



Provided by the author(s) and University of Galway in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite the published version when available.

Title	Irish sources for Spenser's View
Author(s)	Canny, Nicholas
Publication Date	2018-01-31
Publication Information	Canny, Nicholas (2018). Irish Sources for Spenser's View. <i>Spenser Studies</i> , 31-32, 495-510. doi: 10.1086/694440
Publisher	The University of Chicago Press Journals
Link to publisher's version	https://doi.org/10.1086/694440
Item record	http://hdl.handle.net/10379/7288
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/694440

Downloaded 2024-04-20T14:56:51Z

Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.





NICHOLAS CANNY

Irish Sources for Spenser's *View*

The first section of the *View* is widely understood to be influenced by the twelfth-century texts of Gerald of Wales, as transmitted by Richard Stanyhurst in his *Plain and Perfect Description of Ireland* included in Holinshed (1577). These works describe the Norman intervention in Ireland as a civilizing process. Such an identification of sources is problematic, however, because the ultimate purpose of the *View* was to discredit Stanyhurst's argument that Irish-born descendants of the Norman conquerors of Ireland (the so-called "Old English") should complete that task. This case of problematic sourcing is resolved given that Stanyhurst's original text reappeared in the 1587 edition of Holinshed's *Chronicle* accompanied by some translations from the writings of Gerald of Wales made by John Hooker (an English Protestant antiquarian), and also by Hooker's own *History of Ireland 1546–86*, wherein Hooker attributes the disturbed condition of the country to the recalcitrance of Old English lords. This, for Hooker, and also for Spenser, proved that the Irish population of English descent was in greater need of reform than their Gaelic neighbors. Given that this was the novel argument of the *View*, and given close echoes between Hooker's description of famine in Munster and similar passages in the *View*, Hooker's contribution to the 1587 edition of Holinshed's *Chronicle* is arguably the most potent influence on Spenser's work.

Edmund Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (ca. 1596) comes as something of a shock for literary scholars who have been accustomed to consider Spenser as a poet rather than as a social and political commentator. The seeming sudden appearance of this prose text is usually explained by reference either to the political crisis that had been festering in Ireland during the 1590s and that seemed, in 1596, about to spill over into Munster where Spenser had acquired and developed a modest estate, or to the development of a discourse community among the many highly educated English people—Spenser, Ludowick Bryskett, Walter Raleigh, Philip Sidney, Geoffrey Fenton, William Herbert, Richard Beacon, George Carew to name but a few—who all served in Ireland (and most of them in Munster) in various capacities close to this time.¹

I propose in this article to consider how previous scholars have explained why Spenser suddenly departed from verse composition to write the *View*, and to ascertain what other texts besides those associated with prominent literary figures who served in Ireland in the sixteenth century may have influenced how and what he wrote in the *View*.²

The question most frequently asked by those who address this subject is how Spenser's experiences in Ireland (insofar as these can be ascertained) explain what many consider to have been the extreme measures for reforming Ireland that were recommended by Irenius—the interlocutor who many scholars assume represents Spenser himself—in the *View*. The second (less tangible question) is how what Spenser *might have* read about Ireland and its history and literature influenced the pronouncements that he ascribed to either one of his interlocutors (Irenius or Eudoxus) in the discourse. And the third question (more favored by historians than by students of literature) is the extent to which the more radical pronouncements made by Irenius concerning the “reform” of Ireland had been anticipated, or were subsequently repeated, by some of Spenser's English contemporaries in Ireland. Put more crudely, this third question amounts to querying the extent to which Spenser borrowed or plagiarized the opinions of others, or the extent to which others borrowed his ideas without acknowledgment.

While scholars of recent vintage have mulled over these questions they have been no more successful than their predecessors in arriving at consensual answers. The greatest difference arises between some historians who give credence only to what can be established empirically, and some students of literature who speculate about what Spenser *might have* or *must have* read, or heard, or witnessed before he sat down to compose (or final-

ize) the *View*. Scholars have experienced further difficulty in providing precise answers to what appear to be straightforward questions because we do not know when exactly Spenser composed the *View*; whether he drafted the entire text at one time; where, besides being in England, the author was when he put it together; and what his work routine was when he composed this text, or any other of his texts for that matter.

