

**A letter of travel advice? Literary rhetoric, scholarly counsel and practical instruction in the ars apodemica**

Alice started to her feet, for it flashed across her mind that she had never before seen a rabbit with either a waistcoat-pocket, or a watch to take out of it, and burning with curiosity, she ran across the field after it, and was just in time to see it pop down a large rabbit-hole under the hedge.

In another moment down went Alice after it, never once considering how in the world she was to get out again.<sup>1</sup>

When we work with archives we make the archived materials work for us, using textual evidence to interrogate ideas and construct narratives. This, by its nature, means that we as researchers change the function of these materials, introducing our own perspective, context and agenda, and though unavoidable this is something we are responsible for keeping in mind. In *Information and Communication in Venice: Rethinking Early Modern Politics*, Filippo de Vivo reminds us that we should always ask why a record or text survives, as whatever their motivation letters, artistic writings and administrative papers weren't intended for us to find and use as evidence for our own theories.<sup>2</sup> To combat an over-confident appropriation of a text one could search out and focus on its original function or use, but this 'holy grail' objective is not always easy and not always attainable. Reconstructing the lost status of a document can sometimes seem like a lost cause but perhaps the process, regardless of its outcome, can be as enlightening as establishing solid historical fact. Archival research can give us the run-around, in some cases more than others, but can we turn its difficulties to advantages, can we make a virtue out of its complexities and – responsibly – allow historical uncertainty to provide a little intellectual room to manoeuvre?

It need not be the goal of analysis to strip a text back to some objective black and white truth. It is not revolutionary to say that this cannot and should not be the case,

---

<sup>1</sup> Lewis Carroll, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland & Through the Looking Glass* (New York: Bantam Classics, 1981), 2.

<sup>2</sup> Filippo de Vivo, *Information and Communication in Venice: Rethinking Early Modern Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). For discussion of his sources and elaboration of this argument, see the introduction and section on the political arena, Vivo, 1-18, 46-70. One particular source – the Venetian relazioni – illustrates his argument particularly well, since they are essentially taken for granted as valuable historical sources, yet because of their original and secret status they were never meant to be dispersed at all, let alone find their way into archives for our perusal, Vivo, *Information and Communication*, 9.

particularly when the text displays a provenance that points to multiple uses. Rather than clouding our understanding, a text being read in different ways by its contemporaries can in itself be illuminating, because analysis of such varied usage gives additional insight into the text's essential function(s). All early modern texts have at least a life and a critical afterlife – an original reading and a later interpretation – and some texts in addition are understood in manifestly different ways within the former. Letters that at some point become publicly dispersed are a good example of this, where a letter of, for example, advice or defensive apology may function multiply as a communication between two parties, a self-promoting tract for the author and a shared and re-copied literary item. Exploring these different contexts, without prioritizing one so far as to forget the others, will help in the case of this article to reach an understanding of a particular letter of travel advice, made more obscure by its uncertain authorship. It is found in three early printed books, many manuscript copies in epistolary miscellanies, and in one sent version in Lambeth Palace library. This article will present an analysis of this letter and embrace its contextual uncertainties in order to unpick how it works as a text and what it can tell us about the literary tradition it exemplifies, namely that of the *ars apodemica*, or the art of travel.

Before the contents of this particular letter are examined, it will be necessary to detail the various authorial claimants and primary witnesses. There have been several critical commentaries on this letter that attempt to elucidate the claims to authorship, though simply appreciating the critical afterlife of this letter is enough to confuse, as naturally all parties do not reach the same conclusion. The earliest imprint of the letter, which ostensibly offers friendly advice to a peer on what he should observe during his travels, is published in *Certaine Learned and Elegant Workes of the Right Honourable Fulke, Lord Brooke*, under the title 'A Letter by Sir Fulke Grevill to his Cousin Grevill Varney residing in France'.<sup>3</sup> The book was published in 1633, five years after Greville's death, and the letter within dated 20 November 1609. Twelve manuscript copies of this letter are known to be extant, mainly from the first half of the seventeenth century, almost all of which specify Greville as author and four of which name Verney as recipient.<sup>4</sup> The next

---

<sup>3</sup> Fulke Greville, *Certaine Learned and Elegant Workes of the Right Honourable Fulke, Lord Brooke* (Henry Seyle: London, 1633), 295-8, sig. 2R4r -2R5v.

<sup>4</sup> See Peter Beal, *Index of English literary manuscripts. Volume 1, Part 2, 1450-1625* Douglas-Wyatt (London: Mansell, 1980), 103-108 (GrF16-23) for eleven of these copies. Beal includes the

imprint, 1686, has the letter undated and with different correspondents; there is no mention of Greville and instead it is printed as from Thomas Bodley (1545–1613) to Francis Bacon (1561–1626).<sup>5</sup> This witness is found in a collection of three hundred letters appended to Richard Parr's life of the Church of Ireland archbishop James Ussher, mainly comprised of letters to and from the late primate but including several by various great personages that found their way into his papers. The Bodley version is found again in *Reliquiae Bodleianae* (1703), and is almost certainly a direct reprint from the 1686 Ussher volume.<sup>6</sup> The letter in Lambeth Palace Library is apparently a sent version because of the folding creases and remnants of wax seal still visible, however, in true detective genre style the author and recipient are absent; the entire bottom corner of the second verso has been ripped clean away, and the subscription and superscription along with it.<sup>7</sup> Add to this the fact that the Lambeth version has several substantive differences from the printed copies, and is additionally printed by James Spedding as written by Francis Bacon on behalf of the earl of Essex to send to the earl of Rutland, and one may find themselves regretting jumping down this particular rabbit-hole quite so earnestly.<sup>8</sup>

It may help at this point to give a brief account of the literary tradition from which this letter descends. By the end of the sixteenth century, several hundred Englishmen were heading abroad each year for, in the words of one typical passport, their 'increase in

---

Lambeth manuscript under Greville's entry in the IELM, despite the fact that it has substantive differences and does not actually mention Greville. The twelfth was recently identified by Alan Stewart and Harriet Knight, which indicates the likelihood of additional as yet undiscovered manuscripts and the open-ended nature of this discussion, see Francis Bacon, Works: Early Writings 1584-1596, vol 1, ed. Alan Stewart with Harriet Knight (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming), appendix C.

