

國立中山大學外國語文研究所

碩士論文

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE INSTITUTE
OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE
NATIONAL SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY

指導教授：蘇其康

Advisor: Professor Francis H. K. So

題目：羅烈之進退維谷：

《世界史》中天命論與國族論之對壘

Title: Raleigh's Dilemma:

Medieval Providentialism vs. Renaissance Nationalism in

The History of the World

研究生：賴錦儀 撰

By Lai Jin-Yi

中華民國八十九年七月

July 2000

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to express my greatest gratitude to my advisor, Professor Francis K. H. So. Without his patient guidance and invaluable advice, the completion of this thesis would have been impossible. During the days of my writing, Professor So always gave me the most important opinions and encouraged me with his passion for literature and his indefatigable instruction. No words can ever bespeak me of my appreciation for him.

My special thanks are to the examiners, Professor Nicholas Koss (Fu-Jen Catholic U.) and Professor Yang Ming-Tsang (NTU), for their perceptive suggestions which not only enlighten me in various respects but also help improve my knowledge in the field of Renaissance studies.

I would also like to thank my sister musketeers, Pao-I Hwang and Effie Chen, for their lasting support and forever friendship. I am also grateful to many friends, Ashlee, Jay, Gloria and Mona, who generously gave me their helping hands in the past few years. My sincere thanks are to my roommates, Shiao-ching and Yien-Ju, for their companion in H Dorm. Particularly, I want to say thank you to Rocky Shih for his proofreading and constant assistance.

Last but certainly not the least, I would like to express my love for my family and my life-long friends, Cat-egg and Lulu.

I am always indebted.

論文名稱:羅烈之進退維谷:《世界史》中天命論與國族論之對壘

頁數:一百零九頁

校所組別:國立中山大學外國語文研究所

畢業名稱及提要別:八十八學年度第二學期碩士學位論文提要

畢業生:賴錦儀

指導教授:蘇其康 教授

論文提要

本論文旨在以歷史觀念的發展角度來命論與國族論二者之對壘關係。在此部世界史中，羅烈致力於將整個世界的發展史融入基督教一統之教義中，藉以呈現中古傳統之天命觀與英國文藝復興時期新興之國族意識的融合。然而，由於文藝復興時期人文學者對古典文物的回歸，此般的融合卻也揭示了一些根存於內在的相關問題。在此，國族論的興起被視為是古典城邦制度下愛國主義的一種轉型。

因此，本論文第一章著重在史觀的形成與發展，其中古典時期著重於人與其活動的描寫，而中古則著重於神，因為只有神才能使人到達天堂、得到幸福。除了人與神的區別外，此二時期對時間的主張也大不相同。古典歷史學家認為歷史之循環性與塵世間的盛代興衰息息相關，但中古神學家卻堅持一直線性向發展的史觀。有了這些不同的觀念後，第二章所要探討的是人文主義運動及宗教改革對文藝復興時期古典、中古思想之融合所帶來的影響與革新。

第三章處理有關羅烈在《世界史》序言中對天命論的思想架構。於此，羅烈主要傳達之目的是：神的旨意所引導之新教的勝利及塵世之有限與天堂之無盡的對比。因此人們都應該放棄世間欲望的追求而向神尋求救贖。第四章的主題則著重在羅烈於歷史本文中所大量探討與政治、軍事及各種相關之議題，在在展現其對國族意識的倡導，不遺餘力。然而，相對於羅烈天命論與國族論的分野，在其不斷游移於基督教信仰和過去的光榮事蹟之間卻也導致其《世界史》史觀的矛盾性。

本論文在結論中進一步討論羅烈的人格發展及其政治生涯。在詹姆斯一世政權之下所蒙受之冤獄促使他把寫歷史當作一種自我表達來為自己的多重身份及行為辯護。最後，本論文所要強調的是羅烈在《世界史》呈現之古典和中古二者傳統思想的對壘。儘管不斷倡導中庸之道，致力於尋求二者之平衡點，羅烈之天命論與國族論的不相容性仍展現在其史觀的矛盾中。

Abstract

This thesis aims to discuss the confrontation between providentialism and nationalism in Walter Raleigh's *History of the World* in light of the development of the writing of history. Raleigh's proclamation in the Preface to write a universal history demonstrates his endeavor to accord the medieval tradition of divine providence with the new concept of nationalism in the English Renaissance. Yet, the integration of the two ideas reveals the polemics intrinsic in the rooted classical tradition resulted from the humanist revival of antiquity in the Renaissance. Nationalism in terms of its increasing emphasis on men as individual entities here is interpreted as a transformation of the classical patriotism towards the special political structure of city-states.

Therefore, the former part of the first chapter is focused on the primitive formation of the history from epic to the classical historiography in which men and their activities are the primary concerns in the writing of history. The latter part of the chapter then turns to the maturation of the medieval historiography with the rise of Christianity, in which God is considered to be the first cause leading men to the perfect happiness in heaven. Aside from the different emphases on men and God, these two traditions vary from their discrepant assertions of time. The classical historians insist on the cyclic nature of history in correspondence to the wax and wane of the world, while the medieval theologians hold the notion of a lineal sequence of time. Chapter Two then proposes to depict the historiography of the Renaissance as an integration of these two traditions and a renovation due to the humanist movement and the Protestant Reformation.

Chapter Three deals with the theme of divine providence as is theorized in Raleigh's long exposition of the Preface in his *History*. Here, the religious application is purposed to inform the readers of two things: God has directed in the course of

history the victory of Protestantism; worldly happiness is only finite while the heavenly bliss is eternal. Men shall turn to God for the final salvation by renouncing the pursuit of the worldly desires. Chapter Four is attempted to study the nationalistic elements in Raleigh's miscellaneous digressions in which many of his political opinions and military advice are delineated. In contrast to his outline of divine providence, Raleigh shows an inconsistent attitude constantly vacillating from his insistence on the Christian belief to his nostalgia of his past glories.

This thesis concludes with a further investigation of Raleigh the person and his success and frustration between the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I. Raleigh's undeserved imprisonment becomes one of the reasons that motivates him to write a history as a self-expression to justify his life as a courtier, as a soldier, as an adventurer, and as a Christian man to face his difficulties in a "resolved" manner. Finally, I shall return to my argument that the conflict between God and men comes from the confrontation of the classical and the medieval focuses. Though Raleigh advocates to live a moderate life that well-balances the two traditions, he still manifests a dilemma in his presenting the incompatibility between providentialism and nationalism in *The History of the World* with respect to the changeful political powers.

Introduction

History, following the lexicographical definition in *OED*, comes from the Latin word “*historia*” meaning “narrative of past events, account, tale, and story” while its Greek etymology, ἱστορία, denotes “a learning or knowing by inquiry” (v.7 261). In the Latin expression, however, history is merely taken as a recording of the past, a listing of all kinds of accounts which may be based on truth or fiction in a narrative form such as story-telling. Yet, according to the Greek root of the word, there conveys a sense of epistemological understanding in which people acquire knowledge through the process of inquiry. While this lexical notion may bring us to the polemic of the nature of history, it also contains two constituents which form the basis of the development of history. One is the search for truth in history; the other is the use or function of history. Whether it be truth-telling or pragmatic, the discussion of history has been not only evocative but interpretive for the centuries past and will be so for those to come because human developments proceed with the flow of time and with the progressive characterization of human activities. Within the defined time and space, the writing of history seems to be the best way to prove and further define the significance of human existence in the universe.

With this conceptualization, we shall look temporarily into the discussion of history or the philosophy of history of our time as background knowledge and using this structural frame as a point of departure, I shall investigate Renaissance historical writing, particularly Walter Raleigh’s *History of the World*. First of all, I shall draw the controversy between science and humanity in the twentieth century as a starting point since the scientific revolution of the nineteenth century has functioned as an inner dynamic force that altered the philosophy of history. Karl Popper (1902-1994), honored as one of the “original,” “creative” and “greatest” philosophers of science,

defines historicism of the nineteenth century in *The Poverty of Historicism* as:

An approach to the social sciences which assumes that *historical prediction* is their principal aim, and which assumes that this aim is attainable by discovering the ‘rhythms’ or the ‘patterns,’ the ‘laws’ or the ‘trends’ that underlie the evolution of history. (3)

The keywords of this passage highlighted in italics designate a relativism of the flow of history from which certain principles can be extracted to explain and predict the future. This relativism obviously alludes to Darwin’s theory of evolution in the nineteenth century where he studied life as a science with the inter-relationship between nature and the changes of physical environment through time, and advances a mechanism of natural selection intrinsic in the process of evolution. The revolutionary idea of history in the nineteenth century has been promoted to unification with natural scientific methodology in order to find the pattern in history. A similar theory of modification that works through the course of time ensures a successive progression from the past to the present and such a theory will prove the same in the future, a lineal exertion of time. At this juncture, the study of history is identified with a historiography in which historians hold the idea that the similar theory of evolution will be discovered in human history. They believe history does not repeat itself in a cycle, but it progresses with the law of natural selection embedded in the development of history, as was proposed in Darwin’s theory of evolution. Such a law is the emergent goal that historians have to find. But such a positive and active attitude collided with the breaking out of World War I (1914-1918), shattered the scientific ideal and disillusioned many people of the time. Against a scientific search for universal disciplines, Popper defends, “history is characterized by its interest in actual, singular, or specific events, rather than in laws or generalizations” (143). He admits the uniqueness of each particular

historical event, which signifies nothing in its historicity. But, since history is “selective” (150), the points of views are fabricated as an approach to a “historical interpretation” (151). He rejects the predictions of history but formulates the “idea of the open future” in which history is taken as a guesswork with its conjectural probabilities. “It [history] has no reality in it” (3),¹ and the uncertainty of history allows the play of probabilities that opens to interpretations. It is the function of history accommodating the uncertain and tending to be selective that makes it significant for us to learn from the past.

According to Popper then, history is a subjective re-presentation of viewpoints that may introduce multiple interpretations as the historians vary, and which no specific laws can ever satisfactorily explain. Such would be the characteristic of history in the twentieth-century point of view. A few years later, Hayden White (1928-) assumes that history in its pragmatism is somewhat distorted as a means for the historians to arrive at certain purpose in their historical works. In *Metahistory: the Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (1973), White nullifies the truth of history in that each historian interprets history as a narrative form of story-telling under his own theoretical construct, which is not necessarily based on facts but rather a creation as a manifesto of personal ideology. Challenging the established historiography, his theory of history however locates the position of historians with the novelists. By reviewing the typology of historiographical styles in the nineteenth century, he re-inspects the historical work as:

a verbal structure in the form of a narrative prose discourse.

Histories (and philosophies of history as well) combine a certain

¹ Giancarlo Bosetti, introduction, *The Lesson of this Century: with two talks on freedom and the democratic state*. This book is a collection of Popper’s opinions on freedom and democracy interviewed by Bosetti.

amount of “data,” theoretical concepts for “explaining” these data, and a narrative structure for their presentation as an icon of sets of events presumed to have occurred in times past. (ix)

White refers to a purpose (icon) of history by re-creating the past event through theoretical structuralized reproduction. The “historical thinker,” in White’s term, uses different historical materials (data) as the fundamental framework to conceptualize their ideological implication. Here, the word “discourse” denotes an act of back and forth, an interaction between the past and the present seen no longer as diachronic analysis but as a work of art presented in literary styles.

In the midst of modern explications, history has been specified as literary writing in terms of the free association of historical events as evidence to analyze the causality from which different historical studies branch off, such as political history, economic history, psychohistory, social and socio-analytical history, and multiculturalism. Under such an exposition of Popper and White as representatives of the twentieth-century historiography, the purpose of my thesis is to re-investigate Sir Walter Raleigh (Raleigh) and his writing *The History of the World*. Raleigh, a skillful politician, presents his history more a prose work than a formal history because his historiography not only informs the reader of his idea of history but is taken as a way of self-presentation with respect to the social, political and religious changes of his time. In the Preface, Raleigh makes it clear that “beginning with the Creation: I have proceeded with the History of the World; and lastly purposed. to confine my discourse, within this our renowned Island of Great Britain” (124). Grounding his history on the grand schema of the Christian world, he however rests his discourse within national affairs. To undertake such a task, Raleigh realizes his history with personal

appropriation and speculation to explain the course of time and to convince the audience of his history. As he aims to write a universal history (in its religious sense) within the confinement of England of his time, can his *History* be classified with a “post modern” view as an ideological conveyance in terms of the twentieth-century point of view? Does Raleigh try to re-allocate the historical figures through his own presentation of history? Why does he not write a history of Great Britain? To this end, we have to first understand Raleigh and his background of writing a general history.

Walter Raleigh (1552?-1618) was born of a country gentleman. A soldier, captain, adventurer, and writer, he volunteered and participated in many important events in his time. For instance, he was the founder of Virginia (now North Carolina) by sponsoring and dispatching a private navigation to North America. This discovery and the spatial expansion of territories may signal an innovative act that would have to be taken into consideration in later chapters with regard to the political deliberation of his time. After having joined the court in London, Raleigh acquired the favor of Queen Elizabeth during his court service, and was promoted from a country gentleman to the most promising courtier in England because of his lucrative positions in the court and for his profitable privateering at sea. Upon his discovery of Virginia, Raleigh began to practice the idea of building up a colony, but the attempt was abortive. Still, he was believed to be the first of his people to expand the English territory beyond the seas.

In 1592, it seemed that Raleigh had run out of his luck, for his secret marriage with the queen's maid of honor triggered Queen Elizabeth's wrath, and she put him into imprisonment. He was released shortly after, but from then on he was also out of her favor. Raleigh was still active in public activities and in parliament. However, when Elizabeth died in 1603, he was soon arrested for treason under the command of James I and was sent to the Tower of London for thirteen years. During his imprisonment, Raleigh tried several times to ask permission for another expedition to

Guiana in the hope that he might bring back gold for the penniless king and ask pardon for himself. Unfortunately, his last voyage failed, and he was executed in 1618.

Throughout his lifetime, Raleigh showed a great interest in literature. *The History of the World* was composed during his imprisonment, and dedicated to his royal friend, Prince Henry. As a matter of fact, his *History* is considered to be his other attempt to get himself released but the death of Prince Henry thwarted his hope. Critics like Anna Beer and Steven May have looked into his works and find the changes in his writing from those produced in court and those in prison. Most of his coterie poems and prose works in the reign of Elizabeth strongly demonstrate his affection and admiration for the Queen, his patriotism toward England, and his prospect to draw public interest in financing his privateering. With the reversal of his political career, he again uses writing as a form of self-expression, but this time with a different objective. As Anna R. Beer points out:

Under Queen Elizabeth, Raleigh had been the author of coterie poetry, of state propaganda, and political and military advice to the monarch and Privy Council. After 1603, condemned by the king and excluded from the court, he was forced to seek new audiences and to explore new genres. (2)

Under such a premise, Beer is presuming two points from the transformation of Raleigh's writing: one is the experiment with a new literary form; the other, Raleigh's appealing to different groups of audience in his narrative. Though his early poems and prose works were written to curry the favor of the queen or his fellow courtiers, his writing after 1603 turned to "find a public voice" (2), a voice in *History* which bespoke him to justify his grievances and, to use Beer's words again, to challenge his monarch. The change of voices involves the power deliverance from the Tudor

Dynasty to the Stuart dynasty and concerns him with his depreciated status in the court of James I. If Beer is right in maintaining Raleigh's transformation in style with his political derogatory criticism about James I, then we have to see in the later chapters how Raleigh confirms such challenge in the *History*.

The *History*, as Raleigh has intended in the first place, is a traditional Christian universal history, which begins with God's creation of the world and ends in the Last Judgment. Raleigh's idea of history demonstrates the typical medieval historiography in which the historians assert a lineal succession of time that will lead to the religious unification of Christianity, while Renaissance, meaning "rebirth," claims a revival or restoration of the classical tradition. Henceforth, Raleigh includes the alternation of the ancient civilizations in his world history to magnify the cyclic pattern of the world. Moreover, with increasing exploration, discovery of the globe and encountering different peoples and their cultures, historians in the Renaissance no longer appreciate a medieval sacred history in which God is the Designer and human beings work only as His instruments to accomplish His will. Most of the historians separate the mundane pursuit from the sacred veneration and display a predilection for the writing of chronicles to please the monarch, or cater to the popular tastes, or serve as a political propaganda to glorify the nation. Of the most famous are *Union of the Two Noble and Illustrious Families of Lancaster and York* by Edward Hall with an apparent attempt to please the Tudor dynasty, and *The Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland* by Raphael Holinshed. Later, we will have a more detailed comparison of these two historical works. To such historiographical discrepancy and the formation of the idea of history in the Renaissance, we have to probe deeply into the very start of the development of history chronologically to better understand Raleigh's *History* and his purpose in such a historiography.

The first chapter of this thesis will deal with the origin of history by discussing

its vague emergence subordinated in the form of traditional story-telling and grows to the genuine writing of history as in the Greco-Roman era prescribed by the historians of the time. Three historians will be singled out to exemplify the classical historiography in their descriptions of the vicissitudes of the empires and the rise and fall of human civilizations. When the practice comes to the advent of Christianity in the Middle Ages, classical historiography gave way to the medieval historiography, especially under the influence of the theologian's infusion of paganistic elements into Christianity. St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas are two examples exerting a lasting influence in the evolution of the philosophy of history in which time is defined from creation of the world to Last Judgment. The historical works in this phase are directed in light of theological illumination and are labeled as sacred history in contrast to the profane history that emphasizes men and secular perturbations. What differentiates the medieval historiography from the classical lies in the counterposing convictions of the current of time: one distinguishes itself in recognizing history as a cyclic repetition. The other conceives history as successive continuation that it expects an ultimate finality heralded in the age of Christianity.

My second chapter takes to examine the Renaissance historiography with the social transmutation as the backdrop to translate both the converging and diverging forces incorporated in the modern period. Marked by the definition of "modern," the historiography not only embarks on displacing the former two forces in its new and novel discoveries in geography, but the modernness comes to formulate because of the effects to assimilate the two contradictory traditions. However, the modernness has to be explicated in relation to the more advanced understanding of the interior awareness in human psychology and exterior, scientific exploitation of the earth and the universe. Such a broadening of knowledge motivates people of Raleigh's time to take men as the primary concern and re-think what history is, the purpose of writing it, and eventually

the truth in it that the historians endeavor to reveal. Briefly, five historians, including Raleigh, are to be exemplified to generalize the historiography infected with literary ingredients as a form of self-reflection to voice out the historians' criticism of the time.

Chapter Three will focus on the survey of Raleigh's idea of history as a representation of divine providence as is outlined in the Preface of his *History of the World*. As the theme of divine providence is a notion that can be traced back to the Middle Ages, Raleigh's long exposition of Preface is grounded on the justice of God in which God rewards the good and punishes the evils. Predicating his motivation in composing a universal history, he preaches on the role of God as the first cause of life and encourages the reader to eschew the inconstant second causes, those elements relating to human activities in this world. However, this chapter will also discuss the transformation of the idea of divine providence particularly in Tudor England in which a political theology is developed to meet the needs of the Tudor monarchs and to preserve the national mandate of the Tudor Dynasty. With a utilitarian application of a providential history, Raleigh turns the role of God instrumentally to comprise his world history under a Christian framework that will finally lead to the religious reformation and victory of Protestantism in England. Yet, in the reconciliation of the four monarchies with Christian belief, Raleigh's use of divine providence is inconsistently manifested when the political power is succeeded by the Stuart Dynasty. His providentialism in this way can be seen from two respects: a political rendering to please King James I and release him from the Tower of London, and a theological consolation to tell both himself and his readers of the emptiness of the worldly achievements and the importance of the life after death.

Proposing a lineal development of history in the Preface, Raleigh however indulges himself in the delineation of the cyclic secondary causes. And this is the first evidence that Raleigh's assuming the two contending forces at the same time tilts his

providential theory in the Preface. Therefore, the fourth chapter treats the issue of Raleigh's advocacy of nationalism which, in my opinion, is a transformation of the patriotism toward the city-states in the classical tradition. Like the classical historians whose histories are the exaltations of their own cultures, Raleigh expresses his patriotic zeal in the form of history in which many of his political and military opinions are informed. His *History of the World* is written not only for a religious purpose but also for a biographical representation in which much of his success in the Elizabethan age is depicted by way of his employment of digressions. While he makes efforts to demonstrate the world history the revelation of the true religion, Protestantism, Raleigh fails to make a compromise between the conflicting emphases of man and God in the classical and medieval traditions. And this conflict would lead to the more intrinsic controversy between providentialism and the newly developed consciousness of nationalism in the Renaissance. Finally, his history further discloses a more profound layer of meaning presented in the inconsistency of his writing style and his ambiguous standpoints to signify a personal disappointment with the frustration of reality and to reconcile his ambition by way of writing a world history. With such a consideration, Raleigh's history is more than the one he proclaims in the Preface, but his providential history turns out to be an appropriation that yields to its functional purpose in patriotic terms.