Nor do we know the extent of his working library. While I believe that Spenser was unquestionably a well-read person with a curious mind, I have always doubted the contention that, during the years he spent in Ireland, he worked in relatively comfortable conditions with ready access to a plentiful stock of books to which he might refer at his leisure. This latter proposition, which has been most recently proposed in Andrew Hadfield's biography of Spenser, strikes me as implausible even when Hadfield refers to the importation of books from England and from Continental Europe into Ireland in the sixteenth century and to the significant libraries that certainly existed in Ireland from the early decades of the seventeenth century forward.³ Hadfield's proposition that it is "inconceivable that Spenser did not have a substantial library on his estate" that accommodated as least 200–300 volumes, and possibly—given his probable income—as many as the one thousand books that John Donne possessed, takes no account of the disturbed conditions that obtained in Munster and in Ireland more generally when Spenser lived and worked there. Neither does it allow for the fact that the estate and castle Spenser acquired in the Munster plantation had been ravaged by war, which meant that he had to develop a working estate and residence almost from scratch.⁴ It is far more likely, I believe, that Spenser had to hand for consultation at Kilcolman at most a trunkful, rather than a library, of books, and that he would have had to pause to check the accuracy of his facts and recollections on his occasional visits to England or even to Dublin, where he may have been able to gain access to some collections of books. Moreover, the speed at which Spenser produced his enormous output suggests to me that he relied heavily upon the store of recollected knowledge he had gleaned from the great number of books and other sources that he would have read before he visited Ireland. Rudolf Gottfried, who edited the *View* and commented on the text for the Variorum edition of Spenser, did not address this issue directly, but his occasional references to Spenser's "unsure memory" and to Spenser having "not accurately remembered" certain details suggests that Gottfried was also of the opinion that Spenser relied, more than most authors, on memory. I think it even possible that

Spenser believed that he enjoyed the privilege of departing from exactitude because his contemporaries would have known that he was not writing in ideal working conditions.⁵

Nor, when it comes to these latter considerations, do I believe that the *View* (any more than any other of Spenser's works) was the product of a single sitting. I contend that there is an obvious imbalance between the earlier section of the text (roughly the first half) where Spenser developed a modulated dialogue between Irenius and Eudoxus, and the later part where Irenius alone, with but occasional interjections from Eudoxus, prescribed how garrisons could be positioned throughout the country to manage and implement the reform program upon which the two interlocutors had previously agreed, and which Irenius could now describe in detail.⁶ It strikes me (and here I speak as a historian) that much of what Irenius prescribed in this later section could have been borrowed from the official papers from almost any decade of the second half of the sixteenth century, when ambitious governors, or their advisors, frequently made the case that the country could only be brought to good order and profit once the government committed itself to one further major outlay that would enable the queen's army to defeat all opponents in Ireland at one time. Such a comprehensive victory, it was always contended, would then open the way for a reform of the country that, it was argued, was certain to benefit everybody.⁷ One obvious model that may have inspired Spenser was a 1580 text by Sir William Pelham that has recently been edited by David Heffernan together with a range of other reform texts on Ireland ranging in time from 1537 to 1599.⁸

When account is taken of such documentation it becomes clear that there is little original in this later section of the text, besides on the occasions when the two interlocutors engaged in squamous debate on the moral propriety of what was being prescribed by Irenius. I therefore consider it more profitable to concentrate on the dialogue sections to divine what previous experience in Ireland, or what previous writing on the reform of Ireland, might have influenced, inspired, or lent authority to the arguments on which the interlocutors could reach agreement. When considering which Irish factors influenced Spenser in his writing of the dialogue sections of the *View* it seems sensible to pause and reflect on what was his ambition when he undertook to write the *View* besides explaining that the particular problems that Irenius had witnessed, or experienced, in Ireland necessitated the employment of more drastic corrective measures than Eudoxus considered appropriate for use in orderly commonwealths. When seeking