<sup>5</sup> Richard Parr, The life of the most reverend father in God, James Usher (Nathanael Ranew: London, 1686), sig. 5E1r- 5E2r.

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Bodley, Reliquiae Bodleianae: or some genuine remains of Sir Thomas Bodley (John Hartley: London, 1703), 364-9, sig. Aa6v-Bbr. The address to the reader explicitly states that this letter, alongside another much later one to Bacon, were printed previously in the Ussher volume, and since they contained 'Things of more than ordinary Moment, it was thought fit to reprint them', sig. A8v.

<sup>7</sup> Lambeth Palace Library MS 936, item 218, unfoliated.

<sup>8</sup> For Spedding's reasoning, see James Spedding (ed.), The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862), vol.2, 16-19. He asserts that the Lambeth letter 'is not a copy, but apparently the original letter; for the seal remains', 18. The significance of arguing that it is 'the' original letter rather than 'a' original letter will become apparent. It is quite possible that although this document was written to an individual and sent as a letter, it could still have been copied or adapted from another source: it need not be the original composition simply because it has been sent.

good knowledge and learning'; that is, not for the cultivation of taste of the eighteenth century grand tour, nor for official government business or trade but in order to benefit themselves and through this their country via a humanism-influenced educational journey.<sup>9</sup> In order to protect and display their moral, spiritual and physical health, and as repayment for their passport, the casual traveller was expected to make themselves a useful servant of their domestic government. A key way in which this patriotic productivity could be made manifest was by the collection and transmission of observations gleaned from an industrious approach to travel. The emergent tradition of the ars apodemica developed in order to advise and encourage this exodus of men and the influx of their correspondence, and by the later 1500s written travel advice had developed into a widely popular literary genre. The genre spread to printed treatises in the 1570s, first as translations from the continent and then by home-grown authors, and had its earliest instantiations in personal letters from members of the privy council; men such as William Cecil, Lord Burghley and Sir Francis Walsingham who were keen to make use of the traveller's informational access. The last third of the century saw the theory of travel take a decisive turn to the methodological, with the first authors on this art of organising knowledge of the world being Zwinger, Turler, Pyrckmair and Blotius.<sup>10</sup> The didactic treatises all lay emphasis on travel's educative role and how knowledge gained by it should be put towards the good of the common weal, typically listing specific areas on which to gather information in the host country and employing the rhetoric of civic duty and self-improvement in a strikingly repetitive format and style. The fact that the public benefit of this activity is often undefined suggests an indirect usefulness where the information gathered simply makes one a better man in personal terms and a better servant of the crown in a future political career. However, as personal letters the texts

---

<sup>9</sup> Travel license for Peter Manwood of Kent, 1595, M.A.E. Green (ed.), Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1595-1597, (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, & Dyer, 1869), vol. CCLV, 33[1], 148. For estimates of numbers of travellers, see Sara Warneke, Images of the Educational Traveller in Early Modern England (Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1995), 50

<sup>10</sup> Theodor Zwinger, Methodus Apodemica (Basileæ: E. Episcopus, 1577); Hieronymus Turler, De peregrinatione et agro Neapolitano (Strasbourg, 1574) [English translation: The Traveller, (London, 1575)]; Hilarius Pyrckmair, Commentariolus de Arte Apodemica, seu Vera Peregrinandi Ratione (Ingolstadt, 1577). Hugo Blotius corresponded with Zwinger and sent him materials for use in his Methodus, as well as writing a small book on travel: Tabula Peregrinationis continens capita Politica, in Paul Hentzner, Itinerarium Germaniae, Galliae, Angliae, Italiae. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Nuremberg, 1629). For the background and birth of this literary tradition, see Justin Stagl, A history of curiosity: the theory of travel, 1550-1800 (Chur: Harwood Academic, 1995), 47-95 for general discussion, and especially 60-64 for the contributions of these four men.

can also be read as attempts to instigate an almost business-like relationship between patron and traveller, where the latter's privileged geographical and political access renders them a valuable source of intelligence for the home statesman. There is evidently room for debate as to the exact purpose of these texts. As well as the above there is certainly a context where they are seen as literary items to line the bookshelf, and in terms of public literary display it could also be the case that the author is primarily interested in the act of portraying himself as a scholarly councillor rather than invested in the particular matter on which he offers counsel.

We thus have two contexts for the letter, regardless of the author – the letter as essay on travel for a public readership and the letter as sent advice for an individual traveller. The latter becomes further divided when one considers whether the advice is disinterested counsel or expectant instruction. Unpicking the claims to authorship of this one letter may be a way in to these different intentions and so tell us something important about the nature of *ars apodemica* texts. Can we justly interpret them as intended as practical instruction, turning the traveller into a valued gatherer of information, or even something akin to an intelligencer, or do they rightly rest more in the realm of literary text dealing with moral ideal rather than practical use?

The authorial attribution that has sparked the most heated debate, and is the cause of the most recent commentary, is the one which most clearly engages ideas of writing for public display and scholarly exhibitionism, and of letters considered as essays in epistolary form rather than simply posted messages. It is also the attribution most easily dealt with, and hopefully the last word has now been had on the matter in Alan Stewart's laudably clear and thorough exposition in his forthcoming edition, with Harriet Knight, of Francis Bacon's works.<sup>11</sup> They give detailed reasons as to why it will not feature in the Bacon edition, refuting the suggestion first put forward – tentatively – by James Spedding in 1862 that Bacon wrote the letter on behalf of the earl of Essex to send to Roger Manners, earl of Rutland, on his European tour in 1595-6. From an internal reference in the third letter, we know that Essex sent the young Rutland three advisory

---

<sup>11</sup> Stewart with Knight, forthcoming. Reminding us that the torn Lambeth Palace manuscript is the only link to suggest Bacon's authorship, their investigation seriously questions the relevance of this association by conducting a watermark analysis of the volume, showing the letter to be from a different paper stock to its neighbours.

