’ of the work, an inference that is substantiated by an important Latin description of the work on f.2 of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. In what appears to be a draft of the title page Moryson describes each section of the forthcoming Latin *Itinerarium*. The description provides information about the status of the missing fourth part which has no parallel in the printed *Itenerary*:

Tres partes author latina lingua completas et quartam in laceris chartis mutilam seposuit, cum easdem potius Anglico sermone primum scribendas et excudendas (mutato priori consilio) apud se statueret. Et hanc quartam Partem, laceris et mutilis quas dixi chartis usus multos post annos ex Anglico sermone in Latinum traduxit.

The author left three complete parts written in Latin and the fourth one in

damaged form, on torn pieces of paper, when he decided (contrary to his previous plan) to instead write and print these in English first. As for this fourth part, for which he used the aforementioned damaged and torn sheets, he translated it from English into Latin many years later.<sup>28</sup>

Moryson's description, which seems to take the form of an explanation for the missing fourth part, suggests that the work was in fact founded in an autograph Latin text, comprised of the first three parts. The fourth part was for some reason damaged, and rendered on torn pieces of paper. Further, unlike the first three parts, it was written in English. The annotation reveals that Moryson initially intended to print this work in Latin, but then decided 'mutato priori consilio', contrary to his previous plan, to prepare an English text instead. Notably Moryson later completed a draft of the English fourth part in Latin, suggesting that he retained ambitions of publishing a complete Latin *Itinerarium*.

The Latin manuscript that Moryson describes in the above description seems to be the progenitor of both the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and the printed *Itinerary*. Notably the *Itinerarium Pars Secunda* is an autograph Latin manuscript, and so may in fact represent a part of the first Latin manuscript of the work. The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* seems to represent a later stage in the editorial process, as it contains traces of an earlier Latin copy. Scribal errors suggest a preceding work was consulted, and interleaved autograph insertions may have been directly incorporated from this 'first copy'. This understanding changes the nature of the relationship between the printed *Itinerary* and its manuscript antecedent. Rather than being a simple 'travel narrative' translated directly from a single Latin work, the *Itinerary* is in fact the result of a complex editorial process which spanned

---

<sup>28</sup> A more comprehensive analysis of this description is presented in Case Study 5.

several stages, and had its foundation in an early Latin manuscript that was repeatedly amended and retranslated. This stratified process of editing allowed Moryson to incorporate numerous changes and revisions.

A significant portion of this composition time must have been expended on the production of a strong first draft of the work in Latin, as is evidenced by the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, which has itself been informed by a preceding Latin work. The decision to draft the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* in Latin should be considered in the context of the printed *Itinerary's* privilege to print, which licences works in both Latin and English. On the title page of the printed *Itinerary*, Moryson, his 'executors, Administrators, Assignes and Deputies' are granted the privilege to 'sell, assigne and dispose to his or her best benefit, this Book and Bookes as well in the English as the Latin tongue; as well as these parts finished, as one or two Parts more thereof not yet finished, but shortly to be perfected by him'. The privilege is dated 29<sup>th</sup> April, 1617, indicating that at this stage, Moryson was still intending to publish a distinct work in Latin. Whilst changes made to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* do inform the printed *Itinerary*, the work may also be understood as a distinct text, a planned Latin version of the *Itinerary*.

This understanding is strongly supported by consideration of the prefatory material of the *Itinerarium*. The 'Address to the Reader' and the Dedication of the *Itinerarium* are completely different to those in the printed *Itinerary*. There is no correlation in length or argument between the English and Latin versions, suggesting they were intended to introduce distinct printed editions of the work. The Table of Contents also differs considerably, and anticipates a work which incorporates the planned fourth part, which was not published in English. These

differences are not intelligible unless the planned Latin *Itinerarium* is considered to be a distinct version of the work, not just a precursor to the printed *Itinerary*.

Furthermore, the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* has stylistic features which distinguish it from the printed *Itinerary*, again suggesting that it was perhaps originally envisioned as a distinct work, addressed to a distinct audience. Moryson employed a less rigid style in Latin, allowing himself more freedom of creative expression, characterised by frequent classical allusions and a clear expectation of a scholarly readership. Moryson anticipates a more cultivated audience, and as a consequence crafts a self consciously literary text, suffused with jokes, puns and banter, a far more lissom and fluid text than its cumbersome English counterpart. It is also colourful, vivid and evocative, almost florid in places. In contrast the English is dense, factual and brief, curtailing descriptions given free rein in the Latin, and cutting information deemed surplus to requirements. As well as the stylistic differences, a number of telling editorial changes suggest that different audiences were being considered. Material deemed contentious, irrelevant or otherwise unsuited to vernacular translation appears to have been removed.<sup>29</sup> The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* represents a discursive, almost jocular text when compared to the first part of the printed *Itinerary*.

The evidence for these preliminary conclusions will be presented in the following case studies. A series of six case studies will explore points of divergence through close reference to the two texts. Each study will focus on a short excerpt or section taken from the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, which will be examined in conjunction with the parallel text from the printed *Itinerary*. If there is no

---

<sup>29</sup> Textual differences are not always to the detriment of the printed version. On f.133 of the *Itinerarium*, the port of Melvin is mentioned, but described in much greater detail in the printed version. Note that Moryson includes the symbol 'X2' in the margin, possibly indicating he wishes to expand the section by a factor of 2. BL. Harl. MS. 5133, f.133.

parallel, then reasons will be proposed for the omission. The studies do not provide background or contextual information for each passage, with the exception of a short introduction to the Dedicatee in Case Study 4. They instead concentrate on the differences between the Latin and English versions of the text, and if possible suggest reasons for them.

These case studies will be preceded by a description of the contents of BL. Harl. MS. 5133, designed to facilitate future interaction with the manuscript. The manuscript description will be divided into three sections. The first will introduce the hands present in the manuscript, describing how they differ from one another. The second will explain how the text has been paginated and ordered. Together, these two sections will help lay the foundation for the final stage of the description, a full exposition of the manuscript's contents. This description will delineate the manuscript in order, and explain how the text has been compiled, consider any variation in watermarks and chain lines, numbering and pagination, variation in hand, ink or paper, editorial decisions, insertions and other relevant information.

The manuscript description is divided into distinct 'items'. Each 'item' represents a distinct element of the text. For example, the first draft of the 'Address to the Reader' would represent a distinct item, as would Chapter 5 of Book 1. Items may occupy a single folio, or a sequence of folios. As a rule, items never comprise less than a single folio leaf (as defined by the Harleian editor) of text. The items have been presented in the order they appear in the *Itinerarium* as it exists in its current state, except when this would have been illogical, for example in the case of the letter to M.T, which interrupts two sections of concurrent text.

## Hands Present in the Manuscript

### I) Identification

There are two hands present in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. The primary hand, which will be defined as Hand 1, is that of Isaac (or Isakke) Pywall, Moryson's servant. The secondary hand, which will be defined as Hand 2, is that of Fynes Moryson.<sup>1</sup> It is possible to positively identify the hands present by reference to autograph documents and annotations in the *Itinerarium*. Hand 1, that of Isaac Pywall, is referred to in an autograph annotation written in Fynes Moryson's hand in the *Itinerarium Pars Secunda*. Moryson writes of 'Isaakes close writing'.<sup>2</sup> This identifies the other hand as belonging to a third party named 'Isaake'. This may be cross referenced with Moryson's will, in which Moryson's 'servant Isaac Pywall' is identified, bequeathed clothing and bed hangings.<sup>3</sup> It may be assumed that the beneficiary 'Pywall', one of Moryson's executors, is the same 'Isaake' mentioned in the *Itinerarium Pars Secunda*. This is corroborated by the printed version of the 'Address to the Reader', in which Moryson contends he 'wrote the greatest part with my owne hand, and almost all the rest with the slowe pen of my servant'.<sup>4</sup> If the printed version is to be trusted, this confirms that Moryson wrote the

---

<sup>1</sup> Moryson seems to have encountered, and subsequently employed Pywall as a servant, whilst recovering from depression in the Levant Region following the death of his brother. *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 251.

<sup>2</sup> BL Add. MS 367076, 'Fynes Moryson's Itinerary in Ireland', 1599-1603, f. 92.

<sup>3</sup> Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, PROB 11/157, *Will of Fines or Fynes Morison*, 18 March 1630.

<sup>4</sup> *Itenerary*, 'Address to the Reader', unmarked leaf.

*Itinerarium* with the help of one other, his servant, whom his will identifies as Isaac Pywall.<sup>5</sup>

There is strong evidence that Hand 2 may be identified as that of Fynes Moryson.

Firstly, as Moryson contends that there are only two hands at work (in both the Printed *Itinerary* and in the phrasing of the annotation in *Itinerarium Pars Secunda*) then by identifying Hand 1 as Pywall, Hand 2 can only be that of the author.<sup>6</sup> In addition, there are several extant autograph documents which can be compared to the hands present in the *Itinerarium*.<sup>7</sup> The hand used in these documents bears a very close resemblance to Hand 2. For example, the 6 autograph letters sent between 1606 and 1610 demonstrate very similar character construction, and similar average width of characters and words.<sup>8</sup>

Further, Moryson himself confirms his own hand in an autograph annotation in f. 294v of *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. In a lengthy marginal note in a combination of Latin and English, he writes that the letters he purports to insert will be in his own

---

<sup>5</sup> Graham Kew contends that there are 5 hands present in the English manuscript. It seems possible that he may have confused variants for distinct hands. Having studied the examples presented in Kew's work, it seems that he may have confused Fynes Moryson's hand for that of Pywall's, and vice versa. For example, he contends that Moryson contributes the primary hand, whilst Pywall edits the work, when in fact the reverse is the case throughout BL. Harl. MS. 5133. Kew later seems to acknowledge his mistake, when he realises that Pywall cannot have edited the work, as an editorial annotation in BL. Add. MS. 36706 refers to 'Isakkes close writing'. Unless Pywall is referring to himself in the third person, he cannot have edited the *Itinerarium*. He concludes by asserting that it is impossible to know. Kew, p. iv.

<sup>6</sup> BL. Add. MS 36706, 'Fynes Moryson's Itinerary in Ireland', f. 92. The relevant section of the note reads: 'yet as I think that comes by Isakkes close writing of that part thereof which must be remembered when you number the English leaves of this second with those of the first'.

<sup>7</sup> 1. Moryson was Bursar of Peterhouse College 1589-90. Example of autograph in College Rolls, 1589-90. See Peterhouse, Cambridge, Archives, Computus Rolls 1589-90, Fynes Moryson is bursar. 2. Signature on will. 3. Letters written and signed on behalf of Mountjoy in Ireland. 4. Losely Letters. See the Biography section for further information.

<sup>8</sup> The letters represent a snapshot of Moryson's hand at two specific points in time, Spring/Summer 1606-1607, and Summer 1610. The hand in the earlier letters bears the greatest resemblance to the hand present in the manuscript. The characters are controlled, regular and rigid.

hand; *per me scriptas*. The letters are transcribed in Hand 2, positively identifying this hand as that of Moryson.

Furthermore, Hand 2 is the hand most frequently used for corrections, alterations and insertions of an authorial nature. There are two distinct types of amendment made to the text. The first represents real time editing, the writer correcting minor mistakes as they occur. This form of editing is limited to small changes which do not substantially alter the sense of the passage. The second represents authorial editing, changes and corrections which result from a full review of the text. This editing is always in Hand 2, that of Fynes Moryson. Moryson, therefore, may be identified as the editor and corrector of the text, written out by his servant. Moryson will make occasional alterations for grammar, spelling, and word choice, but he will also delete whole passages of text, insert substantial, sentence length, alterations, and extensively annotate in the margin.

## II) Categorisation

Of the two hands, the latter is fairly constant, whilst Hand 1 has a number of variants, discussed at length below.<sup>9</sup> The Hands have been categorised in order of frequency. So although Moryson has authorial control, his hand is nonetheless classified as 'Hand 2', as Pywall writes the greater part of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*.<sup>10</sup>

### Hand 1:

First evident: f. 1v.

---

<sup>9</sup> Note that the present of 4 variants, albeit confined to 2 hands, suggests strongly that the manuscript may well have existed in 4 variant states.

<sup>10</sup> Pywall writes 92.5% of the manuscript, Moryson just 7.5% (discounting editorial additions).

Incidence: f. 1-13, ff. 15-36, ff. 39-55v, ff. 58-101v, ff. 103-188, ff. 190-234v, ff. 237v-294v, ff. 301-357, ff. 358-411, ff. 413-462.

Hand Begins: *Itinerarium Quod Fynes Moryson Anglus Scripsit*

Description of hand:

There are three variants of this hand. Although the size and spacing of characters alters, the composition of individual characters and the regular spacing of characters and text mark this out as the same hand. The differences may be a result of different times of composition, different writing apparatus, lighting or psychological conditions. The differences, along with relative measurements of characters, are analysed in 3 samples below.

Variant 1

Sample: ff. 1v-2

Average vowel height : 3mm (3, 3, 3, 4, 3, 3)

Average large consonant t (L, T, K etc) height : 6mm (6, 6, 6, 7, 7, 5)

Average width of character: 2.5mm (2, 2, 2, 4, 3, 1)

Stylistic notes:

A generous, flowing italic hand. Very regular size and spacing of letters. All large consonant s and capitals are an average of twice the height of vowels or minims. There is a tendency to not finish the rightward stroke of the 'q' leading to possible confusion with the 'g', which is quite similar, but with a more generous loop/final flourish. The Capital 'l' character has a very long tail sweeping left, which may be confused for a capital 'A', which itself is distinguished by the same left

downstroke, but which does not draw back towards the base of the character.

Again, possible confusion with the lower case double 'i', which may resemble a 'y' or 'v', as the downstroke of the final 'i' extends 3mm below the line division. Use of long 's' and short with no discernable relevance.

Variant 2

Sample: f. 25

Average vowel height : 1mm (1,1,1, 1.2, 1, 1)

Average large consonant (L, T, K etc) height : 2.5mm (2.5, 2.5, 2.5, 3, 2, 2,5)

Average width of character: 1mm (1, 1,1,1, 0.7, 1, 1)

Stylistic notes:

A much tighter, more controlled hand than the first incidence of this script. Note that the differences could be a result of the formatting applied to this page-from this point onward in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* , the pages are arranged as if for printing-all the text contained within a 107mm by 165mm text box, and catchwords and subtitles included on each page. The hand may be authenticated by reference to individual characters; if a word begins with a 'v', the composition of this character is marked by a leftward stroke that loops back around to the base of the character, almost forming a full circle. In addition, the composition of the 'e' character is exactly the same, with no differentiation. Each extract adheres to a regular, modern italic 'e', of constant size. This same method of composition is adhered to in ff. 1v-23, although the characters themselves are substantially larger, and the backstroke is more savage, with the nib of the pen pressed against the page to produce a thick, dark line and occasional blotting. I would speculate

that the writing implement used in each example also differs somewhat-the quill used to apply the characters in f. 25 onwards is clearly much more sharp, producing acute, regular characters, and the same regularity of text seen in ff. 1v-23.

### Variant 3

Sample: f. 79

Average vowel height : 2mm (2.5, 2, 2,2, 2, 2)

Average large consonant (L, T, K etc) height : 6mm (5, 7,7,6,5,6)

Average width of character: 2mm (2, 2, 1, 3, 3,2,)

Stylistic notes:

This is the most distinct of the 3 variants, and the most difficult to authenticate. Although similar in size to Variant 1, there are differences. The composition of the 'e' and 'g' characters is exactly the same-regular sized, with idiosyncrasies of composition noted in V.1 adhered to (for example; the loop of the 'g' drifting back towards the base of the character, the regular, modern italic 'e'). However, there are some alterations. The 'q' character is very sharp and angular, and the upstroke reaches up to touch the proceeding character. In addition, the script is marked by blotting and by blacking out of the very tip of the larger consonant characters. For example, on f. 86, the tip of each 'h' in 'habeas' has been completely filled in. This is not a feature of either V.1 or V.2, but could be explicable by use of a different writing implement. It could also be an example of an alteration stemming from boredom or a lack of concentration, similar to doodling-note this does not manifest itself in the introductory folios of the manuscript (insofar as one can

ascertain their order from the methodology of compilation). However, there is good evidence that this is the work of the same scribe as V.1 and V.2. The slant, or angling of the text is constant in all 3 extracts-around 15 to 20 degrees. This is a strong indicator of a particular hand, and is difficult to change, even wilfully. In addition, the percentage similarity of character composition is greater than the deviation. V.1 and V.2 have almost exactly similar character composition, and V.3 is more than 70% similar in analysis of lines 13-23 of f. 86 (V.3) in relation to lines 21-31 of f. 18 (V.1). Note that the disparity in lines per page (31-23) is due to the formatting applied to f. 86, where 50mm of the page is left blank by the use of a text box.

## **Hand 2:**

First evident: f. 13

Incidence: ff. 13-15v, ff. 37-38, ff. 56-57, ff. 235-237, ff. 295-ff.300, ff. 412, ff. 462-490

Hand Begins: *civium frequentiam splendida est*

Description of Hand:

Sample: ff. 37-38.

Average vowel height: 2mm (2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2,)

Average large consonant (L, T, K etc) height : 4mm (3,4, 5, 5, 3, 4)

Average width of character: 1.5mm (1, 1.5, 1.5, 1.5, 1, 2)

Stylistic notes:

A quite different hand to the regular italics and constancy of Hand 1. A much smaller, almost scrawled hand, with the writing implement pressed hard into the page, leaving a very dark imprint and some spread of ink/blotting. There is none of the measured constancy of Hand 1, with characters irregularly spaced and stretched. For example, on f. 24, the 'a' of 'maritamaru', stretches across 4.5mm, three times the average width. The composition of individual characters is also quite different. The 'e' of Hand 2 resembles a capital italic 'E' in miniature; lower case italic 'e' characters are never used, unlike in Hand 1. The long 's' character is used with greater frequency than in Hand 1. Capital letters are also understated, with none of the flourish imparted to capitals in Hand 1. Despite the tight, dense structure of Hand 2, the hand is very closely controlled, adhering to a strict (but unmarked) vertical marking. Hand 2 is also more prone to using Latin abbreviations (particularly for 'quod', 'que', 'quamque' etc) than Hand 1, which provides further evidence that this is Moryson. The hand is also prone to significantly less errors than Hand 1. For example, Moryson makes just two corrections on f. 24/pp. 5 & 6, whereas on f. 58, for example, there are 21 corrections in total. These corrections, and the vast majority of alterations throughout, are in Hand 2, lending further credence to the argument that this is the script of the author and strategic editor, Moryson.

## The Pagination and Ordering of the Manuscript

In order to access the manuscript and understand it for the purposes of this study, it is necessary to comprehend exactly how it has been paginated and ordered.

There are two distinct systems of pagination: pencil numeration in the hand of the Harleian catalogue editor, and Moryson's own inked numbering. For the purposes of this study, the system of pencil pagination has been followed, as the Harleian editor numbers every single folio. Although the pencil pagination is not perfect, it is more reliable and less self-referential than that employed by Moryson.

The pencil pagination is in the hand of an unknown party. It is likely that this system of pagination was introduced when the manuscript was bound in 2 volumes in 1964. The pencil pagination begins on the first folio of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, which has not been paginated by Moryson.<sup>11</sup> F. 1 is marked '1' in pencil, and this system of numbering then remains constant throughout the manuscript, proceeding up to f. 490. The pencil pagination remains regular through second drafts of the 'Address to the Reader', Dedication and Table of Contents. Neither is it interrupted by the insertion of excerpts from another source. Material introduced at f. 36v and f. 55v is numbered 37/38 and 56/57 respectively, even though these insertions interrupt the flow of the text.

However, the pencil pagination is not infallible. For example, it ignores a blank leaf inserted between f. 23 and f. 24. Furthermore, f. 102 and f. 189 are also not

---

<sup>11</sup> This paper seems to have been a part of the original gathering of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, as it is aged, marked, and has chain lines which correspond to the following folios. It is dated '23 February 1719/20', which is presumably the date it entered the Harleian collection.

numbered, although they do seem to have been accounted for in the pagination. In the case of the latter, for example, the preceding folio is marked 188, and the one that follows is marked 190, even though the omitted page is not itself numbered.<sup>12</sup>

The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* is also paginated by Moryson. Whilst the Harleian editor numbers by folio leaf, marking every other page, Moryson paginates every individual page. Moryson's system of pagination begins at '5' on f. 24, and concludes at '1004' on f. 490v. The first folio that Moryson numbers, f. 24, represents a continuation of Chapter 1. Chapter 1 begins at f. 13 and proceeds to f. 15v. This represents 5 quarto sized pages, so it may be assumed that the 5 pages which Moryson numbered have been removed, and replaced with newer material, which has not been paginated and which is one page longer.

Moryson's pagination is instructive, as it defines how the text was ordered at a specific point in its history. Variations allow inferences regarding Moryson's editorial process and intents when reviewing the text. Moryson's system of pagination proceeds without variation until p. 30/f. 36v. This page marks the beginning of Chapter 2. At this point a copy of an autograph letter is introduced, interrupting the surrounding text. Although the letter has been numbered in pencil, by the Harleian editor, it is not included in Moryson's system of numbering. The page before is marked '30', and the page after '31', indicating that Moryson did not account for this insertion at the point when the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* was first numbered. This suggests it represents a later insertion, perhaps designed to add colour or veracity to the text at this juncture.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> For the purposes of this study, the leaves have been represented as if they had been marked, as f. 101 and f. 189.

<sup>13</sup> See Case Study 2.

A further letter is inserted at p. 64/f. 55v. Again, the material introduced is not paginated by Moryson. Moryson's system of pagination remains constant for the following section. F. 63/p. 76 marks the beginning of Chapter 3. F. 89/p. 128 marks the beginning of Chapter 4. The numeration remains regular until f. 101v.p. 152. At this juncture another leaf is inserted, which has not been numbered by Moryson, although it is accounted for in the pencil pagination. The leaf is blank, although the reverse (f. 102v) bears an annotation in English, 'this was putt in to m.2 Fol/149'. The annotation seems to be in Moryson's hand, and replicated the spelling of 'putt' in another note on f. 294v. It seems likely that the note was designed to preface a section of the text that was introduced to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. This section of the text was previously 'putt' into another manuscript, designated as 'm.2'.<sup>14</sup>

The numbering is then regular until f. 156v/p. 260. At this point Book 2, Chapter 1 commences. The numeration and order remain regular throughout, up until f. 188/p. 323. At this point there is another blank leaf, which bears a note in Moryson's hand, 'this was 342 in the other copy tho in this it be but 323'. At this point, the pagination changes to reflect this. For example, on f. 188/p. 323, '342' has been crossed out, and replaced with '323'. This disparity is initially 19 pages, but switches to 21 on f. 189. So, for example, Book 2, Chapter 2 begins on f. 207/p. 353 (del. 374).

It is difficult to accurately explain this disparity. There are two possible conjectures. The first is that the note was designed to preface a section of text that had been inserted into the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* from another manuscript, the 'other copy' that is referred to. The hand of the surrounding text does not

---

<sup>14</sup> As the preceding Introduction to the Analysis states, this may have been the second extant manuscript, *Itinerarium Pars Secunda*, or possibly another undefined manuscript.

change, however, so this material must not have been introduced from the autograph 'first copy' that Moryson wrote. The second is that the note describes the pagination of a parallel manuscript, which is being compared to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. This point of comparison, the 'other copy', is 21 pages longer at this juncture.<sup>15</sup> This annotation would thus reflect the note on f. 92 of *Pars Secunda*, which describes the pagination of parallel manuscripts.<sup>16</sup>

The pagination remains constant until f. 294v. At this point, a sequence of three letters is inserted into the manuscript.<sup>17</sup> The letters, written in Italian and Latin, are in Fynes Moryson's hand, and thus distinct from the surrounding text, which is in Isaac's hand. The letters span 11 pages, from ff. 294v-.300. These inserted letters have been included in Moryson's system of pagination, and from this point onwards the disparity is now 10 pages, as opposed to 21. So, for example, 550 has been amended to 540, 551 to 541, and so on. The pagination remains constant until f. 330/p. 589 (del.599). At this point, the pagination returns to normal, so for example on f. 331/p. 600 the figure '600' has not been changed or excised. There is no evidence in the physical form of the manuscript to explain this. The pagination remains regular until f. 336/p. 610, at which point another number, '620', appears, which has been crossed out. This suggests that the pagination has

---

<sup>15</sup> In particular, this note relates how the 'close writing' of Moryson's scribe, Isaac Pywall, renders the text being composed shorter than the copy it is compared to. This would explain why the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, in Pywall's hand, is 21 pages shorter at this juncture.

<sup>16</sup> A third possibility is that Moryson is comparing this version to the 'other copy', which contained content not transposed to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. For example, on f. 360v Moryson writes a note which suggests he considered including an 'epistle' sent to his brother Richard, although this material does not find its way into the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*.

<sup>17</sup> On f. 234v/pp. 411 (del. 432) a map of Roman is introduced. Although this leaf is not numbered it is included in Moryson's system of pagination.

reverted to the prior disparity, a difference of 10. This 10 page disparity persists until the end the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* (f. 490v/p. 1004).<sup>18</sup>

In addition to pagination, the intended order of the text also needs to be confirmed, in order to support the analysis that follows. A number of copies of the printed *Itinerary* have been examined in order to cross reference the order of the material presented with that of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*.<sup>19</sup>

Order of the prefatory material of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*:

f. 1v Title Page (I)

f. 3 Dedication #1

f. 4-5 'Address to the Reader' # 1

f. 6-12 Table of Contents # 1 (inc. Table of Small Coins)

ff. 13-15 Chapter 1

ff. 16 Incomplete Table of Contents

f. 17 Dedication # 2

ff. 18 Incomplete 'Address to the Reader' # 2

ff. 19-23 Table of Contents #2 (inc. Table of Small Coins)

ff. 24-36. Chapter 1 contd.

---

<sup>18</sup> Note that there are a number of clues in the second section of the *Itinerarium* (Vol. II) which seem to attend to this disparity. On f. 412 Moryson notes that his 'first copy' had different pagination to this copy. This note is appended to the back of a leaf which has been inserted into the manuscript, in Moryson's hand. This suggests that an earlier, autograph copy may inform the *Itinerarium*.

<sup>19</sup> B.L Pressmarks R.B.23 C.364, 983.hl, 241.e.16, G.2850. Moryson's presentation copy, held by Peterhouse College (Perne Library, Pressmark: B.6.2) has also been examined.

Given that the drafts of the Dedication, 'Address to the Reader' and Table of Contents consistently appear in the same order, this sequence can be established as that desired by Moryson. The same order is followed in all copies of the printed *Itenerary* held by the British library. There is some variation between the copies. Most resemble works ordered as the manuscript. However British Library pressmarks 983.hl and R.B C.364 differ. Copy 983.h1 is damaged, lacking the 'Address to the Reader' and Dedication, and so the correct order of the prefatory material cannot be assumed.<sup>20</sup> Copy R.B.23 C.364 is an imperfect copy in which the Table of Contents is interdicted by the Dedication and 'Address to the Reader'.<sup>21</sup> However, in all other copies of the *Itenerary* examined, the order in which the manuscript is arranged is adhered to; this is prefaced by the Title Page, and followed by the first Chapter. The same order would be followed in the manuscript, were it not for the aberrant inclusion of 2 folios of the first Chapter at f. 13. Logically therefore, the following intended order can be established:

1. Title Page
2. Dedication
3. 'Address to the Reader'

---

<sup>20</sup>There is considerable damage to this text. It is prefaced by 3 modern folio sheets. The first folio page of the original printing has been ripped in three places and pasted back together. The reverse side is marked 'blue label 983 hl' and also 'pt 2 wants pages 295, 296, 301, 302', indicating further damage. In addition, the title page (inc. leaf design) has been pasted on to a sheet of modern paper, making it impossible to verify whether the misprint in RB23 has been repeated. Certainly, this text is worn and damaged, and it is possible it has to an extent been reconstructed.

<sup>21</sup>This is illogical as the 'Address to the Reader' has a function in interpreting the table of contents. The Title page is also on the reverse of the first page, whereas one would expect it to be on the facing page when the text was studied. Note that this also replicates the exact order of the manuscript (i.e. title page on f. 1v as opposed to f. 1) so this may not be an error.

#### 4. Table of Contents

#### 5. Table of Small Coins

#### 6. Chapter 1

The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* can be said to be in approximately the order intended by Moryson, if one discounts aberrant inclusions, such as incomplete drafts, blank folios and pages of editorial annotation. This correspondence with the paratexts of the printed parallel allows excerpts from the manuscript to be examined in conjunction with comparable sections of the published *Itinerary*.

## Exposition of the Contents of the Manuscript

**Note:** The prefatory material has been described in greater detail than the main body of the text as it differs most considerably from the English printed *Itinerary*, and because it is the focus of the Case Studies that follow.

**Item 1:** Three blank folios.

The first is stamped: Harley Ms 5133 Folios 1-357. In the bottom left corner of f. 1. '629' has been written in pencil, and then deleted. It has been replaced with the inscription 'B 688 D'. The remaining two folios are blank. These leaves bear no sign of aging, and were presumably introduced to the manuscript when it was rebound in 1964.

**Item 2:** Harleian Catalogue record and Title page to the *Itinerarium*: f. 1.

### *Hand 1*

This is the first folio to be paginated. Note that it is numbered in pencil, distinct from pagination in Hand 2 later in the manuscript. f. 1 is marked in pencil as following:

|                |           |                     |
|----------------|-----------|---------------------|
| <u>14id 16</u> | <u>96</u> | 44                  |
| 5133           | v         | 23 February 1719/20 |

f.1v represents a draft of the title page of the *Itinerarium*, beginning 'Itinerarium Quod Fynes Moryson Anglus scriptit'. There is no textual distinction between the version in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and the printed *Itinerary*. Indeed, the

composition of the printed version is followed in the formatting of the manuscript, which also includes the title page on the verso page. No additions or corrections. Evidence of blotting from facing page.

**Item 3:** Description of the *Itinerarium* f. 2.

*Hand 1 (editing in hand 2)*

f. 2v represents a description of the four parts to the *Itinerarium*. It appears similar to the short description of the three parts to the work that follows the title page in the printed *Itenerary*. However, there is a significant difference. The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* also contains a description of the missing fourth part to the work, which has no parallel in the *Itenerary*. This description does not appear to have been finished, and whilst the first part to the work is described at length, the second and third parts are described in a single sentence each. The description of the third and fourth parts to the work has been conflated. It states that three parts of the work were first written in Latin, whilst the fourth was written in English. This part was since written in Latin, although Moryson writes that it is 'damaged', specifically stating that it is written on 'torn' leaves. The folio has been paginated '2' in pencil. Some blotting. The word 'usas' is crossed out. The word has been re-written in the right hand margin, with the addition of an illegible minim character. This is an authorial correction in Hand 2, as there is an insertion arrow to show the syntax of the sentence has been changed.

**Item 4:** Introduction to Dedication and Dedication #1: ff. 2v-3v.

*Hand 1 (extensive editing in Hand 2)*

Draft versions of introduction to Dedication and Dedication, address to William, Earl of Pembroke. The text is in Hand 1, with extensive authorial corrections in

Hand 2. These are concentrated around the salutation on f. 2v, which has been deleted, crossed out with a flourish, following extensive, illegible editing. The Dedication has been drafted on f. 3. There is a large gap between the opening line and the main text. This is presumably where the deleted salutation was intended to be placed. The Dedication has been corrected in Hand 2, with minor errors corrected. For example, on f. 3v, L5 'more' has been altered to 'morem'. F. 3v has been left blank.

This version of the Dedication is completely different to the printed parallel. Although both versions are addressed to William Herbert, third earl of Pembroke, there are no other similarities. They differ in terms of length and content, and seem to have been intended to introduce quite different works.

**Item 5:** 'Address to the Reader' #1: ff. 4-6.

*Hand 1 (corrections in Hand 1)*

First draft of 'Address to the Reader', beginning 'Lectori Salutem'. There is significant blotting and smudging to the margins, and also the signature, which may explain the presence of another draft later in the manuscript. This draft is written in Hand 1. It appears to be in V.1 of Hand 1, although it also displays the blotted or filled in consonant loops which characterise V.3. This demonstrates that although the two variants appear superficially different they share features that cross over. There are very few alterations to this draft, and many of them appear to take the form of corrections. Insertion of 'lectores' to, f. 4, L.20. Insertion of 'adhuc' to f. 4v, L.2. Deletion of 'diutex' from f. 5, L.15. Insertion of 'haec' to f. 5v, L.6. Addition of 'lectores' between 'huiusmodi' and 'scire' in f. 4, L.18. Vita 'quod' amended to 'vita quo quod' in f. 4, L.19. Insertion of 'adhuc'

between 'dum' and 'viveret' on f. 4v, L.2. Deletion of 'diutius', replaced by 'diurnalium' on f. 5, L.20. Insertion of 'hoc' between 'mihi' and 'exereundi' on f. 5v, L.6.

As with the Dedication, this version of the 'Address to the Reader' is completely different to that of the printed *Itinerary*. The two versions differ in terms of length and content, and the arguments advanced in the Latin version seem intended to introduce a different work.

**Item 6:** Table of Contents #1: ff. 6-12.

*Hand 1 (editing in Hand 2)*

First draft of full table of contents. A somewhat rougher copy than the preliminary drafts of the 'Address to the Reader' and Dedication, incorporating a number of authorial corrections. Deletion of 'Lubecum' from f. 6, L.6, possibly because the original spans 2 lines. Replacement of 'regnum' with 'regionum' on f. 6, L.28. Significant blotting on f. 8. Insertion of 'quoad' (to correct mistake) on f. 9, L.22. Insertion of 'curias' for illegible word, f. 9, L.27. Insertion of 'singula' (to correct mistake) on line f. 10, L.1. Replacement of 'pensi' with 'et pensi' on f. 9v, L.7. Replacement of 'quinque' for 'quinqua' on f. 9v, L.27. Deletion of 'vel tres solidos et quatuor denarios' on f. 1, L.18. Deletion of illegible text on f. 11v, L.11, and deletion of 'unam argentam' from same page. Spelling correction-'Milo' to 'Mediolanenses' on f. 11v, L.26, and correction of 'Argenti' to 'Argen' on line 32. Insertion of 'efficiunt' between 'soulz' and 'quartam' in f. 12, L.5.

There is a further difference, as although the hand remains the same, the ink uses darkens considerably from ff. 10v-12. This could indicate the use of a different quill, or a time lapse between completions of sections. The change becomes

evident at f. 10v, L.17, at the start of the section entitled 'Per Germaniam'. As with the Dedication and 'Address to the Reader', the Table of Contents differs to the printed parallel. This difference is largely confined to the fourth part to the work. In the Latin, it is fully described, and ordered into books and chapters as with the preceding three parts. There is no suggestion that this section is incomplete. In the English, the Table of Contents is reduced to a list of 25 anticipated chapters, and Moryson specifically defines that this section is unfinished. These 25 chapters also differ from those defined in the Latin Table of Contents, which lists 31 chapters, in a different order, with different anticipated content. The extent of the disparity is arresting, and may intimate that the Latin version of the fourth part, which Moryson contends that he has finished in the description on f. 2, contained different content to the English version.

**Item 7:** Book 1, Chapter 1 of *Itinerarium Pars Prima* (incomplete) ff. 13-15.

*Hand 1 (editing in Hand 2)*

Beginning of Part 1, Book 1, Chapter 1. The manuscript has been presented like a printer's copy, incorporating the use of text boxes and woodcuts. The format used in the manuscript is followed exactly in the printed version-with the exception of the woodcuts. In the manuscript, the Title (ITINERARIUM quod Fynes Moryson Anglus Scriptit & c.) is enclosed within a hand drawn (thick, black double line) box. Underneath, a sub-title is given:

Decennalis

Per duodecim Dominia

Peregrinationis observa-

tiones complectens

Underneath this a horizontal line has been drawn. Approximately 20mm underneath this, another parallel line has been drawn, enclosing the text 'PARS PRIMA'. Approximately 17mm underneath this another parallel line has been drawn, this time enclosing 'LIBER PRIMUS'. The text is then ordered underneath a small, central sub-title: 'Caput Primum'. Underneath this, the contents of the opening chapter are delineated:

De itinere Londino (in Anglia

Stodam, Hamburgum, Lube-

Cum, Luneburgum, de reditu

Hamburgum, et itinere Magdeburgum, Lipsiam, Witenburgum urbesque vicinas

in Germania)

Between 'Hamburgum' and 'Lipsiam' 'et itinere Magdeburgum' has been inserted (through hand-drawn arrow to the left margin). In the following paragraph the word 'omino' is deleted from line 6, and 'vacante' is excised from line 7. There is a large vertical insertion in the right margin of f. 13v. It is in Hand 1, but the ink is much darker, perhaps suggest a later alteration. The insertion is also constricted, and although the characters are formed in the same way as the main text, they are smaller and more tightly ordered. At the foot of the marginal insertion, '1591' has been inserted in a gothic hand, vertically, parallel with the inserted text. Over the course of ff. 14-15 the hand becomes increasingly loose, before abruptly tailing off mid-sentence a third of the way down f. 15v. The hand is also much

darker and thicker on this leaf, similar to that of the marginal insertion. This represents another point of divergence from the English printed parallel, in which the first chapter proceeds uninterrupted. The ordering of this section amidst the prefatory material indicates that the beginning of this chapter may have been considered to be a paratext. Although the content of this section has a close parallel with that of the printed *Itinerary*, there are minor textual differences between the two, which are not explained by any amendments made to the text.