for precedents for what needed to be justified, Spenser, like almost everybody in the sixteenth century who wrote of Ireland and its problems, would have referred mentally or textually to the writings of Giraldus Cambrensis (Gerald of Wales), who, despite having lived and worked in the twelfth century, remained into the sixteenth century a prime authority on what was the responsibility of English monarchs toward their lordship of Ireland that had, in 1541, been declared a kingdom “as united and knit to the imperial crown of the realm of England.”⁹ This consideration would suggest that when Spenser undertook to write the *View*, he was seeking, in the light of more recent experience, to update what Gerald of Wales had had to say on how Ireland might be reformed. This concern would have brought him quickly to the reinterpretation of the writings of Gerald that had been rendered by the Dubliner Richard Stanyhurst under the title of *A Treatise Containing a Plain and Perfect Description of Ireland, with an Introduction to the better understanding of the Histories appertaining to that Land*—a treatise that is usually referred to as *The Description of Ireland*.¹⁰ This Stanyhurst text had appeared in the first edition of Holinshed’s *Chronicle*, published in 1577, and Spenser and his contemporaries would have been even more aware of it because it had been reprinted in slightly amended form in the second 1586/87 edition of Holinshed’s *Chronicle*.¹¹ The volume on Ireland of this second edition of Holinshed had been organized, and partly written, by John Hooker, alias Vowell—an English antiquarian, adventurer, and politician who had spent the years 1567–85 in Ireland.¹²

Spenser and his readers would have certainly been familiar with Stanyhurst’s text given that Holinshed’s *Chronicle* was one of the great publishing successes of sixteenth-century England, and also, as Andrew Hadfield has pointed out, Spenser was closely associated with the Carew family who had been Hooker’s patrons.¹³ Moreover, it is clear from the few passing references made to Stanyhurst in the *View* that Spenser was both transfixed by what Stanyhurst had to say of Ireland while being disdainful toward him as a person and a scholar.¹⁴ Thus, I would suggest that Spenser’s choice of Irenius (a person with experience of Ireland) as the name of the lead interlocutor in the *View* was an adaptation by him of the name Irenaeus that had been given to the Englishman with knowledge of Ireland who had discoursed on the difficulty of reforming Irish people in a brief dialogue extract, supposedly by one Alan Cope but actually by Nicholas Harpsfield, that Stanyhurst had included within *The Description of Ireland*.¹⁵ Readers of the *View* who, as I have indicated, would have been familiar with the printed Stanyhurst text, would likely have taken this choice of name as a signal that

Spenser in his own dialogue was responding to, or updating, what Stanyhurst had to say on the same subject of the reform of Ireland.¹⁶

The fact that Spenser chose to develop the *View* as a dialogue suggests also that he agreed with Stanyhurst that dialogue was “a kind of writing . . . commended of the learned.”¹⁷ Moreover, what Stanyhurst had to say of the depravity of the Gaelic population of the Ireland of his own generation, as opposed to the generation of Gerald of Wales, accorded well with what Spenser’s interlocutors had to say on the same subject. However, Spenser, like most of his English-born contemporaries in Ireland, rejected the premise from which Stanyhurst had proceeded, which held that since the descendants of the original English conquerors of Ireland had upheld English civility in Ireland through the centuries, they should now receive assistance from the crown to complete the conquest of the country that had been commenced in the twelfth century.

Spenser’s fundamental disagreement with this proposition would explain why Irenius went to such length to discredit Stanyhurst’s contention that the descendants of the original English conquerors of Ireland had better upheld the civility of their ancestors, including Chaucerian English, than had the population of England itself.¹⁸ Irenius rejected this proposition out of hand supposedly because it did not accord with what he, and many of his contemporaries, had witnessed in Ireland. Here we might recall the many texts by English witnesses, ranging from Edmund Tremayne to Andrew Trollope, that had detailed barbaric practices within the Pale and other parts of the country that professed to uphold English civility.¹⁹ Spenser, and his English-born contemporaries, also wished to distance themselves from Stanyhurst’s further boast that those living within the Anglicized parts of Ireland were the moral and cultural superiors of newcomers from England. To counter this point, people of English birth in Ireland had taken to composing multiple letters and tracts to the effect that they had been repeatedly ostracized, tricked, and cheated by the descendants of the English in Ireland, and particularly by those within the Pale who controlled the judicial process. Moreover, Spenser and his contemporaries (for whom, in this respect, Irenius certainly was a champion) were resentful because the preexisting English population of Ireland, whom Spenser called the Old English or even “the Irish party,” had worked assiduously to undermine the authority of every governor who had striven to pursue a progressive policy in Ireland. Their consistent tactic had been to dispatch delegations of lawyers from the Pale to persuade Queen Elizabeth and her Privy Council in England that her representative in Ireland was behaving tyrannically

in her name.²⁰ Those English who reflected on such episodes could cite the experiences of Sussex, Sidney, and Perrot, but the complaint that was most loudly (or most famously) articulated concerned the recall and disgrace of Arthur, Lord Grey de Wilton.²¹

