*Sergey V. Baigushev, Evgeny A. Khvalkov, Feliks E. Levin, Anastasia M. Novikova, Adrian A. Selin, Aleksandra D. Shisterova, Maksim D. Shkil, Irina D. Yakovleva*

# THE IMAGE OF THE OTHER IN EARLY MODERN IMPERIAL DISCOURSES: VENETIAN DISCOURSE ABOUT ISTRIA AND ENGLISH DISCOURSE ABOUT IRELAND

## BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM
## WORKING PAPERS

*Sergey V. Baigushev[1], Evgeny A. Khvalkov[2], Feliks E. Levin[3], Anastasia M. Novikova[4], Adrian A. Selin[5], Aleksandra D. Shisterova[6], Maksim D. Shkil[7], Irina D. Yakovleva[8]*

# THE IMAGE OF THE OTHER IN EARLY MODERN IMPERIAL DISCOURSES: VENETIAN DISCOURSE ABOUT ISTRIA AND ENGLISH DISCOURSE ABOUT IRELAND[9]

This paper is focused on the image of the Other in early modern European imperial discourses as exemplified by Venetian discourse about Istria and English discourse about Ireland, which have not been previously compared, in the narratives by Pietro Coppo, Fynes Moryson, John Davies and Barnabe Rich.

The authors of the article have analyzed mechanisms of construction of the Image of the Other and political or rhetorical context of its instrumentalization. The examination of English imperial discourses about Ireland and Venetian discourse has demonstrated instrumentalist nature of early modern ethnographic discourses of the Other. Imperial discourse of the Other justified sovereignty of the metropole over the periphery and also communicated knowledge about the Other in order to suggest possible solutions to the problems of governance.

Key words: imperial discourse; early modern ethnography; Venice; Ireland; Pietro Coppo; Fynes Moryson; Sir John Davies; Barnabe Rich

JEL Classification: Z19

[1] National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). E-mail: svbaygushev@edu.hse.ru

[2] National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). Department of History. Associate Professor. E-mail: ekhvalkov@hse.ru

[3] National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). Department of History. Senior Lecturer.E-mail: flevin@hse.ru

[4] National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). E-mail: amnovikova_3@edu.hse.ru

[5] National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). Department of History. Professor. E-mail: aselin@hse.ru

[6] National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). E-mail: adshisterova@edu.hse.ru

[7] National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). E-mail: mdshkil@edu.hse.ru

[8] National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg). E-mail: idyakovleva@edu.hse.ru

# Introduction

The postcolonial turn in historiography exerted a complex impact on early modern studies[10]. On the one hand, with its focus on power-knowledge[11] it stimulated research interest in the image of the Other in early modern ethnographic discourses and its connection with the establishment of power relations and hierarchies. On the other hand, it defined certain asymmetries: current early modern scholarship echoing the spatial scope of postcolonial studies is too preoccupied with European encounters with non-Christian Other in Asia, Africa and America[12] leaving the issue of the Other in early modern Europe aside.

Our research group "Languages of describing the Other in early modern Europe: social contexts and repertoires of interpretation" considers such imbalance unjustified because it deepens the distinction, following the words of David Armitage, between territorial extension of European states and 'external expansion' of European maritime empires thus separating the histories of states and empires[13]. This distinction, in the opinion of David Armitage[14], Barbara Fuchs[15], and Michael Hechter[16], obscures the fact that medieval and early modern European history itself was the product of expansion and colonization, and that the discursive strategies of "othering" which constructed the difference between centre and periphery and produced cultural hierarchies instrumental in the control and transformation of the territories were characteristic of not only early modern European colonies, but of the European 'metropole' as well.

Therefore, by switching the focus from the image of the Other in the New World to the image of the Other in the Old World our research group is advocating 'integrated' history of early modern ethnographic discourses which will answer the question concerning instrumentality

---

[10] About the postcolonial turn see: Doris Bachmann-Medick, *Cultural turns: new orientations in the study of culture* (Berlin, 2016), 131-174; about postcolonial turn in pre-modern studies see: *Postcolonial moves: medieval through modern*, eds. P. C. Ingham, M. R.Warren (New York, 2003); James Tindal Acken, 'Post-Colonialism in Medieval Studies' in *Handbook of medieval studies: terms - methods – trends*, ed. A. Classen (Berlin, 2010): 1137-1140. We would like to distinguish here between postcolonial turn which directly or indirectly influenced research foci, ideological mindsets and analytical categories used by early modern students, and postcolonial theory whose influence on early modern studies is less pronounced and is mostly restricted to early modern literary studies. This distinction is important because not all seminal works which influenced the turn to the image of the Other in early modern historiography belong to the field of post-colonial studies: Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London, 1979), Steven Greenblatt, *Renaissance self-fashioning from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago, 1980), idem, *Marvelous possessions: The wonder of the New World* (Chicago, 1991), Homi K. Bhabha, *The location of culture* (London, 1994).
[11] Bachmann-Medick, *Cultural turns,* 131; Ania Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* (London, 1998), 43
[12] For instance: Stephanie Leitch, *mapping ethnography in early modern Germany: new worlds in print culture* (New York, 2010); Carina L. Johnson, *Cultural hierarchy in sixteenth-century Europe: the Ottomans and Mexicans* (Cambridge, 2011); Shankar Raman, *Renaissance literature and postcolonial studies* (Edinburgh, 2011); *Inventing Americans in the age of discovery: narratives of encounter*, ed. M. Householder (Burlington, 2011); *Practices of coexistence. Constructions of the other in early modern perceptions*, eds. M. D. Birnbaum, M. Sebok (Budapest, 2017); Elizabeth Horodowich, *The Venetian discovery of America: geographic imagination in the age of encounters* (Cambridge, 2018).
[13] David Armitage, *The ideological origins of the British empire* (Cambridge, 2004), 13-14
[14] Ibid, 1-23.
[15] Barbara Fuchs, 'Imperium Studies: Theorizing Early Modern Expansion' in *Postcolonial moves*: 71-92.
[16] Michael Hechter, *Internal colonialism: the Celtic fringe in British national development* (Berkeley, 1999).

of the image of the Other in European internal and overseas expansion and will examine early modern ethnography as a system of knowledge in an attempt to identify universal mechanisms and patterns of describing the Other and repertoires of interpretation of otherness which were deployed in particular contexts. By stating such a comparative perspective, we are assuming the similarity of the languages of the Other in early modern Europe and overseas which were founded on common intellectual resources (Biblical ethnography (Testament and the works of religious authorities[17]); Classical works in ethnography, history, and philosophy known to early modern European audience[18]; medieval and early modern political thought;[19] and medieval and early modern collections of manners and customs[20]).

The ideal outcome of such research project would be a nuanced typology of early modern ethnographic discourses since more often than not inquiries into them are limited to particular empires and regions. In order to do so our research group would like to employ the approach of critical discourse analysis which will enable to examine conceptual and linguistic strategies of representation of the Other in connection with social context thus not only answering the question of *what* the image of the Other meant but also *how* it was constructed[21].

## Early modern imperial discourses: the image of the Other English discourse about Ireland and Venetian discourse about Istria

In this paper, which is aimed at demonstrating our approach, we would like to focus on the image of the Other in early modern European imperial discourses. It is a reminder that internal expansion of the authority of the European states in the 16th-17th centuries was sometimes accompanied by imperial discourse, and ethnographic observation was its integral element[22]. In the context of this work, we define imperial discourse as claims to sovereignty over diverse

---

[17] Colin Kidd, *British identities before nationalism: ethnicity and nationhood in the Atlantic world, 1600 – 1800* (Cambridge, 2004), 9-33; idem, *The forging of races: race and scripture in the Protestant Atlantic world, 1600-2000* (Cambridge, 2006).

[18] For example, see: Margaret T. Hodgen, *Early anthropology in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (Philadelphia, 1964), 17–48; Peter Mason, 'Classical ethnography and its influence on the European perception of the peoples of the New World', in *The Classical tradition and the Americas: European images of the Americas and the classical tradition,* eds. W. Hasse, M. Reinhold (Berlin, 1994): 135–172.

[19] Marshall T. Poe, "*A people born to slavery" : Russia in early modern European ethnography*, 1476-1748 (Ithaca, 2002), 150-167.

[20] Some pre-modern ethnographic works themselves informed ethnographic discourses of the period such as Johann Boemus's *Omnium Gentium Mores, Leges et Ritus*, which, according to Margaret Hodgen, initiated literary and ethnological genre. Hodgen, *Early anthropology*, 131-143.

[21] What makes this type of discourse analysis suitable for our research objectives is that it is the most text-oriented and focused on dominance relations. Teun A. van Dijk, 'Principles of critical discourse analysis', *Discourse and society* 42, no. 2 (1993): 249-283; Norman Fairclough, *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research* (London, 2003), idem, *Discourse and social change* (Cambridge, 2016).

[22] David Armitage, 'Introduction' in *Theories of Empire, 1450-1800*, ed. David Armitage (London, 2016): XXIIII.

territories and peoples and claims to domination of one historical-cultural model[23] over others to justify cultural hierarchies and unequal relationships between constituent parts of the state[24]. We would like to highlight that colonial discourse was a subtype of imperial discourse since the latter not always propagated colonization of subordinate territory, sometimes legitimizing union or other forms of incorporation[25].

The scholars studying different early modern composite monarchies and empires have already demonstrated that image of the Other was a necessary foundation for political claims to subjection of certain territory and its peoples[26], and that it informed and justified certain governmental practices in subordinate territories[27]. Therefore, in this article we would like to posit early modern ethnographic discourse not only as a legitimating language, but as a system of knowledge of the Other which could be put in service of empire-building[28]. In early modern time awareness of the customs and manners of subordinate population was regarded as 'a requisite for being an effective statesman'[29], and by means of ethnographic observations the intellectuals and the officials tried to communicate their knowledge to the centre in order to give an explicit or implicit advice concerning policy-making[30]. In this study, we attempt to find similarities between imperial discourses of the Other and to analyze how they were organized so as to attain a more nuanced understanding of the production of the knowledge of the Other in early modern time.

As objects of comparison, we have chosen early modern English imperial discourse about Ireland and early modern Venetian discourse about Istria. We have selected these regions deliberately for several reasons. Firstly, the sources which we have examined were not intertextually connected, which enables us to test our hypothesis about the existence of some universal mechanisms of the construction of the image of the Other in early modern Europe.

---

[23] We are not emphasizing the notion of superiority of one people over another so as not to fall into anachronism when studying early modern Europe.

[24] To certain extent this definition is a reflection on: A. Pagden, *Lords of all the world: ideologies of empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500-c.1800* (New Haven, 2005), 12-27; Armitage, *The ideological origins of the British Empire*, 29-36; Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, 43-56.

[25] See John Robertson, 'Empire and union: two concepts of the early modern European political order' in *Theories of Empire*: 11-44.

[26] Nicholas P. Canny, 'The ideology of English colonization: from Ireland to America', *The William and Mary Quarterly* 30, no. 4 (1973): 575-598; Anthony Pagden, 'Dispossessing the barbarian: the language of Spanish Thomism and the debate over the property rights of the American Indians' in *The languages of political theory in early modern Europe*, ed. A. Pagden (Cambridge, 1987), 79-98; idem, *Lords of all the world,* 29-62;

[27] Canny, 'The ideology of English colonization'; Michael Braddick, *State formation in early modern England, c. 1550-1700* (Cambridge, 2004), 340-378; Thomas Brochard, 'The 'civilizing' of the Far North of Scotland, 1560-1640' (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Aberdeen, 2010): 110-181.

[28] It does not necessarily mean that it was anyhow used.

