

The History of the World, Part II

Nicholas Popper

At the conclusion of Raleigh's gargantuan 1614 *History of the World*, after his bitter denunciation of princes' inhuman pursuit of fame and his lovely, macabre encomium to death, he wrote, "Lastly, whereas this Booke, by the title it hath, calles it selfe, The first part of the *Generall Historie of the World*, implying a *Second*, and *Third* Volume; which I also intended, and have hewen out; besides many other discouragements perswading my silence; it hath pleased God to take that glorious *Prince* out of the world, to whom they were directed."¹ While previous scholars have largely ascribed this passage significance for connecting Raleigh's project to the death of his hoped-for savior Prince Henry, it is also his clearest statement that he had intended to continue the *History*.² Today, I am going to air a theory today that I developed while working on my monograph examining the scholarly practices and context of the *History*: that he not only intended to write books two and three the *History* but had indeed "hewn" them out, substantially conceptualizing them and even beginning their composition in anticipation of eventual publication. Indeed, there was and remains, I will argue, a "History of the World, part II."

Raleigh's *History* – a massive, exorbitantly erudite work amounting to over 3000 pages in its lone modern edition – was a bestseller in early modern England, going through well over a dozen editions, reprints, and abridgements between its initial publication and 1736.³ Its fine-grained scholarship drew on the impressive library that Raleigh was allowed in his Tower of London rooms, containing works in Latin, English, French, Spanish, and Italian and spanning genres like histories, chronicles, theological tracts, atlases, encyclopedias, scriptural commentaries, and natural histories.⁴ Using arguments and evidence drawn from these sources, he probed problems such as the location of the Garden of Eden, the height of the floodwaters on which Noah's ark bobbed, and the sites of obscure provinces in biblical Canaan. Similarly, he

traced the origins of peoples, mapped the itineraries of scriptural figures, and narrated the emergence of the Assyrian, Persian, Macedonian and Roman Empires over a mosaic of arcane polities. Its readership saw it as something like a textbook in the classical genre of universal history, as for over a century there was no other work like it in English.

If in scope, depth, and purpose it was incomparable amongst English universal histories, it was also idiosyncratic. It terminated abruptly in 168 BC, after the emergence of Rome as the Mediterranean's sole superpower, and therefore never touched meaningful world-historical events like the advent of Christianity. Similarly, Raleigh confronted England's past only as illustrative examples, most notably in the *History's* preface as demonstration of how divine punishment of wayward kings often was visited upon their successors. The chronological curtailment of the *History* has elicited as much commentary as any other aspect of the text. Previous scholars have explained it by seeing its endpoint as marking Rome's domination of the western world, others arguing that this was the point he had reached when Prince Henry succumbed to cholera. What I will argue today probably supports either but the second most fully, since my argument accepts that his cessation of the *History* was sudden and unwanted. Indeed, it's worth pointing out that his library furnished him with ample resources to construct a continuation in much the same way as he did part one, for it brimmed with late antique histories, medieval chronicles, speculative Asian and New World histories, detailed accounts of contemporary European politics, and other sources that would have facilitated its construction and that furnished material occasionally broached in the *History* itself.

I am going to prosecute my more specific case that a form of this continuation exists, however, not on the basis of some glittering archival discovery, but entirely on evidence hidden in plain sight. And while the basic point might seem one of academic curiosity, I will maintain

that much can be learned by recognizing the incipient continuation of the published *History of the World*. In fact, I'd argue, identifying the foundation of part two helps flesh out not only Raleigh's aims for the *History*, but also reveals alterations in how he conceptualized the theoretical use of histories as he wrote his massive tome, and adumbrates his political vision, ideology, and historical theology. Above all it illuminates what one might call his epistemological situatedness—in particular how he viewed his own actions as participating within a broader narrative trajectory of his own devising. Understanding how Raleigh expected to continue his *History* places in relief the reciprocal co-production of his actions and that world-historical framework.

My argument is that the text known as the *Discourse of the Originall and Fundamental Cause of Natural, Customary, Arbitrary, Voluntary, and Necessary Warre* constitutes something like a precis of the subsequent history he hoped to write. This tract exists in a handful of contemporary manuscript copies and was first published by Humphrey Moseley in the collection of Raleighana entitled *Judicious and Select Essays* in 1650. The printed and manuscript editions are not uniform, and the 1650 edition omitted a discussion of civil war that the 1702 edition inserted before his passages on ecclesiastical war, though it belonged after. There is no holograph, but the attribution to him has not been contested, both because it has a clear reference to his authorship of the *History of the World* and because it very much reads like him.