It is only when we take account of such concerns that we can recognize that the truly revolutionary proposition advanced in the *View* was that the descendants of the original English conquerors of Ireland were more formidable opponents of civility, and of the interest of the English crown in Ireland, than were the people of Gaelic Ireland who were considered by all parties to the discussion on the reform of Ireland to be no less barbaric than their ancestors whose mores had been described by Gerald of Wales. To this end, in several passages of the *View*, Irenius turned Stanyhurst's criticism of the Gaelic population of Ireland against Stanyhurst's own community of the Pale. Thus, for example, Irenius referred to the descendants of the original conquerors of Ireland as "the English that were," stating further that they had become "much more lawless and licentious than the very wild Irish."²² Irenius later made it clear that his charge of degeneration was being directed at residents of the Pale and even of the city of Dublin when he detailed a sequence of stratagems that were being deployed to defraud either the crown, or people of English birth, of property to which it, or they, were entitled. These stratagems included the perversion of jury trials when title to property was being tested, the assignment of property to feoffees of trust whenever Irish lords of English descent risked all in rebellion, and the securing of "the profits and revenues" of their lands by similar "colourable conveyances" by young men from the Pale intent upon enrolling in the Catholic seminaries of Continental Europe.²³ Spenser may actually have had Richard Stanyhurst in mind when he listed this last charge.

Spenser, as I have already mentioned, was hardly original when he engaged upon such disparagement of the Old English population, and the author who had pursued this theme with most telling effect, and in the context of disputing what Stanyhurst had to say about the reform of Ireland, was John Hooker, alias Vowell.²⁴ This would suggest that Hooker exerted a profound influence upon what Spenser had to say of the Old English, and this is all the more plausible because Hooker's *History of Ireland 1546–86* was readily available in print. Moreover, when Hooker's work appeared in the second edition of Holinshed's *Chronicle*, it featured side-by-side with Stanyhurst's *The Description of Ireland* and also with Stanyhurst's narration of the history of Ireland during the reign of Henry VIII. Such juxtaposition and the reordering by Hooker of the entire Irish section to Holinshed's *Chronicle*

was probably intended by Hooker to cast doubt upon the claims that Stanyhurst had made concerning his community of the Pale and the role that people from the Pale might play in the reform of Ireland.²⁵ Indeed, when we look more closely at the evidence cited by Hooker to sustain his arguments, and the incidents recalled by him to render them more memorable, it becomes apparent that Hooker was the source of several of the arguments and allusions that added notoriety to Spenser's *View* when they were replicated there.

When John Hooker first became concerned with Ireland in 1567 he was already an accomplished antiquarian with extensive experience on the European continent as well as at Cambridge and in his own native city of Exeter. His interest in Ireland was aroused by Sir Peter Carew, a fellow Devonian who, like Hooker, had also had experience of religious conflict in continental Europe, but who also believed that because his ancestors had been involved in the first English conquest of Ireland, he had a legitimate claim to whatever lands they had then taken into their possession but that had since been acquired by Irish and Old English occupiers. Carew was also satisfied that if he succeeded in reviving these dormant claims to family land in Ireland and in recovering them from those Irish residents who had trespassed upon them for centuries, this would further the scheme then being unfolded by Sir Henry Sidney, as governor of Ireland, to promote the reform of the country and to consolidate the crown's interest there. Hooker's responsibilities in this matter were to construct a pedigree for Carew that would legitimize the claims he was making to land in Ireland, and then to find documentary evidence to demonstrate where precisely these Irish estates were, and who was trespassing upon them. Most of the lands to which Hooker believed Carew might advance a plausible claim were in the province of Munster, but some lay also within the English Pale, and Carew moved immediately to take possession of the Barony of Idrone in County Carlow, which lay within the sphere of influence of the earl of Ormond.²⁶

The entire Old English community in Ireland stood amazed once it became clear that Carew's ambitions enjoyed Sidney's support, and even more so when Hooker, as well as Carew, was returned to the Irish parliament of 1569–71 as members from otherwise unrepresented constituencies. This entire project provoked both bitter opposition in parliament and armed resistance that erupted first in Munster and then also in the province of Leinster, where rebellion included three brothers of the earl of Ormond. This armed disturbance created a major problem for the government of Sir Henry Sidney and for the queen, who was ultimately responsible for the actions of her gov-

ernor. However, it provided Hooker with a prehensile opportunity to discredit the claim of the Old English that they, like their ancestors, were the unfailing upholders of the English interest in the country.