[29] Kathryn Taylor, 'Making statesmen, writing culture: ethnography, observation, and diplomatic travel in early modern Venice', *Journal of Early Modern History* 22 (2018): 1-20.

[30] Arndt Brendecke, *The empirical empire: Spanish colonial rule and the politics of* knowledge (Berlin, 2016), 111-150.

Secondly, we would like to 'turn' the discussion to the European continent since discursive processes accompanying early modern English experience in Ireland and Venetian experience have been rarely placed in the European context. Since the second half of the 20th century Irish historiography has been studying the issues of internal colonialism. David Quinn was the first to regard Tudor expansion as a prologue to its westward expansion and to find similarities between the image of the Irish and the image of the Indians of the New World[31]. Nicholas P. Canny contributed to the Atlantic paradigm of British history[32] by asserting that English colonists in Ireland were aware of Spanish colonial experience, and the image of the Irish they produced was modelled on travel literature with which they were familiar, and in which the image of the barbarian was vividly described.

As regards Venetian expansion, only recently Venetian intellectual discovery of the America has been compared with other European encounters with American population[33] but the role of the image of the Other in Venetian mainland expansion has escaped scholarly attention.

Therefore, in this case study we would like to conflate English imperial discourse about Ireland and Venetian imperial discourse about Istria in order to overcome separation between Atlantic and Mediterranean discursive history of empire-building and in order to seek universal mechanisms of constructions of the image of the Other. In doing so, we attempt to highlight some elements on imperial discourse structure which have not been identified before.

Moreover, we assume that our choice of the objects of comparison is also justified by other factors. In both cases the object of description is a peripheral European other. All of the examined authors were colonists who pursued either civil, or military career in the country they described. Besides that, the examined authors to a certain extent shared cultural background: they either had university education or were well self-educated. It is also necessary to take into account that all imperial discourses, according to Anthony Pagden, were derived from the reception of languages and political models of the Roman Empire[34].

We have selected the sources for analysis which belong to different genres in order to show that imperial discourse in early modern time transcended boundaries of the genre. Among

[31] David B. Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith (1513-1577) and the beginnings of English colonial theory', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 89, no.4 (1945): 543-560; idem, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca, 1966); idem, *Explorers and colonies: America, 1500-1625* (London, 1990).

[32] Nicholas P. Canny, 'The ideology of English colonization': 575-598; idem, *The Elizabethan conquest of Ireland: a pattern established, 1565-76* (New York, 1976); idem, *Kingdom and colony: Ireland in the Atlantic world 1560–1800* (Baltimore-London, 1987). John P. Montano has recently deepened Quinn's and Canny's argument about intellectuals origins of English colonialism: John P. Montano, *The roots of English colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge, 2011).

[33] Natalie Rothman, *Brokering empire: trans-imperial subjects between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca, 2012); Horodowich, *The Venetian discovery of America*.

[34] Pagden, *Lords of all the world,* 11.

English sources we have chosen fragments from the *Itinerary* written by Fynes Moryson dedicated to Ireland. Fynes Moryson was born in 1566 in the family of Lincolnshire gentleman. He had university education having studied at Peterhouse Cambridge and then at the European universities in the 1580s-90s. After his travels across Europe, he was summoned to work as a secretary to Charles Blount, 8th Baron Mountjoy, Lord Deputy of Ireland in 1600. There he participated in the Nine Years War, in which royal forces tried to suppress the rebellion of Hugh O'Neill. In 1603, he returned to England with his patron. There from 1609 to 1625 he worked on his *Itinerary*, a four-part account of his travels in Europe in 1591 and 1595, and to the Holy Land between 1595-1597[35], which also included the description of Ireland and his experience there.

Moryson's *Itinerary* represents a typical example of early modern travel writing. Even though originally *Itinerary* was in Latin, its first three parts were published in English in 1617. Its second part dealt with Ireland[36]. These three parts represented the accounts of Moryson's journeys with some historical interpolations and the narrative of the history of Tyrone's rebellion in Ireland. The fourth part of the Itinerary, also written in English, was published only 300 years later after the death of the author[37]: it was concerned with observations of political organization, religion and customs and manners of the countries he had visited, including Ireland.

Although scholars recognize that in *Itinerary* Moryson articulated imperial discourse about Ireland[38], they paid only fragmentary attention to his text. Graham David Kew and John Cramsie examined *Itinerary* in a more detailed way from different perspectives: Kew did it through the prism of source criticism demonstrating from what contemporary and Classical works Moryson borrowed and what discursive patterns he followed[39] and classifying Moryson's world as an exemplar of early modern primitive anthropology, whereas Cramsie emphasized that Moryson's *Itinerary* represented discursive appropriation of the British space, intellectual discovery of islands, and assertion of English superiority. Moryson followed in the footsteps of his more renowned contemporary, William Camden, who published first edition of *Britannia*, a chorographical description of the crystallizing British composite monarchy[40]. However, Cramsie

---

[35] Graham David Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited: The unpublished itinerary of Fynes Moryson (1566–1630)' (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Birmingham University, 1995): i – ii, lviii-lxxv.

[36] Fynes Moryson, *An itinerary containing his ten yeeres travell through the twelve dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turky, France, England, Scotland & Ireland, Glasgow, J. MacLehose and Sons*, IV, 185-203.

[37] The unpublished fragments of Morysons's Itinerary were published by Charles Hughes in 1903 but we are relying here on the complete edition of the fourth part by Graham Kew. Graham David Kew, ed., 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited: 651-798, 1175-1199, 1673-1702.

[38] For example: Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish.*

[39] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': xc- cclxxiv.

[40] John Cramsie, *British travellers and the encounter with Britain, 1450–1700* (Suffolk, 2015), 181-324.

does not concentrate too much on Moryson's discourse about Ireland, that is why it still remains underexamined.

John Davies was born in 1569 and obtained legal education in the Middle Temple. Since 1603 he began his career in Ireland achieving the status of the Attorney-General in 1606[41]. He is regarded as one of the main architects of the Jacobean policy of conquest of Ireland[42]. In 1612, he published his treatise *A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued[43]*, which was one of the most popular texts on Ireland in the first half of the seventeenth century[44]. In it, he observed the history of Ireland and tried to explain the reasons for previous failures to subdue Ireland and to explain the success of Jacobean conquest.

Davies believed that Ireland could be reformed by means of common law but only after having been entirely conquered. This position made Nicholas Canny and Clare Carroll think that the English lawyer merely developed the colonial project suggested by one of the most active proponents of aggressive conquest of Ireland, Edmund Spenser[45].

Recent scholarship views Davies's vision of the conquest of Ireland as completely different from one designed by Spenser: the project of the English lawyer emphasized more legal assimilation of Gaelic population which did not necessarily entail entire destruction of Irish society and was more based on reform than on coercion[46]. That is why Hans Pawlisch considered Davies a proponent of legal imperialism. It was stressed that Davies's argument was largely inspired by continental legal traditions, for example, by Spanish legal theories which justified Spanish conquest of the Americas[47].

For Davies, the divide between English and Irish was more manifested in law than in culture, and law, in his rendering, was the defining criterion of civilization or barbarity[48]. Due to the legal character of the imperial discourse articulated by Davies, the image of the Other in his

---

[41] Hans S. Pawlisch, *Sir John Davies and the conquest of Ireland: a study in legal imperialism* (Cambridge, 1985), 15-22, 30

[42] Nicholas P. Canny, 'Edmund Spenser and the development of an Anglo-Irish identity', *The Yearbook of English Studies* 13 (1983), 15; Aidan Clarke, 'Pacification, plantation, and the Catholic question, 1603–23' in *A New History of Ireland: Early Modern Ireland 1534- 1691*, eds. T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin, F.. J. Byrne (Oxford, 2009): 188-215.

[43] Sir John Davies, 'A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued nor brought under obedience of the Crown of England until the Beginning of His Majesty's happy Reign (...) 1612' in *Ireland under Elizabeth and James the First*, ed. H. Morley (London, 1890): 217-342.

[44] Pádraig Lenihan, *Consolidating conquest: Ireland 1603-1727* (London, 2014), 42.

[45] Canny, 'Edmund Spenser and the development of an Anglo-Irish Identity': 15; Clare Carroll, *Circe's cup: cultural transformations in early modern writing about Ireland* (Cork, 2001), 13-14.

[46] Pawlisch, *Sir John Davies*, 55-83; D. Alan Orr, 'From a view to a discovery: Edmund Spenser, Sir John Davies, and the defects of law in the realm of Ireland', *Canadian Journal of History* 38 (2003): 403–408; Marie Sophie Hingst, 'One phenomenon, three perspectives. English colonial strategies in Ireland revisited, 1603-1680' (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2018): 52-82.

[47] Hingst, 'One phenomenon, three perspectives': 61-62.

[48] Ibid, 70.

texts was not contextualized enough, and ethnographic discourse — overlooked[49]. In this paper, we will try to demonstrate that Davies's imperial discourse also had some ethnographic elements.

The third protagonist of our paper is Barnabe Rich — the English captain who served in Ireland since 1570s until he obtained a pension in 1606. Unlike Moryson and Davies, he did not have university education, but is believed to have been self-educated and to have been familiar with the classics in translation[50]. In 1610, he published *A New Description of Ireland* (1610) [51], which was dedicated to the Irish.

Several scholars have turned to Barnabe Rich but have not examined the discourse *A new description* in a nuanced manner. Joep Leerssen considered the image of the Irish in Rich's works and highlighted that it was religiously dominated, i.e. Irish barbarity was defined by their Catholicism[52]. Yet Leerssen did not characterize this discourse as imperial. Clare Carroll added that Rich actively used the language of adultery and prostitution in order to demonstrate decay of Catholic Irish and English population in Ireland[53]. Andrew Hadfield asserted that Rich hated Catholic Old English, descendants of first Anglo-Norman colonists, more than Irish[54]. Constance C. Relihan pointed out that the primary objective of Rich's text was not the description of Ireland, but an attack on Catholicism — Ireland as a physical entity was almost absent in his works, thus serving only as a mirror for reflection on general confessional issues[55]. The Irish were equated to the Turks by Rich[56]. According to Relihan, Rich's narratives were full of didacticism which tried to educate the readers about different vicious social practices[57].

From the Venetian side, we have turned to Pietro Coppo[58], a Venetian geographer and cartographer who described Istria. He was born in 1469/70 and was educated in Scuola di San

---

[49] Orr, for instance, distinguishes between ethnological mode of narrative proposed by Spenser and sovereignty-centered narrative proposed by Davies. Orr, 'From a view to discovery': 407-408. In our opinion, Orr underestimates the role of ethnicity in Davies's oeuvre.

[50] 'Rich Barnabe' in *Dictionary of national biography. Volume XLVIII: Reilly-Robins*, ed. Sidney Lee (New York, London, 1896): 105.

[51] *A new description of Ireland wherein is described the disposition of the Irish whereunto they are inclined. No lesse admirable to be perused then credible to be beleeved: neither unprofitable nor unpleasant to bee read and understood, by those worthy cittizens of London that be now undertakers in Ireland: by Barnabe Rich, Gent* (London., 1610). http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A10713.0001.001 (date of access: 20.10.2020)

[52] Joep Leerssen, *Mere Irish & fíor-ghael: studies in the idea of Irish nationality, its development, and literary expression prior to the nineteenth century* (Amsterdam, 1986), 57-61.

[53] Clare Carroll, 'Representations of women in some early modern English tracts on the colonization of Ireland', *Albion: A quarterly journal concerned with British Studies 25*, no. 3 (1993): 384-387.