Previous scholars have, I think, both believed and shrugged at Raleigh's claim of "hewing." This is sensible given that there are no extant writings identified as work towards a continuation of the *History*. To make my case about the *Discourse* requires addressing the problems of the *Discourse's* title, date, apparent autonomy, and thematic organization. As to the title: we do not have a Raleigh copy of the *Discourse* and so it, like other posthumous

publications, may have been imposed by someone else. There is also the possibility that Raleigh gave it the title as a kind of re-purposing after having abandoned the project of the “General History.” Whether one buys this conjecture or not, it adjusts our perspective by allowing us to assess the *Discourse* without assuming its autonomy and instead to explore its relationships to his other writings.

The date poses another problem. The reference in the text to the Somers Island Company locates 1612 as the earliest moment of its construction, but scholars have disagreed about whether it was written before or after the *History*. The key evidence for those who see it as coming after is Raleigh’s citation of the *History* in the *Discourse* when referring to how the Cimmerians—an ancient peoples from the Caucasus steppes—subjugated neighboring peoples rather than migrate a much farther distance to an unpeopled terrain. This, Raleigh says, “I have briefly shewed in an other work.”⁵ Extant manuscripts and printed editions include a footnote keyed this passage to the appropriate section of the published history. But it is unclear whether that footnote is Raleigh’s; it could have been added later. More importantly, there is no suggestion that the “other worke” was published; indeed, we should probably take the vague description as evidence of the opposite. It seems likely to me that he wrote the *Discourse* after the relevant section of on the Cimmerians (1611 by Lefranc’s calculation), but before concluding the whole.⁶

Moreover, other elements of the *Discourse* overlap with later sections of the *History* without referring to them. In the *Discourse’s* section on Civil War, for example, he cited the French Marshal Blaise de Monluc as writing that “if the Mercies of God were not infinite, no of his Profession could expect any”—a quote adapted and ultimately inserted in Book Five of the *History* itself.⁷ Furthermore, his treatment of the Punic Wars, discussed below and also in Book

Five, closely resembled the *History's* without mentioning his “other work,” suggesting that this was part of the preparation for its composition. Rather than seeing this as evidence to date the *Discourse* to post-1614, as some have done, I see these overlaps as pointing towards a date between 1612 and 1614, as Raleigh was composing the final book of the *History*.⁸

Next, one would have to consider what a “hewing” might look like if it did exist and whether the *Discourse* fits such a model. I can readily imagine several options. He could have written an abbreviated form of the envisioned work. He could have hacked out a skeletal version perhaps in list form or as a table of contents, or perhaps the kinds of chronological tables that he appended to the end of the *History*. He could have mapped the sources he wanted to use for each section; Raleigh tended to construct his narratives and analyses in part one by relying on one main source or, more frequently, assembling a small number of relevant texts which he then correlated and contrasted, and it is possible that he merely had determined what authors he would rely on for specific sections. Or he could have written something like an abstract of it, one which highlighted the grander themes he wished it to convey. The preface to the *History* might be construed as a version of this last; in it, he laid out his suitability to write the work and declared its unparalleled value as an instrument of projecting the whole of divine providence before human minds.⁹ The preface is not a perfect model, since it did not incorporate treatments of the ensuing narrative itself, rather serving predominantly as an interpretive guide and not as an overview of the historical trajectory that I think is implied by “hewing.” Nonetheless, I think the *Discourse* comes relatively close to this last notion, for it provides a succinct synopsis of the overarching argument of the envisioned history, supported by historical examples drawn nearly sequentially from post-Roman times that foregrounded his broader themes.¹⁰

These examples, as I will suggest below, are highly illuminating of the practices underlying the construction of the *Discourse*. But the limited body of scholarship on the *Discourse* has not particularly attended to the pattern of examples Raleigh marshalled in this tract. Rather, such work has focused on its debt to Machiavelli's *Discorsi*, and accordingly focused on Raleigh's establishment of principles and reasoned classifications of certain forms and practices of warfare.¹¹ To be sure, it is ordered categorically. But, as I'll show, the categories map a chronology.

Finally, the *Discourse* is seemingly distinctive for its apparent concentration on warfare and the absence of much of the erudite arcana that constituted so much of the *History*. But these features can be seen as a consolidation of the aspects he wished to emphasize from his envisioned continuation. Perhaps the best known statement in the *Discourse* is its opening: "The ordinary Theme and Argument of History is war,"¹² after which Raleigh defined war as sovereign violence, distinguished from punishment of malefactors and slaves. The crucial point here is that he positioned sovereign conflict as the substance of human history whose narration should above all entail an examination of wars. This appears to be because warfare he saw as universal to humanity, from what he described as "naked savages fighting disorderly with stones, by appointment of their Commanders" to those fighting with "the sword, the arrow, the gun, with many terrible Engines of death"—and thus appropriate for both thematic and chronological analysis.¹³ The *Discourse* creates a system for categorizing the causes of such clashes, delimiting types based on empirical inquiry into humanity's many past wars. It thus constitutes a historical epitome articulating a set of philosophical conclusions reached by inductive consideration of past events, one precise kind of wisdom that early modern readers expected to glean from reading histories, exemplified by Machiavelli's works (especially the *Discorsi*). The *Discourse* reflects

Raleigh's absorption of the contemporary conviction that fashioning intellectual systems entailed managing particulars drawn from histories.