This rebellion, as was to be expected, featured prominently in Hooker's *History of Ireland 1546–86*, where Hooker also expounded on the disordered condition of Ireland, including the English Pale, at the time that Sidney had arrived as governor in 1566. Evidence of such disorder was possibly gleaned from manuscript texts by Edmund Tremayne, who had served in Ireland as secretary to Henry Sidney and who, like Hooker and Carew, had come from the English West Country.²⁷ Even though it fell outside his chronological brief, Hooker also debunked Stanyhurst's apologetic treatment of the 1530s rebellion of the Fitzgerald earls of Kildare by representing it as a premeditated withdrawal of allegiance by a supposed loyal lord to a legitimate monarch. Following this introduction of the Fitzgerald dynasty into his discourse, Hooker devoted the main body of his text to describing the "most unnatural" revolts of Gerald Fitzgerald, the sixteenth earl of Desmond, and his kindred "against her sacred Majesty."²⁸ Here Hooker gave prominence to the part played by himself and his patrons, who now included Walter Raleigh as well as Humphrey Gilbert and Peter Carew, in suppressing this revolt in the province of Munster.²⁹ In the course of doing so, Hooker details the slaughter by the crown forces of the invading Italian/Iberian mercenary force at Smerwick, the death of the English seminary priest Nicholas Sander, and the killing successively of Sir John of Desmond and his brother the earl of Desmond and the defilement of their corpses.³⁰

With this text, and with the other modifications he introduced to the Ireland volume in this second edition of Holinshed's *Chronicle*, Hooker had comprehensively discredited Stanyhurst's contention that Ireland's Old English population was, and always had been, loyal to the crown. He was able to do this most effectively with his chronicle of events for the years 1546–86, leading to the conclusion that "most part of all the actions in that age consisted most in continual wars, rebellions and hostility, either against their most sacred kings and queens or amongst themselves."³¹ And, as he detailed these actions, there was no mistaking that those who had consorted with "foreign princes" and with "traitorous Jesuits"—the instruments of Satan and of "that great city upon seven hills that mighty Babylon"—were all people of English ancestry.

In this narrative Hooker was anticipating what Spenser's interlocutors, and particularly Irenius, would have to say of the Old English in the *View*, but Hooker also anticipated what Spenser would have to say of the disas-

ter that had befallen the more vulnerable elements of the population in Munster as a consequence of the rash actions of Old English lords. Here he alluded not only to the loss in battle of “infinite numbers” of fighting men but to the deaths also of “common people” both by the sword and from “the extreme famine” with the result that, by the war’s end, there were in Munster “very few or none remaining alive, saving such as dwelled in cities and towns and such as were fled over into England.” Even those in towns, according to Hooker, lived “in distress,” but their condition was “nothing like in comparison to them who lived at large. For they were not only driven to eat horses, dogs and dead carrion, but also did devour the carcasses of dead men, whereof there be sundry examples,” some of which he cited in graphic detail. The outcome was that “the land itself which before these wars was populous, well inhabited and rich in all the good blessings of God being plenteous of corn, full of cattle, well stored with fish and sundry other good commodities is now become waste and barren, yielding no fruits, the pastures no cattle, the fields no corn, the air no birds, the seas (though full of fish) yet to them yielding nothing.”³²

Hooker did not have the same gift with words as did Spenser, but one cannot but be struck by how Ireneus and Eudoxus, in their discourse, employed several of the same words, images, phrases, and even a few of the sentences that Hooker had used to describe the devastation that had befallen the province of Munster in the aftermath of the conflict there. In the Spenser text, Ireneus, as always, took the lead in describing the condition of the province:

for notwithstanding that the same was a most rich and plentiful country, full of corn and cattle . . . yet ere one year and a half they were brought to such wretchedness, as that any stony heart would have rued the same. Out of every corner of the woods and glens they came creeping forth upon their hands, for their legs would not bear them. They looked anatomies of death, they spake like ghosts crying out of their graves, they did eat the dead carrion, happy where they could find them, yea and one another soon after in so much as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape out of their graves, and if they found a plot of water cress or shamrocks, there they flocked as to a feast for the time, yet not able long to continue long therewithal, that in short space there was none left and a most populous and plentiful country suddenly left void of man or beast. Yet sure in all that war there perished not many by the sword, but all by the extremity of famine.