**Item 8:** Description of the *Itinerarium* # 2: f. 16.

*Hand 1*

This represents a second draft of the material on f. 2. It lists the contents of the three parts to the *Itinerarium*, and explains the missing fourth part. This draft differs from f. 2 as it also includes a long, paragraph length marginal note, written horizontally on f. 16v. The note has been obscured in several places, and so the exact inflection of several terms is difficult to assume. The content is nonetheless significant, although caution must be taken with any interpretation. The note relates to the second draft of the dedication, which follows. It seems to concern the anticipated pecuniary award for the dedication, which Moryson claims to have no interest in. This sentiment is however abetted to a short account of an author who laboured for 'Septennium', or seven years on a work, only to receive no reward. This section is added onto the descriptions of the four parts to the *Itinerarium*, and may either be intended to serve as a further explanatory paragraph, that interprets the following Dedication, or may simply take the form of a self referential annotation, not intended for publication. In either case, the sentiments expressed in the note have no parallel in the printed *Itinerary*.

**Item 9:** Dedication # 2: f. 17.*Hand 1 (extensive editing in Hand 2)*

Second draft of Dedication, which incorporates a salutation to Pembroke, which has been deleted from the first draft. Edited extensively in Hand 2, with deletions and corrections in the margins. The entire salutation has been deleted, f. 17, L.1-8, along with a further passage at the foot of the first page, f. 17, L.25. Substantial annotations, corrections and inter-linear insertions throughout. Deletion of 'Illustrimo Comes' from f. 17, L.1. Insertion of 'unquam' between 'faucibus' and 'protegit' on f. 17, L.8. Deletion of 'devoti solummodo animi testimonium exhibere profitentur' from f. 17, L.21-22. Replaced with 'grati vel benevoli erga Patronum animi, se qualiacumque, possunt testimonium libenter exhibere profitentur.' In bottom margin of f. 17v after sentence ending 'reliquit' sentence length insertion. Note that these insertions do not appear in the first draft, and so f. 17 represents a corrected version of the Dedication. However, other than these corrections, the content does not seem to differ from that of the first draft, so this version may represent a fair copy.

**Item 10:** 'Address to the Reader' #2 (incomplete): f. 18.*Hand 1*

Incomplete draft of 'Address to the Reader'. Paginated in pencil. As with the second draft of the Dedication, the text is indistinguishable from the previous version, except that previous corrections have been incorporated. Almost no additions or corrections. No additions in the hand of the editor. Minor mid-line spelling corrections. No changes for meaning. This seems to represent a fair copy

of the opening of the 'Address to the Reader'. There is no explanation for why it has been abandoned.

**Item 11:** Table of Contents #2: ff. 19-23.

*Hand 1*

Second draft of Table of Contents. Paginated in pencil. No additions or corrections in the hand of the author. As with the other secondary versions of the paratexts, it seems to represent a fair copy of the previous draft. In this case however, there is a slight variation in content. For example, the preceding version ends with a chapter on England, whereas this version ends with a chapter discussing the Greeks, Jews and Muscovites. Note that although content does not seem to have been excised, this version is two folios shorter than the preceding version.

**Item 12:** Book 1, Chapter 1 of *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. 1: ff. 24-36.

*Hand 1 (extensive editing in Hand 2)*

Marked 'Cap 1'. This section represents a continuation of Chapter 1, following on from f. 15v. The text is extensively edited and corrected in Hand 2. These are not corrections, but alterations, as words are replaced by quite different terms. In addition, whole sections have been deleted, or highlighted and marked for correction. There are also significant marginal insertions-in particular, on f. 33, f. 34v and f. 36. This entire section has been formatted as if for printing-vertical lines have been drawn down the page to encompass the text, and space has been left for headers, running titles and catch-words. The margin has been marked as in the Printed *Itinerary*, with towns and topics of interest highlighted i.e. 'Lubecke'

'Hamburg'. This section (ff. 24-36) , and its precursor, (ff. 13-15) closely correspond to Chapter 1 in the printed *Itinerary*.<sup>22</sup>

**Item 13:** Book 1, Chapter 2 of *Itinerarium Pars Prima*: ff. 36v-63.

*Hand 1 (editing in Hand 2)*

The text is paginated in Hand 2 up until p. 30/ff. 36v. This page marks the beginning of Chapter 2. At this point a copy of a letter addressed to 'M.T' is inserted, interrupting the text. Although it has been numbered in pencil, it is not included in Moryson's system of pagination. The two inserted leaves appear to be from different paper (the paper used in the insertion has chain lines of 23mm, as opposed to 20mm in the surrounding leaves) and are in a Hand 2. The pencil numbering of folios and Moryson's pagination remains constant until f. 55v/pp. 64. At this juncture another letter is inserted. Again, there is a change in script to hand 2, and the paper and ink used appear to be quite different.

Evidence of considerable editing throughout, mostly corrections to grammar and spelling. For example, 'Praga' is substituted for 'Pragam' on f. 37. Considerable sections have been excised, and there is also evidence this section has been checked for factual accuracy, for example the date 'Anno 767' is written in the margin of f. 40v. This addition is incorporated into the text of the printed version, on p. 15 (Sig. B2).<sup>23</sup> There is also evidence of large scale authorial editing. For example, on f. 41v a large section (L.7-L14) has been surrounded by an octagonal box and crossed through twice, top-to-bottom-presumably marked for deletion. Interestingly the highlighted text concerns Anabaptists, and was not included in the printed version. In addition, a large section has been deleted by Moryson

---

<sup>22</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 3.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid*, Part I, p. 15.

(Hand 2), on f. 43v, L.8-14. This highlighted section has again not been included in the printed text. Another large section has been marked for deletion on f. 45, L.6-17. In this case, the text has been highlighted by Hand 1. Moryson then takes over the editing, leaving the first 3 lines but excising the rest in his heavy black script. He then replaces the deleted text with a marginal annotation, which is itself heavily deleted post-script. There is additional heavy editing in both Hands 1 and 2 on f. 47v (throughout) and on f. 51.

**Item 14:** Letter to M.T: f. 37-38.

*Hand 2*

Authorial copy of a letter addressed to 'M.T'. The letter represents an interleaved insertion, interrupting concurrent text. The letter is introduced by a short marginal note, which is incorporated into the printed *Itinerary*. The letter is also incorporated into the printed work, addressed to 'Honest M'. The content is almost exactly the same, with minor stylistic variation. The letter has marked physical differences to surrounding material. It is written on quite different paper, which appears to be waxed or possibly a form of membrane, such as vellum. It has been written in a different shade of ink, much more profound shade of black, running to brown and even green in places. The Letter is in Hand 2, and bears very few authorial corrections throughout.

**Item 15:** Letter to Dr. J: ff. 56-57.

*Hand 2*

Authorial copy of a letter addressed to Doctor J. Note the 'J' character is crossed, leading to possible confusion with 'F'. As with Item 14, the letter interrupts concurrent blocks of text, and is written on quite different paper, in a different

shade of ink, which has faded to a dull green colour. The paper is identical to that of the previous insertion, feeling starched or waxed. This letter, and the previous inserted letter to 'M.T' differ from other later letters inserted in the manuscript. For example, Moryson includes a further two letters slightly later in the narrative - to Francis Markham, dated 1 October, 1592 and to Aegidus Hoffman, dated 21 October, 1592. These also have printed parallels at (p. 36, Sig. C6) and (p. 37, Sig. D).<sup>24</sup> Unlike the two inserted letters, these letters are on the same paper, are incorporated in the same hand as the main text and are numbered continuously. This suggests that Items 14 and 15 are perhaps inserted directly from a copy book of letters, or may be transferred from Moryson's travel diaries or a previous copy of the manuscript. This is further evidenced by the composition, as there are very few mistakes, and little authorial editing. The printed parallel is a letter to Dr John Ulmer, dated 24 May, 1592 (p.25, Sig.C).<sup>25</sup> The date and addressee are the same, but the manuscript version is discernibly longer. The subject matter also differs, as for example dates and figures included in the manuscript version are not transposed to the printed *Itinerary*.

**Item 16:** Book 1, Chapter 3 of *Itinerarium Pars Prima* ff. 63v-89.

*Hand 1 (extensive editing in Hand 2)*

f. 63/pp. 76 marks the beginning of Chapter 3. Authorial corrections in Hand 2 throughout ff. 63v-66. Considerable deletions and substitution at the foot of f. 66, two significant marginal insertions on f. 68. Significant deletions on f. 68v, blotting and further deletions on the facing page. Large passages underlined on f. 72 and f. 72v. Very large section deleted on f. 73v along with heavy alterations.

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid, Part I, pp. 36- 37.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, Part I, p. 29.

Considerable deletions, along with a large marginal addition present on facing page. Entire section deleted on ff. 80-81v, stricken through with a diagonal line.

Sections of a letter sent to Aegidius Hoffman on 21 October 1592 deleted.

Corrections focus around Moryson's interaction with Doctor Penzelius, with which he closes the letter. It is significant that, unlike other deleted content, the 'Doctor Penzelius' anecdote is represented in the printed *Itinerary*. This suggests that the marked section may have been altered, rather than deleted. Significant deletions ff. 82v-.83, large section underlined f. 83v. Entire sentence deleted atop f. 84v, significant underlining and alterations on facing page. Marginal insertion on f. 89.

**Item 17:** Book 1, Chapter 4 of *Itinerarium Pars Prima*: ff. 89v-116v.

*Hand 1 (extensive editing in Hand 2)*

F. 89/p. 128 marks the beginning of Chapter 4. This section has been numbered regularly, with the exception of a leaf that has been inserted on f. 102 (see Item 18). Marginal annotation 'Anno 1592' added to f. 89v. This annotation, which seems to take the form of an intended sub-heading, is represented in the printed *Itinerary*. Deletions in the form of corrections ff. 89v-90v. Large section underlined on f. 91. Considerable sections of f. 91v and f. 92 also underlined. Each of the underlined sections is accompanied by the '+' symbol in the margin, along with either character 'c' or 'f'.<sup>26</sup> Heavy underlining and accompanying editing on f. 93v, along with vertical marginal annotation. The entire facing page is underlined. Large section underlined at the foot of f. 94v, along with marginal annotation and

---

<sup>26</sup> These marks may well be annotations Moryson learnt from his spell as Bursar of Peterhouse College. He seems to have a regular system of marking errors with an X, and has other conventions, such as marking material that is to be deleted in boxes crossed with a diagonal stripe. This regular system suggests some training in early modern accountancy. See Adam Smyth, *Autobiography in early modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp.66-68.

considerable deletion throughout. The underlined section is accompanied by a 'c' and 's' along with the '+' symbol once again. Heavy editing in f. 97, along with an annotation in green, possibly faded ink. Large section underlined on f. 99, along with a vertical marginal annotation, and considerable other annotations, including what appears to be sub-titles or section notes in green ink. F. 99v has further marginal annotations, in both black and green, along with further underlining. Deletion of sentence and accompanying annotation on f. 101, underlining on f. 101v, followed by deletion at the foot of the page with accompanying insertion, roughly twice the length of the material removed. Deletions, corrections and underlining ff. 103-104. F. 104 is very heavily edited, with frequent deletions and blotting. Note that the town 'Brill' is spelt two different ways-'Brillam' and 'Briela'. Neither matches the final version, 'Brisla', given in Moryson's accompanying note. As with the previous annotation, '1592', 'Brill' is represented as a sub-heading in the printed *Itinerary*. F. 104v to f. 107 is also heavily edited, in a mixture of black and green ink, which possibly suggests different dates of editing. The remainder of this section is marked by frequent corrections. There are significant marginal annotations on f. 107v, f. 111v, f. 112 and f. 116. In particular, f. 107v has a lengthy, vertical marginal insertion in a tiny, almost illegible hand. There are a number of deletions on f. 108, f. 111, f. 114v, In particular, almost the entirety of f. 108 has been excised and revised. There is a noticeable paper change on f. 96- the paper is much darker, more faded, feels different to the touch, and appears to be covered with a film of membrane, similar to that of the insertions described in Items 14 & 15.

**Item 18:** English Insertion: f. 102.

*Hand 2*

English marginal annotation, concerning the etymology and cultivation of the crop oilseed rape, along with other observations and additions. The hand appears to be that of Fynes Moryson. The annotations may take a form of footnote, or note to self. The full text is transcribed below (retaining original formatting):

-Brill in Latin *Brisla*-

Leyden what payd a meal in Inns. What board by weeke of month

in a citizans house for dyet & chamber.

Rape-An hearb growing neer Lyden out of wch oyle is pressed & they

have mills and (hevabents) to presse it. To know what the hearbs

Rape oyle of rapes name is & what kind of oyle it makes.

& corti (ubius) ingl[....]<sup>27</sup>

---

-Pallace & Louie. Taylor. I & He for S.Germain. /

-A Mapp of Paris-

O Law ex lino et rapis contritur

Moryson's observations are incorporated into the content of Chapter 4, Book 1, Part 1 of the *Itenerary* (the preceding chapter). For example, his description of the cultivation of oilseed rape is represented in a slightly different form on p. 46 of Chapter 4, Book 1, Part 1. 'By the way is a mill, in which they make oyle of rape and line seedes mingled with wallnut shels, and they haue many such miles in

---

<sup>27</sup> 'Ubius' is a term which relates to a Germanic tribe in the Rhine area. Moryson also refers to the 'united provinces', or low countries as the 'Belgae' in the Latin Table of Contents.

those parts'. The observations seem to represent suggestions for content which should be added to the text. For example, the 'mapp of Paris' is represented on f. 344. This content is then introduced to the printed *Itenerary*. Note however, that there is no mention of 'Taylor' in the printed *Itenerary*. The page bears a further annotation in English 'This was putt in to m. 2.Fol/149'. The leaf appears to have been pasted on to another faded, aged leaf.

**Item 19:** Book 1, Chapter 5 of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*: ff. 116v-156.

*Hand 1 (extensive editing in Hand 2)*

Chapter 5 begins on f. 116v/p. 180. Paginated in pencil, and Hand 2. Many authorial corrections throughout. For example, in the title line on f. 116v 'Quintum' is misspelled 'QVINVM' and has been corrected in Moryson's hand. In the subtitle, just below, 'Belgiae' has been corrected to 'Belgarum' in the same hand. Note that this seems to be a distinction which is a feature of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, not the printed *Itenerary*. There is no close translation of 'Belgiae' or 'Belgarum' in the printed text. These frequent errors seem to be a feature of Hand 1. However, other than minor errors, there are no major changes in the initial part of the chapter as with the previous section. A coarser, older, more faded paper is inserted for both f. 125 and f. 126. At the point of the paper change, the script is clearly more heavily marked up, being very heavily edited, with frequent deletions, alterations, and insertions in Hand 2. These may be leaves from an earlier draft, pasted into the manuscript at an indefinite date. The clear, lightly edited script on either side of it may represent a more recent, corrected version. The paper returns to form for f. 127, then the faded type recurs on ff. 128-131, which again are heavily edited. In addition to the editing, the hand is also looser, with more intrinsic mistakes, such as blotting-again suggestive of an earlier

rougher draft. A significant section is underlined in f. 133. This seems to correspond to a change in the printed version. There is further large-scale underlining of passages of text on f. 138v, f. 139, f. 140v, f. 141, f. 145, f. 145v, f. 155 and f. 155v. A large section is deleted on ff. 152-153v. The content is comparable to that of the printed version, suggesting a close translation. For example, on f. 118v Moryson's Latin translation of an inscription from St Mary's Church in Utrecht is reproduced exactly in the printed *Itinerary*:

Accipe posteritas quod per tua secula narres,  
Taurinus cutibus fundo solidata columna est

This is reproduced word-for-word in the printed *Itinerary*, on p. 53:

Posterity hear this. and to your children tell,  
Bull hydes beare vp this piller from the lowest hell.

*(Itinerary, Part I, p.54)*

Notwithstanding inscriptions, there are very close, but not word-for-word similarities in the text itself. For example, in the manuscript, on f. 119, Moryson states:

Die Saturni ad insula flye inter Frisiam occidentatem a dextra ecu oriente &  
Hollandiam a sinistra ecu occidente sitam, 10 milliaria naviguimus.

This is reproduced in a similar form in the printed version, but with the addition of extra information, not present in the manuscript (given in italics):

On Saturday we sailed between West Freesland upon our right hands  
towards the East, and Holland upon our left hands towards the West, and  
after ten miles sayling, came to the Island Fly, *which being of small*

*company, and consisting of sandy hills, hath two villages in it. (Itenerary, Part I, p. 54)*

The suggestion that the manuscript in part differs is supported by underlining in the hand of the editor (Moryson) on f. 133. At this point, the port of 'Meluin' or 'Melvin' in the vicinity of Dantzke is described. Moryson describes the climate, the southern latitude, and makes comparisons with Lubeck in Germany. There is no parallel in the printed version. Instead, the printed version describes the shipping conditions in the harbour (unfavourable), and the local political climate.

Interestingly, 'Meluin' is described in much more detail in the printed *Itenerary*- this may be related to a symbol written in the margin of the manuscript X2 X2 in Moryson's hand. Further revisions are notable on ff. 152-152v. A whole section has been deleted in the manuscript, and alternative content has been added in its place. When compared with the *Itenerary*, dates and figures that Moryson adds to the manuscript have been reproduced in the printed version, suggesting that in this case the revision was on grounds of factual accuracy.

**Item 20:** Book 2, Chapter 1 of *Itinerarium Pars Prima*: ff. 156v-205.

*Hand 1 (editing in Hand 2)*

Book 2, chapter 1 of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. Commences on f. 156v/p. 260.

Note the presence of a line drawing of Venice on f. 158/p.263, and the corresponding table of description overleaf. This section has a close correspondence with the printed parallel, which reproduces a similar drawing on p.75, followed by a description overleaf on p. 76. The numbering and order remain regular throughout, up until f. 188/p. 323. At this point f. 188v is left blank.

There then follows another blank leaf with an important editorial annotation atop the reverse page (see item 21)

Small corrections have been made to errors in Hand 1 by Hand 2. For example, 'etiam' has been changed to 'etiamque' in line 4, and 'Lazarettam' has been changed to 'Lazarretum' in the same hand. F. 158 contains a quill drawing of Venice, with 'Oriens' in the right margin, and 'Occidi' in the left. The accompanying annotations are in Hand 1 so it may be assumed that the drawing is in the hand of Pywall. Light editing throughout in ff. 158-175. Small alterations and corrections, with single word or single line insertions at most. There is a significant amendment made to f. 175v, which appears to draw parallels between the focus of the text at this juncture (marriage ritual) and the accepted policy in England. F. 181 is also heavily altered-13 lines of text are crossed out altogether and there are two significant marginal insertions, one of which is paragraph length (6 lines in Hand 2). Overleaf (f. 181v) a further 14 lines of text have been stricken through. There are lengthy marginal insertions on f. 184 and f. 186. F. 188v is left blank

On f. 192 11 lines of text have been underlined. In the right hand margin the editor, Hand 2, has added two 'x' symbols and 'p.p.'. Light editing ff. 192-197v. Ff. 198 has been heavily edited. 'Vt credent' has been added twice. F. 198v has a large marginal insertion, which replaces 4 lines of deleted text. F. 199 has also been amended, with an 11 line marginal note concerning the 'Papal Territories'. F. 201 has been left blank-there is an incomplete line at the top of the page in Hand 2 which has been heavily crossed out. F. 204v has been very heavily edited. There are 2 paragraph length marginal insertions in Hand 2 and several smaller insertions. There are corrections throughout, and 5 lines of deleted text

altogether. The longer marginal insertion has been added to the bottom margin, upside down, and marked 'impellatur II' (Second impression). On f. 205v there is a large annotation in Hand 2, concerning the flow of the Tiber. It is intended to replace deleted text on line 10, but it is much longer than the excision. Note that it does not appear to have a clear parallel in the printed *Itinerary*.

**Item 21:** English editorial note: f. 189.

*Hand 2*

Editorial note, written entirely in English. In Hand 2, Moryson writes 'this was 342 in the other copy tho in this it be but 323'. In the top left corner of the page, above this note, 343, and then 342 have been crossed out, and replaced with 323. An important addition, which testifies to the existence of an additional copy of the text, which may have informed the composition of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*.

**Item 22:** Book 2, Chapter 2 of *Itinerarium Pars Prima*: ff. 205v-278.

*Hand 1 (editing in Hand 2)*

The 21 page differences between the deleted and corrected numbers represented in Item 21 is maintained throughout Book 2. Chapter 2 begins on f. 207/p. 353 (del. 374). Light editing in Hand 2, ff. 205v-212. Hand-drawn map in Hand 1 on f. 212v (note: all other maps seem to be insertions, in Hand 2). The map appears to be of the Neapolitan peninsula, and has accompanying notes and a key, also in Hand 1. This map and the attendant description are again represented in the printed *Itinerary*, where it is described as 'a description of Naples, and the Territory'.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 109.

Light editing ff. 213-223. F. 223v has 10 lines of text deleted, although no insertion to replace this. The facing page, f. 224, has a 4 line vertical marginal inclusion, intended to be inserted 5 lines down from the top of the page. Light editing ff. 224-234. Ff. 235-236 represents a fold out map of Rome. An accompanying Key, in Hand 2, has been added on f. 237. Note that f. 237v resumes in Hand 1, indicating a similar date of composition. The accompanying descriptions span the next 32 folios, ff. 237-269. It is inscribed in a mixture of Roman and Italic numerals, using a different ink which has faded to a greying red colour. Indeed, the ink may have been red initially, the intent being to distinguish the numerals from the accompanying descriptions. This map is represented in the printed *Itenerary*, on p. 122. The map presented in the printed work differs little from the hand drawn map in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, and this sketch may well have informed the image in the printed *Itenerary*, which Moryson notes has been 'drawn rudely'.<sup>29</sup>

F. 269v has a considerable marginal note-11 vertical lines in the left hand margin- and also 12 individual deletions of words or short phrases. These are stylistic corrections, not alterations due to error, for example 'his lustratus' swapped for 'deinde.' Ff. 270-278v marked by light editing only.

**Item 23:** Book 2, Chapter 3 of *Itinerarium Pars Prima*: ff. 278v-320v.

*Hand 1 and Hand 2*

Book 2, Chapter 3 of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*: ff. 279-320.

Light editing on ff. 278v-294. f. 294v has been heavily edited. Several lines of text crossed out, along with a considerable marginal note. Written in a larger than typical variant of Hand 2. At the end of the Latin note, it is written in English, 'putt

---

<sup>29</sup> *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 122.

the Second in the first place as it was written'. This note prefaces the introduction of a sequence of letters in Italian and Latin, written in Hand 2 (see Item 24). There are a number of additional marginal annotations. On f. 294v, in a combination of Latin and English Moryson writes 'all illustre', or 'all clear'. This annotation prefaces the introduction of the letters, and in a further note on the same leaf Moryson writes 'per me scriptas', or 'in my hand'. This annotation, imbedded in a description of the letters to follow, allows one to positively identify Hand 2 as that of Moryson, as the letters are entirely in his hand. Following the introduction of the letters, the script resumes in Hand 1. F. 301 represents a map of Genoa, in Hand 1, with accompanying key and descriptions in the same hand. This map is again repeated in the printed *Itenerary*, on p. 166.<sup>30</sup>

**Item 24:** Sequence of letters in Italian and Latin: ff. 295-300.

#### *Hand 2*

A sequence of letters in Hand 2. The first is in Italian, and addressed to Nicolla della Rocca. This spans ff. 295-298. Following this, the same letter is then repeated in Latin, spanning ff. 298-299. A third letter is then introduced, also in Latin, addressed to 'Illustri Domino, Domino T.H', which has been sent from his 'Nobile amico, et Anglio F.M, resident in the house of T.A'. This has been sent from 'the man that he loved', "fratris loco", Fynes Moryson'.

The presentation of these letters in manuscript differs to their representation in the printed *Itenerary*. In the printed work, Moryson first presents two Italian letters (presumably as an advertisement of his familiarity with the language) followed by two English translations.<sup>31</sup> Presumably the manuscript omits the

---

<sup>30</sup> *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 166.

<sup>31</sup> *Itenerary*, Part I, pp. 156-163.

Italian origins of the letter sent to 'T.H'. The letters also bear corrections in the hand of Fynes Moryson, and are inscribed on to a different paper to the preceding text, much lighter and paler than that used for the majority of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. They have clearly been introduced from a different source.

**Item 25:** Book 2, Chapter 4 of *Itinerarium Pars Prima*: ff. 321-357.

*Hands 1 and 2 (editing in Hand 2)*

Fourth Chapter of Book 2 begins on f. 321/p. 580. The 10 page disparity in the pagination in Hand 2 changes on f. 331/p. 600. At this point, the original pagination is no longer crossed out for the following 10 pages. On f. 336/p. 610 the numbering reverts to the previous system, with numbers crossed out and replaced. So, for example '610' has replaced the deleted '620' on f. 336. This 10 page disparity persists until the end of the manuscript, f. 490/p. 1004. A map of Paris, or 'Lutetiae' has been inserted on f. 344. This is represented on p. 189 of the printed *Itinerary*.<sup>32</sup> This appears to be in Hand 1, as the accompanying description is in the same hand. Following this, f. 356v bears evidence of heavy authorial revision. 3 paragraph length marginal insertions have been added, to the left, right and bottom margin, but all have been very carefully deleted so that they are illegible. A further 12 lines of text have been crossed out of the page itself, and a further marginal insertion, inserted upside down, has been added to the top margin. The remainder of the text has been edited further in Hand 2.

**Item 26:** Book 3, Chapter 1 of *Itinerarium Pars Prima*: ff. 358-386v.

*Hand 1. Editing in Hand 2.*

---

<sup>32</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 189.

This represents the first section of Vol. II of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. There is no evidence which explains why the manuscript was split into two volumes at this juncture. Minor editing to f. 358, including alterations to the title (grammatical corrections). Insertion of 'a prima peregrinationis iam in' at the foot of the page. Minor editing on f. 358v and f. 359 (again, in the form of corrections). Annotation in left margin of f. 359: 'et peregrini qui [...ex] patria abfueram'. Minor editing ff. 359v-360v. Interesting annotation at the foot of f.360v in English: 'of setting out merry look my last epistle Richard Moryson'. This is not included in the English printed *Itenerary*. This suggests that Moryson was intending to use a letter sent to his brother Richard to indicate that Henry and himself departed for their second journey in great spirits (this journey ended in tragedy with Henry's death).

Significant marginal insertion on f. 361, concerning rates of exchange. Minor editing throughout ff. 361-374. Significant editing in the form of marginal insertions and deletion on f. 374v. Light editing on ff. 375-381. F. 381v more heavily edited, incorporating interlineal insertions, deletions and two marginal annotations. Ff. 382-386v marked by minor editing, in the form of corrections and one line marginal insertions.

**Item 27:** Book 3, Chapter 2 of *Itinerarium Pars Prima*: ff. 386v-415.

*Hand 1 and 2. Editing throughout in Hand 2.*

Subtitle on f. 386v 'De Hierosolyma urbis agriae descriptione', a description of the town and country of Jerusalem. Minor editing on f. 387, two marginal insertions. Heavy editing and blotting on f. 388. Hand drawn map of Jerusalem inserted at f. 390. Not paginated by Moryson. The map has been marked with figures, for ease of reference. These figures are repeated in the following leaves, written in a

distinctive red ink. Note that this functions as an 'Itinerary' of Jerusalem f. 401. The following leaf has a hand drawn diagram of Temple Mount pasted on to it. It is described through two significant (large sentence) annotations, and has also been marked by numbers for ease of reference, as with the map of Jerusalem. Temple Mount is described on ff. 402-404. In the printed *Itinerary*, this description is entitled 'a rude, but true figure in plaine of Christs Sepulcher and the Church built over it in Ierusalem'.<sup>33</sup> F. 404 has a significant, paragraph length insertion which details the history of Temple Mount. Ff. 404v-408v marked by minor editing. F. 409 is more heavily edited, and includes a significant annotation at the foot of the leaf. There is also a deleted annotation in English, at the foot of the leaf: *tooke excellent Book in case of confusion, Lib. 2 Cap. 3 fol. 303*. This suggests Moryson was working from a guidebook when compiling his description of Jerusalem. This text is not referred to in the printed *Itinerary*, but the wealth of detail indicates Moryson may have consulted a secondary source. Light editing ff. 409-411v. Note that the hand changes on f. 412, as this leaf is in Moryson's hand. Note that there is a very significant marginal annotation. Moryson writes overleaf that this 'leefe was 784 in the first copy'. This suggests that Moryson inserted this leaf from a 'first copy', which was autograph. Hand 1 resumes on f. 413. The ink differs, and the hand is much more firmly impressed and controlled than the preceding folios.

**Item 28:** Book 3, Chapter 3: ff. 415-441.

*Hand 1. Editing in Hand 2.*

Light editing, largely restricted to one line annotations, until f. 426v. Marked by a very large vertical annotation, encompassing much of the left margin. No further

---

<sup>33</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 228.

significant editing until f. 429, which has been corrected throughout. At the foot of the leaf three lines of text have been crossed through and replaced with an interlineal insertion. Copies of letters sent from Candia (Crete) are given on ff. 435-437v. Unlike previous letter insertions, they flow into the text and are clearly intended. Note that this represents a clear difference with the printed *Itinerary*. In the manuscript, these letters are written in Latin, whereas in print they are written in Italian and then translated into English, as with the previous sequence of letters. This suggests that Moryson intended them to function as evidence of his travels in the English.<sup>34</sup> Note that from ff. 437-441 there is another variant of Hand 1, much more firmly impressed. This hand gradually becomes more controlled before returning to the familiar primary variant of Hand 1 by f. 441.

**Item 29:** Book 3, Chapter 4: ff. 441-461v.

*Hand 1 and Hand 2. Editing in Hand 2.*

Title at foot of page heavily edited, several lines deleted (obscured by thick black lines). Light editing ff. 441v-445v. Hand drawn map of Constantinople (vague geography of the area: Hellespont and a compass explaining the relative locations of Greece and 'Asia Minoris'). Again, there is an index to this map, which is combined with descriptions on ff. 446v-457. 7 lines of text deleted at foot of f. 452, not replaced. Minor editing on ff. 452v-458. f.458v and f. 459 are both marked by considerable marginal annotations, and lightly edited (corrections). Paragraph length marginal insertion on f. 461 (refers to currency conversion rates).

---

<sup>34</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 255. They may also have functioned as an advertisement of his translation ability, and intellect.

Note that this section is referred to by Moryson in a marginal annotation on f. 92 of the *Itinerarium Pars Secunda* as the 'front' of a text that is being worked up, which 'begins with Constantinople'. It is telling that at this point Hand 2 (Moryson) begins to feature much more prominently in the text, which from f. 462 onwards is written in Hand 2. This may suggest that parts of this section are introduced from a different copy of the text, quite possibly the autograph 'first copy'.

**Item 30:** Book 3, Chapter 5. ff. 462-464v.

*Hand 2. Editing in Hand 2.*

Very difficult to make out the chapter division as the text is very heavily impressed, marked over, deleted and edited throughout. At the top of the page it is just possible to discern 'Cap V'. The full title is given in a marginal insertion. f. 462 seems to have been inserted from another source. The paper differs, and both the physical form of the leaf, the ink and the hand are markedly similar to similar insertions at f. 37 and f. 56. There is an English editorial annotation at the foot of f. 462v, but it has been deleted and is difficult to read. It begins: 100 sides or 12 Sheetes lesse now, it allowed [illegible text]. It seems to refer to the difference between another copy and the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. f. 464 also seems to have been introduced from another source. The paper feels different, and the script is visibly different to the preceding leaves. As with other introduced material in this chapter, it is very heavily edited. f. 464v in particular is very heavily marked, with a number of significant deletions at the foot of the page.

**Item 30:** Book 3, Chapter 6: ff. 465-490.

*Hand 2. Editing in Hand 2.*

Entirely in Moryson's hand. This chapter seems to resemble a composite text, compiled from several different sources. Until f. 467, each leaf is headed 'Cap VI'. However, f. 467 is headed 'Cap 1', which indicates that this text was initially considered for inclusion elsewhere in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, most likely at the beginning of Part III (which would have made more sense). Further, f. 467 seems to have been introduced from a different source, as it shares the quite different paper and ink of the other inserted leaves. Minor editing until f. 473. At this point, a hand drawn monetary table is introduced, which is included at the same juncture in the printed *Itinerary*.<sup>35</sup> This table has been dated 'anno Jacobus Rex 1609', which accurately dates this section of the manuscript. This is followed by a further table on f. 474, again included in the printed text. The following leaf, f. 475, seems again to have been introduced from another source, probably Moryson's 'first copy'. It shares the same paper, ink, signs of damage and physical form as the other insertions. The page has been very heavily edited. Every margin has been filled in with close written annotations. Very little editing to ff. 476-478. F. 479 has been heavily edited. There are extensive deletions, and large annotation has been written in the right margin, which is itself crossed over. Minor editing to ff. 480-487v. A currency conversion table from an Italian printed book has been inserted on f. 488. There is no annotation or acknowledgment that explains the source, and it does not seem to have been included in the printed *Itinerary*. A space has been left for this insertion to be pasted on to f. 489, although it is inserted as a discrete entity. Light editing on remaining leaves. Text ends on f. 490v. There is a pencil annotation on the facing page, '490 Folios', in the hand of the Harleian Catalogue editor.

---

<sup>35</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 282.

## Case Studies

The following section comprises six case studies, each of which will focus on a different section of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. The first study will consider the introduction, the introductory paragraph and a paragraph length insertion to f. 13v. The second study will consider another significant insertion, a letter introduced to the manuscript on f. 37. The third study will investigate a deleted passage on f. 41v. The following three studies will consider prefatory material: the Dedication, the Table of Contents and the 'Address to the Reader'.

These paratexts are quite distinct from their printed equivalents, and so the focus of the final three studies differs. Whilst Case Studies 1, 2 and 3 will consider subtle textual differences, changes in style and expression, Case Studies 4, 5 and 6 will investigate more significant changes. Indeed, Case Studies 4 and 6 will investigate paratexts which are completely distinct from their printed equivalents, whilst Case Study 5 will consider major structural changes to the Table of Contents.

### Case Study 1: Chapter 1 and the Dunkirk Pirates Insertion

This study will investigate Chapter 1 of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, and in particular will focus on the first paragraph and a significant paragraph length insertion on the following leaf. I will consider how this material is expressed in Latin, and compare the content and tone of the introductory paragraph to that of the printed *Itinerary*. Even the most subtle changes in expression are considered, as the introduction is likely to be amongst the most heavily crafted section of any work. In the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, the introduction has the important function of contextualising Moryson's travels, and adds information to his biography, corroborating and confirming aspects of Moryson's life history.

The introduction to the work is inserted amidst the paratexts to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, which suggests that Moryson may have considered it as part of the prefatory material. The first 12 folios of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* are comprised of drafts of the prefatory material; the title page, a description of the work, and versions of the Dedication, 'Address to the Reader' and Table of Contents. Amidst this material, Moryson includes the opening paragraphs of Chapter 1 of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. This comprises several paragraphs which span ff. 13-15v. Over the course of ff. 14-15v the hand becomes increasingly loose, before abruptly tailing off mid-sentence a third of the way down f. 15v. The opening to Chapter 1 is abandoned here. The next 9 folios are taken up with secondary drafts of prefatory material; a description of the work, and corrected versions of the Dedication, 'Address to the Reader' and Table of Contents.

The beginnings of Chapter 1, ff. 13-15v serve to introduce the work, explaining how Moryson prepared for his journey, and describing the initial stage of his travels. At first glance, the English printed version of Chapter One seems similar to

that presented in the Latin. Both versions introduce Moryson's travels, and present the inceptive stage of his journey, travelling from London to Stode, and thence into Northern Germany.<sup>1</sup> In the first paragraph of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, on f. 13, Moryson describes how his Peterhouse fellowship was awarded by Queen Elizabeth's royal mandate.<sup>2</sup> The beginning of this paragraph is comparable to the English printed *Itinerary*, but following this point there are notable changes in content and expression. This short passage is reproduced below:

et paulo post ex serenissimae Reginae Elizabethae mandato indicti Collegii almam societatem ex singulari [omine] praterea omine receptus fui. Nullo enim loco [vacante] adhuc vacante, cum hoc mandatum imperaretur, tamen ipsissimo vesperi quo ad me deferebatur, ex Collegii Sociis unus post brevem aegritudinem moriebatur, sic libens a diuina Dei prouidentia me per reliquae vitae angustias conseruante, exordior.

Or, translated into English:

A short time after, by a remarkable coincidence, I was admitted into the genial society of the College by the published command of [her] most serene [majesty] Queen Ellizabeth. Namely, when the mandate was issued, there was no vacancy in the College, but the very evening I learnt about it, a fellow of the College died after a short sickness. From this point I gladly start (my story), as the Divine Providence has in the same way preserved me in all the troubles in the rest of my life.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 1. In the Table of Contents this section is described as Germany: Booke 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 1 'shortly after (I) was chosen fellow of the said College by Queen Elizabeth's Mandate'.