[54] Andrew Hadfield, *Shakespeare, Spenser and the matter of Britain* (Basingstoke, 2004), 39

[55] Constance C. Relihan, 'Barnaby Riche's appropriation of Ireland and the Mediterranean world, or How Irish is "the Turk"?' in *Remapping the Mediterranean world in early modern English writings,* ed. Goran V. Stanivukovic (New York, 2007): 181-185.

[56] Ibid, 183.

[57] Ibid, 180.

[58] Pietro Coppo, *Piero Coppo del sito de Listria* (Venezia, 1540) (henceforward *Del sito de Listria*).

Marco by the Venetian humanist Marcantonio Sabellico[59]. In Isola he worked as a notary public. In 1540, he published a chorography of the peninsula of Istria (which was slowly incorporated into the expanding Venetian state since the 13th century), entitled "Del sito de Listria" (Concerning Istria). In this text, Koppo observed history and geography of this region, and reported his own expeditions of Istria as well as summarized the data derived from Classical and medieval geographers and historians. This work was the first geographic description of Istria[60].

Although Coppo's Istrian chorography was the best known in his lifetime and became a model for further descriptions of Istria[61], *Del sito de Listria* is the least studied among his works. In her study into Pietro Coppo's and Giovanni Bembo's writings, Erin Maclaque classified Coppo's narrative as an attempt of writing Venetian empire from the margins[62]. Coppo perceived Venetian empire through the lens of his Humanist education, that is through antiquarian scholarship.[63] He adapted the issue of Roman ruins and Roman history in relation to Istria to the geopolitical configuration of the contemporary Venetian empire[64]. Humanist chorographic writing was an intellectual framework for making sense of geopolitical space of the colonies, and for establishing connections between colony and the metropole[65]. Coppo tried to create Italian geographical and historical identity for Istria positing it as a borderland of Italy[66].

## Comparison of the imperial discourses about Ireland and Venice

In the late middle ages and early modern time, knowledge of the Other or of distant territory accompanied the process of empire-building; could be instrumental in solving the problems of governance or could serve as a means of education of the metropole population about the borders of the empire. Although Ireland had been an English lordship since the 12th century, the process of collection of knowledge about it did not start until the Tudor period, when Tudor monarchs decided to handle Irish affairs in a more serious manner and to expand their authority in the areas governed by native Irish lords — in the sixteenth century plenty of treatises about Ireland were written[67]. As regards Istria, its first descriptions appeared in the fifteenth century, and were used

---

[59] Erin Maglaque, *Venice's intimate empire : family life and scholarship in the Renaissance Mediterranean* (Ithaca, 2019), 32.
[60] Ivka Kljajić, Miljenko Lapaine, 'Pietro Coppo', *Kartografija i Geoinformacije* 6 (2006): 180.
[61] Maglaque, *Venice's intimate empire,* 126.
[62] Ibid, 146-153.
[63] Ibid, 124-145.
[64] Maglaque, *Venice's intimate empire*, 145.
[65] Ibid.
[66] Ibid, 137-140.
[67] Steven Ellis and Christopher Maginn argue that the Tudors started discovering Ireland before its actual conquest. The trend for the description of Ireland was set in 1510s when Hatfield Compendium appeared which contained geographic description of

by Venetian officials who were scholars at the same time, e.g. Coppo himself, to understand how to govern the subjected region[68].

John Davies explicitly recognized the importance of knowledge of the Other in order to govern one: "…since the law and her ministers have had a passage among them, all their places of fastness have been discovered and laid open, all their paces cleared, and notice taken of every person that is able to do either good or hurt. It is known not only how they live and what they do, but it is foreseen what they purpose or intend to do."[69] Thus according to Davies, knowledge of the Other could guarantee more effective strategy of subjection.

### a) Claims to sovereignty

It is necessary to highlight that ethnography in the case of territorial expansion was not about mere description of the Other — it either directly justified claims to sovereignty or possession or these claims were inserted in the fabric of the text. Venetian intellectuals from time to time in the 15th-16th century appealed to historical arguments in order to legitimize Venetian expansion into the mainland[70]. For Coppo it was the Greek and Roman past of Istria that connected it with Greek-Roman oecumene and defined its organic connections with contemporary Italy or mainland Venice, even though Venetian geographer did not write about contemporary issues in "Del Sito del Istria". Arrival of Argonauts in Nauporto triggered the process of colonization of the region which was continued by establishment of Roman colonies ('coloni Romani')[71]. The vestiges of antiquity Coppo found in Istria were not only monuments of ancient civilization, but the evidence of the belonging of the region to the mainland Italy[72].

For a long time, the claims of the English monarch over the lordship of Ireland was based on the papal bull Laudabiliter of 1155, information about which was recorded by Giraldus Cambrensis (whose negative portrayal of the Irish was the foundation of early modern representations) in *Expugnatio Hibernica*[73]. With the course of the Reformation in Ireland and in reaction to the rebellions of Catholic nobility in Ireland, Elizabethan and early Stuart authors

---

Ireland. It marked the first attempts to gain a more precise knowledge of a mysterious lordship. Greater control of the Irish government defined a steadier flow of information about it.. Christopher Maginn, Steven Ellis, *The Tudor discovery of Ireland* (Dublin, 2015), 40-42, 187-188.

[68] Maglaque, *Venice's intimate empire*, 63, 126-134.

[69] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 335.

[70] Lester J. Libby, 'Venetian History and Political Thought after 1509',*Studies in the Renaissance* 20 (1973): 25; Sandra Toffollo, 'Constructing a mainland state in literature: perceptions of Venice and its "Terraferma" in Marin Sanudo's geographical descriptions', *Renaissance and reformation* 37, no. 1 (2014): 17.

[71] Coppo, *Del Sito de Listria*, 2-6.

[72] Ibid, 3.

[73] Giraldus Cambrensis, 'Expugnatio Hibernica' in *Giraldi Cambrensis opera*, ed. J, F. Dimock, V (London, 1867), 317-319.

tried to minimize papal foundations of English sovereignty in Ireland and to underline its military origins. Fynes Moryson[74], John Davies[75] and Barnabe Rich[76] not only followed this trend, but emphasized military foundations of English sovereignty over Ireland highlighting that the English king had a right to rule Ireland due to the conquest of the 12th century, and positing the English as conquerors and the Irish as the conquered by invoking parallels with the Roman empire[77].

Moreover, Fynes Moryson similarly to some of his contemporaries[78] projected the origins of English sovereignty even further — into the ancient past to the king Gurguntius, and claimed that Britonnic and then Anglo-Saxon kings also exercised rule over Ireland[79]. Due to this new interpretation of the history of Ireland, the Irish were seen as traditional subjects of the English king, and English conquest — as only a restoration of the historic right rather than as a new possession[80].

However, both Moryson[81] and Davies[82] acknowledged that attainment of sovereignty of the English crown over Ireland was a long process which was completed only with the end of the Nine Years War when the rebellious Ulster lords were subdued, that is with the accession of James I. For Moryson, sovereignty was manifested in absolute command over subjects[83], whereas Davies stuck to the definition of sovereignty by Jean Bodin: "… to give laws unto a people, to institute magistrates and officers over them, to punish and pardon malefactors, to have the sole authority of making war and peace, and the like, are the true marks of sovereignty,…".[84] In other words, for the English jurist sovereignty meant concentrating supreme legislative,

---

[74] Moryson deliberately used the verb "to subdue" in describing military expeditions of Henry II and his vassals in Ireland. Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 655-658.

[75] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 218-219.

[76] Barnabe Rich did not delve into history in his text but also used the language of conquest and submission with regard to relationships between England and Ireland. *A new description of Ireland*, 32-33.

[77] About it see pp. 16-17.

[78] Ciaran Brady thinks that Lord-Deputy of Ireland Sir Henry Sidney was the first to appeal to a more ancient foundation of the sovereignty of the English king, which was also derived from Giraldus Cambrensis, in order to demonstrate that English domination pre-dated all the claims of Irish native lords. Ciaran Brady, 'From policy to power: the evolution of Tudor reform strategies in sixteenth-century Ireland' in *Reshaping Ireland, 1550-1700 : colonization and its consequences*, ed. Brian Mac Cuarta (Dublin, 2011), 33-34; 'An Aćt for the Attainder of Shane Oneile, and the Extinguishment of the name of Oneile, and the entitling of the Queen's Majestie, her Heyres and Successours, to the country of Tyrone, and to other Countries and Territories in Ulster' in *The statutes at large, passed in the Parliaments held in Ireland: from the third year of Edward the Second, A.D. 1310, to the twenty sixth year of George the Third, A. D. 1786 inclusive with marginal notes, and a complete index to the whole*, eds. J. G. Butler, F. Vesey, I (Dublin, 1786): 328-329.

[79] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 653-654. Kew thinks that he borrowed it from William Camden's *Britannia* and Edmund Spenser's *A view on the present state of Ireland*. Ibid.

[80] Andrew Hadfield, 'Briton and Scythian: Tudor representations of Irish origins', *Irish historical studies* 28, iss. 12 (1993): 392-397; Brady, 'From policy to power', 34.

[81] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 666.

[82] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 219, 331-341.

[83] Kew, ' Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 724.

[84] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 222-223.

administrative, and judicial authority as well as the rights of property in one hands[85], that is when all Irish landowners were king's direct or indirect landowners[86].

The past in the narratives of Coppo, Davies and Moryson was instrumental in conveying the message that annexation of the described territory was only the restoration of original possession but not a new foundation. Coppo implied that Venetian sovereignty over Istria was justified by ancient Greek and Roman settlements, whereas English intellectuals insisted on the military foundations of English rule over Ireland. This difference stemmed from different ways of incorporation of Istria and Ireland into metropole: when Coppo wrote his text, Istria had been already subdued[87], whereas English intellectuals created a harshly negative image of the Irish in reaction to resistance of the Irish elite in the Elizabethan period.

## b) **Colonial discourse**

Imperial discourse in the examined texts included colonial discourse which was legitimized by the barbarity of the Other and implicitly undermined the natives' claims to possession. Coppo and Davies seemed to employ so called 'agricultural argument', a modification of the Roman law principle of *res nullius*, according to which "all 'empty things,' which included unoccupied lands, remained the common property of all mankind until they were put to some, generally agricultural, use. The first person to use the land in this way became its owner"[88].

Pietro Coppo out of concern for justification of ancient Greek and Roman colonization resorted to traditional distinction of Classical ethnography between uncivilized nomads who could not work the land and civilized farmers who could do it[89]: "Before the aforesaid Argonauts came, as I said, that part was already inhabited by the pastoral Indigenous Aboriginal people. …and they found coarse people, living following the nature of animals, and fruits produced of an uncultivated earth. After this, they came to live more humanely, and domesticated the earth through cultivating it. And they inhabited it under the cultivation of god and law."[90] In this fragment, Coppo not only emphasized pastoral lifestyle of the native population of Istria, but also

[85] Ibid, 339.
[86] Hingst, 'One phenomenon, Three perspectives', 66.
[87] Josip Banič, 'The Venetian takeover of the Margraviate of Istria (1411–1421): the modality of a passage (with eight previously unedited documents in the appendix)', *History in Flux* 1 (2019): 45-63.
[88] Pagden, *Lords of all the world,* 76.
[89] Brent Shaw, 'Eaters of flesh, drinkers of milk: the ancient Mediterranean ideology of the pastoral nomad', *Ancient Society* 13/14 (1982): 13.
[90] Coppo, *Del Sito de Listria*, 2. "avanti che li preditti Argonauti venissero li come dicemo. laqual alhora era habitat in qua in la da Indigeni Aborigeni gente Pastoral…. et trovorono gente rude vivente secundo la natura de animali et frutti produceva da si la terra non culta. doppo da quelli redutti a viuer piu humano et domestico al culto dela terra. et haver habitatione soto il culto divino et lege. The translation is borrowed from: Maglaque, *Venice's intimate empire,* 139.

highlighted their animal-like lifestyle, the quality which in Classical and early modern eyes disqualified one from possession[91]. By invoking nomad manner of living of the natives, Coppo implied their pre-political condition and therefore linked the origins of polity with Greek colonies since civil life was connected with sedentary lifestyle.[92]

A similar kind of argumentation can be found in John Davies's treatise. Here cultural difference justified colonization. As every early modern English observer, he could not find in Ireland elements of civility associated with settled lifestyle, agriculturalism, and wealthy towns[93], and in spite of his first-hand experience followed the negative pattern established by Giraldus Cambrensis, who in his *Topography of Ireland* emphasized pastoralism of Gaelic society as a characteristic feature of their barbarity[94]. Likewise, Davies was puzzled with the fact that the Irish for twelve hundred years in spite of having "a land abounding with all things necessary for the civil life of man" did not improve the land, build stone houses, and establish cities[95].

