

# ENGLISH MISCELLANY

*A SYMPOSIUM OF HISTORY  
LITERATURE AND THE ARTS*

EDITOR  
MARIO PRAZ

4

EDIZIONI DI "STORIA E LETTERATURA",  
ROME 1953

The English Miscellany will, it is hoped, be published in the early Spring of each year by Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Palazzo Lancellotti, Via Lancellotti 18, Rome.

The distributors in Italy will be Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Palazzo Lancellotti, Via Lancellotti 18, Rome, and in England Parker and Son, 27 Broad St., Oxford.

All contributions should be sent to Prof. Mario Praz, Via Giulia 147, Rome. Manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by international reply coupons covering full postage (or by Italian stamps).

No book reviews will be published.

## CONTENTS

<i>Agostino Lombardo</i> , « The sacrifice of Isaac » e il « miracle play » . . . . .	pag. 1
<i>Orhan Burian</i> , Drama in the Universities . . . . .	» 45
<i>Gabriele Baldini</i> , Mellifluous Shakespeare . . . . .	» 67
<i>Thomas Frank</i> , Elizabethan Travellers in Rome . . . . .	» 95
<i>L. D. Ettlinger</i> , « With all convenient speed to Rome » . . . . .	» 133
<i>Livio Jannattoni</i> , Giuseppe Gioacchino Belli e gli inglesi . . . . .	» 147
<i>John S. Mayfield</i> , Swinburne's Boo . . . . .	» 161
<i>Piero Rebora</i> , Ricordi culturali italiani di Bernard Shaw . . . . .	» 179
<i>Giorgio Melchiori</i> , Eliot and the theatre . . . . .	» 187
<i>Claudia Refice</i> , La scuola di pittura napoletana e l'arte inglese del secolo XIX . . . . .	» 235
<i>Jacob Hess</i> , Precisazioni su Orazio Gentileschi . . . . .	» 247

Proprietà riservata

Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura

Roma - Via Lancellotti 18

tinuamente il pericolo d'oltrepassare la misura; e nei canti delle tre commedie della maturità, egli smentisce senza dubbio coloro che vollero e vogliono vedere nel tempestivo giudizio di Francis Meres un fattore negativo: e il fatto d'esser tornato, nelle ultime commedie seppure affinando prodigiosamente il proprio strumento, ai limiti che caratterizzavano il suo primo canzoniere, offre soltanto una conferma di quanto la parabola di Shakespeare sia chiara, coerente e soprattutto umana; soggetta, come la vita dell'uomo, a ripensare, dopo attinta la maturità, i proprii primi passi di fanciullo. Non per nulla il meditabondo malcontento Jaques di *As You Like It* ci rammenta, in una famosa battuta di quella commedia, come «l'ultima scena della vita dell'uomo, che termina quella sua storia così ricca d'eventi, sia una seconda infanzia e un puro oblio» (II, vii, 163-65).

Lo Shakespeare inzuccherato e dalla lingua dolce come il miele fu dunque soltanto, com'era naturale per chi così intensamente rappresentò a sé, e a noi, la vicenda dell'uomo, lo Shakespeare fanciullo delle prime prove letterarie e quello nuovamente fanciullo degli ultimi letterari ripensamenti.

GABRIELE BALDINI

*Facoltà di Magistero, Roma.*

## ELIZABETHAN TRAVELLERS IN ROME

History does not record who was the first English traveller to Rome, unless he was one of those Angles, of whom, as the story relates, Gregory the Great said that they looked more like angels than Angles and thus set in motion the conversion of England to Christianity. Certainly, Italy has been the goal of English travellers, as of so many others, since very early times. It is not mere fancy or vicarious enjoyment from the comforts of our arm-chairs that lead us to the study of travel, for the traveller in the past was much more than a seeker after pleasure or even danger: in the days before the newspapers or, indeed, any extended traffic in books, he was the ambassador of one country to another, one of the chief vehicles of cultural exchange. His importance during the period we might roughly call the English Renaissance, that period during which the influence of Italy on the cultural life of England was at its height, is therefore worth serious consideration.

Thus a study of Roman travel during the reign of Queen Elizabeth will not merely reveal what the traveller looked for in the Eternal City, but will also help to explain the current Elizabethan attitude to Italy, and to Rome in particular, the representation we find of it in the literature, more especially the popular literature of the age and in short all that the name Rome conveyed to the Elizabethan mind. Unfortunately our material here — interesting and significant material — is scarce, and often our results will be far different from what we might expect. But we can attempt to form some rough picture of the subject.

By way of introduction, we should say something of Rome

as the Elizabethan found it<sup>1</sup>. We cannot with any degree of accuracy call it Renaissance Rome; and, indeed, throughout the 16th century Rome underwent considerable changes, both as regards the city itself and the atmosphere prevailing there. If we want to characterize the half-century with which we are dealing, we might do it under the label Counter-reformation. The spirit of the Counter-reformation is omnipresent, both the laudable and, to us, the objectionable elements. We can see this in its art and architecture, the art of mannerism, that rather frigid art which has been called «the first Western style of the troubled conscience»<sup>2</sup>. We can see it in the revival of the old religious orders and the founding of new orders, especially the society of Jesus, and the renewed piety noticeable in the city<sup>3</sup>, in the missionary zeal of popes like Gregory XIII not only in the outlying Americas or Japan, but also — and of this every English Protestant would be painfully aware — in the countries but lately lost to the Reformers. Above all we can see it, at its best, in the life and work of those two saints who are so characteristic of one side of the Counter-reformation, St. Philip Neri and St. Charles Borromeo, who devoted their lives to reversing the wholly secular spirit of Rome, which had been its heritage from the Renaissance; and it can be seen at its worst in the Inquisition and the Index, those iron defenders of the Faith, with the former of which some of those whom we shall shortly study were only too well acquainted, and which served to keep out of Rome many more who would gladly have ventured thither. In short, Rome was putting into practice the decrees of the Council of Trent, that assembly which had finally divided Europe into opposing Catholic and Protestant

<sup>1</sup> I shall not strictly confine myself to the dates of Queen Elizabeth's reign, so as not to exclude travellers like William Thomas and Hoby.

<sup>2</sup> NIKOLAUS PEVSNER in his article «The Architecture of Mannerism» in *The Mint* ed. Grigson (1948) pp. 116-38, a most interesting analysis of the relation between the Counter-reformation and Mannerism. Cf. also his «Gegenreformation und Manierismus» in *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, vol. 46 (1925) pp. 243-62.

<sup>3</sup> One outward expression of this was the religious pagentry on which many travellers commented. Cf. Montaigne's remarks in his *Journal de voyage en Italie*.

camps, and it was with this, though this is anticipating our conclusion somewhat, that the visiting Englishman, whether Catholic or Protestant, was largely concerned. On the whole they came to see the Rome of their days much rather than the ruins of the capital of ancient civilization.

In one respect the Elizabethan traveller to Rome reminds one unpleasantly of our own times: he had to pierce as veritable an Iron Curtain as the present-day traveller to Moscow, and like all Iron Curtains, it was erected by the conflicting ideologies of the parties concerned. Both sides did their best to discourage travel, and if they were not entirely successful it was due rather to their more elementary system of control, as compared to ours, than to any laxity on their parts. Thus, the returning traveller from Rome had something of the special interest as one whom the Iron Curtain could not stop<sup>4</sup>. Sometimes, indeed, we are treated to «inside stories», which have the same unhealthy

<sup>4</sup> As a comment on this, the following account of the father of the Earl of Clarendon's visit to Rome is interesting, though since it was written nearly 100 years later, it cannot stand as real evidence, especially since I have been unable to find any confirmation of it:

«Henry, the third son, (i. e. Clarendon's father) being of the Middle Temple at his father's death, and being thought to be most in the favour of his mother, and being ready to be called to the bar, though he had studied the law very well, and was a very good scholar having proceeded master of arts in Oxford, had yet no mind to the practice of the law, but had long had an inclination to travel beyond the seas, which in that strict time of queen Elizabeth was not usual, except to merchants, and such gentlemen who resolved to be soldiers; and at last prevailed with his mother to give him leave to go to the Spa for his health, from whence he followed his former inclinations, and passing through Germany, he went into Italy, from Florence he went to Syena, and thence to Rome: which was not only strictly inhibited to all the queen's subjects, but was very dangerous to all the English nation who did not profess themselves Roman Catholics; to which profession he was very averse, in regard of the great animosity Sixtus Quintus (who was then pope) had to the person of queen Elizabeth: yet Cardinal Allen, who was the last English cardinal, being then in Rome, he received so much protection from him, that during the time he stayed there, which was some months, he received no trouble, though many English priests murmured very much, and said, 'that my lord cardinal was much to be blamed for protecting such men, who came to Rome, and so seeing the ecclesiastical persons of that nation, discovered them afterwards when they came in to England, and so they were put to death'. *The Life of Edward Clarendon... written by himself* (Oxford, 1857), I, pp. 3-4.



and hysterical flavour of similar information to-day; significantly they are often written by converts, or apostates, whichever view we prefer<sup>5</sup>. We need not labour the parallel, but it may serve to illustrate the *atmosphere* of Roman travel at the time<sup>6</sup>.