There are appreciable differences in both content and expression between the section quoted above and the equivalent passage in the printed *Itinerary*.<sup>3</sup> The Latin version provides additional details which have been removed from the printed English text. In the English, Moryson recounts how he was granted a fellowship after a place became 'vacant'.<sup>4</sup> In the Latin, he is more discursive, describing how the place became vacant following the death of one of the fellows of the College a short time after an illness 'ex Collegii Sociis unus post brevem aegritudinem moriebatur'.<sup>5</sup> Moryson then attributes this unfortunate but opportune occurrence to the will of God, 'diuina Dei prouidentia', or by the divine providence of God.<sup>6</sup> This also differs from the English version, in which Moryson does not allude to the death of the previous incumbent, and does not mention divine intervention, especially not to the extent that it features in the Latin parallel, 'sic libens a diuina Dei prouidentia me per reliquae vitae angustias conseruante, exordior', or, 'from this point I will gladly start my story, as this divine providence in the same way has preserved me in all the troubles throughout my life.' This gives a clear indication that the English is not a straightforward, literal translation of this Latin manuscript.

There are further differences between the two texts, which are not confined to content included in the Latin and subsequently not translated to the vernacular. The printed version also contains information with no Latin parallel. For example, in the English version Moryson describes the time difference between his Bachelor's degree and Master's qualification, records his field of study, Civil Law,

---

<sup>3</sup> For the full passage, see Appendix A, Item 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup> 'One of the fellows of the College died a short time after an illness'. f. 13.

<sup>6</sup> 'The Divine Providence of God', f. 13.

and then mentions his travels will offer him useful professional experience.<sup>7</sup> This information is entirely absent from the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. The absence points either to the existence of a subsequent, revised copy of the Latin, or to a process of adaptive translation.

Whilst the same information is often presented in the two versions of the opening paragraph, the way in which it is expressed differs, opening the way to distinct nuances. For example, although the granting of the mandate is (ultimately) deemed contingent on the whim of Queen Elizabeth in both versions, she is described as ‘serenissimae’, or ‘most serene’ in the Latin, whilst in the English her title is not prefixed by a superlative. Likewise, the fellows, or rather the association of fellowship is deemed ‘kindly’, ‘almam’, in the Latin, whilst in the English no adjective is used. It is difficult to suggest a concrete rationale for this divergence. Moryson does not seem to have been attempting to make the English translation shorter, as so much content is introduced to the *Itinerary*, both in the form of material which can be tracked through editorial revision in the manuscript, and that which has no parallel in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. It is possible that Moryson was consciously striving for a different voice, appropriate for a vernacular as opposed to Latinate readership.

These differences between the Latin and English versions of the opening paragraph are also reflected later in the introduction. On f. 13v, a lengthy marginal insertion has been added. The insertion has been written vertically up the left margin of f. 13v. Although the script is constricted, it is clearly in the same hand as the preceding text. This perhaps indicates that the insertion represents a

---

<sup>7</sup> Moryson notes it takes him three years to proceed to MA, a further year to become a fellow and commence his study of law, and then contends his travels will benefit his chosen field of study. *Itinerary*, Part I, p.1. See also Appendix A, Item 1.

scribal correction, and not a later authorial insertion. There is further evidence for this, in that it does not interrupt the surrounding text, but fits into the passage to which it is introduced. This is of interest, as it suggests that the scribe, Isaac Pywall, was in the process of transposing text from another source when the passage was mistakenly omitted.<sup>8</sup>

The inserted text details Moryson's departure from England; a quarrel with his father, departure by ship from Leigh, and the pursuit through the sea mists by Dunkirk Pirates in the aftermath of a channel storm. As the passage only represents a short excerpt, it may be quoted in full:

ex patris amicorumque consilio peregrinationi meae fortuito obiecta, me diutius quam putar[a]em detinuerunt. Tandem vero Mensis Maii die primo ineunte iam anno 1591, solui e portu oppiduli Leigh Londino 28 Milliarum per terram, 36 per aquam distantis, (ubi Tamesis vasto ostioni Oceanum deuoluitur). Hinc uela in altum dedimus, et octauo nauigationis die, Mercatorum (ut ita dicam) classe sexdecim nauium, per nebulosum aerem, et uentorum rabiem dispersa, duae Dunkerkensium Pyratarum naues nostram insequere[re]bantur, donec (per Dei gratiam) nebulis postaliquot...

(at this point the passage ends abruptly)

My rashly considered plans for a journey caused objections on the part of my father and friends, and that detained me longer than I thought.

Nevertheless on the first day of the month of May, it being already 1591, I started from the port of the small town of Leigh 28 miles by Land from London, 36 miles by water (where the Thames in a broad estuary flows into

---

<sup>8</sup> This marginal insertion is corrected in Hand 2 (Moryson) which provides further evidence that it was a scribal transcription error, and not a later authorial insertion.

the Ocean). From there we have set our sails into the open sea. On the eighth day of our sea voyage the Merchant Fleet (if I may call it so) of sixteen ships, was dispersed in the misty air by the raging wind, and two Dunkirk Pirates, followed our ship until after some time (by the grace of God) [we left] the fog [behind] ...

This marginal insertion is similar to the parallel text in the English, perhaps more so than the preceding paragraph.<sup>9</sup> However, like the opening paragraph, there are clear differences in expression. In the Latin, Moryson describes how the fleet was proceeding through the 'misty air', when it was dispersed by the 'wild', or 'raging' wind 'per nebulosum aerem, et uentorum rabiem dispersa.' 'Uentorum rabiem', or 'raging wind' in particular is significantly different from the English version, in which Moryson flatly states that the fleet was 'dispersed by a fogge and tempest'.<sup>10</sup> Whilst it could be argued that 'tempest' is a sense translation of 'raging wind', the progression of the pirate narrative supports the contention that the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* had pretensions to literary merit that are absent in the English.<sup>11</sup>

These subtle differences also influence the interpretation of the passage. In the English, the ships are dispersed by both 'a fogge and tempest', whereas in the Latin, the ships are already proceeding through the 'nebulosum aerem' or 'misty air' when they are struck by the raging wind. In the English, the ships are forced to wait in this 'fog' for 'some few houres' before it clears, and they are then able to

---

<sup>9</sup> For more details, see Appendix A, Item 1.

<sup>10</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 2.

<sup>11</sup> In English, 'Tempest', to indicate a violent wind storm, had been in use since 1250 according to the Oxford English Dictionary, and is used in this context in 1665 by Sir Thomas Herbert in *Some years travels into divers parts of Africa and Asia the great* 'Seven whole dayes and nights this tempest lasted.'. See "tempest, n.". OED Online. June 2011. Oxford University Press. 21 June 2011.<<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/198906?rskey=usgKoa&result=1&isAdvanced=false>>.

to proceed unihibited. In the Latin, the sense again is that the ships are in motion, as they are followed, and then themselves leave the fog behind . This contributes to a different perception of events. The sense in the English is that the storm and fog descend on the toiling fleet; in the wake of the tempest the scattered ships are stalked by the pirates amidst the shifting fog for 'houres'. This introduces a sense of suspended, latent threat, absent from the Latin, in which the ships are already proceeding through the nebulous mists when the pirates appear.<sup>12</sup> The action is simultaneous, and more reliant on the imagination of the reader to fill in the narrative details.<sup>13</sup>

The differences between the two texts are subtle, but influence how the reader interacts with the work. Consider the opening paragraph. In the Latin, Moryson states that divine providence was at hand to furnish him with a fellowship, and intimates that this 'prouidentia' helped preserve him from ill fate his entire life. This reference to the role of providence precedes and emphasises another reference to the grace of God, 'per Dei gratiam' in the passage that follows. The Latin presents two references to divine intervention in the first two paragraphs, in essence contributing to a narrative of providence.<sup>14</sup> In contrast, the role of God is limited to a single mention of 'God's mercy' in the Dunkirk Pirates English printed

---

<sup>12</sup> This term 'nebulous' was in contemporary use in English, so it represents a possible nuance of 'nebulis'. See Oxford English Dictionary Online, ref: Peter Lowe, *The whole course of chirurgerie* 'Euill ayr is that which is nebulous and commeth from stincking breathes'. "nebulous, adj.". OED Online. June 2011. Oxford University Press. 21 June 2011 <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/125613?redirectedFrom=nebulous>>.

<sup>13</sup> There are other possible reasons for this divergence. The printed *Itenerary* is consciously constructed as a factual text, and the provision of evidence of times, dates and figures enhances its desired effect of veracity.

<sup>14</sup> See Alexendra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 9.

parallel, which appears isolated and inconsequential without the opening reference to providence.<sup>15</sup>

The subtle variation between the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and the *Itenerary* is expressed in Moryson's own estimation of the English work, which he condemns in the printed 'Address to the Reader' as 'barren and unpleasant'. Certainly, his English prose is plain, factual and without ornament, a stylistic failing noted by many scholars. Moryson does not attempt to excite the imagination of the vernacular reader with figurative language, instead providing additional information, such as the 'hours' of time that pass as the ships are stalked through the shifting mists. In contrast, his Latin is, if not sublime, colourful and erudite, written to excite the imaginative, intellectually vital reader, and clearly intended for a quite different audience.

---

<sup>15</sup> Moryson does note later in the narrative that the merchant fleet reaches safety at an Island called 'Heligland', which he translates later as 'Holy Land'. It is possible that he instead incorporated a less direct reference to Providence into the text. *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 1.

## Case Study 2: The Letter to M.T

This study will focus on a copy of a letter which is introduced into the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. The letter is included in both the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and the printed *Itinerary*, but there are appreciable differences in its presentation and expression. The identity of the correspondent to whom Moryson writes, 'M.T', will be explored, and comparable letters included in both the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and printed *Itinerary* will be considered. I will also consider what the introduction of these letters reveals about the composition of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, and its relation to preceding manuscripts.

The letter is presented in full in the English printed *Itinerary*, on p. 13. In the *Itinerary*, the letter forms an important part of the description of Dresden, adding information and contributing to a lighter, more anecdotal tone. Although it is consciously presented as a copy of an 'autograph' letter, a device to add weight and authority to the account, it is introduced with a short preface, and flows into the narrative.<sup>1</sup> The appearance of the letter in the manuscript *Itinerarium Pars Prima* is markedly different. There is a variety of evidence for this, from the hand in which the letter is written, to the paper on which it is transcribed.

In the Latin, the letter is inserted into a completed section of Chapter 2 as a discrete body of material, interrupting the flow of the narrative. It is introduced into the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* at the beginning of Chapter 2, on f. 37. It is written in Hand 2, that of Fynes Moryson, although the rest of Chapter 2 is entirely in Hand 1. The letter is not paginated, whilst the surrounding text is.<sup>2</sup> The inserted

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid, Part I, p. 13 'I returned againe to Dresden; from whence I wrote this letter concerning my journey, to a friend lying at Leipzig'.

<sup>2</sup> The letter comprises two leaves, marked f. 37 and f. 38 by the Harleian catalogue editor, but not paginated by Moryson. The preceding leaf, f. 36v, is marked '30' in Moryson's hand, and the one following the inserted letter (f. 39) is marked '31'.

letter interrupts two folios of concurrent text, and would seem to represent an interleaved insertion.<sup>3</sup> The introduction of a discrete body of material in a different hand, on paper which has not been numbered, suggests that the letter was introduced after the text had been initially composed, revised and paginated.

This strongly suggests that the insertion of the letter was a later addition made to the work. Considering the physical form of the letter adds further evidence to support this hypothesis. As well as interrupting text, the paper and ink of the interleaved letter differ. The chain lines of the inserted text, ff. 37-38, measure 23mm. The chain lines of the text before and after measure 20mm, indicating the paper was from a different source. In addition, the physical form of the paper differs, feeling waxed, or starched. At points, the paper has become damaged, and a membrane lattice has become visible, indicating that it may in fact be vellum.

indicating the paper is possibly vellum.<sup>4</sup> The ink used on f. 37 and f. 38 is also visibly different to that used in the text before and after. It has faded to a dull green colour in places, and is firmly impressed on the page, in contrast to the light touch and regular black of the preceding and following text in Hand 1. The quite different physical form of the leaves introduced indicates that the letter originates from another source. Although it is unlikely to be an autograph letter, it could well represent an insertion from another body of material, either a day book, a copy

---

<sup>3</sup> At the foot of f. 36v, the text ends 'Territorii Electoris', and a catchword, 'Electoris', is given. At this point, the letter is introduced to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. The text resumes on f. 39, beginning 'Electoris Saxonia'.

<sup>4</sup> As the letter is inscribed on Vellum, it is possible that this letter is a direct insertion from a copy book of letters. Vellum would resist water damage far better than paper, and so it would represent a better choice for a text that had the potential to be taken on travels, or used as a durable point of reference.

book of letters or a previous incarnation of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. Quite possibly, the letter was inserted as a device to add colour or veracity to the work.

There are a number of comparable interleaved insertions to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. The letter addressed to 'M.T' is one of three inserted letters. Moryson uses letters throughout the *Itinerarium Pars Prima & Secunda*, but the insertions differ as they represent material that seems to have been introduced from another source. For example, a second letter is introduced on ff. 56-57.<sup>5</sup> This letter is addressed to 'Dr. J', and bears many similarities with the letter to 'M.T' on f. 37. This letter seems to originate from the same source as the letter to 'M.T'. It interrupts the scribal text, shares the same distinctive chain lines, and seems to have been written on vellum.<sup>6</sup> Again, as with the letter addressed to 'M.T' on ff. 37-38, the text is autograph, interrupts text in Hand 1, and is not paginated, although the surrounding text is. It seems to represent an introduction from another source, most likely added to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* after revision of the original draft.<sup>7</sup>

The third introduction to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* is a sequence of letters in Italian and Latin, on ff. 295-300. Like the previous two introductions, these letters are transcribed on to paper which seems distinct from the preceding folios (in this case it has been trimmed down to almost octavo size). They are also in Fynes Moryson's hand, and so distinct from the surrounding text, which is in the hand of Pywall. However, there are differences between this insertion and the previous

---

<sup>5</sup> Ff. 56-57. Letter to 'Dr J'. Note that the 'J' character is crossed, leading to possible confusion with 'F'.

<sup>6</sup> There are a number of similar introductions which all seem to emanate from the same source. They are all distinguished by matching chain lines, the particular texture of the paper, and the fact that the ink has faded to green. See also f. 467 and f. 474 for examples.

<sup>7</sup> This letter is also represented in the printed *Itenerary*, although there seem to be variations. For example, dates and figures that are included in the manuscript version are not transposed to print. *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 25.

two. The introduction of the letter sequence seems to have been anticipated, and does not interrupt the flow of the text. They are also prefaced by a short marginal note in Moryson's hand, which attends to their introduction.

On f. 294v Moryson writes 'putt the Second in the first place as it was written'. This annotation has a directed resonance in the printed *Itenerary*. Moryson writes 'I will add two Epistles, which I then writ...the first from this place, the second from Florence, after which I departed from this Castle'.<sup>8</sup> In the *Itenerary*, Moryson first presents a letter to an Englishman, 'T.H', followed by a letter to an Italian contact, 'Nicolao della Rocca'. This order is reversed in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, with the letter to Nicolao dell Rocca presented first, followed by the letter to T.H. Moryson's annotation reflects a desire to see the letters accurately relating experience, a sequence of correspondence related exactly 'as it was written'.

The annotation which precedes the introduction of the letters is written in a mixture of Latin and English, and has been obscured by attempts to excise it.<sup>9</sup> It is, however, possible to make out another short section, in which Moryson notes that the following letters are 'per me scriptas', or 'in my hand'. This identifies the correspondence as autograph, but may also have another function. In the printed *Itenerary*, Moryson notes that he travelled to Florence to gain a 'pure' form of the Italian tongue.<sup>10</sup> His later translations of the Italian letters function as an advertisement of his linguistic prowess, as he makes clear 'and these being

---

<sup>8</sup> *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 155.

<sup>9</sup> This is a feature of almost all the English annotations throughout the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, most likely so that they are not mistakenly incorporated into a later version of the text.

<sup>10</sup> *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 155. Note that Moryson also travels to Leipzig in order to learn the 'Misen Speech', or High German, which was reputed 'the purest form' of the language. It seems that the study of European languages was a feature of his travels, possibly in order to facilitate employment upon his return to England. See *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 12.

written in Italian, I will turn into English'.<sup>11</sup> It is possible that the annotation reflects a desire to see the letters presented as autograph correspondence, written and translated by Moryson. This inference is compounded by their presentation in the Latin, which differs slightly from the English. In the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, the letter to Nicolao della Rocca is written in Latin, with no translation into Italian. An Italian translation is then added to the printed *Itinerary*, suggesting that Moryson was keen to highlight the fact that he could write and translate texts in this language.

The inclusion of three distinct insertions to the *Itinerarium* is significant, and contributes to our understandings of Moryson's process of composition. The inclusion of autograph material that has a specific function in evidencing Moryson's travels suggests that he intended to bind his narrative to first hand accounts which would be difficult to dispute. Further, although the Italian letters seem to have been anticipated, it is notable that the other two letters inserted seem to have been included upon revision of the text. This suggests that Moryson returned to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and made the decision to include two further 'autograph' accounts, either to add colour to the text, or in order to corroborate it.

Like the sequence of letters in Italian and Latin, the letter to 'M.T' is also prefaced by a short annotation, which again has a direct resonance in the printed *Itinerary*. In the left margin of f. 36v, a short annotation attends to the introduction of the letter. Although f. 36v is in the primary hand, that of Pywall, the annotation is in Fynes Moryson's hand, indicating that it represents later, authorial editing. This provides further evidence that the letter was introduced later, after the

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

*Itinerarium Pars Prima* had been initially drafted. The annotation is linked to the text of f. 36v by a horizontal line. The line links the annotation with the text three lines further down, at which point a word has been crossed out multiple times, rendering it unreadable, and replaced with 'Dresdena'. The annotation itself has been crossed through with parallel diagonal lines, and is badly obscured. The first 3 lines of text are illegible, and several other words are difficult to decipher. The note is a mixture of Latin and English, and concerns the introduction of the letter. It is difficult to establish an exact meaning, as the deleted section has been partially obscured, and represents a confusion of Latin and vernacular annotations.<sup>12</sup>

The annotation begins in Latin. Although heavily marked and crossed over, the annotation seems to summarise the content of the letter. The first line of the annotation reads 'Itinera Dresdenem .....Epistola lib: scribem' or, 'the journey from Dresden, from where I gladly wrote this letter.'<sup>13</sup> Following this, the annotation switches to English. This section of the annotation seems to refer to the desired presentation of the letter within the structure of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. The English element of the annotation reads 'insert it inclosed with a distance before & after it'. In this context, 'inclosed' may be construed as 'enclosed', that is, Moryson is giving instructions, perhaps to a printer, on the formatting of the text to be inserted. In this respect, it is comparable to the instructions that precede the sequence of letters in Italian and Latin.<sup>14</sup> Given that

---

<sup>12</sup> The Latin annotations state that the coming letter will be in Italian. They are then interrupted by the English, which finish the sentence, introducing another clause which attends to the structure of the inserted letter.

<sup>13</sup> This is to conjecture *libenter* from *lib*: An alternative translation would be 'the journey from Dresden, from where I wrote this letter with great pleasure'.

<sup>14</sup> 'inclosed' has a contemporary meaning of 'surrounded by', similar to the modern term 'enclosed'. See Ian Lancashire (ed.), *Lexicons of Early Modern English* (Toronto: University

in the English printed *Itinerary* the text of the letter is presented as one body, distinct from the preceding narrative, the logic of the construction is that the letter should be presented as a separate entity in the format of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. That such an instruction is present suggests that the format defined by this annotation directly informs the formatting of the English printed version. Following the English component of the annotation, the text switches to Latin once more: ‘Unde has litteras ad amicum lipsias sequentes dedi, hoc iter describentes’, or, ‘from there I have sent this following letter, describing my itinerary, to a friend in Leipzig.’

The intermingling of the Latin and English annotations is at first disarming, but it most likely stems from a confused chronology of editing. When considered together, the Latin elements of the annotation make sense; insert a letter at this juncture, which will serve to add information and a little colour to the description of Dresden. The English elements of the annotation add further information. The Latin annotations seem to represent a posited textual introduction, intended to be transposed into a later draft. Indeed, the full text of the Latin annotation seems to have been introduced into the printed *Itinerary*, where the letter is prefaced with the text ‘This was sent to my friend M, lying at Leipzig, on March 7, 1591.’ an almost exact translation of the legible content of the Latin annotation.<sup>15</sup>

The printed *Itinerary* incorporates the letter at exactly the same point in the work as in the manuscript. As with the manuscript, the letter is presented at the very beginning of Chapter 2. In the printed *Itinerary*, it begins on p. 13. The content of the printed version of the letter is very similar to the Latin. For example, in the

---

of Toronto Library and University of Toronto Press, 2006). Date consulted: 26 November 2010. URL: [leme.library.utoronto.ca/lexicon/entry.cfm?ent=65-2974](http://leme.library.utoronto.ca/lexicon/entry.cfm?ent=65-2974).

<sup>15</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 13.

printed version, Moryson describes sharing a coach with ladies of the Elector Duchess' chamber:

I was alone amongst a coach of women, and those of the Elector Dutchesses Chamber forsooth, which you would have said to be of the black guard. It was a comedy for me to hear their discourse; now declaiming against Calvinists, now brawling together....is there any thing lighter than a woman? And lest the flock of geese should want matter, sometimes they charged me to be a Calvinist, sometimes a Jew; & I answered merrily, that if any of them were but a Consuls wife, I would satisfie them my religion... (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 13)

In the English, Moryson describes how the women playfully 'charged' him with being a Calvinist; in the Latin the ladies 'Calvinistas declamarunt', or declaim him as a Calvinist. There is further evidence that the insertion is transcribed without significant amendments in the English printed version. Moryson makes reference to the humanist scholar Lipsius at exactly the same juncture in each text, and the text of the closing address is word-for-word the same as the English parallel:

Imbrace in my name our common friend G.B and of my louing hosts family, let not a whelp go unsaluted. Farewell honest M, and return me love for love: from Dresden the seventh of March 1591. (*Itinerary*, Part I, p. 14)

The correspondent, 'honest M', to whom Moryson refers, is not identified in either version. Throughout the letter, he is circumspect regarding his correspondent, and 'M' is not referred to again or identified at any point in the printed *Itinerary*.<sup>16</sup> However, the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* provides additional

---

<sup>16</sup> The marginal annotation on f. 36v is even less discursive, simply naming the correspondent as *amico*, a friend.

information. In the Latin version of the letter, Moryson addresses it not to 'M', but to 'M.T'. This may be cross referenced with biographical information to identify the correspondent. The matriculation book of Wittenberg University contains records of all the Englishmen who passed through the institution from the fifteenth century onwards. On 12 June 1591, the names of 'Fynes Moryson Lincolnnesis, Antonius Everstildus Sussexien and Martin Turnerus Eboracen' are recorded.<sup>17</sup> One can only speculate on the relation of Moryson to the other two travellers, Antony Everstildus of Sussex, and Martin Turner of Yorkshire; they may have travelled together to Wittenberg, or met and befriended one another at the University. Nonetheless, Martin Turner provides a possible match for 'M.T', to whom the letter is addressed in the Latin. The chronology of events also fits with an initial meeting in Wittenberg, with Moryson writing to Turner 9 months after their initial meeting, in March 1591/1592.<sup>18</sup>

Later in the printed *Itinerary*, Moryson presents a very similar letter to another correspondent, Francis Markham.<sup>19</sup> Although it could be contended that 'Honest M' might well refer to Markham, there is strong evidence that this is not the case.<sup>20</sup> The letter addressed to Francis Markham has several similarities with the

---

<sup>17</sup> Preserved Smith and Robert Bar, 'The Names of Englishmen at Wittenberg in the Sixteenth Century', *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 36, No. 143 (Jul., 1921) pp. 422-433, p. 425.

<sup>18</sup> Moryson always uses the Julian calendar, unless he specifically states otherwise.

<sup>19</sup> Markham, Francis (1565–1627) was a contemporary of Moryson's at Cambridge, entering Trinity College in 1582. He travelled extensively on the continent, and was with Moryson in Heidelberg in the summer of 1592. See *Itinerary*, Volume I, pp. 77 and D. J. B. Trim, 'Markham, Francis (1565–1627)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/catalogue.urls.lon.ac.uk:80/view/article/18063>, accessed 3 Dec 2009].

<sup>20</sup> Moryson's letter to Markham is presented as being sent in 1592, much later in the chronology of his travels, following his trip to Heidelberg. However, in 1591 when the first letter was sent, Markham was over 200 miles from Leipzig, the location of the correspondent, in Anhaus, Northern Germany. In addition, Moryson has no reservations over naming Markham in the second epistle, whereas he will go no further than 'M' in the first. D. J. B. Trim, 'Markham, Francis (1565–1627)', *Oxford Dictionary of National*

earlier letter to 'Honest M'. The subject matter is light, and the anecdotes intended to be humorous, and verging on the bawdy. For example, in the first letter, Moryson recalls his seclusion with the ladies of the Elector Duchess' chamber, and recounts their ill-concealed interest in him; in the later correspondence he relates 'a lamentable sight, which I dare scarce relate to you, knowing your tendernes in those cases...I saw a very faire maide of fifteene yeeres, married to mine Host an old churle of seventy yeeres'.<sup>21</sup> In common with his later letter to his friend Markham, Moryson's letter to 'M.T' is light in tone, humorous and anecdotal. It describes an altercation between Moryson and a coachman, the subsequent journey in which Moryson is harassed by the Duchess' ladies in waiting, and his excursion to Dresden, from which place he pens the letter.

The Latin is not substantially different from the English version, although there are minor textual distinctions. In the Latin, Moryson likens his hurried exit from the Coach-house to the gait of 'Plautinus Curculio', the Curculio of Plautus.<sup>22</sup> In the English, Moryson adds information to this statement for the edification of the vernacular readership, comparing himself to the 'parasite Curculio in Plautus'. Although not a significant departure from the Latin, this is an example of an editorial change informed by an anticipated English readership. This change is not reflected in any editorial annotations visible on ff. 37-38, so it is presumably the result of a later stage of editing or of adaptive translation.

---

*Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk:80/view/article/18063, accessed 3 Dec 2008].

<sup>21</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 36.

<sup>22</sup> The pun here is on the scurrying, scrabbling gait of a weevil-setting up a passage in which Moryson will associate with, and defeat the low born *uernam* who steals his cloak.

There are further differences between the Latin and the English versions of the letter. As the letter is unaltered in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, these provide further firm evidence for a later stage of editing or adaptive translation. In the Latin, for example, Moryson offers a voluble description of an oversight on his part, forgetting to pay the Coach driver in advance of the journey:

Cuius rei gaudio [dum efferr] dum efficerer, mihi ad currum festinanti  
mercedem hesperno essedario numerare memoria exciderat.

I was thus seized by joy because I found a carriage, that as I was rushing towards it, it completely escaped my memory to pay the driver of this war chariot.

In contrast, the printed *Itenerary* limits this recollection to flat, abrupt expression 'while I was affected, and hasted to hire a place therein, I had forgot to pay for my Coach for the day before'.<sup>23</sup> The change, although only of a few words, is significant. The Latin is fluid, buoyant and capricious; the English a statement of fact. This pattern is repeated in the conclusion to the anecdote, in which Moryson returns from his sojourn in the Coach-house to find the driver has seized his travelling cloak by way of payment:

Ecceautem redeunti sordidum sterquilinum, uernam uerbo (Aurigam dico)  
meis indutum exuuiis (togam itinerariam intelligo) currui nostro adstare.

And I what do I see upon my return? I see that filthy dungheap, this slave (and I speak of the Cart Driver) standing near our carriage, dressed in the spoils of his takings from me, I mean my travelling cloak!

---

<sup>23</sup> *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 13.

The printed version is again more concise: 'There I found the dunghil rascall the Coachman, having my gown on his back' although this is not the only distinction.<sup>24</sup> In the Latin, Moryson is far more colourful and profuse in his diatribe against the coach driver, calling him 'sordidum sterquilinum' or 'filthy, soiled dungheap', and as well defining him as 'uernam', or a 'low-born slave'. Although the English translation, 'villain', has intimations of low character, it does not go so far as the Latin, which offers a more elaborated insult, expressing Moryson's full ire at the Coachman's presumption.<sup>25</sup> More discursive and vibrant than the English, the Latin also represents an attempt to write for a literate, educated audience. For example, Moryson has made no attempt to translate 'Essedario', or 'this war chariot', clearly feeling the inference would be lost on an English readership.<sup>26</sup> The introduction of the theme of war and conflict is a humorous nod to an educated readership, the dull-witted serf who steals a cloak, transformed into a ravaging chariot driver plundering the spoils of war.<sup>27</sup>

Clearly, there is a distinction between the narrative voice presented in the Latin, and that of the English. The Latin is consistently more descriptive, imaginative and

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid, Part I, p. 13.

<sup>25</sup> The contemporary meaning of 'Villain' switches between the designation of one low born, and associations of perfidy, for example, "O villain, villain, smiling, damned villain!" (Hamlet, 1:5, 106). The latter connotation could have been better expressed through the term *proditor*, (a traitor, a betrayer, a deceiver) so the use of *uernam* suggests Moryson is aghast at the low character of the coach driver—a modern translation might be expressed in the term 'vermin'. See Thomas Thomas, *Thomae Thomae dictionarium summâ fide ac diligentia accuratissimè emendatum, magnâque insuper rerum scitu dignarum, & vocabulorum accessione, longè auctius locupletiusque redditum: huic etiâ (praeter dictionarium historicum & poëticum etc* (Cambridge: John Legat, 1600), Sig. LI5 and William Shakespeare, *Hamlet, The Norton Shakespeare*, Stephen Greenblatt (ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 1:5, 106, p. 1687.

<sup>26</sup> Note also that Moryson uses the term 'currus' in the opening sentence of the Latin, which can mean either cart or 'chariot'.

<sup>27</sup> The item lost, *indutum*, can only be described as one's clothing, or coverings. In the English, Moryson is more specific, speaking of his cloak. This may be his treasured travelling cloak, which he was buried in. See Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, PROB 11/157, *Will of Fines or Fynes Morison*, 18 March 1630.

quite simply, more interesting than the English. Although the content of the letter is not factually distinct in terms of information imparted, reading the full letter in Latin is a different experience. The English version appears to have been edited to remove the very narrative vitality that makes the Latin so vivid, and accessible.

The letter also provides evidence of the composition process of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, and the printed *Itinerary*. As this letter, and the later sequence of letters illustrates, changes made to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* have a direct resonance in the printed *Itinerary*. Further, the nature of the changes made reflect a desire to present accurate, factual information; for example, the need to present the Italian letters in the correct order. This has a parallel with the nature of the changes made to the content and expression of the text, which seems to have been edited in order to impose a more methodical, rigid style. These differences illustrate that the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* differs significantly from the printed *Itinerary*, and perhaps represents a distinct version of the text.

### Case Study 3: The Anabaptists Excision

This case study will focus on a significant editorial alteration made to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. The alteration, a paragraph length deletion, is reflected in the English printed *Itenerary*, which again confirms the relationship between the two texts. The following study will investigate the significance of this alteration, considering why this section of text has been deleted and the nature of the content that has been excised. I will also compare the surrounding text in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* to its later presentation in the printed *Itenerary*, investigating subtle changes and variations in expression. Whilst this study will focus on a single alteration, it is hoped that a detailed study of this change will yield valuable insights into the editorial process, as almost every folio of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* has been extensively edited in Fynes Moryson's hand. These amendments both add to and significantly change the original content.

A third of the way down f. 41v, seven lines of text have been surrounded by a hand-drawn octagonal box and crossed through with two vertical lines.

Throughout the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, this convention is used to highlight text marked for deletion.<sup>1</sup> The marked text has no parallel in the printed *Itenerary*, although content on either side of the highlighted material has been transposed.<sup>2</sup> This confirms that this editorial convention indicates text marked for deletion, and also shows that editorial changes made to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* directly inform the English printed *Itenerary*.

The marked text has been deleted from the first chapter of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. This section of the text is in Hand 1, although the text box and surrounding

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, on f. 45, an 11 line section has been surrounded by a text box, which has been stricken through with a diagonal line to indicate it requires deletion.

<sup>2</sup> *Itenerary*, Part I, p. 16.

editorial changes are in Hand 2, that of Fynes Moryson. These changes, and evidence drawn from many other annotations, insertions and amendments proves that Moryson reworked the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* after it had been initially drafted. For example, Moryson extensively edits surrounding text on f. 43v, f. 45 and f. 49v, making grammatical corrections and introducing material in the form of marginal insertions.<sup>3</sup> During the process of revision Moryson made a number of changes to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* which directly inform the printed *Itinerary*, such as the inclusion of ‘autograph’ letters, and the excision of large sections of the text. The marked text on f. 41v is removed from the description of Prague on p. 16 of the printed *Itinerary*.<sup>4</sup> The English printed equivalent of this section comprises a succinct description of Karlsteine Castle and Bethlehem Church, followed by a rendition of planned travels in central Europe, and a brief history of the Hussite warlord, Ziska.<sup>5</sup>

The Latin version of this section differs considerably. There are a number of differences in content, which are not restricted to the section marked for deletion. The description of Karlsteine, itinerary of planned travels and biography of Ziska remain unchanged. However, the description of Bethlehem Church has been cut to a single line in the English version. In the Latin, Moryson is more discursive, including details of the relics of John Hus, and anti-catholic sentiment excised from the English, which will be discussed later.

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, the date ‘Anno 767’ is written in the margin of f. 40v. This correction has been incorporated into the text of the printed *Itinerary*. In addition, a large section has been deleted on f. 43v. This section does not appear in the printed *Itinerary*. Another large section (11 lines) has been deleted on f. 45.

<sup>4</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 16.

<sup>5</sup> Ziska was a famed protestant military leader, at the forefront of the Hussite military resistance. He successfully defended Prague from a Catholic crusade in the summer of 1420, and won many notable military victories. He was also present at the battle of Agincourt, fighting for the English. Frederick Gotthold Heymann, *John Ziska and the Hussite Revolution* (New York: Princeton University Press, 1955), p. 452.

The section marked for deletion concerns religious toleration, extending to peaceful cohabitation, in Prague and across Bohemia. It is prefaced by a short sentence that describes Karlsteine Castle, the repository for the 'corona ceu diadema', 'crown or diadem', of Bohemia. Although there are subtle textual differences between the Latin and English versions of this sentence, the content is largely the same.<sup>6</sup> The deleted sentence is a lengthy one, subdivided into ten clauses. It is transcribed in its entirety below:

Omnium Religionum Pragae (ut in toto Bohemiae Regno, eiusque Provinciis Moravia & Silesia) ingens est confusio: Hussitae Papistae, Lutherani & Caluiniani, quorum multi in eadem domo, eiusdem mensae & Lecte consortes; concorditer uiuunt, ut taceam Anabaptistas, fratres in Collegio & in commune uiuentes, variasque sectas ad cuiusuis cerebri inuentionem libere profitendas.

There is an immoderate confusion of all the religions in Prague, (as well as in the entire Kingdom of Bohemia, and in its provinces, Moravia and Silesia) Hussites, Papists, Lutherans and Calvinists, of whom many share in the same household, and share the same table and bed and live in peace, not to mention the Anabaptists, living together like brothers in a College Commune, and every other conceivable sect one can imagine may be freely professed here.

This deleted sentence is duly absent from the printed *Itinerary*. It is difficult to explain this deletion by reference to the tone of the passage, as it appears to

---

<sup>6</sup>There are minor changes in expression. For example, in the printed *Itinerary* Moryson speaks of a 'crown', whereas the Latin uses the term 'corona', indicating that the crown is in fact a 'diadem'. Although minor, this change informs the reader that that Moryson is speaking of the crown of a kingdom (Bohemia) as opposed to the crown of the Holy Roman Emperor. *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 16.

represent a rational observation of conditions in Prague at the time of Moryson's visit. A closer reading of the passage, however, reveals troubling undertones to the expression, which may in part help explain the deletion. There is a slight ambiguity about the terms 'confusio' and 'ingens'. The former, whilst having a literal meaning of 'confusion', may also indicate a mingling, disorder, or more tellingly, 'shame'. A more apt translation might be 'a shameful confusion' of religions. The term 'ingens', translated as 'immoderate', also has a slightly stronger nuance, that of 'unnatural'. This strongly coloured language suggests a passage influenced by Moryson's Protestant ideology, which may have been removed in order to impose a more neutral or objective tone.