Without convenient access to acquire a complete copy of Walter Raleigh's *History of the World*, I start my study of Raleigh's historiography with two concise primary sources available here in Taiwan. One is *Sir Walter Raleigh: Selected Writings* edited by Gerald Hammond; the other is *Sir Walter Raleigh: Selections from His Historie of the World, his Letters etc.* edited by G. E. Hadow. Both editions provide only fragmentary passages, mostly overlapped, of the original, while they still keep the essence that works well to display the contradiction later discussed in my

thesis. Hoping to benefit from an overall landscape of the evolution of the idea of history, I would like to focus on the fact that Renaissance integration of the classical and medieval traditions causes Raleigh's dilemma in the imbalanced reconciliation of the two. With a touch on personal opinions, his history is taken more as a biographical self-expression in the attempt to justify for himself his earthly desires in spite of his theorization of divine providence in the very beginning of his history.

Chapter One

God vs. Man

The Origin of the Idea of History

When do people start to have history? Or when does the idea of history begin to take shape in people's minds? It is true that we are not sure about the answers, but when we begin to learn about western civilization, we all have to turn to the same origin, Homeric epics. Yet can epic be the first form of history? Hainsworth explains that epic poetry tells the stories that can stimulate human affections:

for primary epic poetry is heroic poetry writ large, its range extended and its insights deepened. At the very least the epic puts people, and therefore feelings, hope, despair, sorrow, and triumph, in the events of the heroic lay; at its best it spreads itself over the whole mass of traditional knowledge. (7)¹

Hainsworth's explication does not necessarily imply epic to be a form of history, but elements of history may be contained in the elaboration of the tradition, as shown in Homer's *Iliad* in which the poet not only tells the story but gives information long embedded in Greek culture. The prominence of epic in Greek culture, or for that matter, in the formative period of Western culture, is expanded to an all-embracing dimension. Three points are important: time, people, and actions (of great heroes or of gods). The form of an epic is a narrative whose primitive phase provides examples of myths and folktales to magnify the greatness of the central figures, while the content or spirit of an epic is directed to many aspects, particularly to a moral purpose. With

¹ J. B. Hainsworth, *The Idea of Epic*. In his explication Hainsworth discusses the evolving of epic as a literary genre at different times. This book offers a comprehensive study of the literary elements in epic convention and the corrective definition of epic poetry from its primitive age to the formation of subgenres at later ages.

the evolution of epic poetry as a genre, it develops a deeper significance in regard to the poet's arrangement of the characters and events to come up with a subjective voice and to relieve himself of various emotions. When its heroes "flit between the worlds of history and folktale" (Hainsworth 5), an epic is usually tinged with imagination to be entertaining or functioning as a "public art." It is entertaining in the sense that the telling of the noble deeds of the hero encourages admiration and emulation among the audience. It functions in another sense so that the public features of art will call up a social interest in the community. Thus, Albert B. Lord relates:

Epic singers from the dawn of human consciousness have been a deeply significant group and have contributed abundantly to the spiritual and intellectual growth of man. (26)

This passage associates the epic genre with an application of historical events as material to explicate the development of human civilization. In its primitive phase, most of Homer's epic materials were taken from legends whose verity were untraceable and with which he fuses his stories with mythological gods and goddesses to elevate the figures with supernatural power and intelligence. Due to the mixture of the real with the fictional, we find Homeric epics more in the air than on earth, which means, more fiction than facts. The subject of an epic poem is usually of national importance; the plot advances with the actions of the heroes, but at many times the Olympian gods and goddesses usurp the role of the leading characters.

Moreover, the concept of time recedes into vagueness. In *Iliad*, the only knowledge we have about time is no more than the time span of ten years of the Trojan War.

Anger be now your song, immortal one,
Akhilleus' anger, doomed and ruinous,
that caused the Akhaians loss on bitter loss

....., and the will of Zeus was done.

Begin it when the two men first contending

broke with one another. (Homer 11)

This is how *Iliad* begins. There are two things that we should bear in mind: first, it is Achilles' wrath with which Homer opens his great epic without any reference to when the contention happens. It is not until later that the audience gets to know that the time is already in the ninth year of the war, and it is also in later books that the readers start to know what has provoked the war between the Greeks and the Trojans. The causes are of no historical importance or historical truth in terms of the hero himself or the war itself, but it further leads to the other topic of the will of Zeus. The characters and heroes are framed to "work together" to fulfill the will of gods, no matter how unfair we feel about their meddling in the chaos.

Ernst Breisach notes, "*The Iliad* is aristocratic history. . . . It fitted aristocratic taste. . ." (6) In this case, it is merely a quasi-history in which the author utilizes what he can draw from the material and by means of his writing style to please the aristocratic audience and win admiration among the common people.

Classical Historiography: History Repeats Itself

An epic is a kind of poem in elevated form in which much creative imagination is rendered to the description, and the subject of the epic not only contains historical greatness but also the mystical characterization of the heroes. With its implicit historicity, epic may be the most primitive form of history, but from another perspective, Tom Griffith proceeds to say, "The Western tradition of history-writing was created by Herodotus (ca. 484-430/420B.C.) and Thucydides (ca. 464-after 400B.C.)."² Herodotus, honored to be the Father of History, has recorded in his *Histories* primarily

the account of the Persian invasion of Greece and collected a wide-range of interesting events and anecdotes. His effortless recording of everything wins him the greatest praise, which was, on the contrary, sharply criticized by his contemporary, Thucydides.

In the very beginning of *Histories*, he claims:

These are the researches of Herodotus. . .

In the hope of thereby preserving from decay the remembrance of what men have done, and of preventing the great and wonderful actions of the Greeks and the Barbarians from losing their due need of glory. . . (Herodotus 3)

His words unmistakably express an adoration of the Greek culture which later generations can also pay homage to, and the same words lay down the degradation of the barbarous Persians considered to be an uncivilized people. As Persia and Greece are two contending political entities, we can well expect some comparisons unavoidable between the eastern and the western world, a confrontation of two governments, imperialistic and democratic. Such a comparative arrangement seems pretty much like Popper's "preconceived selective point of view" by which Herodotus purports to keep the memory of the past and its wisdom by recording the glorious achievements of the Greeks. The arrangement of the historical events signifies that the glory of the past may function as an inspiration for generations, for in the process of human development, the repetitive quality of certain events prompts history to repeat itself. That is why in *Histories*, Herodotus usually compares events happening in different ages so as to find sympathetic counterparts, and anticipates that the audience will be benefited from reading them. He faithfully preserves as various as possible the events seen or heard. But, some of them are so difficult to be credited or even so

² Tom Griffith, introduction, *Histories*, by Herodotus, trans. George Rawlinson vii.

absurd that he was once called the Father of Lies. Thucydides criticizes Herodotus' work as a mere collection rather than history, i.e., "a mixture of myth, fantasy, and entertainment" (Herodotus vii). Thucydides' comment stresses his insistence on the truth of history as more than a mixture of everything. Thucydides was later taken up by the Renaissance historians who perceived truth-telling as the principle of the writing of history. Regarding this kind of criticism, Herodotus reminds his audience in Book VII and in other books of *Histories*, "For myself, my duty is to report all that is said; but I am not obliged to believe it all alike" (568). With this pronouncement, Herodotus' role is more a recorder of things than a historian in a confined issue.

Here, Herodotus has magnified a broader view of history that may include a wide variety of things. During his exile, Herodotus is said to have traveled around that he keeps all in recording of *Histories*, including religious beliefs, funeral rites, art, geography and the ethnography of different peoples. He treats his records as evidences, but not necessarily as what he believes in. In this sense, his is a cultural history which documents all sorts of social customs and phenomena of the time. The idea of space is much more emphasized than in the Homeric epics, while time is vague. In Greek special political structure of city-states that keeps well connection among people, the Greeks pay more attention to themselves and those things happening around them without knowing the flow of time as their contemporary Egyptians have learned to calculate (Herodotus 118). Human activities and wisdom are the main subjects presented through a recording of wars, but Herodotus' narrative conveys a strong sense of fate dominating human life. He believes in "divine providence" (in the Greek sense that the ancients usually ascribed the unexplainable to supernatural intervention). Thus he says, "It mostly happens that there is some warning when great misfortunes are about to befall a state or nation" (457). He therefore concludes that "this [the foreboding] was a prodigy whereby the god warned men of the evils that were coming

upon them” (485). Whenever there is doubt, the people he depicts turn to ask for help or advice from the oracle. It is a religious practice rooted in Herodotus’ time as part of the Greek heritage.

Unlike Herodotus who endeavors to seek the universal quality in human beings to appeal to the sense of sympathy, Thucydides inspects each issue and makes analytical comments on it. Though a contemporary of Herodotus, Thucydides disagrees with the former claiming his writing of history as “hearsay reports” (35) and further contends that the “hearsay reports” indicate:

stories cannot be tested and most of them have from lapse of time won their way into the region of the fabulous so as to be incredible. He [the historian] should regard the facts as having made out with sufficient accuracy, on the basis of the clearest indications, considering that they have to do with early times. (Thucydides 37)

This short passage explicitly demonstrates a historiography that historians, or at least Thucydides himself, should bear in mind, that is, the persistence of documenting accurate facts. What is more, it is he who initiates the abstract idea about time as a sequence that the examples of the old time should shed light on the new in the display of the lesson-giving history. While Herodotus vacillates from one event to another and another, Thucydides makes a further attempt to search for human universality by connecting it to the past. Again, Thucydides expounds:

And it may well be that the absence of the fabulous from my narrative will seem less pleasing to the ear; but whoever shall wish to have a clear view both of the events which have happened and of those which will some day, in all human probability, happen again in the same or a similar way—for those to adjudge

my history profitable will be enough for me. And, indeed, it has been composed, not as a prize-essay to be heard for the moment, but as a possession for all time. (39-41)

First, Thucydides takes writing of history as a serious business, not as an entertaining purpose, in which he is responsible for what he says about the things past and their function of teaching by referring the event that is happening to the one that had happened before. In his attempt to seek similarity among historical events, he believes that history develops repetitively in a cycle, that even the most powerful wanes and the weak waxes, and that formal history, in contrast to Herodotus' *Histories*, is bound to be didactic in the sense that it sets up the moral lessons to educate and enlighten the later generations.

With the awareness of time, Thucydides externalizes a desire to present himself and his history paradigmatic to the younger generations. In Homer and Herodotus, men, be it heroes or kings or generals, are the center of the recorded accounts as they both proclaim to tell the stories of "a certain magnitude" (Aristotle 61).³ However, the presence of gods is omnipresent. Homer's gods take equal or even greater part. Domineering, they interfere with human issues as their business. In Herodotus, though lacking a physical existence, the atmosphere remains divine because gods withdraw into the air as a sign, warning, or prophecy. Thucydides' figures are more humanized. Taking the Peloponnesian War as the topic, he deals not only with the battles between Greece and Sparta, but also with the people engaged in the battles as main characters. By adding his examination to every issue, he advocates to seek for the factual explanation that results in the happenings. Take the defeat of the Greek army as an example, he investigates the economic influence toward politics as an innate reason that promotes the war waged.

The cause was not so much lack of men as lack of money. For it was a want of supplies that caused them to take out a comparatively small force, only so large as could be expected to live on the country while at war. (21)

Such analyses tracing back to the causality of events prevail everywhere in his account of events and make him the Father of History in a modern sense. God's will vanishes; there is no wheel of fortune determining human fate, except conflicts and wars among human beings, peoples, societies, and nations. Thucydides has presented a rationale which excludes the supernatural, insisting on the accuracy of history and his analytical methodology in his writing. His methodology of accuracy and search for causality remained to be the legacy of Roman historiography and will exert a great impact upon the Renaissance.

Roman culture succeeds Greek. When the Romans gradually settle down and grow into greatness, they developed a style of their own which was termed the Greco-Roman. According to Breisach, the Greco-Roman in its narrow sense means that the early Roman historians wrote history in Greek. While Polybius (ca. 200-118), a Greek by birth but living as a Roman for most of his life, became the greatest among the Greco-Roman historians (45). Son of a statesman, he takes part in public affairs at an early age, which helps broaden both his perception in political changes and his views concerning the decline of Greek hegemony as the inevitable. Living to witness himself the formation and expansion of the Roman Empire, Polybius negates the Greek idea of democracy centered on the city-state, and therefore its subsequent decline leads to the coming of the Age of Rome.

For who is so worthless or indolent as not to wish to know by what means and under what system of polity the Romans in less

³ The phrase is borrowed from Aristotle's definition of tragedy.

than fifty-three years have succeeded in subjecting nearly the whole inhabited world to their sole government—a thing unique in history? Or who again is there so passionately devoted to other spectacles or studies as to regard anything as of greater moment than the acquisition of this knowledge? (Polybius 35)

The passage well explains the reason that motivates him to write a “systematic history” (3) to acclaim Roman government. Practicing Thucydides’ s theory in the writing of history, Polybius proceeds to further speculate the dynamic forces that realize Roman accomplishments to a great extent. In so thinking, he turns to a more pragmatic purpose in his writing. He sticks to the searching of first-hand evidence or proof either as an eyewitness or a researcher who has traveled abroad to locate the more convincing facts. Focusing on the accuracy of the facts, he thus elucidates, “For as a living creature is rendered wholly useless if deprived of its eyes, so if you take truth from history, what is left is but an idle unprofitable tale” (35-7)⁴. Like Thucydides, he also assumes a didactic function of history in that there must be universal traits serving as “epitome” in the vicissitudes of the ancient that we can learn from.

Avowing to the belief of the relationship of cause and effect, Polybius presents himself a self-conscious historian by expostulating his grand scheme in Book I (7) in his history, mainly centered on the happenings of the Punic War (218-201B.C.) between Rome and Carthage. By connecting the events with geographical enlargement, the historian writes to encompass the areas that no one has ever attempted before him, including Europe and Asia, west and east, the civilized and uncivilized. As a result, his work is considered “the greatest universal history” in terms of the Roman imperialistic geographical expansion and the secular ambition to amplify the range of

⁴ The page numbers are based on the original text in which the Greek version is printed parallel to the English translation.

the Roman Empire (xi).⁵ However, as he strives hard to trace the very cause of the rise of Roman power, Polybius is invariably trapped in the dilemma of the known and the unknown, which also marks the boundary of his historical thinking within his own world. Failing to provide a satisfactory explanation, he ascribes the rise and fall of human condition to the device of Fortune (11). In an overall providential light, Fortune has guided the Romans to an empire of glory as Fortune has guided him to the devotion of writing Roman history. In all, Polybius has complemented Thucydides to a great degree. After him, the historians focus constantly on the story of Rome as an ever-lasting empire. As the Roman Empire amplifies itself through constant wars, historiography of the time turns to a new emphasis on the characterization of the great generals or chieftains. Biographical or autobiographical works became fashionable means to praise, to condemn, to comment or to justify the actions. Sulla, Julius Caesar, Tacitus, Plutarch, Suetonius are famous historians of this kind.⁶ The theme of men as the focal core strengthens the humanistic concern and the idea of humanization. The emphasis of men has been taken to be a distinct feature in the process of history writing in Greco-Roman tradition and is later borrowed to be the symbolic spirit in the Renaissance. Nevertheless, after the fall of the Roman Empire in AD 476, western civilization enters into a new era, which dislodges itself from the Greco-Roman with the flourishing of Christianity in the Middle Ages.

Medieval Historiography: History Progresses in Succession

The Greeks believed that history is cyclic, that history repeats itself, and that

⁵ H. J. Edwards, introduction, *The Histories*.

⁶ Ernst Breisach, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval & Modern*. In Chapter IV-VI he gives a detailed and inspiring overview of the development of Greco-Roman historiography (40-76).

there must be a decline after one reaches prosperity. The Christian Romans, however, disagreed with the notion of history as a cycle, and assumed that it is successive in the sense that the past events are prepared to lead to the glory of the Roman Empire. To such glory, the whole empire gets trapped by the failure to explain the repetitive nature of the world in never-ending turbulence, wars, conflicts, and changes between powers and between emperors. The writing of chronicles becomes the dominant trend, in which historians use a linear pattern to record a series of events to include the past in sequential order within Christian time. With the spreading of Christianity which appeals to the soul, more and more people turn to seek for spiritual comfort.

Historians like Africanus (ca. 180-ca. 250, *Chronography*) and Eusebius (ca. 263-339, *Chronicle, Ecclesiastical History*) are two of those who endorse the concept that the power of the Roman Empire is the fulfillment of divine will (Breisach 59). When it comes to the age of Constantine (306-337), Christianity was officially revered as a national religion and the persecution of Christians came to a temporary stop. While the Romans expected to see a sustaining empire, the invasion from the Germanic west posed a threat to the corrupted Roman government. Out of disappointment, people began to blame the conversion of Christianity as the cause for weakening the country. St. Augustine (354-430) is one among those who try to solve the theological debate between Christianity and paganism. As we shall see in the development of the idea of history, his teaching became the most influential throughout the Middle Ages, for he is the first to add the theological interpretation to his explanation of history and sets up the so-called philosophy of history. He makes evident the importance of God in history so that God is omnipresent and omniscient, and heaven is the ultimate abode for the soul. Among Christian theologians and historians, St. Augustine, with his tactful reconciliation between the Christian and the pagan in his *Confessions* and *City of God*, stays in the center of discussion as the most representative in the Middle Ages and

builds up the foundation of Renaissance historiography.

In his autobiographical *Confessions*, St. Augustine records the process of his conversion as a revelation of God's Providence. Infused with the inheritance from the classical education in his early age and basing his theory on his interpretation of the Bible, he firmly believed in God's will that reveals him to all the evil-doings of the past in order to construct the present him as a Christian convert. As God first created the human race out of His own image, human beings are supposed to be good because God is the "ultimate Good" and God's creation of the universe is His purpose to create good. To the attribute of goodness, St. Augustine imputes evil to the "privation of Good" (*City of God*, XI:22 454), which is not derived from the hand of God but from the choice made by the free will in every rational soul. "No nature is contrary to God; but a perversion, being evil, is contrary to good" (XII:3 474).⁷ Therefore:

When I chose to do something or not to do it, I was quite certain that it was my own self, and not some other person, who made this act of will, so that I was on the point of understanding that herein lay the cause of my sin. (*Confessions* VII:3 136)

St. Augustine presents his belief in original sin foreboded in Adam's fall in *Genesis*, and people will be punished for their sin because God is just. The punishment is also just "in that no one is punished for the faults of nature, but for the faults of will" (*City of God* XII:3 474). There is embedded a strong conception of redemption and salvation in which Jesus Christ is the mediator between God and men as one who "rules as God over all things, blessed forever" (*Confessions* VII:18 152). In a re-making of human history under the context of a Christian formation of the world, Augustine explicates the

⁷ In *City of God*, Books XI and XII contain a discussion of the fall of angels and men, and how evil first appears, which Augustine expounds through the divine Trinity and the approximate image of the Trinity in men.

first verse of Genesis: “In the Beginning God makes heaven and earth” from Book XI to Book XIII. St. Augustine contends that time exists at the moment God creates the world, for it is God who is able to make things out of nothing, and after which time and space come to be realized by men. Thus, in the *City of God*, Augustine has a similar epistemological classification.

Since God, in whose eternity there is no change at all, is the creator and director of time, I cannot see how it can be said that he created the world after a lapse of ages. (XI:6 435)

This passage seems to distinguish the relationship between God and time, but it, at a greater degree, confirms the mystery of the world before Genesis, and distances men from God with His omnipotence. Human activities and their movements are registered under such background. And this also leads to St. Augustine’s polarity pictured in his *City of God*.

We see then that the two cities were created by two kinds of love: the earthly city was created by self-love reaching the point of contempt for God, the Heavenly City by the love of God carried as far as contempt of self. In fact, the earthly city glories in itself, the Heavenly City glories in the Lord. The former looks for glory from men, the latter finds its highest glory in God, the witness of a good conscience. (XIV:28 593)

This passage specifies men’s subjectivity in contradiction to their submission to God. By asserting the “self,” men indulge themselves with overweening pride in the successes of worldly achievement and they then overlook or forget to respect God in due manner. The earthly world featured by its selfishness reinforces the opposition to the Christian ideal of establishing a brotherhood and sisterhood under the “Lord.” The polarity of the two cities betokens not only the contrast between the spiritual and the mundane, but rather the comparison between Christianity and paganism, between

monotheism and polytheism, and further a re-writing Roman history in subordination to the Christian creation of the world.

God decided that a Western empire should arise, later in time. . .

for the sake of honour, praise and glory. . . . (V:13 201)

The Roman Empire...had this further purpose, that the citizens of that

Eternal. . . should fix their eyes steadily and soberly on those examples

and observe what love they should have towards the City on high, in

view of life eternal. . . . (V:16 205)

As people began to accuse Christians of leading to the decline of the empire, St. Augustine composes *The Confessions* and *The City of God* to call on the Romans to recognize the truth that the glory of the Roman Empire is purposed to fulfill God's design. Accordingly, Rome is elevated to an ordained city where men live to accomplish a "pilgrim's progress" to be in God's City under His Will, an afterlife in Heaven. It is not until Judgment Day that the earthly world would fall and those who are unable to ascend to the City of God, the non-Christians, would incur "the second death" (XIX:28 894), the death of the soul when separated from the life of God and the body is subjected to eternal torments.