With the general theory of travel in Elizabethan times we need not concern ourselves. The subject was discussed at length, and, though an occasional voice was to be heard, objecting to the common habit of sending young noblemen abroad to complete their education<sup>7</sup>, it was generally agreed that travel — with a serious, educational purpose — was beneficial to the young and useful to the state. The best known expression of this view is Bacon's, who says: «*Trauaile* in the younger Sort, is a Part of Education; In the Elder, a Part of Experience»<sup>8</sup>. Briefly, the Elizabethan traveller was to be student, soldier, diplomat and spy rolled into one. Yet in spite of this serious bias to travel, it was undoubtedly a popular activity. One thing we should emphasize, however, namely that the viewing of artistic and historical monuments, however much importance we may attach to this to-day, was considered a very secondary activity of the Elizabethan traveller, even if it was not discouraged altogether.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. my remarks on John Nichols and Antony Munday, below.

<sup>6</sup> I trust Catholic readers will not feel offended at this. We need not in any way equate 16th century Rome with 20th century Moscow, in order to bring out the parallel. The curtain was not (and is not, if we could but see our own times more historically) iron on one side and velvet the other. Besides, historical understanding can only be clouded by an attempt to vindicate one side against the other.

<sup>7</sup> Notably Roger Ascham's, whose comments on foreign travel, and especially Italian travel, are well known: cf. *The Scholemaster in English Works*, ed. W. A. Wright, pp. 222-37.

<sup>8</sup> Bacon's essay 'Of Trauaile'. See also his letters to the young Earl of Rutland in SPEDDING, *The letters and life of Francis Bacon*, II, pp. 6-20. Cf. THOMAS PALMER, *An essay of the Meanes to make our Trauailes, into forraign Countries the more profitable and honourable*, London 1606 4to. and *The Correspondence of Sir Philip Sidney and Hubert Languet*, ed. Pears (his letter to his brother Robert) p. 196 *et seq.* For a modern treatment see CLARE HOWARD, *English Travellers of the Renaissance* (1914) pp. 20-49, E. S. BATES, *Touring in 1600* (1911), pp. 35-59; and with special reference to Italy, L. EINSTEIN, *The Italian Renaissance in England* (1902), pp. 115-54.

But this [i. e. the visiting of historical monuments] being a fantastical attracter, and gluttonfeeder of the appetite, rather than of necessarie knowledge, I will mention no further thereof<sup>9</sup>.

On the whole the traveller — and by this I mean the aristocratic traveller for whom such advice was intended — was concerned with different things; accordingly his reactions to what he saw will differ not a little from those we would expect from a modern traveller.

Yet in many ways the traveller to Rome was not typical of Elizabethan travellers generally, even travellers to other parts of Italy, of whom there were many. We have spoken of the 'Iron Curtain' between England and Rome at that period, and this inevitably made the Roman traveller something of a special case. Every conceivable difficulty was put in his way. Even the defenders of travel in general dissuaded him from such an enterprise:

and if so bee they must needes goe thither[i.e. Italy]let them beware of *Rome*, the Forge of euery policie, that setteth Princes at oddes, or that continueth them in debates, little or much: the tempter of Subiects to ciuil dissensions, & the seller of all wickednes and heathenish impieties, or machediuell of euill policies and practices, that are vnmeet subjects for these worthy Trauailers to spend their time about. As for any good thing, which that State can benefit a Travailler by, I haue not heard of, otherwise than the loathing of the same afterwards: for which pretence no man hath warrant to trauaile thither, or elsewhere<sup>10</sup>.

Besides, Rome being an enemy state, the English government forbade a visit there; if the traveller then chose to disregard this prohibition the Inquisition was ready to pounce upon him, unless he took the most careful measures to hide his nationality and religion. Even so, having avoided these dangers, suspicion

<sup>9</sup> PALMER, *op. cit.*, p. 44; cf. Sidney:

«And when he [i. e. Homer] saith 'cognovit urbes' he means not, if I be not deceived, to have seen towns and marked their buildings: for surely houses are but houses in every place; they do but differ 'secundum magis et minus', but he attends to their religion, politics, laws, bringing up of children, discipline both for war and peace and such like». *Op. cit.*, p. 197.

<sup>10</sup> PALMER, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-5.

might easily cling to him at home for having visited the seat of England's arch-enemy, the Pope, as happened even to so loyal a protestant as Sir Henry Wotton<sup>11</sup>. For the Catholic the journey was no less dangerous: for in many cases a visit by him, if he was a man of any consequence, meant giving up all hope of ever returning to his native country, for he would be sure to be apprehended and charged with plotting against the Queen, if he dared to return openly.

It will be better, however, to consider Catholics and Protestants separately, for according to his religion, the traveller's reason for undertaking the journey, his observations on what he saw and his reactions to it, will differ fundamentally. If this division may seem at times somewhat mechanical, we must remember that it cut right across all beliefs, loyalties and social divisions in that age. We cannot possibly consider them under the same heading.

Let us begin with the Protestants: this class was certainly the smaller of the two, but in many ways it is the more interesting. The direct records of Elizabethans who had been to Rome and recorded their impressions there are scanty in the extreme. Often what does survive is not very illuminating. But we shall endeavour to supplement their accounts by what we can learn of travellers and their activities indirectly from the various collections of official papers and the like.

Our first account in point of time is not, strictly speaking, by an Elizabethan. Yet it would be a pity indeed to omit William Thomas merely because he does not fit into the arbitrary date limit 'Elizabethan'. Thomas was Clerk to the Council in Edward VI's reign, and took a considerable part in the politics of that troubled age, on the more radically Protestant side, for which he later paid with his life<sup>12</sup>. For the present, suffice it to say that he travelled extensively in Italy between 1545-9 and was the author of the first Italian Grammar to be printed in

<sup>11</sup> L. P. SMITH, *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, I, p. 20.

<sup>12</sup> For his career see the *D. N. B.*

England. He was, in fact, in spite of his pronounced Protestantism, a great lover and admirer of Italy, and one who did much to make England aware of Italy and her treasures, both literary and artistic. On his return to England he published *The historie of Italie*<sup>13</sup>, a kind of compendium on that country, with a general introduction on the country, its geography and people, followed by separate sections on each of the more important cities; these sections are partly descriptive, in the guide-book manner, and partly historical. The latter are, needless to say, derivative (in his section on the history of Florence, for example, he cites Machiavelli as a source), but the descriptions are first-hand.

Thomas was a scholar and a humanist, though with a distinctly Protestant tinge. Naturally, then, Rome in his *historie* has pride of place. His descriptions, mainly of the ruins of ancient Rome, are full and he evidently took a great deal of trouble to trace the best authorities. Clearly, he was impressed by these ruins and by the grandiose scale on which it was all built. It is the description of a man who had felt the full impact of Roman civilization on his mind, and he constantly refers what he sees as a ruin back to what he has read about it in texts. He approaches Rome, in fact, with the piety of the scholar, for all that he sees has long been familiar to him through the written word. In a sense it is a home-coming to Thomas, as we to-day might feel a sense of recognition when we look upon a painting for the first time, reproductions of which have been familiar to us all our lives. Thomas's is the typical humanist's reaction to Rome: only as far as English humanists go, he was the only one who has left us his impressions. But then, he probably was one of the very few who visited Rome.

Even so, the matter is not quite as simple as that. As a convinced Protestant he abhorred everything to do with papal ceremony and custom, and thus in his section on Rome he finds

<sup>13</sup> *The historie of Italie...* in the house of T. Berthelet 1549 4to.

space for an extremely hostile description of a procession of the pope and the cardinals which he witnessed while he was there, evidently designed to stir up party feeling against the pope and all his works. The elaborate ceremonies of 16th century Rome were noted by most travellers to Rome, not merely English<sup>14</sup>, and according to his religion the spectator was delighted or disgusted: they certainly made a strong impression and few remained luke-warm. What is perhaps surprising about Thomas, is his mature judgment on the buildings of contemporary Rome. For example, he was not very impressed by the Vatican palace as he found it, which he called «muche greater than goodlie», but he admired St. Peter's greatly (then still in a rather elementary state, it should be remembered), and though he doubted if it would ever be finished, he thought it would be the finest building in the world. Indeed, he seems to have been an admirer of Michaelangelo's architecture, for he is no less enthusiastic about the Palazzo Farnese, which

if he [not Michaelangelo, but Paul III] finishe it, as it is begunne, it would be the galauntest thyng old oer new, that shall be founde againe in all Europe<sup>15</sup>.

Thomas certainly was not indiscriminating at a time when the appreciation of such matters in England was at a very elementary stage. Yet in spite of all these glories, Rome made a sad impression on him, as well it might, when large parts of the city, and those the parts that had been most famous in antiquity, were little better than waste land or at best vineyards. We cannot omit to quote his general impression in full, since, for 16th century England it is unique:

Thynkyng to finde a great contentacion in the sight of Rome, because that amongst al the citees of the worlde none hath been more famous than it, I disposed my selfe to goe thither. But whan I came there, and behelde the wonderfull maiestee of buildynges that the onely

<sup>14</sup> Cf. MONTAIGNE, *Journal de voyage en Italie*, *passim*.

<sup>15</sup> *The historie of Italie*, fol. 41v.

rootes therof doe yet represent, the huge temples, the infinte great palaices the vnmeasurable pillers, moste parte of one peece, fine marble, and well wrought, the goodly arches of triumphe, the baines, the cunctes of water, the images as well of brasse as of marble, the Obeliskes, and a noubre of lyke thynges, not to be founde againe throughout an whole worlde: imaginynge withall, what maiestee the cittee myghte be of, whan all these thynges flourished, Than didde it greeue me to see the onelie iewell, myrrour, maistres, and beautie of this worlde, that neuer had hir lyke, nor (as I thynke) neuer shall, lie so desolate and disfigured, that there is no lamentable case to be harde, or lothesome thyng to be seen that maie be compared to a small parte of it.