Although it may be contended that the passage is strongly worded, Moryson is not typically guarded when assessing religious practice. He speaks of 'Papist impostures' in Rome, links the 'darkness' of Catholic places of worship with the iniquity of the religion, and articulates his fears that he will be poisoned by the French Friars that he lodges with in Jerusalem.<sup>7</sup> These, and many other examples illustrate that Moryson would not have tempered his personal opinion as a matter of course. The most mundane reason for the deletion of the sentence might be that the section was expurgated to free up words or because it was considered irrelevant. However, following the excised section, no content is deleted from the biography of Ziska, or the following section describing Moryson's planned travels. In particular, the description of Ziska is lengthy and florid. It mentions the exact location of his grave, and contains an apocryphal account of his skin being rendered down to construct an 'ominating' war drum.<sup>8</sup> Notably Moryson feels the

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, Part I, p. 240.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, Part I, p. 16, 'and being ready to die, wished them to make a drum of his skinne, ominating that the sound thereof would bee too terrible to the enemies, as they would runne away'.

need to define him as ‘the famous captain of the Bohemians’, the inference being an English audience would be ignorant of him.<sup>9</sup>

If the deletion is not explained by a general desire to précis, then it follows that the section must have been removed on grounds of content. The passage concerns religious freedom in Prague, Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia. Moryson visited Prague in 1592, spending two months there. His account of the religious pragmatism of the populace represents an accurate, if superficial estimation of the situation in what may be loosely termed ‘Bohemia’ at the time.<sup>10</sup> During the final decade of the 16<sup>th</sup> Century the ‘Bohemia Crownlands’ were ruled by a decentralised Habsburg administration.<sup>11</sup> The native feudal nobility were supported by a small contingent of Spanish Catholic noblemen, who helped to exercise control and maintain order.<sup>12</sup> Although the feudal-Catholic nobility nominally ruled Bohemia, they were opposed by the remnants of the Protestant Hussite movement, whose influence prevailed across the country. At the time of Moryson’s travels, there was relative peace between the two factions, and this uneasy union forms the basis of the religiously diverse society Moryson describes in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*.

However, by the time Moryson came to publish, in 1617, the political situation had changed radically. Just a year later, the latest Bohemian revolt would flower into the beginnings of the Thirty Years war, which would change the face of Europe forever, and render elements of Moryson’s *Itinerary* obsolete. In addition,

---

<sup>9</sup> John Hus, a figure who would arguably be more familiar to an English Protestant audience, has material removed from his description, so it seems that Moryson was not cutting information deemed irrelevant. See f. 41v, *Itinerary*, Part I, p. 16.

<sup>10</sup> Hans J. Hillebrand, *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 182.

<sup>11</sup> Josef V. Polišenský & Frederick Snider, *War and Society in Europe 1618-1648* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 1978), p. 57.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid*, p. 57.

the English political situation was now linked to that of Bohemia, through the marriage of Elizabeth of Scotland, daughter of James I, to Frederick IV, Elector Palatine. Elizabeth was betrothed to the Elector in 1612, and married on February 14, 1613.<sup>13</sup> In 1608, Frederick formed the Protestant Union, which prompted a number of estates and principalities to secede from the Habsburgs.<sup>14</sup> Their position in Bohemia was weakened, and Frederick was proposed as a potential head of state. This infraction eventually sparked the Bohemian revolt, which itself catalysed the Thirty Years War.

Given the Elector's political aspirations in regard to Bohemia, Moryson would have needed to exercise great caution in any religious or political appreciations of the region following the betrothal to Elizabeth in 1612. This new alliance would have been sufficient to inhibit publication of any politically contentious material, particularly when there is no textual acknowledgment that the account represents a 25 year old depiction of the region, more history than travel narrative.

Irrespective of the political ramifications, the account was no longer true to the theological and political turmoil in the Bohemia of the time. No traveller of 1617 would have witnessed religious toleration or freedom in this region, nor expect it. Indeed, the principal observations emanating from English travellers in central Europe at this time concern the 'incredible' preparations being made for the pending conflict.<sup>15</sup> It is problematic to provide an exact date for the deletion. Although the original draft of the manuscript may be dated to around 1609, the text may well have been edited and reviewed at a later date. The date of the marriage between Elizabeth of Scotland and Frederick IV might suggest that the

---

<sup>13</sup> Steven Murdoch, *Scotland and the Thirty Years War, 1618-1648* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 2-3.

<sup>14</sup> Geoffrey Parker, *Europe in Crisis, 1598-1648* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), p. 63. Also known as the 'evangelical union'.

<sup>15</sup> Geoffrey Parker, *The Thirty Years War* (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 12.

text was revised some time after 14 February 1613. Whatever the date, it represents clear evidence that Moryson edited his text with a view to the changes in political circumstances since his original journey.

The importance of this section is foregrounded by the numerous editorial revisions and corrections throughout. The deleted section represents seven lines of text on f. 41v, L.7-L.14. The following three lines also appear to have been revised, as there is a significant difference in content between the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and the printed English parallel.<sup>16</sup> However, in this case the manuscript is not marked or altered in any discernible way. This is a significant find. It provides further evidence for substantial differences between the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and the printed English version, beyond those visibly marked for alteration or deletion.

In the Latin, the refashioned section is relatively discursive, running from line 15 to line 17:

Pragae in Templo Bethlehem vocato pulpitem ostendunt, in quo Johannes Hus concionem habere solebat cum Papistae superstitionis prima reformatio pullularet, ibidemque vestes quibus eum usum aiunt aliaque in eius memoriam conservant & curiosis ostendunt.

In Prague in the Church of Bethlehem they display a pulpit, in which Johannes Hus used to address the public when the first reformation sprouted against the Papist superstition, and in the same place they maintain the garments which it is said he used, and other objects devoted to his memory, and show to the curious visitors.

---

<sup>16</sup> See Appendix 1: Case Study 3.

In contrast, the printed version is far more abrupt; ‘At Prague in Bethlehem Church, they show a Pulpit in which John Hus used to preach at the first reformation of Religion’.<sup>17</sup> There are a number of distinctions between the two versions. The printed version omits the anti-Catholic sentiment of the second clause, and the information regarding garments and worship objects in the third clause. In the case of the former, Moryson describes the Pulpit at which John Hus used to preach ‘at the first reformation’ in the English, but in the Latin adds the information ‘Papistae superstitioni...pullularet’, or ‘when the reformation first sprouted against the papist superstition’. Removing this sentiment changes the tone of the clause, from ideological to factual. There is a common logic to this alteration and the preceding deletion. Both changes neutralise the tone of the text, reducing it to bare description.

The final clause has been excised entirely, rather than revised. ‘vestes quibus eum usum aut aliq[ue] in eius memoriam conserverant & curiosi ostendunt’ has been omitted in its entirety. The clause describes the garments Hus wore, objects he used, and other memorabilia, all of which are shown to the ‘curious’ visitors. Hus did represent an important figure in the inception of the reformation, and it is possible Moryson removed the clause as he wanted to distance himself from any intimations of reverence.<sup>18</sup> It would seem that Moryson has altered this section in accordance with the logic of the excision of the prior sentence, in an attempt to restrict his opinions, and observations to the bare minimum, in what had become a contentious and politically fraught field of debate.

---

<sup>17</sup> *Itinerary*, Part I, p.16.

<sup>18</sup> This exclusion would only make sense if the text edited was intended for publication on the continent, designed to appeal to a largely Catholic readership.

The differences between the Latin version of f. 41v and its printed parallel provide important evidence of the progression from manuscript to print. First, there appears to be a clear connection between the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and its printed descendant. Sections altered or deleted in the Latin are not subsequently printed, meaning that, to an extent, the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* must have directly informed the printed *Itinerary*. However, there are also a host of more subtle changes in content, with words, phrases and short clauses removed or altered without corresponding editorial interventions in the manuscript. This suggests either that the content changed considerably upon translation, or that revisions were incorporated into a subsequent Latin copy.

Taken singly, these changes would have a negligible effect, but when considered cumulatively across the whole three part work the overall difference in content would be significant. In the case of this example, a particular political imperative seems to have informed the changes. The Bohemian situation represents just one example of the many considerations Moryson must have taken into account during his editorial process, and it would be possible to investigate further excisions and alterations to learn more about both the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and the printed *Itinerary*.

### Case Study 4: The Dedication

This case study will consider the differences between the printed English Dedication, and the Latin Dedication preserved in the manuscript. The two versions of the Dedication are completely different, and represent distinct texts. They have quite different registers, rhetorical strategies and modes of address. The only major feature they share is a common dedicatee, William Herbert, Third Earl of Pembroke. Securing patronage was not merely an adjunct to publication in the Elizabethan and early Stuart era, but a 'significant condition', without which no author could expect his work to be taken seriously.<sup>1</sup> To choose Pembroke was to attempt to ensure that a work would be seen to have the gravitas and intellectual merit to attract the attention of a family of 'the highest social rank'.<sup>2</sup> In particular, the Pembroke family were reputed to offer an unprecedented level of protection to their client authors, safeguarding their works against vituperative critical attacks, monarchical criticism, and 'calumny or piracy'.<sup>3</sup> With his patron and main benefactor Mountjoy deceased, Moryson had to safeguard his future, and that of the *Itenerary*, by choosing a respected patron such as Pembroke.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Cambridge history of the book in Britain: Volume IV, 1557-1695*, Lotte Hellinga, John Barnard, Donald Francis McKenzie, J. B. Trapp, Maureen Bell (Ed.) (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2002), G. Parry, 'Patronage and the printing of learned works for the author'. 'A Patron's name gave assurances that the book was a responsible work, accountable to a known public figure', p. 174.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*, p. 179.

<sup>3</sup> Michael Brennan, *Literary Patronage in the English Renaissance: The Pembroke Family* (London: Routledge, 1988), p. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Pembroke may have had an additional attraction for Moryson: he was renowned for ensuring works dedicated him were printed, which may have been a concern of Moryson, given that the fourth part to the *Itenerary* was unable to find a printer in 1626. See Dick Taylor, 'The Earl of Montgomery and the Dedicatory Epistle of Shakespeare's First Folio', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 10, No.1 (Winter, 1959), pp. 121-231, p. 121.

Pembroke more than fulfilled these criteria. His career reached its apogee in 1617, the year the *Itenerary* was published.<sup>5</sup> At this point, he was, as Moryson makes clear in the printed dedication:

Lord Chamberlain of his Maisties Houshold,  
  
*One of his Maiesties most Honourable Privie*  
  
Counsell, and Knight of the most noble Order  
  
of the GARTER, &c.

Furthermore, in the year of publication, Pembroke was made Chancellor of Oxford University, a significant appointment that gave him the leverage to sponsor and raise promising intellectuals.<sup>6</sup> In many respects, Pembroke was at the very summit of his ambitions, and an excellent choice for patronage. A year earlier, Jonson had dedicated his Folio 'Works' to Pembroke, depicting him as a symbol of courtly excellence, a resolute figure, holding out against the 'immoral excess' of the court.<sup>7</sup> Pembroke was a staunch defender of Protestant interests, with prominent anti-catholic tracts dedicated to him in 1607 and 1612.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, he was often depicted as heir to the anti-catholic martial tradition of the Earl of Essex, a figure who played a prominent role in Moryson's early life.<sup>9</sup> Pembroke represented a

---

<sup>5</sup> Pembroke had hundreds of works dedicated to him over the course of his lifetime, and 6 alone in 1617. Along with the *Itenerary*, these included a politicised sermon, a set of lectures on the 51<sup>st</sup> psalm and a philosophical enquiry into the nature of human wisdom. See Franklin B. Williams, *An Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses In English Books Before 1641* (London: Biographical Society, 1962), p. 94.

<sup>6</sup> Michael Brennan, *Literary Patronage in the English Renaissance: The Pembroke Family* (London: Routledge, 1988) Pembroke had 'ambitious plans for the utilisation of the country's intellects', p. 145.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid*, p. 143.

<sup>8</sup> In particular the 'anti-papist' *World of Wordes* (Richard Carew, 1607) and a translation of Theodore Beza's satires *News from Italy of a Second Moses* (William Crawshaw, 1612). The second would have had particular appeal to Moryson, seeing as he took a specific detour to seek out Beza on his return from Italy in 1593. See Brennan, p. 143

<sup>9</sup> For more information, see the Biography.

solid, logical choice of patron, mirroring Moryson's religious and political interests, and capable of defending and promoting the *Itenerary* at the very highest levels of society.

Why Pembroke himself would have accepted the dedication, is another matter. Patrons had a vested interest in associating themselves with worthy and respected works. A patron 'demonstrated where his interests were most engaged by accepting various forms of dedication'.<sup>10</sup> It is probable Moryson would have formed an estimation of Pembroke prior to soliciting his patronage, and would have noted he had a specific interest in travel and exploration, a member of the Virginia and Bermuda companies.<sup>11</sup> It is also likely that there would have been prior contact, and approval of the acceptance of the dedication, before publication. Moryson's brother Richard, acting vice president of Munster, 'transferred his loyalties' to Pembroke in 1610, and named him as one of the executors of his will in 1624.<sup>12</sup> Richard had advanced Fynes' interests in securing the patronage of Mountjoy in 1601, and it is probable that he acted on behalf of his older brother again in this matter.<sup>13</sup>

Pembroke was a powerful public figure, ubiquitous at court, and with direct access to James I. In composing his dedication, Moryson had to appeal to the specific interests and preoccupations of Pembroke, tailoring his prose to cement a

---

<sup>10</sup> *The Cambridge history of the book in Britain: Volume IV, 1557-1695*, Lotte Hellinga, John Barnard, Donald Francis McKenzie, J. B. Trapp, Maureen Bell (ed.) (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2002), G. Parry, 'Patronage and the printing of learned works for the author', p. 175.

<sup>11</sup> Victor Stater, 'Herbert, William, third earl of Pembroke (1580-1630)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/13058>, accessed 5 Aug 2011] William Herbert (1580-1630): doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/13058.

<sup>12</sup> Kew, p. lxxxiv.

<sup>13</sup> Fynes also received an introduction to Mountjoy from Richard, and may also have been recommended to the Earl of Essex through his brother's familiarity with him. See Biographical Investigation.

lasting union between client and patron. However, although both the Latin and English Dedications are addressed to Pembroke, there are significant differences between them. In particular, there are notable differences in the nature of the classical and theological imagery used, the main arguments advanced in each composition, and the length of each dedication, with the Latin running to almost three times the length of the English version.<sup>14</sup> Indeed, the English version is very short, and may be quoted in its entirety:

Right Honourable,

Since I had the happinesse imputed to Salomons Servants by the Queene of Sheba, to stand sometimes before You, an eye and eare witnes of your Noble conuersation with the worthy Earle of Deuonshire, (my deceased Lord and Master) I ever admired your vertues and much honoured your Person. And because it is a thing no less commendable, gladly to receive favours from men of eminent worth, then with like choice to tender respect and service to them: I being now led by powerfull custome to seeke a Patron for this my Worke; and knowing that the weakest frames need strongest supporters, have taken the boldness most humbly to commend it to your Honours protection: which vouchsafed; and my selfe shall not only acknowledge this high favour with humblest thankfulnessse, but with ioy imbrace this occasion to avow my selfe now by public profesion, (as I have long been in private affection,)

Your Honours most humble and faithfull servant,

FYNES MORYSON

---

<sup>14</sup> There may be some disparity as translation may influence the word count. Once translated, the manuscript version runs to 491 words, the English just 164.

When compared to the Latin, the brevity of the English version is quite arresting. The opening sentence contains references to a passage from the Bible, and to Moryson's association with the 'Earle of Devonshire', Charles Blount, Baron Mountjoy. Moryson emphasises that he has previously been associated with Pembroke, who was a close friend of Charles Blount, Baron Mountjoy, the 'Earle of Devonshire', Moryson's 'deceased Lord and Master'. Moryson states that he has been witness to what he terms 'noble conversation' between the two. The term 'conversation' has a specific function in the parlance of the *Itenerary*. Throughout the text, it is used to denote high class, intellectual discourse. For example, Moryson refers to the exclusivity of his 'conversation' at the English Court, with Scots of 'the better sort'.<sup>15</sup>

Moryson contends that he has been the 'eye and eare witness' of this discourse, a reference to his function as Mountjoy's secretary, which would bring him into contact with powerful figures in the Earl of Devonshire's social circle. Moryson is appealing to the memory of this prior association, suggesting that he has been a circumspect and prudent 'witness', a careful and discreet observer of the transactions of state.<sup>16</sup> Moryson's humility is founded in mention of 'Salomons Servants'. The reference is to the meeting between King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba in the Book of Kings.<sup>17</sup> The 'happiness' of the servants which Moryson

---

<sup>15</sup> *Itenerary*, Part III, p. 176. Later in the *Itenerary* Moryson praises Venice for its 'free conversation' suggesting that the republic benefits from an intellectually emancipated discourse. Should Moryson wish to criticise a people he encounters, he focuses on their failings in this regard. When displeased with the prospect of Livorno, one of his principal criticisms is that the people have no 'civill conversation'. See *Itenerary*, Part I p. 90 & p. 147.

<sup>16</sup> It is possible, but unlikely, that Moryson intends this as a form of implicit threat. In his Irish manuscript, Moryson uses copies of letters held in the State Papers to support his argument, and it is entirely possible such an assiduous archivist would hold documentary evidence of their meetings.

<sup>17</sup> *The Holy Bible, conteyning the Old Testament, and the New: Newly Translated out of the Originall tongues: & with the former Translations [Tyndale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's,*

describes seems to be a reference to verse 8, in which the Queen of Sheba comments on Solomon's servants 'Happy, are those who serve you and hear your wisdom, and blessed be your God who has bestowed on you much excellency and happiness'.<sup>18</sup> He positions himself as one of these servants, gratified to have been witness to the conversation of Pembroke and Mountjoy, which is likened to the wise counsel of Solomon. This wisdom is thus attributed to Pembroke, the surviving party of this discourse.

Moryson's use of Solomon may also have had other possible contemporary nuances. Whilst early modern writers considered Solomon to be 'first in Royaltie, Sanctitie, Wisdom', he was also renowned for his 'Wealth, Magnificence, Munificence'.<sup>19</sup> The opulence of Solomon was as much a theme as his wisdom and power. In the first Book of Kings, the servants of Solomon draw their happiness from the wisdom of Solomon, but also from their 'sitting at table', 'meat' and 'apparel'.<sup>20</sup> The sense is clear. The rewards of patronage are both material and spiritual. Moryson's dedication acknowledges Pembroke's wisdom, intellect and social standing, but also asks that he rewards his servants in a style befitting a man of 'eminent worth'.<sup>21</sup>

---

*Cranmer's, Parker's, and the Genevan*] diligently compared and reuised by his Maiesties speciall Comandement (Robert Barker, London: 1611) 1 Kings 10, 1-13.

<sup>18</sup> C.H.Toy, 'The Queen of Sheba', *The Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 20, No. 78 (Jul. - Sep., 1907), pp. 207-212.

<sup>19</sup> Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his Pilgrimes*, I (London: William Stansby for H. Fetherstone, 1613) 'Address to the Reader', Unmarked Leaf.

<sup>20</sup> *The Holy Bible, conteyning the Old Testament, and the New: Newly Translated out of the Originall tongues: & with the former Translations [Tyndale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, Cranmer's, Parker's, and the Genevan] diligently compared and reuised by his Maiesties speciall Comandement.* (Robert Barker, London: 1611) 1 Book of Kings, Verse 5.

<sup>21</sup> Fynes Moryson, *An Itinerary*, Dedication to William, Earl of Pembroke, unmarked Leaf. Moryson might well be asking for a direct financial reward here. Patrons were expected to award small but significant gifts of money-£2 to £3-to authors who dedicated their work to them. *The Cambridge history of the book in Britain: Volume IV, 1557-1695*, Lotte Hellinga, John Barnard, Donald Francis McKenzie, J. B. Trapp, Maureen Bell (Ed.) (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2002), G. Parry, 'Patronage and the printing of learned works for the author', p. 175. This remuneration could represent a 'substantial

The second half of the Dedication is concerned with the reception of the *Itinerary*. Moryson asks that his prospective patron help defend his work, as ‘the weakest frames need strongest supports’. This construction calls to mind the imagery Moryson employs in the English ‘Address to the Reader’ when describing the abandoned first draft of his work. He describes how the ‘gates’ of his work swelled, threatening to overwhelm the ‘city’ he sought to construct. This image of a malformed construction is applied again in the Dedication, to suggest that the work is flawed, and will be ill received. This desire for the support of a patron, figuratively expressed through the metaphor of the crumbling or incomplete work, is a common theme in dedications. In a 1615 Dedication addressed to the Prince of Wales, the traveller George Sandys wrote ‘Accept great Prince these weak endeavours of a strong design’.<sup>22</sup> The suggestion again, is of a flawed work, in need of the protection of a strong patron. Moryson asks that Pembroke extend a similar ‘protection’ to his work, perhaps building on the previous image of Solomon, who was often imagined as a figure of stability and strength.<sup>23</sup> For example, in the *Dedication to Purchas his Pilgrimes*, the author imagines the thick

---

source of income’ for writers. See Franklin B. Williams, *An Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses In English Books Before 1641* (London: Biographical Society, 1962), p. x.

<sup>22</sup> Jonathan Haynes, *The Humanist as Traveller: George Sandys’ Relation of a Journey* (Associated Universities Press: London, 1986), p. 18.

<sup>23</sup> Solomon was most often linked with James I, and it is possible that Moryson may imagine Pembroke as Solomon to link him with the highest strata of Stuart Power. For example, in George Carleton’s *A Thankfull remembrance of God’s Mercy James I is depicted as an English Solomon ‘staring down a representation of Guy Fawkes approaching the Houses of Parliament’*. In the image, James is flanked by Elizabeth, who his hard at work repelling the Armada. John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 28.

pillars of Solomon's temple holding out against the impress of Catholicism, twin columns of 'stabilitie and strengyth'.<sup>24</sup>

It is clear that Moryson wished Pembroke to provide a sure foundation for his work by accepting the Dedication, and associating it with his name. Moryson finishes by saying he will now show his 'selfe' through 'public profesion' as he has long been in 'private affection'. This 'private affection' may well be a reference to Pembroke's relationship with Moryson's brother, Richard, which was close.<sup>25</sup> The strength of the English Dedication rests on Moryson's prior association with Pembroke, mediated through his brother Richard and his 'deceased lord and Master', Mountjoy. The rhetoric is simple, and unadorned. Moryson wishes to draw on this connection to ensure that Pembroke, a wise and cultured man of 'eminent worth', extend his protection over the work.

In contrast, the function and rhetorical strategy of the Latin Dedication is quite different. This difference is evident from the very beginning of the Latin.<sup>26</sup> Unlike the English printed equivalent, this section has no argument of prior association. Moryson explicitly mentions that he is a client, in fact a petitioner, and does not at this stage make reference to his former patron, Mountjoy. Instead, he asks 'no more', 'verbo non amplius' than to be allowed to address Pembroke in the words of a 'Clientis devoti', or devoted client.<sup>27</sup> Moryson follows this with a construction that advances a quite different argument to the English version, which has no parallel in the printed *Itinerary*:

---

<sup>24</sup> Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his Pilgrimes*, I (London: William Stansby for H. Fetherstone, 1613) Dedication to Prince of Wales, unmarked leaf.

<sup>25</sup> Indeed, Pembroke was named an executor in Richard's will, which was tended in 1626. Fynes Moryson was not.

<sup>26</sup> The Latin dedication is first drafted on f. 3, with a second draft, corrected in the authorial hand, on f. 17.

<sup>27</sup> f. 17.

Non illucubratur opus, vel septemplex Aiakis clypeus a iusta  
 reprehensione, sed nec politissimum quodque ipsius Mercurii Caduceus a  
 mordacibus inuidi Momi faucibus unquam protegit. Absit ut talis fiducia  
 quicquam in tuo quantumvis potenti patrocínio posuerim.

This work has not lacked midnight oil, but neither the sevenfold shield of  
 Ajax nor the most incandescent wand of Mercury will protect it from  
 criticism, the biting jaws of the envious Momus. Far be it from me to have  
 placed such trust in your patronage, as potent as it is.

In the Latin, Moryson specifically articulates a fear that his work will be the focus  
 of critical vituperation. Moryson contends that even the ‘septemplex Aiakis  
 clypeus’, or sevenfold shield of Ajax, cannot protect him from critics.<sup>28</sup> The  
 temptation is to liken the protection of a patron to that of Ajax, but this is  
 tempered by the following sentence, ‘Absit ut talis fiducia quicquam in tuo  
 quantumvis potenti patrocínio posuerim’, ‘Far be it from me to have placed such  
 trust in your patronage, potent though it might be’.<sup>29</sup> Moryson instead contends  
 that nothing can protect one from a ‘Momus’, or spiteful critic. In the *Iliad*, the  
 shield of Ajax offers protection from the javelins, firebrands and spear thrusts of  
 the Trojans, the critical backlash Moryson fears.<sup>30</sup> However, even this is not  
 sufficient to offer protection from the ‘Momi faucibus’, the ‘jaws of Momus’.

---

<sup>28</sup> A similar metaphor is employed in Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra*, when Anthony is (falsely) informed of Cleopatra’s death: ‘Even the seven-fold shield of Ajax cannot keep the battery from my heart’ (Anthony to Eros, 4:15) William Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, The Norton Shakespeare, Stephen Greenblatt (ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 2690.

<sup>29</sup> *Itinerary*, Dedication to William, Earl of Pembroke, ‘unmarked leaf’. It would have been contentious to liken Pembroke to Ajax directly, for whilst he was renowned as a fierce warrior and stout defender, he was also seen as stupid and ill tempered ‘Valiant as a Lion, churlish as a bear, slow as an Elephant’ See *Troilus and Cressida*, 1:2, 20-21. The Norton Shakespeare, Stephen Greenblatt (ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p.1839.

<sup>30</sup> Richard L. Trapp, ‘Ajax in the Iliad’, *Classical Journal*, Vol. 56, No. 6 (March 1961), pp. 271-275, p. 272.

Similarly, Mercury's *Caduceus*, or wand has two functions, both in illumination, and as a peacemaking or healing agent.<sup>31</sup> Yet even Mercury's gleaming, or glowing wand, cannot provide sufficient illumination to enlighten the mass of anticipated criticism.<sup>32</sup> The significance of these allusions is linked to the opening clauses, where Moryson talks of 'illucubratum,' or 'midnight oil'.<sup>33</sup> Although he has imparted much work to the Latin *Itinerarium*, he fears it will be savaged by critics. The prominent fear of critical attack is linked directly to the mention of Momus. The early modern appreciation of Momus was as a metaphor for unfounded criticism. For example, Marten Van Heemskerck's 1561 painting *Momus criticising the work of the Gods*, has the inscription: 'My name is Momus, born of the night, without a father, the comrade of envy. I enjoy criticising each individual thing. I caused a man to be made with a grating across his heart so he could hide nothing in this hollow from the open senses'.<sup>34</sup> Momus became a frequent symbol of unmerited criticism, and deep, wounding critiques of great artists' work. By the late 16<sup>th</sup> Century, representations of Momus had developed, now functioning as representations of unsurpassed critical ignorance. Sidney for example, in *An Apology for Poetrie*, writes of one who has 'so earth creeping a mind that it cannot lift it selfe up to look at the sky of Poetry, or rather, by a sort of rustically

---

<sup>31</sup> Bernice S. Engle, 'The Use of Mercury's Caduceus as a Medical Emblem', *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (Dec., 1929), pp. 204-208.

<sup>32</sup> There is also a possible allusion to disseminating truth, and in particular 'spreading the faith'. See David R. Hauser, 'Medea's Strain and Hermes' Wand: Pope's Use of Mythology', *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 76, No. 3 (Mar., 1961), pp. 224-229.

<sup>33</sup> Interestingly the Oxford English Dictionary states that this usage in English as not first recorded until 1635, when 'mid-night oyle' is compared to 'mid-night sweat' by F. Quarles in *Emblemes*. As Moryson intends, the sense meaning is to work 'diligently and conscientiously'. See "midnight, n. and adj.". Oxford English Dictionary Online. June 2011. Oxford University Press. 21 June 2011  
<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/118217?redirectedFrom=midnight%20oil>.

<sup>34</sup> Marten van Heemskerck's "Momus Criticizing the Works of the Gods": See David Cast, 'A Problem of Erasmian Iconography', *Simoius: Netherland's Quarterly for the History of Art*, Vol. 7, 1974, pp. 1-2. The image this text decodes is a representation of Momus facetiously criticising the artistic merits of Hephaestus, Poseidon, and Athena respectively.

disdaine, will become such a Mome, as to be a Momus of Poetry'.<sup>35</sup> Similarly, in Jonson's *Poetaster*, Momus is linked with 'matterie sentences', an inability to recognise and appreciate high art and intellect.<sup>36</sup>

This understanding of the function of Momus helps to decode the mention of Mercury's wand, a device to provide illumination to those lacking in it. The contention of the Latin Dedication is that the blind, spiteful attacks of critics will strike home no matter what the defence. Moryson was clearly eager that Pembroke extend the protection of his name. Patrons had an important role to play in defending the work of their clients, particularly in the case of contentious publications, such as travel narratives. Moryson's contemporary, Thomas Coryate, wrote in his dedication to the Prince of Wales that he feared 'to heare some Momus obiecting unto me'.<sup>37</sup> Moryson evidently feared the potential impact of satirists and critics, particularly in the aftermath of the well-publicised reception of the *Crudities*, which occurred in 1611, at least a year before the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* went through its final stage of editing.<sup>38</sup>

Although Moryson also asks for Pembroke's 'protection' in the English Dedication, this request is linked to his estimation of the work, which he perceives to be flawed. In the Latin, Moryson is instead articulating a fear that his work will be

---

<sup>35</sup> Sir Philip Sidney, *An apology for poetry: or, The defence of poesie*, Geoffrey Shepard (ed.) (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1973), p. 142.

<sup>36</sup> Ernest William Talbert, 'The Purpose and Technique of Jonson's "Poetaster"', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Apr., 1945), pp. 225-252.

<sup>37</sup> In the end, Coryate was abandoned by his patron, who ordered that his work, the *Crudities*, could only be published with the addition of over 150 quarto pages of satirical verses mocking the author. See Thomas Coryat, *Coryats Crudities; Hastily gobled vp in five Moneths trauels in France, Sauoy, Italy, Rhetia commonly called the Grisons country, Heluetia aliàs Switzerland, some parts of high Germany, and the Netherlands; newly digested in the hungry aire of Odcombe in the county of Somerset, & now dispersed to the nourishment of the traueiling members of this kingdome*, (London: William Stansby, 1611), Dedication, Sig:B.

<sup>38</sup> See Case Study 3: The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* was likely to have been reviewed around 1612-1613.

subject to malicious critical attacks, a quite different concern. This indicates that he felt the reception of the Latin work would differ to that of the English. In the Latin Dedication, Moryson then moves on to discuss the work itself:

Sunt qui lucubrationibus suis aeternitatem pollicentur eiusque participationem Patronis etiam se impertiri posse confidunt, sed nec me caecus amor mei[ita] <sic> fascinavit, ut hoc opus cum Minerva Phidiae in summa arce collocatum iri sperem: nec tu, qui pro publica re excubias agens Mausoleum in dies magnificentius tibi extruis suffulcro tam imbecilli, quo nominis tui splendor nitatur, eges.

There are those who promise eternal fame to their nocturnal writings, and are even confident they can bestow it upon their patrons, but my senses have never been bewitched by any such blind self love, to think that this work be set up high along with the Minerva of Phidias: nor do you, whose vigilance on behalf of the nation is daily raising a magnificent memorial to yourself, need so weak a prop to support the glory of your name.

Moryson contends that Pembroke's memorial will be a 'Mausoleum' of intellect and wisdom, an edifice founded in the glory of his name. He links this with an estimation of his own work, which he compares unfavourably to the 'Minerva' of Phidias.<sup>39</sup> Moryson employs classical analogies in the Latin which he does not risk in the English, perhaps considering that the inference would be lost on a vernacular audience. Rather than speaking of Solomon, a biblical figure familiar to a Protestant English readership, he alludes to Phidias, the greatest sculptor of classical times. This, and the other classical allusions Moryson presents in the

---

<sup>39</sup> Moryson's contention is that his work represents an honourable addition to this 'mausoleum', but that it will not enjoy the same exalted status as Phidias' sculpture of Minerva (Athena) in the Parthenon.

Latin Dedication, provide clear evidence of a different rhetorical strategy, possibly intended for a distinct audience, familiar with the analogies Moryson makes.

Moryson's description of the 'Mausoleum' or 'monument' of glory that Pembroke's name evokes bears comparison with the English Dedication, in which Moryson seeks to shelter his work under the superstructure of Pembroke patronage, 'knowing that the weakest frames need strongest supporters'.<sup>40</sup>

Although distinct from the English, there are points of contact between the two versions. In both the Latin and the English versions, Moryson explicitly states that he will devote himself to Pembroke's faction. In the English, the terms of this connection are mediated through what Moryson calls 'private affection', an affiliation which rests on Pembroke's relationship with his brother and former patron, Mountjoy.

In the Latin, Moryson instead states that the dedication of his work will itself function as a testament to his loyalty. He uses an analogy from *Orlando Furioso*, likening the carvings of Angelica's name Medorus makes on the bark of individual trees with the perhaps futile gesture of dedicating his work to an eminent patron such as Pembroke: 'et Medorus Angelicae, nomen singulis arborum corticibus insculpens'.<sup>41</sup> This complicated analogy is not transposed to the English

Dedication. Quite possibly this decision is again founded in Moryson's estimation

---

<sup>40</sup> Fynes Moryson, *An Itinerary*, Dedication to William, Earl of Pembroke, unmarked leaf.

<sup>41</sup> The full passage reads: 'Humilius sapiunt & rectius (me censore) faciunt, qui inveteratae consuetudini se hac in parte obsequi, ac devoti solummodo animi testimonium exhibere profitentur. Nam si non praemium certe excusationem meretur, quod consuetudine semel invaluit, et Medorus Angelicae, (tot Heroum amore celebris) nomen singulis arborum corticibus insculpens, eius si famam nihilo auctiorem, certe amorem suum abunde testatum reliquit', or, 'They are more humble and (in my judgment) act more correctly, who confess what they profess, being in ingrained custom a testimony of obedience to your faction, and of the devotion of their spirit. For this, confirmed by custom, deserves at the least excuse, if not reward, as Medorus (beloved amongst celebrated heroes) who carved the name of Angelica onto the bark of individual trees, though he left his own fame no more celebrated, at least testified in abundance to his love'.

of the Latin readership, an intellectual, cultured elite who could accurately decode this imagery. In particular, the reference to an Italian text may have been expected to have a greater resonance for a cultivated Latinate audience in England and on the continent.<sup>42</sup>

Moryson concludes the Latin Dedication by presenting a far more elaborate version of the testament of loyalty he offers Pembroke in the English version. Moryson first employs a religious analogy, contending that God, the author of all good things, 'authori omnium bonum', is influenced by sacrifices made to him. Tellingly, these sacrifices are, however, insignificant, as Moryson adds a clause that defines these material possessions as the rightful property of God, 'vel ex suo'. Moryson seems to be implying that the work he sacrifices to Pembroke functions as a gesture of good faith, an offering that although insignificant still testifies to his loyalty. Moryson builds upon this theme throughout the conclusion to the dedication. He first links his devotion to Pembroke with his past dedication to Mountjoy:

Huic itaque mori ego more gerens te potissimum operi meo Patronum exopto: et post defunctum Dominum ac Herum (pia semper memoria mihi colendum) te orbitatis meae defensorem unice ambiens, hanc qualemcunque devoti erga te obsequii testandi occasionem libenter arripio.

Therefore following this established custom I choose you as the most powerful patron of my work: after the death of my Lord and Master (whose memory I will always cherish) seeking to obtain you alone as the protector

---

<sup>42</sup> Although this text had a wide reception, and was translated into English in 1591, by John Harrington. John Harrington, *Orlando Furioso* (Richard Field: London, 1591).

of my bereavement , and I seize this opportunity to testify my obedience to you.

This section, the penultimate sentence of the Latin Dedication, echoes the contention of the English version, that Moryson has been left abandoned by the unexpected death of Mountjoy ‘post defunctum Dominum ac Herum’, ‘after the demise of my Lord and Master’. However, unlike in the English Dedication, Moryson goes into far more detail about this connection, asking for protection in his ‘orbatis’, or ‘bereavement’. Moryson is in essence abasing himself before his ‘Potissimum Patronum’, or ‘most powerful patron’, perhaps indicating that he is publicly transferring his factional loyalties from his deceased patron Mountjoy to Pembroke.<sup>43</sup>

The sense that Moryson is stating he is forced by circumstance to throw himself on Pembroke’s mercy is confirmed by the final sentence, and in particular the use of two terms, ‘obsequii’, and ‘vernam’. One might expect a firm etymological link with the modern ‘obsequious’, a sense of fawning or flattering. However the term has the contemporary meaning of one who is ‘ready to do as one should have him, pliant and obedient’.<sup>44</sup> Moryson joins this term to the use of ‘vernam’, which gives a true sense of abasement, meaning one’s ‘house born slave’. Indeed, the construction ‘et meipsum in vernam dedo’ may be translated as a ‘I surrender (myself) to you as your house born slave’.

---

<sup>43</sup> The superlative ‘Potissimum’ may also be translated as ‘eminent’, or principal, and this construction may also have a parallel in Pembroke’s estimation in the English version as a man of ‘eminent worth’.