Although he did not explicitly deprive the Irish of their lands, he asserted that this fact made their possessions "uncertain"[96], thus legitimizing both Anglo-Norman settlement and contemporary Jacobean colonization of Ulster[97]. Unlike some of his contemporaries, he attributed this lifestyle to the corrupt native law rather than to their nature and insisted on the necessity to align their possessions with common law instead of dispossession[98]. At the same time, Davies, nevertheless, supported establishment of the colonies in Ireland as a tool which would bring the Irish from barbarity to civil life[99] in accordance with the civilizing discourse of Tudor and early Stuart state-formation[100]. Moryson also supported Jacobean plantations but more from the perspective of pacification of the rebellious part of Ireland[101].

Thus all the examined authors highlighted that the native population was incapable of the formation of the civil polity (Davies and Moryson characterized Gaelic Irish government as

---

[91] Pagden, 'Dispossessing the barbarian': 82-88.
[92] Steven G. Ellis, 'Civilising the natives: state formation and the Tudor monarchy, c. 1400–1603,' in *Imagining frontiers, contesting identities*, eds. S. G. Ellis, L. Klusáková (Pisa, 2007): 78-79.
[93] Ibid, 88
[94] Giraldus Cambrensis, 'Topographia Hibernica' in *Giraldi Cambrensis opera*, 151.
[95] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 292.
[96] Ibid, 291.
[97] 'And this is the true reason why Ulster and all the Irish countries are found so waste and desolate at this day, and so would they continue till the world's end if these customs were not abolished by the law of England'. Ibid, 292.
[98] See Montano, *Roots of English colonialism*.
[99] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 288, 339-340. In this context, he praised particularly the Jacobean policy of plantation.
[100] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith (1513-1577)': 551, 553; Armitage, *The ideological origins*, 48-50; Jane H. Ohlmeyer, 'Civilizinge of those rude partes': Colonization within Britain and Ireland, 1580s-1640s' in T*he Oxford history of the British empire. Volume 1: the origins of empire: British overseas enterprise to the close of the seventeenth century*, ed. N. P. Canny (Oxford, 2011: 135-143.
[101] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 708-710.

tyrannical[102]) and associated foundations of the commonwealth with colonization and conquest which brought civility to the described land.

### c) <u>Allusions to the Roman Empire</u>

We agree with Anthony Pagden that the image of the Roman Empire was a constitutive element of early modern imperial discourses, and the examined texts are hardly an exception. Roman past was a framework for reference in the early modern narratives.

In Coppo's text it played a polysemic role. On the one hand, there was an antiquarian perspective behind "Del Sito de Listria": in line with other Italian humanist texts, it demonstrated awareness of the past "not present"[103]. Ancient monuments which Coppo encountered in Istria represented only traces of great Roman empire. Coppo wrote: "… and so their ancestors were great Romans, of whom nothing remains but some wonderful traces.[104]". Like Venetian-Dalmatian predecessors and contemporaries, Marcantonio Sabellico (1436-1506) Iliya Crijević (1463–1520), and Marin Sanudo (1466–1536), he by means of the survey of the antiquities of Istria restored its ancient past[105].

However, in pre-modern narratives, past was closely connected with the present. As Maqlague asserts, Coppo's antiquarianism was connected with the experience of the empire[106]. According to her, Venetian chorographer used the Roman past of Istria as a model of reassertion of Istrian Italian (Roman) identity[107]. In this context, the relationships between past and present were creative: the former energized the latter[108].

The political message was hidden behind the lines of *Del Sito de Listria*. Although Coppo did not mention Venice in his text at all, Maglaque has shown that in his earlier atlas *De toto Orbe* Coppo distinguished between Italy and Istria connecting the latter to Venetian metropole[109]. As it has already been said, the Roman past of Istria justified its belonging to Venice for several reasons. Description of Istrian ancient history could evoke readers' associations with the famous foundation legend of Venice, according to which first Venice was founded by the Troian hero Antenor and stretched from Pannonia to the Adda, including

---

[102] See pp. 26-27.
[103] Zachary Schiffman, *The birth of the past* (Baltimore, 2011), 147.
[104] … come haveano gia fatto il suo antecessori maxime Romani deliqual ne sono rimasti ancor alquanti mirabel vestigii. Coppo, *Del Sito de Listria*,4.. The translation is taken from Maglague, *Venice's intimate empire*, 136.
[105] Arnaldo Momigliano, *The classical foundations of modern historiography* (Berkeley, 1990), 82-83.
[106] Maglague, *Venice's intimate empire*, 143-144.
[107] Ibid, 137. See pp. 24-25.
[108] About humanist practice of imitation see: Schiffman, *The birth of the past,* 158-163.
[109] Maglague, *Venice's intimate empire*, 141-142.

Aquileia. This legend asserted strong connections between Venice and Terraferma and lent legitimacy to its expansionism representing it as restoration of historic territories[110].

But even if Coppo did not mean it, he might have envisaged parallels between the Roman past of Istria and its Venetian present. Venice in the 15th-16th centuries started stressing its connections with Rome[111], and Bernardo Bembo even called Venetians "New Romans"[112]. In the context of *Del Sito de Listria,* the Romans were an allegory of the Venetians who also brought glory to this region.

Moreover, antiquities of Istria glorified not only it, but the metropole: Venice by incorporation of the territories with ancient heritage creatively appropriated their past in order to strengthen its own prestige[113]. Therefore, Coppo by discovering the antiquities of Istria did to Venice the same thing as English antiquarian William Camden did to Britain, who claimed in his *Britannia*: "I would restore antiquity to Britaine, and Britaine to his antiquity"[114]. By this act of restoration, Coppo symbolically added Istria to Venetian possessions.

Ireland did not possess the Roman past, but for the examined English authors Roman empire served as a pattern of empire-building and an inspiring precedent contemporary England had to emulate in order to govern the Other. The allusions to Roman empire in their texts were required to draw parallels between two great empires — ancient Roman and contemporary Britain[115]. Sir Thomas Smith was the first to highlight that Roman model colonization could be applied to Ireland representing the English as "the new Romans"[116]. Similar analogies could be found in Davies's, Riche's and Moryson's texts. For all three authors Roman colonization exemplified successful enterprise. They characterized it almost in the same manner:

- as the wise Romanes as they inlarged theire Conquests, so they did spreade theire language, with theire lawes, and the diuine seruice all in the lattene tounge, and by rewards and preferments inuited men to speake it (Fynes Moryson)[117]

- … the Roman State, which conquered so many nations both barbarous and civil, and therefore knew by experience the best and readiest way of making a perfect and absolute

---

[110] Toffollo, 'Constructing a mainland state', 15-17.
[111] Patricia Fortini Brown, *Venice and Antiquity: The Venetian Sense of the Past* (New Haven, 1996), 231-242; idem, *Private lives in Renaissance Venice: art, architecture, and the family* (New Haven, CT, 2004), 26–44; Toffollo, 'Constructing a Mainland State', 11-19; Maglague, *Venice's intimate empire*: 132-144.
[112] David Chambers, *The imperial age of Venice*, 1380–1580 (New York, 1970), 12.
[113] Patricia Fortini Brown, 'Acquiring a classical past. historical appropriation in Renaissance Venice' in *Antiquity and its interpreters*, eds. A. Payne, A. Kuttner, R. Smick (Cambridge, 2000): 27-39
[114] William Camden, 'The author to the reader', in D. Sutton, ed., *Brittania, with an English translation by Philemon Holland* (Irvine, 2004) http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/cambrit/fronteng.html (accessed 24.11.2020)
[115] Anastasia Palamarchuk, Sergei Fyodorov, *Antikvarnii diskurs v rannestuartovskoj Anglii* (St Petersburg, 2013), 137.
[116] Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith (1513-1577)': 546-548.
[117] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 715.

conquest, refused not to communicate their laws to the rude and barbarous people whom they had conquered; neither did they put them out of their protection after they had once submitted themselves (John Davies)[118]

- *Maister Stanihurst* is of opinion, that a Conquest should draw three things after it, and that the vanquished should surrender themselves to imitate the Lawes, the Language, & the manner of Apparrell used and accustomed by the Victors (Barnabe Rich)[119].

This similarity in characterization of the Roman experience of empire-building could possibly stem from the fact that Davies, Moryson and Rich read Richard Stanihurst's description of Ireland in Holinshed's Chronicles. There, Stanihurst wrote implying Roman Empire: "For where the countrey is subdued, there the inhabitants ought to be ruled by the same law that the conquerour is governed, to weare the same fashion of attyre, wherewith the victour is vested, & speake the same language, that the vanquisher parleth.[120]" In other words, the experience of the Roman Empire was instructive for Elizabethan and early Stuart intellectuals whose way of governance of different peoples they suggested the crown should imitate.

Moreover, Fynes Moryson and John Davies, and Barnabe Rich to a smaller extent (for whom Roman Empire still represented an example of pagan empire), seemed to adhere to the Romanized approach of Tudor and early Stuart history-writing, which accentuated productive civilizing force of Roman substrate in English history[121]. Moryson and Davies appealed to positive colonial experience of Britain in which Romans having colonized ancient Britons brought the latter to civility. Davies recognized it explicitly:

Tacitus writeth, Julius Agricola, the Roman general in Brittany, used this policy to make a perfect conquest of our ancestors, the ancient Britons. They were, saith he, rude and dispersed, and therefore prone upon every occasion to make war, but to induce them by pleasure to quietness and rest, he exhorted them in private, and gave them helps in common, to build temples, houses, and places of public resort. The noblemen's sons he took and instructed in the liberal sciences, &c., preferring the wits of the Britons before the students of France, as being now curious to attain the eloquence of the Roman

[118] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 272.
[119] *A new description of Ireland*, 32.
[120] Richard Stanihurst, 'A Treatise Contayning a Playne and Perfect Description of Irelande, with an Introduction, to the Better Understanding of the Hystories, Appartayning to that Islande: Compiled by Richard Stanyhurst, and Written to the Ryght Honorable, Syr Henry Sydney Knight, Lorde Deputie of Irelande, Lorde President of Wales, Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, and One of Hir Maiesties Privie Counsell within Hir Realme of England' in *The Firste [Laste] Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande Conteyning the Description and Chronicles of England, from the First Inhabiting vnto the Conquest: The Description and Chronicles of Scotland, from The First Original of the Scottes Nation till the Yeare of our Lorde 1571: The Description and Chronicles of Yrelande, Likewise from the First Originall of That Nation Untill the Yeare 1571 / Faithfully Gathered and Set Forth by Raphaell Holinshed* (London, 1577), 3. http://english.nsms.ox.ac.uk/holinshed/texts.php?text1=1577_4569 (date of access: 20.11.2020)
[121] Palamarchuk, Fyodorov, *Antikvarnii diskurs,* 144-145.

language, whereas they lately rejected that speech. After that the Roman attire grew to be in account and the gown to be in use among them; and so by little and little they proceeded to curiosity and delicacies in buildings and furniture of household, in baths and exquisite banquets; and so being come to the height of civility, they were thereby brought to an absolute subjection.[122]

In invoking these parallels, Davies and Moryson not only stated that the English had to act in Ireland as Romans had done in their empire, but also demonstrated their awareness of temporal backwardness of contemporary Ireland which, in their eyes, was on a lower stage of development than England. By mentioning the example of Roman empire, they also revealed the Ciceronian belief in one path of the humankind from barbarity to civility[123] and thus expressed hopes that through reformation Ireland would also achieve what England had already completed long ago.