From the polarity of his City of God and city of the world, St. Augustine opens the distinction of secular (profane) history from ecclesiastical (sacred) history (Breisach 84) of historians and theologians, separating the earthly government and the Church, and implanting the seed of refutation and causing incessant revolutions and movements both in the Medieval and Renaissance and later ages. While the Greco-Roman historiography tends to meet a political propaganda through wars, victories and glories, it stays at the mundane level. Augustine's predestination brings about hope for people, longing for stability, in the pursuit of eternal life in the other world. And with this providential view he sanctifies his interpretation of the Bible

and a Promised Land in the future for Christianity. From his time down to the end of the fourteenth century, men's perception of the world was still limited. Their ideal is to actualize the unification of the world under Christian God, and such an ideal results in many religious wars between the Christians and Muslims. The historiography at this time shows a successive prospect foregrounding on the ascent to Heaven. And it is from this time on that some historians attempt to write universal history beginning with God's creation and going to Judgment Day, and there all the historical figures and their great deeds are fixed into the framework and function instrumentally to fulfill God's Will (Breisach 94).

Having discussed historiography since ancient Greco-Roman times to St. Augustine, who infuses paganism with Christianity and begins to develop a philosophy of history in a more complete sense within a theological context, we have to turn to the late Middle Ages in order to have a better picture to continue the formation of historical thinking in the early Renaissance. Applying the Platonic or Neo-Platonic pursuit of the soul, Augustine teaches people to live with the hope of an afterlife, a life in the City of God. And his teaching also starts the Christian belief in unitary universalism of the world under God's will. In the thirteenth century, Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) supplements the Augustinian idea with a different perspective which symbolizes a transition from the spiritual quest to a discussion of religion in respect to the pursuit of earthly happiness.⁸ Just as Augustine tries to reconcile Platonism with Christianity, Aquinas utilizes Aristotle's logical methodology to set up the disciplines of physics and biology, and his study of human intellect to understand things known to the human world to combine philosophy with religion. Plato believed that there is an "Ideal," the perfect reality, superior and unknowable to human understanding, for human beings are

⁸ This connection between Augustine and Aquinas is pointed out for me by Professor Francis So in our private conversation on medieval historiography.

but images two times removed from reality. Under such a charismatic rendering of the soul, Augustine encourages to seek a spiritual union with God. On the contrary, Aristotle negates such an abstract distinction by appealing to the five senses and the human mechanism of the mind as means of understanding the world, a down-to-earth study of the external nature, human body, animals, the heavenly body, ethics and even psychology. Raphael the Renaissance Italian artist may best exemplify the two different philosophies in his painting, *School of Athens*, where Plato holds a book (*Timaeus*) in one hand and points to the heaven with the other; and beside him, Aristotle also holds his book (*Ethica*) in one hand but points to the front with his finger in the other. It depicts the two different concerns of these two Greek philosophers, Plato's search for a higher perfection and Aristotle's ultimate goal for human happiness. It is Aristotle's practicality that distinguishes the material from the immaterial, the senses from the intellect, and the body from the soul.

With this distinction of the different emphases, Thomas Aquinas tries to blend Aristotle's scientific inquiry and his intellectual contemplation within the Christian framework, which later leads to the label "Aristotelico-Thomistic" for a type of philosophy (Owens 38).⁹ Aquinas differs from Aristotle in their distinctive cultural backgrounds, Christianity and paganism, monotheism and polytheism, by which Aquinas is able to make use of the Aristotelian logic as means to explain theology through human recognition. As the prefix "poly" may suggest, the Greeks infer the supernatural to divine powers and each of which refers to different deities in command of heavenly affairs. Time itself is immanent and human beings cannot reach the realm of the above unless they are allowed or aided by gods and goddesses. To the

⁹ Joseph Owens, "Aristotle and Aquinas," *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas*. The following account of the relationship between Aquinas and Aristotle is indebted to this book where Owens's enlightening description brings many insightful perspectives.

repetitive pattern of the world, Aristotle's goal to look for human happiness designates the simple fact that human happiness comes from the earthly happiness, though temporal and finite. In contrast to Aristotle's background, Aquinas under the influence of Christian education insists that human happiness can be achieved only through Divine Grace (in the Christian sense) and that it is possible for us to reach to the realm of God. Here, he makes use of Aristotle's method of reasoning, an epistemological inquiry, as a means to perceive the existence of God, and the Church is therefore the mediator for His people to reach the heavenly happiness, both eternal and infinite. Though Thomas Aquinas remains a theologian all his life, his philosophy nevertheless directs to a transition from Augustine's transcendental union with God to regarding human beings as an active agent to recognize God's love and providence. Such a methodology based on human reasoning continues to be the reputed dialectics in the scholastic tradition. And the attitude that takes man as a standpoint later coalesces into the movement of Christian humanism in the fifteenth century.

With the growing popularity of Thomistic Christianity, late medieval historiography undergoes a transformation with regard to the change of the concept of Christian time from paganism. At the time when Augustine dissects the earthly world from the heavenly one, there emerge two divergent forms of history, secular history and ecclesiastical history. The latter is beyond doubt the history written for theological reasons about the formation of the Church and the early church fathers, while the former is the history where past events and emperors are sequentially recorded. At the influence of Christianity, however, the flow of time needs to be appropriated within a religious confinement, a succession with a beginning and an end, within which whatever happens in human world is subjected to the theological context. Each individual, Christian, non-Christian, or even a persecutor, serves as the promoter under the religious order to fulfill the prophecies in the Scripture, the Word of God. In this

case, the secular history, sanctified by the final Christendom, enters into sacred history by adding to the historicity of the Bible. That the secular events are under God's supervision reveals the supremacy of God and authorizes the divine power as the first cause, so that the changes of events and the vicissitudes of empires belong to the second causes subject to the play of fortune. Thus, in his essay, "*Theology and the New Awareness of History*," Chenu finds in the new dimension of time in late Middle Ages a sense of universalism about time in which "a given cultural cycle is the awareness. . . of human activity considered as a whole" (177).¹⁰ Human activity directs the same destiny in the time sequence as God has first intended to lead to the "providential preparation for the age of Christ" and the forthcoming salvation (185). To this purpose, all believe that the glory of Roman Empire is pre-destined, as agreed in Augustine's predestination, that the fall of Rome is a must which prompts to transport the idea of Christ as the Savior. Here Chenu propounds the idea of *translatio imperii* (transference of the empire)¹¹ as the main element in the theology of history. Chenu means that to realize the universal kingdom of Christ indicates the establishment of a Christian empire with its role in unifying the world under divine providence, as was once fulfilled in the "westering of empire from Troy to Rome" (L. Patterson 15). As a result, the past events are arranged to correspond with the prophecy in the Book of Daniel and the Book of Revelation about the four monarchies of the world history. This economic rendering of secular government functioning as a means of the final salvation soon induces the dawning of nationalism afterwards (185).

The idea of *translatio imperii* is further applied by Lee W. Patterson who

¹⁰ M. D. Chenu, *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century: Essays on New Theological Perspectives in the Latin West*. Much of my knowledge about late medieval historiography is based on this book.

¹¹ The idea of *translatio imperii* is popular in medieval tradition which can be traced at least back to St. Augustine (Chenu 185).

contends that in anachronistic paralleling the great deeds and honorific heroes of the past, history provides a prospect of the deliverance of the empires that leads to the Christian coronation at Rome (17). The use of anachronism enables historians to falsify history to meet political needs and legitimize the king's regime. History therefore turns out to be the best propaganda to a king's success.¹² Patterson maintains that historical "recordings," fact-based or fictitious, are no more than disconnected fragments that historians make use of sequentially in assimilation to manifest the moral lessons or experiences to the reference of the rulers. The infusion of mythical elements in literary form into the writing of history yields to the manipulation of the ruler to his propagandist purposes. As the case in his *Historia Regum Britanniae* (c.1136), Geoffrey of Monmouth well incorporates the legendary Arthur into British history as a national hero for the convenience of tracing the British origin to the story of Troy. His fabrication, no matter what connotation it may suggest, was publicly believed and exalted in England, even though his *Historia* was denied by many later historians as mere fiction devoid of historicity. Nonetheless, this fabrication is intensely implemented in the reign of Henry II (1154-89), as Patterson spells out in his essay about *Morte Authrue*, to fit into both political and religious motifs. In addition, in the early Tudor Dynasty, Henry VII (1485-1509) was involved in verifying such a legendary history by naming his first son Arthur so as to create a convincing truth that either Henry VII himself or his son would be the returned Arthur, a heroic return to glorify the English kingdom.

The euhemerization of history expresses that men seem to be motivated by an

¹² In this essay, Patterson clarifies of the concept of time in late Middle Ages. Similar to Chenu's time as continuous, Patterson has however a different rendering of the relation between past, present and future (1-32). The traditional view has it that the present is revealed to be a fulfillment of the past, while Patterson thinks that the present is an reenactment of the past where the past value is passed onto the present (25).

anxiety to trace back not only to the very origin of human beings as a whole, but to an origin specifically of a nation of heroes in the sanctuary of the Christian God. The allusions to Brutus, grandson to Aeneas, and Arthurian legends as British ancestry serve not to report two uncompromising forces in battle, but to indicate the fact that the events in relation to mythical or legendary figures justify the formation of nations and the process of human civilization within a Christian time zone and sanctified by affirmation of providentialism. Such association shows an eagerness of self-affirmation which would endow men in the secular world with significance and enhance the position of human nobility with optimistic progress to everlasting happiness. A futuristic perspective confirms the hope of spiritual or religious quest for otherworldliness. The development of euhemerized history till the close of the Middle Ages tended to allegorize the lives of the saints to an extent that such a hagiographical addition all the more conveys the Christian concept of universal unity and the final ascending to the heavenly world (Breisach 118). The propagation of this combination also inscribes its didacticism, entering its moral teaching by proffering exemplary paradigms of saints or heroes to invoke public contemplation or rather to induce private sympathy. To this appropriation, Patterson argues that the imitation of the antiquity empowers the validity of the present (24) in which historical repetition is only subjected to the ensuing reality of Christian authority. With this understanding then, we shall find that the idea of the Homeric epics as the origin of history is further justified by the Western application and reference to mythical and legendary figures or events.

Chapter Two

Integration and Renovation

Humanism and Reformation

While medieval historiography anticipates the Renaissance development of historical thinking, Christian humanism and the Protestant Reformation are the two most influential movements which introduced much of Europe to embrace the revolutionary or, as the Catholics would call them, anti-Christian features of the Renaissance (Bush, *Renaissance* 21).¹ This chapter will analyze these two movements as the historical setting for Renaissance history and investigate how it changes because of the humanistic awakening and religious reform. Italy was the origin of humanism² since its tangible reminders of antiquity including the ruins of ancient buildings and monuments are the main elements that substantialize the process of human civilizations in the flow of history. These architectural remains not only give vital links to the glorious past of the Roman Empire (Mcgrath 42) but also attract public interest in ancient civilization in the Renaissance period. In the memorable, or rather tragic, year 1453 at the fall of Constantinople, many Greek-speaking refugees and scholars from the east swarmed into western Europe and brought the revival of the classics which emphasize human activities in the classical tradition. Due to their profound interest in antiquity, the Italian humanists were not

¹ The idea of anti-Christian is based on Burckhardt's conception of the nature of Renaissance as against Christian faith and Christian ethics.

² Nicholas Mann, "The origins of humanism," *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*. Mann traces the Latin etymology of *humanitas* to give a definition of humanism in terms of its concern with the legacy of antiquity. He sees humanism as "an activity" of continuity that originated geographically from Italy. Petrarch (1304-74) is one of the early scholars for the study or rediscovery of the classics. Mann's essay provides a concise and lucid description of humanism in respect to the political, philological and philosophical dimensions. Besides, Douglas Bush in *The Renaissance and English Humanism* also offers useful knowledge about the development of English humanism.

merely devoted to the study and emulation of classical literary and artistic works, but they hoped to re-set the autonomous city-state in imitation of the proto-government in ancient Greece and Rome. Cities like Venice, Florence, and Milan are the “brave new worlds” (Mcgrath 41) of the time as the grounds where the Italian humanists started to develop and promote their idea to re-build the cultural value and intellectual heritage of the old world. There were also Italian scholars traveling across the Alps, with the ideal to civilize the northern barbarity. In the north of the Europe, under the influence of the antiquarian movement and its vigorous commercial activity in Italy, younger scholars venture into the center of the Renaissance, Italy. The fervor of these young people leads the movement of humanism back to their countries and initiates an international exercise of humanist movement to (re)interpret and assimilate the ideas and values of the antiquity.

Attracted to educational interests and alarmed by the religious crisis, the humanists in the north, though first motivated by the Italian renaissance, differ from those in Italy and develop their respective humanistic movements that would fit into their current necessity. Erasmus (1466/69-1536) is one of the foremost pioneers to advocate both the restoration of the ancient legacy and the reform of the Church in the early Renaissance. Renaissance in this context calls for a rebirth, or a restoration not only in its literary heritage promoting the study of classics, but also in a religious awakening that cries out a need to reform. Such advocates are called Christian humanists who, fighting against scholastic Christianity, strive for interpreting the original text of the Bible with a humanistic concern to apply Christian doctrines in ordinary life. Though they are not against the traditional concept of the universal Church, their invocation of a revelatory understanding of the Bible nevertheless offends the orthodoxy of the established Church. Erasmus is one engaging himself in the religious reform. Dedicated to the study of the classics and seeking the

reading of Bible in the light of the classics, he edited the New Testament in the original Greek in 1516 with a preface purporting to popularizing the reading of the Bible in all vernacular tongues available.

I utterly dissent from those who are unwilling that the sacred Scriptures should be read by the unlearned translated into their vulgar tongue, as though Christ had taught such subtleties that they can scarcely be understood even by a few theologians, or, as though the strength of the Christian religion consisted in men's ignorance of it. (Strayer et al. 376)³

Erasmus here aims at the dissemination of the teaching of Christ to all people, clergymen or laity, and expects an inner religion that encourages individual practice of religion in life. In his treatise on man's free will (1524), he extols the dignity of man under God that stresses human values and urges the "international brotherhood of Christian virtue and good letters" (Bush, Renaissance 65). By arousing the public consciousness of a higher self, Erasmus diminishes the status of the Church and its function. His advocacy provokes an increasing dissatisfaction of the people, which soon brings about the vehement Protestant revolt against the Catholic Church.

In the political arena, the dissension in early Renaissance between the lay government and the Church has become an earnest issue but is even worsened by the more flourishing nationalism and more serious clerical corruption. Each king gradually reveals his ambition to conquer the neighboring states and to take the power of the Church under his control. Out of this prevailing discontent, some reformers

³ This passage is quoted from "Erasmus' Preface to His Edition of the New Testament" (376). Concerning the Protestant Reformation, the chapter of "Reformation and Revolution in Western Christendom" gives much useful information, especially the English translation of the original tracts or theses by Erasmus and Martin Luther.

begin to support the notion that religious contemplation is a way of life with which its converts may have direct communication with God without the complicated dogmas and ceremonies. This movement, later entitled as the Protestant Reformation, originated from the theses pronounced in 1517 by Martin Luther (1483-1546) in his aversion to the sale of indulgences. Luther's principal propositions are:

There is no divine authority for preaching that the soul flies out of purgatory immediately the money clinks in the bottom of the chest. . .

All those who believe themselves certain of their own salvation by means of letters of indulgence will be eternally damned, together with their teachers. (Strayer et al. 378)

Luther's provocative statement re-asserts the Christian notion of the "original sin" which breeds a bottomless desire of worldly gains. To him, true salvation lies not in the plentiful indulgences one has acquired to redeem his sins but rather in one's firm faith invoked from the bottom of his heart.

Therefore the first care of every Christian ought to be to lay aside all reliance on works, and strengthen his faith alone more and more, and by it grow in the knowledge, not of works, but of Christ Jesus, who has suffered and risen again for him. (378)⁴

This passage conveys the idea that every Christian should concentrate to build up an inward faith in Christ rather than relying on the outward accumulation of "good works," ceremonies, sacraments, pilgrimages and indulgences, works that make the Roman Catholic Church corrupt. With this irreparable breach with the Roman Catholic Church, Luther declares the absolute supremacy of the Scriptures and translates it into German for the convenience of most people who may acquire the

⁴ "Luther on Justification by Faith."

divine truth by reading reverently and fervently the teachings in the Scripture. To such an extent, anyone can be his own priest, and the interpretation of God's Will is no longer confined to a particular few, especially the clergymen, to represent God or as the mediator between God and men.

Thus it may come to pass that the Pope and his followers are wicked and not true Christians, and not being taught by God, have no true understanding, whereas a common man may have true understanding.

Why should we then not follow him? (379)⁵

Here, Luther argues that true Christians abide by what has been written in the Bible and devote their life to the worship of God. But a wicked pope or priest can deceive people by his self-assumed authority and limited interpretation of the Bible, while devising evildoings against the Word of God. Luther indeed calls for freedom from an exclusive interpretive circle and argues that only through strong faith can we secure salvation under divine mercy. Afterwards, he establishes his own church and makes it a most important force against the Catholic Church, which as a result leads to the inevitable contention of a "true" Church.

As Thomas Aquinas lights the fuse of Christian humanism and scholastic tradition by absorbing Aristotelian ideas into theological reasoning, Luther insists on a Christian humanism by breaking with the scholastic authority of the Church. His popularizing the reading of the Bible brings along continuous religious reform movements throughout the Continent. Breaking with Erasmus's insistence on religious faith in a pacifist attitude, Luther evinces a strong commitment to be an opposing force to the Catholic Church. Though a leading figure in the Protestant Reformation, proposing religious freedom from Catholicism, he nevertheless

⁵ "Luther on the Church."

concedes to the lay government's desire to become free from its inferior position subordinate to the Episcopal control, and to common people's oppression by the over-burdened levies from the clergymen. Such a political power struggle was at issue and gradually became in the early sixteen century an open battle between the papacy and the lay government, between the pope and the secular ruler, each for his own respective benefits. Along with this politico-religious refutation, the immediate influence of the religious movement helps us realize the radical changes in Renaissance England under the Tudor Dynasty, though the very cause of English Reformation is no more than a personal marital affair. In fact, Henry VIII has no intention to initiate the enmity with the Catholic Church, but his renunciation induces, firstly, to the dual sovereignty of the king, the head of the secular government and the Church, and secondly to the subsequent upheavals in the later changes of regimes.

Both the humanistic movement and Protestant Reformation have contained certain dynamic impetus in terms of their effects in the political, social, or economic transformations. In the classical sense of history, historians, observant of human activities, were not only time-bound but, geographically, space-bound. To the Middle Ages, the stress of human relationship with God made historians start writing from the ecclesiastical inclination. It was not until at this time of the modern period that the historians change their subject matter again to the anthropocentric concern, undermining the emphasis of heaven prognosticated by means of religious faith. The transference of historical perspective has augmented the scope of Renaissance historiography in which the inter-relationships among nature, universe and humankind retain more delineation than God usually had in the Medieval era. While the theological element is momentous in humanist advocacy to live a divine life, people procure the belief that earthly happiness is the way leading to heavenly paradise.

The Influence of Scientific Innovations

In the evolution of the writing of history, Protestant advocacy for the spirit of God has been considered a critical factor that distinguishes the medieval pedagogy for the word of God from the comparatively new and modern period. To the argument of period discrimination, some critics also put such an assertion into question. On the one hand, Martin Luther does not mean to look for a different Christian religiosity as opposed to that of the medieval, a “doomsday” and a life after (284).⁶ On the other hand, the happening of the movement in different localities does not provoke a universal time, which means, the reformation begins in 1517 in Germany while it happens in England more than ten years later. Time varies with different localities. Among the Italian humanists, Petrarch is the one who first suggested the distinction of the past in three periods: Rome, darkness, and renovation (Breisach 181). Though this general periodization itself implies a progression of history, most of the Italian humanists repudiate the idea of time as a succession, the notion prevailing in the Middle Ages, a period of degradation that they would rather forget.⁷ In this sense, the Renaissance is not only an observation of scholarly historical thinking, but also a denial of Christian teaching. The recovery of the classics as guidance to a brand new era also suggests that the Renaissance is a re-presentation of the classical culture, and it therefore conveys the ancient concept of history as a cyclic repetition. Herschel Baker so agrees, “This metaphor of history as a wheel or circle occurs a thousand times in Elizabethan literature, and it retains its charm for writers well into the age of

⁶ Wolfgang Reinhard, “The idea of Early Modern History,” *Companion to Historiography* 281-292.

⁷ The notion of the Middle Ages first came to be known when the Renaissance scholars started to take it as a “middle time” (William Camden). Until the time when Christopher Cellarius, a textbook writer, published his *Universal History Divided into an Ancient, Medieval, and New Period* in the late seventeenth century, the distinction of the three stages was not clarified (Breisach 181).