texts as he prepared for his departure.<sup>12</sup> Spedding printed our letter as the second in this trio, and ghost-written by Essex's close friend and sometime borrowed pen Francis Bacon, based on the fact that the manuscript was found amidst papers that on the whole were written by Bacon. Though the argument against this attribution is strong, it gets somewhat waylaid in the spirited debate between Paul Hammer and Brian Vickers on the relative authorial dominance of Bacon, Essex and his general secretariat in the earl's writings.<sup>13</sup> Hammer gives clear reasons as to why this attribution is incorrect, namely that the recipient of the first and third letters is about to depart whereas the 'second' addresses someone already abroad, that Spedding himself admits that he 'has no reason to suppose that it was either written by Essex or addressed to Rutland', only that it fits plausibly into his post-dated agenda, and that if it was the one dispatched to Rutland it would not now be lying as a sent epistle in Bacon's archives.<sup>14</sup>

The justified conclusion that our letter is not the 'second' letter gets subsumed in Vickers' attack on Hammer's downplaying of Bacon's overall role in the trio.<sup>15</sup> Vickers focuses on arguing for Baconian echoes in all three texts (and in other key letters and theatrical devices) in order to reclaim Bacon's centrality, but of the three it is only the first Essex letter that clearly shows both typical Baconian phrasing and subject matter. The fame and popularity of this first Essex-Rutland letter can be seen by the large number of surviving manuscript copies, and by its move into print some years later in a collection on travel.<sup>16</sup> The style is distinct from the 'second' and third letters in its use of Latin maxims and much stronger focus on moral guidance and philosophical ideals. This, coupled with its circulation in manuscript, points to its aim being scholarly display in

---

<sup>12</sup> H[istorical] M[anuscripts] C[ommission], Twelfth Report, Appendix IX. The Manuscripts of the Duke of Beaufort, KG., the Earl of Donoughmore, and others (London: H.M.S.O, 1891), 172.

<sup>13</sup> See Brian Vickers, 'The Authenticity of Bacon's Earliest Writings', Studies in Philology, 94:2 (1997); Paul Hammer, 'Letters of Travel Advice from the Earl of Essex to the Earl of Rutland: Some Comments', Philological Quarterly, 74:3 (1995); 'The Earl of Essex, Fulke Greville and the Employment of Scholars', Studies in Philology 91 (1994).

<sup>14</sup> Spedding, Francis Bacon, 18-19.

<sup>15</sup> That Vickers confuses the first and 'second' travel letters does not help matters; he mistakenly states that Spedding found our letter in the Harleian MSS, docketed 'the Earl of Essex's advice to the Earl of Rutland in his journey', which actually pertains to the first letter. See Spedding, vol. 9, 4

<sup>16</sup> Robert Devereux et al., Profitable instructions describing what special observations are to be taken by travellers in all nations, states and countries; pleasant and profitable. By the three much admired, Robert, late Earle of Essex. Sir Philip Sidney. And, Secretary Davison (London: Printed [by John Beale?] for Benjamin Fisher, 1633). For an (incomplete) list of extant manuscript copies, see Hammer, 'Employment of Scholars', 171, ft.20.

order to promote Essex at court. He is therefore writing more in order to publicise his expertise in this popular form of advice, espousing humanist ideals on learning and political usefulness, rather than in order to advise Rutland how to travel; an aim which is taken up more in, and indeed necessitates, the two follow-up letters. Hammer points out that this famous first letter shows evidence of revision and refining, as implied by an apparent discrepancy surrounding the date on which it was meant to have been written. He then takes this dual context even further by positing two letters within one, suggesting that the original first letter sent to Rutland had the focus and intention of practical advice, before it then underwent significant revision to create a text that falls more into the bracket of public literature. This is plausible but lacking in evidence. Whether or not one goes this far, the idea behind it is key – there are several intentions and contexts behind the ars apodemica letter, either competing for or sharing the space it holds in our understanding; this becomes clear just by comparing the first and third letters, or the first and our now authorless ‘second’.

It could be argued that the first Essex letter is barely about travel, and certainly not in as practical a manner as the others, rather it is about cultivating the mind, manners, passions, reputation and knowledge, with the episode of travel merely acting as an opportunity to rhetoricize on these subjects. Where the first letter details grandiose reasons as to *why* gaining knowledge is important (‘Without it, there can be no Liberalitie... no Justice... no Constancy or Patience... no temperance’), the third, following the style seen again and again in letters of travel advice, gives an unadorned, protracted list of the appropriate *contents* of this knowledge.<sup>17</sup> The ‘second’ letter (the Lambeth text) offers similar instruction, requiring the traveller to gather information on topographical, anthropological, legal, financial, mercantile and military matters: ‘if as you pass along you shall inquire carefully... you shall thereby sufficiently gather the strength, riches, traffic, havens, shipping, commodities, vent, and the wants and disadvantages of all places’.<sup>18</sup> Where here we see grounded, practical advice, the example of the first Essex-Rutland letter opens up another possible function for the ars apodemica letter (that of intellectual exhibitionism), and shows such texts functioning as more abstract literary items both contemporarily and in their textual afterlife.

---

<sup>17</sup> Devereux, *Profitable Instructions*, 53-5.

<sup>18</sup> Spedding, *Francis Bacon*, 16-17.

Yet there should not be placed too strong a division between practical advice and the essay-style intellectual display of the first Essex-Rutland letter. Though that example is somewhat different from most in that much of its moral advice is not actually specific to travel, its overall rhetorical structure of respectable humanist counsel is shared by travel advice letters of more 'practical' instruction. This blurs the functions of the texts under discussion, and illustrates how they can exist as essays independent of original context. Essex and/or Bacon recognises the slightly problematic status of their chosen format in the first Essex-Rutland letter, positioning it as neither letter nor proper discourse: 'I will here breake off, for I finde that I have both exceeded the convenient length of a Letter, and come short of such discourse as this subject doth deserve'.<sup>19</sup> In *Profitable instructions*, the Essex-Rutland piece is consciously presented as more of an academic treatise, though this is not to deny the probability of an original posting, either as it stood or before adaptation, as Hammer suggests. The red wax seal stuck to one side of the Lambeth letter is clear confirmation that our particular epistle was used and sent as a 'real' missive, yet it too has an afterlife where it is seen more as essay, and in this context functions similarly to Essex's famous text.