Perhaps the most compelling evidence for the *Discourse's* status as an abstract of the *History's* continuation is the rough but clear chronology underlying Raleigh's taxonomy of war. Tracking his examples of each kind of warfare illuminates how he saw each as dominating, withdrawing, and re-surfacing within successive eras of world history. He began with descriptions of ancient peoples such as the Gauls who engaged war to "take what they needed by strong hand."¹⁴ As Raleigh described it, "there is no misery that urgeth men so violently unto desperate courses, and contempt of death, the Torments or Threats of famine," and he implied that the migrations of the world after the flood that gradually transported peoples from Babel to the Far East and the New World were compelled by such exigencies.¹⁵ This form of war Raleigh termed "the general, the Remedillesse, or the necessary War."¹⁶ It had also constituted the primary dynamic of war after the fall of Rome: as he explained, "it is most certaine that within 1200 yeares last past, all or most of the *Kingdomes* to us knowne, have thoroughly felt the calamities of such forcible trasplanations [sic]," though he also exclaimed that most of western Europe had "cause to rejoyce, and give praise to God, for that he we have been free about 600 years, from such Inundations, As were those of the Gothes, Hunnes, and Vandalls, yea from such as were those of our owne Ancestors, the Saxons, Danes, and Normans."¹⁷

Well before this latter date, however, this form of warfare was no longer dominant, instead giving way to what he termed, "warre voluntary, and customeable, unto which the offering party is not compelled."¹⁸ This sort of war he noted "doth usually borrow pretence from the necessary to make it self appeare more honest," but unlike necessary war, it was not compulsory for survival, and it encompassed numerous different species.¹⁹ The most legitimate

was generated by the “desire of having, and such desire from feare of want.”²⁰ This version often manifested as battles to extend dominion; as Raleigh explained, “if [two princes] be divided by Mountaines they will for the mastery of the passages of the Tops, And finally for the Towns that stand upon the roots. If Rivers run between them, they contend for the Bridges, And thinke themselves not well assured until they have fortified the further banck.”²¹ Often, he conceded, some “small measure of necessity” provoked the quarrel, especially when, for example, younger sons could not inherit land, or artisans lacked purchasers for their goods, but this was distinguished from necessary war because under such conditions princes tended to focus blame on the “Injury, supposed to be done by Forreigners,” rather than acknowledging their own accountability.²² This was the warfare driving recent Spanish imperial efforts in Africa and the New World, he maintained, but it also had propelled the Saxons into England and the “Arabians in Barbarie.”²³

A related species of this type of war was “revenge of injury sustained.”²⁴ In particular, this became likely when a prince’s subjects abroad were maltreated, which often occurred because each ruler had demonstrable cause to favor their own subjects over those of others within their realm, and yet foreign subjects with recourse to their own sovereigns were less given to tolerate injustices and oppressions. Few examples dotted this brief section—most prominently, some of Caesar’s actions fit this type, but Raleigh instead focused on how Elizabeth, when faced with economic injuries to her subjects abroad, fully restored owed monies to her maligned subjects rather than appropriating them to enrich her own coffers.

The next type of warfare was again distinct from but related to this prior species. “As for the redresse of Injuries done unto Princes themselves,” Raleigh maintained, “it may conveniently (though not always, for it were miserable injustice to deny leave to Princes of mainetaining their

owne honour) be referred unto the third motive of Arbitrary Warres, which is meere Ambition.”²⁵ Despite being the warfare furthest distant from necessity, it was the most common cause of wars.²⁶ It was also the most insidious. It too had pervaded the ancient world; as Raleigh pointed out, it spurred the Trojan War, motivated the wicked Israelite king Ahab, and provoked the iniquitous Roman alliance with Mamertine cutthroats in Sicily against Carthage. And ambition could be directed at many targets; as he wrote, “of old times (perhaps before Helen of Greece was borne) Women have been the common Argument of these Tragedies.” But now that mantle had been assumed by “the right of St. Peter, that is the Popes Revenues and Authority.”²⁷