Hobbes and Milton” (Baker 63).⁸

With this understanding, we notice that the Renaissance presents itself as a mere cultural phenomenon (Bush, *Renaissance* 19) in relation to classical restoration as characterized in the terminology of “neo-paganism” or “anti-Christian,” a cancellation of medieval religiosity. However, from the discussion of the medieval historiography, we should also bear in mind the monastic endeavor to infuse the paganistic tradition with a Christian framework in order to justify the Christian time under God. Moreover, accompanying the burgeoning awareness of nationhood in the late Middle Ages, the search for a national origin motivates writers among whom historians or theologians are trying to track the path of the classicists to endorse or legitimate their national birth. This does denote the historical continuation of western culture, a truth never admitted by people in the Renaissance or those of the later times who studied the medieval period as a cultural rupture between the classical age and the Renaissance.⁹ Or, we may accept the well fashioned explication of Douglas Bush who dehistoricizes the Middle Ages as, “a period of a thousand years, a fairly large segment in the recorded life of man, [which] was not itself, an integral and consecutive part of the great panorama, but a sort of interlude between the two periods which really mattered” (27). Here we are not to stay in the contention of the

⁸ Herschel Baker, *The Race of Time*. This book is a collection of three lectures on the Renaissance historiography in which Baker gives a penetrating analysis on the theme of history from different perspectives.

⁹ In the influence of humanism, Breisarch recognizes that “humanists restructured the Western past through the concept of the Dark Ages. . . . They rejected any kinship with the medieval world and preserved continuity only between the ancient and their own period” (159-60). Many scholars talk about the Middle Ages as the “Dark Ages” or a regression that the Renaissance succeeds to renew the spirit of the classics. The individualism presented in Burckhardt signals a revolt against the bondage of the medieval darkness and demonstrates the desire of the Renaissance men to create an age of their own. However, there are those (such as Chenu, Mann, Bush, and Reinhard) who look for the definition of the term “Renaissance” and try to trace the first renaissance as far as back to the eighth or ninth centuries so as to point out the indisputable relationship inherited from the medievalist efforts.

historical meaning of the Middle Ages either as a breakage or continuity, but to extend to the fact that, with the heritage from ancient humanism to the soul-pursuing medieval and to the humanist revival movement and the widespread religious reformation, the so-called Renaissance belongs to a heterogeneous culture embedded with pagan and Christian integration (Mcgrath 44). With the changes of emphasis from indulgence in spiritual ascent to the ontological discussion of human value, man's concern about God as first cause recedes. The idea of dispensation also fades into a deeper reflection of man's position in the world with regard to the social environment, the political changes, and the inquiry into causality of affairs, the second causes. Consequently, we will have to appraise the idea of history in terms of some great achievements of the time in early Renaissance since humanist concern on the dignity of man improved the epistemological understanding by inquiring into men's relationship with the world and the universe. Just as Luther did not mean to establish a new theology, Reinhard then remarks, "Innovation was always non-intentional in those days and disguised as a return to good old times" (284). His statement draws to doubt about the Protestant Reformation as a line marking the Renaissance, and it also points out the significance of certain "innovations" or discoveries that has added to the shifting from medieval religiosity to the modernity presented in Renaissance.

In his survey of the Renaissance historiography, G. E. Aylmer attributes this transformation to the trio invention of printing, gunpowder, and the magnetic compass (264).¹⁰ Douglas Bush in his lecture "Humanism and the Critical Spirit" endorses such an attribution of the invention of printing which brings up the prevalence of reading (*Prefaces* 4), as is also approved by Hillerbrand who points out that the

¹⁰ G. E. Aylmer, "Introductory Survey: From the Renaissance to the Eighteenth Century," *Companion to Historiography*.

invention of printing results in the spread of the Protestant Reformation. What Hillerbrand intends to elucidate is that “the arte of printing” (75)¹¹ has improved the circulation of the Lutheran “new theology,” as opposed to Catholicism, though not appreciable to the reformers in other European countries. With easier availability, reformation thought gets imported to the intellectual center in the University of Cambridge where Erasmus stays for some time. Apart from the easy circulation of books, significant historical events during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries have marked the new epoch both in scientific and geographical discoveries. For example, in the celebrated year of 1492, Columbus first discovered the New World (now South America) and brought the hope of starting a colony abroad. This idea of colonization opened the sea as a new battlefield between the continental countries and initiated the fervor of oceanic adventures to excavate new territories. In 1519 Magellan, a Portuguese captain, achieved his circumnavigation which simultaneously overturned the tradition by the newly-revealed fact of a “well-rounded” earth. More significantly is the new discovery in astronomy in 1543 when Copernicus made known his theory of the heliocentric movement of the earth, which subverts the geocentric tradition, much less a theocentric medieval assumption.

In the age of discovery the world became global; scholars and philosophers conjured up new visions of nature and cosmos;... and the state, emerging as the basic framework for people’s lives, provoked discussions of statecraft, collective identity, customs, and laws. (Breisach 153)

Breisach here reminds us the progress of epistemological understanding in the

¹¹ Hans J. Hillerbrand, “The Spread of the Protestant Reformation of the Sixteenth Century,” *The Transfer of Ideas: Historical Essays*. The term is borrowed from Hillerbrand’s quoting from John Fox.

Renaissance men who focus human activities in a close-up to magnify the development and the importance of human achievements. The theory of history stays not in the level of the unfolding of God's plan, but in a far greater exaltation of the consciousness of each man as an entity in the universe to accomplish something in order to define the value of human existence. Therefore, the characterization of the protagonists in many literary works usually expresses a devouring appetite for the ambition and desires of all sorts, such as the pursuit of honor, fame, power, and wealth. To take some as examples, Marlow's Dr. Faustus shows his hunger for intellectual studies so eagerly that he would rather make deals with the devil at the cost of his life. Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice*, a sly but pathetic fellow, is despised for his avarice for money and possessions. Iago, Macbeth, and Brutus are famous protagonists in Shakespeare's plays condemned by their savage behaviors for the desire of power. We find such examples, especially in Shakespeare's history plays, in which history is in the simplest sense a collection of ceaseless political chaos, military wars, usurpation, power struggles and social disorder. Though Breisach here discloses an overall view of the modern historiography in the age of enlightenment in the seventeenth century, he also points out the changes minutely working or swaying over the historians. We have to underscore the truth that Renaissance historians contemplated less about inward religion than the outward modification of more globalization and the penetrating portrayal of human psychology. Men's association with God is no longer a pivotal factor as the first or final cause by which human happiness is supposed to be perceived through worldly redemption. Men turn to study the physical environment and relate life to the growing and withering of nature and to the heavenly bodies of the universe, which concerns them with a new recognition of the importance of this life as the one and only chance to accomplish the self-fulfillment in the world so much so that they are caught up in the

perpetuation of the secondary causes. The medieval historiography of universalism gives way to chronicles in the old classical styles which put much emphasis on the incipient national feelings. *Polychronicon* written by Ranulph Higden, an enthusiastic monk, is one of the examples recording the English past and testifies the status of the early Renaissance chronicles (Breisach 148).

With this multidimensional development of “new” knowledge of the geographical scope before the discussion of Renaissance historians, the transformation helps relate how it has influenced the Renaissance men, especially such one like Walter Raleigh in his career as a courtier and an explorer. In the era of great changes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Raleigh led a life of much glory in his participation of national events, but however splendid his life was is no more significant than the epistemological cognition of the outer world as increased in his many explorations, the psychological growth from the ups and downs at court, and finally his personal interest in the experimentation of general sciences such as astronomy, chemistry, medicine, etc. A devotee to Queen Elizabeth, a suspected atheist interested in the study of science, and a patriot striving after his desire for national benefits, Raleigh however dedicated himself to the writing of history in the later years of his life, a general history setting within the confinement of Christian lineage. The multiple identities cast in his many-faceted experiences of life assist him to comprise world history, but his past achievements also bring a sense of the inequality of his undeserved trial that religion turns to be the only consolation. As his biographical background suggests, we may well expect to give rise to more insightful observations regarding our thesis of his providentialism and nationalism in the succeeding sections. Before giving explanations as how Raleigh’s *History* is different from the current fashion of chronicle writing among his contemporary historians, we need to know some of his predecessors to picture the general

historiography that laid the foundation of writing history.

Renaissance Historiography: Man vs. God

Of the contemporary historians, four historians prior to Raleigh will be delineated as the most influential in mainstream historiography; their histories are the most characteristic of the period. The first two are Polydore Vergil and Thomas More, the only two humanist historians in England, and the latter two, Edward Hall and Raphael Holinshed are most discussed as the resources of literary works. The following episode excerpted from Sir Thomas More's *History of King Richard III* describes the conversation between the bishop and Duke Buckingham who, dissatisfied with Richard III, is contriving to rebel against the king.

The bishop[John Morton, Bishop of Ely] right humbly thanked
Him [Duke of Buckingham] & said, in good faith my lord I loue
not much to talk mucche of princes, as thing not all out of peril,
thoughe the word be without fault forasmuch as it shal not be taken
as the party ment it, but as it pleaseth the prince to conster it. (32)¹²

This aphoristic passage from Morton almost marks the end of More's *Richard III*, and is often taken as a personal opinion from More's long-term political career to express apprehension in company with the king and an attitude of prudence, or rather a sense of insecurity, toward writing history. Such an implied warning testifies the common point of view of the historians in Tudor England. In the essay "*The Humanist Historians: Thomas More and Polydore Vergil*," Antonia Gransden defines history in the Tudor Dynasty a compilation of examples that gives the truth by using analogous

¹² Thomas More, *The History of King Richard the Third*, online, Renaissance Edition, Internet. The text is transcribed from W. E. Campbell's facsimile of the Rastell edition of 1557 by Richard Bear.

comparisons of particular events from different ages to explain the changes from the present to the past.¹³ Truth in this reasoning tends to be limited or biased in the historian's process of selecting the historical resources. Moreover, the popular practices of patronage need the historians to incorporate particular accounts to please their patrons. Polydore Vergil, an Italian humanist commissioned by Henry VII to write a history of England as propaganda for the country, attacks Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia* and early historical works as fictional. He holds a sceptical view of the non-reality presented in the combination of history and the legends of Brutus and Arthur as national heroes. With his unique identity as an outsider, he is able to observe England in an objective manner and prevents himself from having a patriotic bias. It is also due to his foreign birth that many historians in the sixteenth century objected to Vergil's sceptical treatment of the national legends (Gransden 442). Yet, Vergil still insists that the value of history lies in its function of recording and preserving facts and offering reasonable explanations that could best demonstrate the popular opinions of the time.

Faithful to his responsibility, Vergil the historian suggests to examine the diverse historical events with rational analysis, particularly regarding the political and economic transformation and further a more profound study of personal psychological motivation intricately operating as the main determinant of certain events. In him, we see a revival of the classical or Thucydidean historiography both in his serious attitude toward his task as a historian and in his methodology in dealing with historical facts.¹⁴ Divine providence is the general theme of his history where he

¹³ Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England, v.2, c.1307 to the Early Sixteen Century* 425-453. In this essay, Gransden discusses the early Renaissance historiography under the influence of humanist movement. The author's attentive study and description of Vergil and More greatly help to continue and understand the development of history writing of the later historians.

¹⁴ Gransden marks 1400 as the line when Vergil's writing begins to deviate from the

portrays Henry VII as the victor over the vicious Richard III, recovering the harmony of Great Britain with the union of the families of York and Lancaster. Recording the accounts primarily during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII, his *Anglica Historia* generally breaks into two parts. The first part depicts the current happenings with an analytical interpretation of the political and economical changes and with additional modifications in hope to cater to his royal patrons. In the second part, his writing changes because of his disillusionment with Henry VIII's negation of the instructive function of history and the king's ensuring its potential propaganda to secure the mandate under Tudor sovereignty. After the English Reformation, though a devoted Catholic at heart, Vergil behaved passively in fear of offending the authorities, but his style turned to be much more critical about the monarchs. Of his inconsistent attitudes towards the writing of history between the two monarchs, the facts he insists in history tend to be partial as regards his depreciated status in Henry VIII. Still, his history remains to be the primary resources for younger historians and his eclectic and opinionated history corresponds to the development of writing history in later times as we shall see in his influence on Edward and Holinshed.

For fear of displeasing the king at any time, Thomas More succeeds Vergil in his portrait of Richard in his *Richard III* but leaves both the Latin and English versions uncompleted on account that his history is suspected to have an undertone criticizing the tyranny of Henry VII (Gransden 445). Many scholars conceive this suspicion of criticism can be attested in More's two Latin poems entitled in English translation, "The Good Prince and the Bad Prince" ("De Principe Bono et Malo"):

What is a good prince? He is the sheepdog who puts the wolves
to flight by his barking. What is a bad one. The wolf itself.

facts. To please his patron, Vergil takes the theme of divine providence to secure the ascension of Henry VII.

Quid bonus est princets? Canis est sustos gregis inde

Qui fugat ore lupos. Quid malus? ipse lopus.

and “What is the Best Form of Government” (“Quis Optimus Reipublicae Status”):

You ask which is better, whether a king or a senate rules. . . , I think that a senate is superior from its greater number, and that more good comes from many good people. . . a middle way between the opposing sides of the senate, but you will hardly ever have a king who will be moderate.

Quaeris uter melius, Rex ne imperet an ne Senatus.

. numero praestare Senatum,

Inque bonis multis plus reor esse boni.

. medius saepe inter utrunque Senatus,

Sed tibi vix unquam Rex Mediocris erit.¹⁵

In these two poems, More is against the form of autocratic government under the supremacy of a dominant King; he prefers a republic government, one with polyphonous democracy to better the welfare of the country and its people. Of More’s identity as a humanist historian, we have to recollect his friendship with Erasmus, their humanistic concern for human dignity, and his rejection to be converted to a Protestant that not only ends his political career but puts his life in jeopardy. His republic form of government indicates his dissatisfaction toward a

¹⁵ H. R. Woudhuysen ed., *The Penguin Book of Renaissance Verse 1509-1659* 81-83. Both poems are placed in the section entitled “The Public World” with the original Latin version.

authoritative sovereignty and ultimately proves to be an imaginary ideal in this confrontation with the self-centered king. His *Richard III* is usually presented as a thematic unit featured by More's dramatization of the historical characters and their actions. It is therefore considered more to be a literary device than a formal history and his description of Richard III is widely accepted and applied by the contemporary men of letters.

In the later Tudor period, presenting history in partiality and stressing its propagandistic pragmatism remain to be the mainstream historiography. History is taken as instrumental for such purposes so that writing history is subject to a mechanical listing of historical records or events ready to be incorporated. Edward Hall and Raphael Holinshed are two prominent examples. Both were their predecessors as primary resources and continue to magnify the state and praise the present authority, which actually becomes a mere formality incurring later attacks of their meaningless repetition. For example, John Donne ridicules, "more then ten Hollensheads, or Halls..of triviall household trash he knows." Peter Heylyn agrees, "full of confusion, and commixture of unworthy relations" (A. Patterson 117). Both are critiquing the value of these chronicles as storehouses of pettiness because they have failed the supposed responsibility of truth-telling in history and its use as lesson-instruction. But, as later critics, as displayed in the following discussion, have gradually found out, history may be written from expediency to implicate the historian's elaborate criticism of the Renaissance. In recent studies, some critics hold different views from the former commentaries. For example, in the essay entitled "The Small Cat Massacre: Popular Culture in the 1587 'Holinshed,'" Annabel Patterson argues against such debasement by surveying the second edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles* in 1587 in comparison with the previous one, and concludes with the constant editorial interventions dormant in "many other voices whose

intonations and opinions the *Chronicles* have recorded for posterity”(118).¹⁶ The statement obviously suggests that Holinshed had intended a project better responsive to current social mechanism in his first edition in 1577, but his attempt countered with the later editors who collated a new edition to a great extent and augmented it to be properly deliberated into a “formal” and “proper” history. “It is not merely a question of what facts or events could be recounted but the *manner* (my emphasis) of their recounting that mattered” (129-30). The “manner” here suggests that the different attitudes exert determinant influence upon the historians. The attitude towards the writing of history leads to a new recognition that historical facts or events are arranged as a way of description appropriate for the historian to incorporate his reserved opinions embedded between the lines. While the attitude does not betoken personal political positions to attack or to placate the government, the selected events or the arrangement of the events are the historian’s interpretive representation to satisfy the requirements of the current society. In the case of Holinshed’s *Chronicles*, Patterson expresses in an undertone that history should not be taken for granted as it surfaces, but it is a more complicated contemplation with the change of regimes or with social transformations. In response to Patterson’s viewpoint which demands a re-evaluation of chronicles and re-locates the weight of Holinshed as a historian, Peter C. Herman insists on More’s translation of people’s subversive voices toward Richard III, and also on Hall’s implicit criticism of King Henry’s restarting the war with

¹⁶ After Holinshed’s death in 1580, a group of scholars, “historians or antiquaries,” were called up to revise the first edition published in 1577. Patterson alludes to the fact that this edition contains voices other than catering to the authority. “Holinshed initiated a procedure whereby the reader was left to his own historian.”(126). To this purpose, his successors revised the original chronicle in 1587. For example, the symbol of “cat” in the *Chronicles* with its denotation of the demonic meaning as female or prostitute (as in the word cat-house) implies “the Queen[Mary Tudor] and the debate over the Eucharist. albeit carnivalesque, gesture of defiance”(146). See also her essay, “Local Knowledge: ‘Popular’ Representation in Elizabethan Historiography,” *Place and Displacement in the Renaissance*, ed. Alvin Vos (Bringhamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1995) 87-106.

French and causing the public resistance of financing the war (270).¹⁷ Both More and Hall use the voices of the people to effect public defiance to the authority.

Assuming a view different from the tradition, Herman comments that the complexity of the Renaissance historiography opens various interpretations of the contemporary historians which may require more scrutinized study between the lines to detect the subordinate voices as part of the political landscape (275).

In twentieth century criticism of Renaissance historiography, more and more scholars share the modern interpretation of an detectable layout of personal observations that may draw the historian as participant of history. Such a subjective role however reverses the traditional role of a disinterested historian in the action of recording. The shifting voices in the historical works provide the historians opportunities to reflect on the social surroundings. In the milieu of political absolutism, the historians are prudent of the issues of state affairs without offending the authority. With the examples of Vergil and More, Raleigh also reflects that “whosoever in writing a modern History, shall follow truth too near the heels, it may happily strike out his teeth” (Preface 149). But such preoccupation does not exempt them from writing history in light of politics since “history’s link with politics had been firm ever since Thucydides” (Breisach 186). Therefore, the re-discovery of new voices is usually deciphered as a presentation within a broader scope of their current environment, and it accords to the aforesaid comment about Raleigh’s changing writing style proposed by Anna Beer in her study of Raleigh and his readers in the seventeenth century. Concentrating on the works produced during his imprisonment, Beer points out that Raleigh, a member of the court, is a political

¹⁷ Peter C. Herman, “Henrician Historiography and the Voice of the People: the Cases of More and Hall,” *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 39.3 Fall (1997): 258-283.

propagandist of the state, as we can see from his many poems, pamphlets, and treatises on the topics of Queen Elizabeth and England. For example, *The Discovery of Guiana* is a tract intended to attract the financial investment from the public and their interest to support an exploratory and colonial expedition. As a result, it has been considered as the founding of a proto-colonial discourse (Beer 9). In addition, his report of the fight about the Isles of the Azores, the *Revenge* tract, was published in 1591 to defend the reputation of Richard Grenville. Here Raleigh attacked the Spanish villainy and ended with Queen Elizabeth as the center of his duty to serve and protect her and her nation (79)¹⁸. Nevertheless, his “utilitarian” writings after 1603 went over to suit “the policy to the reading of the world” (Beer14).¹⁹ A contextualized presentation, according to Beer, is attempted to different groups of audience as a self articulation or a hidden critique to challenge the succeeding king, James I. To his readers of the later periods, the prison works became much more accepted and were utilized as political criticism of the monarchical government which failed to negotiate the state affairs with the “evil counsellors.”²⁰ Raleigh’s history with this new vision attracts public interest that eleven editions had been issued during the seventeenth century (Edwards 148).

In retrospect, Renaissance historiography presents us an overview of the historian’s immediate present concern that the development of the idea of history is slowly formulated. Renaissance historians write the history of England for the

¹⁸ Gerald Hammond ed., *Raleigh*.

¹⁹ In the footnote (19), Beer expounds upon how Raleigh’s writing style changes during his years in prison, especially after his disappointment of his release from the prison and the recovery of his status in 1606.

²⁰ Beer uses the chapter entitled, “A Dialogue a Counsellor of State and a Justice of Peace,” to discuss the political ideology in Raleigh’s *History* grasped by his (mis)interpreters in relation to the tracts concerning the issues between power of the monarch and the power of the Parliament.

purpose of delivering facts to offer moral and political lessons and to benefit posterity. Raleigh's writing a history of the world gives himself a position specifically in the visionary historiography in which both the classical and medieval legacies are included to review and further foresee the steps of men in the course of history. Earlier in this chapter we have mentioned the cultural heterogeneity of the Renaissance and its characteristics in the mixture of both classical and medieval inheritance and the many revolutionary movements and innovations. In the clash of these two conflicting conventions between the different focuses of men and God in the Renaissance period, the gradual flourishing of national states threatens the insistence on Christian faith in the Middle Ages. In his *History of the World*, we can also find in Raleigh's universal history the confrontation as projected in his invoking the divine providence and his unresolved desire to advocate nationalistic consciousness and to build up a united kingdom of Great Britain. The next chapter will center on discussing the conflict demonstrated in Raleigh's *History*, particularly his ideal sketch of the structure in the preface and his many opinions expressed through the digressions "in speaking of the past, I point at the present" (Preface 148). It is Raleigh's present-mindedness that motivates him to write history to picture human life as a digression that deviates from the "Laws of History" and from God so that human beings fail to pull themselves up from the vanity of private desires. Raleigh seems to show a self-recognition in evoking the medieval sentiments, which still collapses with his diverse "digressions" or opinions on particular issues of state affairs regarding his past achievements.