Remembering that the Lambeth version is undated and, though sent, need not be the original composition of this letter, there is another attribution and actually a different copy-text that has a fair claim to authenticity, and which takes us further into the above issues. The same letter-text to the Lambeth manuscript – with some substantive differences that will be discussed later – first appears in print under the ascription of the late Fulke Greville to his nephew Grevil Verney, in a collection of the former's works published in 1633.<sup>20</sup> The impression given by the fact that the letter is printed in the volume as one of eight distinct works, following Greville's prose consolatio 'A Letter to an Honourable Lady', is given a voice in Peter Beal's *Index of English literary manuscripts*: these two letters are present in the 1633 volume, in Grosart's nineteenth century collection of Greville's works, and in Beal's index, because 'they are basically essays in epistolary form'.<sup>21</sup> There is no real reason to doubt that Greville sent such a letter in 1609 (as the printed version is dated), since it does give directed person- and

---

<sup>19</sup> Devereux, *Profitable Instructions*, 68-9.

<sup>20</sup> Greville, 295-8, sig. 2R4r -2R5v. The letter within is dated 20 November 1609, and the collection published in 1633.

<sup>21</sup> Beal, *Index of English literary manuscripts*, vol.1, part 2, 103.



geographically-specific advice on travel, which sets it apart from the first Essex-Rutland piece. However, their afterlives as literary texts bring the Essex and Greville letters closer together conceptually.

There is evidence of a wider public interest in the – for argument’s sake – *Greville* letter, beyond the first printing. The multiplicity of surviving manuscript copies of the letter as attributed to Greville suggests one of two things: that either the letter was intentionally circulated in manuscript before the printing, perhaps as display like Essex’s scholarly outputs, or, being treated as a literary text in its own right by those who appreciated its composition, was copied into personal commonplace books and such from the printed text. It is difficult to state with certainty whether print or manuscript circulation came first (though there is some evidence in favour of the latter, as will be shown later), but the immediate context of the copies can tell us something about why they were kept and what they were for.<sup>22</sup> The majority of these twelve copies are estimated to have been made in the early to mid seventeenth century, to be from Greville to Verney or an unnamed kinsman, and are found in composite volumes, often copied alongside state papers and other letters. The location of at least three of these manuscripts suggests that they were copied and kept because they were considered part of this literary tradition of travel advice, showing the texts migrating from personal use to general public interest. Using Beal’s *IELM* references, GrF16 and GrF17 are both preceded in their respective volumes by another well-known letter of travel advice, that of Philip Sidney to his brother Robert during the latter’s continental travels from 1579-82. Accidental differences between these two lettertexts suggest that they may not have been copied from the same source, and so were perhaps independently associated with the Sidney letter. It therefore appears that they were copied for their content by those interested specifically in travel, on top of any attraction to the literary remnants of the famous dead. GrF22 evidences this even more strongly, since it forms part of a manuscript volume of essays on travel, which includes the advice letters of Sidney, Essex, Bacon, Greville and also secretary William Davison, who wrote instructions on travel for his son Francis. Its private owner, the late Bent Juel-Jenson, referred to the volume as the ‘Farmer-Heber

---

<sup>22</sup> None of the manuscript copies are in Greville’s hand, and on examination of their variants Norman Farmer cannot confirm them as pre- or postdating the printed book, Norman K. Farmer, Jr., ‘Fulke Greville’s letter to a cousin in France and the problem of authorship in cases of formula writing’, *Renaissance Quarterly* 22 (1969), 140-7, see 140-2.

MS *Itineraria Collectanea*, and offers a dating of the first quarter of the seventeenth century, which if accurate argues for a manuscript circulation before the 1633 Greville imprint.<sup>23</sup>

One can see here that travel as an art was becoming a subject of increasing intellectual interest. These manuscripts show that letters sent with directed intention to an individual towards the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries are afterward read more widely as interesting discourses on travel, culminating in their print publication (in these cases) in the 1630s. The example of the first Essex-Rutland letter also shows us that this wider readership could be a primary rather than secondary aim. The Greville letter's more grounded, practical advice and person-specific feel suggests that its public life was not the main motivation for its original composition. A pertinent question regarding their life after initial writing might be whether such texts were sometimes copied not out of disinterested appreciation by the armchair traveller but by those wanting to take – or transmit – the advice on travel themselves. Did some people also actively re-use the advice rather than just re-appropriating it for a passive readership?

One example suggesting this active, shared usage can be traced in the papers of Stephen Powle, the youngest son of a chancery clerk, who travelled with Robert Sidney in the early 1580s. A copy of Philip Sidney's famous travel advice letter still lies in Powle's commonplace book in the Bodleian library; we can imagine Robert sharing his brother's political expertise and allowing friends and associates the time to make their own copy of his valued recommendations.<sup>24</sup> Nicholas Popper has identified in Powle's missives a movement towards the type of systematic analysis championed by typical advisory texts following his time spent travelling with Robert Sidney, quite possibly indicating that he used the letter as a practical guide. Evidently Powle followed the philosophy of the *ars apodemica*, since he successfully used the travel as training for his

---

<sup>23</sup> Bent Juel-Jensen, *A highly personal affair: the library of Bent Juel-Jensen* (From the Book Collector, Summer 1966), see 156. Richard Heber (1774-1833) was a book collector who obtained some of his collection from that of Richard Farmer (1735-1797), literary scholar, whose library was sold off after his death. There is an implication in Juel-Jensen's article that this volume was the source for the 1633 *Profitable instructions*, referred to previously in this article as the first imprint of the Essex-Rutland letter.

<sup>24</sup> Bodleian, Oxford, Tanner MSS 169, 262. I am very grateful to Prof. Nicholas Popper for sharing this reference and more general work on Powle.

later employment under Burghley and Walsingham, setting himself up as a competent and scholarly intelligencer via the delivery of information to Burghley in particular. This illustrates the ready application of such texts to both recipient and other readers, and represents another reason for the many extant copies of such letters.