For Raleigh’s the papacy’s wars of ambition marked not just an adoption, but an innovative type of warfare, which the 1702 edition of the *Discourse* gave its own title of “Ecclesiastical War.” He acknowledged that many would hesitate to lump this form of war in with other wars of ambition, as he explained: “For the Warre that hath such foundation, will not only be reputed, free from worldly Ambition, Just and honourable, But holy, and meritorious.”²⁸ To be sure, Raleigh dismissed these ostensible justifications: it was always, he insisted in an Augustinian vein, “not for kingdome of Heaven, But for Dominion upon Earth.”²⁹ And his treatment of this war departed from his previous discussions in other ways that foreground his underlying chronological order, and reveals its ascendancy as perhaps intending to mark the beginning of his third part of the *History of the World*. This section traced not just the evils, but the origins and progresses of this pretended holy warfare, for unlike the other species, this type was not as old as humanity; it had its own temporality and logic. As his initial broad overview explained, “I thinke the honour of devising first this Doctrine: That Religion ought to be inforced upon men by the sword, would be found appertaining to Mahomet the false Prophet.”³⁰ Similarly, he later noted, “The first thereof (of whom I read) that used the advantage of honour

given to him in matter of Religion towards the getting of Temporall possession, was (if not Mahomet himselfe) Abubachar the Successor unto Mahomet.”³¹ This was a type of warfare, that is, which not only declined to observe the separation of ecclesiastical and secular authority that Raleigh identified as prescribed by scripture, but in fact used disingenuous invocations of the sacred to stimulate wars designed to enhance ecclesiastical authority’s secular power. And it was the distinctive feature of the modern age.

Not only did Islam generate this form of combat, but it also supplied a powerful basis for its transmission to Christendom. As he noted, “against these did the Popes, when their authority grew powerfull in the West, incite the Princes of Germany England, France and Italie. Their chiefe enterprise was the Recovery of the Holy Land.”³² The Crusades crystallized Christendom’s adoption of this latter-day warfare. Though Raleigh approved of the Crusades in theory, he saw its noble goal of protecting the faith as overcome by its inflection towards the papacy’s project of enhancing its wealth and appropriating secular authority.

In his depiction, the Crusades marked the horrific culmination of a gradual process. Gregory II’s campaign against the Byzantine Emperor Leo III marked its inauguration when, in 722, his insistence that Rome had been consecrated by the blood of the apostles Peter and Paul was used to draw military protection. Pepin and Charlemagne were subsequently attracted by this vision of holy war and, Raleigh recounted, they protected Rome from the Lombard threat and reinforced its self-sufficiency and autonomy by massively enlarging papal dominion.³³ Almost immediately after Charlemagne, however, popes began to revolt against their fealty to the Holy Roman Empire, “so grew up in them withal a desire, of amplifying their power, that they might be as great in temporall forces as mens opinions have formed them in spirituall matters.”³⁴ The Investiture Controversy at the end of the eleventh century marked the climax of this turn, as the

humiliation of Emperor Henry IV at Canossa emboldened the papacy to ever more outrageous provocations and encroachments. The Crusades heralded a new brazenness emboldened by this triumph; as Raleigh pointed out, Spain would have been a more advisable theater than Jerusalem for a war to recover once-Christian spaces from Islam, but would have inspired fewer recruits and contributions. And popes diverted the monies which flowed in to sustain the Crusades, Raleigh pointed out, to their own purposes, which often included warfare against Christian polities. Over the following centuries, their greed and unslakeable appetite for dominion led them to sacrifice their truest believers to unwinnable conflicts, to promote warfare between co-religionists, and to turn subjects against their appointed rulers. “How few kingdoms are there (if any),” he asked, “wherein by dispensing with others, transferring the right of Crowns, Absolving Subjects from allegiance, and cursing or threatening to curse as long as their curses were regarded, they have not wrought unprobable mischiefs?”³⁵ The Holy Roman Empire was only revived by Rudolf I, he maintained, when it declined papal consecration. And the histories of Sicily, Naples, France, Poland, and England too gave ample evidence of papal usurpations and conturbations caused because the papacy felt free to “dispens[e] with oaths taken for agreement between one King and another, or between Kings and Subjects.”³⁶ Viewed from Raleigh’s perspective, it had been the pope’s “Custome to oppresse Kings by their people, and the people by their Kings, yet his was for serving his owne turne.”³⁷ A century before Raleigh’s time, Leo X had exposed the papacy’s lust and avarice through his addiction to Indulgences, but it nevertheless remained, ironically, the most disruptive and seditious force in all Christendom.

Raleigh’s anti-papal position was, of course, conventional to many Protestants. What was distinct was the imputation to the papacy of a certain species of distinctly malevolent warfare adopted from Islam, the rigidly historical register in which he prosecuted and narrated his

argument, and above all the insistence that the unique tenor of his world lay in the form and prevalence of ecclesiastical conflict.