Chapter Three

History as A Representation of Divine Providence

In the development of the notion of history, the classical and the medieval traditions of history converge in the Renaissance to form a new era, though the integration is enacted often with contradictory struggling forces. When we discuss Raleigh's world history at this threshold of the early modern time, we must look into this confrontation and his effort to reconcile the two modes of cultures, i.e., the classical and the medieval. Raleigh starts off his writing of *The History of the World* not because of the disparate callings of historical works as chronicles, annals, or history, but because of his proclamation in the Preface of writing a history of the world since the creation as based on The Old Testament. "For, beginning with the Creation: I have preceeded with the History of the World." In his attempt, Raleigh, like Augustine laboring to inculcate the historicity of the Bible, has shown an ambition to chronologize world history into the Christian horizon where he connects the events from the ancient world, including three of the four monarchies, in sequential order with the birth of Christianity to its growth and expansion until his present time of England. Aiming at his task to "confine my discourse, within this our renowned Island of Great Britain" (Preface 124),¹ he meanwhile announces in the long Preface his discussion of national affairs in which he has been participating, while maintaining his religious anticipation of a life after death in heavenly happiness. To this purpose he also re-alleges in the end, "in speaking of the past, I point at the present" (150). His words delineate a grand picture where the past events would be recorded to testify to the present. While "the present" connotes a double meaning: the present state of England and his present imprisonment, his ambition to such an encompassing schema predicts

¹ Gerald Hammond ed., *Raleigh*.

the difficulty in homogenizing two intrinsically incommensurable traditions, paganism and Christianity. The methodology of using the past to explain the present is a traditional interpretation of history, as has been illustrated in the previous chapter concerning Patterson's argument (25),² in which the Christians see the New Testament as the fulfillment of the Old Testament. The anachronic comparison between the past and the present will be further elaborated later in this chapter. Thus it turns out to be inevitable in Raleigh's *History of the World* that the focus of his subject vacillates from one point to another, from a strong religious conviction to the self-reflection of earthly frustrations.³ From him we can extract three important issues regarding the relationships between man, the world, and God, and centering the interrelated factors within three topics, that is, the wheel of Fortune, God's Providence and his implicit, or explicit, advocacy of nationalism. Therefore, the following chapter will elucidate how Raleigh develops his ideas in *History* with the theme of divine providence. Claiming to write a universal history, Raleigh expressly manifested his dilemma between a religious moralizing and constantly contemplating his past successes and current ill-deserving imprisonment.

In the Renaissance, it is a common topic to depict the wheel of Fortune⁴ as a

² See Lee W. Patterson, "The Historiography of romance and the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*."

³ Stephen Greenblatt makes an elaborate account of these diverse poles while criticizing Raleigh's ambiguities and contradictions in his *History of the World, Sir Walter Raleigh: the Renaissance Man and His Roles* 127-54.

⁴ Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy*, trans. V. E. Watts 76. According to Watts, the idea of the wheel of Fortune has its origin in the medieval allusion. See the footnote of Book II, in which Watts lists an array of the works dealing with such topics. See also G. V. Smithers, "Notes on the Middle English Poem The Four Foes of Mankind," *Neophilologische Mitteilungen* 92.2 (1992): 199-205; Catherine Brown Tkacz, "The Wheel of Fortune," *South Atlantic Review* [Atlanta] 57.4 (1992): 21-38; Tamotsu Kurose, "The Wheel of Fortune in the Late Middle Ages," *Studies in English Language & Literature* 28.3 (1988): 1-18; Jay Ruud, "'In Meetre in Many a Sondry Wyse': Fortune's Wheel and The Monk's Tale," *English Language Notes* 26.4 June

tempered woman or master of the worldly affairs, and to determine one's life with her likes and dislikes. From the vicissitudes of great men and his personal experiences, Raleigh ascribes human prosperity and adversity to the play of Fortune that is both temporal and finite.

For as Fortune's man rides the Horse, so Fortune herself rides the
Man. Who, when he is descended and on foot: the Man taken from
his Beast, and Fortune from the Man. (Preface 141)

This indicates the truth that one can never possess ever-changing Fortune. Yet, when one gets the favor of fortune, he always has the faith that he can control or create it, which all the more proves that he is subjected to the willful play of Fortune. In this perspective, the world under Fortune presents a repetitive cycle that there must be rise and fall, life and death, a beginning and an end, the same pattern that we have displayed in the classical historiography. In the Greco-Roman times when the knowledge of the world was still confined, the historians naturally associated inexplicable phenomena with a supernatural interpretation. *Fortuna* is the proclaimed goddess that controls human destiny. Though the notion of Fortune alone does not address all the concerns of the Renaissance humanist slogans to revive the classical tradition, Raleigh's purpose is more than interpreting world history as cyclic and giving it the name of "general history"(148). Rather, he makes clear the nature of Fortune and rationalizes that fortune is but a barrier to achieving beatitude and man ought to transcend the earthly boundary lest he be victimized unduly.

Regarding this subject of Fortune, we may retrace the medieval tradition in which Boethius had the fullest discussion in *The Consolation of Philosophy* while trying to

(1989): 6-11; Anke Janssen, "The Dream of the Wheel of Fortune," *The Alliterative Morte Arthure: a Reassessment of the Poem*, ed. Karl Heinz Goller (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1981) 140-152; Lee Bliss, "The Wheel of Fortune and the Maiden Phoenix of Shakespeare's *King Henry VIII*," *ELH* 42 (1975): 1-25.

relieve himself from his misery through the agency of philosophical reasoning.⁵ By personifying Philosophy as a mentor, Boethius the narrator is reminded of a higher pursuit of the true happiness counterpoised by the false happiness that Fortune brings. As the primary nature of Fortune is mutability, he in the end of Book II introduces the paradox of Fortune so that bad fortune “is [of] more use to a man than good fortune” (76), and good fortune always turns out to be enjoyable in the eye but deceitful in reality. Only in bad fortune does one acquire the knowledge that recognizes the constant changes as transitory and incapable of benefiting the human soul. By separating human flesh from the immortal soul, Boethius seeks to prove that the outward accumulation of delight is of no permanent value once checked by death. Therefore he offers consolation for the temporal affliction with human inclination to search the meaning of true happiness, which gives rise to the question of the nature of God. As Philosophy analyzes that “supreme happiness is identical with supreme divinity” (102), God is the Supreme Good that “is set at the head of all things and disposes all things” (135). There is in Boethius’ *Consolation* the Christian concept of God’s all-powerful foreknowledge so that the course of mankind is the unfolding of the divine plan in time, in which men “can learn that sin never goes unpunished or virtue unrewarded” (116), a mutual communication ideally composed between God and men, which is avowed to be Divine Providence.

Up to this basic level of the understanding of fortune and divine providence, Raleigh shares much in common with Boethius’ rationalization, even in his technique to explain how the sense of morality is degenerated from men’s pursuit of goodness to their obsession with earthly fame and materialization. Both aspire to discard the various desires of outward gains. With this similitude, we shall discern the differing

⁵ Boethius(480-524/5) was once an eminent politician but was wronged, imprisoned and executed at Pavia. *The Consolation* was composed during his time in prison.

means by which Raleigh and Boethius arrive at their purposes. As entitled in his masterpiece, Boethius tries to settle his misfortune with philosophy and implant his subject matter on the Christian belief in God. Raleigh, on the other hand, evinces his ill-rewards by way of religion in order to discredit the “City of the World” and to signify the value of the “City of God.” Ultimately there remains the question of man’s free will, by the exercise of which men may be driven into excessiveness. To clarify his observation, Raleigh begins his argument in the varying minds⁶ of every man, which diversifies among themselves even in a single person, and anchors his apprehension of the existence of free will. While it is human nature that man shall cling to the powerful whenever he can and keep a distance when it comes to wane, ambition is the root of evil that resides in man with the presupposition of the original sin since Adam’s fall. To the problem of ambition, Raleigh has a brief survey on man’s psychological “dissimilitude” that:

every one hath received a several picture of face, and every one
diverse picture of mind; every one a form apart, every one a fancy
and cogitation differing: there being nothing wherein Nature so
much triumpheth, as in dissimilitude. (Preface 125)

A man may have multiple “faces” due to the diverse changes of the mind and it is the internal that men are unable to see or know the opinion of others, but which may result in the misunderstanding among men. Here Raleigh recognizes the internal transformation as human nature and as the essential cause that breeds the accumulation of bottomless desire of gains, the increase of riches, power, pride, honor, and fame. Raleigh’s “a several picture of face” exhibits his concern of human psychological changes or desires as the basic impetus that may have great influence on one’s behavior.

⁶ The “minds” here means human psychology, which, in Raleigh’s elucidation, refers to the changeful nature of human mind.

Though he further brings about the issue of conscience as the internal censor of the self, and of others, Raleigh insists his emphasis on conscience which incidentally corresponds to Thomas More's treatment of Richard gnawed by the trial of the king's conscience after murdering his two nephews, the successors of Edward IV. To both historians, the complex mechanism of the mind marks men as distinctive from beasts in general. Such a notion of an afflicting mind has shaped popular imagery in numerous Renaissance literary works, of which Shakespeare has contributed his share in many of his dramatic characters. In Raleigh's words, Richard III is a good actor that "he so well fitted every affection that played with him, as if each of them had but acted his own interest" (131), and a skillful schemer so that all the cunning plays in the process of his usurpation are out of Richard's own hands, full of killings and bloodshed. Richard's fall is destined, owing to his own false judgment and finally he has to go through God's judgment. God, the One in the Old Testament, is an absent-director (Author of all tragedies)⁷ who supervises the acting of His play, while Richard III with his strong desire to be the author of the play, a god himself, defies God and deserves to be punished. Raleigh then summarizes:

it pleased God to strike down York: yet his son the Earl of
 March, following the plain path which his Father had trodden
 out, despoiled Henry the Father, and Edward, the son, both of
 their lives and Kingdoms. (131)

As Raleigh interprets such a notorious king, Richard III must perish and his descendants die with him in the hands of an avenging God, but the devil in him leaves in this world as ever. Such reasoning of historical events confirms Raleigh's idea of the function of history as a mirror by anachronically analogizing similar happenings and

⁷ This phrase is taken from Raleigh's Preface in *The History of the World* 146 (Hammond's edition).

analyzing the motivations that lead to the catastrophe of the great ones so as to warn the later generations of the same tragedy. He says:

History, that it hath made us acquainted with our dead
Ancestors; and, out of the depth and darkness of the earth,
delivered us their memory and fame. . . , we may gather
out of History a policy no less wise than eternal; by the
comparison and application of other men' s forepassed miseries,
with our own like errors and ill deservings. (127)

History is here less a “repository of exempla” (Gransden 247) than the light that points the way for human beings, and the teachings in history serve as the harbinger for descendants to escape from the same “miseries” foreshadowed. The didacticism of history serves to work through past examples and to teach the present by the lessons and wisdom gathered from human activities. By making men acquainted with “dead ancestors,” history is the book of memory that delivered men of the past fame and glory (Preface 127)⁸. With the inexhaustible accumulation of examples, human knowledge of the times past is able to be carried over to after ages. Historical events may have no meaning in themselves until they bear an instructional function with which history begins to bring significance to human existence. In this sense, through repositioning the past figures, Raleigh imposes to re-locate himself to solve the enigma vexed by his imprisonment. To further verify his position, he takes Henry VII as an example to explain his success by referring to Louis XI, King of France, as a “glasse”⁹ so that he can follow the good and be rid of the bad in their similar situation. The imagery of the

⁸ Gerald Hammond ed., *Raleigh, History*.

⁹ George Puttenham, “The Arte of English Poesie” 41. At the issue of historical poetry, Puttenham observes that “no one thing in the world as it were in a glasse the lively image of our dear forefathers, their noble and vertuous maner of life, with other things autentike. . .”

“glasse” serves to bring about the historical comparisons for the reader to attain the knowledge that the forefathers had offered. An immediate instrument of God’s justice to the cruelty of Richard III, Henry VII is a “politic Prince” (132), a wise king that has laid the foundation of the newly united Great Britain. With this comment on Henry VII, Raleigh in fact intends to continue his principal points about the judgment of man and the judgment of God. Greedy for more power, fame, honor and all sorts of material satisfactions of this world, man is so falsified by the course of fortune that he takes pride in his earthly achievements and disrespects God, under the illusion that he is himself the god that governs this world, as in the instance of Richard III. However, God’s judgment may not merely manifest in the present but is also left to posterity. Raleigh is conveying the idea of divine providence or rather retribution in his division of the four monarchies of the ancient of civilizations as was prophesied in the Book of Daniel, those of Persia, Greece, Carthage, and Rome. He then postulates that a like situation happens not only in the case of Henry VII but everywhere in history as briefly summarized in the transference of the different regimes of the first British kings. History itself affirms the principle that the killings done by a former king will be “rewarded” (in its negative sense) to his own descendants and bring them to the consequential calamities.

The infinite wisdom of God doth not work always by one, and the same way, but very often in the alteration of Kingdoms and Estates, by taking understanding from the Governors, so as they can neither give nor discern of counsels. (199)

Men’s judgment is subject to the apparatus of fortune, but God’s judgment endures to be the single source for the final “perfect happiness” (172). Raleigh’s *History*, in contrast to Boethius’ assertion of the justice of God in punishing and rewarding, demonstrates partial aspects of the “benevolence” of God, which, to be more precise,

reveals the concept of divine providence exclusively in the sense of retribution. “And in the end it pleased God to take away all his [Henry VII] own, without increase” (134). As history itself shows, Henry VII’s retribution comes to his grandchildren, for in and after the reign of Henry VIII, England has been in a political and religious turmoil under the threat of invasions from foreign powers. The Tudor Dynasty ends in Queen Elizabeth being heirless and the dynastic power is again transferred to the Stuart Family, James I, otherwise known as Charles IV in Scotland.

In the deliverance of the past kings, the *Translatio imperii* (the transference of empires) posited by Chenu is re-assumed by creating a political theology to convenience and legitimize the claim to the throne, a predominating operation of assuming the “King’s two bodies” which promulgates the sovereign’s status as ordained by God and indestructible. In *The King’s Two Bodies*, Ernst H. Kantorowicz illustrates the dual identities of a king, the body natural, the mortal body of the king, and the body politic, a mystified body which represents metaphysically the symbol of the continuance of kingship. In fact, the introduction of this political theology has arisen from the Middle Ages for the pro-royalists to validate and confirm the legitimacy of the king, and has its most complete development in the Renaissance, especially during the tumultuous regimes of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This double image of a King¹⁰ originated from the Christology of the *duplex Corpus Christi* as his ambiguous essences of mortal and immortal. “One body of Christ which is he himself, and another body of which is the head [of the Church]” (Kantorowicz 268). This association with Christ endears the King as a divinity and preserves the mandate of the royal family, as Chenu puts it, “a providential preparation for the age of Christ”

¹⁰ The word is capitalized after the fashion of Ernst Kantorowicz as to his suggestion of the mystification of king’s body politic based on an entire examination of Christology in Chapter Four.

(185). Furthermore, since the English Protestant Reformation in the reign of Henry VIII, the head of the Church of England is joined to the head of the state and prompts pro-royalist scholars to build up the analogy that parallels Christ with the King. In this inference, a King may die only in the physical sense, but the spirit of the body politic can never be terminated. Apparently, what is concerned here is the deliberation of the continuity of the state, the *Translatio imperii*. Thereafter, “*King is a name of continuance, which shall always endure as the head and governor of the people. and in this the King never dies. although his natural Body dies..*” (Kantorowicz’s italics, 407-8).

The construction of the political theology of the king’s two bodies makes Renaissance Englishmen believe the King ordained by God to bring about the permanency of the country. Such a belief, if not superstition, of the myth creation is deeply involved with the conceptualization of divine providence which may change with the writer’s political attitude as having shown earlier in this chapter. To the historiography professed in the preface, Walter Raleigh aims to explicate the notion of divine providence, or rather retribution, under which men’s prosperity and destiny are at the discretion or judgment of a supervising God. Explicit in the frontispiece of his *History of the World* of the 1614 edition, the religious doctrine of divine providence heralded by the over-looking eye on the top claims a dominant role in history as a whole.¹¹ Trampling over the bodies of death and oblivion, “History,” the central figure, upholds the globe in her hands. The personated History is presented as a sanctuary image escorted with experience (*Experientia*) and truth (*Veritas*) to juxtapose the morality Raleigh has to draw in his history proper. In the figural

¹¹ Beverley Southgate, *History: What and Why?* 44-5.

representation¹² of history in the frontispiece, religion or rather Protestantism, is the primary concern which sheds light on the interpretation of history. In his essay “*Figura*,” Erich Auerbach studies the etymology and the semantic development of “*figura*.” He observes that “*figura*,” model, copy, figment (16-7), begins its new meaning in the Christian world that designates a prophetic signification with the biblical events recorded in the Scripture (27). Christian theologians see that “the persons and events of the Old Testament were prefigurations of the New Testament and its history of salvation” (30). The Old Testament is no longer a national history of the Jews but it enlightens with its promises which will be fully realized in the New Testament and lead to human redemption and salvation with the Nativity of Christ the Savior. The prefigural interpretation of the New Testament as the fulfillment of the Old endowed the Old Testament with historical reality and such a prefiguration of the Bible becomes a rooted tradition (44). Certain passages and events of the Old Testament are composed with “a universal vision of history” (52) so that the past becomes the foreboding of the present, the end of the world in the future and the Kingdom of God.

Whereas in the modern view the event is always self-sufficient and secure, while the interpretation is fundamentally incomplete. the event is enacted according to an ideal model which is a prototype situated in the future and imitated in the figures. . . For every future model, though incomplete as history, is already fulfilled in God and has existed from all eternity in His providence. (59)

The truth is here presented with God’s working through second causes in mundane history in which men acquire knowledge from the accumulated recording of the past

¹² The idea of the figural representation of history is indebted to my advisor Professor So whose advice always enlightens me.

event. Human history is thus interpreted as the unfolding of God's justice and by revealed knowledge, God's promise of eternity must be realized. It is also in this vision of history that Raleigh is motivated to write a universal history with the prefiguration of the events that the past, the present and the future are interconnected.

Raleigh perceives:

Providence is. . . divided into Memorie, Knowledge, and Care:

Memorie of the Past, Knowledge of the present, and Care of the future: and wee our selues account such a man for iudgement, and comparing the one with the other, prouide for the future, and time succeeding. (qtd. in McCabe 51)¹³

There is a well-connected relationships among the past, the present and the future in Raleigh's allotting Memory, Knowledge and Care respectively. Expressing his idea of a providential history to signify the revelatory nature of his universal history, Raleigh believes that the anachronism of the events will also prognosticate the future for the present will become the past, the present and the future. In *The History of the World*, the providential perspective works as the main subject, God as the "supreme governor," the prime mover "of whose Empire all that is true" (*History* II:21:6 171).¹⁴ However, beholding the gaze of the omnipresent eye in the frontispiece, we can easily discern the absolute power of God hinted at from the hierarchical presentation. All the turbulence, flourish and decline of this world belong to secondary causation so that, despite the happiness they might bring, they are only temporary. As this theme of divine providence becomes prevalent in Renaissance writing, we discover a mixture of

¹³ In short of a complete copy of Raleigh's *History of the World*, this statement, which I find useful to convey Raleigh's perception of the providential history, is indebted to McCabe's citation from an original copy.

¹⁴ Gerald Hammond ed., *Raleigh*.

religion with political purpose which has already decreased the religiosity in asserting the absolute power of the king over the church. Contradictory as they may seem of the joining forces, we need to investigate the nature of providence subtly incorporated with the myth and how it works in literature and history.

In his *Mythical Element in English Literature*, E. M. W. Tillyard states that the mythical origin in the literary forms in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries stems from the trends of thought popular in the late Middle Ages in which the medieval writers were ambitious to relate to or assimilate all reality with a theological purpose (24). Though a tradition against the Renaissance men of letters, the tradition however remains an essential part in literature, including the writing of history. By first assuming the Elizabethan world order, Tillyard proposes various sets of correspondences permeating between the planes of creation, an order that calls for analogy between two similar things. As God is in contrast to angels, the physical universe is to the microcosm of man. As there are ranks among angels in the celestial and layers in the heavenly bodies, we have different ranks of the class and the hierarchy of the state, which has come to be a recognized knowledge presented in Raleigh's *History*. "For that infinite wisdom of God, which hath distinguishe his Angels by degrees. . . ; hath also ordained Kings, Dukes or Leaders of people. . .and other degrees among men" (Preface 143)¹⁵. Once the order is disturbed, discord would incur turmoil, and injustice in this world is somehow taken as divine punishment that can only be appeased by God's mercy. This kind of an avenging God with His curse on humans is the fundamental element in myth creating that helps introduce Tillyard's illustration of the Tudor myth.

¹⁵ Gerald Hammond ed., *Raleigh, History*. Also, in Book One Chapter 2:5 entitled "That Man is. . . a little world," Raleigh gives a very detailed description about the resemblance and correspondences that we can find in the parallel of the universe and man. This description well typifies the epistemology of the time.