A good visual example of the twin contexts of the copying of travel advice letters is found in the comparison between two manuscripts in the Harley collection at the British Library: 'A breefe Instruccion for a Traviler', MS 1579 fols. 86r-96r, and 'Short instructions for a Traveller', MS 252 fols. 123r-v.<sup>25</sup> Both these consist of travel advice in a Ramist-style diagrammatical form, which is relatively common in both printed and manuscript *ars apodemica* texts. This style takes the aforementioned list-based classificatory approach to the observational method to its most logical extreme, and was an increasingly fashionable way of ordering knowledge on a variety of subjects, including that of travel. As such, the form itself could be part of the motivation for its creation as a literary piece, or could simply represent an effective and portable condensing of data. 'A breefe Instruccion' seems to suggest the former, thus representing the collecting of *ars apodemica* texts as fundamentally a matter of academic interest. It runs to ten pages, and includes mini-summaries of various provinces as well as Ramist-style detailing of what information a traveller should gather on what topics. It is neatly copied into a large bound volume of paper of a uniform size and quality (barring a small number of unconnected folios that have been pasted in separately) and appears to have been written directly into the collection, as witnessed by the fact that on the verso of the last folio of this text there begins a new piece of writing in a different hand. It can therefore be assumed that this text was intended as a purely theoretical treatise, as part of a volume meant for keeping, as befitting the thick paper, neat writing and general maintenance suggested by its good condition. The collection focuses predominantly on political matters and descriptions of other countries and governments, so it may well have been used as a reference book. The fact that the diagrammatical text, inscribed on the vertical edge with 'Intelligentia in. ... Cosmographia ... Politia ... [Aeconomye]', is on the next page translated from Latin to English, and renamed 'Comon places for

---

<sup>25</sup> Sara Warneke mentions these two manuscripts as examples of the informational charts that circulated during the late sixteenth century. See Sara Warneke, Images of the Educational Traveller in Early Modern England (Leiden: E J Brill, 1995), 48, footnote 31. My transcriptions.

intelligences', clearly indicates that it is more academic exercise than intended for practical use.<sup>26</sup>

The second manuscript, however, could be seen to represent the other context of these ars apodemica texts. Whereas the first is a polished exposition of political history and logical form, the second shows evidence of practical use; more a set of guidelines consulted on the move and crumpled back amongst travelling papers. The host volume is a collection of tracts and loose folio sheets bound together, and its earliest provenance attribution binds it to the minor London merchant and avid collector of state papers and other manuscripts, Ralph Starkey – the collector rather than the writer of the papers.<sup>27</sup> The paper is approximately three quarters of the height of the most common size in the volume and thus likely did not belong with any of the other papers before this binding. It also differs markedly in condition, with some tears, ink blots, a particularly scuffed edge along the bottom of the folio, and slight discolouration with general dirt (certainly more so than the rest of the volume). There are also several different fold marks and multiple creases in such a pattern as to suggest the folding and re-folding into a small packet. Whilst this is not conclusive proof that the paper travelled abroad as befits its contents, the condition certainly suggests use and transportation, and stands in stark contrast to the implied function and intention behind the 'polished' diagrams of Harley MS 1579. The 'Short instructions' itself is an extensive but sparsely detailed breakdown of the necessary subjects on which to gather information, divided into 'The Country... The People... The pollycye & goverment thereof'.<sup>28</sup> There is a more or less verbatim copy of the contents, though in a slightly more written list than synoptic table format, in Harley MS 6893, fols. 169r-172v. Like the previous it is undated, but reveals their common source in its title: 'Most brief but excellent Instructions for a Traveller written by Secretary Davison for His Son'. It is the same advisory letter as that found in Juel-Jensen's manuscript anthology *Itineraria Collectanea* and Fisher's *Profitable*

---

<sup>26</sup> British Library, Harley MS 1579, fol. 93v-94r. The square brackets indicate that the word is partly missing due to a small tear in the paper.

<sup>27</sup> C. E. Wright, Fontes Harleiani : a study of the sources of the Harleian collection of manuscripts preserved in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum (London: British Museum, 1972), 314.

<sup>28</sup> Harley MS 252 fol. 123r.

*instructions*.<sup>29</sup> The recto of the first folio here is quite soiled, noticeably more so than the others in the volume or than the following pages, and the address leaf is endorsed 'instructions for a Traveller'.<sup>30</sup> This, coupled with the heavy vertical fold line down the centre indicating that it has been folded up into a long thin packet, and the inclusion of a couple of unwritten sheets at the end of the treatise, suggests its use as a portable unit.

The print and manuscript circulation of these letters thus implies that there was a growing market for their active consultation as well as passive appreciation, particularly when found in a highly portable format like the tiny octodecimo *Profitable instructions* or the clearly folded packets of the condensed Ramistic expositions. In the Davison letter, the list of information to be gathered is not tailored specifically to Francis but rather offers generic instruction typical of the ars apodemica, which illustrates why a letter written ostensibly for an audience of one could easily apply more widely. Indeed, in the 1633 printed version the relevant text is not even marked out as Davison's own, though his name is on the title page; rather it stands alone in the volume as a standard model.<sup>31</sup> One could argue from this for a growing sense of the collective nature of information gathering for the state, where any traveller can have access to instruction on productive knowledge collection. We can see here an extension of the invitation to contribute, both to the wider humanist project of the systematic recording of knowledge, and to the practical gathering of useful information for governmental and courtly figures.

The fact that the letters were freely copied and the contents widely applicable to any reader, rather than being tailored to their original recipient in any substantial way, has a

---

<sup>29</sup> Devereux, sig. Br-C4v. Also see William Streitberger, Edmond Tyllney, Master of the Revels and Censor of Plays: a descriptive index to his diplomatic manual on Europe (New York: AMS Press, 1986) for a modern printing.

<sup>30</sup> Harley MS 6893, fol. 172v.

<sup>31</sup> Although the octavo contains all three advice texts named on its front cover (Secretary Davison's, the earl of Essex's and Philip Sidney's), following the epistle to the reader the sectional title preceding the first text is simply 'Most notable and excellent instructions for travellers', with no attributed author (sig. Br). In contrast, preceding the next two letters is a whole new title page, even complete with publisher's details, that emphasises their (in)famous authors: 'Two Excellent Letters Concerning Travell: One written by the late Earle of Essex the other by Sir Philip Sidney. London, Printed for Benjamin Fisher, at the Signe of the Talbot, without Aldersgate, 1633.' (sig. C5r). This couples the two texts together as letters and as more personalised pieces of writing than Davison's less 'literary' Ramistic diagram. Perhaps then these can be read even more strongly as ars apodemica texts for scholarly consumption: at the least the emphasis on their authorship points to one reason for collecting and reading such texts, that is a sense of their celebrity.