<sup>44</sup> Thomas Thomas, *Thomae Thomasii dictionarium summâ fide ac diligentia accuratissimè emendatum, magnâque insuper rerum scitu dignarum, & vocabulorumaccessione, longè auctiùs locupletiusque redditum: huic etiàm (praeter dictionarium historicum & poëticum etc* (Cambridge: John Legat, 1600), ‘obsequis’, Sig. Dd.

This is also the most common contemporary English use of the term. It is used in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, for example ‘I see that you are obsequious in your loue’. See “obsequious, adj.”. Oxford English Dictionary Online. June 2011. Oxford University Press. 21 June 2011 <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/129863?redirectedFrom=obsequious>>.

The powerful sense of humility that Moryson expresses in the Latin has no real parallel in the English Dedication, which instead presents a different argument, a contention that the connections of family and patronage that bind Moryson to Pembroke will ensure the Dedication is accepted. This represents just one of the many differences between the two versions, illustrating that they are distinct texts. Although at points each employs similar devices, such as the refrain of Moryson's 'bereavement', these are articulated quite differently. The Latin version is complex, fluid and elaborate, an intelligent and articulate text designed for a classically educated audience. It is host to a number of classical allusions that Moryson did not include in the vernacular; references to Ajax, Mercury, Momus and the sculptor Phidias. In contrast, the English is plain and unadorned, and uses only one analogy, a Biblical reference that would be familiar to a vernacular Protestant audience. The texts also seem to express different interpretations of the work they introduce. The English, for example, is conscious that the work it prefaces is flawed, and perhaps incomplete. In contrast, the Latin anticipates critical attack, a fear perhaps influenced by the negative reception to Coryate's *Crudities*. The extent of these differences demonstrates that the two versions of the Dedication were surely intended to introduce distinct editions of the work.

### Case Study 5: The Table of Contents

This case study will investigate the differences between the printed Table of Contents and the Latin version in manuscript. Although the two are not completely distinct there are a number of significant points of divergence. The extent of this divergence will be investigated in what follows. The Table of Contents is integral to both the printed *Itenerary* and the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, a reference tool that allows the reader to draw the full benefit from the work. It serves to organise what would otherwise be a vast and confusing work, by subdividing the contents into four parts. In the printed Table of Contents, the first three parts are fully described, and a précis of the fourth part is given. In the Latin, all four parts are fully described.

In both manuscript and print each part that is described has been divided into individual 'bookes' in the Table of Contents. These books each have a separate function. For example, in the first part to the work, each book details a separate sequence of journeys within a specific geographical area: Book 1 describes travels through what Moryson terms 'the empire of Germany' and the Low Countries, Book 2 is an account of Moryson's time in Italy and return to England, and Book 3 depicts the final stage of Moryson's travels, across Europe to the Levant and back. Each book is then subdivided into chapters. Individual chapters represent a set stage of a journey, or a distinct attempt to relate historical or practical information. For example, in the printed *Itenerary*, Chapter 4 of Part 1, Book 1, covers Moryson's first period of travel through the Low Countries, a distinct

geographical area; Chapter 1 of Part 1, Book 2, details means of travel, and how to hire coaches and horses.<sup>1</sup>

The Table of Contents is ordered in a way that suggests Moryson intended it to function as a reference tool that would allow the reader of the complete work to unlock the text, and draw full benefit from it. For example, a reader interested in Germany could first turn to the description of Moryson's travels through this region in Part 1, Book 1, Chapter 1. The reader could then qualify this account by reference to Moryson's observations on the clothes and vestments of the German people in Part 3, Book 4, Chapter 1, the history of the nation in Part 3, Book 4, Chapter 4 and his record of the country's customs, traditions and achievements in the liberal arts in Part 4, Book 4, Chapter 1 (though, of course, all four parts were never published together in either English or Latin).

In both the *Itenerary* and the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* the Table of Contents facilitated this kind of interaction with the text, as Moryson makes clear in the printed 'Address to the Reader':

If contemplative men shall reade it at leasure, making choice of the subjects fitting their humours, by the Table of the Contents, and casting away the booke when they are weary of reading, perhaps they may find some delight  
(*Itenerary*, 'Address to the Reader')

Moryson recognised that the Table of Contents was integral to the interpretation of the work, and therefore any changes made to it are significant. The Latin and English Table of Contents both present very similar descriptions of the first three parts to the work. Both works are divided into parallel books and chapters, with

---

<sup>1</sup> *Itenerary*, Table of Contents, unmarked leaf.

divergence limited to minor differences in the wording of chapter descriptions.<sup>2</sup> There is, however, a significant difference in how the contents of the fourth part to the work are presented. In the printed English version, the anticipated contents of the fourth part are not divided into individual books and chapters, but instead presented as a list of 25 anticipated chapters, under the following title:

The Table

The rest of this VVorke, not yet as fully finished,

treateth of the following heads

It is clear from this description that the fourth part to the work has been omitted as it has not been completed. Instead, Moryson lists the anticipated content, perhaps as a form of advertisement for a further work he was intending to print. In contrast, there is no acknowledgement in the Latin Table of Contents that the fourth part is unfinished. Instead, the contents to the fourth part are presented exactly as the three preceding parts; as a fully realised section, divided into individual books and chapters. Unlike the 25 planned chapters listed in the English, the Latin fourth part contains a total of 31 chapters, which are further divided into five separate books.

There is nothing in the Latin Table of Contents which might explain this disparity.

Moryson does, however, offer a description of the four parts to the work on f.2 of

---

<sup>2</sup> There are a number of other slight differences throughout, largely confined to small changes in the wording of Chapter contents. For example in Book 3, Part 3 of the Latin Table of Contents, the chapter description is considerably more effusive than the printed English equivalent. The English description is brief, a short sentence of just 14 words. 'Chap 3. Of the Opinions of old Writers, and some Prouerbs themselves, or of diuers Nations and Prouince'. In contrast, the Latin is 28 words, and although the sense of the description remains the same, new content is introduced. The additions do not add detail to the content, merely ornament. As an example, the English version describes 'diuers nations', whereas the Latin speaks of 'the various nations known unto mankind', 'uariis Nationibus in ore hominum'.

the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, which provides additional information about the status of the fourth part:

Tres partes author latina lingua completas et quartam in laceris chartis mutilam seposuit, cum easdem potius Anglico sermone primum scribendas et excudendas (mutato priori consilio) apud se statueret. Et hanc quartam Partem, laceris et mutilis quas dixi chartis usus multos post annos ex Anglico sermone in Latinum traduxit.<sup>3</sup>

The author left three complete parts written in Latin and the fourth one in damaged form, on torn pieces of paper, when he decided (contrary to his previous plan) to instead write and print these in English first. As for this fourth part, for which he used the aforementioned damaged and torn sheets, he translated it from English into Latin many years later.

In this description, Moryson suggests that the fourth part to the work is not fit to be printed as it is ‘torn and damaged’ paper. This term repeats the language Moryson uses in the *Itenerary* to describe an early draft of his work, which he says is ‘confused and torn’.<sup>4</sup> It also bears comparison with the harsh language he uses in the printed ‘Address to the Reader’ to describe the historical studies he was forced to ‘suppress’.<sup>5</sup> The fourth part may resemble this early work, which Moryson was working on in 1597, or it may in fact refer to the historical studies, which seem similar to the national biographies Moryson intended to present in the fourth part. Either way, it seems certain that the work was not finished as it was damaged. The exact term Moryson uses, ‘laceris’ is a curious word to use in this context, carrying a strong sense of the contemporary English construction,

---

<sup>3</sup> Note: This description is also presented in the Introduction to the Analysis.

<sup>4</sup> *Itenerary*, Part II, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Itenerary*, ‘Address to the Reader’, unmarked leaf.

laceration.<sup>6</sup> This suggests physical damage to the papers; they may have been mislaid, destroyed by Moryson, or suffered as a result of the environment in which they were stored.

There is no consensus on why Moryson only printed the first three parts to the work, when it seems clear that this would damage its reception.<sup>7</sup> The passage quoted above may explain why the fourth part was not incorporated into the *Itenerary* when it was printed in 1617. The physical damage that Moryson describes may be reflected in how the anticipated fourth part is presented in the English Table of Contents, a simple list of 'heads' or chapter titles. This does not, however, explain why the Latin Table of Contents is so different, divided into individual books and chapters. It may be that the fourth part had been completed in Latin, but not finished in English. In the description on f.2, Moryson describes how this section was 'translated from the (original) English into Latin many years later, 'multos post annos ex Anglico sermone in Latinum traduxit'. It may be that Moryson added additional material during the translation process, correcting the damage he describes.

Whatever the reason for this divergence, there is a clear difference between the contents of the English fourth part and the Latin. In the printed version, the first 11 chapters are concerned with descriptions of the states visited, along with historical introductions:

---

<sup>6</sup> It is used, for example, to connote physical damage in John Donne's sermons. See "laceration, n.". Oxford English Dictionary Online. June 2011. Oxford University Press. 21 June 2011  
<<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/Entry/104798?redirectedFrom=laceration>>.

<sup>7</sup> Both Hughes and Kew contend that Moryson did not enjoy the financial rewards he anticipated from the publication of the *Itenerary*, and so did not subsequently publish the fourth part. This does not, however, explain why it went unpublished in the first instance. See Hughes, p. lxi. & Kew, p. xlv.

I containe an historicall introduction, the Kings Pedegree and Court, the present state of the things, the Tributes and Reuenues, the military power for Horse, Foot, and Nauy, the Courts of Iustice, rare Lawes, more specially those of Inheritance and Dowries, and Contracts for mariage, the Capitoll or Criminal Iudgments, and the diversitie of degrees in Families and the Commonwealth.<sup>8</sup>

The Latin differs. In the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, these national descriptions span a total of 13 chapters, divided into two separate books. The two sections are also ordered differently. For example, the first chapter listed in English concerns ‘the Commonwealth of Denmark’. In contrast, the Latin first presents a description of ‘De Turcarum Republica’, or the Turkish Commonwealth.<sup>9</sup> In the English printed *Itinerary*, the parallel description of ‘the commonwealth of the Turkish Empire’ has instead been placed in Chapter 7. Similarly, in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, the description of Denmark has also been relegated, to Chapter 2 of Book 2. This represents a considerable structural change. It is possibly linked to the anticipated readerships for each version of the text. The printed *Itinerary*, translated into English, would be intended for a native audience. The Latin version of this text would be intended for a Latinate English and continental audience. A description of Denmark, a trade partner and regional power, would have greater relevance to

---

<sup>8</sup> The same information is presented in Latin, although the wording differs slightly. ‘succinctam historiae introductionem, Genaologiam Imperatoris, et Aulam Rerum presentem Statum, Tributa, [et] reditusque, militarem, tam Equestrem quam Pedestrem, et Navalem, uris Dicendi curias, Dotisque uxoriae ura, fiducia Capitalia, variosque tam in familia, quam Republica hominum gradu’ or ‘I gather together a historical introduction, the Genealogy of the King and Court, the present state of things, tributes and revenues, the power of horse, foot and navy, curious laws, including those of dowries and marriage, capital judgments, and the diversity of degrees in families and the commonwealth’.

<sup>9</sup> *Republicum* is a neo-Latin construction, defining a nation state: there is no such definition in classical Latin. This definition is not present in Thomas Thomas’ Latin-English dictionary. Thomas Thomas, *Thomae Thomasi dictionarium summâ fide ac diligentia accuratissimè emendatum, magnâque insuper rerum scitu dignarum, & vocabulorum accessione, longè auctiùs locupletiusque redditum: huic etiàm (praeter dictionarium historicum & poëticum etc* (Cambridge: John Legat, 1600).

an English audience. A description of Turkey, geographically distant but extremely powerful on the world stage, would be of greater interest to an anticipated continental readership.

Following the first chapter both the Latin and English versions of the Table of Contents present a description of Poland in Chapter 2. The printed version of the Table of Contents then lists 4 chapters which focus on Italy and the Italian city states:

Chap 3. Of the Commonwealth of Italy, touching the historicall introduction, the Princes pedegrees, the Papall dominion, and the late power of the King of Spaine, with some other subiects of the first Chapter.

Chap 4. Of the particular Commonwealth of Venice, touching most of the foresaid subiects.

Chap 5. The Commonwealth of the Duke of Florence, the Cities of Lucca and Genoa, with the Dukes of Urbino and Mantoua.

Chap 6. Of the Commonwealth of Italy in generall: touching the rest of the heads which belong to the generall state of Italy, rather then of any part thereof.

In contrast, this information spans 6 chapters in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, Chapters 3-8 of Book 1. In the Latin, chapter 3 represents a full description of the whole peninsula of Italy, considered as a single entity, like the preceding national descriptions of Turkey and Poland. In the printed work, the third chapter conflates this with a description of the 'Papall dominion, and the late power of the King of

Spaine, with some other subjects of the first Chapter'.<sup>10</sup> This material is instead presented in the fourth chapter in the Latin, concerning 'De Republica Italia...de Papali Domino, et de novo Hispanorum in Italia Domino'.<sup>11</sup>

Following this, both texts allot a single chapter to Venice, Chapter 4 in print and 5 in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, and each contains a digression on the general state of Italy, with particular regard to powerful city states and significant potentates. This is represented in chapter 6 of the printed version, and chapter 8 in the manuscript. However, the texts again differ in regard to the descriptions of the Dukedoms of Florence, Urbino and Mantua, and the Cities of Lucca and Genoa. Whilst the printed version contains all five descriptions within a single chapter, in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* this information spans chapters 6 and 7. Chapter 6 concerns 'De Florentini Ducatus Domino et...Libera Civitatis Luccae', or, 'the Dominion of the Duke of Florence and the free City of Lucca', whilst chapter 7 describes 'De Genoa Civitate Liberii, et De Ducis Mantuam, Et Ducis Urbinatum', or the 'Dukedom of Mantua and the Dukedom of Urbino'.

Italy is given considerably greater prominence in the Latin than the English. In Latin, 6 of the first 8 chapters are devoted to Italy, whilst just 4 of the chapters given in print focus on this topic. Furthermore, in the Latin these Italian descriptions are contained within the first chapter, which contains only two other national descriptions, that of Poland and Turkey. This may reflect the anticipated continental audience of the *Itinerarium*. The Latin, with its focus on affairs of pan-continental importance, would logically place greater prominence on the politically and culturally powerful Italian city states, the potent military culture of the Poles and the feared Ottoman Empire. The inclusion of the three power blocs

---

<sup>10</sup> See Appendix A, Item 5.

<sup>11</sup> See Appendix A, Item 5.

in the planned first book is of interest. The Italian city states, principally Venice and Genoa, resisted the Turks in the Eastern Mediterranean. The Poles opposed them on land. It is hard to escape the conclusion that Moryson is presenting a review of the general European political situation for a continental readership.

Following this section, which represents Book 1 in the Latin and Chapters 1-6 in the English, Chapters 7-11 listed in the English *Itinerary* cover the 'commonwealths' of the Ottomans, France, England, Scotland and Ireland. In the Latin, the five chapters of the second book are an exact parallel, although as previously discussed, the national description of the Turks is exchanged for that of Denmark in print. In both the English and Latin version this description of the five commonwealths is followed by a series of chapters which focus on the religious beliefs of the nations described. In the English version, this section comprises descriptions of twelve nations, on matters 'touching religion':

Chap 12. Of Germany touching Religion.

Chap 13. Of Bohemerland, Sweitzerland, the united Prouinces of Netherland, of Denmark and Poland, touching Religion.

Chap 14. Of Italy touching Religion.

Chap 15. Of the Turkish Empire touching Religion.

Chap 16. Of France, England, Scotland and Ireland touching Religion.

In the Latin, this information is represented in exactly the same fashion in Book 3, except that an additional chapter is anticipated. The description of the religious practices of 'Bohemia' is allotted its own distinct chapter. In the English version, this is instead incorporated into Chapter 13, which conflates it with descriptions of

'Sweitzerland, the united Prouinces of Netherland...Denmark (and) Poland'. This is an interesting difference, as this places Bohemia on an equal footing with the other, far larger nations allotted an individual chapter; Germany, the Turks and Italy. Taken alone, the omission of Bohemia from the English could be considered an incidental oversight, but the alteration merits investigation, as it corresponds to the exclusion of the section regarding religious tolerance in Bohemia on f.41v.<sup>12</sup> Moryson removed this material from the English printed *Itinerary*, but may have felt that he would be excused a more explicit focus on Bohemia in a Latin continental publication.

Following this Chapters 17-25 in the English correspond to the contents of Book 4 and 5 in the Latin. However, the correlation is not exact, as this material is presented in just 9 chapters in the English, whereas it spans 13 chapters in the Latin. In the English, this section presents social and cultural expositions of fifteen different peoples:

Chap 17. Of the Germans nature, wit, manners, bodily gifts, Vniversities, Sciences, Arts, language, pompous Ceremonies, specially at Marriages, Christenings and Funerals: of their customes, sports, exercises, and particularly hunting.

Chap 18. Of the Bohemians, Sweitzers and Netherlanders of the united Prouinces, their nature, wits and manners & c.

Chap 19. Of the Danes and Polonians nature & c.

Chap 20. Of the Italians nature, wit & c.

Chap 21. Of the Turkes nature & c.

---

<sup>12</sup> See Case Study 3.

Chap 22. Of the Frenchmens nature & c.

Chap 23. Of the Englishmens nature & c.

Chap 24. Of the Scotchmens and Irishmens natures, wits, manners & c.

Chap 25. A generall, but briefe discourse of the Iewes, the Grecians, and the Moscovites.

In the English printed *Itinerary*, the Germans, Italians, Turks, French and English are distinguished by an individual chapter. In the Latin, every nation mentioned above is allotted an individual chapter, with the exception of the final chapter of Book 5, which presents a description of the 'Jewes' and 'Grecians': 'de Judeiis et Graecis'.<sup>13</sup> However, in the English a description of the 'Moscovites' is also presented. This is not included in the Latin. The inclusion of a section on the 'Muscovites' in the English is of interest, as Moryson never travelled into Eurasia, not venturing any further east than Poland. As he has no personal knowledge to impart, Moryson may be responding to a contemporary interest in the culture. Again, as with the preceding section, the Latin contains a distinct chapter on Bohemia, whereas in the English this description has been conflated with that of the 'Sweitzers and Netherlanders of the united Prouinces'. These differences illustrate a distinct focus. The Latin is concerned with presenting a more comprehensive description of Europe, whereas the English has a more modest aim, tending descriptions of nations deemed to be of principal importance, and removing potentially troublesome lines of enquiry into nations such as 'Bohemia'.

This section, comprised of Books 4-5 in the Latin, and Chapters 17-25 in the English is also marked by a textual difference in the descriptions of the nations

---

<sup>13</sup> For details, see Appendix A, Item 5.

presented. The Latin description presents additional information, not transposed to the English:

*Itenerary:*

The...nature, wit, manners, bodily gifts, Vniversities, Sciences, Arts, language, pompous Ceremonies, especially at Marriages, Christenings and Funerals: of their customes, sports, exercises, and particularly hunting.

*Itinerarium Pars Prima:*

De...natura et moribus corporum robore, et ingeniorum acumine, De mechanicis artibus et liberalibus scientiis apud eos florentibus, de Academiis, de lingua, de ceremoniarum pompa praesertim in nuptiis, puerperiis infantibus baptizandis, et mortuorum funeribus. De variis consuetudinibus recreationibus exercitiis, praesertim, venatione, aucupiis, et piscatione.

The...nature, customs, bodily strengths, and ingenious nature, the mechanical arts and sciences, the flourishing of the liberal arts, universities, language, pompous ceremonies especially in marriages, baptising of newly born infants and funerals for the dead. Their various customs, recreations and exercises, especially hunting, fowling and fishing.

The Latin presents a more elaborated description than the English.<sup>14</sup> The populations under analysis are also defined in terms of the ‘flourishing’ of the Liberal Arts, ‘et liberalibus scientiis apud eos florentibus’. The former, no doubt

---

<sup>14</sup> The text of the Latin description is far closer to that of the extant English manuscript to Part 4 than to the *Itenerary*. Notably the order of this manuscript is also exactly the same as that given in the Latin Table of Contents. Kew dates this manuscript to 1620, so its composition may well have been informed by reference to a preceding Latin version of Part 4. Kew, p. 1200 & pp. 1-8 (Contents to Part 4).

reliant on a traditional Senecan definition of the 'Liberalibus scientiis', would incorporate the study of rhetoric, grammar, arithmetic, music, astronomy, and other expected accrements of an educated gentleman. It is noteworthy that this is not transposed to the English, suggesting again that Moryson was trying to access or appeal to an educated continental audience in the *Itinerarium*.

It is clear that the contents of the fourth part listed in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* have a number of significant points of divergence from the English version. The English version merely refers to a list of indefinite titles, 'the following heads', and does not break the fourth part down into dedicated books and chapters. In contrast, the Latin represents a fully organised 'Pars Quarta', organised into books and chapters. Further, the Latin version of 'Pars Quarta' contains six additional chapters. The difference between the two versions is not limited to how they are ordered. The Latin has a greater focus on Italy, the Italian city states, Turkey and other regional powers. The description of the social traits of each nation also differs, and is more elaborate in the Latin. In contrast, the English has a focus on matters closer to home, first presenting a description of Denmark, and removing material that may have been politically contentious, such as the description of matters 'touching religion' in Bohemia.

It is difficult to find a definite logic behind these differences. It is possible that the additional content anticipated in the Latin may reflect material that is not present in the vernacular version of Part 4. Moryson confirms on f.2 of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* that 'Pars Quarta' was first written in English and then translated into Latin, so it may be that additional content was introduced during this process. It may also be that the difference in actual or anticipated content reflects a different

conception of the Latin and English versions of the work. Although the Latin contains six additional chapters, the differences between the two version are not limited to content omitted from the English, which contains a description of the 'Muscovites' not present in the Latin. It may be that these differences represent a conscious attempt to position each work for a different audience.

### Case Study 6: The 'Address to the Reader'

This Case Study will present and consider the differences between the Latin and English versions of the 'Address to the Reader'. Although both texts are of approximately the same length, the content of each is fundamentally different.<sup>1</sup> As with the Dedication, the two versions represent completely distinct texts, and so it is not possible to compare them as 'original' and 'translation'. They discuss different topics, have a different focus, and present different arguments, perhaps positioned for distinct readerships. The Latin 'Address to the Reader' occupies ff. 4-5 of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. It has been placed after the title page, dedication, and the incomplete table of contents to the anticipated first and second parts to the work.<sup>2</sup> The extract begins 'Lectori Salutem', or greetings to the reader, and it is written in the primary hand, that of Isaac Pywall, with authorial corrections in Fynes Moryson's hand.<sup>3</sup>

The English version occupies two folio pages of the *Itinerary*, but unlike the Latin, has been placed before the Table of Contents. This may be as the English 'Address to the Reader' has the partial function of explaining the text that follows, allowing the reader to correctly interpret and utilise the Table of Contents. The English version opens quite differently to the Latin:

For the first part of this Worke, it containes only a briefe narration of the daily iournies, with the rates of Coaches or Horses hired, the expences for horses and man's meat, the soyle of the Country, the situation of Townes,

---

<sup>1</sup> The Latin version runs to 729 words, the English 939. In my translations, the ratio of the first sentence is 34: 32 (Latin to English) and the second 29:54, 1:1 and 3:5.

<sup>2</sup> The incomplete table is entitled *IN Quatuor Partes divisum*, which would seem to indicate four planned sections.

<sup>3</sup> Addition of *lectores* between *huiusmodi* and *scire* in line folio 4, 18. *Vita quod* amended to *vita qo quod* in f. 4: 19. Insertion of *adhuc* between *dum* and *viveret* in f4v: 2. Insertion of *haec* between *mihi* and *expereundi* in f. 5v: 6.

and the descriptions thereof; together with all things there worthy to be seene: which Treatise in some obscure places is barren and unpleasant (esppecially in the first beginning of the worke,) but in other places I hope you will iudge it more pleasant, and in some delightfull, inducing you fauorably to dispence with the barrennes of the former, inserted only for the vse of vnexperienced Trauellers passing those waies.

Moryson begins by explaining the first section of the work, and in part, excusing it. He describes it as a pragmatic, functional text, which seems intended to have some practical utility to the 'vnexperienced' traveller. He stipulates exactly what the reader will draw from the first part of the text: 'a briefe narration of the daily iournies, with the rates of Coaches or Horses hired, the expences for horses and man's meat...etc'. This narrative, Moryson warns, will no doubt prove 'barren and unpleasant'. This almost obstinate pragmatism is a feature of the English 'Address to the Reader' as a whole. Moryson's specific concern is to present his text as useful, as having a directly practical function. It is meant to be employed by those planning a period of travel, or travelling themselves. This is similar to a contention made in the 'Address to the Reader' in *Purchas his Pilgrimes*. Travel is deemed 'useful for useful men'.<sup>4</sup> In his presentation of the *Itenerary*, Moryson categorises himself as one of these 'useful men'. In the English version the work is positioned as having some utility to the intended readership, written not to entertain, but to instruct.

In contrast, the opening to the Latin 'Address to the Reader' has a completely different focus:

---

<sup>4</sup> See Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his Pilgrimes*, I (London: William Stansby for H. Fetherstone, 1613) 'Address to the Reader', unmarked leaf.

Si cuius haec a me scripta prosint, speratam mercedem finemque operi praepositum feliciter assequutus sum, si quis utilitatem hinc haustam agnoscat, is gratitudinis non vulgare encomium, et suarum lucubrationum parem laudem merebitur.

If only this composition of mine would be of use to anybody, I will achieve the reward I have hoped for and the goal I have set out for this work. If anybody at all finds the fruits of my midnight toil to be of use to him, then he should be praised for his gratitude, and equally praised for his own labour.<sup>5</sup>

Whilst both the Latin version and the English are concerned that the work be perceived as useful or of practical value, the means by which this intent is expressed are quite different. This particular concern, that the text may be received as useful, is echoed in the Latin, but the way that Moryson expresses this is far more artful. He intends the Latin 'Address to the Reader' to build a relationship with the anticipated audience, instead of bluntly warning them of its 'barren, unpleasant' nature. Rather than explaining, and apologising for the pragmatic information bound into the narrative, he states that the reader will 'reward' him fully by appreciating, or even merely using the text. Moryson states that he will be satisfied if anybody at all finds the work useful, and that the reader in turn shall be 'praised for his gratitude', should he do so. This construction replicates the logic of the English 'Address to the Reader', but presents the information in a far more subtle and effective manner.

---

<sup>5</sup> lucubrationum: The exact translation of this term is 'working by lamplight', or the modern 'burning the midnight oil.'

The first third of the English 'Address to the Reader' is devoted to describing the first part of the work in detail. This section of the *Itinerary* seems to have concerned Moryson, possibly because he felt that it was burdened with an excess of practical information. Moryson has particular misgivings over the references to European currency that he makes throughout the first part of the work. In the English 'Address to the Reader', he attempts to explain this:

Thirdly and lastly, touching the First Part of this VVorke, when you read my expences in vnknowne Coynes, you may iustly require the explaining of this obscurity, by expression of the values in the English Coynes. But I pray you to consider, that the adding of these seuerall values in each daies iourny, had been an Herculean labour; for auoiding whereof, I haue first set before the First Part, a briefe Table expressing the value of the small Coynes most commonly spent.

The table of small coins is mentioned immediately after the section of the 'Address to the Reader' that deals with the practical aspects of the *Itinerary*. Although Moryson attempts to categorise the table as an adjunct to this section, it is sufficiently aberrant for him to describe it as an 'obscurity'. The term denotes recognition that the table is an unfortunate necessity. Without prefacing the first part of the *Itinerary* with a currency exchange table, the recording of thousands of expenses would be rendered useless. This is also attended to in the Latin version where Moryson describes the 'largam omnium monetarum...collationem,' or 'extended comparision of every sort of money'. The coins recorded are meticulously ordered 'pro valore', according to their value, echoing the concern in the English that they be understood to be of practical use.

However, although both versions of the 'Address to the Reader' attend to the presentation of this table, the concern is articulated differently. In the English version, the matter of 'expences' is first mentioned in the opening sentence, line 2. In contrast, the Latin version addresses this in the final third of the 'Address to the Reader'.<sup>6</sup> These structural differences have an important impact on how each version reads. Practical considerations are addressed in the Latin version, but only after an attempt has been made to engage with the reader, and after a number of different introductory arguments have been advanced. These structural changes mean that in the Latin, the recourse to practical matters functions as an appendage to the text, rather than its primary focus. The opening to the English 'Address to the Reader' both gives a practical explanation of and to a certain extent excuses the work. In contrast, the introduction to the Latin version is concerned not with practical matters, but with the intellectual interpretation of the text:

At me non latet, quam de variis nationibus per subiecta varia liberius paulo scripserim, et quam adhuc magis varia sint hominum ingenia, ita ut iis in universo opere, multoque minus in singulis subiectis, placere desperem.

It has not escaped my notice that I perhaps could have written more liberally on different subjects concerning different nations. In addition to this, the natural intelligence of men varies greatly. I despair of ever appeasing everyone in my whole work, and it will be even harder to do so in its separate parts.

---

<sup>6</sup> This section of the Latin 'Address to the Reader' bears the closest similarity with the English. It also reproduces Moryson's description of the anticipated reader 'iuuenibus inexpertis' or 'unexperienced young men'.

This statement is quite different to the opinions expressed in the English 'Address to the Reader'. Moryson is not concerned with whether the work will be understood, and used effectively, but whether the 'diversity' of topics will appease the informed reader. Rather than listing these topics, or explaining them, as with the English, he instead offers his conception of the problems of authorship; that no one work can ever please a diverse readership. In particular, it may be contended that Moryson is anticipating the problem of addressing a Latinate readership, potentially encompassing many different cultures and belief systems across the continent.<sup>7</sup>

The logic of this section of the Latin 'Address to the Reader' is that everyone, or in this case, every individual reader, is different, and that it is impossible to appease, or appeal to every perspective in any one body of work. This focus on perception has no parallel in the printed English work. It strikes a quite different tone; intellectual, pensive, and almost philosophical. Moryson's concern with the perception of his Latin work is echoed in the prefatory material to *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, in which the author contends that the experience of travel transcends native conceptual boundaries, facilitating 'Divine' wisdom, 'Divine' being a state of mind facilitated by both 'natural' and 'supernatural' experience.<sup>8</sup>

This intellectual objectivity seems to be something that Moryson consciously strives for in the Latin work. In both Latin and English, Moryson uses a similar construction to define the intended readership:

---

<sup>7</sup> Further, Moryson does echo concerns present in the English 'Address to the Reader' when he articulates his concern that the work will not function or be understood when subdivided into separate parts. It is clear that this represents a concern over the unfinished fourth part, perhaps suggesting that Moryson was aware at this stage that it would not be ready to print.

<sup>8</sup> Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his Pilgrimes*, I (London: William Stansby for H. Fetherstone, 1613) Address to the Reader, unmarked leaf.

Againe, for the worke in generall, I professe not to write it to any curious wits, who can indure nothing but extractions and quintessences: nor yet to great States-men, of whose reading I confesse it is vnworthy: but only vnto the vnexperienced, who shall desire to view forraign kingdomes.

Or, in Latin:

Ultimo in loco me hoc opus non profundis Politicarum rerum indagatoribus (quorum gustui nihil praeter quintessentiam sapit) sed iuuenibus inexpertis, et externa regna visendi studio flagrantibus scribere profiteor.

Finally, I declare to have written this work not for those with a profound interest in politics (whose taste can be pleased by nothing but the quintessence) but for the unexperienced young men, who ardently wish to visit foreign lands.

Although both works aim to have a practical function for inexperienced travellers, the Latin 'Address to the Reader' articulates concerns not expressed in the English regarding the interpretation of the work, perhaps founded in the nationalities of the anticipated readership:

Scio unumquemque suae nationis laudes quasi debitas, nec apud se ullam gratiam promerentes, facile omissurum dum interim reprehensiones parce immixtas velut cauteria non ferens, Bellum Authori internecinum libens indicat

I know everyone would easily miss out the praises to his own nation, as due and not deserving any gratitude, while at the same time the same people would not even tolerate moderate reprehension, instead acting as if they were branding irons, and declaring deadly war on the author.

To paraphrase the construction, Moryson states that one could, or should omit the praises of his own nation, in order to forestall any accusations of bias, yet at the same time, if the author was to criticise his own people, even the most modest judgment would be felt as keenly as a cauterising branding iron. In this construction, Moryson seems to be concerned about the reception of his work in England, in particular fearing that his observations will be ill received. However this statement may be clarified by reference to another, similar contention he makes later in the Latin 'Address to the Reader'. Again, this construction has no parallel in the English:

Sed quaecunque tandem censura mihi sit subeunda, nihil me invidia aut odio ductum scripsisse, singula de singulis, ut veritati consentanea videbantur, observasse, tantaque integritate, ut sine discrimine, ne Anglus quidem Anglorum censura abstinuerim, undique me usum, bona conscientia me consolabor.

Whatever the future judgment of me, my conscience is clear and it will be my consolation that I have never written anything envious or hateful, that I tried to make my observations on every single subject in accordance with the truth, and that I was so unbiased in every part of my work that I made no difference for anyone and did not abstain from judgments about the English, even though I am an Englishman myself.

Moryson is concerned that his work will be received as factual, honest and just. He states that his observations are honest 'observasse, tantaque integritate', perhaps brutally so. He excuses this by stating that he has not held back from judging his own countrymen, 'Anglorum censura abstinuerim', even though he is himself English. This may be a form of conceit, a means of excusing some of

Moryson's more honest, or cutting observations of European peoples. Although Moryson attempts to offer a balanced view of the states he exposit, he occasionally presents national stereotypes. For example, at points he castigates Germans as drunkards, condemns Poles as ignorant, and all Catholics as inherently deceitful and superstitious.<sup>9</sup> The Latin 'Address to the Reader' clearly expresses concerns over the reception of descriptions of cultural, social and political systems. The focus on truth and veracity in the above quotation functions as a defence of these observations, which would have a wide continental reception in a Latin work. Moryson's presentation of the work as factual, objective and unsparing of his own countrymen obviates any accusations of national bias. This defence has no parallel in the printed *Itinerary*, as Moryson would have no need to restrict or defend his observations in an English work.

In the Latin, Moryson displays evident unease at the reception of the work. In a further section with no English parallel, Moryson delineates the expected reception of the work, which he anticipates will attract criticism. Moryson uses the image of Aristarchus, a famed literary critic, to convey this anxiety:

Praeclare novi quam sunt praecocia huius aevi ingenia, qua livore inflata,  
non notum erroribus apponere, sed cum Aristarcho, in ipsum Authorem  
involare eumque armis persequi solent.

I know perfectly well how premature are the judgments of our contemporaries, and how filled with malice, how accustomed they are, not only to assign errors, but like Aristarchus, to pursue the author himself and attack him with weapons.

---

<sup>9</sup> Moryson's dismissive and occasionally hostile attitude towards both the Turks and the Irish may be partly excused by attending to his biography—the former colluded in the death of his brother, and he went to war with the latter.

Notably, Moryson does not speak of what might be considered measured criticism or difference of opinion, but of what he terms as ‘malice’, ‘Livre’. The term does not translate exactly, meaning the bluish or purple colouration of a bruise, so the word may be understood as ‘envy’, ‘spite’ or ‘hurtful attacks’. This particular fear is also articulated at length in the Latin Dedication, in which Moryson asks for the protection of his Patron, fearing the attacks of a ‘Momus’, or spiteful critic. Like the blind attacks of Momus that Moryson writes of in the Latin Dedication, there is an evident concern that the work will become the focus of widespread critical vituperation, resulting from pure malice, rather than true engagement with the work:

Illis, mihiq[ue] pariter liberum sit opinari, et quis veritati magis consentia- tur,  
cuius error infirmitatem cuius malitiam-sapiat, iudicium sit posteritatis,  
quam neuter in suas partes trahere poterit

Let both them and I be equally free to hold our opinions, and let posterity  
which cannot be swayed by either side be the judge of who is closer to the  
truth, and whose error smacks of weakness and whose of malice.

The expectation of negative criticism, founded or unfounded, is hardly uncommon in the prefatory material to contemporary works, particularly in the field of travel writing. For example, William Lithgow, publishing in 1614, uses his ‘Address to the Reader’ to attack the ‘gnawing wormes’ which ‘carpe the merites of braver spirites’, with their ‘vomits of venome’, which he vows to ignore.<sup>10</sup> Moryson himself takes a similar approach to the anticipated criticism, contending that he will ignore all slanders made against him, rather than acting against them. In

---

<sup>10</sup> William Lithgow, *Painful Peregrinations* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1614) ‘Address to the Reader’, unmarked leaf.

particular, he states that he will ignore them, as he is now ‘an old man’, who has decided to dedicate the rest of his life to the study of theology, such a burden being to ‘onerous’ to one of his advanced years:

Itaque huiusmodi <lectores> scire pariter velim me nulli detractori omnino  
responsurum, quia mihi iam seni, vitae <que> quod superest Theologicis  
studiis voventi, hoc oneris hac aetate molestissimum evaderet.