Before stepping back to assess the full historical vision of this text and its suitability as a precis of the unwritten portions of the *History*, I should address Raleigh's treatment of civil war that concluded the tract, which Moseley excluded from the 1650 edition but has justifiably been included in all since.³⁸ Raleigh's examples of civil war followed thematically, but not chronologically, on the previous sections. For Raleigh, Civil Wars were caused not by poor governance but by faction. As he explained, "the subtilty used towards some weak men joined with others, over-ruled by the Wealth and Authority of some great ambitious persons, is the main Foundation of all Civil Blood-shed." Indeed civil war was distinguished by the prevalence of false pretexts disguising "other Men's Ambitions" and did not necessarily require factional divisions to devolve into internecine bloodshed.³⁹ In this vein, Raleigh's primary example was the Punic Wars between Rome and Carthage, which would not fit our contemporary notion of a civil war. Here, he previewed the highly appreciative profile of Hannibal so pronounced in the *History* (again, without making reference its publication, suggesting that this portion had not yet been composed), focusing on how faction in Carthage prevented Hannibal from leveling Rome.⁴⁰ Nor was Rome immune from this disease; Raleigh characterized its vulnerability as a product of faction and the unwillingness of the Senate to overrule the people's clamor for self-promoting generals the Senate knew to be incompetent.⁴¹ After the defeat of Carthage, Rome's Cold Civil War ignited. The susceptibility to popular pressure mediated by faction later exploded in the Agrarian Law promulgated by the Gracchi, a law which shared conquered lands between the nobility and Roman people. For Raleigh, the problem lay not in the law itself but that it was "too violently urged,"⁴² and he saw it as inspiring an intensified "State-Frenzy of Sedition," for it

“kindled such hatred between the People and Senate, that it never ended, but with the loss of the Liberty of Rome, and the dissolution of that Republick.”⁴³ The ensuing massacres and feuds led Raleigh to declare “that greater plague cannot come upon a People than a Civil War.”⁴⁴ Worse, it demonstrated that “when Wars are ended abroad, Sedition begins at home, and when Men are freed from fighting for Necessity, they quarrel through Ambition.”⁴⁵ This environment attracted Rome’s worst element, as the bloodshed wrought by Cinna, Sylla, and Marius demonstrated.

If we reorganize the corpus of examples to place those from the Civil War sections before those introduced sequentially through the rest of the tract, the evidence supporting the *Discourse* cumulatively “hews out” a historical narrative subsequent to part one of Raleigh’s *History of the World*. In fact, the Punic War sections flowed into the published *History* itself, and I’d suggest that this reinforces the notion that it was written just before or simultaneously with those sections (which Lefranc estimates were written from 1612 to 1614).⁴⁶ The unrealized second part of the *History of the World*, on this evidence, would have traced how Rome’s removal of its enemies stimulated its Civil Wars, which in turn created the conditions in which the Huns, Lombards, Visigoths and others ultimately toppled it through necessary war, which in turn spiraled into conflicts underpinned by other logics. The end of this period –likely beginning the third part of the *History of the World* – saw Islam’s rise through the innovation of ecclesiastical war. Its adoption by the papacy ushered in the ongoing dynamic of the present which Raleigh inhabited, in which ecclesiastical war was a relentless form of civil division. Though the text was formatted as a systematic overview of types of war, it not only rested upon historical inquiry and chronologically-sequential examples, but functioned as a key to understanding the past, much like the *History’s* preface did. Indeed, it may have been intended as the preface to subsequent publication, but it could also have been conceptualized as a synopsis or as draft material that he

intended to distribute throughout. The specifics here do not really matter; this was material with a clear and striking historical vision intended to galvanize a continuation of the *History*.

Some insights emerge from thinking of the *Discourse* in this way. For one, this broader overview aligns Raleigh with John Bale, John Foxe, and others, who located the papacy's corruption of Christianity at similar moments and defined the Reformation as a restoration of not the primitive church, but of the honeycomb of independent but interrelated churches in the middle of the first millennium.⁴⁷ Raleigh here comes off as a certain kind of very English and early Elizabethan Calvinist. This Calvinism owed little to the works of Calvin; rather than directing scholastic and humanistic inquiry towards emphasizing ongoing reformation within the church itself, it foregrounded the historical theater of a cosmic conflict between salvation and degeneracy. In fact, one might argue that Raleigh's historical articulation constituted a species of Augustinianism related to but distinct from Calvin's. An intense Augustinianism further underlay Raleigh's intense conviction of humanity's depravity, embodied by his insistence on the permanence of warfare as a feature of the human condition (and Raleigh, I suspect many here would agree, never writes more powerfully than when describing that depravity). But Raleigh differed from Foxe and Bale by situating Christian history within the whole of universal history, as Augustine did, rather than bracketing off the pre-Christian past as would become conventional over the seventeenth century, as confessionalizing reformers eschewed inquiry into historical providence in favor of questions concerning proper precedents for doctrine, ecclesiology, and liturgy.⁴⁸ In that sense, Raleigh's universal history was his instrument of reform.