large impact on our interpretation of the Lambeth/Greville letter. It starts to matter less who the original author was, since it is perfectly possible that it was re-used and adapted by people other than its composer. Its author only becomes of central importance once its audience changes from those interested in its contents to those wanting to collect and label it as a literary item. Though there are often idiosyncratic traits of authorship, perhaps more prominent in some letters than others, and personal references to the sender or recipient, on the whole the bulk of the material appears again and again. Stylistically, the personality of the author is tempered by the aforementioned systematic, list-based approach of this genre. The content itself has its roots in verbal advice on moral and physical self-protection; the obvious warnings of elder to youth before the latter ventures beyond parental control. In terms of the political and geographical aspects to observe in a foreign country, the content is common-sensical, with little change even from today – the topographical lie of the land, financial infrastructure, political figures and alliances, and so on. This is why Brian Vickers' previously mentioned argument that draws parallels between the Essex-Rutland trio and Bacon's wider canon falls down when it comes to the Lambeth or supposed 'second' letter. Vickers picks out four points of similarity between the letter and Bacon's 'Of Travel' essay, but the type of instruction here – in essence the list of topics on which to gather knowledge, the encouragement to spend time with local inhabitants and the insistence on keeping a written record – is present throughout the genre.<sup>32</sup>

One of the critical analyses of our letter, Norman K. Farmer's 1969 article, proposes that this formulaic content is evidence that the letters themselves are akin to 'form' letters.<sup>33</sup> He takes the rhetorical style to be that of the 'institutio', or advice from an elder to younger person schooling them in a particular art, and this, together with the fact that it closely follows the advice in printed travel manuals, makes it, for Farmer at least, a formulaic composition. Whether or not they are thought of by their authors as Lipsius-style 'epistolata institutio' and condensations of larger guides to travel, they are certainly heavily influenced by these traditions, but this does not make them the equivalent of

---

<sup>32</sup> Vickers does concede this to some degree, whilst pointing out that even given this tradition of literature the author adds personal touches, concerning Bacon's key interests of 'ingenious inventions' and domestic law. I would argue that legal infrastructure is a subject included by many other advisory texts, and though the mention of inventions is a little more unusual I do not believe it is enough to withstand the counter-evidence to the Bacon claim, and indeed not enough to make one essentially by itself.

model letters of the type found in letterwriting guides. Though I have argued that essentially they could be used in this way, this does not deny their individual flavour and context, particularly for those written with an eye to their likely circulation and the effect this could have on reputation. Similar epistles, such as that from Philip Sidney to his brother, illustrate how such a communiqué could reiterate prescribed advice of public interest, and be shared, circulated and appreciated as a literary text, and yet not constitute a 'form' letter. Perhaps it is the multiplicity of potential authors that encourage viewing our letter as an anonymized formulaic composition, but there are two solid contexts in which it reclaims itself as a personal correspondence. These are the person-specific references in the Greville version in particular, and the substantive differences between it and the Lambeth copy. These take us away from the generic Polonius-style pontificating and back down to the original, practical uses of the sent ars apodemica letter.<sup>34</sup>

The variations between these two texts hold true to the ideas above about re-using the generic advice: the top and tail of the letter have been altered to suit personal circumstance, and the bulk is left the same. The Greville version offers the most personal information, stating sender, recipient, date and geographical references both to the place of writing and the location of the recipient. Though both versions address someone in France, the Greville print version specifies a more precise area by reference to the location from which the recipient's previous letter was sent, Orléans.<sup>35</sup> Surely this tailoring would be pointless if Greville only intended the letter to be circulated as a scholarly piece. The main difference between the two versions (the Lambeth and the Greville) lies in the relative status of sender and recipient. The change turns on the more deferential tone of salutation and subscription in the Lambeth copy, against the familiar

---

<sup>33</sup> See Farmer, 'Fulke Greville's letter', 145.

<sup>34</sup> Polonius's advice to his son Laertes as he departs overseas is a perfect parody of the most moralistic of this type of advice, warning him to look to his intellectual, social and physical well-being (See *Hamlet*, act 1, scene 3).

<sup>35</sup> This is confused somewhat since there is an apparent reference to the recipient residing in the area known as Bigorre in south west France: 'You live indeed in a Country *Bigarre* of two severall Professions'. 'Bigorre' is not mentioned in the Lambeth or Bodley versions, but is in parentheses in the Harley copy of the Greville attribution (BL Harley MS 6908, fols. 89-87). A helpful annotator has written a marginal note in the British Library copy of Alexander B. Grosart's, *The Works in Verse and Prose Complete of the Right Honourable Fulke Greville*, 4 vols, ([S.l.: s.n.], 1870), vol 4, 301-6, (shelfmark 2326.d.8.): 'Bigorre, i.e. now Gascony'. This could either be evidence for the adapted use of another letter, or simply indicate that Verney travelled from Orléans down to the south of France.

terms of address – ‘Cousin’ rather than ‘Lordship’ – and inclusion of monetary gift in the Greville: ‘I have sent you by your Merchant [30li] for your present supply’.<sup>36</sup>

This has big implications for the subtext of the letter. Firstly, the mention of money allows the letter to be seen as functioning as a sort of propaganda for Greville in a second way, on top of the aforementioned intellectual display. If the manuscript circulation predates the publication, this could be as a display of beneficence or, if circulation followed publication, as post-mortem reputation management by his supporters. Shortly before the Greville publication, John Verney, brother of the letter’s stated recipient, complained to the principal secretary and overseer of the edition, John Coke, that their richer kinsman Fulke never wrote such a letter to Verney, but rather sent it to their cousin John Harris. The attribution, Verney claimed, was the result of malicious ulterior motives:

This is some trick...as to possess the world with an opinion that my Lord Brooke should be at great charge with breeding my brother and so take off the charge of the world for what injury he hath otherwise done my brother<sup>37</sup>

Fighting between in-laws over perceived neglect in Greville’s will or his parsimonious reputation during his lifetime could account for the ‘injury’ mentioned, and so Verney’s claim is plausible. However, Coke, who was a close friend of Greville, saw fit to proceed with the publication, and the Verney family also had their own obvious reputational motives, so it is hard to know whom to believe. It is worth mentioning that the printed version retains the sentence but leaves a lacuna where the amount of money is specified, maybe in order to placate the irate Verneys. Some of the manuscripts, however, do include the amount, possibly indicating access to an original and so a predating of the print, as Alexander B. Grosart suggests when he offers his collated version in the 1870 *The Works in Verse and Prose Complete of the Right Honourable Fulke Greville*.<sup>38</sup> That aside, one thing this complication does clarify is how the letter itself was interpreted by its contemporaries: Verney takes offence because it clearly

---

<sup>36</sup> Greville, 295, sig. 2R4r. As will be discussed, the sum of money is not specified in the printed version, but is included in some of the manuscript copies, for example Harley MS 6908.