Eudoxus, who was based in England and had not been witness to the calamity, could only "picture" the scene in his "mind," from what he had heard related by Irenius on how "Munster had been brought to this pass, and all filled with the rueful spectacles of so many wretched carcasses starving, goodly countries wasted, so huge a desolation and confusion."³³

The coincidence in wording between these accounts by Hooker and Spenser is such that Spenser might almost be accused of plagiarism. On the other hand, by choosing Hooker's words and images Spenser may have been suggesting to his contemporaries that it was Hooker (a man with experience in Ireland dating back to 1567) rather than Spenser himself who was being represented by Irenius in the dialogue with Eudoxus (whose name means "the one who teaches well"). While this theory is plausible, we must also take account of differences between how Hooker and Spenser explained the human tragedy they each described, because these differences may explain why Spenser considered it necessary to compose a dialogue of his own rather than refer potential readers to Hooker's narrative, which was already in print and readily accessible. Their fundamental difference concerned the explanations offered respectively by Hooker and Irenius for the famine that had befallen Munster. For Hooker, the spread of famine from Waterford westward to Smerwick was a manifestation of "the just judgement" inflicted by God upon a sinful people, whereas for Irenius it was the chilling consequence of an official policy of resource destruction designed to force those opposing the crown in arms to surrender by imposing famine on the civilian population whose agricultural labor had been sustaining those who remained in arms. Thus where for Irenius the famine was a tragedy "which they themselves had wrought" because of the unwillingness of the rebel leaders to surrender at the designated time to the forces of the crown,³⁴ Hooker cited its occurrence as an example of an angry providence exerting vengeance upon a population that had fallen from the path of righteousness. While the two authors wrote with the common purpose of discrediting the Old English, Spenser may have seen the need to prepare a more secular rendition of events as a preliminary to prescribing a strategy that would bring the senseless cycle of violence to an end.

While Spenser was secular to the extent that he suggested that the Irish in Munster (or their perverse leaders) had brought destruction upon themselves by refusing to submit when they had no longer the military capacity to resist, he was every bit as apocalyptic a writer as was Hooker (witness his poetry). However, he envisaged God's vengeance falling upon England's rulers and on all the peoples governed by Queen Elizabeth, rather than upon

the population of Ireland alone, if authorities in England failed to live up to their responsibility to reform Ireland and defend the reformed population settled there.

As Spenser argued his case, he would have known that Hooker had a communication advantage over him, because Hooker's narrative had been published in one of the most widely consulted English-language anthologies of the sixteenth century—an advantage that became even more pronounced because, as it transpired, Spenser's text was not to be published for a generation and then in a bowdlerized edition that he would hardly have acknowledged. It would seem therefore that Willy Maley and Hiram Morgan, who in recent years have been suggesting that the opinions articulated in Spenser's *View* actually shaped the arguments of other unpublished manuscript texts, or, as has been argued persuasively by Hiram Morgan, that Spenser was the author of one such manuscript, should take account of the similarities, including the verbal similarities, between Spenser's *View* and the Hooker text.³⁵ If they do so they will see that Hooker's publication, like some of the manuscript texts to which they wish to attach importance, fit more readily with Protestant eschatological writing on Ireland, in the tradition of John Bale and John Derricke, than did Spenser's *View*, which was conceived more broadly than texts that discussed happenings in Ireland in isolation.³⁶

National University of Ireland, Galway

NOTES

1. I have made reference to both such factors in previous publications (see Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580–1650* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001], 1–58), and I am pleased to learn that the wider question of English- and Irish-language “writerly connectivity” relating to Ireland during those decades is being investigated through MACMORRIS, a digital humanities project

currently under development directed by David Baker, Patricia Palmer, and Willy Maley.

2. See also the article by Gordon Braden ("The Classical Background of the *View*") in this volume that explores the influence of Tacitus on the *View*.