Therefore I would wish that readers of any kind should know I will respond to no slanders made against me, because to me, already an old man, who has solemnly decided to dedicate the rest of his life to the study of Theology, it would be a very onerous burden in this, my old age.

This unusually pacifistic approach seems to draw its strength from Moryson’s conscious presentation of himself as venerable and devout, not a viable target for the kind of vitriol that overtook and eventually consumed other contemporary works such as Coryat’s *Crudities*. Although Moryson’s defence of his work is comparable to that deployed in the prefatory material of other contemporary travel literature, this strategy is only presented in the Latin version of the ‘Address to the Reader’, and not in the English. The English printed *Itinerary* does not anticipate a negative critical reception, and no parallel defensive argument exists. Presumably, it was not deemed necessary. Instead, the English ‘Address to the Reader’ specifically expresses a concern that the work is flawed.

In the English, Moryson articulates a different description of his work to that offered in the Latin. Rather than describing a work that will attract criticism, he describes a heavily worked, extensively edited text that has lost much of its vitality and impact through this process. Indeed, one gets the impression that

Moryson has rather got lost within his own work, and can no longer discern how the work should or does function, consumed by the idea that it will be misinterpreted or unappreciated. Moryson states that the 'treatise' he has written is 'barren and unpleasant' in parts, especially the 'first beginning of the worke', which he describes at length. Moryson locates the 'unpleasant' expression of his work in both how the work has been compiled, and the date at which it went to print.

Moryson first explains the former in a curious image that he employs to describe the composition of the *Itinerary*:

So as the VVorke may not uniuſtly bee compared to a nose-gay of flowers, hastily ſnatched in many gardens, and with much leaſure, yet careleſſly and negligently bound together. The ſnatching is excuſed by the haſte, neceſſary to Travellers, deſiring to ſee much in ſhort time. And the negligent binding, in true iudgment needs no excuſe, affected curioſitie in poor ſubiects, being like rich imbroidery laid vpon a frize jerkin; ſo as in this caſe, onely the trifling away of much time, may bee imputed to my ignorance, dulneſ or negligence, if my iuſt excuſe be not heard: in the rendering whereof I muſt craue your patience. <sup>11</sup>

It is notable that Moryson states that the work was 'careleſſly and negligently bound together'. This foray into the language common of bookbinding suggests the flaws he identifies in the text stem from the compilation of the work. This is partially attended to by his earlier suggestion that readers consult the Table of Contents, but the real focus is to excuse the omission of the fourth part of the work. Without this section, which was intended to qualify and explain so much of

---

<sup>11</sup> *Itinerary*, 'Address to the Reader', unmarked leaf.

the description it prefaced, the *Itenerary* would indeed seem both 'barren' and 'unpleasant'. The anticipated fourth part rendered the excess of information, facts and contextual data presented in the first part intelligible, so that rather than 'affected curiositie' it would resemble the empirical basis for a series of sociological studies.<sup>12</sup>

In addition to the missing fourth part, Moryson also articulates a specific concern that the work will be received as outdated and irrelevant. By the time Moryson finally came to publish, in 1617, he had last set foot in the provinces described nearly 25 years ago. He devotes almost half of the English 'Address to the Reader' to first explaining, and then excusing this disparity.<sup>13</sup> Moryson states that although it took him many years to prepare the work for print, it was nonetheless drafted in haste:

Touching the VVorke in generall....I wrote it swiftly, in that my pen was ready and nothing curious, as may appeare by the matter and stile: and I wrote it slowly, in respect of the long time past since I viewed these Dominions and since I tooke this worke in hand.<sup>14</sup>

In the process Moryson describes, many years separate the period of travels that inform the work, and its eventual expression in print. Despite this, the

---

<sup>12</sup> This fear may also be articulated to an extent in the Latin, when Moryson expresses a fear that the work will be misinterpreted: 'At me non latet, quam de variis nationibus per subiecta varia liberius paulo scripserim, et quam adhuc magis varia sint hominum ingenia, ita ut iis in universo opere, multoque minus in singulis subiectis, placere desperem.' It has not escaped my notice that I perhaps could have written more liberally on different subjects concerning different nations. In addition to this, the innate qualities of different people are very different. I despair of ever appeasing everyone in my whole work, and it will be even harder to do so in its separate parts'.

<sup>13</sup> There is evidence for the increasingly desperate attempts to make the work relevant in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. Moryson adds information and corrects sections of the text, to update descriptions of towns and provinces visited. For example, the descriptions of Brill and Dansk on f. 104 and f. 133 are heavily edited, and the introduction to Venice, on ff. 152-152v has amended dates and historical data.

<sup>14</sup> *Itenerary*, 'Address to the Reader', unmarked leaf.

composition process has been slow. Moryson states that this has resulted from ‘divers and long distractions’, the preparation of the work in multiple drafts, or ‘divers copies’, and a parsimonious transcription process ‘to save expences, I wrote the greatest part with my owne hand, and almost all the rest with the slowe pen of my seruant’.<sup>15</sup> This concern, that the finished work is badly flawed, resonates throughout the English ‘Address to the Reader’. As in the above example, it is presented as poorly expressed, outdated and irrelevant.

The Latin work also attends to the disparity between the period of travels in which the work is founded and its written expression. However, this is expressed very differently to the English. In a section which again has no equivalent in the *Itinerary*, Moryson attends to this twenty year gap:

De opere parce loquar, sed cum apud coetaneos trito proeli usu p(a)ene suffocatos, et prurienti censura laborantes aemula magis opinione, quam vero valore, librorum aestimatio fieri soleat, ego sinceriori posteritatis iudicio libentius confido. Et unice dicam me hoc opus viginti plus annos apud me manuscriptum detinuisse, non alio consilio, quam ut coetaneorum censuras effugerem. Nam Alexandri Magni longe maximus error semper mihi ante oculos obuersabatur, qui cum Deus esse vellet dum <adhuc> viveret, ne mortuus quidem hunc honorem vilioribus Imperatoribus apud Aethnicos communem est assequutus. cum invidia viventem premat, quem ipsa mortuum coronis redimit.

I won’t speak of my work at length, but as it is usual for my contemporaries (who are almost suffocated by their habitual contests and who suffer from the huge rivalry of contrary opinions) to judge a literary work more by its

---

<sup>15</sup> See Appendix A, Item 6 for full version of the English ‘Address to the Reader’.

reputation than by its true value, I put more trust in the unbiased judgment of posterity. It is enough to say that I was keeping the manuscript of this work for more than twenty years unpublished with a single objective, avoiding the judgment of my contemporaries, because the mistake of Alexander the Great was always on my mind. He wished to be God in his own lifetime, but did not achieve this honour, common to the worst of Pagan Emperors, even in his death. Although the same envy oppresses you while you are alive, once you are dead it bestows upon you a laurel crown.

In the above description, Moryson offers a quite different account of why the work was not prepared more swiftly. Moryson contends that he deliberately delayed the work, in order to have it avoid its being judged upon repute, rather than on its own merits, or true value 'vero valore'. This construction again articulates a clear fear of critical attack, and Moryson thus reprises his earlier argument, stating that he will not defend the work, instead asking that it be judged by posterity, 'posteritatis'. Moryson feels that this understanding of his work will be free of bias, as opposed to the contemporary reception, which he clearly feels will be hostile. It is not certain exactly why Moryson anticipates this negative reaction to his work. It may be that he was influenced by the reception of Coryate's *Crudities*, as mentioned earlier, or it may instead represent a fear that is particular to a Latin edition of the work, which would be expected to receive more studied, scathing critiques than an English edition.

In either case, Moryson states that he has no wish to repeat the mistakes of 'Alexandri Magni', Alexander the Great, who wished to become God in his own lifetime. Moryson instead states that after death he will be crowned, or lauded by the opinion of those who would express 'invidia', envy or hate, in his own lifetime.

Moryson seems to be considering the posthumous reception of his work. This sentiment, along with his earlier contention that the work has been in manuscript for more than twenty years, ‘viginti plus annos’ calls into question exactly when the Latin ‘Address to the Reader’ was drafted. Annotations in the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* date it to 1609 at the earliest, and other authorial changes, such as the excision of Bohemian material, suggest that it was still being edited in 1613, and quite possibly later. Although Moryson’s contention that the work has been in manuscript for more than 20 year may well be exaggerated, it may suggest a later date of composition for the *Itinerarium*.<sup>16</sup> Considering that the work was licensed to print in both Latin and English, a Latin work may still have been considered after the *Itinerary* went to print.

The arguments and contentions that Moryson makes in his Latin ‘Address to the Reader’ provide strong evidence that it was designed to introduce a distinct work. Although there are isolated similarities between the Latin and English versions, such as the descriptions of the table of small coins and of the expected reader, these are far outweighed by the many points of divergence. In particular, much of the Latin ‘Address to the Reader’ is devoted to managing the anticipated negative critical reception, whereas this is not mentioned at all in the English version. The English instead expresses a concern that the work is flawed as result of the delay between travel and publication and the missing fourth part. In the Latin, this twenty year period is instead presented as a conscious decision, a reaction to the expected critical backlash, and the missing fourth part is not mentioned. This section of the Latin also introduces a quite different conception of the work to that expressed in English. Moryson seems to consider the *Itinerarium* as a lost

---

<sup>16</sup> Moryson states that he first began writing an account of his travels in 1597-98, so if his contention is accurate it suggests he was writing the Latin version of the ‘Address to the Reader’ in 1617 at the earliest. See *Itinerary*, Part II, p.1.

cause within his own lifetime, a work which would instead be bequeathed to future generations as an intellectual legacy, a gift which his own peers are unable to appreciate.

## Conclusion

As the Latin 'Address to the Reader' illustrates, Moryson envisioned printing a definitive work that would have a lasting resonance long after his death. Sadly, his image in posterity has not been as intended, based on the imperfect vernacular version. His desire to perfect the 'Itinerary' consumed the last thirty years of his life, but in the end he died without publishing the *magnum opus* he had envisaged. This thesis represents a preliminary step towards reappraising Moryson's life and works. The first part begins to provide the basis for a comprehensive, chronological biography, which would further define his purposes and intents in writing. The second part presents an insight into an earlier version of the work intended for an educated, Latinate audience, quite different to the pragmatic English text which has defined modern critical understanding of Moryson and the scope and purpose of his writing.

The first part to the thesis explored a number of letters, documents and archival sources that revise elements of Moryson's life history. Moryson's early history, education and family background have been delineated, and study of the will of Thomas Moryson has provided evidence of a troubled relationship between father and son. Thomas Moryson's decision to restrict his son's patrimony seems to have been ill received, and, further, calls into question how Fynes funded his travels. Moryson's frequent meetings with Essex men, and the unspecified 'servis' he carries out, allowing his travel licence to be renewed, suggests that he may have had a function as an intelligencer whilst travelling on the continent.

Moryson's decision to travel in disguise and to at points adopt the speech patterns and mannerisms of serving men suggests that he was interested in

maintaining a low profile, a circumspection reflected in his reluctance to name English contacts that he meets and accompanies on his travels. Moryson's subterfuge, his familiarity with cipher and his command of at least six European languages make him an ideal candidate for intelligence work, a strand of his biography that has the potential to be investigated further.

Moryson's connection to the Essex faction was mediated through his brother Richard, a committed retainer of the Earl, and Fynes owes much of his preferment and advancement to this relationship. Richard secured Moryson a place on Mountjoy's staff, although his close connection to the Essex faction was later responsible for Moryson's estrangement from his patron after the Earl's abortive coup. Moryson never recovered from this slight as both the printed *Itinerary* and the physical form of Mountjoy's letters testify. The depth of Moryson's attachment to Mountjoy, mediated through an intense secretary relationship, deserves more attention. It appears to have profoundly influenced the Irish narrative, something which has not been fully recognised in critical interpretations of this work.

Moryson moved to London following the death of his patron Mountjoy, one of the two great 'griefes' which defined his life. Moryson's residence in London is confirmed by the Losely letters, which provide valuable information about his life and circumstances at this time. Whilst living in London Moryson seems to have begun writing the text that would later become the *Itinerary*. He first drafted the historical studies with which he intended to introduce the work, investing three years in their composition before he was forced to abandon them.

Moryson laments this loss of time in the printed 'Address to the Reader', stating that he also lost labour through the 'slowe pen' of his servant. This servant may

well be Isaac Pywall, mentioned in both the *Itinerarium Pars Secunda* and Moryson's will. It seems likely that Moryson took him into service following his brother Henry's death, a blow from which Fynes never really recovered. Moryson became estranged from his brother Richard at some point following his trip to Ireland to visit him in 1613, and Pywall seems to have been his only companion from this point onwards. Pywall is mentioned in his will, and is left all Moryson's clothes, with the exception of his 'best cloake'. This garment is not mentioned in any of the other bequests, and it may be inferred that Moryson was buried in the trappings of his faded ambitions, his old travelling cloak.

This seems a sad epitaph for Moryson, who had such grand ambitions for his work. The descent of the work from the planned 'magnum opus' to the methodical, unfinished *Itenerary* can be tracked through reference to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, which represents an intermediate and parallel Latin version of the work, intended for a distinct, Latinate readership. The existence of different paratexts is the strongest evidence for this. In particular, the Latin Dedication and 'Address to the Reader' are completely distinct, and indicate that Moryson addressed the work to a scholarly audience, expected to understand and appreciate the classical allusions that are entirely absent from the English prefatory material.

In the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, Moryson attempts to address this educated readership, in a way that is quite different from the prefatory material to the English *Itenerary*. Rather than defending the expression of the work, and attempting to define its structure, Moryson anticipates criticism of the arguments he makes, a level of intellectual engagement that he specifically eschews in the printed *Itenerary*, where he states that the work is not intended for either 'great

State-men' or those who 'can indure nothing but extractions and quintessences'.

In the Latin, Moryson plays to this educated elite, anticipating an audience that would engage with and understand the political and religious insights that he offers.

This readership also shapes the expression of the work, which represents another major point of divergence from the printed *Itenerary*. Moryson allowed himself far greater freedom of expression in Latin than in English, and this vitality is evident in even the most prosaic of descriptions. Clearly, this might to some degree be due to the differences between the two languages, but even this does not account for the exclusion of specific terms that could translate exactly into English. In the process of translation, Moryson renders his prose down, producing functional descriptions which present practical information without ornament. It is quite possible that Moryson altered his style in English in order to present his work as a pragmatic, verifiable account of European travel, of interest to the practical, vernacular reader, and as far from the ornate, layered witticisms of Coryate as possible.

The modern critical reception of the *Itenerary*, which was discussed in the introduction, has not been laudatory, and focused on Moryson's pragmatic, methodical approach to his material. The first part of the *Itenerary* is burdened with lists of expenses, vernacular translations of plaques and epitaphs and records of distances travelled. Modern critical approaches have not recognised that this first part to the work is intended to be factual and accurate, and that much of the colour and life that the *Itenerary* lacks is contained within the planned fourth part, which was never published.

The *Itinerarium Pars Prima* contains valuable information explaining why this fourth part was not published. In an annotation on f. 2 of the manuscript, Moryson writes that this part of the work is written on damaged and torn sheets of paper. It appears that this part was at some point damaged, and as a result was not ready to print in 1617. Moryson also confirms that this work was first completed in English, and then translated into Latin, which again suggests that he was still intending to produce a Latin version of the whole work at some stage.

There is further evidence for this in the Table of Contents, on ff. 6-12 of the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. Unlike the printed Table of Contents, it anticipates a fully developed *Pars Quarta* divided into separate books and chapters. This suggests that the Latin *Itinerarium* was being prepared as a four part work. Had this come to fruition, it would have significantly altered the reception of the text, and allowed Moryson to present the work as he originally intended. Without this fourth part, the work suffered. The fourth part of the work is by far the most insightful and discursive of the four, and presents Moryson's opinion of and understanding of cultural, religious and political differences. By proceeding to print without completing this section, Moryson damaged the reception of his work, and furthermore, removed much of his own voice and opinion from the work, leaving a flat, impersonal account.

As a result, Moryson's purpose in writing is not understood, and a number of competing critical interpretations of the work proliferate. Moryson's original intents are disregarded, but by returning to the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, much can be learnt about Moryson's original conception of the 'Itinerary' and how it related to the printed version. Insertions and deletions of material allow an insight into the logic that informed Moryson's revision of the work. For example, Moryson

inserts a letter into the manuscript on f. 36, and removes a passage concerning religious toleration in Bohemia on f. 41. In the first case, it is possible that Moryson is reacting to concerns that his work is not sufficiently interesting, a fear that is articulated in the printed 'Address to the Reader'. His response is to include contextual material, which has a useful secondary function of adding veracity to his account. In the second case, it is possible that the deletion is a reflection of Moryson's fears regarding the political resonance of the work, a form of self-censorship.

Throughout the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, hundreds of similar changes and deletions substantially alter the content, changes which can be tracked by comparing the manuscript to the printed *Itinerary*. In particular, the changes and alterations Moryson makes in order to prepare his work for a vernacular audience are of interest. He makes repeated attempts to render the work factually accurate, often altering dates and figures and testifying to points of reference. The letters he inserts are examples of this tendency, introduced to the text as a form of evidence, that he has travelled to a location, and that he has immersed himself in the culture.

Moryson's meticulous attention to detail in part represents an attempt to make the work relevant for a Jacobean audience; a quite different readership to the one he would have imagined when he began his sequence of travels twenty five years earlier. For example, the table of small coins, which Moryson is at pains to explain in both the Latin and English 'Address to the Reader', is updated in 1609, and is even authenticated by reference to an Italian printed work, a page of which Moryson pastes directly into the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. The *Itinerarium Pars*

*Prima* has revealed much about this extended editorial process, and how it shaped the form eventually taken by the English *Itinerary*.

As Moryson contends in his English 'Address to the Reader', the work was indeed the product of an extended editorial process, proliferated over 'divers copies'. Evidence for these early manuscripts is present in both *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and *Itinerarium Pars Secunda*, and should from now on inform critical understanding of the genesis of the work. It seems clear that, as Moryson states, he first wrote an autograph work, three parts of which were completed in Latin, with the fourth written in English, and badly damaged. This autograph work seems to be the 'first copy' that Moryson describes in his English 'Address to the Reader', and it is possible that the *Itinerarium Pars Secunda* represents an extant portion of this autograph work.

In contrast, the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* seems to resemble a copy based on and including leaves from this autograph work. Annotations in the *Itinerarium Pars Secunda* suggest that the *Itinerarium Pars Prima* represents only one stage in an extended editorial process, which also involved the ongoing composition of English manuscripts. It is difficult to assume much about this long and complicated process, but it is certain that the many different drafts and extensive editing contributed to the eventual flat expression of the work in print.

Moryson's life ambition was to publish a definitive work which would provide an exposition of the nations of Europe at the turn of the sixteenth century. This would have been a timely description of a continent about to be engulfed by decades of religious war. It is likely that the *Itinerarium* was originally intended to function as a European answer to Camden's *Britannia*, an authoritative work that would define trans-continental conceptualisation of the peoples and nations of

Europe. Just as Camden did, Moryson intended to bind his source work and personal opinion to the observations he made whilst travelling, during which he minutely observed the cultural transactions of the peoples that played host to him, with the intention of compiling a canonical work that would redefine the early modern history of Europe.

Moryson was never able to complete this work to his satisfaction, and it is clear that he anticipated the failure of his life's ambition in the English 'Address to the Reader'. His clear grief at the 'barren and unpleasant' work that has come to print is only too apparent. This study presents an insight into an earlier, more vital version of the work. This distinct Latin text was intended to access a cultivated, Latinate audience, an intellectual readership that would appreciate the value of the empirical observations Moryson presented with such care. The essence of this work lies locked within the *Itinerarium Pars Prima*, a valuable source which has the potential to reveal far more about Fynes Moryson's life and works.

## Appendix A

### Latin Transcriptions from *Itinerarium Pars Prima* and Parallel Content from the printed *Itenerary*

#### Item 1: Case Study 1

##### i) Introduction

Latin (*Itinerarium Pars Prima*: f. 13)

Cantabrigiae in Collegio Domi Petri dum litteris operam darem, annum aetatis decimum octavum ingressus Bacchilaurii gradum adeptus sum, et paulo post ex serenissimae Reginae Elizabethae mandato indicti Collegii almam societatem ex singulari [omine] praterea omine receptus fui. Nullo enim loco [vacante] adhuc vacante, cum hoc mandatum imperaretur, tamen ipsissimo vesperi quo ad me deferebatur, ex Collegii Sociis unus post brevem aegritudinem moriebatur, sic libens a diuina Dei prouidentia me per reliquae vitae angustias conseruante, exordior.

English (*Itenerary*: p. 1)

Being a Student of *Peter-house*, in *Cambridge*, and entred the eighteenth yeere of my age, I tooke the degree of Bachelor of Arts, and shortly after was chosen Fellow of the said Colledge by Queene *Elizabeths* Mandat. Three yeers expired from my first degree taken in the Vniuersitie, I commenced Master of Arts, and within a yeere after, by the fauour of the Master and Fellowes, I was chosen to a vacant place of Priuiledge to studie the Ciuill Lawes.

## ii) Dunkirk Pirates Insertion

**Note:** the final sentence of the insertion is not concluded in *Itinerarium Pars Prima*. This is reflected in the parallel English content below.

Latin (*Itinerarium Pars Prima*: f.13v)

ex patris amicorumque consilio peregrinationi meae fortuito obiecta, me diutius quam putar[a]em detinuerunt. Tandem vero Mensis Maii die primo ineunte iam anno 1591, solui e portu oppiduli Leigh Londino 28 Milliarum per terram, 36 per aquam distantis, (ubi Tamesis vasto ostioni Oceanum deuoluitur). Hinc uela in altum dedimus, et octauo nauigationis die, Mercatorum (ut ita dicam) classe sexdecim nauium, per nebulosum aerem, et uentorum rabiem dispersa, duae Dunkerkensium Pyratarum naues nostram insequ[e]bantur, donec (per Dei gratiam) nebulis postaliquot...

English (*Itinerary*: p. 1)

At last, in the beginning of the yeere 1591, and vpon the first day of May, I tooke ship at *Liegh*, distant from *London* twenty eight miles by land, and thirtie six by water, where *Thames* in a large bed is carried into the Sea. Thence we set saile into the maine, and the eight day of our sailing, the Merchants Fleet of sixteene ships being dispersed by a fogge and tempest, two *Dunkerke* Pirats followed our ship, till (by Gods mercy) the fog being cleared after some few hours...

## Item 2: Case Study 2

Latin (*Itinerarium Pars Prima*: f. 37)

M.T Salutem

Mi M(arce), scias me sequenti die quo Lipsia discessi, praeter opinionem currus Dresdenam tendentis opportunitatem propitio casu nectere. Cuius rei gaudio [dum efferr] dum efficerer, mihi ad currum festinanti mercedem hesperno essedario numerare memoria exciderat. Sed cum ad iter iam quasi signum daretur, forte hunc errorem cogito paruumque moram, ab itineris consortibus impetrans, ad hospitium sicut Plautinus Curculio subito properaui. celeriter [re]curro, ubi Aurigam inueniens, pecuniam illi debitam, famulo (non sine testibus, ut alio sensu ille sit comicus) in manus numero, eademque festinatione non sine sudore profusius manente recurro. Ecce autem redeunti sordidum sterquilinum, uernam uideo (Aurigam dico) meis indutum exuuiis (togam itinerariam intelligo) currui nostro adstare.

English (*Itinerary*: p. 13)

Honest M. Know that after I parted from you at *Torg*, by good hap, and beside my expectation, I light vpon a Coach going to *Dresden*, with which good hap, while I was affected, and hasted to hire a place therein, I had forgot to pay for my Coach for the day before. But when we were ready to go, remembering my errour, and intreating my consorts to stay a while for mee, I ranne backe to the Inne, as speedily as the Parasite *Curculio* in *Plautus*; and finding not the Coachman there, I gaue the money to the seruant of the house before witnesses, and so returned to the Coach all sweating with hast. There I found that dunghill rascall the Coachman, hauing my gowne on his backe.

### Item 3: Case Study 3

Latin (*Itinerarium Pars Prima*: f .41v)

In Castello *Karlstein* non longe Praga distante corona ceu diadema Regni reponitur [Omnium Religionum Pragae (ut in toto Bohemiae Regno, eiusque Provinciis Moravia & Silesia) ingens est confusio: Hussitae Papistae, Lutherani & Caluiniani, quorum multi in eadem domo, eiusdem mensae & Lecti consortes; concorditer uiuunt, ut taceam Anabaptistas, fratres in Collegio & in communi uiuentes, uariasque sectas ad cuiusuis cerebri inuentionem libere profitendas.] Pragae in Templo Bethlehem uocato pulpitem ostendunt, in quo Johannes Hus concionem habere solebat cum prima Papisticae superstitionis reformatio pullularet, ibidemque uestes quibus eum usum aiunt, aliaque in eius memoriam conseruant, et curiosis ostendunt. in hac urbe duos circiter menses diuersabar, unde discessurus Uiennam (contra Turcas omnium more famosum propugnaculum) uidere cupiebam, sed Nurnbergae et Augustae potius uidendae studium ita ualuit, ut ab hoc itinere desisterem, quod casu melius quam putabam successit, me (ut deinceps dicendum) in Belgiam reuocato, ude per Poloniam in Italiam transire libuit, (Gallia bello ciuili ardenti, meque ab eadem uia bis facienda prae studio nouitatis auerso) atque ita Uiennae uidendae commodior occasio se mihi (ut suo loco dicendum) obtulit. Liceat mihi hoc in uiatorum gratiam addere, nempe in uia quae Praga Uiennam ducit, Pagum esse Chassel dictum, qui nouem milliaria Praga distat, ubi Ziska Bohemorum tanti nominis Dux sepultus iacet, qui Hussitarum strenuus propugnator, iam moriturus illis consuluit, ut tympano militare pellem sui defuncti obducerent, cuius sonitu audito, confidenter fore diuinabat ut inimici consternati fugerent, (tanta illi in armis fiducia erat, ut uel mortuum se terrorem hostibus iniicere posse putaret)

English (*Itinerary*: p. 16)

Not farre from *Prage* they say, that the Crowne of the Kingdome is laid vp, in *Karlsteine* Castle. At *Prage* in *Bethlem* Church, they shew a Pulpit in which *Iohn Hus* vsed to preach at the first reformation of Religion. I liued at *Prage* some two moneths, and being to depart from thence, I would haue gone to *Vienna* (the famous Fort against the Turkes) but my desire to see *Nurnberg* and *Augsburg* so preuailed, as I left that iourney, which by chance happened better then I imagined, for being called backe into the Low Countries (as heereafter I shall relate), I passed thence through *Poland* into *Italy*, because *France* was shut vp by the ciuill warres, and I euer shunned to goe twice one way, and so had the opportunitie (more fit then the former) to see *Vienna*. Now for their sakes who may passe from *Prage* to *Vienna*, giue mee leaue to remember, that in this way their is a Village called *Chassel*, some nine miles from *Prage*, where the famous Captaine of the *Bohemians*, called *Ziska*, lies buried, who did lead the *Hussites* valiantly, and being ready to die, wished them to make a Drumme of his skinne, ominating that the sound thereof would bee so terrible to the enemies, as they would runne away, (such confidence had be in Armes, as being dead he thought to terrifie his enemies).

#### Item 4: Case Study 4

Latin (*Itinerarium Pars Prima*: f. 3)

Illustrissimo Domino

Fas mihi sit (Illustrissime Comes) per tibi innatam et continus assuetam benignitatem, te graviora agentem paucis interpellare: & patrociniū tuum pro concessō habenti Clientis devoti nomine (verbo non amplius) te affare. Non illucubratum opus, vel septemplex Aiācis clypeus a iusta reprehensione, sed nec politissimū quodque ipsius Mercurii Caduceus a mordacibus invidi Momi faucibus unquam protegit. Absit ut talis fiducia quicquam in tuo quantumvis potenti patrociniō posuerim. Sunt qui lucubrationibus suis aeternitatem pollicentur eiusque participationem Patronis etiam se imp<e>rtiri posse confidunt, sed nec me caecus amor mei[ita] <sic> fascinavit, ut hoc opus cum Minerva Phidiae in summa arce collocatum iri sperem: nec tu, qui pro publica re excubias agens Mausoleum in dies magnificentius tibi extruis suffulcro tam imbecilli, quo nominis tui splendor nitatur, eges. Humilius sapiunt & rectius (me censore) faciunt, qui inveteratae consuetudini se hac in parte obsequi, ac devoti solummodo animi testimonium exhibere profitentur. Nam si non praemium certe excusationem meretur, quod consuetudine semel invaluit, et Medorus Angelicae, (tot Heroum amore celebris) nomen singulis arborum corticibus insculpens, eius si famam nihilo auctiorem, certe amorem suum abunde testatum reliquit. Immo ipsi Deo, omnium <bonum> auctori omnium rerum Domino, hoc pii officii nomine, victimarum et odorum (vel ex suo) oblationes acceptae, grataeque euadunt. Huic itaque mori ego more<m>gerens te potissimum operi meo Patronum exopto: et

post defunctum Dominum ac Herum (pia semper memoria mihi colendum) te orbitatis meae defensorem unice ambiens, hanc qualemcunque devoti erga te obsequii testandi occasionem libenter arripio. Et fruatur sane hoc opus sua sorte, ac pro merito suo vel vivat, vel interitum patiatur. Tu modo supplicem Clientem non asperneris; tu modo a tui observantissimo benignos oculos non auertas. Denique tibi quo dixi animo hoc quaecunque sit munus, quam possum officiosissime offero, et meipsum in vnam dedo.

Tibi ad imperata humiliter

[humiliter] obeunda promptissimus

*Fynes Moryson*

English (*Itinerary*: prefatory material, unmarked leaf)

Right Honourable,

Since I had the happinesse imputed to Salomons Servants by the Queene of Sheba, to stand sometimes before You, an eye and eare witnes of your Noble conuersation with the worthy Earle of Deuonshire, (my deceased Lord and Master) I ever admired your vertues and much honoured your Person. And because it is a thing no less commendable, gladly to receive favours from men of eminent worth, then with like choice to tender respect and service to them: I being now led by powerfull custome to seeke a Patron for this my Worke; and knowing that the weakest frames need strongest supporters, have taken the boldness most humbly to commend it to your Honours protection: which vouchsafed; and my selfe shall not only acknowledge this high favour with humblest thankfulnesse, but with ioy imbrace this occasion to avow my selfe now by public profesion, (as I have long been in private affection,)

Your Honours most humble and faithfull servant,

FYNES MORYSON

## Item 5: Case Study 5

**Note:** Line breaks have been preserved in the below, so that the structure may be compared to the English.

(Latin: *Itinerarium Pars Prima*: ff. 6-12).

Index Librorum et Capitum

per totum hoc opus subiectum

complectens

Pars Prima

Liber Primus

Cap 1: De itinere Londino (in Anglia)

Stodam HamburgamHamburgum, Lube=

[cum], Lubecum, Lunebur=

gum; de reditu Hamburgum

Lipsiam Wittenbergam,

urbesque vicinas (in Germania)

Cap 2: De itinere Lipsia Pragam (in Bohemia)

Nurnbergam Augustam Ulmam, Lindoiam,

Constantiam (in Germania) Scafusam,

Tiguriam, Badenum, ac Basileam (in Helvetia)

Cap 3: De itinere Basilea Argentinam, Hei=delbergam, Francofortium, Cassulam, Brunsvicum, Luneburgum, Hamburgum Stodam, Bremam, Oldenburgum, et Emdenam, Imperii Urbem, ab ea parte limitaneam.

Cap 4: De itinere Emdena, Lugdunum Batavorum, et per Unitarum Provinci=arum urbes Belgicas

Cap 5: De itinere ex Belgarum unitis Provin=ciis per littora Germanica Stodam et Lubecum, de navigatione in Damam et Gedanum (vulgo Dantz) in Prussia ac itinere per Poloniae regnum [regionum] Patavium (vulgo Padua) in Italia.

## Liber 2

Cap 1: De itinere Patavio Venetias Ferraram Bononiam, et Ravennam, et per maris Adria=tici littus Anconam, deinde per latitudinem Italiae Romam, (non longe a mari Tirrheno Sitam)

Cap 2: De Itinere Neapolin, redituque Romam,

et utriusque urbis descriptione, de itinere cursorio Siennam et Florentiam, Pistoiam Lucam, et Pisam, ac trium posterius nominatarum urbium descriptione

Cap 3: De itinere Livornum, reditu Florentiam et Siennam (ac urbium descriptione) De itinere terrestri Lirigin (in quo Lucam Pisamque, denuo transii) maritimo Genoam, (urbisque descriptione), et terrestri Paviam (seu Ticinum) Mediolanum, Cremonam, et Mantuam, (urbiumque descriptione), ac de reditu Patavium.

Cap 4: De Petrarchae sepulchro Arguae visitato, de itinere Vicenzam, Veronam, Bresciam et Bergomum (in Italia) et Alpibus superatis Churiam, Tigurin, Solthurnum, Genevam, et (in reditu) Bernam, (in Helvetia) hinc Argentinam (in Germania) et Cathelaunum, Lutetiam Rothomagum et Dieppam (in Gallia) deinceps de transfretatione et itinere terrestri Londinum (in Anglia)

Liber tertius

Cap 1: De itinere per unitas Belgiae Provincias  
et per maris Germanici littus, Stodam, deinde  
Brunsvicum et recta via Nurnbergam, Augustam  
Oenopontem (vulgo Inspruck) (in Germania) Vene=  
tias (in Italia) et per Mediterraneum mare  
eiusque Insulas Hierosolymam; In quo itinere  
loca prius lustrata compendiose percurro.

Cap 2: De Hierosolymae urbis agrique descriptione

Cap 3: De itinere terrestri, Hierosolyma Joppam  
Maritime Tripolin (in Syria) terrestri Haleppum  
et Scanderonam, et de transfretatione in Candiam  
Insulam.

Cap 4: De Itinere Candia (partim per terram,  
partim per mare) per Graeciae Littora, et Maris  
Aegaeis, Ponti et Propontidis insulas Constantinopolin  
usque, pari modo et reditu Venetias per mare et  
terrestri itinere Augustam, Nurnbergam  
et Stodam (in Germania) de transfretatione  
in Angliam.

Cap 5: De itinere Anglia Scotiae et Hiberniae Comitatus

Cap 6: De pecuniarum ad extera regna transmu=

tandarum ratione, variisque variorum regnorum  
monetis, ac de milliariis diversa per varias  
orbis partes mensura

Pars Secunda

Liber Primus

Cap 1: De Hibernici Itinerarii prooemio et de  
Carolo Blount Barone Mountioy Domino  
Heroque meo (faelicis memoriae in Hiberniae  
Dominum Deputatum, misso, deque huius il-  
lustris Domini qualitate, eiusque in genere  
consiliis, quibus Rebellium praecordia rupit,  
afflictaeque Hiberniae pacem dedit, et de rebus  
ab eo gestis exeunte anno 1599.

Cap 2: De particularibus Proregis gestis in  
prosecutione Rebellium facta Anno 1600.

Liber Secundus

Cap 1: De particularibus Proregis gestis, ad  
Rebelles prosquendos, et de Hispanis Hiberniam  
inuadentibus Anno 1601.

Cap 2: De Kinsaliae obsidione ac deditone, et  
Hispanorum in Hispaniam reditu eodem anno 1601

Liber Tertius

Cap 1: Belli prosecutio per Baronem [Dominum]  
Dominum Mountioy Dominum Deputatum  
contra Hiberniae Rebelles. Anno 1602

Cap 2: De misericordia Tyronis indulta belloque  
sic prorsus sopito. Et de nova seditione per  
{Mor....} urbes excitata, ut publicum Romana  
Religionis exercitum stabilirent, Et de eodem  
quoque sedata; una cum Proregis in Angliam  
revocatione, meritisque virtutum praemiis  
ipsi largitis, Ineunte Salutis Anno 1603.  
immaturaque eius intra paucillos annos  
morte, cum Hiberniae adversarium  
Statum post Decennium relapsae nuda  
mentionem adiecta.

Pars Tertia

Liber Primus

Cap 1: Peregrinandum esse, sed quibus et quatenus

Cap 2: De praeceptis quae Tyronibus usui  
esse possunt.

Cap 3: De veterum opinionibus et Proverbiis  
aliquot mihi inter ratiocinandum aut  
legendum (dum peregre essem) obuiis, quae  
de Peregrinis ipsis, aut de variis Nationibus  
in ore hominum, aut libris impressis, passim  
volitant.

## Liber Secundus

Cap 1: De commodius itinerandi et equos, ac  
currus conducendi modis

Cap 2: De Sepulchris, Monumentis, et  
Aedificiis in genere; Nam superius  
eadem in particulari itinerum narra=  
tione, singula (suo loco) {..ulius} descripsi

Cap 3: De Germania, Bohaemia, et Helvetia  
quoad Geographicam descriptionem, situm  
fertilitatem, mercaturam, et victum

Cap 4: De Belgiae unitis Provinciis, Daniaque

et Polonia, quoad dicta praecedentis tertii

Capitis Subiecta

Cap 5: De Italia, quoad singula praecedentis tertii Capitis Subiecta

Liber Tertius

Cap 1: De Turciae Imperii Geographica descriptione, situ, Fertilitate, mercatura, et victu.