Neuerthelesse whan I remembred againe the occasions, whereof these gloriouse thynges haue growen, what noubres of warres the Romyanes haue mainteyned, with infinite bloudsheddyng, destructions of whole countreys, rauishmentes of chaste women, sacke, spoyle tributes, oppression of common welthes, and a thousande other tyrannies, without the whiche the Romaines could neuer haue achieved the perfection of so many wonders as mine eye dyd there beholde: Than perceiued I, howe iust the iudgement of god is, that hath made those antiquitees to remayne as a foule spoyle of the Romaine pride, and for a witnesse to the worldes ende of their tyranny. So that I wote not whether of these two is greater, either the glorie of that fame, that the Romaines purchased with their wonderfull conquests: or their present miserable estate, with the deformitee of their antiquities<sup>16</sup>.

Thomas was, after all, a puritan as well as a humanist. He was not one of the young aristocrats travelling for education to whom Bacon's advice was to be addressed later. Our next traveller, who has left a record of his journey, was such a one. Sir Thomas Hoby, later the translator of *Il Cortegiano* and thus one of the great interpreters of the Italian Renaissance in England, travelled in Italy between 1548-50. He was clearly the type of young man preparing himself for the service he was later to render to his country. His experiences and impressions are set down in a diary preserved in the British Museum<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 22.

<sup>17</sup> Ms Egerton 2148 printed as *A Booke of the Travaile and Lief of me in Camden Miscellany X*.

While he was in Siena studying Italian, news arrived of the death of pope Paul III and Hoby hurried to Rome in the train of Cardinal Salviati to witness the papal election. This admittedly forms the chief interest of his brief remarks on Rome, though he got tired of waiting and left for Naples before the election of the new pope, but not before he had, in the company of three other Englishmen

throughlie searched owt suche antiquities as were here to bee seene...<sup>18</sup>.

All the same his remarks are disappointing, especially coming from the translator of Castiglione. He mentions the various opinions as to the size of the walls in ancient times, notes the Capitol, the Pantheon and a few more of the most famous ruins in a rather off-hand fashion, and concludes:

the whiche [i.e. the ruins of the seven hills] I passe over all: and the particularities thereof I leave to the searchers owt of them by the instructions of Lucias Faunus, Martian and Biondo...<sup>19</sup>.

Even more sketchy is the account of one, Richard Smith, who kept a journal of the tour on which he accompanied Sir Edward Unton as tutor in 1563<sup>20</sup>. In all they spent some three weeks in Rome, not a very long time for those days when it was usually a matter of months, not weeks, during which time they saw the antiquities of the city. Smith found Rome

hath been so often spoiled that is seemeth not exceeding beutyfull —, but notwithstanding ther ar many goodly palaces of cardenalls —, of any auneynt buildynges nothing lefft standinge.

We can see from his last remark that his observation was not very acute. Nor, indeed, is the rest of his account much more than a list of buildings, sandwiched in by odd bits of information about ancient Rome, although he does mention the

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 25.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>20</sup> MS Sloane 1813 printed as *The Grand Tour of an Elizabethan* by A. H. S. YEAMES in *Papers of the British School at Rome* VII (3).

building of the Vatican palace and St. Peter's, which seem to have impressed him. But his observations throughout are most commonplace and Rome, clearly, was no more than one more city visited on his extensive tour of the Continent. What Sir Edward Unton thought of these things the diary does not tell us. Its chief interest lies in the fact that it is one of the very few such diaries which have come down to us.

Our next account is that of Fynes Moryson who was in Rome some 30 years later. The atmosphere there in the mean time had changed considerably. In the accounts we have been considering so far there is no sense of danger or daring as we find in the book we are about to consider. The 'Iron Curtain' had come down with a bang, when Elizabeth was excommunicated in 1570. There was no longer any question of a compromise; the Catholics in England were being persecuted with increasing ferocity and at times, such as shortly after the execution of the first Jesuit missionaries in 1581, anti-catholic feeling in England ran high. On the other hand, the Catholics abroad were busy plotting all sort of mischief against the queen and her government, and though their ardour had been somewhat damped by the defeat of the Armada in 1588, they had not yet given up hope of 'converting' England by force. Under these circumstances we cannot wonder that Rome was hardly safe ground for an English Protestant.

But to return to Moryson: he is certainly an interesting figure, the only professional traveller we have so far met. A Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge, he must have been one of the first holders of a travelling scholarship, of which he made excellent use, for he travelled all over Europe and over a considerable part of the Middle East; though he lost a brother on one of his journeys to the East, it is amazing that he returned at all, to publish an account of his experiences in a thick Folio volume<sup>21</sup>. His natural caution, which is one of his chief cha-

<sup>21</sup> *An Itinerary... written by Fynes Moryson Gent.* (London, 1617), reprinted in 4 vols. Glasgow 1907. I quote from this edition.



racteristics, stood him in good stead on the occasion of his visit to Rome, shortly before Easter 1594. Moryson, we have said, was a professional traveller, and Rome was merely one of a great number of places he visited. All the same, he was something of a scholar and quite at home in Roman history. Like Henry Hyde, he sought and obtained Cardinal Allen's protection, just in case of difficulty, but on being recognized as an Englishman by some of the English clergy of the city, who offered to show him the 'sights' of Rome, he changed his lodgings to escape their attentions, fearing that their presence might lead to religious argument and thus endanger him, or to his having to acquiesce in their opinions. But his visit was cut short, by the enquiry after strangers by the Roman clergy, who wanted to ascertain that everybody duly communicated before Easter. This speedily drove Moryson and his companions, two German Protestants, out of Rome. Before leaving the city, however, he paid a short visit to Bellarmine disguised as a Frenchman. It seems that this pillar of Counter-reformation controversy held a strange fascination for visiting English Protestants, for Sir Henry Wotton did almost exactly the same<sup>22</sup>. Moryson, it seems, was actuated by mere curiosity, for after a pleasant half hour's talk, during which the great scholar treated him very kindly, he hurried to an inn on the outskirts of Rome, where his horse was ready for him, and fled in all haste into the territory of the Duke of Tuscany.

Evidently, even under the protection of Cardinal Allen, Moryson felt far from safe. Still, in the four days that he was in Rome he saw a good deal, though some of his descriptions sound a little second hand. Ancient Rome receives pride of place, but everything is dealt with fully and fairly. In spite of his caution, Moryson nearly got into trouble as when, for example, in his haste to see everything (and in this he is reminiscent of the modern American-style tourist) he hired a mule on his first day to take him to the seven privileged churches,

<sup>22</sup> Cf. L. P. SMITH, *op. cit.*, I, p. 294.

an action which drew a very caustic remark from an Italian to the effect that poor wretches have to seek their salvation on foot, whereas he sought it in comfort.

On the whole his descriptions are too objective, too much in the nature of a guide-book, to be of very much interest to-day. He is descriptive rather than appreciative, scholarly rather than tendentious, so that a remark like the following is rather out of tune with the rest of his account:

But who would not wonder that from the Gate (XIX) Portusa, the way should leade into the Valley of Hell (for so it is called), close to the holy seate of the Popes<sup>23</sup>.

The following are fairer examples of the tenor of his comments, and may serve to illustrate his general sensibility:

A man cannot sufficiently wonder at the ruines of Dioclesians Baths, by which it seemes they were of incredible greatnesse; and they report, that this Emperour compelled many thousands of Christians to worke upon this building for many yeeres<sup>24</sup>.

Or this on the Cappella Paolina:

This Chappell at the lower end of the said Gallery, hath the name of Pope Paul the third of the Family of Farnese, and it is little, and of a round forme (as I remember), but it is beautifull beyond imagination. The images of the Apostles seeme to bee of silver, and Paradice painted upon the arched roofo, with Angels flying, being the worke of Michael Angelo, seemed to me admirable<sup>25</sup>.

We have said that Moryson's work is partly a guide-book for future travellers to Rome. What of guide-books proper? These were mainly written in Latin or Italian, and as the young traveller would certainly know these languages, he would be expected to use these. However, one guide-book written for

<sup>23</sup> *An Itinerary* I, p. 267.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 293.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 280.

the use of Englishmen does survive<sup>26</sup>. Its interest is but slight and it is to be hoped that the general standard of taste in England was higher at that time than is implicit in the tone of the book. Certainly, the visitor who followed the *True Direction* would have seen most of the sights of Rome and his information would, on the whole, have been correct<sup>27</sup>. But the comments in it are sporadic and of a very elementary nature. Besides, the book suffers from the besetting vice of all guide-books, the 'bestow something to drink' style, a style from which Fynes Moryson is not entirely free either. The observation on Michaelangelo's Moses will give an idea of the scope of the work:

there is a statue of Moses, the height of two men, of entire piece, and also other fair statues.

With this we come to the end of direct travellers' accounts of Rome, with one important exception, that of Piers, whom we shall consider later<sup>28</sup>. Were this all we have to go upon, our harvest would be lean indeed. Moreover, our idea of the Elizabethan in Rome would be most one-sided, for the typical traveller to Rome — if such there did exist — was certainly not concerned with guide-books and antiquities, or only to a very minor degree. On the other hand, the traveller who publishes a book of his experiences, or keeps a diary, would certainly tend to stress these aspects most. But we must reserve judgment on how typical any particular class of traveller was until we have considered the other evidence.