3. The authority that Hadfield cites for his opinion comes from chapters or sentences in Raymond Gillespie and Andrew Hadfield, eds., *The Oxford History of the Irish Book*, vol. 3, *The Irish Book in English, 1550–1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), esp. 18–19, 62–65, 91–105, 169–71. Some aristocrats, such as the earl of Kildare, had sizable holdings of books prior to this time.

4. Andrew Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 226–30.

5. Edwin Greenlaw et al., eds., *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition*, vol. 10, *The Prose Works*, ed. Rudolf Gottfried (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1949), 417, 429.

6. The edition I have used in preparing this article is Edmund Spenser, *A View of The Present State of Ireland*, ed. W. L. Renwick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970). The essential dividing point that I discern comes at p. 93, where Eudoxus interjects: "now that we have thus ended all the abuses and inconveniences of that government which was our first part, it followeth next that we pass unto the second part, which was of the means to cure and redress the same, which we must labour to reduce to the first beginning thereof." All citations to the *View* hereafter come from this edition.

7. On this mode of thinking, see Ciaran Brady, *The Chief Governors: The Rise and Fall of Reform Government in Tudor Ireland, 1536–1588* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); a typical prescriptive passage in the *View* features pp. 95–103 (with an especially long passage, 99–100) where Irenius describes how garrisons will be allocated throughout the country; in another (122–41) Irenius describes how the costs of the garrisoning of the country will be met in the medium term.

8. William Pelham, "A Probable Discourse How Upon the Extinguishing of this Rebellion the Province of Munster may be kept from any Revolt hereafter . . .," in *Reform Treatises on Tudor Ireland, 1537–1599*, ed. David Heffernan (Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, 2016), 182–204; several examples of more general military texts may be consulted in David Edwards, ed., *Campaign Journals of the Elizabethan Irish Wars* (Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, 2014); for lists of the military establishment in Ireland with details on where each garrison was stationed, see any of the Treasurers' Accounts for the sixteenth century filed under TNA, S.P. 65.

9. "An Act that the King of England, his heirs and successors, be Kings of Ireland," in *Statutes at Large . . . 1310–1786* (Dublin, 1786), 1:176–77; the persistent importance of Gerald of Wales has been detailed in Richard McCabe, *Spenser's*

Monstrous Regiment: Elizabethan Ireland and the Poetics of Difference (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 58–59.

10. On Stanyhurst, see Willy Maley, *Salvaging Spenser: Colonialism, Culture and Identity* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1997), 34–39; and Colm Lennon, *Richard Stanihurst: The Dubliner, 1547–1618* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1981); John Barry and Hiram Morgan, eds., *Great Deeds of Ireland: Richard Stanihurst's "De Rebus in Hibernia Gestis"* (Cork: Cork University Press, 2013); this last has a seventy-two-page introduction with much to say on the career of Stanyhurst.

11. Stanyhurst, *The Description of Ireland*, first appeared in Raphael Holinshed, *The Historie of Ireland from the first inhabitation thereof, unto the year 1509 collected by Raphaell Holinshed and continued till the year 1547 by Richard Stanyhurst* (London, 1577), sig. A1r–D4v. The 1587 edition of Holinshed's Irish text was entitled *The Second Volume of Chronicles containing the Description, Conquest, Inhabitation and Troublesome Estate of Ireland* (London, 1586/87). There Stanyhurst's *Description* looked different from what had been printed in the 1577 edition of Holinshed only because the introductory remarks within the original text had been extracted from the main body of the text (presumably by John Hooker) to become an "Epistle Dedicatory" addressed to Sir Henry Sidney.

12. On Hooker, alias Vowell, see the entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Apart from occasional editorial comment by Hooker on how Holinshed had organized the contents of the 1577 edition, Hooker augmented the original text in 1587 by listing (*The Second Volume of Chronicles*, 98–99) all the governors of Ireland from Strongbow to Sir John Perrott, and he added his own translation into English of the *Expugnatio Hibernica* by Giraldus Cambrensis (Gerald of Wales), which he substituted for Holinshed's twenty-page summary of the *Historia et Topographia* of Ireland, also by Gerald of Wales, that had appeared in the 1577 text. Hooker then proceeded with his history of Ireland from the death of King Henry VIII to 1587, which he introduced (101–10) with a dedication addressed to Sir Walter Raleigh.

13. Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser*, 211–12.