Seeing the *Discourse* as an abstract of the *History's* continuation also helps illuminate Raleigh's political commitments. Raleigh was no republican monarchomach, and he believed subjects owed their rulers obedience—whether or not they were tyrants or heretics. But he also

believed that princes were beholden to right and justice, and that the best resisted lawless ambition and were content with stability. This political philosophy little differed from that of his captor King James'. Furthermore, we have here an anti-imperial Raleigh, or at least one who saw the ineluctable pursuit of empire as something fraught rather than majestic, and intended the ventures he supervised in Roanoke and Guiana to limit Spanish universal monarchy rather than usher in a new global British Empire.⁴⁹ But it's also a Raleigh characterized by profound gloom. For he recognized that even those princes and peoples—like its churches, for that matter—he perceived as warranting divine favor were always mutable, always vulnerable to the cavils and manipulations of the deceitful. For the story of humanity was its susceptibility to manipulation and propensity to bloodshed.

This emphasis was at the heart of the *History of the World* as well, reinforcing that he notion that the erudite, particularized story he told in that text represented a grand narrative of the varieties of human fallenness. Discerning the relationship between these two texts for the *Discourse* yields a slightly different lesson. It hints that as he composed the *Discourse* years after starting the *History*, he wished to foreground how theoretical knowledge could be inductively generated by empirical inquiry into the past. Through the process of research and composition, this suggests, Raleigh more sharply stressed how the excision, sifting, correlation, and classification of historical particulars could reveal atemporal, eternal laws of humankind. This type of practice of reading emerged as an increasingly powerful rationale for learning about the past through the seventeenth century and galvanized new ways of producing political, natural philosophical, and religious knowledge; Raleigh's adversary Francis Bacon remains the best known advocate of such a method, but his more philosophical lucubrations largely theorized developments already permeating scholarly practice throughout Europe. Raleigh's choice of this

particular type of systematic treatment – rather than the alternatives articulated above or the strategies underlying the preface to the *History*– suggests that he refined and recalibrated, though did not radically reverse, his sense of how to read histories over the years of writing the *History of the World*.

Nonetheless, Raleigh’s reading process evinced by the *Discourse* should not be seen as a form of proto-social scientific systematization with aspirations towards modern objectivity. His inquiry into the past remained above all exemplary—a style of history using past episodes to yield rules of virtue and vice. And it was also powerfully genealogical, in which his contemporary phenomena were ontologically related to past predecessors. Thus it reveals how strongly he perceived his present through the filter of the past.⁵⁰ Through such communion with history, he fixed the religious conflicts characteristic of his time as an iteration of the relentless recrudescence of evil ambition.

What most requires absorption is the degree to which Raleigh saw his contemporary world as participating in the historical, and how the practice of situating himself this way constructed not just his perception of the past, but of his present. Papist Christianity’s cardinal feature was its reliance on ecclesiastical warfare, but this was itself an adaptation of the permanent bug of humanity, one distinctive mostly for producing civil strife by injecting crude faction with promises of the sacred. And this ecclesiastical warfare and faction he understood as the indelible character of his age. But more, seeing how Raleigh bridged the chasm between the end of the *History* and his present illuminates how he, epistemologically, positioned himself not at a critical distance from the past able to assess dispassionately its models of virtue and vice or its processes of causation, but like Augustine as moving among its shadows, darknesses flickering in new forms. He perceived his world as distinct from Babylon, Egypt, Judea, or Rome

only in its accidents and particulars, as the same theater of degeneracy staged upon a modified set. More than simply writing universal history, he inhabited it, himself a subject and instrument of providence permeated by the depravity inscribed in all humanity, but that through the writing and study of history might yet come to know and project into the world glimpses of the inscrutable divine, embodied and refracted through the pen wielded by his own fallen body.

¹ Walter Raleigh, *History of the World* (London, 1614), V.6.12, p. 776 (second pagination).

² For Raleigh's relationship with Henry, see Leonard Tennenhouse, "Sir Walter Raleigh and the Literature of Clientage," in *Patronage in the Renaissance*, ed. Guy Fitch Lytle and Stephen Orgel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 235-58; and the important criticisms in Anna Beer, "'Left to the World without a Maister': Sir Walter Raleigh's *The History of the World* as a Public Text" *Studies in Philology* 91 (1994): 432-63.