Unfortunately this is far from full. In certain cases, such as when the traveller ran into trouble with the authorities, either at home or in Rome, we might find some reference to

<sup>26</sup> *A true Description and Direction of what is most worthy to be seen in all Italy* printed in the *Harleian Miscellany*, V, pp. 1-41. It is not dated but belongs to the end of Elizabeth's reign.

<sup>27</sup> Though the author is not above confusing the Pantheon with S. Stefano because both are circular in form and of Pagan origin.

<sup>28</sup> Be it understood, as far as I am aware; there may still be a good deal of material in private libraries of which I am ignorant.

him in the various collections of official documents preserved. But really significant evidence is sparse indeed. For one thing, the number of Protestants — and we are only concerned with these at the moment — who reached Rome could never have been very large. The policy of the popes against heresy was too severe to make such a visit worth the risk<sup>29</sup>. A report dated July 1582 puts the number of Englishmen, excepting those in the seminaries, in the whole of Italy at no more than twenty, and these are said to be in constant fear for their lives<sup>30</sup>. This number seems to have increased considerably during the next fifteen years, for in January, 1596-7 Sir Thomas Challoner writing to Essex observes that:

such a rabble of English roam now Italy that it would seem as though the English laws did not forbid the voyage<sup>31</sup>.

But we must not take this too seriously, for what might seem a stream to him may seem no more than a trickle to us. Sir Henry Wotton, about whom we shall have more to say presently, gives a most illuminating picture of Roman travel at this period:

I am always sure that his times [i.e. those of Clement VIII] were unto us more pernicious than any of his predecessors, and <not> so much by the length, as by the very quality of them. For whereas before the English Protestant that came in fear to Rome, either lived disguisedly, which by consequent kept him from the company of ill persuaders, or craved at his first coming the protection of Cardinal Alen, obliging himself to depart within a day or two, when he had seen the antiquities (for in other form the said Cardinal, who was himself subject to the Inquisition, could not yield unto it); I say whereas before these were the two courses of our Countrymen (neither any third shift imaginable); under Clement VIII (*mutatis artibus*), began not only permission and

<sup>29</sup> The pope claimed jurisdiction over all baptised Christians, not merely those baptised according to the Catholic rites. The fact that an Englishman was the subject of a foreign power which did not recognize the pope's authority did not give him immunity from the Inquisition.

<sup>30</sup> *Cal. S. P. Foreign*, vol. 1582, p. 134.

<sup>31</sup> *Historical Manuscripts Commission Hatfield MSS VII*, p. 10.

connivancy, but invitation and allurements of all nations and religion promiscuously. Through which freedom and conversation they began little by little to take hold of such as came thither, entering into them (where they saw them weakest), not as they were wont, with certain arguments of the school, which they found to be but an overloading of young capacities, and the longer way, but working now upon every discontentment in the party (which by conversation they discovered), and upon every outward scandal at home, deriding, commiserating and running through all affections; catching first the fancy, and by that the judgment and conscience, with certain popular observations (as I may term them) upon this or that accident... that in their order of converting *primo persuadent et postea docent*<sup>32</sup>.

Wotton's contention is borne out by the increasing number of references to English visitors in Rome found in the State Papers. But apart from a short and insignificant letter from William Cecil, son of Sir Robert Cecil, who was in Rome in 1585<sup>33</sup>, Wotton's are the only letters describing a stay in Rome. As such, quite apart from their considerable intrinsic interest, they are worth quoting extensively. He had been travelling on the Continent for some time, when in 1592 he decided to venture to Rome. His aim is clear: he wanted to penetrate to the very seat of the arch-enemy, in order to be of more use to his sovereign in the fight against militant Catholicism, which was to be so dear to his heart in his days as English ambassador in Venice<sup>34</sup>. He was perhaps somewhat over-cautious, for he disguised himself as a light-headed German Catholic and chose a dissolute French nobleman as his companion.

<sup>32</sup> L. P. SMITH, *Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton* I, pp. 332-3. Clare Howard (*op. cit.*, pp. 72-100) gives an account of the success of this policy of Clement VIII's on Lord Ross, who was first separated from his tutor, who was imprisoned, and then an easy prey for the Jesuits. But this was later during the reign of James I.

<sup>33</sup> He writes to Walsingham to excuse his breach of the law in going there: «di che [i. e. having been to Rome] mi ne dole assai, ma io vinto della curiosita di vider quella citta e quei Costumi e quelle Corti... ma pero mi son fermato pochissimo e per magor [sic] sicureta mi vestij alla francese e caminai per Roma Sconosciuto, a fatto, in modo che non ho perpassato periculo alcuno, ne mentre vi son stato ne manco nel ritorno». Letter from Padua, dated 24 November 1585. *S. P. Dom.* 184 fol. 109.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. L. P. SMITH, *op. cit.*, I, p. 75 *et seq.*

To take the benefit of this, [i.e. the Frenchman's company] I entered Rome with a mighty blue feather in a black hat; which though in itself it were a slight matter, yet surely did it work in the imaginations of men three great effects. First, I was by it taken for no English, upon which depended the ground of all. Secondly I was reputed as light in my mind as in my apparel (they are not dangerous men that are so). And thirdly no man could think that I desired to be unknown, who by wearing of that feather, took a course to make myself famous through Rome in few days. These judgments and discourses of the people passing by me, and some pointing at me, I was fain to suffer. Safety, and a conscience clear before my God, were the things I sought there. Credit is to be looked unto in England. And thus stood my entrance<sup>35</sup>.

That time, however, he only stayed in Rome for ten days, thinking it, like Fynes Moryson, the better part of valour to depart before Easter. On his return from Naples, where he had gone from Rome, he stayed some three weeks and had already «grown somewhat cunning and practick of Rome», when he was forced to depart in haste through meeting an Englishman whom he had reason to mistrust. He sums up his experience thus:

No Englishman, containing himself within his allegiance to her Majesty, hath seen more concerning the points of Rome than I have done; which I speak absolutely without exception: I have been present at three solemnities of the Roman Church, the consecration of the Rose<sup>36</sup>, marriage and distribution of dowries unto virgins<sup>37</sup> and the taking of possession<sup>38</sup>; which is accounted the principal sight that may be seen in these parts. The whore of Babylon I have seen mounted on her chair, going on the ground, reading, speaking, attired and disrobed by the cardinals, or rather by Montalto alone, in both her mitres, in her triple crown in her *lettica* on her moyl<sup>39</sup> at mass and lastly in public Consistory. Certain other private points which are not to be committed unto letter (because

<sup>35</sup> L. P. SMITH, *op. cit.*, pp. 271-2.

<sup>36</sup> i. e. the *Rosa d'Oro*, a ceremony performed on the 4th Sunday in Lent. (L. P. S.).

<sup>37</sup> The giving of alms to the orphans of the Ospedale di S. Spirito in the church of S. Maria sopra Minerva, mentioned also by others writers.

<sup>38</sup> Of S. Giovanni in Laterano as the cathedral of the bishopric of Rome (L.P.S.).

<sup>39</sup> *Lettica* i. e. litter, *moyl* i. e. mule (L. P. S.).

I know not the event of a piece of paper), I will defer till the rendering of myself unto your Honour's sight and service. Of Rome in short, this is my opinion, or rather indeed my most assured knowledge, that her delights on earth are sweet, and her judgments in heaven heavy <sup>40</sup>.

Again like Moryson, Wotton visited Bellarmine, a fact for which he subsequently excuses himself to Lord Zouch (his correspondent) by saying that he did not treat of matters of policy.

Wotton's letter is as singular as it is interesting, for an extended search has revealed nothing of comparable importance in the material that survives. Moreover, he was one of the very few English literary figures who ever visited Rome. Sir Philip Sidney stopped short at Venice and Padua, and Spenser, though he translated Du Bellay's *The Ruins of Rome*, never visited that city himself. The same is true of every other major Elizabethan writer.

What information can we glean from other sources? For example, Thomas Sackville, Earl of Dorset, the author of the Induction to *The Mirror for Magistrates*, found himself in Rome in 1563-4. Apparently he went abroad to save money, a curious thought to-day <sup>41</sup>. He arrived sometime before Christmas 1563 and was promptly imprisoned together with a Mr. Travers and their servant <sup>42</sup>, but he was quickly released, after a declaration, attesting to his virtue and nobility, signed by some of the most influential English Catholics in Rome, had been presented to the Civic Prefect of the city <sup>43</sup>. After this he seems to have gained the favour of the English Catholics in Rome, for he was invited to dine with them at the English Hospice <sup>44</sup> and attempts were even made to use Sackville as a mediator between Rome and the English government, though nothing came of

<sup>40</sup> L. P. SMITH, *op. cit.*, p. 274.

<sup>41</sup> COOPER, *Athenae Cantabrigienses* II, p. 484.

<sup>42</sup> *Cal. S. P. Foreign*, vol. 564-5, pp. 34, 37, 48.

<sup>43</sup> This document is printed in *Catholic Record Society*, II, pp. 5-7.

<sup>44</sup> This is clear from a complaint about the behaviour of the inmates of the Hospice, printed *ibid.*, pp. 46-63.

this, and in May 1564 we find him back in Paris <sup>45</sup>. It will be seen that at this time the English Catholics, and, indeed, the Curia had not yet given up hope of a peaceful settlement with Elizabeth. The episode, moreover, seems to have left no stain on his Protestant character. We may assume that Rome was merely one station in his travels across the Continent, and but for the unfortunate incident of his imprisonment we should know nothing about it.