### d) Chorographies

Visual mapping of the territory in the form of maps or textual — in the form of descriptions, views, surveys, etc.[124] was another tool of gaining control of the Other's territory, subordination of the Other and making the Other comprehensible. Scholarship on the issues has demonstrated that cartographic knowledge was instrumental in early modern state-formation[125]. In the examined texts, chorographic descriptions were a tool of control, served incorporating and rhetorical functions and surely were a tribute to well-established generic patterns of ethnographic discourse.

As it has already been mentioned, Coppo's work was the first chorography of Istria. It was modeled on Ptolemy's *Geographia* and contemporary antiquarian writings[126]. In spite of the fact that Coppo traveled along the region, he relied on Classical sources for creation of topography of the region[127]. Unlike Irish intellectuals, Coppo was primarily concerned with the place so chorography was central to his writing. His chorographic narrative was mainly concentrated on the ruined environment of Istria and its natural glories[128]. Descriptions of Istrian antiquities

---

[122] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 273.
[123] Keith Thomas, *In pursuit of civility: manners and civilization in early modern England* (New Haven, 2018), 180-181. It is indicative that Davies and Moryson drew attention to the issue of language, and the fact that Davies mentioned eloquence means that it was Cicero he had in mind. See Cicero, *De Inventione* I.i.2.
[124] Richard Helgerson, 'The land speaks: cartography, chorography, and Subversion in Renaissance England', *Representations* 16 (1986): 52-65; Montano, *The roots of English colonialism,* 155, 196.
[125] About it see: Jordan Branch, *The cartographic state : maps, territory and the origins of sovereignty* (Cambridge, 2014).
[126] Maglaque, *Venice's intimate empire,* 126-128.
[127] Ibid, 135.
[128] Coppo, *Del Sito de Listria*, 3-13.

enabled Coppo to domesticate the region connecting it with the mainland with the help of the Roman past.

Moreover, chorography helped Coppo to "produce" Istria positing the land as "ultima region de Italia " (borderland), incorporating it to the geographical idea of Italy[129], by which as his own maps testified he could have meant Italy[130]. The region was represented as a geographical limit of Italy which separated the peninsula from "barbarous nations"[131]. Coppo reproduced the same kind of separation between Roman and barbarous elements in Istrian history when he distinguished between towns with ancient past and the new cities (cittá nova) which appeared after the Lombard Invasions. The latter did not spark Coppo's interest either because "they did not demonstrate anything new" as he wrote[132].

Chorographic description helped Coppo to guide mainland audience's intellectual acquisition of the region, to inform them about the region they may have not known about. In this representation, Istria was portrayed not as a whole geographical entity, but as a dotted and ruined condition, a place which used to belong to civilization from which only traces had remained. These traces comprised the footholds of civility in the region.

Moryson and Riche did not pay so much attention to chorography because they were more interested in the peoples and contemporary condition of Ireland but, nevertheless, included some chorographic remarks in their texts in accordance with the genre of the survey. As Montano asserted, in Tudor and early Stuart Ireland mapping was an integral element of knowledge about Ireland since chorography and cartography reduced the Irish landscape to a "conceivable, visible, and, at least in theory, a controllable object"[133]. Seeing was a prelude to understanding and appropriating[134], and geography — a framework for containing the world[135].

Moryson also did not rely on his own experience and borrowed the chorographic description of Ireland from William Camden's Britannia[136] whose chorographic approach to the history of Britain was in its turn inspired by reading of Flavio Biondo's *Italia Illustrata*[137]. In

---

[129] Coppo, *Del Sito de Listria*, 1. The representation of Istria as a borderland was derived from Flavio *B*iondo's *Italia Illustrata*. Maglaque, *Venice's intimate empire,* 140.
[130] Ibid, 141.
[131] Coppo, *Del Sito de Listria*, 13.
[132] Ibid, 10.
[133] Montano, *The roots of English* colonialism, 156.
[134] Mercedes Maroto Camino, '(Un)folding the map of early modern Ireland: Spenser, Moryson, Bartlett, and Ortelius', *Cartographica* 34, no. 4 (1997): 7.
[135] Lesley B. Cormack, *Charting an Empire: Geography at the English Universities, 1580–1620* (London, 1997), 13.
[136] Moryson recognized it himself. Moryson, *An itinerary containing his ten yeeres travel*, 185. He presented a very short version of Camden's description of Ireland. See: Camden, 'Ireland' in *Britannia*. http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/cambrit/irelandeng1.html#ireland1 (last accessed: 25.11.2020)
[137] F.J. Levy, 'The making of Camden's Britannia', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 26, no. 1 (1964): 76.

Camden's description of Ireland past events, historical-cultural, ethnographic and historical-geographical materials were presented in close connection with contemporary geographical framework. By reading such chorographies, the audience consumed geographies in their historical retrospective in which the past was closely connected with the present[138] (in the same vein *Del Sito de Listria* could have impacted its readers).

The borrowed fragment in Moryson's Itinerary played the same incorporating role as in *Britannia* demonstrating that Ireland was a part of the British monarchy. Such representation showed the dynamics of the possession, and in the Irish context illustrated how Ireland was slowly subdued by English conquerors.

In one aspect Moryson's description of Ireland differed from Camden's original: its political and cultural connotations took precedence over antiquarian. Moryson's geography of Ireland presented a topography of manners[139] and political loyalty which, as any other surveys, assessed the level of submission of Ireland to royal authority.

In Camden's and Morryson's chorographies Ireland was represented as an unstable region. In the description of the island from south to north, both Camden and Moryson admitted that some regions, particularly Ulster, were rebellious[140]. Moryson ranged Irish regions from "deserving praise for …. faithfulnesse towards the English"[141], to "degenerate and barbarous" or "infamous of .. Rebellion".[142] Therefore, the map of barbarity and civility probably emerged as a result of reading of Moryson's narrative.

In this context, the presence of Irish native names of the places[143] and peoples[144] recorded together with English analogues but in Irish signified not tolerance, but incompleteness of conquest[145]. Even though Ireland was visualized in Moryson's *Itinerary* as not completely tamed territory, which was partly manifested in its linguistic diversity resisting English rule, the English captain expressed optimism in the final success of the enterprise. The rhetorical aim behind Moryson's geography of Ireland was to point at the discrepancy between advantageous geographical conditions and fertile land, and barbarity of the Irish who failed to derive benefit

---

[138] Ekaterina Pronina, *U istokov evropeiskogo natsional'nogo istoriopisania. Andre Dushen i Uil'am Kemden* (Saarbrücken, 2013), 162.
[139] Thomas, *In pursuit of civility*, 76-83.
[140] Moryson, *An itinerary containing his ten yeeres travel*, 189-190
[141] Ibid, 188.
[142] Ibid,190.
[143] "The first is by the Irish called Mowne, by the English – Mounster….". Ibid, 186
[144] "Westmeath is also inhabited by many great Irish Septs, as the Omaddens,the Magoghigans,O malaghlensa, and MacCoghlans which seeme barbarous names". Ibid, 189.
[145] About the issues of language in Elizabethan period see: Patricia Palmer, *Language and conquest in early modern Ireland: English renaissance literature and Elizabethan imperial expansion* (Cambridge, 2001).

from it. By presenting Irish geography in a favorable light and its population — in the negative, Moryson fashioned a colonial argument implying colonization of Ireland and subjugation of its local population, and in this rhetoric he echoes Tomas Smith:

> I freely professe, that Ireland in generall would yield abundance of all things to civill and industrious inhabitants. And when it lay wasted by the late Rebellion, I did see it after the comming of the Lord Montjoy daily more and more to flourish, and in short time after the Rebellion appeased, like the new Spring to put on the wonted beauty[146].

Thus mapping of the trophies of the Irish land and its vices in *Itinerary* was regarded by Moryson as well as other English observers of Irish affairs as a requisite for a perfect conquest.

Barnabe Rich, like Moryson, in his little chapter about geography of Ireland in *A new description* reproduced the same idea about disconnection between geography and native population of Ireland[147]. Yet Ireland was almost absent as a geographical entity from his text. He declared that he was not going to discuss geographical details: "My meaning is not to make any Cosmographicall description of Ireland, I have nothing to do with Longitude, with Latitude, nor with Altitude: I will not speake of the Countrey how it stretcheth it selfe towards the East, or towards the west, nor how it is devided into Prouinces, into Shires, nor into Countries; nor how the countrey is replenished with Citties, with Towns, and Villages"[148].

In our opinion, Rich avoided geography not only because the main objective was an invective against Catholicism as Relihan thinks[149], but also because the English soldier, in contrast to Moryson, was pessimistic about attainability of the conquest of Ireland judging by his radical negative portrayal of the Irish. He openly dissociated himself from so widespread surveys about Ireland which strove to control Ireland geographically, because he would like to stress uncertainty of the English conquest and nonconformity of Ireland due to its prevailing Papism and to imply that it still avoided control. As David Baker has shown, Rich's contemporaries used indefinite mapping strategies in order to show incompleteness of authority in Ireland[150], and Rich tried to do the same by deliberately rejecting any attempt to map Ireland in his text, that is to contain uncontainable.

---

[146] Moryson, *An itinerary containing his ten yeeres travel*, 196.
[147] *A new description,* 5-7.
[148] Ibid, 4
[149] Relihan, 'Barnaby Riche's appropriation of Ireland': 181-182.
[150] David Baker, 'Off the map: charting uncertainty in Renaissance Ireland' in *Representing Ireland: literature and the origins of conflict, 1534–1660*, eds. B. Bradshaw, A. Hadfield, W. Maley (Cambridge, 1993): 76–93.

## e)  <u>Cultural differences and the discourse of superiority</u>

Cultural differences were produced in order to justify superiority of the dominant cultural model over the Other and in order to advocate certain action in relation to the Other. "Othering" was realized through the ethnocentric standards of descriptions with which the Other was compared. Nevertheless, these standards could depend on individual perceptions of the dominant cultural model.

The Others differed in Coppo's narrative and in the texts by Moryson, Davies, and Rich. In *Del Sito de Listria,* the Other was transferred to the past. The antagonists of Greco-Roman civilization were the Lombards (Langobards). Coppo portrayed them as a destructive force which destroyed (destruger), annihilated (anichilar), and burnt (abrugiar)[151] foundations of Latin civility, defined in the text culturally as monuments, book and language. Lombards (Langobards) brought with themselves their barbarian language which as a result of the fusion of Latin was transformed into *volgare* which Coppo deemed inferior to the ancient language.

Maqlague correctly asserts that the narrative of Lombard (Langobard) invasion in *Del Sito de Listria* was an exemplum which was written into general observations about decay, corruption and devastation on the Italian peninsula during barbarian invasions[152]. Coppo employed a widespread Renaissance interpretative scheme in which "otherness" and change were attributed to deviation from the original[153], and cyclical pattern of history in which times of development were succeeded by times of invasions and decay[154]. It seems that Coppo treated post-invasion history of Istria in the same way as Petrarch perceived the Middle ages — as the time of darkness.