³ The most significant focused treatments of the *History* as a whole include C.H. Firth, "Sir Walter Raleigh's *History of the World*," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 8 (1918): 427-46. F. Smith Fussner, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), 191-210; Pierre Lefranc, *Sir Walter Raleigh Écrivain: L'Oeuvre et les Idées* (Paris, A. Colin; Québec, les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1968), 254-334 and passim; F.J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1967), 286-94; C.A. Patrides, ed., *The History of the World* (London: MacMillan, 1971); John Racine, Jr., *Sir Walter Raleigh as Historian: An Analysis of the History of the World* (Salzburg: Universität Salzburg, 1974); D.R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and the "Light of Truth" from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990); Anna Beer, "'Left to the World without a Maister'"; Joseph Levine, "Sir Walter Raleigh and the Ancient Wisdom," in *Court, Country and Culture: Essays on Early Modern British History in Honor of Perez Zagorin*, ed. Bonnelyn Young Kunze and Dwight D. Brautigam (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1992), 89-108; Nicholas Popper, *Walter Raleigh's History of the World and the Historical Culture of the Late Renaissance* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

⁴ Walter Oakeshott, "Sir Walter Raleigh's Library," *Library* 5th ser 23 (1968): 285-327.

⁵ Walter Raleigh, *A Discourse of the Originall and Fundamentall Cause of Naturall, Customary, Arbitrary, Voluntary and Necessary Warre* (London, 1650). The reference appears to be to HW, II.28.4.3

⁶ For the best discussion of the date of the *Discourse*, see Steven W. May, *Sir Walter Raleigh* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1989), 106-107; Lefranc dates it to between 1614-1616 for reasons I find unclear (Lefranc, *Sir Walter Raleigh Écrivain*, 54). For Lefranc's dating of book II of the *History*, see Lefranc, *Sir Walter Raleigh Écrivain*, 641.

⁷ "That were not the mercies of GOD infinite...it were in vaine for those of his profession to hope for any portion of them: seeing the cruelties by them permitted and committed, were also infinite." Raleigh, *History*, V.6.2, p. 715 (second pagination).

⁸ Raleigh, *Discourse*, D1r.

⁹ For the importance of providence, see Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

¹⁰ Most Raleigh scholars have seen the *Discourse* as closely related to his *Invention of Ships*, which was likely produced around the same time and through the same practices. I can readily imagine a way to fold the *Invention* into the theory I lay out here, and for the temporal relationship between the two, see May, *Walter Raleigh*, 110. But note that the *Invention*'s chronological foundation does not follow the trajectory that the *Discourse* does.

¹¹ For this perspective, see Vincent Luciani, "Raleigh's *Discourse of War* and Machiavelli's *Discorsi*," *Modern Philology* 46 (1948): 122-131; Lefranc, *Sir Walter Raleigh Écrivain*, 224-253, 614-632. For other discussions of the *Discourse*, see also Paul Jorgensen, "Theoretical Views of War in Elizabethan England," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 13 (1952): 469-81.

¹² Raleigh, *Discourse*, C7v.

¹³ Raleigh, *Discourse*, C7v-C8r. In warfare's universality it resembles law, but is in fact a consequence of law's failures, for as he puts it, God's "Great Charter" to Adam of "go forth and multiply in fact engendered rather than resolved conflict. Raleigh, *Discourse*, C8v.

¹⁴ Raleigh, *Discourse*, D1r.