Certainly, Sackville was not the only English nobleman to visit Rome; e.g. Thomas Arundell, later first Baron Arundell of Wardour, a great favourite of Elizabeth's and by no means inclined towards Catholicism, stayed at the English Hospice in 1580 <sup>46</sup>. But apart from the fact that he had been there we can say nothing. The same applies to a number of others of whom we read, usually because they were in trouble, either with the authorities at home or those in Rome <sup>47</sup>.

We have emphasised that Rome was for obvious reasons not a city favoured by the aristocratic traveller. The young English nobleman who returned to his native country affecting Italian manners, dress or speech, of whom the well-known tag said that *l'inglese italianato è il diavolo incarnato*, did not find Rome a very congenial school in which to learn these things. He remained, probably, at Florence or Venice, and of these travellers we have ample notice; but they are outside our immediate province. The Roman traveller was always something of an exception.

Travel was, of course, not confined to the aristocracy. Occasionally we hear of a number of travellers of humbler origin; some of these travelled out of mere curiosity or wanderlust.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.* p. 9.

<sup>46</sup> From the Pilgrim Book of the Hospice as printed by FR. FOLEY, *Records of the English Province S.I.*, VI, p. 548, where cf. Foley's note.

<sup>47</sup> E.g. in *S. P. Tuscany* I fols. 136, 138, we read of Sir Henry Glenham, who was in Rome in 1600, where he saw the ceremonies connected with the Jubilee year, and of the son of Sergeant Heal, who was with him, and who was imprisoned by the Inquisition.



Thus we read of one Nicholas Flute who went on a merchant vessel to Civitavecchia in 1593 on the understanding that

if he should deserve his meat and drink by his labour he should have it free, or otherwise his father should pay for it<sup>48</sup>.

From there he went to Rome on foot, where he found a fellow-passenger, Gilbert Smyth, a merchant, lying sick and attended by an English soldier and a Jesuit. Flute, naturally, denied all dealings with the latter or with any priest in Rome, and there seems no reason to doubt his veracity. While in Rome he occupied himself as any modern traveller would, visiting the churches, amongst which he mentions St. Peter's not yet entirely finished, and the many other sights of Rome. Then as now, there was quite a brisk trade in souvenirs, for though Flute did not bring back any brass models of St. Peter's, he brought some 'plots', that is to say plans, of the chief churches of Rome, which, he says, were openly sold in the streets of Rome.

Or we might cite the case of Francis Ridlestone, a London goldsmith, who apparently went to Rome for a wager in August 1579. All we learn of him, except that «he wanted language», is that the English community in Rome pounced upon the unfortunate goldsmith when he presented himself at the English Hospice, to try and sound him for news of Elizabeth's proposed marriage to Navarre — the great political topic of the moment — and finding that he knew nothing, tried to, convert him to Catholicism. But at this Ridlestone took fright and hurriedly departed after only six days<sup>49</sup>.

Other adventurers were more suspect: and their consciences were, to say the least of it, rather elastic. From time to time some such soldiers of fortune, and often of misfortune, found their way to Rome and tried to gain minor employments there

<sup>48</sup> H. M. C. Hatfield MSS IV, p. 582.

<sup>49</sup> From the report of Charles Sledd, an English spy in Rome, MS Yelverton XXVI fols. 97-8, preserved at Elvetham Hall, Mants., by kind permission of the owner, Lady Gough-Calthorpe.

among the Catholic exiles; they carried messages or letters for the English in Rome, but their activities are of no interest to us. Such records as remain of them are to be found in the official papers of the time<sup>50</sup>.

There were, of course, no diplomatic relations between England and the See of Rome; trade was difficult and dangerous. The visiting merchant had to be circumspect so as not to excite the interest of the Inquisition, and his best course was to seek the protection of some influential English Catholic. Some were unlucky, for example, Francis Tucker, who was in the prisons of the Inquisition no less than 17 months. What his exact history was is not clear, for at one time he seems to have acted as spy, together with one Thomas Blackwell, for the English Catholics in Rome, and an English informer writes about them that

may on such monster doth mor hurtt then a thousand, for any on almost might come to rome or rounde about those partes yf ytt wear not for them<sup>51</sup>.

Possibly Tucker resorted to this expedient to gain his freedom, for he later declared that he hated Rome and everything connected with it.

Of those travellers who did come into conflict with the authorities in Rome we usually find some record. In 1581 the pope gave orders that all Englishmen who came to Rome on 'bargains of return', a form of life-insurance, were to be apprehended and executed as felons. Since the English College refused to carry out this decree, its execution was entrusted to the Inquisition<sup>52</sup>. But I can find no record of any case in which this actually happened<sup>53</sup>.

<sup>50</sup> E. g. *Cal. S. P. Dom. Add.*, vol. 1566-79, p. 361 or H. M. C. Hatfield MSS IV, p. 466; or *Cal. S. P. Dom.*, vols. 1591-4, pp. 223-4, and a number of others.

<sup>51</sup> John Arden to Burghley, *S. P. Italian* I, fol. 152v.

<sup>52</sup> *Cal. S. P. Foreign*, vol. 1581-2, p. 335.

<sup>53</sup> We have seen that Englishmen were imprisoned from time to time e. g. Sackville. See also *Cal. S. P. Foreign*, vol. 1581-2, p. 270, and vol. 1583-4, p. 301. *Cal. S. P. Foreign Add.*, p. 617. Among a list of prisoners of the Inquisition, printed

Two cases, similar in many details, attracted notoriety at the time. Both of the men in question were undoubtedly religious fanatics. Richard Atkins apparently thought of trying to convert the lion in his own den, for he went to Rome and after trying to expostulate with the priests there on their wicked impiety and idolatry, assaulted one of them in St. Peter's just as he was elevating the host. We are not surprised to learn that, far from gaining any converts, he paid for this piece of folly with his life<sup>54</sup>.

The other, Walter Marsh, attracted even more attention, especially as it was thought, or at least given out, that he was an English spy. But nothing is more unlikely. Marsh, a native of London, came to Rome in 1593 at the age of 34, and entered the English College as a student in March of that year<sup>55</sup>. After a short while, however, he went to Flanders to recover from some sickness. In 1595 we find him again in Rome, where he committed an outrage similar to Atkins's on a priest of the church of St. Agatha, who was carrying the sacrament in procession. He was immediately taken and would have been lynched by the angry populace, but for the intervention of a cardinal present at the time. He was denounced to the Inquisition as a relapsed heretic and tortured and finally burnt. The affair seems to have created quite a stir at the time, and there are a number of accounts of it, all more or less in agreement as to the main facts. An incident such as this would serve as very good propaganda material for either side, and this is probably why we find that in some accounts he is said to have been a spy, for nothing could be more unlike the act of one who wished to avoid attracting attention<sup>56</sup>.

by PASTOR, *History of the Popes*, XXIV, p. 562, appears an Englishman by the name of 'Guglielmo Cochelles'. Cf. also the case of the son of Sergeant Heale cited above.

<sup>54</sup> MUNDAY, *An English Romaine Lyfe* (1582) reprinted by G. B. HARRISON in *The Bodley Head Quartos* No. 12, pp. 100-5. The story is also told in F. MUTI-NELLI, *Storia Arcana ed Aneddotica d'Italia* (Venezia, 1885) I, pp. 131-2.

<sup>55</sup> From the College Diary, as printed in *Liber Ruber venerabilis Collegii Anglorum de Vrbe* No. 37 in *Catholic Record Society* pp. 89-90.

<sup>56</sup> The story is recounted at length by PIERS (cf. below) pp. 63-5, as a warning

When presented in suitably sensational form, as by Munday, such incidents could have quite considerable influence on the popular conception of Rome. Let us turn to two men who are important in the formation of public opinion (if we can speak of this in the Elizabethan period), though their credentials as 'travellers' are somewhat doubtful. They are John Nichols and Anthony Munday, both in a sense Catholic apostates.

We must bear in mind that Nichols and Munday were writing at a time when anti-catholic feeling, and especially anti-Jesuit feeling, was at its height in England. There was a genuine popular outcry against the first Jesuit missionaries, who had been dispatched in 1580; Campion and his companions were executed in 1581, after a trial that would not stand up well to modern scrutiny. Men like Nichols and Munday who had been to Rome but a short time previously and who could thus claim to tell the 'inside story' of that 'Babylon' and 'sink of vice', were in a position to fan this hatred considerably: and they did not hesitate to do so.

Neither of them was a particularly savoury character. Let us take Nichols first. Born in 1555 at Cowbridge, Glamorgan-shire, he was educated at Hart Hall and Brasenose, but left before taking his degree. For a time he was a schoolmaster and later curate, but in 1577 went to Antwerp and from there to Douay. We need not concern ourselves with his activities in these places, especially as our only authority for them is his own testimony, a suspect one. He gradually worked his way south and arrived in Rome early in 1579, where he was brought before the Inquisition and abjured heresy; after this he became

example of impiety. Also by CARDINAL D'OSSAT, *Lettres* (Paris, 1698) I, pp. 153-4 and in the diary of Marc'Antonio Valena, extract printed by G. G. GENOLA, *Roma Papale e i Martiri del libero pensiero*, p. 131, though the date is there given erroneously as 1594; cf. also *Cal. S. P. Dom.*, vol. 1598-1601, p. 197.