Subsequent decay after the barbarian invasion implicitly legitimized its inclusion in Venetian Terraferma with which Coppo associated renovation, that is restoration of the ancient glory. Cyclicity of the history of Istria (the period of primitive peoples — Greek colonies — Attila's invasion — Roman colonies —Lombard invasion) in the narrative determined the renaissance of the region under the Venetian rule. Roman appearance in the region after Attila's invasion pre-figured late medieval Venetian presence. Thus, in describing the antiquities of Istria Coppo presented the model of both Istrian past and future.

---

[151] Coppo, *Del Sito de Listria,,*11.
[152] Maglaque, *Venice's intimate empire,* 139.
[153] Peter Burke, *Languages and communities in early modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2004), 23.
[154] Ernest Breisach, *Historiography: ancient, medieval, & modern*, 2nd ed (Chicago, 2004), 183.

However, the political objective of *Del Sito de Listria* was not only justification of the imperial rule, but also demand for further inclusion of the region into Venetian empire given the fact that he succeeded in persuading the doge in Venice to grant more freedoms and to improve the quality of governance in the region[155]. In order to explain the significance of Istria for Venice, Coppo not only presented a poetic description of the region but also deliberately portrayed it as unstable and vulnerable to barbarian invasion[156]. He completed his work with a reminder that Alps separate Italy from the barbarous nations[157]. It is the barbarous North that is the real Other in *Del Sito de Listria* since from there came all the invasions into Italy. By means of mentioning Lombard (Langobard) invasion into Italy which started with the incursion into Istria and by means of critical remarks of volgare Coppo tries to instill fear in the readers of his text in the possibility of another barbarian invasion into Istria, which could lead to further subjugation of Italy[158]. In portraying Istria as a frontier region the Venetian chorographer, in fact, represents it as a bastion of Italian culture which if not properly protected or given attention to would become the spoils of the barbarians with foreseeable consequences for the mainland.

*Del Sito de Listria* represented a strategy of integration of the Other. Istrian Other was silenced in the text. Furthermore, he was assigned an Italian identity on the basis of the shared past with the mainland[159] and common descent since Coppo claimed: "… so their ancestors were great Romans"[160].

The text of the Venetian chorographer was more concerned with similitudes than with differences, a strategy which was also characteristic of early modern ethnography[161]. In this context, Coppo's narrative exemplified the productive power of early modern ethnographic discourse which could with its capacities to create identities of the Other either to exclude, or to include one. Such an integrative description of Istria could possibly stem from self-reflection of Coppo who, having become a member of Istrian political society, would like to find in the text

---

[155] Ivka Kljajić, Miljenko Lapaine, 'Pietro Coppo': 180; Maglaque, *Venice's intimate empire,* 90.
[156] Maglaque, *Venice's intimate empire*, 141.
[157] Coppo, *Del Sito de Listria,*13.
[158] In this portrayal of the region Coppo followed in the footsteps of his contemporaries who also insisted on the inclusion of Istria on the basis of its borderland position. See Maglaque, *Venice's intimate empire*, 139-141.
[159] Ibid, 139.
[160] "… come haveano gia fatto il suo antecessori maxime…". Coppo, *Del Sito de Listria,* 4. The translation is borrowed from: Maglaque, *Venice's intimate empire*, 136.
[161] Hodgen, *Early anthropology in the sixteenth and seventeenth Centuries*, 295-353; Johnson, *Cultural hierarchy in sixteenth-century Europe*, 135-140.

the foundations of the connections between Venetian and Istrian identity[162] which would not make him alien in both situations.

Unlike Coppo, Moryson, Davies and Rich were concerned with differences between the English and the Irish. Inferiority of the latter legitimized superiority of the former. English observers of Ireland thought that understanding of these differences could be instrumental in solving the question of the governance of Ireland. Similarly to Coppo, the examined English intellectuals used ethnocentric standards in describing the Irish, and relied on classical or English authorities in their descriptions, and sometimes declaratively — on their personal experience (particularly Moryson).

The concept of civility was broadly defined in English discursive practices. It was tightly connected with issues of culture and 'order', the mode of conduct of good citizen, which included non-barbarous style of living involving language and dutiful acceptance of established authority[163]. Moreover, culture itself in English concepts of civility was also intertwined with the creation of well-ordered polity: implied accommodation to the cultural norms, and, first and foremost, to the language of the superior as a sign of submission, whereas deviation from these norms could be equated to disobedience and disloyalty[164]. Thus, Moryson, Davies and Rich describing the Irish tried to evaluate their level of submission and to suggest possibilities of obtaining this submission.

Generally, the negative image of the Irish in the texts was amplification of the canonical image of the native population of Ireland from Giraldus Cambrensis's *Topographia Hibernica* in which they were described as barbarous in all spheres of life[165]. Irish lack of civility was taken for granted by all of the authors. In the examined descriptions, the image of the Irish was modelled on the image of Scythians[166] in Classical ethnography. The comparison with Scythians conjured up concrete associations in the eyes of the readers. They were represented as warlike barbarians whose uncivil behavior was manifested in treachery and rebelliousness[167] which made it uneasy for the government to trust them.

---

[162] We are developing the idea of Maglague who made an argument about complex relationships between Coppo's Venetian and Istrian identity in his political career but did not connect it with *Del Sito de Listria*. Maglaque, *Venice's intimate empire*, 91-103.
[163] Thomas, *In pursuit of civility, 16-17*, 116.
[164] Ibid, 66, 111-3.
[165] Giraldus Cambrensis, 'Topographia Hibernica', dist. III, cap. IX, 149-153.
[166] Tudor and early Stuart intellectuals started even stressing Scythian descent of the Irish in order to explain their alleged barbarism. The examined authors are hardly an exception. Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 652-653; *A new description,* 18. About the origins of the idea of a Scythian ancestry of the Irish see: Hadfield, 'Briton and Scythian': 401-408.
[167] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 228, 290; Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 685,690, 697; *A new description,* 3, 9, 15-17, 20, 23, 74, 80, 92, 113.

Conceptualization of the Irish as barbarians and the peculiarities of political context inevitably dictated that Gaelic lordships were characterized as tyrannical since in Classical ethnography and philosophy barbarian government were despotic, i.e. fell short of the civil polity. Davies, Moryson and Rich understood tyranny[168] in accordance with early modern redefinitions of Aristotle's concepts of tyranny: the oppressive regime in which the ruler pursues only one's own interests, abuses his own subjects, "domesticates" their property and governs arbitrarily[169]. Moryson's portrayal of Gaelic polity exemplifies this attitude best of all: "These foresaid meere Irish Lords of Countryes governe the people under them with such tyranny, as they know no king in respect of them, who challenge all their goods and Cattell to be theirs saying[170]".

Another feature of Irishness which was an obstacle to incorporation of this island to British monarchy was their native Brehon law which was also deemed tyrannical. As it has already been mentioned, Davies placed the Irish law in the centre of his argument about the failures of the English conquest of Ireland: "For, if we consider the nature of the Irish customs, we shall find that the people which doth use them must of necessity be rebels to all good government, destroy the commonwealth wherein they live, and bring barbarism and desolation upon the richest and most fruitful land of the world…"[171]. Moryson also shared this idea[172].

Furthermore, in relation to Ireland Moryson, Davies and Rich shared Tudor and early Stuart rhetoric of expanding British monarchy which insisted on the necessity of religious and linguistic uniformity as a means of establishing mutual understanding and a guarantee of submission of the peoples to the monarch[173]. Irish Catholicism and language were regarded by the examined authors as obstacles for good government in the country and causes of alienation of the Irish from the English. Papism was the main object of Rich's attack, and in Moryson's text it

---

[168] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 686-687, 713; Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 332; *A new description,* 24.
[169] Poe, *A people born to slavery*, 154-155.
[170] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 686.
[171] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 290.
[172] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 687, 713.
[173] See 'Concerning the laws to be used in Wales' in *The statutes at large, from the first year of King Edward the Fourth to the end of the reign of queen Elizabeth. To which is prefixed a table of titles of all the Publick and private statutes during that time*, ed. O. Ruffhead, II (London, 1770): 240; 'An Act for the English Order, Habite, and Language' in *The statutes at large, passed in the Parliaments held in Ireland*, I (Dublin, 1786): 120-121; 'A proclamation concerning the Kings Majesties Stile, of King Great Britaine, & c.' in *Stuart royal proclamations. Volume I: royal proclamations of king James I: 1603-1625*, eds J. F. Larkin & P. L. Hughes (Oxford, 1973): 95.

came to the fore in one whole chapter[174]. As regards language, all of the authors expressed the desire that the conqueror and the conquered would speak the same language:

- And in generall all nations have thought nothing more powerfull to unite myndes then the Community of language[175]. (Moryson)

- …We may conceive and hope that the next generation will in tongue and heart and every way else become English, so as there will be no difference or distinction but the Irish Sea betwixt us[176]. (Davies)

- Now, for the Irish to inure themselues to speake English, I thinke it were happy for England & Ireland both…[177] (Rich)

Therefore, all the examined authors portrayed otherness of the Irish as a problem which prevented them from being good subjects but their interpretive models differed and depended on the their argument. Moryson was almost close to Aristotelian concept of natural slavery and attributed Irish barbarity to their nature, thus completely reproducing the Classical model, according to which despotic government was natural for the barbarians[178]. Rich also resorted to natural inclination of the Irish towards cruelty but was more inclined to think that primeval cause of all was Catholicism. Unlike them, Davies rejected the inherent barbarity of the Irish and, as it has already been mentioned, employed legal definition of barbarism putting the blame for their inferiority on their laws and weak English government which failed to grant them common law[179].

It is also necessary to highlight that English imperial discourse in the examined texts as well as in *Del Sito de Listria* articulated the idea of decay and degeneration. All of the authors portrayed the descendants of first Anglo-Norman colonists, the majority of whom were Catholics, as degenerate who decayed as a result of the mutual interaction with the Irish. In relation to English colonists as well as in relation to Romans in Istria, foreign element was regarded as a corrupt force. Moryson, Davies and Rich stressed the danger of Irish culture since it was capable of absorbing of the colonists and of making them rebels[180]. For Gaelicized colonists renovation was associated with return to the English modes of civility from which they

---

[174] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 1175-1199. We would like to allude to Carina L. Johnson who claimed that in the 16th century adherence to correct religious doctrine became a 'necessary evaluative category of a culture or people'. Johnson, *Cultural hierarchy in sixteenth-century Europe*, 263. For Rich Papism was the main sign of Irish barbarity.
[175] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 715.
[176] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 335-336.
[177] *A new description*, 34.
[178] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 782.
[179] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 290.
[180] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 660, 663, 684, 696-701; Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 227, 229, *A new description*, 34.

deviated. As regards the native Irish, the prospects were different. Unlike Coppo, Davies, Moryson and Rich did not venerate antiquity, vice versa, they despised it. The problem of Ireland was that it stuck in the condition of barbarism, thus being at a lower cultural level than England. In the most explicit way this argument was fashioned by Davies.

In describing native population of Ireland as backward English intellectuals unexpectedly arrived at the conceptual innovation of change[181] in which the reform was understood not as a return to the original condition but as proceeding to a new stage, that is ascent to civility. Moryson equated English power with "Orpheus who with his sweete harpe and [holy] [wholeso<mest>] precepts of Poetry laboured to reduce the rude and barbarous people from living in woods, to dwell Ciuilly in Townes and Cittyes, and from wilde ryott to morall Conversation"[182].