14. Spenser, *View*, 55–56.

15. Willy Maley, *Nation, State and Empire in English Renaissance Literature: Shakespeare to Milton* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 45–61, esp. 59–61, where Maley shows convincingly that Stanyhurst was aware that Harpsfield rather than Cope was the author of the offensive text.

16. Stanyhurst, *Description of Ireland*, in *The Second Volume of Chronicles*, 10–11; Stanyhurst (10) described Critobulus as "the pleasant conceited gentleman of the interlude" which, if my speculation is correct, would mean that Spenser considered this a fit description for Eudoxus.

17. *Ibid.*, 10.

18. In *ibid.*, 3–4, the author claimed that the English Pale had become "mere English." While acknowledging that the English language spoken outside the city

of Dublin had become corrupted by Irish language idiom to the point where it had become a "gallimaufrie of both the languages," Stanyhurst still asserted that, in places as far removed from Dublin as Wexford, "the dregs of the old ancient Chaucer English" had remained in use.

19. Edmund Tremayne to Cecil, April 12, 1570 (TNA, SP63/30/42), same to same July 23, 1570 (TNA, SP63/30/71), same to same February 20, 1571 (TNA, SP63/31/15); Andrew Trollope to Walsingham, September 12, 1585 (TNA, SP63/85/39); two of the Tremayne texts have now been edited in Heffernan, *Reform Treatises*, 72–83, 96–103.

20. The critics of government were described by Irenius as "the Irish party" in Spenser, *View*, 23.

21. On precedents, see Brady, *The Chief Governors*, esp. 209–44; more specifically on Lord Grey, see Spenser, *View*, 106.

22. Spenser, *View*, 63; see also 48.

23. *Ibid.*, 22, 27, 163.

24. The influence of Hooker's contribution to Holinshed on Spenser's thinking has been commented upon by several previous scholars, as, for example, McCabe, *Spenser's Monstrous Regiment*, 24, 240–41, but none more so than Christopher Highley, *Shakespeare, Spenser, and the Crisis in Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 10–11, 74. Thomas Herron, *Spenser's Irish Work: Poetry, Plantation and Colonial Reformation* (Aldershot: Routledge, 2007), 127–28, 194–98, assesses the influence of Hooker on the *poetry* of Spenser.

25. On the ordering of material in the second edition of Holinshed, see notes 10 and 11 above; see also Stephen Booth, *The Book Called Holinshed's Chronicles* (Los Angeles: Book Club of California, 1968), esp. 63–68.

26. Spenser himself in the 1580s had many properties in, on, or around the Pale, including lands that were formerly part of the Abbey of Graney ten miles northeast of Carlow (Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser*, 182–83).

27. *Second Volume of Chronicles*, 328; Edmund Tremayne, as cited in note 18 above; Tremayne, at this time, held an influential, if relatively inconspicuous, post as clerk to the English Privy Council.

28. *Ibid.*, 103.

29. *Ibid.*, 366–67, 419.

30. *Ibid.*, 104, 446, 454.

31. *Ibid.*, 458.

32. *Ibid.*, 459–60; Rudolf Gottfried in Greenlaw et al., eds., *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition*, vol. 10, *The Prose Works*, 381–82, refers to Hooker's description of the famine in Munster as also those offered by Trollope, Sir Warham St. Leger, Captain Edward Stanley, and the Annals of the Four Masters. While complimenting Hooker for offering "the most complete and outside the *View* the most vivid description" of the famine, Gottfried does not dwell on how Spenser was probably influenced by Hooker's interpretation.

33. Spenser, *View*, 104–5.

34. *Ibid.*, 104.

35. Willy Maley, ed., “The Supplication of the Blood of the English . . . Cryeng out of the Yearth for Revenge,” *Analecta Hibernica* 36 (1995): 3–77; Hiram Morgan, “Tempt not God too long, O Queen’: Elizabeth and the Irish Crisis of the 1590s,” in *Elizabeth I and Ireland*, ed. Brendan Kane and Valerie McGowan-Doyle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 209–38.

36. John Bale, *The Vocacyon of Johan Bale* (London, 1553); John Derricke, *The Image of Ireland* (1581), ed. D. B. Quinn (Belfast, 1985). Andrew Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser’s Irish Experience: Wilde Fruit and Salvage Soyl* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 94, also makes the telling point that Hooker linked his exposition on Ireland to John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*.