For the sake of completeness the English spies in Rome, perhaps the largest single class of travellers, ought to be mentioned, but their reports, though comparatively numerous, contain nothing save names of English Catholics in Rome with their supposed activities and plots, and are not, therefore, of any interest to us. For a general account of their activities and importance, see C. READ, *Mr. Secretary Walsingham* II, p. 330 *et seq.*

a scholar at the English College<sup>57</sup>. He later claimed to have presented a sermon defending his protestant convictions to the pope on this occasion<sup>58</sup>, but as to the likelihood of this, let the reader judge. He was soon dismissed from the College, *tamquam ineptus* as the College Diary says, though he himself claimed that he went to Rheims of his own accord for his health's sake. He found his way back to England, where he once more repented his errors, this time of Catholicism. This he did first of all in the Tower and later in three virulent little books, one of which was immediately answered by a book attributed to Parsons the English Jesuit<sup>59</sup>. Early in 1582 we find him again on the Continent, this time in France. He was arrested at Rouen and charged with a number of religious offences. Once more he repented, though not before he had written an insolent letter to Cardinal Allen<sup>60</sup>. Whether this new conversion was due to torture or just fickleness we do not learn. The English ambassador in Paris intervened on his behalf on this occasion, but apparently without success<sup>61</sup>.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Anthony à Wood should characterize Nichols as

a man of most unstable character, timorous, vain-glorious and a meer braggadocio<sup>62</sup>.

And his books can only endorse this opinion. They belong to a species of 16th century controversy which would hardly be worth considering here, were it not for the fact that the

<sup>57</sup> According to his own account, given in the letter 'To the worshipfull companie of Merchant Aduenturers', which forms the preface to his *The Oration and Sermon made at Rome... by Iohn Nicols*, London 1581, 8vo, sig. Ba<sup>v</sup>, this took place in 1578, but both the College Diary (*op. cit.*) and *A True Report of the late apprehension and imprisonment of Iohn Nicols*, Rheims 1583, 8vo., fol. 4<sup>v</sup>, agree in giving 1579 as the date for this. The latter also prints the text of his abjuration.

<sup>58</sup> Printed in his *Oration*, *op. cit.*

<sup>59</sup> There are some rather delicate bibliographical problems here, for both Nichols and Parsons wrote another book each, which have not survived, but with these we need not concern ourselves.

<sup>60</sup> This as well as his repentance, is printed in *A True Report*, *op. cit.*

<sup>61</sup> *Cal. S. P. Foreign*, vol. 1583, pp. 109, 118, 122, 167, 188.

<sup>62</sup> *Athenae Oxonienses* ed. Bliss, I, col. 497.

author had actually been to Rome and claimed to have personal knowledge of the enormities he described. The title of his *Pilgrimage*<sup>63</sup>, his last and most abusive book, is by itself indicative of the contents:

whrein (*sic*) is displaied the liues of the proude Popes, ambitious Cardinals, lecherous Bishops, fat bellied monkes, and hypocriticall Iesuites.

Where he heard the stories which he relates by the dozen I do not know, but they read like poor imitations of the clerical satire of the *Decameron*, though entirely without any of Boccaccio's wit or humour, unless we are to call extravagant abuse humour. The crimes with which he charges the priests of the Catholic Church cover the whole range of criminal behaviour, though, characteristically, those connected with sexual laxity or perversion are most frequent.

Nichols is, after all, very much the type of repented sinner or converted heretic: the more insecure he feels his position, the more he rants and pours abuse on his opponents. Possibly he ranted with equal vigour against Elizabeth and the Protestants while he was in Rome. His facts are, of course, quite unreliable. Even his chapter on the English College in Rome, where he had himself been a scholar, consists of nothing but abuse and adds nothing to our knowledge of that place. But at a time of enflamed passions and violent hatred of all things Catholic, books like these, probably, had a success far beyond their merits. Indeed, they may have furnished later writers who had never been to Rome, with a picture of that city such as we find it in Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller*, or in the drama of violence and crime.

Anthony Munday, though not a very much more attractive character, is more reliable. He was personally concerned in the trial of Campion as a witness for the prosecution, and as a result of his statements aspersions were cast upon his general veracity, and more especially it was alleged that he had never been in

<sup>63</sup> *Iohn Nicolls Pilgrimage*, London 1581, 8vo.

Rome<sup>64</sup>. As a denial of this he published *An English Romaine Lyfe* in 1582, an amusing and deftly written piece of journalism. Driven by wanderlust, he left his master in London and went to France with a companion, Thomas Knowell. After a number of adventures, which included being robbed near Amiens, they reached Rome on February 1st (presumably in 1578) with a recommendation to the English College. There Munday gave himself out as the son of a Catholic nobleman, with whom he had had some acquaintance. He was admitted as a scholar, though according to his own account he studied very little and did all he could to avoid the devotions required of the students, for which he suffered severely under the strict College discipline, which he describes most vividly and with a good deal of gusto. Especially amusing is his account of the time he was forced to spend in a haunted room in the College, because he incurred the dislike of the rector. For the rest he describes the daily life of the scholars fully and, as far as it is possible to judge, accurately<sup>65</sup>. Interspersed with his descriptions are remarks on the treasonable intentions of the scholars and their speeches against the queen and her ministers, though most of this is no doubt pure propaganda. The revolt of the scholars against the rector, which led to the establishment of Jesuit management, is described in full and Munday seems to have been active in it<sup>66</sup>. Throughout his book Munday asserts that in his heart he was never a Catholic and that he abominated evryting he saw at Rome; but, of course, as to this it would be very difficult to express an opinion.

In addition to all the matter on the College, we are given a highly contemptuous account — as befits a good Protestant —

<sup>64</sup> Though Munday was undoubtedly not an uncorruptible witness, to put the matter mildly, he had certainly been to Rome.

<sup>65</sup> E. g. he agrees with Piers (cf. below) even in such details as what the scholars had for breakfast.

<sup>66</sup> For an account of this see the introduction to FOLEY, *Records*, *op. cit.*, and Tierney's edition of Dodd's *Church History*, II, p. 160 *et seq.* and p. ccxvi *et seq.* and the documents there printed.

of the churches and their relics, together with stories of miracles, clearly designed to arouse the contempt of the English reader. The Roman carnival is described in full, and he is particularly interested in some of the savage festivities which took place on these occasions, such as the 'race' the Jews of Rome were forced to run along the Corso, which he relates with obvious relish. Like other visitors from the North<sup>67</sup>, he was intrigued by the spectacle of the Flagellants on Maundy Thursday, which appealed to that love of violence which is so apparent in many a popular Elizabethan writer. And as a final make-weight we get the description of Richard Atkins's execution, which we have already referred to.

Exactly what it was that drew Munday to Rome is difficult to say. Rome to him was a monster to be seen with one's own eyes and then to be left as quickly as possible for fear of being devoured<sup>68</sup>. No doubt the element of daring entered into it too or perhaps he had genuine leanings towards Catholicism at one time. What is entirely absent is any sense of the past greatness, of the glory, even if faded, of ancient or indeed modern Rome. Munday was, of course, no scholar; but even so he must have had some inkling of what the name Rome meant to many of his countrymen, but he does not betray it even in one sentence. He is too completely the journalist revealing the 'horrible treasons' and 'superstitious idolatries' of Rome, to concern himself with such things. Between Thomas and Munday lies the whole range of interest of what the Protestant Englishman sought in Rome. Hardly forty years separate their visits in time, yet from the accounts they left behind them, it would seem scarcely credible that they are describing the same city.

\* \* \*

<sup>67</sup> Montaigne, too, was intrigued by this, cf. his *Journal*. For an account in a different spirit, see PIERS (cf. below).

<sup>68</sup> «Onely for the desire I had, to see it, that when I came home againe, I might say, once in my life I haue been at Roome», he says in answer to why he went there at all, *op. cit.*, p. 19.



Let us turn to the Catholics. Here it is more difficult even than among the Protestants to define the traveller. Rome was throughout our period the centre of a good deal of Catholic intrigue and general political activity on the part of the Catholic exiles. Moreover, large numbers of Englishmen came to Rome to perfect themselves in the Catholic faith, unable to do so at home, and these scholars are only travellers in a very remote sense.

We have already mentioned the English Hospice and College in Rome more than once, and since our study of the English Catholics in Rome will be largely concerned with these institutions, it will be well to say something about their history. A Hospice for English pilgrims had existed in the city since early mediaeval times, but after Henry VIII's break with Rome this naturally fell into disuse. After a short period of activity during the reign of Mary, the hospital again fell into decay with the advent of Elizabeth on the English throne. Its wardenship and other offices, however, provided a sinecure for English Catholic exiles in need of an income; and in fact Sir Edward Crane, the last English envoy to the Apostolic See, was appointed warden at the death of Queen Mary. But the conduct of the Hospice inmates was too lax for the more rigorous spirit of the times. There is a vigorous complaint about the worldly life of the inmates and the bad management of the Hospice dating from 1568 among the Jesuit archives in Rome<sup>69</sup>. They were accused of excessive interest in secular affairs and especially of being too friendly to visiting English Catholics of rank. We can easily understand the more co-operative attitude of this earlier generation of exiles, for at that time the door still seemed open to a compromise between Elizabeth and the pope, and not unnaturally they were eager to secure the best terms possible for themselves. But more extreme counsels won the day in Rome

<sup>69</sup> It is anonymous; I have already referred to this, see *Catholic Record Society*, II, pp. 46-63.

and after the excommunication of the Queen in 1570, this door was firmly slammed and English Catholics had to rely on underground activity and Spanish intervention in the hope of gaining their ends.