Tudor myth comes first to take shape in Polydore Vergil's effort to legitimize the title of Henry VII to the throne. Vergil, according to Tillyard, sees a pattern in English history ranging from Richard II to Henry VII so that "it shows the justice of God punishing and working out the effects of a crime, till prosperity is re-established in Tudor monarchy."¹⁶ Such a providential pattern not only exemplifies why history repeats itself in the cycle, but why it continues to grow into full elaboration in Edward Hall in his exaltation of the marriage of the Houses of Lancaster and York to end the civil dissension and restore the national order to bring up the climactic reign of Henry VIII. Here Tillyard tries to offer a theory applicable to Renaissance historiography, but his proposition later induces much controversial criticism, especially in Henry Ansgar Kelly's scrutinized review of the historical works produced in the period. First of all, Kelly expresses a negative attitude toward Tillyard's all-inclusive comments that would never be workable in that "everyone assumed the whole when referring to the parts, just as references to planets presupposed the rest of the cosmos."¹⁷ Secondly, the assumed pattern collapses when it comes to the theme of divine providence inconsistently brought about in different historical works, which means, the theory does not work simultaneously but it changes with the political stance that each historian purports. Therefore, to the ascension of Henry IV, they have the Lancastrian myth operating in condemning the crime of killing committed by Richard II; the anti-Lancastrian myth, namely the Yorkish sympathizers, taking Henry IV as a usurper; and also the Tudor myth which may vary in each historian's evaluation of the English past kings.¹⁸ Pinpointing the inconsistency in history, Kelly reexamines the

¹⁶ Tillyard, *Shakespeare's History Plays* 43.

¹⁷ Henry Ansgar Kelly, *Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare's Histories* 9-10 and 297-8.

¹⁸ In Kelly's study, he has taken many examples elucidating the discrepancies

text of the Bible which itself has variants¹⁹ and Augustine in his endeavor to reconcile paganism with Christianity in the *City of God* where all the happenings in this world are pre-destined by the work of God so that the temporal good and evil things in this life should come to both alike. Augustine goes on and asks, “in the present distribution of temporal things, does God plainly evince his own interference” (Kelly 3). The God in such a formulation tends to be, in a broad sense, more flexible in rewarding and punishing; yet the role of God may go through changes in the hands of the historians for their respective purposes. The so-called “divine providence” is submitted to many a writer’s utilitarian media either to legitimize the sovereignty or to yield to be propagandistic for the state.

From the description of the potent constituents behind Renaissance historiography, we may now have the idea that divine providence comes from the rewarding of the virtues and the punishing of the vices.²⁰ The description of hereditary retribution becomes the main reason, especially in Renaissance historiography, to elucidate the transference of succeeding power. The idea of a retributive providence is manifestly

presented in each historian. One may take side with the House of Lancaster but change later in the reign of the House of York. As in Vergil’s case, Kelly demonstrates the inconsistency among the three versions of English history. He finds that there is not so much emphasis of the theme of divine providence before Richard III and the ascension of Henry VII. It was not until Edward Hall that history has the full development in the theme, while in Holinshed, the earlier edition of 1577/78 may best represent his view and the second edition in 1587 however has much correction by the later editors.

¹⁹ Kelly, *Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare’s Histories* 2-3. God’s justice in the Book of Deuteronomy contains the punishment not only to the one who has sinned but to posterity, “a kind of collective justice operative.” Whereas, two chapters further in the same book, God’s justice means only to the punishment of those who hate Him(1-2). As the former gives the picture of God as inexorable, the latter, according to Kelly, turns to be more acceptable to the Christians and the like.

²⁰ The working of divine providence in Raleigh’s history is demonstrated through the incessant punishments of God, and the idea of a retributive providential point of view is discussed as the center in Kelly’s study of the Renaissance historiography.

exercised in Raleigh's summary of past English kings and his rendering of the world history. "[God is] all-powerful, and whose revenges are without date and for everlasting" (163). To the contrary, the heathen gods are but inventions by mortal men and are no less mortal in view of the fact that the gods themselves fear to be destroyed, and they are no longer worshipped because devouring Time (in Raleigh's word) has eaten up their bodies and images so that what is left to them are but "temples of stone and dureful Marble" (159). Therefore in Raleigh's account of the story of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, though having built great works in Babylon, he is still honored and protected under the shelter of God with much happiness until he becomes forgetful of God and sets up a golden image which symbolically enhances himself as a god. God inflicts him with a seven-year-penalty for his disrespect.²¹ In the example of Nebuchadnezzar, Raleigh expresses a negative attitude towards the influence of human affections. He then contemplates:

Yet as all human affections, wherein due reference to God is wanting, are no better than obscure clouds, hindering the influence of that blessed light. . . ; so that insolent joy, which man in the pride of his vain imagination conceiveth of his own worth, doth above all other passions blast our minds, as it were with lightning, and make us to reflect our thoughts upon our seeming inherent greatness, forgetting the whilst him, to whom we are indebted for our very being. (178)

In this understanding, Raleigh points out that the device of human affections is the fallible quality of human mind so that men's wisdom should seek the counsel of God with due respect. When overcome by excessive passion, men become deluded by the seeming greatness that they have built in this world and ignore God. It is

²¹ Gerald Hammond ed., *Raleigh, History*, III:1:11 177-8.

Nebuchadnezzar's idolatry that violates the decree of God and results in his later punishment. Raleigh here recognizes the significance of modesty without which men, drowned in the sea of "pride and vain glory" (178), defy God his Creator and is destined to be condemned. Divine Providence is consequently apprehended through the reward and vengeance of God. Another example concerns Alexander the Great.²² In his many earthly victories in the battlefield, he makes good use of his wisdom to judge and shows his mercy to the defeated so that he is able to accomplish his fame and greatness. However, "the spirit of the *Universal*, piercing, moving and governing all things hath ordained, to erect to cast down, to be established or destroyed, and to bring all things, Persons and States to the same certain ends."²³ Marvelous as he is, he finally has to be judged by God for his former cruelties, his vanity to worship the heathen god, Jupiter, and his excessiveness in drinking (IV:2:23 207).

Such a Law of God applied to the British Kingdom is also applicable to the other countries, a universal law that makes Raleigh ask about the meaning of men's lives only to travail and witness the perpetual fluctuation. In the process of the inquiry, he presents death both as an end of this life and a beginning of the other world in his interpreting the relationship of God and man and his comparison of man's transitory inhabitation of this world. He reflects, "It is in the present time that all the wits of the world are exercised." Confirming the use of history, he also criticizes man's unteachability and his forgetfulness of the lessons from the past, "so we neither look behind us what hath been, nor before us what shall be" (139). Blinded by the shining

²² Raleigh, *History*, Book Four 186-208.

²³ The original sentence has been re-arranged. Raleigh writes, "such spirits [of great men] have been stirred up in sundry Ages of the world, and divers parts thereof, to erect and cast down again, to establish and destroy, and to bring all things, Persons and States; to the same certain ends, which the infinite spirit of the *Universal* piercing, moving, and governing all things hath ordained" (191-2).

glory of the present gains, men are deluded by the misconception that possession is eternal, while they nearly overlook inescapable death lurking wherever there is life. Death, the eventual victor, is the master of Fortune as well, for all the earthly properties and rewards which men chase after all their life have to come to a close and turn to nothingness. Raleigh rationalizes that human relations to the world come from the body where resides the soul, and the world, “no being” (143), is but a temporary inhabitation for the body which separates from the soul when he expires. Whence, the perfect happiness must have resulted from man’s knowledge in his hope, one that well anticipates the spiritual beatitude of an afterlife. A devout life after the model of saints, advocated by the Christian humanist, exercising charity and practicing religious virtues to please or plead the mercy of God, becomes the means of acquiring the eternal joys of Heaven, reserved by God, through divine revelation. And that is also the final salvation for men to be received by God and to enter the world of “no ending” (143), i.e., Heaven. By this rationale, Raleigh is also re-proposing the Christian idea of time, as Augustine once defined it, that of a successive movement beginning with creation and stopping, in terms of one’s life span, when one comes to the door of death to meet the Last Judgment Day. “It is therefore Death alone that can suddenly make man to know himself” (V:6:12 272). In his labor to internalize divine providence, or rather retribution, Raleigh develops the frequent contrast of the temporality of the worldliness checked by death and the otherworldliness commenced by death, an eschatological view that responds to the theological calling in its futuristic anticipation of eternity. To Raleigh, history in such outlining can be a book of revelation envisioned by the prophetic role of the historian that gives light to the audience by:

referring all unto the will of God, I mean, to his revealed will: from which that his hidden purposes do not vary, this story, by many great examples, gives most notable proof. True it is that the concurrence

of second causes with their effects, is in these books nothing largely described, nor perhaps exactly in any of those Histories that are in these points most copious. (170)

History as a result is the unfolding of God's Will operating through the temporal manifestations of secondary causes. By reading the cyclic historical events, the audience get to learn from the past lessons to better discern the truth of God and to live a virtuous life.

Raleigh's notion of eschatology undoubtedly comes from the Christian view of the end of the world, which receives its meaning in three respects: the biblical descriptions of the creation in Genesis, the periods of the *Historia mundi* (history of the world), and the coming of the Antichrist.²⁴ Bredero indicates that the six-day imagery of creation parallel to the six stages of life gives the people's expectation to return to God on the seventh day, an eschatological outlook that encourages the Christians to perform good virtues in daily life. And the prophecy of the four monarchies as four divisions of the *Historia mundi* in the Book of Daniel is another allegorical interpretation of the fulfillment of history. On the third level, the assumption of the Antichrist (symbol of moral decline) serves to condemn the head of the Catholic Church as "king of hypocrites" or "Satan's ambassador."²⁵ Raleigh comments that even the reverend clergymen can not escape from the trial of worldly desires (126). Raleigh's faith in Protestantism is best evidenced in his portrayal of Francis I as the worthiest king of France, for the French king "did never enjoy himself after he had commanded the destruction of the Protestants" (138). Raleigh seeks to prove that God is everywhere

²⁴ Adriaan H. Bredero, "The Announcement of the Coming of Antichrist and the Medieval Concept of Time," *Prophecy and Eschatology* 3-13.

²⁵ Jane Dawson, "Apocalyptic Thinking of the Marian Exiles," *Prophecy and Eschatology* 75-91.

the same God so that those who have persecuted the Protestants would die without posterity. “The Protestants remain more in number than ever they were, and hold to this day more strong cities than ever they had” (138). In the essay “Apocalyptic Thinking of the Marian Exiles,” Dawson explains that most British Protestants lived their lives in light of the apocalyptic thinking which was of the crucial importance especially in the reign of Mary Tudor (symbol of the Antichrist). They detected in the Book of Revelation (Apocrypha) the gradual unfolding of the English chronicles.²⁶ “It is as full clearance to all the chronicles and most notable histories. opening the true nature of their ages, times and seasons” (Dawson 79). The Christian eschatological interpretation towards death expects the approaching of the Judgment Day when every one should go under the sentence of death. So Raleigh says, “God will bring every work into judgment, that man hath done under the sun” (153). It is not until in the face of death that truth shall be revealed because “God will not be mocked” (144).

The word “Apocrypha” in the Greek carries the same of the “hidden” to designate that some precious knowledge or wisdom is preserved from an inner circle of the believers.²⁷ This hidden knowledge or wisdom was widely borrowed by the Christians in respect to God’s unsearchable Will so that His intention must be for human goodness and can never be guessed by human intelligence. Associated with the “hidden” truth in the Scripture, Raleigh, with good reason, elevates the writing of the world history in its revelatory implication that intimates the corporeal into the higher realm of the incorporeal: “The Heavens are high, far off and unsearchable: we have

²⁶ In her essay, Dawson relates that the ecclesiastical writers produced in the Marian Exile always turned first to the Apocrypha where the biblical allusions well fitted to support and explain the victimization of the Protestant martyrs. See also her examples of John Fox, John Bale and other writers of the time.

²⁷ This definition of the word is summarized from the introduction to the Apocrypha in *The Revised English Bible: with the Apocrypha* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989) iii.

sense and feeling of corporal things; and of eternal grace, but by revelation” (140). Subsequently, in the corporeal level, though always accompanying death, time is narrowly confined within the lapse of life and death, but time never stops its flow and the world keeps its course under God’s plan even after death. Raleigh disagrees with the secular definition of time and re-asserts the belief of predestination in which the course of human civilization is a navigation where all are in the same boat with God as the captain. Through Raleigh’s diminishing the significance of this life by inferring the anticipation of an afterlife under the defense of divine (in)justice, history plays such a role as a textbook open for moral education from the collection of experiences (*Experientia*) and the ultimate truth (*Veritas*). Raleigh thinks that men are so blinded from the counsel of God that history “hath here in a singular prerogative above all that have been written by the most sufficient of merely human authors: it setteth down expressly the true, and first causes of all that happened” (169-70). And it is the end and the scope of history to teach by past examples of the most exquisite for men “to know and to attain true felicity, both here, and hereafter” (172).

With his ideal structure of negation, Raleigh however contradicts himself in his tragic disposition which denies human capability of learning from the past, as exhibited throughout his general history. Emphasizing the theological reason as the first cause, he also devises that God’s “unsearchable” will performs through the second causes which may include anything happening in the world, though most people may ascribe it to the play of fortune. Unsearchable as it is so termed, God tends to be functional to devalue the worth of history, for man’s position is reduced to a subject inactive in attending any worldly activities so much so that human free will becomes an absurd feature appointed by God (May 89).²⁸ In the poem, “*On the life of man,*” Raleigh

²⁸ From Racin’s commentary on Raleigh’s *History*, May concludes, “The insistence on an absolute divine providence obviates the value of history, for whatever we may learn

comments that life is “a play of passion” that we are here for “this short comedy”(55). While the “comedy” insinuates happy atmosphere, it is for the fun of the all-powerful God, “the Author of all our tragedies” (146), to watch over the “short” performance which ironically proclaims its tragic reference. “Heaven the judicious sharp spectator is,/ That sits and marks still who doth act amiss;/ Our graves that hide us from the searching sun/ Are like drawn curtains when the play is done” (55) To the tragic element of life cast down by transience, Raleigh conveys a sense of Stoic asceticism that keeps him from coveting the worldly purchases of honor and fame and directs him to the ideal virtuous life waiting for the salvation. While on the other hand, he also shows his reminiscence to the enjoyment of the past glories that prevents him from a total renunciation of his secular appetites. He therefore returns to the emphasis on this life in the world and justifies his worldly pursuits with proper or “righteous” ways that may bring prosperity to the posterity (143). It is also the only consolation for his contemporary adversity, for a “Christian man” like him should bear it “resolvedly” (146). Here, Raleigh’s dilemma comes from the unsettling forces between his quest for an eternal union with God and his non-religious quest for great accomplishments in this finite life. His assertion of a Christian man is agreeable to the theme of divine providence in the Preface as the backdrop of his writing of history; however, his self-consolatory approach discloses a reflection of his ambition to appropriate world history as propaganda of English nationalism in the name of religion.

from the past cannot be applied to changing the future in a manner contrary to God’s will” (89).

Chapter Four

History as A Propaganda of Nationalism

When we look at the notion of divine providence that prevails in the writing of history in the Renaissance, we find a historiography oscillating between the historians' vocation to record nothing but the truth and their over-simplification of a retributive divine providence, especially well developed in the Tudor Dynasty. The political theorization of the divine providence sufficiently adopted the Tudor myth via theological internalization to convince the people of the legitimacy of the royalty. With this embodied political purpose, the demarcation between truth and fiction is so blurred by the mythical appropriation to deify the magnitude of the rulership that the new type of writing makes history subjected to the purpose of national propaganda since the late Middle Ages. Regarding the theme of providentialism dominant in the medieval convention of spiritual pursuit, E. K. Rand has well observed, "prison-literature often takes the form of a theodicy, an attempt to assert eternal Providence and Justify the ways of God to men" (23).¹ This comment virtually relates both Boethius to Raleigh of their hardships in prison, and writing is one way of self-presentation to rise above the physical limitation. The former was psychologically released from the consolation of philosophy, while the latter was deeply trapped by uncompromising forces, one appealing to the consolation of theology, the other indulging in the nostalgia of past glories.

On the theological plane, divine providence is developed and well incorporated by the Renaissance historians with the notion of the king's two bodies, the body natural and the body politic. The body natural indicates the king's mortal body that dies with the king's life, while the body politic remains eternal and indestructible. The creation

¹ V. E. Watts, introduction, *The Consolation of Philosophy*.

Lai

of the political theology designates the union of religion and polity especially in Tudor England when Henry VIII announced to separate from the control of the Roman Catholic Church in 1532. Under the influence of Luther's revolt against the Catholics to ask for religious freedom, the Protestant Reformation in England demonstrates that Henry VIII demands not only a theological independence from Rome but also expresses a political dissatisfaction with papal jurisdiction over the king. This chapter will explicate Raleigh's nationalism in *The History* with his autobiographical style of writing and digression he presents his history as an propagandist appropriation to arouse or to advocate the national sentiment among the Englishmen. As nationalism is a widespread conception of Tudor England, patriotism is by no means the reflection of such an consciousness. Though his writing of history exhibits a sense of indulgence in worldly achievements, Raleigh however tries to renounce this worldliness with his construction of history in light of divine providence. Focusing on the delineation of men and their activities, the second causes, Raleigh the historian is caught in the cycle of the rise and fall of the world history. *The History of the World*, incomplete, ends in the flourish of the Roman Empire, the fourth and the last in his description, but "after some continuance, it shall begin to lose the beauty it had" (270). It is the uncertainty of this world that Raleigh desires to draw the significance of the first cause that supports men to reach to the higher realm of bliss.

The establishment of the Church of England which conjoins religious dominance and political authority under the supremacy of the king signals a fundamental and revolutionary shift of attitude with the expression of national sentiment (Greenfeld 30). In "God's Firstborn: England," Liah Greenfeld observes that the corporate consciousness of a nation is "at its core a Humanist notion" in which the nation is perceived as a community of free and equal individuals (30). The premise of each individual as an independent entity requires a communal commitment with which the

Lai participants are actively engaged in the public affairs. The nature of nation in this sense is consolidated in two respects, which are the movements of humanism and religious reformation. We can trace this route back to both Erasmus and Luther and their influence in the subsequent renovations of the Renaissance period. Erasmus' advocacy of human dignity drives to a collective awakening that emphasizes human beings as important factors in social and political transformation, and Luther's assertion of freedom from the exclusive circle of biblical interpretation brings about the vernacularization of Scripture. The influence of humanism and reformation consequently comes to be the most elemental in the formation of collective consciousness of nationhood in England. Raleigh is subject to the like influence in the Elizabethan age. In "Of our base and frail bodies: and that the care thereof should yield to the immortal soul,"² Raleigh admits that each man is an individual made out of dust of the earth and says that "our bodies are but the anvils of pain and diseases, and our Minds the Hives of unnumbered cares, sorrows, and passions" (153). Though the state of man in the universe in this sense evinces a humble position under God, Raleigh associates the external creation of the bodies with the internal emotions of the human mind to emphasize every human being as individual entity in the world. Raleigh then goes on to the description of man in "That Man is (as it were) a little world: with a digression touching our mortality."³

Man, thus compounded and formed by God, was an abstract or model, or brief Story of the Universal: in whom God concluded the creation, and work of the world, and whom he made the last and most excellent of his creatures, being internally endued with a divine

² Gerald Hammond ed., *Raleigh, History*, I:2:3 152-154.

³ Gerald Hammond ed., *Raleigh, History*, I:2:5 154-162.

Lai

Creator, after whose image he was formed, and endued with the powers and faculties of reason and other abilities, that thereby also he might govern and rule the world, and all other God' s creatures therein. (154)

In the lengthy explication of “Man” with the first letter capitalized, Raleigh discusses man as an independent subject and his relations to the world above in both theological and astronomical terms. The discussion immediately distinguishes the improvement of human epistemology of the world from a traditional two-dimensional perspective to a three-dimensional correspondence among God (theological), Man (social), and the physical Universe (scientific) in the modern era. As man was formed after the image of God, he is the most excellent among other creatures because God gifts him with a divine understanding so that only man is capable of ruling the world and the other creatures. This reasoning of man' s competency of rulership over others, in due course, initiates the modern idea of sovereignty, and after the English Protestant Reformation the notion of nation comes to develop in England to signify a sharp disintegration of religious values from the Roman Catholic Church.

In the survey of the philological evolution of the word “nation” which originally means “the elite,” Greenfeld states that the separation from the Roman Catholic Church and the redefinition of social hierarchy after the dissolving of monasteries by Henry VIII mark significant links that result in more religious enthusiasts and the upstart of the new nobility through the ownership of the land (48). The Protestant Reformation in England functions as one of the vital determinants in the change of social hierarchy, especially in the mutable regimes of the Tudors kings. Nationalism till the Marian persecution of the Protestants to the glorification of the Elizabethan age is conceptualized to represent an inseparable relation between the religious declaration of a true religion distinct from Catholicism and the political insistence on an independent

Lai country (63). In breaking with Rome, the Englishmen show much enthusiasm for the new learning. In the Greenfeld's study, the growth of the new gentry is "complemented by parallel developments among the professions, especially lawyers and later clergy, and the merchants" (48). The observation indicates a higher or better education of the people that promotes the sophistication of the contemporary society. Literacy becomes one reason for the dissemination of nationalism with English as the national language by which the writers of the time find the means of expression and interpretation to popularize the perception of nationalistic sentiment.