Similarly to *Del Sito de Listria*, the image of the Other in the examined English texts about Ireland was subdued to political rhetoric and the project each of the authors suggested. The examined English ethnographic descriptions were responses to political crisis in Ireland which started with the rebellions in Elizabethan Ireland. Trying to understand its nature, English intellectuals appealed to the ideas of cultural differences. Even though the discourse of the examined texts was also incorporating like in a Venetian case, still Coppo, Moryson, Davies and Rich insisted more on differences than on similitudes and constructed a more exclusive image of the Other. Coppo implied that Istrians had already Italian identity, whereas for Moryson, Davies, and Rich such kind of a result could only be obtained in the future.

Moryson, Davies and Rich used inferiority of the Irish population in order to legitimize English claims to sovereignty over Ireland, and in order to justify main tenets of Tudor and early Stuart state-formation which included elimination of 'tyranny' of overmighty lords[183] of both Irish and English background, 'Anglicization', conquest and plantations. That is why they imagined the Irish as incapable of civil government and living under the yoke of tyrannical princes and laws. Such an image foregrounded the necessity of the reformation of Ireland.

Moreover, all of the authors were New English, that is new settlers in Ireland, and the arguments of the barbarity of the Irish and decay of traditional English Catholic nobility disarmed the claims of the latter to government and lent legitimacy to the claims of the former to govern Ireland as persons possessing knowledge of the country and having a programme of its

[181] Nicholas P. Canny, *Formation of the Old English elite in Ireland* (Dublin, 1975), 25.
[182] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 690-691.
[183] Rory Rapple, *Martial power and Elizabethan political culture : military men in England and Ireland, 1558-1594* (Cambridge, 2009), 162-199.

reform. Barbarity of the Irish and degeneration of the English justified that other standards of government in comparison to England could be applied to them, given the fact that Dublin administration from time to time tried to restrict participation of Irish nobility in the government[184].

However, the discourse of otherness of the Irish was contingent on particular historical situation and individual political projects. Moryson, writing his Itinerary during the Nine Years war in Ireland, tried to advocate military strategy of subjugation devised by his patron, lord deputy of Ireland, Lord Mountjoy. In order to support the use of the martial law, Moryson constructed such an image of the Irish which would explain why they and English deserved different kinds of authority. That is why he described the Irish as typical barbarians in an almost Aristotelian manner,[185] and Catholic English — as degenerate . Moryson stressed that English form of government would not fit the Irish due to their different nature: "the meere Irish by nature have singular [and] obstinate pertinacity in retayning their old manners and Customes, so as they could neuer be drawne, by the lawes, gentile government, and free conversation of the English, to any Civility in manners, or reformation in Religion.[186]", and advocated that only force, not law could lead them to the subjection: "theire nature in generall rather requires a valiant, Active Deputy, then one that is wise and politicke if wthhall he be slowe and faint harted.[187]"

Davis disagreed with Moryson that the Irish should be ruled in a different way from the English. It is necessary to take into account that Davies wrote his treatise during the Jacobean period of pacification and thus articulated a slightly different image. In his opinion, Ireland had already been subdued by conquest, and he promoted legal strategy of reformation of Ireland. Moryson located complete conquest of Ireland in a distant future, whereas Davies presented an apology of the rule of James I and admitted the success of the English enterprise, dividing the history of Ireland into then, the time of failure, and now, the time of happy reign. According to him, it was James who managed to govern Ireland correctly and to pacify its population[188]. In order to glorify the rule of the English king, Davies constructed a more conciliatory image of the Irish portraying them as capable of reformation. That is how he concluded the narrative: "For

---

[184] Here the argument of the famous late medieval English jurist John Fortescue could be relevant who explained that the regal rule was legitimate when the people were degenerate. James M. Blythe, *Ideal government and the mixed constitution in the Middle* Ages (Princeton, 2014), 261

[185] Aristotle insisted that barbarian and civilized peoples are worthy of different power. Aristotle, *Politics*, 1285a

[186] Kew, 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited': 1674.

[187] Ibid, 672. Moryson continued with this explanation further: Ibid, 794-797.

[188] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes': 331-341.

there is no nation of people under the sun that doth love equal and indifferent justice better than the Irish, or will rest better satisfied with the execution thereof, although it be against themselves; so as they may have the protection and benefit of the law when upon just cause they do desire it.[189]"

The darkest picture was presented by Barnaby Rich. Also living in the Jacobean period, he, nevertheless, expressed disbelief in the possibility of subduing Catholic population and warned royal administration again relying on them and making use of their service because of their disloyalty[190]. He implied that the Irish could become good subjects only if they converted to Protestantism.

## Conclusion

The examination of English imperial discourses about Ireland and Venetian discourse presented in this study has demonstrated instrumentalist nature of early modern ethnographic discourses of the Other. Striking similarities between Venetian and English imperial discourses stemmed not only from shared cultural background of the authors, but also from the resemblance of the situation in which they were deplored — that is imperial expansion, integral feature of which was the ethnographic discourse.

In order to justify sovereignty of the metropole over the periphery English and Venetian imperial discourses used historical arguments which represented the territory of the Other as historically belonging or connected with the metropole, thus representing the expansion as restorative act.

Furthermore, inferiority of the Other disarmed claims of the native elite to sovereignty: it is important to take into account that the examined discourses were primarily aimed against native elites with whom imperial power competed, and Irish case is indicative in this context. All the examined authors resorted to "agricultural argument" in order to highlight that the native population was incapable of the formation of the civil polity and associated foundations of the commonwealth with colonization and conquest. The model of the savage or the barbarian derived from Classical ethnography or the topos of degeneration were instrumentalized in order to fulfill these aims.

---

[189] Davies, 'A discovery of the true causes', 342.
[190] *A new description*, 111-116.

Chorographic description of the territory of the Other confirmed acquisition of the lands and establishment of domination over them. Yet if there was resistance to the expansion, the described territory could be deliberately described as an unstable entity. As *Del Sito de Listria* demonstrated that even description of the past of the described territory could fulfill the task of symbolic appropriation of the periphery by the metropole.

Imperial descriptions of the Other were ethnocentric and evaluated the Other from the perspective of the dominant cultural model. Dominance of the English and of Romans was hidden between the lines of these ethnographies. The observers looked down on the regions they described. Therefore, the examined texts actualized hierarchies.

Apart from legitimizing function, imperial discourses had a practical function. They represented a discovery of the Other which had to be described in order to be made "conceivable, visible and controllable object". Coppo discovered the ancient past of Istria, whereas English intellectuals discovered the essential features and characteristics of the Irish and Catholic English residing in Ireland.

The examined texts were an attempt, as Erin Maglague called it, of writing the empire from the margins. Moryson, Davies, Rich and Coppo tried to communicate the knowledge to the centre in order to educate the mainland about periphery (thus symbolically adding the region to the landscape of the state) and to recommend how the region should be governed on the basis of the information about characteristics of the native peoples. In this context, the examined texts were a kind of counselling.

It is necessary to highlight a twofold attitude of the imperial discourses towards cultural differences. On the one hand, they legitimized subjection of the region and validated claims of metropole officials to govern in the periphery. On the other hand, these differences were treated as a problem which required a solution. Moryson, Davies and Rich construed Irish barbarity as incompatible with establishment of civil polity and suggested a way of 'Anglicization' of the "Orher". All the examined authors including Coppo interpreted diversity as a decay or corruption[191] — the Venetian chorographer portrayed volgare as a deviation from Latin, whereas English intellectuals tried to explain the reasons for barbarity of the Irish. All of the authors believed that the expansion brought with itself civility and would transform the identity of the Other.

---

[191] By the way, it was a characteristic feature of early modern conceptualizations of diversity. Kidd, *British identities,* 9-33; Kathryn Taylor, 'Ancients and moderns in sixteenth-century ethnography', *History of European Ideas*, 46, no. 2 (2020): 124.

In this context, the examined texts articulated transformative discourse which suggested particular course of actions. Yet understanding of the transformation by Coppo and English observers was different: for Coppo it was imitation of the ancient past, for Moryson and Davies — leading Ireland to the stage of civility. Thus, Venetian chorographer and English intellectuals thought that knowledge of the Other was a requisite for effective governance and understanding problems of the region.

Furthermore, Venetian imperial discourse about Istria and English discourse about Ireland represented two different descriptive strategies of constructing identity of the Other. Imperial discourse in *Del Sito de Listria* digested the Other assigning Italian identity to him by means of shared past and ancestry. The Other in Coppo's narrative was located beyond the Alps. Thus, imperial discourse in *Del Sito de L'istria* was inclusive and sought similitudes. Conversely, Moryson, Davies and Rich articulated exclusive discourse which was concentrated on radical differences between the Irish and English and thus legitimized alienation of the native elites whose civilized condition was denied. However, unlike Moryson and Rich who portrayed the Irish in such a way so as to explain that English mode of government could not fit them, Davies considered prospects of inclusion of the Irish by means of common law.

Our case study has demonstrated that the image of the Other was contingent on a particular historical situation and rhetorical aims of the text. The authors used available discursive patterns derived from Classical authorities, medieval and early modern political theory, contemporary or earlier works in order to communicate certain political message.

To conclude, the fact that we have been able to identify so many parallels and similar discursive strategies in the early modern Venetian imperial discourse about Istria and early modern English imperial discourse about Ireland, which have not been compared before, confirms our hypothesis about universal mechanisms and patterns of describing the Other and repertoires of interpretation of otherness in early modern time, and makes the comparative research into early modern language of describing the Other in early modern Europe and overseas worthwhile. Further study into this issue will definitely enrich our understanding of how early modern ethnographic knowledge defined representations of the Other, and how these representations were used in particular political contexts.

# Bibliography

*A new description of Ireland wherein is described the disposition of the Irish whereunto they are inclined. No lesse admirable to be perused then credible to be beleeved: neither unprofitable nor unpleasant to bee read and understood, by those worthy cittizens of London that be now undertakers in Ireland: by Barnabe Rich, Gent*. London: [By William Jaggard] for Thomas Adams, 1610). http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A10713.0001.001 (date of access: 20.10.2020)

Acken, James Tindal. 'Post-Colonialism in Medieval Studies' in *Handbook of medieval studies: terms - methods – trends*, ed. A. Classen. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010: 1137-1141.

Armitage, David. 'Introduction' in *Theories of empire, 1450-1800*, ed. D. Armitage. Abingdon: Routledge, 2016: xv-xxxiii

*The ideological origins of the British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2004.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. *Cultural turns: new orientations in the study of culture*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016.

Baker, David. 'Off the map: charting uncertainty in Renaissance Ireland' in *Representing Ireland: literature and the origins of conflict, 1534–1660*, ed. by B. Bradshaw, A. Hadfield, W. Maley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993: 76–93.

Banič, Josip. 'The Venetian takeover of the Margraviate of Istria (1411–1421): the modality of a passage (with eight previously unedited documents in the appendix)', *History in Flux* 1 (2019): 41-77.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The location of culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Blythe, James M. *Ideal government and the mixed constitution in the Middle* Ages. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014.

Braddick, Michael. *State formation in early modern England, c. 1550-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Brady, Ciaran. 'From policy to power: the evolution of Tudor reform strategies in sixteenth-century Ireland' in *Reshaping Ireland, 1550-1700: colonization and its consequences*, ed. by B.Mac Cuarta. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011: 21-42.

Branch, Jordan. *The cartographic state : maps, territory and the origins of sovereignty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Breisach, Ernest. *Historiography: ancient, medieval, & modern*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Brendecke, Arndt. *The empirical empire: Spanish colonial rule and the politics of knowledge*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016.

Brochard, Thomas. 'The 'civilizing' of the Far North of Scotland, 1560-1640' (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Aberdeen, 2010),

Burke, Peter. *Languages and communities in early modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Cambrensis, Giraldus. 'Expugnatio Hibernica' in *Giraldi Cambrensis opera*, ed. by J. F. Dimock, V. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867: 207-411.