That the Hospice was run more for the benefit of the residents than the pilgrims is clear from the accounts for the year 1575, a Jubilee year be it remembered, which is printed in Dodd's *Church History*<sup>70</sup>. In that year 17 permanent residents were budgeted for, the warden eight chaplains and eight servants. The warden's expenses were estimated at 130 crowns p. a. while the pilgrims were only allowed 108, though it was assumed that there would always be three in the Hospice. For alms, gifts of food and clothing only 54 crowns were set aside, whereas the chaplains each received a considerably larger sum than this. Evidently then, there was enough reason for complaint.

This Hospice, however, was transformed by Gregory XIII into a college for English missionary priests, a want of whom was acutely felt by the authorities at this time<sup>71</sup>. After a short period, the management of the College was in 1579 entrusted to the Society of Jesus. Under its supervision it expanded rapidly, though not without its attendant troubles. The Hospice remained, however, under separate management in order to fulfill its ancient function of harbouring pilgrims. The rule there, as in most similar institutions, was that commoners were granted eight days free board and noblemen three. But these limits were not always observed. Later on in the 90's, owing to the fear of English agents in Rome, only pilgrims with a recommendation vouching for their Catholic reliability were admitted to both the Hospice and the College.

Fortunately the records of both these institutions have been

<sup>70</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, cccxlv-cccxlvi.

<sup>71</sup> Actually the College at Rome was an offshoot of the one at Douay, which was unable to cope with the demand for a Catholic education for Englishmen. For the whole complicated history and its birthpangs in the form of a threatened strike of the students, see F. A. GASQUET, *A History of the Venerable English College, Rome* (1920) and the introduction to FOLEY, *Records, op. cit.*, also the documents printed in Tierney's Dodd, *op. cit.*

preserved and published<sup>72</sup>. From them we can gain some idea of the Catholic traffic to Rome. The Pilgrim Book, as published by Foley, begins in 1580, and from that date until the end of Elizabeth's reign some 731 pilgrims were received at the Hospice, though some of the names recorded appear more than once. Among them we find the names of a number of well-known English Catholics *e.g.* Lord Paget stayed there in 1585, Dr. Barrett, President of Douay College, in 1596 and Sir Thomas Fitzherbert and Sir William Stanley in 1601. But on the whole, most of the Hospice's guests were humble English Catholics, who, no doubt, came to Rome for pious reasons, stayed their allotted eight days, during which they did their devotions and then went home again. Some came with their wives and these were usually boarded out in the city at the Hospice's expense. In order to guard against the pilgrim who made a living of begging, the survival of that perennial mediaeval nuisance, the palmer, the authorities made a rule that pilgrims were to be admitted only once in six years, but this was not applied consistently. Some representative figures might be of interest: thus in the Jubilee year of 1600 the greatest number of pilgrims was admitted, as we might expect, namely 74. But on the other hand in 1580 only one sought its hospitality. On the average about 33 pilgrims were admitted annually. Of those a fair proportion later entered the College as scholars; *e.g.* of the 29 whose names are recorded for the year 1587, 14 entered the College and of the 24 in 1597 again 14 became students. We cannot, therefore, regard all the 731 pilgrims as travellers in the sense in which we have been using this term so far.

At the best these records can yield minimum figures or names: they do not tell us anything about the pilgrims. Pro-

<sup>72</sup> Those of the College as the *Liber Ruber*, *op. cit.*, a most faithful, edition which supersedes the incomplete and inaccurate one printed by FOLEY, *op. cit.*, where the Pilgrim Book of the Hospice is also to be found. This is a translation from the Latin original preserved in the archives of the English College; how accurate it is I do not know, since I have not seen the original.

bably the pilgrims' first action in Rome would be to visit the seven privileged churches of the city; to go to confession and receive the sacrament. Then, as time permitted, he might visit the most important of the other churches, the *scala santa* and similar places of worship; perhaps he looked at the most prominent of the ruins and so would depart for home again. The chief impression he carried with him of the Eternal City, was undoubtedly of the pomp and splendour of the centre and head of the Church and, perhaps, if he had chosen his season well, of the passionate manifestations of piety with its attendant ceremonies full of colour and music. These things, above all else, he would note, for he could not see them at home; and whereas the Protestant who saw them would condemn them as vain show and impious idolatry, to the Catholic pilgrim they would be a proof of the invincible might and eternal glory of the One Church.

It is natural that the Catholic nobility was in the habit of sending its sons abroad for their education, since they were debarred from the English Universities. This practice grew with the years and in the 90's the authorities in England were getting anxious about the number of young men who went abroad illegally (since to travel legally a licence was required, which would never be granted to a Catholic) ostensibly to learn languages, but in fact to enter some Catholic College on the Continent<sup>73</sup>. We cannot, of course, assume that all or even very many of these found their way to Rome, but some certainly did. No doubt their names are often to be found in the two Diaries we have considered above.

Let us take one example to illustrate this. Among the papers in the Public Record Office is a letter from Robert Markham

<sup>73</sup> For example, in 1593 we read that one Thomas Blake was arrested for regularly conveying recusants, their money and effects to the Continent. *Cal. S. P. Dom.*, vol. 1591-4, pp. 408-10. For similar complaints cf. *ibid.*, vol. 1598-1601, pp. 48, 220, *H. M. C. Hatfield MSS*, VII, p. 10.

to his brother Sir Griffin<sup>74</sup>. Robert was a young Catholic who travelled on the Continent to perfect his education as befitted a man of his station. His brother, anxious lest his associations on the Continent might bar his preferment at home, had advised him to do nothing which might compromise him in England later, and had suggested service in the Emperor's army against the Turks, as an occupation worthy of his rank. But Robert rejected this advice and went to Rome to study. Clearly, in Rome he fell under the influence of the English seminarists there, who urged him to enter some college,

for myne owne reputation which woulde hardlye be mayntayned if I should remayne in common innes or hired chambers, which beare noe good report in Rome how honest soeuer the partye be which is in them<sup>75</sup>.

Markham did his best to persuade his brother that he remained loyal to the Queen in all but his religion, but his position in Rome was fraught with the utmost difficulty. Probably the pressure of the English priests in Rome was too strong for him (or possibly he wrote the whole letter with his tongue in his cheek) for John Arden writes of him:

there ys on young Marckham come to Rome & goeth to scholl & muste be a preiste... he rayleth cowardly against all<sup>76</sup>.

Whether he did become a priest I do not know. But his case cannot be considered unique.

To consider fully all the English Catholics in Rome during the reign of Elizabeth, all those permanent and semi-permanent residents in the English College, the Hospice and the city, would mean writing the whole complicated history of the Catholic exiles and their aspirations during the latter half of the 16th cen-

<sup>74</sup> *S. P. Italian States* I, fols. 118-9. It is dated « 4th of Februarye » but without the year, which can be inferred as 1592-3 from a letter from the English agent John Arden (*ibid.* fols. 150-4), where he is mentioned.

<sup>75</sup> *MS cit.*, fol. 118v. His name does not appear in the English College Diary, but he may have been there as a convictor, or entered one of the other colleges in Rome.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. previous note, *MS cit.*, fol. 152.

tury: something entirely out of the scope of this article. I will, therefore, conclude this survey with the account of one who was certainly a traveller, and combined many of the interests of the visiting English Catholic.

Henry Piers (1568-1623) is the author of the only travel diary including Rome, written by a Catholic<sup>77</sup>. This document, which has hitherto been almost entirely neglected, is headed *A Discourse of HP his travelles written by him selfe* and is contained in MS Rawl. D 83 in the Bodleian. It is a lengthy work, running to some 220 pages folio, of varying interest.

Henry Piers, an Anglo-Irish Catholic, went on a journey to Rome in 1595. His purpose was partly that of an ordinary traveller, but mainly religious, for immediately after his arrival in Rome he went to the English College, where he was reconciled to the Catholic faith (as had long been his purpose) and became a 'convictor' *i.e.* one who lived in the College as a student, but did not take the College vows. With the rest of his journey through the Netherlands, Germany and Italy we are not concerned. Piers was still a young man of 27 when he undertook the journey, but already married, which probably accounts for his entering the College only as a convictor. He stayed in Rome for two years, after which he returned to his estate in Ireland via Spain where he spent a further six months in the English College at Seville.

His account of Rome, which occupies the main portion of his MS (pp. 30-163), is of uneven interest. From the outset he did his best to remain politically neutral while in Rome, and this attitude nearly involved him with the Inquisition early on during his stay, for some Irishmen in Rome had denounced him for refusing to consider the Irish wars as fought for the Catholic faith<sup>78</sup>. On the whole his political views, however, seem to have

<sup>77</sup> There is a little volume headed « *Diarium Itineris* » in the British Museum, MS Sloane 1898, fols. 22-38, probably written by a student at Douay, but the section on Rome is missing.