Walter Raleigh is a typical example under the complex social context where a peculiar mixture of tradition, innovation and national sentiment motivates the discovery of English past through antiquarian study and imitation of antiquities. During the Tudor Dynasty, chronicle writing came to be a popular representation of patriotism to the English nation, a political propaganda that satisfies people with the victorious glories of the English past. Raleigh's *History of the World* and many of his miscellaneous writings are under the influence of the corporate nationhood so that his advocacy of nationalism rests in his personal participation of national business. In his chronological ordering of the world history of ancient civilizations with Christianity, Raleigh uses a Thucydidean methodology which seeks likeness among historical events, and presents a cyclic view of history by the rise and fall of the ancient kings. In Book Five of the *History*, Raleigh defines the origin of the nations after the flood and shows the division of the nations only proves the "selfsame" history of all nations (216). Relating to the wisdom accumulated from the old time, human civilizations are gradually developed with knowledge of all kinds: philosophy, moral teachings and law. Raleigh's reason for a cyclic history is related to men's lack of moderation: limitless desire of wealth, vanity of beauty and a devouring appetite for food and drink. But time will ultimately take revenge. Raleigh recapitulates the repetitive pattern that

Lai

Thucydides has already exemplified in classical historiography. The time sequence is a succession while the description of the account is to present the natural law of the world, which is a repetitive pattern of events that Raleigh purports to display.

In “A discourse concerning Joas’ triumphant entry into Jerusalem, with a brief account of the conduct of Charles VIII in the city of Florence,” as the title explains, Raleigh here anachronically draws a comparison between the biblical event and a more recent one in the reign of the French king, Charles VIII.⁴ Commenting as a well-experienced commander in great battles, Raleigh suggests to make use of every opportunity during the war to seize and conquer other countries. In the case of Joas, the descendant of Kings, Raleigh shows an intolerance toward Joas’ inglorious entrance to Jerusalem through a breach and his covetous appetite of the treasures after the entry. Joas fails to do his job as a commander leading his army to conquer Jerusalem, and his ruin is brought about by his avarice in defiance of God’s commandments. Likewise, Charles VIII misses the chance to subdue the town of Florence under his control because he has been called away during the war. Raleigh then concludes, “Diversitie of circumstance may alter the case: it is enough to say, that it might be in Jerusalem, as we know it was in Florence” (67). The summary of the repetitive nature of history is emphasized by Raleigh’s paralleling the historical incidents. The reason that Raleigh shows in his history reveals his belief in the nature of the world in which empires have waxed and waned throughout history. This reason of uncertainty serves to persuade and encourage men to accept a hope of an afterlife. Here Raleigh on the one hand sees history as cyclic and adopts the figural approach that we have elucidated in the previous chapter. Taking the past as prefiguration to explain the present is Raleigh’s

⁴ G. E. Hadow ed., *Sir Walter Raleigh: Selections from his Historie of the World, his Letters etc* 63-7.

Lai strategy in his writing, particularly a universal history. Raleigh integrates the ancient history into the Old Testament and with the prophetic nature of which the truth will be revealed through the manifestation of the “self-sufficient” (Auerbach 59) model of the past and the re-presentation of such a model in the present. His providential history lies in operation of the temporal second causes in the events of the past with the promise of the future after the Judgment Day. With respect to his inculcation of providentialism, Raleigh endeavors to historicize both traditions politically directed to the fulfillment of the prophecy regarding the decline of the Roman Empire and the corruption of the Roman Catholic Church. The ultimate goal is to lead to the epoch of the true religion, which is, the victory of the Church of England.

Therefore, in “Of the beginnings of Rome, and of Romulus’ birth and death,”⁵ Raleigh tells the story of Romulus, the founding father of Rome, and analyzes that the ambitious king could claim himself Lord only in the “narrow Territories” (176) he had conquered:

after which time the Sovereignty fell into the hands of *Numa*, a man to him unknown, and more Priestlike than Kinglike: wherein Rome itself in her later times hath somewhat resembled this King. . . afterwards. . . she [Rome] fell into the subjection of a Prelate, swelling by degrees from the Sheephook to the Sword, and therewith victorious to excessive magnificence, from whence by the same degrees it fell. . . (176)

In the brief sketch, Raleigh the historian exerts a prophetic role that foresees the triumphant glory of Christianity over Rome with the words “Priestlike,” “Kinglike,” and “Prelate.” While the “Prelate” represents the corrupted Pope in Rome “swelling”

⁵ Hammond, *Raleigh, The History*, II:24:5 174-176.

Lai

with excessive ambition and causes the ensuing political contentions of religious power, Rome is destined to fall. The image of the Pope, denoting moral decline, symbolizes the Antichrist who betrays the Christian disciplines and is to be condemned and substituted by the rise of “true” Church. In this rendering, history verifies the present with the rise of the Church of England. And Raleigh’s nationalism originates from a religious prospect in which the English mandate is already ordained.

Returning to the comparison between the history Joas and Francis, as Raleigh has pointed out the inability of Joas to “concoct” a land already conquered, he conjectures that the reason why Joas should go and get the city is because God does not forbid it (64). Concerning the liberty of using conjecture in the writing of history, Raleigh contends that the rehearsal of the probabilities as mere conjectures does not dismiss his job as a historian. Though the freedom of conjecture to a great extent testifies to the inconstancy of human life with regard to the “dissimilitude” of the human mind, the permission of speculation allows ambiguities with the authorial imagination in historical works. With the diversity of the human mind, Raleigh explains, historians on some occasions fail to give sufficient reasons of why history happens (170-1). To the unfathomable psychological dimension as the dynamic cause that triggers the occurrence of the historical moment, Raleigh’s response recalls the humanist concern that considers individuals as entities able to take roles in the course of history, even one who signifies no great importance in the account. Therefore, certain examples of the ancient emperors are depicted to verify Raleigh’s proposition that a minor figure can exert unpredictable influence toward the event, but whose advice is always denied by the king. And it is a proposition that assimilates his current condition in the court of King James. In the story of Xerxes (III:6:2 182), Raleigh infers that Xerxes’ rejection of his uncle’s opinion to cease the war with Greece brings about his final defeat in the war, for the king, despising the enemy, has overestimated his army. In the description

Lai
of Xerxes' uncle, Artabanus, Raleigh seems to speak with Artabanus in a melancholic tone to lament on the sorrowful end of life so that Raleigh contemplates through Artabanus the fleeting of this life and expresses a desire for death (180-2). In his seeming renunciation of this world, Raleigh articulates his current disappointment and continues to give accounts of the vicissitudes of past emperors with his reflections on the national affairs.

Raleigh's nationalism is presented in his rendering a parallelism between the past and the present. In this process the function of history is manifested in the anachronic comparison of events to lead to his own representation of the idea of history. Here we can compare him with Polybius in his patriotism in chronicling the victories of the Roman warriors and maintaining the magnificence of the Roman Empire as the strongest nation of the whole world (the classical world). Polybius' *Histories* is a political record of the Roman government in the wake of military and diplomatic advantages to assure its lasting success. In the vein of patriotic disposition, Raleigh issues his opinions mainly about the government of a nation concerning the relationship among the king, the courtiers and the people and the polemics of political circumstance with foreign countries. Raleigh once contends that "neither the Macedonian nor the Roman soldier, was of equal valour to the English" (V:1:1 209). The comparison of the English soldiers with the ancient Romans not only shows Raleigh's confidence in the English army but serves as a reminder of a deep-rooted patriotism in the English nation. Raleigh's assertion may confront Polybius' confidence in the Roman army, but by analogizing the different groups of soldiers Raleigh again draws the nuances from his past experiences attending in numerous important battles. "This I say; that among their wars, I find not any, wherein their valor hath appeared, comparable to the English" (Hammond, *Rlaegh* 210). Raleigh thinks the reason why the Mecedonian and the Roman warriors could have won so many battles is because they have better and

Lai

greater arms than their opposites (of base courage), while what the English soldiers have are of equal or even of greater in number, and they still successfully defeated the enemy. Raleigh therefore takes Julius Caesar, the most renowned commander in chief, as an example. Under the leadership of their bravest commander, the Roman warriors are much motivated by the morale of the army and conquered the Gauls. However, the English soldiers in the war with France advance their valor in fighting against the French army superior both in arms and number to the English. To better demonstrate English morale, Raleigh relates to the differences of the two enemy armies, the Gauls and the French, saying that “the Gauls, a stout people, but inferior to the French” (211). As there are more factions in modern Europe than in ancient Rome, the Germans are a great threat to all the European countries while the only invaders to Rome are the Gauls. Best equipped of all the nations, the Romans fight to expand the Roman dominion and to preserve their own territory, and the Rome becomes an invincible nation because it has not met its equals. Englishmen on the contrary face the nations “every way equal to ourselves” (214) so that “our danger lay both before and behind us; and the greater danger at our backs. [fearing] a stronger invasion by land, than we could upon France.” To give a convincing account, Raleigh quotes from a French historian, “The English comes with a conquering bravery, as he, that was to gain everywhere, without any stay: he forceth our [French] guard, placed upon the bridge to keep the passage (213). Raleigh’s long explanation of the English army over the Roman re-proposes the issue of the England’s efforts to break with Rome and the assertion of a sovereign polity from the Catholic Church. It is by God’s blessing that has converted the English hindrance into help so that those who should dare to challenge the English army will find that they would rather encountered “as great a puissance, as was that of the Roman Empire” (214).

As this comparative schema is applied to magnify the greatness of the English

Lai
 nation, Raleigh goes on giving advice on strategic tactics in defense against foreign invaders, especially the Spaniards. In many respects, we find traces of Raleigh's tangible advertisement of nationalism or his advancement to colonize the barbarities manifested in his efforts to civilize the people of Ireland and those natives living in primitive forms outside the mainland. Edmund Spenser concurs with Raleigh in the destination to join Ireland unto England. Spenser considers that the Irish are a savage people and need to be reformed in imitation of England which has undergone the process of civilization as attested in English history (McCabe 44-6). "Societies do not simply evolve of their own nature, but develop in accordance with the judicious exercising of firm discipline and royal vigilance" (44). McCabe's statement evinces Spenser's admiration for English in the Elizabethan age so that the government of the royalty is influential to the formation of a well-developed society. Therefore, Spenser's masterpiece *The Faerie Queen* aims not only to glorify the Queen Elizabeth in his conceit of Gloriana but contains also a brief sketch of English history in Book II of *The Faerie Queen* which traces English origins to the story of Brutus and Romulus. The symbol of the mystical figure Gloriana represents the royal pedigree of Elizabeth to endorse the lasting reign of the dynastic power. On nationalistic representation, Robert Lawson-Pebbles comments that "Raleigh exceeds Spenser, extending the image of chastity from the queen. . . to distinguish English and Spanish modes of colonisation" (5). The comparison between Raleigh and Spenser all the more proves that history incorporated to become propagandist of nationalism is a prevalent phenomenon in the Elizabethan.

In this respect, Raleigh shows no exception, and many of his treatises and tracts in prose are rendered to such a purpose. In his first voyage to Guiana, he reveals:

myself seeming to purpose nothing else than the entrance or
 discovery [of Guiana] thereof, but bred in them an opinion that I

Lai

was bound only for the relief of those English, which I had planted
in Virginia [now North Caroline].⁶

The colonial ideology is deeply rooted in his desire to conquer savagery, to “defend the country of Guiana from their [the Spanish] invasion and conquest” (83) and to bring the “bruit” (82) to English civility. His vocation for the plantation of Virginia or Guiana and his animosity to the savage Spaniards spell out his ambition to strengthen and amplify the British Empire. Regarding the definitions of “nation” and “empire,” Linda Gregerson comments that the form of a nation as a political community is substantialized by a group of people affiliated to a limited sovereignty and a defined territory. Empire is on the other hand an idea of expansion to colonize others, an unlimited construction over subjugation (228). In addition, Greenfeld tries to trace the evolution of the two vocabularies and defines them according to the changes in the historical development. Greenfeld notices that the meaning of the two words varies with the contemporary social, political or religious transformation. The word “empire” designates more a spiritual unification affiliated to true religion than a political sovereign (34-5). The deliberation of the two words, in Raleigh’s case, serves to further illustrate the point that Raleigh is writing a universal history that connotes the Christian ideal to establish the true religion, the Church of England, and the ambition to assimilate other nations under the universal Church. Such an advocacy of establishing an English empire that can no longer be actualized in his imprisonment may only be realized through history writing. Again, history concedes to the propagandistic expediency of a English nationhood. “Historiography, still under humanist influence throughout the 1500s, became involved in and colored by the various national development” (Breisach 171). Breisach not only points to a

⁶ Gerald Hammond ed., *Raleigh*, “The Discovery of Guiana” 82.

Lai collective nationalistic concern in the Renaissance in answer to the sense of patriotism, but also discloses a structural confrontation under the theoretical frame of providentialism. In *History of the World*, much of the description is heavily tinged with an autobiographical coloration through the arrangement of digressions. For example, a military expert in war, Raleigh remarks that the army should defend or fight not for the mere performance of personal valor but for the benefit of the country (IV:2:3 193), and that the job of a soldier is to raise the morale of the army and lead the troops to victory (IV:2:4 195). Moreover, in presenting Darius' s procession of his army with the prayers of the priest, Raleigh satirizes the heathen superstition because war has nothing to do with the divine. It is the potentiality of the army that matters (195-6). Excluding God from war affairs, Raleigh seems to contradict himself with providential profession and to emphasize his fundamental agenda of strengthening the English military or marine power to fight against Spain. His animosity to the Spaniards unfortunately violates the pacifist policy of the weak king (James I) who affords the enemy many friendly terms.

Raleigh' s*History* in this sense is both political and military, presented in a series of wars, the great deeds of heroes, and also the overturn of kings. Digressing through fragmentary actions of the kings and princes, Raleigh expresses his opinions where he, being a courtier and soldier, offers a Machiavellian style of theorizing personal political viewpoints and the fighting skills from the past wars. For instance, he thinks that a good form of government should “sufficeth by itself to retain the people” (168). He suggests an autonomous government in which perfect communication is with the hierarchical power distributions of God, the King and the subjects.⁷ Except for taking

⁷ As Raleigh' s*History* starts its course from an aristocratic point of view, we will not discuss additional topics beyond the relationship of the three above.

Lai

God as an instrument to explicate his providential history, Raleigh concentrates on the elaboration of the mutuality of the King and his subjects. As a good government grounds on bottom-up obedience, he proposes a reciprocal returning of the King by reason that “as long as by wisdom they keep the hearts of the people” (Raleigh quoting from Bacon, II:19:6 167). The government then may function well itself whether or not it be tyrannized by the absolute power, for “Monarchs need not to fear any curbing of their absoluteness by mighty subjects” (167). At the issue of a good governor, Raleigh gives his emphasis to the commonweal of the public that the governor should dedicate to the service of the people. As to his qualifications for the good king, Raleigh underscores much in religious terms. “Of Christian Kings if there were many such, the world would soon be happy” (228). By saying that the king should be religious and zealous in God’s causes, Raleigh conceptualizes in a theological vein that puts God over king. “Under such a king. . . by God’s blessing. . . a land should flourish, with increase of Trade, in countries before unknown; that Civility and Religion shall be propagated, into barbarous and heathen countries” (229). Raleigh then returns and concludes that such a king is still subjected to mortality since he may die or err, but the more important is his wisdom and fame that could set him free from the limitation of time and space. By referring to the duty of a king, Raleigh here seems to disrupt in the end to talk about not only a king but also men as a whole to the fact that, apart from God, men’s wisdom and fame succeed to the cycle of life and death.

In the autobiographical dimension, behind his loyalty to the English monarchy, Raleigh is nevertheless much motivated by personal worldly successes and splendors to write the history, or a military bible, to educate the reader and to advocate his ideal of expanding the territory and civilizing the barbarity under the British imperialistic shelter. Premiering the reason of providential calling, Raleigh gets tripped by his dilemma in reconciling his desire to a self-consolatory intent in religion and his sense

Lai
of injustice to be incarcerated for life. As the writing of history is a utilitarian application in the Renaissance, it receives two layers of reading: “speaking of the past” and ‘pointing at the present.’ Setting the principle from the past examples, historians mean to highlight the present issues, those issues disturbing in the confrontations of the other (subjects) and the self, of the prince and the subjects, of the punishing and rewarding, and of religion and ambition. A self-reflection of the frustrations in reality, history can be critical; a propaganda of the national benefits, history can be fictionalized; an appropriation of glorification of the deified Prince, history can be hypocritical. In terms of the political stance, the incorporation betokens the attempt to establish and consolidate the Englishness of the country in response to the flower of nationalism first appeared in the late Middle Ages. And it is not until Henry VIII that the English nationhood was conceptualized as a collective consciousness of the public that we see the published works of chronicles, chronography and cartography mushroomed in this period of time. Such works, as David Starkey suggests, contain the subtlety of humanist reworking of history with regard to the antiquarian restoration (146-7). The historiography is transformed when the historians begin to put more emphasis on the description of physical activity and geographical discovery.

Conclusion

Confrontation

From the Renaissance historians, including Raleigh, some features may be deduced in the following to shape up a historiography of the time. There is generally an inconsistency in the historians' writing which reflects the shift of the monarchs, the delay of the publishing due to the historians' sense of insecurity, the "excuses" for the incomplete versions, and the addition and reduction of different editions. Accordingly, these features confirm no discrepancy of essences that entitle their history as general history or chronicles because most of the features are directed to the contemporary history of England and will be verified in Raleigh's present-mindedness of writing *The History of the World*. The inconsistency of Raleigh's historiography lies in the confrontation between the two intrinsically conflicting legacies: the classical and the medieval cultures. In terms of the writing of history, the two traditions are initiated to find the truth, but both confront with each other in two respects: one is the different notions of time; the other, the varied emphases in writing itself with the rise of the modern notion of nationhood.

In the classical historiography, history is a recording of human activities. Observing the vicissitudes of empires, the historians consider that history repeats itself in a cycle, which is manifested in the repetition of day and night, the life and death in nature, and the rise and fall of the empires. Driven by patriotic zeal, the historians tend to utilize the historical material to adulate the glory of their kings. In this understanding, historians like Thucydides and Polybius, concerned with their present circumstances, set up the foundation of modern historiography in which man is the center of the accounting and the truth of history must be certified by the accuracy of the facts. The reason of history is rationalized by the re-presentation of human behavior in the world defined by its geographical limitation. In the formative phase of history,

people are so confined within their own epistemological cognition of the outward world that they show much respect to changeful nature, and ascribe the inexplicable to the supernatural powers, i.e., the gods and goddesses. History, as we have illustrated in its Western origin from the inheritance of epic convention, is presented with an indistinguishable confusion between reality and imagination.

It is not until the rise of Christianity that the medieval historiography ushers in a new phase when religion forms to satiate people's desire to renounce the turbulence wrought by consecutive wars and to find a spiritual consolation that could help them transcend the chaotic condition. With the positioning of God, men begin to believe a defined time that starts from God's creation of the world and ends in Judgment Day, a successive lineage in which the course of history is a realization of God's Will. The Christian God is the Supreme One, omnipresent, omnipotent and omniscient. He is the ultimate resting place for men to achieve eternal happiness. The medieval historiography, featured by a visionary perspective, anticipates a future union with God in the afterlife. Human value is depreciated with the change of emphasis from the classical period of worldly accomplishments to the medieval era of divine providence, an idea that serves to be the only salvation for human sins. In the nature of Christian God and those of the pagan, we can detect the fundamental distinction between Christianity and paganism. As men in the images of themselves create the pagan gods, the gods are inspirited in "make-believe" reality¹ so that the world of the gods is subjected to the mutability of fortune and fate. The Christian God, on the other hand, out of Goodness, makes things out of nothing and creates men in the image after Himself. Men are naturally drawn to the goodness to endear God, but those who deviate from God are the rebels and should be punished by Him. To harmonize the two beliefs, Augustine is the first person, or rather the first theologian, to combine Christianity with

paganism to convince people of the ascent of heaven after death. His addition to the historicity of the Bible leads to the direction of a universal history in light of Divine Grace, but the increasing emphasis of God dehistoricizes the development of human history. The delineation of the pagan gods comes from a focus of men as center with a present immediacy to associate the unexplainable with the supernatural, while the appearance of the Christian God encourages men to forsake the earthly city with the hope to enter into the heavenly city.

Therefore, when the classical and the medieval traditions emerge in the Renaissance era, Renaissance historiography betrays a process of heterogeneity in which historians make efforts to harmonize the integration. Still, the conflict remains with the radical transformations in all respects: religious, social, political, psychological, and scientific innovations. While the revival of the antiquity turns to re-emphasis on men, the theological ideal becomes functional to convenience the political purpose, which is especially manifested in Tudor England. With the radical controversy of the power struggle between the Catholic Church and the Church of England, the consciousness of a corporate nationhood is strengthened by a firm belief to build up the national aura of Englishness distinct from that of the Rome. In Raleigh's time, when the notion of nation gradually comes to form, history is condensed to a propaganda of English nationalism, and the theme of divine providence yields to a utilitarian use as an endorsement of the royal mandate. Raleigh's motivation to write a universal history attempts to reveal a truth that God's justice prevails in the course of history everywhere at any time. And it is the truth that will be demonstrated through the cyclic arrangements of the worldliness, the second causes. However, his construction of the providentialism fails to assist his proclamation, on the one hand, to reduce the significance of the worldly ambition and to preach for a future in heaven.