<sup>37</sup> See HMC, *The Manuscripts of the Earl Cowper*, (London, 1888) vol. 1, 483-4.

<sup>38</sup> Grosart, *Works in Verse and Prose*, vol.4, 301-6.



implies an indebtedness, a financial relationship that makes the author not just kindly advisor but expectant patron, and thus casts the recipient in the role of subordinate.

The sense of business transaction is keenly felt in the printed version; monetary gift and practical return are linked by apophasis in the protestation that the writer is 'no severe exacter of Account, either of your Mony or Time', which in its denial obligates the recipient.<sup>39</sup> This implicit financial patronage can also be seen in Philip Sidney's letter to Robert, where he writes that their uncle the earl of Leicester sends £40 with a view to continue such support. The elder brother advises: 'write largely and diligently unto him, for in troth I have good proof that he means to be every way good unto you'.<sup>40</sup> One could argue that the letters are simply disinterested, kindly counsel, rather than any attempt to obligate a return, but the references to money stress what is already there; that there is a real expectation that the information to be gathered under the topics listed will be shared. Whilst the writer of our letter adheres to the tradition of warning the young traveller to protect his moral virtue and give himself full benefit of the learning available to him, the main function is to explain the type of information the sender would like relayed. This may, he states, 'make your life more profitable to your country, and yourself more comfortable to your friends', which employs indirect language to couple the dual motivations of this information gathering, that is of patriotism and personal advancement.<sup>41</sup> His closing comments seal the deal more overtly, and stress in a friendly but firm tone the expected response: 'If in this time of your liberal traffic, you will give me any advertisement of your commodities in these kinds, I will make you as liberal a return from myself and your friends here, as I shall be able'.<sup>42</sup> Thus we can see that within the courtly advice there is practical dealing, where the terms of the trade – 'commodities' and 'return' – are set out.

Even with the reference to money absent, the Lambeth text retains enough from the above examples to be read as an attempt to create this type of patronage arrangement. The explicit subordination objected to by John Verney is reduced by the respectful tone, yet there is still a sense of expectation. The slight downplaying helps us to view this

---

<sup>39</sup> Quoted here from Reliquiae Bodleianae, 364, sig. Aa6v. The lettertext is substantially the same in the Greville copies.

<sup>40</sup> Stuart Pears, The Correspondence of Philip Sidney and Hubert Languet, (Farnborough, 1971), 223.

<sup>41</sup> Reliquiae Bodleianae, 369, sig. Bbr.

information exchange in a more subtle manner, reminding us that it belongs in the realm of civilian letterwriting rather than that of professional espionage and employed agents. Thus the young recipient is not to chase after court gossip 'lyke an Intelligencer', but to seek 'more constant ground' in the constitution of the country's political framework, in order to fulfill the duty of informing himself, his patron, and his country on foreign affairs.<sup>43</sup> Stewart and Knight point out that the respectful tone of this version makes it even more unlikely that it was written by Bacon on behalf of Essex; one can hardly imagine Essex pleading of the young Rutland 'your Lps: pardon for this bouldenes' or that he would 'moste humblye take leave'.<sup>44</sup>

Returning for the last time to the issue of authorship, one wonders if the other possible contender for this version, that is, Thomas Bodley writing to Francis Bacon, would fit this tone of address. Since the letter is later printed under this ascription it has a valid authorial claim akin to that of Greville, and if it was sent by Bodley this would predate Greville's purported sending, making him the creative author. As Bacon is the recipient in this construction, and this sent letter lies amongst his papers, it could be supposed that this physical object was the original that was later adapted, sent and circulated by Greville, then printed under both his and the original author's name. However, as we have seen from attempts to use the Lambeth letter's current location as proof for a connection with Bacon, there is simply not enough evidence for this. The humility of tone need not be evidence against this ascription, considering the normality of self-deprecation in letters, and the fact that (at the most likely dating; 1576-79) Bodley was a travelling scholar trying to break into government service, writing to the well-placed younger son of Lord Keeper Bacon.<sup>45</sup> However, without sender and addressee marked on the letter, it could easily have been written by someone else to Bacon, or collected by him as a matter of interest, or simply have been caught up in his papers by mistake.

---

<sup>42</sup> Reliquiae Bodleianae, 369, sig.Bbr.

<sup>43</sup> Reliquiae Bodleianae, 367, sig.Aa8r.

<sup>44</sup> LPL MS 936, 218, [2r].

<sup>45</sup> Francis Bacon travelled to France in 1576 until the death of his father effected his return in early 1579. He joined the diplomatic entourage of Sir Amias Paulet, and spent some time lodging with a civil lawyer, Markku Peltonen, 'Bacon, Francis, Viscount St Alban (1561–1626)', Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2007 [<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.catalogue.ulrls.lon.ac.uk/view/article/990>, accessed 3 May 2011], hereafter ODNB.