<sup>78</sup> His reluctance to admit this is understandable, since his father William Piers had been one of Elizabeth's captains in Ireland, and rewarded for his services by the grant of Tristernagh Abbey, Co. Westmeath.

been somewhat ingenuous, for his constant assumption that English Jesuits like Parsons acted out of pure piety in their various plans for England, with no political *arrière pensée*, cannot, surely, be called anything else. Piers's *Discourse* like Moryson's *Itinerary* in this respect, is a mixture of personal diary and descriptive guide-book. What he has to say of the life in the English College and its scholars, is interesting and bears out Munday's account, though naturally Piers is full of praise for everything he saw there. He was greatly impressed by the religious ceremonies and processions he observed in Rome, some of which he describes in great detail, and this is one of the most interesting parts of his work. We feel the influence of the Society of Jesus most markedly here for, as indeed in all his remarks on religious matters, the peculiar flavour of Jesuit piety is very noticeable. (E. g. it is characteristic that he considered the *Gesù*, even before its Baroque interior decoration, «one of the fairest and somptuous Churches in Rome»<sup>79</sup>). The passages of Catholic Apologetics, with which his whole work is interspersed, are clearly not of his own invention. On the other hand his description of the Jesuit *Exercitia Spiritualia* as practised in the English College, is interesting, if not original.

But his account of the churches of Rome, of which he mentions 73 by name, together with a full list of all the possible (and many impossible) relics to be found in them, complete with indulgences attached thereto, is, to the modern reader, tedious in the extreme<sup>80</sup>. The actual descriptions of the churches, when they are present at all, are most disappointing, for Piers had very little artistic sensibility. Thus, for example, though he mentions the Sistine Chapel, he does not notice its frescoes (surely a cause of wonder even to the most blunt understanding) and in S. Pietro in Vincoli there is no mention of the Michaelangelo Moses. His Risen Christ (in S. Maria sopra Minerva) is mentioned as

<sup>79</sup> MS *cit.*, p. 58.

<sup>80</sup> It is largely second-hand too, for this section as well as that on the antiquities of the city is taken from GIERONIMO FRANCINI, *Le cose maravigliose dell'alma città di Roma*, Venetia, 1594.

«vpon the highe altare of that Churche standethe a Rare Imadge of our Sauior», since what interested him in that church is that the court of the Inquisition held its sessions there. These examples might be multiplied to demonstrate his indifference to such matters; but as we have seen, in this he was not alone; it was merely a question of degree. Piers was, in fact, an ordinary sort of man with a limited education and a mediocre intelligence. What impressed him was the large, gaudy and colourful, of which he could have his fill in Rome. We must, of course, remember that this was all new to the visitor from England, and even more so from Ireland, which had never known anything like the splendour of Italian life at the Renaissance and after. Unfortunatly Piers, and no doubt a number like him, came too early for the enjoyment of the Baroque in its full exuberance.

Piers, we have said, was no scholar. His description of ancient Rome, under such headings as 'The Highways of Rome' and 'The Bridges of Rome' etc. are perfunctory and indeed largely translations or condensations of his source Francini. They do not mean anything to him, and it is characteristic that in his section on the Capitol, on mentioning the pillar to Marc'Antonio Colonna, the papal general during the battle of Lepanto, he devotes some 12 pages to an account of this battle, whereas the remaining six hills are dealt with in one page. In short, Piers' interests are those of a Munday, except that Piers looks at everything through the rosy spectacles of a believer (and a convert at that) while Munday wears the dark glasses of the determined sceptic. We are not called upon to judge which is the truer and more objective account, for our interest lies precisely in the subjective nature of the traveller's impression; only this can tell us what Rome meant to the Elizabethan.

Our survey has largely been concerned with bare facts and dates. Can we draw any conclusions? Can we fix upon some composite idea and say: this is what Rome meant to the Elizabethan, that he went to see? It seems hardly possible. In the first place it would be wrong to ask of the 16th century traveller



an emotion more proper to a later age, such as the 18th century, when Goethe would not even allow himself a full day in Florence so eager was he to be in Rome, and when Gibbon, some years earlier, looking down from the Capitol on the bare-footed monks chanting their litanies in the ancient temple of Jupiter, saw, as in a revelation, what the great task was which he felt himself called upon to perform. The nearest approach we find to this is the humanist lament of William Thomas, which we have quoted at length. But on the whole the humanist during the age of Queen Elizabeth, though not at the beginning of the century, stayed away from Rome. None could have been a greater admirer of her ancient glory and majesty than Roger Ascham, but he never visited the venerable ruins of the civilization that inspired him above all else. Perhaps even more than the loose Italian morals, which he castigates so sharply, he could never forget that Rome was now the seat of what he regarded as anti-Christ. We are back at the religious — or political, it makes no difference — issue: in some way our Roman travellers were always involved in this. Even so 'pure' a traveller as Fynes Moryson could not avoid it. It is perhaps paradoxical, but none the less true, that to the age in England which 'rediscovered' classical civilization, Rome, in its physical aspect at least, above all else meant papal Rome. But after all this is not surprising. As the capital of the Catholic Church and Catholic world, she was, in the circumstances of the time, England's chief enemy. The Iron Curtain of religious division, perforce, cast its heavy shadow on all our travellers.

If this is true of the more educated and aristocratic traveller, it is more especially so of the uneducated man. Whereas a man with a classical education, such as Sir Henry Wotton, was aware of the historical overtones of the name Rome, though these were scarcely audible in the political conditions of the time, the uneducated traveller like Munday had not even that background as a frame of reference. To him Rome was a monster — to be seen to be believed — and the ruins, if indeed he noticed them at all,

partook of this attribute of monstrosity by the very fact of their strangeness and size. The Catholic, on the other hand, went there full of faith and to him Rome was the birthplace and sacred ground of his Church: the more sophisticated reader of to-day might perhaps smile at the great importance he attached to the numerous relics he was shown there and ask whether all this was a *necessary* condition of his faith. To an earlier age these things seemed important: in a positive sense to the Catholic, who found proof and confirmation of his beliefs in them, and to the Protestant in a negative sense, attracting and repelling him at the same time; even for him it all had to be seen to be properly disbelieved.

What influence the traveller had on the wider English public's idea of Rome would be difficult to say. The admiration of ancient Rome was certainly due to its literature, then familiar to every educated man, not to the contemplation of the physical remains of that civilization. In many ways 16th century Italy was still the leader of Europe, a position she was very soon to forfeit. What our own age admires above all else in Renaissance Italy — giving that term its widest connotation — her leadership in the arts, was scarcely noticed by the Elizabethan. To him she was above all leader in manners and the arts of life — and the refinements of vice. It is indeed characteristic that traveller after traveller, while hardly mentioning Raphael or Michaelangelo, waxes enthusiastic about the gardens of Italy with their curious and elaborate contrivances. Nashe, who had never been to Italy, and whose Italian scenes in *The Unfortunate Traveller* were probably partly inspired by direct contact with travellers and partly books, gives a full description of one of these marvels. In these matters it was felt Italy excelled.

For the rest, Rome was a glittering Babylon of corruption. Again *The Unfortunate Traveller*, a work of fiction in a double sense, is a fair indication of what the popular Elizabethan writer associated with the name Rome. We are not concerned with how true or false such a picture was, but with the idea it disse-

minated. The tragedy of violence, almost invariably, set in Italy, and seen at its best in Webster, did the rest. We cannot, of course, blame this sinister picture entirely on to the traveller, for many elements had a hand in it. Sometimes it seems as if the Elizabethan took all that was wicked, perverse and deceitful and called it Italy. But this is too large a subject for us to discuss here<sup>81</sup>. But the traveller certainly helped in the composition of this picture.

THOMAS FRANK

*Istituto Orientale, Napoli.*

<sup>81</sup> In this connexion I cannot but refer the reader to Prof. Mario Praz's British Academy lecture «Machiavelli and the Elizabethans» (Proc. British Academy 1928) who shows by what process in the popular mind all wickedness and depravity became associated with Italy.

## “ WITH ALL CONVENIENT SPEED TO ROME „

Im Jahre 1780 erschien by Dodsley in London, dem bekannten Verleger so vieler englischen Poeten des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts, ein langes anonymes Gedicht in ungereimten Jamben, betitelt: «Ancient and Modern Rome». Der Verfasser war George Keate, ein begüterter Gentleman, dem es seine behaglichen Umstände erlaubten, ganz seinen verschiedenen Liebhabereien zu leben. «Ancient and Modern Rome» war nur eines von vielen höchst mässigen und langweiligen Gedichten, die er während der nächsten Jahre mit grosser Regelmässigkeit veröffentlichte.

In der Literaturgeschichte wird man vergeblich nach Keates Namen suchen. Weder Inhalt noch Form machen seine Schöpfungen bemerkenswert. In einem Jahrhundert, in dem die Fähigkeit den Gefühlen in gebundener Sprache freien Lauf zu lassen zur guten Erziehung gehörte, war Keate nur einer unter vielen heute längst vergessenen Dichterlingen. Er schrieb aus Vergnügen, nicht um Geld zu verdienen, wie seine bissige Zeitgenossin Fanny Burney bemerkte. Keate wird erst interessant, wenn wir die kurze Lebensbeschreibung, die in dem «Dictionary of National Biography» erschien, durchlesen. Wir erfahren dann, dass Keate eine Art Amateur-Archäologe war, dass er eine kleine Abhandlung über römische Keramik verfasst hat und zum Mitglied der «Society of Antiquaries» gewählt wurde, dass er eine Sammlung von allerlei Kuriositäten besass, aus der die Münzen später in die Bodleiana in Oxford gelangten. Wir hören ferner, dass er malte und seine Bilder wiederholt in der Royal Academy ausstellte. -

Folgen wir nun dieser Spur weiter nach, so stossen wir