Cap 2: De Gallia, quoad primi Capitis Subiecta

Cap 3: De Anglia, quoad primi Capitis Subiecta

Cap 4: De Scotia, quoad primi Capitis Subiecta

Cap 5: De Hibernia, quoad primi Capitis Subiecta

Liber Quartus

Cap 1: De Germanorum, Bohemorum, Helvetorum, Belgarum, Danorum, Polonorum, et Italarum vestita.

Cap 2: De Turcarum Gallorum, Anglorum,  
Scoturum, et Hibernorum vestita.

Cap 3: De Germaniae et Bohemiae Republica  
quoad Succinctam historiae introductionem  
Principum Genealogias, et Aulas Rerum  
presentem statum, Tributa, reditusque  
militarem, tam Equestrem, quam Pedestrem,  
et Navalem iuris dicendi curias, leges  
rariores, Haereditatis adeunde Dotisque  
uxoriae in familia; quam Republica homi=  
num gradus

Cap 4: De Principum Germaniae et urbium  
liberarum Republicis particularibus,  
vitae ac necis potestatem habentibus

Cap 5: De Helvetica Republica quoad  
varia superiorum Caputum Subiecta

Cap 6: De Belgica Republica secundum  
dicta praecedentium Caputum Subiecta

Pars Quarta

Liber Primus

Cap 1: De Turcarum Republica quoad  
succinctam historiae introductionem,  
Genealogiam Imperatoris, et Aulam  
Rerum presentem Statum, Tributa, [et]  
reditusque, militarem, tam Equestrem  
quam Pedestrem, et Navalem, iuris Dicendi  
curias, Dotisque uxoriae iura, fiducia, Capi=  
talia, variosque tam in familia, quam  
Republica hominum gradus

Cap 2: De Poloniae Republica, quoad singula primi capituli subiecta.

Cap 3: De Italiae Republica quoad singula  
praedicti Capituli subiecta, et varia absolu=  
torum Principum domina. Ac primum  
in hoc Capite de solo historiae compendio  
generali

Cap 4: De Republica Italiae, nempe de Prin=  
cipum Genealogiis, de Papali Domino, et  
de novo Hispanorum in Italia Domino,  
quoad aliqua primi Capituli subiecta

Cap 5: De particulari Venetorum Republica  
quoad aliqua primi Capituli subiecta

Cap 6: De Florentini Ductatus Domino et  
intermixta liberae Civitatis Luccae Repub(licae)  
quoad aliqua primi Capitis Subiecta

Cap 7: De Genoa Civitate Libera, et De  
Ducis Mantuae, Et Ducis Urbinatum  
Dominis quoad aliqua primi Capitis subiecta

Cap 8: De Italiae Republica in genere, et de  
potentioribus Dominiis particulatim, quoad  
reliqua primi Capitis subiecta.

Liber Secundus

Cap 1: De Franciae Regno, nempe <quoad> historicam  
Introductionem, Regis Genealogiam et  
Aulam rerum presentem statum Tributa,  
reditusque, militarem, tam Equestrem quam  
Pedestrem et Navalem, iuris dicendi curias  
leges rariores, Haereditatis adeunde, [uxoriae]  
Dotisque uxoriae iura, fiducia, capitalia, variosque  
tam in familia, quam Republica hominum  
gradus.

Cap 2: De Daniae regno quoad singula

primi Capitis Subiecta.

Cap 3: De Angliae regno quoad singula

primi Capitis Subiecta.

Cap 4: De Scotiae regno quoad singula

primi Capitis Subiecta.

Cap 5: De Hiberniae regno quoad singula

primi Capitis Subiecta.

Liber Tertius

Cap 1: De Germania quoad religionem.

Cap 2: De Bohemia quoad religionem

Cap 3: De Helvetiis, Belgis, Danis et Polonis,

quoad religionem.

Cap 4: De Turcarum religionem.

Cap 5: De Italorum vel potius Romanorum

religione

Cap 6: De religione apud Gallos, Anglos,  
Scotos et Hibernos

Liber Quartus

Cap 1: De Germanorum natura et moribus  
corporum robore, et ingeniorum acumine,  
De mechanicis artibus et liberalibus  
scientiis apud eos florentibus, de Academiis,  
de lingua, de ceremoniarum pompa  
praesertim in nuptiis, puerperiis infantibus  
baptizandis, et mortuorum funeribus.  
De variis consuetudinibus recreationibus  
exercitiis, praesertim, venatione, aucupiis,  
et piscatione.

Cap 2: De Helvetiis quoad primi capitis subiecta.

Cap 3: De unitis Belgaram Provinciis quoad primi capitis subiecta.

Cap 4: De Dania quoad <singula> primi capitis subiecta.

Cap 5: De Bohemia quoad primi capitis subiecta.

Cap 6: De Polonia quoad primi capitis subiecta.

Cap 7: De Turcis quoad <singula> primi capitis subiecta.

Liber Quintus

Cap 1: De Italorum, natura et moribus

corporum robore, et ingeniorum acumine,

De mechanicis artibus et liberalibus

scientiis apud eos florentibus, de Academiis,

de lingua, de ceremoniarum pompa

praesertim in nuptiis, puerperiis infantibus

baptizandis, et mortuorum funeribus.

De variis consuetudinibus recreationibus

exercitiis, praesertim, venatione, aucupiis,

et piscatione.

Cap 2: De Gallis quoad primi capitis subiecta.

Cap 3: De Anglia, quoad primi capitis subiecta.

Cap 4: De Scotia quoad primi capitis subiecta.

Cap 5: De Hibernia quoad primi capitis subiecta.

Cap 6: Generalis sed brevis de Judeis et Graecis discursus.

English (*Itinerary*: prefatory material, unmarked leaf)

A Table Of the Contents of  
the Seurall Chapters contained in this Booke.

THE FIRST PART.

The first Booke.

Chap1. Of my iourney from London (in England) to Stode, Hamburg, Lubecke, Lüneburg: my returne to Hamburg, and iourney to Magdeburg, Leipzig, Wittenberg; and the neighbouring Cities (in Germany)

Chap 2. Of my iourney from Leipzig, to Prage (in Bohemia) to Nurnberg, Augspurg, Vlme, Lindoy, Costnetz (in Germany) Schaphusen, Zurech, Baden, and Bazell (in Sweitzer-land.)

Chap 3. Of my iourney from Bazell to Strasburg, to Heidelberg, to Franckfort, to Cassiles, to Brunswicke, to Lüneburg, to Hamburg, to Stode, to Breme, to Oldenburg and to Embden, (the last Citie upon the confines of the Empire in German)

Chap 4. Of my iourney from Embden in Germany, to Leiden in Holland, and through the united provinces of the Low Countries.

Chap 5. Of my iourney out of the united Prouinces, by the sea coast to Stode, and Lubeck, in Germany, of my sailing to Denmarke, and thence to Dantzck in Prussen, and my iourney thro- row Poland, to Poduoia in Italy.

The second Booke.

Chap 1. Of my iourney from Paduoa to Venice, to Ferrara, to Bologna, to Ravenna, and by the shoare of the Adriatique Sea to Ancona; and then crossing the breadth of Italy, to Rome, seated not far from the Tirrhene Sea.

Chap 2. Of my iourney to Naples, and my returne to Rome, and of the description of both Cities: of my iourney cursory to Sienna, Fiorenza, Pistoia, Lucca, and Pisa, and the description of the three last Citties.

Chap 3. Of my iourney to Ligorno, my returne to Florence, (or Fiorenza) and to Sienna, and the description of these Cities. Of my iourney by land to Lirigi (in which againe I passed by Lucca and Pisa) and by sea to Geona, with the description of that Citie, and my iourney by land to Pauia, to Milano, to Cremano, and to Mantoua, with the descriptions of the Cities, and of my retourne to Paduoa.

Chap 4. Of the Sepulcher of Petrarch at Arqua; of my iourney to Vicenza, Verona, Brescia, and Bergamo: (in Italy) then passing the Alpes to Chur, Zurech, Solothurn, Geneva, and (in my returne thence) to Berna, (in Switzerland,) thence to Strasburg (in Germany,) and to Chalon, to Paris, to Roan, and to Diepe, (in France) and finally of my passage by sea and land to London (in England)

### The third Booke.

Chap 1. Of my iourney to Stode, through the united Prouinces of Netherland, and vpon the sea-coast of Germany; then to Brunswicke, and (the right way) to Nurnberg, Augsburg, and Insbrucke (in Germany) and from thence to Venice in Italy, and so by the Mediteranan Seas and the Llands thereof, to Ierusalem. In which iourney, I slightly passe over the places described in my former passage those waies.

Chap 2. The description of the Citie of Ierusalem, and the Territory thereof.

Chap 3. Of my iourney from Ierusalem by land to Ioppa, by sea to Tripoly in Syria, by land to Haleppo and Scanderona, and of our passage by sea to the Iland Candia.

Chap 4. Of my iourney from Candia (partly by land, and partly by sea) by the sea shoares and by the Ilands of the Aegean Sea, Pontus and Propontis, to the Citie of Constantinople, and of my iourney thence by Sea to Venice, and by land to Augsburg, Nurnberg, and Stode (in Germany) and of my passage ouer sea into England.

Chap 5. Of my iourney through many severall Shires of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

Chap 6. Of the manner to exchange monies into forraigne parts, and the diuers monies of diuers parts, together with the diuers measures of miles in sundry Nations, most necessary for the understanding of the former Iournall.

## THE SECOND PARTE

### The first Booke.

Chap 1. Of the Induction or Preface to my Irish Iournall; and a compendious narration how Charles Blount, Lord Mountioy, (my Lord and Master of happy memory) was cho-sen Lord Deputy of Ireland, and of this worthy Lord's quality; as also of the Counsels in ge-nerall by which he broke the Rebels hearts, and gave peace to that troubled State, together with his particular actions in the end of the yeere 1599.

Chap 2. Of the Lord Deputies particular proceedings in the prosecution of the Rebels in the yeere 1600.

The second Booke.

Chap 1. Of the Lord Deputies particular proceedings in the prosecutions of the Rebels, and of the Spaniards inuading Ireland in the yeere 1601.

Chap 2. Of the besieging of the Spaniards at Kinsale, with the deliuey of the Towne to the Lord Deputy, and their returne into Spaine in the same yeere 1601.

The third Booke.

Chap 1. Of the prosecution of the warre by the Lord Moutioy Lord Deputy, against the Rebels in the yeere 1602.

Chap 2. Of Tyrones taking to mercy, whereby the warre was fully ended; and of a new mu-tiny of the Cities of Mounster, for establishing the public exercise of the Roman Religion, with the appeasing thereof; together with the Lord Deputies recalling into England, and of the rewards there given him for his Service in the beginning of the yeere 1603: with mention of his untimely death within few yeeres after; and the state of Ireland some ten yeeres after.

THE THIRD PART.

The first Booke.

Chap1. That the visiting of forraigne Countries is good and profitable, but to whom, and how farre.

Chap 2. Of precepts for Trauellers, which may instruct the unexperienced.

Chap 3. Of the Opinions of old Writers, and some Prouerbs themselves, or of diuers Nati-ons and Prouinces.

The second Booke.

Chap 1. Of the fit meanes to trauell. and to hier Coaches or Horses in generall.

Chap 2. Of Sepulchers, Monuments and Buildings in generall, (for I have formerly spoken particularly of them)

Chap 3. Of Germany, Bohmerland and Sweitzerland, touching the Geographicall description, the situation, the fertility, the trafficke, and the diet.

Chap 4. Of the united Prouinces in Netherland, and of Denmark and Poland, touching the said subiects of the precedent third Chapter.

Chap 5. Of Italy touching the subiects of the third Chapter going before.

The third Booke.

Chap 1. Of the geographicall description of Turkey, the situation, fertility, trafficke and diet.

Chap 2. Of France, touching the particular subiects of the first Chapter.

Chap 3. Of England, touching the particular subiects of the first Chapter.

Chap 4. Of Scotland, touching the particular subiects of the first Chapter.

Chap 5. Of Ireland, touching the particular subiects of the first Chapter.

The fourth Booke.

Chap 1. Of the Germans, Bohemians, Sweitzers, Netherlanders, Danes, Polonians and Ita-lians apparell.

Chap 2. Of the Turkes, French, English, Scottish, and Irish apparell.

Chap 3. Of the Germans and Bohemians, Commonwealth, under which title I containe an historicall introduction, the Princes Pedegrees and Courts, the present state of things, the Tributes and Reuenues, the military state for Horse, Foot, and Nauy, the Courts of Iustice, rare Lawes, more specially the Lawes of inheritance and of womans Dowries, the Capitall Iudgements, and the diuersitie of degrees in Families, and in the Common-wealth.

Chap 4. Of the particular Commonwealths, as well of the Princes of Germany, as of the free Cities, such as both have absolute power of life and death.

Chap 5. Of the Commonwealth of Sweitzerland, according to the diuers subjects of the third Chapter.

Chap 6. Of the Netherlanders Commonwealth, according to the foresaid subjects of the third Chapter.

#### The Table

The rest of this VVorke, not yet as fully finished,  
treateth of the following heads

Chap 1. Of the Commonwealth of Denmarke, under which title I containe an historicall introduction, the Kings Pedegree and Court, the present state of the things,  
the Tributes and Reuenues, the military power for Horse, Foot, and Nauy, the Courts of Iustice, rare Lawes, more specially those of Inheritance and Dowries, and Contracts for mariage, the Capitoll or Criminal Iudgments, and the diversitie of degrees in Families and the Commonwealth.

Chap 2. Of the Commonwealth of Poland, under which title & c.

Chap 3. Of the Commonwealth of Italy, touching the historicall introduction, the Princes pedegrees, the Papall dominion, and the late power of the King of Spaine, with some othersubiects of the first Chapter.

Chap 4. Of the particular Commonwealth of Venice, touching most of the foresaid subiects.

Chap 5. the Commonwealth of the Duke of Florence, the Cities of Lucca and Genoa, with the Dukes of Urbino and Mantoua.

Chap 6. Of the Commonwealth of Italy in generall: touching the rest of the heads which belong to the generall state of Italy, rather then of any part thereof.

Chap 7. Of the Commonwealth of theTurkish Empire, under which title & c. as followeth in the first chapter.

Chap 8. Of the Commonwealth of France, under which title & c.

Chap 9. Of the Commonwealth of England, under which title & c.

Chap 10. Of the Commonwealth of Scotland, under which title & c.

Chap 11. Of the Commonwealth of Ireland, under which title & c

Chap 12. Of Germany touching Religion.

Chap 13. Of Bohemerland, Sweitzerland, the united Prouinces of Netherland, of Denmark and Poland, touching Religion..

Chap 14. Of Italy touching Religion.

Chap 15. Of the Turkish Empire touching Religion.

Chap 16. Of France, England, Scotland and Ireland touching Religion.

Chap 17. Of the Germans nature, wit, manners, bodily gifts, Vniversities, Sciences, Arts, language, pompous Ceremonies, specially at Marriages, Christenings and Funerals: of their customes, sports, exercises, and particularly hunting.

Chap 18. Of the Bohemians, Sweitzers and Netherlanders of the united Prouinces, their nature, wits and manners & c.

Chap 19. Of the Danes and Polonians nature & c.

Chap 20. Of the Italians nature, wit & c.

Chap 21. Of the Turkes nature & c.

Chap 22. Of the Frenchmens nature & c.

Chap 23. Of the Englishmens nature & c.

Chap 24. Of the Scotchmens and Irishmens natures, wits, manners & c.

Chap 25. A generall, but briefe discourse of the Iewes, the Grecians, and the Moscovites.

**Item 6: Case Study 6**

Latin (*Itinerarium Pars Prima*: ff. 4-5)

Lectori Salutem,

Si cuius haec a me scripta prosint, speratam mercedem finemque operi praepositum feliciter assequutus sum, si quis utilitatem hinc haustam agnoscat, is gratitudinis non vulgare encomium, et suarum lucubrationum parem laudem merebitur. At me non latet, quam de variis nationibus per subiecta varia liberius paulo scripserim, et quam adhuc magis varia sint hominum ingenia, ita ut iis in universo opere, multoque minus in singulis subiectis, placere desperem. Scio unumquemque suae nationis laudes quasi debitas, nec apud se ullam gratiam promerentes, facile omissurum dum interim reprehensiones parce immixtas velut cauteria non ferens, Bellum Authori internecinum libens indicat. Praeclare novi quam sunt praecocia huius aevi ingenia, qua livore inflata, non notum erroribus apponere, sed cum Aristarcho, in ipsum Authorem involare eumque armis persequi solent. Itaque huiusmodi <lectores> scire pariter velim me nulli detractori omnino responsurum, quia mihi iam seni, vitae<que> quod superest Theologicis studiis voventi, hoc oneris hac aetate molestissimum evaderet. Illis, mihi que pariter liberum sit opinari, et quis veritati magis consentiatur, cuius error infirmitatem cuius malitiam sapiat, iudicium sit posteritatis, quam neuter in suas partes trahere poterit. De opere parce loquar, sed cum apud coetaneos trito proeli usu pene suffocatos, et prurienti censura laborantes, aemula magis opinione, quam vero valore, librorum aestimatio fieri soleat, ego sinceriori posteritatis iudicio libentius confido. Et unice dicam me hoc opus viginti plus

annos apud me manuscriptum detinuisse, non alio consilio, quam ut  
 coetaneorum censuras effugerem. Nam Alexandri Magni longe maximus error  
 semper mihi ante oculos obuersabatur, qui cum Deus esse vellet dum <adhuc>  
 viveret, ne mortuus quidem hunc honorem vilioribus Imperatoribus apud  
 Aethnicos communem est assequutus. cum invidia viventem premat, quem ipsa  
 mortuum coronis redimit. Sed quaecunque tandem censura mihi sit subeunda,  
 nihil me invidia, aut odio ductum scripsisse, singula de singulis, ut veritati  
 consentanea videbantur, observasse, tantaque integritate, ut sine discrimine, ne  
 Anglus quidem Anglorum censura abstinerim, undique me usum, bona  
 conscientia me consolabor. Insuper de opere, dicam, nihil id minus quam  
 lucernam olere, quod successiuis horis, quasi consumendi otii causa, celerrime  
 quidem, licet, ob multa unita impedimenta, minus cito, exaravi. [Insuper]  
 <Deinde> quod [i]inanes nonnunquam repetitions fecerim, benevoli lectoris  
 veniam deprecor, qui modo in subiectis tam inter se affinibus, tamque  
 frequenter pertractandis, easdem penitus effugere quam sit difficile cogitet, facile  
 eam mihi indulturus videtur. Si quis accuratum magis, ut de Repub(lica) ita de  
 singulis subiectis, discursum hic desideret, certe habet fatentem reum, Nec enim  
 mei instituti fuit, Rerumpub(licarum) arcana et singulorum subiectorum  
 abstrusiora quaeuis perscrutari, quorum nec unius cerebrum, nec tantilli aevi  
 spatium, capax est. Sat Peregrinanti, ut rerum humanarum generalem notitiam  
 carperis, cum Oratore et Poeta, nulla in re rudis evadat, modo in seria magis,  
 suaeque vitae maxime conducentia, penitius inspicere, eaque usui suo  
 accomodare scias. Nec ego misellus, me accuratas in omni genere  
 observationes, sed mihi (eique adhuc iuueni et in seria minus intento) obvias  
 tantum modo, deliniaturum profitebar, hac aetate si peregre proficiscerer, longe  
 fortassis alia ipse observaturus, et aliorum ingenia res supra meum captum

sublimiores meditari non nescius. Sat mihi, si quod pollicitus, sum pro mea facultate, Itinerantis more (quasi littora lambens, et spicas, quae metentium manus fugerint colligens) praestiterim. De reliquo quod pro rerum tenuitate minus haec perstrinxerim iure accusandus uideor et ut culpae conscius do vincas manus. Certe historiarum, et Cosmographicarum descriptionum compendia triennii otium imprudenti mihi absumpserunt, cuius tanto sudore perfecti laboris, non alia laus, quam fidelis relationis (quae plebeio cuius mecum communis esse potest) et industria (de more minima, de iure non sane magna) ad me redundat. Et historiae quidem compendiis opus tandem perfectum in immensum extumuisse - cum viderem sola maximarum mutationum perbreui mentione facta, contentus, eadem supprimenda censeo. An prima operis Parte, eo quis [diutius] diurnalium sumptuum relationem propter continuas in rerum pretio et monetarum valore mutationes supervacaneam iudicet, certe ut nos hodie ex antiquis historiis post bellorum et Rerum publicarum mutationes, multa ad nostrum in his rebus iudicium {...dendum} utilia colligimus; ita ex supradicta relatione, si non alia utilitas, saltem presentis aevi cum elapso iucunda collatio haurienda videtur. Si quis monetis Lectori (misi in suo cuique regno) incognitas obiiciat, is Tabulam primae Parti praefixam, et primae Partis, ac libri tertii caput sextum consulat, et in prima perbreuem ac in altero largam omnium monetarum pro valore-collationem curioso cuius satisfacturam et perutilem insuper de monetarum transmutandarum ratione discursum inueniet. Ultimo in loco me hoc opus non profundis Politicarum rerum indagatoribus (quorum gustui nihil praeter quintessentiam sapit) sed iuuenibus inexpertis, et externa regna visendi studio flagrantibus scribere profiteor. Restat ut Deo optimo Maximo qui mihi <haec> expereundi, et experta scriptus mandandi facultatem dedit, devoto corde, gratias, quas possim maximas, et humilimas referam, earumque actione, opus <ut>

absoluturus, ita exordiar. Denique Lectori benevolo pacem, invido  
resci[pi]scentiam, opto, et utrumque bene valere iubeo.

Tuae benevolentiae  
imprimis studiosus.

Fynes Moryson

English (*Itinerary*: prefatory material, unmarked leaf)

To The Reader

For the first part of this Worke, it contains only a briefe narration of the daily iournies, with the rates of Coaches or Horses hired, the expences for horses and man's meat, the soyle of the Country, the situation of Townes, and the descriptions thereof; together with all things there worthy to be seene: which Treatuse in some obscure places is barren and unpleasant (espetially in the first beginning of the worke,) but in other places I hope you will iudge it more pleasant, and in some delightfull, inducing you favourably to dispence with the barrennes of the former, inserted only for the use of unexperienced Travellers passing those waies. Againe, you may perhaps iudge the writing of my daily expences in my iournies to be needles & unprofitable, in respect of the continuall change of prices and rates in all Kingdoms: but they can neuer be more subject to change, then the affaires of Martiall and ciuill Policie: In both which, the oldest Histories serue vs at this day to good vse. Thirdly and lastly, touching the First Part of this VVorke, when you read my expences in vnknowne Coynes, you may iustly require the explaining of this obscurity, be expression of the values in the English Coynes. But I pray you to consider, that the adding of these seuerall values in each daies iourney, had been an Herculean labour; for auoiding whereof, I have first set before the First Part, a brief Table expressing the value of the small Coynes most commonly spent, and also have expresdly & particularly for each Dominion and most part of the Prouinces, set downe at large, how these values answer the English Coynes, in a Chapter written of purpose to satisfie the most curious in this point, namely the fifth Chapter of the third Booke, being the last of this First Part: in which Chapter also I have briefly discoursed of the best means to exchange

monies into forraigne parts. Touching the VVorke in generall, I wil truly say, that I wrote it swiftly, and yet slowly. This may seeme a strange Riddle, and not to racke your wit with the intepretation, my selfe will expound it: I wrote it swiftly, in that my pen was ready and nothing curious, as may appeare by the matter and stile: and I wrote it slowly, in respect of the long time past since I viewed these Dominions and since I tooke this worke in hand. So as the VVorke may not uniuistly bee compared to a nose-gay of flowers, hastily snatched in many gardens, and with much leasure, yet carelessly and negligently bound together. The snatching is excused by the haste, necessary to Travellers, desiring to see much in short time. And the negligent binding, in tru iudgment needs no excuse, affected curiositie in poor subiects, being like rich imbroidery laid vpon a frize jerkin; so as in this case, onely the trifling away of much time, may bee imputed to my ignorance, dulnes or negligence, if my iust excuse be not heard: in the rendering whereof I must craue your patience. During the life of the worthy *Earl of Devonshire*, my decased Lord, I had little or no time to bestow in this kind: after his deth, I lost fully three yeers labor ( in which I abstracted the Histories of these 12 Dominions thorow which I pased, with purpose to ioyne them to the Discourses of the seuerall Commonwealths, for illustration and ornament: but when the worke was done, and I found the bulke thereof to swel, then I chose rather to supresse them, then to make my gate bigger then my Citie.) And for the rest of the yeers, I wrote at leasure, giuing (like a free and vn hired workman) much time to pleasure, to necessary affaires, and to diuers and long distractions. If you consider this, and withall remember, that the worke is first written in Latine, then translated into English, and that in diuers Copies, no man being able by the first Copie to put so large a worke in good fashion. And if you will please also to take knowledge from me, that to saue expences, I wrote the greatest part with

my owne hand, and almost all the rest with the slowe pen of my seruant: then I hope the losse of time shall not be imputed vnto me. Againe, for the worke in generall, I professe not to write it to any curious wits, who can indure nothing but extractions and quintessences: nor yet to great State-men, of whose reading I confesse it unworthy:but only to the vnexperienced, who shall desire to view forraign kingdomes. And these may, the rather by this direction, make better vse of what they shall see, heare, and reade, then my selfe did. If actiue men neuer reade it, I shall wish them no lesse good successe in their affaires. If contemplative men shall reade it at leasure, making good choice of the subjects fitting their humours, by the Table of Contents, and casting away the booke when they are weary of reading, perhaps they may finde some delight: only in case of distaste, I pray them remember, to and for whom it was written. To conclude, if you be as well affected to me, as I am to you, howsouer I deserue no thanks, no doubt I shall be free from blame. And so I wish you all happinesse, remaining

*Yours in due respect,*

Fynes Moryson

## Appendix B

### Letters and Documents used in the Biographical Investigation

#### Transcriptions of principal letters used in study (in chronological order)

##### 1606-1607 Correspondence

(i) Fynes Moryson to Edward Lacon, 21 January 1606, *Losely Manuscript*, SHC, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters, Z/407/Lb. 621

(ii) Fynes Moryson to Edward Lacon, 12 February 1606, *Losely Manuscript*, SHC, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters, Z/407/Lb. 622

(iii) Fynes Moryson to Edward Lacon, 6 July 1607, *Losely Manuscript*, SHC, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters, Z/407/Lb. 623

##### 1610 Correspondence

(i) Fynes Moryson to Mr Gresham, 7 May 1610, *Losely Manuscript*, SHC, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters, Z/407/Lb, 628

(ii) Fynes Moryson to Mr Garrett, undated, *Losely Manuscript*, SHC, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters, Z/407/Lb, 629

(iii) Fynes Moryson to Mr Curwin, 19 June 1610, *Losely Manuscript*, SHC, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters, Z/407/Lb, 630

## 1606-1607 Correspondence

## Letter 1

Mr Lacon. The tyme of the paying of the Kinges rent being neere  
 I thought it good to remember your promise (when you were with me) to send  
 me xxl out of your [next] michelmas rent for the payment thereof.  
 I pray you to, and it be some tyme better after and in the meane tyme  
 I pray you lett me have from you as at the tmye when I expect it, because 5  
 it would be a great displeasure to me if I have  
 looked for it and you have fayled me. I shallbe in Eire  
 most part of Lent and Easter hollydayes in *which* tyme if you  
 send it I pray you lett it be delivered to my brother Alington  
 and his aquittance shall be as sufficent as my owne for the 10  
 discharge. I heare that after this michaelmas rent the former  
 tenant will be payed and that Suite will be made there ffor discharge of  
 the Land. but theare is another debt drawn out of the effects of  
 wardes due by my brother *Edward* Morison for which the land will be  
 all extended anone and when that is answered there is a greater 15  
 debt of my brother Thomas to be charged on Tetney *Grange*. I am  
 watchfull and have some intelligence to knowe of any alterations  
 and will not fayle to use my best meanes for the reconing of the  
 lease and will advertise you of any imminent change, for it  
 concerneth you no less then my self since you will nowhere 20  
 have a quiet proportion of your lease as during the Kinges extent  
*which* havinge all statutes and \_\_\_\_ for coming on Tetney.  
 I pray you send the rent against that tyme but (the truthe is {*sure*})

it can be uncovered) it may be payd here before Easter, and in  
the mean tyme let me have from you when to expect it. So with  
my very hearty commendations praying you upon opportunity  
to remember my kynde tone to Mr Musseden and my sister I  
ask to remember me to your neighbour John Chapman and his wife.  
I bid you a very hasty ffarewell. from my chamber at  
Mr Jarvis his house in Redcrosse Street the 21<sup>st</sup> of January 1606.

25

30

Your very lovinge friend

Fines Morison

## Letter 2

Note: This letter is in v. poor condition

Mr Lacon, I *{received}* your *{letter}* by this bearer , and for the twenty pounce  
*{deducted}* by the Sheriff out of your rent, if the high Sheriffe  
 be cast out of the doore and have payed it there is no remedy but to repay  
 it hym againe, Otherwise I am promised by my Brother Alington and by my  
 Brother *{Wingfield}* that they will take opportunity, with, Mr Osborne 5  
 for assurance of my warrant of *{exchanging}* at the next tearme  
 if the under Sheriffe or any servant of his will call upon me or them for  
 the dispatch of yt till such tyme I am warranted by them both to write  
 unto you that you should intreaty the under Sheriff in theyr name to forebaer  
 leasing the same. I doubt not but they bring in Personall office so that 10  
*{surely}* he will regard their intent for a great matter. I wrote onto  
 you the other day to remember you of the xx pounds you promise to paie me  
 so to paye the Kynges rente, and because the tyme is at hande I againe pray  
 you to send yt to me if you can possibly, before Easter and because I goe out  
 of the countrie before mid Lente, and retourne not till after the holydayes 15  
 if you sende yt in the meane tyme I praye you gived yt to my Brother Allington  
 or if you cannot finde commodity to sende yt up before the beginninge of  
 the next tearme, yet I pray you in the meane tyme sende me worde when I  
 shall retourne excepte yt till then. I may because yt that if you can sende  
 yt before you shall doo me a great pleasure to save me that trouble accordinge 20  
 to your friendly promise when you werr with me. So to leave I pray *{I}* maie  
 hear from you with the Firste. So with my very hartly commondaycons

I leave you to the protection of the Almighty. from my lodginge at  
*Master Jarvis* his house in Redcross Street this 12 of Ffebruary  
1606.

25

Your very loving friends

Fynes Morison

## Letter 3

Mr Lacon I looked to have seene you before *your* going downe  
but I was better contented to fayle therein, because I hoped *your* speedy  
departure could not be without a releef of your molestation  
*which*, better content to you the Satisfaction to *your* arrears.  
Upon the promise to pay xx L at Bartholemewes fayre and of *your* 5  
michelmas rent to any of whom I should have take it up,  
I have borrowd the mony, upon my brother Allingtons being  
ingaged to see it payed at that tyme, *which* presumeth to performe  
upon this my letter, and I said upon your promise assured  
for to releave it, and thereafter pray you not to fayle 10  
the payment if not at the tyme precisely, (*which* doth not  
much import) yet assone after as you can! I knowe  
not whether you will come up in michaelmas tearme or  
at what tyme you will send up the rest of the rent, but if  
it be after the day prefixed for the Kinges rent, I pray 15  
you likewise by my brother Allington send me up at michel  
mas five poundes for the halfe yeares Rent to the King.  
So *with* my hearty commedattions and wish of your welnesse  
I commend you to the Almightyes Protection. Ffrom my  
Lodging in Redcrosse Street and Mr Jarvis his house. The 20  
Sixth of July 1607

Your assured frend

Fines Morison

## 1610 Correspondence

Letter 4

To My very lovinge and  
 very respected friend  
 Mr Gresham at  
 Ffullum

I pray you to believe me on my honest word, that [which]  
 The sute in Lawe wherof you write is not followed by me, but by  
 A gentleman *Sir Richard Moryson* hath imployed to that purpose onlye  
 And that to his great charge, *though* he might have had as much opportunitie  
 By me self of free cost (I meane for my paynes not if {*expence*} or 5  
 if Lawe. So at first it is not in my power to doo any thing  
 herein (according to *your* request or of my self and since you  
 may heare *Sir Richard Moryson* hath some jelosy of [my] me So  
 as he would not comitt the cause to my care. I hope you  
 will not think fitt that I should by evasion deliver him 10  
 whom he hath truste. This I write is the truth written  
 in more playness for the {*sacred*} paynes that I would  
 wish to any, but such a good friend as your self, to whom  
 further {*I do*} give full Saticffaction of my readyness to doo  
 any curtesy in my power. And if at your comming to [here] 15

towne you will please to see me at my lodging

I will make both further pointes clear to you, and assure

you to be free [of any] (to my uttermost power), of any

attachement to be served on you at this *your* coming to

me. Or if you please to send me word whear you

20

lodge I will come to you for I desyre to speak

*with you* about a small matter concerning me. Ye

because I shall have occasion to showe you many papers [I]

as occasion speache shall offer for making all

I say more cleare to you. I rather wish (if it may serve

25

*with your comercey* that you would come to my lodging

whear you shallbe free from any trappe so so farre as I can

possibly prevent it. And so I take my leave.

7 May 1610

Your very lovinge friend

Fines Moryson

## Letter 5

Mr Garret, I pray you speak with Mr Curwin in the Ffleete, and  
apoint with him a tyme for Mr Gresham's meeting you hear in my chamber  
and give him assurance, that he shall come ergo away from thear without  
any trouble from you or by your meanes. And lett me know the tyme of meeting  
when you have spoken with Mr Curwin that I may be waiting in my chamber. 5

Your very lovinge friend,

Ffynes Moryson

Mr Curwin his lodging is hard by the door on the left hande.

## Letter 6

To my very lovinge  
 friend Mr Curwin  
 at the Ffleete

Mr Curwin. I marvayle so that I heare not from Mr Gresham  
 in regard I have caused Mr Garret to stay *Sir Richard Morysons* Suit  
 in the exchequer only to speake with him wanting to his desyre  
 and have my Self put in my Bill in the duchye to *which* he  
 promised me Speedy answer. Mr Garrett will stay no longer 5  
 from prosecuting this suite, and if he would give me direct answer  
 in my owne business affaire I should see what to resolve, wheras now  
 I lease the tearme in wavering expectance and if he fayle me  
 in the curtosy promised, he shall doo me double wrong, not only  
 in fayling me (*which* I am lothe to thinke he should doo) but in stayinge 10  
 me from taking other courses I intended before. I pray you lett  
 me have a Speedy and direct answer, and I will be beholden to  
 you for your kyndness, and if you please to further me in so  
 honest a cause, you shall fynde me thankfull. So I take  
 my leave. 19 June 1610 15

Your very loving friend  
 Fynes Moryson

### Transcription of the will of Thomas Moryson

Surrey History Centre Archive, Losely Manuscript, LM/1083/5, 21 Nov 1592, copy of inquisition post mortem on Thomas Moryson [Morrison], esq, who died 19 Feb 1592.