¹ The idea of the "make-believe" reality is that of Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis* 14.

On the other hand, he adds to his own opinions acquired from his duty in the court service of Queen Elizabeth, which leads him to bring to the core of nationalism embedded in his advocacy of the English nationhood and English colonialism . Moreover, observing that fame (229)² and honor (143) are the eternal marks or ensigns for descendants to admire and contemplate, Raleigh further discloses a reserved intention involved in his dilemma between a relief found in the theological consolation and the nostalgia of his past glories checked by his undeserved imprisonment.

The writing of history in this sense not only serves as a “glasse” (Puttenham 41) where epitomized lessons are set to evoke sympathies by comparisons, but functions rather as a “Glass before the eyes of the most beautiful, and makes them see therein, their deformity and rottenness; and they acknowledge it” (272)³. To Raleigh, the glass image reflects the double or the self in the mirror becomes a sign of all that the self is not. A vision of the past where he had his most glorious day now turns to be a scene of “deformity and rottenness” (Gregerson 203). We are reminded of his reflective eyes:

seeing the slothful Censurers of all ages, have not spared to tax the Reverend Fathers of the Church, with Ambition; the severest men to themselves, with Hypocrisy; the greatest lover of Justice, with Popularity; and those of the truest valour and fortitude, with vainglory. (Preface 126)

Raleigh’s recounting the decline of the three ancient monarchies and leaving the flourishing moment of the fourth, the Roman Empire, is intended to discredit the cyclic mode of secondary causes and to deliver his sense of self-abnegation compensated by a religious conviction of an eternal life after life. What contradicts Raleigh himself is his condensing a universal law that God rewards the virtuous and punishes the vicious,

² Hammond ed., *Raleigh, The History*, V:2:2:iv.

but he fails to give reasonable explanation for the perishing of the good and the rise of the evil. He gives people a hope for the future in heaven without any indication of hell for the condemned. The ambiguity is rooted in his denial of the dead ancestors' knowledge of the posterity concerning their prosperity (142) and his belief that wisdom and fame shall prevail to the betterment of the descendants. With all these contradictory and ambiguous contentions, we however shall take Raleigh the person into consideration with respect to his identity as a courtier and his experience during the court of Elizabeth where much of his success makes him a national figure and the court of James I where his entreating of a reciprocal exchange of courtesy fails him in the Tower of London..

Concerning the polemics of the historian's inconsistency, Stephen Greenblatt comments that Raleigh's *History* "is so riddle with uncertainties, ambiguities, and outright contradiction. . . . There is scarcely an issue on which Raleigh's position is not ambiguous" (140). Greenblatt sees that the motivation of Raleigh's writing a universal history comes from his egoistic wish-fulfillment that his history will be both a realization of the grandeur of man's vision as a whole and his futile endeavor to achieve his goals (128), those which Raleigh has been striving after all his life. Raleigh lives a life consisting of a series of histrionic gestures to "fashion" his own identity as a work of art (ix).⁴ Greenblatt gives many convincing accounts about his imaginative creativity and concludes that Raleigh's conflict is due to his failure to distinguish reality from fiction. Yet, what Greenblatt sees about Raleigh the historian is only partially reported in the interplay of reality and fiction. In my opinion, there are complex reasons that we should take into consideration regarding the inconsistency and the ambiguity in Raleigh's *History*. It is true that the life of a Renaissance man is

³ Hammond ed., Raleigh, *The History*, V:6:12.

⁴ Stephen Greenblatt, preface, *Sir Walter Raleigh: the Renaissance Man and*

usually interpreted as an “art” or a performance so that we often come across the customary metaphor of life as a play on the stage in sundry literary works. Popular art wins much favor at court and with which each participant of the court has to conform to the mannerism that teaches to be an ideal courtier. The wide circulation of various manuals of this kind in the early Renaissance such as Castiglione’s *The Book of the Courtier* may explain how important the court performance is to those who plead for royal benefactions. In the court of Elizabeth, as already shown in his devotion to her, Raleigh was a total worshipper of the royal mistress and dedicated many of his poems, particularly in praise of the Queen, notably the long poem named *Ocean to Cynthia*,⁵ which, though left only in part, exalts the glorification of the queen both in divine and national terms. With the popularization of the King’s two bodies, the demigod portrait of the king is further firmly maintained in the court of Elizabeth I. In the study of the philological shifts of the word “court” in the Renaissance, Catherine Bates suggests that it did not originally designate an amorous inference, but it was defined as “being at court” or “behaving as courtiers behave,” the courtesy handed down from the medieval chivalric convention. Not until the reign of Elizabeth did the word generate the “love-making” relationship in the court, a presumably male-dominant system of heredity which was changed with her identity as a female sovereign and with a re-creation of the myth by identifying her virginity with Virgin Mary (Bates 11-4).⁶ The court in this occasion develops to a romantic atmosphere where the custom of “gift-exchange” starts

HisRoles.

⁵ Hammond ed., Raleigh, “The 21st (and last) Book of the Ocean to Cynthia” 37-49.

⁶ Opening her statement with the derivation of “court” diachronically, Bates associates the rhetorical ambiguity of the Elizabethan literary works synchronically to locate her thesis about the reciprocity of the “gift-exchange” between the courtier and the queen. However, the communication might fail when the courtiers was not appreciated by the royal favor and would not be rewarded reciprocally. And it is due to the solicit of royal favor that induces to the “highly complex, tactical, and strategic rhetorical procedure,” a “highly pressurized communication,” and the general ambiguity of the rhetoric.

to exist and the coterie poetry becomes a strategy to ask for royal favor. For example, before the death of Elizabeth in 1603, Raleigh dedicated many of his poems to the glorification of the queen with a well designed imagery of a vestal goddess (*Ocean to Cynthia*) and was received with enviable rewards. In 1587, he introduced Edmund Spenser and his work *The Faerie Queene* to the court. Raleigh then gave great acclaim to Spenser's imaginative construct of the queen as Gloriana in his epic poem. Additionally, Raleigh then wrote a poem that started with "Me thought I saw the grave where Laura lay."⁷ As the title "A vision upon this conceit of *The Faerie Queene*" shows, Raleigh combines the image of the virgin queen with an allusion to the classical mythology to signify the queen with celestial beauty. Though Spenser did not join the court in London as he had wished, he was bestowed with a good amount of reward money through Raleigh's recommendation.

As the custom of "gift-exchange" dominates the court, the purchase of royal favor becomes an important process for the courtiers to be raised into prominence in the political arena. Raleigh was one of the most favored courtiers in the Elizabethan age, but the reciprocity failed him when it came to the court of James I. The court has gone through a transformation in the transference of political powers and reverses Raleigh's career in his court service ever since. Desiring to restore his reputation and lost estates, Raleigh strives to invalidate the Tudor myth and substitutes it with the new "Stuart myth" to endorse the unification of the English nation. Raleigh in the Preface of his *History* says that it is "the cold air of Scotland. . . God hath diffused by the sunshine of his grace: from whence His Majesty now living, and long to live, is Descended" (135). The referred action of descent re-enforces the significance of King James as a demigod ordained to bring about the conjoining of "Scotland to

⁷ Gerald Hammond ed., *Raleigh* 30.

England,” and thanks to James at his reign as Charles IV in Scotland for not declaring war against England to make the union more difficult. While shifting through the various levels and nuances of the meanings of the word “court,” Bates indicates:

Philology gave these [Renaissance] men a method, however limited, to set about restoring the past, making its axioms and its sentences live again, and inspiring them to embark on the huge process of recovery which their editions, versions and imitations of biblical and classical texts all represents. (23)

From this awareness, Bates draws up the historicity from studying the philological texts with which the use of language becomes an instrument to reconstruct history.

Compared with Greenblatt’s assertion of Raleigh’s egoism which leads to the latter’s failure, Bates cleverly broadens the sophistication and profundity of the social milieu as an inner dynamic of the historical period with the subtlety of philological evolution that brings to the transformation of court tradition.

With this application of language to the economy of representation, Raleigh has clarified beforehand an attempt to write history early in his composing the *Ocean to Cynthia*:

As if, When after Phoebus is descended
And leaves a light much like the past day’s dawning
And, every toil and labour wholly ended,
Each living creature draweth to his resting,
We should begin by such a parting light
To Write the story of all ages past,
And end the same before th’ approaching night. (39)⁸

⁸ Hammond ed., *Raleigh*, “The 21st (and last) Book of the Ocean to Cynthia.”

Here Raleigh the poet gives positive credit to the enlightening effect of writing “the story of ages past.” From this passage Greenblatt also approves of Raleigh’s early intention of writing history, but one that is highly unlikely to be a universal history (128), while Greenblatt’s estimation can always be contended by Raleigh’s statement of the fact that the purpose of history is to “hold before mine eyes/ The images and forms of worlds past,/ Teaching the cause why all the flames that rise/ From forms external can no longer last” (173-6 41). By “images and forms of worlds past,” Raleigh is actually proposing to write a world history to “record” the course of human civilizations on the one hand, but is troubled by the tragicness of worldly transience on the other. Thus, he says men are but “all slaves to age and vassals unto time,/ Of which repentance writes the tragedy” (179-80 41). The conclusion of men’s helplessness under the mastery of time seems to correspond to the historiography that he has formulated in the Preface and preceded to consolidate the belief in the divine providence. However, the common over-simplification of divine providence in the Renaissance, as we have discussed, is the means convenient for the historians to please the royal patrons. History writing, or any form of writing, can also be an expression of self-reflection to which it later causes the complication of the “rhetorical *procedure*” (Bates 11). Raleigh’s inconsistent writing results in his negation of the achievements of the past kings so as to legitimize the claim of Kings James to the crown while struggling in divulging his secret feeling of dissatisfaction. The challenge Raleigh has dared here is his effort to set up a paradigmatic government for the court of James I through which embedded criticism turns to be a justification of his undeserved disgrace in the Tower of London. With his hypothesis of a mutual communication between the governor (God, the King) and the governed (the King, the subjects), Raleigh is entreating a fairer reward from the king. The ideal form of government, in Raleigh’s opinion, is a self-sufficient one able to retain the hearts of the people, and ready for itself from attack

(II:19:6 168). There conveys the autonomous relationship of the power hierarchy in which the King is subjected to the obedience of God, and the people, to the King. The reciprocity between God and men (in terms of king's nature as a man) is manifested through divine providence that rewards the good and punishes the bad, while the gift-exchange between the King and the subjects is detained by King James' convicting him of treason.

Upon the discussion of Raleigh's nationalism in connection with his commentaries in the fields of military and politics in *History of the World*, the secondary causes usher the priority of the first cause in Raleigh's application of his prefatory claim of divine providence in the development of history into five books. To this deviation, Greenblatt may be correct to focus on Raleigh's egoism and his histrionic manner with harsh criticism. While Raleigh tries to interpret the world history with his relatively different experiences undergone in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods, his inconsistent attitude turns to be justifiable considering his identity as a Renaissance man. Under the unique court tradition and political inconstancy, men in the Renaissance are highly pressurized by the shifts of both internal, the legacy of two conflicting forces, and external, the epistemological realization of men and the universe. A Renaissance man easily gets victimized in the mechanism of the transference of monarchs. Raleigh's self-justification about the right of men to seek for secular rewards turns to be a reflexive correspondence to the position of human subjectivity under the condition that "worldly goods be well gotten, and that we raise not our own buildings out of other men's ruin" (143). In these words, Raleigh demonstrates an assuredness of his own integrity to the pursuit of worldly success. For such a justification, the rhetorical discrepancies in *History* only excuse Raleigh of his verdict of treason and bring about the reader's sense of pity for his grievances in prison. The uniqueness of his history lies in Raleigh's multiple roles, particularly as a man unable to forsake earthly

ambitions, as a participant in the historical moment to make history and as a historian to portray the historical moment in history. His historical text authenticates the historical moment, but it fails to persist his recognition in theological consolation because God is only instrumental to expedite his justification of his personal ambitions. What is more, his last voyage in the expedition of Guiana set forth in 1617, a final attempt to reach a lasting name, seems to contradict himself with his religious convictions of meaninglessness of the worldly city and of the vision in the heavenly city. Many suspect that his last voyage is initiated by the national concern to find gold for the king or his another attempt to realize a selfish desire, while Raleigh's speech on the scaffold serves as the most critical moment that justifies his course of life as significant as that of a national hero. And with enough reason, Raleigh's universal history is considered to be a critique of the king and the government as a whole that Milton refers to Raleigh's *History* several times in *Paradise Lost* and Oliver Cromwell recommended the *History* to his son for its military and political advice (Edwards 147).⁹

On the other side, the historian, wanting the precept, is so tied, not to what should be but to what is, to the particular truth of things and not to the general reason of things, that his example draweth no necessary consequence, and therefore a less fruitful doctrine. (Sidney 107)

On the truth of history and function of history, many have doubt the validity of the historical reality in terms of the accumulation of the out-dated information. Though a highly developed time that opens a three-dimensional perspective in the Renaissance, the controversy concerning the universality of history still remains. Philip Sidney contends that poetry is a higher form of philosophical representation than that of history because the historian, "loaden with mouse-eaten records" (105) inducts only partial

⁹ See also Steven May, Sir Walter Raleigh 98 and 124.

truth by recording particular incidences and gets trapped within the found truth. The poet, on the contrary, does not confine himself in particularities but reports the universal to deduce the reason of things. Sidney's depreciation of history agrees with Aristotle's distinction that the historian tends to design the plot and the probability of history to write about particular individuals (Aristotle 68-9). Both Sidney and Aristotle seem to deny the function of history of the historians' claim to offer examples for the betterment of every one, while they contend that poetry can go beyond of the confinement of time to prove the universal truth that the poet aims to direct. This argument of the universal and the particular, on the one hand, avails us nothing but to focus on the nature of history that we have elucidated in the development of the idea of history from ancient Greco-Roman, Medieval period, to the pre-modern Renaissance. On the other hand, the argument may well serve to explain the evolution of the classical and medieval historiography and of the conflicting emphases of men and God in the integration of the two in the modern Renaissance. This argument is where the thesis starts to interpret Raleigh's *History of the World* by way of surveying the intrinsically diverged traditions and to find in Raleigh the confrontation that he ultimately fails to negotiate his vocation to his advocacy of nationalism and his pursuit of worldly success with the theological conviction to spiritual happiness. His identity as a courtier drives him in a present-mindedness to spell out the dissatisfaction of his ill-deserved condition and to reflect on the contemporary trends of thoughts in various areas. On the other hand, his identity as a historian motivates him in a history-mindedness to review and foresees in the course of history a law exerting in time that will reveal the Divine Truth and anticipates the way to God's kingdom. While struggling to reach a compromise between his pursuit of a religious consolation and the insistence of a modest way of life, Raleigh fails to quench his worldly ambitions even by such a vocation. Raleigh's dilemma can never be solved even with his "resolved" manner

toward his life as a whole. Nor can the conflict between providentialism and nationalism be settled with two contended traditions rooted in the development of human civilization.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

- Hadow, G. E. ed. *Sir Walter Raleigh: Selections from his Historie of the World, his Letters etc.* Clarendon: Oxford UP, 1926.
- Hammond, Gerald ed. *Sir Walter Raleigh: Selected Writings.* Middlesex: Penguin, 1986.

Secondary Sources

- Aristotle. *Poetics.* Trans. S. H. Butcher. Clinton: Colonial P, 1966.
- Auerbach, Erich. "Figura." *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature.* Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1973. 11-76.
- . "Odysseus Scar." *Mimesis.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988. 3-23.
- Augustine. *Confessions.* Trans. R. S. Pine-Coffin. London: Penguin, 1961.
- . *City of God.* Trans. John O' meara. London: Penguin, 1984.
- Baker, Herschel. *The Race of Time.* Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1967.
- Bates, Catherine. *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Beer, Anna R. *Sir Walter Raleigh and his Readers in the Seventeen Century.* New York: St. Martin' s P, 1997.
- Bentley, Michael ed. *Companion to Historiography.* London: Routledge, 1997.
- Boethius. *The Consolation of Philosophy.* Trans. V. E. Watts. Middlesex: Penguin, 1986.
- Bredero, Adriaan H. "The Announcement of the Coming of Antichrist and the Medieval Concept of Time." *Prophecy and Eschatology.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1994. 3-13.

- Breisach, Ernst. *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval & Modern*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.
- Bush, Douglas. *The Renaissance and English Humanism*. London: Oxford UP, 1962.
- . *Prefaces to Renaissance Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1966.
- Chenu, M. D. *Nature, man, and Society in the Twelfth Century: Essays on New Theological Perspectives in the Latin West*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.
- Dawson, Jane. "Apocalyptic thinking of the Marian Exiles." *Prophecy and Eschatology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994. 3-13.
- Edwards, Philip. *Sir Walter Raleigh*. London: Longmans, Green, 1953.
- Gransden, Antonia. *Historical Writing in England, v.2, c.1307 to the Early Sixteen Century*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1982.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Sir Walter Raleigh: the Renaissance Man and His Roles*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1973.
- Hainsworth, J. B. *The Idea of Epic*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991.
- Hawthorn, Jeremy. "Hayden White: History as Text." *Cunning Passages: New Historicism, Cultural Materialism and Marxism in the Contemporary Literary Debate*. New York: St. Martin's, 1996. 36-47.
- Herman, Peter C. "Henrician Historiography and the Voice of the People: the Cases of More and Hall." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 39.3 (1997): 258-283.
- Herodotus. *Histories*. Trans. George Rawlinson. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1996.
- Hillerbrand, Hans J. "The Spread of the Protestant Reformation of the Sixteen Century." *The Transfer of Ideas: Historical Essays*. Ed. C. D. W. Goodwin

- and I. B. Holley, Jr. Durham: South Atlantic Quarterly, 1968.
- Homer. *Iliad*. Trans. Robert Fitzgerald. Garden City: Anchor, 1975.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *King's Two Bodies*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1981.
- Kelly, Henry Ansgar. *Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare's Histories*.
Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1970.
- Lawson-Pebbles, Robert. "The many faces of Sir Walter Raleigh." *History Today* 48.3 (1998): 11 pp. Online. Internet. 12 Dec, 1998.
- Lord, Albert B. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1981.
- May, Steven. *Sir Walter Raleigh*. Boston: Twayne, 1989.
- Mcgrath, Alister E. *Reformation Thought: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Mann, Nicholas. "The origins of humanism." *The Cambridge Company to Renaissance Humanism*. Ed. Jill Kraye. New York: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- McCabe, R. A. *The Pillars of Eternity*. Dublin: Irish Academic P, 1989.
- More, Thomas. *The History of King Richard the Third*. Eugene: U of Oregon, 1997. Online. U of Oregon. Renaissance Editions. Internet. 22 July, 1998. 1-32.
- . "The Good Prince and the Bad Prince." *The Penguin Book of Renaissance Verse 1509-1659*. Ed. H. R. Woudhuysen. London: Penguin, 1993. 81.
- . "What is the Best Form of Government." *The Penguin Book of Renaissance Verse 1509-1659*. Ed. H. R. Woudhuysen. London: Penguin, 1993. 82-3.
- Owens, Joseph. "Aristotle and Aquinas." *The Cambridge Companion to Aquinas*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.
- Patterson, Annabel. "The Small Cat Massacre: Popular Culture in the e1587

- ‘Holinshed.’” *Reading Between the Lines*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1993. 117-59.
- . “Local Knowledge: ‘Popular’ Representation in Elizabethan Historiography.” *Place and Displacement in the Renaissance*. Ed. Alvin Vos. Bringhamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1995. 87-106.
- Patterson, Lee W. “The historiography of romance and the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*.” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 13.1 (1983): 1-32.
- Polybius. *Histories*. Trans. W. R. Paton. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1992.
- Popper, Karl. *The Poverty of Historicism*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- . *The Lesson of this Century: with two talks on freedom and the democratic state*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Puttenham, George. “The Arte of English Poesie.” *Elizabethan Critical Essays*. Ed. G. Gregory Smith. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1964.
- Sidney, Philip. *An Apology of Poetry*. Ed. Geoffrey Shepherd. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1994.
- Southgate, Beverley. *History: What and Why?* London: Routledge, 1996.
- Starkey, David. “English.” *The Renaissance in National Context*. Ed. Roy Porter and Mikulas Teich. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992. 146-63.
- Strayer Joseph R., Hans W. Gatzke and E. Harris Harbison. *The Mainstream of Civilization Since 1500*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974.
- Thucydides. *History of Peloponnesian War*. Trans. C. Forster Smith. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1991.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. *Some Mythical Elements in English Literature: being the Clark Lectures 1959-60*. St. Clair Shores, Mich.: Scholarly P, 1971.

---. *Shakespeare's History Plays*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986.

White, Hayden. *Metahistory: the Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.