This leaves the printed Bodley to Bacon ascription. The lettertext in this copy is near-identical to that by Greville, and due to the aforementioned specificity of this version both men cannot have sent the exact same text.<sup>46</sup> This means that either the Bodley or Greville attributions are mistaken, or that Bodley wrote the letter and it is printed as his but mistakenly in a later format, after Greville personalised the text. The conditions specified by this version seem to suit Greville's situation at that time. He states 'I have sent you by your Merchant 30li for your present supply, and had sent you a greater summe, but that my extraordinary charges this yeere have utterly unfurnished me', which fits with the fact that by 1609 when the letter is dated, Greville had been engaged for some years in refurbishing Warwick castle, his seventh residence, at huge cost.<sup>47</sup> Despite aspersions cast over his liberality, Greville is seen elsewhere actively sponsoring travellers, including John Coke in earlier years, for whom he provided as much as £200 per annum and a commission to travel on behalf of the earl of Essex.<sup>48</sup> On top of this, Stewart and Knight point out that Grevil Verney did travel in France at this time, and there is evidence that Greville gave him some financial support.<sup>49</sup> It remains possible that Bodley sent an earlier version of the letter to Bacon, since the copying and re-using of such texts has been shown to have been accepted practice, stemming more perhaps from the lack of authorial control in a manuscript culture rather than from any morally-loaded sense of plagiarism. If Bacon received either form of the letter, it can only have been in the late 1570s when as a young man he was sent to France to complete his education under the guidance of the ambassador Sir Amias Paulet. At this time Bodley was also in France, cultivating government contacts and laying the ground for his career in diplomacy. Known to be a precocious child, with a brother already working as an intelligencer, as well as being ideally placed to gather information at the centre of

---

<sup>46</sup> The primary difference is in accidentals, though there are very rare substantial differences, e.g. 'the debased Age', 'this debauched Age'; 'Ordinances, Strength, and Progress of each', 'ordinances, progresse, & strength of each'. Though the bulk of the subscription is identical, the final signing-off differs: 'Your's to be commanded, Thomas Bodleigh.', 'Your very loving Cousin, FULKE GREVILL. From Hackney this 20. of November, 1609.'

<sup>47</sup> *Reliquiae Bodleianae*, 364, sig.Aa6v. For Greville, see John Gouws, 'Greville, Fulke, first Baron Brooke of Beauchamps Court (1554–1628)', *ODNB*.

<sup>48</sup> Ronald Rebholz, *The life of Fulke Greville, first Lord Brooke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 96.

<sup>49</sup> Stewart with Knight, *Early Writings 1584-1596*, forthcoming.

Anglo-French diplomatic activity, Bacon could well have represented an ideal prospect to Bodley at this time.<sup>50</sup>

Bodley was later to correspond with both Anthony and Francis Bacon on the level of friendship, and in fact next to the travel advice letter in the 1686 Parr volume is another from Bodley to Francis Bacon, dated 18 February 1607, commenting on his new book, the *Novum organum*.<sup>51</sup> There is no question over the authenticity of this letter (there are extant manuscript copies as well as this imprint), which could add credibility to Parr's inclusion of the one on travel advice. Essentially, it seems odd that Parr would invent a new attribution for the letter, which is incidental to the main project of the volume, being an account of the life of the archbishop and scholar James Ussher, complete with an extensive collection of letters. It seems reasonable to assume that our letter, with its Bodley-Bacon details, was found amongst Ussher's papers as per the claim of Richard Parr (one of Ussher's chaplains) simply because there seems no reason for him to have preferred it to be by Bodley rather than Greville. Yet one should recognise that the *Life* itself does have an agenda and certain reputational motives. The volume is published thirty years after Ussher's death, and competes with a large quantity of posthumous publication, beginning with the printing of his funeral sermon by former chaplain Nicholas Bernard. This was followed by several of Ussher's own works, all of which contributed to the process of moulding and managing his reputation.<sup>52</sup> The politico-religious threats of the 1680s influenced Parr's further re-shaping of the archbishop's afterlife, and he sought to emphasise his subject's religious moderation by downplaying Ussher's puritan associates and retaining his severe anti-catholicism – an emphasis particularly relevant and risky on James II's accession. Both Greville and Bodley were firm protestants and so on current evidence there is little reason to suppose a direct correlation between agenda and the ascription of the letter. Yet it remains important to recognise the reasons behind publication, the fact that there was already a 'Life' of Ussher on the market, and that Parr's publication came thirty years after the supposed owner of all these letters died.

---

<sup>50</sup> See Clare Howard, *English Travellers of the Renaissance* (London; New York: J. Lane, 1914), 43: 'for observation and experience, there was no place so advantageous as the household of an ambassador, if one was fortunate enough to win an entry there'.

<sup>51</sup> Parr, *James Usher*, sig. 5E2r-5F2r.

<sup>52</sup> Alan Ford, 'Ussher, James (1581–1656)', *ODNB*.

In addition, though the title page claims the three hundred letters to have been ‘collected and published from original copies under their own hands’, there is no extant original manuscript, or indeed contemporarily copied manuscript, under Bodley’s name.<sup>53</sup> The letter is at least circulated as Greville’s during or just after his lifetime – the long years passing between the deaths of Bodley, Bacon, and also Ussher and the first known identification of the letter as by Bodley adds such a gulf that a misattribution somewhere along the way is entirely possible. The apparently earlier version in Lambeth Palace could be seen as having greater authority as copy-text than either the Greville or Bodley texts, since being a sent missive it is closer to an original intention than those mediated by the printing process (or even by manuscript circulation) years after purported postage. However, we simply don’t know how the two versions are connected; it could in fact be a later – re-used – copy.

Essentially, the truth of who first penned this letter is not so important. Through its varying contexts, afterlives and the ways in which it has been read, it becomes for us both an object of interest and a tool through which other matters can be discussed. Its functions vary from personal letter of honest counsel, intellectual display meant for circulation, formulaic letter of prescribed advice, or invitation to a patronage relationship based on intelligencing and information gathering. In these different guises, as facilitated by the question over authorship and by its multiple representation through different media, light is cast not just on the letter itself but on each of the thematic and archival topics it engages. We see it operating in a literary context, circulated in manuscript and printed for a market keen to read these texts of popular interest; in a context where it works to promote the author’s scholarship and possibly beneficence; in an afterlife where it becomes embroiled in sharp debates on shared authorship and ghost-writing; and as part of a practical tradition of scholarly and fiscal support, where the sentiment is so widely applicable that the letter could easily have been copied and re-used by different senders. Though it seems likely from the evidence that Greville composed the letter, a black and white certainty is simply not possible. However, I would argue that this isn’t a problem, since solution is not my primary aim. After all, Alice may not have known where she was heading as she leapt down that rabbit hole, but it made for an interesting journey.

---

<sup>53</sup> Parr, James Usher, title page.

A LETTER OF TRAVEL ADVICE? LITERARY RHETORIC, SCHOLARLY COUNSEL AND 22  
PRACTICAL INSTRUCTION IN THE ARS APODEMICA

Elizabeth Williamson

Queen Mary, University of London