-
- ¹⁵ Raleigh, *Discourse*, D3r.
- ¹⁶ Raleigh, *Discourse*, D3v.
- ¹⁷ Raleigh, *Discourse*, D2v.
- ¹⁸ Raleigh, *Discourse*, D3v.
- ¹⁹ Raleigh, *Discourse*, D3v.
- ²⁰ Raleigh, *Discourse*, D4r.
- ²¹ Raleigh, *Discourse*, D4r.
- ²² Raleigh, *Discourse*, D4v, D5r. Accordingly, though “feare of harme and prevention of danger...is just and taught by nature...neverthelesse, because warre cannot be without mutall violence: It is manifest that the allegation of danger and feare serves only to excuse the suffering part, the wrongdoer being carried by his owne will.” Raleigh, *Discourse*, D6v-D7r.
- ²³ Raleigh, *Discourse*, D5v.
- ²⁴ Raleigh, *Discourse*, D7r.
- ²⁵ Raleigh, *Discourse*, E3v.
- ²⁶ Raleigh, *Discourse*, E3v. He called it the “true cause of more wars, then have troubled the world upon all other occasions whatsoever.”
- ²⁷ Raleigh, *Discourse*, E4v-E5r.
- ²⁸ Raleigh, *Discourse*, E5r.
- ²⁹ Raleigh, *Discourse*, E5v.
- ³⁰ Raleigh, *Discourse*, E5r.
- ³¹ Raleigh, *Discourse*, F3r-v.
- ³² Raleigh, *Discourse*, E5v.
- ³³ Raleigh, *Discourse*, F5r. Pepin and Constantine, he maintained, had donated to the papacy “the most of those Lands, which the Pope now holds in Italie, and not to restore them the Emperour, from whome the Lumbards had gotten them.”
- ³⁴ Raleigh, *Discourse*, F5v. Local Romans despised the monsters who despite being “the faction of cut-throats, and strumpets” acquired St Peters chair, but though they “despised that hypocrisy, which the world abroad did reverence as holinesse,” they and numerous other polities were brought in line. Raleigh, *Discourse*, F6r.
- ³⁵ Raleigh, *Discourse*, E7v.
- ³⁶ Raleigh, *Discourse*, G2v.
- ³⁷ Raleigh, *Discourse*, G4r.
- ³⁸ Raleigh says much that resonates with the kinds of questions addressed by Hobbes and others reflecting on the Civil Wars they witnessed, for example describing the condition of war as “the state of Nature of men out of community.” Similarly Raleigh wrote, “Certain it is, the condition of no Nation was ever bettered by a Civil War, for when the People and the Government draw the Sword against each other, all former Compacts and Agreements for securing of Liberty and Property are dissolved, and become void; for flying to Arms is a state of War, which is the meer state of Nature of Men out of Community, where...I shall enjoy my Life, my Substance, or what is dear to me, no longer he that has more Cunning, or is Stronger than I, will give me leave.” Walter Raleigh, *Three Discourses* (London, 1702), 97. He subsequently declared that consciences were bound by human law. Nonetheless, he also discussed circumstances when subjects were within their rights to remove “defective” governors arguing that it was a people’s right to remove governors “where the Person or Persons Possessing the Supream Power are incurably defective.” Raleigh, *Three Discourses*, 101. Raleigh did not interrogate this category particularly, but he associated it with “avarice, ambition, or revenge,” leading them to corrupt justice in the name of their own enrichment. Raleigh, *Three Discourses*, 105. But, he argued, these cases would lead to regime change “without Blood-shed” since such patently corrupt incompetent officials could not possibly muster their own war party. Raleigh, *Three Discourses*, 108.
- ³⁹ Raleigh, *Three Discourses*, 108-109.
- ⁴⁰ Raleigh’s admiration of Hannibal, see Charles G. Salas, “Raleigh and the Punic Wars” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 57.2 (1996): 195-215; and Anna R. Beer, *Sir Walter Raleigh and his Readers in the Seventeenth Century: Speaking to the People* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997) 22-59.
- ⁴¹ Indeed, Raleigh contrasted the Senate’s fickleness with the constancy of Atilius Regulus, in another treatment reprised in part one, but maintained that majorities tended to slope towards vice and laziness rather than accepting the pains often attendant upon individual virtue.
- ⁴² Raleigh, *Three Discourses*, 134.
- ⁴³ Raleigh, *Three Discourses*, 133-34.
- ⁴⁴ Raleigh, *Three Discourses*, 135. Raleigh predominantly blamed the Civil Wars on the nobility, whose actions proved their preference for wealth over honor

⁴⁵ Raleigh, *Three Discourses*, 136.

⁴⁶ Lefranc, *Sir Walter Raleigh Écrivain*, 641.

⁴⁷ For this literature, see Richard Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse: Sixteenth Century Apocalypticism, Millenarianism, and the English Reformation: From John Bale to John Foxe and Thomas Brightman* (Oxford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1978); David Loades, ed., *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997); Christopher Highley and John N. King, eds., *John Foxe and His World* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002); Thomas Freeman and Elizabeth Evenden, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of John Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

⁴⁸ For this seventeenth century emphasis, see above all Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); see also Thomas Betteridge, Thomas, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530-83* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999). For ecclesiastical histories more broadly, see Irena Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)* (Leiden: Brill, 2003); and Katherine Van Liere, Simon Ditchfield, and Howard Louthan, eds., *Sacred History: Uses of the Christian Past in the Early Modern World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

⁴⁹ Similarly, see Arthur Williamson, "An Empire to End Empire: The Dynamic of Early Modern British Expansion," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 227-56

⁵⁰ For the fluid line between prophecy and history, see A.N. McLaren, "Prophecy and Providentialism in the reign of Elizabeth I" in *Prophecy: The Power of Inspired Languages in History 1300-2000*, ed. Bertrand Taithe and Tim Thornton (Stroud: Sutton, 1997), 1-30.