#### Will of Thomas Moryson, 19 January 1591 (1592)

In the name of god amen *Sir* Thomas Morison of Caderbie in the Countie of Lincoln esquire beinge whole in bodie and of pefecte remembraunce praised be god doe make this my laste will and testamente in manner and forme followinge. Ffirste I bequathe my Soule to allmightie god the father, the sonn and the hollie ghoste, thee proud and one god, Stedfastlie and faithefullie trustinge and belivinge, by the onlie merite of the moste bitter deathe and passion of my Saviour and redeemer Jesus christe, to have receeve and see forgivienes and pardonn of all my Sinns and life everlastinge, Yeat touchinge the veracitie of life in this mortall & transitory worlde, and howe beautefull, it is, for the Satisfsaction of my minde and conscience, and that my younger children yeat not advanaced maie be provided for, and my debtes wholie and trulie Satisfsied and discharged, and that all further legacies and bequestes, as I Shall discharge and bequathe, by this my last will and testaumente maie be peformed <Thus> I give and bequathe to the poore people inhabitinge within the the parishe of St Botolph without Aldersgate in the cittie of London ffive poundes of lawfull englishe moneie. And to the poore people inhabitinge within the townes of {Hawhardby} {Caderby} {Woldeneson} and {Thoresbie} in the countie of Lincolne five poundes and to the

poore people in Tetney Twentie shillings. Item I give and biquathe to my sonn  
 Ffines Morison Three hundred poundes of good and lawfull money of Englande To  
 be paide unto him when he shall come and be of the age of twentie eighte yeeres,  
 And in the meane time I will that my Exequitors shall paie unto him Tenn poundes  
 yeerlie unto Suche time as he shall come and be of the said age of twentie eighte  
 yeeres. Item I give unto my said sonn Ffines Morison, the advowson of the  
 whole gifte of the prebende or rectorie of Louthe in the Said towne The *whiche* I  
 and my sonn George Alington have of the gifte and graunte of *Master* {Devreux}  
 and *Master* {Cave}Esquire. Item I give and bequathe to my Sonn Richarde  
 Morison, one annuitie or rente, charge of Twentie poundes by yeere out of my  
 grange or capitall {uassage} in Tetney, and other landes theare, in the Saide  
 Countie yeerlie to be paid at the feaste of Easter and michellmas by then foresaid  
 or within fifteen daies nexte after tithe of the said leases , And if it shall happen  
 the Said annuitie or rente charge of Twentie poundes, or anie parte or parcel  
 thearof, to be behinde and unpaide at the Said feastes and daies, That then it  
 shallbe lawful to the Said Richard Morison or his assigned, to take a {asuritieses}  
 {discharge}, and the same to keepe and detaine untill satisfied and paide of all  
 further avowages as shallbe behind unaccseced and unpaide. I would alwaies that  
 if my said sonn Richard, shall hereafter {alliot}, bargaine <or> sell his said annuitie  
 or rente charge of Twentie pounce by yeere, or anie parte or parcell thearof. That  
 then this my gifte and biqueste Shalbe to him utterlie voide and if noe office, anie  
 thinge hearin contained to the contrarie wherwith standinge. Item I give and  
 bequiathe to my lovinge daughters, Jane Allington and Ffaiethe Mussenden My two  
 standing cuppes or bowles double gilte nowe beinge in my house in London, And  
 Jane Allington to take her {th\_i\_e\_} *without* them she will have. Item I give and  
 bequathe to Francis Morrison, and Elizabethe Morison daughters of my Sonn

Edwarde Morison either of them one hundred poundes of lawewfull englishe  
 monie at the daie of their severall marriages, or when they or either of them  
 shall accomlishe the full age of Twentie and one yeeres *whichsoever* shall  
 happen further And if it shall please god that their or either of them shall die and  
 departe the worlde before they or either of them shall be married or to be of the  
 saide age of Twentie one yeeres That then my minde and will is the other for  
 livinge shall have the portion of the other sisters for dieinge. Item I give to Charles  
 Alington, the sonn of George Allington fortie poundes. And to Hughe Allington  
 Sonn of the said George Allington fortie poundes. And to hughe Allington Sonn of  
 the said George one hundred markes to be paide to them or either of them when  
 thei or either of them shall come and be of the age of Twentie one yeeres, And if  
 it happen the saide Charles or Hughe or either of them to die before their or  
 either of them doe accomlishe the saide age of Twentie one yeeres, Then my  
 minde, and will is that the portion of him for dienge before the said age of Twentie  
 one yeeres shall come and remaine to his brother ther livinge. Item I give to  
 everie one of my brothers William Morison his children three ponde five  
 shillinges eighte pence To everie one of my [nep]nephewe Cowper his childrenn  
 Three ponde five shillinges eighte pence. To everie one of my neiphewe  
 Leonarde Palmer his children Three ponde five shillinges eighte pence. to my  
 nephewe Thomas Morison sonn of henrie Morison five poundes. To John Deere  
 fortie shillinges. And Richard Deere fortie shillinges. Item I give to my cosin  
 {Hawer} five poundes, And to everie one of my servauntes and women servauntes  
 to whome I paie wages, one yeeres wages. Item I give and bequathe to Thomas  
 Morison deere sonn of my sonn Edward Morison Tenn poundes to be paide unto  
 him, when he shall accomlishe and be of the age of Twentie one yeeres. Item I  
 give and bequathe to my sonns Ffynes Morison Henrie Morison Richarde Morison

And to my daughters Jane Allington and ffaithe Mussenden, all my plate nowe in my house in London, not bequathed in this my last will and testamente, to be divided amongst them by the discretion of my exequotors or anie twoe of them Item I give and bequathe unto my lovinge daughters Jane Allington and Ffaithe Mussenden To either of them Twoe paire of fine sheetes Two pillowes and two pillowbeds, One fine table clothe, and one dozen of napkins of my linen at Cadeby, in the countie of Lincoln by the discretioun of my exequotors. Item I give to my goddaughters Katherine Rimmer and Katherine Ganderton, and to my Goddsonns Anthonie williams and Thomas Palmer, to everie of them, a ringe of the value of Twentie shillinges, And to my neice {Twiberman} Three pounde Five shillinges eighthe pence And to her daughter Ffortie shillinges, And I give to my clerkes Matthew Palmer Thomas Spencer Richard Pettee and William Halton for everie one of them one colte or nagge by the discretioun of my exequotors. Item I given and bequathe unto my sonn Edwarde Morison all my plate in my house at caderby aforesaid Excepte the lesser double gilte bowle, or standing cup theare the *which* I give to my daughter morioson, his wife. Item I give to my <said> son Edwarde Morison, my ringe, with the seale of <my> armes. Item I give and bequathe to my sonn Richarde Morison one bedstead and a featherbed withall the furniture thearunto belonging Item I give and bequathe to my sonn henrie Morison one bedstead, one featherbed withall the furniture thearunto belonginge, my lease of the {domaines} of the manor of Waythall with the {appointingue} in the Countie of Lincoln and the lease of his chamber in Graies Inn, in the countie of midlesex. And the lease of the thirde parte of the graunge of {\_as\_audall} and the fifthe parte of the saide Graunge in the countie of Lincoln. Item I give and bequathe to my Sonn Thomas Morison and Helen his wife, my brewinge kettle in my house at {Camden} in the Countie of Hertfordee, And for

muche of my pewter brasse, and other impllementes theare, to the value of  
 Twentie poundes, Lynn Morison theire daughter fiftie poundes to be paide to her  
 when she shall accomlishe the age of Twentie and one yeeres, or daie of her  
 marriage the *which* shall happen further. Item I give unto Robert Morison oute of  
 the sumes of my sonn Edward Morison one annuitie or rente charge of Tenn  
 poundes of lawfull englishe monie out of my graunge in Tentney and other landes  
 pastures and withal gross parcel of the said graunge theare givinge his title  
 naturall to be paid yearlie at Easter and Michellmas by { } retourne or within  
 fifteen daies after either of the said feastes, And if it shall happen the saide  
 annuitie or rente charge, or anie parte thearof to be behind and unpaid at the said  
 fifteen daies That then it shallbe lawfull for the saide Robert Morison or his  
 assigned to take a {asuritieses discharge}and the same to keep and detaine, until  
 he be satisfied and paid of all further owages as shallbe behind uncaccessed, and  
 unpaid And that my last will and testament maie the better be performed my  
 debts and legacies thearby discharged My mind and will is that my exquotors or  
 the {Govenors} or the {Govenors }of them shall presantlie after my deathe with as  
 muche Speede as comfortablie maie be, Give, bargaine {alliot} and sell all that my  
 manor of Ffulsowe with the {appurtenante} and all my landes, furniture  
 and{heraditreses} in Fflusowe, Marche Chappell, Gainetheorpe, Macholme,  
 Goldcoate and Utterbie in the Countie of Lincoln, And all debt my capitall {ussage}  
 or {Tenenesie} with the {appurtenant} in the parish of St Botolphs without  
 Aldersgate in the cittie of London. And with the monie that shallbe received for  
 the Said, shall satisfie contente and paie all my debtes, and all my legacies, by this  
 my last will and testament givven and bequathed to { } or oxford at  
 {Saturdaie}, Daies {fi\_\_e} and {f\_\_ed} as shallbe due to be paid to them and everie  
 of them. Item I give & bequathe unto my sonn Edward Morison, all that my

capitall {uessage} graunge or {Tenanisie} with the{appurtenant} in Tetney, and all  
 other meadowes pastures and feedinges, called Another thinge in Tentey  
 aforesaid, and the tithe corn, and hay of the said Graunge and Another thigne as  
 either of them with the {appturtenants} in Tetney aforesaid. To my sonn Edward  
 Morison and his heires forever, uppon the condition that he my said sonn Edward  
 Morison shall suffer Cousine Ffrancss Mussenden and George Alington or the  
 children of them, To give grante {alliot} bargaine and sell all that my saide  
 manour of Ffulsowe and my capitall {uessage} or {Teneneicie} in London  
 aforesaid, wherin he hathe any righte or title by (lease) of the {f\_\_} whearby it  
 cannot be decided by my last will and testament or if onlie two parts of the saide  
 premisses and that my will and meaninge is that if my foresaide Sonn Edward  
 Morison goe about to lett or hinder the salen of the premises, according to my  
 true intente and meaninge, and shall refuse to make anie appeasement to my  
 saide sonnes Ffrancis Mussenden, and George Allington or all his {\_\_ese} he cann  
 remaine in the same for the furtheraunce of the sale of the premises That then  
 this devise shallbe voide unto my saide sonn Edward Morison and unto his  
 heires. And that I give and bequeathe the saide capitall {ussuage} graunge of  
 Caderbie and other premises with the {appointinge} in Tetney aforesaid unto my  
 sonnes Ffynes Moryson, Henrie Morison and Richard Morison and that my will  
 and meaninge is, that my said younger sonns before nominated shall haveholde  
 and owne the saide{uessage}landes {Tenancies} and {hereditariese} in  
 Tetney aforesaid, after my debtes funerall and legacies paide, To them and to  
 theare heires forever. Item my will and minde is, That if my sonnes Edward  
 Morison and Thomas Morison, or either of them, or anie other, by theare  
 asserted meanes or procurement doe lett or interupte the exequtors of this my  
 last will and testamente, or anie thinge thearin contained, accordinge to my first

meaning and to them or either of them given by me in this my last will and  
 testamente, shall be to them or either of them for interruptinge utterlie void and  
 of noe effecte, anie thing contained in this my last will and testamente to be  
 contrarie wherewith {standing} Item I make and ordain my lovinge sonn Edwarde  
 Morison, Ffrancis Mussenden and George Allington exequtors of this my last will  
 and testamente and doo give unto the saide Ffrancis Mussenden Tenn poundes,  
 And the said George Allington Twentie poundes for their paines, and also I doo  
 make and ordaine my verie good Lorde the Lord Cheife Justice of England Sir  
 Andrew {\_\_\_\_} Knight and my verie lovinge and assured frendes Knighte Allington  
 and Thomas Tailor esquire Supervisors of this my last will and testamente  
 and doe give every one of them one piece of plate of the value of five poundes  
 The {residue} of all my goods, leases, cattell, foells and plate not before  
 bequeathed, my funeralle expenses, my debtes paide, and legacies discharged, I  
 give and bequeathe to my sonn Edward Morison. Item my will and minde is that if  
 anie ambiguitie, doubte or question shall growe, or arise in this my last will and  
 testamente and my meaninge thearin Then I will and my minde is that my saide  
 meaninge shall be decided, expounded, determined and ordered by my said  
 exequtors or anie two of them. Item witnes whearof I have hearbie ascribed my  
 name and Also my Soale. The nineteenthe daie of Januarie in the Thirtie fourethe  
 yeare of the raigne of our sovraigne ladie Elizabeth by the grace of god of  
 England Fraunce and Ireland {The one} defender of the faithe or One thousand,  
 five hundred and ninetie one. Thomas Morison, Sealed and published in the  
*companie* of Richard Pettell, Henrie Barber, William Halton, Sir Roberte Robinson.

### Transcription of the Will of Fynes Moryson

National Archives, Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, PROB 11/157, Will of Fines or Fynes Morison, 18 March 1630.

Mr Fines Morison his last will and testament bearinge date 15 Sept. 1629

To Mrs Elizabeth Dynne his pictures To George Allington Esquire His best night Capp and handkercheife To Mr FFrancis Dynne his bookes and Cabonett. To Mr William Ireland his gilded halberd To Mrs Susan Ireland his wife all his lynnens and the trunke wherein it lyeth To Sarah Ireland two redd chaires and two redd stooles both of cloth To Mr Edward Waterhouse Twentie shillinge To his Servant Isaac Pywall all his wearinge apparel excepte his best cloake Also his bed wherin he lay with the furniture belonging there unto. As alsoe the hanginge of his chamber. And of this his last will he makes Mr Francis Dynne Executor. This is the effect of the will of Mr Ffynes Moryson who died the twelfth of Ffebruary last.

Witnesses FFrancis Dynne Isaak Pywall Susan Ireland

Probatum fuit testamentum suprascript apud London

Decimo octavo die mensii Martii Anno Domini Millimo sexcentesimo vicesimo nono Juramento Ffrancisei Dynne executoris

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

#### Printed

John Aubrey, *Miscellanies Upon The Following Subjects* (London: Edward Castle, 1696)

Angel Day, *The English Secretorie* (London: Richard Lane, 1592)

Thomas Bennet, *Athenae Oxonienses, An exact History of all the Writers and Bishops who have had their education in the most famous University of Oxford* (London: Thomas Bennett, 1691)

*The Holy Bible, conteyning the Old Testament, and the New: Newly Translated out of the Originall tongues: & with the former Translations [Tyndale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, Cranmer's, Parker's, and the Genevan] diligently compared and reuised by his Maiesties speciall Comandement* (London: Robert Barker, 1611)

Sir Thomas Brown, *Religio Medici* (London: Andrew Crooke, 1643)

William Camden, *Britain, or A chorographical description of the most flourishing kingdoms, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the ilands adioyning, out of the depth of antiquitie: beautified with mappes of the severall shires of England: vwritten first in Latine by William Camden Clarenceux K. of A. Translated newly into English by Philemon Holland Doctour in Physick: finally revised, amended, and enlarged with sundry additions by the said author.* (London: John Bishop & John Norton, 1610)

Thomas Coryate, *Coryats Crudities; Hastily gobled vp in five Moneths traueils in France, Sauoy, Italy, Rhetia commonly called the Grisons country, Heluetia aliàs Switzerland, some parts of high Germany, and the Netherlands; newly digested in the hungry aire of Odcombe in the county of Somerset, & now dispersed to the nourishment of the traueiling members of this kingdome* (William Stansby: London, 1611)

Thomas Coryate, *Coryat's Crudities* (Glasgow: Maclehose, 1905)

Thomas Coryate, *The Odcombian Banquet: dished foorth by Thomas the Coriat, and serued in by a number of noble wits in prayse of his Crudities and Crambe too* (Thomas Thorp: London, 1611)

Richard Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana* (H. Clark for Joseph Watts: London, 1689)

Thomas Dekker, *Lantern and Candlelight*, Viviana Comensoli (ed.) (Centre for Renaissance and Reformation Studies: Toronto, 2007)

- Laurence Echard, *A most compleat compendium of geography* (London: Thomas Salisbury, 1691)
- John Florio, *A Worlde of Wordes, Or Most copious, and exact Dictionarie in Italian and English*, (London: Edward Blount, 1611)
- Thomas Fuller, *The Historie of the Holy War* (1647) (Glasgow: Glasgow University Press, 1883)
- Thomas Fuller, *The Histories of the Worthies of England* (London: John Grismond, 1662)
- Thomas Fuller, *English Worthies in Church and State, Alphabetically digested into the severall shires and countries therein contained* (London: William Thackeray 1684)
- Clare Gebert (ed.), *An Anthology of Elizabethan Dedications and Prefaces* (University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia, 1933)
- Peter Heylyn, *France Painted To The Life* (London: William Leake, 1656)
- Richard Hooker, *The Worke of Richard Hooker* (London: Thomas Newcomb for Andrew Crook, 1666)
- Ben Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair*, Colin Counsell (ed.) (Nick Hern Books: London, 1997)
- Ben Jonson, *Every Man Out of His Humour*, Helen Ostovich (ed.) (Manchester University Press: Manchester, 2001)
- William Lithgow, *Painful Peregrinations* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1614)
- Martin Luther, *Biblia Das ist die gantze beiligi Schnifft*, Translated by Martin Luther (Wittenberg: Charios Lehn, 1589)
- Gervase Markham & Nicholas Banton, *Conceyted Letters, Newly Layde Open* (London: B. Alsop for Samuel Rand, 1618)
- Fynes Moryson, *An Itenerary written by Fynes Moryson, Gent. First in the Latine Tongue, and then translated by him into English. (Containing his ten yeeres travell through the twelve dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turkey, France, England, Scotland, and Ireland.)* (London: J. Beale, 1617)
- Fynes Moryson, *An Itinerary Containing His Ten Yeeres Travell through the Twelve Dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turkey, France, England, Scotland & Ireland, Vol I-IV* (Glasgow: Glasgow University Press, 1907)

William Nicholson, *The English historical library, or, A short view and character of most of the writers now extant, either in print or manuscript which may be serviceable to the undertakers of a general history of this kingdom* (London: 1696)

Abbe Nollet & Thomas Birch, 'An Additional Remark to One of Mr. William Watson, F. R. S. in His Account of the Abbe Nollet's Letter concerning Electricity'. *Philosophical Transactions* (1683-1775), Vol. 48 (1753 - 1754), pp. 484-486

Sir James Perrott, *The Chronicle of Ireland 1584-1608*, Herbert Wood (ed.) (Dublin: The Stationery Office, 1933)

Peter Pett, *The happy future state of England: or, A discourse by way of a letter to the late Earl of Anglesey, vindicating him from the reflections of an affidavit published by the House of Commons, Ao. 1680 etc* (London: 1688)

Thomas Powell, *Humane Industry, or, A history of most manual arts deducing the original, process and improvement of them: furnished with a variety of instances and examples, showing forth the excellency of human wit* (London: Henry Herringman, 1661)

Samuel Purchas, *A Theatre of politicall flying insects*, 1657 (T. Parkhurst: London, 1657)

Samuel Purchas, *Pvrchas his pilgrimage. Or Relations of the vworld and the religions obserued in all ages and places discovered, from the Creation vnto this present. In foure partes. This first containeth a theologicall and geographi call historie of Asia, Africa, and America, with the ilands adiacent. Declaring the ancient religions before the Floud ... With briefe descriptions of the countries, nations, states, discooueries, priuate and publike customes, and the most remarkable rarities of nature, or humane industrie, in the same. By Samuel Purchas, minister at Estwood in Essex* (London: William Stansby for H. Fetherstone, 1613)

Samuel Purchas, *Purchas his Pilgrimes. In five bookes. The first, contayning the voyages made by ancient kings and others, to and thorow the remoter parts of the knowne world, etc* (London: William Stansby for H. Fetherstone, 1625)

Barnaby Rich, *A New Description of Ireland wherein is described the disposition of the Irish, whereunto they are inclined, etc* (London: T. Adams, 1610)

William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, The Norton Shakespeare, Stephen Greenblatt (ed.) (London: Norton & Company, 2005)

William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Othello, the Moor of Venice*, The Norton Shakespeare, Stephen Greenblatt (ed.) (London: Norton & Company, 2005)

William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Anthony and Cleopatra*, The Norton Shakespeare, Stephen Greenblatt (ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, The Norton Shakespeare, Stephen Greenblatt (ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

Sir Philip Sidney, *An apology for poetry: or, The defence of poesy*, ed. Geoffrey Shephard (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1973)

John Spencer, *Kaina kai palaia. Things new and old. Or, A store-house of similies, sentences, allegories, apophthegms, adagies, apologues, divine, morall, politicall, &c. with their severall applications. Collected and observed from the writings and sayings of the learned in all ages to this present. By John Spencer, a lover of learning and learned men* (London: W. Wilson and J. Streater for John Spencer, 1658)

Thomas Thomas, *Thomae Thomasi dictionarium summâ fide ac diligentia accuratissimè emendatum, magnâque insuper rerum scitu dignarum, & vocabulorum accessione, longè auctiùs locupletiusque redditum: huic etiàm (praeter dictionarium historicum & poëticum etc* (Cambridge: John Legat, 1600)

Richard Verstegan, *The post of the world wherein is contayned the antiquities and originall of the most famous cities in Europe. With their trade and traficke. With their wayes and distance of myles, from country to country. With the true and perfect knowledge of their coynes, the places of their mynts: with al their martes and fayres. And the raignes of all the kinges of England. A booke right necessary and profitable, for all sortes of persons, the like before this tyme not imprinted* (London: Richard Rowlands, 1576)

Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses* (London: Thomas Bennet, 1691)

**Manuscript**

BL, Stow MS 325, Council of Trade Document, f. 187b

BL. Add. MS. 36706, 'Fynes Moryson's Itinerary in Ireland', ff. 1-289

BL. Harl. MS. 5133 'Itinerarium quod Fynes Moryson Anglus scripsit, Decemalis suae peregrinationis observationes continens, per Germaniam, Bohemiam, Helvetiam, Belgiae Provincias unitas, Daniam, Poloniam, Italiam, Turciam, Galliam, Angliam, Scotiam, et Hiberinam', Vol.I &II, ff.1-490

Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 'An itinerary', pt 4, MS no. Xciv ff.1-681

National Archives, Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, PROB 11/125, Will of Edward Lacon, Gentleman of Tetney, Lincolnshire, 09 May 1615

National Archives, Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, PROB 11/157, Will of Fines or Fynes Morison, 18 March 1630

National Archives, Records of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, PRO 1 /4 Will of William Shakespeare 25 March 1616

National Archives, Probate Records, Curtis, Jarvis, of St. Gyles, Cripplegate, London, citizen & borderer, ref. 1669W, August 16 1670

Peterhouse, Cambridge, Archives, Computus Roll, 1589-90

Peterhouse, Cambridge, Archives, Buttery Books, M.3.7

Peterhouse, Cambridge, Archives, Buttery Books, M.3.6

Records of the Exchequer, and its related bodies, with those of the Office of First Fruits and Tenths, and the Court of Augmentations, E367 LINCOLNSHIRE, Morison, Fines: Two parts of the manor of Tetney, 1604

Suffolk Record Office, Lowestoft, Adair Family Archives, HA12/A2/1/64, 'The Rebellion of the Earl of Desmond' extract from Fynes Moryson's Itinerary, Part II, Book I, Chapter 1, p.3.

Surrey History Centre Archive, Losely Manuscript:

LM/1083/5, 21 Nov 1592, copy of inquisition post mortem on Thomas Moryson [Morrison], esq, who died 19 Feb 1592

LM/1083/8/1 20 Nov 1596, certified copy of bargain and sale

LM/1083/15/1-4 Sep-Dec 1608, articles of agreement

**Letters****Mountjoy Correspondence**

National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Sir Robert Lovell to Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, October 8 1600, SP 63, 207, V, f. 255

National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy to the Privy Council, December 11 1600, SP 63, 207, f. 97

National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy to Sir Robert Cecil, February 4 1601, SP 63, 208, I, f. 89

National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy, to the Privy Council, February 6 1601, SP 63, 208, f. 97

National Archives, State Papers Domestic, Sir Robert Cecil to the Lord Deputy, Dublin Council and the commanders in the Low Countries, Feb 10, 1601, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic series, of the reigns of Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth, (James I) 1547-1580 (1581-1625), (1547-1590)* R. Lemon (ed.) (Mackie & Co: London, 1872) p. 547

National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy to Sir George Carew, February 7 1601, SP 63, 208, I, f. 106

National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy to Sir George Carew, February 7 1601, SP 63, 208, I, f. 106

National Archives, State Papers Ireland, Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy to Sir Robert Cecil, February 24 1601, SP 63, 208, pt. I, f. 138.

#### **1606-1607 Correspondence: Lacon**

(i) Fynes Moryson to Edward Lacon, 21 January 1606, Losely Manuscript, SHC, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters, Z/407/Lb. 621

(ii) Fynes Moryson to Edward Lacon, 12 February 1606, Losely Manuscript, SHC, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters, Z/407/Lb. 622

(iii) Fynes Moryson to Edward Lacon, 6 July 1607, Losely Manuscript, SHC, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters, Z/407/Lb. 623

#### **1610 Correspondence: Gresham**

(i) Fynes Moryson to Mr Gresham, 7 May 1610, Losely Manuscript, SHC, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters, Z/407/Lb, 628

(ii) Fynes Moryson to Mr Garrett, undated, Losely Manuscript, SHC, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters, Z/407/Lb, 629

(iii) Fynes Moryson to Mr Curwin, 19 June 1610, Losely Manuscript, SHC, Papers of Sir George More, Lacon Letters, Z/407/Lb, 630

## Secondary Sources

Robyn Jade Adams, 'Both diligent and secret: The intelligence letters of William Herle', QMUL PhD thesis, 2004

John C. Appelby and Paul Dalton (ed.), *Pirates and Communities; scenes from Elizabethan England and Wales in Outlaws in Medieval and Early Modern Europe Crime, Government & Society 1066-1600* (Ashgate: Surrey, 2009)

Ian W. Archer, 'The Charity of Early Modern Londoners', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, Vol. 12 (2002), pp. 223-244

John Michael Archer, *Sovereignty and Intelligence: Spying and Court Culture in the English Renaissance* (Stanford University Press: California, 1993)

Rebecca Ann Bach, *Colonial transformations: the cultural production of the New Atlantic World 1580-1640* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002)

David J. Baker, Willey Maley, *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Jack Beeching (ed.), *Voyages and Discoveries, The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation* (London: Penguin, 1972)

Thomas Bettridge, *Borders and Travellers in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007)

Penrose Bois, *The Urbane Traveller, 1591-1635* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1942)

Clifford Edmund Bosworth, *An intrepid Scot: William Lithgow of Lanark's travels in the Ottoman lands, North Africa and Central Europe, 1609-21* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006)

Michael. Brennan, *Literary Patronage in the English Renaissance: The Pembroke Family* (London: Routledge, 1988)

Patricia A. Cahill, *Unto the breach: martial formation, historical trauma and the early modern stage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

David Cast, 'A Problem of Erasmian Iconography', *Simoilus: Netherland's Quarterly for the History of Art*, Vol. 7, 1974, pp. 1-2

Edward Chaney, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour: Anglo-Italian cultural relations in the Renaissance* (London: Frank Cass, 1998)

- Chloe Chard, *Pleasure and Guilt on the Grand Tour: Travel Writing and Imaginative Geography 1600-1830* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999)
- Peter Clark, *The European Crisis of the 1590s: Essays in Comparative History* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985)
- Dudley Edwards and Mary O'Dowd (ed.), *Sources for Early Modern Irish History 1534-1641* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)
- James Ellison, *George Sandys: travel, colonialism and tolerance in the seventeenth century* (Cambridge: DS Brewer, 2002)
- Geoffrey Rudolph Elton, *The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1982)
- Bernice S. Engle, 'The Use of Mercury's Caduceus as a Medical Emblem', *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (Dec., 1929), pp. 204-208
- Christopher D. Gabbard, *Gender Stereotyping in Early Modern Travel Writing on Holland* *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 43.1 (2003), pp. 83-100
- Jonathan Goldberg, *Writing Matter: From the hands of the English Renaissance* (Stanford University Press: California, 1990)
- Paul F. Grendler, 'The Universities of the Renaissance and Reformation', *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 57, No. 1 (Spring, 2004), pp. 1-42
- Andrew Hadfield, *Amazons, Savages, and Machiavels; Travel and Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630: An Anthology* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 2001)
- Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Travel and Colonial Writing in the English Renaissance, 1545-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)
- Andrew Hadfield, John McVeagh, *Strangers to that land: British perceptions of Ireland from the Reformation to the Famine* (Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1994)
- Paul E. J. Hammer, 'Cuffe, Henry' (1562/3–1601) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2008
- Paul E. J. Hammer, 'Danvers, Sir Charles' (c.1568–1601) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2008
- See Paul E. J. Hammer, 'Devereux, Robert, second earl of Essex' (1565–1601) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2008
- Paul E.J. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2<sup>nd</sup> Earl of Essex, 1585-97* (Cambridge University Press: London, 1999)

- Paul E.J. Hammer, 'The Use of Scholarship: The Secretariat of Robert Devereux, Second Earl of Essex, c.1585-1601', *English Historical Review*, 1994, pp. 26-51
- Michael Hattaway, *A New Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture, Vol I* (Chichester: Blackwell, 2010)
- David R. Hauser, 'Medea's Strain and Hermes' Wand: Pope's Use of Mythology', *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 76, No. 3 (Mar., 1961), pp. 224-229
- Jonathan Haynes, *The Humanist as Traveller: George Sandys' Relation of a Journey* (Associated Universities Press: London, 1986)
- John Barnard, Lotte Hellings, Donald Francis McKenzie, J. B. Trapp, Maureen Bell (ed.), *The Cambridge history of the book in Britain: Volume IV, 1557-1695* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2002)
- Frederick Gotthold Heymann, *John Ziska and the Hussite Revolution* (New York: Princeton University Press, 1955)
- A.J. Hoenselaars, *Images of Englishmen and Foreigners in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Associated University Press: London, 1992)
- Peter Holland, 'Shakespeare, William' (1564–1616) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2008
- Peter Holmes, 'Warmington, William' (b. c.1556, d. after 1627) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2008
- Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992)
- Charles Hughes, *Shakespeare's Europe* (London: Sherratt & Hughes, 1903)
- Peter Hulme and Tom Youngs (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- Anders Ingam, 'English literature on the Ottoman Turks in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', PhD thesis, Durham University (2009)
- Frederick M. Jones, *Mountjoy 1563-1606, The Last Elizabethan Deputy* (Colman & Reynolds: London, 1958)
- Ivo Kamps, Jyotsna G. Singh, *Travel Knowledge: European 'discoveries' in the early modern period* (New York: Palgrave, 2001)
- Graham Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited: the unpublished "Itinerary" of Fynes Moryson (1566 - 1630)' (Birmingham University PhD Thesis, 1998)
- Barbara Korte, *English travel writing from pilgrimages to postcolonial explorations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000)

- Ann Kussmaul, *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1981)
- Kate Loveman, *Reading Fictions 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008)
- Wallace T. MacCaffrey, 'Cecil, William, first Baron Burghley' (1520/21–1598) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2008
- Antoni Maczak, *Travels In Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995)
- Christopher Maginn, 'Blount, Charles, eighth Baron Mountjoy and earl of Devonshire' (1563-1606), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2008
- Peter C. Mancall, 'Introduction: What Fynes Moryson Knew', *The Journal of Early Modern History*, Vol. 10, (2006), Issue 1/2, pp. 1-9
- Scott Mandelbrote (ed.), Peterhouse College Sale Catalogue, *Donations of Books to Peterhouse* (Cambridge: Peterhouse, 2007)
- Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge University Press: London, 1995)
- Robert W. Maslen, *Elizabethan Fictions-Espionage, Counter-Espionage and the duplicity of fiction in the Elizabethan Prose Narrative* (Clarendon Press: London, 1997)
- William E. Mead, *The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century* (Ayer Publishing, London, 1970)
- See Leslie Moscow McGranahan, 'Charity and the Bequest Motive: Evidence from Seventeenth-Century Wills,' *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 108, University of Chicago Press, 6 (Dec., 2000), pp. 1270-1291
- Bruce McLeod, *The Geography of Empire in English Literature 1580-1745* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999)
- Andrew W. Moore, 'Fountaine, Sir Andrew' (1676–1753) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2008
- Hiram Morgan, *Tyrone's Rebellion: The outbreak of the nine years war in Tudor Ireland* (Boydell Press: Suffolk, 1993)
- Steven Murdoch, *Scotland and the Thirty Years War, 1618-1648* (Leiden: Brill, 2001)
- Heiko Oberman and James Tracy (ed.), *The Handbook of European History 1400-1600*, (E.J Brill: New York, 1994)

Melanie Ord, *Travel and Experience in Early Modern English Literature* (Palgrave: Basingstoke, 2008)

Helen Ostrovich, *The mysterious and the foreign in early modern England* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008)

Patricia Palmer, *Language and conquest in early modern Ireland: English Renaissance literature and Imperial expansion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Geoffrey Parker, *Europe in Crisis, 1598-1648* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001)

Geoffrey Parker, *The Thirty Years War* (London: Routledge, 1997)

Thomas Pennant, *Some account of London* (London: printed for Robert Faulder, New Bond-Street, by R. Taylor and Co. 38, Shoe-Lane, Fleet-Street, 1805)

Mike Pincombe (ed.), *Travels and translations in the sixteenth century: selected papers from the Second International Conference of the Tudor Symposium* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004)

A. F. Pollard & Rev. Sean Kelsey, 'Wilson, Sir Thomas' (d. 1629) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2008

Josef V. Polišínský & Frederick Snider, *War and Society in Europe 1618-1648* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 1978)

David B. Quinn (ed.), *The Hakluyt Handbook* (London: Hakluyt Society, 1974)

David B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1966)

Richard Rambuss, 'The Secretary's Study: The Secret Designs of the Sheperdes Calendar', *ELH*, vol. 59, 1992, pp. 313-335

Michael J. Redmond, *Shakespeare, Politics and Italy: Intertextuality on the Jacobean Stage* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009)

Robert W. Richgels, 'The Pattern of Controversy in a Counter-Reformation Classic: The Controversies of Robert Bellarmine', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 2, Catholic Reformation (Summer, 1980), pp. 3-15

William Rockett, 'The Structural Plan of Camden's Britannia', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (Winter, 1995), pp. 829-84

I.A. Shapiro, 'The Mermaid Club', *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 45, No. 1 (Jan., 1950), pp.6-17.

William Joseph Sheils, 'Whitgift, John' (1530/31?–1604) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2008

Jyotsna G. Singh, *A companion to the global Renaissance: English literature and culture in the age of expansion* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009)

Preserved Smith and Robert Bar, 'The Names of Englishmen at Wittenberg in the Sixteenth Century', *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 36, No. 143 (Jul., 1921), pp. 422-433

Adam Smyth, *Autobiography in early modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

H. L. Snuggs, 'Fynes Moryson and Jonson's Puntarvolo', *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 51, No. 4 (Apr., 1936), pp. 230-234

Robert Somerville, *History of the Duchy of Lancaster* (Chancellor and Council of the Duchy of Lancaster: London, 1953)

Peter Stallybrass, Roger Chartier, J. Franklin Mowery, Heather Wolfe, 'Hamlet's Tables and the Technologies of Writing in Renaissance England', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 55.4 (The Folger Shakespeare Library: Washington, 2004), pp. 379-419

Victor Stater, 'Herbert, William, third earl of Pembroke (1580–1630)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2008

Alan Stewart, *Close Readers-Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England* (Princeton: New Jersey, 1997)

Anna Suranyi, *The Genius of the English Nation: Travel Writing and National Identity in Early Modern England* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998)

Lawrence Stone, 'Elizabethan Overseas Trade', *The Economic History Review*, New Series, Vol. 2, No. 1 (1949), pp. 30-58

Michael Strachan, *The Life and Adventures of Thomas Coryate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962)

Michael Strachan, 'Coryate, Thomas' (1577?–1617) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Sept 2004)

Ernest William Talbert, 'The Purpose and Technique of Jonson's "Poetaster"', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Apr., 1945), pp. 225-252

Ulrike Tancke, *Bethinke thy selfe, Writing Women's Identities in Early Modern England* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010)

Dick Taylor, 'The Early of Montgomery and the Dedicatory Epistle of Shakespeare's First Folio', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 10, No.1 (Winter, 1959), pp. 121-231

- E. H. Thompson, 'Elizabethan economic analysis: Fynes Moryson's account of the economics of Europe', *History of Economic Ideas*, 3/1 (1995), pp. 1-25
- Edward H. Thompson, 'Moryson, Fynes' (1565/6–1630) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2008
- C.H.Toy, 'The Queen of Sheba', *The Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 20, No. 78 (Jul. - Sep., 1907), pp. 207-212
- Richard L. Trapp, 'Ajax in the Illiad', *Classical Journal*, Vol. 56, No. 6 (March 1961), pp. 271-275
- David J. B. Trim, 'Markham, Francis' (1565–1627) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); online edn, Oct 2008
- Anthony F. Upton, *Europe 1600-1789* (London: Arnold, 2001)
- Alexendra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)
- John Watkins, *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- Karl P. Wentersdorf, 'Hamlet's Encounter with the Pirates', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Winter, 1983), pp. 434-440
- Franklin B. Williams, *An Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses In English Books Before 1641* (London: Biographical Society, 1962)
- Mary Floyd-Wilson, Garrett A. Sullivan, *Embodiment and environment in early modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)
- Austin Woolrych, *Britain in Revolution 1625-1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- C. E. Wright, *Fontes Harleiani: a study of the sources of the Harleian collection of manuscripts preserved in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London: British Museum, 1972)
- Richard Wunderli and Gerald Brocee, 'The Final Moment before Death in Early Modern England', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (Summer, 1989), pp. 259-275

## Reference

James A. Ballantine, *A Law Dictionary of Words, Terms, Abbreviations and Phrases Which are Peculiar to the Law and of Those Which Have a Peculiar Meaning in the Law. Containing Latin Phrases and Maxims With Their Translations and a Table of the Names of the Reports and Their Abbreviations* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1916)

W.W Greg and E. Boswell, *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company*, (Bibliographical Society: London, 1955)

Hans J. Hillebrand, *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of the Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996)

Ian Lancashire (ed.), *Lexicons of Early Modern English* (Toronto: University of Toronto Library and University of Toronto Press, 2006)

R. Lemon, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic series, of the reigns of Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth, (James I) 1547-1580 (1581-1625), (1547-1590)*, (Mackie & Co: London, 1872)

F. W. Maitland, *The Forms of Action at Common Law* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1962)

H. Wanley, D. Casley, W. Hocker, and C. Morton, with an index by T. Astle, *Catalogue of the Harleian Collection of Manuscripts preserved in the British Museum* (London: 1759) Vol. II

*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2009); online edn [<http://www.oxforddnb.com>].

*Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford, 2009), online edn. [<http://www.oed.com>]