'Topographia Hibernica' in *Giraldi Cambrensis opera*, ed. by J. F. Dimock, V. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867: 3-201.

Camden, William. *Brittania, with an English translation by Philemon Holland*, ed. by D.F.Sutton. Irvine: The University of California, 2004. http://www.philological.bham.ac.uk/cambrit/ (accessed 24.11.2020)

Camino, Mercedes Maroto. '(Un)folding the map of early modern Ireland: Spenser, Moryson, Bartlett, and Ortelius', *Cartographica* 34, no. 4 (1997): 1-18.

Canny, Nicholas P. 'Edmund Spenser and the development of an Anglo-Irish identity', *The Yearbook of English Studies* 13 (1983): 1-19.

*Formation of the Old English elite in Ireland*. Dublin: National University of Ireland, 1975.

*Kingdom and colony: Ireland in the Atlantic world 1560–1800*. Baltimore, London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

*The Elizabethan conquest of Ireland: a pattern established, 1565-76*. New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1976.

'The ideology of English colonization: from Ireland to America', *The William and Mary Quarterly* 30, no. 4 (1973), 575-598.

Carroll, Clare. *Circe's cup: cultural transformations in early modern writing about Ireland*. Cork: Cork University Press, 2001.

'Representations of women in some early modern English tracts on the colonization of Ireland', *Albion: a quarterly journal concerned with British studies* 25, no. 3 (1993: 379-393.

Chambers, David. *The imperial age of Venice*, 1380–1580. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1970.

Clarke, Aidan. 'Pacification, plantation, and the Catholic question, 1603–23' in *A new history of Ireland: early modern Ireland 1534- 1691*, ed. by. T.W. Moody, F. X. Martin, F. J. Byrne. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009: 188-215.

Coppo, Pietro. *Piero Coppo del sito de Listria*. Venezia: Francesco Bindoni & Mapheo Pasini, 1540.

Cormack, Lesley B. *Charting an empire: geography at the English universities, 1580–1620*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Cramsie, John. *British travellers and the encounter with Britain, 1450–1700*. Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer Ltd. 2015.

Davies, Sir John. 'A discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued nor brought under obedience of the Crown of England until the Beginning of His Majesty's happy Reign (...) 1612 in *Ireland under Elizabeth and James the First*. ed. H. Morley. London: Routledge, 1890: 217-342.

Ellis, Steven G., 'Civilising the natives: state formation and the Tudor monarchy, c. 1400–1603,' in *Imagining frontiers, contesting identities*, ed. by S. G. Ellis, L. Klusáková. Pisa: Edizioni Plus - Pisa University Press, 2007: 77-92.

Fairclough, Norman. *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge, 2003.

*Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Fortini Brown, Patricia, 'Acquiring a classical past. historical appropriation in Renaissance Venice' in *Antiquity and its interpreters* , ed. by A. Payne, A. Kuttner, R. Smick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000: 27-39.

*Private lives in Renaissance Venice: art, architecture, and the family*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

*Venice and antiquity: the Venetian sense of the past*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

Fuchs, Barbara. 'Imperium studies: theorizing early modern expansion' in *Postcolonial Moves*, ed. by P.C. Ingham, M. R. Warren. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003: 71-90.

Greenblatt, Steven. *Marvelous possessions: the wonder of the New World*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1991.

*Renaissance self-fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980.

Hadfield, Andrew. 'Briton and Scythian: Tudor representations of Irish origins', *Irish historical studies* 28, iss. 12 (1993): 390-408.

*Shakespeare, Spenser and the matter of Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Hechter, Michael. 'Internal colonialism: the Celtic fringe in British national development', 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Helgerson, Richard. 'The land speaks: cartography, chorography, and subversion in Renaissance England', *Representations* 16 (1986): 50-85.

Hingst, Marie Sophie. 'One phenomenon, three perspectives. English colonial strategies in Ireland revisited, 1603-1680' (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 2018),

Hodgen, Margaret T. *Early anthropology in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964.

Horodowich, Elizabeth, *The Venetian discovery of America: geographic imagination in the age of encounters.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2018).

*Inventing Americans in the age of discovery: narratives of encounter*, ed. by M. Householder. Burlington: Ashgate, 2011.

Johnson, Carina L. *Cultural hierarchy in sixteenth-century Europe: the Ottomans and Mexicans.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Kew, Graham David. 'Shakespeare's Europe revisited: The unpublished itinerary of Fynes Moryson (1566–1630)' (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Birmingham University, 1995)

Kidd, Colin. *British identities before nationalism: ethnicity and nationhood in the Atlantic world, 1600 – 1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

*The forging of races: race and scripture in the Protestant Atlantic world, 1600-2000.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Kljajić, Ivka & Lapaine Miljenko. 'Pietro Coppo', *Kartografija i Geoinformacije* 6 (2006): 180-181.

Leerssen, Joep. *Mere Irish & fíor-ghael: studies in the idea of Irish nationality, its development, and literary expression prior to the nineteenth century*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publ. Co, 1986.

Leitch, Stephanie. *Mapping ethnography in early modern Germany: new worlds in print culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Lenihan, Pádraig. *Consolidating conquest: Ireland 1603-1727*. London: Routledge, 2014.

Levy, F.J. 'The making of Camden's Britannia', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 26, no. 1 (1964),: 70-97.

Libby Lester J. 'Venetian History and Political Thought after 1509', *Studies in the Renaissance* 20 (1973): 7-45.

Loomba, Ania, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Maginn, Christopher & Ellis, Steven. *The Tudor discovery of Ireland*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2015.

Maglaque, Erin. *Venice's intimate empire: family life and scholarship in the Renaissance Mediterranean*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019)

Mason, Peter. 'Classical ethnography and its influence on the European perception of the peoples of the New World', in *The classical tradition and the Americas: European images of the Americas and the classical tradition,* ed. by W. Hasse, M. Reinhold. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994: 135-172.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. *The classical foundations of modern historiography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Montano, John P. *The roots of English colonialism in Ireland.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Moryson, Fynes*, An itinerary containing his ten yeeres travell through the twelve dominions of Germany, Bohmerland, Sweitzerland, Netherland, Denmarke, Poland, Italy, Turky, France, England, Scotland & Ireland.*Vol. IV. Glasgow, J. MacLehose and Sons, 1907.

Ohlmeyer, Jane H. 'Civilizinge of those rude partes': Colonization within Britain and Ireland, 1580s-1640s' in T*he Oxford history of the British empire. Volume 1: The origins of empire: British overseas enterprise to the close of the seventeenth century*, ed. by N. P. Canny. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011: 124-147.

Orr, Alan D. 'From a view to a discovery: Edmund Spenser, Sir John Davies, and the defects of law in the realm of Ireland', *Canadian Journal of History* 38 (2003),

Pagden, Anthony. 'Dispossessing the barbarian: the language of Spanish Thomism and the debate over the property rights of the American Indians' in *The languages of political theory in early modern Europe*, ed. A. Pagden, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987: 79-98.

*Lords of all the world: ideologies of empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500-c.1800.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.

Palamarchuk, Anastasia & Fyodorov, Sergei. *Antikvarnii diskurs v rannestuartovskoj Anglii*. Saint Petersburg: Aleteja, 2013.

Palmer, Patricia. *Language and conquest in early modern Ireland: English renaissance literature and Elizabethan imperial expansion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Pawlisch, Hans S. *Sir John Davies and the conquest of Ireland: a study in legal imperialism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press , 1985.

Poe, Marshall T. "*A people born to slavery": Russia in early modern European ethnography*, 1476-1748. Ithaca:Cornell University Press, 2002.

*Practices of coexistence. Constructions of the other in early modern perceptions*, ed. by M. D. Birnbaum, M. Sebok. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2017.

Pronina, Ekaterina, *U istokov evropeiskogo natsional'nogo istoriopisania. Andre Dushen i Uil'am Kemden.* Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 2013.

'Rich Barnabe' in *Dictionary of national biography. Volume XLVIII: Reilly-Robins*, ed. Sidney Lee (New York: Macmillan and Co. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1896: 105-108.

Quinn, David B. *Explorers and colonies: America, 1500-1625*. London: Hambledon Press, 1990.

'Sir Thomas Smith (1513-1577) and the beginnings of English colonial theory', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 89, no.4 (1945), 543-560;

*The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966);

Rapple, Rory. *Martial power and Elizabethan political culture: military men in England and Ireland, 1558-1594*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Relihan, Constance C. 'Barnaby Riche's appropriation of Ireland and the Mediterranean world, or How Irish is "the Turk"?' in *Remapping the Mediterranean world in early modern English writings,* ed. by G. V. Stanivukovic. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007: 179-189.

Robertson, John. 'Empire and union: two concepts of the early modern European political order' in *Theories of Empire, 1450-1800*, ed. by D. Armitage. Abingdon: Routledge, 2016: 11-44

Rothman, Natalie. *Brokering empire: trans-imperial subjects between Venice and Istanbul.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Schiffman, Zachary. *The birth of the past.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

Shankar, Raman. *Renaissance Literature and Postcolonial Studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.

Shaw, Brent. 'Eaters of flesh, drinkers of milk: the ancient Mediterranean ideology of the pastoral nomad', *Ancient Society* 13/14 (1982): 5-31.

*Stuart royal proclamations. Volume I: royal proclamations of king James I: 1603-1625*, ed. by J. F. Larkin & P. L.Hughes. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1973.

Taylor, Kathryn. 'Ancients and moderns in sixteenth-century ethnography', *History of European Ideas*, 46, no. 2 (2020): 113-130.

'Making statesmen, writing culture: ethnography, observation, and diplomatic travel in early modern Venice', *Journal of Early Modern History* 22 (2018): 1-20.

*The Firste [Laste] Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande Conteyning the Description and Chronicles of England, from the First Inhabiting vnto the Conquest: The Description and Chronicles of Scotland, from The First Original of the Scottes Nation till the Yeare of our Lorde 1571: The Description and Chronicles of Yrelande, Likewise from the First Originall of That Nation Untill the Yeare 1571 / Faithfully Gathered and Set Forth by Raphaell Holinshed*. London: Imprinted [by H. Bynneman] for Iohn Harrison. 1577). http://english.nsms.ox.ac.uk/holinshed/toc.php?edition=1577 (date of access: 20.11.2020)

*The statutes at large, from the first year of King Edward the Fourth to the end of the reign of queen Elizabeth. To which is prefixed a table of titles of all the Publick and private statutes during that time*, ed. by O. Ruffhead, 2. London: Printed for Mark basket, printer to the king's most excellent majesty, and by the assigns of Robert Basket; and by Henry Woodfall and William Strahan, Law Printers to the Kings most excellent majesty, 1770.

*The statutes at large, passed in the Parliaments held in Ireland: from the third year of Edward the Second, A.D. 1310, to the twenty sixth year of George the Third, A. D. 1786 inclusive with marginal notes, and a complete index to the whole*, ed by J. G. Butler & F. Vesey, I. Dublin: Printed by B. Grierson, printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1786.

Thomas, Keith. *In pursuit of civility: manners and civilization in early modern England*. New Haven: Yale University Press , 2018.

Toffollo, Sandra. 'Constructing a mainland state in literature: perceptions of Venice and Its "Terraferma" in Marin Sanudo's Geographical Descriptions', *Renaissance and reformation* 37, no. 1 (2014): 5-30.

van Dijk, Teun A. 'Principles of critical discourse analysis', *Discourse and society* 42, no. 2 (1993): 249-283.

## Contact details and disclaimer:

Feliks E. Levin

National Research University Higher School of Economics (Saint Petersburg, Russia). Department of History, Senior Lecturer;

flevin@hse.ru

.